
With reference to the EDS sought by the RO, MOEFCC, GOI, Dated-13/08/2018, reply is furnished at your end but the reply is not satisfactory for some of the EDS, kindly rectify the same as per the mentioned action-

1- For point no. 1, Details of area mentioned in village wise breakup and component wise breakup is not matching with total area. State Government may mention the detail of area in village wise breakup at para B 2.3 and component wise breakup at para B 2.4 in Part I online.

<u>Action to be taken</u>- The detail of area mention in the B-2.4 i.e. the component wise breakup not matched with the detail provided at the other places. Kindly rectify the same. (screenshot is attached for your reference).




- 2- For point no. 2, As per muck disposal plan complete 96530 cum balanced muck is proposed to be disposed in NFL area but details of muck disposal area not filled at para B.4 in part I. State Government may fill the detail of area proposed for muck dumping in non- forest land at para B 2.4. Further, 11 km long road is covering good altitude from the base so adequate care must be taken to check the soil erosion and stabilize the muck disposal sites.

 Action to be taken- Detail of muck to be mentioned at B-2.4-component wise breakup, as the same has not been mentioned at the relevant place. (as per above screenshot).
- 3- For point no. 6, As per DSS analysis of CA area, 1 ha. area found in MDF prposed in civil soyam land. State Govt. may either submit the certificate of DFO certifying that the area is

suitable for CA purpose, along with the list of trees present in MDF area or may change this area with some other area which is suitable for CA.

<u>Action to be taken-</u> Please upload the site suitability certificate as the document uploaded is not correct as well as the same has not been signed by the DFO.(Screenshot is attached for your reference).




- 4- For point no. 8, No. of trees in mentioned as 211 in para 4, part II and in tree cenumeration list but in CF's Site inspection report the number of trees is mentioned as 389 State Government may clarify this disparity and submit/ upload the correct information of trees.

 Action to be taken- still the same difference persist in the tree list uploaded (208 trees), Part II 4(ii)(390 trees) and in CF recommendations(389 trees). Kindly correct the anomalies.
- 5- For point no.9, Name of proposed area not mentioned in administrative approval. State Government may submit the administrative approval mentioning the name of the proposal.

 <u>Action to be taken-Kindly upload the complete administrative approval order.</u>
- 6- For point no. 11, Complete 3.238 ha area is mentioned as RF in DFO's SIR certificate 1.225 ha. area is mentioned as Civil soyam land. State Government may clarify.

 Action to be taken- Still the area is mentioned as reserved area, Kindly rectify the same.(screenshot is attached for your reference).



- 7- For point no.- 15, CA site suitability certificate not found uploaded. State Government may upload the site suitability certificate of CA area in additional formation documents in Part II.

 Action to be taken- Please upload the site suitability certificate as the document uploaded is not correct as well as the same has not been signed by the DFO.
- 8- For point no. 16, It is seen from data given in para 14 of part-II that the CA stipulated is not commensurate with the forest land diverted. State Government may review the same and provide the correct information.
 - <u>Action to be taken-</u> Please furnish the same detail online in part II as provided in the hard copy as the details are not matched.

.....NODALOFFICE.....