1 : Environment Cost Benefit Ratio

| 5577 | 1 : Environment Cost Benefit Ratio |  |   |            |  |  |
|------|------------------------------------|--|---|------------|--|--|
| 5.N. | Parameters                         | MoEF Guidelines for CBA  | Hydro Project                           | Total loss |  |  |
|      |                                    | of forest land   |   | (Rs lakh)  |  |  |
| *    |                                    | diversion,2017   |   |            |  |  |
| Α    | <b>Environmental Cost</b>          |  |   |            |  |  |
| 1    | Eco-system services                | Economic value of loss of  | NPV of 23.39 ha forest                  | 224.00     |  |  |
|      | losses due to                      | eco-system services due  | land (eco-class-IV) to be               |            |  |  |
|      | proposed forest                    | to diversion of forests  | diverted                                |            |  |  |
|      | diversion                          | shall be the net present   | (i)23.39x957780                         |            |  |  |
|      |                                    | value (NPV) of forest land   | =Rs224.00 lakh                          |            |  |  |
|      |                                    | being diverted   |   |            |  |  |
| 2    | Loss of animal                     | To be quantified and   | (i)23.3876x Rs10000/ha                  | 23.39      |  |  |
|      | husbandry                          | expressed in monetary  | =Rs 23.39 lakh                          |            |  |  |
|      | productivity including             | terms or 10% of NPV  | (ii) 10% of Rs 224                      |            |  |  |
|      | loss of fodder                     | applicable, whichever is   | lakh=Rs 22.4 lakh. (Max.                |            |  |  |
|      |                                    | maximum  | of two is adopted)                      | -          |  |  |
| 3    | Cost of human                      | To be quantified and   | As per R&R Plan                         | 0.00       |  |  |
|      | resettlement                       | expressed in monetary  |   |            |  |  |
|      | , coctile in cit                   | terms as per R&R Plan  |   |            |  |  |
| 4    | Loss of Public facilities          | To be quantified and   | No public facilities on                 | 0.00       |  |  |
|      | and administrative                 | expressed in monetary  | forest land are to be                   |            |  |  |
|      | infrastructure (Roads,             | terms as per actual cost   | diverted                                |            |  |  |
|      | buildings, schools,                | basis at the time of   | 4.7.5.755                               |            |  |  |
|      | dispensaries, electric             | diversion.   |   |            |  |  |
|      | lines, railways, etc.) on          | alversion.   |   |            |  |  |
|      | forest land, which                 |  |   |            |  |  |
|      | would require forest               |  |   |            |  |  |
|      | land if these facilities           |  |   |            |  |  |
|      | were diverted due to               |  |   |            |  |  |
|      | the project.                       |  |   |            |  |  |
| 5    | Possession value of                | 30% of environmental   | 30 %of Rs 224 lakh                      | 67.20      |  |  |
|      | forest land diverted               | costs (NPV) due to loss of   | = Rs 67.20 lakh                         |            |  |  |
|      | Torest faria arraits               | forests or circle rate of  |   |            |  |  |
|      |                                    | adjoining area in the  |   |            |  |  |
|      |                                    | district should be added   |   |            |  |  |
|      |                                    | as a cost component of   |   |            |  |  |
|      | ,                                  | possession value of  |   |            |  |  |
|      |                                    | forestland, whichever is   |   |            |  |  |
|      |                                    | maximum  | -                                       |            |  |  |
| 6    | Cost of sufferings to              | The social cost of   | There shall be no                       | 0.00       |  |  |
| 0    | oustees.                           | rehabilitation of oustees  | oustess from private                    | 00         |  |  |
|      | ousices.                           | (in addition to the cost   | land. Therefore, social                 |            |  |  |
|      |                                    | likely to be incurred in   | cost. of rehabilitation of              |            |  |  |
|      |                                    | providing residence,   | oustees is =0.00                        |            |  |  |
|      |                                    | occupation and social  | 543(CC3 13 -0.00                        |            |  |  |
|      |                                    | services as per R&R plan)  |   |            |  |  |
|      |                                    | be worked out as 1.5   |   |            |  |  |
|      |                                    | times of what oustees  | 1 to |            |  |  |
|      |                                    | should have earned in  |   |            |  |  |
|      |                                    | A CONTRACTOR OF THE CONTRACTOR | 4.44.17-11                              | Renewal    |  |  |
|      |                                    | two years had he not been shifted.   |   | (5)        |  |  |
|      |                                    | been simted.   |   | 1.7 VAX9   |  |  |

| Andreas of the last of the las |  |  |   |          |
|--|--|--|---|----------|
| 7  | Habitat fragmentation cost                   | While the relationship between fragmentation         | 50% of Rs 224 lakh<br>=Rs 112.00 lakh                     | 112.00   |
|  |  | and forest goods and                                 |   |          |
|  |  | services is complex, for                             |   |          |
|  |  | the sake of simplicity the cost due to fragmentation |   |          |
|  |  | has been pegged at 50%                               |   |          |
|  |  | of NPV applicable as a                               |   |          |
|  |  | thumb rule.  |   |          |
| 8  | Compensatory                                 | The actual cost of                                   | Cost of CA including                                      | 351.94   |
|  | afforestation & soil                         | Compensatory   | maintenance cost  |          |
|  | moisture conservation cost                   | afforestation & soil                                 |   |          |
|  | COSC   | moisture conservation and its maintenance in         |   |          |
|  |  | future at the present                                |   |          |
|  |  | discounted value                                     |   |          |
| 9  | Cost of Environmental                        | As per cost of EMP                                   | Total cost of EMP after                                   | 2515.03  |
|  | Management Plan for                          | included in EIA report                               | discounting cost of                                       |          |
|  | avoiding, mitigating,                        | avoiding the cost of losses                          | Compensatory  |          |
|  | checking the adverse impacts on various      | already included in serial No.1 to 8.                | afforestation plan, cost of human resettlement            |          |
|  | environmental                                | NO.1 to 8.   | i.e., R&R plan, relocation                                |          |
|  | components during                            |  | cost of public facilities=                                |          |
|  | construction and                             |  | Rs lakh (2867-351.94) =                                   |          |
|  | operational phase of                         |  | Rs 2515.03 lakh   |          |
|  | the project.                                 |  |   |          |
|  | Economic Benefits                            |  |   | 3293.56  |
| B<br>1   | Increase in                                  | To be quantified and                                 | Benefit cost from net                                     | 26376.84 |
| -  | productivity attribute                       | expressed in monetary                                | annual energy from PSP                                    | 20370.04 |
|  | to the specific project                      | terms avoiding double                                | @ difference of   |          |
|  |  | counting   | levelized tariff Rs                                       |          |
|  |  | Ÿ  | 8.67/unit at Rs3.0/unit                                   |          |
|  |  | ,  | pumping cost and the pumping cost of Rs                   |          |
|  |  |  | 3.0/unit  |          |
|  | E  |  | =465.2 GWh x  |          |
|  |  |  | Rs 5.67/unit (8.67-3.00)                                  |          |
|  |  |  | = Rs26376.84lakh  |          |
| 2  | Number of                                    | As per DPR   | The project will directly                                 |          |
|  | Populations benefit                          | 7  | benefit the population                                    |          |
| - 1.   | due to specific project                      |  | of the country as a whole and the state in                | 0.00     |
|  |  |  | particular, due to  | 0.00     |
|  |  |  | enabling Karnataka  |          |
|  |  |  | Govt., to harness much                                    |          |
|  |  |  | more renewable energy                                     |          |
| 1  |  |  | (Solar and Wind)  |          |
|  |  |  |   |          |
| 3  | Economic benefits due                        | As per DPR   | (i) During peak stage of                                  | 382.98   |
| 3  | Economic benefits due to direct and indirect | As per DPR   | (i) During peak stage of construction, employment will be | 382.98   |

16Bens

| employment due to the project.  generated for 650 skilled/semi-skilled/unskilled labour. Assuming that on an average 500 persons are employed with an average minimum wage of Rs 9383/-pm after discounting the income of Rs 3000/pm by the person being earned before being engaged in construction, the net benefit shall be =Rs 6383x12x500= Rs382.982lakh.  (ii) After completion during operation about 25 people will get employment for O&M, routine upkeep / maintenance of roads and buildings. Average benefit shall be | •        |  |  |  |
|---|----------|--|--|--|
| 4 Economic benefits due to compensatory afforestation  Benefits from such compensatory afforestation accruing over next 50 years monetized and discounted to the present value should be included as benefits of compensatory forestation. For benefits of CA the guidelines of the Ministry for NPV estimation may be consulted  Compensatory afforestation in 23.65 ha @ discount rates of 2% /yr of NPV =0.02X12.28X23.65 = Rs 5.80lakh  | 5.80     |  |  |  |
| Total Environment Benefits (B)  | 26840.62 |  |  |  |
| Total benefits due for useful life of 40-year =40x(26376.84 +75+5.80) +382.98   |          |  |  |  |
| Environment Benefit Cost Ratio= 1058906.78/3293.56  |          |  |  |  |

