

**File No. P-17024/21/2020-RC (372039)**  
**Government of India**  
**Ministry of Rural Development**  
**Department of Rural Development**

KrishiBhavan, New Delhi  
Dated the 18<sup>th</sup> March, 2021.

**Minutes**

**Sub:- Minutes of Meeting of Pre-Empowered Committee to discuss the project proposals for PMGSY-III submitted by the State Government of Punjab for the 2020-21 (Batch-II) -reg.**

A copy of the Minutes of the Meeting of the Pre- Empowered Committee held on 16<sup>th</sup> March, 2021 through VC to consider the project proposals for Batch-II of 2020-21 under Pradhan Mantri Gram Sadak Yojana-III (PMGSY-III) is forwarded herewith for information and necessary action.



(Lalit Kumar)

Deputy Secretary to the Government of India

Tele. No. 011- 23382406

Email:- [lalit.kr@nic.in](mailto:lalit.kr@nic.in)

**Distribution:**

1. The Principal Secretary, Public Works (Roads & Building) Department, Government of Punjab, Mini Secretariat, Sec-9, Chandigarh-143001, Punjab.
2. The Chief Engineer-cum-Empowered Officer, Punjab Roads and Building Development Board, PWD, S.C.S. 61-62, Sector-54, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor, Phase-II, Mohali (Chandigarh) Punjab.

Copy for information to:-

Sr. PPS to Secretary (RD)/PSO to AS&FA(RD)/PPS to AS (RD)/PPS to JS(RC)/All Directors, NRIDA, New Delhi.

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PRE-EMPOWERED COMMITTEE HELD ON 16<sup>th</sup> March, 2021 AT 11.00 AM TO CONSIDER THE PROJECT PROPOSALS SUBMITTED BY GOVERNMENT OF PUNJAB UNDER PMGSY III (BATCH II), 2020-21**

A Meeting of the Pre-Empowered Committee was held through Video Conference on **16<sup>th</sup> March, 2021 at 11.00 AM** under the Chairmanship of Joint Secretary, Department of Rural Development & DG, NRIDA to consider the project proposals submitted by the State of Punjab under PMGSY III (Batch II) of 2020-21. Following officials were present in the meeting.

Dr Ashish Kumar Goel	Joint Secretary (RC) & DG, NRIDA
Shri. B C Pradhan	Consultant/Director (Tech), NRIDA
Shri Deepak Ashish Kaul	Director (F&A), NRIDA
Shri I.K.Pateriya	Director (P.II &P.III), NRIDA
Shri Pradeep Agrawal	Director (P.I), NRIDA
Shri Lalit Kumar	Deputy Secretary (RC), MoRD
<b>State Govt. Representatives</b>	
Shri Vikas Pratap	Principal Secretary, Public Works (B&R) Department, Govt. of Punjab
Shri N.P.Singh	Chief Engineer, SRRDA, Punjab
Shri B.S. Dhanoa	Chief Engineer, Punjab Mandi Board
Shri Sher Mohammad	General Manager (PMGSY)-cum-SQC, SRRDA
Shri Kamaldeep Singh	Superintending Engineer, Punjab Mandi Board
Shri Deepak Goyal	Executive Engineer (PMGSY), Punjab PWD (B&R)
Shri Kamaljit Singh	Deputy Director (IT), SRRDA, Punjab
Shri Deep Chand	Controller Finance, SRRDA, Punjab
Shri Santokh Singh	ITNO, SRRDA, Punjab

**2. Current Proposal by the State:**

A detailed presentation on the proposal submitted by the State of Punjab under Batch-II of 2020-21 was made by NRIDA before the Pre-Empowered Committee. The details of the proposal are as under:-

State Proposal dated	Current proposal as per OMMAS as on 13.3.2021			
	No of Roads/ LSBs	Length	Cost (Rs in Crores)	Avg. Cost
Up-gradation	96	943.94 km	728.56	77.18 Lakh/km
<b>Total</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>943.94 km</b>	<b>728.56*</b>	<b>77.18 Lakh/km</b>
<b>* MoRD Share: 437.14 crore</b>			<b>State Share: 291.42 crore</b>	

(i) The State of Punjab has been allocated target length of 3,362.50 Km under PMGSY-III, out of which State was sanctioned 1,045.51 km under Batch-I, 2020-21. The current proposal is for 96 roads of 943.94 Km at an estimated cost of Rs. 728.56 crore (Central Share- Rs. 437.14 crore and State share- Rs. 291.42 crore).

(ii) Out of 96 road works proposed in the current batch, only 36 roads have been scrutinized by STAs on OMMAS. PTA has not yet scrutinised any proposals on OMMAS. Scrutiny of remaining proposals by STA is reportedly in progress. State representative intimated that the scrutiny of the roads by the STA would be completed



by 20th March, 2021 and thereafter, scrutiny of 10% of the proposals by the PTA would be taken up on priority.

(iii) The state has proposed 10 roads of 3.75 m carriageway width (84.61 km) at an average cost of Rs 55.21 lakh/km, 83 roads of 5.50 m carriageway width (834.62 Km) at an average cost of Rs 79.24 lakh/km and 3 roads of 7.00 m carriageway width ( 24.71 Km) at an average cost of Rs. 82.39 lakh/km.

(iv) The Committee observed that the average cost is on higher side in Kapurthala, Firozpur, Nawasahar and Pathankot districts. The Committee also observed that non-pavement cost is high in Bathinda district. The State representative intimated that the State Government shall get these proposals examined once again and submit the justification/revision.

(v) During discussion, the State representative raised the issue of non-acceptance of candidate roads of less than 5 Km by the OMMAS and requested for relaxation. The State was asked to submit proposal with detailed justification as to how such roads where the length of candidate road is less than 5 km and length proposed for construction is even lesser, are eligible to be taken up under PMGSY-III. A final view on such proposals would be taken by the Empowered Committee.

(vi) During the presentation of the proposal, the State representative while requesting for clearance of bridge proposals of Batch-I, which is presently under examination in NRIDA, also intimated that there are 22 LSBs proposals in the current batch, for which the preparation of DPRs is underway. The state was asked to clearly mention about bridge proposals in each batch, including the current batch, indicating that the proposal would be submitted after preparation of the DPRs.

### 3. Length wise proposal details

Out of 96 roads proposed in the current batch, 1 road is of less than 3 Km, 5 roads are 3 to 5 km length, while 90 roads are more than 5 km length as per the following details:-

Sl No	Items	No of roads	Length in km	Pavement cost in Crores	Average Pav cost (Lakh / km)	Total cost in Crores	Average cost (Lakh / km)
1	Less than 3 km	1	2.74	1.25	45.62	1.99	72.83
2	3 to 5 km	5	21.82	14.14	64.79	16.69	76.26
3	5 km and above	90	919.38	571.21	62.13	709.88	77.17
	<b>Total</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>943.94</b>	<b>586.60</b>	<b>62.14</b>	<b>728.56</b>	<b>77.18</b>

As per programme guidelines of PMGSY-III, the candidate roads should preferably be of length not less than 5 km. The State has 6 roads of less than 5 Km in the current batch. The Government State should submit justification as to how they are MRL/TR and eligible under PMGSY-III. Proposals of road length less than 5 Km should only be in exceptional cases.

The average candidate road length is 10.87 Km and average proposed road length is 9.83 Km.

#### 4. Existing surface details

Brick soling	Track	Gravel	WBM	BT	CC	Total
0	161.96	0	0	777.79	4.19	943.94

The existing surface of around 161.96 Km is Track. The State and NRIDA should examine the eligibility of these roads under PMGSY-III considering their CUCPL ranks, Trace Map cut, PCU (traffic survey) value. The Committee was intimated that the State Government has not yet uploaded proposals on GEOSADAK. The State representative intimated that the same would be completed by 22nd March, 2021. The State representative also assured that the State would submit road-wise justification for taking up 161.96 Km Track roads.

#### 5. Traffic wise details of road

In 3.75 m carriageway width, 5 roads of 30.53 km are in T6 & T7 category, 4 roads of 46.48 km are in T8 and 1 road of 7.60 Km in T9 Category. In 5.5 m carriageway width, 1 roads of 8.05 km are in T6 & T7 category, 15 roads of 135.33 km are in T8, 56 roads of 582.21 Km are in T9 category and 11 roads of 109.04 Km in IRC 37 category. In 7 m carriageway width 3 roads of 24.71 km are in T9 category.

#### 6. Planning

##### (i) Trace Map Cut-Quality of roads

Min. Trace Map Rank	Numbers of Proposals	%
1 to 15	65	65%
16 to 50	27	27%
51 to 100	6	6%
> 100	1	1%
<b>Total</b>	99	

All proposals greater than Trace Map rank 50 are yet to be checked on Satellite Imagery, which shall be done after uploading of proposals by the State on GEOSADAK. The State representative intimated that 7 roads of Trace Map rank more than 50 are possibly block boundary roads and assured that these proposals shall be examined once again and if not found in order, will be excluded from the current batch proposals.

##### (ii) Planning Audit (Satellite Based)

- No proposal has been uploaded on GEOSADAK. State assured uploading of proposals by 22nd March, 2021.
- Sample of 27 proposals having Trace Map rank more than 50 and earthen portion more than 50% have been identified by NRIDA for auditing for their utility as TR/MRL under PMGSY-III. State Government should complete uploading of all proposals on GEOSADAK so that the process auditing could be undertaken in respect of these 27 roads.

##### (iii) Pucca Drain Lengths being proposed in Excess of Habitation Area

- The committee observed that 190 Km pucca drain is being proposed in the current batch of proposals. Further, 12 Km CC road is being proposed again over existing CC. The State representative intimated that the State Government



would look into these aspects once again and revise the proposal, wherever required.

(iv) **Proposal Checks [Data Related]- Non-eligible length being proposed**

District Name	Block name	PACKAGE ID	TOTAL LENGTH	Eligible CUCPL Length	Excess Length Proposed
Ludhiana	Sudhar	PB10129	5.1	3.85	1.25
Ludhiana	Sidhwan Bet	PB10127	15.3	10.8	4.5
Amritsar	Majitha	PB01140	21.75	12.75	9
Tarn Taran	Bhikhiwind	PB22008	8.26	5.49	2.77

Length above eligible length more than 20% cannot be proposed. State should either drop this length or move completely to State Share. State representative intimated that these proposals would be examined once again and necessary corrections would be done in the DPRs wherever required.

**7. Exclusion of High priority roads**

227 high priority roads have been skipped citing lands issues, but specific details have not been provided. These proposals need to be rechecked and proper justification road-wise for exclusion of the proposals needs to be furnished by the State. The State should ensure that there is no instance where a more deserving road is skipped. Further, in case of 12 roads, which are high in priority list, it appears that State is not interested in riding surface improvement of these roads. State Government should furnish justification for the same as well.

**8. DPR observations**

i. State should provide a copy of SLSC approval, MP-I, MP-II and MP-III formats and consent letters of Hon'ble MPs on final proposal.

ii. While designing crust thickness, the credit of existing pavement is taken as 150/200 mm GSB, which is on the lower side. The SRRDA should check the provision in all the DPRS based on the existing pavement component (thickness of different layers).

iii. As per PMGSY-III guidelines, road safety audit should be done on all the roads as the candidate road length is more than 5 km.

iv. For traffic more than 1 MSA, third party traffic survey and axle load survey needs to be attached in the DPR.

v. As per IRC:SP:20 below 1.0 m dia. pipe culverts should be avoided. State has provided 450 mm & 600 mm dia pipe culverts. State may simply provide buried pipe conduit at these locations.

vi. Provision of retaining walls made in the DPRs seems to be on higher side. SRRDA should check the provision as per the ground requirements and provide photographs.

vii. Size of RCC side drains provisioned is on higher side. The same should be rationalized and checked by SRRDA. Also the length of side drains to be restricted to built up area only.

viii. Higher number of CD works have been proposed. State needs to explore the possibility of maintaining existing good CDs with minor repairs instead of reconstruction, wherever possible.

ix. 03 roads of 7 m carriage way has been proposed having total length of 24.71 km, but the additional cost has not been taken in higher specification cost which is to be borne by the state under higher specifications.

x. Proper credit should be given to existing CC roads depending on their design life and load bearing capacity. Road-wise justification/information should be provided.

## 9. Maintenance

The State has proposed Rs. 47.92 crore (6.60 % of the construction cost) for 5 years routine maintenance cost and Rs. 148.54 crore (20.39 % of the construction cost) for 6<sup>th</sup> years routine maintenance cost, which are acceptable. 5 years routine maintenance cost after 6<sup>th</sup> year's renewal needs to be included in the proposal.

## 10. R & D Proposals

State has proposed 24 roads of 241.68 km using waste plastic technology. State should propose adequate length under the category main streaming technology with minimum 10% need to be proposed other than the length proposed adopting waste plastic such as cement stabilized sub-base / base course, Roller Compacted Concrete Pavement (RCCP), Cell filled concrete, White topping, Cold Mix Technology and surface dressing on low volume roads, etc.

The proportion of roads proposed under R&D Technology is as under:-

Sl No	Description	Minimum length to be proposed in km	Length proposed in km	Percentage of R& D roads with respect to total length
1	Technology with IRC Specification (Main streaming of Technology) – 10% a. Waste Plastic	94.00	241.68	25.53%
2.	Technology with IRC Accreditation / other technology- 5%	47.00	<b>State has not taken any IRC accredited technology</b>	

## 11. Progress of PMGSY works

The status of implementation of PMGSY-I, II and III in the State are as under:-

### Roads

S.No	SCHEME	SANCTIONED		COMPLETED		BALANCE		UNAWARDED	
		Nos.	LENGTH (Km)	Nos.	LENGTH (Km)	No. of Roads	Length (km)	No. of Roads	Length (km)
1	PMGSY I	1,050	6,937.21	1,050	6,912.43	-	-	-	-
2	PMGSY II	123	1,342.82	123	1,330.79	-	-	-	-
3	PMGSY III	98	1,045.50	0	0.00	98	1045.50	98	1045.50
	<b>Total:</b>	<b>1,271</b>	<b>9,325.54</b>	<b>1,173</b>	<b>8,243.23</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>1045.50</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>1045.50</b>



**Bridge (No.)**

S.No	SCHEME	SANCTION (Nos.)	COMPLETED (Nos.)	Balance (Nos.)	Unaward (Nos.)
1	PMGSY I	-	-	-	-
2	PMGSY II	7	7	-	-
3	PMGSY III	16	-	16	16
	<b>Total:</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>16</b>

PMGSY-I and PMGSY-II works have completed in the State. Out of 98 road works sanctioned to the State under PMGSY-III, financial evaluation has been completed in respect of 97 roads and 1 road is under re-tendering. The State representative intimated that the work will be awarded after a decision on MoU to be signed with Gol is taken by the State, which is in final leg of approval.

**12. eMARG: Onboarding**

95% packages have been locked, 86% contractors have been registered and on 8% packages payment has started, Rs. 3.58 crore payment has been done through eMARG. The State should take action for saturation on e-Marg. RI and PE are pending for more than 100 roads. The same may be done on priority.

**13. Maintenance Abstract**

Maintenance Abstract			
Year (s)	Maintenance Liability during Year (Rs. Cr.)	Fund Received (Rs. Cr.)	Expenditure (DLP) (Rs. Cr.)
2016-17	11.98	0.00	0.00
2017-18	13.43	0.00	0.00
2018-19	15.15	49.54	55.13
2019-20	14.80	8.00	8.32
2020-21 (13.03.2021)	14.98	32.06	4.73
<b>Total:</b>	<b>70.34</b>	<b>89.6</b>	<b>68.18</b>

Funds received status seems to be not updated, state may verify and update. Funds received against DLP only should be entered in OMMAS.

The attention of State was invited towards the provisions of the programme guidelines, which stipulate that the release of 2<sup>nd</sup> installment of programme fund in a year shall be subject to submission of, among others, a certificate from CEO of SRRDA that maintenance funds required as per maintenance contracts in force had been spent during the previous financial year. For release after May of a year, the certificate should also include that 50% of such maintenance funds requirements for the current financial year have been released by the State, whereas for release after November the certificate should be for 100% of such funds. The State's attention was also invited towards Ministry's advisory dated 12<sup>th</sup> January, 2021 on the subject and the State was advised to take immediate corrective action.

**14. Renewal Length status (km)**

A total of 6,528.11 km road length is due for renewal in the State, against which only 470.46 km has been renewed as per OMMAS. The State need to confirm the data and update on OMMAS.

## 15. Quality Issues (2<sup>nd</sup> tier)

i. SQM-04 SQMs are in position, against the requirement of 34 SQMs. Process for empanelment of SQMs is under process. About 15 SQMs are likely to be empanelled shortly.

ii. **Unsatisfactory % based on NQM inspections (April' 2018-February'2021) -**

- o Completed Works - 0.00 % - 12 Completed works inspected
- o Ongoing Works -0.00% - 50 Ongoing works inspected
- o Maintenance works - 1.49% - 67 Maintenance Works Inspected

iii. **Anomalies of SQM Inspections during 2020-21-**

- o Conditions of shoulders in some of the maintenance roads are not maintained properly, but given 'Satisfactory' by SQMs. (Package No:- PB01118, PB15063, PB15065, PB0420, PB14018)
- o Condition of Culverts cannot be justified from the pictures uploaded in OMMAS, as pictures of culverts or CDs does not show the quality of material and workmanship such as positioning, size and shape of pipes & cushion over pipes, and is not showing the clear passage paths whether it is cleared or clogged. Casual inspection done by the SQMs in this particular context. (Package No:- PB01140, PB14018, PB1329, PB0167, PB13060, PB0735, PB744, PB654, PB0421, PB14018).
- o Main information board are against the guidelines of PMGSY which are given "Satisfactory" by the SQMs.(Package No:- PB0590- Firozpur, PB0558-Fazilka) .

The Quality of SQM inspection needs improvement. The State was advise to organize the training/orientation programme for the SQMS.

## 16. Finance Issues:

- i. Out of pending state share of Rs. 279.21 crore, funds amounting to Rs. 2.85 crore only has been released. State should take immediate action for release of balance State share.
- ii. Non submission of PMGSY financial reconciliation report.
- iii. Non submission of Bank Interest verification reports from F.Y 2010-11 to 2018-19.
- iv. Negative Balance under Deposit Repayable Head (Head No. 3.03 " Sums due to Contractors on closed accounts"), amount of Rs. (-) 1.02

The State should take immediate action for early credit of pending state share and in any case before the meeting of the Empowered Committee. The State should also expedite action on remaining issues indicated above.

17. Pre- Empowered Committee suggested the state to send the compliance on all the observations mentioned in the foregoing paras so that EC meeting for sanctioning of the proposal could be conducted at an early date.

The meeting ended with vote of thanks to and from the Chair.

\*\*\*