

**Name: District- Bageshwar-Dewaldhar-Maithan-Leti-Girechhina MR**

The Following objection dated -20-04-2017 yet not rectified by CF/DFO/User agency, Please rectified in Designated place of online part I and Part II. And also provide the answer of the following shortcoming in same languages.

**....Nodal office, Dehradun....**

| REPLY   | EDS   | Sl. No |
|---|---|--------|
| Authority letter dated uploaded at section A-1 (part I) by user agency.   | Authority letter still not uploaded by the user agency.     | 2.70   |
| Technical map uploaded at section C (part I) by user agency.  | Technical map uploaded but the same is not approved by DFO. | 2.71   |
| V.L.C. proceeding message certified attached with I.R.A. confirmed uploaded at section A in form A-1 part I by user agency. | V.L.C. the message of message I have not uploaded.          | 2.72   |
| Final copy of the proposal has been sent.   | Final hard copy of the proposal still not received.         | 2.73   |

(Signature)  
Nodal office, Dehradun

**Dewaldhar-Maithan-Leti-Girechhina MR in District-Bageshwar (6.9975 ha)**

The reply of this office EDS dated 10.08.2016 has been submitted by the Addl. PCCF & Nodal Officer vide letter dated 03.04.2017 uploaded on 07.04.2017. Following shortcomings still remain in the reply/proposal:-

1. In reply to point no.6 of EDS, it is mentioned that the revised cost benefit analysis has been uploaded at para-G (a) but it is seen from the documents uploaded that the monetary figures given in Annexure-VI (b) i.e. parameters for evaluation of loss of forests and Annexure-VI (c) i.e. parameters for evaluation of benefits notwithstanding loss of forests do not tally with the monetary figures given in the cost benefit ratio calculation sheet. This discrepancy in the monetary figures is required to be removed by the State Government.
2. In reply to point no.7 of EDS, it is mentioned that the justification for locating the project in the forest land has been uploaded in Part-I but the document has not been found uploaded at para-D (i) instead a google earth map showing the proposed road has been uploaded at para-D- (i). Justification has been found uploaded as additional document in Part-I. State Govt. is requested to upload the justification at designated place in Part-I online.
3. In reply to point no. 10 of EDS, it is mentioned that the CA scheme for 13.995 ha has been uploaded but the CA scheme has not been found uploaded at para- 13 (vii) of online Part-II. However, the CA scheme for 13.995 ha has been found uploaded at S.No. 17 of additional documents in Part-I. Moreover, the geo referenced digital map and the map in Survey of India toposheet showing CA area uploaded at para-13 (ii) & (iii) of Part-II are different from the maps uploaded at para-L of online Part-I. State Govt. may upload the CA scheme and the correct maps at designated places in online Part-II.
4. The forest land proposed for diversion comes to 6.9975 ha but the area of forest land is mentioned as 6.9915 ha by the DC in the FRA certificate. State Govt. may submit the FRA certificate after mentioning the correct area.
5. It is seen from the muck dumping plan that the muck is proposed to be disposed of at 5 sites in RF land and 3 sites in State Land but this land has not been included in the forest land proposed for diversion. State Govt. may clarify this discrepancy and submit revised proposal after including the forest land required for muck disposal, if necessary.
6. It is seen from DSS analysis of the proposed CA area that this land overlaps with the CA land proposed against proposal no. FP/UK/ROAD/10143/2015, FP/UK/ROAD/12464/2015 & FP/UK/ROAD/11032/2015. The State Govt. may review the position and change the CA area and submit all necessary documents for the new area to be proposed for CA.
7. The no. of trees per hectare comes to 42 trees and the density is mentioned as 0.3 which does not appear to be correct. Moreover, NPV rate has been charged for the dense forest category @ of 8.45 lakh per hectare in Eco class- V which is not correct rate keeping in view the density of 0.3 (open forest). State Govt. may reviewed the density and the NPV rate to be charged and submit revised NPV calculation mentioning density, eco class & rate etc.
8. It is seen from the data given in para-14 i.e. the district profile that the progress of CA (1315.278 ha) is equivalent to the CA stipulated (1315.278 ha). State Govt. may confirm the data.
9. State Govt. may submit original copies of the geo referenced digital map of the proposed road as well as the land proposed for CA for placing in the hard copy of the proposal.

State Government is requested to remove the above shortcomings and submit revised information/documents/clarifications so that further action is taken in the matter at the earliest.