

CHAPTER- III

IMPLEMENTATION OF SCHEMES

3.1 Implementation of Solid Waste Management in Himachal Pradesh.

3.1.1 Introduction

Under the powers conferred by the Environment (protection) Act, 1986, the Municipal Solid Waste (Management and Handling) Rules 2000 were notified by the Government of India. The objectives of the rule is to make every municipal authority within the territorial area of the municipality responsible for implementation of the provisions of these rules and for any infrastructure development for collection, segregation, storage, transportation, processing and disposal of municipal solid waste. Section 42 of the Himachal Pradesh Corporation Act, 1994 and Section 45 of Municipality Act 1994 renders the responsibility for management of solid waste on Himachal Pradesh Municipal Corporation and Municipal Councils/Nagar Panchayats respectively within its area.

Audit observations relating to compliance to Municipal solid waste by 21⁸ municipalities is discussed below:-

3.1.2 Planning

Clause 4 of the Municipal Solid Waste (M&H) Rules stipulates that setting up of waste processing and disposal facilities were to be developed by 31 December 2003. It was noticed that out of 21 municipalities, the waste processing and disposal facilities were set up by two⁹ municipalities by due date. Four¹⁰ municipalities had set up waste processing and disposal facilities after due date upto August 2007 and remaining 15 Municipalities have not set up the waste processing and disposal facilities for want of authorization from Pollution Control Board. Thus, waste processing and disposal facilities were not set up by the due date, indicate weakness in planning and management of municipal solid waste as well as violation

⁸ Bilaspur, Chamba, Dalhousie, Dharamshala, Hamirpur, Kangra, Kullu, Mandi, Nurpur, Nahan, Naina Devi, Nalagarh, Palampur, Poanta Sahib, Parwanoo, Rampur, Solan, Shimla, Sundernagar, Theog and Una.

⁹ Municipal Corporation, Shimla and MC Solan.

¹⁰ MC Dharamshala, Hamirpur, Kullu and Nahan.

of municipal solid waste rules and therefore, Municipal Solid Waste was being disposed of/dumped without proper landfill.

3.1.3 Segregation

The implementation schedule in the Municipal Solid Waste rules specified activities to be taken up by the municipality to ensure that segregation of Municipal solid waste takes place. This would ensure that collected waste is segregated and processed accordingly, with the organic waste being processed and non organic waste being disposed of in landfills. It was noticed in audit that the concept of door to door collection, segregation, transport and disposal of municipal Solid waste has not been introduced in any of municipalities in the state. However, the Municipal Corporation, Shimla has entered into agreement in April 2007 with private agency for door to door collection in few wards of corporation. In Mandi municipality door to door collection has been started in four out of 13 wards. In remaining municipalities un-segregated municipal solid waste was being collected. Thus segregation at source was not taking place leading to all kinds of waste being mixed together for dumping. However, segregation after collection was being done by the rag-pickers only where waste processing and disposal facilities were set up.

3.1.4 Storage

Municipal Solid Waste rules provide that Municipal authorities should establish and maintain storage facilities in such a manner that they do not create unhygienic and unsanitary conditions around it. It was noticed that in 21 municipalities, 1505 number of waste facilities (bins) having capacity of 262 ton municipal solid waste daily were available, of which only 796 numbers were covered storage facility and 709 number were open storage facility. Thus the waste was not being properly stored. The frequency of clearance of waste bins was between daily to fortnightly. The problem of poor storage of waste was compounded by the fact that daily clearance of storage bins was not taking place and would lead to accumulation of waste and creation of un-hygienic conditions due to open storage facilities.

3.1.5 Transportation.

Municipal Solid Waste rules provide that covered vehicles should be used for transportation of waste so as to prevent waste not being visible to public or exposed to open environment and preventing their littering/scattering. It was noticed

that out of 91 vehicles in 21 municipalities, 58 covered vehicles and 33 open vehicles were being used for transportation of waste. Thus usage of uncovered trucks/vehicle would cause scattering besides exposed to open environment.

3.1.6 Disposal

Municipal Solid Waste rules specified that land filling should be restricted to non-biodegradable, inert waste and other waste that are not suitable either for recycling or for biological processing and that land filling of mixed waste should be avoided. It was noticed that landfill site already identified in Shimla municipality stood exhausted in 2003. Thereafter no landfill sites had been developed as of September 2007 in the state as per the provisions of Municipal Solid Waste (MH) rules 2000. In the absence of landfill the municipalities resorted to dumping of waste in open dumpsites. This posed immense risks to health of the public as well as causing contamination of the environment.

3.2 Expenditure on construction of Rehan Basera in non-identified areas Rs. 55.28 lakh.

3.2.1 Guidelines of National Slum Development Programme (NSDP) provide that the Rehan Basera should be constructed only in the identified slum pockets.

The MC Kangra identified ward no. 1, 2 and 4 as slum pockets. The construction of Rehan Basera building was awarded to a contractor (2004), and expenditure of Rs. 42.82 lakh incurred on its construction in ward no. 5, which was not declared as slum pocket. The said building was lying incomplete (November, 2007) as the finishing works had not been completed. This resulted in inadmissible and unfruitful expenditure of Rs. 42.82 lakh. E.O stated (December, 2007) that the construction of Rehan Basera was taken up in un-identified area as there was no land available in identified slum pockets.

3.2.2 Likewise, contrary to the guidelines for construction of Rehan Basera, MC Theog (Rs. 3.93 lakh) and MC Poanta Sahib (Rs. 8.53 lakh) had incurred expenditure of Rs. 12.46 lakh for construction of Rehan Basera in non-identified slum pockets. Therefore, expenditure of Rs. 12.46 lakh incurred thereon was irregular. The concerned EOs stated (January 2008) that no land was available in identified slum pockets.

The above replies were not tenable in view of the fact that Rehan Basera were constructed in non-identified areas, defeating the objective of the scheme.

3.2.3 Rs. 10 lakh for construction of Rehan Basera in Rampur area was received from Director, Urban Development Shimla during 2003-04 and 2004-05 which was kept in MC account operated in State Bank of India at Rampur. The work had not been started so far (February 2008) as the area, where Rehan Basera was to be constructed, falls within flood prone area. However, MC Rampur vide resolution No. (34) 5 decided (June 2006) to change site near Bus stand with estimated cost of Rs. 34.46 lakh. EO stated (February 2008) that the work could not be started due to insufficient funds. Thus initial improper planning had resulted in non utilisation of funds received previously.

3.3 Irregular expenditure under National Slum Development Programme.

Guidelines of NSDP provide that the slum pockets are to be declared for execution of works under the programme.

It was noticed that no area has been declared as slum pocket by the Government. However, Five¹¹ ULBs had identified certain pockets having slum like characteristics within area without seeking approval of State Government. In the absence of specific approval for declaration of slum pockets which were having slum like characteristics, the expenditure of Rs. 53.65 lakh incurred between 1999-2000 and 2006-2007 under NSDP was irregular.

3.4 Construction of IDSMT Project.

(i) Blocking of funds due to non-completion of IDSMT Project.

With a view to slow down migration from Rural areas and Smaller towns to large cities by development of selected small and medium towns which are capable of generating economic growth and employment, a project under centrally sponsored scheme of “*Integrated Development of Small and Medium Town*” (IDSMT) for development of Rampur Bushahr was sanctioned in 1997-98 for Rs.1.00

¹¹ MC Parwanoo Rs. 23.91 lakh, NP Chowari Rs. 1.58 lakh, Jubbal Rs. 10.55 lakh, Kotkhair Rs. 6.59 lakh and Rohru Rs. 11.02 lakh.

crore. Funds for this scheme amounting to Rs. 1.00¹² crore was received between 1998-2002.

Scrutiny of records revealed that as per approved components of the project, shopping complex, development of roads, parks and drains in the colonies were to be constructed. An amount of Rs. 72.00 lakh was incurred for construction of shopping complex and drains in the colonies, but the following components had not been started so far (February, 2008) even though these works were sanctioned in June 1999.

(Rs. in lakh)

<i>Sr. No.</i>	<i>Name of components</i>	<i>Amount sanctioned</i>	<i>Expenditure incurred</i>	<i>Balance amount</i>
1.	Construction & Development of road to Khopri	16.00	0.27 lakh (Trace cutting)	15.73
2.	Construction & Development of road from Brow Bridge to Graveyard.	6.92	-----Nil-----	6.92
3.	Development of Hanuman Ghat Park	8.21	3.28 (retaining wall)	4.93
Total		31.13	3.55	27.58

The EO stated (December 2007) that the construction of Khopri road could not be started due to change of alignment, the construction of road from Brow Bridge to Grave Yard could not be started as the site was washed away in the flood and after incurring an expenditure of Rs. 4.93 lakh for retaining wall in Hanuman Ghat Park, no further amount was utilised as the area falls within flood zone. The facts remain that projects were not chosen properly and as such Rs. 27.58 lakh was blocked and lying with MC Rampur Bushahr.

(ii) **Unfruitful expenditure due to non-completion of IDSMT Project.**

The IDSMT project was sanctioned by Government of India (2001) for Rs. 139.96 lakh for Poanta Sahib. Funds amounting to Rs. 120.45 lakh for construction of the project were received by MC between 2001 and 2007.

As per the approved components of the project shopping complex, parking, road, community hall, construction and improvement of drainage system were to be executed. The construction of project was started in 2001-02 and

¹² Central grant Rs. 48.40 lakh, State grant Rs. 32.00 lakh and loan Rs. 19.60 lakh.

expenditure of Rs. 119.05 lakh had been incurred (*March, 2007*) for construction of shopping complex (Rs.79.87 lakh), parking-cum-community hall (Rs. 39.18 lakh). Only shopping complex was completed (*January, 2005*) from where Rs. 30,000/- monthly income as rent was being received by MC. The work on other components of the project had not been taken up (*January, 2008*) which has not only resulted into unfruitful expenditure but also deprived the MC from earning revenue. E.O. stated that the IDSMT project could not be completed for want of funds. But facts remains that the MC itself has not contributed its share of funds.

3.5 Non-utilisation of Slaughter House.

Construction of Slaughter House under IDSMT scheme at Theog near Economically Weaker Section Colony at Kotkhair road was awarded for Rs. 4.92 lakh to a contractor (*November, 2003*) by the MC Theog. The work was completed in *January, 2005* at a cost of Rs. 9.55 lakh, but the possession of the premises was taken over in *June, 2007* by the MC Theog. The scrutiny of the project report revealed that an income of Rs. 1.80 lakh annually and 5 per cent increase in every year as a lease rent was expected to generate from the proposed slaughter house. It was noticed that instead of starting Slaughter House, the Industrial Training Institute (ITI) was housed (*August, 2007*) in the premises without finalization of the rent deed with ITI which resulted into diversion of funds spent for construction of Slaughter House. Moreover, MC Theog had taken over the possession of premises after 34 months from the date of its completion, which has resulted into revenue loss of Rs. 5.10 lakh approximately, worked out on proposed income of Rs. 1.80 lakh annually.

3.6 Non Commencement of work.

Four¹³ ULBs had received Rs. 32.22 lakh between 2003-04 & 2006-07 for execution of various developmental works such as Rehan Basera, Paths and Community Hall etc. Test check of record revealed that although a period of one to four years had elapsed, no execution of work had been taken up. EO Theog stated (*November 2007*) that works could not be started due to non-availability of trained staff. Other EOs stated (*May 2007 to November 2007*) that works could not be started due to non-approval of estimates and non-completion of other codal formalities. Non-

¹³ MC Parwanoo Rs. 5.00 lakh, Rampur Rs. 10.00 lakh, Theog Rs. 6.25 lakh. and NP Chowari Rs. 10.97 lakh

commencement of work not only resulted into blockade of Government funds but also deprived the intended benefits to the beneficiaries.