कार्यालय प्रभागीय वनाधिकारी, चम्पावत वन प्रभाग चम्पावत Email-dfo_chamawat_uta@yahoo.co.in

847

सेवा में,

वन संरक्षक उत्तरी कुमाऊँ वृत्त, उत्तराखण्ड, अल्मोड़ा।

विषय:-

जनपद चम्पावत में नरसिंह डांडा से भगीना भण्डारी मोटर मार्ग निर्माण प्रस्ताव स0

18336 / 2016 की आपत्ति के सम्बन्ध में।

संदर्भ:-

आपका ई०डी०एस० का दिनांक 21.10.2019

महोदय.

उपरोक्त विषयक आपके संदर्भित आपत्ति के कम में प्रस्तावत विभाग से प्राप्त आख्या आधार पर वांछित सूचना / आख्या निम्न प्रकार प्रेषित हैं:-

क्र. संख्या	आपत्तियां	निराकरण
01	correct detail of user agency at para A-2(i) of Part I.	PSUs in different district of State under rura development department.
i i r r	at para con Part I. The end point of the	benefitted habitation village as well as othe important places i.e school ,nearest marke ,health centreshas been uploaded at para C or Part I.A Separate Justification has been uploaded in additional details in online part-1 regarding
n Fu sh	t is mentioned in the VLC proceedings held under FRA that the Voint meeting of Gram PanchayatBhagina Bhandari, GP Barpas Production of Garkot was held on 28.11.2015 but the proceedings has not been signed by gram Pradhan of Garkot and BarpasGps. Turther, the date is mentioned as 20.11.2015 in the attendance neets i.e. prior to the date of meeting which is not in order. That is a second content of the date of meeting which is not in order. That is a second content of the date of meeting which is not in order.	LC proceedings under FRA with sign of Gram radhan of Garkot and Barpas has been bloaded in order at para K or part I.

04	The gco-coordinates of the proposed CA area i.e. Sulla Civil (6.84 ha) given in the Soltoposheet map uploaded at para-L (vi) of the Para-I and para-13 (iii) of Part II do not match with the geo-coordinates given in the geo referenced map uploaded at para-L (V) of Part I and para13 (ii) of Part II. In addition, the location of proposed CA site given in this Soltoposheet is different from the location given in in an another Soltoposheet map uploaded at S. No. 3 of additional documents in Part I, geo-coordinates of which match with the geo-referenced map. State Government may remove this discrepancy and submit/upload the revised documents in regard.
05	The alternate alignment examined has been shown in the initial one third part of the proposed road only in the map uploaded at para-D (ii) of Part I. State Government may submit clarification in this regard. प्रस्तावक ने अपने व्याक संव ukz/pmgsy/71 date 09-09-2020 से नोडल कार्यालय को प्रेषित की गयी है। Discrepancy has been removed from the kml as well as in the uploaded maps. Submitted in hard copy also
06	It is seen from the land schedule that the RoW of 9.00 m has been taken into consideration for calculation of forest as well as private land but it does not match with the 7.00 m width (RoW) mentioned in prarup-16 provided with the Hard Copy. State Government may clarify this discrepancy in the RoW.
07	In view of point No. 6 above, the forest land proposed for diversion (3.42 Ha) does not match with the area given in the component wise breakup at para-B 2.4 of Part I. In component wise breakup 0.76 has of forest land is earmarked for muck disposal sites, hence the total forest land required for the diversion comes to 4.18 ha instead of 3.42 ha. State Government may submit clarification and provide the correct data in this regard.
8	In the hard copy of enumeration list of tress, the total is mentioned as 168 tress instead of 167 trees. The trees falling in diameter class of 0-10 cm have not been counted which is required. State Government may provide/ upload the list of trees including the trees falling in 0-10 dia class. There is 47 trees falling under 0-10 cm and list has been revised and uploaded in online part-1 as well as in online part-II and submitted in original. Hence total no of tress in enumeration list (167+47=214).
9	The density of vegetation, NPV rate and amount of NPV uploaded in Part I and Part II is different from the data given in NPV details provided with the hard copy. State Government and part-II. may clarify this discrepancy.
	It is seen that 7 no. of muck disposal sites have been mentioned in muck disposal plan but only 6 sites have been shown in the maps submitted with the hard copy and those uploaded in Part I. State Government may clarify this discrepancy.
9	t is seen from data given in para 14 of Part II that the CA stipulated (1573.25 ha) is not commensurate to the forest land diverted (896.9834 ha). State Government may provide correct

	data at para 14, Part II online in district profile.	
12	Name of the road is incorrect in the recommendation (Part V) of the State Government. State Government may provide the recommendation of State Government for this project.	Government (Part V) by the State
13	State Government may remove above shortcomings and submit revised documents/ information/ clarification and upload the information/ documents, wherever required.	Shortcomings and revis documents/information/clarification has been submitted in original.

ō .

more justified, some governors and acquire conficiency of con-

भवदीय

चम्पावत वन प्रभाग चम्पावत