


Diversion of 0.2728 ha of forest land in favour of HPPWD for the construction of Link road to Ansara Loharli Kms 0/0 to 4/140 , within the jurisdiction of Hamirpur Forest Division Distt Hamirpur, HP.

The following shortcomings are to be attended:

1. Estimated cost of the proposed road has although been mentioned against column No.A-1(vii) of online part-I but has not been mentioned against column No.1(iii) in hard copy of part-I. In online part-I, 195 lac have been mentioned and in hard copy, estimated cost has not been mentioned.
2. Against column No.E(ii), '1300' and against E(iii), '15090', has been mentioned in online part-I whereas in hard copy of part-I against column No.1(vi), nothing has been mentioned. The employment details given in online part-I and placed in hard copy should match. Necessary corrections are required to be made in the employment details in online as well as in hard copy.
3. As per latest instructions of GoI, the maps, digital and map on toposheet in online part-I, duly signed by User agency and DFO concerned are required to be uploaded. Presently these maps have only been signed by UA.
4. Against column No.K(i), although FRA certificate of 0.4292 ha has been uploaded but the village level committee proceedings uploaded are the photocopies. As per GoI instructions against this column the complete FRA certificate in original alongwith all the proceedings of district level committee, SDM Level committee and Village level committee, if not in original duly attested by the issuing department are required to be uploaded.
5. Instead of mentioning the working plan prescription of the forest land proposed for diversion, it has been mentioned that 'The forest land involved in the case is designated as UPF Badoi C1 in the Working Plan of Hamirpur Forest Division' has been mentioned. The working plan prescription for the proposed forest land is required to be mentioned against this column.
6. There is violation in the present proposal but in hard copy of part-II, 'No' has been mentioned whereas in online part-II, detail of violation has been mentioned and in the detail of violation, the period of work done(year), '12' has been mentioned whereas in the report of joint inspection committee placed at P.No.53-54 of the proposal folder, the date of starting work, 2007 has been mentioned. The date of starting work mentioned in online part-II and mentioned in the report of the committee should match.
7. The contents mentioned against column No.6(a) in site inspection report are not proper. Revised site inspection report of DFO is required to be submitted/uploaded in online part-II.

  
Nodal Officer cum-AP CCF (FCA)  
O/O Pr. CCF, H P. Shimla