

## कार्यालय :- वन संरक्षक, प्रादेशिक अंचल चतरा।

वन भवन, स्थान+पो0+जिला- चतरा, झारखण्ड - 825401 E-mail Address : <u>cf-chatra@gov.in</u>, Phone No. : 06541-253690

पत्रांक :

दिनांक :

सेवा में,

क्षेत्रीय मुख्य वन संरक्षक, हजारीबाग।

विषयः—

– सी0सी0एल0 द्वारा चन्द्रगुप्त खुली खदान कोल परियोजना हेतु 699.38 हे0 (चतरा दक्षिणी वन प्रमंडल अन्तर्गत—400.96 हे0 एवं हजारीबाग पश्चिमी वन प्रमंडल अन्तर्गत—298.42 हे0) वन भूमि अपयोजन (ऑनलाईन प्रस्ता0 सं0 PF/JH/MIN/ 140599/2021) प्रस्ताव के संबंध में।

प्रसंग :-- आपका ज्ञापांक 2354 दिनांक 05.10.2023

महाशय,

उपर्युक्त विषयक प्रासंगिक पत्र के संदर्भ में सूचित करना है कि विषयक परियोजना सी0सी0एल0 द्वारा चन्द्रगुप्त खुली खदान कोल परियोजना हेतु 699.38 हे0 (चतरा दक्षिणी वन प्रमंडल अन्तर्गत 400.96 हे0 एवं हजारीबाग पश्चिमी वन प्रमंडल अन्तर्गत 298.42 हे0) वनभूमि अपयोजन प्रस्ताव में भारत सरकार, पर्यावरण, वन एवं जलवायु परिवर्तन मंत्रालय, नई दिल्ली का पत्रांक 8-24/2023-FC दिनांक 22.09.2023 द्वारा पन्द्रह बिन्दुओं पर पृच्छा की गई है। पृच्छित बिन्दुओं का निराकरण प्रतिवेदन वन प्रमंडल पदाधिकारी, चतरा दक्षिणी वन प्रमंडल के पत्रांक 166 दिनांक 22.01.2024 से समर्पित किया गया है। वन प्रमंडल पदाधिकारी से प्राप्त निराकरण प्रतिवेदन बिन्दुवार निम्नवत् है:–

Condi Queries raised by Gol tion No.		Compliance report	
1	3	5	
i)	As Schedule-I species have been reported in the area and DFO also mentioned the fragmentation of wildlife habitat, comments of PCCF (Wildlife) and CWLW Jharkhand on the	The applied area is a good habitat of wildlife. Its surrounding area also, being a good habitat of many wild animals, shall definitely bear some impact on wild animals inhabiting the area for which a Wildlife Management Plan shall be required. The Asian Elephant, the endangered one, through do not reside in the proposed area permanently, they visit these areas every year in search food and fodder and damage the crops, houses etc.,	I, II & III
	likely impact of the project on the movement of wildlife in general and elephant in particular needs to be furnished by the State. Further, comments	In order to minimize the impact of the proposed mining operation on the environment, it is considered absolutely necessary to prepare a site-specific wildlife management plan and implement it at the expense of the user agency in order to accept the proposed proposal.	*

	may also be furnished on the adequacy of mitigation measures like Site Specific Wildlife Management Plan or Comprehensive Integrated Wildlife Management proposed for the area.	The comments on adequacy of mitigation measures shall be made after receipt of such mitigation plans prepared as compliance of in-principle approval. In this regard, the user agency has submitted a certificate of Undertaking. (Enclosed as annexure-III)	
ii)	The authorities in the State Forest Department have	The plans as recommended by State Forest department along with their tentative cost, time required for preparation and	
	recommended preparation	duration of implementation is given as under	
	of various Plans and their implementation either	PlansTentatiTime required for PreparationDuration of Implementatio	
	before or concurrently with	(In Rs) n	
	the mining operations. Detail of such plans, in tabular form indicating	Wildlife35-45One month after grantOver a periodManageme nt PlanCrore principle approvalof 10 years of operation	
	clearly against them, their		
	tentative cost, time	Soil & 25-35 One month after Over a period	
	required for preparation	MoistureCroregrantofIn-of10yearsofConservatiprinciple approvaloperation	
	and duration of	on Plan	
	implementation, etc. need	Top soil 25-35 One month after Over a period	
	to be furnished by the	manageme Crore grant of In- of 10 years of	
	State.	nt plan principle approval operation	
		1. User Agency shall prepare and submit the above-	
iii)	In online Part-II, it has been reported that the proposed forest land is moderately vulnerable to erosion. Therefore, mitigation measures in this regard needs submission.	<ul> <li>mentioned plans once In-principle approval is granted to them and the actual cost shall be deposited in CAMPA Account before actual breaking/ non-forestry use of the forest land.</li> <li>2. In this regard, the user agency has submitted a certificate of Undertaking. (Enclosed as annexure-III)</li> </ul>	111
iv)	Cost benefit Ratio has been	In this regard User agency has submitted revised Cost-Benefit	V
	estimated as 1:81.92 which	Analysis in light of guidelines issued by MoEF&CC, GoI in this	
	is exorbitantly high. The	regard dated 06-01-2022. Enclosed as annexure- V	
	analysis may be revisited by		
	the user agency by applying		
	appropriate economic tools	a	
	to accurately estimate the		
	various parameters and		
	detailed analysis thereof	~	
	may be submitted to the	2	•
	Ministry.		
v)	Detail of safety zone of the	The User Agency has left a patch of 7.5 m of forest all along the	VI
	mining leases for raising	Coal Block boundary as Proposed Safety Zone. The area of safety	
	afforestation has not been	zone comes to be 2.9 Ha which is part of 699.38 Ha of forest land	
	submitted along with the	diversion proposal.	
1	proposal. Same needs to be	0	
С	CL Chandragupt OCP 699.38 ha	U	

	submitted along with	Com	pensatory	affore	station	plan c	over dou	uble d	egrade	d forest	
	complete detail of	fied for	1400 H	a whic	h also	includes					
	supporting attributes such	CA area against the 2.9 Ha of safety zone. The afforestation scheme of entire 1400 Ha along with suitability									
	as afforestation scheme,								1		
	suitability certificate, KML	ificate, KM	L file of	1400	Ha CA la	and (whi	ch incl	udes 5	.8 Ha CA		
	files, etc.	dem	arcated se	paratel	y in Da	mdoya	Village	agains	st 2.9 H	la safety	
	a decisión agust a sea de sua	zone	e) and KML	file of	2.9 Ha	safety z	one, are	enclo	sed in t	the form	
		zone) and KML file of 2.9 Ha safety zone, are enclosed in the fo of <i>CD</i> enclosed by user agency as Annexure VI.									
vi)	From the purpose-wise break	up of	forest land	d, the f	ollowin	g may k	e ascert	ained			
a)	An area of 0.14 ha has been		1) A DPR	of Chl	notki St	tream d	iversion	and s	traight	ening of	V
	proposed for diversion of		15						100 A	by IIT	1
	Nadi/nalla. The status of	12							5	icy. (The	
	feasibility reports for said						56			f CD as	
	diversion along with			ure VII							
	comments of Water	Dive	rsion prop	1.000	1	n recor	nmende	d by	Chief	Engineer	
	Resource Department on	20120-001	ter Resour					. 10 miles			
	the feasibility of said	and the second	NOC. (The		5 wa	- 88 A.		ä.			
	proposed diversion needs	1.00	ource Dep								
	to be informed by the State.		exure VIII)							,	
							3		21 201		
b)	An area of 13.94 ha of	As p	er the advi	ice of N	10EFCC	, the lar	nd-use p	ropose	ed in th	e earlier	
	forest land has been		nitted For			5 S.	1.00				
	proposed for infrastructure	0							10.000	• • • × v	
	while only 2.3 ha only has			view to reduce forest land for infrastructural components. The							
	while only 215 he only has	earlier and proposed land-use is given below:									
	been proposed in pop-		•3	poseu i	anu-us	e is give	ii below				
	been proposed in non- forest land The State			posed i	anu-us	e is give			se for		1
	forest land. The State		Earlier Land		: 		Revise	d Land-U astructu		%	
	forest land. The State Government may therefore			-Use for In	frastructi Non-		Revised	d Land-U astructu Non-	re Total	Change	
	forest land. The State Government may therefore assess the legitimacy of	S N			frastructi	u <b>re</b> Total Area	Revise	d Land-U astructu	re	127.24	
	forest land. The State Government may therefore assess the legitimacy of site-specificity of various	s	Earlier Land	Use for In Forest	frastructi Non-	ure Total	Revised infr Forest	d Land-U astructu Non- Fore	re Total Area	Change in Forest	
	forest land. The State Government may therefore assess the legitimacy of site-specificity of various infrastructural components	s	Earlier Land	Use for In Forest	frastructi Non- Fores t	u <b>re</b> Total Area	Revised infr Forest	d Land-U rastructu Non- Fore st	re Total Area (in	Change in Forest	
	forest land. The State Government may therefore assess the legitimacy of site-specificity of various infrastructural components and possibility to shift non-	S N	Earlier Land	-Use for In Forest Land	frastructo Non- Fores t Land	Total Area (in Ha)	Revised infr Forest Land	d Land-U astructu Non- Fore st Land	re Total Area (in Ha)	Change in Forest Land	
	forest land. The State Government may therefore assess the legitimacy of site-specificity of various infrastructural components and possibility to shift non- site-specific components to	S N 1	Earlier Land Component 2 CHP Infrastruct	Use for In Forest Land 3	frastructi Non- Fores t Land 4	ure Total Area (in Ha) 5	Revised infr Forest Land 6	d Land-U rastructu Non- Fore st Land 7	re Total Area (in Ha) 8	Change in Forest Land (3-6)/3	
	forest land. The State Government may therefore assess the legitimacy of site-specificity of various infrastructural components and possibility to shift non-	S N 1	Earlier Land Component 2 CHP	Use for In Forest Land 3	frastructi Non- Fores t Land 4	ure Total Area (in Ha) 5	Revised infr Forest Land 6	d Land-U rastructu Non- Fore st Land 7 3.41 11.5	re Total Area (in Ha) 8	Change in Forest Land (3-6)/3	
	forest land. The State Government may therefore assess the legitimacy of site-specificity of various infrastructural components and possibility to shift non- site-specific components to	S N 1 1	Earlier Land Component 2 CHP Infrastruct ure (Field	Use for In Forest Land 3 9.30	frastructu Non- Fores t Land 4 5.52	Total Area (in Ha) 5 14.82	Revised infr Forest Land 6 4.45	d Land-U rastructu Non- Fore st Land 7 3.41	re Total Area (in Ha) 8 7.86	Change in Forest Land (3-6)/3 - 52 %	
	forest land. The State Government may therefore assess the legitimacy of site-specificity of various infrastructural components and possibility to shift non- site-specific components to	S N 1 1	Earlier Land Component 2 CHP Infrastruct ure (Field Workshop,	Use for In Forest Land 3 9.30	frastructu Non- Fores t Land 4 5.52	Total Area (in Ha) 5 14.82	Revised infr Forest Land 6 4.45	d Land-U rastructu Non- Fore st Land 7 3.41 11.5	re Total Area (in Ha) 8 7.86	Change in Forest Land (3-6)/3 - 52 %	
	forest land. The State Government may therefore assess the legitimacy of site-specificity of various infrastructural components and possibility to shift non- site-specific components to	S N 1 2	Earlier Land Component 2 CHP Infrastruct ure (Field Workshop, Substation etc) Road,	Use for In Forest Land 3 9.30 13.94	frastructu Non- Fores t Land 4 5.52 2.30	Total Area (in Ha) 5 14.82 16.24	Revised infr Forest Land 6 4.45 0.00	d Land-U rastructu Non- Fore st Land 7 3.41 11.5	re Total Area (in Ha) 8 7.86 11.56	Change in Forest Land (3-6)/3 - 52 % - 100 %	
	forest land. The State Government may therefore assess the legitimacy of site-specificity of various infrastructural components and possibility to shift non- site-specific components to	S N 1 1	Earlier Land Component 2 CHP Infrastruct ure (Field Workshop, Substation etc)	Use for In Forest Land 3 9.30	frastructu Non- Fores t Land 4 5.52	Total Area (in Ha) 5 14.82	Revised infr Forest Land 6 4.45	d Land-U astructu Non- Fore st Land 7 3.41 11.5 6	re Total Area (in Ha) 8 7.86	Change in Forest Land (3-6)/3 - 52 %	
	forest land. The State Government may therefore assess the legitimacy of site-specificity of various infrastructural components and possibility to shift non- site-specific components to	S N 1 2	Earlier Land Component 2 CHP Infrastruct ure (Field Workshop, Substation etc) Road, bridge,	Use for In Forest Land 3 9.30 13.94	frastructu Non- Fores t Land 4 5.52 2.30	Total Area (in Ha) 5 14.82 16.24	Revised infr Forest Land 6 4.45 0.00	d Land-U astructu Non- Fore st Land 7 3.41 11.5 6	re Total Area (in Ha) 8 7.86 11.56	Change in Forest Land (3-6)/3 - 52 % - 100 %	
	forest land. The State Government may therefore assess the legitimacy of site-specificity of various infrastructural components and possibility to shift non- site-specific components to	S N 1 2	Earlier Land- Component 2 CHP Infrastruct ure (Field Workshop, Substation etc) Road, bridge, culvert	Use for In Forest Land 9.30 13.94 4.38	frastructu Non- Fores t Land 4 5.52 2.30 14.20	Total Area (in Ha) 5 14.82 16.24 18.58	Revised infr Forest Land 6 4.45 0.00 4.38	d Land-U astructu Non- Fore st Land 7 3.41 11.5 6 14.2 0	re Total Area (in Ha) 8 7.86 11.56 18.58	Change in Forest Land (3-6)/3 - 52 % - 100 %	
	forest land. The State Government may therefore assess the legitimacy of site-specificity of various infrastructural components and possibility to shift non- site-specific components to	S N 1 2	Earlier Land Component 2 CHP Infrastruct ure (Field Workshop, Substation etc) Road, bridge,	Use for In Forest Land 3 9.30 13.94	frastructu Non- Fores t Land 4 5.52 2.30	Total Area (in Ha) 5 14.82 16.24	Revised infr Forest Land 6 4.45 0.00	d Land-U astructu Non- Fore st Land 7 3.41 11.5 6 14.2 0	re Total Area (in Ha) 8 7.86 11.56	Change in Forest Land (3-6)/3 - 52 % - 100 %	
	forest land. The State Government may therefore assess the legitimacy of site-specificity of various infrastructural components and possibility to shift non- site-specific components to	S N 1 1 2 3	Earlier Land Component 2 CHP Infrastruct ure (Field Workshop, Substation etc) Road, bridge, culvert Total	Use for In Forest Land 3 9.30 13.94 4.38 27.62	frastructu Non- Fores t Land 4 5.52 2.30 14.20 22.02	Total Area (in Ha) 5 14.82 16.24 18.58 49.64	Revised infr Forest Land 6 4.45 0.00 4.38 8.83	d Land-U astructu Non- Fore st Land 7 3.41 11.5 6 14.2 0	re Total Area (in Ha) 8 7.86 11.56 18.58	Change in Forest Land (3-6)/3 - 52 % - 100 %	
	forest land. The State Government may therefore assess the legitimacy of site-specificity of various infrastructural components and possibility to shift non- site-specific components to	S N 1 1 2 3	Earlier Land- Component 2 CHP Infrastruct ure (Field Workshop, Substation etc) Road, bridge, culvert	Use for In Forest Land 3 9.30 13.94 4.38 27.62	frastructu Non- Fores t Land 4 5.52 2.30 14.20 22.02	Total Area (in Ha) 5 14.82 16.24 18.58 49.64	Revised infr Forest Land 6 4.45 0.00 4.38 8.83	d Land-U astructu Non- Fore st Land 7 3.41 11.5 6 14.2 0	re Total Area (in Ha) 8 7.86 11.56 18.58	Change in Forest Land (3-6)/3 - 52 % - 100 %	
	forest land. The State Government may therefore assess the legitimacy of site-specificity of various infrastructural components and possibility to shift non- site-specific components to	S N 1 1 2 3	Earlier Land Component 2 CHP Infrastruct ure (Field Workshop, Substation etc) Road, bridge, culvert Total	Use for In Forest Land 3 9.30 13.94 4.38 27.62	frastructu Non- Fores t Land 4 5.52 2.30 14.20 22.02	Total Area (in Ha) 5 14.82 16.24 18.58 49.64	Revised infr Forest Land 6 4.45 0.00 4.38 8.83	d Land-U astructu Non- Fore st Land 7 3.41 11.5 6 14.2 0	re Total Area (in Ha) 8 7.86 11.56 18.58	Change in Forest Land (3-6)/3 - 52 % - 100 %	
c)	forest land. The State Government may therefore assess the legitimacy of site-specificity of various infrastructural components and possibility to shift non- site-specific components to	S N 1 1 2 3	Earlier Land Component 2 CHP Infrastruct ure (Field Workshop, Substation etc) Road, bridge, culvert Total plan is enc	Use for In Forest Land 3 9.30 13.94 4.38 27.62 losed a	frastructu Non- Fores t Land 4 5.52 2.30 14.20 22.02 22.02 s Anne:	Total Area (in Ha) 5 14.82 16.24 18.58 49.64	Revised infr Forest Land 6 4.45 0.00 4.38 8.83	d Land-U astructu Non- Fore st Land 7 3.41 11.5 6 14.2 0 29.1 7	re Total Area (in Ha) 8 7.86 11.56 18.58 38.00	Change in Forest Land (3-6)/3 - 52 % - 100 %	
c)	forest land. The State Government may therefore assess the legitimacy of site-specificity of various infrastructural components and possibility to shift non- site-specific components to the non-forest land.	S N 1 1 2 3 The	Earlier Land Component 2 CHP Infrastruct ure (Field Workshop, Substation etc) Road, bridge, culvert Total plan is enc The loca	Use for In Forest Land 3 9.30 13.94 4.38 27.62 losed a	frastructu Non- Fores t Land 4 5.52 2.30 14.20 22.02 s Anne: ap of t	Total Area (in Ha) 5 14.82 16.24 18.58 49.64 49.64 <b>xure IX.</b>	Revised infr Forest Land 6 4.45 0.00 4.38 8.83 8.83	d Land-U astructu Non- Fore st Land 7 3.41 11.5 6 14.2 0 29.1 7 29.1 7	re Total Area (in Ha) 8 7.86 11.56 18.58 38.00	Change in Forest Land (3-6)/3 - 52 % - 100 % 0 -68 %	
c)	forest land. The State Government may therefore assess the legitimacy of site-specificity of various infrastructural components and possibility to shift non- site-specific components to the non-forest land.	S N 1 1 2 3 The	Earlier Land Component 2 CHP Infrastruct ure (Field Workshop, Substation etc) Road, bridge, culvert Total plan is enc The loca project i	Use for In Forest Land 3 9.30 13.94 4.38 27.62 losed a ation m	frastructu Non- Fores t Land 4 5.52 2.30 14.20 22.02 22.02 s Annes ap of t ded by	Total Area (in Ha) 5 14.82 16.24 18.58 49.64 49.64 xure IX.	Revised infr Forest Land 6 4.45 0.00 4.38 8.83 8.83 ect show (existing	d Land-U astructu Non- Fore st Land 7 3.41 11.5 6 14.2 0 29.1 7 29.1 7 vs tha a s we	re Total Area (in Ha) 8 7.86 11.56 18.58 38.00 t the p ell as pr	Change in Forest Land (3-6)/3 - 52 % - 100 % 0 -68 %	

ha of forest land earmarked for safety zone. Rationalize for including green belt area in the project which could otherwise be excluded from the project and be managed by the Forest Department. Considered view of the State Government in this regard needs to be furnished	<ol> <li>The User Agency has submitted that, in compliance of generic condition of the EC approval, belt of width not less than 7.5 mtrs shall be developed all along the mine lease area. This apart, the statutory barriers against surface features like river, nallah, public road etc are to be maintained as per Coal Mines Regulation 2017. As a best practice measure, the area left as barriers is developed and maintained as Green Belt with a view to enhance the plantation cover and decrease the carbon footprint. Such green belts also function as wind breaks.</li> <li>The User Agency has submitted that, the area is also required to maintain mine boundary in continuity and to divert entire forest land falling within the project boundary.</li> <li>Also the User Agency has submitted that they have proposed the green belt as part of mitigation measures for dust suppression.</li> <li>It is evident from above that it will be very difficult for State Forest department to manage the intervening parcels of forest land bounded by mining activities and statutory restrictions against surface features. In view of this, it is proposed to maintain these parcels of land as green belt aggregating to 55.61 Ha (which includes 36.82 ha green belt aggregating to infrastructural activities to non-forest land) as green belt as shown in the revised land use. The forest area earmarked as green belt will be kept and maintained as such, and no non-forestry activity should be undertaken therein.</li> </ol>	
Details of area proposed for dumping of overburden is not available in the purpose-wise breakup. Comments in this regard may be provided by the State Government.	<ul> <li>The User Agency has submitted that,</li> <li>1) Chandragupta OCP mine has been planned in a sustainable manner and &gt;95% of OB will be dumped internally so as to minimize the land degradation to the minimum extent possible.</li> <li>2) Total volume of overburden expected to be generated in Chandragupta OCP is 995.34 Mn cum. Out of this, 946.96 Mn cum (=95%) is proposed as internal dump without affecting any external surface area other than the quarry itself.</li> <li>3) Only 48.38 Mn cum is proposed to be dumped externally in the nearest adjoining operational mine of Central Coalfields Limited i.e., Amrapali OCP.</li> <li>Integrated Dump plan of Amrapali OCP incorporating 48.38 Mn m<sup>3</sup> of Chandragupt OCP is enclosed by User Agency as Annexure X</li> </ul>	X&XI
	for safety zone. Rationalize for including green belt area in the project which could otherwise be excluded from the project and be managed by the Forest Department. Considered view of the State Government in this regard needs to be furnished Details of area proposed for dumping of overburden is not available in the purpose-wise breakup. Comments in this regard may be provided by the	for safety zone. Rationalize for including green belt area in the project which could otherwise be excluded from the project and be managed by the Forest Department. Considered view of the State Government in this regard needs to be furnishedgeneric condition of the EC approval, belt of width not less the area is a barriers against surface features like river, nallah, public road etc are to be maintained as Green Belt with a view to enhance the plantation cover and decrease the carbon footprint. Such green belts also function as wind breaks.3) The User Agency has submitted that, the area is also required to maintain mine boundary in continuity and to divert entire forest land falling within the project boundary. (4) Also the User Agency has submitted that they have proposed the green belt as part of mitigation measures for dust suppression. It is evident from above that it will be very difficult for State Forest land bounded by mining activities and statutory restrictions against surface features. In view of this, it is proposed to maintain these parcels of land as green belt aggregating to 55.61 Ha (which includes 36.82 ha green belt aggreen belt will be kept and maintained as such, and no non-forestry activity should be undertaken therein.Details of area proposed for dumping of overburden is not available in this regard may be provided by the State Government.The User Agency has submitted that, 1 Chandragupta OCP mine has been planned in a sustainable manner and >95% of OB will be dumped internally so as to minimize the land degradation to the minimum extent possible. 2) Total volume of overburden expected to be generated in Chandragupta OCP is opposed as internal dump without affecting any external surface area other than the quarry itself. 3) Only 48.38 Mn cum is proposed to be dumped

		Copy of Dumping Strategy as per the approved PR of Chandragupt Project and Amrapali project has been enclosed by User Agency as Annexure XI	
vii	Analysis of the area proposed for diversion and area proposed for CA area using DSS analysis revealed the following which needs clarification:	A total of 802.05 Ha has been earmarked for CA. The details of CA land with 'compensatory afforestation scheme, revised KML files, DGPS & Topo Maps are enclosed as Annexure: XIV.	XIV
a)	Google imagery shows the presence of Settlements, Roads and Agriculture land etc. within the proposed forest land for diversion	The User Agency has submitted that the roads passing through the Forest area within the coal block will be shifted outside the Coal block boundary along with shifting of village habitat and encroachers at the time of commencement of mining operations.	XII
b)	As per Google imagery, Tandwa Barrage has been constructed after the year 2016 over the Garhi Nadi (River) and part of barrage project is falling in the forest patch which has been proposed for diversion.	The User Agency has submitted that, the barrage is not falling in the forest patch proposed for diversion. The barrage structure is approximately 140 mtrs away from the project boundary. However, a small part of stone pitched embankment is touching the South-Western boundary of the project at an approximate distance of <b>20 mtrs</b> only. As per the approved Project Report of Chandragupt OCP: "The Southern Boundary has been fixed leaving a barrier of 100 mtr from the southern geological block boundary of Pachra South block." As such, the quarry edge will be 100 mtrs away from the embankment. (Barrage Location Plan is enclosed by User Agency in the form of CD & Hard copy as Annexure XIII)	XII
c)	Google imagery shows the encroachment of Agriculture land, plantation activities and presence of settlement in CA patches.	DFO Chatra South has submitted that total of 800.00 Ha of degraded forest land was proposed as CA land in Chatra South Forest Division. In light of the observations made by MoEF&CC, Gol vide letter dated 22-09-2023, the CA sites were physically verified. Upon verification of the proposed CA sites, a total of	XIV

d) e)	recently in the CA patch namely Mahuari and New Road has been constructed in the CA patch namely Village – Kendua. Out of total 1400 ha (DSS Calculated) forest land proposed for CA, 31 ha of land is characterized with	254.25 Ha of degraded forest land was found unfit for CA plantations due to presence of trees, encroachments, water bodies etc. Rest 545.75 Ha. of degraded forest land was found fit for CA plantations. In this regard encumbrance free alternative fresh CA land to the tune of 256.30 Ha (Chatra South: 47.3Ha & Chatra North:209Ha) along with CA Scheme, Suitability Certificate has been made available. Hence, a total of 802.05 Ha (545.25 Ha + 256.30 Ha) has been earmarked for CA. The details of CA land with compensatory afforestation scheme, revised KML files, DGPS & Topo Maps are enclosed as <b>Annexure: XIV.</b>	
viii)	Moderately Dense Forest. Quantitative details of deaths of human and elephants in last five years may be furnished by the State along with details of existing and proposed elephant corridors in the	Quantitative details of deaths of Human and Elephants in last five years i.e., 2019-20 to 2023-24 under Chatra South Forest Division is attached as <b>Annexure-XV</b> . DFO Chatra South Division has submitted that there is no Notified Elephant Corridors in Chatra South Forest Division. On the basis of elephant movements, three elephant corridors have been proposed in Chatra South forest division. However, the proposed	XV
ix)	landscape. External dump is being proposed in 86.16 ha of land in Amrapali OCP, which is not given in the proposal but included in Mining Plan. Therefore, compliance status of Amrapali OCP shall be	mining project does not fall on any of these proposed elephant corridors. The User, Agency has submitted that the external dump of Chandragupta OCP is proposed in an area of 89.16 Ha of land in Amrapali OCP. The approval of Project report enclosed in the form of CDof Amrapali OCP along with approved dumping strategy plan is attached as Annexure XVI for quick perusal. The compliance status of already diverted forest proposal of 531.64 Ha in respect of Amrapali OCP is enclosed Compliance report of Amrapali by User Agency as Annexure XVII)	XVI& XVII
x)	submitted. In case Amrapali OCP is not of the UA then an NOC from the UA of Amrapali OCP shall be submitted.	The User Agency has submitted that both Amrapali OCP and Chandragupta OCP are the projects of Central Coalfields Limited under the administrative control of 'Amrapali & Chandragupt Area'. As such, no NOC is required for Chandragupta OCP from Amrapali OCP.	
xi)	Amrapali OCP boundary is in the west side of the Barki River, the impact of having mining on both the sides of river will require deep understanding of the impact of hydrology of the river, so comments of the State shall be submitted in this regard.	side and 60 m on Chandragupt side from the HFL of the River.	XVIII

	<ul> <li>3) During heavy rainfall conditions, the active mine sumps will act as surge ponds and effectively reduce the peak flow rates in Barki River. Thus, Barki River will not experience any flooding-related problems during heavy rainfall.</li> <li>Additionally, as part of the study on diversion of Chutki nalla, IIT Roorkee has conducted a study on Barki river also. The study states that Barki has a catchment of 231.50 sqkm.</li> <li>The study suggests no risk of flooding on the surrounding landscape.</li> <li>Alsoany deficit in natural run-off will be compensated by mine discharge and run-off from reclaimed land and hence there will not be any variation in the flow of Barki river.</li> <li>Therefore, it can be ascertained that there will not be any direct impact of proposed mining on the surface hydrology of Barki River.</li> <li>Control measures like toe wall, garland drain, check dams and siltation ponds to arrest siltation, and ETP with oil and grease removal mechanism to treat workshop effluents, will be in place.</li> <li>( <i>The DPR from IIT,ROORKEE is enclosed in the farm of CD</i> by User Agency as Annexure VII)</li> </ul>	
xii) A high level bridge over Barki river needs to be constructed to connect the proposed OCP, the location of the bridge and its connectivity should be shown through KML for further DSS analysis.	A high-level bridge over Barki riverfor connectivity with the Chandragupt OCP is proposed by the user Agency. The KML file is attached <i>in the form of CD</i> by User Agency as Annexure XIX)	XIX
xiii) Chotki river falling in the proposed site has to be diverted as per the proposal but the site inspection report or the comments of the State is silent on it, specially about its impact on the water security and hydrological cycle downstream.	The diversion proposal has further been recommended by Chief Engineer (Water Resources Department), Jal Bhawan, Ranchi for issuance of NoC.	
xiv) Since the area has elephant therefore the cases of the Human Elephant conflicts in the district needs to be looked into, for which deaths of human and elephants in the Chatra and	i.e., 2019-20 to 2023-24 under Chatra South Forest Division is attached as Annexure-XV	

V

	Hazaribagh district in last five years to be provided. Loss of property and crop damage and compensation given and pending should also be provided.		
xv)	Recommendation of the CWLW will be needed specially regarding need of wildlife management and mitigation of conflict plan.	The CWLW has given comments regarding need of wildlife Management and mitigation of Man and animal conflict. (Copy enclosed as <b>Annexure I</b> )	

वन प्रमंडल पदाधिकारी, चतरा दक्षिणी वन प्रमंडल से प्राप्त निराकरण प्रतिवेदन की छः प्रतियां इस पत्र के साथ संलग्न कर अग्रेतर आवश्यक कार्रवाई हेतु समर्पित की जा रही है।

आपका विश्वासी, ह0/– वन संरक्षक, प्रादेशिक अंचल, चतरा। ज्ञापांक : 6° दिनांक : 30.01.202.4 प्रतिलिपि :– प्रधान मुख्य वन संरक्षक–सह–कार्यकारी निदेशक, बंजर भूमि विकास बोर्ड, ज्ञारखण्ड, रांची को सूचनार्थ एवं आवश्यक कार्रवाई हेतु समर्पित। वन संरक्षक, प्रादेशिक अंचल, चतरा।