



BRUHAT BENGALURU MAHANAGARA PALIKE

No: DCF/PR-1486/2022-23

Office of the
Deputy Conservator of Forests,
Bruhat Bengaluru Mahanagara Palike
N.R Square, Bangalore

Date: 30.11.2022

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM

Sub: Permission regarding Translocation and Removal of trees which are standing at the Project Area from Sarjapur Main Road to Carmelaram Railway Cross and ROB for the Project of "Widening and Improvement of Carmelaram Road and Construction of Railway Over Bridge" Bengaluru – reg

- Ref: a. ಕಾ.ಪಾ.ಅ/ರ.ಮೂ.ಸೌ/ಮ-ಮರ/ಪಿ.ಆರ್/37/22 - dtd 18.04.2022
b. Member Secretary, TEC and ACF Letter No. ACF/PR 60/2022-23 dtd 28.11.2022 along with Report and Proceedings of Tree Expert Committee

* * * * *

Preamble:

The Executive Engineer, Road Infrastructure Development, Mahadevapura Zone, BBMP (EE, RID, BBMP) vide their letter cited under reference (a) above, has sought permission for clearance of 202 number of trees which are standing at Project area from Sarjapur Main Road to Carmelaram Railway Cross and ROB, Bengaluru.

As such Public Notice dated 18.04.2022 was issued by the Tree Officer & DCF, BBMP as per Section 8 (3) of the Karnataka Preservation of Trees Act 1976 (as amended in 2015) with the intention to invite objections/remarks from public.

In response to the public notice, no suggestion/objection was received from public within the stipulated dates. Further the Tree Officer remarked that even though no objections/suggestions have been received, the first priority of the Forest authorities will be to save and retain more number of trees at the spot and in case that is not possible, the next option would be translocation of such trees which fulfill the desired criteria and felling of the trees has to be last resort. The Compensatory Afforestation would involve planting of saplings duly following the norms of 10 saplings to be planted in lieu of each tree translocated/felled (i.e., in the ratio 1 : 10).

In this context, the Field Forest Officers conducted the spot inspection on 28.06.2022, the ACF/DCF visited the area on 29.06.2022, and then TEC visited the areas and conducted field Inspection on 29.07.2022, duly examining all the trees besides having discussions with the Project Engineers.

The Field Inspection Report was tabled during the TEC meeting held on 26.08.2022 and detailed discussions were held.

- i. The primary objective of the TEC was to retain-on-site as many trees as possible.
- ii. In case the trees are falling within the project activity area and their removal becomes inevitable, the next option for TEC was for translocation of trees depending upon its general condition and its location so that the extraction of root ball of adequate size becomes feasible.
- iii. The felling of trees has to be the last resort and that has to be done very judiciously in a prudent manner.

Based on the records/documents produced by RID, BBMP followed by thorough scrutiny of the same and detailed discussions of the field inspection reports which were prepared after examination of each and every tree, the following order is issued.

ORDER

Under the circumstances explained above and in exercise of the powers vested with the undersigned as per Section 8 (3) of Karnataka Preservation of Trees Act, 1976 and based on the guidelines and decisions taken as per the Field Inspection Report and Proceedings of the Meeting dated 26.08.2022 of the TEC for retention-on-site, translocation, and removal of trees which fall in RID, BBMP Project Area from Sarjapur Main Road Junction to Carmelaram Railway Cross including Construction of Railway Over Bridge, the below mentioned schedule is approved subject to the conditions mentioned thereon. This Order will come into effect after fifteen (15) days from the date of uploading of the order on the Official website of BBMP and for that purpose separate directions will be issued from this Office.

SCHEDULE

1. The Twenty Nine (29) trees which are listed in Annexure A appended to this Official Memorandum have to be retained-on-site. Hence, permission is declined to remove the said 29 trees and they should continue to stand at their present locations.
2. Based on the considerations as stated above and also detailed in the Report, the Twenty Four (24) trees which are listed with justification, enclosed to this Official Memorandum as Annexure B have to be translocated. Hence permission is accorded to translocate the said 24 trees to suitable places as mentioned below in the 'Conditions'.
3. The remaining One Hundred and Forty Nine (149) trees only which are listed with justification, enclosed to this Official Memorandum as Annexure C can be removed. Hence permission is accorded for removal of these said 149 trees only as per the felling of trees norms adopted by Karnataka Forest Department (KFD).

Conditions

1. No damage should be caused to the trees which are retained on the spot, while carrying out the civil works or any project related works.
2. The trees which are retained-on-site have to be properly protected and maintained. Accordingly RID, BBMP should give an assurance in this respect.
3. The translocation of trees should be done at suitable vacant space at nearby BBMP Vemana Playgrounds, Doddakannahalli, Bengaluru in collaboration with the DCF, BBMP.

4. The Persons/Agencies who are entrusted with translocation works should have sufficient knowledge and experience in such works.
5. The work of translocation of trees has to be executed under close supervision of Officials/Officers of Forest Wing of BBMP and according to the formulated guidelines of UAS, Bengaluru.
6. The trees so translocated have to be properly maintained and taken care of, for a minimum period of three years.
7. The entire process of translocation of trees has to be properly documented and records compiled in a systematic manner.
8. In lieu of the trees translocated and felled, 10 healthy and heighted saplings have to be planted in lieu of each tree either translocated or felled. The saplings have to be planted as per forestry practices and maintained for a minimum period of three years. Photographs and proper documentation has to be there for saplings/seedlings planted.
9. Regular monitoring must be done to ensure the conducive growth of translocated trees and planted saplings/seedlings.


Tree Officer and

Deputy Conservator of Forests
Bruhat Bengaluru Mahanagara Palike,
Bengaluru

Copy to:

1. The Executive Engineer, Road Infrastructure Department, Mahadevapura Zone, Bengaluru
2. The Chairman, Tree Authority and Chief Conservator of Forests, Bangalore Circle, Bangalore for kind information
3. The Member Secretary – Tree Expect Committee, and the Assistant Conservator of Forests, BBMP for information and further action.
4. The Assistant Conservator of Forests, BBMP for information and further action
5. The Range Forest Officer/Deputy Range Forest Officers for information and further action
6. Office Copy

Retention of Trees

Widening and railway over bridge Improvements of Carmelaram Road Development

Sl. No.	Tree No.	Tree Name	Girth (M)	Height (M)	TEC Recommendation	Justification
1.	1 1(a)	<i>Tabubia rosia</i>	0.95	3.00	Retention	The tree is standing outside the proposed project area, i.e., widening of existing road. The tree is recommended for retention.
		<i>Tabubia rosia</i>	0.80	2.50		
2.	2	Nalli	0.70	2.00	Retention	The tree is standing outside the proposed project area, i.e., widening of existing road. The tree is recommended for retention.
3.	4	Nilgiri	1.30	4.00	Retention	The tree is standing outside the proposed project area, i.e., widening of existing road. The tree is recommended for retention.
4.	5 5(a) 5(b)	Nilgiri	0.95	3.50	Retention	The tree is standing outside the proposed project area, i.e., widening of existing road. The tree is recommended for retention.
		Nilgiri	0.60	2.00		
		Nilgiri	0.40	2.00		
5.	7 7(a)	Athi	0.55	2.00	Retention	The tree is standing outside the proposed project area, i.e., widening of existing road. The tree is recommended for retention.
		Athi	0.30	2.00		
6.	8 8(a)	Honge	0.40	2.00	Retention	The tree is standing outside the proposed project area, i.e., widening of existing road. The tree is recommended for retention.
		Honge	0.35	2.00		
7.	9 9(a)	Mahogany	0.60	2.00	Retention	The tree is standing outside the proposed project area, i.e., widening of existing road. The tree is recommended for retention.
		Mahogany	0.30	2.00		
8.	10 10(a)	<i>Tabubia rosia</i>	0.60	3.00	Retention	The tree is standing outside the proposed project area, i.e., widening of existing road. The tree is recommended for retention.
		<i>Tabubia rosia</i>	0.40	2.00		
9.	11	Hole Dasavala	0.40	2.00	Retention	The tree is standing outside the proposed project area, i.e., widening of existing road. The tree is recommended for retention.

10.	12	Basavanapada	0.60	2.50	Retention	The tree is standing outside the proposed project area, i.e., widening of existing road. The tree is recommended for retention.
11.	13	Honge	0.45	2.50	Retention	The tree is standing outside the proposed project area, i.e., widening of existing road. The tree is recommended for retention.
12.	17	Mahogany	0.45	2.50	Retention	The tree is standing outside the proposed project area, i.e., widening of existing road. The tree is recommended for retention.
13.	43	Tabubia rosia	0.50	2.00	Retention	The tree is standing outside the proposed project area, i.e., widening of existing road. The tree is recommended for retention.
14.	171	Honge	0.70	2.00	Retention	The tree is standing outside the proposed project area, i.e., widening of existing road. The tree is recommended for retention.
15.	172	Honge	0.35	2.00	Retention	The tree is standing outside the proposed project area, i.e., widening of existing road. The tree is recommended for retention.
16.	173	Honge	0.45	2.00	Retention	The tree is standing outside the proposed project area, i.e., widening of existing road. The tree is recommended for retention.
17.	174 174(a)	Honge	0.40	2.00	Retention	The tree is standing outside the proposed project area, i.e., widening of existing road. The tree is recommended for retention.
		Honge	0.30	2.00		
18.	175	Mahogany	0.35	2.00	Retention	The tree is standing outside the proposed project area, i.e., widening of existing road. The tree is recommended for retention.
19.	176	Hoovarasi	0.35	2.00	Retention	The tree is standing outside the proposed project area, i.e., widening of existing road. The tree is recommended for retention.
20.	177	<i>Tabubia rosia</i>	0.35	2.50	Retention	The tree is standing outside the proposed project area, i.e., widening of existing road. The tree is recommended for retention.

21.	178	<i>Tabubia argentia</i>	0.25	2.00	Retention	The tree is standing outside the proposed project area, i.e., widening of existing road. The tree is recommended for retention.
22.	183	Akasha mallige	0.25	2.00	Retention	The tree is standing outside the proposed project area, i.e., widening of existing road. The tree is recommended for retention.
23.	184	Honge	0.35	2.00	Retention	The tree is standing outside the proposed project area, i.e., widening of existing road. The tree is recommended for retention.
24.	185	<i>Tabubia rosia</i>	0.35	2.00	Retention	The tree is standing outside the proposed project area, i.e., widening of existing road. The tree is recommended for retention.
25.	186	<i>Tabubia rosia</i>	0.30	2.00	Retention	The tree is standing outside the proposed project area, i.e., widening of existing road. The tree is recommended for retention.
26.	187	<i>Tabubia rosia</i>	0.35	2.00	Retention	The tree is standing outside the proposed project area, i.e., widening of existing road. The tree is recommended for retention.
27.	188	Jacaranda	0.35	2.00	Retention	The tree is standing outside the proposed project area, i.e., widening of existing road. The tree is recommended for retention.
28.	191	Aala	1.50	3.00	Retention	The tree is standing outside the proposed project area, i.e., widening of existing road. The tree is recommended for retention.
29.	202 202(a)	Aala	0.80	2.00	Retention	The tree is standing outside the proposed project area, i.e., widening of existing road. The tree is recommended for retention.
		Aala	0.65	2.00		

Total trees for Retention = 29 Nos.


Tree Officer &

Deputy Conservator of Forests
BBMP, Bangalore.

Translocation of Trees

Widening and railway over bridge Improvements of Carmelaram Road Development

Sl. No.	Tree No.	Tree Name	Girth (M)	Height (M)	TEC Recommendation	Justification
1.	15 15(a)	Nilgiri	1.70	4.50	Translocation	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and hence cannot be retained. The tree is forked, matured and does not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
		Nilgiri	1.25	3.00		
2.	45	Honge	0.60	2.50	Translocation	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is young and healthy. The tree is recommended for transplantation.
3.	50 50(a)	Mahogany	0.45	2.50	Translocation	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is young and healthy. The tree is recommended for transplantation.
		Mahogany	0.35	2.50		
4.	51	<i>Tabubia rosia</i>	0.60	3.00	Translocation	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is young and healthy. The tree is recommended for transplantation.
5.	59	<i>Terminalia arjuna</i>	0.75	2.50	Translocation	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is young and healthy. The tree is recommended for transplantation.
6.	65	Akasha Mallige	0.45	2.50	Translocation	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is young and healthy. The tree is recommended for transplantation.

7.	70	<i>Tabubia rosia</i>	0.25	2.00	Translocation	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is young and healthy. The tree is recommended for transplantation.
8.	72	<i>Tabubia rosia</i>	0.35	2.00	Translocation	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is young and healthy. The tree is recommended for transplantation.
9.	73	<i>Tabubia rosia</i>	0.50	2.50	Translocation	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is young and healthy. The tree is recommended for transplantation.
10.	74	Mahogany	0.30	2.00	Translocation	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is young and healthy. The tree is recommended for transplantation.
11.	77	Honge	0.35	2.50	Translocation	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is young and healthy. The tree is recommended for transplantation.
12.	80	Mahogany	0.80	3.00	Translocation	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is young and healthy. The tree is recommended for transplantation.
13.	89	Honge	0.40	2.00	Translocation	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is young and healthy. The tree is recommended for transplantation.
14.	90	<i>Jacaranda Mimosifolia</i>	0.45	2.00	Translocation	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and hence the tree cannot be retained.

						The tree is young and healthy. The tree is recommended for transplantation.
15.	93	Honge	0.45	2.50	Translocation	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is young and healthy. The tree is recommended for transplantation.
16.	95	Honge	0.40	2.00	Translocation	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is young and healthy. The tree is recommended for transplantation.
17.	96	Hole Dasavala	0.35	2.00	Translocation	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is young and healthy. The tree is recommended for transplantation.
18.	99	Honge	0.45	2.00	Translocation	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is young and healthy. The tree is recommended for transplantation.
19.	100	Honge	0.35	2.00	Translocation	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is young and healthy. The tree is recommended for transplantation.
20.	101	Honge	0.30	2.00	Translocation	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is young and healthy. The tree is recommended for transplantation.
21.	102	<i>Terminalia arjuna</i>	0.65	2.00	Translocation	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is young and healthy. The tree is recommended for transplantation.
22.	110	Honge	0.35	2.00	Translocation	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB,

						hence the tree cannot be retained: The tree is young and healthy. The tree is recommended for transplantation.
23.	111	<i>Terminalia arjuna</i>	0.75	2.50	Translocation	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is young and healthy. The tree is recommended for transplantation.
24.	135	Honge	0.30	2.00	Translocation	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is young and healthy. The tree is recommended for transplantation.
Total trees for Translocation = 24 Nos.						


Tree Officer &

Deputy Conservator of Forests
BBMP, Bangalore.

Felling of Trees

Widening and railway over bridge Improvements of Carmelaram Road Development

Sl. No.	Tree No.	Tree Name	Girth (M)	Height (M)	Justification
1.	3	Nilgiri	1.80	5.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and hence cannot be retained. The tree is matured and does not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
2.	6	Nilgiri	1.40	3.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and hence cannot be retained. The tree is matured and does not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
	6(a)	Nilgiri	2.20	3.50	
3.	14	Nilgiri	1.75	7.50	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and hence cannot be retained. The tree is matured and does not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
4.	16	Nilgiri	2.10	4.50	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and hence cannot be retained. The tree is matured and does not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
5.	18	Nilgiri	1.75	5.50	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and hence cannot be retained. The tree is matured and does not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
6.	19	Nilgiri	1.20	4.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and hence cannot be retained. The tree is matured and does not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
7.	20	Nilgiri	1.10	3.50	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and hence cannot be retained. The tree is matured and does not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
8.	21	Nilgiri	1.25	6.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and hence cannot be retained. The tree is matured and does not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.

					for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
9.	22	Nilgiri	1.00	3.50	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and hence cannot be retained. The tree is matured and does not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
10.	23	Nilgiri	1.30	4.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and hence cannot be retained. The tree is matured and does not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
11.	24	Nilgiri	1.40	4.50	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and hence cannot be retained. The tree is matured and does not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
12.	25	Nilgiri	1.20	5.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and hence cannot be retained. The tree is matured and does not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
13.	26	Nilgiri	1.00	4.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and hence cannot be retained. The tree is matured and does not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
14.	27	Nilgiri	1.60	6.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and hence cannot be retained. The tree is matured and does not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
15.	28	Nilgiri	0.80	2.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and hence cannot be retained. The tree is matured and does not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
16.	29	Nilgiri	1.20	4.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and hence cannot be retained. The tree is matured and does not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
17.	30	Nilgiri	1.50	5.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and hence cannot be retained. The tree is matured and does not qualify

					for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
18.	31	Nilgiri	1.00	3.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and hence cannot be retained. The tree is matured and does not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
19.	32	Nilgiri	1.25	3.50	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and hence cannot be retained. The tree is matured and does not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
20.	33	Nilgiri	1.00	3.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and hence cannot be retained. The tree is matured and does not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
21.	34	Nilgiri	1.30	4.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and does not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
22.	35	Nilgiri	1.50	6.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and does not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
23.	36	Nilgiri	1.60	4.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and does not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
24.	37	Nilgiri	1.60	6.50	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and does not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
25.	38	Nilgiri	1.40	4.50	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and does not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.

26.	39	Nilgiri	1.00	3.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and does not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
27.	40	Nilgiri	1.30	3.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and does not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
28.	41	Nilgiri	1.50	5.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and does not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
29.	42	Nilgiri	1.00	3.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and does not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
30.	44	Nilgiri	1.60	6.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and does not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
31.	46	<i>Tabubia rosia</i>	1.00	3.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured with defects (decay symptoms) and does not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
32.	47	Nilgiri	1.60	6.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and does not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
33.	48 48(a)	Nilgiri	1.60	6.50	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained.
		Nilgiri	1.40	6.00	

					<p>The tree is forked, matured and does not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.</p>
34.	49	Honge	0.40	2.00	<p>The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is with defects (decay symptoms) and does not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.</p>
35.	52	Nilgiri	1.20	5.00	<p>The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and does not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.</p>
36.	53	Nilgiri	1.45	6.00	<p>The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and does not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.</p>
37.	54	Nilgiri	1.70	6.00	<p>The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and does not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.</p>
38.	55	Honge	0.35	2.00	<p>The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is close to open drainage channel with decay symptoms and does not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.</p>
39.	56	Honge	0.45	2.00	<p>The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is close to open drainage channel with decay symptoms and does not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.</p>
40.	57	Honge	0.45	2.00	<p>The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is close to open drainage channel with decay symptoms and does not qualify for translocation.</p>

					The tree is recommended for felling.
41.	58 58(a)	<i>Terminalia arjuna</i>	1.20	2.50	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained.
		<i>Terminalia arjuna</i>	1.00	2.50	The tree is forked, matured and does not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
42.	60	Nilgiri	0.80	4.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree species and its decay symptoms do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
43.	61	Hoovarasi	0.35	2.50	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is with decay symptoms and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
44.	62	Nilgiri	2.00	4.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is forked, matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
45.	63	Seeme thangadi	0.35	2.50	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree species and its decay symptoms do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling. .
46.	64	Nilgiri	1.50	6.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
47.	66	Nilgiri	1.50	4.50	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
48.	67	Seeme thangadi	0.90	2.50	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and do not qualify

					for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
49.	68	<i>Terminalia arjuna</i>	1.00	2.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
50.	69	Nilgiri	1.00	5.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
51.	71	<i>Tabubia rosia</i>	0.35	2.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is young and healthy. The tree is recommended for transplantation.
52.	75 75(a) 75(b)	Seeme thangadi	0.75	2.50	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is multiforked and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
		Seeme thangadi	0.65	2.50	
		Seeme thangadi	0.60	2.00	
53.	76 76(a)	Seeme thangadi	1.00	2.50	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is forked, matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
		Seeme thangadi	0.45	2.00	
54.	78	Nalli	0.50	3.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is with tip drying symptoms and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
55.	79 79(a)	Nilgiri	1.20	4.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is forked, matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
		Nilgiri	1.00	3.00	
56.	81	<i>Tabubia rosia</i>	1.20	2.50	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained.

					The tree is matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
57.	82 82(a) 82(b)	<i>Tabubia rosia</i>	0.90	2.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is forked, matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
		<i>Tabubia rosia</i>	0.45	2.00	
		<i>Tabubia rosia</i>	0.40	2.00	
58.	83	<i>Tabubia rosia</i>	0.50	3.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is with decay symptoms and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
59.	84	Nilgiri	1.40	4.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
60.	85	Nilgiri	1.50	4.50	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
61.	86	Nilgiri	1.35	5.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
62.	87	Nilgiri	1.40	3.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
63.	88	Nilgiri	1.90	7.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
64.	91	Honge	0.25	2.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and hence the tree cannot be

					retained. The tree is with defective (decay symptoms) and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
65.	92	Honge	0.45	2.50	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is with defective (decay symptoms) and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
66.	94 94(a)	Honge	0.30	2.50	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and hence the tree cannot be retained.
		Honge	0.25	2.00	The tree is forked with defective (decay symptoms) and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
67.	97	Honge	0.45	2.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is with defective (decay symptoms) and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
68.	98	Honge	0.25	1.50	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is with defective (decay symptoms) and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
69.	103	<i>Terminalia arjuna</i>	1.10	3.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
70.	104	Honge	0.35	2.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is with defective (decay symptoms) and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
71.	105	Gull mohar	1.65	3.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot

					<p>be retained. The tree is matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.</p>
72.	106	Nilgiri	2.00	7.00	<p>The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.</p>
73.	107	Nilgiri	1.70	6.00	<p>The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.</p>
74.	108	Nilgiri	2.00	7.00	<p>The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.</p>
75.	109	Honge	0.25	2.00	<p>The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is with defective (decay symptoms) and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.</p>
76.	112	<i>Terminalia arjuna</i>	1.20	4.50	<p>The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.</p>
77.	113	Honge	0.35	2.00	<p>The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is with defective (decay symptoms) and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.</p>
78.	114	Honge	0.38	2.00	<p>The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is with defective (decay symptoms) and do not qualify for translocation.</p>

					The tree is recommended for felling.
79.	115	Honge	0.24	2.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is with defective (decay symptoms) and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
80.	116	Honge	0.24	2.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is with defective (decay symptoms) and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
81.	117	Honge	0.25	2.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is with defective (decay symptoms) and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
82.	118	Tecoma	0.35	2.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is with defective (decay symptoms) and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
83.	119	Honge	0.45	2.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is with defective (decay symptoms) and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
84.	120	Honge	0.45	2.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is with defective (decay symptoms) and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
85.	121	Honge	0.25	2.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is with defective (decay symptoms) and do not qualify for

					translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
86.	122	Honge	0.45	2.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is with defective (decay symptoms) and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
87.	123	Nerale	0.45	2.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is with defective (decay symptoms) and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
88.	124	Honge	0.75	2.50	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is with defective (decay symptoms) and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
89.	125	<i>Tabubia rosia</i>	0.35	2.50	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is with defective (decay symptoms) and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
90.	126	Honge	0.45	2.50	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is with defective (decay symptoms) and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
91.	127	Honge	0.40	2.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is with defective (decay symptoms) and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
92.	128	<i>Tabubia argentia</i>	0.35	2.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is with defective (decay

					symptoms) and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
93.	129	Basavanapada	0.35	2.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is with defective (decay symptoms) and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
94.	130	Hoovarasi	0.35	2.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is with defective (decay symptoms) and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
95.	131	<i>Tabubia rosia</i>	1.35	4.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is with defective (decay symptoms) and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
96.	132	Hoovarasi	0.45	2.50	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is with defective (decay symptoms) and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
97.	133	Honge	0.25	2.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is with defective (decay symptoms) and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
98.	134	Jacaranda	0.25	2.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is with defective (decay symptoms) and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
99.	136	Nilgiri	0.45	2.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained.

					The trunk of tree is chopped and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
100.	137	Nilgiri	1.00	6.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The trunk of tree is chopped and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
101.	138	Nilgiri	1.35	5.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
102.	139	Nilgiri	1.80	8.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
103.	140	Nilgiri			The tree has fallen due to rainfall (as reported by Field Forest Officer). The tree is categorised under felling.
104.	141	Nilgiri	1.00	3.50	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
105.	142	Nilgiri	1.60	6.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
106.	143	Nilgiri	1.00	2.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
107.	144	Nilgiri	1.00	3.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.

108.	145	Nilgiri	0.80	2.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
109.	146	Nilgiri	1.00	6.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
110.	147	Nilgiri	1.10	5.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
111.	148	Nilgiri	1.10	6.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
112.	149	Nilgiri	1.00	5.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
113.	150	Nilgiri	0.85	4.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
114.	151	Nilgiri	1.00	5.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
115.	152	Nilgiri	0.90	4.50	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and do not qualify for translocation.

					The tree is recommended for felling.
116.	153	Nilgiri	1.25	6.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
117.	154	Nilgiri	1.00	3.50	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
118.	155	Nilgiri	1.10	4.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
119.	156	Nilgiri	0.85	3.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
120.	157	Nilgiri	0.70	2.50	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
121.	158	Nilgiri	0.95	6.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
122.	159	Nilgiri	0.95	5.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
123.	160	Nilgiri	1.15	8.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and do not qualify

					for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
124.	161	Nilgiri	1.10	6.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
125.	162	Nilgiri	1.35	8.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
126.	163	Nilgiri	0.85	3.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
127.	164	Nilgiri	1.25	4.50	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
128.	165	Nilgiri	1.25	3.50	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
129.	166	Nilgiri	1.55	6.50	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
130.	167	Nilgiri	1.00	5.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
131.	168	Nilgiri	0.75	4.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained.

					The tree is matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
132.	169	Nilgiri	0.90	4.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
133.	170	Nilgiri	1.50	4.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and ROB, hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
134.	179	Nilgiri	1.00	6.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
135.	180	Nilgiri	1.20	8.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
136.	181	Nilgiri	1.25	7.50	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
137.	182	Nilgiri	1.45	5.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
138.	189	Nilgiri	1.80	7.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
139.	190	Nilgiri	2.20	5.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and hence the tree cannot be

					retained. The tree is matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
140.	192	Seeme thangadi	0.45	2.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is with defective (decay symptoms) and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
141.	193	Nilgiri	1.50	3.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
142.	194	Nilgiri	2.20	4.50	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
143.	195	Nilgiri	1.00	4.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
144.	196	Nilgiri	1.90	5.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
145.	197	Nilgiri	1.00	4.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
146.	198	Nilgiri	1.50	2.50	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.

147.	199	Nilgiri	1.50	2.50	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
148.	200	Nilgiri	1.00	2.00	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
149.	201	Nilgiri	1.80	4.50	The tree is standing within the standard width of the carriage way proposed for widening and hence the tree cannot be retained. The tree is matured and do not qualify for translocation. The tree is recommended for felling.
Total trees for felling = 149 Nos.					


Tree Officer &

Deputy Conservator of Forests
BBMP, Bangalore.