# OFFICE OF THE PCCF (HOFF), RAJASTHAN, JAIPUR

F 14( )/2017/FCA/PCCF/ 3623 Date: 25.9.18

To

Secretary (Forest),
Government of Rajasthan,
Jaipur.

Sub :- Diversion of 4.1 Ha. of forest land in favour of PWD PMGSY-WB Division Shahpura (Bhilwara, Rajasthan) for construction of BT Road from Bijolia to Chatrikheda under Rajasthan Road Sector Modernization Project FP/RJ/ROAD/20893/2016

Ref : - APCCF (Central ) & Regional Officer GOI Lucknow letter no 8B/Raj/06/18/2018/FC/143 dated 31-5-2018.

Dear Sir,

With reference to above mentioned subject compliance of APCCF (Central) & Regional Officer GOI Lucknow letter no 8B/Raj/06/18/2018/FC/143 Dated 31.5.2018 based on information provided by CCF/DCF/UA is submitted.

| S.N. | Observation | Compliance |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | As per GIS DSS Analysis :<br>1. KML file in CD along with hard copy have not been submitted in the form of CD with the proposal.<br>2. Geo coordinates of proposed forest land for diversion on page 26 are not legible.<br>3. The kml file of proposed forest land for diversion and geo referenced map are not matching.<br>4. Original topo sheets for proposed forest land for diversion and compensatory afforestation have not been submitted with the proposal.<br>5. The map of proposed compensatory afforestation provided on page no 59 of the project proposal is without Geo grid. | As per DCF reply:<br>1. KML file in CD along with hard copy is enclosed.<br>2. Legible geo coordinates on geo referenced map is enclosed.<br>3. Revised KML file and DGPS map uploaded and hard copy is enclosed.<br>4. Original topo sheets for proposed forest land for diversion and compensatory afforestation is submitted with the proposal.<br>5. Revised map of proposed compensatory afforestation with Geo grid is uploaded in part I and hard copy is enclosed. |
| 2 | A. The proposal for new road has not been justified on the basis of minimum forest land requirement. Justification note mentions that aligment of existing cart road has been followed which is incorrect and needs justification on the basis of minimum forest land requirement. Minimum three aligment are to be analysised prior to finalization of aligment. | A. User agency enclosed justification of requirement of minimum forest land. Copy of justification is enclosed.<br>B. The aligment of proposed road has been followed by existing cart road. So that there is no need of three aligment. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | B. Copy of map showing alternatives examined (uploaded at D (a) part I ) is without details. | |
| 3 | Document and certificate provided under FRA 2006, uploaded online as well as in hard copy have following shortcomings:<br>a. All documents of four villages have not been submitted.<br>b. As per submitted documents of village level 9.0 ha. Forest land is proposed where as proposal is for 4.1 ha.<br>c. The certificate issued by the DM is without the name of all four villages, extent of diversion is mentioned as 5.5 ha. And without seal.<br>d. Most of the papers are Xerox copies. | a. All documents of four villages have been submitted online as well as in hard copy.<br>b. Previously ROW for road has been taken 15 meter but it revised to 10 meter i.e. the proposed forest area is revised. Revised certificate of 4.1 ha. from DM is enclosed.<br>c. Revised FRA certificate of 4.1 ha. from DM is enclosed.<br>d. Authenticated documents are uploaded and attached. |
| 5 | a. Land schedule is based on requirement of ROW width 10 meter whereas cross section uploaded mentions varying requirement of width from 9 to 10 meter.<br>b. Requirement of forest land shall be calculated chain age wise which will be depend on height of the embakment. | a. Revised cross section is uploaded and submitted in hard copy.<br>b. Chain age wise area calculation sheet is enclosed and uploaded in part I of the proposal. |
| 6 | Unauthantic revenue maps have been uploaded with the proposal which do not surve any purpose. | Authanticated revenue maps have been uploaded with the proposal. |
| 7 | a. Assesment of crown density as 0.1 is significantely less as 299 no of tree exist in a patch of 4.1 ha. Of forest land. Uploaded part II mentions crown density 0.1-0.4.<br>b. Online enumeration list contain re values in 0-30 cms girth class which is absured.<br>c. The proposal is without enumeration of pole crop. | A. As per DCF there is 0.3 is crown density Iin the proposed forest land Correction is made in part II.<br>B. Correction in part II is made.<br>C. There is no pole crop in the proposal. |
| 8 | Working plan prescription for proposed forest land for diversion at sr no 5 part II is mentioned as NIL. The relevant information needs submission. | Working plan prescription for proposed forest land for diversion at sr no 5 part II is mentioned. |
| 9 | Site suitability certificate of CA patch has not been submitted | Site suitability certificate of CA patch has been uploaded and submitted. |
| 10 | Site Inspection Report of concerned DCF is without mentioning legal status of proposed forest land for diversion. | Revised Site Inspection Report by DCF mentioning legal status is uploaded in part II. Hard copy is enclosed |
| 11 | NPV estimation will change and will be based on revised crown density. | Crown density is revised. NPV estimation is submitted as per crown |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | density. |
| 12 | Most of documents provided with the proposal are without seal of signing authority. | Documents provided with the proposal are with seal of signing authority is enclosed. |

Enclosed: As above

Your's sincerely

(A.K. Singh)
APCCF Protection &
Nodal Officer FCA
Rajasthan, Jaipur
Tel: 0141-2713760 M - 9414045146

**F 14( )/2017/FCA/PCCF/** **Date:**

Copy forwarded for:

1- APCCF (Central), Government of India, MOEF & CC Regional Office, Central Zone, Pancham Tal,Central Bhavan, Sector H, Aliganj, Lucknow.
2- CCF Ajmer
3- DCF Bhilwara
4- Executive Engineer, PWD, PMGSY, Shahpura, Bhilwara

APCCF Protection &
Nodal Officer FCA
Rajasthan, Jaipur