

1. Total period for which the land proposed to be diverted is not mentioned in online Part I.
2. The authority letter is not issued in favour of Mr Kundan Lal Verma for whom details are filled in online Part I.
3. The total of area in village wise break up comes 3.19 ha while the area proposed for diversion is 3.22 ha. It is mentioned in other details of villages to be benefited that there are 7 numbers of villages to be benefited but in village wise break up 8 numbers of villages are mentioned. The State Govt may do the necessary correction in online Part I.
4. In the geo referenced digital map of the area proposed for diversion, uploaded at C (iv) Part I online, geo coordinates are shown at very few points. May provide/upload scanned copy of GIS software generated geo referenced digital map to the exact scale of the proposed road showing geo coordinates at 200 to 300 m interval along the alignment including all turning points.
5. The digital map of area proposed for CA is provided does not serve the purpose. May provide/upload GIS software generated geo referenced digital map of the area proposed for CA providing geo coordinates at all corner points in shape (polygon/closed area) file. The area should be exclusively marked of area proposed for CA i.e. 6.44 ha, not the whole land bank of 8.372 ha. The State Govt may revise the KML file accordingly and upload the revise KML file for the area 6.44 ha in online Part I.
6. If this project involve boundary of seven or eight villages as mentioned in the list of villages to be benefited and village wise break up provided with the proposal then proceedings of village level committee (VLC) meeting pertaining to other villages may also be furnished with the FRA certificate.
7. The copy of FRA certificate uploaded is issued on dated 12-1-2015 while the proceeding of district level committee (DLC) meeting signed on 16-1-2015. Procedurally the FRA certificate issued after DLC meeting. The State Govt may also mention the area and name of the project in the DLC proceeding and upload the documents in correct sequence in this column in online Part I.
8. The CA scheme provided with the proposal is for area 6.40 ha while it should be for double the area proposed for diversion i.e. 6.44 ha area. The State Govt may provide revised CA scheme.
9. The area having 0.4 density as mentioned in Part II, but 86 trees per hectare do not account for 0.4 density and also not account for dense forest for which the State Govt had calculated the NPV. State Govt may correct the density and calculation of NPV.
10. The same copy of document is uploaded against MoU signed between user agency and present owner, ownership proof and non encumbrances certificate for the forest land in Part I. The State Govt may upload the correct required document in the place.
11. The financial and administrative approval for the road is of 20 km while only 16 km road is proposed for diversion. The State Govt may clarify that is there any future extension of this alignment is needed? if yes, then the proposal may revise for the whole sanctioned length i.e.20 km.
12. Working plan prescription is not provided in online Part II for reserved forest area involved in the proposed diversion.

पत्रिका संख्या / 12-1 / दिनांक 20-7-2016
 जिला जल संवर्धन विभाग, अरमोड़ा
 की अध्यक्षता एवं उपरोक्त विभागों का निरीक्षण निराकरण
 कार्य प्रस्ताव को संतोषजनक माना गया है।
 प्रशासकीय अधिकारी,
 अरमोड़ा वन विभाग, अरमोड़ा