

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF STANDING COMMITTEE OF NATIONAL  
BOARD FOR WILD LIFE**

**DATE: 25<sup>th</sup> August, 2004.**

**VENUE: Paryavaran Bhawan, New Delhi**

The third meeting of the Standing Committee of National Board for Wild Life (NBWL) was held on 25<sup>th</sup> August 2004. Hon'ble Minister for Environment and Forests could not preside over the meeting due to his commitments in the on-going Parliament session. In his absence, the members present elected Secretary (E&F) to preside over the meeting.

A list of members and participants is at **Annexure-I.**

The following issues were discussed and decisions taken before the regular agenda items were taken up for discussions:-

- (i) At the outset, the Member Secretary, pointed out that the I.A.s concerning the proposals for diversion/de-notification of National Park and Sanctuary area come up for hearing before the Hon'ble Supreme Court frequently calling for filing of affidavits on the decisions of the Committee. Since the approval of the draft minutes takes long time, it was suggested to devise a mechanism for adopting the decision taken by the Standing Committee at the earliest. **It was decided that, if need be, the affidavits can be filed on the basis of draft minutes of the meeting approved by the Chairperson and a copy of the response to such IAs can then be circulated to the Members.**
- (ii) Members were of the view that that all cases concerning diversion/de-notification, destruction, exploitation, removal etc. as mentioned in section 29 of the Wild Life (Protection) Act, 1972 should be placed before the Standing Committee along with the opinion of the State Government and the State Board for Wildlife. **Accordingly, it was decided that all such cases as referred to above would be considered by the Standing Committee only after obtaining the opinion of the State Govt. and the State Board for Wild Life.**
- (iii) **A decision was taken that the Expert Team of the Standing Committee of NBWL, during their visit, will be free to co-opt other experts from the related fields. The co opted experts will be selected on the basis of the guidelines of this Ministry dated 1<sup>st</sup> April 2004 (Annexure II). The expenditure on travel and stay etc of the co-opted experts for this purpose would be borne from the funds of the user agency.**

- (iv) Members pointed out that they do not get secretarial assistance for communicating with the states and the applicants; for preparing the reports; for accessing the records etc. They were of the opinion that all expenditure of the secretariat including travel and stay etc during field visits should be borne preferably by the applicant. For this purpose the applicant may be asked to deposit certain processing fee to the secretariat. The unutilized amount will be refunded to the applicant. **It was decided that a dedicated Secretariat of NBWL will be set up to provide assistance to the members in all matters concerning duties and functions of the Members of the Board. The NBWL Secretariat will charge fees from the user agency for conducting the site inspection, hiring of co-opted members, preparation of report and any other related matter. The fees for this purpose will be charged on case-by-case basis.**

The committee, thereafter, proceeded with the items on the Agenda for the day:-

## **Agenda Item No.1**

### **Confirmation of the Minutes of the meeting of the Standing Committee of National Board for Wild Life held on 18<sup>th</sup> March, 2004.**

The minutes of the meeting held on 18<sup>th</sup> March, 2004 were approved with the following changes.

**(i) Agenda Item No.2 (b) :**

The last sentence in the para viz.,

*“It was also decided to drop the agenda item for further discussion”*

was replaced with the following :-

*“The Standing Committee requested that the Minister of Environment and Forests should take up the issue at his level and keep the Committee informed”.*

**(ii) Agenda Item 2(d)**

After the sentence “.....complete the settlement process”, the following sentence was added.

*“It was decided to have an overall picture of the cumulative impact of various proposals on Askot Sanctuary”.*

**(iii) Agenda Item 7(b)**

The following was inserted at the end.

*“The site inspection should include, inter-alia,*

- *Options for under passes – Control of forest department over the road – rumble strips and also – address the question as to why the road link through a sanctuary or national park is necessary and is there an alternative.*

**Agenda item no. 2**

**Action taken report on the recommendations of the Standing Committee of National Board for Wild Life in its meeting held on 18<sup>th</sup> March 2004.**

**2.(a) Denotification of Salim Ali City Forest National Park, Jammu & Kashmir**

The Committee was of the view that sufficient time has been given to the State of Jammu and Kashmir to respond to the recommendations of the Expert Committee that visited the site in the month of March-April, 2003. The State Government, however, failed to respond to the repeated requests of the committee. It was, therefore, decided to accept the recommendation of the Expert Committee and to ask the State Government to supply all relevant information as asked for in the recommendations at the earliest possible. In addition, it was also decided that a professional institute would be identified by the Ministry of Environment and Forests, Govt. of India to monitor the discharge of effluents in the wildlife habitats and the Dal Lake. The State Government will take necessary mitigation measures in case the levels of pesticides, chemicals and fertilizers or any other pollutant increases the critical level.

**2 (c) I. A. No. 27 of 2002 in C.W.P. No. 337 of 1995 – Diversion of 142.699 ha of additional forest land for Upper Jonk Irrigation Project in Nuapada District.**

The Member-Secretary, gave a detailed account of the diversion proposal. After due consideration, the committee decided to reject the proposal and to accept the reports of Chief Wild Life Warden (Memo Number 5465 dated 2.12.2003) and the Conservator of Forests (Central) {Number 8(22)3/2000-FCE dated 7.11.2001}. It was also decided that these two reports will be filed in the affidavit in response to IA No.27 of 2002.

**2 (c) (i) Diversion of 30.76 ha from Neoradehi Sanctuary for construction of Nirandpur tank Project.**

The Director, Project Tiger, informed the Committee that the site inspection could not be carried out and that inspection will be completed within a month and the report will be circulated to the Members before the next meeting.

**2 (d)**

- 1. Re-alignment of Askot Musk Deer Sanctuary**
- 2. Re-alignment of Govind Pashu Vihar.**

The Member-Secretary briefed the committee regarding the proposals pertaining to diversion/denotification of Askot Musk deer Sanctuary. The settlement process is likely to take time. It was decided that the State Government would place the proposals for realignment of Askot Musk deer Sanctuary and Govind Pashu Vihar afresh after the completion of settlement process.

- 3. Diversion of 91.701 ha of forest land from Askot Sanctuary for Dhauliganga Intermediate Stage Power Project by NHPC.**
- 4. Diversion of 175.05 ha of forest land from Askot Sanctuary for Goriganga Stage III A Power Project by NHPC.**

The Committee considered the request of NHPC but was of the opinion that bio-diversity assessment studies conducted by BSI and ZSI during 1987-93 and 1992-1994 respectively were too old and, therefore, the request of NHPC that the previous report may be accepted was not agreed upon. It was decided that BSI and ZSI would submit a comprehensive report on the floral and faunal diversity in the Askot musk deer Sanctuary and the impact of the project on the bio-diversity for consideration of the proposals by the committee.

**2. (f) I. A. No. 37 of 2003 in W. P (C) No. 337/1995- Diversion of 48.385 ha (25 Kms) of forest land from Askot Musk Deer Sanctuary for laying 132 KV transmission line**

It was decided that an expert team comprising of Dr. R.B. Lal, Inspector General of Forests (WL), MoEF, Shri Ravi Singh and Shri S.C. Sharma will visit all sites concerning diversion cases together in Askot Sanctuary and submit report to the committee.

**2. (g) Diversion of 3.98 ha of forest land from Sawai Mansingh Sanctuary, Rajasthan, for construction of *Kushalipura nallah*.**

The site inspection report of the Expert Committee that visited the Sawai Mansingh Sanctuary was accepted and the representative of the State Government and the user agency were informed that the proposal was not acceptable.

The user agency, however, submitted another alternative route that fell outside the sanctuary. The applicant also pointed out that Rajasthan was a drought prone State and, therefore, availability of water to the local farmers was essential for their security and livelihood. The Chief Wild Life Warden mentioned that though the area was outside the sanctuary yet it constituted part of the Ranthambore Tiger Reserve. He requested that another site inspection may be done before considering the proposed alternative. The committee decided that the same team along with Director, Project Tiger as had made earlier inspection, would conduct a site inspection and submit their report.

**2. (h). Diversion of 1.44 ha of forest land from Sri Venkateshwara Sanctuary, Andhra Pradesh for construction of ropeway.**

The Member Secretary pointed out that the Hon'ble Supreme Court vide their order dated 19-4 – 2004 have already approved the diversion proposal subject to certain conditions. The Chief Wild Life Warden, Government of Andhra Pradesh briefed the Committee about the project and informed that necessary measures would be taken by the State Government to reduce the vehicular traffic through the sanctuary especially between dusk and dawn when the wild animals are more prone to accidents. The Committee, while agreeing to the proposal, asked the Chief Wild Life Warden to submit the details of the actions to be taken for protection of wildlife from accidents.

**2. (i). I.A. No. 33 of 2003 in W.P (C) No. 337/1995- Diversion of 46 ha of forest land from Radhanagari Sanctuary, Maharashtra for construction of Dhamani Irrigation project.**

The Member- Secretary, informed the Committee about the diversion proposal. The Committee decided that an expert team comprising of Shri Darshan Shankar, Ms. Dilnavaz Variava and the Regional Deputy Director, Wild Life Preservation (WR), Mumbai, may conduct a site inspection and place the report before the committee.

**2. (j). I.A. No. 35 of 2003 in W.P (C) No. 337/1995- Diversion of 146.26 ha of forest land from Dalma Sanctuary, Jharkhand for construction of Subarnarekha Multipurpose Irrigation Project.**

Shri S.C Sharma, gave a detailed account of the site inspection to the Committee. He also informed that the site inspection report could not be completed on time due to lack of secretarial assistance. The Committee, after detailed discussion with the Secretary ( Irrigation), Jharkhand decided to recommend the project on the basis of the presentation and discussions. It was nevertheless clarified that all conditions specified in the report, as and when, made available would be acceptable to the State. The Secretary (Irrigation), Jharkhand assured that whatever conditions are laid down by the Committee will be acceptable to the State Government in this regard.

**2. (l). Diversion of 4.959 ha of forest land from Sitamata Sanctuary, Rajasthan for construction of power house.**

Shri Ravi Singh explained about the project proposal to the Committee. He informed that only 3 MW power would be added to the State Power Grid through this project. Further, that it was not a viable project since the power would be generated only for three months in a year. The Chief Wild Life Warden, Rajasthan also supported the view of the expert committee that the project would not be beneficial for the wild life in the area.

Mr. Ravi Singh advised the results of the site visit of the team to Sitamata Sanctuary, Rajasthan. Given the vulnerability of the Sanctuary in its present condition, the negative effects of constructing a power house in a sensitive portion of the sanctuary and the already deleterious effect of constructions within the Sanctuary, the project was not recommended. It was noted that whilst the installed capacity of the project is proposed at 5.5 mega watts from dam storage, in view of the declining rainfall, generation estimates would be at 60% of the installed capacity and that too at possibly not more than 120-140 days in a year. the impact of the power house on the sanctuary would be negative. The Chief Wildlife warden Rajasthan also supported the view of the expert Committee that the project would not be beneficial for the wildlife area.

**The Committee, therefore, decided to reject the proposal.**

**3 Please refer to Agenda item 3 of the minutes**

**4. Please refer to Agenda item 4 of the minutes**

**5 Trade regulation for wild medicinal plant taxa**

The matter was deferred to the next meeting

**6 LA No. 1011 in W.P (C) 202 of 1995- Diversion of 12.764 ha of forest land from Chambal Sanctuary, Uttar Pradesh, for construction of broad gauge railway line**

Shri S.C Sharma made a detailed presentation on the site visit. The Committee, after discussing the site inspection report in detail, decided to accept the same and recommend the proposal for diversion of 12.764 Ha. with the following conditions, as mentioned in the site inspection report:

- i) Railway authorities will construct *pucca* retaining walls of suitable dimensions of 500 mtrs. width on each side of the railway line on both banks to prevent any damage to the high banks of the river through soil erosion.
- ii) The Railway Authorities would carry out stone pitching on both sides of the railway embankment through its entire length within the Sanctuary area of Madhya Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh. This would safeguard soil erosion in the area.
- iii) The Railway Authorities would pay cost of penal compensatory afforestation of locally occurring species over 50 ha. of forest land in the area adjoining the railway line in National Chambal Sanctuary part of Madhya Pradesh which is a revenue land. Madhya Pradesh Government would be required to notify this area as forest.
- iv) During discussions with local people during the site visit, it was revealed that there is serious conflict between villagers and the forest staff on account of taking out fuel wood from the Sanctuary area. Therefore, substantial component of the work should be under the eco-development of the villages falling within 1 km of the railway line within the Sanctuary area. Certain entry point activities would also be necessary but main emphasis should be on providing fuel wood and grazing to these villages in areas outside the Sanctuary.
- v) Railways will ensure that no garbage is thrown into the Chambal Sanctuary from any of the trains passing through the Sanctuary. For achieving this objective, it is recommended that a team consisting of Mr. S.K. Chawla and Mrs. A.H. Patel, both Members of the Supreme Court Expert Committee for Solid Waste Management, may be appointed to draw a detailed plan for implementation by the Railway Authorities.

- vi) The Railway Authorities would deposit 5% of the Project cost (within the Sanctuary area and the forest area) for carrying out conservation works within the Sanctuary. These funds would be placed at the disposal of State Government of Uttar Pradesh for being used as a trust fund. The works to be carried out with these funds would be decided by a Committee comprising of Dr. B.C. Choudhary of Wildlife Institute of India, Dr. Asad Rahmani, Director, BNHS, Dr. R.J. RAO AND chief Wild Life Warden of Uttar Pradesh, Chief Wild Life Warden of Madhya Pradesh with Dr. Rehmani as Chairman. The team will also make recommendations about the location and the dimensions of pathways (bridges) required for crossing of animals. The same team would advise the State Government about species to be planted, nature, extent and location of embankments, eco-development work to be carried out around the Sanctuary and such other aspects as are required for the protection and up gradation of the Sanctuary.
- vii) The Railways would correspond with the Chairman and on team members' direction provide airfare and local transport and other help that may be necessary for the visits of the team members.
- viii) Since the disturbance by the project is minimal, containable and no alternative route avoiding the Sanctuary is possible, the project implementation can proceed under guidelines/supervision of the Committee in para 5. However, implementation of the above 2 studies (paras 5 & 6) should precede actual commissioning of the railway services through this sector.

**7 (a) Diversion of 529.70 ha of forest land from Sitanadi Sanctuary, Chattisgarh for construction of Sondhur dam irrigation project**

Shri S.C Sharma made a detailed presentation on the site visit. The Committee, after discussing the site inspection report in detail, decided to accept the same and recommended the proposal for diversion of 529.70 ha. with the following conditions as mentioned in the site inspection report:

- i) The irrigation department would be required to pay Rs.50.00 crores as Net Present Value of forests to be submerged under water, consequent to increase in the water level. This money should be utilized for reducing the biotic pressures including relocation of villages situated in the heart of the proposed Tiger Reserve.
- ii) State Government must take appropriate measures to make Udanti Sanctuary free of live stock and upgrade it to a **national park** level. Remaining area of the proposed Tiger Reserve should be notified as a **Sanctuary**. Grazing of live stock in Sitanadi Sanctuary and the new area notified as Sanctuary has to be reduced to a level that its impact is brought down to the level of the carrying capacity of the area.
- iii) A scientific plan should be prepared for the purpose in consultation with BNHS and Wildlife Institute of India.



- iv) Villages Deojar Amdah and Amarah in Udanti should be relocated outside Udanti Sanctuary expeditiously and arrangements of regular tracking of wildlife should be started at the earliest. Funds for this purpose can be provided by the Central Government under the Scheme “Development of National Park and Sanctuaries”.
- v) Irrigation Department should provide another Rs 3.5 crores (5% of the project cost) to the State Forest Department for strengthening the protection infrastructure of the area and for creation of alternative sources of biomass for use by the villagers relocated from the proposed Tiger Reserve.
- vi) State Forest Department should take up a programme of insitu captive breeding of Cheetal, Sambar and other ungulates to augment the herbivore population of the area for augmenting the prey base for carnivores.
- vii) DNA profiles of wild buffaloes of Udanti Sanctuary should be taken and genetically swamped individuals should be captured, taken out of the national park..
- viii) No fishing should be permitted inside Sondhur Reservoir in the view of the fact that hunting inside wildlife sanctuary is prohibited under the Wild Life (Protection) Act.
- ix) An independent evaluation of the functioning of the EDCs operating in Dhantari Division, Udanti Division including Sitanadi Sanctuary and Udanti Sanctuary should be undertaken and the activities having adverse impact on wildlife should be banned with immediate effect.

**7 (b) Black –topping of road link passing through Dandeli Sanctuary and Anshi National Park**

Shri Darshan Shankar made a detailed presentation on the site visit. The Committee, after discussing the site inspection report in detail, decided to accept the same. The proposal for Black –topping of road link passing through Dandeli Sanctuary was recommended with the following conditions as mentioned in the site inspection report:

- i) The activity should be restricted only to the existing road and no further acquisition of land or felling of trees be allowed.
- ii) The reconstruction and rehabilitation exercise of the road should be of highest quality feasible so that no repairs be required for next 8-12 years causing frequent disturbance to the habitat.
- iii) The actual repair work should start only when the required material/equipment has been mobilised so that the work is carried out in the park for minimum possible time. All labour camps, crushers etc. should be located outside the DWLW and ANP areas.
- iv) For providing safety to the crossing animals and avoid road accidents speed breakers/rumble strips be constructed at the identified locations of the animal movements. Enough hoardings and signages may also be put up for the public and vehicles.

- v) The CWLW, Karnataka, has recommended for providing fund for the development of Park and Sanctuary. The KSHIP has also agreed for providing Rs.34.54 lakh to the Forest Department. The team while endorsing the view of the CWLW suggests that 5% of the cost of the project or Rs.35.00 lakhs whichever is higher should be made available by the KSHIP to the Forest Department for the developmental activities of the Park and Sanctuary as proposed by CWLW in his letter dated 29.11.2001.
- vi) The two toll gates be established at both the entry points of the patch of the road passing through DLWS and ANP at the cost of the project. The Forest Department be allowed to collect toll from the vehicles passing through the corridor. This money also be utilized by the Wildlife authorities for maintenance of Park and Sanctuary.
- vii) The traffic in the stretch of road passing through DWLS and ANP after sunset and before sunrise would be regulated by the Forest Department.

While giving environmental clearance to the Kalinadi stage II Hydroelectric Project, the Dept. of Science and Technology, Govt. of India, vide their letter No. 3/24/78-HCT/Env dated 6<sup>th</sup> August 1979, one of the conditions was that 'the boundary of the existing WLS at Dandeli should be expanded to cover the reservoirs created by Kalinadi Stage I and Stage II projects'. The State Govt should comply this with. The reservoir created by Kalinadi Stage I is the Supa reservoir and those under Stage II are the Kodasalli and Kadra backwaters of river Kali.

The PCCF (WL) and the Chief Wildlife Warden, Karnataka, informed the Standing Committee that the Govt. has already initiated this process and it is likely to be approved. The Chief Wildlife Warden stated that the forest area in question under Kalinadi stage I is sandwiched between Supa reservoir and the sanctuaries of Goa State, and the forest land in question under Kalinadi Stage II lies partly adjacent to the Dandeli WLS near Ulvi, and partly sandwiched between Anshi NP and the Kali river, and situated in steep slope. The overall extent of the area proposed to be added would be around 395 sq. kms. The relevant map was gone through in detail. It was concluded that by including the above areas to the Dandeli WLS and the Anshi NP, it will result in a larger landscape of protected area unifying and encompassing those in Goa and Karnataka, thereby providing better and secure conditions for the wildlife to exist.

It was unanimously decided to recommend to the Karnataka State Govt. to take suitable urgent measures to add these potential areas of 395 sq. kms. as detailed in the enclosed map to the existing WLS and NP, in the best interest of the Wildlife. This will also fulfill the conditions imposed by Govt. of India for taking up the Kalinadi Stage II project.”

### **Agenda Item no. 3**

#### **Review of inclusion of edible nest Swiftlets and Holothurians in the Schedule I of the Wild Life (Protection) Act, 1972**

The Member-Secretary gave a brief account of the edible nest swiftlets and holothurians. Views were also expressed by Dr. Asad Rahmani, Director, BNHS and Shri R. Shankaran, Scientist, SACON and others regarding the edible nest swiftlets and holothurians. It was agreed that the research project can be continued and permission can be granted under Section 49B (3) of the Wild Life Protection Act, 1972 in project mode, provided the Chief Wild Life Warden, A&N islands comes up with the action points for protection of swiftlets in and outside the protected area. Similarly, a project on the sea ranching of Holothurians can also be initiated by the concerned State Governments and permission can be granted under the Wild Life (Protection) Act, 1972.

### **Agenda Item no. 4**

#### **Guidelines for diversion proposals**

It was decided that the Ministry will formulate guidelines for submitting the proposals to the Standing Committee by October, 2004.

### **Agenda Item no. 5**

#### **Fresh proposal for Diversion/denotification of national Park/Sanctuary received for consideration by the Standing Committee.**

- i. **Diversion of 0.1532 ha of forest land from Rajaji National Park for laying pipeline for drinking water by the Uttaranchal Pey Jal Sansadhan Vikas Evam Nirman Nigam Ltd. ( I A No. 53 in CWP 337 of 1995)**

The representative of the user agency explained to the committee about the project proposal. The Committee decided to defer the matter to the next meeting in view of the fact that neither the Chief Wild Life Warden, Government of Uttaranchal was present nor his comments were received.

- ii. **Diversion of forest land from Pakke (Eagle nest) Sanctuary, Arunanchal Pradesh, for construction of road for the Army by the Border Roads Organization. ( I A No. in CWP 202 of 1995)**

The representative from the Indian Army made a detailed presentation on the project proposal. The Committee, after discussion, decided that an expert team comprising of the Chief Wild Life Warden, Government of Karnataka, Shri S.C Sharma, Shri Ravi Singh and the Deputy Inspector General (WL) would conduct site inspection and place a report before the committee.

**iii Diversion of 49 ha of forest land from Renuka Sanctuary, Himachal Pradesh, for construction of Renuka hydro-electric project by the Himachal Pradesh State Electricity Board.**

The Member-Secretary explained to the committee about the project proposal. The official from the Himachal Pradesh Forest Department also gave a detailed note on the project proposal. The Committee, after discussion, decided that a team of experts comprising of Smt Maya Singh, Member of Parliament (Rajya Sabha), Shri S.C Sharma, Shri Ravi Singh and the Inspector General of Forests (WL), MoEF would conduct a site inspection and place a report before the Committee.

**iv. Diversion of 43.74 ha of forest land from Kangchendzonga National Park for construction of Toong-Chatten road by the Border Roads organizations. ( I A No. 788 in CWP 202 of 1995)**

The representatives of the Army as well as the Border Roads Organization gave a detailed presentation on the project proposal. The committee, after discussion, decided that the matter shall first be placed before the State Board of Wildlife. The Committee also decided that the State Government will provide information as requested by this Ministry vide its letter No.6-4/2004 WL-I dated 22<sup>nd</sup> July 2004.

## **Agenda item No.6**

### **Any other item with the permission of the Chair.**

**i. I. A. No. 20/2002 in W.P (C) No. 337/1995 - Diversion of forest land from Rajaji National Park, Uttaranchal, for construction of charitable hospital by Raghavendra Sewashram Samiti**

The Member-Secretary informed the Committee informed that the Raghavendra Sewashram Samiti had approached the Ministry of Environment & Forests with a request that their case pertaining to diversion of 19.5 ha of forestland from Rajaji National park for construction of charitable hospital may be considered once again. They had also requested that the representative of the Sewashram Samiti should be given an opportunity to apprise the committee members.

The Committee, agreed to the request and decided that the representatives of the Raghavendra Sewashram Samiti may be invited to present their case during the next meeting.

**ii. Diversion of 78.165 ha of forest land from Pangolakha Sanctuary, Sikkim for construction of road by the Army. ( I A No. 1029 in CWP 202 of 1995)**

The representative of the Army invited the attention of the members to the letter of M/o Defence No. PC –A/40001/MO4/891/B/90/D/(GS-V) dated 31<sup>st</sup> December 1990. The said letter mentions that any forestation/deforestation including setting up of Wildlife Sanctuaries and National Parks within 50 Kms of the border should be planned in consultation with the Ministry of Defence. He further submitted that in I.A No. 1029/2004 in W.P (C) 202/1995, filed on behalf of the Ministry of Defence permission of the Hon'ble Supreme Court was sought for up gradation of existing tracks viz, Track Junction- Bheem Base, Bheem Base- Doka La and Flag Hill- Doka La to Class 9 specification. This was required in view of the geo strategic importance and to protect the sensitive Siliguri corridor from the north as the development across the international borders in the area have made the corridor extremely vulnerable. It was essential for the Army to improve the communication infrastructure in the region and that at present only a Class 5 operational track connects Track Junction to Bheem Base. Beyond Bheem Base, there is a 8 Kms long animal track to Doka La. Therefore, the poor state of communication and transportation was causing serious administrative difficulties to troops deployed at the borders. The details of the land required for the up gradation of the track to Class 9 are as follows:

Sl.No.	Name of Road/Track	Length (in kms)	Area (in hec.)
1.	Track Junction – Bheem Base	5.875	6.765
2.	Bheem Base – Doka La	7.600	11.400
3.	Flag Hill – Log Br – Madhubala/Dengchuk La – Doka La	40.00	60.00
<b>Total</b>		<b>53.475</b>	<b>78.165</b>

The above alignment forms a part of the Pangolakha Wild Life Sanctuary. However, the State Government while issuing the notification No. 10/9WLC/02/127 dated 5.9.2002 for the constitution of the Pangolakha Sanctuary did not consult either the Ministry of Environment & Forests or the Ministry of Defence. It was requested that the proposal for the diversion of 78.165 ha of the Sanctuary area might be recommended.

In view of the position explained by the representative of the Army it was decided to recommend the proposal for the diversion of 78.165 ha from Pangolakha Sanctuary for up gradation of the track to Class 9 specifications with the following conditions:

- i) The Army will ensure that labourers involved in constructing the road be adequately supplied with fuel so that they do not denude the adjoining areas of wood and brush for purposes of firewood.
- ii) That these labourers should be controlled and prevented from trapping wildlife including small mammals during the period of the project.

**iii. Laying of Optical fibre cable by Oil India Limited along the existing pipeline passing through the Kaziranga National Park.**

The Chief Wild Life Warden, Government of Assam gave a detailed presentation on the proposal for laying of Optical Cable Fibre by the Oil India Limited along the existing pipeline. The cable line passes through the Kaziranga National Park. The Chief Wild Life Warden mentioned that the portion of pipeline passing through the Kaziranga National park is being maintained by the Oil India Limited and that it is not likely to cause any damage, destruction, exploitation or removal of any flora or fauna in Kaziranga National Park.

The Committee, after discussion, decided to recommend the proposal with the following conditions:

- a) The user agency would deposit a sum of Rs 5 lakhs for the better management and conservation of the Kaziranga National Park.
- b) The user agency would provide necessary fuel for the protection of the Park free of cost during the flooding seasons.
- c) Any other conditions as specified by the Chief Wild Life warden, Government of Assam.

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

\*\*\*\*\*

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS PRESENT IN THE MEETING OF THE STANDING  
COMMITTEE OF NATIONAL BOARD FOR WILD LIFE HELD ON 25.08.2004**

- |     |  |                           |
|-----|--|---------------------------|
| 1.  | Dr. Prodipto Gosh, Secretary (E &F)                                  | <b>-in the Chair</b>      |
| 2.  | Smt. Maya Singh, Member of Parliament (Rajya Sabha)                  | - Member                  |
| 3.  | Shri. N.K. Joshi, DGF &SS, MoEF                                      | - Member                  |
| 4.  | Shri Darshan Shankar, Director, FRLHT, Bangalore                     | - Member                  |
| 5.  | Ms. Dilnavaz Variava   | - Member                  |
| 6.  | Shri Ravi Singh  | - Member                  |
| 7.  | Shri S.C. Sharma   | - Member                  |
| 8.  | Shri. R.M Ray, Chief Wild Life Warden,<br>Government of Karnataka    | - Member                  |
| 9.  | Shri. M.C. Malakar, Chief Wild Life Warden,<br>Government of Assam   | - Member                  |
| 10. | Dr. J.R.F. Alfred, Director,<br>Zoological Survey of India, Kolkata. | - Member                  |
| 12. | Shri. Vinod Rishi, Addl. DGF(WL), MoEF                               | - <b>Member-Secretary</b> |

Officials from MoEF.

1. Dr. R.B Lal, Inspector General of Forests (WL)
2. Dr. Rajesh Gopal. Inspector General of Forests & Director, Project Tiger.
3. Shri S.S Bisht, Inspector General of Forests & Director, Project Elephant.
4. Shri Asheem Srivastav, Deputy Inspector General (WL).

\*\*\*\*\*