भारत सरकार
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
पर्यावरण, वन एवं जलवायु परिवर्तन मंत्रालय
MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT, FORESTS & CLIMATE CHANGE

Regional Office (WCZ)
Ground Floor, East Wing
New Secretariat Building
Civil Lines, Nagpur - 440001
apccfcentral-ngp-mef@gov.in

F. No. FC-II/CH-38/2016-NGP/521 **Dated: 13th June, 2016**

To

The Principal Secretary (Forests),
Government of Chhattisgarh,
Forest Department,
Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhavan,
New Raipur (CG).

Sub: Diversion of 37.919 ha of Forest Land in favour of Executive Engineer, CSPTCL, Chhattisgarh for laying and construction of 132 KV DCSS Bhanupartappur-Pankhajur transmission line in Kanker District in the State of Chhattisgarh – regarding.

Sir,

I am directed to refer to the State Government of Chhattisgarh. letter no. F-513/2016/10-2 dated 25.05.2016 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) of the MoEF&CC at Nagpur revealed following:

i. Hard copy of Part-I has not been submitted along with the proposal. Further, Part-II submitted online and hard copy furnished along with the proposal varies substantially in their content. CA details have been provide online while Part-II submitted along with the proposal mentioned that these requirement will be incorporated at the time of mining plan and processing of transmission line which implies that underlying documents have not been scrutinized by the DCFs concerned.

ii. Dates on which inspection of the area was undertaken by the DCFs concerned has not been indicated in their respective inspection reports. Moreover, instead of uploading inspection report online, the DCFs concerned have uploaded a scanned copy of Part-II of Form-A. Further, site inspections reports of the DCF/CF pertaining to the area identified for raising CA may also be submitted by the State Government.

iii. Certificates regarding location of area proposed for diversion beyond the eco-sensitive zone of PAs have not been submitted by the DCFs concerned. Certificates from the DCF, West Bhanupratappur, certifying information furnished in respect of Part-II have not been submitted.

iv. Exact distance of the proposed alignment from the boundary of forest land has not been provided to ascertain how deep inside the forest the alignment of transmission has been proposed by the User Agency.

v. *Exanimation of the kml/shape files on DSS, it is revealed that out of four patches identified for CA, 3 patches falls in the category of moderately dense forest having density above 40% and may not be suitable for* raising CA. The State Government is therefore required to identify alternate sites for raising CA.

vi. No abstract details of CA area (whether degraded forest or non-forest land) have been provided by the DFO in Part-II. It is noticed invariably that inadequate information is submitted by the concerned DCFs in Part-II. Instead of referring the annexure in the proposal, the DCFs, concerned may be directed to fill at least abstract of information in the Part-II and detailed information may be referred in the Annexure submitted along with the proposal. The State Government may take action as appropriate to ensure compliance in this regard

vii. As per the certificate of District Collector, Kanker towards the settlement of rights issued for individual village indicating village wise forest and revenue forest area total forest area involved in

P.T.O.

the proposal is 40.874 ha, comprising of 38.34 ha PF/RF area and 2.534 ha of revenue forest area. The discrepancy in the area proposed for diversion and reported by the District Collector may be re-visited by the State Government exact legal status of the land proposed for diversion may be ascertained. Further, a detail of action taken on settlement of rights in respect of 10 rights holders, as reported by the District Collector may also be submitted by the State Government.

viii. Copies of record of consultations meeting of the Sub-Divisional Level Committee, as required under the provision of clause (a) of Form-I annexed to MoEF&CC's advisory dated 5.07.2013 has not been submitted along with the compliance of Scheduled Tribes and Other Traditional Forest Dwellers (Recognition of Forest Rights) Act, 2006.

ix. For want of detailed report on various attributes examined for various alternatives viz. forest area, number of trees, length, feasibility etc. and comments of DCFs concerned thereof, it appears that alignment has been finalized based on single parameter i.e. length in forest area. A report on the same may be submitted by the State Government.

x. As per Cost benefit analysis, the BC ration has been worked out to be 1:2.39 Lakhs, which is exorbitantly high. Parameters to evaluate cost of the project have not been taken into consideration appropriately. CB analysis needs to be re-worked by applying appropriate techno-economic tools to suitably assess the parameters for assessment of losses and benefits of the project.

xi. Details of employment potential in terms of man days of skilled, semiskilled and unskilled persons on permanent (direct and indirect) and temporary (direct and indirect) basis. Also employment potential of the project, during post construction phase, has also not been provided.

In view of the above, I am directed to request the State Government to submit the information on the shortcomings, as indicated above, to this office for further necessary action in the matter.

Yours faithfully,

Charan Jeet Singh
Scientist 'C'

Copy to:

1. The PCCF, Government of Chhattisgarh, Raipur
2. The Nodal Officer FCA), O/o of the PCCF, Government of Chhattisgarh, Raipur.
3. User Agency (M/s Executive Engineer, HTV (Construction) Division, Chhattisgarh State Electricity Transmission Company, Bhilai-3).
4. Guard File.

-sd-
Charan Jeet Singh
Scientist 'C'