



कार्यालय- प्रभागीय वनाधिकारी, तराई केन्द्रीय वन प्रभाग, हल्द्वानी

तिकाोनिया वन परिसर, हल्द्वानी, नैनीताल, उत्तराखण्ड।

फोन व फैक्स - 05946 220186, ई-मेल dfotaraicentral@rediffmail.com

पत्रांक सं० 47 /12-1(2) हल्द्वानी

दिनांक 4 जुलाई, 2015

सेवा में,

निदेशक
कृषि उत्पादन मण्डी समिति,
हल्द्वानी, जनपद नैनीताल।

विषय : वन भूमि हस्तान्तरण।

संदर्भ : भारत सरकार पर्यावरण, वन एवं जलवायु परिवर्तन मंत्रालय, पिरियसन रोड, वन अनुसंधान संस्थान परिसर, देहरादून के पत्र सं० 8बी/यू.सी.पी./09/05/2015 /एफ.सी./259 दिनांक 13.05.2015

महोदय,

उपरोक्त विषयक क्रम में अवगत कराना है कि भारत सरकार पर्यावरण, वन एवं जलवायु परिवर्तन मंत्रालय के उक्त संदर्भित पत्र (संलग्न) में दी गयी आपत्तियों का अपने स्तर से निराकरण करने का कष्ट करें, आपत्तियों का निराकरण करने के उपरान्त प्रस्ताव को अधोहस्ताक्षरी कार्यालय में भेजने/अपलोड करने की कृपा करें, ताकि उक्त प्रस्ताव उच्च स्तर को प्रेषित किया जा सके।

संलग्न - उपरोक्तानुसार।

भवदीय,

(सनावन)

प्रभागीय वनाधिकारी
तराई केन्द्रीय वन प्रभाग, हल्द्वानी



भारत सरकार
पर्यावरण, वन एवं जलवायु परिवर्तन मंत्रालय
क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय,
पियर्सन रोड,
वन अनुसंधान संस्थान परिसर,
पो03010 न्यू फॉरेस्ट, देहरादून-248006
दूरभाष: 0135-2750809,
ईमेल/Email - moef.ddn@gmail.com

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT,
FORESTS & CLIMATE CHANGE,
REGIONAL OFFICE,
Pearson Road, FRI Campus,
P.O. New Forest, Dehradun - 248006
Phone: 0135-2750809

पत्र सं0 8बी/यूसी.पी/09/05/2015/एफ.सी./259

दिनांक: 13.05.2015

सेवा में,

अपर प्रमुख वन संरक्षक एवं मोडल अधिकारी
वन संरक्षण, इन्दिरानगर फॉरेस्ट, कालोनी,
उत्तराखण्ड, देहरादून।

विषय: जनपद-नैनीताल में कृषि उत्पादन मण्डी समिति इन्हानी का विस्तारोत्तरण हेतु 10.0035 हे0 वन भूमि का मण्डी समिति को 30 वर्षों की लीज पर दिया जाने का प्रत्यावर्तन।

सन्दर्भ: अपर सचिव, उत्तराखण्ड शासन, उत्तराखण्ड का पत्रांक-122/X-4-15/2(14)/2015 दिनांक: 17.03.2015

Sir,

I am to refer to the letter mentioned above and to convey that on scrutiny of the proposal, following shortcomings have been found:

- 1- In para-2 of Part-I, purposive break up of total land required is not given by the user Agency (UA). In addition, through in para-4 of Part-I, it is mentioned that clearance under EPA is not required, UA has to intimate the total proposed built up area in order to assess if EC is required for the project.
- 2- The layout plan only provides information on no. of various kinds of structures proposed to be built but does not provide component wise area, which may be given now.
- 3- In para-1 of Part-I, brief description of the project with justification for locating the project in forest area has not been provided.
- 4- In the Cost benefit analysis, the parameters for evaluation of loss of forest (Annexure-vi(c)) have not been quantified and expressed in monetary terms.
- 5- The density is mentioned as 10-40% but either average density be given in one figure or stratified density may be given i.e density and area of each density segment if there is substantial variation in density from place to place within the area proposed for diversion.
- 6- After reviewing density, NPV calculation is also required to be reviewed. The NPV rates charged do not appear to be commensurate to the density.

- 7- Since the area comes be under Elephant Corridor, the comments of CWLW (Chief wild life Warden) may be provided.
 - 8- The figures/data given in para-12 of Part-II are confusing. These may be reviewed by the State Govt. and clear position intimated.
 - 9- Details about alternative examined and reasons for rejection are not provided.
 - 10- It is seen from the Google Map of the CA area than the area is covered by dense vegetation, hence may not be suitable for CA. Selection of area proposed for CA is required to be reviewed by the State Govt. and if same area is selected, density of this area may be reported.
 - 11- The logic behind the proposal for plantation over 10.00 ha (20,000 Seedlings) in the vacant space around is not understood.
 - 12- This is a non-site specific activity for which 10 ha reserve forest has been proposed for diversion involving felling of 500 trees. Why can't this be established on non-forest land.
 - 13- It is mentioned in one of the documents that the area is proposed to be taken on lease for 30 years but this aspect has not been reflected/included by the State Govt. elsewhere in the proposal. In case the area is proposed to be assigned on Lease, this may be clearly indicated in the title of the proposal and in Part I of the proposal.
 - 14- The area mentioned in the online proposal is 10.0035 ha but in Part-I&II it is shown as 10 ha and the administrative approval issued for 10.00 ha area. Need to be corrected.
 - 15- The proceedings of the District Level Committee meeting have not been submitted with the FRA Certificate issued by District collector, which may be submitted now.
- You are requested to submit revised documents/information/clarifications as mentioned above. Further action will be taken on receipt of above documents/information/clarification.

Yours faithfully,

(Ajay Kumar)
Addl. PCCF

1. The Principal Secretary (Forests), Govt. of Uttarakhand, Subhash Road, Deharadun.
- ✓ 2. Officer Order Pad.

13.5.2015
(Ajay Kumar)
Addl. PCCF

