No. 16/27/2011-PA (N)/ 1888 – 1914

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
CENTRAL WATER COMMISSION
PROJECT APPRAISAL ORGANIZATION

510(S), SEWA BHAWAN,
R. K. PURAM,
NEW DELHI-110 066
Date: **23.09.2011**

Sub: 112th meeting of the Advisory Committee for consideration of techno-economic viability of Irrigation, Flood Control and Multipurpose Project proposals held on 14.09.2011.

Enclosed please find herewith a copy of the summary record of discussions of the above meeting held on 14th September 2011 at Sewa Bhawan, R. K. Puram, New Delhi for information and necessary action.

Encl: As above

(S.K. Srivastava)
Chief Engineer (PAO)
& Member Secretary of the
Advisory Committee

To

Members of Committee:

1. Chairman, CWC, Sewa Bhawan, R. K. Puram, New Delhi.
2. Secretary (Expenditure), Ministry of Finance, (1st Floor) North Block,New Delhi.
3. Secretary, Department of Power, S.S. Bhawan, IInd Floor, New Delhi.
4. Secretary, Ministry of Environment & Forests, 4th Floor, Room No- 404/05, Paryavaran, Bhawan,CGO Complex, New Delhi.
5. Secretary, Ministry of Tribal Affairs, Room No. 738, A-Wing, Shastri Bhawan, New Delhi.
6. Secretary, Department of Agriculture & Cooperation, Krishi Bhawan, New Delhi.
7. Director General, ICAR, Room No-108, Krishi Bhawan, New Delhi.
8. Chairman, CEA, Sewa Bhawan, R. K. Puram, New Delhi.
9. Chairman, Central Ground Water Board, Jam Nagar House, Man Singh Road, New Delhi.
10. Adviser (WR), Planning Commission, Yojana Bhawan, New Delhi.
11. Sr. Adviser (Power), Planning Commission, Room No-107 Yojana Bhawan, New Delhi.
12. Financial Adviser, Ministry of Water Resources, Room No-401 S.S. Bhawan, New Delhi.

Special Invitees:

13. Member (WP&P), CWC, New Delhi.
14. Member (D&R), CWC, New Delhi.
15. Member (RM), CWC, New Delhi.
16. Commissioner (Projects), Room No-411, S.S.Bhawan, MoWR, New Delhi.
17. Commissioner (Ganga), Ministry of Water Resources, CGO Complex, New Delhi.
18. Commissioner (B&B), Ministry of Water Resources, Mohan Palace, New Delhi
19. Chief Advisor (Cost), Department of Expenditure, Ministry of Finance, Lok Nayak Bhawan, New Delhi.
20. Principal Secretary, Water Resources Department, Government of Karnataka, Bangalore.
21. Secretary, Irrigation & Flood Control Department, Government of Sikkim, Gangtok-737001
22. Secretary, Water Resources Deptt, Govt of Maharashtra, Mantralaya, Mumbai, 400032.
23. Secretary (Water Resources), NWSWR & Kalpsar Deptt., Govt. of Gujrat, 1st Floor, Block No.-9, New Sachivalay, Gandhinagar
24. Secretary, Irrigation & Public Health, Government of Himachal Pradesh, Sachivalaya, Simla-171002
25. CE, FMO, CWC, New Delhi.

Copy for information to:

26. Sr. PPS to Secretary, Ministry of Water Resources, Room No-407, Shram Shakti Bhawan, New Delhi.

"SUMMARY RECORD OF DISCUSSIONS OF THE 112th MEETING OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION, FLOOD CONTROL AND MULTI PURPOSE PROJECTS, HELD ON 14th SEPTEMBER 2011 FOR CONSIDERATION OF TECHNO-ECONOMIC VIABILITY OF PROJECT PROPOSALS."

The 112th meeting of the "*Advisory Committee on Irrigation, Flood Control and Multi-purpose Project*" was held on 14.09.2011 at 1700 hrs. in the Conference Room of Central Water Commission, Sewa Bhawan, R.K. Puram, New Delhi under the Chairmanship of Shri D.V. Singh, Secretary (WR). List of participants is enclosed at **Annexure-I**.

At the outset, Chairman welcomed the participants and requested the Member-Secretary to take up the agenda for discussion. Agenda items discussed and decisions taken are as under:

I) CONFIRMATION OF THE SUMMARY RECORD OF THE DISCUSSIONS HELD DURING THE 111TH MEETING:

The Summary Record of Discussions of the 111th meeting of the Advisory Committee was circulated vide Letter No.16/27/2011-PA (N)/1572-96 dated 25.08.2011. Since no comments on the same have been received, the Committee confirmed the Summary Record of discussions of the 111th meeting of the Advisory Committee.

II) PROJECT PROPOSALS CONSIDERED BY THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE:

1.0 MAHI RIGHT BANK CANAL PROJECT, GUJARAT (NEW- ERM, Estimated Cost Rs. 300.01 Crore at 2009 Price Level):

The representative of the Government of Gujarat indicated that during the passage of time, the irrigation capacity of the project has been reduced due to silting, scouring and overall deterioration in the selected reaches of the canal system, damage to some of its existing structures, heavy weed growth in some patches of canal, deformation of designed earthen canal section and seepage observed in the distribution network. As a result there is almost, no supply of irrigation water to 8,500 ha of the CCA near to tail end of the project. The present ERM proposal has been planned to restore the irrigation potential in the existing command of the project.

On a query regarding the schedule of rate, project authorities clarified that the SOR in the State has not been revised after 2009 and thus the SOR-2009 is still applicable as on date. They ensured that there would be no further revision in the cost estimates of the project.

The committee accepted the proposal with the condition that no further time and cost overrun would be allowed.

2.0 IMPROVEMENT OF KAKRAPAR RBMC, UKAI RBMC AND UKAI LBMC, GUJARAT (NEW-ERM, Estimated Cost Rs. 296.51 Crore at 2009 Price Level):

The representative of the Government of Gujarat stated that during the passage of time, the irrigation capacity of the project has been reduced due to silting, scouring and overall deterioration of the canal system, damage to some of its structures, deformation of designed earthen canal section and seepage observed in the distribution network. They also mentioned that earlier the canal was designed to carry water as per existing cropping pattern prevailing before taking up the project but subsequent upon development of the irrigation in the command, farmers started growing cash crops i.e. sugarcane and hot paddy which consume more water. As a result, some of the command areas are being provided with partial irrigation on one hand while on the other hand there is almost no supply of irrigation water to the tail end of the project. The present ERM proposal has been planned to provide full irrigation to the existing command of the project as per the revised cropping pattern and also to provide irrigation benefits to the deficit area of 3,500 ha of the command near the tail end which happens to be a Tribal Area.

On a query regarding the schedule of rate, project authorities clarified that the SOR in the State has not been revised after 2009 and thus the SOR-2009 is still applicable as on date. They ensured that there would be no further revision in the cost estimates of the project.

The committee accepted the proposal with the condition that no further time and cost overrun would be allowed.

3.0 PURNA BARRAGE-2 (NER DHAMANA) IRRIGATION PROJECT, MAHARASHTRA (REVISED-MEDIUM, Estimated Cost Rs. 617.46 Crore at 2010-11 Price Level):

On a query regarding substantial increase in the cost of the project, the representative of the Government of Maharashtra replied that the major reasons for increase in cost is the change in design of the barrage and its appurtenant structures. They further clarified that as per the in-situ geological investigation, the foundation design had to be changed due to poor strata encountered at certain depths. As a result, the design of the barrage and its appurtenant structures had to be changed. They further mentioned that in view of the non availability of the expertise in the state, the present design of barrage had been got done by the WAPCOS.

After detailed discussions, the committee decided that before considering the proposal, the detailed Design of the barrage and its appurtenant structures may be examined by CWC. The project authorities were advised to submit the detailed design of the Barrage and its appurtenant structures to CWC. Also the reason for the large increase in project cost since last year needs to be analyzed.

4.0 UPPER KUNDLIKA PROJECT, MAHARASHTRA (REVISED- MEDIUM, Estimated Cost Rs. 154.916 Crore at 2009-10 Price Level):

On a query regarding considerable increase in cost of the project, Government of Maharashtra representative stated that the major reasons for increase in cost is the change in design of the canal and distribution system after detailed survey of the command area and price escalation. They further mentioned that during excavation of tunnel, variations in rock strata were encountered which resulted in the increase in cost of the project. The representative from CGWB suggested for conjunctive use surface and ground water in the command area of the project to get rid of the water-logging problem in the command.

State Government representative also ensured that there would be no further revision in the cost of the projects in view of the fact that tender had already been awarded for all the construction works.

After discussion, the committee accepted the proposal with the condition that no further time and cost overrun would be allowed.

5.0 **MAHARASHTRA WATER SECTOR IMPROVEMENT PROJECT (MWSIP), MAHARASHTRA (NEW-ERM-MAJOR, Estimated Cost Rs. 2351.50 Crore at 2010-11 Price Level):**

It was stated that the scheme was a World Bank assisted project. The loan agreement between the state government and World Bank was signed on 19th August, 2005 with target date of completion by 31st March 2012 and that extension by three years i.e. up to March, 2015 was under consideration. The Planning Commission had conveyed in-principle approval subject to acceptance by the Advisory Committee and investment clearance by the planning Commission.

The representative of the Government of Maharashtra stated that the rehabilitation of the scheme was taken up with the active involvement of Water Users Associations (WUAs) right from its survey & investigation stage to completion stage. On a query on increase in water use efficiency, it was informed that with the completion of the project, water use efficiency would be increased by more than 30%. Regarding abnormal delay in submission of the DPR to CWC for examination, it was clarified that during the initial stage there were many problems in the collection and compilation of data.

After brief discussion, the committee accepted the proposal.

6.0 **FLOOD PROTECTION WORKS OF LENDI NALLA AT KATOL TOWN IN NAGPUR DISTRICT OF MAHARASHTRA (Estimated Cost Rs. 24.37 Crore at 2009-10 Price Level):**

On a query regarding salient features of the project, the representative of the Government of Maharashtra stated that with resectioning of the Lendi nallah and Jam river, the scheme would minimize the inundation of urban area and agricultural fields nearly the Katol town. The benefits to be accrued from the project were also explained by the State Government representative.

After brief discussion, the committee accepted the proposal.

7.0 **FLOOD PROTECTION WORKS FOR HEMAVATHI RIVER AT BANKAL TOWN AND SIX VILLAGS VIZ. BANKENHALLI, HYDARAGUDDA, BAKKIHALLA, MUGREHALLI, KITTLEGANDI AND SUBRAMANYA VILLAGES OF MIDIGERE TALUK IN CHIKAMAGALUR DISTRICT, KARNATAKA (Estimated Cost Rs. 47.56 Crore at 2010-11 Price Level):**

Government of Karnataka on being asked for increment of the estimate from Rs. 38.8 crore as approved by state TAC in December 2009, the representative of Government of Karnataka informed that that increment was made in view of the

revised design flood by CWC. It was further stated that the work on the project would start as soon as investment clearance is accorded to this project.

After brief discussion, the committee accepted the proposal.

8.0 FLOOD PROTECTION WORKS FOR RIVER BANKS OF GHATAPRABHA RIVER AT GOKAK TOWN OF BELGAUM DISTRICT IN KARNATAKA STATE (Estimated Cost Rs. 34.07 Crore at 2010-11 Price Level):

The representative of the State Government explained the objective of the proposal. On a query regarding the increase in the cost of the project from Rs. 15.5 crore as estimated by the project authorities earlier, it was informed that the project has been designed as per revised hydrology for 100 years return period as suggested by CWC.

After brief discussion, the committee accepted the proposal.

9.0 STABILIZATION OF SEER KHAD AND FLOOD PROTECTION WORKS FROM JAHU TO BUM IN TEHSIL GHUMARWIN, DISTRICT BILASPUR, HIMACHAL PRADESH (Estimated Cost Rs. 23.17 Crore at 2010 Price Level):

On a query, it was explained by the representative of State Govt. that proposal has been prepared on the basis of study carried out by Central water and Power Research Station, Pune.

After brief discussion, the committee accepted the proposal.

10.0 IMPROVEMENT OF STORM WATER DRAINAGE BELOW GREENFIELD AIRPORT AT PAKYONG, SIKKIM (Estimated Cost Rs. 48.55 Crore at 2010 Price Level):

Government of Sikkim explained the project proposal. They mentioned that the proposal had been framed to undertake drainage training works so that estimated runoff was drained safely to the nearest river. As such, the project would protect the cultivated land and public properties of the villages downstream of the airport.

After brief discussion, the committee accepted the proposal.

Annexure-I

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Members of the Committee:

S/ Shri

1.	D. V. Singh, Secretary (WR), Ministry of Water Resources	In the Chair
2.	R. C. Jha, Chairman, CWC, New Delhi	Member
3.	Dr. P. S. Minhas, ADG (S&WM)),ICAR, New Delhi (Representing Director-General, ICAR)	Member
4.	Tanmoy Das, Chief Engineer, CEA (Representing Chairman, Central Electricity Authority)	Member
5.	S. Das, Deputy Secretary, MoTA (Representing Secretary, Ministry of Tribal Affairs)	Member
6.	Avinash Mishra, Joint Advisor (WR), Planning Commission, New Delhi	Member
7.	Dr Poonam Sharma, Scientist-D (Representing Chairman, CGWB)	Member
8.	Smt. Ananya Ray, Joint Advisor & Finance Advisor, MoWR, New Delhi.	Member
9.	S. K. Srivastava, Chief Engineer, PAO, CWC, New Delhi	Member- Secretary

Special Invitees:

a) Ministry of MoWR

10. Pradeep Kumar, Commissioner (Projects), MoWR, New Delhi

b) Ministry of Finance

S/ Shri

11. P. K. Aggarwal, Advisor (Cost), Ministry of Finance, New Delhi

12. B. Bandopadhya, Joint Advisor (Cost), Ministry of Finance

c) State Government officers

Himachal Pradesh

S/ Shri

13. Ashok Shreedhar, Chief Engineer,I&PH, Himachal Pradesh.

Karnataka

S/ Shri

14. B. Guruprasad, Chief Engineer, Minor Irrigation, Govt. of Karnataka

15. S. B. Siddagangappa, Chief Engineer, Minor Irrigation (N), Govt. of Karnataka

Gujrat

S/ Shri

16. J. B. Patil, CE & Additional Secretary, NWRWS&K Deptt, Gandhinagar
17. G. K. Sarvaiya, CE & Additional secretary, NWRWS&K Deptt, Gandhinagar
18. Abhay M. Barve, SE, Mahi Irrigation Circle, Nadiad

Maharashtra

S/ Shri

19. R. W. Nikum , Chief Engineer, WRD, Nagpur
20. R. B. Shukla, Chief Engineer, WRD, Amravati
21. R. V. Jaltuse ,SE, Irrigation Project Circle, Akola
22. B. S. Swami ,SE, Irrigation Project Circle, Beed
23. R. M. Cauhan , SE, CADA ,Nagpur
24. D. R. Joshi, SE, MWSH ,Mumbai

Sikkim

S/ Shri

25. Rakesh Khanna, Secretary, Irrigation & Flood control Deptt, Gangtok
26. Gozin Lachen- Pa, SE, Irrigation & Flood control Deptt, Gangtok

d) Central Water Commission

S/ Shri

27. A. K. Ganju, Member (D&R), CWC, New Delhi.
28. M. E. Haque, Member (WP&P), CWC, New Delhi.
29. B.G. Kaushik, Chief Engineer(PPO),CWC, New Delhi
30. V. K. Chawla, Chief Engineer(IMO),CWC, New Delhi
31. A. M. Patil, Chief Engineer, MCO, CWC,Nagpur.
32. Gorakh Thakur, Director, Cost (I), CWC, New Delhi
33. D.M. Raipure, Director (Apr),CWC, Nagpur
34. Ajay Kumar, Director, PA(N), CWC
35. M. S. Sahare, Director, PA(S), CWC
36. D. P. Mathuria, Director (FM), New Delhi
37. B. C. Vishwakarma, Director, IP(S), CWC