

1. Short narrative of the project in online Part I do not give adequate information.
2. Total period for which area to be diverted is not correctly filled in online Part I.
3. Proceedings of village level committee (VLC) meeting is provided for two Gram Sabhas and the name of same villages are mentioned in the list of villages to be benefited by the road but in village wise break up the details of four villages are given. The State Govt may clarify the name of villages through which the said road is passing and update the details accordingly in village wise break up and provide VLC proceedings for remaining Gram Sabhas in online Part I.
4. In the village wise break up 0.5 ha area is shown as muck dumping while the State Govt should shown the name of village in which this area of 0.5 occurred.
5. The State Govt has provided/uploaded the scanned copy of GIS software generated geo referenced digital map without showing geo-coordinates which is not acceptable. The State Govt may provide/upload the correct map showing geo coordinates at 200 to 300 m interval along the alignment including all turning points on exact to the scale and ensure the uploading of correct revised map in online Part I.
6. The State Govt may provide/upload GIS software generated geo referenced digital map of the area proposed for CA which should be 14.05 ha providing geo coordinates at all corner points in shape (polygon/closed area) file. The Google earth map will not accepted for the purpose.
7. The State Govt may review the density and eco class of the area in view of the number and type of species proposed to be felled in the area and correct the NPV calculation in hard copy as well as in online Part II.
8. In the muck disposal plan it is mentioned that total material to be disposed in dumping yards is 24792 cum while the capacity of dumping yard is only 5000 cum. The State Govt may clarify that where will be the remaining muck dumped?
9. In the Cost Benefit analysis uploaded in the Part I in both performa VI b and VI C needs to be quantified in monetary terms. Cost over Benefit ratio may also be worked out.
10. Employment details provided in online Part I is seems to be incorrect. The State Govt may review the information and provide correct information if required.
11. The area mentioned in FRA certificate is 6.525 including all annexure while the area proposed for diversion is 7.025 ha. The revised FRA certificate is required mentioning the correct area with all annexure.
12. The FRA certificate is undated.
13. The CA scheme is uploaded in Part II is only for area of 13.05 ha while it should be prepared for twice the area proposed for diversion i.e. 14.05 ha. The State Govt may provide revised CA scheme and upload the same in online part II.
14. Working plan prescription is not provided in online Part II.