

No.Ft.48-3489/2016(FCA)
H.P.Forest Department.

Dated Shimla-1, the

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

To:-CCF Nahan.

Subject:- Diversion of 0.327 ha of forest land in favour of HPPWD for the construction of Link road from village Bhogpur Simbalwala km 0/0 to 3/440(Portion 1/730 to 2/120 and 3/285 to 3/440 i.e.0.545 Kms within the jurisdiction of Nahan Forest Division Distt Sirmour, HP.

Memo:-

Kindly refer to your office letter No.C-X-19/Nahan/9489 dated 12.03.2020, on the subject cited above.

2. The proposal received has been found incomplete. The following shortcomings have been noticed in the proposal which are to be completed. The proposal folders received are also returned herewith for necessary corrections. All the requisite documents may please be placed in the proposal folder with proper numbering and index.

W.D. Against column No.B-2.3, village-wise breakup has not been given. But as per GoI instructions dated 01.08.2019, a certificate (providing detail of villages benefitted) duly authenticated by competent revenue authority may also be submitted and uploaded in online part-I, as an essential document with the proposal on the prescribed format as under:

Sr.No.	Name of the village	Village code	Population
1			

- FD
2. Against column No.C(iii) and (C(iv), although map on toposheet and digital map of the forest land proposed for diversion have been uploaded but have not been countersigned by the DFO concerned. As per latest instructions of GoI, map duly signed by the user agency and countersigned by DFO concerned are required to be uploaded.
 3. Against column No.D(i), the justification for locating the project over forest land has been uploaded but has not been countersigned by DFO concerned. Justification signed by the user agency and countersigned by DFO concerned is required to be uploaded.
 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(i), 'No', has been mentioned whereas in hard copy of part-I against column No.1(vi), 'Approx. mandays will be generated' has been mentioned but the number of mandays have not been mentioned. The employment details given in online part-I and placed in hard copy should match. Further it is clarified that employment details whether it is permanent or temporary are required to be mentioned against column No.E(i) as well as in hard copy of the proposal folder. Necessary corrections are required to be made in the employment details in hard copy as well as in online part-I of the proposal.

5. Against column No.K(i), although FRA certificate alongwith all the proceedings has been uploaded but all are the photocopies. As per latest GoI instructions, FRA certificate in original alongwith copies of all the proceedings duly attested by the issuing department are required to be uploaded against this column and placed in the hard copy of the folder which is to be submitted to GoI. Presently in hard copy of the folder, photocopy of FRA certificate attested by XEN concerned has been placed.
6. Against column No.I(i), 'No', has been mentioned. As per latest instructions of GoI, in case of "No", the distance from the protected area or their Eco sensitive zone is required to be obtained from DFO concerned for uploading against additional information details.
7. Undertakings to pay the cost of CA, NPV addl. NPV have although been uploaded but have not been signed by DFO concerned although the stamp of DFO concerned has been affixed for countersignature.
8. There is difference in density of vegetation mentioned in online part-II and in hard copy of part-II. In online part-II against column No.4(i), the density of vegetation 0.2 has been mentioned whereas in hard copy of part-II, against column No.7(vi), 0.06 has been mentioned. The density of vegetation mentioned in online part-II and in hard copy should match.
9. Instead of mentioning the working plan prescription of the forest land proposed for diversion, it has been mentioned that 'Failed portion to be taken up for plantation and soil conservation works are also required' has been mentioned. The working plan prescription for the proposed forest land is required to be mentioned against this column.
10. CA has been proposed over 2.89 ha of forest land but while calculating the area of CA in KML file it is coming 3.15 ha instead of 2.89 ha.
11. There is difference in District profile mentioned in online part-II and hard copy of part-II. Against the stipulation of 638.0964ha of CA, the progress 652.8596 ha of CA has been shown. Further, the progress of CA has been mentioned upto 21.12.2016 in hard copy and in online part-II, the progress of CA upto 26.11.2017 has been given. The update progress is required to be given in both in online as well as in hard copy of the proposal.
12. In the site inspection report of DFO concerned uploaded in online part-II and placed in hard copy of the proposal, against the column Nos 4 & 5, NA has been mentioned. The information in respect of these columns should be in Yes or No. Further nothing has been mentioned/marked against column No.6(a) of site inspection report.
13. Against the column of recommendations of DFO concerned instead of uploading the hard copy of part-II, copy of site inspection report has been uploaded. Now it can not be uploaded because as per portal once the recommendations have been uploaded cannot be uploaded again.
14. No dates have been mentioned in hard copy of part-I,II and III.

Encl:-As above.

Nodal Officer Cum-Addl. Pr.CCF(FCA)HP

18 MAR 2020

Endst.No.Ft.48-3489/2016 (FCA) Dated Shimla-1, the
Copy is forwarded to the following for information & necessary action as above.

- ✓ 1. DFO Nahan.
- ✓ 2. Executive Engineer, HPPWD Division Nahan, District Sirmour, HP.

Nodal Officer Cum-Addl. Pr.CCF(FCA)HP

Endst. No.

9707

Dated

23/03/2020

Copy along with its proposal folders (in triplicate) is forwarded to DFO Nahan for further action.