

Government of India  
Ministry of Environment & Forests  
(Wildlife Division)

Paryavaran Bhawan,  
CGO Complex, Lodi Road,  
New Delhi-110003

F. No. 6-43/2007 WL-I(pt)  
Dated: 24<sup>th</sup> December 2012

All Members,  
Standing Committee of NBWL

Sub: Revised Minutes of the 25<sup>th</sup> Meeting of Standing Committee of NBWL, after confirmation in the 26<sup>th</sup> Meeting.

Sir/Madam,

The 25<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Standing Committee of National Board for Wildlife (NBWL) was held on 13<sup>th</sup> June 2012 under the chairpersonship of Hon'ble Minister of State (Independent Charge) for Environment and Forests. The minutes of the Meeting was circulated to members on 12<sup>th</sup> July 2012. Subsequently comments were again received from some members. These comments were placed for discussion during the 26<sup>th</sup> Meeting held on 31<sup>st</sup> October 2012, where, while confirming the minutes of the 25<sup>th</sup> Meeting, it was decided that the comments received would be incorporated below the respective agenda items.

In this context, kindly find enclosed a copy of the revised minutes of the 25<sup>th</sup> meeting of Standing Committee of NBWL, after incorporation of the comments received from the members, as appropriate. The minutes have the approval of the chairperson, Standing Committee of NBWL.

Yours faithfully,

  
(Vivek Saxena)  
Deputy Inspector General (WL)

Encl: As above

**Distribution:**

1. Director General of Forests and Special Secretary, MoEF.
2. Director, Wildlife Institute of India, Dehradun.
3. Dr Asad Rahmani, Director, BNHS, Mumbai-25.
4. Shri Kishor Rithe, President, Satpuda Foundation, Amravati-444607.
5. Executive Director, Nature Conservation Foundation, Mysore - 570 002.
6. Shri Brijendra Singh, 28, Sunder Nagar, New Delhi-110003.
7. Dr M.K. Ranjitsinh, 'Krishnasar', No 5 Tiger Lane, W6 C Lane, Sainik Farms, New Delhi-110062.
8. Dr Divyabhanusinh Chavda, "Suryodaya", 310 Gopi Defence Colony, Vaishali Marg, Jaipur-302021.

Contd./2

**Ministry of Environment and Forests  
Wildlife Division**

\*\*\*\*

*In pursuance to the decision taken by the Standing Committee of National Board for Wildlife (NBWL) held on 31<sup>st</sup> October 2012, the comments and suggestions of the members received with respect to the minutes of the Standing Committee of NBWL held on 13<sup>th</sup> June 2012 are being accordingly incorporated in a separate paragraph at the end of the recorded minutes of the agenda item. The revised minutes of the Standing Committee of NBWL held on 13<sup>th</sup> June 2012 are as under:*

**Revised minutes of the 25<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Standing Committee of National Board for Wildlife held on 13<sup>th</sup> June 2012 in Paryavaran Bhawan, CGO Complex, Lodhi Road, New Delhi.**

The 25<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Standing Committee of National Board for Wildlife (NBWL) was held on 13<sup>th</sup> June 2012 in the Ministry of Environment and Forests (MoEF), New Delhi with Hon'ble Minister of State (Independent Charge) for Environment and Forests in chair. The list of participants is at **Annexure-1**.

Additional Director General of Forests (WL) and Member-Secretary, Standing Committee of National Board for Wildlife welcomed the Hon'ble Chairperson, the members, Chief Wildlife Wardens of the States, and all other delegates and officials who were present in the meeting.

Hon'ble Chairperson then requested the Member Secretary to take up the agenda items for discussion.

**Agenda No. 1: Confirmation of the minutes of the 24<sup>th</sup> Meeting of Standing Committee of National Board for Wildlife held on 13<sup>th</sup> December 2011.**

The Member Secretary informed the Committee that the draft minutes of the 24<sup>th</sup> Meeting of Standing Committee (SC) of NBWL, held on 13.12.2011 were circulated to the members on 28.12.2011 for comments within two weeks as had been decided in the Meeting. The comments received, were incorporated appropriately, and the revised approved minutes were circulated to the members on 23.01.2012.

Committee Member, Ms. Prerna Bindra, requested that the draft protocol prepared by the MoEF on determination of Critical Wildlife Habitats may be placed before the Standing Committee of NBWL. She also suggested that with respect to the Demwe project, the fact that all non-official members had strongly objected to this project and endorsed the site inspection report of Dr Asad Rahmani, may be taken on record. She further stated that these suggestions may be incorporated in the minutes of the 24<sup>th</sup> Meeting.

***Ms. Prerna Bindra suggested the following be incorporated in the minutes of the 24<sup>th</sup> Meeting of Standing Committee of NBWL held on 13.12.2011:***

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

***Instead of: "It was decided that the draft protocol would be circulated amongst the Members, and their views would be communicated to the MoTA".***

***The minutes should read:***

***"It was decided that the draft protocol would be placed before the members for their comments and consideration before finalisation"***

***Agenda item No. 3.3.1: Construction of 1,750 MW Demwe Lower HE project in Lohit District, Arunachal Pradesh***

***The following be included in the minutes:***

***All non-official members of the Standing Committee were of the firm opinion that the 1,750 MW Demwe Lower project should not be cleared and they endorsed Dr Asad Rahmani's report.***

The suggestions made by Ms Prerna Bindra were agreed to.

With these suggestions for incorporation in the minutes, the Standing Committee of NBWL confirmed the minutes of the 24<sup>th</sup> Meeting held on 13.12.2011.

**Agenda No. 2: Action Taken Report on the decisions taken during the 23<sup>rd</sup> and 24<sup>th</sup> Meetings of the Standing Committee of NBWL**

The Member Secretary presented before the Committee the actions taken with respect to the decisions of the 23<sup>rd</sup> and 24<sup>th</sup> Meetings of the Standing Committee of NBWL. The deliberations and decisions on various agenda items are appended below:

**Item No. 2 {2[3.1]}: Wildlife Conservation Issues**

**(a) Framing ecologically sound policy for dealing with linear intrusions.**

The Member Secretary informed the Committee that in its 22<sup>nd</sup> Meeting, the Committee had assigned the task of preparation of draft guidelines on linear intrusions in Protected Areas to Dr Shankar Raman, Member, SC, NBWL, and had also decided to take a view in the matter once the draft guidelines were ready. Dr Shankar Raman had prepared the draft guidelines which had also been circulated amongst the members of the Standing Committee of NBWL.

Dr Madhusudan, NCF, Mysore proposed that the draft guidelines may be hosted on the website of the Ministry seeking comments from stakeholders in general. He also informed that he had created an exclusive e.mail id for receipt of the comments. Once the comments were received, and appropriately incorporated, the Standing Committee could take a view in the matter.

Shri Kishor Rithe mentioned that the accidental deaths of wild animals were occurring in the entire country due to "existing" linear installations like electric transmission lines, roads, highways, railway lines and irrigation canal network passing through wildlife areas including PAs and wildlife corridors. He quoted a few recent incidents that occurred in Maharashtra. He emphasized that immediate mitigation measures were required to make existing linear installations safe for wildlife, and that the concerned departments were expecting funds for the purpose from the state forest departments (SFDs). However, SFDs were not in a position to provide this kind of financial support, as the cost estimated for such mitigation measures was more than the entire budget of the state forest departments. So, he proposed that honourable Minister may consider writing to the concerned Ministries/Departments like Ministry of Power, Water Resources, Road Transport and Highways, Railways, Rural Development and Finance for providing adequate funds for taking up mitigation measures by concerned departments in consultation with state forest/wildlife department to avoid fatal accidents involving wild animals.

Dr M.K. Ranjitsinh mentioned that insulation of electricity lines and underground cabling were some established measures for the purpose, but often there have been cases when at places the wires lie exposed, causing accidents. He suggested that the arrangements for rectification of defects and for breakage of wires should be ensured by the Electricity Boards of the respective states, within a prescribed time limit and it should be their responsibility to do so. He also suggested that a small core-group could be set up under the Standing Committee to finalize the draft guidelines with appropriate inclusion, inter alia, of measures for the laying of and maintenance of electric lines over Protected Areas. The Principal Secretary (Forests), Maharashtra suggested that as the danger of death of wild animals due to old infrastructure was more, future clearances for laying of new electric lines may stipulate the condition of refurbishing the old electric lines to the satisfaction of the forest department.

It was agreed that the background note as well as the draft guidance document would be uploaded on the MoEF website for two months for comments of all stakeholders to be sent at the e.mail created by NCF, i.e., linearintrusions@gmail.com. Dr Shankar Raman would collate and incorporate the comments received thereupon, and prepare a revised document accordingly. Thereafter, the SC could consider constitution of a core group to finalize the revised draft. Final draft would be placed for consideration of the Standing Committee of NBWL.

**(b) Measures to check damage to environment on account of extraction of minerals.**

The Member Secretary informed the Committee that the matter was considered by the Standing Committee in its 22<sup>nd</sup> Meeting held on 25<sup>th</sup> April 2011. However, the Committee had decided to defer the agenda.

Dr Madhusudan, NCF, Mysore suggested that the NBWL should come up with a background paper on this subject of much importance to conservation of wildlife in the country.

Ms. Perna Bindra emphasized that since mining had grave ecological impacts, a background paper, which looked in particular at the impacts of mining on wildlife, PAs,

critical wildlife corridors, etc, on the lines of the report on linear intrusion being coordinated by Dr Madhusudan, would be welcome.

The Chairperson informed that although a Committee under the chairmanship of the Secretary (Environment and Forests) was looking into the general issues of mining in forest areas, she would like to study this particular issue in consultation with the concerned authorities, and thereafter would take a view in the matter.

**Item 2[4(B) (12)] : Proposal for denotification of land from Radhanagari Sanctuary for Sarvade minor irrigation project, Maharashtra.**

The Member Secretary gave a brief introduction regarding the proposal under consideration.

Dr Asad Rahmani informed that he had conducted the site inspection and had recommended the proposal with certain specific conditions. He suggested that his condition no. [(e) (ii)] of the recommendation for providing benefits to only local people was based on the original objective of the project, and therefore, should not be diluted.

Mr.Kishor Rithe pointed out that the fact sheet detailing the project (Annexure-1/ pages 19-22) did not mention his viewpoint which had been minuted in 23rd Meeting of SC-NBWL (page-6 of revised minutes of 23rd SC-NBWL Meeting circulated on 23rd January 2012). He reproduced the revised minutes for the agenda item as follows:

*“Mr. Kishor Rithe strongly objected to the proposal and submitted that it would affect the process for determination and notification of the Critical Wildlife Habitat, and resettlement work in the sanctuary as per the Government of Maharashtra’s affidavit in the Hon’ble High Court, Nagpur Bench. A cumulative impact study, of all major and minor irrigation projects in and around Radhanagri Wildlife Sanctuary, should be conducted first, to know the total ecological impact of all such schemes on ecology of the region and biodiversity therein. Mr. Rithe also stated that he had written a letter to the then Chairman, on 5<sup>th</sup> February 2011 expressing these concerns with the request to reject the project”.*

He also pointed out that Dr Rahmani’s report had suggested / mentioned (1) a cumulative impact study of all major and minor irrigation projects around Radhanagari WLS, and (2) Other potential threats to ecology of the region due to changing agricultural pattern from the traditional crops to sugarcane cultivation. He stated that irrigation projects were luring outside farmers and city dwellers to purchase land, and, subsequently change the present land use which was resulting in increased human-wildlife conflict.

Ms Prerna Bindra said that she had already voiced her objections in the April 25, 2011 Meeting of the Standing Committee of the NBWL, and that the following be recorded again:

*“I record my dissent on this clearance given the harmful ecological impacts, which were also discussed in the meeting. It is understood that the area to be submerged is under very good forest cover which will be destroyed irreplaceably.”*

The Chief Wildlife Warden, Maharashtra informed the Committee that although the recommendations of report of Dr Asad Rahmani had been received by the State Government, it was yet to take a final view in the matter. He also stated that there was no PIL pending in the court about Radhanagari WLS. On this, Mr. Kishor Rithe informed that the PIL that he had mentioned was about resettlement of villages from PAs in Maharashtra pending before

Nagpur Bench of Mumbai High Court (WP No.3960/2006 Nature Conservation Society V/S the State of Maharashtra) where CWLW had expressed the need to resettle 11 villages from Radhanagari WLS. He further stated that as some of these villages would be beneficiaries of this project, it would discourage the process of resettlement, and will also affect the process of declaration of the Critical Wildlife Habitat under FRA 2006.

The Committee after discussion, decided to once again forward the original recommendations made by Dr Asad Rahmani without any changes, to the State Government for its concurrence, and to take a final view after receipt of the opinion of the State Government on this proposal.

**Comments by Shri Kishor Rithe:**

*"He also pointed out that Dr. Rahmani report has suggested / mentioned 1) cumulative impact study of all major and minor irrigation projects around Radhanagari WLS 2) Other potential threat..... in human-wildlife conflict..... Include- 3) also consider the views of Gadgil committee report before final permission. On this, the chair informed the board that Gadgil committee report is yet under consideration."*

**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 the Border Security Force had, in compliance to the decision of the Standing Committee of NBWL, submitted a revised proposal with new alignment with a revised requirement of land as 1520 ha.

Dr M.K. Ranjitsinh suggested that in view of alienation of large area outside the fence, and within the International Border (IB), the infrastructure like border outposts (BOPs) and patrolling roads should be built outside the fence so that the remaining areas of the Park remain unbroken for the movement of wildlife. He inquired whether the other recommendations contained in the field visit report proposed by him and Dr Rajesh Gopal were acceptable to the BSF or not, as there was no mention of the same in the revised proposal. He also suggested that the revised proposal of the BSF should be considered and commented upon by the State Board for Wildlife also, before the Standing Committee of NBWL considers it.

The Member Secretary, NTCA also suggested that the views of the State Board for Wildlife should be obtained on the revised proposal.

The Deputy Inspector General, Border Security Force, informed that as per international regulations, it was not possible to locate the BOPs and road outside the fence.

The Chairperson opined that this is an extremely sensitive matter involving the national security on one hand, and the concerns expressed by the Members on the other for threat to movement of wildlife. It would, therefore, be appropriate to have the recommendation of the State Board for Wildlife on the proposal, and then take a view.

The Committee thereafter, decided that the State Chief Wildlife Warden be requested for placing the revised proposal before the State Board for Wildlife, and come with

recommendation of the Board within a period of two weeks, for consideration of the standing committee in its subsequent meeting.

**Item 2[4.2(2)]: Proposal for development of 8 lane access controlled expressway on right bank of Upper Ganga Canal (UGC) from Sanauta Bridge (Bulandshahar) to near Purkazi (Dist. Muzaffarnagar) near Uttar Pradesh-Uttarakhand border.**

The Member Secretary informed the Committee that during the 23<sup>rd</sup> Meeting it was decided that the report of the Forest Advisory Committee (FAC) be obtained on the proposal, and thereafter the matter would be considered by the Standing Committee of NBWL. He also informed that the report of the FAC was awaited.

In view of the aforesaid, the Committee decided to defer the agenda.

**Item 2[4.1 (25)]: Diversion of 6.07 ha of forest land from Rajaji National Park for establishment of Ayush Gram, Uttarakhand.**

The Member Secretary informed the Committee that Dr A. J. T. Johnsingh along with representative of the Director, Wildlife Institute of India (WII) had conducted the site inspection, and the Standing Committee considered the report and desired that the conditions proposed in the report should be brief, focused and explicit, and to this end, decided that Director, WII may review the report. Accordingly, Director, WII had submitted a report with specific conditions.

Dr A.J.T. Johnsingh brought to notice the presence of illegal settlers in the Chilla Power colony who have jobs in Haridwar and, therefore, travel between Chilla and Haridwar in vehicles till late in the night. He further said that late night movement of these settlers was causing disturbance to elephants particularly for groups with calves that too in summer when they want to go to the river (Ganges) for water. He suggested that to avoid such disturbance to the movement of elephants, the illegal settlers from Chilla Power colony should be evicted at the earliest. Uttarakhand FD should initiate appropriate action for the purpose.

Ms. Perna Bindra said that the site report had specified that one of the conditions in giving the approval was that the Shyampur Range, which was rich in wildlife and had recorded considerable tiger presence would be added to the Rajaji National Park. She informed that the State Government had passed a GO to merge the Shyampur Range with the Rajaji National Park about six months back, but despite this, no actual action on ground had taken place. She desired to know if any progress in the matter had been made.

The Chief Wildlife Warden, Uttarakhand mentioned that the proposal suggested by Ms. Perna Bindra was under consideration of the State Government.

After discussions, the Committee unanimously decided to forward the conditions stipulated by and reviewed by the Director, WII to the State Government of Uttarakhand, for conveying its concurrence on the conditions within a period of three months.

**Comments by Ms. Perna Bindra:**

*"...The Hon'ble minister asked the Chief Wildlife Warden, Uttarakhand if this was so, and requested for a timeline by which Shyampur could be annexed to Rajaji. The Chief Wildlife Warden requested for three months' time..."*

**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 as per the decision of the Standing Committee of NBWL, site inspection was conducted by Dr M.K. Ranjitsinh, Dr Divyabhanusinh Chavda and Dr Asad Rahmani, and that the report had been circulated to all the members.

Dr M.K. Ranjitsinh briefly explained the facts contained in the site inspection report. He mentioned that while the team had no objection for the Gaduli to Hajipur to Bhitara Mota section of the road, which would also require clearance from FAC, the team was opposed to the stretches from Kuneria to Dholavira and Maovana to Gadakbet to Santalpur. He also informed that the reason for not agreeing to the two sections was that one of the proposed areas was the only breeding ground for flamingos in Asia, and the movement of traffic would have a negative impact on this important habitat. In general, both the areas were subject to inundation by sea every year, and supported a unique wildlife and ecology consequently. Any construction of road in these areas would restrict the movement of water, and therefore, the associated dependent wildlife. He further stated that the area were inundated for about 8 months in a year and hence any road construction there, would involve raising high embankments which not only would impact hydrology of the area, but also involve high cost and limited utility as compared to the existing road network, which though was longer, but was well maintained. He also mentioned that the Dholavira – Khadir Sanctuary segment would require the approval of the Archeological Survey of India

Dr Divyabhanusinh Chavda complemented the views expressed by Dr M.K. Ranjitsinh. He emphasized that the only breeding site of the flamingos would be destroyed if this road was constructed. He also added that owing to the nature of the terrain, this road would perennially face the threat of sinking and submergence.

Dr Asad Rahmani informed that the flamingo area was one of the sites included as 'Important Bird Areas' in the country. He informed that the flamingos were breeding there for more than 100 years, and this was the only site in Asia where the flamingos breed. He further stated that construction of this road would bring in a change in the entire water regime of the area, and may adversely impact the flamingo habitat. He also suggested that instead of this alignment, an alternate alignment be opted for.

Ms Prerna Bindra supporting the report of Dr Ranjitsinh, Dr Divyabhanusinh and Dr Asad Rahmani said that if this proposed road was built, the only breeding site of the flamingos in Asia would be completely destroyed, and, therefore, she strongly recommended that this proposal should be rejected. She added that it was tragic that we would be considered as compromising the last habitats of critically endangered wildlife that we were in fact mandated to protect.

The Deputy Inspector General, Border Security Force, mentioned that the proposed road was strategically important and would eventually cut down the distance between different border posts from about 300 km to 25 kms thereby reducing the travel time for operations of sending supplies to the force significantly. He informed that the proposed road

would benefit at least 10,000 security personnel who were posted on the unfenced stretches of border of the State with Pakistan. He suggested that he could explain the security imperatives to the committee with the help of a map.

On hearing views of the inspection team and the BSF, the Committee decided that a detailed presentation be made by the Border Security Force on this agenda in the next meeting of the SC to enable the committee to take a final view in the matter.

**Comments by Dr M.K. Ranjitsinh:**

*"In Item no. 4.1(2): On diversion of forest land in the Kutch Desert Sanctuary (Page 6), in the third last line after the phrase "---and limited utility" and before the words"..... as compared to the existing road network.." the following phrase may be inserted " of only 4 months in the monsoon,.."*

**Comments by Ms. Prerna Bindra:**

*"Ms Prerna Bindra said that she supported the report of Dr Ranjitsinh, Dr Divyabhanusinh and Dr Asad Rahmani. If the proposed road were to come up, the only breeding site of the flamingoes in Asia would be irrevocably destroyed, and that therefore she strongly recommended that this proposal should be rejected. She added that it was tragic that we would consider compromising the last habitats of critically endangered wildlife that we are mandated to protect.*

*All non-official members strongly opposed the project on grounds of the devastating and irrevocable impacts on the breeding site of the flamingos and the fact that reasonable alternatives were available."*

**Item 4.2 (1): Proposal for setting up Captive Thermal Power Plant (4x60 MW) with 1 MTPA cement Grinding Unit and 1 MTPA Coal Washery- proposal within 1.5 kms from boundary of Kaimur Wildlife Sanctuary, Uttar Pradesh.**

The Member Secretary informed the Committee that as per the decision taken by the Standing Committee of NBWL, the Wildlife Institute of India had conducted a study and the report of the study had been circulated among the members. He also informed that as per the report, the plant was proposed in an area which was already full of human and associated infrastructural activities in the Robertsganj township. He also mentioned that no environmental clearance had yet been granted for this proposal.

Ms. Prerna Bindra pointed out that there was apparently violation of Forest (Conservation) Act, and also violation of the Environment (Protection) Act, as mentioned in the WII report. According to her, as the site was only 1.5 km away from the boundary of Kaimur WLS, the Wild Life Protection Act had also been violated as work on the plant had started without the requisite permission from the Standing Committee of NBWL, and without obtaining environmental clearance for the project. She informed that there were other ecological concerns, that the WII report had clearly pointed out, like the plant proposed to draw water from the upstream of the nearby river, which not only would have grave ecological impacts but would also negatively impact the drinking water availability, the agrarian economy, and consequently the livelihood of the villagers downstream. She added that even the local people were not in favour of such large number of polluting activities in their vicinity.

Dr Madhusudan (NCF) added that, as mentioned in WII's report, drawing water from a river that drained into the Kaimur WLS could pose serious problems for wildlife in the sanctuary.

Shri Kishor Rithe objected to the proposal stating that it was a captive thermal power plant, and at a distance of merely 1.5 km from the sanctuary.

The Inspector General of Forests, Forest Conservation, MoEF informed the Committee that he and Ms. Prerna Bindra had carried out site inspection for another similar proposal wherein FAC violation was noted and it was found that the matter was *sub-judice*. The present proposal was, however, different and located 1.5 km away from the boundary of Kaimur WLS and was part of the already established township. He stated that there was violation of Environment (Protection) Act in this case and that the WII report had also indicated this fact.

The Chairperson sought to know if there had been any violations of the Wild Life (Protection) Act, 1972. The Member Secretary informed the Committee that the proposal was referred to the SC of NBWL in view of the requirement of the Environment Clearance as the project area fell within 10 Km of the boundary of the Kaimur WL Sanctuary, and that there were no reported violations of Wild Life (Protection) Act, 1972.

After discussions, the Committee decided that the proposal did not merit further consideration by it, and recommended to refer the proposal to the Impact Assessment Division/Forest Conservation Division of MoEF to take necessary action in view of the reported violations, and in light of the report of the WII on the subject.

**Comments by Ms. Prerna Bindra:**

*"...Ms. Prerna Bindra added that even before the requisite clearances were granted, the proponents had begun construction of the plant. There was clear violation of the Forest (Conservation) Act, 1980 and also violation of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986, as mentioned in the WII report. As the site was only 1.5 km away from the Kaimur Wildlife Sanctuary The Wildlife Protection Act had also been violated as work on the plant had started without the requisite permission from the NBWL... Non-official members voiced that such blatant violation of the law should not be endorsed."*

**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 as per the decision of the Standing Committee of NBWL, the State Government had submitted the status of each of the said roads, the details of which had also been circulated among the members.

Dr Divyabhanusinh Chavda reminded the Standing Committee that earlier it had taken a decision that existing roads in National Parks and Sanctuaries would only be allowed to be repaired, and certainly not permitted to be broadened or converted to hard top roads. He emphasized that this should be kept in mind before taking decisions.

Ms. Prerna Bindra informed that as earlier communicated by mail, by non-official members in a letter dated October 19, 2011 that 'in principle approval' was not accorded, according to their understanding. Instead, information was sought on maps, kind of work for which permission was required, and besides, it was decided that no gravel road in PAs would be converted to black-topped roads, though existing roads, could be repaired as long as these remain in the same original form, i.e., with no widening, new construction or diversion of forest land.

Shri Kishore Rithe suggested that site specific reports may be obtained with respect to each of the said roads as was done earlier in case of the proposal for 12 roads involving Bagdara Sanctuary.

The Committee after discussion, decided to carry out a site inspection by Ms. Prerna Bindra, Dr Madhusudan, NCF, Mysore, and one representative from the National Tiger Conservation Authority to enable it to take a view in the matter. Ms. Prerna Bindra suggested that the nominated members/official could divide themselves in two teams as a large number of roads was to be inspected. This will help in completing the task faster.

#### **Comments by Ms. Prerna Bindra:**

*"Ms Prerna Bindra informed that as earlier communicated by e-mail by the non-official members in a letter dated 19<sup>th</sup> October, 2011; 'in principle' approval was not accorded. Information was sought on maps, the kind of work for which permission was required and it was decided that no gravel road in PAs would be converted to black top, though existing roads, can be repaired as long as they remain in the same form-with no widening, new construction or diversion of forest land. The rest, especially, of construction/widening was to be deferred till information on the same came in, and a final view would then be taken."*

#### **Item 4.1 (1): Proposal involving erection of 2m x 2m structure within Tillanchang Sanctuary, Andaman and Nicobar Islands for temporary use by Indian Navy.**

The Member Secretary informed the Committee that as per the decision of the Standing Committee of NBWL, Dr Asad Rahmani had carried out a site inspection along with representative of CWLW, Andaman and Nicobar Islands, and had submitted the report. The report had been circulated among the members.

Dr Asad Rahmani mentioned that the area under consideration was the best habitat for Nicobar Megapode and the navy's intervention would have an adverse impact on the fragile

nesting sites of the species. He mentioned that the site was sacred for the Nicobarese people and every year they visit this island considering it as a shrine.

Some members were of the opinion that in case of an accident, the nesting sites of the birds could be damaged and the only population of the unique species could be wiped out.

The representative of the Indian Navy gave a brief presentation on the proposed activities planned in the site. He informed that the site was selected after an extensive reconnaissance of many locations carried out over a period of three years, for the strategic purpose, and this location was the only one found suitable for the purpose as there were no fishing and shipping activities in the area. He assured that the use of the area was temporary and with safeguards to avert any untoward incident.

All non-officials members strongly felt that this was the only habitat of an endemic bird and hence they unanimously supported Dr Asad Rahmani's report.

Ms Prerna Bindra said that the impact was not only of the test firing, but also of associated activities. She added that the tiny island of Tillanchong harboured virtually all animal species found in the Nicobar archipelago, many of them being rare, and endemic, including the endemic Nicobar Megapode. She said the proposed activity posed an extremely serious threat to the fragile island ecosystem and its endangered and endemic wildlife.

All non-officials members strongly felt that this was among the last remaining habitats of an endemic bird and must be preserved and they unanimously supported Dr Asad Rahmani's report.

After detailed discussion, and taking on board all comments of the non-official members, the Committee decided that one pilot testing would be permitted to understand the impact of testing on the area.

**Comments by Ms. Prerna Bindra:**

***"Item 4.1 (1): On the proposal involving erection of 2m x 2m structure within Tillanchang Sanctuary, Andaman and Nicobar Islands for temporary use by Indian Navy.***

*In the minutes it is written that the committee has decided that there should be pilot testing. I do not recall the non-official members agreeing to the pilot testing as we all supported Dr Asad Rahmani's report."*

**Item 4.1 (2) proposal for taking up reconnaissance survey and investigation in the Galathea National Park by Border Roads Organization for construction of road from Shastri Nagar to Indira Point, Andaman and Nicobar Islands.**

The Member Secretary informed that in accordance with the decisions taken by the Standing Committee of NBWL, site inspection was carried out by Dr Asad Rahmani along with representative of CWLW, Andaman and Nicobar Islands, and the report submitted by the team had been circulated amongst the members.

Dr Asad Rahmani gave a brief description on the salient features of the site inspection report. After discussions on the report, the Standing Committee unanimously decided to

recommend the proposal subject to the following conditions as stipulated in the site inspection report:

- (i) *The area between Galathea National Park and Campbell Bay National Park which has status of protected forest should be included in the Galathea National Park by the Andaman and Nicobar Island Forest Department and the Andaman and Nicobar Island Administration. The southern tip of Great Nicobar, which has good lowland coastal forests should be added to Galathea National Park. Shompens, who live in the forest, should have all rights in this newly protected area as they have the rights in the two existing Parks.*
- (ii) *In collaboration with Andaman and Nicobar Forest Department, the BSF should realign the road in such a way that minimum area of Galathea National Park is impacted. The road should be as near the border of the Park as possible.*
- (iii) *The Forest Department should have full control and access to this road for all times of the year.*
- (iv) *The road should not become an excuse to revive the plan to develop a dry dock and refueling base for international shipping in Galathea Bay and making Great Nicobar a free port. After construction of this road, all developmental activities should be defence and forest related. No new human settlement should be allowed near the road.*
- (v) *The Border Road Organization should take special care to avoid dumping of non-degradable waste during and after construction of the road, not only inside the National Park but all along the constructed road and the sea coast and the sea. All non degradable waste should be brought back to Campbell Bay and disposed of according to the standards notified by the concerned Pollution Control Board.*

**Item 4.1 (3): proposal for installation of coastal surveillance RADAR and power supply source in Narcondam Island Sanctuary, Andaman and Nicobar Islands.**

The Member Secretary informed the Committee that as per the decision of the Standing Committee of NBWL, site inspection was carried out by Dr Asad Rahmani along with representative of CWLW, Andaman and Nicobar Islands, and his report was circulated amongst the members.

Dr Asad Rahmani informed the Committee that Narcondam Island is the only habitat globally for the critically endangered Narcondam Hornbill. The Birds are seen in the hillock wherein the RADAR is proposed to be installed. He also added that the impact of allied activities after installation of the radar, like construction of road, movement of people, etc were more destructive than the installation of the Radar itself. He indicated that presently, there was no jetty in the island and after the installation, the jetty would be developed and lead to more disturbance in the area.

Dr Madhusudan, NCF, Mysore opined that allowing habitats of critically endangered species for such activities should be very carefully considered, as the very intent of creation of a Protected Area is for according protection to the endangered species particularly species in Schedule I of the Wild Life Protection Act. Ms. Prerna Bindra and Shri Kishor Rithe supported the opinions expressed by Dr Asad Rahmani and Dr Madhusudan.

Dr Divyabhanusinh Chavda stated that there were very few inviolate areas left in the country. He added that by permitting projects such as Kutch road, Naval target exercise and RADAR station on Narcondam Island, we would jeopardize respectively the only breeding site of flamingos, the megapode in India, and lastly the Narcondam hornbill which was endemic to this island only.

All the non-official members supported the opinions expressed by Dr Asad Rahmani, Dr Madhusudan, Divyabhanusinh Chavda, and strongly opposed the recommendation of the project.

The Commander, Indian Coast Guard, informed the Committee that the RADAR installation required only 0.6736 ha of Sanctuary land, and that the location was strategically important. Further, he added that the RADAR cannot be installed at the Police outpost near the coast as it would not have a 360 degree surveillance coverage, and that the area being on the volcanic ash bed, did not have sufficient strength to withstand the weight of the structure of the RADAR. He also added that the Indian Coast Guard was entrusted with the protection of marine biodiversity as well and therefore, was aware of the significance of the area from biodiversity point of view. He also added that the surveillance will include monitoring and controlling the criminal threats to the biodiversity of the region

The Chief Wildlife Warden, Andaman and Nicobar Island mentioned that the location proposed by the Indian Coast Guard was strategically important and was supported. He suggested possibility of several smaller units around the island, which however, was not found feasible. On the question of second best choice or alternate sites, Coast Guard representative informed that in order to achieve effective surveillance in the area beyond the islands, this was the only strategic location. He indicated that all the safeguards against any damage to the ecology would be observed.

After discussions, the Chairperson decided that a view would be taken on this proposal by her separately, taking note of the views expressed by non-official members and the Commander, Coast Guards.

**Item 4.1 (5): Proposal for development of skywalk for promotion of wildlife tourism at Bhalleydhunga involving 2.10 ha of Maenam Wildlife Sanctuary in South Sikkim.**

The Member Secretary informed the Committee that as per the decision of the Standing Committee of NBWL, site inspection was carried out by Shri Kishor Rithe and his report was circulated amongst the members.

Shri Kishor Rithe informed that he had recommended for the survey and investigation for construction of the single ropeway with one cabin only. This, he said could even be used for sanctuary management as presently the sanctuary was inaccessible due to non-existence of road network. He added that presently, there were only two trekking routes up to Bhalleydhunga, one from Rabangla and another from Yang-Yang which were damaged due to landslides. However, he mentioned that the proposed skywalk project was not in tune with the wildlife conservation. He added that the allied activities that come up with the proposed skywalk could be more disturbing than the skywalk itself. He stated that the proposal needed to be looked into carefully so that there was very little impact on wildlife in the area.

The Chief Wildlife Warden, Sikkim informed that 81% of the total area of Sikkim is forest, and that 31% of the State was under Protected Area coverage, which was being

considered for further expansion. He stated that proposal of skywalk intended to showcase the biodiversity of the area to the people and will have minimal disturbance to the wildlife therein. He further stated that in terms of sanctuary area to be diverted and other possible impacts on wildlife, there was hardly any difference between the proposal for construction of skywalk and the ropeway. He, therefore, requested for permission of SC for carrying out survey and investigation of both the skywalk, and the ropeway. He assured that all aspects of impacts will be covered in the survey and investigation of skywalk and the ropeway.

After discussions, the Committee unanimously decided to recommend for conducting survey and investigation for construction of the skywalk, and the ropeway, and directed the CWLW/State Government to place the survey and investigation report before the Standing Committee as and when the same was ready.

**Comments by Shri Kishor Rithe:**

*"Please delete the following statements which I never stated.*

*"He added that the allied activities that come up with the proposed skywalk could be more disturbing than the skywalk itself. He said that the traffic from Yang-Yang to Bhalleydhunga should be regulated. He stated that the proposal needed to be looked into carefully so that there was very little impact on wildlife in the area."*

**Item 4.1 (7): Proposal for construction of diversion channel from Kushalipura Nallah to Mansarovar Dam (length 2,010 m) from RD 210m to 2,220m in Rajasthan.**

The Member Secretary informed the Committee that as per the decision of the Standing Committee of NBWL, the report of the Regional CCF (Central), Lucknow, had been obtained and circulated amongst the members. He also informed that Regional Office, Lucknow had issued FC clearance in 2005 based on the recommendation of the State CWLW/State PCCF/State Government in 2005.

Dr Divyabhanusinh Chavda stated that he had travelled on the entire sector from Kushalipura to Mordungri in January 2012, when he witnessed large-scale clear felling of trees and also the deep depth of the proposed pipeline. He said that this project was rejected earlier after a site inspection by the members of the Standing Committee of NBWL. He questioned the authority of the Regional Office of the Ministry of Environment and Forests to overrule the decision of the Standing Committee of NBWL. The Hon'ble Chairperson said that she would look into the matter.

Dr Chavda suggested further that the Rajasthan Government must ensure proper crossing/underpasses to enable free movement of animals including tigers crossing over from Ranthambhore into Mansingh Sanctuary and beyond.

Ms. Prerna Bindra said that she agreed with Dr Divyabhanusinh Chavda. She had recorded her opposition of this proposal in the 23<sup>rd</sup> Meeting of the Standing Committee of National Board for Wildlife held on 14<sup>th</sup> October 2011 and reiterated her stand against recommending this proposal.

The Member Secretary, NTCA, informed that since the clearance was granted and sizable work on the project had already been completed, it will not be advisable to reject the

proposal, which had the potential of leveraging the support of local community that was in dire need of water for drinking and irrigation. Instead, the project should be cleared with safeguards in consultation with WII. The Chief Wildlife Warden, Rajasthan informed that water was critical to the area and people's support in conservation initiatives would not be possible, if their genuine needs were not sympathetically considered. He added that people should be on board for the conservation of tiger and other precious wildlife in the area. He also stated that the State Government intended to take all possible measures to safeguard the wildlife, including creation of suitable passages across the channel for safe movement of wildlife.

After discussions, the Committee decided to recommend the proposal subject to the following conditions stipulated by the Chief Wildlife Warden and the State Board for Wildlife:

- i. *Chainage 60 m to 210 m: All along this part of channel, there is a hill on one side and a road on the other. The user agency shall construct a masonry retaining wall having a height of 6' along the length of the channel on the side of the road.*
- ii. *Chainage 210 m to 2,220 m: the diversion channel will be constructed underground and covered by an arch cover. The arch cover shall be further covered with a layer of soil to a minimum of 60 cm thickness so that the area looks natural. Moderate tapering slopes would be maintained on both sides of the arch cover between 210 m to 870 m to facilitate free movement of wild animals.*
- iii. *Chainage 2,220 m to 2,700 m: the diversion channel will be an open channel with a side slope of 1:1.*

**Item 4.1 (8): Proposal for diversion of 19.503 ha of forest land from Rajaji National Park for the use of Shri Raghavendra Sewashram Samiti for construction of a hospital.**

The Member Secretary informed the Committee that as per the decision taken by the Standing Committee of NBWL, site inspection was conducted by Dr A.J.T. Johnsingh and the report along with a representation of the Sewashram Samiti, had been circulated amongst the members.

Dr A.J.T. Johnsingh briefly explained the salient features of the site inspection report. He also mentioned that the area proposed for diversion by the proponent had signs of important wild animals like tiger, elephants, leopards, etc. He also said that the land was required by the Ashram authorities to grow medicinal plants, which according to him can be grown elsewhere.

The non-official members unanimously pointed out that the proposal had already been rejected many times by the Standing Committee, and that the proponents had cast unreasonable aspersions on Dr A.J.T. Johnsingh in their representation, which was not acceptable, and hence outrightly rejected the representation.

The Committee after discussing the site inspection report decided to once again reject the proposal.

**Item 4.1 (11): proposal for converting earthen shoulders into hard shoulders of existing NH-8 in Bewar (km 58.245) to Gomti Chauraha (km 177.00) Section from Km 58/245 to Km 177/000 in Todgarh Raoli Sanctuary, Rajasthan.**

The Member Secretary informed the Committee that as per the decision taken by the Standing Committee, the State Government had provided a detailed presentation on the proposal which had been circulated amongst the members.

After discussions, the Committee recommended the proposal subject to the following conditions as stipulated by the Chief Wildlife Warden, Rajasthan:

- i. No night camping by labourers or other personnel shall be allowed during the construction of road and construction activity will be permitted only during day time.*
- ii. No construction material shall be stored within the Sanctuary boundary.*
- iii. No construction material like sand, soil and stone, etc shall be collected from the sanctuary or forest area.*
- iv. User agency shall pay an amount equal to 5% of the project cost to the sanctuary management for better management of the Sanctuary.*
- v. To check the speed of vehicles, speed breakers shall be provided at an interval of 500 m in Sanctuary area by user agency.*
- vi. The underpasses shall be constructed by user agency at an interval of 1 km.*
- vii. The user agency shall put and maintain signboards on both sides of the road mentioning that the road is passing through the Sanctuary.*
- viii. Plantations in three rows on both sides along the road shall be done and maintained by user agency in consultation with PA in-charge (DCF).*
- ix. On both sides of the road boundary, pucca wall of about 1.8 mts height shall be constructed by the user agency in consultation with PA incharge (DCF).*
- x. No tree cutting will be allowed.*
- xi. The User agency will not create burrow pits in the Sanctuary area, for construction of road.*
- xii. User agency shall clear all the debris left, after construction is over.*

**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 as per the decision taken by the Standing Committee of NBWL, site inspection was conducted by Ms. Purna Bindra along with the AIG, NTCA and the report had been circulated amongst the members.

Ms. Purna Bindra briefly flagged the salient features of the site inspection report. She said that she understood the importance of the link provided by the road, and the fact that it had heavy usage. She added that at the time of her visit, condition of the road was very poor and there was heavy traffic plying on this section of the road. She, therefore, in the joint report had pointed out an urgent necessity to repair the road, with provision for construction of suitable under-passes and over bridges for safe passage of tigers and other wildlife in the area as recommended in the report. She also pointed out that tigers and other wildlife regularly used the road and such passages must be planned as suggested in the report, before any work on the road commenced.

The Chief Wildlife Warden, Madhya Pradesh informed the Committee that the State Government had taken note of the suggestions made by Ms. Purna Bindra during the site visit and had since repaired the roads. During discussions, it transpired that NTCA was in the process of considering this area as a tiger reserve.

After discussions, the Committee decided that the site inspection report be forwarded to the Member Secretary, NTCA for his views. The proposal will be placed for consideration of the SC after comments/views of MS, NTCA had been received.

**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 report of NTCA and WII, as decided by the Standing Committee of NBWL was still awaited.

The Committee requested the NTCA and WII to expedite the site inspection and submission of the report for consideration of the Committee.

**Action Taken Report on the decisions of the Standing Committee of NBWL taken in its 24<sup>th</sup> 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 Chairperson assured that the orders on the constitution of the sub-committee will be issued at the earliest. The sub-committee has since been constituted under the chairmanship of Dr M.K. Ranjitsinh.

**Item 2.1 (3): Central funding to be restricted to Protected Areas directly under the Wildlife Wing and managed by trained officers**

The Member Secretary informed the Committee that in pursuance to the decision taken by the Standing Committee, Hon'ble Minister of State (Independent Charge) for Environment and Forests had written to the Hon'ble Chief Ministers of all States/Union Territories for effective action at the earliest.

Dr M.K. Ranjitsinh opined that the Ministry should fix strict timelines for the State Governments to put in place trained personnel for managing Protected Areas. The Member Secretary explained in detail the adverse impact of setting up of such a deadline on wildlife conservation in general in the States. Mr. Kishor Rithe expressed that if the timeline was not fixed, States would never endeavour to change the present situation. He suggested a time period of three years for the purpose. Honorable Chairperson agreed to get the suggestion examined. Dr Ranjitsingh stated that the parameter for positive action on part of States would be more nominations from the State Governments for training in wildlife management in the Wildlife Institute of India.

Dr A.J.T. Johnsingh endorsed the view of Dr Ranjitsinh. All non-official members stressed the importance of having trained personnel to manage PAs, and supported the views expressed by Dr Ranjitisingh and Dr Johnsingh. The Committee agreeing with the views expressed, requested the Director, Wildlife Institute of India to inform the committee about

the number of trainees deputed by each State/UT in the next professional course commencing in September 2012.

**Item 2.1 (4): Declaration of Kolamarka Sanctuary**

The Member Secretary informed that the concerned members of the sub-group have been requested to take necessary action.

Both Dr M.K. Ranjitsinh and Shri Kishor Rithe were of the opinion that Kolamarka was the only refuge for the purest wild breed of wild buffalo and, therefore, needed to be protected by declaring the same as a sanctuary.

The Chief Wildlife Warden, Maharashtra informed the Committee that the State Government had since declared four new Sanctuaries, viz, New Navegaon Sanctuary, New Nagzira Sanctuary, New Bor Sanctuary and New Great Indian Bustard Sanctuary and that the State Government was aware of the importance of a home for the wild buffaloes and has decided to initially declare Kolamarka as a Conservation Reserve for eliciting people's support in conservation of the species. Later on, the status of the Protected Area would be elevated to that of a Sanctuary in a phased approach. Shri Kishor Rithe stated that the Standing Committee (SC) in its 24th Meeting had already discussed in detail the options of "conservation reserve" and "sanctuary" for Kolamarka, and had after due deliberations recommended to notify Kolamarka as a "sanctuary".

After discussions, the Committee decided to recommend to the State Government to consider declaring Kolamarka as a Wildlife Sanctuary.

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

The Member Secretary informed the Committee that this matter was already considered while taking up Agenda Item No. 1, i.e., confirmation of minutes of the 24<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Standing Committee of NBWL wherein it had, *inter alia*, been decided to place the draft implementation protocol before the members of the Standing Committee of NBWL for their comments and consideration before finalization.

**Item 2.2 (2): Elephant Electrocution Deaths in Odisha**

The Member Secretary informed that this matter was also covered while discussing the agenda item pertaining to draft guidelines for linear intrusions.

The Committee took note of the item accordingly.

**Item 2.2 (3): Protection of wildlife and CAMPA work practices**

The Member Secretary informed the Committee that the decision taken by the Standing Committee on this issue in its last meeting was communicated to the CEO, CAMPA. However, by then the National CAMPA Advisory Council (NCAC) meeting of

CAMPA had already been convened. Therefore, the CAMPA Cell would once again be requested for needful action.

Ms. Purna Bindra said that the use of CAMPA funds for the voluntary relocation of people from core critical tiger habitats, PAs, and even crucial wildlife areas outside, wherefrom people were eager to move out was discussed in the last meeting of the Standing Committee. She added that while she was aware that the MoEF had sent a letter in this regard to the States in 2010, only a few States were actually making CAMPA funds available for voluntary relocation which she said was grossly inadequate in view of the fact that there were numerous petitions for relocation from people living within core critical habitats and PAs, and funds were falling short for the purpose. She further added that even NTCA did not have requisite amount of funds to meet the requirement on account of relocation. She requested if the matter could be pursued and if the Hon'ble Minister could write to the States in this regard.

Shri Kishor Rithe opined that CAMPA funds should also be used for resettlement of villagers from National Parks and Sanctuaries along with the Tiger Reserves, Elephant Reserves and also some narrow important corridors connecting the PAs. The Principal Secretary (Forests), Maharashtra informed that the State Government of Maharashtra was already utilizing CAMPA money for resettlement purposes in Tiger Reserves. He proposed to consider setting norms for utilization of a certain proportion of CAMPA funds, say 15%, dedicated for resettlement/relocation purposes. Chairperson indicated that uniform norms might not be feasible. Shri Kishore Rithe requested to use the word resettlement/relocation in place of acquisition of land in the communication of Standing Committee to CAMPA, which was agreed to.

The Chairperson desired to know the extent of utilization of CAMPA money for relocation/resettlement purposes in other States also.

After discussions, the Committee decided to seek the details of use of CAMPA funds for resettlement purposes from various States. It was also agreed to request the NCAC for permitting use of a certain percentage of CAMPA funds with a view to enhancing the present quantum of CAMPA funds being used by States for relocation and resettlement purposes in the wildlife areas.

### **Item 2.3 (8 and 9): Saving ponds in Coimbatore and adjoining areas in Tamil Nadu.**

The Member Secretary informed that the Ministry had already requested the Chief Secretary, Government of Tamil Nadu for needful action.

Dr A.J.T. Johnsingh informed the Committee that the NGOs in Coimbatore were doing excellent work and requested Hon'ble Chairperson to visit the area. The chairperson agreed to consider request of Dr Johnsingh.

### **Item 2.3 (11): Proposal for Nandhaur Wildlife Sanctuary.**

The Member Secretary informed the Committee that the information sought from the FC Division had since been received and that the State Government would be requested for needful action.

Ms. Prerna Bindra requested that the proposal to declare and notify Nandhour, an uninhabited stretch of about 850 sq. km of forest, with a recovering, breeding population of tigers, and other wildlife like elephants, as a wildlife sanctuary was pending with the State. She requested if it could be expedited.

The Chairperson assured the Committee that she would write to the Hon'ble Chief Minister, Uttarakhand on this issue requesting him to declare Nandhour as a wildlife sanctuary.

**Item 2.4 (3): Dachigam National Park.**

The Member Secretary informed the Committee that the sub-committee under the chairmanship of Dr M.K. Ranjitsinh had already been constituted.

Dr M.K. Ranjitsinh proposed that the Ministry should designate a nodal officer for all such sub-committees constituted by the Standing Committee who could be contacted by the members as and when required.

The Chairperson decided that the Deputy Inspector General of Forests (Wildlife) in the Ministry of Environment and Forests would be the focal point for all such committees constituted by the Standing Committee of NBWL. Dr Johnsingh made suggestion of encouraging young wildlifers also to carry out studies in Dachigam National Park.

**Item 2.4 (4): Non-compliance by NHAI of FAC conditions of a four-lane expressway (NH-54E) through the Kaziranga-Karbi Anglong elephant and tiger corridor.**

The Member Secretary informed the Committee that a DO letter had been written by the Secretary (Environment and Forests) to Chief Secretary, Assam and another DO letter by the Hon'ble Minister of State (Independent Charge) for Environment and Forests to the Hon'ble Union Minister for Road Transport and Highways.

Shri Kishor Rithe said that NHAI was under obligation to consider and address resettlement of affected people, wildlife issues and other related matters. He added that the Authority cannot ignore these important issues, and go on completing construction of 20 Km of roads every day. He said that it was the duty of the Chief Wildlife Wardens to take action against the defaulting project workers, and inform the concerned authorities of NHAI. He added that when he drew the attention of the Chief Wildlife Warden to the violations by NHAI, the former simply said that he had not received any formal complaints from the local people or anyone else. Shri Rithe said that we should not wait for the people to raise objections, but the CWLWs should take action as and when any violation came to their notice. He also said that in serious cases of violation, the Ministry was also required to deal with the NHAI strictly. He further said that several cases had been filed against NHAI already, like the one relating to NH- 6 passing through the corridor between Nagzira Sanctuary and Navegaon National Park in Maharashtra. However, according to him, no action had been taken against the defaulting NHAI and forest department officers under FC Act 1980. He said that the Tiger corridor was being cut by the construction of the NH-6 highway in Maharashtra, but the NHAI was not taking adequate measures for mitigating the negative impacts on the landscape as suggested by wildlife authorities of Maharashtra.

Shri Kishor Rithe further pointed that under the same agenda item, during 24th Meeting of SC-NBWL, the issue of violation of FC Act 1980 as well as Wild Life Protection

Act 1972 by NHAI and allegedly by some forest officers in respect of NH-6 projects through Nagzira Sanctuary and Navegaon National Park in Maharashtra was discussed. However, action was yet to be initiated in this regard.

Ms. Perna Bindra requested that the copies of the letters written by MEF/Secretary (E&F) may also be circulated amongst the members of the Standing Committee of NBWL.

The Chairperson took note of the request and decided that copies of all such letters written in pursuance to the decisions of the Standing Committee of NBWL be circulated amongst the members as well.

**Item 2.5 (1) : Contour canal in Anamalai Tiger Reserve (TR).**

The Member Secretary informed the Committee that a DO letter had been written by the Secretary (Environment and Forests) to Chief Secretary, Tamil Nadu. However, site inspection report of the integrated committee of different departments to suggest mitigation measures was still awaited.

Dr Madhusudan, NCF, Mysore informed that no major work on the canal was continuing as before although the Secretary, MoEF had written to the Tamil Nadu Government to facilitate a field assessment involving Drs TR Shankar Raman and AJT Johnsingh on behalf of the SC-NBWL. However, this committee of officers of different departments was yet to become functional.

The Chairperson informed the Committee that she would write to Hon'ble Chief Minister on this issue so that the Committee could make a site visit at the earliest.

**Comments by Dr M.D. Madhusudan:**

*"Dr Madhusudan, NCF, Mysore informed that work on the canal was continuing as before although the Secretary, MoEF had written to the TN Government to facilitate a field assessment involving Drs TR Shankar Raman and AJT Johnsingh on behalf of the sC-NBWL. However, this committee of officers of different departments was yet to become functional." However, what is carried in the final minutes communicates exactly the opposite and states that, "no major work on the canal was continuing...", which I had not stated and is factually incorrect."*

**Item 3.3.1: Construction of 1,750 MW Demwe Lower HE project in Lohit District, Arunachal Pradesh.**

The Member Secretary informed that this issue had already been discussed while considering the agenda item no.1, i.e., 'Confirmation of minutes of the 24<sup>th</sup> Meeting of Standing Committee of NBWL'.

The Committee took note of the matter.

**Item 3.1: Supreme Court case regarding Sigur Elephant Corridor, Tamil Nadu.**

The Member Secretary informed the Committee that the Ministry had filed a report in the Supreme Court, which was made available to Ms Perna Bindra, as desired by her.

Ms. Prerna Bindra requested that the report of the Expert Committee as well as that filed by the Ministry of Environment and Forests in Supreme Court be circulated amongst the members of the Standing Committee of NBWL. She said that she stood by the opinion expressed in the letter written by the non-official members on 05.01.2012 which reiterated their opinion expressed in the Standing Committee Meeting of December 13, 2011, endorsing the report of the High Court appointed Expert Committee (copy of the letter attached at **Annexure-2**).

The Chairperson mentioned that the report of the Ministry was mainly based on the concerns pertaining to the implementation of the Forest Rights Act, 2006. She also added that the NBWL members were welcome to give their suggestions/opinion and if agreed, an additional affidavit containing views of the non-official members could be filed before the Hon'ble Supreme Court on behalf of the NBWL. Dr Johnsingh who had extensively worked in this area in 1974 and 1975 said that the foothills of the Nilgiris (here the Glenmorgan Mountain) was an excellent wildlife habitat, but now the valley between the foothills and Vibhoodhimalai was full of resorts. He requested the Hon'ble Chairperson to make a visit to the area in question.

Dr Madhusudan, NCF, Mysore, informed that he was in full agreement for effective implementation of the Forest Rights Act, 2005, but there were reports of violations, which needed to be looked into.

Shri Kishor Rithe opined that the practice of declaring the Reserved Forests with wildlife potential as corridors or Protected Areas in Maharashtra, should also be adopted by other States.

After discussions, the Chairperson decided that the report of the Expert Committee of Tamil Nadu and the report filed by the Ministry in the Supreme Court would be circulated amongst the members of the SC.

### **AGENDA ITEM NO. 3:**

**3.1: Proposals that were placed for consideration in the 23<sup>rd</sup> Meeting of the Standing Committee of NBWL held on 14<sup>th</sup> 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 the proposal involved construction of Baglinga M.I. project at Baglinga. Site is situated in compartment no.26 of East Melghat Forest Division. The project area is 14.75 ha of reserved forest having 709 trees which is within the proposed buffer area of Melghat Tiger Reserve. The project area is close to the outer boundary, and thus more than 8.5 km away from the core area of Melghat Tiger Reserve. He also added that the State Board for Wildlife, the Chief Wildlife Warden, Maharashtra and the National Tiger Conservation Authority had recommended the project.

Shri Kishor Rithe mentioned that one power generation project, viz, Chikhaldara Pump Storage project (hydel project) having reservoirs at two sites, one at Chikhaldara and another at Baglinga, was rejected long back by the Expert Committee on River Valley

Projects. He stated that the site for the proposed project specially the reservoir at Baglinga was a good virgin forest in a valley. Chief Wildlife Warden explained that the location was about 8.5 km away from the core area of Melghat Tiger Reserve and that the project would help water management in the buffer area also.

After discussions, the Committee decided that a site inspection be carried out by Dr Asad Rahmani and Shri Kishor Rithe, and a report after inspection be submitted for consideration of the SC of NBWL.

**2. Proposal for establishment of steel plant and electricity generation unit as an extension project of M/s Welspun Max Steel Company in the non-forest area within 10 km of Phansad Wildlife Sanctuary, Maharashtra.**

The Member Secretary informed the Committee that the proposal was for establishment of steel plant and electricity generation unit over 350 ha as an extension project of M/s Welspun Max Steel Company in the non-forest area within 10 km of Phansad Wildlife Sanctuary, to its existing sponge iron plant at Village Salav in Raigarh District. The said steel plant was situated along the sea coast adjoining Phansad Sanctuary at Revdanda, at about 4.7 km from Phansad Sanctuary. He also informed that the State Board for Wildlife and the Chief Wildlife Warden, Maharashtra had recommended the proposal.

Dr Asad Rahmani informed the Committee that he had prepared the Conservation Plan for the area as part of the mitigatory measures for the project.

The Committee, after discussion, decided to recommend the proposal subject to the following conditions stipulated in the conservation plan prepared by Dr Asad Rahmani:

**A) Status Assessment Studies**

*(i) M/s Welspun will support a detailed study for documentation of biodiversity and formulation of conservation plan for Rayashet Reserved Forest.*

*(ii) Similarly, a comprehensive long term study on freshwater fishes shall be undertaken at the priority sites shown in the report as a CSR activity. State Forest Department (SFD) will institute the studies and the cost will be borne by the project proponent.*

*(iii) Long term monitoring surveys in this area are needed to map current distribution and population structure of *Gerarda prevostiana*. Further research work should be specific to map current density, distribution and area of occupancy. Comparative work in disturbed and undisturbed habitats is more important to plan further conservative measures. SFD will take follow-up action for the purpose for which funding support will be provided by the user agency.*

*(iv) A comprehensive study of sea turtle nesting shall be initiated specifically to assess the vulnerable areas prone to damage by oil spills at Revdanda and Nagaon area. SFD will initiate steps to carry out this study through a reputed organization with funding support from the user agency.*

**B) Conservation Implementation Measures**

*(i) A green zone will be developed between mangroves and the plant as a buffer zone between the two. However, no afforestation will be taken up with exotic species. Native species only shall be used for green belt development.*

- (ii) The Evergreen/semi-evergreen patches along the streams and moist deciduous patches on hill slopes near Rayashet, degraded moist deciduous and scrub forests near Waghulwadi to Yesde, moist deciduous forests near Barshiv, Phansad Dam and Morande Dam shall be protected by the SFD with funding support from the user agency.
- (iii) Nurseries for the endangered and endemic species of plants listed in the Annexure IVa of final report shall be developed at suitable sites and the seedlings shall be planted as a part of eco-restoration measure at suitable sites as suggested by the Forest Department as part of the conservation plan.
- (iv) Afforestation of degraded forest area using native species will be taken up to reduce pressure from surrounding villages on the protected areas and reserved forest areas. Selection of the plant species and areas for afforestation, and local people's awareness and participation in these activities are the key factors to make the initiative acceptable and effective. Also, degraded forests and social forestry plantations shall be restored by planting native species such as *Acacia catechu*, *Terminalia bellerica*, *T. chebula*, *Semecarpus anacardium*, *Phyllanthus emblica*, *Sapindus laurifolius*, *Xanthozylum rhetsa*, etc. This will be in tune with the principle of ecological restoration, and also serve the needs of local communities with respect to minor forest products.
- (v) Deforestation in riparian zone of streams shall not be permitted as it causes habitat alteration and changes in species assemblage.
- (vi) Changes in stream topography shall not be permitted as that would cause further loss of habitat diversity.
- (vii) Damming of primary headwater streams shall not be permitted in suggested conservation priority zones as headwater streams are the breeding grounds of most of the stream fishes.
- (viii) Introduction of exotic fish species shall not be permitted in natural water bodies.
- (ix) Specific plan for conservation of plateaus shall be developed with adequate financial support from the user agency.
- (x) The tree plantation shall be undertaken on grassland and plateaus.
- (xi) Oil Spill Contingency Plan including Tier 1 Oil spill containment plan and proper infrastructure for the same must be developed before the project gets operational.
- (xii) Mangrove restoration shall be undertaken at suitable areas in the vicinity of the proposed project which are degraded due to the anthropogenic stresses including industrial development in the past. The area under stunted mangroves near Revdanda village is one such location for restoration.
- (xiii) Specific funds required shall be allocated by the user agency for sandy shore clean up at Korlai Fort area.
- (xiv) Conservation programme at least for some insect groups for example, butterflies shall be launched by developing butterfly gardens, and by starting awareness campaigns in schools and colleges, etc.
- (xv) Awareness campaigns among veterinary practitioners and farmers shall be initiated to avoid use of Diclofenac and to implement the ban on Diclofenac Veterinary use by Govt of India to protect vultures.
- (xvi) Site specific community education programmes through competent organizations with appropriate financial support shall be initiated. An independent social audit by a reputed organization like Tata Institute of Social Sciences (TISS) to assess the effectiveness of education programmes shall be organised.
- (xvii) Welspun Maxsteel shall set up a Monitoring Committee comprising representatives of forest department, BNHS, and Company nominees to monitor the implementation of Conservation Plan. The Committee shall meet at least 4 times in a year to review the progress of implementation of the conservation plan in the initial two years. Thereafter, it

*shall meet at least twice a year for next three years. The need of the Committee can be reviewed after five years.*

**3.2: Proposals that were placed for consideration in the 24<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Standing Committee of NBWL held on 13<sup>th</sup> December 2011 but could not be discussed due to paucity of time.**

**1. Proposal for diversion of 1.4459 ha of forest land from Balaram Ambaji Sanctuary for construction of railway line passing through the Sanctuary by Dedicated Freight Corridor Corporation of India Ltd., Gujarat.**

The Member Secretary informed the Committee that the project envisages construction, maintenance, and operation of the Dedicated Freight Corridor (DFC) by the Indian Railways so as to provide a modern, quicker, safer freight transportation system. The proposed DFC Palanpur Yard is about 6 Kms away from the existing Palanpur Yard of the Indian Railways. The Ministry of Railways (through the DFC Ltd.) intends to construct the proposed DFC tracks within the existing area in the possession of Railways adjoining the Balaram Ambaji Sanctuary. He also added that the State Board for Wildlife and the Chief Wildlife Warden, Gujarat had recommended the project.

Dr Divyabhanusinh Chavda mentioned that there is already a railway line passing through the Sanctuary which was more than hundred years old and now they propose to widen the same railway track. He added that he was aware of the site and suggested that it could be recommended.

After discussions, the Committee decided to recommend the proposal subject to the following conditions suggested by the Chief Wildlife Warden, Gujarat:

- i. The construction of yard and the camp should be at least 3 kms away from the Sanctuary.*
- ii. Proper underpasses shall be provided for movement of wildlife at every one km in consultation with Chief Wildlife Warden.*
- iii. Culvert/pipe shall be provided at every one km between the underpasses. Further 10 inch diameter pipe shall be provided at every 200 mts distance to facilitate free movement of reptiles.*
- iv. Metal beam crash barrier shall be provided on both sides of the railway line.*
- v. Programme for controlling the speed of the trains shall be decided in consultation with the local Forest Division.*
- vi. Afforestation along the railway line shall be done.*
- vii. Impact assessment studies shall be organized by Railways periodically in consultation with the State Forest Department.*
- viii. The civil structures shall be designed in such a manner that water flow to the Thol Lake is not obstructed. The same shall be ensured by providing culverts.*
- ix. Adequate number of appropriate signages shall be placed throughout the track in the protected area.*
- x. An amount of Rs.5 lakh will be deposited annually with the State Forest Department for improving the measures for wildlife conservation.*
- xi. The user agency shall strictly ensure that no damage is caused to flora and fauna in the area during execution of the project.*

- xii. *The CWLW or any officer authorized or working under him shall monitor the compliance of conditions and on any non-compliance, shall report to MoEF, who may place the case before the Standing Committee for cancellation of this permission.*
- xiii. *Any other conditions that may be imposed by CWLW/Government from time to time will be strictly complied with.*

**2. Proposal for railway line passing near Thol Wildlife Sanctuary to be constructed by Dedicated Freight Corridor Corporation of India Ltd., at a distance of 700 mts from Thol Sanctuary, Gujarat.**

The Member Secretary informed the Committee that the project envisages construction, maintenance, and operation of the Dedicated Freight Corridor (DFC) by the Indian Railways so as to provide a modern, quicker, safer freight transportation system. The proposed alignment is within 5 Kms of the boundary of Thol Wildlife Sanctuary and the nearest distance from the Sanctuary boundary is 700 meters. He added that the State Board for Wildlife and the Chief Wildlife Warden, Gujarat had recommended the proposal.

Ms. Purna Bindra mentioned that Thol was an important wetland and bird sanctuary and very close to the city of Ahmedabad. She said that she had seen the sanctuary for many years, and rapid urbanisation, construction and other developmental projects were damaging the Thol Sanctuary because of adverse impacts, and that the impact of freight corridor, movement of trains, etc should be seen in conjunction with this fact.

After discussions, the Committee unanimously decided that a site inspection be carried out by Ms. Purna Bindra, and the inspection report be placed by her before the SC of NBWL for its consideration.

**AGENDA ITEM NO.4**

**4.1.: Fresh proposals involving diversion of land from within National Parks and Sanctuaries.**

**1. Establishment of Lighted Beacon at Patrie Island- taking up non forestry activities in National Park.**

**2. Proposal for removal of bamboos in areas of gregarious flowering in Shoolpaneshwar Sanctuary by Forest Department, Gujarat.**

**3. Proposal for removal of bamboos in areas of gregarious flowering in Vansda National Park, Gujarat by Forest Department, Gujarat.**

**4. Diversion of 0.165 ha of forest land falling in Kalatop-Khajjiar Wildlife Sanctuary and extension of existing Lakarmandi-Dainkund Road (Dalhousie) by 500 mts. in favour of Chief Admn. Officer, Air Force Station, Dalhousie, District.**

**5. Proposal for construction of Ropeway Cable Car from Mubarakh Mandi to Mahamaya Park and Shahabad near Babu Fort, Jammu & Kashmir, involving Bahu Conservation Reserve.**

**6. Proposal for laying 132 KV D/C Hiranagar-Battal-Manwal transmission line, Jammu and Kashmir.**

**7. Diversion of 1.241 ha of forest land from Madhav National Park for investigation/survey and laying of underground pipeline for supply of drinking water to Shivpuri town, M.P.**

With regard to inconclusive discussions on sub-items 2 and 3 above, Dr Ranjitsinh stated that removal of bamboos from PAs under the pretext of eliminating fire hazard had been a ploy to harvest bamboos for commercial purposes, which was explicitly banned under the Wild Life Protection Act. His contention was supported by other non-official members.

Due to shortage of time, the above mentioned seven items were deferred for discussion in the next meeting of the Standing Committee.

**8. Rationalization of the boundary of Koyana Wildlife Sanctuary, Maharashtra.**

The Member Secretary informed the Committee that the Government of Maharashtra, had declared Koyna Wildlife Sanctuary on 16<sup>th</sup> September 1985 under Section 18 of the Wild Life (Protection) Act, 1972. The notified area of the Sanctuary was 423.55 sq. Kms which included 229.45 sq. Kms forest area and 198.02 sq. Kms non-forest area. The Enquiry Officer appointed under the Wild Life (Protection) Act, 1972 for the enquiry of Koyna Wildlife Sanctuary had conducted enquiries under Sections 19 to 25 of the said Act and submitted their reports to the concerned Collector. The Enquiry officer and Sub-divisional Officer, Karad had passed orders for exclusion of non-forest area of 14 villages of Patana Taluka of Koyna Wildlife Sanctuary admeasuring an area of 99.65 sq. Kms.

The Member Secretary also added that some developmental works like roads, resorts, dam and wind mills had been executed in this area, on the assumption that these areas had been recommended for exclusion from the Sanctuary. One PIL No. 140/2010 has also been filed before the Hon'ble High Court of Bombay, and an application before the CEC regarding the violations of Wild Life (Protection) Act, 1972 was pending. However, there is no stay whatsoever in the matter.

He further stated that the State Government had also proposed five areas, viz, Rajmachi (122 sq. Kms), Sudhagarh Tamni (220.18 sq. Kms), Tipagad (52.4 sq. Kms), Isapur (bird) (121.55 sq. Kms) and Kopela/Kolamarka (90.93 sq. Kms) for setting up new sanctuaries and/or for increasing the area of existing Protected Areas.

Dr Divyabhanusinh Chavda suggested that since the area was in a Tiger Reserve, prior concurrence of the NTCA must be taken, and, therefore, the proposal should go to NTCA for its views.

The Committee after considering the requirement of the State Government decided to recommend the proposal for rationalization of the boundaries of the Koyna Wildlife Sanctuary subject to the condition that the five areas proposed for declaration of Wildlife Sanctuaries would be notified prior to denotification of the areas of Koyna Sanctuary, and that the denotification will also be subject to the consideration of the proposal by the Member-Secretary, NTCA, outcome of the court case on this matter pending before the Hon'ble High Court of Bombay and the I.A. pending before the Central Empowered Committee.

### **Comments by Shri Kishor Rithe:**

*"The Committee after considering the requirement of the State Government decided to recommend the proposal for rationalization of the boundaries of the .....Please include-*

*Koyna Wildlife Sanctuary subject to the conditions that the area to be deleted, **will still remain as part of the Sahyadri Tiger Reserve.**"*

### **Comments by Dr M.D. Madhusudan:**

*"The Committee after considering the requirement of the State Government decided to recommend the proposal for rationalization of the boundaries of the Koyna Wildlife Sanctuary subject to the condition that the five areas proposed for declaration of Wildlife Sanctuaries would be notified prior to denotification of the areas of Koyna Sanctuary, **and that the areas deleted from within Sahyadri Tiger Reserve would be added to its buffer**, and that the denotification will also be subject to the outcome of the court case on this matter pending before the Hon'ble High Court of Bombay and the I.A. pending before the Central Empowered Committee." has not been carried. If I recall correctly, this point was also made by Mr Pardeshi, Principal Secretary (Forests), Govt of Maharashtra, in an email he too had circulated."*

### **9. Proposal for laying 11 KV HT/LT line to provide connection to BPL families under Rajiv Gandhi Vidyutikaran Yojana in Desert National Park Sheo Block Barmer District., Rajasthan.**

Due to shortage of time, the agenda item was deferred for discussion in the next meeting of the Standing Committee.

### **4.2: Proposals with respect to activities outside National Parks and Sanctuaries but within 10 km from the boundary of the Protected Areas.**

#### **1. Proposal of M/s Shri A.X. Poi Palondicar for renewal of mining lease for production of Iron Ore with production capacity of 0.20 MTPA and expansion in capacity of Manganese ore from 0.010208 MTPA, Goa.**

The Member Secretary informed the Committee that the proposal was for renewal of mining lease for production of iron ore adjacent to the Netravali Sanctuary. It had been indicated that the rights were held under erstwhile Mining Concessions granted by the Portuguese regime, and the mine had been in operation since 1950s and was now converted into a Mining Lease. He also informed that the IA Division of the Ministry had granted Environmental Clearance for the mining lease with the condition that clearance from Standing Committee of NBWL would be obtained. He added that the proposal was considered by the Standing Committee of NBWL in its meeting held on 12<sup>th</sup> April 2010, and was rejected.

Ms. Purna Bindra mentioned that the case of this particular mine had been rejected twice in two earlier meetings of the Standing Committee, although there were a number of mines in Goa in the vicinity of Protected Areas. She said that as is well-known there are many mines operating close to PAs, and amidst good forest area, and that it had come to her

notice that in spite of NBWL rejecting certain proposals for mining, mining activity still continued in areas of these rejected proposals.

Dr Asad Rahmani informed that there was presently a moratorium on mining in Goa. The Chief Wildlife Warden Goa informed that some cases of mining within 10 km from Protected Areas in Goa were recommended by the Standing Committee of NBWL, but these proposals were rejected by the FAC and are now pending before Hon'ble Supreme Court for orders. In the meantime, the Government of Goa has set up 2 committees to look into the aspect of declaration of Eco-Sensitive Zones (ESZ) around national Parks and Sanctuaries in Goa. He further stated that the report of the Committee would be forwarded to the Ministry by the State Government by 31.07.2012, to facilitate a final decision of notification of ESZ around protected areas by the MoEF.

After discussions, the Committee decided to await the final notification of Eco-Sensitive Zones around National Parks and Sanctuaries in Goa by the Ministry under the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986.

### **Comments by Ms. Prerna Bindra:**

*"...Ms. Prerna Bindra mentioned that this particular mine had been rejected twice in two earlier meetings of the Board. She said that as is well-known that there are many mines operating close to PAs, and amidst good forest area, and it had come to her notice that in spite of NBWL rejecting certain proposals for mining, mining activity continued. This particular project continued, in spite of being rejected by the NBWL, and in fact the MoEF had written to the Chief Wildlife Warden of Goa MoEF that the M/s A.X. Poi Palondicar mines were restarted in spite of the NBWL Standing Committee unanimously rejecting the proposal..."*

### **2. Proposal for seeking permission of National Board for Wildlife for establishment of 135 MW Captive Thermal Power Plant by M/s Bhubaneswar Power Pvt. Ltd. over 48.06 ha non-forest land at Anantpur village in Cuttack District of Odisha.**

The Member Secretary informed the Committee that the proposal was for establishment of coal-based captive thermal power plant of 135 MW (2x67.5) capacity at village Anantapur of Athagarh Tahsil in Cuttack. The project site was 5.92 kms away from the Chandaka Sanctuary and 9.94 kms away from Nandankanan Zoo/Sanctuary.

Ms. Prerna Bindra opined that the Chief Wildlife Warden had suggested that the project proponent should look for an alternative site as it would have an adverse impact on the wildlife in the vicinity. She suggested that a site inspection be carried out first.

The Member Secretary informed that the project site was in an already developed industrial location and that the comments of Chief Wildlife Warden were general in nature, inter-alia, proposing efforts to locate an alternative site. He further stated that it was advisable that the project was located in an already impacted area like an industrialized site rather than in a forest area as an alternative. He also stated that the comments of CWLW were considered by the State Board for Wildlife, who had recommended the proposal.

The Chief Conservator of Forests, Odisha, mentioned that the site was located on non-forest land between two Sanctuaries, and did not involve any diversion of forest land. He added that the user agencies had suggested mitigatory measures for reducing the heat emissions.

After discussions, it was decided to seek clarification from the State government regarding feasibility of alternative site at the earliest. After receipt of the response from the State Government, the Chairperson would take a view in the matter.

**Agenda Item No. 5: Any other item with the permission of the Chair.**

Dr Madhusudan opined that maps of the project proposals were often not received by the members to enable them properly analyze the impacts of the proposals. He requested that the maps be provided along with the agenda items.

Ms. Prerna Bindra mentioned that the non-official members of NBWL had sent an e.mail seeking certain clarifications regarding Tiger Reserves and Elephant Reserves related to March 2011 guidelines issued by the MoEF. She also opined that elephant corridors were recognized under Rules of Forest Conservation Act.

The Chairperson mentioned that maps would be provided to the members along with the agenda items. She further added that there was no proposal for taking Tiger Reserves out of the purview of the NBWL, and any reports on this issue were incorrect, although there was an issue of Elephant reserves and wildlife corridors that are not legally notified entities and the Ministry was having internal consultations on this issue. However, she added that no final view had yet been taken in the matter.

Shri Kishor Rithe suggested that an additional parameter should be incorporated in the proforma of agenda notes of SC-NBWL to the effect as to "whether the proposal was already considered and rejected by SC-NBWL in an earlier meeting". This was agreed to by the Standing Committee.

**Comments by Ms. Prerna Bindra:**

*"...Ms Prerna Bindra noted that elephant corridors were a legal entity according to the rules of the Forest Conservation Act, and she requested that the Standing Committee may please be kept apprised of the matter, given its considered relevance..."*

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

\*\*\*\*



**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS ATTENDING THE 25<sup>TH</sup> MEETING OF STANDING  
COMMITTEE OF NBWL HELD ON 13<sup>th</sup> June 2012.**

1	Smt. Jayanthi Natarajan Hon'ble Minister of State (Independent Charge) for Environment and Forests	<b>Chairperson</b>
2.	Dr M.K. Ranjitsinh	Member
3	Dr Divyabhanusinh Chavda	Member
4	Dr A.J.T. Johnsingh	Member
5	Ms. Prerna Bindra	Member
6	Dr Asad Rahmani, Director, Bombay Natural History Society, Mumbai.	Member
7	Dr M.D. Madhusudan, Nature Conservation Foundation, Mysore	Member
8	Shri Kishor Rithe, Satpuda Foundation, Amravati.	Member
9	Shri P.R. Sinha Director, Wildlife Institute of India, Dehradun	Member
10	Dr Jagdish Kishwan Addl. Director General of Forests and Director, Wildlife Preservation	<b>Member- Secretary</b>
11	Dr Rajesh Gopal, Member Secretary (NTCA)	Invitee
12	Shri A.K. Srivastava Inspector General of Forests (FC), MoEF	Invitee
13	Dr S.K. Khanduri, Inspector General of Forests (WL), MoEF	Invitee
14	Shri Praveen Pardeshi, Principal Secretary (Forests), Government of Maharashtra.	Invitee
15	Shri Arvind Kumar, PCCF and Principal Secretary of Forests, Sikkim.	Invitee
16	Shri S.W.H. Naqvi, PCCF(WL) and Chief Wildlife Warden, Maharashtra	Invitee
17	Dr P.K. Shukla, PCCF (WL) and Chief Wildlife Warden, Madhya Pradesh	Invitee
18	Shri S.V. Kumar, PCCF(WL) and Chief Wildlife Warden, Andhra Pradesh	Invitee
19	Shri A.K. Singh, Chief Wildlife Warden, Jammu and Kashmir.	Invitee
20	Shri Anil Mainra, PCCF and Chief Wildlife Warden, Sikkim.	Invitee

21	Shri D.V. Negi, PCCF (WL) and Chief Wildlife Warden, A&N Islands.	Invitee
22	Shri S.K. Goyal, Chief Wildlife Warden, Gujarat	Invitee
23	Shri S.S. Sharma, PCCF and Chief Wildlife Warden, Uttarakhand	Invitee
24	Shri A.S. Brar, Add. Pr. Chief Conservator of Forests (WL), Jaipur, Rajasthan.	Invitee
25	Shri P.Thaplyal, Addl. PCCF (WL), Arunachal Pradesh.	Invitee
26	Shri Richard D'souza, Addl. PCCF and Chief Wildlife Warden, Goa.	Invitee
27	Shri Vivek Saxena Deputy Inspector General of Forests (WL), MoEF	Invitee
28	Shri S.S. Chahar, DIG(OPS), BSF, MHA	Invitee
29	Shri Prabhat Tyagi, Joint Director (WL), MoEF	Invitee
30	Shri S.P. Subudhi, Director, Rajaji National Park, Dehradun	Invitee

\*\*\*