TAMIL NADU LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

(2011-2012)



(FOURTEENTH ASSEMBLY)

FORTIETH REPORT

(Presented to the Assembly on 7-5-2012)

Legislative Assembly Secretariat,

Chennai-600 009.

TAMIL NADU LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

(2011-2012)

(FOURTEENTH ASSEMBLY)



FORTIETH REPORT

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS ON THE PARAGRAPHS INCLUDED IN THE REPORT OF THE COMPTROLLER AND AUDITOR GENERAL OF INDIA (Civil) FOR THE YEAR 2000-2001 RELATING TO ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS DEPARTMENT

CONTENTS

Paragraph Number (1)	Subject (2)	Pages (3)
	Composition of the Committee on Public Accounts (2011-2012)	iii
	Introduction	v
	REPORT	
	REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS ON THE PARAGRAPHS INCLUDED IN THE REPORT OF THE COMPTROLLER AND AUDITOR GENERAL OF INDIA (Civil) FOR THE YEAR 2000-2001 RELATING TO ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS DEPARTMENT	
	ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS DEPARTMENT	
1.	Implementation of Environmental Acts and Rules relating to Air-pollution and Waste Management	1-2
2.	Monitoring of Air Pollution	2-3
3.	Shortfall in survey of Ambient Air Quality	3-4
4.	Non-conduct of Stack Monitoring Survey	4
5.	Other points of interest	4-5
6.	Ambient Air Quality Monitoring	5-6
7.	Non-setting up of AAO Station at Udhagamandalam	7
8.	Vehicle Emission	7-8
9.	Gross under-utilisation of equipment	8-9
10.	Issue of Fitness Certificate without PUC Certificate	9
11.	Irregular collection of testing fee	9-10
12.	Anomalies in monitoring and testing of vehicles for emissions	10-11
13.	Consequences due to non-setting up of VEM Stations by the TNPCB	11-12
14.	Hazardous wastes-Management and handling	12-13
15.	Lack of monitoring control of hazardous wastes generating industries	13-14
16.	Disposal of effluent samples in an unscientific manner by the laboratories	14
17.	Bio-Medical Waste (Management and Handling) Rules 1998	14-16
18.	Municipal Solid Waste (Management and Handling) Rules 2000	16-17
19.	Green Belt for abatement of pollution and environment Improvement	17-18

20.	Green Belt for abatement of Pollution and Environment Improvement	18-19
21.	Expenditure in excess of PCCF guidelines	20-21
22.	Avoidable expenditure on digging of larger size pits	21-22
23.	General	22

ANNEXURE

Summary of Recommendations 23-25



TAMIL NADU LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Composition of the Committee on Public Accounts (2011-2012)

(Constituted on 10th June 2011)

CHAIRMAN

1. Thiru S.Ramachandran

MEMBERS

2. Hon.Thiru O.Panneerselvam,
   Minister for Finance (*Ex-Officio*)
3. Thiru P.G.Narayanan,
   Chairman, Committee on Estimates (*Ex-Officio*)
4. Thiru V.Somasundaram
   Chairman, Committee on Public Undertakings (*Ex-Officio*)
5. Thiru K.P.Anbalagan
*6. Thiru M.S.M.Anandan
7. Thiru P.V.Kathiravan
8. Thiru Kadambur Raju
9. Thiru V.P.Kalairajan
10. Vacant
11. Thiru M.Gunasekaran
12. Thiru O.K.Chinnaraj
13. Dr.Kovi.Chezhian
14. Thiru R.Duraikkannu
15. Thiru K.Pandiarajan
16. Thiru K.V.Markendeyan
17. Thiru R.Ramamoorthy
18. Tmt R.Rajalakshmi
19. Thiru S.John Jacab

SECRETARIAT

Thiru A.M.P.Jamaludeen	..	Secretary
Tmt G.Gayathiri	..	Joint Secretary
Selvi S.Philomena	..	Deputy Secretary
Thiru Rm.S.Giridharan	..	Under Secretary

* Upto 11-12-2011

INTRODUCTION

1. I, Chairman, Committee on Public Accounts having been authorised by the Committee (2011-2012) to submit the Report on their behalf present this Fortieth Report on the paragraphs pertaining to Environment and Forests Department included in the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India (Civil) for the year 2000-2001.

2. The Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the year 2000-2001 was laid on the Table of the House on 10.5.2002.

3. The Committee at its meeting held on 11-9-2007 examined the Secretary to Government, Environment and Forest Department in connection with the important paras pertaining to that Department.

4. The Committee records its appreciation of the valuable assistance rendered by the Secretary, Legislative Assembly, Principal Accountant General (Civil Audit) and Deputy Secretary, Finance Department. The Committee is also thankful to the Secretary to Government, Environment and Forests Department for the co-operation extended to the Committee in its deliberations.

5. The original notes submitted by the department and the particulars, clarifications etc., made available during evidence have been taken into account by the Committee in finalising this Report.

6. The Committee approved this Report at its meeting held on 22nd November 2011.

Chennai-600 009,
22nd November 2011,
Karthigai 6,
Thiruvalluvar Aandu-2042.

S.RAMACHANDRAN,
Chairman,
Committee on Public Accounts.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS ON THE PARAGRAPHS INCLUDED IN TH REPORT OF THE COMPTROLLER AND AUDITOR GENERAL OF INDIA FOR THE YEAR 2000-2001 (Civil) RELATING TO ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS DEPARTMENT

ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS DEPARTMENT

1. Implementation of Environmental Acts and Rules relating to Air-pollution and Waste Management (Para 3.3 of Audit Report 2000-2001)

1.1. Introduction

The Committee notes that the increased industrial activity and increase in vehicular population lead to increase in discharge of pollutants thereby affecting the ambient air quality, which in turn has an adverse effect on vegetation and human health. Government of Tamil Nadu made the Tamil Nadu Air (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Rules, 1983 on the basis of the Air (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1981 of Government of India (GOI). The GOI also made the following Rules in order to implement the provisions of the Environment (Protection) (EP) Act, 1986.

Sl. No.	Rules	Purpose
1	The Environment (Protection) Rules, 1986	Prescribe standards for emissions or discharge of environmental pollutants
2	The Hazardous Wastes (Management and Handling) Rules 1989	Prescribe procedure for environmentally sound management and disposal of hazardous wastes.
3	The Bio-Medical Waste (Management and Handling) Rules 1998	Prescribe procedure for segregation, packaging, transportation, storage and disposal of bio-medical waste
4	The Recycled Plastics Manufacture and Usage Rules, 1999	Regulate the manufacture and usage of recycled plastics, carry bags and containers
5	Municipal Solid Wastes (Management and Handling Rules 2000)	Prescribe procedure for collection, segregation, storage, transportation, processing and disposal of Municipal solid wastes.

1.2. Organisational Set up

Secretary to Government, Environment and Forests Department was in overall charge of prevention, control and abatement of Industrial Pollution. Tamil Nadu Pollution Control Board (TNPCB) through its District offices and laboratories oversees and monitors the implementation of relevant rules and regulations.

Secretary to Government, Home (Transport) Department was in overall charge of control of vehicular pollution, Transport Commissioner through his Zonal offices and

Regional Transport Officers (RTOs) oversee and monitor the implementation of relevant rules and regulations.TNPCB had set up nine Vehicle Emission Monitoring (VEM) stations.

Significant points noticed during the Review on the implementation covering 1996-97 to 2000-01 are discussed below:-

2. Monitoring Air Pollution (Para 3.3.4 of Audit Report 2000-2001)
Industrial Emission (Para 3.3.4.1 of Audit Report 2000-2001)
Shortfall in Inspection (Para 3.3.4.1.1. of Audit Report 2000-2001)

2.1. The Committee notes that in September 1988, GOI issued guidelines categorizing industries into red, orange and green based on their potentiality for causing pollution. TNPCB further classified these industries into large, medium and small with reference to their gross fixed assets. GOI categorized the industries engaged in the manufacture of 17 specified products as "17 Category highly polluting industries".

"17 category" industries are to be inspected twice a month and red-large industries once a month by the engineers of TNPCB.

Audit covered 26 industries "17 Category" and found that in respect of 24 industries shortfall in inspection was over 54 per cent during 1996-97 to 2000-2001. This indicated poor monitoring even in the case of highly polluting industries. Further heavy shortfall in inspection ranging between 83 and 98 per cent was observed in respect of 39 industries covered in audit falling under red large category.

2.2. The Department in its Explanatory Notes has stated that District Environmental Engineers (DEs), Assistant Environmental Engineers attend to huge number of works including Inspection of Industries as prescribed for these categories of Industries such as

1. Attending District level Environmental Committee meetings chaired by the District Collector.

2. District Aquaculture Meeting

3. District Coastal Regulation Zone Management meeting

4. Agriculture grievance Day Meeting

Further owing to increased Public Awareness on Environmental Pollution, the Board receives complaints on water, air and noise pollution from public directly and complaints forwarded from the Chief Ministers' Complaint Cell which are time bound and to be attended immediately and Public Interest Litigation cases are on the rise and the District Officers have to furnish comprehensive reports to the Court.

The Department has finally stated that taking into account the work load of the officers as stated above, the Central Pollution Control Board (CPCB) has fixed the norms for inspection of such industries (the Department has appended the de tails of

norms fixed by the CPCB) and against the norms fixed by the CPCB there would not be any shortfall.

2.3. During deposition the Chairman, Pollution Control Board has stated that a target has been fixed for the inspection of the industries. Further no norms had been framed either in Rules or Acts for the inspection of Industries. He further stated that the shortfall in inspection of Industries more than 54% had been calculated on the basis that the industries were to be inspected twice a month. He informed the Committee that the pollution control Board divided in 2004, after a review, that the 117 category of industries be inspected once a month and that, based on the norms they have achieved 85% of the target

The Chairman, TNPCB also stated that it was difficult to inspect all the industries in Tamil Nadu with the existing staff strength. Hence the Engineers were advised to segregate important industries, industries causing more pollution, Industries receiving more complaints and inspect them. By this, the target has almost been reached.

2.4. The Committee recommends that the norms prescribed by the CPCB to inspect the industries should be adhered to 100% by the Department.

3. Shortfall in survey of Ambient Air Quality (Para 3.3.4.1.2 of Audit Report 2000-2001)

3.1. The Committee notes that sub-rule 3-B of Rule 3 of Environment (Protection) (EP) Rules, 1986 prescribes that the combined effect of emission of pollutants from industries, processes, automobiles and domestic sources shall not be permitted to exceed the specified concentration in ambient air. TNPCB was required to monitor the position through its laboratories (Mobile/ District/ Advanced Environmental Laboratories) by conducting Ambient Air Quality (AAQ) surveys and Stack Monitoring (SM) surveys.

In respect of 25 out of 26 industries falling under "17 category" covered in Audit, shortfall in AAQ survey ranged between 20 and 100 per cent as compared to the norm of twice a year.

It was further noticed that neither the laboratories, responsible for conducting the surveys, maintained a list of industries to be covered each year nor was any such list furnished regularly to the laboratories by the District Offices.

3.2. The Department in its Explanatory Notes has stated that during the past five years, the number of 17 category industries have increased from 119 in the year 1995-96 to 202 in the year 2000-2001 ie almost doubled over the years. Besides the other category of industries namely Large Red/Medium Red category of industries have also increased for which ambient air quality surveys are required to be conducted before renewal of the consent to these industries. With the available manpower in laboratories and facilities, the Board was carrying out stack/ambient air quality surveys, which satisfy Central Pollution Board (CPCB) norms. Regarding maintenance of register for conducting air surveys, the Department has stated that

the District Officers were regularly issuing sampling programmes to be conducted in their respective jurisdiction to concerned labs.

3.3. During deposition the Chairman, Pollution Control Board stated that they have taken two types of action for air quality monitoring. First industries should subject themselves to inspection by the laboratories accredited by Government of India. This practice is now followed by the Board. Though the Pollution Control Board undertakes the inspection once a year due to inadequate staff strength, the third party air quality monitoring is conducted in a good manner.

3.4. Second, the industries which discharge large effluents are inspected by on line monitoring. The level of pollutants in the effluents discharged by such industries would be recorded on line automatically and can not be hidden. During 2006-2007, the Board identified and listed out 168 such industries and action was being taken to monitor them. By adopting these two methods, of monitoring, the Board had reduced its survey from twice a year to once a year.

3.5 The Committee recommends that the Board strictly adhere to the norm of two surveys in a year and that Board should take necessary action to deploy adequate staff for carrying out the survey according to norms.

4. Non-conduct of Stack Monitoring Survey (Para 3.3.4.1.3 of Audit Report 2000-2001)

4.1. The Committee notes that to ensure that stack emission is within the standards, the SM survey was required to be done along with AAQ survey. However, out of 1040 AAQ surveys conducted by five laboratories covered in audit, SM Survey was not conducted in 338 cases, due to non-provision of port holes, inaccessibility of port holes, non-provision of platform in the stacks and chimneys being small.

4.2. The Department in its Explanatory Notes has stated that Stack survey was to be conducted only for those industries for which stack emission standards were fixed by the TNPCB in the Consent Order. The Department has further stated that stack monitoring as per CPCB Guidelines for the list of industries identified for conducting air survey were being conducted.

4.3 Committee notes with displeasure that inaccessibility to stacks, non-provision of port holes and non-provision of platform in the stacks chimneys attributed by the Board for shortfall had not been addressed by the Department.

4.4. The Committee desires to know whether all the industries for which stack monitoring has been fixed at prescribed periodical intervals have been instructed by the Board to provide appropriate facilities that would enable the Board to conduct stack monitoring.

5. Other points of interest (Para 3.3.4.1.5 of Audit Report 2000-2001)

(c) MRF Limited

5.1. The Committee notes that in respect of boilers the tolerance limits for Suspended Particulate Matter (SPM) and Sulphur Dioxide (SO2) were 150 mg/NM^3 and

400mg/NM^3 respectively. The results of SM surveys conducted on appointed days were as shown below:-

Name of the Boiler	Date of Stack Monitoring (values in mg/NM^3)							
	26 and 28 August 1997		28 and 29 December 1998		22 and 23 December 1999		25 and 27 of July 2000	
	SPM	SO2	SPM	SO2	SPM	SO2	SPM	SO2
JT Boiler	647	181	494	11	182	643	135	448
SF Boiler	288	312	353	08	406	608	138	467
TS Boiler	312	085	323	05	221	554	146	501

Evidently most of the test results were in excess of the limits. However, TNPCB did not take any punitive action against the industry. Further the TNPCB did not analyze the reasons for the abnormally low level of SO2 in December 1998.

5.2. The Department furnished the results of stack survey conducted during 10/2001 and 6/2002 and stated that the parameters were within the norms. In regard to low level of SO2 in December 1998, the Department stated that it might be due to incomplete combustion that took place in the boiler firing resulting into deposits if sulphur in the bottom of the furnance and the unit was addressed to provide wet scrubber arrangement to the boilers so as to effectively control the particulate matter emission.

5.3. The Committee desires to know the action taken for the excess over limits during four years successively from 1997 to 2000.

6. Ambient Air Quality Monitoring (Para 3.3.4.2 of Audit Report 2000-2001) Ambient Air Quality Monitoring in Chennai and Tiruchirappalli (Para 3.3.4.2.1 of Audit Report 2000-2001)

6.1. The Committee notes that for monitoring the level of air pollutants, TNPCB had set up stations during the year 1997 in five locations including three traffic intersections at Thiyagaraya Nagar, Kilpauk and Vallalar nagar in Chennai City.

In all the three traffic intersection stations the level of pollutants exceeded the AAQ norms prescribed by Central Pollution Control Board as shown below:-

Year	Percentage of samples exceeding the norms	
	SPM	RPM
1998-1999	71 to 92	41 to 80
1999-2000	65 to 76	45 to 78
2000-2001	75 to 95	57 to 81

As against the norms of 200 ug/m3 for Suspended Particulate Matter (SPM) and 100 ug/m3 for Respirable Particulate Matter (RPM) the maximum values of SPM and RPM recorded were as high as 1900 ug/m3 and 913 ug/m3 respectively during 2000-2001.

In all samples taken in certain months the SPM exceeded the norms as indicated below:-

(Number of months)

Station Location	1998-1999	1999-2000	2000-2001
Kilpauk	-	1	6
Thiyagaraya Nagar	7	2	7
Vallalar Nagar	2	1	3

Though TNPCB stated (July 2001) that seminars were organized to create awareness among public, free emission clinics and surprise emission checks were conducted with the help of Transport Department, the pollution levels were on the increase year after year which indicated that the action taken by the Board was inadequate.

Five AAQ stations were set up in Tiruchirapalli between November 1999- March 2000. An analysis of data for 1443 samples revealed that the SPM and RPM value exceeded the norms in respect of 541(38 per cent) and 244(17 per cent) samples respectively between November 1999 and March 2001.

6.2. The Department in its Explanatory Notes has stated that AAQ Monitoring in Chennai city was being done for a period of 8 hours only during heavy traffic period and hence the maximum levels of SPM, RSPM might not be comparable with the 24 hours standard of ambient air quality notified by the CPCB. The Department has further stated that steps were being taken to reduce vehicular pollution by implementing the scheme of vehicle emission checking which was mandatory for all the vehicles and Government had introduced unleaded petrol and low sulphur 0.005% in Chennai city and improving traffic management system so as to contain air pollution caused by vehicles and action was being initiated for introducing alternative eco friendly fuel LPG for auto rickshaws and cars and the Oil Companies had taken steps for installation of auto LPG dispensing station in Chennai city. The Department did not furnish any reply in respect of AAQ stations mentioned in Audit paragraph in Tiruchirapalli.

6.3. The Committee recommended that the air quality norms should be adhered to at all times and this has to be ensured more during the peak hours only when the pollution is likely to be extensive causing a major health hazard to the public.

6.4. The Committee desires to know the specific proposals considered and put into action specifying the fixed timeframe and orders specifically issued prescribing the methodology.

7. Non-setting up of AAQ Station at Udhagamandalam (Para 3.3.4.2.2 of Audit Report 2000-2001)

7.1. The Committee notes that in December 1998, Government under Hill Area Development Programme, sanctioned Rs.7.69 lakh for installation of AAQ station at Udhagamandalam for continuous monitoring of AAQ and collection of other meteorological data. The amount was released to the TNPCB in March 1999. All the requisite equipment purchased at a cost of Rs.7.19 lakh between July 1999 and March 2000 remained idle (March 2001) for want of manpower. The Noise Level Meter valued at Rs.2.45 lakh purchased in October 1999 was however diverted to DEL Coimbatore.

7.2. The Department in its Explanatory Notes has merely stated that the instruments were being used for Air Quality survey analysis of samples.

7.3 Committee desires to know whether the required staff were deployed and the equipments were utilised.

8. Vehicle Emission (Para 3.3.4.3 of Audit Report 2000-2001)
Non-incorporation of provision relating to Emission Checking (Para 3.3.4.3.1 of Audit Report 2000-2001)

8.1. The Committee notes that according to sub-rule (7) of Rule 115 of Central Motor Vehicles Rules, introduced in 1993, every vehicle, after the expiry of one year from the date of first registration, should carry a valid "Pollution under Control" (PUC) certificate from an agency authorised for this purpose by the State Government. Similar provisions were, however, not incorporated in the Tamil Nadu Motor Vehicles (TNMV) Rules so far (May 2001) though the entire State was declared as "Air Pollution Control Area" from October 1983.

8.2. The Department in its Explanatory Notes has stated that the Tamil Nadu Government was fully aware and conscious of the need to contain the pollution level. But at the same time, the Government wanted to enforce the rules gradually after creating awareness among the public and creating necessary facilities for obtaining Pollution under Control Certificate. The Department had further furnished the list of Government authorised private testing stations to issue Pollution under Control (PUC) Certificates and stated that Government Notification thereof had also been issued for the above stations.

8.3. During deposition the special Commissioner, Transport Department has stated that the Central Government has prescribed the limits of emission standards in the New Motor Vehicles Act 1988 followed by Central Motor Vehicle Rule 115(7) which came into force on 26.3.1993 and stipulated that every Motor Vehicle to carry a valid pollution under control certificate. This rule is applicable throughout India. The State Government have only to authorise the agencies from whom certificate shall have to be obtained. This provision has already been incorporated in the Tamil Nadu Motor Vehicle Rules 116(A) and it has been followed consecutively for the past 10 years upto the level of 100%

8.4 The Committee desires to know as to when the provision was incorporated in Tamil Nadu Motor Vehicle Rules. The Committee also desires to have a detailed report on the implementation of the provisions to contain pollution caused by emission from motor vehicles.

9. Gross under-utilisation of equipment (Para 3.3.4.3.2 of Audit Report 2000-2001)

9.1. The Committee notes that the Government purchased in March 1995 and March-April 1996, 28 sets of pollution testing equipment at total cost of Rs.99.66 lakh (each set consisting of one Gas Analyser (GA) and one Smoke Meter (SM)) and the same were issued to RTOs for conducting checks. The amount was reimbursed by GOI in November 1995 (Rs.49.94 lakh) and March 2000 (Rs.49.72 lakh).

(i) Nine sets of equipment supplied during 1995 and 1996 to RTOs based in Chennai Urban Aglomeration where not in use since February 1997 due to entrusting the work of conducting the pollution tests and issue of PUC certificates to private agencies in Chennai.

Four sets were transferred (March and September 1997) to RTOs of Enforcement Wings in Coimbatore, Salem, Chennai and Madurai for carrying out surprise check of vehicles. However, only 1548 vehicles were tested during 1997-98 and 1998-99 by all the above Enforcement Wings. Based on the highest number of 912 vehicles tested by Enforcement Wing, Coimbatore in 1997-99 average number of vehicles tested per day worked out to 1.25 vehicles only which cannot be considered optimum.

(ii) Out of the twenty-eight sets supplied to RTOs performance of twenty sets in Chennai Urban Agglomeration and other districts was reviewed in audit and it was revealed that 26 equipments failed.

Period from the date of supply	Chennai Urban Agglomeration		Other Districts	
	GAs	SMs	GAs	SMs
within 12 months	Nil	Nil	4	2
Between 12 and 24 months	3	3	6	8

Thirty-two equipments were kept idle for periods ranging from 15 to 68 months due to repairs of which 11 equipments were still under repair as of March 2001. Information regarding the date from which the equipments were out of order was not available in respect of 8 equipments.

No annual maintenance contract was entered into, although it was necessary to ensure that the equipment was in order to conduct emission checks. There was gross under-utilisation of these costly equipments.

9.2. The Department in its Explanatory Notes has stated that after the warranty period, initially no AMC was entered into for repair and maintenance of the equipments. However, action has now been taken to get the equipments repaired and put them back for use. Regarding entering into AMC with the suppliers, Department has furnished the list of suppliers with whom AMCs were entered into up to 31.3.003 in respect of certain equipments. The Department further stated that Tamil Nadu Government had started implementing the Scheme in 1992 and is continuously striving to enforce the scheme to perfection. In the first phase, the Government wanted to create awareness among the Public to facilitate voluntary compliance of rules by the vehicle owners and to enforce them strictly thereafter. In such a situation, there are bound to be certain initial difficulties and once the legislation is updated, adequate infrastructure facilities of testing stations improved things would settle down and progress in this area could be achieved. Though "Pollution control Measures" is intended to be general revenue to State it is a regulatory measure to prevent atmospheric pollution. The Department has finally concluded that so far as implementation of Pollution Control measures are concerned, the State Government as already noted are gradually enforcing the measures and all vehicles would be subjected to compulsory mandatory check within a specified period.

9.3 Since these pieces of equipment help in monitoring/ recording the essential parameters of pollution that enables the Board to keep track of the developments and help the Board in decision making thereof, they ought to have been maintained in full working condition all throughout the year. Belated action only points out the lack of seriousness in the implementation of the measures. Committee desires to know whether any target date was set for implementing the control measures.

10. Issue of Fitness Certificate without PUC Certificate (Para 3.3.4.3.3 of Audit Report 2000-2001)

10.1. The Committee notes that because of failure of pollution testing equipment as discussed above 14 RTPs issued fitness certificates in respect of 1,57,834 vehicles during 1997-1998 to 2000-2001 without conducting the test, in violation of Government Orders issued in September 1997.

10.2. The Department in its Explanatory Notes has stated that the non-availability of adequate facilities with the Tamil Nadu Pollution Control Board/ and the failure of Pollution testing machines at RTOs had created a situation, resulting in the issue of Fitness Certificate without support of pollution under control certificate. It has further stated that now there were adequate stations, the FCs were issued only after production of PUC certificates.

10.3. The Committee desires to know whether any monitoring mechanism at the appropriate level for ensuring compliance.

11. Irregular collection of testing fee (Para 3.3.4.3.4 of Audit Report 2000-2001)

11.1. The Committee observes that as stated earlier pollution testing equipment were supplied to 28 RTOs from April 1995 onwards. Orders were issued only in January 1997 authorising the RTOs to conduct test and issue PUC certificate.

However, even prior to this date 8 RTOs collected the fees amounting to Rs.15.23 lakh after conducting the tests. Further though certain RTOs were not supplied with equipment and the equipment supplied to others were not in working condition, yet 12 RTOs collected testing fees amounting to Rs.80.15 lakh during the period 1997-98 to 2000-2001 without testing.

11.2. The Department in its Explanatory Notes has merely accepted the audit findings and stated that collection of testing fee without the test actually conducted was not proper and the collection thus made was not in order.

11.3. During deposition, the Special Commissioner, Transport Department stated that they have purchased equipments for the pollution testing purpose. But they were not functioning. As such certain R.T. Offices have collected the fees at the prescribed rates and credited into Government Account. The Officers involved in this case were retired from the Service. Hence it was not possible to take action against them.

The Commissioner further informed that the Pollution testing centres are now maintained by the Private institution only. They are conducting inspection twice a year.

11.4. The Committee recommends that the Department should ensure that such lapse should not occur in future.

12. Anomalies in monitoring and testing of vehicles for emissions (Para 3.3.4.3.5 of Audit Report 2000-2001)

12.1. The Committee notes that though private emission testing stations were authorised to conduct emission testing as early as February 1997, yet it was only in March 2001, after being pointed out in Audit that the designated officers were instructed by Transport Commissioner to undertake the monthly inspection of such stations to check compliance of conditions of authorisation.

Sub-rule (4) of Rule 116-B of TNMV Rules dealing with grant and renewal of authorisation to private testing stations was amended in October 1998 revising the validity period of authorisation and its subsequent renewal from one year to five years. This was contrary to the clarifications sent (February 1998) by the Transport Commissioner to Government according to which the validity of the original authorisation should be for five years and subsequent renewal be on yearly basis. As a result of this ill-conceived amendment the yearly checks got postponed to five long years, leading to inadequate monitoring and control.

As per the extant rules, effective from 1 July 1998 all vehicles other than goods vehicles in Chennai Urban Agglomeration should be subjected to emission checking. In Chennai city, 141 private testing stations were authorised to conduct the checks from February 1997. Despite this, as against the city's vehicle population of 11,07,601 as on 31 March 1999 only 7,28,319 vehicles were tested by these stations upto April 2000, constituting a shortfall of 34 per cent. Evidently six monthly emission checks as contemplated were not also conducted.

12.2. The Department in its Explanatory Notes has not furnished any specific reply as to the period prescribed (in G.O. dated October 1998 contrary to clarification sent earlier by the Transport Commissioner to Government) for subsequent renewal of the period of validity of authorisation of the private testing centres. The Department has further stated that during the meeting held on 30.1.2002, it was proposed to impose a fine of Rs.500 uniformly through out the State for not possessing a valid Emission Under control certificate and the proposal was under examination of the Government and once orders were issued, the enforcement would be triggered.

12.3. During deposition, the Special Commissioner, Transport Department has stated that the subsequent renewal period of the private emission testing centres was revised from one year to five years. However, instruction have been issued to inspect the emission centres twice a year and to cancel the license whenever mistakes are found out.

12.4. The Committee insists that the department should take action to restore the original position ie., the original authorisation should be for five years and subsequent renewals should be on yearly basis and send a report to the Committee.

13. Consequences due to non setting up of VEM stations by the TNPCB (Para 3.3.4.3.6 of Audit Report 2000-2001)

13.1. The Committee notes that the TNPCB was the authorised agency for issuing PUC certificate in respect of goods vehicles in Chennai from February 1992 and in respect of fitness certificate bound vehicles (transport vehicles) in Dindigul, Nilgiris, Kancheepuram and Tiruvallur Districts from July 1998. However, while TNPCB did not set up a Vehicular Emission Monitoring (VEM) station in Tiruvallur so far (May 2001) a VEM station was set up at Kancheepuram only in April 1999. As a result, the RTO Kancheepuram issued fitness certificates to 1586 vehicles without PUC certificates between July 1998 and April 1999.

Further, a VEM Station was set up at Gudalur in Nilgiris district by TNPCB on 6th October 1999 at a cost of Rs.2.70 lakh. This station functioned up to 29 October 1999 only with temporary staff, and was closed thereafter, for want of staff. However, RTO Gudalur issued 1,064 fitness certificates to transport vehicle between November 1999 and December 2000, even though PUC certificates were not produced.

13.2. The Department in its Explanatory Notes has merely stated that the TNPCB was addressed to state the reasons for not setting up of VEM stations at Tiruvallur and for delayed setting up of station at Kancheepuram and for closure of the VEM station at Gudalur and a report would be furnished after the receipt of their replies.

The Department has further stated that the Regional Transport Commissioner, Kancheepuram and MVI, Gudalur had since been addressed to explain the reasons for issue of FC to transport vehicles without PUC and a report would be furnished after receipt of the replies.

13.3. During deposition, the Member Secretary, stated that as on date these vehicle emission monitoring station (VEM) for heavy vehicles are in three places at

Chennai and Thiruvallur districts. They are functioning under the control of the Pollution Control Board. Through these centres the emission checks are conducted for about 25,000 heavy vehicles at Chennai in a year. Only after getting the result of the emission checks, the RTOs are issuing fitness certificate to the vehicles.

Special Commissioner, Transport Department informed that there were large number of private Emission Testing Centres in every towns. As on date necessary facilities are not available for emission checks in places like Chengleput, Kancheepuram, Thiruvallur, Cuddalore. He further stated that they have written to the Government that in addition to PCB testing centres, Private Testing Centres should also be authorised to undertake testing. The proposal is under Governments consideration.

13.4. The Committee insists that the Department should ensure that adequate vehicle Emission Testing centres are opened in Chengalpat, Kancheepuram, Thiruvallur, Cuddalore and Gudalur and to avoid such lapses as issue of fitness certificates (FCs) without 'Polluction under Control Certificates' (PUCs) in future.

14. Hazardous Wastes- Management and handling (Para 3.3.4.4 of Audit Report 2000-2001)

Non-setting up of common disposal facilities for Hazardous Wastes (Para 3.3.4.4.1 of Audit Report 2000-2001)

14.1. The Committee notes that the Rule 8 of Hazardous Wastes (Management and Handling) Rules, 1989, (before it was amended in January 2000) fixed the responsibility to identify sites for disposal of hazardous wastes on the State Government or a person authorized by it. By an amendment in January 2000, the responsibility was extended also to operator of a facility or any association of occupiers. TNPCB identified eight hazardous waste disposal sites in eight districts.

National Environmental Engineering Research Institute conducted Environmental Impact Assessment studies in 1994-97 at a cost of Rs.32 lakh at Mannalure, and Siruseri. However the Revenue Department expressed (Septemeber 1998) its inability to handover the site at Mannalur due to strong public objection, while the site at Siruseri was proposed to be taken over by Small Industries Promotion Corporation of Tamil Nadu for setting up the Information Technology Park. Therefore these two sites were dropped. As regards other six sites, permission to enter upon the site has been given by the Collectors concerned in respect of three sites only as of July 2001.

The fact, however, remained that even after eleven years no common facility for disposal of Hazardous Wastes was set up in the State, progress was very slow.

14.2. The Department in its Explanatory Notes has merely forwarded the reply as furnished by the TNPCB.

The Board has stated as follows:-

The TNPCB has identified a site at S.No.148/3/c Melakottaiyur Village, Chengalpattu Taluk, Kancheepuram Disrict as on alternative to the site identified earlier at mannelure village and Siruseri Village.

Based on the initiatives taken by Tamil Nadu Pollution Control Board, the industries in Kancheepuram, Thiruvallur and Chennai Districts have formed the Industrial Waste Management Association. The association has been constituted with the objective (i) to establish a forum comprising producers of industrial waste, technicians, scientists and service providers for management of waste in the districts of Chennai, Kancheepuram and Tiruvallur (2) identify service provides to build own, operate, maintain and take full liability of the landfill and the industrial waste received (during operation and after closure of the landfill).

The association has identified a service provider for developing the site at Melakottaiyur village into a secure land fill facility. Tamil Nadu Pollution Control Board is following up with the revenue authorities for obtaining necessary permission to conduct the Environment Impact Assessment studies and for further alienation of the land to the IWMA.

In addition based on the persuasion of Tamil Nadu Pollution Control Board the Federation of Common Effluent Treatment Plants have identified a site at Nallur Village, Karrupagounderpalayam, Tirupur Taluk, Coimbatore District for developing a secure landfill primarily of safe disposal of sludge generated from treatment of textiles dyeing effluent.

The Environment Impact Assessment of the site has been completed and the Government in the E& F Department has been addressed to issue public notice inviting objections and suggestions from public. The Tamil Nadu Pollution Control Board proposes to take up the development of the said sites on priority basis through the concerned association of occupiers. Till such time hazardous wastes are to be stored by industries in lined on site storage facilities or in compatible containers based on the quantity generated".

14.3. Committee desires that the Department should take expeditious action for setting up of common disposal facilities for hazardous wastes and send a detailed report to the Committee.

15. Lack of Monitoring control of hazardous wastes generating industries (Para 3.3.4.4.2 of Audit Report 2000-2001)

15.1. The Committee notes that the Occupier (i.e. Units) who generated and occupier or operator, who has facilities for collection, reception, storage, transportation etc., of hazardous wastes were required to get authorisation from TNPCB for any of the above activities. Out of 218 units covered in audit located in Coimbatore, Kancheepuram, Madurai and Salem Districts, TNPCB had not issued authorisation for 29 units. 130 Units had not got the authorisations renewed as of May 2001.

Units so authorised were required to submit to TNPCB an annual return, incorporating therein certain essential information such as total volume of the waste, mode of transportation, description of method of disposal etc., However, as of

1999-2000 none of the 58 Units in Coimbatore and 39 Units in Madurai filed the prescribed return, which was also not insisted upon by the TNPCB. As a result TNPCB was deprived of vital data for monitoring /enforcing necessary controls.

15.2. The Department appended the reply of TNPCB. The Board stated that they were insisting the units to file the returns and information pertaining to method of disposal and storage of waste was being periodically obtained from the concerned units and renewal of consent was issued only if the industries comply with the conditions.

15.3. During witness examination the Member Secretary, Pollution Control Board has stated that as on 31.3.2007 there are 2540 industries as hazardous wastes generating industries. Out of this 2263 units were sanctioned authorisation by the pollution control board. Action has been initiated to sanction authorisation to 215 units and applications have yet to be received from 62industries.

15.4. Committee desires to know whether the balance 277 hazardous waste generating industries had been sanctioned authorization. Committee recommends that the Department devise a mechanism to watch and ensure that the industries renew their authorization periodically and that they submit the prescribed annual return without omission. The Department should send a detailed report on this.

16. Disposal of effluent samples in an unscientific manner by the laboratories (Para 3.3.4.4.3 of Audit Report 2000-2001)

16.1. The Committee notes that the Assistant Engineers and Assistant Environmental Engineers were required to collect, in a month, a minimum of ten treated and untreated hazardous effluent samples, for purpose of laboratory analysis. After conducting laboratory analysis, the effluent was let out into the sewers without any treatment (except for those containing cyanide and bacteriological samples) as none of the five laboratories had the facilities to dispose of these effluents scientifically. Ostensibly, TNPCB itself did not follow the rules which required that all such effluents must be treated before disposal.

16.2. The Department in its Explanatory Notes has merely stated that most of the Tamil Nadu Pollution Control Board Labs were in rented buildings and treatment of effluent facilities would be provided in the proposed own buildings and effluent treatment facility had been provided at labs housed at the own buildings of TNPCB.

16.3. The Committee insists the Board to be a roll model in such cases and they should let out the effluent samples only after proper treatment. Even where the labs are situated in rented buildings, alternate arrangements must be made to treat it before they are let out. The Committee desires to have a report on the action taken.

17. Bio-Medical Waste (Management and Handling) Rules 1998 (Para 3.3.4.5 of Audit Report 2000-2001)

17.1. The Committee notes that under the provisions of EP Act, 1986 GOI notified (July 1998), Bio-medical Waste (Management and Handling) Rules, 1998.

These rules which laid down norms for treatment and disposal of bio-medical waste were applicable to all persons who generate, collect, receive, store, transport, treat, dispose or handle bio medical waste in any form.

As per Schedule VI of the Rules ibid, the waste treatment facilities like incinerator, autoclave/microwave system were to be installed by 30 June 2000 in respect of (i) hospital and nursing homes in towns with population of 30 lakh and above and (ii) hospitals and nursing homes with 500 beds and above in towns with population below 30 lakh.

TNPCB identified 202 hospitals in Chennai city and 15 hospitals in other towns, which were required to have facilities for waste treatment by 30 June 2000. The data collected from TNPCB indicated that these hospitals generated 809 MT of solid bio-medical waste per month. Seventy seven per cent of the said quantity generated by 178 hospitals/ Nursing Homes was not being disposed of as per the norms provided under Schedule I of the Rules ibid and 115 hospitals did not have incinerator facilities as of August 2000.

The quantity of solid bio-medical waste generated by the 202 hospitals and nursing homes in Chennai city was 572 MT per month. TNPCB advocated the establishment of a large common incineration facility to prevent the localised air pollution likely to be caused by the individual incinerators set up by the major hospitals in the city, as they are located in thickly populated areas.

TNPCB further stated that the Chennai based hospitals and nursing homes proposed to utilise the common treatment facilities to be set up by Chennai Corporation.

The Chennai Corporation stated (August 2001) that the tenders for setting up of common treatment facility called for were subsequently cancelled as the first tenderer could not procure the requisite land within the time frame of 3 months.TNPCB was not inclined to grant permission in respect of the land identified by the second tenderer and suggested the tenderer to set up the facility at the land proposed to be acquired by the Board. As this did not materialise, the Chennai Corporation was taking steps to call for tenderer again (August 2001).

The fact thus remained that major quantity of solid bio-medical waste generated was not being disposed of by the hospitals in a scientific manner. No headway has been made to set up common treatment facility for the waste generated by hospitals in Chennai.

17.2. The Department in its Explanatory Notes has stated as follows:

"As incineration of bio-medical waste could result in dioxin, a carcinogenic compound, Tamil Nadu Pollution Control Board is insisting hospitals to go in for non-incineration technologies like autoclave or microwave. Incineration will be permitted as a treatment option only for pathological and anatomical wastes.

Though few hospitals in Chennai have provided double chambered incinerators, Tamil Nadu Pollution Control Board is insisting for treatment at a common bio-medical waste treatment and disposal facility which is required to be set up outside the city

limit away from residential area. As hospitals are located in thickly populated areas, Tamil Nadu Pollution Control Board is discouraging treatment at individual hospitals. However, segregation of wastes based on hazard class and final mode of treatment is being encouraged. Indian Medical Association (IMA) and the identified Government and private hospitals have been requested to taken time-bound action for identifying the sites and setting up common facilities for management of bio-medical wastes. Tamil Nadu Pollution Control Board has conducted workshops/seminars in management of bio-medical waste for its won staff, members IMA and other medical and para medical personnel. Notices has been issued to hospitals and health care facilities to take steps for segregation of bio-medical waste at source and establish bio-medical waste treatment and disposal facility collectively.

17.3. Considering the serious health hazard posed to the Environment by such wastes generated by the Hospitals and nursing homes, Committee desires the Board to expedite the steps which are being considered now and ensure that the facility is in place, in a time bound manner in all units that generate such wastes in the State, in consonance with the norms stipulated and in accordance with the most suitable scientific manner of disposal of such wastes.

The Committee also desires to be informed of the progress to date made by the Board on this issue.

18. Municipal Solid Waste (Management and Handling) Rules 2000 (Para 3.3.4.6 of Audit Report 2000-2001)

18.1. The Committee observes that in exercise of the powers conferred under Section 3,6 and 25 of EP Act, 1986 GOI made in September 2000. Municipal Solid Waste (Management and Handling) Rules, 2000. According to these rules, the municipal authority concerned was responsible for collection, segregation, storage transportation, processing and disposal of municipal solid waste. The rules provided for staggered, implementation of the activities so as to set up waste processing and disposal facilties by 31st December 2003. In Tamil Nadu 102, Municipalities and 6 Corporation were covered by these rules.

The solid waste generated in Chennai Corporation area alone ranged from 22,036 MT to 34,648 MT during the years 1996-2000. The above waste was dumped in open landfill without any treatment in two sites at Perungudi and Kodungaiyur.

TNPCB replied to Audit that these rules were to recent origin and steps were being taken at field level to implement them.

18.2. The Department in its Explanatory Notes has stated as follows:

"Tamil Nadu Pollution Control Board has issued circular letters to all Municipalities and Corporations in Tamil Nadu to take necessary steps for setting up waste processing facilities improvement the existing dump sites and identification of landfill sites for further use as per the time frame specified in schedule of the Municipal Solid Waste (M&H) rules 2000.

They have been specifically addressed to segregate, store, transport and process municipal solid wastes in compliance with schedule II, with a request to consider level filling as a last option only for non recyclable solid waste. Tamil Nadu Pollution Control Board has convened several workshops for management of municipal solid waste, which were participated by commissioners of corporation/municipalities, NGOs, field experts and they have shared their experiences, mainly focused on solid waste management issues problems and short term/long term solution to mitigate the same, The need for segregation and composting of the segregated organic wastes was emphasized. Commissioners of the local bodies and elected councilors have attended these workshops and meetings. The field officers of Tamil Nadu Pollution Control Board will monitor the implementation of these rules by the concerned local bodes. Circulars have been issued to Commissioners of all local bodies to handle municipal solid waste by adhereing to the provisions of Municipal Solid Waste (M&H) Rules 2000.

The feasibility studies on solid waste management for the local bodies of Udhagamandalam Kodaikanal Palani, Tiruchendur, Kanyakumari, Rameswaram, Mamallapuram and Courtalam in Tamil Nadu which are all centres of tourism has been started at a cost of Rs.23.60 lakhs from Board's fund. The consultants have furnished the reports and the finalisation is in progress. These reports would help the local bodies to implement solid waste management projects.

18.3. Considering the serious health hazards posted to the Environment by such wastes handled by the Local Bodies and Corporations, Committee insist that the Board expedite the steps and ensure that the facility is in place early in all Local bodies that handle such wastes in the State, in consonance with the norms stipulated and in accordance with the most suitable scientific manner of disposal of such wastes. Since these Local Bodies are the third tier of Governance in a federal form of Government, adherence to Environmental Acts and Rules made thereon must be implemented in letter and spirit by them. If warranted the Board may consider taking up the issue at appropriate higher level for suitable budgetary support from the Government to Local Bodies for provision of such facilities in each and every local body in the State.

The Committee desires to be informed of the latest progress made by the Board on this issue.

19. Green Belt for Abatement of Pollution and Environment Improvement (Para 3.12 of Audit Report 2000-2001)

19.1. The Committee notes that with the object of controlling and adverse effects of air and water pollution and improve the aesthetic beauty; the Project "Green Belt for abatement of pollution and environment improvement" was implemented in Tamil Nadu. Based on the proposals sent by the Government of Tamil Nadu (GTN) (Environment and Forests Department) Government of India (GOI) Ministry of Environment and Forests sanctioned (December 1999) Rs.4.56 crore and released Rs.4 crore for raising 2.94 lakh saplings in five cities @ at a cost of Rs.155 per plant. The balance cost of Rs.55.70 lakh was to be borne by State Government.

GOI released in December 1999 Rs. 4 crore to the Central Pollution Control Board (CPCB) which was subsequently transferred (January 2000) to the Tamil Nadu Pollution Control Board (TNPCB) . TNPCB in turn released Rs.3.19 crore to the Forest

Department. The funds were credited to the Government account (Forest Deposit) and released to the five implementing Forest Divisions through letters of credit (LOCs) issued by the Finance Department.

During 1999-2001 Rs.3.19 crore was released to 5 divisions against which an expenditure of Rs.3.29 crore was incurred.

Out of the total expenditure, Rs.3.11 crore was from Central funds and Rs.18.81 lakh was from State funds. In all 5.13 lakh saplings were raised, exceeding the original target. The balance amount of Rs.80.75 lakh was lying with TNPCB and Rs.8.71 lakh was available with Forest Department. This was permitted (June 2001) by GOI to be used for raising/planting additional 1.74 lakh saplings during 2001-2002.

Against the target of 4.80 lakh saplings (for raising) and 2.94 lakh saplings (for planting) in the five divisions viz., Greater Chennai, Madurai, Coimbatore Salem and Tiruchirappalli the achievement was 5.13 lakh (for raising) and 2.42 lakh (for planting).

There was shortfall in planting to the extent of 35,000 plants in Chennai and 10,000 in Madurai.

20. Green Belt for Abatement of Pollution and Environment Improvement (Para 3.12 of Audit Report 1999-2000)
Para 3.12.4. Boosting of Estimates
Para 3.12.4.1.

20.1. The Committee notes that the proposals sent to GOI were prepared by PCCF based on a model estimate prepared by District Forests Officer (DFO) chengalpattu. As per the proposals, the cost per sapling Rs.155 (for raising the sapling - Rs.55, for planting the sapling Rs.80 for supervisory charges and awareness programme Rs.20/-)

State Government incurred expenditure of Rs.3.11 crore for raising 5.13 lakh and planting 2.42 lakh saplings. As against the unit cost of Rs.155 per plant estimated in the proposals sent to GOI, the average unit cost worked out to Rs.97.26 in respect of 4 divisions and Rs.103.07 in one division.

Thus the estimate forwarded to GOI was inaccurate, unrealistic and over pitched to an extent of Rs.1.51 crore for 2.94 lakh plants.

The reasons for the lower unit cost are:-

(a) PCCF did not obtain estimates from the 5 implementing Forest divisions, but only from DFO Chengalpattu before sending the proposals to GOI. When he called for estimates from the 5 Divisional officers in March 2000 much after the commencement of the scheme, it was seen that the estimated cost of certain components was much less than the rates projected to GOI.

(b) No supervisory charges were incurred by 4 divisions and only a meagre sum of Rs.14.52 lakh was incurred by one division (Chennai). Thus the estimate sent to GOI was boosted to the extent of Rs.39.99 lakh on this component.

(c) PCCF issued guidelines in March 2000 to the implementing divisions which contained norms for preparing the estimates by the division. As per the guidelines one protective watcher was to be engaged for 500 sapling whereas in the proposals sent to GOI provision was made for engagement of one protective watcher for 250 saplings.

(d) As per the proposal, provision was made for watering the seedlings twice a day for first 90 days at the rate of Rs.113.60 for 1000 saplings per day and once a day for next 120 days at the rate of Rs.56.80 for 1000 saplings per day. However the DFOs adopted much lower rate in the range of Rs.33.60 to Rs.57.96 for watering twice a day and in the range of Rs.16.80 to Rs.28.98 for watering once a day.

20.2. The Department in its Explanatory Notes has stated in the reply as follows:-

"The estimates for the scheme were prepared after taking into account the quality and standards needed for raising and sustaining the plantation under adverse circumstances prevailing on pavements in urban settings. Taking note of the erratic rainfall pattern in the State in the past few years and damage of saplings due Vandalism a survival rate of 80% was assumed and an in-built provision was made for replacement of withered and damaged saplings.

The estimate was only obtained from the District Forest Officer, Chengalpattu due to time constraints and experience of the District Forest Officer, Chengalpattu in implementing the plantation programmes in his division.

The amount of awareness and supervision was provided in the estimate considering the expenditure to be incurred on the staff for supervision and various awareness programmes to be conducted by various municipal corporations, Pollution Control Board etc..But during implementation, supervisory staff for Chennai alone was sanctioned by the Government. Further the expenditure towards awareness creation by TNPCB from their own funds had also emerged, resulting in savings under this component. This expenditure was incurred on State Component only and estimate was based on number as the programme is based on number of samplings.

The officers of the Department tried their best economies the operations in each and every stage that resulted in operations carried out in much lower rate than estimated. Further some of the service organisations and industrial houses expressed their support for implementation of the project and offered to take up maintenance of the plants. This was not envisaged while preparing the project as a result there was savings on maintenance".

20.3. The Committee insists that the Department, with its properly coordinated information system and the available data on experience, should attempt to project a more realistic estimate so that the release of funds can be planned more accurately as per requirement.

21. Expenditure in excess of PCCF Guidliness (Para 3.12.4.2 of Audit Report 2000-2001)

21.1. The Committee notes that some of the implementing divisions incurred expenditure on certain items at higher rates than included in the guidelines issued by PCCF to the implementing divisions/ the proposal sent to GOI or not included in the guidelines/proposal, resulting in avoidable expenditure of Rs.29.55 lakh as detailed below:-

(a) As against the rate of Rs.6 fixed by PCCF for fencing per plant which included cost of cutting, transportation, fixing, etc of locally available thorny materials two implementing divisions (Greater Chennai and Coimbatore) incurred expenditure at the rate of Rs.15 for fencing. This had resulted in an extra expenditure of Rs.7.90 lakh.

(b) As against the rate of Rs.6 per supporting pole for sapling, one implementing agency (Salem) incurred expenditure at the rate of Rs.15 per pole resulting in extra expenditure of Rs.3.18 lakh.

(c) Expenditure on certain items of work like digging of borewells, purchase of motor, pumpsets drip irrigation system and providing infrastructure to existing nurseries which were not contemplated in the scheme was incurred by four divisions leading to avoidable expenditure of Rs..3.87 lakh (Greater Chennai. Madurai Coimbatore and Tirunelveli).

(d) Four out of five implementing divisions engaged nursery watchers and incurred an expenditure of Rs.9.61 lakh (March 2001) on wages through there is no provision in the proposals for engagement of nursery watchers.

(e) Although the proposal submitted to GOI stated that the saplings would be raised in forestland two divisions (Madurai and Salem) raised in sapplings in five private nurseries and paid land rent of Rs.2.23 lakh in 2000-2001. The DFOs had not obtained the approval of the PCCF for paying rent.

(f) One division (Coimbatore) incurred Rs.3.98 lakh for transporting saplings by hired lorry on load basis. The rate per sapling worked out to Rs.7.17 as against the rate of Rs.2.20 indicated in the proposal sent to GOI. The extra expenditure incurred was Rs.2.76 lakh.

21.2. For sub para (a) the Department in its Explanatory Notes has stated that the expenditure was unavoidable and highly essential and incurred as per the prevailing conditions as per the forest Schedule of Rates for the circle.

For sub-para (b) the Department in its Explanatory Notes has stated that the rate was approved by the Conservator of Forests, Salem for the year 1998-99 and the rates prevailed for the subsequent years also unless they were revised. The Department has further stated that the Casuarina poles of 5 to 8 cm dia and 1 mt high as per PWD Schedule of Rates was Rs.19 and the rate for 2 metres tall casuariana poles was Rs.38/- and the rates adopted and implemented after ascertaining the market rates through quotations and hence it could not be called higher.

For Sub-para (c) the Department in its Explanatory Notes has stated that works like digging of bore wells. Purchase of motors, pump sets. Drip irrigation system and providing infrastructure to existing nurseries are part of the nursery/planting operations and that these operations were carried out economies the cost involved in purchasing water for nursery saplings in the situation where the water supply free of cost was not available and northeast monsoon was scanty.

For sub-para (d), the Department in its Explanatory Notes has stated that there was no permanent infrastructure available for raising nursery in Salem and in Madurai too out of 7 nurseries, two were in private land and to keep up the time schedule, these lands were used for raising nursery and seedlings raised and therefore the expenditure was unavoidable and reasonable.

For Sub-para (e) the Departmental in its Explanatory Notes has stated that the Model estimate sent to GOI was general for whole State and to not take care of the rates prevailing in individual places and the transport have to adopted as per the local conditions and this transportation was carried out the lowest quotation basis as the planting spots were far away from the nurseries and adequate care was taken to avoid damage to the sapling while transportation and hence the expenditure incurred was reasonable.

21.3. During deposition, the PCCF has stated that an average rate was adopted while formulating model estimate and according to local conditions, the expenditure has to be incurred either less or more. Though Rs.15 was spent for fencing as against Rs.6, the total expenditure incurred for each plant was much less ie., Rs.109. than the stipulated amount of Rs.155 per plant.

The Committee insists that for all the deviations from the approved norms by the field officers/DFOs/COFs prior sanction of PCCF should have been obtained and this should be followed in future.

22. Avoidable Expenditure on digging of larger size pits (Para 3.12.4.3 of Audit Report 2000-2001)

22.1. The Committee notes that according to the model estimate submitted to GOI taller seedlings are to be planted in pits of size 60cm x 60 cm x 60 cm. PCCF instructed all implementing Divisions (March 2000) to adopt pits of size 75cm x 75 cm x 75cm and follow PWD Schedule of rates. However PWD rates were available for digging pits of size 1 $_{m3}$/10 $_{m3}$ only and the rates were derived proportionately by the implementing divisions for 75cm x 75cm x75cm. The rates so adopted were much higher than the Forest Schedule of Rates for digging pits of size 60 cm x 60 cm x 60 cm in all the five divisions.

Similarly, the rates adopted for planting were higher than the Forest Schedule of Rates in 4 divisions. By specifying larger size proposed in the model estimate there was an avoidable expenditure of Rs.41.38 lakh.

22.2. The Department in its Explanatory Notes has stated that larger sized pits as adopted considering the nature of site available for planting in corporations and in

some places saplings were to be planted on the concrete pavements and to ensure survival and to ensure initial base of loose soil of at least 75 cm, the PCCF recommended 75 cm ^{3} pits for planting taller saplings and instructed to adopt PWD SSR for pitting works since there was no FSR for this size of pits.

However PWD schedule of rates were available for digging pits of size 1mt/1 mt x 1mt only and the rates were derived proportionately by the implementing divisions for 75cm x 75 cm x 75 cm.

22.3. The Committee observes that the PCCF ought to have projected and indicated the required size of pits of 75cm^3 in the original proposal sent to Government and should have appropriately got the sanction for the proportionate funds. Deviating later and incurring additional expenditure on the component diluting the whole process of planning for implementation of such an important scheme does not augur well for the system.

The Committee desires that the Department strictly desist from incorrect proposals on similar schemes in future.

23. General

23.1 The Committee desires that expeditious action should be taken by the Government on all the recommendations in this report. Wherever specific time limits have been indicated in the recommendations, they should be adhered to. In other cases, a final report of action taken should be sent within six months.

Chennai-600 009,
22nd November 2011,
Karthigai 6,
Thiruvalluvar Aandu-2042.

S.RAMACHANDRAN,
Chairman,
Committee on Public Accounts.

TRUTH ALONE TRIUMPHS

ANNEXURE

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Committee recommends that the norms prescribed by the CPCB to inspect the industries should be adhered to 100% by the Department. (Paragraph No.2.4)

2. The Committee recommends that the Board strictly adhere to the norm of two surveys in a year and that Board should take necessary action to deploy adequate staff for carrying out the survey according to norms. (Paragraph No.3.5)

3. The Committee desires to know whether all the industries for which stack monitoring has been fixed at prescribed periodical intervals have been instructed by the Board to provide appropriate facilities that would enable the Board to conduct stack monitoring. (Paragraph No.4.4)

4. The Committee desires to know the action taken for the excess over limits during four years successively from 1997 to 2000. (Paragraph No.5.3)

5. The Committee recommended that the air quality norms should be adhered to at all times and this has to be ensured more during the peak hours only when the pollution is likely to be extensive causing a major health hazard to the public. (Paragraph No.6.3)

6. The Committee desires to know the specific proposals considered and put into action specifying the fixed timeframe and orders specifically issued prescribing the methodology. (Paragraph No.6.4)

7. Committee desires to know whether the required staff were deployed and the equipments were utilised. (Paragraph No.7.3)

8. The Committee desires to know as to when the provision was incorporated in Tamil Nadu Motor Vehicle Rules. The Committee also desires to have a detailed report on the implementation of the provisions to contain pollution caused by emission from motor vehicles. (Paragraph No.8.4)

9. Since these pieces of equipment help in monitoring/ recording the essential parameters of pollution that enables the Board to keep track of the developments and help the Board in decision making thereof, they ought to have been maintained in full working condition all throughout the year. Belated action only points out the lack of seriousness in the implementation of the measures. Committee desires to know whether any target date was set for implementing the control measures. (Paragraph No.9.3)

10. The Committee desires to know whether any monitoring mechanism at the appropriate level for ensuring compliance. (Paragraph No.10.3)

11. The Committee recommends that the Department should ensure that such lapse should not occur in future. (Paragraph No.11.4)

12. The Committee insists that the department should take action to restore the original position ie., the original authorisation should be for five years and subsequent renewals should be on yearly basis and send a report to the Committee. (Paragraph No.12.4)

13. The Committee insists that the Department should ensure that adequate vehicle Emission Testing centres are opened in Chengalpat, Kancheepuram, Thiruvallur, Cuddalore and Gudalur and to avoid such lapses as issue of fitness certificates (FCs) without 'Polluction under Control Certificates' (PUCs) in future. (Paragraph No.13.4)

14. Committee desires that the Department should take expeditious action for setting up of common disposal facilities for hazardous wastes and send a detailed report to the Committee. (Paragraph No.14.3)

15. Committee desires to know whether the balance 277 hazardous waste generating industries had been sanctioned authorization. Committee recommends that the Department devise a mechanism to watch and ensure that the industries renew their authorization periodically and that they submit the prescribed annual return without omission. The Department should send a detailed report on this. (Paragraph No.15.4)

16. The Committee insists the Board to be a roll model in such cases and they should let out the effluent samples only after proper treatment. Even where the labs are situated in rented buildings, alternate arrangements must be made to treat it before they are let out. The Committee desires to have a report on the action taken. (Paragraph No.16.3)

17. Considering the serious health hazard posed to the Environment by such wastes generated by the Hospitals and nursing homes, Committee desires the Board to expedite the steps which are being considered now and ensure that the facility is in place, in a time bound manner in all units that generate such wastes in the State, in consonance with the norms stipulated and in accordance with the most suitable scientific manner of disposal of such wastes. The Committee also desires to be informed of the progress to date made by the Board on this issue. (Paragraph No.17.3)

18. The Committee desires to be informed of the latest progress made by the Board on this issue. (Paragraph No.18.3)

19. The Committee insists that the Department, with its properly coordinated information system and the available data on experience, should attempt to project a more realistic estimate so that the release of funds can be planned more accurately as per requirement. (Paragraph No.20.3)

20. The Committee insists that for all the deviations from the approved norms by the field officers/DFOs/COFs prior sanction of PCCF should have been obtained and this should be followed in future. (Paragraph No.21.3)

21. The Committee observes that the PCCF ought to have projected and indicated the required size of pits of 75cm^3 in the original proposal sent to Government and should have appropriately got the sanction for the proportionate funds. Deviating later and incurring additional expenditure on the component diluting the whole process of planning for implementation of such an important scheme does not augur well for the system. The Committee desires that the Department strictly desist from incorrect proposals on similar schemes in future. (Paragraph No.22.3)

22. The Committee desires that expeditious action should be taken by the Government on all the recommendations in this report. Wherever specific time limits have been indicated in the recommendations, they should be adhered to. In other cases, a final report of action taken should be sent within six months. (Paragraph No.23.1)

******



Government Central Press, Chennai-600 079.