10-8-11 ✓
30-8-11 ✓
11-10-12 ✓
26-4-13 ✓

CONFIDENTIAL.

Revenue (1893) Department.

G.O., No. 4788.
Confidential No. 625.
DATED 22 December 93.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Communicating to the Board of Revenue Pro: P. W. D. considering that it is quite unnecessary to investigate the proposed Varsanad Valley Reservoir project.

10

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
fo	1041	Rev	14.3.93				
fo	1485	Rev	22.4.93				

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
fo	2261	Rev	9.6.94				
fo	2891	Rev	21.7.94				

Cno 3866/93

0/18 —2,000—13-3-93. Confidential

F.C. no 5198 of 94 fo. 289 21.7.94

(1893.)

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

Current Number. 5/
8622

From
Govt P.W.D.

47 88
22 Dec 93

H.M. and
H.E. the Governor.

Dated 22
Received 24 } November/93

Enclosures

No. 36251V

SUBJECT.

Considering that it is quite unnecessary to investigate the proposed Varasanad Valley Reservoir Project

RFO

ABSTRACT.

No 4788 of 22nd December 1893

Sp. mis L.L. 19/12/93

Communicated to the Commr of Land Revenue -

Rm
8 Dec 93.
Elgar
10 Dec/93

To the Comrs of Land Revenue.
DLS. 25-12

Note - The papers have I presume been seen by His Exc. the Governor already in the P.W.D. The reference was made at His Exc.'s suggestion.

Rm
Returned to H.E. the Governor
Chr

— confidential —

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

again

READ the following

GO No. 81 dated 30th Janv: 93 Rev. dept.

" " 1932 " 26 May 93 "

Read also:—

Note by the Chief Engineer P. W. D.

dated 2nd November 1893:—

It is not very clear why the papers connected with the suggested reservoir on the Upper Vaigai have been dealt with in the General Branch, the question being one of Irrigation, and having nothing to do with the Periyar Project, the control of which has for special reasons been retained by this Branch.

2. As however they have hitherto been so dealt with, and as I have some personal knowledge of the country affected I venture to submit the following remarks for the consideration of Govt.

3. Go. (Revenue Department)

(40—2,000—11-10-93.

No.

№ 1932 of 26th May 1893 though dated subsequently to Mr Fear's reports of the 29th April and 7th May 1893, refers to an earlier question and no orders have yet been passed upon the reports themselves.

4. The G.O. in the Revenue Dept. recognises the fact that the work to be done requires the services of a special officer, and that officer will have to be a man of some experience and considerable judgment. It will be exceedingly difficult to spare such an officer without detriment to the regular work of the Department, even now, and the difficulty will be increased if as is most probable special terms are offered which will induce the retirement of several of the most experienced and efficient of our Executive Engineers.

5. That the suggested reservoir can be constructed there need be no doubt whatever; there are no special engineering difficulties in the way, but whether there is the smallest chance of its repaying directly or indirectly the cost of its construction is another question.

6. I gather from the papers that the reservoir is expected to serve two purposes; 1st the extension of irrigation in the Gandamanaya-Kanur zemindary and possibly in the Government taluq of Peraeolum, and 2nd the regulation and partial prevention of floods in the main river.

7. As regards the first object I am certain that investigation will show that no return worth mentioning as compared with the cost of a high dam can be looked for from increased irrigation.

8. It is only during exceptional years that any Vaigai water goes to waste at all and cal-

-ntations of the possibility of
extension of cultivation must be
based upon normal years and
not upon exceptional ones. The
whole raison d'etre of the Periyar
Project lies in the known fact
that the existing supply of the
Vaigai is already fully utilised
and that no appreciable increase
of cultivation can be looked for
except by a definite addition
to this supply.

9. It may be taken as certain
that no increase of irrigation
under the Upper Vaigai is possible
without detriment to existing interests
lower down, and that no appreciable
direct return is to be obtained
from regulating works in the
Varasanad Valley.

10. As to the second object I
must confess to being at a loss
to understand how anyone
could suppose that a reservoir
in the Varasanad Valley could
prevent such "floods causing de-
struction of tanks" as are contem-
plated in para 19 of the Revenue
Board's Proceedings, printed with
G.O. No 81 of the 30th January 1893.

11. In the first place there is
no evidence whatever that disasters
of any kind have ever occurred
from floods in the river. I was
at work between Madura and
Tuticorin during the monsoon of
1869 when the river floods were
nearly if not quite the highest
on record, and have been
intimately acquainted with the
District ever since; neither then
nor at any subsequent time have
I seen or heard of any case in
which serious damage has been
done by floods in the Vaigai,
nor do I believe that any
such case has occurred.

12. Tanks were breached then

and on many other occasions not by the water in the river, but by water on its way to the river, and this damage could not be effected one way or another by a reservoir in the Varasanad Valley.

13. Tanks fed from a river by channels with open heads are occasionally breached by floods in the river which cause more water to enter the tanks than their surplus weirs can carry off, but this very rarely happens even to tanks with permanent anicuts (on the Suruli which has thirteen channels with heads to which sluices have only been put within the last few years a tank is hardly ever breached from this cause) because the bank of the supply channel nearly always goes before that of the tank itself, and in any case all risk can be prevented by the construction of head sluices at a cost not one hundredth part of that of the proposed reservoir.* In the lower Vaigai damage of this kind is the less likely to happen because the supply channels are mostly fed by "corumbus" which are breached long before the supply reaches an amount likely to endanger the tank banks.

14. If the Government will ask for a return of the actual damage done by water passing down or coming from the Vaigai (not by water going to it) during the last thirty years I shall be surprised if the total amounts to as many thousands of rupees

* The principal channel that from the Periar on the left bank of the river has already been protected in connection with the Periyar distribution works.

15. It must further be borne in mind that the proposed reservoir deals only with a fraction (certainly not more than a tenth and I think less) of the whole catchment basin of the Vaigai at Kannad, and does not affect either of its two great tributaries the Suruli and the Varaha Nadi, the former of which carries far more water than the Vaigai proper and the latter little less.

16. The Periyar Project may be left out of consideration so far as the question of the reservoir is concerned. On the one hand the execution of the Project will not set free any Vaigai water for extension of irrigation, as the designs provide for the utilisation of the whole of the Periyar water in addition to the existing supply of the Vaigai. On the other hand the "fresh element of danger" dreaded by the Board of Revenue will not exist; even supposing the Periyar Head Sluices to be accidentally left full open during the occurrence of a flood in the Vaigai the additional water they sent down will not be more than five per cent of the natural flood discharge of the latter river and will be absolutely imperceptible at any point below its junction with the Suruli.

17. I am prepared to assert with the utmost confidence that the proposed reservoir would be absolutely worthless either for the extension of irrigation or for the prevention of damage from floods and would suggest for the consideration of Government

the question whether it is worth while to proceed with an investigation which can lead to no practical results.—

Order:— No. 3025 W dt Nov 22nd 1893.

In the face of the decided opinion expressed by the Chief Engineer His Excellency the Governor in Council considers it quite unnecessary to investigate the proposed Varasanad Valley Reservoir Project.

(True Extract)

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS
24 NOV 93
REVENUE DEPARTMENT

W Boddy Major R.E.,
Under Secy to Govt. P.W.D.

To,
The Revenue Department.

Ec 5 Nov.

First copy sent to Press.

Returned for Signature.

Despatched.

NUMBER OF COPIES REQUIRED. { Order complete. / Letter only. / Order complete with Letter.

READ AGAIN G.O., No. 189 , DATED

Spare Copies.

Struck .. ..

Issued .. ..

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO C. No

Total ..

In hand ..

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT .. .. ..

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH IN ORIGINAL.

N.B.—

A = Print in full.
B = Not to be printed.
P = Print abstract only.
Q = Print heading only.