**Regd Parcel**

No.Ft.48-4019/2020(FCA)
H.P.Forest Department.

Dated Shimla-1, the 18 FEB 2021

From: Nodal Officer-cum-APCCF(FCA)
O/O Pr. CCF, H P (HoFF)

To:-CCF Rampur.

**Subject:-** **Diversion of 7.3722 ha of Addl.forest land in favour of Himachal Pradesh Power Corporation Ltd. for the construction of Shongtong Karchhan HEP450 MW due to enhancement in the existing capacity of HEP 402 to 450 MW and due to change in the river course during flood and usage of already diverted dumping site used by BRO within the jurisdiction of Kinnaur Forest Division distt Kinnaur, HP.**

P-9

**Memo:-**

Kindly refer to your office letter No.FCA-1(Kinnaur)/6011 dated 2.2.2021 on the subject cited above.

2. The proposal received has been found incomplete. The following shortcomings have been noticed in the proposal which are to be completed. Proposal folders received are returned herewith. All the requisite documents may please be placed in the proposal folder with proper numbering and index.

1. There is difference in estimated cost of the project mentioned against column No.A-1(vii) of online part-I and mentioned against column No.1(iii) in hard copy of part-I. The estimated cost of the project should tally as mentioned in hard copy and in online part-1.
2. Against column No.K(i), 'Yes', has been mentioned and FRA certificate has also been uploaded, but instead of uploading the original FRA certificate alongwith all the proceedings, photocopy of FRA has been found uploaded. As per GoI instructions, original FRA certificate alongwith all the proceedings if not in original, duly attested by the issuing department is required to be uploaded against column No.K(i).In both the proposal folder photocopy of FRA has been placed. Atleast in one of the proposal folder, original copy of FRA certificate alongwith all the proceedings is required to be placed.
3. Against column No.I(i), 'No', has been mentioned. As per latest instructions of GoI, in case of "No", the distance from the protected area or their Eco sensitive zone is required to be obtained from DFO concerned for uploading against additional information details in online part-I.
4. There is difference in the density of vegetation mentioned in online part-II and mentioned in hard copy of part-II. In online part-II, against column No.4(i), '0.3' has been mentioned whereas in hard copy against column No.7(vi), '2.79 or say 3, has been mentioned. The density mentioned in online and hard copy should match and the density of vegetation is required to be mentioned in decimal unit as has been mentioned in online part-II.
5. As per enumeration lists of trees placed in the hard copy of proposal folder only 53 trees are standing over the forest land proposed for diversion whereas in online part-II against column No.4(ii), 112 trees have been shown. Thus there is difference in number of trees mentioned in online part-II and in hard copy of part-II. It is not clear how much number of trees are involved in the present proposal. Total number of trees involved in the proposal is required to be mentioned in online part-II and should match with the enumeration lists of the trees placed in the proposal folder. Further enumeration lists have not been signed by the DFO concerned.

PTO

6. Scientific name of all the trees have neither been mentioned in online part-II nor in hard copy of part-II. If the scientific name of all the trees are not in the dropdown menu, the scientific name of all the trees are to be mentioned within bracket with the local name of the trees. General abstract of all the trees coming in the proposed project alongwith scientific names duly signed by the DFO concerned is required to be placed in the proposal folder.
7. Against column No.8 (i), instead of reporting the wild life present in and around the forest land proposed for diversion, 'No wildlife or National Park is present in the vicinity of proposed land' has been mentioned against this column. The wild life present in and around the forest land proposed for diversion is required to be mentioned against this column.
8. Against column No.11, in online part-II, 'Yes', has been mentioned, whereas against column No.11(i)(a) and (b), of online part-II, no details have been mentioned. Further, in hard copy of part-II, against column No.9, 'No', has been mentioned. Revised part-II, with correct details is to be placed in hard copy.
9. Against column No.12 of online part-II, 'Yes' has been mentioned. Why the work has not been stopped?
10. CA scheme uploaded against column No.13(ii) in online part-II and placed in the proposal folder is on the current wage rates.Revised CA scheme on current wage rates of 2020-21 is required to be prepared for uploading in online part-II and placing in hard copy of part-II.
11. One of the digital maps of the CA site, uploaded against column No.13(iii) has not been signed by DFO concerned.
12. As per latest instructions of GoI, also endorsed to all CFs/CCFs, the PDF of hard copy of proposal folder is also required to be uploaded in online part-I, by the user agency. The user agency be advised to upload the same after necessary corrections are made in the proposal folder.

Encl:-2 proposal folders.

Nodal Officer-cum-Addl.Pr.CCF(FCA),
O/o Pr.CCF(HoFF) HP Shimla-1.

No. Ft.48-4019/2019(FCA)Dated Shimla-1,the 18 FEB 2021

Copy is forwarded to the following for information & necessary action as above.

1. DFO Kinnaur.
2. Senior Manager, STKHEP,HPPCL, Recongpeo,Distt Kinnaur,HP.

18/02/2021

Nodal Officer Cum-Addl. Pr.CCF(FCA)HP
O/o Pr.CCF(HoFF) HP Shimla-1

18/2/2021