

shortcomings still observed in the online reply.

1. Convert CA details in-(L) g, [user agency - to other].
2. Please upload ownership proof , Mou and non encumbrance certificate and at section L (iv)-f,g,h in form A, Part I.
3. Cost benefit analysis (C/B) uploaded in Part I is not as per prescribed format VI (b) and VI(c) in the guideline. The State Govt may provide C/B analysis as per prescribed format should be quantified in monetary terms.
4. The village wise break up shows that the road passed from the area of four villages but in the village level committee proceedings of FRA certificate only one gram panchayat is mentioned. The State Govt may comment on the same and if required provide VLC proceedings for other gram sabhas also.
5. Component wise break up in online Part I does not indicate the area details marked for other components like muck disposal etc.
6. The CA stipulation against total forest area diverted in the district is not commensurate. The State Govt may do necessary correction or justify the differences with factual reasons.
7. The details of trees proposed to be felled provided in hard copy, it is seen that the counting of trees done in 7m width in few compartments. As the width of the road proposed for diversion is 9m therefore the revised tree enumeration taking 9m width may provide and correct the same in online Part II.
8. In the muck disposal plan it is not clear that the area marked for muck disposal in the area other than the private land is included in the forest land proposed for diversion. The revised land schedule may be provided clarifying the same.
9. The NPV calculated at the rate prescribed for very dense forest while 77 trees per hectare does not account for very dense forest category. The State Govt is also categorised the forest in Eco class III which seems inappropriate as per species of the area concern. The State Govt may review the Eco class and NPV rate and provide/upload the revised information to this office.

....Nodal office, Dehradun....