

Construction of Bungidhar Mehalchauri Bachhuwaban MR, km-25 to Syuni Talli Motor Road under PMGSY (2.73 ha)

The reply of this office EDS dated 24.05.2016 has been submitted by the State Government vide letter dated 08.07.2016 uploaded on 11.07.2016. Some shortcomings are still found in the proposal which are given below:

1. In reply to point No.- 1 of EDS dated 24.05.2016 & point No.-6 of EDS dated 18.05.2016, it is mentioned that the 434.32 ha CA has been done prior to 2008 against 1031.955 ha of forest land diverted which is not the correct reply of the query. As per data given in para-14 of online Part-II, the CA stipulated (434.32 ha) is not commensurate to the forest land diverted (1031.955 ha). Logically, CA stipulated should be double the area of forest land diverted. Any mismatch between the CA stipulated and the forest land diverted is required to be clarified suitably.
2. In reply to point No.- 1 of EDS dated 24.05.2016 & point No.-7 of EDS dated 18.05.2016, it is mentioned that the density has been revised to 0.3 now in online Part-II and accordingly, NPV has been recalculated but, the density is mentioned as 0.2 instead of 0.3 in the NPV calculation sheet attached with the reply.
3. In reply to point No.- 1 of EDS dated 24.05.2016 & point No.-8 of EDS dated 18.05.2016, the reply of PCCF & Nodal Officer is not understandable. Further, the DFO has mentioned that the same has been corrected but, the working plan prescriptions are still not given in para-5 of online Part-II in respect of 2.38 ha of RF land proposed for diversion.
4. In reply to point No.- 1 of EDS dated 24.05.2016 & point No.-9 of EDS dated 18.05.2016, it is mentioned that an estimate of Rs. 35.00 lacs has been prepared to stop soil erosion but, the details of the mitigative measures to be implemented has not been submitted/ attached with the reply.
5. In reply to point No.- 1 of EDS dated 24.05.2016 & point No.-10 of EDS dated 18.05.2016, it is mentioned that the land required for the road is Civil and Panchayati Land and the affect of Leopard etc. is negligible in the area. Construction of road will have any special impact. But, it is seen from para-2 of online Part-II that 2.38 ha of Reserve Forest Land is also involved in the proposal which is contradictory to the reply given above.
6. The reply of point No.-2 of EDS dated 24.05.2016 has not been submitted by the State Govt. wherein it was informed that the DSS analysis of the area proposed for CA revealed that 1.00 ha area is falling in very dense forest which is not considered suitable for CA. State Govt. was asked to change the 1.00 ha area proposed for CA in some other suitable area.

State Govt. is requested to remove the above shortcomings and submit necessary documents/information.