SITE INSPECTION REPORT OF DCF BHARATPUR

File No.: FP/RJ/MIN/125714/2021
Date of Proposal: 05/03/2021

Introduction

| 1. | Name of the Project | Diversion of 398.0085 Ha Forest Land of |
|-----|--|--|
| 1 | - ** | Block A and B Paharpur Tehsil |
| | | Roopwas, Dist. Bharatpur. |
| 2. | Name of the District/Division | Bharatpur |
| 3. | Date of Inspection | 21/04/2021 and 07/05/2021 |
| 4. | Name & designation of the Inspection Officer | Mohit Gupta, DCF Bharatpur. |
| 5. | Name & designation of the other Officer who attended the inspection including representatives of the user agency | Jatan Singh, Range Officer, Bandh Baretha Jaiveer Yadav, Surveyor |
| 6 | Legal status of forest land with area proposed for diversion | Protected Forest |
| 7 | If area required for diversion has been demarcated on the ground | Partially |
| 8 | Item-wise breakup of the forest land proposed for diversion | Two Forest Blocks - proposed to b diverted partially. |
| 9 | Condition of vegetation and type of forest applied area | Mostly rocky (Daang), Very scard vegetation, totally degraded forest, ol mines spread all over and extensive eroded. |
| 10 | Position of wildlife in general | Very rare visit of wild animals has bee observed in past 5-7 years as per censulfindings. |
| 11 | Whether the applied area is involved with any | The area earlier was part of Bandh Bareth |
| - | eco-sensitive area/national park/sanctuary | Wildlife Sanctuary. The sanctual |
| • | | boundaries have been rationalised, an |
| | | new modifications of Eco sensitive zor have already been proposed. The fore |
| | | block under consideration is more tha |
| 1 | | 1km away from the newly rationalise |
| | | wildlife sanctuary. |
| | | |
| Ų. | | In this context, the inspection is being dor |
| 3 | | in the context that corresponding |
| | | modification of the Eco sensitive zone w |
| | ng va | be done by the central government. There |
| 3 N | | is no point in considering eco sensitive zon |
| | | of an area that itself is not the part of the sanctuary now. |
| V | lo. of the trees to be felled and its impact on | No significant impact. |

| | the systems. | T. |
|----|--|--|
| 13 | Details of broken up area and reclamation done if any. | Not Reported. |
| 14 | Position of displacement of people and adequacy of rehabilitation, if any | Reported NIL. |
| 15 | Position of rare and endangered species available of importance of area from eco-social point of view. | There are no rare or endangered species reported in these forest blocks. |
| 16 | Non Forest land used in the project and non- forest land selected for compensatory Afforestation is included in the report or not. | Non Forest Land for use in project is reported NIL. |
| | | For compensatory afforestation, the land selected is Kankanchal Parbat which is already in the possession of forest department of Rajasthan. |
| 17 | Suitability of Identified non forest area for compensatory Afforestation | Land is suitable and ecologically relevant. Suitability is being given on the basis that the land is already in possession of the forest department and hence, it ought to be suitable. The working plan of Bharatpur division also included this land in the plantation circle. |
| 18 | Violation of Forest (Conservation Act 1980 if any and action taken thereof. | No violation by the user agency has been reported till now. |

Assumptions/Context on which recommendations are based

Since the project involves a significant chunk of land, and the proposal is being processed keeping in view the spirit of ease of doing business, and also under the situation of COVID times, the undersigned is listing some fair assumptions that he has made to make this site inspection report useful and more relevant to the decision makers

- The proposal is unique in the sense that it asks for more than 50 percent of land of the forest blocks. Usually, either whole forest blocks or only small portions of the block (say 5-10 percent) are applied for diversion.
- The proposal that has been forwarded to DFO office is presented along with a briefly worded mining plan. It is being assumed that a detailed mining plan will be made later and no new conditions that are detrimental to forest laws will be added by the user agency.
- 3. There is a shifting error in the area applied for diversion. It is being assumed that it is only due to technical snag of display. So, undersigned has assumed that the area for diversion is along the forest blocks boundaries in east and south directions. (Maps attached in hard copy files will make this assumption clearer)
- 4. It is also being assumed that the areas inside the forest blocks, which are not being applied for diversion, mining department is considering them out of the cluster of mining operations. An undertaking in this respect that mining department will not

- renew sub portions of any leases lying in the area should be taken at the time of final approval of second stage.
- 5. There are two areas in the same hills which are revenue land areas of villages Sirrondh and Mahalpur Chura. These areas are near to Bansi Paharpur Forest Blocks and have a history of mining leases. It is being assumed that the mining department will follow the guidelines of FCA of not giving 'part renewals' in these areas.
- 6. The mining plan is not showing the exit route of proposed mined minerals. So, assumption is that the standard route that goes through the villages will be used for transportation. It is being assumed that no route is required via forest land in the area.
- 7. Principle of natural justice and efficiency.

Site Inspection Report

- 1. The site inspection in respect of the project was done on two days 21st April 2021 and 07th May 2021 by the undersigned along with his team and representatives of the mining department (A site attendance report is uploaded in miscellaneous documents).
- 2. The salient details of forest land, relevant project related facts and observations are as follows:

| Item-wise break-up details of the forest land proposed for diversion The item-wise break-up of the forest land and non-forest land are usually divided into succomponents. These details can be given at a later stage in compliance of final approval. | | | | | |
|--|--|------------------|--|--|--|
| SI No. | Component | Forest Land (ha) | | | |
| 1 | Mining Area | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| 2 | Waste Dump | | | | |
| 3 | Sub-Grade Ore Stock Yard | | | | |
| 4 | Top Soil Stock Yard | | | | |
| 5 | Crusher Plant | | | | |
| 6 | Work Shop and Office Building | | | | |
| 7 | Roads | | | | |
| 8 | Garland Drains around Dump & Stoc | k Yard | | | |
| 9 | Parapet Walls | | | | |
| 10 | Green belt Development including 7 | .5 m Safety Zone | | | |
| 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | A SECTION OF THE SECT | NV /A | | | |

3. Whether proposal involves any construction of building (including residential) or not. If yes, details thereof: Not Reported.

Note - There will be more chances of illegal encroachments in forest land remaining undiverted. Hence, it seems prudent to close down the remaining forest area with a 6 feet high wall.

4. Total cost of the project at present rates: Not Reported.

5. Wildlife:

Whether forest area proposed for diversion is important from wildlife point of view:

As the area is fragmented and lies embedded in a mining zone (both legal and illegal), its relevance as far as wildlife is concerned is quite low. No movement of leopard/tiger or other big cats has been observed here in past decade as per records of the forest department. However, Bandh Baretha wildlife sanctuary lies to the west of these forest blocks. Since, mining department wants to start mining operations in the area, the approach must ensure no disturbance reaches to the sanctuary. For this, it seems prudent to develop Sukhasila block as a suitable ecological buffer zone from mining area. Also, as per ground situation, there seems some mining potential should be provisioned.

Vegetation:

Total number of trees to be felled - NIL The area where there is tree density has been taken up as a plantation area by the user agency. Approximately 3669 trees mostly small ones have been reported by the Range Officer. And most of them will be covered in plantation area proposed. However, it is suggested that if in future, any large tree is to be cut, the mining department will take permission from the District Environment Committee. Also, option tree translocation can be explored on need basis after final approvals.

Effect of removal of trees on the general ecosystem in the area: No visible impact.

7. Background note on the proposal:

The mining department proposes to auction mines of pink/red sandstone by diverting 398.0085 Ha area of Bansi Pahadpur A and B forest blocks.

8. Compensatory afforestation:

CA land details are submitted by the mining department. In this context, it is interesting to know that the proposed land is already in the charge of DCF Bharatpur and forms the part of Range Cama.

This land was handed over to forest department on the condition that it will be used in lieu of future diversion proposals. In this regard, if one has to apply principle of natural justice, this land can be considered to be a compensatory land for the above proposal. However, under informal discussions with office staff, there was also a viewpoint that once a land is allotted to forest department, it cannot be considered as a land bank. In this regard, I stick with my earlier opinion that this land can be debited from the land bank. However, for the sake of logic and completion, I would suggest that complete Kankanchal parbat should be one unit even if it means compensating more. This decision is now being left to higher competent authorities. Whether land for compensatory afforestation is suitable from plantation and (a) management point of view or not: Perfectly suitable from management point of view. There are old mines in the area, these can be reclaimed and the whole hillock can be a great ecologically important area. Whether land for compensatory afforestation is free from encroachment/other (b) encumbrances: Yes. from important afforestation compensatory land for (c) Whether • Religious/Archaeological point of view: Yes, forms part of Braj chaurasi kos parikrama. Land identified for raising compensatory afforestation is in how many patches, whether (d) patches are compact or not: Single patch, and compact. Plantation ars are identified. Map with details: (e) Attached with the report. Total financial outlay: (f) Whether proposal involves violation of Forest (Conservation) Act, 1980 or not. If yes, a Not submitted. detailed report on violation including action taken against the concerned officials: 9. No violation has been done by the user agency. Whether proposal involves rehabilitation of displayed persons. If yes, whether rehabilitation plan has been prepared by the State Government or not: 10. No. Not reported by user agency Reclamation plan: Not submitted 11. Details & Financial allocation: not submitted

Note
12. Details on catchment and command area under the project:
Not Reported.

13. Cost benefit ratio: N/A

- 15. Observations & Recommendations along with broad perspective reasons: The site inspection report in this unique case can not be made in a business as usual manner. The undersigned has followed the spirit of the FCA guidelines and tried to ensure that this area genuinely is used for productive works and causes minimal impact on the environment. The area has been extensively surveyed by me again and again in last one year in capacity of DCF WL Bharatpur. Two times, I visited the area after this proposal was received. On the basis of above, following observations are being made -
 - 1. There is not much ecological utility of the area that will remain undiverted but there is clear expectation of substantial amount of illegal activities specially mining that can occur in this area. The reason for not appplying diversion of this area is unknown. However, if this area is to remain with the forest department, strict protection measures need to be undertaken. These include -
 - Enclosure of the forest land with a wall approximately 20km long wall will be needed @INR 28 LAKHS per kilometer (departmental norms). The detailed estimate can be given after in principle approval.
 - 3. Development of a mining ecological buffer area in Sukhasila forest block lying to the south west of Bansi Pahadpur B block. For this, I recommend development of small water bodies in Sukhasila block and construction of a wall along with the Kachchha path that goes to village Dumariya. A schematic map is being attached. Detailed estimates can be given at the second stage approval stage.
 - 4. Herbivore Management in the area Some resources such as Rescue vehicle for forest department for rescuing animals that can stray from Bandh Baretha wildlife sanctuary to this mining are must be provided. I recommend allocating one rescue vehicle and developing a wildlife rescue centre in the Range Office of Bandh Baretha.
 - 5. Integrated wildlife action plans can also be developed jointly by the mining department and forest department in the area.
 - 6. A list of undertakings to be submitted by the user agency should be compiled by decision makers at all levels.
 - 7. Small Naalas in Bansi Pahadpur A and B blocks can be used as garland drains and dump drains if detailed mining plan permits. There doesn't seem to be any connectivity of drains in Bansi Paharpur block as far as sending water into bandh Baretha dam is concerned since the proposed area is downstream of the dam. However, village pond of Bansi Pahadpur village should be conserved by the mines owners of the region. This condition must be put in auction/allocation/EC processes.
 - 8. There is a railway barrier that opens up a way in Bansi Pahadpur block. There is no utility of that railway barrier now. It must be closed down. Mining department must write to Ministry of Railways in this regard. The GPS reading of railways in the GPS reading of railways in

| 200 | | | |
|-------------|---|--|--|
| 7. | is (26*55'57"N, 77*29'51"E). Closing/dismantling this barrier is critical and must | | |
| | be done. | | |
| | If a large tree is to be cut in the area, effort to ensure tree translocation should be | | |
| | made. The cost must be borne by mining lease holders. | | |
| • | 10. Signages to drive within speed limits must be installed on mineral exit routes til | | |
| | Bayana Industrial area. I suggest, speed limit signage every 300 metres. | | |
| 4.7 | 11. Above recommendations are in addition to the basic FCA guidelines that need to | | |
| 4.0 | be followed. | | |
| 16. | Whether there are any alternative sites/routes/alignment for locating the project on the | | |
| 2 1 | non-forest land: | | |
| | | | |
| 17. | No. Utility of the project: | | |
| 17. | Will ensure production of aesthetically beautiful sandstone. | | |
| | 2. Employment generation in the region. | | |
| | 3. Reduction in illegal mining. | | |
| 18. | Numbers of Scheduled Caste / Scheduled Tribes to be benefited by the Project: Not estimated. | | |
| | | | |
| (a) | Whether land being diverted has any socio-cultural/ religious value: | | |
| | Not reported | | |
| (b) | Whether any sacred grove or very old growth trees/forests exist in the areas proposed | | |
| \~ <i>1</i> | for diversion: | | |
| | | | |
| • | No. 2010 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 10 | | |
| (c) | Whether the land under diversion forms part of any unique eco-system: | | |
| | No. 11 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | | |
| 19. | Situation with respect to any protected Area: | | |
| 19. | Situation with respect to any protected Area. | | |
| , b | Bandh Baretha wildlife sanctuary is approximately 4-5 km away. | | |
| | | | |
| 20. | Any other information relating to the project: nil | | |

Conclusion - This project looks quite useful and necessary for government and public welfare in the region. Efforts along with this are already being made to conserve forests and environment. This project can become a flagship project as far as balancing development and environment considerations are concerned.