

Extraction of Minor Minerals in Swarna Nadi, Jhajra Range

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

1. Name of the project is not mentioned at designated place in online Part-I.
2. Short narrative of the project does not give any information except the purpose.
3. Village wise breakup of land is not given at designated place in online Part-I.
4. Component wise breakup is not given. '0' is mentioned in component column.
5. Geo-referenced map is provided in google earth image and only 4 geo-coordinates are given which is not sufficient.
6. DSS Analysis of the forest land proposed for diversion shows the area as 104.46 ha instead of 23.75 ha.
7. Area shown in map appears to be surrounded by agriculture land and human habitations but, no village wise breakup of land is given. Moreover, it is stated to be the RF Land.
8. Justification for locating the project in forest land is not opening.
9. C/B Analysis uploaded in online Part-I is not opening. In hard copy also the parameters have not been quantified and expressed in monetary terms.
10. In FRA certificate issued by DC name of 4 villages are mentioned but Gram Sabha proceedings of 2 villages only submitted.
11. Estimated reserve of RBM is mentioned as 2,16,000 million tones in online Part-I but mining plan says that 2,16,000 metric tones will be extracted annually for 5 years. Moreover, estimated reserve is mentioned as 21,60,000 million tones in online Part-I.
12. Proposed use of minerals is not mentioned in para- M-7.1(x) of online Part-I.
13. No transplantation plan is submitted in para-M-7(ii) of online Part-I.
14. District wise area is not given in online Part-II.
15. WP prescription is not given in online Part-II.
16. Approximate distance is mentioned as 0.00 km in online Part-II.
17. Details of WL is not given in online Part-II.
18. Geo referenced map for CA is submitted in google earth image with 4 geo-coordinates only which does not appears to be sufficient. DSS Analysis shows the area as 87.69 ha instead of 48.00 ha. Further, 27 ha area falls in Moderately Dense Forest (MDF) category.
19. In para-14 of online Part-II (District profile), CA stipulated is not commensurate to the forest land diverted.
20. Patch wise details of CA area is not filled up in para-13(i) of online Part-II.
21. Consent of Gram Sabha is not submitted.
22. Details of Safety Zone as per para-4.7 of the guidelines and Ministry's letter No.- 11-125/2014-FC dated 27.05.2016 has not been submitted with the proposal.

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