	Site Ins	pection Rep	port			
	(Prescribed vide PCCF(HoF	F) No.Desk			Mary 1	
-	14.	1	Proposal No. F			59/2017
	Items		Observation a	ind remarks		
1	Name of the project and location	Rehabilitation and up-gradation of NH-66 from Km 406/030 to Km 450/170 [Kalmath to Zarap section] to				m Km
	Village, Range, Round& Beat					
		four -lane with paved shoulder in the state of				
		Maharashtra under NHDP-IV in the state of				
		Maharashtra under NHDP IV.				
		Village	Gut& Survey No.	Range	Round	Beat
		Osargaon	1708,147,136/A, 146,151,1709,1775, 1983,1736	Kankawali	Digwd e	Kalsuli +
		Kasal	21/A/3,21A/4,21/B,2 1/A/5,200/5,200/7	Kadawal	Kasal	Kasal
2	No Cal II	Pavasi	103	Kudal	Nerur T.H	Nerur T.H
2	Name of the User Agency.	II.	Engineer Natio	nal High	way D	ivision,
3	Date of site inspection.	Ratnagiri (M.H.)				
4		28/12/201				
4	Extent (ha.) and legal status of forest land proposed for diversion.	2.8715 Ha.				
	proposed for diversion.	Legal status: -Identified Forest Area & Village Pavashi				
		is undecided under Maharashtra Private Forest				
5	a) Details of forest land proposed for	(Acquisition) Act 1975) Rehabilitation and up-gradation of NH-66 from Km				
	diversion and activity-wise break-up of	406/030 to Km 450/170 [Kalmath to Zarap section] to				
	forest land.	four -lane with paved shoulder in the state of				
		Maharashtra under NHDP-IV in the state of				
		Maharashtra under NHDP IV.				
	b) Density and Eco-value class.	0.4 & Eco-value class one				
6	Whether the requirement of forest land as	Yes, The proposed forest land is unavoidable and				
	proposed by the User Agency in col.2 of	barest minimum. As the alignment of road is as per				
	part-I is unavoidable and barest minimum	existing National highway for is up gradation of exiting				
	for the project. If no, recommended area	national, so alternative alignment is not possible.				
	item-wise with details of alternative	-				
7	whather the proposal involves any	No				
,	Whether the proposal involves any construction of building (including	INO				
	residential) or not? If yes, details thereof.					
8	a) Whether forest area proposed for	No				
•	diversion is important from wildlife point	110				
	of view or not.			- 1		
	b) Details of any rare or endangered or	No any rare/endangered/unique species of flora and				
	unique species of flora and fauna found in	fauna is found in this area. The area is not a part of				
	proposed forest land. If so, the details	national Park, wildlife sanctuary etc.				
	thereof.	anottally cit.				
	c) Aerial distance from the nearest	25 Km. Fr	om Radhanagri Wi	Idlife Sanct	liary	
	boundary of any protected Area (km).	25 Km. From Radhanagri Wildlife Sanctuary.				
	d) Remarks about sensitivity of the forest	NA				
	area likely to be affected due to project.	1				
	e) Whether wildlife mitigation plan is	No				
	e) Whether wildlife mitigation plan is required? If yes, reasons therefore:	No				
9	e) Whether wildlife mitigation plan is	No 606 Nos.				

		and the state of t
	b) Number of trees to be felled of girth below 60cm:	
	c) Number of trees to be felled of girth above 60 cm:	303 Nos.
	d) Effect of removal of trees on the general ecosystem in the area.	
10	Background note on the proposal (short summary).	Rehabilitation and up-gradation of NH-66 from Km 406/030 to Km 450/170 [Kalmath to Zarap section] to four -lane with paved shoulder in the state of Maharashtra under NHDP-IV in the state of Maharashtra under NHDP IV.
11	Whether the proposal involves any violation of Forest (Conservation) Act 1980? If yes, a detailed report on violation including action taken against the concerned officials to be attached.	No
12	Whether the proposal involves rehabilitation of displaced person. If yes, whether rehabilitation plan has been approved by the State Government?	No
13	Details on catchments and cultural command area under the project (if applicable).	
14	Utility of the project.	This is a highway project and as per user agency when construction work is start then almost 400 person/year generate temporary employment.
15	Whether land being diverted has any socio-cultural/ religious values? Whether any scared grove or very old growth trees/forests exist in the areas proposed for diversion?	No
16	Any other important information related to the project (Separate note may be attached, if required).	
17	Details of documents and photographs enclosed:	
18	Recommendations of the Inspecting Officer	Recommended for acceptance.
_		

Dated: 06/01/2018 Place: Sawantwadi

(S.B. Chavan)
Deputy Conservator of Forests
Deputy Conservator of Forests
Forest Division Sawantwadi