

No.Ft.48-5297/2021(FCA)
H.P.Forest Department.

Dated Shimla-1, the

16 APR 2022

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

Subject:- Diversion of 211.8427 ha of forest land in favour of NHPC Ltd, NHPC Office complex Sector 33, Faridabad, Haryana, for the construction of Dugar Hydro Electric Project (500.00MW) HEP within the jurisdiction of Pangi Forest Division distt Chamba, HP.

Memo:-

Kindly refer to your office letter No.D-V dated 30.3.2022 on the subject cited above. P-14

2. The proposal received has been found incomplete. The following shortcoming has been noticed in the proposal which is 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 is estimated cost mentioned in online part-I and mentioned in hard copy of part-I. Against column No.A-1(vii) of online part-I, 392043 lacs has been mentioned and against column No.A(6) in hard copy of part-I at P.No.10, the cost of the project 3393.21 lac has been mentioned. The estimated cost mentioned in online part-I and mentioned in hard copy of part-I should match.
2. There is difference is the detail of non forest land mentioned against column No.A-1(ix) and mentioned against column No.A-9, in the hard copy of part-I, at P.No.10.In online part-I, the non forest land 11.79ha has been mentioned and in hard copy of part-I, at P.No.10, the non forest land 8.78ha has been mentioned.
3. Against column No.B-2.3 in online part-I, although the detail of village wise break up has been given but the total of non forest land is non tallying with the total non forest area requirement. In village-wise break-up the detail of non forest land 8.78 ha has been mentioned whereas 11.79 ha non forest land has been proposed in the present proposal. The total of village wise breakup should tally with the total forest /non forest area requirement.
4. There is difference in employment likely to be generated, mentioned against column No.E in online part-I and given in hard copy of the proposal. Against column No.E(ii), '80' and against E(iii), '1000', has been mentioned, whereas in hard copy of part-I against column No.E(1)(a)(ii), 1000 during pre-construction activity and 2500 during construction period has been mentioned. The details of employment generation mentioned in online part-I and hard copy of part-I should tally.
5. Although cost benefit analysis has been uploaded but has not been signed by DFO concerned. In the hard copy also, the cost benefit analysis placed at P.No.177-181 has not been signed by the DFO concerned. Signed copies are required to be uploaded and placed in the proposal folder.

PTO

6. Although FRA certificate has been uploaded against K(i). But only FRA certificate in original has been uploaded and all the proceedings are photocopies. As per GoI instructions the FRA certificate in original alongwith all the proceedings district level, SDM Level and village level proceedings if not in original duly attested by the issuing department is required to be uploaded against this column No.K(i).
7. Against column No.5 of online part-II, instead of uploading the working plan prescription of the forest land proposed for diversion, the detail of the proposed Duger HEP has been mentioned. Against this column the working plan prescription of the forest land proposed for diversion is required to be mentioned.
8. Against column No.4(i) to (iv), total 11617 have been mentioned, whereas as per abstract of trees placed in the hard copy of the proposal folder, an abstract of 20777 trees has been placed. The total trees involved in the proposed project are required to be mentioned on the portal which should tally with the abstract and enumeration lists placed in the proposal folders.
9. As per details mentioned against column No.13, CA has been proposed in 13 patches and KML files of all the patches have also been uploaded. Out of 13 patches, the KML files uploaded against Sr. Nos, 2,4 and 9 are not correct. Hence revised KML files of these patches are required to be uploaded. Further, the area of KML file uploaded at Sr. No.13, is not tallying with the forest area proposed for CA. The area of patch has been mentioned 21.28 ha but while calculating the area of patch, it is coming 20.3 ha instead of 21.28 ha. Revised KML file is required to be uploaded at Sr. No.13.
10. CA schemes are required to be prepared patch wise. For total forest area only one CA scheme has been prepared.
11. NPV has not been calculated on revised rates.
12. There is difference in District profile mentioned in online part-II and in hard copy of part-II. District profile is required to be corrected in hard copy as well as in online part-II.
13. Density of vegetation of proposed CA areas is required to be specified in CA site suitability certificate.
14. All the documents placed in the proposal folder either should be original or attested one. Photocopies placed in the proposal folder should be attested either by user agency or DFO concerned.
15. As per GoI instructions the PDF of all the documents of hard copy of the proposal folder is required to be uploaded in online part-I or II.
16. In view of observation raised at Sr. No.8 above, the details of number of trees mentioned against column No.7(vii) is required to be corrected.
17. Muck dumping site involves 1525 trees. Possibility of locating muck dumping site in private land or treeless forest land is required to be explored.

Encl:-As above.

Nodal Officer-cum-APCCF (FCA),
O/o Pr. CCF (HoFF), H.P.Shimla-1

Endst. No. Ft. 48-5297/2021 (FCA)

Dated Shimla-1, the

16 APR 2022

Copy is forwarded to the following for information and necessary action.

1. DFO Pangi.
2. General Manager, Dugar HEP, H.P.

Nodal Officer-cum-APCCF (FCA),
O/o Pr. CCF (HoFF), H.P.Shimla-1

[Signature]
6/4/2022

*16/1/2022 to 16/4/2022 DFO Pangi
by proposal folder
24
FCA NTPC
14.2.2022*