

**TWELFTH KERALA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**

**COMMITTEE  
ON  
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS  
(2006-2008)**

**EIGHTEENTH REPORT**

(Presented on 10th July, 2007)



SECRETARIAT OF THE KERALA LEGISLATURE  
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM  
2007

TWELFTH KERALA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

**COMMITTEE  
ON  
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS  
(2006-2008)**

**EIGHTEENTH REPORT**

**On**

**Action taken by Government on the Recommendations contained  
in the Hundred and Nineteenth Report of the Committee  
on Public Accounts (2001)**

824/2007.

## CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Composition of the Committee	.. v
Introduction	.. vii
Report	.. 1
Appendices :	
I Summary of Main Conclusions/Recommendations	.. 10
II Circular No. FGB(5) 25507/99 dated 1-11-1999	.. 11
III G. O (Ms) No. 157/80/PW dated 30-9-1980	.. 12

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS (2006-2008)

*Chairman :*

Shri Aryadan Muhammed

*Members :*

- Shri C. T. Ahammed Ali  
” Alphons Kannanthanam  
” P. Jayarajan  
” K. M. Mani  
” K. P. Mohanan  
” C. K. P. Padmanabhan  
” M. Prakashan Master  
” Thiruvanchoor Radhakrishnan  
” N. Rajan  
” A. K. Saseendran

*Legislature Secretariat :*

- Dr. N. K. Jayakumar, Secretary  
Shri K. Gireesa Kumar, Joint Secretary  
Shri K. Ravikumar, Deputy Secretary  
Shri J.Ramakrishnan Potti, Under Secretary

## INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman, Committee on Public Accounts, having been authorised by the Committee to present this Report on their behalf, present the Eighteenth Report on Action Taken by Government on the Recommendations contained in the Hundred and Nineteenth Report of the Committee on Public Accounts (2001).

The Committee considered and finalised this Report at the meeting held on May 30, 2007.

ARYADAN MUHAMMED,

Thiruvananthapuram,  
10th July, 2007.

*Chairman,  
Committee on Public Accounts.*

## **REPORT**

This Report deals with the action taken by Government on the recommendations contained in the 119th Report of the Committee on Public Accounts (2001).

The 119th Report of the Committee on Public Accounts (2001) was presented to the House on March 2, 2001 and it contained 11 recommendations relating to Public Works Department. Government were addressed to furnish the statements of action taken on the recommendations contained in the Report on 30th March 2001. The final replies were received on 20-4-2005.

The Committee examined the statements at its meetings held on 7-11-2002 and 28-6-2005.

The Committee was not satisfied with the action taken by Government on recommendation Nos. 5 and 10 (Para Nos.14 & 24) and decided to pursue them further. Such recommendations, replies and the further recommendations are included in Chapter I of this Report.

The Committee decided not to pursue further action for the remaining recommendations in the light of the replies furnished by Government. Such recommendations and their replies are incorporated in Chapter II of this Report.

## CHAPTER I

RECOMMENDATIONS IN RESPECT OF WHICH ACTION TAKEN  
BY GOVERNMENT ARE NOT SATISFACTORY AND  
WHICH REQUIRE REITERATION**Recommendation***(Sl. No. 5 Para No. 14)*

1.1 The Committee notice that the construction of a bridge at Maruthoorkadavu across Karamana river was executed without conducting proper investigation before drawing up detailed design. The Committee is distressed to note that the deviation from the approved design, despite specific direction issued by Chief Engineer (DRIQ) pointing out lapses in investigation conducted is the root cause for the subsequent development which ultimately resulted in an additional expenditure of Rs. 8 lakhs. The Committee feels that had the factors like site condition, bearing capacity of foundation media. etc., have been studied well through proper soil test and proper investigation conducted by experts before executing the work, inordinate delay as well as extra-expenditure could have been avoided to a greater extent. It has come to the notice of the Committee that in many instances of major bridge works the Public Works Department proceeded with the work initially on the basis of rough estimate before finalising the design owing to pressure from different sectors to take up the work. Expressing concern over this, the Committee urge that Government should review the present system and procedure in approving the design and structures and take steps to avoid the recurrence of such instances of delay and extra expenditure in future.

**Action Taken**

1.2 Generally, the bridge works are executed by following the approved design by the DRIQ Board after conducting the investigation of the sub soil. No sub soil investigation was done by the officers who actually executed the works. They followed the approved design supplied. The Officers who are executing the works have no authority to change the design.

**Further Recommendation**

1.3 The Committee reiterates its recommendation that, the present system and procedure in approving the design and structure of major bridge works should be reviewed and desires to be informed about the action taken in this regard.

**Recommendation***(Sl. No. 10 Para No. 24)*

1.4 After considering all the facts brought out in evidence, the Committee have come to the conclusion that there have been lapses on the part of the officials

of the PWD in ensuring custody of the site under the control of Forest Department and coming under the Conservation Act, 1980, and in handing over the site to the contractor without the clearance of that department for construction of quarters for Judicial Officers at Idukki. The Committee cannot understand the logic of tendering the work on the assumption that the formal approval would be received in due course. Had the Department acted according to the provisions of the PWD Code, Manual, the infructuous expenditure of Rs. 1.33 Lakhs incurred on preliminary works could have been avoided. The Committee recommends that in future no work shall be awarded/tendered before the site is made available to be handed over to the contractor. The Committee also desires to check the recurrence of such violations of codal provisions in future.

#### **Action Taken**

1.5 In order to avoid such lapses the Chief Engineer (Buildings & Local Works) has already issued directions to all concerned officers in PWD to follow all prevailing rules in the Department strictly and not to tender/award any work before the site is available to be handed over to the contractor. (A copy of the circular is included as Appendix II).

1.6 Further based on the recommendation of the Committee the Chief Engineer is forwarding the copy of Circular to all the Circles and Division Offices once again re-iterating the above instructions.

#### **Further Recommendation**

1.7 The Committee recommends that in future, works should be tendered or awarded only after making the sites ready to be handed over to the contractor.

## CHAPTER II

RECOMMENDATIONS IN RESPECT OF WHICH THE COMMITTEE DO  
NOT DESIRE TO PURSUE ACTION IN THE LIGHT OF THE REPLIES  
RECEIVED FROM GOVERNMENT**Recommendation***(Sl. No. 1 Para No. 6)*

2.1 The Committee finds that a sum of Rs. 2.79 lakhs was lost to Government by terminating the contract without invoking penal clauses in the agreement of the work in the first reach of Karuvarakundu-Attapady road. The contractor has succeeded in earning unintended benefit. But after completing all the works except the collection of 36 mm metal, the contractor attributed the delay to non-supply of departmental materials worth Rs. 0.87 lakh. So by not rearranging the work promptly the contractor gained by relieving from executing the balance work while Government lost Rs. 2.79 lakhs (extra expenditure on collection of 36 mm metal plus extra cost due to alternate arrangement). This loss is in addition to the heavy loss sustained by the people in Hilly areas by being deprived off the benefits of the road.

**Action Taken**

2.2 The loss of Rs. 2.79 lakhs stated to have been incurred to Government is arrived at by the Accountant General for terminating the contract without invoking the penal clauses in the agreement. Action is suggested against Officers responsible for not taking steps at the appropriate time to include provision in the budget for the balance work.

**Recommendation***(Sl. No. 2 Para No. 7)*

2.3 The Committee are dissatisfied to note that there were lapses on the part of the officers to take action at the appropriate time to include provisions in the budget for the balance work by reviewing the records of old scheme when the scheme was discontinued during 1984. The Committee note that this case had been pending for more than five years. The Committee feels that it was highly irregular on the part of the officers for keeping the work incomplete up to 1989 without moving for budget provision. The Committee are of the view that if the departmental officers were earnest enough to send proposals for providing funds for this work in the budget the department could have averted the inordinate delay. The Committee desires that the names of persons responsible for inordinate delay and the details of action taken in this regard may be intimated to the Committee as promised by the Principal Secretary.

**Action Taken**

2.4 In this case the work was taken under scheme for development of communication facilities in Hilly areas under Head 537(F) (W) hill roads and later the scheme was wound up and balance work sanctioned and rearranged under village roads. Sincere efforts had been taken by the department to obtain special sanction for arranging the balance work and completing the same. It is seen that the delay was attributable to a change in the sanctioned scheme and budgeting procedure involved. Actually the delay period is five years and officers associated with this work from various levels are involved. It is not practicable to isolate and fix the responsibility on an individual or particular group of officers. The delay in completion of the work was due to winding up of a scheme and sanctioning under a different head. In view of the difficulties involved in identifying the individuals, fixing the responsibility and framing specific and sustainable charges the objection raised by the Committee may kindly be dropped.

**Recommendation**

*(Sl. No. 3 Para No. 8)*

2.5 The Committee are at a loss to understand, why the Department could not foresee the actual period required for the completion of the work and the availability of sufficient budget provision, before entering into an agreement with the contractor. The Committee opine that once a work is awarded to a contractor the tendency to extend the period of completion of such work shall not be encouraged and infrastructure facilities should be provided to the contractor to complete the work within the agreement period.

**Action Taken**

2.6 This is noted for future guidance.

**Recommendation**

*(Sl. No.4 Para No.9)*

2.7 The Committee regret to note that the Principal Secretary, Public Works Department was not in a position to furnish the details regarding the date on which this scheme was discontinued and a copy of the Government Order as assured by him. The Committee urge that the details should be furnished to the Committee within two months.

**Action Taken**

2.8(1) The Hill road scheme was commenced as per G.O. (MS) No. 157/80/PW dated 30-9-1980. Copy of the Government Order is included as

(Appendix—III). No Government Order is seen issued calling off the scheme. As per records, in 1985-86, the scheme was dropped from the budget proposals.

(2) From 1985-86 onwards there was no provision in the budget proposals for the continuance of this work.

(3) There was no budget provision for this work from 1985-86 onwards. In 1988 this work was taken up under Village Road Schemes.

#### **Recommendation**

*(Sl. No. 6 Para No. 15)*

2.9 The Committee observe that in spite of the specific directions issued by Chief Engineer (DRIQ) works on the bridge were carried out without conducting necessary soil tests and bearing capacity of founding media. The Committee urges that whenever such failure/lapses are pointed out regarding the execution of work, specific sanction from Government should be obtained. The Committee desires to be informed whether the department had taken any action against those who disobeyed the directions issued by Chief Engineer (DRIQ) and the officers responsible for the loss to the exchequer.

#### **Action Taken**

2.10 Specific instructions have been given by the CE (DRIQ) in the notes of the general arrangement drawings regarding the bearing capacity founding level and the stress occurring in founding level due to loads coming on the structure. If any discrepancy is found in the soil investigation report the field officers are instructed to take confirmatory borings at pier and abutment points before execution and get the design revised. There is no provision in the accepted schedule to conduct soil investigation during the actual time of execution of the work.

#### **Recommendation**

*(Sl. No. 7 Para No. 19)*

2.11 The Committee could find no justification on the part of the Public Works Department for not taking any action to rearrange the work of Kakkavayal-Kolayal-Kariambadi-Kenichira road owing to the discontinuance of the Hill Road scheme. The Committee are not convinced of the stand taken by the Department that this particular road was not a PWD road and opine according to the Rules of Business, when the Cabinet approves the proposal putforth by the Minister for PWD for construction of road, such road belongs to PWD. The Committee feels that the Department had been indifferent in the matter and that no attempt was made to protect the interests of Government.

### **Action Taken**

2.12 The PWD had taken sincere efforts to complete the work. For completing the work on discontinuance of the Hill Highway Scheme the same had to be included in the budget and sanction obtained from Government. Due to the good efforts from Chief Engineer Government sanction for take over of the road was obtained on 27-11-1992 vide G.O. (Rt.) No.1374/92/PW&T. dated 27-11-1992. Subsequently this work was included in Budget for 1992-93 with a provision of Rs. 1.00 lakh as item 441/98. A rough cost estimate for balance works towards completion of work was submitted to Government for Administrative Sanction and A/S was accorded for Rs. 42.50 lakhs. Special sanction for arranging work was accorded by Government vide G.O.(Rt.)No.409/93/PW&T dated 19-3-1993. Detailed estimate was prepared and submitted to Chief Engineer and Technical Sanction was issued by Chief Engineer. Thereafter the work was tendered and awarded to Shri P. P. Abdul Khadar, Contractor @ 48% above Estimate Rate. The site was handed over to him on 1-6-1994 and work was completed on 26-3-1995.

2.13 Therefore, it may please be seen that PWD had taken steps to rearrange the work on discontinuance of Hill Highway Scheme and in fact the work was completed on 26-3-1995. Government have sanctioned take over of the road from Panchayat and ordered (i) proportionate reduction in maintenance grant to Panchayat on transfer of the road (ii) surrender of road with minimum 8 m width to PWD and (iii) to take steps for improving the road only after Panchayat actually surrendered the road with required land width. This Government order was complied with and road taken over and work completed by PWD.

2.14 PWD had taken every possible steps to protect the interest of the Government. The work was rearranged by bringing the same in the state budget and then obtained Administrative Sanction, Special Sanction and Technical Sanction for the same. The work itself was completed in a short span of 10 months against the allowed completion time of 18 months. Therefore it may be seen that there had been no indifference on the part of PWD in this case.

### **Recommendation**

*(Sl. No. 8 Para No. 20)*

2.15 The Committee seriously note that there has been unpardonable delay on the part of the department in terminating the original contract and in fixing the liability of the original contractor. During evidence, the witness informed that the liability of the Contractor on account of risk and cost could not be fixed due to the delay in rearranging the work. The Committee do not accept the stand taken by the Department. As per the instruction issued by the Government in the matter the liability of the Contractor should be determined and recovered within a period

of one year from the date of termination of the work. The action on the department officials in lagging the determination and recovery of dues from defaulting contractor indefinitely was highly irregular.

#### **Action Taken**

2.16 The contractor was issued notices as required. As the terms of contract were very favourable to the State at 10% below estimate rate all efforts were taken to get the work done by the same contractor. When all attempts failed the contract was terminated on 16-7-1986 at the risk and cost of contractor and the security deposit was forfeited to the Government.

2.17 Immediately on termination of the contract the contractor approached the High Court by filing O.P. 6574 of G and the Hon'ble Court had issued a stay by ordering no action on the matter. Thereafter the Hill Highway Scheme was abandoned by Government and Department had to take over the road and get the same included in the budget with adequate provision.

2.18 Due to the special circumstances explained above the delay in arranging the balance work could not be avoided, without retendering and finalising rates the liability of the original contractor could not be determined. Meanwhile the panchayat (the road at that time belonged to the panchayat) carried out some works to make traffic possible along the road. This further complicated the matter.

#### **Recommendation**

*(Sl. No. 9 Para No. 21)*

2.19 The Committee recommends that action should be taken against the officials responsible for the delay in rearranging the balance works and also in determining and not recovering the liability of the defaulting contractor.

#### **Action Taken**

2.20 It may please be seen that delay in rearranging the work was not due to failure of officials but due to the special circumstances explained earlier. The period of around seven years involved in taking over the road, bringing into budget under a new head of account, sanctioning the estimates etc. and several officers associated with the process make this a wide ranging exercise. It is not practicable to identify the individuals or groups of officers and fix the responsibility pointed out in the recommendations of the Public Accounts Committee. Hence in view of the difficulties involved in identifying the individuals, fixing the responsibility and framing specific and sustainable charges against them the objections of the Committee in this regard may kindly be dropped.

**Recommendation**

*(Sl. No.11 Para No.27)*

2.21 The Committee are not satisfied with the explanation put forth by the witness for the slackness on the part of the department in defending the case properly which led to an avoidable expenditure of Rs. 2.61 lakhs to Government. The Committee view with serious concern the negligent manner in which the court cases are dealt with in several Government Departments. The Committee feels that no effective follow up action was taken by the Public Works Department in defending the case. The Committee underline the need for the necessity of taking prompt action and better co-ordination and interaction between the departmental officers and government pleaders so as to check the recurrence of such failures in defending departmental cases.

**Action Taken**

2.22 Keen interest is taken in dealing with court cases. The government pleaders are frequently contacted and discussions are held with them in preparing defence statements and counter affidavit.

Thiruvananthapuram,  
10th July 2007.

ARYADAN MUHAMMED,  
*Chairman,*  
*Committee on Public Accounts.*

## APPENDIX I

## SUMMARY OF MAIN CONCLUSIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS

<i>Sl. No.</i>	<i>Para No.</i>	<i>Department Concerned</i>	<i>Conclusions/Recommendations</i>
1.	1.3	Public Works	The Committee reiterates its Recommendations that, the present system and procedure in approving the design and structure of major bridge works should be reviewed and desires to be informed about the action taken in this regard.
2.	1.7	„	The Committee recommends that in future works should be tendered or awarded only after making the sites ready to be handed over to the contractor.

APPENDIX II

NO. FGB(5) 25507/99.

Office of the Chief Engineer  
PWD Building & Local Works  
Thiruvananthapuram, dt. 1-11-1999

CIRCULAR

*Sub:*—Arrangement of works—Strict adherence of P. W. D. Code and PWD Manual—Instruction issued—Reg.

*Ref:*— 67th report of Public Accounts Committee.

In the above report of the P.A.C. it is observed that while arranging the works, the departmental procedures are not strictly observed. Lack of proper planning and investigations lead to inordinate delays in completion of works causing revision of estimates resulting in avoidable extra expenditure on account of such works.

In some cases works are tendered before the sites are ready to be handover to the contractors. The committee have expressed their dissatisfaction in this regard and decided to have a check on the recurrence of such violations of codal provisions.

Therefore, it is directed that in future, while arranging works, all prevailing rules in the department should be strictly followed and no work shall be tendered/awarded before the site is made available to be handed over to the contractors.

Please note that any failure in this regard will be viewed seriously.

(Sd.)

*Chief Engineer.*

APPENDIX III  
GOVERNMENT OF KERALA

**Abstract**

BUILDINGS AND ROADS—SCHEME FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNICATION  
FACILITIES IN HILLY AREAS—DISTRIBUTION OF AMOUNT EARMARKED  
IN THE BUDGET—ORDERS ISSUED

---



---

PW & E (C) DEPARTMENT

G. O. (Ms.) No. 157/80/PW. *Dated, Thiruvananthapuram, 30th September, 1980.*

---



---

*Read* :—Letter dated 11-4-1980 from the Chief Engineer, General, Buildings and Roads.

ORDER

The hilly region which comprises more than a third of states total area still continued to remain backward in many respects. These areas which include Idukki, Wayanad and Kasaragod account for the production of a major proportion of foreign exchange earning cash crops of the state. One of the reasons for the backwardness of these areas is lack of proper communication facilities. Government have therefore decided to undertake the construction of a few important roads in the backward hilly areas of the State for which an amount of Rs. 300 lakhs has been exclusively earmarked in the current years budget.

Government are now pleased to approve the distribution of Rs. 3 crore earmarked for the development of communication facilities in hilly area during 1980-81 for the road works shown in the list appended to this order.

By order of the Governor,

C. P. RAMAKRISHNA PILLAI,

*Special Secretary to Government.*

To

The C. E. (B & R)  
All Superintending Engineers (B & R)  
All Executive Engineers (B & R)  
The Accountant General  
The Finance Department

Copy to

PW (K) Dept.  
The U. S. PWD  
PWD (C1) & C4  
Office of the Minister (PW)  
DPR for

## APPENDIX TO G. O. (MS) NO. 157/80/ PW DATED 30-9-1980

**Buildings and Roads Division, Calicut**

<i>Sl. No.</i>	<i>Name of work</i>	<i>Length</i>	<i>Amount</i>	<i>Amount expected to be spent in 1980-81 (Rs. in lakhs)</i>
1.	Koodaranji Kakkadampil Road	12 km	25 lakhs	5.50
2.	Chathankottunad Mittathupilavu Vannathiyettu Vattippana Pasukadavu Road	19.88 km	48 lakhs	6.00
3.	Muliyangal Kaithakkelli road	8 km	15 lakhs	4.00
4.	Koodaranji Poovaranthod Kakkadampil Chaliyar Nilambur road.	7 km	15 lakhs	4.00
5.	Kalladi Anakkampoil road	16 km	50 lakhs	6.00
6.	Oliyet Thrissileri road	5 km	8 lakhs	2.00
7.	Poothanpara Choorani Pakkramthalam road	6 km	14 lakhs	4.00
8.	Koodaranji Pulleerampara Roads and Bridges Development Corporation including construction of bridge across Cherupuzha	8 km	15lakhs	4.00
9.	Vateeli Ezhukkandy Theechi road	11.3 km	15 lakhs	3.00
9A	Thalayad Vayalad road	-	-	1.00
10.	Kakkavayal Koiaroyal Kariyampadi Kenichira road	11 km	20 lakhs	4.00
11.	Pachikkadavu Chundankunnu road	3.5 km	5 lakhs	1.00
12.	Pandikadavu Chukkukadavu Pannichal road	3.5 km	6 lakhs	2.00
Total		111.18 km	236 lakhs	46.50

**Buildings and Roads Division, Manjeri**

<i>Sl. No.</i>	<i>Name of work</i>	<i>Length in km.</i>	<i>Amount</i>	<i>Amount required for 1980-81</i>
1.	Calicut Nilambur-Gundallor road Km. 100/0 to 103/600	3.60 km	4 lakhs	4.00 lakhs
2.	-do- 97/0 to 100/0	3 km	5.00	5.00 „
3.	-do- 92/0 to 97/0	5 km	5 lakhs	5.00 „
4.	Karuvarakundu- Attappadi road 0/0 to 12/0	12 km	50 lakhs	9.00 „
5.	Karulayi-Chuliyod road	5 km	5 lakhs	3.00 „
6.	Nilambur Organntteri road	-	5 lakhs	3.00 „
7.	Vazhikadavu Chakkapaadam	5 km	5 lakhs	3.00 „
Total		33.60	79.00	32.00 „

**Buildings and Roads Division, Cannanore**

<i>Sl. No.</i>	<i>Name of work</i>	<i>Length</i>	<i>Estimate amount</i>	<i>Anticipated amount to be spent during 1980-81</i>
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1.	Nettakallu Kumbadje (via) Benlinja (Belinja to Kumbadje)	6 km	6.5 lakhs	2.5 lakhs
2.	Mattara Kallingi road	3 km	3.0 lakhs	2.0 „
3.	Vallithode Anapandy road	3.2 km	20.00 lakhs	6.0 „
4.	Edoor Company Nirath Anapathy Angadi Kadavu Charal Valavuppara road	11 km	12.0 lakhs	4.0 „
5.	Chamandikunnu (Panathady) Chazhungal road	5 km	5.0 lakhs	3.0 „
6.	Chittarikkal-Kummumkai road	7.0 km	5.0 lakhs	3.0 „
7.	Karayatta Kunderipoil road (Maloor Panchayat)	15 km	20 lakhs	5 „

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
8.	Kannavam Thodikulam Idambthiri Kadaripoyil (bridge) (Chithariparamba Panchayat)	8 km	10.00 lakhs	4.0 lakhs
9.	Bethurpara Pallanji Pandi with Causeway at Palanji	4.45 km	6.00 lakhs	3.0 "
10.	Delampady	3.0 km	2.5 lakhs	2.50 "
11.	Chemberi-Puranhal-Venkunnu- Kavala road connecting Eruvassy Naduvil Panchayat	4.5 km	4.5 lakhs	3.0 "
12.	Padiotchal Cherupara Thimiri road, connecting Peringome- Vayyakkara Alakode Chappara- ppadava Panchayat	10 km	10.0 lakhs	3.0 "
13.	Perumuda Dharmathadka road	3 km	3.0 lakhs	3.0 "
Total		83.15 Km	91.50 lakhs	44.0 lakhs

**Buildings and Roads Division, Palghat**

<i>Sl. No.</i>	<i>Name of work</i>	<i>Length in km.</i>	<i>Amount</i>	<i>Amount expected to be spent during 1980-81</i>
1.	Malampuzha Anakkallu road	12 km	24 lakhs	6 lakhs
2.	Nenmara-Nelliampathy road	31 km	15 lakhs	3 lakhs
3.	Anakkatty-Scholayar road improvements	12 km	12 lakhs	3 lakhs
4.	Mettupalayam-Meenakshipuram road	20 km	10 lakhs	2.0 lakhs
5.	Pathiripala-Kongad road improvements	11 km	11 lakhs	3 lakhs
6.	Agali Jelly para road	8 km	15 lakhs	3.0 lakhs
7.	Parambikulam Sethumada road	20 km	10 lakhs	2.0 lakhs
Total		114 km	97 lakhs	22.0 lakhs

## IDUKKI DISTRICT

## Buildings and Roads Division, Palghat

<i>Sl. No.</i>	<i>Name of work</i>	<i>Length in km.</i>	<i>Amount in lakhs</i>	<i>Amount expected to be spent during 1980-81</i>
1.	Arakulam Moolamattom road	3.475	5.0	3.0
2.	Arakulam Kulamavu road	15.0	15.0	7.0
3.	Kulamavu Puliyanmala road (via) Idukki and Kattappana	54.982	50.0	35.0
4.	Neriamanagalam Idukki road (including the loop road)	50.318	50.0	35.0
5.	Chembalam Kattappana road	6.0	11.9	5.0
6.	Myladumpara to Kallarukutty road (Via) Muniara	28.0	-	4.0
7.	Alady Kumily road	10.0	9.8	6.0
8.	Valanjakanam Peerumedu road (via) Vedipura	4.0	9.1	3.0
9.	Udumbanoor Vazhathope Idukki road	-	-	4.0
10.	Chelachuvad Vannappuram via Kanjikuzhy	-	-	5.0
11.	Kattappana Kumily road via Vallakkadavu Ist reach	-	-	5.0
12.	Kattappana Kumily road via Vallakkadavu Ist reach	-	-	5.0
13.	Erattayar Thoivala road	5.0	6.0	4.0
14.	Kattappana Pampadumpara via Kochuthavala	-	-	3.0
Total		176.775	156.8	120.00

**Buildings and Roads Division, Trichur**

<i>Sl. No</i>	<i>Name of work</i>	<i>Length in km</i>	<i>Amount in lakhs</i>	<i>Amount expected to be spent during 1980-81</i>
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1.	Kallur Alathur Kottamuri road	-	-	1.0
2.	Mannamangalam Chennaipura road	-	-	1.0
3.	Kavanad Kanakamala road	-	-	1.0

**Buildings and Roads Division, Trivandrum**

1.	Aryanad-Kottakkakom road	-	4.50	2.00
2.	Aryanad-Palode road	-	5.00	2.00
3.	Chullimanoor-Anad-Pulippara road	-	4.50	2.00
4.	Road from Chayam to Peringamala	-	6.00	2.00
5.	Kallara-Adappura road	-	4.00	2.00
6.	Brimore-Ponmudi road	-	5.00	2.00

**Buildings and Roads Division, Quilon**

1.	Quilon-Shenkotta road (Ghat section)	-	10.00	5.00
2.	Seethathode-Gurunathan Mannu road	-	6.00	1.00
3.	Alimukku-Achencoil road	-	5.00	2.00
4.	Mekkara-Achencoil road	-	5.00	2.00

**Buildings and Roads Division, Kottayam**

1.	Erattupettah-Poonjar road	-	5.00	1.50
----	---------------------------	---	------	------

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
2.	Approach road to Government Dispensary-Poonjar Panchayat	-	2.00	1.00
3.	Anthinadu-Melukavu road	-	5.00	1.00
4.	Mukkoottuthara-Kanamala road (via) Ummikuppa	-	8.00	1.00
5.	Koruthodu-Kanamala road (via) Kalaketty	-	10.00	1.00
6.	Poonjar-Koottickal & II reach	-	10.00	1.00
7.	Poonjar-Peringalem road 2nd section	-	5.00	1.00
8.	Road from Parathanam to Mundakayam-Koottikal	-	7.00	1.00
9.	Ambara-Mancombu road	-	5.00	1.00
10.	Erumeli-Mukkada road	-	4.00	1.00
11.	Erattupettah-Chennad road	-	5.00	1.00
12.	Erattupettah-Wagamon road	-	7.00	1.00