

(1) Number of pages _____

(2) Date of repair _____

(3) Initials of the Referencer _____

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE

Government of Madras

Public Works DEPARTMENT

G.O. No.	1149	(9)	Press
B.P. No.			Mis.
Dated	8.5.		1876.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Public Works Department,
8th May 1876*

No 135 Read the following endorsement of the Chief Engineer for Irrigation,
dated Ootacamund, 28th April 1876, No 51 W —

From Major J BEATTY, R E, District Engineer, Godavery, to Lieutenant-Colonel
J MULLINS, R E, Chief Engineer for Irrigation, dated Dowlaishweram,
21st March 1876, No 3,745

In continuation of my letter No 3,555,* of 6th instant, I have now the honor to

*To the Secretary to Government, Public Works
Department, returning the Mokhassadar's
petition

submit the plans, estimate, and report of
the Assistant Engineer in charge of No 4
Range in the matter of the Seetaramasa-
garam tank of Teegalavuncha

2 The catchment basin of the Seetaramasagaram tank is at the northern
extremity of the Ellore taluq, and is about $87\frac{1}{2}$ square miles in extent The tank bund is
about half a mile long, between the low hills on either side of the valley, and is in fair
order, with one sluice in the centre, and only requiring a good surplus weir to make it
capable of holding $9\frac{1}{2}$ feet on the floor of the sluice, or by raising the bund to a uniform
height throughout it would hold $11\frac{1}{2}$ feet on the sluice floor The catchment basin,
as will be seen by reference to the accompaniment marked B, contains thirty-one small
tanks, which drain into the Seetaramasagaram tank, and these are unprovided with
masonry escapes

3 The village of Teegalavuncha is situated in $17^{\circ} 6'$ north latitude and $81^{\circ} 6'$
east longitude, and is about 4 miles north-east of Chintalapudi The tank bed, about
which there has been the longstanding dispute, is situated partly in the village of
Teegalavuncha, and partly in the village of Racherla which belongs to a Mokhassadar,
the bund and lower part of the bed is in Teegalavuncha, and when there is much
water in the tank the lands of Racherla are said to be more or less flooded

4 Teegalavuncha is a Government village, and the people naturally desire to
have a full supply maintained in the tank They state that formerly 9 to 10 feet was
considered the proper maximum level on the sill of the sluice, the Mokhassadar of
Racherla, on the other hand, claims all land above the level of 3.75 feet on the sluice
sill, and for several years past has managed to get the water kept down to a maximum
of about 5 feet Owing to insufficient supply in the tank the people of Teegalavuncha
have been unable to cultivate the whole of the ayacut, only an average of 81 acres
having been cultivated during the last four years out of an ayacut of 190 acres

5 The Mokhassadar appears to have first raised his claim, to have the flood
level in the tank reduced, about six or eight years ago, and the whole question having
been inquired into by the Assistant Collector Mr Happell, and Assistant Engineer
Mr. Andrews, the Acting Superintending Engineer, on 14th December 1870, directed
the Assistant Engineer to "take the necessary steps for retaining water in the tank
to the maximum height and thus restore it to its original capacity contrary to the
wishes of the Mokhassadar of Racherla"

6 Subsequently, however, in March 1873, the Collector, Mr Foster, having
visited the place, decided in favor of the Mokhassadar, fixing the level for the crest
of a surplus weir at 3.75 feet on the sluice sill, and the District Engineer called on
the Assistant Engineer to furnish a plan and estimate. Owing, however, to repeated

changes in the charge of the range which was then under Lieutenant J. F. Dorward, and subsequently under Mr Martin, Supervisor Baker, Akjee Ramiah, and now under Mr Martin again, the settlement of this matter was lost sight of or postponed until lately, when Mr Martin had the accompanying survey and levels of the tank, &c, prepared by his Overseer in the intervals of other work

7. The survey of the tank shows that the water spread at 4 feet above the sluice floor would be 73 23 acres, at 7 feet it would be 186 73 acres, and at 10 feet it would be 302 96 acres. But the Collector having decided what the level of the crest should be, would seem to have given over to the Mokhassadar all above that level, and determined that it was inexpedient to propose storing more than the minimum supply of water. Improvement of this tank would therefore necessitate the payment of heavy compensation to the Mokhassadar, as well as a further great expenditure on surplus weirs to the thirty-one tanks in the valley above, while it is very doubtful if the ayacut of this tank can be sufficiently extended to justify the outlay.

8. The catchment basin being taken at $87\frac{1}{2}$ square miles, using the formula $D = C \sqrt[3]{M^2}$, and taking $C = 562.5$, we get the maximum flood discharge 11081 25 cubic feet per second nearly, and Mr Martin has estimated for a surplus weir of 175 feet, which would probably be ample. He has assumed that with maximum flood level in the tank, the water in the escape channel would stand at 2 feet above the crest of the weir, i.e., d_1 will be 4 feet, and d_2 will be 2 feet. Possibly 150 feet would be sufficient, but with the possibility of some of the tanks above breaching it is better to give the extra length.

9. Mr. Martin's estimate amounts to Rupees 4,070; and I may observe that the Collector has not expressed any opinion as to what proportion of the cost should be borne by the Mokhassadar. As the Mokhassadar will probably be the principal gainer by its construction, and it seems doubtful whether the crest might not justly have been fixed some feet higher, I consider that he should bear the cost of the masonry work, i.e., Rupees 3,460, all earthwork being done at the cost of Government.

ENCLOSURES EIGHT

- A — Range Officer's report
- B — Statement of tanks above Teegalavuncha
- C — Estimate of proposed surplus weir
- D — Sketch map of catchment basin
- E — Survey plan of tank
- F — Sections of tank bund
- G — Sections of escape channel
- H — Plan of surplus weir

SUBMITTED for the consideration of orders of Government

The question is, it appears to the undersigned, whether the Seetaramasagaram tank should be improved at a considerable cost or left as it is, and it is thought that the answer should be that it is not worthwhile, under the circumstances, to do anything to it.

2. The tank has a catchment basin of $87\frac{1}{2}$ square miles, and there are thirty-one tanks above it, most of which are unprovided with proper escapes. Part of the tank bed lies in a Mokhassadar's village, and there have been constant disputes as to what

the extent of the waterspread should be. Mr Happell, when Assistant Collector, appears to have decided against the Mokhassadar's claim to have the water level reduced, but what depth on the sluice sill he fixed upon as proper does not appear. Mr. Foster, on the other hand, decided in favor of the proprietor, and settled that 3 75 feet above the sluice sill is the full tank level.

3. The estimate for a surplus weir at this reduced level amounts to Rs 4,070. The tank revenue particulars are as follow —

Ayacut {	Area	Acres	190 40
	Assessment	Rupees	556 12
Average cultivation		Acres	81
			172
Revenue			73
Do Inam			

If the ayacut be an indication of the former capacity of the tank Mr Foster's decision would seem to be wrong, and the level of the old escape channel points the same way, but taking it to be right, and to be acted upon, it cannot be worthwhile to incur a large expenditure on a tank which, when full, will be $3\frac{3}{4}$ feet deep, which is capable at that depth of cultivating only 81 acres, and which has thirty-one tanks above it. Building a surplus weir at the level indicated will neither increase the revenue materially, nor be of much benefit to the villagers cultivating under it, though it would perhaps save them some trouble.

4. It seems probable that it would not be prudent to allow 6 feet of water to be discharged over the proposed surplus weir unless the soil be hard, and from the depth to which the surplus channel has cut hard soil would seem not to be present, so the ultimate outlay on the construction of a waste weir would be likely to exceed the present estimate.

(Signed) JOHN MULLINS, Lt-Col, R.E.,
Chief Engineer for Irrigation

No 136 ORDER THEREON, 8th May 1876, No 1,149

IRRIGATION, No 20

HIS GRACE the Governor in Council is of opinion that it will not be worthwhile to incur a large expenditure on the improvement of a tank which is so unfavorably circumstanced as that of Seetaramasagaram, and that it should be kept on the same footing as hitherto.

(True Extract)

Colonel,

Offg Under Secy to Govt, P.W.D.

To the District Engineer, Godavery
" Chief Engineer for Irrigation
" Revenue Department

Exd S T Austin
Spare Copies

Encls. 9

Submitted for the consideration and orders of Government.

The question is, it appears to the undersigned, whether the Sectaramadagaram tank should be improved at a considerable cost or left as it is, and it is thought that the answer should be that it is not worth while under the circumstances to do anything to it.

2. The tank has a catchment basin of $87\frac{1}{2}$ square miles, and there are 31 tanks above it most of which are unprovided with proper escapes. Part of the tank bed lies in a Motkassidar's village and there have been constant disputes as to what

the extent of the waterspread should be. Mr Hapell when Assistant Collector appears to have decided against the Mokhassidar's claim to have the water level reduced, but what depth on the sluice sill he fixed upon as proper does not appear. Mr Foster on the other hand decided in favour of the Proprietor and settled that 3.75 feet above the sluice sill is the full tank level.

3. The estimate for a surplus weir at this reduced level amounts to Rupees 4070. The tank revenue particulars are as follow:-

Ayacut	area	acres	190.40
	assessment	Rupus	556.12

Average cultivation	acres	81
	revenue	172
	do Inam	73

6
If the ayacut be an indication of the former capacity of the tank Mr Foster's decision would seem to be wrong, and the level of the old escape channel points the same way, but taking it to be right and to be acted upon it cannot be worth while to incur a large expenditure on a tank which when full will be $3\frac{3}{4}$ feet deep, which is capable at that depth of cultivating only 81 acres, and which has 31 tanks above it. Building a surplus weir at the level indicated will neither increase the revenue materially, nor be of much benefit to the villagers cultivating under it, though it would perhaps save them some trouble.

4. It seems probable that it would not be prudent to allow

6 feet of water to be discharged
over the proposed surplus
weir unless the soil be hard,
and from the depth to which
the surplus channel has cut,
hard soil would seem not to
be present, so the ultimate
outlay on the construction
of a waste weir would be
likely to exceed the present
estimate.

Wm. L. L. L.
Colonel
Chief Engineer for Irrigation

Ostacumind
28th April 1873

To
The Secretary to Govt.
P.W.D.

1/22

1/22

1/22

1/22

Current No of 187

" "

" "

" "

" "

P. 4. 1876 Department
M WORKS FORM No 3

Current No 3397.

From

The Chief Engineer
for Brigades

No 5797

Dated 28 April

Recd. 10 May

1876.

Subject —

Submitting letter from
the District Engineer Madras
forwarding an estimate for
constructing a surplus well
to the Sektaramasagarum
tanks of Nagalaravathi in Eluru
Taluk

ENCLOSURE 9-

From

to

"

"

"

"

"

"

LATER CASES.

Current No of 187

" "

" "

" "

Orders and Proceedings in file

Depart- ment	No	Date	ENDORSEMENTS		
			Depart- ment	No	Dated

135

No 1149

Public Works Department

PROCEEDINGS of the MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Under date the 8th May 1876.

Read the following —

From the Chief Engineer
for Brigades
H.E. No. 5797 28 April 76.

His Grace
the Governor in
Council is of
opinion that it
will not be worth
while to incur a
large expenditure
on the improve-
ment of a tank
which is so unfavour-
ably circumstanced
as that of Sektara-
masagarum, and

that it should be
kept on the same
footing as hitherto.

Aug. 29/4

SE for money ✓
CE for J. Walter & Enchored
Rev Sept ✓

N^o 135/36

Debit 20/5/58

3397

Govt. of 1870 Madras.
PUBLIC WORKS.

2.

The D. & Godavery

Dtd

Int

Re

For

G O, 8th May 1870, 1169

No. 135

Sectaramacagaram.

Dank - Godavery D.

Considering that
it is not worth while
incurring a large
expend. in the
improvement of the