

Ministry of Environment and Forests

Wildlife Division

Minutes of the 28th Meeting of the Standing Committee of National Board for Wildlife held on 20th March 2013 in Paryavaran Bhawan, CGO Complex, Lodhi Road, New Delhi.

The 28th Meeting of the Standing Committee of National Board for Wildlife (NBWL) was held on 20th March 2013 in the Ministry of Environment and Forests (MoEF), New Delhi. The meeting was convened under the chairmanship of the Secretary (E&F) since Hon'ble Minister of State (Independent Charge) for Environment and Forests was indisposed and had orally authorized the Secretary (E&F) to chair the meeting on her behalf. The members unanimously agreed for nomination of the Secretary (E&F) for chairing the 28th Meeting. The list of participants is at **Annexure-1**.

The agenda items were then opened for discussion.

Agenda No. 1:

1A. Confirmation of the minutes of the 26th Meeting of Standing Committee of National Board for Wildlife held on 31st October 2012.

The Member-Secretary informed the committee that the draft minutes of the 26th Meeting of Standing Committee of NBWL, held on 31.10.2012 were circulated to the members on 21st November 2012 for their comments within two weeks as decided in the 24th Meeting of the Standing Committee. The comments that were received were appropriately incorporated in the minutes and the final minutes were circulated to all members on 20th December 2012 . No further comments have been received on the final minutes.

The Committee unanimously confirmed the minutes of 26th Meeting of Standing Committee of NBWL, held on 31.10.2012.

1B. Confirmation of the minutes of the 27th Meeting of Standing Committee of National Board for Wildlife held on 12th December 2012.

The Member Secretary informed the Committee that the minutes of the 27th Meeting of Standing Committee of NBWL, held on 12.12.2012 were circulated to the members on 24th January 2013. Comments on the final minutes were received from Ms. Prerna Bindra and Shri Kishor Rithe, members, Standing Committee of NBWL.

The chairman opined that minutes reflect the essence of the discussions and decisions taken during the meeting and need not necessarily be verbatim of the discussions. He suggested that the comments may be taken as noted in the minutes of the 28th meeting. This was agreed to by the members.

The comments received from Ms. Prerna Bindra and Shri Kishor Rithe are appended.

Agenda No. 2: Action Taken Report

The Member Secretary presented the actions taken on the decisions in the 26th and 27th Meetings held on 31st October and 12th December 2012.

Item 2[4(2)]: Proposal seeking permission for control of fencing and patrol road along the Indo-Bangladesh Border in Dampa Tiger Reserve, Mizoram.

The Member-Secretary informed the Committee that during the 27th Meeting of the Standing Committee of NBWL, the chairperson had advised the BSF that a meeting may be convened with the Additional Director General of Forests (WL) and State Government of Mizoram regarding the conditions stipulated by the site inspection team in their report, to resolve the matter and based on the discussions, the matter could be referred to the State Board for Wildlife for their re-consideration. He added that in pursuance to this decision, a meeting was convened on 14th January 2013 under his chairmanship. He also apprised the Committee that BSF had agreed for additional fence inwards, as suggested by the Standing Committee and BSF was advised to submit revised proposal to the State Government of Mizoram seeking recommendation of the State Board for Wildlife.

Dr M.K. Ranjitsinh observed that the proposed inner fence was smaller and had fewer strands than the outer (border) fence and suggested that the inner fence proposed should also be equally strong, 32 feet rather than single line fence, as has been proposed now. He desired that his opinion should be communicated to the State Board for Wildlife as well.

Dr A.J.T Johnsingh opined that the inner fence behind the post should be enough to ensure separation of the tiger reserve from the patrol tracks without causing much negative impact on wildlife.

The Member Secretary informed that the revised proposal of BSF had been sent for the consideration of the State Board for Wildlife and once the response of the State Board for Wildlife on the revised proposal is received, the Standing Committee could consider it.

The committee agreed to the suggestion of the Member Secretary and decided to await the response of the State Board for Wildlife for its further consideration.

Item 4.1 (2): Diversion of 79.474 ha of forest land in Kutch Desert Wildlife Sanctuary and Wild Ass Sanctuary for construction of Gaduli to Hajipur-Odma-Khavda-Kunariya-Dholavira-Maovana-Gadakbet-Santalpur road.

The Member Secretary informed the Committee that this proposal was discussed in the meeting held on 14th January 2013 under his chairmanship to consider the Dampa issue. The BSF was requested to submit a revised proposal for consideration of the Standing Committee, which was awaited.

The DIG, (Border Roads) made a brief presentation on the proposed revised alignment of the road. He said that as per the revised alignment, a de-tour of 32 kms with minimum impact on flamingo's habitat has been suggested and that there would be culverts every 20 kms and they would come back to the Standing Committee with the revised proposal.

Ms. Prerna Bindra mentioned that the members were opposed to the proposal totally, since it was having a serious impact on the wildlife of the fragile Kutch region.

Dr M.K. Ranjitsinh was of the opinion that it was not the question of adverse impact on flamingoes alone, but also on other biodiversity in the region. He added that the Shravan Kavadia mangrove area, which is unique being far away from the coast, would be affected and therefore, needs to be protected. He suggested that the road should be taken further south of the present proposal outside of the Great Rann Sanctuary to ensure that the area is maintained in an un-fragmented state.

The committee, thereafter, decided that the revised proposal should also consider all the observations made by the members and submit a revised proposal for consideration of the Standing Committee of NBWL.

Item 5.2 to 5.14:

- 5.2. Construction and Upgradation of 2.5 km. road from Khatola to Kisli, M.P.**
- 5.3. Construction and Upgradation of 2.6 km Road from 14 km off T-2 to Mukki, M.P.**
- 5.4. Construction and Upgradation of 5.13 km Road from Rajomal to Manoharpur, M.P.**
- 5.5. Construction of Stop dam cum Causeway on Rehti- Tendukheda Road at Km 82/2, M.P.**
- 5.6. Construction and Upgradation of 6 km Tendukheda- Taradehi- Sarra to Kudpura Approach Road, M.P.**
- 5.7. Approach road from Somkheda to Hinouti – Ramgarh, M.P.**
- 5.8. Construction and Upgradation of 4.20 km of Bamhori to Kotkheda Road, M.P.**
- 5.9. Construction of MDR to Mokla Road, M.P.**
- 5.10. Construction of 14.20 km road for NH-12, 7 km. to Malkuhi Jhilpani Dhana, M.P.**
- 5.11. Construction of 4.73 km Somkheda-Suhela Approach Road, M.P.**
- 5.12. Upgradation of 8.55 km road from Bineka to Borpani, M.P.**
- 5.13. Widening of State Highway 59 from Indore to Gujrat Border, M.P.**
- 5.14. Upgradation of Bhiapur to Amchhekala Dam Road, M.P.**

The Member-Secretary informed the committee that a site inspection was to be conducted by Ms. Prerna Bindra, Dr Madhusudan and representative of NTCA.

Ms. Prerna Bindra informed that the site inspection would be conducted soon and report would be submitted for consideration of the committee. The committee unanimously agreed to this.

Item 4.1 (12): Proposal for rehabilitation and upgradation of NH-69 to 'lane configuration' in Obaidullahganj to Betul Section passing through Ratapani Sanctuary, Madhya Pradesh

The Member Secretary informed the committee that site inspection has been conducted and the report was to be considered by the Technical Committee of NTCA.

The Member-Secretary, NTCA informed that the report has been placed before the Technical Committee of NTCA and the recommendations suggested in the site inspection report have been approved by the Technical Committee of NTCA.

Dr A.J.T Johnsingh opined that any road passing through wildlife sanctuaries and national parks should only be 2-lane and a policy in this regard needs to be adopted by the Central Government. Dr Kishor Rithe also endorsed the views of Dr Johnsingh on this matter.

After discussions, it was decided that within the wildlife sanctuary, additional width should not be permitted. Proposal was recommended with conditions that the following action points be taken up, as has been recommended in the site inspection report:

- (i) *Identification and documentation of the movement paths, denning/resting sites, watering spots, etc. being used by the tigers and other wildlife will be undertaken along the stretch of NH-69, that passes through the Sanctuary with particular focus on the stretch in between the coordinates 22° 54' 8.40" N, 77° 39' 15.36" E and 22° 51' 14.13" N, 77° 39' 15.36" E. The study must be got carried out at the earliest by the Wildlife Institute of India or other competent authority in partnership with the Wildlife Wing of the Madhya Pradesh Forest Department.*
- (ii) *Existing two lane NH-69 may be repaired with the following conditions, so as to facilitate smoother movement of traffic on the highway:*
 - (a) *All repair work must be carried out within daylight hours, between sunrise and sunset.*
 - (b) *No labour camps may be set up within the area of the sanctuary*
 - (c) *Workers must stick to the highway and not enter the forest*
 - (d) *No firewood, water or other forest produce should be collected by the workers for repair works.*
 - (e) *No garbage, rubble, etc. shall be deposited within the limits of the Sanctuary, either within the forest or besides the highway.*
 - (f) *Movement and usage of heavy machinery is to be minimized. Noise to be kept at minimum decibels.*
- (iii) *In the 1 km wide wildlife passage already identified by site inspection team of NBWL, and those identified additionally by the Wildlife Institute of India, if any, rumblers and speed breakers at intervals of 200 m from each other, or other such appropriate distance as identified by the Wildlife Institute of India must be built, in order to slow down the traffic to avoid wildlife road kills. Appropriate mitigation measures must be adopted, after preparing a mitigation plan with the help of WII, at the cost of the user agency.*

- (iv) *Culverts along the highway must be preserved. Measures need to be taken to prevent water logging in them during the monsoons, to allow animals space to cross over during monsoons, allow more light in, and to allow better vegetation.*
- (v) *Speed limit should be restricted to 30 km/hr on the 12.44 km stretch passing through the Sanctuary, all through the Protected Areas parking and littering, sounding of horns, etc should not be permitted, as practiced on highways passing through Bandipur Tiger Reserve, Nagarhole Tiger Reserve, etc in the State of Karnataka.*
- (vi) *Clear signboards should be put up frequently to indicate these and offenders must be fined. Concerned Range Officers must be given this responsibility.*
- (vii) *Frequent speed breakers must be constructed along the 12.44 km stretch of NH-69 that passes through the Ratapani Sanctuary. Identified wildlife crossing points should be especially taken into account in this regard.*
- (viii) *Patrolling and monitoring by forest staff must increase along the highway and attempts must be made to identify more wildlife crossing points. Those already identified must be thoroughly monitored. Wildlife orientation of field staff is necessary.*
- (ix) *Notification of Ratapani Tiger Reserve be expedited for more focused wildlife management and conservation of tiger.*
- (x) *The Chief Wildlife Warden submit a report on the implementation of the conditions for the road repair to the Standing Committee of NBWL. The permission granted by Standing Committee of NBWL may be put up for review after a period of 18 months to two years, for mid term corrective measures, if any.*
- (xi) *The Singhori Sanctuary, to the north east of Ratapani Sanctuary, may be considered as part of the buffer area of the proposed Ratapani Tiger Reserve.*

Item 4.2(1): Proposal for diversion of 477.03 ha of forest land in Kondapuram RF of Paloncha Division for Kondapuram underground coal mine by Singareni Collieries Company Limited, Andhra Pradesh.

The Member-Secretary informed the committee that the site inspection was completed by the NTCA and the proposal was awaiting response from the Technical Committee of NTCA.

The Member-Secretary, NTCA informed that the officers of NTCA had visited the site and have recommended the proposal subject to certain conditions. The Technical Committee had approved the recommendations indicated in the report of the site inspection team.

The committee recommended the proposal subject to the following conditions, as suggested by the site inspection team:

- i. *Kondapuram underground mine shall never be converted to open cast mine after the reserves extractable from the underground mine become exhausted.*
- ii. *A detailed management plan for the entire landscape between Pakhal Wildlife Sanctuary, Kinnarsani and Papikonda National Park shall be prepared and recommendations implemented immediately.*

- iii. *The funds received from SCCL in lieu of operation of Kondapuram underground mine, shall be used for the above planning and implementation.*
- iv. *Effective measures to minimize pollution especially of the water resources, erosion and particulate pollution must be strengthened by SSCL in its existing and proposed mining operations so as to minimize further damage to the environment.*

Action Taken Report on the decisions of the Standing Committee of NBWL taken in its 24th Meeting held on 13.12.2011

Item 2.1 (1 and 2): Framing of Rules for the functioning of the Standing Committee of NBWL and Mechanism to ensure implementation of conditions stipulated by the Standing Committee while approving proposals.

The Member-Secretary informed the committee that the sub-committee under the chairmanship of Dr M.K. Ranjitsinh had finalized their draft report and had been circulated to the members of the Standing Committee of NBWL. A copy of the draft report was also circulated to the members during the meeting.

Dr M.K. Ranjitsinh mentioned that the sub-committee had altogether seven meetings, the last one was held on 6th March 2013 and had finalized the draft rules and procedures. He desired that it would be better to convene a separate meeting, exclusively to discuss this draft, and other similar issues, so as to make the draft more cogent.

The committee supported the proposal to convene a separate meeting for discussing the draft rules and procedure.

Item 2.1 (5): Implementation Protocol on Critical Wildlife Habitats to be approved by the Standing Committee.

The Member-Secretary informed the committee that comments on the draft protocol had been received from the Ministry of Tribal Affairs along with the suggestions of the National Advisory Council and these were circulated to the members for their perusal. He also added that a comprehensive draft protocol has been prepared which is under consideration of Hon'ble Minister of State (Independent Charge) for Environment and Forests. He also elaborated that once the draft note is approved, it would be circulated amongst the members of Standing Committee of NBWL and would be taken up for discussion.

Shri Kishor Rithe mentioned that in the last meeting of Standing Committee of NBWL, it was decided to convene a separate meeting to discuss the draft protocol, however, the meeting had not been convened yet. He urged the Ministry to convene the meeting at an early date.

Dr. Ranjitsinh suggested that a separate meeting be convened to discuss the draft protocol and the draft rules of procedure of the SC.

Member Secretary assured to circulate the revised draft protocol, as soon as it is approved to the members of Standing Committee before convening the meeting

3.1: Proposals that were placed for consideration in the 23rd Meeting of the Standing Committee of NBWL held on 14th October 2011 but could not be discussed due to paucity of time.

1. Proposal for construction of Baglinga M.I. project at Baglinga in Chikhaldara Taluka in Amravati District of Maharashtra.

The Member-Secretary informed the committee that in pursuance to the decision taken by the Standing Committee of NBWL in its 25th meeting held on 13th June 2012, site inspection was conducted by Shri Kishor Rithe and the report received was circulated to the members.

Shri Kishor Rithe explained the salient features contained in the site inspection report. He mentioned that this proposal was different from the irrigation project at Chikkaldara, which was earlier rejected by the Expert Appraisal Committee for River valley projects. He said that he had recommended the proposal subject to certain conditions.

The chairman requested the Chief Wildlife Warden, Maharashtra to comment on the site inspection report.

The Chief Wildlife Warden, Maharashtra, mentioned that he had gone through the report of the site inspection team and was in agreement with the conditions suggested in the site inspection report.

The committee recommended the proposal subject to the following conditions, as suggested in the site inspection report:

- i. This proposal should be strictly treated as Minor Irrigation project as per the project proposal and should not be used for any other project like hydel etc which may impact the Melghat Tiger Reserve.*
- ii. The project proponent has promised that for soil and moisture conservation works in the catchment area, 2% of the project cost will be provided by the Water Resources Department. This money should be deposited with the Melghat Tiger Conservation Foundation.*
- iii. The Water Resources Department should also provide technical expertise to Melghat Tiger Reserve to develop stream based water resources around villages in buffer area of MTR to minimise the biotic pressure (by domestic livestock and people) on tiger habitat.*
- iv. As most of the affected tribal families are marginal land holders, project proponent should pay due compensation mainly to secure their agriculture based livelihood and ensure that the project or the land acquisition process for the project should not lead to encourage/force tribal to do encroachment on forest land around their village or in the catchment of the project.*

- v. *JFM committees have been established at Ramtek, Vastapur, Malakapur, Badanapur and Hardamal which are in the command area to draw the benefits from this project. They also need to appreciate the fact that project could come up only after sacrificing the forest land and hence they need to participate proactively in conservation of forest around their villages as well as in the catchment area of this project. Specially forest department/ MTR Buffer administration need to educate them about this aspect through JFMC/EDC.*
- vi. *The project authority has provided land in lieu of the project land in Achalpur Tahsil to be transferred to Forest Department. The Superintending Engineer was also agreed to hand over one abandoned irrigation colony for village relocation from core area of MTR. Project proponent should furnish more information on this to Field Director, MTR.*
- vii. *If government promote any activity like fishing in the M.I. tank, the permission should be granted to only local EDC/JFMC in consultation with Field Director, MTR.*
- viii. *The letter expressing opinion of PCCF(Wildlife) attached to project proposal has mentioned that the proposal to declare Rajmachi (Thane,Pune,Alibag), Tipagarh (Gadchiroli), Sudhagarh-Tamni (Western Ghat) have been sent to the state Government. The notification process should be expedited.*

Action Taken on the decisions of the 27th meeting of the Standing Committee held on 12.12.2012.

2.1.1(4). Proposal for setting up of 2x660 MW coal fired based Thermal Power Plant at Lakhisarai District, Bihar. (The project area is 3 km away from the sanctuary)

The Member-Secretary informed the committee that the proposal was placed for consideration in its 26th meeting held on 31st October 2012 but could not be discussed. The matter was again placed for consideration in its 27th meeting held on 12th December 2012 wherein again it was deferred since the representative of State Government was not present .

In this context, Ms Prerna Bindra pointed out that it would be prudent to know the proposed ESZ of the sanctuary.

Mr Kishor Rithe mentioned that the proposal is about a thermal plant and is just 3 km from the Sanctuary and therefore, was not acceptable.

Dr M.D. Madhusudan mentioned that the members had not received the copy of the proposal and therefore, considered opinion cannot be provided at this time.

The chairman mentioned that the environmental clearance for the project has been received and the Expert Appraisal Committee (EAC) would have had considered the merits and de-merits of the case and the committee may abide by the EAC recommendations. He explained that the EAC looks into zone of influence based on the locality factors such as wind direction, to decide on environmental impact and take decisions accordingly. Existence of a wildlife area in the vicinity is taken very seriously by EAC in their appraisal.

The Committee, after discussions, decided to await environmental clearance for the proposal.

(Note of the Ministry: *The Member Secretary clarified that the above proposal was listed in the agenda for the 26th meeting of Standing Committee of NBWL held on 31st October 2012. Copies of the project proposals, received from the State Governments, including this proposal, were forwarded to all the members prior to the 26th meeting.*)

2.1.1 (10) Proposal for River Bed Mining of Sand Bajri and Boulders (Minor Minerals), Lease area 12.06 ha at Lot No. 9, River-Solani, village-Thapal Ismailpur, Tehsil-Behat, District- Saharanpur, Uttar Pradesh.

Discussed along with the following 11 proposals included under agenda item 4 (fresh proposals):

1. **Proposal for River Bed Mining of Sand Bajri and Boulders (Minor Mineral), Lease area 13.36 ha at Lot No. 29, River-Solani, Village- Badshahpur, Tehsil-Behat, District-Saharanpur, Uttar Pradesh.**
2. **Proposal for River Bed Mining of Sand Bajri and Boulders (Minor Mineral), Lease area 10.32 ha at Lot No. 30, River-Solani, Village-Khushhalipur, Tehsil-Behat, District Saharanpur, Uttar Pradesh.**
3. **Proposal for River Bed Mining of Sand Bajri and Boulders (Minor Mineral), Lease area 18.75 ha at Lot No. 31, River-Solani, Village-Khushhalipur, Tehsil-Behat, District-Saharanpur, Uttar Pradesh.**
4. **Proposal for River Bed Mining of Sand Bajri and Boulders (Minor Mineral), Lease area 6.48 ha at Lot No. 33, River-Kaluwala Rao Village- Kaluwala Jahanpur (Dakshin), Tehsil-Behat, District-Saharanpur, Uttar Pradesh.**
5. **Proposal for river bed mining of sand, Bajri & Boulders, Lease Area-8.91 ha at lot no.28, River Solani, Behat, Saharanpur, U.P.**
6. **Proposal for river bed mining of sand, bajri & boulders, lease area-5.59 ha., at lot no.-25, River-Kaluwala Rao, Behat, Saharanpur, U.P.**
7. **Proposal for river bed mining of sand, bajri and boulders, lease area-7.69 ha., at lot no.-24, river-Kaluwala Rao, village-Jyantipur Bans, Tehsil-Behat, Saharanpur, U.P.**
8. **Proposal for River Bed Mining of Sand Bajri and Boulders (Minor Mineral), Lease area 6.25 ha at Lot No. 15, River-Shahjahanpur Rao, Village-Fatehpur Pelon, Tehsil-Behat, District-Saharanpur, Uttar Pradesh.**
9. **Proposal for River Bed Mining of Sand Bajri and Boulders (Minor Mineral), Lease area 6.85 ha at Lot No. 12, River-Lalo, Village-Ganeshpur, Tehsil-Behat, District-Saharanpur, Uttar Pradesh.**
10. **Proposal for River Bed Mining of Sand Bajri and Boulders (Minor Mineral), Lease area 7.00 ha at Lot No. 11, River-Lalo, Village- Thapal Ismailpur, Tehsil-Behat, District-Saharanpur, Uttar Pradesh.**
11. **Proposal for River Bed Mining of Sand Bajri and Boulders (Minor Mineral), Lease area 12.15 ha at Lot No. 10, River-Lalo, Village-Thapal Ismailpur, Tehsil-Behat, District-Saharanpur, Uttar Pradesh.**

The Member Secretary informed that in pursuance of the decision of the Standing Committee of NBWL, the site inspection was conducted and report received was circulated amongst the members.

Shri Kishor Rithe mentioned that the proposal was considered on the plea that it was for the benefit of local people and would provide employment opportunities to them. However, the proposal merits close examination because of their proximity to Rajaji National Park (RNP) and their location in the Shivalik Elephant Reserve(ER). Accordingly, the site inspection team have recommended only two proposals out of twelve. He informed that the site inspection team had interacted with the local communities. He further added that there were ample evidences of wildlife movement in the area and only the two proposals, which are recommended, are furthest in distance from RNP (9.5 Km) as well as RER (5.1 & 5 Km) among 12 proposals that committee has considered. They are also recommended only to ensure domestic needs of local people though there are more mining proposals presently under consideration, and can satisfy local domestic need, but does not come to SC-NBWL as they do not come within 10 km from RNP. The rest of the proposals did not merit consideration. There are 400-600 crushers operating in the river bed which are actually putting pressure to have such more mines in the area. He informed that most of the local people were against the activity as it caused inconvenience to people living in the locality. The most important factor that was considered while analyzing the proposal was the movement of wild elephants.

A short video clipping showing the local people's sentiments against these projects and stating that they do not get any employment out of them and actually causes human-wildlife conflict was also shown to the members.

Dr A.J.T Johnsingh mentioned that continuing mining in this area will be an ecological disaster to all and one cannot allow this to continue to happen. Such mining would have a devastating impact on the wildlife.

Ms. Prerna Bindra mentioned that it was apparent that the local villagers were intimidated by the miners---. She said that media reports and other information received during site visit had indicated illegal mining across the region. She further said that the mining was changing the ecology of the river, and had restricted the movement of elephants causing human-elephant conflict, a fact also voiced by the local people. They stated they were not in favour of mining, and preferred to seek employment in nearby towns like Dehradun and Saharanpur.

The Chief Wildlife Warden, Uttarakhand was requested for his comments on the recommendations of the site inspection team. The Chief Wildlife Warden, Uttarakhand mentioned that he was in agreement with the recommendations of the team that the area was part of the Shivalik Elephant habitats. The Chief Wildlife Warden, Uttar Pradesh also agreed to the suggestions made by site inspection team.

The Committee, thereafter agreed to go by the recommendation of the site inspection team and recommended the following proposals subject to the conditions mentioned below them:

- (i) **Proposal for river bed mining of sand, bajri and boulders, lease area-7.69 ha., at lot no.-24, river-Kaluwala Rao, village-Jayantipur Bans, Tehsil-Behat, Saharanpur, U.P.**

(ii) Proposal for river bed mining of sand, bajri & boulders, lease area-5.59 ha., at lot no.-25, River-Kaluwala Rao, Behat, Saharanpur, U.P.

Conditions:

- i. *Mining of minor minerals at two sites (lot number 24 and 25) to be carried out only under and approved framework of mining plan, which should provide for reclamation and rehabilitation of the mined out areas.*
- ii. *Mining plan should take a note of the level of production, level of mechanisation, type of machinery used in the mining of minor minerals, quantity of diesel consumption, export of mineral products outside the district etc as per the SC order dated 27 February 2012.*
- iii. *Regional Management plan is required to be prepared which should include other projects in the district specially around RNP in both the states-Uttar Pradesh as well as Uttarakhand.*
- iv. *Excessive in-stream sand and boulder mining caused the degradation of rivers and rau. In stream mining lowers the stream bottom of rivers which may lead to bank erosion.*
- v. *District administration should ensure that the number of crushers working in this tehsil should be as per the quantum of material that above two projects can supply. Extra licenses or permission to operate more crushers in the tehsil would encourage more sand mining in the area around Rajaji National Park.*
- vi. *The project proponent should pay 2 % of the project cost to the forest [PLA] account of CF Saharanpur which should be strictly used for creating water conservation structures by gravitational "Gujalar" method--as this is a dry area and conflict accentuates due to water scarcity, and for wildlife protection. CF Saharanpur should ensure protection of wildlife on such waterholes or water bodies created in 10 km periphery of RNP. The CF's [also] should also explore possibilities of eco-tourism in which the local people can be partners and/or employed. Given that this is an Elephant Reserve and contiguous to the important Corbett-Rajaji landscape, wildlife management and protection should be part of the working plan and of high priority. Since wildlife does not recognise park and state borders, coordination between officials of both sides, and UP and Uttarakhand government is of utmost importance.*
- vii. *Requisite safeguard measures to be duly implemented and effectively monitored by the respective regulatory Authorities as suggested in the SC order dated 27 February 2012, as well as mitigative measures suggested in the Biological study report annexed in the project proposal.*
- viii. *The depth of mining may be restricted to 3m / water level, whichever is less.*

2.2.2(8) Proposal for black topping of the forest road between Akbarpur and Adhaura village in the already existing alignment inside the Kaimur Wildlife Sanctuary, Bihar.

The Member Secretary informed the committee that the proposal was placed for consideration in the 27th meeting held on 12th December 2012 and was deferred since the representative of the State Government was not present.

The Chief Wildlife warden, Bihar informed that this road was connecting the villages in Mahua and Akabarpur and that part of the road was already black topped. The area is affected by Left Wing Extremism (LWE) and black topping of the road would benefit in movement of police, beside helping the forest department in anti poaching activities.

Dr M.K. Ranjitsinh opined that inside a National Park/Sanctuary, the roads should only be maintained and should not be widened or converted and if the committee starts making exceptions to this, then there would be a flood of proposals seeking clearance on similar lines. Therefore, it would be better to maintain the decision taken by the Standing Committee of NBWL in this regard.

Ms. Prerna Bindra agreed with Dr Ranjitsinh,. She also added that the percentage of Protected Area over the total geographical area of the State was very less, and there needed to be extra cautious in activities that further fragmented the same. Ms Prerna Bindra also pointed out here that Nagarjunasagar Tiger Reserve had successfully overcome the LWE problem and, that a number of factors had been responsible in achieving this task and it is naïve to assume that blacktopped roads would play a pivotal role in resolving this problem.

Shri Kishor Rithe was of the opinion that there were some 100 odd LWE affected districts in the country and many of these also encompass Protected Areas and hence should not influence decision making in such PAs.. Blacktopping of road is not the only factor which can help to stop LWE activities.

Dr A.J.T Johnsingh was of the opinion that the road kills in the country are increasing now a days.

The committee, after discussions, decided to recommend that the road be maintain as an all weather road. Considering the submissions made by the Chief Wildlife Warden, the Committee also clarified that if the road is critical from the LWE viewpoint, the proposals from appropriate authorities would be needed to be proposed.

2.2.2(13) Diversion of 25 ha of forest land from Yaanoupokpi-Lokchao Wildlife Sanctuary (YLWS) for Reconnaissance Survey and Track clearance (RSTC) which includes construction of service track in along the Indo-Myanmar border between boundary pillar No.79-81in Moreh Area, district Chandel of Manipur by Assam Rifles.

The Member Secretary informed the committee that the proposal was considered during the 27th meeting held on 12th December 2012 but could not be discussed since the representative of State of Manipur was not present in the meeting.

The Chief Wild Life Warden, Manipur made a brief presentation on the project proposal, highlighting the biodiversity of the area. He added that the fencing had already been completed after approval from the NBWL. He also mentioned that there is no new diversion of land and only the already diverted land would be used for this purpose.

Dr Ranjitsinh was of the opinion that the State Government should have forwarded the proposal in totality and not in piecemeal form, which was reiterated by Ms Purna Bindra. The Representative of the Assam Rifles clarified that the proposal is only for a walking track and that no black topping is contemplated.

The committee, after discussion, recommended the proposal subject to the condition that no black topping would be done as well as the following conditions, as stipulated by the Chief Wildlife Warden, which are, *inter alia*, primarily related to FC clearance :

- i. *The User Agency should pay the amount for Compensatory Afforestation over 50 ha for Rs.64.75 lakhs and the net present value (NPV) for Rs.1173.75 lakhs for preparation of Action plan for 7 years for development of the sanctuary to mitigate the adverse impact of diversion of wildlife habitat.*
- ii. *The user agency should strictly comply with the directives of the central government and the state Government concerning the matter.*
- iii. *The user agency should not use heavy and noisy machineries or cause and pollution.*
- iv. *The user agency should not divert any waterways and put any fire inside the sanctuary adjacent to the area to be diverted.*
- v. *The User agency should not start any activity until the 2nd stage (final) approval of the diversion is accorded by the Central Government.*

2.2.2(15) Survey for construction of new broad gauge railway line by North Frontier Railways from Sevok in West Bengal to Rongpo at Sikkim over 32.586 ha within Mahananda Wildlife Sanctuary, West Bengal.

The Member Secretary informed that in pursuance of the decision of the Standing Committee of NBWL, the site inspection was conducted by a team comprising of Dr M.K. Ranjitsinh, Dr Madhusudan and Ms. Purna Bindra and the report was circulated amongst the members.

Dr M.D. Madhusudan explained the site inspection report. He said that the team had only recommended for survey. He said that the higher reaches of the landscape are highly fragmented and large number of elephants keep moving in the area. The traffic in the region is also expected to increase over a period of time.

Dr M.K. Ranjitsinh mentioned that the debris from the work are likely to cause damage to a distance of 10 kms along the border of the Sanctuary and also to the Teesta River. Blasting generates lot of debris in the river and disposal of this debris is a serious concern. The Government of West Bengal had given an assurance to declare the lower region of Teesta River basin as a sanctuary during 1995 while seeking clearance for lower Teesta River barrage project.

Ms Prerna Bindra requested for strict compliance of the conditions given by the team, and a local monitoring committee put in place.

The committee, after discussions, agreed for only survey and investigation subject to the condition that this recommendation should not be construed as a final clearance for the proposal. It was also suggested that the earlier assurance of the West Bengal Govt. to declare a sanctuary in the lower Teesta basin be fulfilled prior to a future submission of a proposal for the construction of the proposed railway. The DGF&SS mentioned that some Elephant experts should also be included in the survey and investigation team.

4.1(15) Proposal for Kotri-Chechat Limestone (Building Stone) Mine (M.L.No.19/93) of M/s Abdul Sattar S/o Shri Abdul Kareem Village Kotri Chechat District Kota, Rajasthan. (within 10 kms of Mukandra NP/Dara Sanctuary).

The Member Secretary mentioned that site inspection was to be conducted by NTCA and Dr Divyabhanusinh Chavda. The Member-Secretary, NTCA informed that the site inspection would be carried out soon.

The committee decided to consider the proposal after receipt of the site inspection report.

AGENDA ITEM NO.3

3.1: Briefing on India's position for the 16th Conference of Parties (CoP) to CITES in March 2013

Member Secretary elaborated on the participation by Indian delegation in COP 16 meeting of CITES at Bangkok including the interventions made on various agenda items. The presentation included the major decisions including listing of sharks in appendix II and technological ways for determination of source of contraband ivory seizures. Dr M.K. Ranjitsinh was of the opinion that India had played a major role in CITES since its ratification. There have been reports of relaxation of ban for trade in ivory and rhino horn. He desired that India should play a major role in controlling the trade of Shahtoosh, Rhino horn, musk, ivory etc, so as to ensure the protection of the species in the wild.

Ms. Prerna Bindra was of the opinion that India should have supported the motion on listing of the threatened shark species, of which she had provided supporting material. She said that listing in Appendix II ensures that exploitation is based on scientific assessment and on a sustainable basis, which would help ensure survival of the species and therefore also benefit fishermen in the long term. Member Secretary explained that the position taken by India was for region specific study to ascertain conservation status and the processes before taking decisions on listing in CITES Appendices, in view of livelihood issues involved in fishing in our coastal areas.

3.2 Agenda item proposed by members.

(i) Ms. Prerna Bindra said that a judiciously planned and notified ESZ will go a long way in protecting the integrity of our few remnant wildlife habitats and PAs especially in the current environment with increasing pressure of multiple uses on forest land. She mentioned that the members appreciate the proactive and strong conservation efforts taken by the Ministry in the matter of Eco-Sensitive Zones. She expressed concern that ESZs around National Parks and Sanctuaries were being proposed in an arbitrary manner, and that ESZs must be based on the ecological imperatives of the PA and its landscape. State Governments need to take due care and diligence while identifying the eco-sensitive zones. She urged the Ministry to ensure proper scrutiny of the proposals received from the state governments. She suggested the formation of zonal committees to look into the different aspects of the draft notification, besides having an overarching committee at the central level.

Dr M.D. Madhusudan was of the opinion that the impetus of eco sensitive zones comes from the National Wildlife Action Plan and the Wildlife Conservation Strategy 2002. He added that by May 15th, more than 400 proposals could be received in the Ministry and therefore, there should be a proper mechanism for scrutinizing the proposals. He also mentioned that scientific institutions could be roped in for scrutinizing the proposals.

Shri Kishor Rithe requested to club his agenda item which is on the same subject. He appreciated the proactive steps taken by MoEF by issuing a letter dated 31-12-2012 and given a deadline of 15th February 2013 to submit site specific ESA proposals which was extended up to 15th May 2013. He also appreciated equally positive response from the states/UTs by submitting 100 proposals to the MoEF.

He stated that the 100 proposals which have been received by MoEF, and more to come before 15th May 2013, needs careful scrutiny to assess whether they are as per the site specific, case to case and on scientific basis. He requested the details for these proposals and wanted to know the number of proposals representing the tiger reserve buffers (if any, whether Tiger Conservation Plan-TCP is approved?). He felt this important as Hon'ble Supreme Court in its order dated 16th October 2012 has already asked the states to submit their TCPs in next six months period to the NTCA and NTCA had already clarified that the buffers of TRs need to be notified as ESA.

He also suggested to form the subcommittee of SC-NBWL to undertake the scrutiny of these proposals to ensure that states/UTs have followed the MoEF /NBWL guidelines in true letter and spirit.

The chairman clarified that the Ministry has devised a mechanism for proper scrutinizing the proposal at a three tier system. The Wildlife Division would scrutinize the proposals in consultation with the Wildlife Institute of India. Subsequently, the draft notification would be placed in public domain for inputs from all the stakeholders. All inputs at that stage will be duly considered. For considering the proposals and giving final shape, a high level committee under the chairmanship of the Additional Secretary, comprising of experts, etc is in place for evaluation of the comments received as well as the proposal, before final notification. He added that all due care would be taken by the Ministry to ensure

that the notifications are not arbitrary in nature. Dr. Johnsingh suggested that there could be a team of experts for each state who could help the State Government to demarcate the ecosensitive zones. A good example is seen in the state of Karnataka.

(ii) On the second issue regarding **Elephant Reserves**, Dr M.D. Madhusudan mentioned that the Ministry had set up a committee under Shri Vinod Rishi to examine the entire facets of elephant reserves, but still there was a need to closely see that there is more regulation in the Elephant Reserves. He added that the elephant reserves are created through an executive order and can be de-notified through another executive order, therefore, there is a need to give a legal status to these reserves and that till the committee comes up with its recommendation and the elephant reserves are given legal rights, regulatory role should be given to the National Board for Wildlife. He said that during the recent times, there have been several reports of train hits of elephants which need to be seriously looked into.

Ms. Purna Bindra stressed that her agenda item had clearly outlined the imperative to give Eco-Sensitive zone status to elephant and tiger corridors, and also other identified key wildlife corridors in totality. The committee was only for the purpose of elephant corridors and reserves and had time frame of a year. Meanwhile, an alarming rate of diversion in key wildlife habitats and corridors is being witnessed. She pressed that diversion of forest land in Elephant Reserves, elephant and tiger corridors that are identified and demarcated by the state government/central government, be immediately brought under the purview of the Standing Committee of the NBWL.

Shri Kishor Rithe endorsed the views of Ms. Purna Bindra and stated that "the wildlife corridors" are already part of the Wild Life (Protection) Act which means tiger, and elephant and hence they should be given the status of ecologically sensitive areas.

Dr M.K. Ranjitsinh mentioned that the WTI had made a detailed list of potential elephant corridors in the country and had published them in the form of a book and forwarded to all the State Governments, but still, the States were reluctant to even consider them for notifying the elephant corridors. He added that the wildlife corridors used to be acquired through private funding and handed over to the State Governments. The States were even reluctant to declare these as reserve forests under the Forest Departments and even less so as conservation reserves and sanctuaries. He urged the States to create sanctuaries for conservation of biodiversity in toto and not just that particular species in whose name the sanctuary is created.

Dr A.J.T Johnsingh mentioned that we are losing corridors day by day and not a single corridor has been functionally established and legally notified.

(iii) **CAMPA Funds:** The DGF&SS informed that some proposals for relocation of people from Tiger Reserves with CAMPA funds were received and Hon'ble Minister has approved the same, and now it is pending ratification of the NCAC.

Ms. Purna Bindra mentioned that the people living in tiger reserves, other PAs, and even outside PAs were petitioning to move out, and cited the example of Uttarakhand. She said that fund availability was one limiting factor and stressed that states should be encouraged to use CAMPA funds for voluntary relocation as it was important not just from the conservation perspective, but equally important for human welfare, as those

living within forests faced tremendous hardships. She indicated that a percentage of state CAMPA funds, as well as from the principle amount of CAMPA needs to be earmarked for voluntary relocation.

Shri Kishor Rithe mentioned that Maharashtra has actually used the CAMPA money for relocation of villages. They also declared the state package of Rs.10 Lakh per family similar to centrally sponsored scheme of Union Government for the villages from Sanctuaries and National Parks who want the voluntary relocation. Similar steps could be taken by other states as well.

The DGF&SS requested the members to forward a proposal to this extent to the CAMPA which could be considered by the NCAC in its next meeting for implementation.

(iv) **Review of National Wildlife Action Plan:** The Member Secretary informed that the Ministry has already moved the process for constitution of the committee.

(v) **Status of endangered species:** Dr M.K. Ranjitsinh mentioned that if we keep on waiting for the states to respond to the request of the Ministry for forwarding the status report of endangered species, then it would be a long wait. He urged that the Ministry should, in a pilot mode, seek specific information from the States on the status of certain species and the manner in which the funds provided have been spent for conservation of that species. He added that the NBWL had identified 17 species and the State Governments were to come up with concrete plans for their recovery, but till date there have been no species recovery programme on a pilot project mode. He also added that the Ministry should strictly be monitoring the recovery plan so that the results of the recovery plans and the states of the endangered species could be constantly reviewed. He also mentioned that if the MoEF does not assume leadership, coordination, updating and monitoring of these recovery plans and leaves them entirely to the states, there will be little impact and species will go extinct.

The Committee after discussion decided that the States should come forward with the following:

- (a) Whether there has been any recovery in the population of the concerned species?
- (b) Whether there have been any decrease in population of the species and if so, why?
- (c) What has been the impact of the management interventions on the population status of the species?

(vi) **Encroachments:** Shri Kishor Rithe mentioned that there are large number of encroachments in protected areas in the country. People tend to grab the forest land under the garb of the FRA. People tend to register a claim before Gramsabha on the forest land first, before even encroaching a forest land. Later they start girdling trees, setting fire, ploughing the forest land and oppose forest department to leave the encroached land by showing that "their claim is pending" (no encroachment should be treated as an encroachment till pendency of claim).

The Member Secretary informed that the suggestions made by Shri Rithe would be conveyed to the Ministry of Tribal Affairs

The Committee after discussions, decided that the matter may be first examined in the MoEF and thereafter, forwarded to the Ministry of Tribal affairs for their views and action.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 4:

4.1: Proposals involving areas within 10 kms from boundaries of National Parks and Sanctuaries.

4.1(1) Proposal for Laying of 400 KV electric transmission line from Vapi (Gujarat) to Navi Mumbai passing through Matheran Eco-sensitive zone, Maharashtra.

The Member Secretary informed the committee that the proposal was for laying of 400 KV transmission line through Matheran Eco-sensitive zone. He mentioned that the proposed transmission line passes along one side of Sensitive Zone-North and North West side very close to Ambarnath M.I.D.C. area. The project site does not form part of any sanctuary or National Park. He further mentioned that as per the State Government, there will be minimum pressure on forest, that is also for short time and the elevated position of the line helps free movement of wildlife in the area without any hindrance or obstruction. He also mentioned that the proposal was recommended by the State Board for Wildlife.

Shri Kishor Rithe mentioned that the Maharashtra State Electricity Distribution Company Limited (MSEDCL) has agreed in the state Board for Wildlife meeting to make few most sensitive existing transmission lines underground in Protected Areas of Maharashtra and hence we should recommend this proposal with the condition to follow that decision of SBWL. The Government of Maharashtra and the MSEDCL also have agreed to allocate funds to take some mitigatory measures for transmission lines. These good practices should be adopted by other States as well.

The Committee decided to recommend the proposal. The committee also requested Shri Rithe to share the best practices he had indicated, with the Standing Committee.

4.1(2) Proposal for removal of old manganese dumps outside Jambughoda Wildlife Sanctuary on its border beyond 1 km distance from the Jambughoda Wildlife Sanctuary by Gujarat Mineral Development Corporation.

The Member Secretary informed the committee that the proposal was for removal of old manganese dumps located outside the sanctuary within and beyond 1 km distance of the sanctuary. He added that as per the proposal, the old manganese ore dumps are scattered inside and outside the Jambugoda Wildlife Sanctuary beyond 1 km distance from the Sanctuary and were removed using semi manual method by GMDC, after obtaining temporary work permit. However, no mining is done and only manganese ore waste dumps are required to be removed by obtaining work permit. He also mentioned that the proposal was recommended by the State Board for Wildlife.

The Committee after discussion decided that Dr M.K. Ranjitsinh and Shri Kishor Rithe shall undertake a site inspection and submit a report to the committee for its consideration.

- 4.1(3) Proposal for lime stone mining project of Saurashtra Chemicals Ltd. for captive consumption in Soda Ash Plant. Limestone mining lease area is at a distance of 7.27 km from the boundary of Barda Wildlife Sanctuary.**
- 4.1(4) Proposal for Dharampur-Khajawadri limestone mine of M/s Saurashtra Chemicals Ltd., on 18.21 ha at a distance of 6.55 km from Barda Wildlife Sanctuary, Gujarat.**
- 4.1(5) Proposal for Dharampur-Khajawadri limestone mine lease area of 9.31 ha at a distance of 6.55 km from Barda Wildlife Sanctuary, Gujarat in favour of Saurashtra Chemicals Ltd.**
- 4.1(6) Proposal for Dharampur-Khajawadri limestone mine of M/s Saurashtra Chemicals Ltd. of 14.61 ha at a distance of 5.18 km from Barda Wildlife Sanctuary, Gujarat.**
- 4.1(7) Proposal for Dharampur-Khajawadri limestone mine of M/s Saurashtra Chemicals Ltd., on 40.46 ha at a distance of 6.55 km from Barda Wildlife Sanctuary, Gujarat.**

The Member Secretary informed that all these proposals involved mining around the Barda Sanctuary.

Dr M.K. Ranjitsinh mentioned that the Government of Gujarat had done exemplary work on conservation of Asiatic lions and deserves full appreciation. He added that Gujarat Government had identified Barda as a suitable habitat for lions and the lions have been moving close to the boundaries of Barda, but have not have been able to move further into Barda, due to presence of large number of mines scattered along its boundary. He emphasized that he was not against mining but the fact that conservation of such an important species like **the** Lion should never be overlooked. He also pointed out that the prevalent wind direction also helped to carry the dust and the noise of the mining operations into the precincts of the adjacent Barda Sanctuary. Ms Prerna Bindra expressed concern on the large number of mining leases –and even illegal mining--around Barda.

The Committee after discussion decided that Dr M.K. Ranjitsinh and Shri Kishor Rithe shall undertake a site inspection and submit a report to the committee for its consideration.

- 4.1(9) Proposal for Kotri-Chechat Limestone (Building Stone) Mine (M.L.No.121/92) of M/s Abdul Sattar S/o Shri Abdul Kareem Village Kotri Chechat District Kota, Rajasthan. (within 10 kms of Mukandra NP/Dara Sanctuary). The mine is located at a distance of 6 km from Darra WLS.**

4.1 (10) Proposal for mining renewal and capacity expansion of M.K. 59/87 of M.S Goodwill advance Stone company Kota, Rajasthan.

These proposals were taken up together. The Committee decided that since a team will be carrying out site inspection of the Mukundwara National Park, these proposals would also be covered by them and a combined report for the three proposals would be submitted by the site inspection team.

4.1(11) Proposal for laying of 14”dia. Kota-Jaipur Cross country underground pipeline from Kota to Asalpur (near Jaipur), Rajasthan. (The proposed project is 1.1 km away from Ramgarh Sanctuary and 2.5 km away from Chambal Wildlife Sanctuary).

The Member Secretary informed the committee that the proposal was for laying of 14”dia. Kota-Jaipur Cross country underground pipeline from Kota to Asalpur (near Jaipur), Rajasthan. The proposed Kota-Jaipur Pipeline 210 km long, 14”dia cross country multi product pipeline passes through minimum forest area of 4.08 ha. The pipeline route selected is not passing through any sanctuary or prohibited areas. The pipeline will handle Motor Spirit, High Speed diesel, Kerosene and ATF. The proposal is of National Importance as it relates to meeting the demand of petroleum products in the region. He also mentioned that the proposal was recommended by the State Board for Wildlife.

The Committee, after discussions, decided to recommend the proposal subject to the following conditions as suggested by the Chief Wildlife Warden, Rajasthan:

- i. 2% of the cost of works in the area passing through 10 kms radius of sanctuary would be paid by the user agency for the better management and protection of sanctuary area.*
- ii. Manpower engaged in project works will not use fire wood for any purpose. The user agency M/s BPCL will provide alternative fuel for domestic use to resident staff and labour.*

4.1(12) Proposal for Oil India Ltd. for use of 304.15 ha non-forest land falling within 10 km from the boundary of Dibru-Saikhowa National Park and Bherjan-Borajan-Padumoni Wildlife Sanctuary for expansion of gas field development in Tengakhat-Naharkotia-Jorajan area, Tinsukia-Dhola area and Doomdooma-Pengeri area in Assam.

The Member Secretary informed the committee that the proposal was for Oil India Ltd. for use of 304.15 ha non-forest land falling within 10 kms from the boundary of Dibru-Saikhowa National Park and Bherjan-Borajan-Padumoni Wildlife Sanctuary for expansion of gas field development in Tengakhat-Naharkotia-Jorajan area, Tinsukai-Dholai area and Doomdooma-Pengeri area in Assam. He also mentioned that the proposal was recommended by the State Board for Wildlife.

The project proponent gave a brief explanation regarding the project.

Ms. Prerna Bindra mentioned that she had written to the Hon'ble chair about various representations received by the local people on a similar proposal ('Use of 114.267 ha of non-forestland falling within 10 kms from the boundary of Dibru-Saikhowa and Borjan-Bherjan Padumani WLS for laying of crude oil pipeline etc by Oil India Ltd.), that was recommended in the last meeting, The local people had raised serious concerns and pointed out irregularities. She also mentioned that as regards to the present proposal it was apprehended that drilling into a wetland could lead to drying of wetland and habitat loss to animals as well as economic loss to local people, She said that any recommendation should be given only after proper verification and after ascertaining facts of the case.

The Committee after discussion decided that Ms. Prerna Bindra and Dr M.D. Madhusudan shall undertake site inspection with respect to this proposal as well as with respect to the following proposal that were recommended in the 27th meeting held on 12.12.2012 and submit a combined report to the committee for its consideration:

“Proposal for use of 114.267 ha of non-forestland falling within 10 kms from the boundary of Dibru-Saikhowa National Park and Borjan-Bherjan Padumani Wildlife Sanctuary for laying of crude oil pipeline etc by Oil India Ltd., Assam”

4.1(13) Proposal for establishment of 2x500 MW Coal based Thermal Power Plant at Tuticorin, Tamil Nadu by M/s Neyveli Lignite Corporation Limited (NLC) along with Tamil Nadu Power limited, Tuticorin.

The Member Secretary informed the committee that the proposal was for establishment of 2x500 MW Coal based Thermal Power Plant at Tuticorin, Tamil Nadu by M/s Neyveli Lignite Corporation Limited (NLC) along with Tamil Nadu Power limited, Tuticorin. He also mentioned that the proposal was not recommended by the State Board for Wildlife. Chief Wildlife Warden has recommended the proposal subject to certain conditions.

CWLW, Tamil Nadu stated that project proponents have provided for extra cooling towers to ensure that temperature does not exceed beyond 30 degrees.

Ms Prerna Bindra noted that the work on this project had already been commenced without obtaining clearance from the NBWL and therefore, was a violation of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 as well as the orders of Hon'ble Supreme Court.

Shri Kishor Rithe mentioned that in some earlier cases of *fait accompli* nature, the Standing Committee had rejected such proposals and this proposal being of thermal power plant should be rejected out right.

Ms. Prerna Bindra while endorsing the views of Shri Rithe mentioned that the recent Supreme Court judgment applied only to linear projects, but in thermal projects like this, it is not applicable. She also pointed out that effluents of a thermal plant would be fatal to the fragile ecology of the Gulf of Mannar National Marine Park.

Dr. M.K. Ranjitsinh stated that violation need to be brought to the notice of Hon'ble Supreme Court.

Chairman explained that in some such cases, it needs to be seen that the recent policy decisions about the clearance process allowed the project proponents to start the work outside the forest areas subject to the condition that the progress can not be taken as an argument for clearance. Though this position has been accepted for linear projects only, it is to be examined under what circumstances the project is progressing. He also informed that the project might have gone through the CRZ clearance process, which can be verified and reported to the S.C.

The Committee decided that the Environment Clearance and CRZ clearances issued by the Ministry will be looked into and appropriate action taken including stopping of work, if required. The committee also decided to take up the constitution of State Board for Wildlife with the State as no proposal can be considered by the committee unless it is recommended by the State Board which is mandatory.

4.1(14) Proposal for collection of minor minerals: River bed-Kosi, district Nainital, Uttarakhand.

The Member Secretary informed the committee that the proposal was for collection of minor minerals from Kosi river bed. He also mentioned that the proposal was recommended by the State Board for Wildlife.

Ms. Purna Bindra mentioned that when these proposals were recommended by the SBWL, of which she was a member, it had been conditional to the fact that the state would make efforts to revive the crucial Gola corridor which was all but blocked. She stressed the urgent need to protect and revive the corridor. She said this was important also from the standpoint of escalating human-elephant conflict. She said the centre had taken much effort in the past to try save the corridor—and this needed to be revived. She urged that the Centre and the State Government should constitute a monitoring committee for this purpose.

Dr. AJT Johnsingh opined that the corridor can be revived to some extent provided the wall built between the road and the Indian Oil Corporation is broken for certain distance, the timber depo is shifted to some other place may be near Haldwani and the para-military camp is provided an alternate site,(Gabua forest patch in Terai West FD was originally suggested) and boulder mining in the Gola river is stopped at least for 2km in line with the corridor).

The committee after discussions, agreed to the suggestions made by Ms. Bindra. The committee decided to recommend the proposal subject to such conditions as may be prescribed by the State Chief Wildlife Warden and that the centre would work with the State Government to take efforts to protect the Gola Corridor for wildlife movement, including constitution of a monitoring committee for this purpose.

4.1(15) Proposal for collection of minor minerals: Collection for minor minerals from river Dabka, District Nainital, Uttarakhand.

The Member Secretary informed the committee that the proposal was for collection of minor minerals from dabka river bed. He also mentioned that the proposal was 10.71 kms from Corbett Tiger Reserve and was recommended by the State Board for Wildlife.

Dr A.J.T Johnsingh mentioned that although this project was outside the jurisdiction of the Standing Committee of NBWL, this proposal requires to be discussed due to the fact that it lies in the prime tiger habitat and therefore should not be permitted.

The Committee therefore decided to adopt a special resolution to be conveyed to the State Government that the work of mining of minor minerals from Dabka, Nainital must not be pursued on ecological considerations.

4.1(16) Proposal for collection of minor minerals: Collection for minor minerals from river bed-song-3, District Dehradun, Uttarakhand.

4.1(17) Proposal for collection of minor minerals: Collection of minor minerals from river bed Jakhan-2, district, Dehradun, Uttarakhand.

The committee considered these two proposals together.

After discussion, the committee decided to recommend the proposal subject to the condition as may be prescribed by the State Chief Wildlife Warden and that the State Government would write prescriptions to protect the prime tiger habitat at Dabka and Gola Corridor to ensure free and safe wildlife movement, including constitution of a monitoring committee for this purpose.

4.1(18) Proposal for diversion of 1.73 ha of forest land in Velugodu RF of Wild Life, Atmakur Division for laying of pipeline for drinking water supply from Velugodu Balancing Reservoir to CPWS Yerragudur, in favour of Superintending Engineer, RWS & S, Kurnool.

The Member Secretary informed the committee that the proposal was for diversion of 1.73 ha. of forest land in Velugodu RF of Wild Life, Atmakur Division for laying of pipeline for drinking water supply from Velugodu Balancing Reservoir to CPWS Yerragudur, in favour of Superintending Engineer, RWS & S, Kurnool. He also mentioned that the proposal was recommended by the State Board for Wildlife.

The Chief Wildlife Warden, Andhra Pradesh mentioned that the project site was 4.45 kms from the sanctuary boundary and is for laying drinking water pipeline. He clarified that the proposed pipeline will be laid underground.

The Member Secretary, NTCA mentioned that the proposal could be permitted as only very small area is required and it was outside the core tiger area.

Shri Kishore Rithe expressed his concern on the irrigation colony which is situated in the core of the Nagarjunsagar Srisailam Tiger Reserve (NSTR). He told about the order of Hon'ble Mumbai High Court, Nagpur bench in WP No.320 of 2001 to remove irrigation colony from the core of Pench Tiger Reserve, Maharashtra state and expected similar action in NSTR.

The Committee after discussions decided to recommend the proposal with the following conditions as endorsed by the State Board for Wildlife:

- (i) *The user agency shall supply water to Velgode Central Nursery situated opposite to Reservoir by laying pipeline at the cost of user agency.*
- (ii) *The user agency should also supply the water to the Dr.Y.S.R Smruthi Vanam which falls on enroute for benefit of visitors, etc.*

The Committee also recommended that the State Government shall initiate action for removal of the Irrigation colony at Sundipetta in the Nagarjunsagar Srisailam Tiger Reserve.

4.1(19) Proposal for rehabilitation and upgradation to four lane configuration of Obaidullaganj to Betul Section of NH-69 passing through the Ratapani Wildlife Sanctuary, Madhya Pradesh. (within 10 kms of Eco-sensitive zone).

4.1(20) Proposal for conversion of two lane to four lane of Obedullaganj-Betul, Madhya Pradesh. (within 10 kms of Bori Wildlife Sanctuary).

These two proposals were taken up for discussion together as they were of similar nature. The Member Secretary briefed the committee regarding the two proposals.

Shri Kishor Rithe opined that all such proposals involving Tiger Reserve should always have comments of the NTCA. Member Secretary NTCA endorsed the proposal subject to adequate safeguards and mitigation measures.

After discussions, the committee decided to recommend the two proposals subject to the safety limit and other safeguards suggested by NTCA.

4.1(21) Proposal for four-lanning of NH-3, Gwalior to Shivpuri section under NHDP Phase-IV, Madhya Pradesh (within 10 kms from Ghatigaon Bustard Sanctuary).

The Member Secretary informed the committee that the proposal was for four-laning of NH-3, Gwalior to Shivpuri section under NHDP Phase-IV, Madhya Pradesh (within 10 kms from Ghatigaon Bustard Sanctuary). He also mentioned that the proposal was recommended by the State Board for Wildlife.

Dr M.K. Ranjisingh stressed the need to have dedicated efforts for conservation of Great Indian Bustard in the sanctuary, as this sanctuary was created for the

conservation of Great Indian Bustards and they are now at the point of total extinction in this sanctuary and indeed, in the State of MP.

The committee, after discussions, decided to recommend the proposal subject to conditions to be specified by the Chief Wildlife Warden, and State Board for Wildlife Madhya Pradesh.

4.1(22) Proposal for widening of existing 2 lane single carriage way to 4-lane divided carriage way from RD 0.000 to 50.700 km i.e. Zirakpur-Patiala section of NH-64, Punjab.(Located at 6 km from the boundary of the Bir Motibagh Wildlife sanctuary).

4.1(23) Proposal for widening of existing 2-lane road to 4 lane road from Patiala (km 50.00) to Bathinda (km 209.500) section of NH-64, Punjab. (Patiala-Sangrur-Barnala-Bathinda Section), Punjab. (Within 10 kms of boundaries of NP/WL).

The committee decided to consider these two proposals together as they were of similar nature. The Member Secretary briefed the committee regarding the two proposals. He also mentioned that both the proposals were recommended by the State Board for Wildlife.

Ms. Prerna Bindra pointed out that Punjab had very little area in the PA network, and it was very unfortunate that even this was being further fragmented and degraded. She also stressed the need to give better protection to the Harike lake as it was a flagship conservation initiative of the State Government. She highlighted the need for removal of encroachments along the Harike lake.

The Committee, after discussions, recommended the two proposals subject to such conditions to be specified by the Chief Wildlife Warden. The committee while taking note of the concerns raised by Ms. Bindra decided to request the State Government of Punjab to take appropriate action for better concerted efforts for conservation of Harike lake Sanctuary including considering removing the encroachments that are negatively impacting the wildlife in the sanctuary.

4.1(24) Proposal for laying of Natural Gas pipeline by GSPL India Transco Ltd. (GITL) in the Vicinity of Bori Wildlife Sanctuary, Madhya Pradesh. (within 10 kms)

The Member Secretary informed the committee that the proposal was for laying of Natural Gas pipeline by GSPL India Transco Ltd. (GITL) in the Vicinity of Bori Wildlife Sanctuary, Madhya Pradesh. He also mentioned that the proposal was recommended by the State Board for Wildlife and also subject to condition that there will be no diversion or change of status of land. Shri Kishor Rithe stated that the Project proponent should deposit the 2% of the project cost with the corpus fund of Satpura Tiger Reserve Foundation as Bori Sanctuary is a critical Tiger habitat and core of Satpura Tiger Reserve.

The committee after discussion decided to recommend the proposal subject to such conditions to be stipulated by the Chief Wildlife Warden.

4.1(25) Proposal for laying of Natural Gas pipeline by GSPL India Transco Ltd.(GITL) in the Vicinity (3 to 5 kms away) from Narsingharh Wildlife Sanctuary, Madhya Pradesh.

The Member Secretary informed the committee that the proposal was for laying of Natural Gas pipeline by GSPL India Transco Ltd. (GITL) in the Vicinity (3 to 5 kms away) of Narsingharh Wildlife Sanctuary, Madhya Pradesh. He also mentioned that the proposal was recommended by the State Board for Wildlife.

The committee after discussion decided to recommend the proposal subject to such conditions to be stipulated by the Chief Wildlife Warden.

4.1(26) Proposal for setting up Clinker Grinding and Flyash Mixing Unit at RIICO Paryavaran Industrial Area Sakatpura, Kota outside Chambal Crocodile Sanctuary, but within 10 km of boundary of Project Site (Kota Cement Works).

The Member Secretary informed the committee that the proposal was for setting up Clinker Grinding and Flyash Mixing Unit at RIICO Paryavaran Industrial Area Sakatpura, Kota outside Chambal Crocodile Sanctuary, but within 10 km of boundary of Project Site (Kota Cement Works). He also mentioned that the proposal was recommended by the State Board for Wildlife.

Dr M.K. Ranjitsinh mentioned that the proposal involves drawl of water from the Chambal river and the report of the WII had not recommended any further projects in the Chambal river especially involving drawl of water from the river. He drew the attention of the committee to the fact that the Chambal river was the only safe habitat for Ghariyals and River dolphins.

Ms. Prerna Bindra suggested for maintaining the previous decision of the Standing Committee of NBWL which had said that no further proposals –particularly involving withdrawal of water--from Chambal would be considered based on the WII report.

The committee, after discussions, decided to reject the proposal on the basis of the report of WII and the previous decision of the Standing Committee of NBWL which was based on the report of WII.

4.1(27) Proposal for expansion of M/s. GEA-BGR Energy System India Ltd. on the existing plant premises developed by Andhra Pradesh Industrial Infrastructure Corporation (APIIC) and located in Sy. No. 111, A5, Panamagadu Industrial Estate of SPSR Nellore District falls in Pulicat Bird Sanctuary.

The Member Secretary informed the committee that the proposal was for expansion of M/s. GEA-BGR Energy System India Ltd. on the existing plant premises developed by Andhra Pradesh Industrial Infrastructure Corporation (APIIC) and located in Sy. No. 111, A5, Panamagadu Industrial Estate of SPSR Nellore District. He also mentioned that the proposal was recommended by the State Board for Wildlife.

The Chief Wildlife Warden, Andhra Pradesh mentioned that this was an existing factory and was not causing any pollution to Pulicat Lake since it is mainly an assembling and fabricating unit. He added that though the area falls within the sanctuary, it is not located within wetland area and reserve forest area. The project will neither release any effluents in the sanctuary nor withdraw any matter from lake and was a green project.

The committee after discussion decided to recommend the proposal subject to such conditions to be stipulated by the Chief Wildlife Warden.

4.1(28) Proposal for refurbishment of 2x30 MW Chandrapur Thermal Power Plant using coal based boilers by replacing existing oil fired boilers falling within 10 kms from the boundary of Amchang and Pobitora Wildlife Sanctuary, Assam.

The Member Secretary informed the committee that the proposal was for refurbishment of 2x30 MW Chandrapur Thermal Power Plant using coal based boilers by replacing existing oil fired boilers falling within 10 kms from the boundary of Amchang and Pobitora Wildlife Sanctuary, Assam. He also mentioned that the proposal was recommended by the State Board for Wildlife.

Dr M.K. Ranjitsinh was of the opinion that the project could bifurcate the Pobitora and the Raja Mayang area which are crucial Rhino movement areas, especially during the annual flooding season. He suggested that the project proponents should look for alternative site.

The committee decided to defer the proposal as the Chief Wildlife Warden, Assam was not present.

4.1(29) Proposal for 520 MW Hydroelectric Power Project, Teesta Stage-IV on river Teesta in North Sikkim by NHPC Ltd.

The Member Secretary informed the committee that the proposal was for 520 MW Hydroelectric Power Project, Teesta Stage-IV on river Teesta in North Sikkim by NHPC Ltd. The project location falls 4 km away from the Fambonglho Wildlife Sanctuary. He added that the proposal was recommended by the State Board for Wildlife.

Dr M.K. Ranjitsinh highlighted that the ecology of Teesta river was seriously deteriorated and this project requires careful consideration. Kishor Rithe asked about the present power generation capacity of Sikkim and actual consumption. Principal Secretary (Forest) admitted that the present generation is much more than the actual requirement of the state and the state sells the surplus power. However he stated that the power generation and tourism are the two major sources of getting revenue for the Sikkim state and hence this proposal is essential. On this Kishor Rithe expressed that the serious environmental concerns have been raised by local conservationists about this project and they need to be addressed as the project is proposed at only 4 km away from the Fambonglho Wildlife Sanctuary.

Ms. Prerna Bindra suggested that a cumulative impact assessment of all the hydro power projects on the Teesta River should be undertaken immediately, given the many dams on the Teesta, and their deleterious impact on the rich biodiversity region as well as local livelihoods and sentiments.

The committee decided that a team comprising of Dr M.K. Ranjitsinh, Kishor Rithe, Dr A.J.T Johnsingh and Dr M.D. Madhusudan would carry out site inspection and submit a report to the committee for its consideration.

4.1(30) Proposal for rehabilitation and resettlement of Dwellers of Dal and Nigeen Lakes Srinagar, at Raki-Arth near Hokersar Wetland, Jammu & Kashmir. (Falls within 10 kms boundary of Hokersar Wetland Reserve).

The Member Secretary informed the committee that the proposal was for rehabilitation and resettlement of Dwellers of Dal and Nigeen Lakes Srinagar, Jammu & Kashmir. Two sites were identified - one located on the Harwan Nallah near Chandpora and the other one at Rakh-i-Arath near Bemina. The proposed site falls within 0.5 kms boundary of Hokersar Wetland Conservation Reserve, J&K. He added that the Hokersar Wetlands Conservation Reserve is one of the Ramsar Sites in the State. The proposed project is to rehabilitate the Dal and Nigeen dwellers (about 60,000 persons). He also mentioned that the proposal was recommended by the State Board for Wildlife.

The Vice chairman of the J&K Lakes and Waterways Development Authority (LAWDA) explained in detail about the plan to be undertaken for the rehabilitation. He said that an EIA study has been carried out and that there are facilities within the resettlement colony for recycling of waste. He also added that there are elaborate arrangement for sewage treatment. The SBWL while considering this proposal had also suggested for erecting a wall between the lake and the rehabilitation colony to prevent any adverse impact to the lake.

Dr M.K. Ranjitsinh mentioned that the wall should be sufficiently high and should be erected before the settlement takes place. He also suggested that a buffer between the wall and the colony should also be created and that the people should first completely remove their settlement from their original place and then only start moving to the new area. He requested that adequate arrangements for sewage and effluent treatment should be ensured.

The committee, after discussions, decided to recommend the proposal subject to the condition that there would adequately high wall would be built between the settlement

and the lake; the area between the wall and lake will be maintained as a buffer region; and that the people shall be settled in the new location only after they have completely dismantled their earlier settlement in the Dal Lake. The committee also decided that the following conditions, as stipulated by the Chief Wildlife Warden shall also be complied with:

- a. *The mitigatory measures suggested and recommended in Environment Impact Assessment report shall be implemented to safeguard the ecological environment of surrounding areas including the Hokesar Wetland.*
- b. *3% of the present project cost i.e. Rs.12.5016 crores shall be used towards the conservation and management of Hokesar Conservation Reserve including baseline studies for future impact on flora and fauna.*
- c. *Green belt of sufficient width will be developed around the project site at the cost of the project in consultation with the Forest Department.*
- d. *Air and water quality monitoring stations shall be established near Hokersar Wetland Reserve.*
- e. *A committee of officers under the Chairmanship of Conservator of Forests (Wildlife)/Regional Wildlife Warden Kashmir and comprising of Regional Director, State Pollution Control Board and CF North Circle Kashmir and Vice Chairman, LAWDA shall monitor the conditions related to environment.*
- f. *The user agency shall also adhere to the following conditions:*
 - i. *The area under proposed project site shall not be utilized for any other purpose other than the one for which recommendations are made.*
 - ii. *That area of activity and expansion thereof shall remain confined to the specified boundaries of the project site without extending them beyond. A cement wall shall be erected around the proposed establishment to avoid further expansion towards the wetland.*
 - iii. *Proper waste disposal technology shall be adopted for the proposed colony apart from developing green areas within the colony as proposed in the Plan. The user agency shall abide by rules and regulations as laid down in J&K Wildlife (Protection) Act, 1978 (amended 2002) and guidelines notified by the Ministry of Environment and Forests, Govt. of India, in connection with Hon'ble Supreme Court of India's directions issued on 14.12.2006 regarding declaration of Eco-Sensitive Zone.*
 - iv. *That afforestation plan projected in the EIA report including establishment of green belt shall be raised and put into place in consultation with the experts to ensure environmental protection and needs of wildlife in the surrounding sites.*
 - v. *That pollution to various physical components of environment including scientific disposal of sewage should be ensured to avoid pollution to the streams following to the Hokesar Wetland. A proper sewage system disposal technique shall be ensured and no sewage/effluent shall enter the wetland.*

4.1 (31): Proposal for construction of passenger aerial Ropeway starting from Kud (99 km NHIA) to village Sangote to Karlah, Patnitop, J&K. (The proposed site is 1 km away from the Conservation Reserve)

The Member Secretary informed the committee about the proposal for construction of passenger aerial Ropeway starting from Kud (99 km NHIA) to village Sangote to Karlah, Patnitop, J&K. The proposed site is 1 km away from the Sudhmahadev Conservation Reserve. He also informed that the proposal was recommended by the State Board for Wildlife.

The Chief Wildlife Warden, Jammu and Kashmir mentioned that Patnitop attracts a lot of tourists from across the country besides local visitors with breathtaking views of the mountainscape overlooking Chenab basin. During the spring season paragliding, rock climbing, cross country events are conducted in the region. The Government of Jammu & Kashmir intends to develop an aerial ropeway deviating NH-1A through Kud-Sangote-Karla (Patnitop). The project envisages having its base terminal station at a point close to 99 km milestone on Jammu Srinagar NH-1A.

The committee after discussion decided to recommend the proposal subject the following conditions, as suggested by the Chief Wildlife Warden:

- i. *Mitigation measures for wildlife conservation as provided in the EMP will be implemented by the Wildlife Department on the cost to be borne by the user agency.*
- ii. *Approval from the Forest Department may also be taken in view of the affidavit filed by the Department in the Hon'ble Supreme Court.*
- iii. *Home stays shall be promoted in the Patnitop area and land use change in respect of construction from bonafide use to commercial should have the approval of the Forest Department.*
- iv. *Tourist development plan of Patnitop area should be approved by the Forest Department.*
- v. *All the conditions imposed by the Ministry of Environment and Forests shall be strictly adhered to by the Patnitop Development Authority.*
- vi. *Patnitop development authority shall also pay 5% cess on its turnover to the Forest Department every year for improvement of forests apart from NPV etc. for benefit/upkeep of forests in the Patnitop Area.*
- vii. *A project based study should be initiated to assess the status of flora and fauna through reputed consultant or university.*
- viii. *Need for regulating construction activity on private lands within the forest areas for which the guidelines shall be issued by the Government.*
- ix. *Carrying capacity studies need to be initiated to study the effect of increase tourism on the ecology of the area.*

4.2 FRESH PROPOSALS FOR DIVERSION OF FOREST LANDS OF PROTECTED AREAS.

4.2 (1) Permission for Tarring of Jewali-Gadi-Bori-Kharbi road in Painganga Wildlife Sanctuary, Maharashtra.

The Member Secretary informed the Committee that the proposal was for Tarring of Jewali-Gadi-Bori-Kharbi road in Painganga Wildlife Sanctuary, Maharashtra. He added that the proposal was recommended by the State Board for Wildlife.

The Chief Wildlife Warden, Maharashtra informed that there are 11 villages inside the Sanctuary out of which only Ekamba, Morchandi, Sondabhi, Jeorala and Paroti villages are to be resettled as per the settlement officer's report. The remaining six villages will remain in the sanctuary as per settlement report. The population of tribals in these villages is large. Their long term demand of B.T. road was intensified during January 2009.

Shri Kishor Rithe mentioned that this particular road is parallel to the Painganga River, which is the main water source for wild animals of the Painganga Sanctuary during the lean period. By tarring this section of the road, the safety of wildlife would be in danger. Therefore, no black topping should be permitted and only an all weather road should be allowed.

Dr M.K. Ranjitsinh mentioned that during the early 2000, the Ministry had constituted four sub-committees for rationalization of boundaries of National Parks and Sanctuaries-region wise, of which, he was the chairman for the sub-committee on western region. During that time, the issue of rationalization of boundaries of the Painganga Sanctuary was also taken up. However, nothing concrete took place after that. He said that there was an urgent need to rationalize the boundaries of several sanctuaries including this one.

After discussion, the Committee recommended that the Jewali-Gadi-Bori-Kharbi section could be developed within the existing width as an all weather road except cementing and black topping. The Committee requested the Chief Wildlife Warden, Maharashtra to look into the issue of rationalization of boundaries of Painganga Sanctuary.

4.2 (2) Construction of intake well near left bank of Chambal river at Kota barrage reservoir falling in National Chambal Ghariyal Sanctuary, Rajasthan.

The Member Secretary informed the Committee that the proposal for construction of intake well near left bank of Chambal river at Kota barrage reservoir which falling in National Chambal Ghariyal Sanctuary, Rajasthan.

The Chief Wildlife Warden, Rajasthan explained the project proposal in detail.

Dr. M.D. Madhusudan raised concern over the project as it would have a deleterious effect on Gharials in the river. Similar concerns were also expressed by Dr M.K. Ranjitsinh and Ms Purna Bindra who stressed out that further exploitation of Chambal's waters was unacceptable, given that it was a very important habitat of the critically endangered Gharial.

Shri Kishore Rithe wanted to know about the present water augmentation policy of the Government of Rajasthan and also expressed his concern on such a project being taken up in Chambal river.

After discussion, the committee decided that, in view of the WII report on water intake from Chambal river and the earlier decision of the Standing Committee of NBWL, this proposal be rejected.

4.2 (3) Proposal for survey and investigation for construction of Humbarli Pumped Hydroelectric Project (2x200 MW) in Koyana Wildlife Sanctuary, Maharashtra.

The Member Secretary informed the Committee that the proposal for survey and investigation for construction of Humbarli Pumped Hydroelectric Project (2x200 MW) in Koyana Wildlife Sanctuary, Maharashtra.

The THDC representative gave a brief about the proposal to the committee.

Dr M.K. Ranjitsinh opined that the region was in the seismic zone and earthquakes could not be ruled out. Any earthquake could break the dam and the magnitude of the subsequent damage cannot even be imagined.

Kishor Rithe informed that the Maharashtra caecilian (*Indotyphlus maharashtraensis*) is a species of *caecilians* described in 2004 by scientists of Bombay Natural History Society from Koyana WLS. It is only the second species of *Indotyphlus* known to science. He further mentioned that proposed site is a virgin forest and the construction of the hydro-electric power project may have a negative impact on the caecilians in the Sada ecosystem along the ridges and rare amphibians and reptiles on ridges as well as in the valley. Ms. Prerna Bindra pointed out the proposed project was within the core zone of the Sahyadri Tiger Reserve.

The Member Secretary, NTCA mentioned that the committee should not rush to a decision and the proposal requires more closer examination and it would, therefore be advisable to have a site inspection.

After discussion, the committee decided that the site be inspected by NTCA and the decision will be taken by the Standing Committee based on their report.

4.2 (4) Proposal for renewal of the existing BT damaged road from Amer/Amber road to Nahargarh fort, Jaipur, Rajasthan.

The Member Secretary briefed the Committee regarding the proposal. The Chief Wildlife Warden, Rajasthan also explained the project proposal.

The committee, after discussion, decided to recommend the proposal subject to the following conditions, as stipulated by the Chief Wildlife Warden:

- i. *No night camping shall be allowed during the construction for road by labourers and construction activity will be permitted during day time only.*
- ii. *No construction material should be stored in Sanctuary boundary.*
- iii. *The user agency will put and maintain signboard on both sides of the road mentioning that the road is passing through Sanctuary.*
- iv. *No tree cutting will be allowed.*
- v. *User agency will clear all the debris left after construction activity.*

Chief Wildlife Warden of Maharashtra raised the issue regarding repair of existing black top roads in some of the PAs of Maharashtra. The committee suggested that the permissions of such regular repairs within the existing width should be given by the state chief wildlife wardens as per the appropriate conditions.

4.2 (5) Proposal for rationalization of boundaries Balaram-Ambaji Wildlife Sanctuary, Gujarat.

The Member Secretary informed the committee that the proposal was for **the** rationalization of **the** boundaries Balaram-Ambaji Wildlife Sanctuary, Gujarat.

After discussion, the committee decided that the site be inspected by a team comprising Shri Kishor Rithe and Dr M.D. Madhusudan and submit a report to the committee for taking a view on the proposal.

4.2 (6) Proposal is for permission to use private agricultural land for non-agricultural/educational purpose in village Kashti in GIB Sanctuary in Maharashtra State.

The Member Secretary informed the committee that the proposal was for permission to use private agricultural land for non-agricultural/educational purpose in village Kashti in GIB Sanctuary. The Chief Wildlife Warden explained the details of the proposal.

Shri Kishor Rithe mentioned that the area under PA network in Maharashtra has drastically reduced from 4.97% to 2.6% i.e. from 15,332.49 sq. km. to 8,058.66 sq. km. -a sharp drop by 60.55% after denotification of the GIB sanctuary area from 8496.44 sq. km to merely 1222.61 sq. km. He said that though this is a private area, he was not in agreement with the proposal of building educational institute as this would lead to further township development in the vicinity of the already fragmented GIB sanctuary.. The educational institute can be built at any other suitable place away from the already reduced GIB sanctuary.

Dr M.K. Ranjitsinh suggested that the views of Dr Asad Rahmani, who was not present for this meeting, should be taken before further considering the proposal.

After discussion, the committee decided that Dr Asad Rahmani may be requested to carry out a site inspection and submit a report for consideration of the committee.

4.2 (7) Proposal for diversion of 0.3514 ha of forestland falling in Majathal Wildlife Sanctuary for drawing water from Pazeena Khad in favour of Executive Engineer, I&PH Division Arki, District Solan, H.P.

The Member Secretary briefed the committee regarding the proposal. The Chief Wildlife Warden, Himachal Pradesh explained the proposal to the committee.

Since certain crucial information regarding water intake was not available, the committee decided to defer the proposal.

4.2 (8) Permission for carrying out Survey & Investigation works/Forest clearance in the Itanagar Wildlife Sanctuary division, Arunachal Pradesh for improvement/upgradation of Papu-Yupia-Hoj-Potin Road from 0.00 km to 7.00 km under Prime Minister's package-reg.

The Member Secretary briefed the committee regarding the proposal. However, as the Chief Wildlife Warden, Arunachal Pradesh was not present for the meeting, the committee decided to defer the proposal.

4.2 (9) Proposal for diversion of 1.2 ha of forestland from Kutch Desert Wildlife Sanctuary for construction of border outpost of 133 BSF Battalion, Gujarat.

The Member Secretary briefed the committee regarding the proposal. The Chief Wildlife Warden, Gujarat explained the salient points of the proposal to the committee.

Dr M.K. Ranjitsinh mentioned that the proposed site was an excellent undisturbed xyrophytic climax vegetation site one of the very last in Kutch and cannot be allowed to be lost.

The committee, after discussions, decided to reject the proposal.

4.2 (10) Revised proposal for diversion of 124.054 ha of forest land from Majathal Wildlife Sanctuary for construction of Kol Dam Hydro Power Project, Himachal Pradesh.

The Member Secretary briefed the Committee regarding the proposal. The Chief Wildlife Warden, Himachal Pradesh explained the salient features of the project. The representatives of the NTPC also explained the proposal to the committee.

Ms. Prerna Bindra mentioned that the Majathal Sanctuary was an excellent habitat for Cheer pheasant, a Schedule I species. She informed that the proposal was earlier placed for consideration by the Standing Committee in the 20th meeting of the Standing Committee on October 13th, 2010 and was rejected as the committee was provided with wrong information, and also because it was an important habitat of the Cheer Pheasant,. She also pointed out at the time also work had already started on the project even though there was no clearance from the SC, NBWL. Besides, the proposal had no clearance from the State Board for Wildlife. She further said that recommendations for proposals were not to be

done by circulation to members but discussed and decided in SBWL meetings, chaired by the CM, so there is responsibility and accountability for decisions.

Currently, it had come to her notice that though the proposal was rejected by the SC, NBWL, the NTPC had completed 80% of the work without even obtaining clearance from the NBWL, which was a clear case of violation,. She explained that it had come to the notice of the SC members that after the SC, NBWL decision the Hon'ble Chair had requested the NTPC to reduce the height of the dam and come back to the Standing Committee with a revised proposal. The SC, NBWL members had written to the Hon'ble chair in this regard. However, instead of waiting for clearance from the NBWL, the NTPC had started the work, which was not acceptable.

Shri Kishor Rithe mentioned that such violations inside the sanctuary need to be dealt with utmost seriousness and should be punished as per the Wildlife Protection Act 1972.

Dr A.J.T Johnsingh mentioned that cheer pheasant occur in the higher reaches and the impounding of water will take place in the lower reaches. This factor should be kept in mind while decisions are taken. the area was an excellent habitat for Cheer Pheasants and activities should be planned after careful consideration on their impact on the habitats of these species.

After discussions, the committee unanimously decided that this project cannot be recommended, and that the work must be stopped immediately.

4.2 (11) Diversion of 134.0364 ha of forest land from Kachchh Desert WLS for construction of Kutch Branch Canal in favour of Sardar Sarovar Narmada Nigam Ltd., Gujarat.

The Member Secretary briefed the committee regarding the said proposal. The Chief Wildlife Warden also gave a brief explanation on the project. He mentioned that the State Board for Wildlife had not recommended the proposal.

Dr M.K. Ranjitsinh mentioned that water was important for the Kutch region and this canal was also, therefore, important. He requested that more area need to be added in the Bustard conservation area between Naliya and Jakhau in Kutch and if this canal proposal is fit to be approved, it should be on the basis of land to be added here in lieu of land to be lost for the canal.

After discussions, the committee decided the proposal would be considered only after the following:

(i) Dr M.K. Ranjitsinh would conduct a site inspection and submit a report for consideration of the Committee.

(ii) The State Government would place this proposal before the SBWL and convey the recommendation to the Standing Committee.

4.2 (12) Proposal for laying of proposed pipeline for 3x100 MW Combined Cycle Power Project Stage- II Dholpur, on existing pipeline of Stage-I from existing intake well and reservoir from National Chambal Ghariyal Sanctuary, Rajasthan.

The Member Secretary informed the Committee that the proposal for laying of proposed pipeline for 3x100 MW Combined Cycle Power Project Stage- II Dholpur, on existing pipeline of Stage-I from existing intake well and reservoir from National Chambal Ghariyal Sanctuary, Rajasthan, was recommended by the Standing Committee of NBWL in its meeting held on 25th April 2011. Subsequently, the project proponent had approached the CEC and Hon'ble Supreme Court for final approval. The CEC while recommending the proposal had stipulated certain conditions, one amongst them being that the user agency shall deposit 5% of the project cost for the conservation of Ghariyal Sanctuary. This condition was also upheld by Hon'ble Supreme Court while granting final approval for this project. Now the user agency has approached the Standing Committee of NBWL for waiving off the condition of 5% cost.

Ms. Prerna Bindra mentioned that while the proposal was recommended by Standing Committee of NBWL on 25th April 2011, she had given a dissent note to this decision. She said she was not in agreement with recommending this project at all.

After discussion, the committee decided not to agree to the present proposal and decided to adhere to the recommendations of the CEC and the order of Hon'ble Supreme Court on this proposal. (earlier recommendations of NBWL)

4.2 (13) Proposal for survey and investigation for Gargai project in Tansa Sanctuary for Gargai River Project, Maharashtra.

The Member Secretary informed the committee that the proposal was for survey and investigation for Gargai River Project in Tansa Sanctuary.

Shri Kishor Rithe mentioned that availability of water to Mumbai city was a critical issue. At the time of approval for the Shahi project, the project authority had given a written undertaking that "It is not necessary to construct any new source for water supply up to year 2031" . He also mentioned that the former Chief Wildlife Warden himself had rejected this proposal as this dam will destroy 750 ha of good forest area of Tansa sanctuary and hence he would not support this proposal.

The representative of the user agency clarified that Shahi project was not a drinking water project and that the irrigation department had no authority to give such an undertaking as the responsibility and mandate for drinking water to Mumbai city was with the Municipal Corporation. He explained that the proposed project is for the requirement of Navi Mumbai area and is for survey and investigation only.

Ms. Prerna Bindra mentioned that a permission for survey and investigation should never be construed as a clearance for the project.

The committee, after discussions, decided to have a site inspection by Dr Asad Rahmani and take a view based on the site inspection report.

4.2 (14) Proposal seeking permission for black topping/tarred of already existing four roads from Lakh Bahosi Bird Sanctuary, district Kannauj, Uttar Pradesh.

The Member Secretary informed the committee that the proposal was for black topping of already existing four roads in Lakh Bahosi Bird Sanctuary, district Kannauj, Uttar Pradesh.

The Chief Wildlife Warden, Uttar Pradesh mentioned that a major portion of the sanctuary was revenue and private land and this road was not within the forest land.

Dr M.K. Ranjitsinh mentioned that there were other cases of roads passing through Protected Areas and therefore, the committee should take a holistic view after having consultations. A generic guidelines should be adopted for considering such road proposals.

The committee, therefore, decided that a sub-committee under the chairmanship of Dr M.K. Ranjitsinh, and comprising Dr M.D. Madhusudan, Ms. Prerna Bindra, representative of NTCA, representative of WII and Chief Wildlife Wardens of two States, be constituted by the Ministry for framing 'Generic Guidelines for roads within Protected Areas'.

The committee also decided that maintenance of the roads indicated in this proposal, as 'all weather road', could be taken up by the State Government. However, no black topping shall be permissible till above committee submits its report.

4.2 (15) Proposal for laying of 765 KV S/C Indore-Vadodara part-I transmission line in Kharmor Wildlife Sanctuary by Power Grid Corporation of India Ltd., Madhya Pradesh.

The Member Secretary briefed the committee regarding the proposal. The Chief Wildlife Warden mentioned that the project proponent had informed that they have made an alternate alignment and so were withdrawing the proposal.

The committee accepted the decision of the project proponents to choose an alternate alignment and to withdraw the proposal.

4.2 (16) Proposal for establishment of 400 KV D/C Rajgarh-Karamsad transmission line passing through Kharmor Wildlife Sanctuary, Madhya Pradesh.

The Member Secretary informed the committee regarding the proposal.

The representative of the user agency informed that the terminal station was inside the Sanctuary and therefore, they had no other option to take the transmission line.

Dr M.K. Ranjitsinh desired to know the location of the nesting sites of the lesser florican in the Sanctuary area.

The committee, after discussion, decided that the Chief Wildlife Warden, Madhya Pradesh ascertain the nesting sites of the Lesser Florican in the Sanctuary. Kishor Rithe suggested to take help of Mr.P.M.Lad , retired Chief Wildlife Warden of Madhya Pradesh who has extensively studied the Lesser Florican here since last four decades, to assess their nesting sites and submit a report for consideration and for taking a view on this proposal.

4.2 (17) Construction of road from Nauradehi Wildlife Sanctuary from Tendukheda-Taradehi Maharajpur road km.26, 27, 28/2-4-6, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37 & 38/2=7.80 Km, Madhya Pradesh.

4.2 (18) Widening/Improvement of existing Tendukhera-Patan-Rehli road (SH-15A) (km.78/8 to 99/10=21.4 kms) passing through Nauradehi Wildlife Sanctuary, Madhya Pradesh.

The committee decided to take the two proposals together as they were of similar nature and were in the same Sanctuary. The Member Secretary informed the committee about both the proposals.

After discussions, the committee decided that the sites be inspected by the Dr M.K. Ranjitsinh and the committee would take a view after considering the site inspection report.

4.2 (19) Proposal for construction of high level bridge on Chambal river at Pinahat. Two districts will be connected with each other of two States (Fatehabad-Pinahat-Ambaha-Morena) (U.P., M.P.).

The Member Secretary briefed the committee regarding the proposal. The Chief Wildlife Warden, Madhya Pradesh, informed that this proposal stands withdrawn.

The committee accepted the request of the Chief Wildlife Warden for withdrawing the proposal.

4.2 (20) Diversion of 11.272 ha. of forest land from Sone Ghariyal Sanctuary for reconstruction and development to 4 lane with paved shoulders and maintenance of NH-75 Ext. from km.0+000 to km.82+400 Rewa-Sidhi section, Madhya Pradesh.

The Member Secretary briefed the committee regarding the proposal. The Chief Wildlife Warden, Madhya Pradesh explained the salient features of the proposal to the committee. The Secretary, PWD, Madhya Pradesh also made a brief presentation on the proposal.

After discussion, the committee decided to recommend the proposal subject to the following conditions, as stipulated by the State Government:

- i. *The agency will see that minimum vehicular movement should be in the sanctuary area.*

- ii. *Minimum movement of the staff of the user agency is to be allowed in the said area.*
- iii. *No damage should be caused to flora and fauna of the said area by user agency and its establishment.*
- iv. *The agency and/or conductor will not use the area of the sanctuary which is not included in this project for the movement, transportation and any other purpose of the construction and maintenance of the project.*
- v. *The agency or contractor will strictly follow the provisions of wildlife (Protection) Act, 1972.*
- vi. *The user agency will take utmost care and precaution so that no damage is caused to wildlife by the project.*
- vii. *Soil, water conservation works in the said area may be taken by user agency.*

4.2 (21) Proposal for denotification of land inside Satpura Tiger Reserve for religious functions and roads, Madhya Pradesh.

The Member Secretary informed the committee that the proposal was for denotification of land inside Satpura Tiger Reserve for religious functions.

The members and the NTCA were not in favour of this project as it would have a serious impact on the fragile ecology of the Tiger Reserve. After discussion, the committee unanimously decided to reject the proposal.

4.2 (22) Diversion of 1.11 ha of forest land from Pulicat Bird Sanctuary for construction of high level bridge at Km 0/4, Chennai Pulicat Road to Pasiyavaram Road, Tamil Nadu.

4.2 (23) Diversion of 0.65 ha of forest land from Pulicat Bird Sanctuary for construction of fish landing centre at Periyamongodu in Thiruvallur district, Tamil Nadu.

The committee decided to take these two proposals together as they were in the same sanctuary. The Member Secretary briefed the committee regarding the proposals. He mentioned that the State Board for Wildlife has not recommended the proposal.

The committee was of the view that as per the Wildlife Act, it was a statutory requirement to have recommendation of the SBWL for such activities inside Sanctuary. The committee after discussions decided to consider both the proposals after receipt of the recommendation of the SBWL.

4.2 (24) Proposal for diversion of 180.79 ha of forestland for construction of Bansagar Irrigation project (Adwa-Meja Jirga link channels) canal of 25.60 km length out of which, length beyond 15 km falls in Kaimur Wildlife Sanctuary, Uttar Pradesh.-(I.A.No.128, 129 and 144 in W.P. (C) No.337/1995.

The Member Secretary informed the committee that this proposal was recommended by the Standing Committee of Indian Board for Wildlife in its meeting held on 17th February 2003, with certain conditions. One of the conditions stipulated was for

relocation of 10 villages outside Kaimur Wildlife Division. The State Government had subsequently requested for waiving of this conditions as the people in these villages were reluctant to move. Hon'ble Supreme Court while hearing the matter had referred the matter to NBWL for consideration of the request of the State Government.

The Chief Wildlife Warden, Uttar Pradesh mentioned that there were actually 13 villages who were approached by the Forest Department and Irrigation Department with rehabilitation plan, however, the villagers were still reluctant to accept the rehabilitation plan proposed by the State Government.

Shri Kishor Rithe opined that the Chief Wildlife Warden should ask the officials to conduct the Gram Sabha meetings wherein, they should explain the rehabilitation package at Rs.10 Lakh per family as described in centrally sponsored scheme. They should document the grievances and reason of opposition to relocation (or any suggestion) etc expressed by each family and should come back to SC-NBWL..The visit of village representatives shall also be arranged to relocate villages from Madhya Pradesh or Maharashtra.

Ms. Perna Bindra mentioned that the canal bisects the Sanctuary, and hence would have a deleterious impact.

Dr M.K. Ranjitsinh mentioned that the villagers should be given offer for land in the command area along with other options, as applicable. He was of the opinion that any good option put forward to the people would never go unaccepted.

The committee, after discussion requested the Chief Wildlife Warden to once again take up the relocation package with the Gram Sabha and come back to the Standing Committee of NBWL.

4.2 (25) Diversion of 0.97 ha of forest land in Pasuvemula Reserve Forest of WLM Nagarjuna Sagar Division for Anupu & Koppunuru Lift Irrigation Scheme(LIS) on the Foreshore of Nagarjunasagar Dam in Macherla, Andhra Pradesh.

The Member-Secretary briefed the committee on the proposal. The Chief Wildlife Warden, Andhra Pradesh explained the salient features of the project proposal. The Member Secretary, NTCA informed that the area was part of the Nagarjunsagar Srisailam Tiger Reserve.

After discussion, the committee decided that the site be inspected by NTCA and the decision will subsequently be taken by the Standing Committee based on their report.

4.2 (26) Diversion of 4.493 ha of forest land from Pench Mowgli Wildlife Sanctuary for rehabilitation/upgradation of existing 2 lane to 4 lane on Seoni-Khawasa (MP) MH Border Section of NH-7, Madhya Pradesh.

The Member-Secretary briefed the committee on the proposal.

The Member-Secretary, NTCA informed the committee that this was an old proposal. The proposal was rejected by the Standing Committee of NBWL. NTCA, NHAI and WII had discussed the matter again to look for alternative alignment suggesting safeguards. The proposed road passes through a very important corridor and the NTCA and WII had suggested for several underpasses and over-bridges. The NTCA has also forwarded its report in this regard to the Ministry.

The members were of the opinion that the report of NTCA be shared with them before a view is taken on the proposal.

Ms. Prerna Bindra stressed that the NH-7 cuts through the critical Kanha-Pench tiger corridor, and hence this widening was not acceptable. She also said that unfortunately it was seen that NHAI had not taken care of compliance of the conditions stipulated by the regulatory authorities in various cases. This had been it pointed out and discussed in a previous meeting of the SC, NBWL.

Shri Kishor Rithe mentioned that a present proposal has only considered Pench Tiger Reserve of Madhya Pradesh. However after this proposal, the Mansinghdeo sanctuary and the buffer of Pench Tiger Reserve in Maharashtra have been recently notified. The proposed NH-7 is already bordering both these areas hence it requires permission of state board for wildlife of Maharashtra.

After discussions, the committee decided that the report of the NTCA on this proposal be circulated amongst the Standing Committee of NBWL for their consideration. A view on the proposal would be taken thereafter.

4.2 (27) Diversion of 0.412 ha of forest land from Sudhmahadev Conservation Reserve for construction of road from Sira to Garhi in Udhampur District by PMGSY Department, Jammu & Kashmir.

The Member Secretary briefed the committee regarding the proposal. The Chief Wildlife Warden explained the salient features of the proposal.

After discussion, the committee decided to recommend the proposal subject to the following conditions, as stipulated by the Chief Wildlife Warden:

- i. *5% (i.e. Rs.13.0915 lakhs) of project cost (i.e. Rs.261.83 lakhs) shall be paid by the user agency for management of wildlife in Sudhmahadev Conservation Reserve.*
- ii. *b. The user agency, while implementing the road construction project, will abide by the orders to be issued by the Hon'ble Supreme Court and follow provisions of the Jammu and Kashmir Wildlife Protection Act, 1978 (Amended upto 2002) strictly.*
- iii. *c. The user agency shall also pay NPV charges on the land to be diverted as per Hon'ble Supreme Court orders.*
- iv. *d. The user agency will follow the eco-friendly engineering practices during the construction.*
- v. *e. Warning/informatory sign boards and hoardings shall be provided on the road section passing through the Conservation Reserve.*

- vi. *No quarrying/mining operations shall be carried out within the boundaries of the Conservation Reserve.*
- vii. *Speed limit sign boards/speed breakers shall be constructed at the areas of potential animal movement for ensuring slow speed of vehicles.*
- viii. *The user agency will ensure that littering of any kind is strictly avoided by its staff and also by construction workers. All waste material such as plastics, tar barrels, gunny sacks, bottles, tin cans etc. would be properly disposed off outside the Conservation Reserve. No waste material will be left either near or away from the road in the Conservation Reserve.*
- ix. *The user agency will ensure that minimum damage is done to the local flora. Cutting of local flora by construction workers would be strictly prohibited. The concerned officials of the user agency collaborate with the Conservation of Forests (Wildlife) Jammu and other forest establishment to ensure that no damage is caused to the flora and fauna.*
- x. *The labour employed by the user agency shall not extract any firewood from the Conservation Reserve area and shall not camp within the boundaries of Conservation Area.*
- xi. *No debris shall be dumped inside the boundaries of Conservation Reserve.*

4.2 (28) Proposal for diversion of 0.222 ha of forestland from Mount Abu Sanctuary for construction of road connecting to the proposed school of BAPS Sanstha at Salgav village at Mount Abu, Rajasthan.

The Member Secretary briefed the Committee on the proposal.

The Committee, after discussion decided to recommend the proposal subject to the condition that there shall be no black topping of the road and the following conditions as stipulated by the Chief Wildlife Warden:

- i. *No night camping shall be allowed during the construction of road by labour & construction activity will be permitted only during day time only.*
- ii. *No tree cutting will be allowed.*
- iii. *The construction material for road will be brought from the area outside the sanctuary area.*
- iv. *The user agency will not create barrow pit in sanctuary area for the construction of road.*
- v. *User agency will clear all the debris left after construction activity.*

4.2 (29) Diversion of 1.843 ha (1.393 bridge, 0.45 road) of forest land from National Chambal Crocodile Sanctuary for upgradation of Sabalgarh-Karoli road (SH-2) & construction of high level bridge across Chambal river on Sabalgarh-Karoli road upto Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh.

The Member Secretary briefed the Committee on the proposal.

The members desired to know whether the entire structure would be built in the boundary of the Madhya Pradesh State or it would also involve lands in Rajasthan.

The Secretary, PWD informed that the structure would fall within the areas of both Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan as the Chambal river separates these two states.

The Chief Wildlife Warden, Rajasthan informed that he was not aware of such a proposal being referred to them for consideration.

The Committee, after discussion decided that the user agency may forward the proposal to the Chief Wildlife Warden, Rajasthan, who shall seek the recommendations of the Rajasthan State Board for Wildlife. Thereafter, a consolidated proposal shall be submitted to the Standing Committee of NBWL for its consideration.

4.2 (30) Proposal for construction of New High Level Bridge and approach road across Sone river in km.6+600 to 10+100 near Jogdha on Bahari-Hanumana Road-SH-52 passing through Son Gharial Sanctuary, Madhya Pradesh.

The Member Secretary briefed the Committee on the proposal. The Secretary, PWD made a brief presentation highlighting the salient features of the project.

The Committee, after discussion decided to recommend the proposal subject to the condition that the Chief Wildlife Warden shall ensure that the construction of the bridge does not affect the nesting sites of Gharials, **crocodiles and turtles** and such other conditions, as may be stipulated by the Chief Wildlife Warden.

4.2 (31) Proposal for construction of Kanchanpur Railway Station and laying of two additional lines at the station in Katni-Singroli Section at Km.1218.170 passing through Sanjay Dubri Wildlife Sanctuary, Madhya Pradesh.

The Member-Secretary informed the Committee that the proposal was for construction of Kanchanpur Railway Station and laying of two additional lines at the station in Katni-Singroli Section at Km.1218.170 passing through Sanjay Dubri Wildlife Sanctuary, Madhya Pradesh.

Ms. Prerna Bindra as well as Kishor Rithe were of the opinion that construction of a Railway Station within the Tiger Reserve would have serious impact on the tiger movement.

After discussion, the committee decided that NTCA would undertake a site inspection and submit a report to the Standing Committee of NBWL for its consideration.

4.2 (32) Proposal seeking permission for widening of existing 2-lane NH-3 section passing through Madhav National Park which is part of four laning project from Gwalior to Shivpuri in district Shivpuri, Madhya Pradesh.

The Member Secretary briefed the committee on the proposal. The committee, after discussion decided to defer the matter till the committee under the chairmanship of Dr. M.K. Ranjitsinh submits its report.

4.2 (33) Proposal for construction of road from Sopakha village to Chewabhanjyang via Jorbotay in West Sikkim by the Roads & Bridges Department, Government of Sikkim for connecting the Police & SSB Out Posts at Chewabhanjyang.

The Member-Secretary informed the committee that the proposal was for construction of road from Sopakha village to Chewabhanjyang via Jorbotay in West Sikkim by the Roads & Bridges Department, Government of Sikkim for connecting the Police & SSB Out Posts at Chewabhanjyang.

After discussion, the committee decided that the site be inspected by the same team for the Teesta proposal considered earlier in the agenda. The team would include Dr M.K. Ranjitsinh, Dr. A.J.T Johnsingh, Shri Kishor Rithe and Dr. M.D. Madhusudan. The Standing Committee would take a view after considering the site inspection report.

4.2 (34) Diversion of 0.30 ha of forest land from Barsey Rhododendron Sanctuary for augmentation of Soreng & Chakung Water Supply Schemes from Ringyang Khola (River), in West Sikkim by the Water Security & PHE Department, Government of Sikkim.

4.2 (35) Diversion of 0.01 ha of forest land from Fambonglho Wildlife Sanctuary for augmentation of Rural Water Supply Scheme (RWSS) from Palay Khola, by Rural Management and Development, Deptt, Sikkim.

The committee decided to consider these two proposals together as they were of similar nature. The Member Secretary briefed the committee on the proposals.

The Committee, after discussion decided to recommend the proposals subject to the following conditions, as stipulated by the Chief Wildlife Warden:

- i. *Labour camps will not be permitted to be set up inside the sanctuary.*
- ii. *All workers need to obtain permits for working in the project site inside the sanctuary.*
- iii. *Construction materials should be stored in the identified area.*
- iv. *No felling of trees or destruction of wildlife habitat, exploitation or removal of any wildlife including forest produce from the sanctuary should take place.*
- v. *Authorized sanctuary personnel will check the construction sites as and when required.*
- vi. *The project implementing authorities and workers will obey Dos and Don'ts of the sanctuary.*

4.2 (36) Diversion of 01 ha of forest land from Pangolakha Wildlife Sanctuary for establishment of Border Out Post of Sashastra Seema Bal at Hathicherey, East Sikkim.

The Member-Secretary informed the Committee that the proposal for establishment of Border Out Post of Sashastra Seema Bal at Hathicherey, East Sikkim.

After discussion, the committee decided that to recommend the proposal subject to condition as stipulated by the Chief Wildlife Warden, Sikkim.

4.2 (37) Diversion of 6.700 ha of forest land from Chambal Crocodile Wildlife Sanctuary for construction of 765 KV transmission line (Partly S/C and Partly D/C) between MP (Gwalior) and Rajasthan (Jaipur) passing through Chambal (Crocodile) Sanctuary near villages Rahu Ka Gaon, Madhya Pradesh.

The Member Secretary briefed the committee on the proposals. The Chief Wildlife Warden, Rajasthan explained the salient features of the project proposal.

The Committee, after discussion decided to recommend the proposal subject to the following conditions, as stipulated by the Chief Wildlife warden:

- i. *The establishment/construction of towers in & adjoining sanctuary area will be done in the presence of local wildlife/forest staff.*
- ii. *5% of the project cost, which is being incurred inside the sanctuary area will be deposited in Rajasthan Protected Areas Conservation Society by the user agency for the development of National Chambal Sanctuary.*
- iii. *Tree felling/cutting will not be allowed.*
- iv. *No night camping should be allowed during erection of electric line in the sanctuary area by labour.*
- v. *All other permissions will be obtained by the user agency.*

4.2 (38) Diversion of 2.340 ha. of forest land from National Chambal Wildlife Sanctuary for construction of high level bridge across Chambal river at Usaighat on Ambah-Pinahat Road in Km 24/2, Madhya Pradesh.

The Member Secretary briefed the committee on the proposal. The Secretary, PWD, made a brief presentation on the project proposal.

The committee desired to know whether the area would also involve land within the State of Uttar Pradesh. It was informed that the land within Uttar Pradesh would also be involved.

After discussion, the committee decided that the user agency should forward a copy of the proposal to the Chief Wildlife Warden, Uttar Pradesh, who would place the proposal for consideration of the Uttar Pradesh State Board for Wildlife. A consolidated proposal should thereafter, be placed before the Standing Committee of NBWL for consideration.

4.2 (39) Proposal for upgradation/widening of Baihar-Topla-supkhar-Chilpi State Highway-26 passing through Kanha Tiger Reserve, Madhya Pradesh.

The Member Secretary informed the committee that the proposal was for upgradation/widening of Baihar-Topla-supkhar-Chilpi State Highway-26 passing through Kanha Tiger Reserve, Madhya Pradesh.

Ms Prerna Bindra pointed out that the road passes through the rich Halon valley where much effort has been taken to revive the endangered barasingha and also through the chicken neck linking the eastern and western parts of the reserve, and that widening must not be allowed.

Dr M.K. Ranjitsinh as well as Kishor Rithe were of the opinion that this road should not be widened as it would have very severe negative impact on the *Barasinghas* of the Tiger Reserve. The NTCA was also not in favour of this proposal.

After discussion, the committee decided to reject the proposal.

4.2 (40) Proposal for setting up of eco-tourism facilities in Madhuban under Mount Harriet Eco-tourism circuit, Andaman & Nicobar Islands.

The Member Secretary briefed the committee on the proposals. The Chief Wildlife Warden, Andaman & Nicobar Islands explained the salient features of the project proposal.

Ms. Prerna Bindra suggested that although it was not directly related to this proposal, but, she requested the Andaman & Nicobar Islands Administration to take up conservation of the critically endangered Dugongs in the area on top priority. All possible efforts for its conservation should also be taken up by the Ministry.

After discussion, the committee decided to recommend the proposal along with a direction to the Andaman & Nicobar Islands to take up Dugong conservation on top priority basis as well as with such other conditions, as may be stipulated by the Chief Wildlife Warden.

4.2 (41) Diversion of 35 Sq. mts. of forestland from East Island Wildlife Sanctuary for installation of coastal surveillance RADAR, Andaman & Nicobar Islands.

The Member Secretary briefed the committee on the proposal. The representative of the Coast Guard made a brief presentation on the salient features of the proposal. The Chief Wildlife Warden, Andaman & Nicobar Islands clarified that the area proposed for diversion was only 0.0035 ha (35 Sq. mts)

After discussion, the committee decided to recommend the proposal subject to such conditions stipulated by the Chief Wildlife Warden.

AGENDA ITEM NO. 5: Any other item with the permission of the Chair.

With the permission of the chair, the following two items placed for consideration of the committee:

(1) Proposal for construction of Navi Mumbai International Airport at Panvel Taluk, District. Raigad in Maharashtra.

The Member Secretary briefed the committee regarding the proposal. The Chief Wildlife Warden, Maharashtra informed that the proposal was recommended by the State Board for Wildlife.

Shri Kishor Rithe mentioned that he was aware of the project as he was present during the meeting of the State Board for Wildlife, but he had certain reservations as it would have an impact on birds in the Sanctuary.

After discussions, the committee decided that a team comprising of Dr Asad Rahmani and Shri Kishor Rithe would conduct site inspection and submit a report to the Standing Committee of NBWL for consideration.

(2) Diversion of 5.1709 ha of forest land from Gautam Budh Sanctuary for erection of 11 KV transmission line under Rajiv Gandhi Vdyutikaran Yojana.

The Member Secretary briefed the committee regarding the proposal. The members desired that they require time to study the proposal and discuss it thereafter. Therefore, the committee decided to defer the proposal.

The meeting ended with a vote of thanks to the Chair.

ANNEXURE

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS OF THE 28TH MEETING OF STANDING COMMITTEE OF NBWL HELD ON 20TH March 2013.

1.	Dr. V. Rajagopalan Secretary, E & F	Chairman
2.	Dr S.S. Garbyal Addl. Director General of Forests & Director, Wildlife Preservation	Member-Secretary
3.	Shri A.K. Srivastava Addl. Director General of Forests (FC) & Additional Charge of DGF&SS	Member
4.	Shri P.R. Sinha Director, Wildlife Institute of India, Dehradun	Member
5.	Dr. M.K. Ranjitsinh	Member
6.	Dr A.J.T.Johnsinh	Member
7.	Ms. Prerna Bindra	Member
8.	Dr M.D. Madhusudan Nature Conservation Foundation, Mysore	Member
9.	Shri Kishore Rithe, Satpuda Foundation, Amravati.	Member
10.	Dr. Rajesh Gopal, Member Secretary (NTCA)	Invitee
11.	Dr S.K. Khanduri, Inspector General of Forests (WL)	Invitee
12	Shri M.S. Negi, Inspector General (FC)	Invitee
13	Shri A.M. Singh, IGF (PE), MoEF	Invitee
14	Shri Arvind Kumar, Principal Secretary & PCCF, Government of Sikkim, Gangtok.	Invitee
15.	Shri A.K. Singh, Chief Wildlife Warden, J&K	Invitee
16	Shri Dhirendrasigh, Chief Wildlife Warden, Punjab	Invitee
17	Shri S.W.H.Naqvi, Chief Wildlife Warden, Maharashtra	Invitee
18	Shri Liandawla, Chief Wildlife Warden, Mizoram	Invitee
19	Dr. Rupak De, Chief Wildlife Warden, U.P.	Invitee

20	Shri M.Trivedi, PCCF(WL), CWLW, A&N Islands	Invitee
21	Shri Bhawan Singh, PCCF & Chief Wildlife Warden, Chennai	Invitee
22	Shri S.S.Sharma, PCCF & Chief Wildlife Warden, Uttarakhand	Invitee
23	Dr P.K. Shukla, PCCF(WL) & Chief Wildlife Warden, Madhya Pradesh.	Invitee
24	Shri A.V. Joseph, PCCF (WL) & Chief Wildlife Warden, A&N Islands	Invitee
25	Shri A.S. Brar, APCCF & Chief Wildlife Warden, Rajasthan	Invitee
26	Shri B.A. Khan, Addl.PCCF cum Chief Wildlife Warden, Bihar.	Invitee
27	Shri Rakesh Sood, C.C.F. Wildlife (South), Shimla, H.P.	Invitee
28	Shri C.K. Patil, CCF (WL), Bhopal, Madhya Pradesh	Invitee
29	Shri K.Jagadishwar Singh, Chief Conservator of Forests, Manipur.	Invitee
30	Shri A.O.Shakeel, CF(WL), Gujarat State, Gandhinagar	Invitee
31	Mr. Vivek Saxena Deputy Inspector General of Forests (WL)	Invitee
32	Shri Prabhat Tyagi, Joint Director (WL)	Invitee
33	Shri Vikas Marwah, O/o DIG, SSB, Development Area Gangtok, Sikkim.	Invitee
34	Comdt(DG)Shri K.C. Singh	Invitee

APPENDIX

Comments on the minutes of the 27th Meeting of the Standing Committee of NBWL held on 12th December 2012, as received from the members

Comments by Ms. Prerna Bindra

“2.1.2(7). Proposal for Baranda Laterite mine of M/s Jayprakash Associates Ltd. falling at a distance of 3.00 km from Narayan Sarovar Wildlife Sanctuary, Gujarat.

4.1 (12) Proposal for Kharoi Jadva Vhaghapaddhar, Harudi limestone mine of M/s Jayprakash Associates Ltd. (Formerly known as Gujarat Anjan Cements Ltd.) at a distance of 4.8 km from Narayan Sarovar Wildlife Sanctuary, Gujarat

4.1 (14) Umarsar lignite mine of GMDC, on 2186.76 ha at a distance of 4.4 km from Narayan Sarovar Sanctuary, Gujarat.

In reference to these proposals, the Principal Chief Conservator of Forests (WL) Gujarat had stated that:

- *There is an order of Hon'ble Supreme Court dated 7th May 2010 regarding prohibition of mining activities up to only 3 kms from the boundaries of the Narayan Sarovar Sanctuary &*
- *The State had already notified the Eco-Sensitive Zone under the Environment Protection Act which was 2.5 km*

Given the above, it was felt that these proposals, therefore, were outside the purview of the Standing Committee, NBWL which was the decision, subject to the verification of the order of the Hon'ble Supreme Court, and the final notification of the ESZ. I request that these may be made available to the non-official members of the SC, NBWL. This is especially important given that these are major projects with considerable impact to rare wildlife and prohibited in Eco Sensitive Zones as per the guidelines of the MoEF.

Item 4.1 (2): Diversion of 79.474 ha of forest land in Kutch Desert Wildlife Sanctuary and Wild Ass Sanctuary for construction of Gaduli to Hajipur-Odma-Khavda-Kunariya-Dholavira-Maovana-Gadakbet-Santalpur road.

Please add: *All non-official members endorsed the site inspection report by Dr Ranjitsinh, Dr Divyabhanusinh and Dr Asad Rahmani and stated that given the grave consequences of the proposed road, this proposal must be rejected.*

Item No. 2.2.1 (10): Proposal for River Bed Mining of Sand Bajri and Boulders (Minor Minerals), Lease area 12.06 ha at Lot No. 9, River-Solani, village-Thapal Ismailpur, Tehsil-Behat, District- Saharanpur, Uttar Pradesh.

Please add:

*Shri Kishor Rithe and Ms. Perna Bindra observed that the map for only one of the above proposal was received along with agenda for the meeting on 31st October 2012 while maps for other proposals were not provided to them and therefore, it would be difficult to offer any opinion on the proposals. They requested that **detailed and clear** maps may be provided to the members **along with the proposals** for judicious intervention and fruitful discussion of proposals during the Meeting.*

The para

“Ms. Perna Bindra added that opinion of the Chief Wildlife Warden Uttarakhand may be necessary as sites are close to Rajaji National Park.”

Be replaced by:

“Ms Perna Bindra pointed out that the PA in question and in proximity to the proposed mining was Rajaji National Park was in Uttarakhand. It was, therefore, important that the opinion of the Chief Wildlife Warden Uttarakhand be taken in considering this proposal.”

Item No. 2.2.2(1): Proposal for laying of 400 KV D/C Mundra-Zerda transmission line-II in Wild Ass Sanctuary by Gujarat Energy transmission Corporation Ltd, Gujarat.

***Please add:** that the status of the land would remain as PA, and the land not to be transferred to the project proponent and continues to remain with the forest department*

in the para:

The committee after discussion, decided to recommend the proposal subject to the condition that the State Government would fix the responsibility and accountability on the project proponent in case the conditions are not complied to and in case there is death/injury to the wild animals due to electrocution and, that the status of the land would remain as PA, and the land not to be transferred to the project proponent and continues to remain with the forest department. and that the nature of the vegetation below the transmission lines would remain unchanged. It was also indicated that the following conditions as stipulated by the Chief Wildlife warden, Gujarat would also be strictly complied with:

Item No. 2.2.2(9): Proposal for reconstruction and maintenance of existing road from km.57/400 to 155/000 of Satna-Bamitha- Section of NH-75 (2 laning with paved shoulders) passing through Panna National Park, Madhya Pradesh.

The following be added:

“Ms Perna Bindra asked that it be clarified whether the road was being repaired and maintained in the current condition and that it was not being widened or expanded, and was informed categorically that this was the case.”

Item No. 2.2.2(11): Permission to execute the upgradation to 2 lane configuration of Obaidullaganj -Rehti road under PWD in Ratapani Wildlife Sanctuary, Madhya Pradesh.

The para

“The Secretary, PWD mentioned that the proposal involves only maintenance of the existing road and the existing road width only would be upgraded.”

be replaced by:

“The Secretary, PWD mentioned that the proposal involves only maintenance of the existing road and the existing road width only would be upgraded As Ratapani is a proposed tiger reserve, the opinion of the NTCA was sought, and.”

Item No. 2.2.2(14): Proposal for repair and re-carpeting of existing B.T road from MDR-111 (Baroni Shiwar SWM Shyampura Bhuri Pahari Kurgaon)to Ranthambore Fort, Rajasthan.

After discussions on the proposal and with the opinion of the NTCA), the committee decided to recommend the proposal

Item No. 2.2.2 (15): Survey for construction of new broad gauge railway line by North Frontier Railways from Sevok in West Bengal to Rongpo at Sikkim over 32.586 ha within Mahananda Wildlife Sanctuary, West Bengal.

*“Ms. Prerna Bindra said that she had been to this area and opined that Mahananda is an important PA which is part of the Gorumara-Jaldapara-Buxa landscape of North Bengal. She said that Mahananda WLS was already fragmented and under various threats.
“*

*The affected forest blocks of the Sevoke-Rangpoo railway line will be Gola, Chawa, Andhera and Ruyem in Mahananda, which are low mountain areas and are very rich in flora and fauna. According to field reports, there are tigers in these blocks, Mahananda has a breeding population of tigers, according to the state census done in 2004 it has a population of 16 tigers. Importantly, one endemic and endangered orchid Diplomeris hirsuta is available in this patch only, . She also pointed out that elephant mortality due to train accidents in this region is fairly frequent, and in 2010, seven elephants were mowed down here in the railway line of Gulma to Alipur Duar which goes through Sevok.
.. She suggested that in view of the above, and to protect this PA and its wildlife, this project could not be recommended the Railways should consider of an alternate route.”*

AGENDA ITEM NO.3: Agenda proposed by Members, Standing Committee of NBWL

The following be added:

“Ms Prerna Bindra said that while we must increase the outlay for all species, this was not to undermine or decrease the existing outlay for any species. She also pointed out that in the meeting of the NBWL on 5th September, 2012, the matter of a wildlife official for each regional office of the MoEF had been discussed and endorsed by the Hon'ble Prime Minister. She said this will help strengthen wildlife management and conservation, and desired to know the progress of this.”

3(iii) Agenda items proposed by Ms. Prerna Bindra.

The para

“The Member Secretary mentioned that Ms. Prerna Bindra had proposed two agenda items regarding bringing Elephant Reserves and wildlife corridors under the purview of the Standing Committee of NBWL and that for commercial exploitation of bamboo and other NTFP.”

be replaced by:

“The Member Secretary mentioned that Ms. Prerna Bindra had proposed two agenda items regarding bringing Elephant Reserves and key wildlife corridors under the purview of the Standing Committee of NBWL and that of commercial exploitation of bamboo and NTFP/MFP in critical wildlife areas.

Ms Prerna Bindra said the matter of including ‘standing bamboo’ as NTFP/MFP and commercial exploitation of NTFP/MFP in PAs and important wildlife areas was a matter of much concern from the wildlife perspective. It was decided that this issue would be discussed in the meeting to be held for Critical wildlife Habitats as decided in Item 2.1 (5).”

In the context of the other agenda, she said that it was important to bring in already identified tiger and elephant corridors immediately under the purview of the SC, NBWL, and further identify other key wildlife corridors for the same. She stressed that it was important to bring Elephant Reserves under the purview of the SC, NBWL. She said that this was provided for in the guidelines issued by the Ministry in March 2011 which should be upheld. She suggested that the Elephant Reserves & key wildlife corridors should be declared as eco-sensitive zones.

3(iii) Agenda items proposed by Ms. Prerna Bindra.

The following para to be deleted:

“Ms. Prerna Bindra mentioned that the Elephant Reserves need special protection measures and the guidelines issued by the Ministry in March 2011 should be considered for taking up

activities within the Elephant Reserves. She also suggested that the Elephant Reserves should be declared as eco-sensitive zones.”

Item No. 4.1 (12): Proposal for Kharoi Jadvā Vhaghapaddhar, Harudi limestone mine of M/s Jayprakash Associates Ltd. (Formerly known as Gujarat Anjan Cements Ltd.) at a distance of 4.8 km from Narayan Sarovar Wildlife Sanctuary, Gujarat.

The following be added:

“Ms Prerna Bindra mentioned that said the sanctuary --and the habitat around it (as per the information provided) is the home for wolf, hyena and other endangered species like caracal, bustard. She added that the concerned officer writes in the agenda that "This population will get disturbed and will be dislocated. and that the two proposals submitted by the user agency for laterite mining ore from village Baranda and second for limestone mining due to which the present Reserve Forest of village Harudi will be mined almost all around which will close corridor for the wildlife living inside the reserve forest.

[As in other cases of the Narayan Sarovar sanctuary (2.1.2(7), it was felt that in view of the Supreme Court order and the fact that the proposal is beyond the notified Eco-sensitive, it was therefore not under the purview of the Standing Committee, and therefore not deliberation and considered by the Standing Committee.”]

As in other cases of the Narayan Sarovar sanctuary (2.1.2(7), it was felt that in view of the Supreme Court order and the fact that the proposal is beyond the notified Eco-sensitive Zone, it was therefore not under the purview of the Standing Committee, and therefore not **deliberated** and considered by the Standing Committee.”

Item No. 4.1 (13): Proposal is for Mevasa Bauxite mine of GMDC, on 186.96 ha at a distance of 3.44 km from Marine Wildlife Sanctuary, Gujarat.

The following be added:

“Ms Prerna Bindra seconded Dr Ranjitsinh and said the disposal of the slurry and other effluence --which maybe getting disposed into the Marine sanctuary or in its surrounds, /into the sea-which would have a grave impact on wildlife. she reiterated Dr Ranjitsinh's intervention in stating that the state needs to affirm whether the proponent was complying with the conditions, how it was disposing off slurry, and only after such a report was given could the proposal be considered.”

Item No. 4.1 (14): Umarsar lignite mine of GMDC, on 2186.76 ha at a distance of 4.4 km from Narayan Sarovar Sanctuary, Gujarat.

The following be added:

“As in other cases of the Narayan Sarovar sanctuary (2.1.2(7) & 4.1 (12), it was felt that in view of the Supreme Court order and the fact that the proposal is beyond the notified Eco-

sensitive, it was therefore not under the purview of the Standing Committee and therefore not deliberated [deliberation] and considered by the Standing Committee.”.”

Item No. 4.2 (2): Diversion of 38.370 ha of forest land from Ratapani Wildlife Sanctuary for rehabilitation and upgradation to 4 lane configuration of Bhopal-Bareilly Section of NH-12 involving Madhya Pradesh.

The para:

“Ms. Prerna Bindra mentioned she had carried out site inspection for another case relating to road upgradation involving Ratapani Sanctuary, and had found that the condition of the road was in a dilapidated state and therefore, the State Government should take immediate action for at least restoring the status of the road as a poorly managed road is equally bad for the wildlife conservation. She also added that the State Government should take proactive steps to declare Ratapani Sanctuary as a Tiger Reserve at the earliest. She also added that fencing should be done with utmost caution”

be replaced by:

Ms Prerna Bindra mentioned that the opinion of the NTCA be taken on board as this was a proposed tiger reserve.

Ms. Prerna Bindra said that she had carried out site inspection for another case relating to road upgradation involving Ratapani Sanctuary, and found that the road was in a very poor condition. Rather than **considering repairing [repair]** the road, the proponent had straightaway sought permission for road widening, In PAs and ecologically fragile areas, it is prudent that existing roads be maintained in the best possible manner in the current form, instead of being expanded, in order to minimise disturbance and damage to wildlife and its habitat. She also added that the State Government should take pro-active steps immediately to notify Ratapani Sanctuary as a Tiger Reserve at the earliest. She also added that fencing, and under passes and other such mitigatory measures should be done with utmost caution and with the advise and involvement of wildlife biologists and forest department.

Item No. 4.2(4): Diversion of 0.377 ha of forest land from Bhimbandh Wildlife Sanctuary for doubling of existing single railway line between Ratanpur & Jamalpur Station passing through Bihar.

After discussion, the committee decided to recommend the proposal, **as the areas proposed was very small and would have little impact on the wildlife therein (please delete)**. The committee also decided that the conditions to be stipulated by the Chief Wildlife Warden would be strictly complied with by the user agency.

Item No. 4.2 (5): Proposal for development of Skywalk for promotion of Wildlife Tourism at Bhalleydhunga, Maenam Wildlife Sanctuary, South Sikkim

The para:

“Ms. Prerna Bindra mentioned that she had given her dissent note with respect to the permission of the Standing Committee for survey and investigation for the sky walk project. She added that it is not the sky walk itself that would cause an impact to the project but the

fact that these are other ancillary activities would have more deleterious effect on the wildlife. She stressed that she was not at all in favour of approving the project. She further emphasized that once such a proposal was recommended by the Standing Committee, it would become a clear precedence for other states to follow the suit.”

be replaced by:

Ms. Prerna Bindra pointed out that she had given her dissent note with respect to the permission of the Standing Committee for survey and investigation for the sky walk project. She stressed that she was [noted] **NOT at all** in favour of approving the project. She said that such a project had no place in a Protected Area.

She further said that the PA system was under major stress--there was pressure to denotify/and divert land from PAs for various reasons including security, development and for the immediate benefit of communities--all of which usually took precedence over wildlife. Now, we are seeking to denotify/divert land from a PA for a tourism project, which is of entertainment value. What then was the sanctity of a PA? If wildlife was not priority even in a Protected Area, then it was a sad state of affairs. She added that while the quantum of land to be denotified may seem small, the issue was one of priorities and sanctity. She also cautioned about the impact of other ancillary activities, would have more deleterious effect on the wildlife. She further emphasized that if such a proposal was recommended by the Standing Committee, it may set a precedence. She said that her comments and her dissent for the same be recorded.”

Comments by Shri Kishor Rithe:

“ Item 2.1 (5): Implementation Protocol on Critical Wildlife Habitats to be approved by the Standing Committee.

Hon’ble chairperson indicated that a separate meeting **with exclusively SCNBWL members** to discuss this matter would be called soon.

Item No. 2.1(5): Diversion of 80.507 ha of forestland within 10 kms from boundary of Kedarnath Wildlife Sanctuary for construction of 444 MW Vishnugarh-Pipalkoti Hydroelectric Project in district Chamoli, Uttarakhand.

After discussions, the Committee decided **that** Ms. Prerna Bindra, who is member of State Board for Wildlife as well as the Standing Committee of NBWL, **will go for site inspection and will submit the report to SC-NBWL.** The State Board for Wildlife may undertake site inspection, if deemed necessary.

Item No. 2.1(6): Construction of double lanning of railway line roposed by Dedicated Freight corridor in Sanjay Gandhi NP, Maharashtra (Within 10 kms of Tungareshwar Sanctuary).

He stated that State Government should allocate enough funds for removal of encroachments **and also should make the resources available**, if necessary.

Item No. 2.1.2(7): Proposal for Baranda Laterite mine of M/s Jayprakash Associates Ltd. Falling at a distance of 3.00 km from Narayan Sarovar Wildlife Sanctuary, Gujarat.

After discussions, the Committee decided to study the Supreme Court order before recommending the proposal.

Item No. 2.1.1(8): Diversion of land for lime stone mines due to location of Son Gharial Crocodile Sanctuary within 10 km of the Mining lease, Madhya Pradesh:
Badgawna Revenue, Distt.Sindhi-68.910 ha. (Revenue land)
Majhigawan Extension, Distt.Sidhi-54.825 ha (Forest Land)
Hinauti Extension, Distt.Satna, 258.864 ha (Forest land)

Dr M.K. Ranjitsinh was of the opinion that Madhya Pradesh had the history of not complying with the conditions for notifying new Protected Areas. **On this, Kishor Rithe** quoted the example of the case of Narmada **Sagar** Dam project, wherein, the Wildlife Institute of India had recommended for creation of four Protected Areas in Madhya Pradesh like **Onkareshwar National Park, Singaji (Srnamna) wildlife sanctuary, Mandhata wildlife sanctuary, Narmada Conservation Unit-I, Narmada Conservation Unit-II** in lieu of submergence area. However, the State Government was yet to notify these as Protected Areas.

Item No. 2.1.1 (10): Proposal for River Bed Mining of Sand Bajri and Boulders (Minor Minerals), Lease area 12.06 ha at Lot No. 9, River-Solani, village-Thapal Ismailpur, Tehsil-Behat, District- Saharanpur, Uttar Pradesh.

Shri Kishor Rithe and Ms. Prerna Bindra observed that **there are no EIA reports** the map for only one of the above proposal was received along with agenda for the meeting on 31st October 2012 while maps for other proposals were not provided to them and therefore, it would be difficult to offer any opinion on the proposals.

AGENDA ITEM NO.3: Agenda proposed by Members, Standing Committee of NBWL

(iii) **Agenda items proposed by Ms. Prerna Bindra.**

Shri Kishor Rithe mentioned that the National Wildlife Action Plan (2002-2016) has emphasized that "All identified areas around PAs and wildlife corridors to be declared as ecologically fragile under the EP Act 1986" and then all these proposals must mandatorily come before the Standing Committee of NBWL. **He as well as member Secretary of NTCA** suggested that the buffer areas of Tiger Reserves should also be declared as eco-sensitive zones.

Item No. 4.1 (14): Umarsar lignite mine of GMDC, on 2186.76 ha at a distance of 4.4 km from Narayan Sarovar Sanctuary, Gujarat.

The Member Secretary presented the proposal for Umarsar lignite mine by the Gujarat Mineral Development Corporation at a distance of 4.4 km from Narayan Sarovar Sanctuary, Gujarat. **Mr.Kishor Rithe objected this proposal looking at its close distance to sanctuary and as per the guidelines of MoEF the proposal is "prohibited" in ESA.**

Ms. Prerna Bindra mentioned that as per the fact sheet of the proposal, the sanctuary is the home for caracal, wolf, bustard etc. and mining in the near vicinity of the sanctuary would definitely have a negative impact on these animals which are critically endangered.

Item No. 4.2 (5): Proposal for development of Skywalk for promotion of Wildlife Tourism at Bhalleydhunga, Maenam Wildlife Sanctuary, South Sikkim.

Shri Kishor Rithe mentioned that after the site inspection, he had only accorded his agreement for "Survey and investigation" of the rope way and not for the sky walk. He also added that he had recommended for repair of the two trail paths so that local villagers should be able to use these paths to take the tourists on trek like in Khangchenjunga National Park and that sky walk being an entertainment project cannot be agreed to. He added that the Chief Wildlife Warden should give adequate funds for improvement of trail paths. He said that with adequate safeguards for the wildlife rope way could be agreed for easy access to sanctuary and for the use of forest staff for forest protection but not the sky walk as this would increase the traffic load and destruction of the entire habitat.

The Principal Secretary and Resident Commissioner, Sikkim explained that Sikkim is the only state in India having more than..... He also added that the project would not disrupt the regional ecology and natural habitat of the area and has been strategically planned to blend with the regional environs that would eventually earn revenue for the state not only to sustain the project but also to support the wildlife zone and forest cover in the region.

Mr.Kishor Rithe asked about the number of cabins to be used as it should not exceed the carrying capacity of the sanctuary. Principal Secretary said the Ropeway cabins would have the capacity of 20 cabins with a capacity of 8 person per cabin and it would take ten and half minutes for one cabin to reach the skywalk cantilever from the starting point."
