Appendix

(See Rule-6)

Form for seeking prior approval under Section 2 of Forest (Conservation) Act, 1980 for the proposal by the State Government and Government of India.

PART-A

(To be filled by the User Agency)

1.	Project	
i.	Short Narrative of the proposal	Proposal for Diversion of 2.74 ha. land for Proposed Petroleum Pipeline with OFC From Krishnapatnam – Hyderabad through Comp.No.393 Ravuru RF, Compartment No. 392, Ramayampatnam ,in Ongole Range Giddalur Division in favour of Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited, under FC Act 1980
ii.	Map showing the required forest land	Map enclosed
iii.	Cost of the Project	2046 crores
iv.	Justification for locating the project in forest land.	The various considerations for alternative routes are explored and the final route selected on the basis of 1. Avoidance of Wild Life Sanctuaries, Reserved Forest, Mining area and Defence establishment to the best possible. 2. Avoidance rocky marshy and low-lying areas 3. Safety of people and environment 4. Easy access to route during construction and operation. 5. The route was selected based on least disturbance to environment, forests, human habitation and aquatic bodies. It avoids National Parks and Wild Life Sanctuaries.
v.	Cost-Benefit Analysis (to be enclosed)	Not applicable (since less than 5 ha.)
vi.	Employment likely to be generated.	Employment will be generated through contractors & Sub-Contractors during construction and operation.

PROJECT LEADER
Krishnapatnam Hyedrabad Pipeline Project
Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited
Hyderabad

2.	Purpose-wise Breakup of the total forest land required	Total 2.74 ha. of forest land is required.
3.	Details of displacement of the people due to the project, if any	There are no people living in the applied area or adjacent area. Hence, displacement of people due to the project does not arise.
i.	Number of families	Not applicable.
ii.	Number of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribe families	Not applicable.
iii.	Rehabilitation plan (to be enclosed)	Not applicable.
4.	Whether clearance under Environment (Protection) Act 1986 required	Not applicable.
5.	Undertaking to bear the cost of raising and maintenance of compensatory afforestation and / or penal compensatory afforestation., as per the scheme prepared by the State Government (Undertakings to be enclosed)	Undertakings enclosed.
6.	Details of certificates / documents enclosed as required under the instructions.	1. Authorization Certificate 2. Bare Minimum Certificate 3. Undertakings to pay CA / ACA. 4. Undertakings to pay NPV / ANPV. 5. No Violation Certificate. 6. Undertaking to obtain RoFR certificate (linear) in due course. 7. All other related undertakings

PROJECT LEADER
Krishnapatnam Hyedrabad Pipeline Project
Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited
Hyderabad

JUSTIFICATION REGARDING ALTERNATIVES EXAMINED FOR LINEAR PROJECT

Alternatives Explored for Krishnapatnam - Hyderabad Pipeline Project: KHPL Project of Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited in Andhra Pradesh State		
Description	**Status of land**	**Area in Ha.**
Alternate-1	Forest	2.74
Alternate-2	Forest	8.5970
Alternate-3	Forest	8.0360

The other alternatives (Alternative-2 & Alternative-3) are being rejected on grounds of as follows: -

1) Alternative 2 & 3 involves more forest area 8.5970 and 8.0360 hectares respectively to be diverted which is more than the alternative-1.
2) In Alternative -2 the pipeline will be in close proximity to the sensitive sanctuary area. Laying of pipeline in the sanctuary sensitive area is technically not feasible involving safety of the pipeline.
3) The terrain in Alternative Route-2 and 3 is hilly where laying of pipeline poses several construction challenges.
4) Alternative -2 passes near to the area where most of the lands are non-agriculture land and pipeline cannot be laid in NA lands as per P&MP Act'1962.
5) Though the overall length (Forest area and Non-forest area) of the pipeline is more in Alternative-2 which increases the project cost.
6) Alternative -3 passes in close proximity to populated areas and most of the lands are also non-agriculture land; pipeline cannot be laid in NA lands as per P&MP Act'1962.
7) Number of turning points (TPs) in Alternative 2 and 3 are more that needs bends etc which will add-on to the cost of the project.

Looking into the above, it is imperative for KHPL pipeline passing in Andhra Pradesh State in Alternative-1 is more apt technically and safety in comparison to the other two alternatives viz,. Alternative-2 and Alternative-3.

Date:

Place:

PROJECT LEADER
Krishnapatnam Hyedrabad Pipeline Project
Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited
Hyderabad

For Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited