

**COMMITTEE
ON
GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES
(1998-99)**

TWELFTH LOK SABHA

FOURTH REPORT

CLEANSING OF RIVER CHALIYAR

(Presented to Lok Sabha on 11.3.99)



58A
LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT,
NEW DELHI

Price : Rs. 8.00

CORRIGENDA
TO
THE FOURTH REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON
GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES
(TWELFTH LOK SABHA)

Page No.	Para No.	Line	For	Read
4	-	4	may	many
5	2.7	13	<u>Add</u> after periodically	
9	1	19	t	to
10	3.2	2	implement	implemented

CONTENTS

	PAGE No.
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE (1998-99)	(iii)
INTRODUCTION	(v)
REPORT	1
CHAPTER I — Introduction	1
CHAPTER II — Pollution in Chaliyar — The Background and Facts	3
CHAPTER III — Observations/Recommendations	9

APPENDIX

Minutes of Eighth Sitting of the Committee held on March 5, 1999.	12
--	----

ANNEXURE

Statement to reply to USQ No. 599 dated November 26, 1996.	13
---	----

COMPOSITION OF MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT
ASSURANCES (1998-99)*

Shri E. Ahamed — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

2. Shri Amrik Singh Aliwal
3. Shri Mohd. Ali Ashraf Fatmi
4. Shri Vijay Goel
5. Shri Tarun Gogoi
6. Shri Ganga Ram Koli
7. Shri Sanat Kumar Mandal
8. Shri Rupchand Pal
9. Shri Hari Kewal Prasad
10. Shri A. Venkatarami Reddy
11. Shri Dileep Sanghani
12. Shri A. Siddaraju
13. Shri Sartaj Singh
- ** 14. Dr. C. Suguna Kumari
- *** 15. Shri Uttamrao Deorao Patil

SECRETARIAT

1. Dr. A. K. Pandey — *Additional Secretary*
2. Shri P.D.T. Achary — *Joint Secretary*
3. Shri K. Chakraborty — *Deputy Secretary*
4. Km. J.C. Namchyo — *Assistant Director*

* The Committee was nominated by the Speaker w.e.f. August 6, 1998 vide para No. 553 of Lok Sabha Bulletin Part—II dated August 6, 1998.

** Nominated to the Committee on August 20, 1998 as published vide para No. 585 of Lok Sabha Bulletin Part—II dated August 20, 1998 vice Shri Arjun Charan Sethi resigned.

*** Nominated to the Committee on December 3, 1998 as published vide para No. 768 of Lok Sabha Bulletin Part—II dated December 3, 1998 vice Shri Prithviraj D. Chavan resigned.

INTRODUCTION

I, Chairman of the Committee on Government Assurances having been authorised by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present this Fourth Report of the Committee on Government Assurances.

The Committee (1998-99) was constituted on August 6, 1998.

At their sitting held on March 5, 1999, the Committee considered and adopted the Fourth Report.

The Conclusions/observations of the Committee are contained in this Report.

NEW DELHI;
March 5, 1999

Phalgun 14, 1920 (Saka)

E. AHAMED,
Chairman,
Committee on Government
Assurances.

REPORT

CHAPTER I

Introduction

1.1 On 26 November, 1996, Unstarred Question No. 599 addressed to the Minister of Environment & Forests was raised by Shri E. Ahamed, M.P. The question was as follows:

- (a) whether the Government have taken up the rivers for cleansing under the Central Government Scheme and the progress made thereunder;
- (b) if so, the details of rivers taken up;
- (c) whether representation has been received to include river chaliyar in Kerala under this scheme; and
- (d) if so, the reaction of the Government thereto?

1.2 The then Minister of State in the Ministry of Environment and Forests (Capt. Jainarain Prasad Nishad) answered the question as follows:—

- (a&b) The Government had approved in July 1995, a National River Conservation Plan to take up pollution abatement schemes in 46 towns located on the polluted stretches of 18 rivers in 10 States of the country at an estimated cost of Rs. 772 crore. The details of various components of the National River Conservation Plan, state-wise, town-wise and river-wise are given in Annexure.
- (c&d) A representation had been received from the Hon'ble Member of Parliament, Shri E. Ahamed for inclusion of river Chaliyar in Kerala under this scheme. The Hon'ble Member of Parliament has been requested to take up the matter with the Government of Kerala. A copy of the letter addressed to the Hon'ble Member of Parliament has been forwarded to the Government of Kerala."

1.3 The Committee had decided to take up this matter as an assurance and authorised Shri E. Ahamed, Chairman of the Committee to hold discussions with the concerned authorities.

1.3-A As is clear from the answer, the Central Government approved a National River Conservation Plan in 1995 at an estimated cost of Rs. 772 crores to be implemented in respect of 18 major rivers in the country. But the rivers in Kerala did not figure in the Annexure to the answer which contains the details of rivers and the States where this plan would be implemented. Shri E. Ahamed was asked to take up the matter of including the Chaliyar river in Kerala in the proposed plan with the Government of Kerala. It is interesting to note in this context that in 1995 it was also decided by the Central Government to identify the Status of pollution in the medium

and minor rivers of the coastal States and accordingly on 27 June, 1995, the Kerala State Pollution Control Board conveyed a list of ten rivers of the States for inclusion in the second phase of the National River Conservation Plan. Chaliyar was one of the rivers included in this list. But, it is rather strange that the above reply which was given to Parliament on 25th November, 1996 did not contain this information. As per the request from the Minister of Environment and Forests Shri E. Ahamed took up with the Government of Kerala the question of pollution in and cleaning of the Chaliyar river. A meeting of the Committee on Government Assurances of Lok Sabha of which Shri E. Ahamed was the Chairman, with the Chief Secretary and other senior officials of the Government of Kerala as well as State Pollution Control Board was held in the Durbar Hall at Trivandrum on 10.1.1997. In this meeting, the Chief Secretary, Government of Kerala gave an assurance to the Committee that the State Government would send a proposal to the Ministry of Environment and Forests for the cleaning of Chaliyar river. As a follow up, Shri E. Ahamed, Chairman, CGA having been authorised by the Committee, paid a visit to Trivandrum on 1.8.1997 and held further discussions with the officials of the State Government. He was informed by the Chief Secretary that a project entitled "action plan for cleansing of River Chaliyar" was sent to the Ministry of Environment and Forests on 7.5.1997 with an estimated cost of Rs. 302.64 lakhs. This report was prepared by the Centre for Water Resources Development and Management. The National River Conservation Directorate in a letter on 14.8.1997 asked the State Government to prepare a feasibility report on the clean-up of Chaliyar river. The CWRDM sent to the Directorate the details of available data on Chaliyar river, but the feasibility report could not be sent as according to them no data was received from the State Pollution Control Board so far.

1.4 On 1.2.1999 Shri E. Ahamed, Chairman, CGA of 12th Lok Sabha again visited Trivandrum and held discussions with Chief Secretary and other officials on this matter. Thus, although a number of discussions have taken place, the matter has not made any progress. This whole issue of cleaning the polluted Chaliyar river rests at this stage now.

CHAPTER II

Pollution in Chaliyar—the background and facts

2.1 The Chaliyar river is one of the major rivers of Kerala which has the third largest annual water discharge and the fourth largest catchment area. It flows through densely populated areas and provides water for drinking, industry and irrigation. This river has a total length of 169 kms and has, in its estuarine portion, the rarer riverine port in the southern zone.

2.2 Chaliyar had been a major source of clean drinking water. 30 million litres of its water is used daily for drinking purpose. For purpose of irrigation 107 million litres of Chaliyar water is used daily. The total quantity of water used for various purposes is 213 million litres every day. The entire water supply of the Calicut Corporation depends on this river.

2.3 Pollution in this river has become a serious health hazard to the people of Calicut district and has sparked off public agitations many times in the past. There are alarming reports about fatal diseases like cancer, heart ailments, serious skin disorders, respiratory ailments etc. being caused by pollution in this river. Continuous public agitations against pollution in Chaliya have compelled the authorities to appoint experts committees to study this problem. A number of reports are available which highlight the serious nature of the problem. But so far no durable solution has been found and the people of this district and the adjoining districts of north Kerala continue to suffer from the illeffects of Pollution.

Role of M/s Grasim Industries in the Pollution of Chaliyar.

2.4 Pollution of Chaliyar is caused mainly by the effluents discharged by Grasim Industries (Mavoor Gwalior Rayons) located at Mavoor. This factory, established in 1963, produces chiefly rayon grade pulp and viscose staple fibre. As per the records made available to the Committee, it produces 4800 tonnes of pulp, 270 tonnes of paper, 2130 tonnes of viscose staple fibre, 1355 tonnes of sodium sulphate, 2100 tonnes of sulphuric acid and 373 tonnes of carbon di-sulphide per month. Located at 25 km upstream from the river mouth, this factory wholly depends on Chaliyar for its requirement of water as well as the discharge of effluent. The factory requires 41000 M3 of water for its pulp division and 100650 M3 water for its staple fibre division daily. The total effluent generated daily from both these divisions is 40000 M3 which is released into the Chaliyar at two places, namely Elamaram and Chungappally. These effluents pollute the river as they are not treated as per the norms laid down by the statutory bodies in this regard. The company has been widely accused of being callous towards enforcing the strict anti-pollution norms.

Committee and their Reports

2.5 A number of Committees have gone into the question of Pollution of Chaliyar caused by the Rayon Factory at Mavoor and suggested remedies. In 1982 the Estimates

Committee of the Kerala Assembly undertook a study of the problem of Pollution of this river and in its report severely criticised the approach adopted by the company in dealing with pollution. The Petition Committee of Rajya Sabha had visited the factory and given a report recommending may short-term and long term measures. It is said that not a single recommendation of that Committee has been implemented by this Company. In 1995 a team from the Engineers India Limited visited Mavoor and after studying the problem made recommendations about the level of treatment of effluents. In the same year an expert team under the State Pollution Control Board was appointed by the State Government to study the problem in depth and recommend steps to remedy the situation. This Committee made 19 recommendations in its report submitted in 1996 and suggested that the Company implement them within a period of two months. A note received from the Kerala State Pollution Control Board lists out of the recommendations:—

1. The company shall operate the existing facilities continuously and effectively. The existing treatment plant needs augmentation. The company shall submit the proposals for the same within 2 months.
2. The company shall prepare reports showing pollutants removal efficiency of each treatment unit and the total system once in every 3 months and submit the same to Kerala State Pollution Control Board.
3. The settled solids and sludge shall be removed continuously in periodically at short intervals from the lagoons and tank so that the maximum designed volume will be available for reaction and treatment.
4. The company shall adopt waste minimisation techniques and shall recycle effluents as far as possible and reduce water consumption. Proposals for these shall be prepared and submitted to the Kerala State Pollution Control Board within 2 months.
5. Storm water from the premises shall be segregated and disposed separately without allowing its entry into treatment units and without having any chance of diverting or letter effluents directly or overflows from treatment units with storm water drains.

Notes on Grasim Industries Ltd. Mavoor, Kozhikode:

6. Anaerobic digestion of high BOD effluents shall be adopted as it will produce alternate energy source.
7. For colour removal indigenously available technology shall be tried and adopted. Treatability studies, if required, shall be taken up simultaneously to determine optimum operating conditions.
8. Effluent dispersion arrangements shall be made at the discharge point at Chungappally along the river bed.
9. Electrical power back up systems shall be provided in the acid plant so as to avoid frequent stops and start ups due to KSEB power failure. Caustic

scrubbing system shall be continuously operated and shall be interlocked with the production process to avoid non-operation of scrubbing system.

10. CS₂ emissions from Staple Fibre Division shall be eliminated as expected to be achieved with the commissioning of Klaus sulphur recovery plant. If it is not possible the Company shall not run the CS₂ plant.
11. Solid wastes shall be disposed scientifically based on a disposal plan approved by the Kerala State Pollution Control Board.
12. The Company shall take necessary steps to prevent and control accumulation of H₂S and other gases in the gravity line conveying effluent to Chungappally.
13. The Company may carry out periodic inspection and maintenance of the effluent treatment plants and the effluent lines from safety point of view and constant vigil should be there to prevent occurrence of accidents.
14. The Kerala State Pollution Control Board shall intensify the vigil and watch over the operation of effluent treatment plant and emission control measures.
15. The Kerala State Pollution Control Board shall re-establish the ambient air quality monitoring station at Vazhakad and set up a new monitoring station at Elamaram for regular monitoring of air quality.

2.6 As per this note the Company has implemented all except three recommendations which are as follows :—

1. Colour removal of effluent.
2. Effluent dispersion arrangement at Chungappally.
3. Scientific solid waste management.

2.7 In view of prolonged public agitation the Government of Kerala appointed another expert Committee in May 1997 headed by Dr. B. Sengupta (at present Member Secretary of the Central Pollution Control Board) to study in detail the pollution caused by Grasim Industries and recommend solutions. This Committee while commenting on the water pollution control adopted by the Company reported as follows :—

“In order to assess the present status of pollution control measures, the Committee visited the factory and effluent treatment facilities. Though the industry has got an extensive effluent treatment plant, from the data that the Committee verified it is observed that final, effluent quality standard is not fully achieved by the Company. BOD, COD, Sulphides and colour are the major parameters that were found to be exceeding the standard specified by the Kerala State Pollution Control Board. The company is not assessing periodically efficiency of each unit processes adopted. As a result, failure of any individual unit is not detected and rectified in time. Reduction in capacity due to settled solids/sludges in lagoons and reaction tanks affects the treatment efficiency very badly. In

the staple fibre division for removal of sulphides and zinc though some facilities are made, it is not found to be satisfactory. The industry is not monitoring T.O.C.L. and no clean technology for pulping process has been adopted by industry so far."

It found that the industry was not meeting the parameters prescribed for waste water discharge. It also found that the industry was not meeting the standard fixed with reference to BOD, Sulphide and colour. The Committee made 28 recommendations and suggested a time-frame of one year within which to implement them.

2.8 As per a note from the Kerala State Pollution Control Board, the progress of implementation is reported by the Company every month and the Board verifies it and gives follow up instructions. The note further says that progress upto December 1998 was evaluated by a committee of senior officers of the Board and found that of the 28 recommendations, 15 have been implemented, 10 are at various stages of implementation and there is no progress in respect of 3 recommendations. These three recommendations are :—

- (i) The company need to adopt indigenous technology for effluent colour removal. The sludge therefrom is to be filtered in advanced type filters or to be safely stored till filters become available.
- (ii) The emission of carbon di-sulphide, hydrogen sulphide and sulphur dioxide from Carbon di-sulphide plant and using sections is to be reduced and to be discharged through a taller (82 m) stack.
- (iii) The hazardous wastes (mainly solid waste) are to be properly disposed as per the Hazardous Wastes Rules.

2.9 Another Committee which studied the problem of pollution in Chaliyar is the Committee on Environment (1996-98) of the Kerala Assembly. This Committee in its tenth report submitted in the Assembly on 22 April, 1998, highlights the serious nature of pollution in Chaliyar caused by Grasim Industries and severely indicts the industry for polluting the only source of clean water for the people of Kozhikode. The Committee reports that during the past 35 years, people of this area are increasingly suffering from cancer, heart ailments, asthma, skin diseases, TB etc. It says that hundreds of people have died and many are suffering from incurable diseases. It is convinced that the incidence of cancer is increasing in Vazhakad Panchayat. The report also refers to media reports saying that this industry goes on flouting the agreements arrived at under the supervision of the Government, the courts etc. as well as the orders of the Pollution Control Board. The Committee found that the existing system of effluent treatment in the factory is far from satisfactory as a result of which the effluents which are not properly treated flow into the river.

2.10 Some of the recommendations of the Committee are :—

- (i) Recommendations of Dr. Sengupta Committee should be strictly implemented within one year.
- (ii) 25% of the net profit of the Company should be spent on the welfare of the people living near the factory.

- (iii) Most modern equipment for measuring the level of pollution should be installed.
- (iv) The company should undertake at its own cost, supply of clean drinking water to the people living in areas near the factory.

2.11 M/s. Grasim Industries Limited submitted a note to the Chairman, CGA in which it says that the Company has been seriously implementing all directions issued by the authorities and fulfilling all the parameters laid down with regard to the treatment of effluents. The note says:—

“We are seriously considering to install a new Recovery Boiler costing Rs. 25.00 crores for arresting the chemicals going into the effluent and doubling of the gravity line, costing Rs. 2.00 crores and lining of lagoons, costing Rs. 25.00 lakhs.

Based on the decision taken in the meeting held by the District Collector on 28.6.1995, M/s. Engineers India Limited, New Delhi was entrusted with the details study of our existing effluent treatment plant. Engineers India Limited's report has been received and they have observed that they have received full cooperation as well as data asked for from us and from the data provided, they have observed that Grasim is meeting the prescribed standards except colour.

We have also got sample analysed by reputed recognised laboratories in Thrissur and Ernakulam, and the Government Central Laboratory at Trivandrum, and their reports testify that the treated combined effluent discharged are well within the parameters prescribed by the Board. Daily tests of effluent sample are also carried out and monthly reports are submitted to the Pollution Control Board, and the Board is fully satisfied about the results and satisfactory treatment of the effluent.”

2.12 In the meeting Shri E. Ahamed, Chairman, CGA had with the senior officials of the Government of Kerala and the Pollution Control Board at Trivandrum on 1.2.1999, Dr. D.C. Sharma, of the Zonal Office, CPCB, Bangalore who was asked by the Secretary, Ministry of Environment as per request by Chairman, CGA to conduct an on-the-spot study and assessment of the present pollution status and suggest measures explained his findings and suggestions. He said as follows :—

“The effluent and emission standards laid down by the CPCB or MEF are general standards and these can be made more stringent by the SPCB if the local situation warrants it. Considering the close proximity of dwelling houses to the factory and the high population density in the area the standards need to be more stringent.

Colour is the most objectionable part of the effluents. People will not accept a coloured effluent discharge into the river as they use the river for various purposes. If colour is removed the major problem of effluents will be solved. Along with colour, COD also will be reduced to the limits of SPCB. The industry has not so far taken the issue seriously though both the Committees set

up earlier had strongly recommended it. The Company claims it to be impossible or impractical or non-viable. The company is not in a position to produce any record to support their claim that they have made any attempt at it. Sludge handling may be slightly difficult but not impossible.

Regarding CS₂ emissions, Shri Sharma pointed out that, if preventive approach is adopted CS₂ release from the reactor on high pressure development, can be avoided. At present when high pressure is developed it is released by bursting of asbestos flaps provided as a safety measure. He suggested to incorporate pressure measuring mechanism in the reactor and to control or prevent the reaction when pressure is built up beyond a present value based on safety angle. Director of Factories and Boilers will look into these aspects and issue necessary directions to prevent release of toxic gases into the environment by such accidents. Further, if at all any such release is made, the Company should have the facility to collect and treat the released gas. This is not there at present.

Coal ash dumping is carried out by the Company in a most unscientific way. The wastes both coal ash and other sludges are not dumped in properly lined area and are not covered with red earth as required. As a result the wind, carries the dust particles from the dumping site and pollute the entire area.

Dr. Sen, Gupta Committee report should be implemented in toto. A fool proof system is to be adopted to control pollution. Closure of the factory is not the correct solution. There can be a temporary closure to implement the control measures.

CPCB is ready to take up a detailed study in the industry and can render any help needed.

2.13 In the above meeting, the Chairman, CGA enquired whether the State Pollution Control Board could not invoke section 30 of the Water (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1974 to meet the situation arising out of the failure of the Company to execute the work suggested by the Board, the Chairman of the State Pollution Control Board said this provision has not been invoked so far due to various practical difficulties. The Chairman was informed by the KSPCB that three major recommendations of Dr. Sen Gupta Committee have not been implemented by the Company. These relate to:—

- (i) Increasing the Chimney height in the staple fibre division;
- (ii) colour removal; and
- (iii) scientific disposal of hazardous wastes.

CHAPTER III

OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1 Chaliyar river is the main source of water for drinking, irrigation and industries in several parts of Malappuram and Kozhikkode (Calicut) districts. About 30 million litres of water is used daily from this river for supply of drinking water in Calicut Area. As per statistics 107 million litres of its water is used for irrigation daily. It is no wonder that pollution of such a vital source of water has caused great and prolonged public outcry in Kerala. Various documents and papers relating to the pollution of this river caused by the discharge of effluents from Grasim Industries Limited have been placed before this Committee. The Committee have also been benefitted by the discussions its Chairman had with the State Government officials, officers of the Central as well as State Pollution Control Boards on this matter. The reports of various expert Committees including the Committee on Environment of the Kerala Assembly dealt with this problem in great details. The Committee have also taken note of the company's point of view on this issue. After careful consideration of all aspects of the problem, the Committee make the following observations.

- I. The decision to identify the status of pollution in medium and minor rivers in the Coastal States and include them in the IIInd phase of the National River Conservation Plan was taken sometime in 1994-95. Accordingly, the Government of Kerala had submitted the list of ten rivers including the Chaliyar for study. The Committee find that even after four years, this plan has not made any worthwhile progress except that there have been some correspondence between the State Government and the Union Government. Section (2) (h) of the Water (Prevention and Control of pollution) Act specifically says that one of the functions of the Central Pollution Control Board is to "plan and cause to be executed a nation-wise programme for the prevention, control or abatement of water pollution". The Committee feel that the performance of the Central Board in this regard has been far from satisfactory. The Central Board was made the co-ordinator for this project of cleaning the medium and minor rivers in the Coastal States. But in the absence of any proper co-ordinated action, the problem of pollution of rivers in these States particularly in Kerala has aggravated causing serious health hazard to the people. The Committee therefore, urge upon the Union Government to give proper directions to the Central Pollution Control Board to speed up this work so as to complete it within a fixed time-frame. The Union Government should also provide necessary funds to implement this plan as it is a Central Plan. The Government of Kerala has already decided to take up this matter. Taking the gravity of the situation into account, the Central Government should take urgent anti-pollution measures in river Chaliyar.

II. The Committee find that the Chaliyar river is one of the highly polluted rivers in Kerala. But it is surprised to note that neither the State Government nor the State Pollution Control Board nor the Central Board has been able to take any effective measure to check pollution of this river. It is within everyone's knowledge that the pollution in the Chaliyar river is caused mainly by the effluents discharged from Grasim Industries Limited. It is also known to all that pollution in Chaliyar can be checked only when this industry takes effective steps to treat the effluents as per the prescribed norms. Several Committees have been appointed and many studies have been undertaken to study the problem of pollution in Chaliyar. The State pollution Control Board, in one of its notes, says that most of the recommendations made by these Committees have been implemented. The industry too claims that it has implemented most of the recommendations. But the Committee find that the danger of pollution has not abated as is evident from the fact and the note received by the Committee, that there was a case of death and of hospitalisation of a number of people as late as in January, 1999.

3.2 The State Pollution Control Board admits that the Grasim Industry has not implemented three vital recommendations. These recommendations relate to the colour of the effluent, the emission and discharge of carbon di-sulphide etc. and the disposal of hazardous wastes. The Committee fully endorse the experts' opinion on these three aspects as there is a consensus among them on these points. **But the Committee are surprised that despite clear and unambiguous recommendations on these points by experts Committees the industry has not taken any action in respect of them and the pollution Control Board has not been able to take any action against the industry.** The Committee find that Section 30 of the Water (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act empowers the Board to execute the work itself in case the Party fails to do it and recover the expenditure incurred from the Party. The statement made by the Chairman, the State Board, that there are practical difficulties in invoking this section is not convincing. The Committee think that it is a failure of will on the part of the State Pollution Control Board. The Board and the State Government should have known that they had to proceed against the Company on a number of occasions on issues relating to anti-pollution measures. Only after the Company lost in the courts of law it felt compelled to take anti-pollution steps. This being the past experience, the Board and the State authorities should have utilised the legal provisions in full to ensure that the company enforces the norms relating to pollution which has become serious health hazard affecting a large number of people. The Committee are informed that the State Board has issued instructions to the Company to implement the remaining three recommendations by July, 1999. The Committee hope that the Company will fully comply with this direction. The Committee also urge upon the State Government to ensure that the company complies with all the recommendations.

3.3 The Committee are not in favour of the Industry being closed down as it will affect the workers. The industry should exist. The State Board has stated that if the three recommendations referred to above are implemented the problems of pollution caused by the effluents would be solved. The Committee, therefore, urge upon all

concerned to see that these measures are taken expeditiously so that the industry can carry on without causing pollution.

NEW DELHI;
March 5, 1999

Phalgun 14, 1920 (Saka)

E. AHAMED,
Chairman,
Committee on Government Assurances.

APPENDIX

MINUTES

Eighth Sitting

Minutes of the Eighth Sitting of the Committee on Government Assurance held on
March 5, 1999 at 1500 hours in Party Meeting Room '139' First Floor
Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi

The Committee met on Friday, March 5, 1999 from 1500 hrs. to 1545 hrs.

PRESENT

Shri E. Ahamed — *Chairman*

Members

2. Shri Amrik Singh Aliwal
3. Shri Ganga Ram Koli
4. Shri Hari Kewal Prasad
5. Shri A. Siddaraju
6. Shri Sartaj Singh

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri P.D.T. Achary - *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri K. Chakraborty - *Deputy Secretary*
3. Km. J.C. Namchyo - *Assistant Director*

2. The Committee considered the draft of 4th Report and adopted the same after certain modifications in the Report. The Committee authorised the Chairman to present the Report on March 11, 1999.

3. The Committee decided to hold their next sitting on March 18, 1999.

The Committee then adjourned.

ANNEXURE

ANNEXURE REFERRED TO IN PART (A) & (B) OF REPLY TO LOK SABHA
UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 599 TO BE ANSWERED
ON TUESDAY, THE 26.11.1996.

(Rs. in Lakhs)

S.No.	State/Towns	River	Total Cost Including Cost of Land	Contribution of States
1	2	3	4	5
1.	ANDHRA PRADESH		5379.00	2689.500
	1. Mancherial	Godavari		
	2. Bhadrachalam	Godavari		
	3. Rajamundry	Godavari		
	4. Ramagundam	Godavari		
2.	BIHAR		3222.03	1611.015
	5. Ranchi	Subarnarekha		
	6. Jamshedpur	Subarnarekha		
	7. Ghatshila	Subarnarekha		
3.	GUJARAT		9869.89	4934.945
	8. Ahemadabad	Sabarnat		
4.	KARNATAKA		2699.79	1349.895
	9. Shimoga	Tunga (Krishna)		
	10. Harihara	Tungabhadra (Krishna)		
	11. Bhadravathi	Bhadra (Krishna)		
	12. Davanagere	Tungabhadra (Krishna)		
	13. K.R Nagar	Cauvery		
	14. Kollegal	Cauvery		
	15. Nanjangud	Cauvery		
	16. Sri Rangapatnam	Cauvery		
5.	MADHYA PRADESH		10659.47	5329.735
	17. Indore	Khan		
	18. Ujjain	Kshipra		
	19. Burhanpur	Tapti		
	20. Mandideep	Betwa		
	21. Bhopal	Betwa		
	22. Vidisha	Betwa		
	23. Jabalpur	Narmada		

1	2	3	4	5
	24. Seoni	Wainganga		
	25. Chapara	Wainganga		
	26. Keolari	Wainganga		
	27. Nagda	Chambal		
6.	MAHARASHTRA		11733.39	5866.695
	28. Karad	Krishna		
	29. Sangli	Krishna		
	30. Nasik	Godavari		
	31. Nanded	Godavari		
7.	ORISSA		2484.77	5866.695
	32. Cuttack	Mahandi		
	33. Talcher	Brahmini		
	34. Chandbali	Brahmini		
	35. Dharmshala	Brahmini		
8.	PUNJAB		22937.61	11468.805
	36. Ludhiana	Satluj		
	37. Jallundhar	Satluj		
	38. Phagwara	Satluj		
	39. Phillaur	Satluj		
9.	RAJASTHAN		1393.68	686.840
	40. Kota	Chambal		
	41. Keshorai Pattan		Chambal	
10.	TAMIL NADU		3820.00	1910.000
	42. Kumara Palayam	Cauvery		
	43. Bhawani	Cauvery		
	44. Erode	Cauvery		
	45. Trichy	Cauvery		
	46. Palli Palayam	Cauvery		
(A)		Total:	74199.6	337099.81
(B)	State Share on 50:50 basis		= 37099.81	
(C)	Add 5% of cost of works only towards expenditure on establishment Research & Development and Monitoring		= 3009.22	
(A+C)	Total estimated cost (74199.63+3009.22)		= 77208.85	
(D)	Central Share		= 40109.03	

© 1999 BY LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

Published under Rule 382 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha (Ninth Edition) and printed by the Manager (P.L. Unit) Government of India Press, Minto Road, New Delhi-110002.