Public Works (1899) Department.

G.O., No. 1084 \9

DATED 21st Dec 1899.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Vemulapad tank, Kurnool Dt.

The estimate, amounting to Rs 9100, for restoring the — sanctioned for execution as a famine relief work.

78

Indexed. 22.12.99 / B 1571

[P. W. 2. 500—27-10-99.]

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

Class ~~II~~ IV – Other Minor works for which neither capital nor Revenue nor individual accounts are kept.

(a) In charge of the P.W.D.

Original Works.

Kurnool Division.

Restoring the Vemulapad tank.

Estimate ....Rs 9,100.

2. This sanction is registered as No. 96. I, of 1899-1900.

A.E.H.
17.12.99

11/12
SS.

W.H.
13.12.99

N.B. The Vemulapad project is, I trust, not lost sight of. It must be pushed on as a possible famine work.

A.E.H.
17.12.99

To

The Chief Engineer for Irrign: ✓

,, Supg: Engineer, III Circle. with ✓

,, Examiner P.W. Accounts. ✓ 19 enclosures

Collector of Kurnool ✓

11-12-99

H.S. 15/12

11/12/99

D 22/12/99.

E. Form No. —900—27-3-98.

H.E. 2

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT,
IRRIGATION BRANCH.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Restoring the Vemulapad tank.
Note recommending for sanction
Estimate of Rs 9,100 for — as a famine relief work

UNDER date the

READ the following

From the Superintending Engineer, III Circle, No.4365 I, dated 2nd December 1899.

No 248 I dt 13.12.99

Note by the Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

The Superintending Engineer, III Circle, submits for sanction under 33 "Famine Relief" the accompanying estimate amounting to Rs 8880 for restoring the Vemulapad tank in the Kurnool District. It is reported that the restoration of the tank will bring under irrigation about 60 acres of land from which a revenue of Rs 200 or a return of 2.3 per cent is anticipated. The estimate which has been increased in this office to Rs 9,100 owing to errors found in the calculations may be sanctioned.

D.J.

18/12/99

9100
0.115
22.0

No: 1084 I dt 21.12.99.

ORDER THEREON.

The following estimate is sanctioned for execution as a famine relief work, if required:-

Irrigation.

33 Famine Relief.

Class

A.S.H.

(1899) Department.

CURRENT No. 31 KR

Urgent

19.12.99

From The Superintdg. Engineer
3rd Circle
Bellary

Order

No. 4365 I

Dated 2-12-99

Received } 4-12-99.
Registered }

Enclosures 22 { Plans 8
{ Other papers 13 Recd

Spare copies.

SUBJECT.

Vemulapad tank.

Forwards for sanction
an estimate Rs 8880 for
restoring the — as a
Famine Relief work

D.E.I.

Note.
Amount of estimate Rs 8880.
Area of land which will be submerged in tank bed on its restoration 160 acs
for which compensation is roughly estimated at Rs 3,000
Rev Dept apparently not consulted.
Probable area of new irrigation 100 acs
Do Rev 60 to Rs 200

3 PM 5/12/99

5.12.99

BACK PAPERS.

No.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

No.	Date.

8

Public Works (1899) Department.

CURRENT No. 10382

Urgent

Order

From The Chief Engineer for Irrigation

No. 248 I

Dated 13 12 99

Received & **Registered** } 19-12-99

Enclosures ~~22~~ Plans 9 others 11 } Total 20

Spare copies.

SUBJECT.

Vemulapaud Tank in the Kurnool Dt. — Estt of Rs 9,100 for restoring the — Note recommending that the — may be sanctioned as a famine relief work.

Read A.W.B. please

BACK PAPERS.

No.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

No.	Date.

No. 1365 I

Superintending Engineer's Office,
3RD CIRCLE.
Bellary 2d December 1899.

FROM Lieut. Col. W. L. C. Baddeley R.E.
SUPERINTENDING ENGINEER,
3RD CIRCLE,

To

THE Chief Engineer
for Irrigation,
Madras

C...
FOR [illegible]
4-DEC. 1899
31 KR

Sir,

22 Enclosures.

1 Report
1 minor previous statement
1 Data
4 Calculation sheets
4 Ditto estimates
6 or detail estimate for Rs 490
1 abstract estimate for Rs 8880
4 sheets of levels section
3 Plans of masonry works
2 Tracings of [illegible]
22
1 [illegible] work book

I have the honour to forward an estimate amounting to Rs 8,880 for restoring the Vemulapad tank in the Koilkuntla Taluk, Kurnool District.

2. In the report it is stated that the tank is not worth restoring on account of the small return expected, but as there are signs of distress in the neighbourhood the Collector has asked me to bring the estimate under sanction.

I therefore recommend it as a Famine Relief work and request the favour of very early sanction.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

W. L. C. Baddeley Lieut. Col. R.E.
Supdg. Engineer, III Circle.

RB 20/12/99

From
The Superintending Engineer,
3rd Circle,

To

The

Dated
Received 189 .

Enclosures.

No.

Subject.

Rec 520
10382/14

Public Works (1899) Dep

in Go
ay 29 w
despa

G.O., No. 1085 I

DATED 22nd Dec **1899.**

[Despatch Abstract.]

Chitrachavady Channel, Coimbatore Dn.

Letter from Mr. A. A. G. Malet, explaining the circumstances that led to the excess outlay incurred on the construction of an aqueduct and bridge in lieu of the Pungoliyur outlet on the —, recorded with remark

Indexed. 15/1

[P. W. 2. / 500—27-10-99.]

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

PUBLIC WORKS
IRRIGATION B

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

UNDER date the

READ the follo

G.O. No. 932 I. of 26 Oct /99.
Memo to Mr. Mallet No 51 C.I. of 8 Nov /99
Letter from do - of 14 Nov /99

No: 1085 L.G. 22-12-99

Recorded with the remark that apart from ~~the~~ ~~explanation furnished~~ the alterations in design and in rates accounting to some extent for the estimate for the work referred to having risen by increments from Rs 4870 to Rs 6720, the file indicates the original estimate sanctioned in G.O. No. 573 I, of 16 June/96, to have been defective & that some of the defects were carried on into the two revised estimates sanctioned

S/

s No. 325 I & 1119 I
…rath & 13 Dec/97.
…tively.

Issue

WH
7.12.99

To the Chief Engr for I. ✓
Supg Engr IV Circle ✓
Mr A.A.G. Malet ✓
D 22/12/99

ICLS
7/12/99

E. I. Form No. 1—1,000—2-2-97.

H.E.

14

Explanation from Mr Malet regarding excess incurred in constg an aqueduct and bridge in lieu of the Pungalyur outlet on the Chitrachavady channel — Coimbatore Dn.

Submitted to His Excellency with reference to his remarks ✗ dated 12.10.99 on the E I's note accompanying G.O. No 9322 I dated 26.10.99. Instructions are requested whether Mr Malet should be called on for a fuller report. The net excess reported by the Supg. Engr. agrees with the Completion Report which is on the file.

WH
21.11.99

+) Logged H

Prog No 328 I
29.3.97

due to other rates
Rs 948 reduced by saving in quantities to Rs 733 paid for rubble in mortar and revetment

~~this being nearly the whole excess of the final cost above the third estimate~~ —

E.I.

It will be seen from Mr. Malet's reply that the inadequate rate for rough stone regarding which his explanation was asked for was that of the original estimate which appears to have been prepared by Mr. D.E. Winslow in 1895 when Executive Engr. of Coimbatore Divn —

The point noticed by H.E. was that ~~the work was originally estimated to cost Rs 4870 has~~ the estimate for this work had risen by increments from Rs 4870 to Rs 6720 which would indicate looseness in estimating — E.I. was asked to say whether he considered the officers concerned free from blame.

The point referred to Mr. Malet only related to the excess of ~~Rs 669~~ due to ~~the lower~~ rate paid for rough stone, ~~and~~ To

Elucidate the point noticed by H.E. it is necessary to look into the reasons why the ~~estimated~~ final cost of the work exceeded the original estimate by Rs1850 or nearly 38 per cent.—

The file furnishes the following information—

1. The design submitted by Mr. De Winton, in 1895 was similar to one carried out in 1884 by Mr. Lammie the S.E. thought the section of the walls decidedly light but was apparently prepared to pass the design as the 1884 design had stood all right— Mr. Harman the S.E. who ~~[illegible]~~ succeeded Mr. Lammie considered the walls too thin and provided for their being made thicker in the first revised estimate of 1897— Feby

— Excess Rs 730

P.W.G. No 325 I
29.3.97

2. The work was apparently then started in May 97 via complet. report. and it was found that the site survey was wrong involving an alteration in design— the rate for

Flag I

Note of E.I.
P.W.G. 1110 I
18.12.97.

Flag J

Excess Rs 569.

concrete was also increased involving extra expenditure of Rs 232.— The second revised est. was sanctioned in Dec. 97 — Excess Rs 550. Mr. Blake the Sub Dl. Officer apparently found it necessary during execution to promise an extra rate for rough stone but did not report this—

In short the design was entirely altered and the rates were altered — ~~If he assumed the~~

The S.E. and Ex. Eng. under whom the orig.l est. was prepared were different from those under whom the work was carried out— Some part of the alterations in design was due to a difference of engineering opinion this may have been the case to some extent also in the case of rates (different specification of work would affect the rates) There is no information on this point— Apart from this the file indicates the original estimate to have been defective and the defects were carried on into the two revised estimates—

J.S. 18/11/99.

The papers may be recorded with a comment in the margin of this Note.

A.H.
5.12.99

Some of —

Public Works (1899) Department.

CURRENT No. ~~418 M.~~ 10079

From A. A. G. Malet Esq.
Ag. Sant. Engr. to Govt.

Order

No. -

Dated	14 - 11 - 99.
Received / *Registered*	~~16 - 11 - 99.~~ 9.12.99
Enclosures	9 papers. 6
Spare copies.	

SUBJECT.

Aqueduct and Bridge in lieu of Pungalizar Outlet on the Chitrachavadi Channel — Explains the circumstances that led to the excess outlay on the —.

J.B.
16/11

17/11/99

16/11/99

H.E. 21-11-99

BACK PAPERS.

No.	Date.
I 51 CI	8-11-99
R 50 CI	5-9-99

FURTHER PAPERS.

No.	Date.

S. E./6 1,000—17-1-99.

No.

Government of Madras.

Office of Sanitary Engineer,
Poonamallee Road (Park Town),
Madras, 14th ~~November~~ 1899.

From

A.A.G. Malet Esq., A.M.I.C.E.
~~J. A. JONES, Esq., MEM. INST. C.E., F.R.S.E.,~~
~~Ag. Sanitary Engineer to Government,~~

To

The Chief Engineer for Irrigation.

FOR IRRIGATION
16 NOV. 1899
418 M

Sir,

In returning the enclosures sent with your Memorandum No.51 C.I. dated 8th November 1899 I have the honour to state that when submitting revised estimate I accepted the rates provided in the original estimate for constructing an Aqueduct and Bridge in lieu of Pungaliyar outlet on the Chithrachavady channel sanctioned in G.O.No. 513 I dated 16th June 1896.

2. These rates were fixed by competent authority prior to my assuming charge of the Division and I ~~saw~~ had no occasion to question them. The question of the adequacy of the rate for stone used on this work was not as far as I am aware raised during my incumbency of the Coimbatore Division either by the Sub Divisional Officer or the Contractor.

3.

3. If you wish me to go more fully into the question I will write to the Executive Engineer, Coimbatore Division for the information necessary to enable me to make a full report.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant.

A A G Malet 11.11

Ag. Sanitary Engineer to Govt.

Enclosures.

Suptg. Engr's IV Circle No.219/I dated 5.9.99 & enclosures.

G.O. No.1119 I dated 13-12-97

G.O. No.325 I dated 29-3-97

G.O. No.513 I dated 16-6-96

G.O. No.932 I dated 26-10-99

2/2

Public Works (1899) Department.

IRRIGATION BRANCH.

ISSUE No. 51 C.I

To

~~The~~ A. A. G. Malet Esqre

(Reply to letter No. , dated)

Dated 8-11-99

Despatched 11—do—

Enclosures *

* Particulars of Enclosures.

SUBJECT.

Constructing an aqueduct & bridge in lieu of the Pungolyar outlet on the Chitrachavaddy Channel — Coimbatore Dn — Forwards certain correspondence with a request to explain for the information of Govt the cause of provision of inadequate rates in the sanctioned estimate for it

Indexed

E. I. Form No. 13—4,000—7-1-99

BACK PAPERS.

No.	Date.
R 50 C.I.	7-7-99

Sent to Government with No. I.,
dated 189 .
Printed with G.O., No. I.,
dated 189 .

REMINDERS ISSUED.

No. 1, dated 189 .
" 2 "
" 3 "
" 4 "
" 5 "

KEEP-WITHS.

FURTHER PAPERS.

No.	Date.
R 418 W.I.	14-11-99

Papers—
Orig. of G.O. 932 I d/ 26/10/99

Memo No. 51 C.I. d. 8-11-99

Enclos. 5

S.E. IV Circle No. $\frac{219}{I}$ d/ 5-9-99
& Enclos:
G.O. No. 1119 I d/ 13.12.97
3253 I, d/ 29.3.97
5739 I, d/ 16.6.96
932 I d/ 26.10.99.

In forwarding herewith letter, No. $\frac{219}{I}$, d/ 5 Sept/99 & its enclosures, from the Supg. Eng., IV Circle, the undersigned has the honour to observe that the Sub Dn. Officer can promise an increase of rates only subject to the Ex. Engr's sanction. Mr. Malet must, it is thought, have inspected the work during its progress & should probably have found out the distance from which stone had to be brought – now stated to be 4½ miles – Where

te original rate was
uitable for a carriage
f only a mile or two.
Mr Malet is requested
t explain for the in-
formation of Govt
the cause of the provision
of inadequate rates
in the sanctioned
stimate for the work.

8/11/99

W.H.
8.11.99

M.E.I

put up the
papers relating to
this case again

10/11

Submitted

10/11/99

To Mr. Malet A.C.G. & as Sanitary Engr ~~thro' the S.E.~~ to Govt.

7/11/99

Pre. Encl 10079/99

EXAMINER,
P. W. ACCOUNTS
11 SEP 1899

Public Works (1899) Department.

CURRENT No. ~~5009~~

PWE + 2
6851/99
10074

From The Supdg. Engineer
4th Circle

~~**Order**~~ No 302 dt. 8-9-99

To C for verification of excess shown in the completion report & early return.

8/9/99 D.E.I

FOR IRRIGATION
15 SEP 1899
186

A

To
E.I. No. 3037 B/A dated 14th Septr/99

The excess outlay has been verified & found correct.

13.9.99

H.R.

13.9.99

14-9-99

C

7/9/99

7.9.99

No. 219/I

Dated 5th September 1899.

Received }
Registered } 7 — do —

Enclosures 3. Completion Rept etc.

Spare copies. ✓

SUBJECT.

Aqueduct & bridge in lieu of Pungaliyur outlet on Chitthrachavady Channel—

Requesting to obtain sanction of Government to an excess of Rs 570 over the sanctioned estimate for constg. an —

R
7-9-99

BACK PAPERS.	
No.	Date.
R 11 D	d/ 13-12-97

FURTHER PAPERS.	
No.	Date.
R 418 M	d/ 14-11-99

P. W. D. FORM NO. 45 A.

P. W. ACCOUNTS 11 SEP 1899

NAME OF WORK— Constructing an aqueduct & bridge in lieu of Dungalipur outlet in Chittrackavady Channel.
FUND— Provincial
DEPARTMENTAL HEAD— Irrigation
SERVICE HEAD— 43 minor works
MAIN HEAD OF CLASSIFICATION— Works for which neither Capital nor Revenue accounts are kept.
SUB-HEAD OF CLASSIFICATION—
ARM OF THE SERVICE—
REFERENCE TO LAST SCHEDULE DOCKET SUBMITTED—No. 103, *for the month of* Febry 1899.
AUTHORITY— G.o. no. 1119 I d/ 13th December 1897.

Sub-heads of estimate.	As estimated.			As executed.			Differences.*			Reference to paras. overleaf explaining differences.
	Quantity.	Rate.	Amount.	Quantity.	Rate.	Amount.	Quantity.	Rate.	Amount.	
		Rs.	Rs.		Rs.	Rs.		Rs.	Rs.	
1 Concrete in Surki mortar	12320	12	1478	12375	12	1485	55	12	7	
2. Rough Stone in — do	14835	13	1928	13681	18/4	2497	1154	5/4	569	
3 Earthwork for banking	200000	3	600	129100	3/	387	70900	3/-	213	
4 Rough stone revetment & ~~abutment~~ aprons	9500	6	570	8387	8 3/4	734	1113	2 3/4	164	
5 Grouped sub heads below Rs 500 each			1802			1991			189	
6 Contingencies			136			u			136	
7 Supervision			136			78			58	
8. Value of materials available from present outlet.			-500			-452			-48	
TOTAL ...			Rs. 6150			Rs. 6720.			Rs. 570	

Sanctioned in G.O. no. 32 d/ 26-1-99 and regd. no 80 I of 1899-1900

72.5 / 1858.99

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

Cuts 11-9-99

C. W. Merlin

Dated the ______ 189 .

W.S.P. 9.9.99 13/9

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.

15 SEP 1899

1/50 C.2

2/186

E. No. 1 to L. No. 219/I

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.

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
A. A. G. Malet Esq: Ex: Engr:	May 97	March 98
C. H. A. Burlton Esqr — do	April 98	Feby/99.
~~Overseer~~ Sub Consr: I. G. Blake Supr:	May/97	— do —

EXPLANATION OF DIFFERENCES.

MRS 3 / 5584/89 / 10079

SUPG. ENGINEER'S OFFICE P. W. D. No. 667 C.I 19 AUG 99 Encld 2 FOURTH CIRCLE

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

Completion report of Original works and Special Repairs.

DIVISION— Coimbatore

NAME OF WORK— Constructing an aqueduct & bridge in lieu of Pongaliyar outlet on the Chittrachavadi Channel.

Amount of estimate—Rs. 6150

Expenditure " 6720

Difference 570

Percentage of excess (if any)— 9.27.

Date of commencement— May 1897

Date of completion— February 1899.

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.

EXAMINER, P. W. ACCOUNTS 11 SEP 1899 No. E. No. 3 to L. No. 219/I

SUPG. ENGINEER'S OFFICE P. W. D. No. 667 C.I 19 AUG 99 Encld 1 FOURTH CIRCLE

E. No. 127.

10,000—27-8-97

CIRCLE— IV

DIVISION— Coimbatore

DISTRICT— do

ESTIMATE FORM.—Comparative Statement of Differences.

To accompany the Revised Estimate

No. 97 of 1897-98 for* Constg. an Aqueduct & Bridge in lieu ~~lieu~~ of Pongaliyar Outlet on the Chittrachavadi Channel No. 15.

Amount of Est. Rs. ~~6750.~~ 6720

Amount of original Est. 6150.

Excess reqd. to be sanctioned ~~600~~ 570

---

* Here enter the Name and Description of work in full.

MRS 4 / 5584/89 / 10079

ESTIMATE FORM.—Comparative Statement of Differences.

Description of Work.	Original Estimate.			~~Revised Estimate.~~ As actually executed at increased rate			More.	Less.	Explanation of Difference.
	Quantity.	Rate.	Amount.	Quantity.	Rate.	Amount.			
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
		Rs.	Rs.		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	Rs.	
1 Concrete in Surki mortar	12320	12-0-0	1478	12375	12-0-0	1485	7	–	1 As per actual works
2 Do – in Portland Cement	610	47-0-0	287	608	58-0-0	353	66	..	2 Increase in amount due to the increased rate being allowed vide data attached
3 Rough stone in Surki Mortar	14835	13-0-0	1928	13681	18-4-0	2497	569	..	3 do — do — do
4 Covering stone slabs	719	0-8-0	360	719	0-8-0	360	..	..	
5 Pointing with Surki Mortar	55 Sft.	2-8-0	138	5961	2-8-0	149	11	..	5 As per actual works
6 Rolled Steel beams	24 5/24 cwt	11-0-0	268	4	41-0-0	164	..	104	6 As per actual cost
7 Jungle wood wrought & put up.	143	2-8-0	358	168.8	2-8-0	422	64	..	7 Increase in quantity is due to the insertion of joists under planking
8 Gravelling, watering & stamping	190	4-0-0	8	195	4-0-0	8	..	..	
9 Rough stone for revetment	9500	6-0-0	570	8387	8-12-0	734	164	..	9 Same remarks against item 2 & 3
10 Gravel bedding 6" thick	3170	2-0-0	63	1739	2-0-0	35	..	28.	
11 Earthwork for excavating foundations		L.S.	70		L.S.	~~70~~ 52	..	18	10. As per actual works
12 Baling water		L.S.	50		L.S.	50	..	..	
13 Tarring two coats	..	..	..	1700	2-0-0	34	34	..	13 Found necessary during execution
14 Dismantling the existing outlets.		L.S.	100	11807	2-0-0	236	136	..	14 As per actual work & measurements
15 Guard stones	..	..	..	12	1-0-0	12	12	–	15 Found necessary when the work was in progress
16 Earthwork for forming bank & widenings	20000	3-0-0	600	129100	3-0-0	387	–	213	16 As per actual work & measurements
17 Land Compensation		L.S.	50		L.S.	15	..	35	17 As per actual cost
18 Clearing prickly pear	..	..	..	187000	0-4-0	47	47	..	18 Found necessary during execution
19 Drainage & cartage for above girders		L.S.	50		L.S.	26	..	24	19 Actual expenditure on this item
20 Fixing the above	..	..	..	4	4-0-0	16	16.	–	20 As the girders were ordered by the P.W.D it was found necessary to pay to the Contractor for fixing
Total Rs.			6378			~~7100~~ 7082	1126	~~404~~ 422	
21 Deduct the value of old materials available (i.e.) for rough stone			500	7866	5-12-0	462	48	..	21. As per actual quantity available
Net ~~total~~			5878			~~6628~~ 6630	1174	~~404~~ 422	
Contingencies			136			12	–	124	
Supervisions			136			~~70~~ 78	–	~~46~~ 58	
Total			6150			~~6750~~ ~~6720~~ 6150	1174 574 604	~~574~~ 604	
					Rs	~~600~~	~~600~~		
						570	570		

Amount required to be sanctioned Rs ~~600~~ 570

A. Dunne
Supg: Engineer
4th Circle.

C H B Burton
13/8/

STATION,
Dated 189 .

10,000—27-3-97.

3/50 C.9

Exec
Co
6
TOTAL.

tive

iiba

EXAMINED
P. W. ACCOUNTS
11 SEP 1899

ESTIMATE FORM.—Abstract.

Quantity.	Description of Work.	Rate.	Per	Amount	TOTAL.
1	2	3	4	5	6
		RS.		RS.	RS.
	Data sheet to accompany the estimate for Contg: Aqueduct and bridge in lieu of Pungaliyur outlet Chittrachavadi Channel				
	100 cft of Rough stone in Surki Mortar.				
100 cft	of Rough stone in Chunam as per schedule	10-0-0	100 cft	10-0-0 ✓	
~~100~~ "	Add to above for Surki cement	2-0-0	100 cft	2-0-0 ✓	
100 "	Stone cartage 4½ miles.	5-4-0	100 cft	5-4-0 ✓	
16 "	Lime cartage 3 miles	1-14-0	100 cft	-4-10 ✓	
11 "	Surki cartage 4 miles	3-12-0	100 cft	-6-7 ✓	
22 "	Sand cartage 1 mile	1-1-5	100 cft	-3-10 ✓	
	Sundries.			-0-9 ✓	✓
	Total Rs for 100 cft of Rough stone in surki mortar Rs				18-4-0
	100 cft of Rough stone packing.				
100 cft	of Rough stone packing both for apron & revetment as per schedule			3-8-0 ✓	
100 cft	Rough stone cartage 4½ miles -	5-4-0	100 cft	5-4-0 ✓	✓
	Total Rs for 100 cft of Rough stone packing — Rs				8-12-0.
	100 cft of Portland Cement Concrete.				
100 cft	of Portland cement as per schedule	46-8-0	100 cft	46-8-0 ✓	
112½ cft	" granite metal extra rate for using granite metal	4-0-0	-do-	4-8-0 ✓	
16 cft.	Cement cartage 4 miles	3-12-0	-do.	0-9-7 ✓	
32 cft	Sand cartage 1 mile.	1-1-5	-do-	0-5-7 ✓	
112½ cft.	" granite metal cartage 4½ miles.	5-4-0	-do-	5-14-6 ✓	
	Sundries.			0-2-4	✓
	Total Rs for 100 cft of Portland cement concrete — Rs				58-0-0
	Grand Total of Estimate ..				

STATION ——— }
Date ——— 189 . }

15 SEP 1899

3/186

AR

2/50 C.S.

12/2/51

C W B Butler
Executive Engineer.
Coimbatore Divn.

(E. No. 132.)

50,000—12-2-97.

EXECUTIVE ENGINEER'S OFFICE
No. 3609 J
28 JUN. 1898
Encl 2
COIMBATORE.

COIMBATORE SUB-DIVISION
No. C/924
24 JUN. 98
P. W. D.
COIMBATORE DIVISION.

EXECUTIVE ENGINEER'S OFFICE
No. 5926 J
5 OCT. 1898
Encl 3
COIMBATORE.

SUPDG. ENGINEER'S OFFICE, P.W.D.
No.
9-NOV.89
Enclo.
FOURTH CIRCLE

E. No. 2 to L. No. 219/J

Circle—

Division—

District—

Taluk (or Estate in case of Estate Works.)

ESTIMATE FORM.—Abstract.

Financial Head—

Budget Head—

Departmental Head—

Main Head—

Sub-Head—

Project of which the work forms part—

Section—

Name of Work—

Amount of Estimate, Rs.—

To be carried out by—

REFERENCES.

MoE 4 5
5584
100/14

No. 219/J

EXAMINER P. W. ACCOUN
11 SEP 1899

Office of the Superintending Engineer,
FOURTH CIRCLE.
~~Coimbatore~~ Coimbatore 5th September 1899.

From

A. H. Garrett Esquire,
Superintending Engineer,
Fourth Circle, Coimbatore.

To

The Chief Engineer for Irrigation
Madras

CHIEF ENGINEER FOR IRRIGATION
7 - SEP. 1899
No. 50 C.I.

Enclosures. 3

1 Completion Report
1 Comparative Statement
1 Data Sheet.

Sir,

I have the honour to submit herewith a completion report together with a Comparative Statement explaining the cause of excess in each item over the second revised estimate of Rs 6150 for constructing an aqueduct and bridge in lieu of Pungaliyur outlet on the Chittrachavady Channel, sanctioned in G.O. no: 1119 I dated 13.12.97, and to request you will be good enough to obtain sanction of Government to the total excess of Rs 570. This excess is chiefly due to the necessity of raising certain rates, for which a data sheet is furnished. The work was finished in August 1898 and apparently Mr. Malet had intended sending up a third revised estimate before

FOR ...
15 SEP. 1899

1/186

before he was relieved by Mr. Bulton.

In November 1898, Mr. Bulton forwarded a file of Correspondence connected with the work and applied for orders. There was no agreement and the Contractor appointed by Mr. Blake, the Sub Division officer had been promised higher rates by Mr. Blake, though nothing about the inadequacy of the estimate rates was ever reported by Mr. Blake. On the Exec Engineer reporting that the rates entered in the Comparative Statement now sent were in his opinion fair rates, an opinion in which I concurred, he was told in January last that there should be no delay in paying off liabilities and submitting a Completion report explaining the excess.

This report and statement have only now been received and are submitted herewith.

In conclusion I may add that the Sanctioned estimate was prepared in the Division Office and that the Sub Division officer is not responsible for the incorrect rates, though he is much to blame for not having brought their inadequacy to notice before.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your Most obedt Servt.

Supdg Engineer IV Circle

1.9.99.