


No.Ft.48-4071/2020(FCA)
H.P.Forest Department.

Dated Shimla-1, the 16 SEP 2021



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

To:CCF Shimla

Subject:- Diversion of 4.5338 ha of forest land in favour of HPPWD for the construction of road from Bijamal to Halau via Shallan GP Halau Kms 0/0 to 7/0 Kms, within the jurisdiction of Chopal Forest Division Distt Shimla, HP.

Memo:-

Kindly refer to your office letter No.C-28-b-1603/FCA(Online)/Chopal 12.8.2021 on the subject cited above.

2. The proposal received has been found incomplete. The following short has been noticed in the proposal which is to be completed. Proposal folders received returned herewith. All the requisite documents may please be placed in the proposal with proper numbering and index.

1. Check list has not been countersigned by CCF concerned at P.No.7.
2. Details of forest are requirement Check list Sr. No.6 placed at P.Nos.23-25, in signing by DFO concerned, have been countersigned by DFO concerned.
3. Although KML file of the proposed road has been uploaded against column N but the alternate alignments examined have not been shown in the KML file.
4. The contents of justification are not correct. Diversion has been applied for 4 of forest land whereas in the justification, 5.7615 ha forest land is required for construction of road, has been mentioned.
5. In FRA certificate also the forest area 5.7367 ha has been mentioned instead of 4.5338 ha of forest land.
6. Although certificate showing the distance of the proposed road from the protected area and its eco-sensitive zone has been uploaded in online part-I and in hard copy folder at P.No.159, but the it is not clear in the requisite certificate whether the distance is an aerial distance or otherwise. It is required to be mentioned clearly in the requisite certificate that this distance is an aerial distance. Further, the forest area mentioned 5.7367 ha instead of 4.5338 ha in the requisite certificate.
7. Working plan prescription has not been mentioned in online part-II, against the column No.5, meant for Working plan prescription.
8. Against column No.4(i), the density of vegetation 0.06 and eco class-V has been mentioned and in the bill of NPV has also 0.06 and eco class-V has been mentioned whereas the rate of eco class -VI been levied in the bill of NPV. The bill of NPV is required to be calculated as per density and eco class of the forest land proposed for diversion.
9. The scientific names of all the trees have not been mentioned against column No.6 in online part-II. In online part-II, for all the trees involved 'Others' has been mentioned. If the scientific name of all the trees involved is not appearing in the bill of NPV module, the scientific names of all the trees should be mentioned within the bill of NPV against the column of local name of the trees.

SALE
✓
17/9