

## PROPOSAL NO. FP/UK/ROAD/12951/2015

1. Short narrative of the proposal is not satisfactory in online Part I.
2. Total period for which the proposed area to be diverted is not provided in online Part I.
3. The component wise break up is not complete as the areas for muck disposal is not mentioned in the break up in Part I.
4. In the geo referenced digital map of the area proposed for diversion, uploaded at C (iv) Part I online, geo coordinates are shown in google map which does not serve the purpose. May provide/upload scanned copy of clear GIS software generated geo referenced digital map to the exact scale of the proposed road showing geo coordinates at 200 to 300 m interval along the alignment including all turning points.
5. The digital map of area proposed for CA is provided in google map, which does not serve the purpose. The State Govt may provide/upload GIS software generated revised map showing geo coordinates for all corner points in polygon (.shp) closed file.
6. The State Govt may review the employment generation detail given in Part I appears to be incorrect. The correct information may fill.
7. The village level committee (VLC) proceeding provided for only one village while as per village wise break up the proposed alignment passing through the boundary of three villages. The VLC for other two villages may upload along the FRA certificate in designated place in Part I.
8. It is mentioned in the online Part II that the area is prone to erosion therefore the State Govt may explain the protective measures to be taken during the proposed construction.
9. The data furnished in the district profile is appears to be incorrect as the total diverted land does not tally with the CA stipulation. The State Govt may review the information furnished and if required may clarify the differences.
10. The density appears to be incorrect in online Part II and the NPV calculation is also not correct. The State Govt may review the same and provide correct density and NPV calculation in view of the tree felling involved.
11. Details of wildlife in online Part II are not provided.
12. As per the information regarding tree enumeration in hard copy of the proposal out of 964 trees 734 trees are below diameter 0-10 cm therefore the trees proposed to be felled are 230 but the entry of 233 trees are made in online Part II, which may be corrected accordingly.
13. As per Decision Support System (DSS) analysis, out the total area of 4.46 ha proposed for CA, 2 ha is moderately dense forest. State Govt may replace this 2 ha area with some other area suitable for CA and provide/upload revised digital map, SoI topohseet map and KML file of the complete 4.46 ha CA area again after making the above change.
14. The area 0.130 ha is marked for muck dumping in the civil land which is not clear that is it included in the area proposed for diversion. If the area marked for muck dumping attracts FCA, 1980 it should be a part of area proposed for diversion. The State Govt may revise the proposal accordingly and all necessary documents may be corrected accordingly in online Part I and II. The State Govt may propose the muck dumping in private land with provided NOCs of land owners to this office.