

TAMIL NADU FOREST DEPARTMENT

From

Selvi K.Karthikeyani, IFS.,
Wildlife Warden,
Hosur Forest Division,
Mathigiri – 635 110.

To

The Principal Chief Conservator of Forests,
Forest Head Quarters Building,
Guindy – Velachery Main road,
Near Kannigapuram check post,
Guindy,
Chennai-600 032.

(Through Conservator of Forests, Dharmapuri Circle,
Dharmapuri)

C.No. 7228 / 2022 / D, dated –10-2022

Sir,

- Sub : Forest (Conservation) Act, 1980 – Dharmapuri Circle / Wildlife Warden, Hosur Forest Division, Hosur – Proposal for diversion of 0.9856ha of forest land in Ayaranapalli village for erection of 110KV Transmission line from Rayakottai – Kelamangalam road to TATA Electronics Company in Ayaranapalli village in Krishnagiri District - Regarding.
- Ref : 1) Online forest clearance proposal uploaded by the Executive Engineer, TLC / TANTRANSCO, Opp. Collectorate, Dharmapuri, Dharmapuri District – Proposal No. FP / TN / Trans / 155570 / 2022 dated 19-05-2022.
- 2) The Executive Engineer, TLC / TANTRANSCO, Opp. Collectorate, Dharmapuri, Dharmapuri District Lr.No. EE / TLC / DPI / F.TATA Electronics / D.209 / 22 dated 02-09-2022.
- 3) The Principal Chief Conservator of Forests (Head of Department), Chennai. C.No. TS3 / 15954 / 2022, dated 18-10-2022.
- 4) The Conservator of Forests, Dharmapuri C.No. 9138 / 2022 / D dated 20-10-2022.

I submit to state that, as per the shortcomings raised by the Principal Chief Conservator of Forests (Head of Department), Chennai in the Ref (3) cited above, and also as per the instructions by the Conservator of Forests, Dharmapuri in the Ref (4) cited above on the proposal for diversion of 0.9856ha of forest land for Ayaranapalli village for erection of 110KV Transmission line from Rayakottai - Kelamangalam road to TATA Electronics Company in Ayaranapalli village in Krishnagiri District. I submit para wise replies is as follows.

Para (i)

As per the instructions given by the Principal Chief Conservator of Forests, Chennai in the Ref (3) cited above, the legal status of the proposed diversion area is now corrected as **“Forest by dictionary meaning”** instead of **Reserved Forest** in the web portal in Sl. No.2 of Part-II of Form-A.

Para (ii)

In the Ref (3) cited above, the Principal Chief Conservator of Forests, Chennai have asked for clarification about Wildlife Mitigation plan which is already proposed in this proposal. In this regard, I submit my replies is as follows.

In 1.00 km radius of proposed diversion area, there is no any notified Wildlife Corridor. But, the proposed diversion area is seasonally and occasionally used by the Elephants to a radius of more than 5.00 km from the proposed diversion area. The distance from the nearest boundary of the sanctuary (Cauvery North Wildlife Sanctuary) to this proposed area is at about 2.10 km, and there is seasonal and occasional movement of elephants noticed from the sanctuary area to the proposed area and around for crop raid. There is also a railway line passing close to the proposed diversion area at a distance of nearly 2.00 km for a length of nearly 10km. The railway line is located between Cauvery North Wildlife Sanctuary and proposed area. In the year 2003 and 2013, totally 7 number of elephants died due to train hit in this railway stretch. The brief details of elephant movement and Human–Elephant negative interaction is mentioned in the Wildlife Mitigation plan along with maps. Hence, in order to manage negative interaction, the Wildlife Mitigation plan is already proposed for 765.00 lakhs and submitted to the Principal Chief Conservator of Forests and Chief Wildlife Warden, Chennai for approval.

Further it is stated that, based on the above fact and also as per the instructions of the Principal Chief Conservator of Forests in the Ref (3) cited above, the following changes have been made in Part-II of Form-A in the web portal.

(i) Sl.No.8(i) is changed as **“Occasional / Seasonal movement of Elephant found”** instead of “No”.

(ii) Sl.No.8(ii) is changed as **“Yes”** instead of “No”.

(Because, the proposed area is not part of any notified Wildlife Corridor. But, the proposed diversion area is seasonally and occasionally used by the Elephants. The distance from the nearest boundary of the sanctuary

(Cauvery North Wildlife Sanctuary) to this proposed area is at about 2.10 km, and there is seasonal and occasional movement of elephants noticed from the sanctuary area to the proposed area and around for crop raid. There is also a railway line passing close to the proposed diversion area at a distance of nearly 2.00 km for a length of nearly 10km. The railway line is located between Cauvery North Wildlife Sanctuary and proposed area. In the year 2003 and 2013, totally 7 number of elephants died due to train hit in this railway stretch).

- (iii) Sl.No.8(iv) is changed as “**Yes**” instead of “No”.

(Because, in 1.00 km radius of proposed diversion area, there is no any notified Wildlife Corridor. But, the proposed diversion area is seasonally and occasionally used by the Elephants to a radius of more than 5.00 km from the proposed diversion area for seasonal crop raid. The brief details of elephant movement and Human–Elephant negative interaction is mentioned in the Wildlife Mitigation plan along with maps).

- (iv) Sl.No.8(v) is changed as “**Yes**” instead of “No”.

(Because of Occasional / Seasonal movement of Elephant is found in the proposed area).

Para (iii)

a) The Compensatory Afforestation scheme is prepared based on the model estimate communicated by the Principal Chief Conservator of Forests, Chennai in letter No.TS4 / 24632 / 2022 dated 13-10-2022. Accordingly, 10% casualty replacement and engaging protection mazdoor for 12 months is proposed for the first year maintenance work. And, Scraping 1m dia. and soil work, application of Bio-fertilizer, Watering and Engaging protection mazdoor for 3 months is proposed in the second year and third year maintenance work. Scraping for 1m dia. and soil work only included in the 4th year to 10th year maintenance and calculated to a total cost of 29.564 lakhs this may be approved.

b), c) As per the model estimate, brush wood fencing work is proposed during planting instead of chain link fencing which was already proposed.

d) The works for water harvesting structure was also not included in the CA scheme estimate. **The estimate proposed for CA scheme is as per model estimate communicated above.**

