

Pollution abatement of river Koshi at Ramnagar(Nainital) (0.9488)

On scrutiny of the proposal, following shortcomings have been found.

01. It is seen from the information given in para-A-3(i) and (iii) of online Part-I that the online application is submitted by Shri Mukesh Kumar but the authority letter uploaded at para-A-3(xvii) of online Part-I is issued in favour of Shri Upendra Kumar Gupta.
02. The total of village wise breakup of forest land given in para-B-2.3 comes to 0.9478 instead of 0.9488.
03. The component wise breakup of forest and non-forest land given in para-B-2.4 does not appear to be complete because nothing is given under non-forest land. Land required for all the project components is required to be shown.
04. Three no. of Kml files uploaded in para-C are not opening which may be uploaded again showing all the project component.
05. The map in Survey of India Toposheet uploaded at para-C(iii) is not clear.
06. The geo-referenced map uploaded at para-C(iv) is also not clear. GIS software generated geo-referenced digital map showing all the project components clearly along with geo-coordinates is required to be submitted.
07. NOC of Gram Sabha has not been submitted.
08. In online Part-II, the no. of project affected trees is shown as nil but the density is mentioned as 0.6. Moreover, the enumeration list uploaded as additional document in online Part-I and in the hard copy shows the no. of project affected trees as 28.
09. The information given in para-8(ii), (iii) & (iv) of online Part-II regarding the project area being part of national park, wildlife sanctuary, biosphere reserve, tiger reserve, elephant corridor, wildlife migration corridor etc, or located within eco-sensitive zone or located within 1Km of any national park, wildlife sanctuary, biosphere reserve, tiger reserve, elephant corridor, wildlife migration corridor etc is confusing and lacking in clarity. The information may be reviewed and re-submitted along with comments of the Chief Wildlife Warden, if required.
10. It is seen from the information given in para-14 of online Part-II that the CA stipulated is not commensurate to the forest land diverted.
11. DFO has not recommended the proposal in the Site Inspection Report.
12. NPV calculation uploaded in online Part-I is not correct.

State Government is requested to remove the above short comings and submit/upload revised information/documents.