

EDS DATED 23-05-2016 IN PROPOSAL NO. FP/HP/ROAD/11141/2015

1. Short narrative of the project is still not giving adequate information in Part I.
2. Total period for which the proposed land to be diverted is not mentioned in Part I.
3. GPS coordinate of 200-300m distance along the proposed alignment including geo-coordinate on every turn is provided by the State Govt in google image which should be on GIS software generated georeferenced map.
4. The area mentioned in Sub Divisional Level committee (SDLC) and Village Level Committee (VLC) proceedings is not match with the area proposed for diversion. The State Govt may revise the area accordingly in SDLC and VLC.
5. The road as mentioned in the title is up to Majokhi but in KML file the end point of the road is in Dhari. The Sate Govt may comment on this and change the title of the project accordingly, if required.
6. The CA scheme and other details pertaining to CA site is provided in the hard copy as well as in online Part I and II is for area 9.8 ha while it should be given for twice the area proposed for diversion i.e. $5.659 \times 2 = 11.318$ ha. The State Govt may revise the CA area and upload the other required details/documents accordingly in Part I and II.
7. The Sol toposheet map indicating area proposed for CA and GIS software generated geo-referenced map showing coordinates for all corners of the polygon is not uploaded in the designated column in Part I and II.
8. The KML file shows the CA site proposed in four patches while in details of column L of Part I detail of only one patch is provided. The State Govt may review the same and provide correct detail of CA area proposed in the proposal.
9. Authority letter for the applicant is not uploaded in Part I. the letter uploaded is not correct.
10. Village wise breakup is not provided in Part I.
11. Correct component wise break up is not provided in Part I.
12. Density of the area proposed for diversion should be mention in decimals in Part II.
13. Cost benefit analysis (C/B) is not provided in correct form as it should be given with proper quantification of loss and benefit in monetary terms.
14. Approximate distance of the proposed site from the forest boundaries is not provided.
15. The NPV calculation is not provided with the proposal. The State Govt is advised to review the density and provide NPV calculation accordingly.
16. CA stipulation is not commensurate with the total forest area diverted in the district.
17. In the DSS analysis 7.0 ha area of CA is Moderately Dense Forest (MDF) and 1.0 ha area in Very Dense Forest (VDF) which is not suitable for CA. The State Govt may review the area again and proposed the VDF and MDF area in other places if required.