कार्यालय प्रभागीय वनाधिकारी, कन्नौज वन प्रभाग, कन्नौज। पत्रांक (857/14-1 दिनांक 20 मई, 2017

सेवा में,

मुख्य वन संरक्षक

कानपुर मण्डल कानपुर।

विषय:-

Diversion of 21.6 ha. protected forest land with felling of 1.554 numbers of trees for widening and strengthing of Chibramau-Saurikh-Bidhuna Road (MDR 13) from Km 0.000 Km 31.000 in kannauj District, UP-reg.

सन्दर्भ:-

आपका पत्रांक 4083 / 14-1 दिनांक 19.04.2017

महोदय,

उपरोक्त विषयक एवं सन्दर्भित पत्र के अनुपालन में छिबरामऊ—सौरिख—बिधूना मार्ग (एम0डी0आर0 13) फोरलेन चौड़ीकरण एवं सुदृढ़ीकरण प्रसताव में लगायी गई आपित्तयों का निराकरण कर प्रस्ताव पुनः आपकी सेवा में प्रेषित है:—

Sl.	Objection	Refutation
1	The kml file of diverted forest land has not been provided in CD. The uploaded lml file show ashift and does not exactly show the proposed forest land. The	Corrected KML file of diverted forest land is uploaded nad CD is attached with file
2	same needs revision. The geo referenced map uploaded for proposed forest land diversion lacks geo coordinates of all key points.	Geo referenced map with geo key coordinates is uploaded and attached with file.
3	The uploaded topo sheets showing proposed forest land diversion is in complete and proposed forest land is shown on beyond the boundaries of topo sheet.	Corrected topo sheets of showing proposed forest land for diversion is attached.
4	Land schedule uploaded as additional document of part I is without details of balance RoW or forestland after accounting proposed forest land diversion.	land schedule with balance is uploaded and attached with file.
5	The proposal is without enumeration of polesize crop.	Pole size crop is not available.
6	The Compensatory Afforetatrion (CA) entimates uploaded and CA estimate provided in hard copy are at variance. The uploaded CA estimate includes abstract of plantation on vacant space and on divider also.	uploaded estimates of Compensatory Afforetatrion (CA) has been connected accordance with CA estimate provided in hard copy.
7	These two additional compensatory Afforestation (CA) estimates are without due vetting from the State Government.	
8	The hard copy of proposal does not contain filled up part V (recommendation of the State Government).	
9	The recommendation of DFO for the proposal has not been uploaded at Sr No. 16 of the part II.	
10	The benefit cost analysis enclosed with the proposal is not as per FCA guidelines and needs revision.	The Cost. benefit analysis submitted FCA guidelines.

भवदीय

(आर्0कें0) सिंह) प्रभागीय वन्नधिकारी नौज वन प्रभाग, कन्नौज