PARAWISE REPLIES TO THE QUERIES RAISED ON 29.11.2021

PARAWISE REPLIES TO THE QUERIES RAISED ON 29.11.2021	
Queries raised	Replies by User Agency
a. Village wise break-up: As per technical verification the non-forest land alignment is passing through Sy. No. 58 of Yarbanahalli Village instead of Survey No. 58 of Musenayakanahalli Village as provided by the User Agency in Form-A (Part-I). Moreover, Sy. No. 58 of Yarbanahalli Village which is not in the name of User Agency as per RTC whereas SY. No. 58 of Musenayakanahalli Village which is in the name of User Agency. This needs to be verified and rectified.	After verification of the village map it is concluded that the non-forest land alignment is passing through Sy. No. 58 of Yarbanahalli Village instead of Survey No. 58 of Musenayakanahalli Village. Accordingly, Part-I of Form-A has been corrected.
b. Geo-referenced Maps: The User Agency needs to upload whole Village Maps for both villages showing forest and non-forest areas for the complete project in addition to the mosaic/part Village Maps showing correct boundary of the village.	Complied. The whole village map of Yarabanahalli village has been uploaded in the additional information section.
 c. Compensatory Afforestation: Instead of uploading whole village map only part Halbhavi Village Map is uploaded. GPS readings provided are not overlapping with uploaded CA KML file and shows a variation up to (1, 3, 4 Points – 0.6255 mtr) (2nd point - 4.3044 mtr). Hence, the proposed CA land should be laid on the whole village map and proper KML file needs to be uploaded. 	As instructed, whole village map of Halbhavi village has been uploaded in the additional information section. A revised kml file has been uploaded in L(iv)(c).
 The same CA land (Sy No. 39 of Halbhavi Village CA land) is provided in the other proposal FP/KA/MIN/24548/2017 (which has already got Stage-II approval). This needs to be verified and rectified. 	 Initially, we had proposed Sy. No. 39 of Halbhavi village for the FC proposal of Rama Iron Ore Mine (FP/KA/MIN/24548/2017). Later, location of CA land had been changed due to the unavoidable reasons. The reasons for change of CA land is cited below in chronological order: As per the directions from the APCCF (FC) office vide letter dated 31.01.2019, we had requested DCF office to issue CA Suitability Certificate, CA scheme & to authenticate maps for Sy. No. 39 for our Rama Iron Ore Mine FC proposal. As per APCCF (FC) direction and our request letter, DCF office had issued CA suitability certificate, CA scheme & authenticated maps.

- Accordingly, DCF Ballari had forwarded the documents to CCF, Ballari vide letter dated 27.02.2019 and same had been forwarded by CCF Ballari to APCCF (FC) vide letter 06.03.2019.
- Meantime, due to the delay in Mutation of Sy No. 39 in favour of Forest Department, presence of Pot Kharab (as per RTC records) in the CA land & APCCF office direction to keep all parcels in same division for better management, we had proposed different parcels of CA lands which were already transferred and mutated in favour of Forest Department at that time.
- Subsequently, a clarification was sought by the APCCF (FC) office vide letter dated 18.07.2019 and the response was submitted to the office of DCF Ballari for further processing vide our letter dated 20.07.2019.
- On dt. 19.08.2019, APCCF (FC) office had again raised an EDS for clarification on Change of CA lands from Stage-I to Stage-II. Accordingly, we had replied with the proper reasons for change of CA lands from Halbhavi to Agasanuru vide our letter dated 29.08.2019. The same had been accepted by the then APCCF (FC).
- Finally, the revised CA lands of 33.80 ha. from Agasanuru Village, Siruguppa Taluk & Tumati Villages, Sandur Taluk of Ballari Division were accepted by APCCF (FC) office and the details were mentioned in the recommendation letter to Government of Karnataka vide letter dated 03.09.2019 and the final approval was accorded by Government of India on 19.11.2019.

Since, the Sy. No. 39 of Halabhavi was not allocated to any of our project, we have proposed this land in lieu of Neotrex Infrastructural Corridor proposal.

