

**MINUTES OF THE 8th MEETING OF THE REGIONAL EMPOWERED COMMITTEE (REC)
OF REGIONAL OFFICE, NORTH CENTRAL ZONE, DEHRADUN
HELD ON 10TH MARCH, 2016**

The Eighth meeting of the Regional Empowered Committee (REC) of the Regional Office, North Central Zone, Dehradun was held on 10th March, 2016 at Regional Office, Dehradun under the Chairmanship of Shri Ajay Kumar, Addl. PCCF, Regional Office, Dehradun.

Following official/non-official members & the special invitees were present in the meeting.

S.No.	Name	Designation
1.	Shri Ajay Kumar Addl. PCCF, R.O., Dehradun	Chairman
2.	Dr. G.S. Rawat, IFS (Retd.)	Member
3.	Shri Praveen Thaplyal, IFS (Retd.)	Member
4.	Shri M.S. Negi CF, R.O., Dehradun	Member Secretary
Special Invitee		
5.	Shri S.T.S. Lepcha Addl. PCCF & Nodal Officer, Uttarakhand.	Special Invitee
6.	Dr. VRR Singh Nodal Officer- cum-APPCF (FCA), H.P.	Special Invitee
7.	Representatives of the User Agencies	

The following proposals seeking diversion of forest land for non-forest purposes pertaining to Uttarakhand and Himachal Pradesh were discussed in detail and the decision taken by REC is as under:-

S. N.	NAME OF PROPOSAL	DECISION TAKEN BY THE REC
HIMACHAL		
1.	Diversion of 1.3062 ha of forest land in favour of M/s Manorma Stone Crusher at Joginidhar (Chutti Bihal) for stone quarry for feeding of existing Stone Crusher established on private land at village Nalini, Post Office Hurla, Tehsil Bhunter, within the jurisdiction of Parvati Forest Division, District. Kullu, H.P.	<p>Regional Empowered Committee discussed the proposal seeking diversion of 1.3062 ha of forest land in favour of M/S Manorma Stone Crusher at Joginidhar (Chutti Bihal) for Stone quarry for feeding of existing Stone Crusher. Committee noticed that the forest land proposed for diversion is not a part of any Protected Area and no rare and endangered species of flora and fauna have been reported. Committee also noted that the proposal was discussed in the REC meeting held on 30.10.2015 and essential details on 3 points were sought from the State Govt. Committee noted that the reply of the State Govt. on first 2 points is satisfactory but, the reply of the third point regarding land for muck disposal was not found satisfactory. Moreover, the representative of the User Agency was not present in the meeting to explain the shortcomings.</p> <p>After detailed discussion on various aspects of the proposal, the committee decided to defer the proposal and request the State Govt. to submit following information / documents after receipt of which the proposal will be placed in the next REC meeting.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In response to point No.3 of the query raised by REC in its meeting held on 30.10.2015 regarding land for dumping of mining waste, State Govt. vide letter dated 19.02.2016 had informed that the muck will be dumped in 0.1620 ha area which is part of 1.1098 ha of forest land in Tukra No. 1. But, as per purpose wise breakup submitted with the State Govt. letter dated 21.10.2014, the whole 1.1098 ha of forest land is proposed for mining purpose only. State Govt. may submit revised

		<p>purpose wise breakup and the geo-referenced map showing all the project components both in hard and soft copy.</p> <p>2. State Govt. is also required to clarify the issues regarding Chief Secretary's Certificate on non-availability of non-forest land for CA in the State as asked vide letter No.7-27/2014 dated 17.02.2016.</p>
2.	<p>Diversion of 2.1754 ha of forest land in favour of M/s Paras Stone Crusher Prop. Shri Pratap Singh, VPO Burua, Tehsil Manali, District Kullu for stone quarry within the jurisdiction of Kullu Forest Division, Distt. Kullu, H.P.</p>	<p>Regional Empowered Committee discussed the proposal seeking diversion of 2.1754 ha of forest land for Stone Quarry in favour of M/s Paras Stone Crusher. Committee noticed that the forest land proposed for diversion is not a part of any Protected Area and no rare and endangered species of flora and fauna have been reported. The committee also noticed that no tree felling is involved in the project. Committee was informed that the area proposed for diversion and area proposed for CA is clear as per result of Decision Support System (DSS) Analysis except for the fact that the area proposed for diversion touches 1st order Beas River. However, committee was of the view that since it is proposed to extract stone (minor mineral) from river bed and hence it may not have any adverse effect on hydrology. It was also noted that the proposal is for extraction of minor minerals (stone) from the river bed hence, as per guidelines given in para-3.2 (vi) (a) of the hand book, CA is allowed to be done over degraded forest land twice in extent to the forest area being diverted so the clarification on Chief Secretary's Certificate regarding non-availability of non-forest land for CA is not required in this case.</p> <p>After detailed discussion on various aspects of the proposal, the REC decided to recommend the proposal to the MoEF & CC, Govt. of India for approval with following condition:</p> <p>1. State Govt. will upload revised digital map of area proposed for diversion and area proposed for CA, online, which has been provided in CD.</p>

UTTARAKHAD

3.	Diversion of 6.390 ha of forest land for construction of Pokhri-Chandikaghat Motor Road in favour of PWD, within the jurisdiction of Pithoragarh Forest Division, Distt. Pithoragarh, Uttarakhand.	<p>Regional Empowered Committee discussed the proposal seeking diversion of 6.390 ha of forest land for construction of Pokhri-Chandikaghat Motor Road. The committee noted that the proposal was discussed in the REC meeting held on 27.08.2015 and essential details on 4 points were sought from the State Govt. Committee noted that the reply of the State Govt. on all points except point No. 3 which required submission of geo-referenced digital map for the area proposed for diversion and area proposed for CA, is satisfactory. It was also noted that the no. of trees in 9m RoW is 840 (above 10 cm dia) and the no. of trees in 7m width of the proposed road is 575 (above 10 cm dia). The forest land proposed for diversion is not a part of any Protected Area and no rare and endangered species of flora and fauna have been reported. Committee was informed that as per results of DSS analysis, no abnormality has been noticed in the area proposed for CA.</p> <p>After detailed discussion on various aspects of the proposal, the REC decided to accord in-principle approval for diversion of 6.390 ha of forest land subject to submission of following information / documents:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Soft copy of the geo-referenced digital map for the area selected for CA showing geo-coordinates at all corners points of the polygon.2. Soft copy of the geo-referenced digital map for the forest land proposed for diversion showing geo-coordinates at 200m to 300m interval including all curves along the alignment of the proposed road in Shape File (.shp).3. Minimum number of trees will be felled which will not exceed 840 trees. However, initially permission for felling of 575 trees only in 7m width will be given by the DFO. Felling of trees in excess of 575 and not exceeding 840 will be given by DFO under exceptional
----	--	--

		circumstances after recording reasons under intimation to the Regional Office.
4.	<p>Diversion of 2.15 ha of forest land for the construction of 2X2.5 MW Phulibagar Small Hydro Electric Project in favour of Eastern Ramganga Valley Hydro Project Co. Pvt. Ltd., on lease for 30 years within the jurisdiction of Pithoragarh Forest Division, Distt. Pithoragarh, Uttarakhand.</p>	<p>Regional Empowered Committee discussed the proposal seeking diversion of 2.15 ha of forest land for construction of 2X2.5 MW Phulibagar Small Hydro Electric Project. The project is a 'run of river' scheme to be developed on Jakula Nadi which is a tributary of Ramganga River. The committee noted that the no. of trees proposed for felling is 35. It was also noticed that the forest land proposed for diversion is not a part of any Protected Area and no rare and endangered species of flora and fauna have been reported. Since, no forest land has been asked for transmission line, on enquiry the representative of the User Agency informed that the power will be evacuated through the existing Transmission Line of Uttarakhand Power Corporation Ltd. (UPCL) which is passing at a distance of 10-15 m away from the power house location and the Transmission Line proposed for this short distance does not involve forest land. However, no documents were produced / available in support of this evacuation plan on behalf of UPCL. Committee was informed that as per DSS analysis results, area proposed for diversion and area proposed for CA were found satisfactory. However, extent of area proposed for CA could not be ascertained due to geo-coordinates not available for all turning points.</p> <p>After detailed discussion on various aspects of the proposal, the committee decided to recommend the proposal to the MoEF & CC, Govt. of India for approval subject to submission of following information / documents / clarifications.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Keeping in view the kind of species, the Eco Class may not be Eco Class-VI. State Govt. may review the Eco Class and revise the NPV Bill, if required accordingly. 2. 16 Trees per ha do not account for 0.4 density. Therefore, density may be reviewed and NPV Bill also

		<p>revised, if required accordingly.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Part-I of the proposal is signed by Uttarakhand Infrastructure Project Company Private Limited as well as by the GM, Eastern Ramganga Valley Hydel Projects Co. Pvt. Ltd. So it is not clear as to which company is the User Agency. State Govt. may clarify the matter regarding the actual User Agency in the instant case and submit documents issued by the competent authority in support. 4. Evacuation Plan duly approved by UPCL will be provided. 5. In the Digital map of CA, geo-coordinates are not provided at all turning points. State Govt. may provide digital map of CA giving geo-coordinates at all turning points to give exact shape (polygon) file to enable calculation of CA area through DSS Analysis.
5.	<p>Diversion of 8.788 ha of forest land for rehabilitation and upgradation of existing 2-lane Nagina-Kashipur Section of NH-74 KM 132.000 to KM 175.000 into 4-lane with paved shoulders within the jurisdiction of Ramnagar Forest Division, District Udham Singh Nagar, Uttarakhand.</p>	<p>Regional Empowered Committee discussed the proposal seeking diversion of 8.788 ha of forest land for rehabilitation and upgradation of existing 2-lane Nagina-Kashipur Section of NH-74 KM 132.000 to KM 175.000 into 4-lane with paved shoulders. The committee noticed that the no. of trees proposed for felling is 1952 trees. It was also noticed that the forest land proposed for diversion is not a part of any Protected Area and no rare and endangered species of flora and fauna have been reported. It was noticed that short narrative on proposal was not giving information of segment wise width of RoW already existing and additional RoW required. Similarly, some discrepancies were also noticed in the Cost Benefit Analysis. It was informed to the committee that no irregularity has been noticed in the area proposed for CA as per results of DSS Analysis.</p> <p>After detailed discussion on various aspects of the proposal, and in view of the importance of the project, the committee decided to accord in-principle approval for</p>

	<p>diversion of 8.788 ha of forest land subject to submission of following information / documents / clarifications.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. State Govt. may submit the short narrative including length segment wise existing RoW, additional RoW required and total RoW. 2. State Govt. may submit geo-referenced digital map showing geo-coordinates at all the corner points of the areas (polygon) identified for CA both in hard and soft copy. Soft copy may be submitted in Shape File (.shp). 3. The Eco Class of the forest land proposed for diversion may be reviewed and if required, NPV calculation may be revised by the State Govt. 4. The monetary figures given in summary for C/B Ratio calculation do not tally with the monetary figures given in Annexure-VI(b) and Annexure-VI(c). Moreover, parameters at sr. no. -1 of Annexure-VI(b) and at sr. no.-1&2 of Annexure-VI(c) have not been quantified and expressed in monetary terms. The parameter at sr. no. -3 (Annexure-VI(c)) is not quantified in the correct manner. State Govt. may submit revised C/B Analysis. 5. The FRA Certificate dated 26.09.2014 has been submitted but the proceedings of the District Level Committee Meeting, Sub-Divisional Level Committee Meeting and Gram Sabha Meeting are not submitted. Moreover, the area is mentioned as 8.78 ha instead of 8.788 ha in the FRA Certificate. State Govt. may submit the lacking/corrected documents accordingly. 6. In para-14 of Part-II, the CA stipulated (100.01 ha) is not commensurate to the Forest Land Diverted (42.654 ha), which may be clarified by the State Govt. 7. The quantity of surplus muck is mentioned as (-)10,649.55 cm. The negative value of surplus muck has
--	---

		<p>not been explained. State Govt. may submit the details of muck generated, muck to be utilized and surplus muck, if any along with details of Muck Disposal Sites.</p>
6.	<p>Diversion of 9.153 ha of forest land for Construction of Bhagwati to Timta Motor Road under PMGSY (15.90 km.) in favour of Gramya Vikas Vibhag within the jurisdiction of Almora Forest Division, District Almora, Uttarakhand.</p>	<p>Regional Empowered Committee discussed the proposal seeking diversion of 9.153 ha of forest land for construction of Bhagwati to Timta Motor Road under PMGSY (15.90 km). The committee noticed that the no. of trees proposed for felling is 194 and the forest land proposed for diversion is not a part of any Protected Area. In addition, no rare and endangered species of flora and fauna have been reported. It was informed to the committee that no irregularity has been noticed in the area proposed for CA as per results of DSS Analysis.</p> <p>After detailed discussion on various aspects of the proposal, committee noted that certain essential details are required to be sought from the State Govt. Therefore, the committee decided that the following essential details may be sought from the State Govt. and thereafter the proposal may be placed in the next REC meeting.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is mentioned in the note below enumeration list submitted as additional document that the 103 trees of 0-10 and 10-20 cm dia class (Nap land 56 Nos. and forest land 47 Nos.) will be transplanted by the UA. State Govt. may review the feasibility of transplantation and submit report on the same. 2. Geo-coordinates at only 5 points are given along the alignment of 15.90 KM long road which is not sufficient. State Govt. is required to submit geo-referenced digital map for the forest land proposed for diversion showing geo-coordinates at an interval of 200 m to 300 m including all turning points along the alignment of the road. 3. Parameter at sr. no.-1 of Annexure-VI(b) of Cost Benefit Analysis is not quantified and expressed in monetary


		<p>terms. Moreover, density is mentioned as 0.6 instead of 0.4 for calculation of environmental losses in parameters at sr. no.-5 of Annexure-VI(b). In addition, the parameter at sr. no.-1,2,4,6 & 8 of Annexure-VI(c) have not been quantified and expressed in monetary terms. Also, the monetary figures given in CB Ratio calculation sheet do not tally with the monetary figures given in Annexure-VI(b) and Annexure-VI(c). State Govt. may submit revised C/B Analysis after removing the shortcomings.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Geo-coordinates of the area proposed for CA are not given at all the corner points of the polygon. Moreover, the digital map is not clear. Revised digital map may be submitted. 5. Suitability Certificate of the land proposed for CA may be uploaded on the web portal. 6. It is mentioned that the muck is proposed to be disposed off in the private land for which 23 NOCs have been submitted. But, the Muck Disposal Plan attached as additional document in Part-I is not opening now hence, further details could not be verified. State Govt. may upload the Muck Disposal Plan again.
7.	<p>Diversion of 46.745 ha of forest land for widening and upgradation of existing 2-lane road to 4-lane with paved shoulders of Roorkee-Chutmalpur-Saharanpur-Yamunanagar UP/Haryana Border Section of NH-73 (km 0.00 to km 22.00) and Chhutmalpur-Ganeshpur Section of NH-72A in favour of NHAI, within the jurisdiction of Haridwar Forest Division, Distt. Haridwar, Uttarakhand (FP/UK/ROAD/7730/2014).</p>	<p>Regional Empowered Committee discussed the proposal seeking diversion of 46.745 ha of forest land for widening and upgradation of existing 2-lane road to 4-lane with paved shoulders of Roorkee-Chutmalpur-Saharanpur-Yamunanagar UP/Haryana Border Section of NH-73 (km 0.00 to km 22.00). The committee noticed that the forest land proposed for diversion falls in the legal category of Protected Forest (roadside plantation) and the no. of trees proposed for felling is 8782 including 5748 Eucalyptus trees. It was also noticed that the forest land proposed for diversion is not a part of any Protected Area and no rare and endangered species of flora and fauna have been</p>

reported. Committee was informed that no irregularity has been noticed in the area proposed for CA as per the result of DSS analysis. Some shortcomings were, however, noticed in Cost Benefit Analysis and Muck Management Plan.

After detailed discussion on various aspects of the proposal, and in view of the importance of the project, committee decided to accord in-principle approval for diversion of 46.745 ha of forest land subject to submission of following information / documents.

1. State Govt. may submit short narrative of the proposal including length segment wise existing RoW, additional RoW required and total RoW.
2. State Govt. may submit the detailed Muck Disposal Plan showing quantity of muck generated, quantity of muck to be used and surplus quantity of muck along with details of dumping sites.
3. Monetary figures given in Cost Benefit Ratio Calculation Sheet do not tally with the monetary figures given in Annexure-VI(b) and Annexure-VI(c). Revised CB Analysis may be submitted by the State Govt.
4. Suitability certificates may be submitted for all the sites selected for CA.
5. CA Stipulated is not commensurate to the forest land diverted since 1980. Correct position may be intimated by the State Govt. in this regard.
6. In the Site Inspection Report of DFO, nothing is mentioned about presence of rare / endangered / unique species of flora and fauna in the area which may be done and SIR resubmitted.
7. Soft copies of the geo-referenced maps for the forest land proposed for diversion and the land proposed for CA may be uploaded in the web portal in Shape File (.shp).

This issues with the approval of Addl.PCCF, Regional Office (North Central) Dehradun-Cum-Chairman REC.



(M.S. Negi)
Member Secretary

File. No. RO-DDN/REC/1-2014/VOL-2/

Dated March, 2016

Copy for information & confirmation to:

1. Dr. G.S. Rawat, IFS (Retd.), 102/2, Vasant Vihar, Dehradun-248006.
2. Shri Praveen Thaplyal, IFS (Retd.), Shivkripa, Sangam Vihar Chouras, P.O. Kikileshwar, Distt. Tehri -249161, Uttarakhand
3. Dr. S.P. Singh, 09, Waldorf Compound, Mallital, Nainital-263001, Uttarakhand.
4. The Addl.PCCF & Nodal Officer, Forest Conservation, Uttarakhand, Indira Nagar, Forest Colony, Dehradun for information. He is requested to take action on the decisions taken in the REC meeting (Project wise) & ensure submission of compliance to this office for further necessary action.
5. The Nodal Officer-cum-Addl.PCCF (FCA), Forest Department, Govt. of Himachal Pradesh, Talland, Shimla, H.P. for information. He is requested to take action on the decisions taken in the REC meeting (Project wise) & ensure submission of compliance to this office for further necessary action.



(M.S. Negi)
Member Secretary



43

17