

**कार्यालय अपर प्रमुख वन संरक्षक एवं नोडल अधिकारी, वन संरक्षण,
इन्दिरानगर फॉरेस्ट कालोनी, उत्तराखण्ड, देहरादून।**

सेवा में,

अपर प्रमुख वन संरक्षक (केन्द्रीय),
भारत सरकार,
पर्यावरण, वन एवं जलवायु परिवर्तन मंत्रालय,
क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय, 25-सुभाष रोड़,
देहरादून।

विषय:-जनपद-बागेश्वर के विकसखण्ड कपकोट में पैठान दारसिंह नाथीसेरा से भन्तोला तक 9.5 किमी० मोटर मार्ग के निर्माण हेतु। **FP/UK/ROAD/15682/2015**

महोदय,

विषयांकित प्रकरण के सम्बन्ध में उप वन संरक्षक, उत्तरी कुमाऊँ वृत्त, अल्मोड़ा, से प्राप्त आख्या के क्रम में प्रयोक्ता एजेन्सी द्वारा प्रेषित बिन्दुवार सूचना निम्न प्रकार प्रेषित की जा रही है :-

क्र०सं०	प्रश्न	उत्तर
1	Short narrative of the project in online part I do not give an adequate information.	Short narrative details of the projects filled at section A-1(iii) in Form A Part I by user agency.
2	Authority letter is not issued for the applicant in part I.	Authority letter of the proposal uploaded at section A-3 (xvii) in Form A Part I by userAgency.
3	Proceedings of village level committee (VLC) meetings pertaining to villages Natishera and Bhantola is not provided with the FRA certificate.	FRA and village level committee meeting certificate attached in part I at section K(a) by user agency.
4	In the village wise breakup of the villages Haroli is not mentioned while it enlisted among the village to be benefited by the road, it is also not justified that only three villages are enlisted in the list to be benefited from the road and on the other hand only two village to be benefited from the road mentioned by CF in his recommendation in online part II but the village wise breakup given details of four villages. the State Govt, may rectify the information in all segment and give correct detail for the same with proper justification if required.	User agency has filled that Haroli village shown in village wise breakup at section B-2.3 in Form A Part I by user agency.
5	The component wise breakup does not show area marked for muck disposal and other componenet like bridge in online part I. The State Govt. may upload/provided the correct details in online part I.	Component wise breakup include muck disposal as filled at section B-2.4 in Form A Part I by user agency.
6	The State Govt has provided/uploaded the scanned copy of GIS software generated geo referenced digital map in google earth map which is not acceptacle. the State Govt may provide/upload the correct map showing geo coordinates at 200 to 300m interval along the alignment including all turning points on exact to the scale and ensure the uploading of correct uploaded in part I.	The revised new GIS software generated geo-refernced digital map showing geo-coordinates to the exact scale of the proposed road at 200-300m including all turns are uploaded at section C in Form A Part I by user agency.

7	The geo referenced digital map of area proposed for CA uploaded is not acceptable for the purpose as provided without mentioning geo coordinates for all corners. the State Govt may provide/upload GIS software generated digital map of the area proposed for CA providing geo coordinates at all corner points in shape (polygon/closed area) file. the google earth map will not be accepted for the purpose.	GIS map uploaded at section L-(v) in Form A Part I by user agency.
8	The SOI Toposheet map locating area proposed for CA is not uploaded in part I the Map uploaded in this column is Google earth map the State Govt may upload the correct file.	SOI toposheet for CA uploaded at section L-iv in Form A Part I by user agency.
9	Copy of map indicating location of alternative examined is not uploaded in the designated place in part I.	User agency mentioned that there is no alternative route.
10	Justification of locating the projects in forest land uploaded in part I is not satisfactory, The State govt may upload revised justification in the designated column.	Revised Justification uploaded at section D in Form A part I by user agency.
11	125 trees per ha does not account for 0.2 density the State Govt may revise the density accordingly in online part II.	Revised Density be corrected in part II by DFO.
12	In the Site inspection report by DFO. is incomplete as the point 5.2, 5.3, 5.4 and 5.5, are not answered by the DFO, the same may be rectified and corrected SIR may upload in the designated place in online part II.	Corrected SIR report has been enclosed in online Form A part II by DFO.
13	In the muck disposal plan it is not clear that the place identified for the disposal of muck during the construction is in forest area or in private land. If the area marked for muck dumping is in area which attracts provisions of FCA, 1980 then the State govt. may clarify that whether this area included in the area proposed for diversion or not. If not then revised proposal after addition of this area may be submitted to this office along with all necessary revised documents/information.	User agency mentioned that Now all the muck disposal will be carried out in non forest Nap land. the previously shown location which are situated in forest area are removed and whole of the muck is disposed of in Nap land therefore, no need to revise the proposal certificate of the same is now uploaded and attached at designated place.

भवदीय,

(विनोद कुमार)

अपर प्रमुख वन संरक्षक एवं नोडल अधिकारी