

## भारतसरकारRegional Office (WCZ)GOVERNMENT OF INDIAGround Floor, East Wingपर्यावरण, वन एवंजलवायुपरिवर्तनमंत्रालयNew Secretariat BuildingMINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT, FORESTSCivil Lines, Nagpur - 440001& CLIMATE CHANGEE-mail: apccfcentral-ngp-mef@gov.in

## F.No. FC-III/MH-35/2018-NGP 4724

Date: 01.01.2019



The Secretary (Forests), Revenue and Forest Department, Hutatma Rajguru Chowk Madam Cama Marg Mantralaya, Mumbai – 400032.

Sub: Diversion of 383.8535 ha of forest land in favour of Maharashtra State Road Development Corporation Limited, Bandra (W), Mumbai for construction of Nagpur-Mumbai Super Communication Expressway (Package- V) passing through from Village Taranganpada, Igatpuri Taluka, Nashik District to Village Amane, Bhiwandi Taluka, Thane District of 78 Kms in the state of Maharashtra - Regarding.

Sir,

The undersigned is directed to refer to . FLD-1218/C.R.313/F-10 dated 30.11.2018 on the above subject seeking prior approval of the Central Government under Section-2 of the Forest (Conservation) Act, 1980 and to say that preliminary scrutiny of the proposal in the Regional Office (WCZ), MoEF&CC revealed following:

- i. Deputy Conservator of Forests, West Nashik Division has mentioned that tunnel of length 3.375 Km is passing through the Division for which 39.177 ha of Forest land is being diverted. Therefore, area calculation statement submitted, may be revisited by the State Government and detailed area calculation statement in terms of Length X Breadth and Curvature may be calculated and the same shall be submitted by the State Government.
- ii. Maps viz. 10 Km radius map showing protected areas and protected area Distance Map is not submitted.
- iii. Certificate, from the DFO/ DCF concerned, regarding location of the area outside/ within 10 Km of distance from the boundary of protected areas is not submitted.
- iv. Details of facts as contained in the Part- II of the proposal viz. Topography of the area, Geology and Slope to erosion are not mentioned.
- v. Original certificate ensuring importance of Scheduled Tribes and Other Traditional Forest Dwellers (Recognition of Forest Rights) Act, 2006, in prescribed format as per Govt. of India guidelines issued vide letter no. 11-9/98 FC (pt) dated 5<sup>th</sup> July, 2013 for linear projects is not submitted. The same has to be submitted along with English translated copies documentary evidences in the form of copies of the resolutions of the concerned Forest Rights Committee(s), Gram Sabha(s), Sub-Division Level

Committee(s) recording their consent for the proposal and bearing signature of the participants have not been submitted. The same is required to be submitted by the State Government. In addition to this, copies of record of proceedings of the Forest Rights Committee, Sub Divisional Level Committee(s) may also be submitted.

- vi. Details on Justification for selecting the proposed alternative and Reasons for discarding other alternatives is not mentioned.
- vii. Discrepancy is observed in the details of employment potential likely to be generated from implementation of the project in online Part- I application and hard copy submitted by the User Agency. In online application it is mentioned that 6000 permanent employment and 28,28,570 mandays of temporary employment will be generated from the project. Whereas, in Part- I submitted along with the proposal it is mentioned that about 13,68,570 mandays of employment will be generated from the project and permanent employment for 100 persons will be generated. Therefore, correct details on employment potential likely to be generated in terms of Skilled, Semi-skilled and Unskilled persons/ mandays (permanent and temporary) by implementation of the project may be submitted by the User Agency.
- viii. Discrepancy is also observed in total cost of the project. In online application it is mentioned that the total cost of the project is 964266 Lakhs, whereas in Part- I submitted along with the proposal it is mentioned that the total cost of the project is 536500 Lakhs. Therefore, correct details shall be submitted by the User Agency.

In view of the above, I am directed to request the State Government to submit information on the shortcomings, as indicated above, to this Ministry for further consideration of the proposal for approval under the Forest (Conservation) Act, 1980.

Yours faithfully,

Ange

(Dr. E Arockia Lenin) Scientist 'C'

Copy to:

- i. The PCCF, Government of Maharashtra, Nagpur.
- ii. The Addl. PCCF & Nodal Officer (FCA), Government of Maharashtra, Nagpur.
- iii. User agency.
- iv. Guard file.

askyc

(Dr. E Arockia Lenin) Scientist 'C'