


Clarification for the queries raised by Chief Conservator of Forests

Query No -1: In the site inspection report, it is mentioned that the proposed site is nor RF-
Clarify:

Clarification: It is to submit that, due to typographical error, a wrong sentence has got pasted in 2nd para of the site inspection report. Infact, the proposed area is a part of reserved forest. Hence, in 2nd para of the site inspection report, the sentence " **Further, the area does not form a part of any reserve forest, national park, wild life sanctuary, biosphere reserve and tiger reserve or elephant corridor.** However, since the area is in the sea coast, it comes under the CRZ regulations " Should be read as "**Further, the area does not form a part of any national park, wild life sanctuary, biosphere reserve and tiger reserve of elephant corridor**". This error has already been eliminated in the hard copy of the site inspection report submitted through offline

Query No- 2: In Sl.No.13 of Part II CA details do not match with the area proposed for Diversion - Clarify:

Clarification: It is submit that the area proposed for diversion is less than 1.00 ha and as per sec.3.2 (vii) (b) of Forest Conservation Act 1980, for the projects that require less than 1ha. forest, Compensatory afforestation shall not be insisted, and hence, the user agency has not identified area for Compensatory afforestation. Butin online system, filing of CA area details is must(even though, CA is not mandatory for public utility projects requiring less than 1.00 ha forest area) and without which, the process of filling the form can not be completed. Hence, for the sake of online filing formality, a dummy area of 1.00 acre is uploaded as compensatory afforestation area and the same is mentioned in the site inspection report and certificate of CA land filed through both online and off line.


Deputy Conservator of Forests,
Mangalore Division, Mangalore