Public Works (1898) Department.

G.O., No. 381 – I

DATED 7th May 1898

12th Mr

[Despatch Abstract.]

Excess expenditure. Authorizing the Examiner of P.W. Accounts, to admit the [illegible], aggregating Rs 15251, incurred on the Rushikulya Project, Ganjam Dn.

100/6

Fd. Ryd. 11/5/98

[P. W. 26.
1,000—12-2-98.]

Indexed.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

IRRIGATION.
ACCOUNT.

Government (1898) of Madras.
PUBLIC WORKS.

Recd.	1898.	*Enclosures*	
Regd.		*Spare copies*	

G.O., No. 381 I., 7th May 1898.

MAY.

Excess Expenditure

Authorizing the Examiner of Public Works Accounts to admit the — aggregating Rs. 15,251, incurred on the Rushikulya project, Ganjám division.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Irrigation.
Account.

READ—the following papers :—

From W. C. DEMORGAN, Esq., M.I.C.E., Executive Engineer in charge, I Circle, to the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, dated Waltair, 2nd April 1898, No. 7 G.N.

I have the honour to submit herewith completion reports for the works noted below connected with the Rushikulya project, and of which the first two have been verified by the Examiner, and to request that you will be good enough to obtain sanction of Government authorizing the Examiner, Public Works Accounts, to admit the total excess of Rs. 15,251 on the three works :—

	RS.
(1) Distributary No. 11 from $40\frac{5}{8}$ miles + 460 feet of Rushikulya canal—	
Amount of estimate	24,060
Expenditure	30,667
Difference ...	— 6,607
(2) Distributary No. 12 from $43\frac{1}{8}$ miles + 100 feet, Rushikulya canal—	
Amount of estimate	2,750
Expenditure	— 4,568
Difference ...	— 1,818
(3) Distributary No. 15 from $51\frac{1}{2}$ miles, Rushikulya canal—	
Amount of estimate	10,630
Expenditure	17,456
Difference ...	— 6,826
Total excess ...	15,251

The Executive Engineer has explained the causes of excess in the completion reports.

The excess may be met from the balance for unforeseen works.

ENCLOSURES.

COMPLETION Report of Original Works and Special Repairs in connection with Distributary No. 11 of Rushikulya Canal, Ganjám Division.

Sub-heads of estimate.	As estimated.			As executed.			Differences.*			Reference to paragraphs overleaf explaining differences.
	Quantity.	Rate.	Amount.	Quantity.	Rate.	Amount.	Quantity.	Rate.	Amount.	
		RS. A. P.	RS.		RS.	RS.		RS.	RS.	
Cutting and embankment—										
1. Earthwork	5,974·000	2 11 3	16,148	7806·400	..	26,628	—1,832·400	..	— 7,730	
2. Rock cutting	..	..	..							
3. Removing rock in channel where met with.	..	..	1,800							
4. Cattle-ramps, 10 at 50 ..	..	..	950							
,, 6 at 75 ..	..	..	..							
Total ..	5,974·000	..	18,898							
Lock spitting, 3 lines of channel.	1,584·00 634·00	0 1 3 0 1 6	124 59	.. ..	.. ..	.. ..	.. ..	.. ..	.. ..	
Total ..	2,218·00	..	183	4192·95	0 1 2	306	1974·95	..	— 123	
Turfing	10,468·00	0 4 0	2,617	3,318·39	0 3 10	795	7,149·61	..	1,822	
Clearing jungle	..	..	580	..	..	1,022	..	..	— 442	
Purushottapur road diversion ..	..	..	150	..	..	132	..	..	18	
Petty supervision	..	..	547	..	..	1,118	..	..	— 571	
Contingencies	..	..	1,085	..	..	580	..	..	505	
A, B, C, D, E, F, G, branches commenced and abandoned.	..	..	..	..	..	80	..	..	— 80	
RS. A. P.										
Lock spitting, 38,915 R. ft. 29 15 3	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	
Clearing jungle .. 50 4 8	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	
Contingencies .. 0 1 6	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	
Total .. 80 5 5										
Deduct—Arrears ..	..	..	..	..	..	— 6	..	..	— 6	
	RS.			RS.			RS.			
Total ..	24,060			30,667			— 6,607			

* Excesses in block type; savings in ordinary type.

EXPLANATION FOR DIFFERENCES.

Cutting and embankment.—Cause of excess in quantity is due (1) to bed level being altered to avoid an extra drop, (2) to the channel being taken round the drinking water tank of Gurinti at the 3rd mile instead of through it as originally designed.

The excess in rate is due to the original rate of earthwork being low. The channel running in deep cutting in places. There are three drops averaging 10′ each.

Lock spitting.—Excess due to subsequent alterations and to branch channels being investigated not provided for in the original estimate.

Turfing.—Only banks where the ground level was below channel bed were turfed.

Jungle clearing.—Actual jungle cleared.

(Signed) J. M. LACEY,
Offg. Ex. Engineer, Ganjám Dn.

2nd March 1898.

Completion Report of Original Works and Special Repairs in connection with Distributary No. 12 of Rushikulya Canal, Ganjám Division.

Sub-heads of estimate.	As estimated.			As executed.			Differences.*			Reference to paragraphs overleaf explaining differences.
	Quantity.	Rate.	Amount.	Quantity.	Rate.	Amount.	Quantity.	Rate.	Amount.	
		RS. A. P.	RS.		RS.	RS.		RS.	RS.	
Cutting and embankment—										
1. Earthwork	840·000	2 5 0	1,943	1,113·345	3 7 3	3,845	**— 273·345**	..	**— 1,702**	
2. Removing rock in channel where met with.	..	..	100							
3. Cattle-ramps, No. 2, at Rs. 50.	..	..	100							
Total ..	840·000	..	2,143							
Lock spitting, 3 lines of channel.	323·40	0 1 3	25	77,090	0 1 0	48	..	..	**— 23**	
Turfing	1,293·60	0 4 0	323	57·80	0 4 0	14	..	..	309	
Clearing jungle	..	..	100	..	..	165	..	..	**— 65**	
Petty supervision	..	..	79	..	..	369	..	..	**290**	
Contingencies	..	..	80	..	..	127	..	..	**— 47**	
Total ..		RS. 2,750			RS. 4,568			RS. **— 1,818**		

* Excesses in block type; savings in ordinary type.

Explanation for differences.

Earthwork.—The channel runs through an uneven country and the centre line was in many places above the line of banking. This point was ignored in framing the estimate and the consequence was that less height of banking was calculated for.

Heavy rates had to be paid for deep cutting and hard gravelly soil *at three of the drops* and also for banking in places where earth had to be brought from a distance; this accounts for the excess in rate.

Petty supervision.—The excess is met from the saving under turfing.

Lock spitting, clearing jungle and contingencies.—The excess is small: this calls for remarks.

(Signed) J. M. LACEY,
Offg. Ex. Engineer, Ganjám Dn.

4th March 1898.

Completion Report of Original Works and Special Repairs, in connection with Distributary No. 15 of Rushikulya canal, Ganjám Division.

Sub-head of estimate.	As estimated.			As executed.			Differences.			Reference to paragraphs below explaining differences.
	Quantity.	Rate.	Amount.	Quantity.	Rate.	Amount.	Quantity.	Rate.	Amount.	
		RS. A. P.	RS.		AS.	RS.			RS.	
Cutting and Embankment—										
1. Earthwork c. ft.	2,820·000	2 8 0	7,050	3,791·601	..	14,144	**— 963·101**	..	**— 5,919**	(*a*)
2. Rock-cutting .. ,,	8·500	50 0 0	425							
3. Removing rock in channel where met with.	..	..	300							
4. Cattle ramps No. 9 at Rs. 50 each.	..	..	450							
Turfing	7,046·00	0 4 0	1,762	2635·00	4	659	4,411	..	1,103	(*b*)
Preliminary expenses ..	..	..	..	..	..	541	..	..	**— 541**	(*c*)
Clearing jungle	..	..	..	..	..	414	..	..	**— 414**	(*d*)
Fixing boundary mark stones.	..	..	..	..	..	175	..	..	**— 175**	(*e*)
Lockspitting 3 lines of channel.	1,409·00	0 1 6	132	1,504·80	..	142	**— 95·80**	..	**— 10**	
Petty supervision	..	..	255	..	..	420	..	..	**— 165**	
Contingencies	..	..	256	..	..	365	..	..	**— 109**	
Carrying water from Thoti tank across No. 15 distributary.	..	..	..	..	..	273	..	..	**— 273**	(*f*)
Earthenware pipes to pass the drainage of Jarapukali tank under the channel.	..	..	..	..	..	323	..	..	**— 323**	(*g*)
Total ..		RS. 10,630			RS. 17,456			RS. **— 6,826**		

Explanation of Differences.

(*a*) *Cutting and embankment.*—The excess in quantity is due to a change in alignment at two places. The original alignment ran through two inam tanks entering at one side and taking off at the other. The owners objected to the distributary being taken through their tanks and refused the terms for free irrigation offered. The line consequently had to be taken below the tanks in low ground.

The excess in amount is due to the original low rate of the estimate, for the first mile the line runs through hard gravel; rock-cutting and hard soil is met within the 5th and 6th miles. Parts of the channel run in banks 12 and 18 feet high.

(*b*) *Turfing.*—Only high banks and places where the bed was above the natural level of the ground were turfed. Hence saving.

(*c*) *Preliminary expenses.* }
(*d*) *Clearing jungle.* } Not provided for in the original estimate.
(*e*) *Fixing boundary mark stones.* }

(*f*) *and* (*g*) Pipes for carrying the tank water across the channel had to be provided. Hence the last two items.

(Signed) J. M. LACEY,
Executive Engineer, Ganjám Dn.

To the Examiner of Public Works Accounts, dated 7th April 1898, No. 130.

For verification of excess outlay and early return.

(Signed) F. J. WILSON,
for Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

7th April 1898.

From the Examiner of Public Works Accounts, dated 18th April 1898, No. 1263 B/A.

Verified and herewith returned.

No. 152 I.

Note by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

The Executive Engineer in charge, I Circle, applies for sanction to the excess aggregating Rs. 15,251 incurred on the following distributaries of the Rushikulya project:—

	EXCESS. RS.
(1) Distributary No. 11 from $40\frac{5}{8}$ mile + 460 feet of Rushikulya canal.	6,607
(2) Distributary No. 12 from $43\frac{1}{8}$ mile + 100 feet of Rushikulya canal.	1,818
(3) Distributary No. 15 from $51\frac{1}{2}$ mile of Rushikulya canal	6,826

2. The excess on the above items are attributed chiefly to the following causes:—

Item (1) The alteration of the bed level of the channel to avoid an extra drop and the channel having been taken round a drinking water tank, instead of through it as originally designed and the original rate for earthwork having been found inadequate, as the channel ran in deep cutting in some places.

Item (2) Provision for a sufficient height of banking, not having been made in the original estimate and sufficient rate for earthwork not having been originally allowed on account of deep cutting and hard gravelly soil and for banking in places where earth had to be brought from a distance.

Item (3) Change in alignment of the channel to prevent its passing through two inam tanks as originally intended and rates originally provided having been found insufficient, owing to hard gravel, rock-cutting and hard soil having been met with.

3. The explanations given are incomplete. The works were begun in October and November 1894 and the estimates submitted by the Superintending Engineer in November 1895 and March 1896 when it should have been possible to make a close estimate of the cost. Apart from this, it was the duty of the Executive Engineer, when it was discovered when the estimates would be largely exceeded, to report the fact and submit revised estimates without delay. These completion certificates are only for the earthwork items sanctioned in the several Government Orders quoted so that the total excess on each channel is still unknown. The excesses now reported amount to Rs. 15,251 on estimates of Rs. 37,440 and would have been Rs. 3,234 in excess of this, but that most of the turfing which was considered necessary when the estimates were made and would in any case have been an improvement has been omitted.

G.O., No. 666 I., dated 19th August 1895.
„ „ 1 I., „ 3rd January 1896.
„ „ 314 I., „ 1st April 1896.

(Signed) W. HUGHES,
Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

2nd May 1898.

ORDER—No. 381 I., dated 7th May 1898.

The Examiner of Public Works Accounts is authorized to admit the expenditure incurred on the works referred to, the excess Rs. 15,251 being met from the balance of the provision for unforeseen works of the Rushikulya project which will then be reduced to Rs. 27,928.

2. The Superintending Engineer will see that the rules regarding the submission of revised estimates are strictly observed.

3. This sanction is registered as No. 25 I. of 1898-99.

(True Extract.)

Under Secretary to Government,
Irrigation Branch.

To the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.
„ Superintending Engineer, I Circle.
„ Examiner, Public Works Accounts.

Exd. Shaik Karim.

H.E. the Governor

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT,
IRRIGATION BRANCH.

No. 381 I. d/ 7-5-98

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Authorizing the Ex. to pass Excess Expenditure incurred on certain works of the Rushikulya canal.

UNDER date the

READ the following

Print with Enc.	From the Ex. Engr in charge First Circle	(H.E. No 7. G.N. dated 2. 4. 98)
Print	To the Examiner of P.W. Accts	(H.E. No 130 „ — 7. 4. 98)
	From „ do „	(H.E. No 1263 13/A „ 18. 4. 98)
Print	Note by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation — — —	(H.E. No 152 I „ 2. 5. 98)

10

× Flap Y

The Executive Engineer in charge, First Circle, applies for sanction to the Excess aggregating Rs 15,251 incurred on the following distributaries of the Rushikulya Project.

	Excess Rs.
(1) Distributary No 11 from $40\frac{5}{8}$ m + 460 ft. of Rushikulya canal — — — — — — —	6,607
(2) Distributary No 12 from $43\frac{1}{8}$ m. + 100 ft of — do —	1,818
(3) Distributary No 15 from $51\frac{1}{2}$ m of — do — —	6,826

Issue

W.H.

6.5.98

[illegible] 7.5.98

2. The Excess on the above items are attributed chiefly to the following causes:—

Item (1) The alteration of the bed level of the channel

To be passed thro' K.D. before issue

[illegible]

to avoid an Extra drop and the channel having been taken round a drinking water tank, instead of through it as originally designed and the original rate for Earthwork having been found inadequate, as the channel ran in deep cutting in some places.

Item (2) Provision for a sufficient height of banking, not having been made in the original estimate and sufficient rate for Earthwork not having been originally allowed on account of deep cutting and hard gravelly soil and for banking in places where earth had to be brought from a distance.

Item. (3) Change in alignment of the channel to prevent its passing through two drain tanks as originally intended and rates originally provided having been found insufficient, owing to hard gravel, rock-cutting and hard soil having been met with.

3. The Explanations given are incomplete ~~[illegible] but satisfactory~~. JH The works were begun in October & November 1894 and the Estimates submitted by the Supg Engineer in November 1895.

G. O. No 666. I. d/19. 8. 95 - Ney. III
" " 1. I. 3. 1. 96. " H
" " 314. I. 1. 4. 96. " P.

Irrigation Acct

A.94

and March 1896 when it should have been possible to make a close estimate of the cost. Apart from this, it was the duty of the Executive Engineer, when it was discovered when the estimates would be largely exceeded, to report the fact and submit revised Estimates without delay. These completion certificates are only for the Earthwork items sanctioned in the several Government orders quoted so that the total Excess on Each channel is still unknown. The Excesses now reported amount to Rs 15,251 on Estimates of Rs 37440 and would have been Rs 3234 in Excess of this but that most of the turfing which was considered necessary when the estimates were made and would in any case have been an improvement, has been omitted.

Order thereon

The Examiner of Public Works Accounts is authorized to admit the Expenditure incurred on the works referred to, the Excess Rs 15,251 being met from the balance of the provision for

for unforeseen works of the Rushikulya project which will then be reduced to Rs 27,928.

will be filled in before issue

2. The Superintending Engineer will see that the rules regarding the submission of revised estimates are strictly observed.

A.H.
3.5.98

3. This sanction is registered as No 25 I of 1898–99.

W.H. 2.5.98

I

To

The Chief Engineer for Irrign
" Supg Engr. First Circle,
" Exr of P. W. Accts.

8/5/98

E. I. Form No. 1—500—3-12-96.

Public Works (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. 4022

3819

From the Chief Engineer for Irrgn

Order

No. 152 I

Dated 6-5-98
Received
Registered } 7-5-98
Enclosures 7
Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Excess expenditure incurred on certain works of the Rushikulya Canal — authorizing the Examiner to pass the —

F.E.9

9/5/98

BACK PAPERS.

No.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

No.	Date.

Public Works (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. 94

Order

From The Examiner, P. W. Accts. Madras

No. 1263 B/A

Dated 18th April 1898

Received 19 — Do —

Enclosures

Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Completion reports for Distributaries No. 11, 12 and 15 of Rushikulya Canal — Returns duly verified &c —

Draft disposal for apprl –

JEJ

21/4/98

19/4/98

19/4/98

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
130 d/ 7.4.98			

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

N° 15 d/ 3.3.98

a/1

B

Public Works (1898) Department.

CURRENT No. 37 GN

EXAMINER,
P. W. ACCOUNTS.
14 APR. 1898
No.

From W. De Morgan Esquire
Executive Engineer in charge I Circle

8

No 130 d/ 7.4.98

Order

To C for verification of excess outlay & early return.

D.E.I.
7/4

CHIEF ENGINEER
FOR IRRIGATION.
19 APR. 1898
No. 94

7/4/98

No. 7 GN

Dated 2nd April 1898.

Received 7 — Do —

Registered

Enclosures 3

Spare copies

No 1263 B/A d/ 18th April 1898

To E.I.

9

Verified and herewith returned.

W/ 16.4.98

C

15/4/98

16/4/98

16/4/98

SUBJECT.

Completion reports for Distributaries no 11, 12 and 15 of Rushikulya Canal — Submitting the 3 — and requesting to obtain the sanction of Govt. & authorizing the Examiner P.W. accounts to admit the excess outlay incurred on the same.

BACK PAPERS.

No.	Date.

8

FURTHER PAPERS.

No.	Date.

NOTES.

Reference to P. W. D. Code.

Chapter III, para. 80; and Chapter IX, paras. 38 to 43.

1. This form should be submitted to the Examiner with the accounts of the month in which the work is reported to be completed. It is only intended to be used for works, the outlay on which is recorded by sub-heads or items of work and which have exceeded the sanctioned estimate by more than 5 *per cent.*

2. When work has been executed for the Civil or Military department, the countersignature of the Civil or Military authority concerned should be obtained to the form of Certificate (Form No. 45B. or 45D.); and the Certificate should be attached to the Completion report.

3. The entries in the Completion report must accord with the closing entries in the Register of Works, and the last Schedule docket submitted to the Examiner.

4. In the case of contribution works, proposal should be submitted as to the disposal of the unexpended balance, if any.

EXAMINER P. W. ACCOUNTS 19 MAR. 1898 No.

CHIEF ENGINEER FOR IRRIGATION. 7 APR. 1898 No. 37 GN

EXAMINER, P. W. ACCOUNTS 14 APR. 1898

SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER No. 7364 5 MAR 98

Names of Engineers and Subordinates by whom the work was supervised, giving the dates of their several incumbencies, *i.e.*, the dates of taking and making overcharge, in connection therewith.

NAMES.	Period of incumbency.	
	From	To
Executive Engineers		
J. F. Somers Cove Esqre.	November 1894.	
W. De Morgan Esqre.	21.11.94	4.3.96
John Inglis Esqre.	5.3.96	19.4.96
W. Loam Esqre	April/96	May/96
W. De Morgan Esqre.	June/96	Nov/97.
Assistant Engineers		
J. M. Lacey Esqre	Nov/94	20.7.95
M.R.Ry U. Venkatareddi Naidu Garu, Rai Bahadur	21.7.95	22.9.95
J. M. Lacey Esqre.	Sept/95	Nov/97.

Explanation of differences

Vide separate sheet attached

No 15 d/3.3-98

Inde 8/3/98

(2)

P. W. D. Form No. 45 A.

Enclosure to No 7 GN dated 7-4-98

Completion report of Original works and Special Repairs.

DIVISION— Ganjam

NAME OF WORK— Distributary No 11 from 41 6/8 m + 460 ft of R. canal.

Amount of estimate—Rs. 24060

Expenditure " 30,667

Difference " 6607

Percentage of excess (if any)— 27.46.

Date of commencement— November 1894.

Date of completion— November 1897.

Forwarded to the Examiner, P. W. Accounts, __________ for verification, as this Office No. ____, dated __________ 189 .

*Documents accompanying.**

Executive Engineer,

__________ *Division.*

Transmitted to the Superintending Engineer, __________ Circle, duly verified as this Office No. ____, dated __________ 189 .

Examiner, P. W. Accounts,

Transmitted to __________ for record as this Office No. ____, dated __________ 189 .

Superintending Engineer.

---

* Here note "Completion certificate" granted by the Civil or Military authority concerned, report, specification, drawing and detail of quantities, when necessary.

P. W. D. FORM No. 45 A.

NAME OF WORK— Distributary No 11 from 40 5/8 miles + 460' of R Canal.
FUND— Famine Relief and Insurance.
DEPARTMENTAL HEAD— I Works.
SERVICE HEAD— 35 Construction of protective Irrigation Works.
MAIN HEAD OF CLASSIFICATION— 3 Distributaries
SUB-HEAD OF CLASSIFICATION— 4 Earth work.
ARM OF THE SERVICE—
REFERENCE TO LAST SCHEDULE DOCKET SUBMITTED—No. 21, for the month of November 1897.
AUTHORITY— Regr No $\frac{16}{24}$ of 96·97 & $\frac{463}{12}$ of 95-96 & GO Nos 3149 of 1·4·96 & 19 of 3·1·96.

Sub-heads of estimate.	As estimated. Quantity.	Rate.	Amount.	As executed. Quantity.	Rate.	Amount.	Differences.* Quantity.	Rate.	Amount.	Reference to paras. overleaf explaining differences.
		Rs.	Rs.		Rs.	Rs.		Rs.	Rs.	
Cutting & Embankment										10260 25950 3621
1. Earth work.	5974·000	2/11/3	16148							
2. Rock cutting	-	-	-							
3. Removing rock in channel where met with	-	-	1800	7806·400		26628	-1832·400		-7730	
4. Cattle Ramps 10 @ 50 6 @ 75			950							
	5974·000		18898							
Lockspitting 3 lines of Channel	1584·00	0/1/3	124							
	634·00	0/1/6	59							
	2218·00		183	4192·95 4055·95	0/1/2	306	1994·95 1837·95		-123	
Turfing	10468·00	0/4/0	2617	3318·39	0/3/10	795	7149·61		1822	/
Clearing jungle			580			1022			-442	
Purushottapur Road diversion			150			132			18	
Petty Supervision			547			1118			-571	
Contingencies			1085			580			505	
A.B.C.D.E.F.G. branches Commenced & abandoned Lockspitting 38915 rft 29·15·3 clearing jungle 50·4·8 contingencies 0·1·6 80·5·5						80			-80	
Deduct arrears—						-6			-6	
13-1 / 97-8 TOTAL ...			Rs 24,060			Rs. 30,667			Rs. -6,607	

* Excesses to be entered in red ink ; Savings in black ink.

Dated the ____________ 189 .

Executive Engineer.

N. B.—When any considerable deviations from the original design have occurred, the report, specification, drawings and details of the measurement of the work actually done, in the same form as the estimates, should accompany the Completion report.

Explanation of differences

Cutting and Embankment - Cause of excess in quantity is due (1) to bed level being altered to avoid an extra drop (2) To the Channel being taken round the drinking water tank of Gurinti at the 3rd mile instead of through it as originally designed.

The excess in rate is due to the original rate of earth work being low. The Channel running in deep cutting in places. There are three drops averaging 10' each.

Lockspitting. Excess due to subsequent alterations and to branch channels being investigated, not provided for in the original estimate.

Turfing - Only banks where the ground level was below Channel bed were turfed.

Jungle clearing - Actual jungle cleared.

Offg Exec Engineer
Ganjam Dn

Compd
1·3·98.

To The Superintending Engineer 1st Circle

EXAMINER,
P. W. ACCOUNTS.
19 MAR. 1898
No.

EXAMINER,
P. W. ACCOUNTS
14 APR. 1898
No.

NOTES.

Reference to P. W. D. Code.

Chapter III, para. 80; and Chapter IX, paras. 38 to 43.

1. This form should be submitted to the Examiner with the accounts of the month in which the work is reported to be completed. It is only intended to be used for works, the outlay on which is recorded by sub-heads or items of work and which have exceeded the sanctioned estimate by more than 5 per cent.

2. When work has been executed for the Civil or Military department, the countersignature of the Civil or Military authority concerned should be obtained to the form of Certificate (Form No. 45B. or 45D.), and the Certificate should be attached to the Completion report.

3. The entries in the Completion report must accord with the closing entries in the Register of Works, and the last Schedule docket submitted to the Examiner.

4. In the case of contribution works, proposal should be submitted as to the disposal of the unexpended balance, if any.

EXAMINER,
P. W. ACCOUNTS
19 MAR. 1898
No.

CHIEF ENGINEER
FOR IRRIGATION.
7 APR. 1898
No. 37 GN

CHIEF ENGINEER
FOR IRRIGATION
19 APR. 1898
96

EXAMINER,
P. W. ACCOUNTS
14 APR. 1898
No.

Names of Engineers and Subordinates by whom the work was supervised, giving the dates of their several incumbencies, *i.e.*, the dates of taking and making overcharge, in connection therewith.

Names.	Period of incumbency.	
	From	To
Executive Engineers		
J. F. Somers Eve Esqre.	November/94.	
F. DeMorgan Esqre.	21.11.94	4.3.96
John Inglis Esqre.	5.3.96	19.4.96
M. Loam Esqre.	April 96.	May/96.
F. DeMorgan Esqre.	June/96	Augt: 97.
Sub Dl Officers		
Assistant Engineers		
J. M. Lacey Esqre.	Nov/94	20.7.95
M.R.Ry. H. Venkatareddy Naidu Rai Bahadur	21.7.95	22.9.95
J. M. Lacey Esqre.	Septr/95	July/97.

Explanation for differences.
Vide Separate sheet attached

Ml/8³/98 No. 18 d/ 5.3.98

4

743 E.N.

P. W. D. Form No. 45 A.

Ewlbs 2 GNo. 7 GN/72.4.98

Completion report of Original works and Special Repairs.

DIVISION— Ganjam

NAME OF WORK— Distributary No: 12 from 43 1/8 Mile + 100' R. canal.

Amount of estimate—Rs.		2750
Expenditure	"	4568
Difference		1818
Percentage of excess (if any)—		66.11

Date of commencement— November/94

Date of completion— July/97

Forwarded to the Examiner, P. W. Accounts, ______ for verification, as this Office No.______, dated______189 .

Documents accompanying.

786 E.N.
26/12/97

Executive Engineer,

______ *Division.*

Transmitted to the Superintending Engineer, ______ Circle, duly verified as this Office No.____, dated______189 .

Examiner, P. W. Accounts,

Transmitted to ______ for record as this Office No.______, dated ______189 .

Superintending Engineer.

---

* Here note "Completion certificate" granted by the Civil or Military authority concerned, report, specification, drawing and detail of quantities, when necessary.

EXAMINER,
P. W. ACCOUNTS.
19 MAR. 1898
No.

EXAMINER,
P. W. ACCOUNTS.
14 APR. 1898
No.

6 No. E14 dated 23/2/98
26

Enclos 3 & No 7 GN 2.4.98

SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER
28 FEB 98
FIRST CIRCLE

CHIEF ENGINEER
FOR IRRIGATION.
7 APR. 1898
No. 37 GN
3

EXECUTIVE ENGINEER'S OFFICE
P.W.D.
9 MAR 98
GANJAM DIVISION

EXAMINER,
P. W. ACCOUNTS.
14 APR. 1898
No.

CHIEF ENGINEER
FOR IRRIGATION.
19 APR. 1898
No. 94
3

Completion report of Original works and Special Repairs.

Division	Ganjam.
name of work.	Distributary no 15 from 51½ miles R. Canal.
Amount of Estimate	Rs 10,630
Expenditure	" 17,456
Difference	" 6826
Percentage of Excess	64.2 ~~[illegible]~~
Date of Commencement	Octr/94
Date of Completion	Octr/97

names of Engineers and Subordinates by whom the work was Supervised, giving dates of their Several incumbencies.

names	Period of incumbency	
	From	To
Executive Engineers		
J. F. Somers Eve Esqr	October 1894	20th Novr/94
W. De Morgan Esqr	21st Novr 1894	4th March/96
John Inglis Esqr	5 March 1896	19th April/96
M. Loam Esqr	April 1896	May/96
W. De Morgan Esqr	June 1896	October/97
Assistant Engineers		
J. M. Lacey Esqr	October/94	20th July/95
W. Venkatareddi naidu Garu Rai Bahadur	21st July/95	22nd Septr/95
J. M. Lacey Esqr	September/95	October/97

Explanation of differences.

(a). Cutting and Embankment – The excess in quantity is due to a change in alignment at two places. The original alignment ran through two Inam tanks entering at one side and taking off at the other. The owners objected to the Distributary being taken through their tanks and refused the terms for free irrigation offered. The line consequently had to be taken below the tanks in low ground.

The excess in amount is due to the original low rate of the estimate for the 1st mile the line runs through hard gravel; rock-cutting and hard soil is met with in the 5th & 6th miles. Parts of the channel run in banks 12 & 18' high.

(b). Turfing – Only high banks and places where the bed was above the natural level of the ground were turfed. Hence saving.

(C). Preliminary expenses }
(d) Clearing jungle } not provided for in the original Estimate.
(e) Fixing B. M. stones }

(f & g). Pipes for carrying the tank water across the channel had to be provided. Hence the last two items.

Executive Engineer
Ganjam Dn.

To,

~~The Examiner P.W. Accounts, Madras, for verification and transmission to the Supdg Engr.~~ ①

The Superintending Engineer
First Circle.

OWSC
4022/98

S. E. I. / 5 1000—20-2-97.

No. 7 GN

AMINER, ACCOUNTS 14 APR. 1898

From

W C De Morgan Esqre
~~J. C. Larminie Esq.~~ M. I. C. E.
~~Superintending~~ Engineer, in charge
~~Executive~~ First Circle.

Enclosures. 3 To

The Chief Engineer for Irrigation
Madras

Waltair, 2nd April 1898.
~~Camp~~ Desp'd 4th April 98

Sir,

I have the honor to submit herewith completion reports for the marginally noted works connected with the Rushikulya Project and of which the first two have been verified by the Examiner and to request that you will be good enough to obtain sanction of Government authorizing the Examiner P.W. Accounts to admit the total excess of Rs 15,251 on the 3 works.

(1) Distributary No. 11 from 40 5/8 m + 460 ft of R Canal
Amount of Estt Rs 24060
Expenditure … 30667
- 6607

(2.) Distributary No. 12. from 43 1/8 m + 100 ft R Canal – Amount of Estt Rs. 2750
Expenditure 4568
- 1818

(3) Distributary No. 15 from 51 1/2 miles R Canal Amount of Estt Rs. 10630
Expenditure Rs. 17456
- 6826

The Executive Engineer has explained the causes of excess in the Completion Reports.

The excess may be met

from the balance for unforeseen works.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obedt servant
J. D. Morgan
3/4 98
Executive Engineer
in charge I Circle