

CHAPTER-IV WORKS EXPENDITURE

SECTION-‘A’-REVIEW

FLOOD CONTROL DEPARTMENT

4.1 Flood control measures undertaken by the Flood Control Department in Assam

A review of the flood control measures undertaken by the State Government revealed that while poor financial condition of the Government hindered flood control activities, the funds provided by the Union Government for the purpose could not be utilised in full and reimbursement obtained. Non-plan expenditure including salary component was continuously on the rise indicating Government's failure to give priority on creation of flood control infrastructure.

Highlights

-- While priority should have been on creation of flood control infrastructure and implementation of flood control measures, higher expenditure ranging from 40 to 70 per cent (Plan) and 87 to 94 per cent (non-Plan) for salary was made against 30 to 60 per cent (Plan) and six to 13 per cent (non-Plan) for works during 1996-97 to 2001-2002.

-- Out of 25 schemes recommended by the Planning Commission between 1998-99 and 2001-2002 to be funded under non-lapsable central pool of resources, only four schemes could be completed at the end of March 2002 due to delay in release of fund to the executing department.

-- In 1996-97 the Union Government agreed to provide Rs.25 crore as grants in aid on reimbursement basis for implementation of 15 schemes but the department could claim reimbursement of Rs.10.09 crore only and the grant of Rs.14.91 crore could not be availed by the State Government. Consequently, none of the schemes could be completed during the year.

-- During 1996-97 to 2001-2002, under State plan there was shortfall in achievement ranging from 20 to 86 per cent in construction of embankment/retirement dyke and 16 to 47 per cent in execution of anti erosion works. The shortfall in coverage of area to be benefited ranged between 33 and 94 per cent.

-- In Dhubri E&D Division there was unfruitful expenditure of Rs.2.11 crore due to abandonment of a work midway.

-- In Goalpara E&D Division there was wasteful expenditure of Rs.27.36 lakh due to erosion of the newly constructed retirement dyke as the

protection work was not taken up in the eroded site where retirement dyke was constructed.

-- In violation of payment procedure Rs.9.10 crore was paid by seven divisions during 2000-2001 and 2001-2002 through 5,906 hand receipts and the entire expenditure remained out of audit scrutiny as the bills remained unvouched.

-- Ten divisions executed 99 works at a total cost of Rs.26.06 crore without administrative approval and technical sanction.

4.1.1 Introduction

Assam is one of the most flood prone States in the country. Forty *per cent* (3.15 million hectares) of the total geographical area (7.84 million hectares) is flood prone. The State is devastated by flood caused by two rivers namely Brahmaputra and Barak and their tributaries. In September 1954 the Union Government announced a national policy on flood comprising three phases namely immediate, short term and long term measures. Since then a considerable number of flood control measures (immediate and short term) have been under taken by the Flood Control Department in the Brahmaputra and the Barak valley to provide protection to flood affected area of 1.63 million hectares.

4.1.2 Organisational set up

Flood control measures are undertaken by the Flood Control (FC) Department in the entire State, which comprises 23 districts, 48 sub-divisions and 25,590 villages. The department is headed by the Secretary and assisted by two Deputy Secretaries. Under the Secretary there are two Chief Engineers and seven Zonal Officers (Additional Chief Engineer). There are 33 flood control divisions (27–working divisions, four–Mechanical divisions, one–Soil Research Division and one–Hydraulic Research division). There is a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) on whose recommendations the schemes are approved for execution by the department. There is also an apex body *viz.*, Assam State Flood Control Committee for Brahmaputra and Barak Valley headed by the Chief Minister for formulating policy and implementation of flood control measures.

4.1.3 Audit Coverage

Out of 23 districts, nine districts* (39 *per cent*) were selected for review. Selection was made on the basis of expenditure (53 *per cent* of total expenditure), geographical location (Upper Assam, Lower Assam and Barak Valley) and flood prone areas. Again out of 27 working divisions which implement flood control measures, nine divisions# (three in Upper Assam, five in Lower Assam and one in Barak Valley), constituting 33 *per cent* of total divisions were test-checked during the period from February 2002 to June 2002.

* (a) 1. Dibrugarh, 2. Tinsukia, 3. Sivasagar, 4. Kamrup, 5. Nalbari, 6. Goalpara, 7. Dhubri, 8. Dhemaji and 9. Karimganj.

(b) 1. Dibrugarh E&D Division, 2. Dhemaji E&D Division, 3. Sivasagar E&D Division, 4. Guwahati West E&D Division, 5. P.G.P. Division, 6. Nalbari E&D Division, 7. Goalpara E&D Division, 8. Dhubri E&D Division and 9. Karimganj F.C. Division.

4.1.4 Financial management

Provision of funds, authorisation for expenditure (fixation of ceiling) and expenditure incurred thereagainst during the period from 1997-2002 by the Flood Control Department for flood control measures is given in Appendix-XVII.

(a) Unutilised funds and its effects on flood control measures

During the period from 1997 to 2002 against budget provisions of Rs.361.47 crore, the authorisation for drawal (ceiling) was issued for Rs.198.84 crore (55 per cent) due to acute financial crisis which led to savings of Rs.162.65 crore (45 per cent) over budget provision. The resultant effect was that out of 132 schemes taken up from 1996-97, 100 schemes remained incomplete. These are discussed in the succeeding paragraphs.

(b) Continued rise in salary expenditure

While works remained unexecuted more funds were provided to meet salary expenditure, as would be evident from the table below. The ratio of budget provision and expenditure on establishment and works to total provision and expenditure under Plan and non-Plan during 1996-97 to 2001-2002 were as indicated below:

Plan

(Rupees in crore)

Head of A/c	Year	Budget provision					Actual expenditure				
		Work	Establis hment	Total	Percentage of provision to total provision		Works	Establis hment	Total	Percentage of expenditure to total expenditure	
					Works	Estt..				Works	Estt.
4711-C.O., F.C. plan	1996-1997	11.21	7.58	18.79	60	40	11.00	6.33	17.33	63	37
	1997-1998	10.53	8.04	18.57	57	43	8.73	7.10	15.83	55	45
	1998-1999	10.53	8.04	18.57	57	43	5.03	7.77	12.80	39	61
	1999-2000	6.67	12.23	18.90	35	65	5.81	10.40	16.21	36	64
	2000-2001	5.00	11.35	16.35	31	69	4.89	10.99	15.88	31	69
	2001-2002	5.00	11.46	16.46	30	70	5.00	11.00	16.00	31	69
Total		48.94	58.70	107.64			40.46	53.59	94.05		

Source: Information furnished by the Department.

Non-Plan

(Rupees in crore)

Head of A/c	Year	Budget provision					Actual expenditure				
		Work	Establis hment	Total	Percentage of Provision to total provision		Mainte nance and Repair Works	Establis hment	Total	Percentage of expenditure to total expenditure	
					Works	Estt.				Works	Estt.
2711-F.C., Non-plan	1996-1997	6.16	40.32	46.48	13	87	1.81	40.32	42.13	4	96
	1997-1998	7.59	49.29	56.88	13	87	4.58	43.98	48.56	9	91
	1998-1999	7.12	59.54	66.66	11	89	3.00	58.95	61.95	5	95
	1999-2000	7.16	85.58	92.74	8	92	2.42	62.66	65.08	4	96
	2000-2001	5.35	70.18	75.53	7	93	5.37	64.00	69.37	8	92
	2001-2002	5.35	79.33	84.68	6	94	4.15	63.07	67.22	6	94
Total		38.73	384.24	422.97			21.33	332.98	354.31		

Source: Information furnished by the Department.

With reference to total provision in the Plan sector there was continued rise in budget provision for salary component varying from 40 to 70 per cent against continued decline in works component from 60 to 30 per cent during 1996-97 to 2001-2002. Similarly expenditure on salary component rose from 37 to 69 per cent against

decline in works expenditure from 63 to 31 *per cent* during the same period. In the non-Plan sector also against the provision ranging from 87 to 94 *per cent*, the expenditure was from 91 to 96 *per cent* for salary component while under works component expenditure was as meager as four to nine *per cent* against provision varying between six and 13 *per cent* during the period. Thus, while priority should have been on flood control measures, a larger provision was made and expenditure incurred on establishment and the effect of financial crisis faced by the Government thus had an adverse impact on flood control works.

Further, scrutiny of schemes revealed that the works taken up were of non-Plan nature *viz.*, emergent anti-erosion works, construction of retirement dyke to close the breach of embankment to protect the country-side in case of breach and temporary palliative measures *etc.* No investment was made since 1996-97 to create additional flood control infrastructure. It was seen that out of budget provision of Rs.107.64 crore during the period from 1996-97 to 2001-2002 under head of account "4711-Flood Control and Drainage" an expenditure of Rs.94.05 crore was incurred on non-Plan nature of works (Rs.40.46 crore) and salary (Rs.53.59 crore) though as per norm only 10 *per cent* of Plan funds were to be utilised as salary and balance to be utilised for creation of additional infrastructure.

(c) *Parking of funds in Revenue Deposit*

Test-check of records revealed that in March 1996 the Guwahati West Embankment and Drainage Division drew Rs.3.97 crore as nodal office for execution of different flood control schemes under State Plan. The details of schemes and division involved were not available in records of the nodal officer. The amount was kept in revenue deposits in the same month as per directive of the Government without utilising the same for the intended purpose. Subsequently, between September 1997 and December 2001 the division drew Rs.1.48 crore from the revenue deposit as per authorisation by the Government and remitted the same to 16 disbursing officers (Executive Engineers) executing the schemes. However, Rs.2.49 crore still remained unutilised (March 2002) in revenue deposit.

4.1.5 *Tardy implementation of schemes*

(a) *Schemes funded under non-lapsable central pool of resources*

In 1998 the committee for funding the schemes under Non Lapsable Central Pool of Resources (NLCPR) recommended the financing of 25 flood management schemes costing Rs.62.36 crore for works (excluding the cost of land acquisition amounting to Rs.2.21 crore which was to be borne by the State Government from its plan fund resources) at different locations of Brahmaputra and Barak basin (spread over 13 districts and 15 divisions). The Union Government had released Rs.20.00 crore only (Rs.5.00 crore in 1998-99, Rs.5.00 crore in 2000-01 and Rs.10.00 crore in 2001-02). The entire amount was expended on 25 schemes up to March 2002. An additional amount of Rs.20.00 crore released by Government of India in February 2002 was allotted by the department to 15 divisional officers in June 2002 (Rs.10 crore) and August 2002 (Rs.10 crore). Reason for delay in release of funds was not stated.

Records revealed that, out of 25 schemes taken up during 1999-2001, which were scheduled to be completed by March 2002, only four schemes had been completed after incurring expenditure of Rs.8.73 crore including unpaid liability of Rs.3.25 crore and flood prone area of 0.19 lakh hectares could be protected till March 2002. The

remaining 21 schemes remained incomplete after incurring expenditure of Rs.35.71 crore including unpaid liability of Rs.21.21 crore. The delay in completion of the schemes was attributed to delay in release of funds to the executing department. In certain cases contractors refused to carry on with work/or deliberately delayed works due to non-receipt of payments against their preferred bills.

(b) Scheme funded by Central Loan Assistance (CLA)/Grants

The complex flood, erosion and drainage congestion problems of Assam were studied by eminent engineers, experts and various committees constituted by the State Government as well as by the Union Government and they were of the view that the effective solution to the flood management problem would be in the implementation of mega multipurpose projects whereby peak floods can be moderated by operating the reservoirs to reduce the flood heights in lower reaches. But implementation of these mega projects would take considerable time as these involve inter-state implications and require detailed and time consuming investigations. Till then it is required to continue with short-term measures for giving relief to the people from the fury of flood and stabilise the assets created so far. It would be necessary to strengthen/stabilise the embankment system which have outlived their designed lives, so that they can withstand the high flood with minimum damage.

In accordance with recommendation and suggestion regarding execution of various short-term measures incorporated in the Master Plan prepared by the Brahmaputra Board (constituted for the purpose by an act of Parliament in 1980), Flood Control Department is executing such schemes costing more than Rs.one crore under Central Loan Assistance (CLA) outside the State plan framework.

The position of schemes funded by Central Loan Assistance between 1996-97 and 2001-2002 is given below:

Year	New scheme	Schemes completed	Spill over/ongoing schemes	Estimated cost (Rs.in crore)	Outlay (Rs.in crore)	Funds provided (Rs.in crore)	Remarks
1996-97	15	Nil	15	31.13*	--	10.09	* Including Rs.6.13 crore spill over to next year.
1997-98	8	1	22	46.69	30.00	18.00*	* Rs.eight crore out of Rs.18 crore was deducted at source towards repayment of earlier loan.
1998-99	Nil	7	15	NA	22.00	18.00	--
1999-2000	16	Nil	31	63.00	63.00	15.00	--
2000-2001	Nil	Nil	31	--	Nil	Nil	--
2001-2002	15	Nil	40*	217.68	44.00 (including 10 per cent State share)	Nil	*six Schemes costing less than Rs. three crore were excluded in the Annual Plan 2001-2002 as per guidelines of the Planning Commission.

Source: Information furnished by the Department.

In view of the stringent financial condition and persistent demand of the State Government, the Government of India, Ministry of Finance, Department of Expenditure agreed to provide Rs.25 crore during 1996-97 as grants-in-aid on reimbursement basis for execution of 15 short-term measures schemes costing Rs.31.13 crore (including spill over amount Rs.6.13 crore). On completion of the schemes 0.25 lakh hectares area was expected to be benefited. But due to financial constraints of the State, an amount of Rs.10.09 crore could only be spent and got reimbursed during 1996-97 and the grant of Rs.14.91 crore could not be availed of by

the State Government. As a result none of the schemes could be completed and consequently benefits envisaged had not been realised during 1996-97.

Between 1997-98 and 2001-2002 another 39 schemes were taken up for implementation with central loan assistance, of which six schemes costing less than Rs. three crore were excluded from the Annual Plan 2001-2002 as per guidelines of the Planning Commission. Thus, 48 schemes were to be executed with Central loan assistance/Grants up to 2001-2002.

A scrutiny of the records revealed that out of 48 schemes only eight schemes could be completed (one in 1997-98 and seven in 1998-99) in all respect with an expenditure of Rs.20.39 crore including unpaid liability of Rs.4.43 crore as of March 2002. The remaining 40 ongoing schemes were at different stages of implementation ranging from 0 to 90 *per cent* after incurring expenditure of Rs.86.44 crore including unpaid liability of Rs.43.19 crore since 1997-98. The divisions implementing the schemes did not furnish formal completion certificate for the schemes completed except mentioning the percentage of physical progress in the quarterly progress report. The reason for non-submission of completion certificate was neither on record nor stated. In view of non-receipt of Central assistance and stringent financial condition of the State Government, it was injudicious on the part of the department to take up new schemes without completing the ongoing schemes.

(c) State plan schemes

Between 1996-97 and 2000-2001, year-wise target and achievement for different works under State Plan schemes of Flood Control and Drainage were as under:

Year	Item of works	Target	Achievement	Shortfall	Percentage of shortfall
1996-97	1.Embankment/retirement and Raising/Strengthening work (in Km).	5.50	8.00	--	--
	2.Ante-erosion work (in number).	17	9	8	47
	3.Benefited area (lakh hectares).	0.003	0.003	--	--
1997-98	1.Embankment/retirement and Raising/Strengthening work (in Km).	20	2.5	17.50	86
	2.Ante-erosion work (in number).	14	14	--	--
	3.Benefited area (lakh hectares).	0.050	0.003	0.047	94
1998-99	1.Embankment/retirement and Raising/Strengthening work (in Km).	12.20	2.00	10.20	85
	2.Ante-erosion work (in number).	12	10	2	16
	3.Benefited area (lakh hectares).	0.03	0.003	0.027	90
1999-2000	1.Embankment/retirement and Raising/Strengthening work (in Km).	2.50	2.00	0.50	20
	2.Ante-erosion work (in number).	7	7 no	--	--
	3.Benefited area (lakh hectares).	0.01	0.001	0.009	90
2000-2001	1.Embankment/retirement and Raising/Strengthening work (in Km).	8.00	2.00	6.00	86
	2.Ante-erosion work (in number).	10	7 no	3	30
	3.Benefited area (lakh hectares).	0.003	0.002	0.001	33
2001-2002	1.Embankment/retirement and Raising/Strengthening work (in Km).	8	2.10	5.90	74
	2.Ante-erosion work (in number).	12	14	--	--
	3.Benefited area (lakh hectares).	0.002	0.002	--	--

Source: Information furnished by the department.

It would be seen from above that shortfall of construction of embankment/retirement dyke and raising and strengthening of existing embankment under State Plan during 1997-98 to 2000-2001 ranged between 20 and 86 *per cent*. Shortfall in anti-erosion

work during the period from 1996-97 to 2000-2001 ranged between 16 and 47 *per cent*, whereas shortfall in protection of flood prone area during the same period ranged between 33 and 94 *per cent*.

The reason for such a large shortfall in achievement was due to less allocation of funds than the approved outlay for the works in the respective year.

4.1.6 Irregularities in execution of works

During test-check of records following irregularities were noticed in implementation of the scheme:

(a) Unfruitful expenditure on abandoned work

In Dhubri E&D Division, the work “construction of Brahmaputra Dyke from Balikuchi to Fakiraganj at Paravita (41 km to 45.42 km)” commenced from September 1992 at an estimated cost of Rs.3.03 crore. The work was to be completed by August 1995. After achieving about 70 *per cent* of work the same was abandoned in October 1998 due to encroachment of land by the flood affected people of the locality. Also, the dyke at chainage 46 km was eroded in the year 1997 including a length of about 440 metre of the retirement dyke at tail end. Subsequently, the gap got further widened and remained unplugged in the down stream leading to non-completion and abandonment of balance 30 *per cent* work. Thus, the expenditure of Rs.2.11 crore so far incurred at Paravita Dyke including liability of Rs.1.30 crore became largely unfruitful.

(b) Wasteful expenditure

In Goalpara E&D Division, a work *viz.*, “Construction of retirement* from chainage 19.46 km to 24.60 km of Brahmaputra Dyke from Kharmuja to Balikuchi at Bawratol in Fatengapara area” for protecting 4,000 hectare of agriculture and homestead land from flood was started in April 1999 on the basis of go-ahead order by the Secretary, Flood Control Department without obtaining administrative approval and technical sanction. Administrative approval for Rs.3.40 crore and technical sanction to the work for Rs.3.39 crore were accorded in June 1999 and March 2001 respectively. The work was allotted to different contractors with stipulation to complete the work within 30 to 45 days from the date of issuing work order (April 1999). Till 24 June 2000 only 85 *per cent* of works at a cost of Rs.0.56 crore, could be completed by the contractors. No action was taken against the contractors for delay in execution as per agreement. On 25 June 2000 the floodwater eroded 1,125 metres of the newly constructed embankment due to non-execution of erosion protection work before taking up the construction of embankment. Thus, the expenditure of Rs.27.36 lakh out of Rs.0.56 crore incurred by the division for construction of 1125 metres of embankment became wasteful.

(c) Avoidable expenditure on settlement of outstanding liabilities

According to standard condition of contract a contractor is to submit bill for works executed in each month and divisional officer was to clear the bill within 10 days of

* Retirement: Short embankment constructed to protect entering of flood water in the countryside through breach portion of the original embankment.

its presentation. Test-check revealed that in nine divisions bills for Rs.29.37 crore* as of March 2002 were not settled for years together due to non-release of funds by the Government in time and a few contractors filed court cases for settlement of outstanding claims amounting to Rs.2.11 crore. During 1996-97 to 2001-2002 the divisions incurred an avoidable expenditure of Rs.29.59 lakh on account of interest (Rs 26.60 lakh) and cost of suit (Rs.2.99 lakh).

4.1.7 Other points of interest

(a) Payment through Hand Receipts

According to the provision of Rule 311 of the Assam Financial Rules, hand receipt (HR) is a simple form of voucher for payment of petty amount or for advance payments and should not be utilised where prescribed forms are applicable. For payment of running account bills and final bills where prescribed form of voucher is applicable, payment by hand receipts is irregular.

During test-check it was seen that Rs.9.10 crore was paid by seven divisions through 5906 hand receipts during 2000-2001 and 2001-2002 in violation of the rules *ibid*. The amount paid through HR varied between Rs.3,000 to Rs.2.50 lakh. The payment through hand receipts were made against the running account bills/final bills of the contractors for the works done and measured without passing the bills for payment and in many cases payments have been made three to four times without effecting requisite deductions on the plea that the bill had not been passed finally. Due to such part payments through hand receipts the original bills remained un-passed and outside the purview of audit for years together as they were not considered as vouchers. Besides this, due to such payments possibility of excess/double payment, misappropriation and evasion of taxes cannot be ruled out. As such the expenditure of Rs.9.10 crore was not susceptible to audit.

(b) Execution of works without administrative approval and technical sanction

As per codal provisions no works should be taken up for execution without administrative approval and technical sanction from the Government/competent authority.

Test-check revealed that:

(i) in eight divisions 69 works were executed during 1992-93 to 1996-97 at a cost of Rs.24.10 crore (including unpaid liability of Rs.0.86 crore) till March 2002 without technical sanction from the competent authority,

*

(Rupees in crore)

Head of Account	Amount of unpaid bills for the period from July 1999 to March 2002
4711-capital outlay on Flood Control	
(a) State Plan	7.71
(b) JRC	0.55
2711-Flood Control, Maintenance and Repairs	5.33
2245- Relief on Calamity	15.78
Total	29.37

(ii) Executive Engineer of Guwahati East division and Dhemaji E&D division executed 30 works during 1994-95 to 1996-97 involving an expenditure of Rs.1.96 crore without administrative approval from Government.

Reasons for spending Rs.26.06 crore by the divisions without administrative approval (Rs.1.96 crore) and technical sanction (Rs.24.10 crore) in violation of codal provisions were neither on record nor stated.

(c) Extra expenditure on excess staff

According to norm fixed in Flood Drill Meeting (May 1986) one section assistant (SA) and one *khalashi* can be engaged by a division for each five km length of embankment and drainage channel, each protection sites, for each major sluice and for all office building of the division. During test-check in seven divisions it was seen that there was deployment of excess section assistants (95) and *khalashis* (265) over prescribed norms for reasons not on record. The deployment of excess staff led to extra expenditure of Rs.6.76 crore between 1999-2000 and 2001-2002 as detailed below:

(Rupees in lakh)						
Sl. No.	Name of division	Period	Men in position (No.)	Requirement as per norms (No.)	Excess (No.)	Extra expenditure
1.	Nalbari E&D.	1999-2000 to 2001-02	Khalasi-191	102	89	128.89
2.	Sivasagar E&D.	-- DO --	SA-168	126	42	118.11
3.	Karimganj F.C.	-- DO --	Khalasi-147	94	53	93.87
4.	Guwahati West E&D.	-- DO --	Khalasi-141	97	44	72.75
5.	Dhubri E&D.	-- DO --	SA-68	44	24	66.45
			Khalasi-58	44	14	28.77
6.	Dhemaji E&D.	-- DO --	SA-87	73	14	29.69
			Khalasi-103	73	30	47.06
7.	PGP Divisionn.	-- DO --	SA-23	8	15	31.87
			Khalasi-43	8	35	58.04
Total			SA-346	251	95	675.50
			Khalasi-683	418	265	675.50

Source: information furnished by the divisions.

4.1.8 Monitoring, evaluation and quality control

There is a monitoring committee specifically for the works done under Central Loan Assistance/Grants. It was seen that the committee had visited many sites and suggested modification of approved estimates as per site condition and the divisions accordingly modified the estimates with approval of the competent authority. But no monitoring committee was formed to oversee the implementation of the schemes executed under non-lapsable central pool of resources. A quality control cell in the office of the Chief Engineer is responsible for overseeing implementation of the schemes on the basis of physical and financial progress reports received from each division. However, the Chief Engineer could not specify the schemes where quality of work/materials were checked by the quality control cell or produce any report on quality control.

4.1.9 The matter was referred to Government in July 2002; their reply had not been received (October 2002).

4.1.10. *Recommendation*

In view of the audit findings following recommendations are made:

- (a) The department should ensure higher budgetary allocation of fund for creation and maintenance of flood control infrastructure, and reduce expenditure on establishment.
- (b) On going schemes should be completed on priority basis instead of taking up new scheme with limited resources.
- (c) Part payment through hand receipts must be discontinued forthwith, and proper accounts maintained for all payments to contractors and suppliers.

SECTION 'B'-PARAGRAPHS

FLOOD CONTROL DEPARTMENT

4.2 Nugatory expenditure on idle drivers and handymen

Due to 10 bulldozers under the Executive Engineer, Mechanical Division (Flood Control) Jorhat remaining off road for period ranging from two years to four years for want of major repairs, services of 13 drivers and seven handymen of these bulldozers remained idle leading to nugatory expenditure of Rs.48.46 lakh on their salaries till March 2002.

Test-check (November 2001) of records of the Executive Engineer, (EE) Mechanical Division (Flood Control), Jorhat, revealed that ten bulldozers were procured by the department from M/s Bharat Earth Movers Ltd. between the years 1973-76 for utilisation by the EE. These bulldozers were lying off road for periods ranging from two to four years as of March 2002 as they had outlived their working life and required major repair for their further utilisation. The Zonal Additional Chief Engineer, Dibrugarh submitted (February 2001) a repair estimate (Rs.30.70 lakh) of these bulldozers to the Chief Engineer, Flood Control, Assam, Guwahati for approval. The approval is yet to be accorded (June 2002). 13 drivers and seven handymen attached to these bulldozers remained idle.

Although EE had stated (June 2002) that the services of 13 drivers and seven handymen were utilised for earth works as and when required, the departmental orders showing allotment of their work and particulars of bulldozers in which their services were utilised from time to time could not be furnished to audit. The EE paid Rs.48.46 lakh towards salaries of these 20 incumbents from the date of off road of bulldozers till March 2002.

Thus, failure of the department to get the bulldozers repaired for putting them in working condition and non-utilisation of services of 13 drivers and seven handymen properly resulted in nugatory expenditure of Rs.48.46 lakh on their salaries.

The matter was reported to Government in June 2002; their reply had not been received (October 2002).

PUBLIC HEALTH ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

4.3 Unfruitful expenditure due to non-analysing of fluoride content in water after commissioning of deep tube well

Due to delay ranging from seven to ten years in analysis of water sample of four drinking water supply schemes and prolongation of these schemes even after detecting fluoride content in water beyond permissible limit the EE, PHE Rural water supply division, Diphu incurred unfruitful expenditure of Rs.1.35 crore.

Test-check (August 2000) of records of the Executive Engineer (EE) Public Health Engineering, Rural Water Supply Division, Diphu and subsequent updating (February 2002) of information revealed that four drinking water supply schemes were commissioned between August 1989 and March 1993 at a cost of Rs.45.37 lakh. The progressive expenditure on continuing these schemes upto November 2001 was Rs.1.80 crore. These schemes were administratively approved between March 1984 and March 1988 at an estimated cost of Rs.0.73 crore for providing pure and safe drinking water to 7,778 beneficiaries as indicated in Appendix-XVIII. Stipulated date of completion and technical sanction of the schemes were neither on record nor furnished to audit.

Water analysis (August 1999) of these schemes revealed that fluoride content in the water varied from 3.2 to 23.33 mg per litre against the permissible limit of 1 to 1.5 mg per litre. The EE stated (August 2000 and June 2001) that it was not possible to ascertain fluoride content in water before installation of deep tube well as various chemicals were used during trial boring. Water analysis was not done prior to August 1999 due to non-availability of testing equipments. Immediately after detection of fluoride content in water beyond permissible limit precautionary sign boards were displayed for not using the water for drinking and to use the same for bathing and washing purpose as the fluoride content beyond permissible limit might cause severe ailments like fluorosis, kidney failure, paralysis *etc.* Moreover, EE had also stated that proposal for defluoridation of water and considering alternative source of water was sent to competent authority for approval, which was awaited as of June 2002. But the EE could not furnish the date of sending such proposal to competent authority.

The contention of the EE lacks credibility as, given the non-availability of testing equipment, analysis of water sample for drinking purposes should not have taken seven to ten years from the date of commissioning of the schemes unless there was total laxity. Displaying of signboards for not using the water for drinking purposes was in gross violation of the objective for which the schemes were implemented. Seeking approval of alternative source of water also indicated that the schemes failed to achieve the intended objectives. Thus, lack of initiative and prolongation of schemes by the department led to unfruitful expenditure of Rs.1.35 crore* as of November 2001.

* Expenditure upto November 2001: Rs.1.80 crore
Less: expenditure upto the date of commissioning Rs. 0.45 crore
Rs.1.35 crore

The matter was reported to Government in June 2002; their reply had not been received (October 2002).

4.4 Wasteful expenditure on three piped water supply schemes

The boring of three deep tube wells for supply of drinking water to villagers without geo-physical survey and consultation with Central Ground Water Board resulted in wasteful expenditure of Rs.33.94 lakh.

According to instructions (May 1987) of Chief Public Health Engineer, Assam, deep tube wells (DTW) should be installed only after detailed geo-physical survey and in consultation with the Central Ground Water Board (CGWB) regarding availability of water bearing strata in the proposed site.

Test-check (October 2001) of records of the Executive Engineer (EE), Kaliabor Public Health Engineering Division revealed that for supply of safe and pure drinking water three piped water supply schemes (PWSS) were administratively approved (January-February 1989) for Rs.24.24 lakh^s under Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme. These schemes were taken up for execution during 1989-90 without technical sanction and ascertaining the availability of water bearing strata in the proposed site. The three PWSS were commissioned^s between 1992-93 and 1994-95 without treatment plant at a cost of Rs.33.94 lakh^s with actual progress in execution ranging between 50 per cent and 75 per cent upto September 2001.

The depth of boring of DTWs varied from 55.99 to 92.72 running metre against the estimated 100 running metre for each of the three schemes. The EE had not taken up any test boring. Reasons for short boring, not conducting the test boring, not ascertaining the availability of water bearing strata from CGWB, non-completion of work and how supply of safe and pure drinking water was ensured without treatment plant called for by audit from the EE was awaited (June 2002). Two of the three DTWs became non-functional between February 1994 and October 1999 due to draw down[#]/dried up source.

Thus, due to boring of DTWs without consulting the CGWB regarding availability of water bearing strata followed by non-execution of test boring and short boring rendered the expenditure of Rs.33.94 lakh wasteful besides depriving villagers of drinking water.

The matter was reported to Government in July 2002; their reply had not been received (October 2002).

Schemes	Year of commission	Coverage of population (in numbers)	(Rupees in lakh)	
			Approved amount	Expenditure upto September 2001
Napani PWSS	1992-93	1330	6.65	10.68
Anjukpani PWSS	1992-93	1506	7.53	9.41
New Salna PWSS	1994-95	2765	10.06	13.85
Total			24.24	33.94

[#] Where water level in bored wells goes down.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

4.5 Avoidable financial liability and extra expenditure on construction of RCC bridge

Non-adherence to the terms and conditions of the contract agreement with a firm for construction of a RCC bridge resulted in additional financial liability of Rs.0.53 crore and extra expenditure of Rs.13.41 lakh.

The construction of RCC Bridge No. 12/1 on Nagaon Bhuragaon Road via Dhing was administratively approved (March 1993) at an estimated cost of Rs.0.90 crore. The Chief Engineer (CE) PWD (Roads) awarded (March 1994) the works to a firm at a tender value of Rs.0.81 crore with the stipulation to complete the work by September 1995. The firm started the work in February 1995 and left the work in March 1997 after completion of 38 *per cent* of work valued Rs.33.16 lakh due to non-payment of running accounts bills, non-supply of departmental materials *etc.*, as per contract agreement. The contractor issued (March 1997) notice for arbitration as per clause of the tender agreement and the department constituted (September 1997) a panel of arbitrators. The arbitrators awarded (February 1999) the firm an amount of Rs. one crore against the claim of Rs.2.49 crore and directed the department to pay the claimant an amount of Rs.23.11 lakh against all outstanding claims and to allot the balance work to the same firm at Rs.0.77 crore. The amount of award of Rs.23.11 lakh would bear 18 *per cent* interest per annum from the date of award till the final payment of the amount.

Test-check (February 2002) of the records of the Executive Engineer (EE), Nagaon West Road Division and further information obtained (March 2002) from the division revealed that the EE had paid (March 1999) Rs. 33.16 lakh including Rs.4.77 lakh due to the firm at the time of abandonment of work and also paid to the firm award money of Rs.23.94 lakh* till February 2002. EE did not furnish Government sanction for the payment of award money and the same called for by Audit from the CE which was awaited as of May 2002.

The CE awarded (April 2000) the balance 62 *per cent* work (value Rs.47.59 lakh) of the bridge proper to the same firm at Rs.0.77 crore for completion by April 2001. The bridge proper was completed in August 2001. Till May 2002, the EE had paid Rs.0.96[@] crore to the firm.

* Award money	Rs.23.11 lakh
Less: amount already paid	<u>Rs. 4.77 lakh</u>
	Rs.18.34 lakh
Add: interest paid in March 1999	<u>Rs. 5.60 lakh</u>
	Rs.23.94 lakh
@ Payment for bridge proper	Rs.66.83 lakh
Payment against Arbitration award	Rs.23.11 lakh
Payment of interest	<u>Rs. 5.60 lakh</u>
	Rs.95.54 lakh

Thus, failure of the Department to adhere to the terms and conditions of contract agreement with the firm resulted in avoidable additional financial liability of Rs.0.53 crore[#] besides extra expenditure of Rs.13.41 lakh[§].

The matter was reported to Government in June 2002; their reply had not been received (October 2002).

4.6 Extra avoidable expenditure due to breach of contract agreement for construction of a RCC bridge

Non-supply of store material and non-clearance of dues to the firm for construction of a RCC bridge by the EE, Morigaon Road division led to breach of contract agreement resulting in extra avoidable expenditure of Rs.43.95 lakh.

Test-check (January 2001) of the records of the Executive Engineer, (EE) Morigaon Road Division, revealed that the construction of RCC Bridge No. 5/1 on Jagi Bhakatgaon road was administratively approved (March 1993) for Rs.0.90 crore and awarded (March 1994) to a firm at a lump sum contract value of Rs.0.75 crore with stipulation to complete the work by March 1996. The firm commenced the work in March 1994 and completed in May 1998. The division paid the firm a sum of Rs.0.73 crore up to January 1999 against a claim of Rs.0.73 crore preferred in 12th running account bill as incomplete final bill.

According to the agreement, the department had to supply materials like cement, steel *etc.*, and the interim payment was to have been made to the firm within 10 days from the presentation of the bill. The firm suspended the work from time to time due to non-availability of material and non-payment of claims in time leading to delay in completion of work. Owing to non-availability of material in departmental stores, the EE allowed (May 1995) the firm to procure the same from the recognised manufacturers or their authorised agents. Accordingly, the firm procured from time to time cement and steel valued Rs.8.91 lakh of which the department paid Rs.6.21 lakh to the firm up to December 1997.

Owing to breach of contract agreement on the part of the department, the firm requested (March 1998) to settle their claim of compensation through arbitration. Accordingly, Government set up (August 1998) an arbitration panel and the panel directed (July 1999) the Government to pay the claimant an amount of Rs.49.54 lakh (including outstanding amount due against running bills and supply of cement and steel) against the claim of Rs.1.68 crore, along with 18 *per cent* simple interest from the date of award to date of payment. Government had sanctioned (August 2000) the arbitration award for Rs.0.57 crore (amount of award, Rs.0.50 crore+Rs.0.07 crore as interest from 1 July 1999 to 31 August 2000), of which the division paid Rs.0.56 crore to the firm up to March 2001.

# Payment against value of work as per original agreement	Rs.33.16 lakh
Payment against Arbitration award	Rs.23.94 lakh
Value of balance work as per new tender agreement	<u>Rs.76.96 lakh</u>
	Rs.134.06 lakh
Less: tender value of work as per original agreement	<u>Rs. 80.75 lakh</u>
	Rs. 53.31 lakh

[§] Price escalation: Rs.2.23 lakh + cost of prolongation of work: Rs.5.58 lakh + Interest: Rs.5.60 lakh; Total: Rs.13.41 lakh

Thus, failure of the department to supply store material and non clearance of dues in time in violation of the agreement with the firm resulted in an avoidable extra expenditure of Rs.43.95 lakh* of which Rs.33.22 lakh alone was compensation for prolongation of contract and interest. Interestingly while the department continued to default in payment of bills and supply of materials leading to breach of the terms and conditions of contract agreement with the firm during the period of four years from March 1994 to March 1998 the arbitration award was paid within a period of less than one year. Steps taken by the department to investigate and prevent such a waste of scarce Government resources was not on record.

The matter was reported to Government in June 2002; their reply had not been received (October 2002).

4.7 Extra avoidable expenditure due to non-installation of electricity meters

The department realised only Rs. three lakh against payment of Rs.13.64 crore, as it had not installed electricity metres in Government staff quarters and continued to charge at flat rates resulting in a loss of Rs.13.61 crore during the period December 1999 to April 2001.

Government of Assam decided (February 1994) to install electricity meters in all categories of Government residential accommodation to rationalise the electricity charges and to relate them to actual consumption. Pending completion of metering, the Government fixed flat rates of electricity charges to be realised from the allottees of staff quarters at Rs.30 and Rs.15 per month with effect from March 1994, which was revised to Rs.70 and Rs.50 per month with effect from July 2000 in respect of staff quarters for Ministerial and Gr. IV staff respectively.

Test-check (October 2001) of records of the Estate Officer, Dispur revealed that the electricity meters to staff quarters were not installed till the date of audit for reasons not on record. The department paid Rs.13.64 crore^s to ASEB as electricity charges for 512 staff quarters at Dispur Capital Complex and realised Rs. three lakh^s only from the allottees during the period from December 1999 to April 2001.

* 1. Compensation arising out of prolongation of contract	Rs.16,46,425.00
2. Payment due for works done at enhanced rate after expiry of contract period	Rs. 8,68,504.00
3. Compensation towards depreciation of different material during the overrun period	Rs. 1,00,210.00
4. Interest on the amount found due and payable from the date of cause of action to the date of the award and from the date of award to the date of payment	Rs.16,75,204.00
5. Cost of arbitration	Rs. 1,05,075.00
	Rs.43,95,418.00

s

(Rupees in crore)

	Category of staff quarters	Number of quarters	Electricity charges paid	Electricity charges realised at flat rates
1	Ministerial staff quarters	110	12.93	0.01
2	Grade IV staff quarters	402	0.71	0.02
	Total	512	13.64	0.03

Thus, failure of the department to install individual electricity meters in the staff quarters since February 1994 and continued realisation of electricity charges at flat rates not commensurate with the cost of actual consumption of electricity paid to ASEB led to undue financial benefit to the allottees besides extra avoidable expenditure to the tune of Rs.13.61 crore.

The matter was reported to Government in May 2002; their reply had not been received (October 2002).

4.8 Irregular payment through Hand Receipts

Rupees 2.55 crore were paid to the contractors through hand receipts resulting in unauthorised payments.

In terms of Rule 311 of Assam Financial Rule, hand receipt is a simple form of voucher intended to be used for all miscellaneous payments and advances, for which none of the prescribed forms of the bills are suitable. Government of Assam had expressly instructed (June 1996) to stop payment through hand receipts.

Test-check (December 2001 and February 2002) of the records of Executive Engineers (EEs) PWD, Magazine Division, Guwahati and PWD (Roads) West Division, Nagaon revealed that the EEs paid Rs.1.52 crore and Rs.1.03 crore respectively through hand receipts during March 2001 to November 2001 and March 2001 to October 2001 respectively. Also, the two divisions did not maintain (i) any register for monitoring payments made through hand receipts to avoid double payment, (ii) stock register for hand receipts, and (iii) contractor's ledger to watch contract-wise up-to-date payment. Part payments through hand receipt were made without passing the regular running bills of contractors. In reply both the divisions stated (January 2002 and February 2002) that due to paucity of funds part payment was made through hand receipts against huge claims of a large number of contractors. The replies of the EEs were not tenable as they were to restrict the liabilities for payment according to the availability of funds and payment through hand receipts must not have resorted to.

Thus, gross violation of rules and orders by both the divisions resulted in irregular payments of Rs.2.55 crore (Rs.1.52 crore + Rs.1.03 crore). Moreover, due to part payment through hand receipts at random, without observing any formality the expenditure of Rs.2.55 crore could not be vouchsafed in audit. Possible misappropriation, double payment, over payment etc., could also not be ruled out.

The matter was reported to Government in July 2002; their reply had not been received (October 2002).

4.9 Unauthorised re-appropriation of Government revenues

EE, PWD Diphu Roads Division unauthorisedly re-appropriated Government revenues of Rs.32.87 lakh by diverting the class V deposits towards payment of contractors/suppliers bills

Test-check (January-February 2002) of records of the Executive Engineer, PWD, Diphu Road Division revealed that the division had withdrawn (February 2001) an amount of Rs.40.84 lakh from Class V* deposit. The amount pertained to Assam General Sales Tax (AGST) and Income Tax, which was deducted at source from the running account bills and were lying in class V deposit since May 2000. Out of the withdrawn amount the division remitted (February 2001) Rs.7.97 lakh to bank as Income Tax. However, the particulars of contractors in whose favour Income Tax were deposited were not produced to audit. The balance amount of Rs.32.87 lakh was spent (February 2001) towards payments of contractors/suppliers bills against 22 road/drainage works as per orders of the Karbi Anglong Autonomous Council Authority. This resulted in an unauthorised re-appropriation of Government revenues to the tune of Rs.32.87 lakh.

The matter was reported to Government in June 2002; their reply had not been received (October 2002).

4.10 Undue financial benefit to supplier and locking up of Government money

Non-supply of 813.600 MT out of 2100 MT cement by a firm to the Executive Engineer, Road division, Diphu against advance payment of Rs.82.32 lakh (100 percent) without any agreement led to locking up of Rs.31.89 lakh for over 18 months besides excess payment of AGST Rs.5.88 lakh.

As per Assam Financial Rules (Rule 274), advances to contractors are prohibited and every endeavour should be made to maintain a system under which no payments are made except for work actually done.

Karbi Anglong Autonomous Council (KAAC) accorded (January 2000) administrative approval for procurement of 2,600 tonne cement for utilisation by all divisions in the district. In July 2000, the KAAC directed the Additional Chief Engineer (Addl. CE) PWD (Roads and Bridges) Diphu to procure 2,100 tonne cement from a Guwahati based authorised dealer for all nine divisions[@] in the district at Rs.3,500 per tonne plus 12 *per cent* Assam General Sales Tax (AGST).

Government of Assam re-fixed (April 1998) the rate of AGST to four *per cent* for procurement of cement and certain other items of goods by Government departments,

* Deposit head that holds, until clearance, all receipt *viz.*, Income Tax, Assam General Sales Tax, Forest royalty *etc.* deducted from bills.

[@] Diphu Roads Division (400 MT), Diphu Building Division (300 MT), Dokmoka Road Division (450 MT), Bakulia Road Division (150 MT), Borpathar Road Division (200 MT), Kohora Road Division (150 MT), Baithalangshu Road Division (250 MT), Hamren Road Division (100 MT) and Umpanai Road Division (100 MT).

undertaking *etc.* from dealers registered under the AGST Act, 1993. AGST were to be deducted at source from the bills of the firms and deposited in the treasury by the buying department except where the firms furnished a declaration countersigned by the Superintendent of Taxes under whom the firm was registered, to the effect that the goods were supplied from the stock procured from within Assam.

Test-check (January 2002 -February 2002) of records of the Executive Engineer, Roads division, Diphu and further information collected (May 2002 and June 2002) by audit from the EE and Addl. CE revealed that the Addl. CE placed (July 2000) order with the firm for supply of 2100 tonne cement[@] within October 2000. The payment was to be made by the EE on proforma bills of the firm subject to subsequent adjustment of share of payment from the EEs of other divisions.

Between October 2000 and November 2000 EE made advance payment of Rs.0.82 crore (cost of 2,100 tonne cement: Rs.73.50 lakh AGST: Rs.8.82 lakh) against 13 proforma bills of the firms without entering into agreement or obtaining security deposit from the firm for reasons neither on record nor stated to audit. The EE had not deducted AGST at source due to production of tax paid declaration by the firm. The EE was to pay AGST Rs.2.94 lakh (four *per cent* of Rs.73.50 lakh) instead of Rs.8.82 lakh. Of the 2,100 MT cement, the firm delivered 1,286.400 MT valued at Rs.50.43 lakh during December 2000 to May 2001. Despite repeated pursuance by Addl. CE and EE the balance 813.600 tonne cement worth Rs.31.89 lakh was not supplied by the firm even as of May 2002. Due to non-execution of agreement *etc.* the department evidently was not in position to enforce the supply of balance quantity cement or to recover Rs.31.89 lakh from the firm.

Thus, advance payment of Rs.82.32 lakh against proforma bills was not only violative of rules but also resulted in locking up of Rs.31.89 lakh with the firm for over 18 months which is fraught with eventual loss to Government. Also failure of the EE to restrict payment of AGST to four *per cent* led to undue excess payment of Rs.5.88 lakh to the firm which was awaiting recovery as of May 2002.

The matter was reported to Government in June 2002; their reply had not been received (October 2002).

4.11 Unproductive expenditure due to non-clearance of boulders and abandonment of the construction of road work

The EE, Bakulia Road Division spent Rs.2.03 crore for construction of 31.50 km long road in five phases between 1987 and 1997. The works in four of the five phases remained incomplete due to lack of proper planning by the department. The works were stopped at the instance of the KAAC, which resulted in unproductive expenditure of Rs. 1.48 crore.

For enabling Hindustan Paper Corporation Nagaon to transport bamboos from the forest areas taken on lease by them and for providing road facilities to the local people, construction of a 31.50 Km out of 40 Km long “Horguti-Chumbachari

[@] ACC super brand OPP/43 grade cement conforming to ISI specification.

Anglong Road” was taken up in five phases during August 1985 to July 1995 at an estimated cost of Rs.2.12 crore for completion between 1987 and 1997 (details furnished in Appendix-XIX). The proposed road was to connect the leased areas with National Highway (NH) 36 at Langhin Tiniali. Replying to audit query the Executive Engineer (EE), Bakulia Road Division stated (July2002) that 6.02 km long motorable road connecting from Langhin Tiniali at NH 36 existed on the proposed road prior to 1987.

Test-check (May 2000) of records of the Executive Engineer, (EE) Bakulia Road Division revealed that the (i) EE spent Rs.0.55 crore on survey, land acquisition and construction of 11.55 km road in phase-I during 1987 covering a total length of the road upto 17.57 km from NH 36. The total expenditure on the works incurred by EE aggregated Rs.2.03 crore till April 2000. (ii) Road length beyond 17.57 km (say 18 km) and upto 31.28 km under phase-II to phase-IV involving balance expenditure of Rs.1.48 crore remained incomplete for non-execution of hume pipe culverts, cross drainage works *etc.* The EE stated (May 2000) that road beyond 18th km was not motorable as the-execution of hume pipes culverts was pending due to non-availability of blasting materials for clearance of rocky strata between 18th and 20th km. and that an estimate for the clearance of rocks and boulders manually was awaiting approval. An item of work due for completion in 1989 was at the stage of obtaining approval of the estimate in the year 2000. This clearly shows that proper planning was lacking over the years. EE had not taken up works on Vth phase in pursuance of direction (September 1996) of Karbi Anglong Autonomous Council to stop the works including work-in-progress leading to its abandonment for reasons not on record.

Thus, failure of the department to complete the road from Phase II to Phase V resulted in unproductive expenditure of Rs.1.48 crore out of Rs. 2.03 crore. The primary objective of linking the leased out areas to the National Highway for transport of bamboos was also not achieved.

The matter was reported to Government in June 2002; their reply had not been received (October 2002).

4.12 Wasteful expenditure for construction of a RCC bridge on river Chandrakhola in Dhubri district

Injudicious decision of the department to construct a RCC bridge located in an erosion prone area led to wasteful expenditure of Rs.0.95 crore.

Border Road Construction (BRC) Division, Dhubri undertook construction of a RCC bridge on River Chandrakhola at chainage 2700 of Indo Bangladesh border Road (Phase-V) in Dhubri district. The work awarded to a contractor at a tendered value of Rs.66.24 lakh with stipulation to complete the work by June 1997, was completed (October 2000) at a cost of Rs.0.95 crore.

Test check (February 2002) of records of the Executive Engineer (EE), BRC division, Dhubri revealed that both ends of the aforesaid bridge had been eroded for a length of 18 to 20 metres due to flood that occurred in July 1998. Approval from the Chief

Engineer to a revised estimate (July 1999) for Rs.1.45 crore for approaches and protection works on eroded gaps was awaited (June 2002). Following the inspection of work/site and direction by the Superintending Engineer (SE) all works of Phase-V were stopped (October 2000) due to lack of feasibility.

Further, Commissioner (Border), Ministry of Home affairs reported (July 2001) to the department that even by taking up the costly venture on extension of bridge by another 80 metre in one end to cover the eroded gap, the RCC bridge would not serve any purpose as it was only 300 metre from the Brahmaputra river. The river bank was also under constant threat of erosion and some items of works in the bridge *viz.*, BUG erection and deck slab casting were executed by PWD after the approaches were eroded. Taking note of the report, the department had taken up (November 2001) a cost appraisal for new alignment of the bridge, which was evidently an admission that the bridge would not be used for traffic and abandoned.

Injudicious decision of the department for construction of a RCC bridge at highly erosion prone area led to wasteful expenditure of Rs.0.95 crore. Also, the department had not investigated the lapses to fix responsibility on the errant officer(s)/official(s).

The matter was reported to Government in July 2002; their reply had not been received (October 2002).