

Sub: Diversion of 64.00 ha Reserved Forest land for Tiger Interpretation Safari Park at Kakadiya village, Tilakwada Ta. Of Narmada District in favour of Conservator of Forests, Wildlife Circle, Vadodara.

1. The State Government of Gujarat vide their letter No. FCA-1018/10-49/17/S.F-36/F dated 07.03.2018 submitted the above mentioned proposal seeking prior approval of the Central Government under Section-2 of the Forest (Conservation) Act, 1980.
2. The facts related to the proposal as contained in the State Government's letter dated 07.03.2018 are given below in the form of fact sheet:

FACT SHEET

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|---|---|----------------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|------------|
| 1. | Name of the Proposal | Diversion of 64.00 ha. Reserved Forest land for Tiger Interpretation Safari Park at Kakadiya village, Tilakwada Ta. Of Narmada District in favour of Conservator of Forests, Wildlife Circle, Vadodara. | | | | | | | |
| 2. | Location (i) State (ii) District | Gujarat Narmada | | | | | | | |
| 3. | Particulars of Forests: (i) Name of Forest Division and Forest area involved. (ii) Legal status/Sy. No. (iii) Map | Narmada Forest Division 64.00 ha Reserved Forest Toposheet submitted : 68/c | | | | | | | |
| 4. | Brief not on vulnerability of the forest area to erosion | The site falls within the lower Narmada valley which geologically includes the Precambrian basement metamorphic and granites, having medium slope, there is no possibility of erosion. | | | | | | | |
| 5. | Approximate distance of proposed site for diversion from boundary of forest. | 25 km. | | | | | | | |
| 6. | Species-wise (scientific name) and diameter class-wise enumeration of trees (to be enclosed. In case of irrigation/hydel projects enumeration at FRL. FRL. Meter & FRL-4 meter also to be enclosed. | S. No. | Scientific Name | Local Name | (31 - 60) cm | (61- 90) cm. | (91- 120) cm | (121 - 150) cm | (> 150) cm |
| | | 1. | Embelica officinalis | Amalaka | 26 | 12 | | | |
| | | 2. | Tamarindus indica | Amali | 25 | 15 | | | |
| | | 3. | Terminalia arjuna | Arjun Sadad | 12 | 25 | 2 | | |
| | | 4. | Azadirachta indica | Limado | 48 | 23 | | | |
| | | 5. | Eucalyptus | Nilgiri | 58 | 38 | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|-----|--|--|-------------------------|-----------|-----|-----|----|--|--|
| | | 6. | Diasporus melanoxylon | Timaru | 58 | 30 | | | |
| | | 7. | Acacia catechu | Khair | 340 | 428 | 82 | | |
| | | 8. | Tectona grandis | Sag | 54 | | | | |
| | | 9. | Butea monosperma | Khakhar | 25 | 38 | | | |
| | | 10. | Holoptelia integrifolia | Palpaniya | 15 | 26 | 2 | | |
| 7. | (ii) Density | 0.35 | | | | | | | |
| 8. | Whether forms part of National park, Wildlife Sanctuary, Biosphere Reserve, Tiger Reserve, Elephant Corridor, etc. (if so, details of the area and comments of the Chief Wildlife Warden | No | | | | | | | |
| 9. | Whether any RET species of flora and fauna are found in the area. If so details thereof | No | | | | | | | |
| 10. | Whether any protected archaeological/ heritage site/defense establishment or any other important monuments is located in the area. | No | | | | | | | |
| 11. | Whether any work of in violation of the Forest (Conservation) Act, 1980 has been carried out (Yes/No). If yes details of the same including period of work done, action taken on erring officials. Whether work in violation is still in progress. | No | | | | | | | |
| 12. | Whether the requirement of forest land as proposed by the user agency in col. 2 of Part-I is unavoidable and barest minimum for the project, if no recommended area item-wise with details of alternatives examined. | No any alternative. | | | | | | | |
| 13. | Compensatory Afforestation | | | | | | | | |
| | (i) Details of non-forest area/degraded forest area identified for CA, its distance from adjoining forest, number of patches, size of each patches. | Compensatory afforestation over degraded forest land of 20 ha. | | | | | | | |
| | (ii) Map showing non-forest/degraded forest area identified for CA and adjoining forest boundaries. | Yes | | | | | | | |
| | (iii) Detailed CA scheme including species to be planted, | Detailed scheme of CA is at Pg no. 54-55/c. | | | | | | | |

| | | |
|------------|---|--|
| | implementing agency, time schedule, cost structure, etc. | |
| | (iv) Total financial outlay for CA | 60.86 lakhs. |
| | (v) Certificate from the competent authority regarding suitability of the area identified for CA and from management point of view. | Yes (Page 59 & 60) |
| 14. | Catchment Area Treatment | NA |
| 15. | Rehabilitation of Oustees a) No of families involved b) Category of families c) Details of rehabilitation plan | NA NA NA |
| 16. | Employment likely to be generated | Yes, Permanent/Regular employment: 30 Temporary Employment (Number of person-days): 24000 |
| 17. | Compliance of Scheduled Tribe and Other Traditional Forest Dwellers (Recognition of Forest Rights) Act, 2006 | Enclosed at Pg no. 48/c. |
| 18. | Site Inspection Report by DFO/CF with their specific recommendation | SIR by DCF, Narmada at Pg-/50-51c SIR by CF, Narmada at pg-52/c |
| 19. | Cost Benefit Ratio | Enclosed at pg. 32-36/c |
| 20. | Total Cost of the Project | Rs. 2154.44 Lakh. |
| 21. | Recommendation i. DCF ii. CF iii. Nodal Officer/PCCF iv State Government | Recommended (Pg-81/c) Recommended (Pg-82/c) Recommended (Pg-27/c) Recommended (Pg-28/c) |
| 22. | District Profile (i) Total Geographical area of the district (ii) Total Forest area/ Divisional Forest area (iii) Total area diverted since 1980 (iv) Total CA stipulated since 1980 (Forest land) a. Forest land including penal CA b. Non Forest Land (v) Progress of Compensatory Afforestation a. Forest land b. Non Forest land | 275550.00 ha. 114769.99 ha 3326.398 ha (10 cases) 2388.00 ha 1372.94 ha 2386.00 ha 1372.94 ha |

3. The Detailed Note: Tiger Interpretation Park, Narmada is proposed in Kevadiya village, Tilakwada of Narmada District, the project is proposed for 64.00 ha, since the project is on the way to Sardar Sarovar dam & ongoing statute of Unity, valley of Flower project, there is regular flow tourists & their number increase sharply during vacation period which helps to grasp opportunity of the inflow of tourists. There is no human habitation within proposed area of project. As proposed project will benefit local community by generation of employment in the form of tourist guide, sell of local items, souvenir shops etc.

4. The lay out plan is as follow:

- i) Building & other facilities- 14 Ha,
 - ii) Safari Area- 40 Ha,
 - iii) Restricted area- 5 Ha.
5. The area involved has been declared as a Reserved Forest land vide Government of Gujarat Notification No. AKH/70-77/FLD-1677/71707-P, dated 09.06.1977.
 6. This project being established to mitigate the rising challenge of human wildlife conflict, to create awareness and show care the need for construction of animal in the region.
 7. 1382 trees are required to be cut in the demanded area. Girth and Species wise list of trees is enclosed (pg 18/c)
 8. There is no violation of Forest (Conservation) Act, 1980 as Certified by the concerned Deputy Conservator of Forest.
 9. The Project area is not a part of Protected area /Sanctuary/National Park and the project area is 25 Km. away from the Shoolpaneshwar Wildlife Sanctuary.
 10. Project authority has submitted undertakings to defray the cost of CA, NPV and any increase thereof. (Pg. 44-45/c)
 11. CA is proposed at 20 ha forest land at Comp. NO. 12, village- Namariya Ta- Tilakwada District -Narmada Scheme of CA is given.
 12. Site inspection report of the Project area is provided by the concerned CF & DCF.
 13. APCCF and Nodal Officer (FCA), Gujarat State, Gandhinagar has recommended the proposal.
 14. Additional conditions under chapter-5 of FCA, 1980 shall be applicable to this proposal as the Government of Gujarat's Resolution No. FCA-1013/11-10/11/SF-24/F, dated 12.06.2015. The user agency has be bound to comply additional condition as per the aforementioned resolution. The project authority has submitted undertakings for the same.
 15. The FRA is enclosed (**pg no. 48/c**) but it is not in accordance with the guidelines of the Ministry dated 03.08.2009 read with 05.07.2013.
 16. The Cost Benefit Analysis is enclosed (**pg no. 32-36/c**) is not in accordance with the guidelines of the Ministry dated 01.08.2017.

In view of above, the facts related to the proposal may be placed before FAC in its forthcoming meeting for their examination and appropriate recommendation.
