41st MEETING OF STANDING COMMITTEE OF NATIONAL BOARD FOR WILDLIFE (2nd MARCH 2017)



GOVERNMENT OF INDIA MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT, FOREST AND CLIMATE CHANGE INDIRA PARYAVARAN BHAVAN, JOR BAHG ROAD JOR BAGH, NEW DELHI 110 003

INDEX

| S.No. | AGENDA ITEM | | |
|--------|---|--------|--|
| 41.1 | Agenda Item No.1 | | |
| | Confirmation of the Minutes of 40 th Meeting of the Standing Committee of National Board for Wildlife held on 3 rd January 2017 | 3 | |
| 41.2. | Agenda Item No.2 | | |
| 41.2.1 | Action taken report on the recommendations of 40 th Meeting of the Standing Committee of National Board for Wildlife held on 3rd January 2017 | | |
| | Agenda Item No. 3 | | |
| 41.3 | Policy Issues and Representations received from user agencies | 8-15 | |
| 41.3.1 | Converting status of forestland to revenue land, when the former has been used to rehabilitate villages from core areas of National Parks and Wild Life Sanctuaries | | |
| 41.4. | Agenda Item No.4 | 16.27 | |
| 41.4.1 | Proposals for diversion of forest land of Protected Areas | 16-37 | |
| 41.4.2 | Proposals for taking up development activities within 10 km distance from the boundaries of Protected Areas | | |
| 41.4.3 | Additional Agenda Items | 71-81 | |
| 41.5. | Agenda Item No.5 | 82 | |
| | Any other item with the permission of the Chair | | |
| | Attachment 1.1 | 83-111 | |

AGENDA NOTES FOR 41st MEETINGOF THE STANDING COMMITTEE OF NATIONAL BOARD FOR WILD LIFE

Date: 27.02.2017

Venue: Indira Paryavaran Bhawan, New Delhi

AGENDA ITEM NO.1

Confirmation of the minutes of the 40th Meeting of Standing Committee of National Board for Wildlife held on 3rd January 2017

The minutes of the 40th meeting of SC-NBWL were circulated on 8th February 2017. No comments have been received till date.

Copy of the minutes is at Attachment 1.1

AGENDA ITEM NO.2

40.2. Action taken on the decisions of the Standing Committee of NBWL taken in its previous meetings.

| S.No | Agenda Item | Action taken | Category |
|------|--|--|-------------|
| | ATR of 40 th meeting | | |
| 1 | 36.4.2.1 Setting up 5.25 MTPA- Development of Floating storage and Re-gasification Unit (FSRU) facilities for import of LNG within the existing deep water port at Kakinada, Andhra Pradesh. The proposed site is 2.5 kms away from the boundary limits of Coringa Wildlife Sanctuary. | According to Terms of Reference (TOR) for EC, impact on Marine Life would be assessed. Since the proposal is 2.0 kms from Coringa WLS, Impact Mitigation and Wildlife Conservation Plan is required to be submitted. As the report on impact and other aspects related to marine life was still awaited, the Committee deferred the proposal. The report from State is still awaited. | Oil/Gas |
| 2 | 36.4.2.12 Construction of Singoli-Bhatwari Hydroelectric Project 99 MW by M/s L&T Uttaranchal Hydropower Limited. The proposed site falls within 10 kms from the boundary of Kedarnath Wildlife Sanctuary. | Proposals were considered by the SC-NBWL in its 39 th meeting held on 23 rd August 2016. During the meeting, it was decided by the Standing Committee to seek the comments of Ministry of Water | Hydro Power |
| 3 | 36.4.2.13 Construction of 171 MW Lata Tapovan Hydro Power Project of NTPC Ltd, Uttarakhand. | Resources, River Development of Ganga Rejuvenation on the proposed projects. Letter sent to Ministry of Water Resources on | Hydro Power |
| 4 | 36.4.2.14 Construction of 520 MW (4x130) Tapovan Vishnugad Hydroelectric Project of NTPC Ltd, Uttarakhand. The proposed site falls outside Nanda Devi National Park at a distance of 7.5 km. | 23rd September 2016 for their comments.Comments are awaited from | Hydro Power |
| 5 | 34.4.2.11 Proposal of Ms Stone International Pvt. Ltd Chechat for expansion and renewal of Kotah Stone (Building) production in Mining lease no.22/92 situated in village Chechat in Tehsil | A committee of NTCA has visited the site and accorded concurrence to the proposal. The Standing Committee decided to defer the proposals in view of non-finalization of ESZ | Mining |

| | Demonstration District II | | |
|---|--|--|---------|
| | Ramganj Mandi, District Kota | proposal of Mukundra Hills TR | |
| | which lies at about 6.4 km aerial | by state. | |
| | distance from the Darrah Wildlife | | |
| | Sanctuary/ Mukundra Hills | | |
| | National Park. | Revised proposal of the | |
| 6 | 34.4.2.12 Proposal for renewal of | | Mining |
| | existing lime stone mining lease | awaited from the State. | |
| | no.24/87 in village Pipakhedi, | | |
| | Tehsil Ramganj Mandi District | | |
| | Kota near Darrah Wildlife | | |
| | Sanctuary, Rajasthan by M/s | | |
| | Zahoor Ahmed, Abdul Majid. | | |
| | The proposed mining lease 8.5 | | |
| | km away from Darrah Wildlife | | |
| | Sanctuary. | | |
| 7 | 34.4.2.13 Proposal of Ms | | |
| | Associated Stone industries | | |
| | (Kota) limited for expansion and | | |
| | renewal of Kotah Stone | | |
| | production in mining lease | | |
| | no.1/89 situated in Tehsil | | |
| | Ramganj mandi, District Kota, | | |
| | Rajasthan. | | |
| 8 | 39.4.2.5 Proposal for International | Proposal was considered by the | Tourism |
| | Amusement & Infrastructures | SCNBWL in its 39 th meeting | |
| | Ltd for "Jaipur Mega Tourism | held on 23 rd August 2016. | |
| | City" a Recreational Project at | During the meeting, the Chief | |
| | village Daulatpura Kotra., Tehsil | Wildlife Warden, Rajasthan | |
| | Amer District Jaipur, Rajasthan. | mentioned that the Environment | |
| | | Clearance for the project is | |
| | | under consideration of SEIAA, | |
| | | Rajasthan. | |
| | | Status of Environment | |
| 9 | 39.4.2.7 Proposal for stone | Clearance is awaited. | Mining |
| 7 | 39.4.2.7 Proposal for stone mining lease area 4 ha (private | Proposal was considered by the | winning |
| | land) in Khasra No. 357 village | SCNBWL in its 39 th meeting | |
| | Ghoora, Tehsil-Rajnagar, Dist. | held on 23 rd August 2016. | |
| | Chhatarpur, Madhya Pradesh. | The IGF, NTCA mentioned that | |
| | The mining area is 6.67 km away | the mine location has not been | |
| | from Panna Tiger Reserve. | ascertained as yet. The | |
| | | Committee asked the NTCA and | |
| | | Wildlife Institute of India to | |
| | | | |

| | | verify the location and furnish | |
|----|--|---|--------|
| | | | |
| | | the report within one month | |
| | | The report is still awaited. | |
| 10 | 40.4.1.7 Proposal for diversion of 39.75 ha of forest land from Nauradehi Wildlife Sanctuary in width of 30 m in km.66.200 to km. 77.700, km.91.300 to km.91.900 & km.93.000 to km.93.900 for widening of existing 2-lane to 4-lane of NH- 12 from km.10.40 (junction of NH-7 bypass at Jabalpur) to Km.301.80 (near Bhojpur Junction) section Madhya Pradesh under NHDP Phase III. | SCNBWL in its 40 th meeting held on 3 rd January 2017. Nauradhi sanctuary is a part of the area proposed to be added to Panna TR in lieu of the diverted | Road |
| 11 | 40.4.1.8 Proposal for diversion of 0.145 ha of forest land from Nauradehi Wildlife Sanctuary for construction of Harduwa reservoir canal, Madhya Pradesh. | Proposal was considered by the SC-NBWL in its 40 th meeting held on 3 rd January 2017. Nauradhi sanctuary is a part of the area proposed to be added to Panna TR in lieu of the diverted area for Ken-Betwa Link Canal. After discussions, the Standing committee decided to defer the proposal and requested NTCA to examine the proposal and furnish its comments at the earliest. Comments of NTCA are still | |
| 12 | 32.4.2(19) Proposal for Lakheri Chamovali mining lease of M/s ACC Limited, Lakheri Cement Works, Lkaheri, Dist. Bundi (Rajasthan) for mining purpose of limestone, Rajasthan. | awaited. That keeping view of the State of Rajasthan, the NTCA and the User Agency, besides perusing scientific reports of the WII, Dehradun and WWF-India, the middle ground suggested by the NTCA Technical Committee is the most optimal solution in the instant case which takes into account concerns of tiger conservation as well as those of | Mining |

| | | the plant. | |
|----|---|---|--------|
| 13 | Proposal for denotification from Radhanagari Sanctuary for Savarde Minor Irrigation Project, Maharashtra. | After discussions, the Standing Committee decided to defer the proposal pending acceptance of the conditions by the State. No response on the acceptance has been received from the State. | Policy |
| 14 | 40.3.2.2 Proposal for bauxite mining lease area 206.37 ha at village Talagaon in Taluka Radhanagari and village Baveli in Taluka Gaganbawada, Dist Kolhapur, Maharashtra. | Additional information has been called by the DGF&SS regarding the validity of lease. The decision expected shortly. | Policy |

Agenda Item No. 3

41.3. Policy Issues and Representations received from user agencies

41.3. Change of status of "forest land" to "revenue land" when the former has been used to rehabilitate villages from core areas of National Parks/Wildlife Sanctuaries/Tiger Reserves forest land

The Hon'ble Supreme Court passed an order in I.A. No. 1658 in W.P. (C) No. 202/1995 on 21.11.2008 on conversion of status of forest land to revenue land, when the former has been used to rehabilitate villages from core areas of National Parks and Wildlife Sanctuaries. Operative part of the said order is reproduced below:

"CEC has filed a report regarding the permission for change in the legal status of the forest land approved under the F.C. Act by the MoEF for rehabilitation of villagers of three villages namely Kosla, Botezari and Palasgaon (Single) in Andheri Wildlife Sanctuary in District Chandrapur, Maharashtra. It was also stated therein that the relocation of these villages is required because the boundary of the national park is to be extended and therefore, modification in the order passed by this Court on 13.11.2000 in Writ Petition (C) No. 337/1995 is sought for. We make it clear that despite the order passed by this Court on 13.11.2000, the MoEF is permitted to change in the legal status of the forest land approved under the F.C. Act for relocation of these villages for the purpose of extending the boundary and for rehabilitation of the tribal people residing there.

Application is disposed of accordingly."

- Based on the Supreme Court order as above, the MoEF&CC vide its letter No. 5-3/2007-FC dated 8.9.2009 conveyed approval of the Central Government for changing the legal status of forest land with retrospective effect covering all such cases of diversion of forest land, diverted under Forest (Conservation) Act, 1980, for relocation /rehabilitation of villages from National Parks / Wildlife Sanctuaries/Tiger Reserves from 'forest land' to 'revenue land' (Annexure 41.3.1).
- The FC Division of the MoEF&CC referred this matter to NTCA as the aforesaid order named only 3 villages of the Tadoba-Andhari Tiger Reserve, which rendered it unsuitable for blanket implementation, and deemed the aforesaid letter void.
- 4. NTCA sought comments of the Ministry of Law and Justice which had advised it to file a Clarificatory Application before the Apex Court on the matter, which NTCA did vide letter of even number dated 8.10.2015. However, the application is yet to be listed.

 At the same time, the State of Madhya Pradesh approached the Hon'ble Apex Court on the same matter in context of voluntary village resettlement in Satpura Tiger Reserve [Diary No. 51575/2016 in WP (C) 337 of 1995].

6. The above application of the State of Madhya Pradesh, was however, not found maintainable by the Apex Court and in its order dated 29.9.2016, the Apex Court made the following observations (Annexure 41.3.2):

'The Counsel for the State of Madhya Pradesh has filed an application for seeking a relaxation in the order dated 13.8.2000 in respect of Satpura and Panna Tiger Reserves in Madhya Pradesh and permit change of legal status of Forest land to revenue land in respect of Satpura Tiger Reserve .

As per the report submitted by the Registry in the matter relating to the National Parks and Wildlife Sanctuaries certain directions were passed by the Green Bench on 5.10.2015 one of the order read thus:

"II. MATTERS RELATING TO NATIONAL PARKS AND WILDLIFE SANCTUARIES

Now we come to matters relating to National Parks and Wildlife Sanctuaries.

At the time of hearing on the aforesaid subject, certain suggestions are made by the learned amicus curiae and other senior counsels. By incorporating them, we pass the following order(s):

All matters for grant of permission for implementation of projects in areas falling in National parks/sanctuaries, including rationalization of boundaries etc. will be considered by the Standing Committee of the National Board for Wildlife ("NBWL") on its own merits and in conformity with the orders and directions passed by this Court from time to time, i.e. ion 14.02.2000. 16.12.2002, 13.11.2000, 9.5.2002, 25.11.2005 and 14.09.2007 and other subsequent clarificatory orders/judgment(s) passed by this Court including the Goa Foundation Judgment, i.e. Goa Foundation Vs. Union of India & Ors., reported in (2014) 6 SCC 590.

We request the NBWL to furnish a copy of the orders passed by it within 30 days' time to the C.E.C. The C.E.C. is at liberty, if, for any reason, they are aggrieved by the decision of the Standing Committee of NBWL to approach this Court by filing an appropriate petition/application.

In all those matters where there is already decision of the Standing Committee of the NBWL shall abide the parties with all the conditions imposed therein.

If any party is aggrieved by the decision of the Standing Committee of the NBWL, they are at liberty to approach an appropriate forum for appropriate relief(s)."

It is apparently clear that all matters relating to grant of permission for implementation of projects in areas falling under the National Park/Sanctuaries including rationalization of the boundaries are to be considered by the Standing Committee of the National Board for Wildlife (NWBL) and any other decision rendered thereafter is appealable before the Competent Authority.

In view of the aforesaid the present application will not lie. Even otherwise a perusal of Annexure-A4 on record, which is a letter issued by the Union of India (Ministry of Environment and Forests) to all the Principal Secretary/Secretary (Forests) of all States and Union Territories whereby the Central Government has already conveyed the approval for changing the legal status of forest land with retrospective effect covering all such cases of diversion of Forest land, diverted under Forest (Conservation) Act, 1980 for relaxation/rehabilitation of villages from National Parks / Wild Life sanctuaries / Tiger Reserves from "Forest Land to Revenue Land".'

7. In light of observations of the Hon'ble Apex Court on conversion of "forest land" to "revenue land" when the former has been used to rehabilitate villages from core areas of National Parks/Wildlife Sanctuaries/Tiger Reserves, the matter is placed before the Standing Committee for consideration.

F. No. 5-3/2007-FC Government of India Ministry of Environment and Forests (FC Division)

> Paryavaran Bhawan, CGO Complex, Lodhi Road, New Delhi - 110 510 Dated: 8th September, 2009

10

The Principal Secretary / Secretary (Forests). All State / UT Governments.

Sub: Diversion of forest land for non-forestry purposes under Forest (Conservation) Act, 1980 - Guidelines for relocation/rehabilitation of villages from National parks / wildlife sanctuaries / Tiger Reserves regarding.

Sir,

The Ministry of Environment and Forests, Government of India has been receiving representations from different State / UT Governments stating that the clause 'legal status of forest land shall remain unchanged' precludes possibility of relocated villages, who are by and large tribals, from becoming absolute owners of the land allocated to them and by retaining the status of land as 'forests', several ongoing developmental works in the district are not implemented in the area, which deprives the relocated people from their due benefits. After careful examination of the issue, the matter was taken up with the Central Empowered Committee (CEC) which recommended to the Supreme Court for relaxation of its order dated 13.11.2000 in WP (C) No. 337/1995, to permit Ministry of Environment and Forest (MoEF), to allow change in the legal status of the forest land approved for diversion under the Forest (Conservation) Act. 1980 for the relocation of villages from the National Parks / Sanctuaries.

The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India vide its order dated 21.11.2008 in 1A 1658 in WP (C) No. 202/1995, referring to the CEC's report for permission for change in the legal status of the forest land diverted under Forest (Conservation) Act, 1980 by the MoEF, for rehabilitation of villagers of three villagers in Andhari Wildlife Sanctuary, Maharashtra, ordered that "...we make it clear that despite the order passed by this Court on 13.11.2000, the MoEF is permitted to change in the legal status of the forest land approved under the Forest (Conservation) Act, 1980 for relocation of these villages for the purpose of extending the boundary and for rehabilitation of the tribal people residing there". It is also informed that the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India vide its order dated 09.05.2008 regarding correction of the judgment dated 28.03.2008 has already accorded 'full exemption' from payment of Net Present Value (NPV) to the relocation / rehabilitation of villages for the serves to alternate forest.

land. In this connection, this Ministry's letter of even number dated 05.02.2009 may kindly be referred to.

In view of the above, I am directed to convey the approval of the Central Government for changing the legal status of forest land, with retrospective effect covering all such cases of diversion of forest land, diverted under Forest (Conservation) Act. 1980 for relocation/rehabilitation of villages from National parks/wildlife sanctuaries/Tiger Reserves from 'forest land' to 'revenue land'.

It is further reiterated that this stipulation is strictly restricted to relocation/rehabilitation of villages from National parks/wildlife sanctuaries/Tiger

This is issued with the approval of competent authority.

(C.D. Singh) Sr. Assistant Inspector General of Forests

Copy to:-

1. The Principal Chief Conservator of Forests, All States / UTs. 2. The Chief Wildlife Wardens, All States / UTs.

3. The Nodal Officer (FCA), O/o the PCCFs, All States / UTs. 4. All Regional Offices of MoEF located at Bhopal, Shillong, Bangalore, Bhubaneshwar, Lucknow and Chandigarh.

5. The RO (HQ). MoEF, New Delhi.

6. Monitoring Cell, FC Division, MoEF, New Delhi.

(C.D. Sr. Assistant Inspector General of Forests

Annexure 41.3.2

<u>. Sec. PIL(W)</u> Diary No.51575/2016

INTERLOCUTORY APPLICATION NO.... OF 2016 (Application for Relaxation of Order dated 13.11.2000) IN

-6-

WRIT PETITION(C) NO. 337 OF 1995

CENTRE FOR ENVIR. LAW, WWF-I VS.

.. PETITIONER

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

IN THE MATTER OF :-STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH .. RESPONDENTS

APPLICANT

The Counsel for the State of Madhya Pradesh has filed an application for seeking a relaxation in the order dated 13.8.2000 in respect of Satpura and Panna Tiger Reserves in Madhya Pradesh and permit change of legal status of Forest land to revenue land in respect of Satpura Tiger Reserve.

As per the report submitted by the Registry in the matter relating to the National Parks and Wildlife Sanctuaries certain directions were passed by the Green Bench on 5.10.2015 one of the order read thus :

"II. MATTERS RELATING TO NATIONAL PARKS AND WILDLIFE SANCTUARIES:

Now we come to matters relating to National Parks and Wildlife Sanctuaries.

At the time of hearing on the aforesaid subject, certain suggestions are made by the learned amicus curlae and other senior counsels. By incorporating them, we pass the following order(s):

All matters for grant of permissions for implementation of projects in areas falling in National parks/sanctuaries, including rationalization of In view of the aforesaid the present application will not lie. Even otherwise a perusal of Annexure- A4 on record, which is a letter issued by the Union of India(Ministry of Environment and Forests) to all the Principal Secretary/Secretary(Forests) of all states and Union of Territories whereby the Central Government has already conveyed the approval for changing the legal status of forest land with retrospective effect covering all such cases of diversion of Forest land, diverted under Forest (Conservation) Act, 1980 for relaxation/rehabilitation of villages from National Parks/Wild Life sanctuaries/Tiger Reserves from "Forest Land to Revenue Land."

-8-

-3-

For the reasons discussed above, I am constrained but to hold that the present application is not maintainable. It does not disclose any reasonable cause to be entertained at this stage. As a sequal it is ordered to be lodged under the provisions of Order XV, Rule 5 of supreme Court Rules, 2013.

Parties be informed accordingly.

In view of the aforesaid the present application will not lie. Even otherwise a perusal of Annexure- A4 on record, which is a letter issued by the Union of India(Ministry of Environment and Forests) to all the Principal Secretary/Secretary(Forests) of all states and Union of Territories whereby the Central Government has already conveyed the approval for changing the legal status of forest land with retrospective effect covering all such cases of diversion of Forest land, diverted under Forest (Conservation) Act, 1980 for relaxation/rehabilitation of villages from National Parks/Wild Life sanctuaries/Tiger Reserves from "Forest Land to Revenue Land."

-8-r

-3-

For the reasons discussed above, I am constrained but to hold that the present application is not maintainable. It does not disclose any reasonable cause to be entertained at this stage. As a sequal it is ordered to be lodged under the provisions of Order XV, Rule 5 of supreme Court Rules, 2013.

Parties be informed accordingly.

Agenda Item No. 4

FRESH PROPOSALS WITHIN PROTECTED AREAS (NATIONAL PARKS/WILDLIFE SANCTUARIES)

41.4.1 Proposals within the Protected Areas

The list of proposals for taking up non-forestry activities within Protected Areas is as follows. Fact sheets are at Fact sheets are at **Annexure 41.4.1 (Pg No. 15 - 34)**

| S.No | State | F .No. | Subject |
|------|-----------|---------------|--|
| 1 | Madhya | 6-187/2014 WL | Diversion of 1.83 ha of forest land from Madhav |
| | Pradesh | | National Park to lay underground sewage pipeline across |
| | | | Madhav NP, Madhya Pradesh (Page No. 18, 19, 20). |
| 2 | Madhya | 6-117/2016 WL | Proposal for renovation and maintenance of Amadehi |
| | Pradesh | | reservoir repair work of the waste weir in Satpura Tiger |
| | | | Reserve, Dist. Hoshangabad, Madhya Pradesh (Page No. 21, 22). |
| 3 | Uttar | 6-184/2016 WL | Diversion of 0.504 ha of forestland from Sohagibarawa |
| 5 | Pradesh | 0-10+/2010 WL | Wildlife Sanctuary for construction of border outpost |
| | Tracom | | (BOP) Chowki of Shastra Seema Bal, Maharajganj |
| | | | within the area of Sohagibarawa Wildlife Sanctuary, |
| | | | Maharajganj, Uttar Pradesh(Page No. 23, 24). |
| 4 | Uttar | 6-185/2016 WL | Proposal for establishment and operating Retail Outlet |
| | Pradesh | | with required facilities in private land situated in village |
| | | | -Mishirpur, plot khasra no.223M Right side of Asifabad |
| | | | -Garh road (MDR) on km 12 District Meerut, Utter |
| | | | Pradesh (Page No. 25, 26). |
| 5 | Rajasthan | 6-167/2016 WL | Proposal for diversion of 0.07 ha of reserved forest land |
| | | | from Nahargarh WLS for laying of underground electric |
| | | | cable from Doordarshan tower to the Nahargarh Fort |
| | | | Entrance length 1400 meters and width of trench 0.05 |
| | | | meters, APP depth 1.0 meter for establishment of Jaipur |
| | | | Wax Statues Museum at Nahargarh Fort, Rajasthan (Page No. 27, 28). |
| 6 | Telangana | 6-166/2016 WL | Diversion of 20.53 Ha of forest land in Warangal District for |
| | renanguna | | improvement of the existing road from Nakkerekal to |
| | | | Mallampally Road of NH-365 from km 121/0 to 154/0 in |
| | | | favour of Executive Engineer, NH Diversion, Warangal |
| | TT 1 | C 10/2017 M/ | Telangana (Page No. 29, 30). |
| 7 | Telangana | 6-19/2017 WL | Diversion of 0.54 Ha in Mansorabad RF and 2.31 Ha in Kuntloor RF total 2.85 Ha for strengthening and widening of |
| | | | existing road from Nagole Junction to Gowrelly X road |
| | | | passing through Mahavir Harina Vanasthali National Park, |

| | | | Hyderabad in favour of Hyderabad Metropolitan Development Authority (HMDA), Hyderabad (Page No. 31). |
|----|--------------------|---------------|--|
| 8 | Jammu & Kashmir | 6-187/2016 WL | Underground Laying of Optical Fibre Cable (OFC) for Indian Army under Project Network for Spectrum (NFC), Directorate General of Signals, Ministry of Defence in Ladakh Region, Leh District, Jammu & Kashmir (Page No. 32, 33). |
| 9 | Jammu & Kashmir | 6-27/2017 WL | Diversion of 0.459 ha of forest land from Ramnagar Wildlife Sanctuary for laying of underground Optical Fibre Cable by the Network for spectrum (NFS) cell, Directorate General of Signals, Ministry of Defence (Page No. 34, 35). |
| 10 | Jammu & Kashmir | 6-28/2017 WL | Proposal for diversion of 7.60 ha forestland from Changthang Cold Desert Wildlife Sanctuary for establishment of National Large Solar Telescope, Ladakh, Jammu & Kashmir (Page No. 36, 37). |

| | | (1) | | |
|------|---|---|--|--|
| 1 | Name of the proposal | Diversion of 1.83 ha of forest land from Madhav | | |
| | | National Park to lay underground sewage pipeline | | |
| | | across Madhav National Park, Madhya Pradesh | | |
| 2 | Name of the protected Area | Madhav National Park | | |
| | involved | | | |
| 3 | File No. | 6-187/2014 WL | | |
| 4 | Name of the State | Madhya Pradesh | | |
| 5 | Whether proposal is sub- judice | - | | |
| 6 | Area of the protected area | 354 km^2 | | |
| 7(a) | Area proposed for | 1.83 ha | | |
| | diversion/Denotification | | | |
| 7(b) | Area so far diverted from the | Not mentioned in the proposal | | |
| | protected area(s) | | | |
| 8 | Name of the applicant agency | Public Health Engineering Department, Shivpuri, | | |
| | | Madhya Pradesh | | |
| 9 | Total number of tree to be | 1142 trees to be felled down | | |
| | felled | | | |
| 10 | Maps depicting the Sanctuary | Yes | | |
| | and the diversion proposal | | | |
| | included or not | | | |
| 11 | Recommendation of State Boar | | | |
| | | s considered the proposal in its meeting held on 8 th July | | |
| | | Environmental Impact Assessment by a reputed national | | |
| | | ards for ensuring safety of the wild animals in Madhav | | |
| | National Park before recommend | | | |
| 12 | | sal as given by the applicant agency | | |
| | | of forest land from Madhav National Park to P.H.E.D of | | |
| | | ervation project Shivpuri is being executed by P.H.E.D | | |
| | under which 150 km sewer line will be laid ranging from 150 mm to 1100 mm dia. 3.305 | | | |
| | km sewer line of 1100 mm dia RCC NP4 pipeline pass through N.P. area. The width of the trench will be 4 meter in 2 305 km length and 0 meter in 1.0 km length. This sewer line | | | |
| | trench will be 4 meter in 2.305 km length and 9 meter in 1.0 km length. This sewer line will pass through Compartment No 50, 55 & 56 of National Park area. Thus the total | | | |
| | 1 0 1 | will pass through Compartment No.50, 55 & 56 of National Park area. Thus the total | | |
| | | affected forest area comes to be 1.83 ha. The ground will be leveled after laying of sewer. | | |
| | There will not be any degradation of wildlife of the National Park. At present, the water supply to Shivpuri town is through Sakhaya Sagar (Chandnatha) Lake. This lake forms a | | | |
| | supply to Shivpuri town is through Sakhaya Sagar (Chandpatha) Lake. This lake forms a part of Madhav NP and gets polluted through nallah of Shivpuri town and Jadhav Sagar | | | |
| | | roject, pollution free water will be available for water | | |
| | - | as well as for the consumption of wildlife of the National | | |
| | Park. | | | |
| | | e will be laid underground in the "right of way" of road | | |
| | - | onal Park, Shivpuri towards Jhansi. After laying of sewer | | |
| | pubbling in ough the muchan run | ond I ark, on opul towards shansi. The haying of sewer | | |

| | habitats of the Protected Areas. After execution of the project, the people of Shivpuri town will get pollution free drinking water, because Jadhav Sagar and other lakes will be rendered free of pollution. They will come forward and cooperate in conservation of Wild Life in the Protected Areas. The treated sewage water from sewage treatment plant may also be used for drinking purposes of wild life and forestry plantation. Thus, the implementation of project shall not likely to make any negative impact on the wildlife of the area. Negative Impact: No likely negative impacts were observed. |
|-----|---|
| 13 | Rare and endangered species found in the area |
| | The proposal indicates the presence of leopard, wild dog, wolf, jackal, hyena, etc. |
| 14 | Opinion of the Chief Wildlife Warden |
| | The Chief Wildlife Warden has recommended the proposal with the following |
| | justification: |
| | The proposed 33.5 meters Sewer line passes through the Madhav National park and |
| | untreated sewage will flow through it. Sewage Treatment Plant has been proposed at a |
| | place 340 meters outside Madhav National Park. The treated sewage will again flow into |
| | the park through Barhi river. Accidental breaking of sewer line within park limits or |
| | breakdown at sewage treatment plant will pose a grave danger to the wildlife of Madhav |
| | National Park through infection. Although the agencies claim that this is the only viable option, Environmental Impact Assessment by a reputed national agency is required to |
| | assess the threats to wildlife before taking a decision. |
| | Recommendation of State Government |
| | The project is not going to cause exploration or removal of any wildlife but felling of |
| | 1142 trees is involved. The proposed 3305 meters sewer lane passes through the Madhav |
| | National Park and untreated sewage will flow through it. Sewage Treatment Plant has |
| | been proposed at a place 340 mtrs outside Madhav National Park. The treated sewage will |
| | again flow into the park through Barhi river. Accidental breaking of sewer line within |
| | park limits or breakdown at sewage treatment plant will pose a grave danger to the |
| 1.5 | wildlife of Madhav National Park through infection. Although the agencies. |
| 15 | Comments of Ministry The NTCA has recommended the proposal with the following mitigation measures: |
| | a) The materials for construction should be procured from outside the park area. |
| | b) The user agency (PHE department) and the contractor firm should carry out the |
| | construction work only during the day time (8 am To 5 pm). |
| | c) The pipeline should be covered with excavated materials after the construction. Care |
| | should be taken that the pipeline is totally underground and at a minimum depth of 1 |
| | meter below soil surface. |
| | d) All other excavated construction debris should be disposed of as suggested by the |
| | Director, Madhav National Park and/or away from the park boundary at the cost of the |
| | user agency. |
| | e) While digging the trench, shorter lengths (as decided by the Park Director) may be |
| | taken at a time and laying of pipeline and refilling of the trench should be undertaken |
| | simultaneously within the shortest possible period (not exceeding 2-3 days) so as to |
| | avoid disruption animals movements and wildlife (especially infant) mortality by |
| | falling in the open trench while trying to cross the road. |

| f) Use of heavy machinery such as earth moving/drilling machines should be minimal |
|---|
| (restricted only for rocky areas) so as to reduce noise pollution. |
| g) The pipeline is proposed to be laid parallel and within the distance of <5 mtr of cattle |
| proof rubble wall demarcating the park boundary. The user agency and the contractor |
| engineering firm should ensure that no damage to this wall is caused at any phase of |
| construction work. |
| h) A gate value should be constructed where the pipeline enters the National Park area so |
| as to check/curtail entry of untreated sewage in the park if needed in the future |
| The Standing Committee may like to take a view on the proposal. |

| | | (2) | |
|------|---|--|--|
| 1 | Name of the Proposal | Proposal for renovation and maintenance of Amadehi | |
| | | reservoir repair work of the waste weir in Satpura Tiger | |
| | | Reserve, Dist. Hoshangabad, Madhya Pradesh | |
| 2 | Name of the protected Area | Satpura Tiger Reserve | |
| | involved | | |
| 3 | File No. | 6-117/2016 WL | |
| 4 | Name of the State | Madhya Pradesh | |
| 5 | Whether proposal is sub- | Not sub-judice | |
| | judice | | |
| 6 | Area of the protected area | 654.49 km^2 | |
| 7(a) | Area proposed for | No new area is to be diverted in this proposal as only | |
| | diversion/Denotification | repair is proposed. Status of land remains same. | |
| 7(b) | Area so far diverted from the | 0.10 ha | |
| | protected area(s) | | |
| 8 | Name of the applicant agency | MP Water Resources Department. | |
| 9 | Total number of tree to be | No clearing of vegetation is required. | |
| | felled | | |
| 10 | Maps depicting the Sanctuary | Yes | |
| | and the diversion proposal | | |
| | included or not | | |
| 11 | Recommendation of State Board for Wildlife | | |
| | | is recommended the proposal in its meeting held on 18 th | |
| | April 2016. | | |
| 12 | Brief justification on the proposal as given by the applicant agency | | |
| | Proposal for renovation and maintenance of Amadehi reservoir repair work of the waste | | |
| | | Dist. Hoshangabad, Madhya Pradesh. Since the dam is | |
| | | for irrigation and renovation maintenance is to be done in | |
| | | Pachmarhi Sanctuary renovation and maintenance granted | |
| | 1 | sion in Pachmarhi sanctuary. 0.10 ha dam area is already | |
| 12 | | y prior to notification of the sanctuary. | |
| 13 | Rare and endangered species for | | |
| | | ence of tiger, leopard, spotted deer, barking deer, four n wild boar, indian gazelle, sloth bear, jackal, wild dog, | |
| | - | ii wiid boat, iidiali gazelle, siotii beat, jackat, wiid dog, | |
| 14 | hyena, bison, peacock, etc. Opinion of the Chief Wildlife Warden | | |
| 14 | - | | |
| | The waste weir of Amadehi Reserve will be constructed on the boundary of tiger reserve. | | |
| | No removal of wildlife including forest produce is involved. Drinking water will be | | |
| | provided to wildlife with the construction of the waste weir. No habitat of wildlife will be affected from this waste weir. | | |
| | | ecommended the proposal with the conditions imposed by | |
| | the State Board for Wildlife. | commended the proposal with the conditions imposed by | |
| 15 | | roposal with the following comments | |
| 15 | - | nension of the dam should be allowed apart from repair of | |
| | | nerge 0.10 ha of land, (the listed width of the dam being 3 | |
| | waste wen which would subl | herge 0.10 ha of fand, (the fisted width of the dam being 5 | |

m length being 140 m should be maintained).

- 2) During the repair of the aforesaid, the materials should be brought from outside.
- 3) No trees should be cut or affected during the repair work.
- 4) The repair work should be strictly carried out during the time frame which would avoid the peak animal activity period from 6 pm to 6 am.
- 5) No accommodation construction should be created inside the park for labor and construction workers.
- 6) It should be ensured that all the debris post repair work is removed from the tiger reserve.

The Standing Committee may like to take a view on the proposal.

| | | (3) | |
|------|--|--|--|
| 1 | Name of the Proposal | Diversion of 0.504 ha of forest land from Sohagibarawa Wildlife Sanctuary for construction of Border Outpost(BOP) of Shastra Seema Bal, Maharajganj within the area of Sohagibarawa Wildlife Sanctuary, | |
| | | Maharajganj, Uttar Pradesh | |
| 2 | Name of the protected Area involved | Sohagibarwa Wildlife Sanctuary | |
| 3 | File No. | 6-184/2016 WL | |
| 4 | Name of the State | Uttar Pradesh | |
| 5 | Whether proposal is sub- judice | Not sub-judice | |
| 6 | Area of the protected area | 492.80 km^2 | |
| 7(a) | Area proposed for diversion/Denotification | 0.504 ha of reserved forest land | |
| 7(b) | Area so far diverted from the protected area(s) | Nil | |
| 8 | Name of the applicant agency | Shastra Seema Bal Maharajganj. | |
| 9 | Total number of tree to be felled | No clearing of vegetation is required. | |
| 10 | Maps depicting the Sanctuary and the diversion proposal | Yes | |
| 11 | included or not Recommendation of State Board for Wildlife | | |
| 11 | The State Board for Wildlife has recommended the proposal in its meeting held on 17 th August 2016. | | |
| 12 | Brief justification on the proposal as given by the applicant agency The objective of the project is to connect Border outpost of Shastra Seema Bal (SSB). | | |
| 13 | Rare and endangered species found in the area Sohagibarawa is the refuge for animals like tiger, leopard, jungle, cat, small indian civet, bull, deer and many others. It is also has varied species of birds like little cormorant, snake bird, brahmini duck, common teal, little egret, cattle egret, black ibis, spoon bill, etc. | | |
| 14 | Opinion of the Chief Wildlife Warden The Chief Wildlife Warden has recommended the proposal with the following mitigation measures and conditions: 1) Protection & Mitigation measures for wild life should be ensured as per guidelines of Government of India (MoEF&CC). 2) User agency should provide the funds for reduction in negative impact for conservation & Eco-development activities of wild life & habitat as per guidelines of MoEF&CC, Government of India. 3) Land shall not be used for any purpose other than that specified in the proposal. | | |
| | 4) Rules and regulation of the concerned departments for establishing the project shall be complied with. 5) The instructions/orders passed by the State/Central Govt. and the directions passed | | |

| | | by Hon'ble High Court/Hon'ble Supreme Court/National Green Tribunal from time to time regarding such project shall be complied with. |
|----|-----|--|
| | 6) | User agency will ensure that the project personnel engaged in the project shall |
| | | observe the provisions of the Wild Life (Protection) Act, 1972 & Rules made there under. |
| | 7) | Construction waste materials shall not be thrown inside the sanctuary area or movement corridor of the wildlife. |
| | 8) | User agency will take all precautions including technical measures to contain the noise and air pollutions and protection from fire due to construction activities. |
| | 9) | The project proponent shall obtain consent to establish and to operate from U.P. Pollution Control Board and effectively implement all the conditions stipulated therein. |
| | 10) | The project proponent shall undertake plantation work by planting the native species in the area adjacent to project area/sanctuary for which necessary finance will be provided by the user agency. |
| | 11) | Amount of net present value (N.P.V) shall be paid by the User agency as per rules. |
| | 12) | No laborers' camp shall be established in the sanctuary/forest area or other sensitive area. |
| | 13) | Two GPS sets shall be provided to concern division, Sohagibarawa Wildlife Division, Maharajganj by the user agency for the survey and demarcation of the sanctuary boundaries. |
| 15 | Com | ments of Ministry |
| | | Standing Committee may like to take a view on the proposal. |
| | • | - · · · · · · · |

| | | (4) | |
|---|--|--|--|
| 1 | Name of the Proposal | Proposal for establishment and operating Retail Outlet | |
| | | with required facilities in private land situated in village - | |
| | | Mishirpur, plot Khasra No.223M Right side of Asifabad - | |
| | | Garh road (MDR) on km 12 district Meerut, U.P | |
| 2 | Name of the protected Area | Hastinapur Wildlife Sanctuary | |
| | involved | | |
| 3 | File No. | 6-185/2016 WL | |
| 4 | Name of the State | Uttar Pradesh | |
| 5 | Whether proposal is sub- judice | Not sub-judice | |
| 6 | Area of the protected area | 2073 sq.km | |
| 7(a) | Area proposed for | 0.076677ha of private land +0.0576286ha (Govt. land) | |
| | diversion/Denotification | =0.1343ha | |
| 7(b) | Area so far diverted from the | NA (Not mentioned in the proposal) | |
| | protected area(s) | | |
| 8 | Name of the applicant agency | M/s. Essar Oil and Gas Ltd. | |
| 9 | Total number of tree to be felled | No clearing of vegetation is required. | |
| 10 | Maps depicting the Sanctuary | Yes | |
| | and the diversion proposal | | |
| | included or not | | |
| 11 | Recommendation of State Board for Wildlife | | |
| | | s recommended the proposal in its 7 th meeting held on 17 th | |
| 10 | August 2016 with conditions. | | |
| 12 | · · · · | sal as given by the applicant agency | |
| | | nent of and operation of retail outlet with required facilities | |
| | such as compound wall, chain link fencing, public toilet, applicable RVI element, air fac | | |
| electrification and other safety equipment. The proposed area is situated am habitation. As such, the proposal will provide fuel to local people but it wi | | | |
| | | | |
| 13 | negative impact on wildlife habitat. There are no alternatives to the proposal.Rare and endangered species found in the area | | |
| | e i | oth bear, jackal, wild pig and the lesser cats- fishing cat, | |
| | leopard cat, jungle cat, civet, etc. | | |
| 14 | Opinion of the Chief Wildlife Warden | | |
| | - | ecommended the proposal with the following conditions: | |
| | i) Protection and mitigation me | easures for wildlife should be ensured as per guidelines of | |
| | Government of India. | | |
| | | nd Gas Ltd, Noida should provide the funds for reduction in | |
| | • • | ation and Eco-development activities of wildlife and habitat | |
| | 1 0 | of Environment and Forest Government of India. | |
| | | y purpose other than that specified in the proposal. | |
| | iv) Rules and regulation of the complied with. | concerned departments for establishing the project shall be | |
| | - | sed by the State Govt./Central Govt. and the directions | |
| | , The more defined of the past | sea of the state cova central cova and the allections | |

| | passed by Hon'ble High Court/Hon'ble Supreme Court/National Green Tribunal from |
|----|---|
| | time to time regarding such project shall be complied with. |
| | vi) User agency will ensure that the project personnel engaged in the project shall observe |
| | the provisions of the Wildlife (Protection) Act 1972 and Rules made there under. |
| | vii)Construction waste materials shall not be thrown inside the forest area or movement corridor of the wildlife. |
| | viii) User agency will take all precautions including technical measures to contain the |
| | noise and air pollutions and protection from fire due to project activities. |
| | ix) The project proponent shall obtain consent to establish and to operate from U.P. |
| | Pollution Control Board and effectively implement all the conditions stipulated therein. |
| | x) The project proponent shall undertake plantation work by planting the native species in |
| | the area adjacent to project area/sanctuary for which necessary finance will be provided |
| | by the user agency. |
| | xi) Amount of Net Present Value (NPV) shall be paid by the User Agency as per directions |
| | contend in G.O.No writ 526/14-2-2008. |
| | xii)No labourers' camp shall be established in the forest area or other sensitive area without |
| | prior permission of competent authority. |
| | xiii) Two GPS sets shall be provided to the Meerut Forest Division by the user agency for |
| | the survey and demarcation of the sanctuary boundary. |
| 15 | Comments of Ministry |
| | The proposal is for setting up a retail outlet petrol pump for the basic facility of the local |
| | people residing within the Sanctuary. |
| | The Standing Committee may like to take a view on the proposal. |
| L | |

| | | (5) | |
|--------|---|--|--|
| 1 | Name of the Proposal | Proposal for diversion of 0.07 ha of reserved forest land from Nahargarh WLS for laying of underground electric | |
| | | cable from Doordarshan tower to the Nahargarh Fort Entrance length 1400 meters and width of trench 0.05 | |
| | | meters, APP depth 1.0 meter for establishment of Jaipur | |
| | | Wax Stataue Museum at Nahargarh Fort, Rajasthan. | |
| 2 | Name of the protected Area | Nahargarh Wildlife Sanctuary | |
| | involved | | |
| 3 | File No. | 6-167/2016 WL | |
| 4 | Name of the State | Rajsthan | |
| 5 | Whether proposal is sub- judice | Not sub-judice | |
| 6 | Area of the protected area | 5240 ha | |
| 7(a) | Area proposed for | 0.07 ha | |
| - | diversion/Denotification | | |
| 7(b) | Area so far diverted from the | - | |
| 8 | protected area(s) Name of the applicant agency | | |
| 8 9 | Total number of tree to be | No clearing of vegetation is required. | |
| 7 | felled | No clearing of vegetation is required. | |
| 10 | Maps depicting the Sanctuary | Yes | |
| | and the diversion proposal | | |
| 11 | included or not | | |
| 11 | Recommendation of State Board for Wildlife | | |
| | The State Board for Wildlife has recommended the proposal in its meeting held on 20 th October 2016 with the condition to deposit 2% of the cost of the project will be deposited by | | |
| | | | |
| | the user agency in the account of Rajasthan Protected Areas Conservation Society (RPAC for Wildlife conservation and mitigation works along with the other conditions prescribed | | |
| | the Chief Wildlife Warden. | | |
| 12 | | sal as given by the applicant agency | |
| | | t. of Rajasthan proposed to establish the Wax museum in | |
| | | C will connect Doordarshan tower to Wax museum. | |
| 13 | Rare and endangered species for | | |
| 1.4 | It is noted that the presence of hyena, wolf, jungle cat, chinkara, sambhar, nilgai, etc. | | |
| 14 | Opinion of the Chief Wildlife W | | |
| | i) No work shall be done before | ecommended the proposal with the following conditions: | |
| | ii) No machinery shall be allow | | |
| | iii) No tree shall be cut during th | • | |
| | | y labourers within and 500 mtrs from WLS boundary. | |
| | | thin and 500meters from WLS boundary. | |
| | - | l should be disposed outside the sanctuary area. | |
| | vii) The project personnel will abide with the provisions of the Wildlife (Protection) A 1972. | | |
| | | | |

| 15 | Comments of Ministry |
|----|---|
| | The proposal for laying OFC for Wax museum requires 0.07 ha of land within the WLS. |
| | The Standing Committee may like to take a view on the proposal. |

| | | (6) | |
|------|--|---|--|
| 1 | Name of the proposal | Diversion of 20.53 ha of forest land from Pakhal | |
| | | Wildlife Sanctuary for improvement to the existing | |
| | | road from Nakkerekal to Mallampally Road of NH- | |
| | | 365 from km 121/0 to 154/0 in Warangal district in | |
| | | Telangana in favour of Executive Engineer, NH | |
| | | Division, Warangal, Telangana | |
| 2 | Name of the protected Area | Pakhal Wildlife Sanctuary | |
| | involved | | |
| 3 | File No. | 6-166 /2016 WL | |
| 4 | Name of the State | Telangana | |
| 5 | Whether proposal is sub-judice | Not sub-judice | |
| 6 | Area of the protected area | 583.32 sq km | |
| 7(a) | Area proposed for | 20.53 ha | |
| | diversion/Denotification | | |
| 7(b) | Area so far diverted from the | Not mentioned in the proposal | |
| | protected area(s) | | |
| 8 | Name of the applicant agency | Roads & Buildings Department, Executive Engineer, | |
| | | NH Division, Warangal. | |
| 9 | Total number of tree to be felled | Not mentioned in the proposal. | |
| 10 | Maps depicting the Sanctuary | Yes | |
| | and the diversion proposal | | |
| | included or not | | |
| 11 | Recommendation of State Board fo | | |
| | Recommendation of State Board for Wildlife has not been enclosed. | | |
| 12 | Brief justification on the proposal as given by the applicant agency | | |
| | Rehabilitation and up gradation of NH-365 from km 121/000 to 154/0 i.e., from Nakkerekal | | |
| | to Mallapally to two lane with paved shoulders in the state of Telangana under NHDP-IV on EPC basis. NH-365 is the newly converted National Highway. It is the important highway | | |
| | | | |
| | | llapally, passing through Thanamcherla, Maripeda | |
| | Mahaboobabad, Gudur, Mangalvarpe | | |
| | The existing road width is 12.00 mtrs and the same is proposed for widening to a width 25.00 mtrs. Hence the additional width of 13.00 mtrs is taken into consideration calculating the forest area required for diversion. The existing road is passing through for | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | area in different stretches as mentioned against in the area statement below:24.80 ha of forest land required for diversion, of which 20.53 ha are falling through Pakha | | |
| | Wildlife Sanctuary. | inversion, or which 20.33 ha are failing unough fakilar | |
| 13 | Rare and endangered species found | l in the area | |
| 15 | J | habitat for tiger, leopard, wild dogs, etc. | |
| 14 | Opinion of the Chief Wildlife Ward | | |
| | - | nmended the proposal with the following conditions: | |
| | 1) The user agency should deposit an amount of Rs. 48.00 lakhs with the Forest | | |
| | 1) The user agency should depos | at an amount of Rs. 48.00 lakes with the Porest | |
| | Department for implementing the | | |

| | signage's, etc. at the appropriate places, to be decided in consultation with the local Divisional Forest Officer. |
|----|--|
| 15 | Comments of Ministry |
| | The Standing Committee may like to take a view on the proposal. |

| | | (7) |
|-------|--|--|
| 1 | Name of the Proposal | Diversion of 0.54 ha in Mansorabad RF and 2.31ha in |
| | _ | Kutloor RF total 2.85ha for strengthening and widen |
| | | of existing road from Nagole Junction to Gowrelly X |
| | | road passing through Mahavir Harina National Park, |
| | | Hyderabad in favour of Hyyderabad Metropolitan |
| | | Development Authority (HMDA), Hyderabad. |
| 2 | Name of the protected Area | Mahavir Harina National Park |
| 2 | involved | C 10/2017 WI |
| 3 | File No. | 6-19/2017 WL |
| 4 | Name of the State | Telangana Not sub-indice |
| 3 | Whether proposal is sub- judice | Not sub-judice |
| 6 | Area of the protected area | 1459 ha |
| 7(a) | Area proposed for | 0.54 ha in Mansorabad RF and 2.31 ha in Kutloor RF |
| /(a) | diversion/Denotification | total 2.85 ha |
| 7(b) | Area so far diverted from the | NA (Not mentioned in the proposal) |
| . (-) | protected area(s) | |
| 8 | Name of the applicant agency Metropolitan Development Authority (HMDA) | |
| 9 | Total number of tree to be | No clearing of vegetation is required. |
| | felled | |
| 10 | Maps depicting the Sanctuary | Yes |
| | and the diversion proposal | |
| | included or not | |
| 11 | | |
| 10 | Not mentioned in the proposal. | |
| 12 | • • • • • • • | sal as given by the applicant agency |
| | | ng Inner Ring Road and Outer Ring Road for smooth joining areas for decongestion of main city. |
| 13 | Rare and endangered species for | |
| 15 | | h bear, jackal, wild pig and the lesser cats (fishing cat, |
| | leopard cat, jungle cat, civet, etc) | |
| 14 | Opinion of the Chief Wildlife V | |
| | - | recommended the proposal with the condition that the |
| | | inder pass of 40 ft. width for smooth passage of wild |
| | animals at the designated place. | |
| 15 | Comments of Ministry | |
| | 1 1 | n of connecting roads at two places of ring roads of |
| | Hyderabad City. | |
| | SBWL recommendation has not i | |
| | The Standing Committee may lik | te to take a view on the proposal. |

| | | (8) | |
|------|---|--|--|
| 1 | Name of the Proposal | Underground Laying of Optical Fibre Cable (OFC) for | |
| | _ | Indian Army under Project Net Work for Spectrum | |
| | | (NFC), Directorate General of Signals, Ministry of | |
| | | Defence in Ladakh Region, Leh Disrict, Jammu & | |
| | | Kashmir | |
| 2 | Name of the protected Area | Changthang Cold Desert Wildlife Sanctuary & Karakoram | |
| | involved | Wildlife sanctuary | |
| 3 | File No. | 6-187/2016 WL | |
| 4 | Name of the State | Jammu & Kashmir | |
| 5 | Whether proposal is sub- judice | Not sub-judice | |
| 6 | Area of the protected area | 4000 km ² ha (Changthang Cold Desert Wildlife | |
| | _ | Sanctuary) and 5000 km ² (Karakoram Wildlife sanctuary) | |
| 7(a) | Area proposed for | Total area 28.035 ha (26.1 ha from Changthang Cold | |
| | diversion/Denotification | Desert Wildlife Sanctuary) and 23.025 ha from | |
| | | Karakoram Wildlife sanctuary) | |
| 7(b) | Area so far diverted from the | No diversion of any area from both Sanctuaries is | |
| | protected area(s) | required. | |
| 8 | Name of the applicant | Directorate General of Signals, Ministry of Defence in | |
| 0 | agency | Ladakh Region, Leh District, Jammu & Kashmir | |
| 9 | Total number of tree to be felled | No clearing of vegetation is required. | |
| 10 | Maps depicting the | Yes | |
| | Sanctuary and the diversion | | |
| | proposal included or not | | |
| 11 | Recommendation of State Boar | | |
| | The proposal is considered in SBWL meeting held on 18 th May, 2016 and it was defe | | |
| 10 | for site inspection report. | | |
| 12 | Brief justification on the proposal as given by the applicant agency | | |
| | | nly used by Indian Army personnel for smooth running and Border area. As such the Network is significant from | |
| | expeditious network along the Border area. As such the Network is significant Defence point of for effective border management. Following is the list of active | | |
| | Defence point of for effective border management. Following is the list of action taken/proposed to be taken in the whole block/zone in which the proposed area is located: | | |
| | | ion of closures to adi natural regeneration, water harvesting | |
| | , U | ty toilets, community halls, foot paths and foot bridges, etc. | |
| | | Crate bunds, water channels, etc. | |
| | 4) Handling man wildlife confli | ct: Predator proof coral pens, ex-gratia to the victims. | |
| | This proposed project will gener | ate jobs for locals. However minor disturbance only during | |
| | the process of laying of the OFC | | |
| 13 | Rare and endangered species f | | |
| | The proposal is inside the Sanctu | laries | |
| | Changthang Wildlife Sanctuary | | |
| | | es, brown-headed gulls, strip geese, rust geese terns, kiang, | |
| | tibatan gazelles, tibetan wolves, | foxes | |

| | Karakoram Wildlife sanctuary | | |
|----|--|--|--|
| | The main flora in the sanctuary is Arnebia euchroma, Bergenia stracheyi, Ephedra | | |
| | Gerardiana, and Hyoscymus niger. | | |
| | The main fauna in this sanctuary are migratory population of chiru (tibean antelope), ladakh | | |
| | urial, asiatic ibex, tibetan wolves, foxes, links and snow leopard. | | |
| 14 | Opinion of the Chief Wildlife Warden | | |
| | The Chief Wildlife Warden has recommended the proposal with the following conditions: | | |
| | 1) That the trenches to be dug for the OFC shall be properly refilled and compacted after | | |
| | its laying as per the standard practice. | | |
| | 2) That the use agency shall seek permission for carrying out any maintenance of OFC in | | |
| | sanctuary area as and when required | | |
| | 3) That the user agency shall pay NPV charges as per the orders of Hon'ble Supreme | | |
| | Court. | | |
| | 4) 5% of the project costs in proportion to the length falling in the sanctuaries shall be | | |
| | paid by the user agency. | | |
| 15 | Comments of Ministry | | |
| | The Standing Committee may like to take a view on the proposal. | | |

| | | (9) | | | |
|------|---|---------------------|------------------------|--------------|--|
| 1 | Name of the ProposalDiversion of 0.459 ha of forest land from Ramnagar | | | | |
| | | - | for laying of underg | - | |
| | | | Network for spectru | | |
| | | Directorate General | l of Signals, Ministry | v of Defence | |
| 2 | Name of the protected Area | Ramnagar Wildlife | Sanctuary | | |
| | involved | | | | |
| 3 | File No. | 6-27/2017 WL | | | |
| 4 | Name of the State | Jammu & Kashmir | | | |
| 5 | Whether proposal is sub- judice | Not sub-judice | | | |
| 6 | Area of the protected area | 31.50 sq km | | | |
| 7(a) | Area proposed for diversion/Denotification | 0.459 ha | | | |
| 7(b) | Area so far diverted from the | Name of the | Area diverted | Year of | |
| /(0) | protected area(s) | proposal | Area urverteu | Diversion | |
| | | Four lanning of | a) Ramnagar | 2011 | |
| | | Jammu- | WLS=7.97 ha | | |
| | | Udhampur | b) Nandini | | |
| | | section of NH- | WLS=13.40 ha | | |
| | | 1A | | | |
| | | Total | 21.37 ha | | |
| 8 | Name of the applicant agency | 16 Corps Operating | | | |
| 9 | Total number of tree to be felled | Clearing of vegetat | ion is not required. | | |
| 10 | Maps depicting the | Yes | | | |
| | Sanctuary and the diversion | | | | |
| | proposal included or not | | | | |
| 11 | Recommendation of State Boa | rd for Wildlife | | | |
| | The State Board for Wildlife has recommended the proposal in its meeting held on 18 th | | | | |
| | May 2016 with the condition that no damage whatsoever shall be caused to the | | | | |
| | environment and ecology of the area during the survey/investigation. | | | | |
| 12 | Brief justification on the propo | sal as given by the | applicant agency | | |
| | Since the proposed project of laying optical fiber passing through the protected area | | | | |
| | involves 0.3 mtr width and 1.65 digging mtr depth and there would be no cutting of | | | | |
| | trees involved. At the same time it is important for the security point of view. | | | | |
| 13 | Rare and endangered species f | ound in the area | | | |
| | Not mentioned in the proposal | | | | |
| 14 | Opinion of the Chief Wildlife | Warden | | | |
| | The Chief Wildlife Warden has recommended the proposal with the following | | | | |
| | The enter whatte warden i | | | | |
| | conditions: | | | | |
| | | | e properly refilled a | nd compacted | |

| | 6) | That the user agency shall seek permission for laying out any maintenance of OFC |
|----|---|--|
| | | in sanctuary area as and when required. |
| | 7) | That the user agency shall pay NPV charges as per the orders of Hon'ble Supreme |
| | Court. | |
| | 8) | 5% of the project cost in proportion to the length falling in the sanctuary shall be |
| | | paid by the user agency. |
| 15 | Comments of Ministry | |
| | The Standing Committee may like to take a view on the proposal. | |

| | | (10) |
|------|--|---|
| 1 | Name of the Proposal | Proposal for diversion of 7.60 ha forestland from Changthang Cold Desert Wildlife Sanctuary for establishment of National Large Solar Telescope, Ladakh, Jammu & Kashmir |
| 2 | Name of the protected Area involved | Changthang Cold Desert Wildlife Sanctuary |
| 3 | File No. | 6-28/2017 WL |
| 4 | Name of the State | Jammu & Kashmir |
| 5 | Whether proposal is sub- judice | Not sub-judice |
| 6 | Area of the protected area | 4000 sq km |
| 7(a) | Area proposed for diversion/Denotification | Breakup of the land use area required (7.60 ha) |
| | | (a) 0.1 ha will be used to construct a telescope building and installation of the telescope. (b) 5 ha will be preserved towards south and west for the telescope & associated scientific instruments to allow free flow of air. (c) 2.5 ha will be used for solar photovoltaic array, wind mill, battery bank and power house in small building with sufficient clear area around the structures. |
| 7(b) | Area so far diverted from the protected area(s) | Nil |
| 8 | Name of the applicant agency | Indian Institute of Astrophysics, Bangalore |
| 9 | Total number of tree to be felled | Clearing of vegetation is not required. |
| 10 | Maps depicting the Sanctuary and the diversion proposal included or not | Yes |
| 11 | Recommendation of State Board for Wildlife The State Board for Wildlife has recommended the proposal in its meeting held on 18 th May 2016 with the additional condition mentioned with the further rider that no damage whatsoever shall be caused to the environment and ecology of the area during the survey/investigation. | |
| 12 | Brief justification on the proposal as given by the applicant agency For the stellar and galactic astronomy the Institute has established a telescope at Hanle, Ladakh region in Jammu and Kashmir State a mountain site and pursuing scientific observations from the 2 meter class telescope. It is well known in the astronomy studies that for the night time telescopes the mountain sites are good and for the day time observations of the sun the lake site with large water body is well suited. The site is very good for putting the solar telescope. A comparison of the atmospheric parameters at the site with the other solar sites around the world indicated that it is a | |

| | world class site: it is one of the best in the world. One of the main advantages of the | | | |
|----|--|--|--|--|
| | Pongong lake site is that apart from large amount of sunshine hours in the site, the | | | |
| | number of hours of good seeing hours (in astronomical terms) to observe the sun | | | |
| | without any major disturbance from the Earth's atmosphere is large. | | | |
| 13 | Rare and endangered species found in the area | | | |
| | Not mentioned in the proposal. | | | |
| 14 | Opinion of the Chief Wildlife Warden | | | |
| | The Chief Wildlife Warden has recommended the proposal with the following | | | |
| | conditions: | | | |
| | 9) The user agency shall pay 5% of the cost of the project to the J&K Wildlife | | | |
| | Protection Department for activities aiming at conservation of wildlife and its | | | |
| | habitat in Changthang Wildlife Sanctuary. | | | |
| | 10) The user agency shall pay NPV as per the orders of the Hon'ble Supreme Court. | | | |
| | 11) The recommendations of the committee constituted under Chief Secretary, J&K | | | |
| | vide G.O. No.248-FST of 2010 dated 11.06.2010 shall be followed. | | | |
| | i. The mitigation measures suggested in the EMP will be adhered to by the user | | | |
| | agency. | | | |
| | ii. A monitoring committee shall be constituted comprising of Regional Wildlife | | | |
| | Warden, Ladakh representative of NGO working in the field of wildlife | | | |
| | conservation, Wildlife Warden Leh and representative of user agency to oversee | | | |
| | the implementation of prescribed measures during the execution of the project. | | | |
| | 12) The conditions stipulated by the Ministry of Defence shall be followed strictly. | | | |
| | 13) Local people shall be given preference in employment to minimize the impact on | | | |
| | wildlife due to influx of outside people. | | | |
| | 14) The project staff and labourers involved in the setting up of Solar Telescope will | | | |
| | be informed about the dos's and don'ts in Changthang Wildlife Sanctuary. | | | |
| | 15) The construction debris generated due to the setting up of Solar Telescope shall be | | | |
| | | | | |
| | disposed of in an environmental friendly manner in consultation with the Regional Wildlife Warden, Ladakh. | | | |
| | 16) The solar telescope along with bare minimum infrastructure may be installed near | | | |
| | the Lake. All other supporting infrastructure should be constructed away from the | | | |
| | | | | |
| | lake in consultation with the Wildlife Department. 17) That further civil construction shall not be allowed at the proposed site. | | | |
| | 18) That the site shall be developed by the user agency as an educational awareness | | | |
| | observatory and opened to interested tourists visiting Pangong Lake. | | | |
| | 19) That the local labourers/employees to be engaged by user agency shall reside at | | | |
| | | | | |
| 15 | the nearby village Merak. Comments of Ministry | | | |
| 13 | • | | | |
| | The Standing Committee may like to take a view on the proposal. | | | |

41.4.2 Proposals for taking up activities within 10 km from the boundaries of Protected Areas

The list of proposals for taking up non- forestry activities within Protected Areas is as follows. Fact sheets are at **Annexure 41.4.2** (**Pg No. 37 - 67**)

| S.No | State | F.No. | Subject |
|------|-------------------|---------------|---|
| 1 | Delhi | 6-15/2017 WL | Proposal for CAPFIMS Central Armed Police Forces Institute of Medical Science (along with R&R Hospital and allied Institutes), New Delhi. The proposed site is 200 km from the Asola Bhatti Wildlife Sanctuary (Page No. 40, 41). |
| 2 | Madhya Pradesh | 6-31/2015 WL | Construction of Halon Irrigation project near village Karanjiya across river Halon in Mandla district situated in the buffer zone of Kanha Tiger Reserve, Madhya Pradesh (Page No. 42, 43). |
| 3 | Madhya Pradesh | 6-23/2016 WL | Construction of Intake Well in Son River in Son Gharial Wildlife Sanctuary, near village Kurwah for water supply scheme of Sidhi township, Madhya Pradesh (Page No. 44, 45). |
| 4 | Madhya Pradesh | 6-172/2015 WL | Diversion of 19.653 ha forest land for widening and up gradation of Betul-Sarni-Tekadhana-Junnardev Road (SH-43) passing through Satpura-Pench corridor in Chhindwara district, Madhya Pradesh (Page No. 46 , 47). |
| 5 | Maharashtra | 6-17/2017 WL | Proposal for widening of existing Dahisar-Surat Section from 4-lane to 6-lane between 497.400 km to 498.900 km along NH-8 in the State of Maharashtra. The area required for the project is outside the Sanjay Gandhi National Park, Borivali (Page No. 48, 49). |
| 6 | Maharashtra | 6-180/2016 WL | Proposal for construction of barrage (civil works) for Kanhan River Project across Kanhan River at Kochi village, Saoner taluk, Nagpur Dist, Maharashtra state. The proposed site is 8 km away from the boundary of Mansingdeo Wildlife Sanctuary (Page No. 50, 51). |
| 7 | Uttar Pradesh | 6-144/2016 WL | Proposal for setting up retail outlet proposed by Indian Oil Corporation, Bareilly Division, Bareilly, at private land Khasara No. 248 and 249 village Kripanathpur tehsil Dhanaura district JP Nagar on 141 km SH No- 51 Badaun-Bilsi-Bijnor Road, within ESZ from Hastinapur WLS (Page No. 52, 53). |

FRESH PROPOSALS WITHIN 10 KMS FROM BOUNDARY OF NATIONAL PARKS/WILDLIFE SANCTUARIES

| 8 | Uttar Pradesh | 6-145/2016 WL | Proposal for the diversion of 0.47 ha of reserved forest |
|-----|---------------|---------------|--|
| 0 | | 0110/2010 112 | land from Shivalik Elephant Reserve for construction |
| | | | of a new lane tunnel on NH-72 A (new 307) between |
| | | | km 33 and km 34 near Dat-Kali Temple in the |
| | | | Elephant Reserve Shivalik Forest Division Saharnpur |
| 9 | Uttar Pradesh | 6-5/2017 WL | (Page No. 54, 55, 56). |
| 9 | Uttar Pradesn | 0-3/2017 WL | The proposal for extension /re-notification of ASAN |
| | | | Field Firing Range for Gazette Notification from |
| | | | 01.01.2016 to 31.12.20125. Established since 1987 |
| 10 | | | (Page No. 57, 58). |
| 10 | Telangana | 6-163/2016 WL | Proposal for Survey & Exploration of Uranium over 22 km^2 for survey 472 km^2 in 2 km size of 2 and 4 |
| | | | 83 km ² [over an area of 7 km ² in 2 blocks of 3 and 4 km ² in Nidgul RF of WLM division, Nagarjuna Sagar |
| | | | and 76 km ² in 2 block of 38 km ² of each] in Amarabad |
| | | | Tiger Reserve by Atomic Minerals Directorate for |
| | | | Exploration and Research, South Central Region, |
| | | | Telangana (Page No. 59, 60). |
| 11 | Andhra | 6-6/2017 WL | Proposal for Construction of Shipyard and Allied |
| | Pradesh | | Facilities at Ship Building Center, Krishna Gate, |
| | | | Naval Basic, Visakhapatnam, Andhra Pradesh (Page |
| 12 | Rajasthan | 6-22/2017 WL | No. 61, 62). Laying of underground 12.75" diameter steel pipeline |
| 12 | Kajasulali | 0-22/2017 WL | for transportation of Naptha from Jaipur to Panipat |
| | | | Refinery of IOCL (Page No. 63, 64). |
| 13 | Deiesthen | 6-23/2017 WL | |
| 15 | Rajasthan | 0-23/2017 WL | Proposal for modernization of existing manufacturing |
| | | | unit for increase of clinker and cement production; |
| | | | expansion in existing mines upto 8 MTPA and |
| | | | installation of new power plant of 17.5 MW within |
| | | | existing owned complex of M/s Mangalam Cement, |
| | | | village Modak, Dist. Kota, Rajasthan (Page No. 65, |
| 1.4 | Dele (1 | C 04/0017 M | 66). |
| 14 | Rajasthan | 6-24/2017 WL | Barmer-Pali Pipeline Project for 'Laying 18''dia |
| | | | natural gas pipeline originate from CAIRN's |
| | | | Rageswari Terminal near village Guda Malani, Tehsil |
| | | | /District Barmer and terminated at village Shivtalav, |
| | | | Tehsil Bali, Dist. Pali (connecting GIGL's MBPL |
| | | | mainline) (Page No. 67, 68). |
| 15 | Kerala | 6-26/2017 WL | Construction of new dry dock facility at Cochin |
| | | | Shipyard Ltd. within the existing premises Ernakulam, |
| | | | Kerala (Page No. 69, 70). |

| | | (1) | |
|-----|---|---|--|
| 1 | Name of the Proposal | Proposal for CAPFIMS Central Armed Police Forces | |
| | - | Institute of Medical Science (along with R&R Hospital | |
| | | and allied Institutes), New Delhi. The proposed site is 200 | |
| | | meters from the Asola Bhatti Wildlife Sanctuary. | |
| 2 | Name of the protected Area | Asola Bhatti Wildlife Sanctuary | |
| | involved | | |
| 3 | File No. | 6-15/2017 WL | |
| 4 | Name of the State | New Delhi | |
| 5 | Whether proposal is sub- judice | Not sub-judice | |
| 6 | Area of the protected area | 4845.58 acres | |
| 7(a | Area proposed for | Nil, the proposed site is 200 m away from the Asola | |
|) | diversion/Denotification | Bhatti Wildlife Sanctuary. | |
| 7(b | Area so far diverted from the | Nil | |
|) | protected area(s) | | |
| 8 | Name of the applicant agency | CAPFIMS Central Armed Police Forces Institute of | |
| | | Medical Science (along with R&R Hospital and allied | |
| | | Institutes) | |
| 9 | Total number of tree to be | No felling of tree is required. | |
| | felled | | |
| 10 | Maps depicting the Sanctuary | Yes | |
| | and the diversion proposal | | |
| | included or not | | |
| 11 | Recommendation of State Board for Wildlife | | |
| | - | roposal that recommendation of SBWL is not applicable as | |
| 10 | SBWL has not been constituted in | | |
| 12 | Brief justification on the proposal as given by the applicant agency | | |
| | CAPFIMS is a referral and research hospital proposed to be established at Maidangarhi on area of 51.4 acres. The total plot area is 2,08,009.30 sq. m out of which 44200.00 sq. m shall | | |
| | | The land has been allotted by DDA vide allotment letter No. | |
| | $F.22(3)10/1L/1429$ dated 27^{th} Ju | aly 2012. The total population of the Hospital has been | |
| | | ich the patients (IPD) will be 800, patients (OPD) will be | |
| | | s' will be 2160, hospital attendants will be 1200, hostel | |
| | students will be 2144, mess capac | city will be 200, barracks residents will be 462, college staff | |
| | will be 1140, visitors will be 114, | and residential will be 3520. | |
| | Positive Impact | | |
| | | ing buffer zone can improve the diversity if the ecology by | |
| | | icated in the mitigation plan of the project. The dumping of | |
| | - | s can be checked by the very presence of the institute. | |
| | · · · | sanctuary by breaking of boundary wall will be minimized | |
| | thereby preventing encroach | ients. | |
| | Negative Impact | common boundary wall with the senatury, the project will | |
| | As the proposed project shares a have impact on the sanctuary as f | common boundary wall with the sanctuary, the project will | |
| | \sim nave number on the synchrydd ys h | 1111 INA/ N | |

| | (i) Air pollution due to operation of DG sets will go towards ABWLS when the wind |
|----|--|
| | direction is towards the sanctuary. |
| | (ii) Noise with the campus, though may be minimal, and may affect immediate adjoining |
| | areas up to a distance of 100 m. |
| | (iii) Man-animal conflict can arise due to entry of wildlife in to the premises. |
| | The project will be located at 28 [°] 28' 28.65" N Latitude and 77 [°] 12' 54.87" E longitude. |
| 13 | Rare and endangered species found in the area |
| | The proposal indicates the presence of jungle cat, indian civet, indian grey mongoose, |
| | hyaena, black buck, small ndian mongoose, pea-fowl, spiny tailed lizard, etc. |
| 14 | Opinion of the Chief Wildlife Warden |
| | The Chief Wildlife Warden has recommended the proposal with the condition to deposit 5% |
| | of project fund for soil moisture conservation works and improvement of wildlife habitat. No |
| | soil/Badarpur excavation is permitted in ridge/morphological ridge area contiguous to the |
| | project site. |
| 15 | Comments of Ministry |
| | The Standing Committee may like to take a view on the proposal. |

| | | (2) | | |
|------|---|---|--|--|
| 1 | Name of the Proposal | Construction of Halon Irrigation project near village Karanjiya across river Halon in Mandla district | | |
| | | situated in the buffer zone of Kanha Tiger Reserve, Madhya Pradesh. | | |
| 2 | Name of the protected Area involved | Kanha Tiger Reserve | | |
| 3 | File No. | 6-31/2015 WL | | |
| 4 | Name of the State | Madhya Pradesh | | |
| 5 | Whether proposal is sub-judice | Not sub-judice | | |
| 6 | Area of the protected area | 940 km ² | | |
| 7(a) | Area proposed for diversion/Denotification | The proposed site is 7 km from the boundary of Kanha National Park. Only forest area of 149.33 ha (109.80 ha in submergence and 39.53 ha for canal construction). | | |
| 7(b) | Area so far diverted from the protected area(s)Nil | | | |
| 8 | Name of the applicant agency | Narmada Valley Development Department, Govt. of Madhya Pradesh | | |
| 9 | Total number of tree to be felled | | | |
| 10 | Maps depicting the Sanctuary and the diversion proposal included or notYes | | | |
| 11 | Recommendation of State Board for Wildlife The State Board for Wildlife has recommended the proposal in its meeting held on 11 th August 2015. | | | |
| 12 | Brief justification on the proposal as given by the applicant agency The Halon irrigation project envisages construction of a composite dam near village Karanjiya, Dist, Mandla, Madhya Pradesh across river Halon, a tributary of river Burnner, which in turn is tributary of river Narmada. The Halon Irrigation Project contemplates to provide irrigation facilities to a tribal area of 16782 ha (CCA-13040 ha) in Mandla District, a tribal area in Madhya Pradesh. The project will irrigate land on the left bank through gravity flow canal. An area of 1680.11 ha (private land 1413.02 Government land 167.39 ha and forest land 109.80 ha) will come under submergence at FRL due to this project. The dam site is about 7 km from Kanha National Park boundary and within the buffer zone. | | | |
| 13 | Rare and endangered species four | nd in the area | | |
| | The species found in Kanha Tiger bear, barasingha, etc. | Reserve are royal Bengal tiger, Indian leopard, sloth | | |
| 14 | Opinion of the Chief Wildlife Wa | rden | | |
| | Forest area of 149.33 ha (109.80 ha | a for submergence and 39.53 ha for Canal construction) | | |
| | is required in the Buffer Zone of | Kanha Tiger Reserve. Environmental Clearance and | | |

| | Forest clearance has been given by the MoEF vide letters dated 4.1.2010 and 2.2.2011 | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| | espectively. It will provide irrigation facilities to 46 villages in tribal areas in 16782 ha in Andla district. The dam site is 7 km from the boundary of Kanha National Park. | | |
| | The Chief Wildlife Warden has recommended the proposal. | | |
| | Comments of Ministry | | |
| | Environmental Clearance obtained from Ministry of Environment and Forests, | | |
| 0 | Sovernment of India vide their letter No.12011/13/2009-IA-I dated 4 th January 2010 and Forest Clearance vide letter No.8-55/2006-FC dated 2 nd February 2011. | | |
| 0 | Comments of NTCA are as under: | | |
| | The work at site is already under progress .The project has been approved by Expert Appraisal Committee for River Valley and Hydroelectric Project and has also received final/stage-II approval of the Central Government under Section-2 of the Forest (Conservation)Act, 1980 for diversion of 149.33 ha of forest land for division. The location of the project is in the buffer zone of Kanha tiger reserve. The area is much drier and this part of the buffer has more village settlements. The location map shows that the Halon Project is not affecting connectivity of Kanha Tiger Reserve with any other tiger reserve within the landscape. | | |
| | 3) Project involves rehabilitation and resettlement 1577 families from fifteen villages in two districts namely Mandla and Balghat. All this should be carried beyond the limits of Kanha Buffer zone and also outside the limits of the identified corridors. | | |
| | 4) Water flow to downstream should be regulated in line with the natural flow regime to sustain existing ndian e vegetation and aquatic biodiversity. During the lean period 100% of the existing flow should be maintained and during non-lean period the prescribed minimum by the hydrology and aquatic biodiversity experts should be ensured. | | |
| | 5) The user agency should provide 24/7 water facility for wildlife use and forest related activities in the area and along the canal as desired by the Forest Department without any cost. | | |
| | 6) The Catchment Area Treatment Plan should be implemented on the lines of approved Tiger Conservation Plan. There should be active involvement of Kanha Field Director for deciding activities under CAT Plan. | | |
| | 7) The 81.50 km length of canal passes through many forest areas from its start from the Halon Irrigation Project involving 41.81 ha forest land of diversion. It is proposed to build underpasses of desired length (30 mtr to 50 mtr) along the forest areas wherever canal is bisecting/fragmenting the forest area. This will ensure connecting for various species across the canal. The location of underpasses should be decided after due consultation with the Forest Department officers. The minimum height of the underpass should be 5mtr. | | |
| | 8) Proper care should be taken during the construction phase to avoid disturbance in the area. | | |
| 1 | The Standing Committee may like to consider. | | |

| | | (4) | | | |
|------|---|---|--------------------------------|--------------------------|------|
| 1 | Name of the Proposal | Diversion of 19.653 ha gradation of Betul-Sa (SH-43) passing throu Chhindwara district, Ma | rni-Tekadhana 1gh Satpura-P | -Junnardev Dench corrido | Road |
| 2 | Name of the protected Area involved | Satpura-Pench corridor | | | |
| 3 | File No. | 6-172/2015 WL | | | |
| 4 | Name of the State | Madhya Pradesh | | | |
| 5 | Whether proposal is sub-judice | Not sub-judice | | | |
| 6 | Area of the protected area | Satpura NP-528.7304 S Bor Sanctuary-485.715 Pachmarhi WLS-491.63 | 34 Sq Km | | |
| 7(a) | Areaproposedfordiversion/Denotification | Nil, The proposed sit Satpura-Pench Corridor | | n away from | the |
| 7(b) | Area so far diverted from the protected area(s) | Name of Project | Area Diverted | Year of Diversion | |
| | | Amadeh Irrigation Project | 41.04 ha | 1992 | |
| | | Temporary road for Bridge construction on Piparia Pachmarhi Road | 0.9625 ha | 2007 | |
| 8 | Name of the applicant agency | MP Road Development | Corporation I | .td., Bhopal. | |
| 9 | Total number of tree to be felled | No clearing of vegetation | | | |
| 10 | Maps depicting the Sanctuary and the diversion proposal included or not | Yes | | | |
| 11 | Recommendation of State Board for Wildlife The State Board for Wildlife has recommended the proposal in its meeting held on 11 th August 2015 with the condition that the adequate wildlife protection measures in the project as mentioned in agenda note. | | | | |
| 12 | Brief justification on the proposal as given by the applicant agency Diversion of 19.653 ha forest land for widening and up gradation of Betul-Sarni-Tekadhana- Junnardev Road (SH-43) passing through Satpura-Pench corridor in Chhindwara district, Madhya Pradesh. The proposed site is 5.26 km away from the Satpura-Pench Corridor. | | | | |
| 13 | Rare and endangered species found in the area The proposal indicates the presence of Bengal tiger, gaur, dhole, sloth bear, chousinga, black buck, etc. | | | olack | |
| 14 | Opinion of the Chief Wildlife Warden The proposed road is necessary for improving the connectivity between two districts. Field Director, Satpura Tiger Reserve has made a joint inspection and suggested underpasses, sign boards, speed breakers etc at those locations, which are being used by wildlife to cross from one side to another. Project proponents have agreed to these conditions to provide safe | | | | |

| | passage to wildlife at several places within the corridor. | | |
|----|--|--|--|
| | The Chief Wildlife Warden has recommended the proposal. | | |
| 15 | Comments of Ministry | | |
| 10 | NTCA has recommended the proposal with the following mitigation measures for strict | | |
| | compliance: | | |
| | (1) To have minimal impact on permeability to wild life after the widening up of road ways | | |
| | becomes functional, a minimum of 3 new underpasses each of 300 m length as proposed | | |
| | and extension of one bridge from 60 m to 300 m length as suggested should be | | |
| | constructed the design of which should meet the minimal underpass requirements of | | |
| | height and length. | | |
| | (2) The length of Major bridge number 1,2 &3 underpasses (as per the site appraisal report) | | |
| | should be a minimum of 300 m length with a minimal height of 5 m at the lowest point | | |
| | and existing bridge number 4 should be modified from 60 m to 300 m length with a | | |
| | minimal height of 5 m at the lowest point so as to permit movement of tiger and their prey across the proposed widening of SH-43. | | |
| | (3) Distance between proposed major bridges No 1 (MB 1 & MB 2) is about 400 m aerial | | |
| | distance at least within 100 m distance. | | |
| | (4) Fencing/tunneling in vicinity of under passes on either side should be done at least | | |
| | within 100 m distances. | | |
| | (5) Besides the dimensions and number of underpasses, there structure would need to have | | |
| | sound and light barriers to them effective wild life passage way. | | |
| | (6) Speed of the vehicles plying through the forest patches of the corridor need to be | | |
| | regulated to below 20 km per hour. | | |
| | (7) The Box culvet should be constructed at the four new locations (as per site appraisal $1/2$ | | |
| | report) with the minimum height of 5 m X 5 m width so that other than small animals, | | |
| | tiger abd leopard also may use this kind of box culvert structure.(8) Total 22 existing pipe canal passages have been identified which can be used by small | | |
| | mammals and herpeto fauna. However they are required with fences all along the road | | |
| | side. While upgradation of SH-43, these structures can be modified appropriately with | | |
| | pipe culvert, design of these is provided in the site appraisal report. | | |
| | (9) In places close to streams or wet area, the alignent of road should be made on retaining | | |
| | wall as these may also guide animals to use underpass or box/pipe culvert. | | |
| | (10) To minimize the risk of accident a Monkey ladder is needed at least in five potential | | |
| | sites of northern plains langur crossing places. | | |
| | (11) State High Way Authority shall provide signage at 100 m before exist and entry | | |
| | appoints of the forest patch of the corridor area. | | |
| | (12) State High Way Authority shall deposit Rs. 15 lakhs in the fund of Forest department | | |
| | for awareness raising among the public through developing a Nature Interpretation Centre. | | |
| | (13) A joint monitoring committee comprising State High Way Authority, NTCA, MP | | |
| | Forest Department, WII, etc., needs to be constituted for compliance monitoring of | | |
| | mitigation measures, the cost of which should be borne by State High Way Authority | | |
| | The Standing Committee may like to consider. | | |
| | | | |

| | | (5) | |
|----------------|---|--|--|
| 1 Na | me of the Proposal | Proposal for widening of existing Dahisar-Surat | |
| | - | Section from 4 lane to 6 lane between K.M. | |
| | | 497.400 to K.M.498.900 along NH-8 in the State of | |
| | | Maharashtra. The area required for the project is | |
| | | outside the Sanjay Gandhi National Park, Borivali. | |
| | me of the protected Area | Sanjay Gandhi National Park | |
| | volved | Tungareshwar Wildlife Sanctuary | |
| | e No. | 6-17/2017 WL | |
| | me of the State | Maharashtra | |
| | hether proposal is sub- lice | Not sub-judice | |
| 6 Ar | ea of the protected area | Sanjay Gandhi National Park-103.68 km ² | |
| | - | Tungareshwar Wildlife Sanctuary-95.24 sq.km | |
| 7(a) Ar | ea proposed for | 4.5454 Ha, the area required for the project is | |
| div | version/Denotification | outside the Sanjay Gandhi National Park, Borivali. | |
| 7(b) Ar | ea so far diverted from the | - | |
| | otected area(s) | | |
| | me of the applicant agency | National Highways Authority of India (MoRT&H) | |
| 9 To fel | tal number of tree to be led | Not mentioned in the proposal | |
| 10 M a | aps depicting the Sanctuary | Yes | |
| an | d the diversion proposal | | |
| | cluded or not | | |
| 11 Re | Recommendation of State Board for Wildlife | | |
| | | at the Hon'ble Chief Minister of Maharashtra, who is | |
| | | I for Wildlife, has accorded approval to this project. | |
| | 11 1 0 | will be ratified in the ensuing meeting of SBWL, | |
| | aharashtra. | | |
| | • | al as given by the applicant agency | |
| | | tarts from Surat in Gujarat State and ends at Dahisar | |
| | | aharashtra State from Km.263.000 to Km.502.000 on | |
| | | NH-8. The project corridor links the industrial cities Vapi and Mumbai. The rapid industrial development | |
| | | gion will eventually lead to higher traffic volume for | |
| | | a central spine and therefore needs augmentation of | |
| | bre carriageways. | t central spine and therefore needs augmentation of | |
| | • | India has taken up the Six Lanning of important | |
| | • • • | er NHDP, Phase V programme. The Surat-Dahisar | |
| | | m) of NH-8 is one of the important routes and this | |
| | | Gandhi NP area between 497.400 km to 498.900 km | |
| | | ashtra and it is not feasible to avoid them. | |
| | Rare and endangered species found in the area | | |
| 13 Ra | ne and chuangered species to | | |
| | e i | ence of leopard, jungle cat, rusty spotted cat, small | |

| | deer, sambar, spotted deer, crested porcupine and about 38 species of reptiles of which | | |
|----|--|--|--|
| | Indian rock python, common monitor and ndian marsh crocodile are the endangered | | |
| | species. | | |
| 14 | Opinion of the Chief Wildlife Warden | | |
| | The project falls in the notified ESZ of Sanjay Gandhi National Park, Borivali. The proposal is to widen the existing four lane road to six lane which will remove the bottle neck existing at present since, the road on either end has already been widened to six lane. The Chief Wildlife Warden has recommended the proposal with the following conditions: 1) The project proponent assures and abides to comply the conditions laid down by GOI, MoEF (IA) Division for Environment Clearance. 2) The ease the traffic the proposal is recommended with the condition that widening is restricted to R.O.W. (area currently in possession of NHAI) and does not extend to adjoining forest area of Sanjay Gandhi National Park, Borivali. 3) Compound wall will be constructed on both side of the road in Survey No.217 of | | |
| | Sanjay Gandhi National Park by NHAI (approx. 200 meters). 4) The project proponent shall construct the protection wall along the boundary of Sanjay Gandhi National Park, Borivali where it has not been constructed and along the length of the road to be strengthening or where broadening of the road is proposed by the proponent. In the hillock portion of the proposed road gabion structure shall be constructed by the project proponent so as to protect the soil from landslides etc. 5) The project proponent will deposit an amount of 2% cost of the length which is passing through ESZ of Sanjay Gandhi NP, Borivali with Chief Conservator of Forest & Director, Sanjay Gandhi NP, Borivali for habitat development, protection and conservation of Sanjay Gandhi NP, Borivali and Tungareshwar Wildlife | | |
| | Sanctuary in accordance with the approved management plan. | | |
| 15 | Comments of Ministry | | |
| | The Standing Committee may like to take a view on the proposal. | | |

| | | (6) |
|--------------|--|--|
| 1. | Name of the Proposal | Proposal for construction of barrage (civil works) for |
| | | Kanhan River Project across Kanhan River at Kochi |
| | | village in Tq. Saoner, Dist Nagpur, Maharashtra. The |
| | | proposed site is 8 km away from the boundary of |
| | | Mansingdeo Wildlife Sanctuary. |
| 2. | Name of the protected Area | Mansingdeo Wildlife Sanctuary |
| | involved | |
| 3. | File No. | 6-180/2016 WL |
| 4. | Name of the State | Maharashtra |
| 5. | Whether proposal is sub-judice | Not sub-judice |
| 6. | Area of the protected area | 182.59 km^2 |
| 7(a). | Area proposed for | Nil, the proposed site is 8 km away from the boundary |
| | diversion/Denotification | of Mansingdeo Wildlife Sanctuary. 51.00 ha forest |
| | | land of Maharashtra & 21.00 ha forest land of Madhya |
| | | Pradesh; total 72.00 ha. Forest land is involved but |
| | | forest land is not part of sanctuary/National Park. |
| 7(b). | Area so far diverted from the | Nil |
| | protected area(s) | |
| 8. | Name of the applicant agency | Executive Engineer, Irrigation Project Division, |
| | | Wainganga Nagar Ajani, Nagpur. Water Resources |
| | | Department, Maharashtra. |
| 9. | Total number of tree to be felled | No clearing of vegetation is required. |
| 10. | Maps depicting the Sanctuary Map is enclosed | |
| | and the diversion proposal | |
| | included or not | |
| 11 | Recommendation of State Board for Wildlife | |
| | | ommended the proposal in its meeting held on 22 nd June |
| | | project agency will deposit 2% amount of the total |
| | 1 0 | e protection and development of wildlife & its habitat |
| | | tion Foundation and other conditions laid down by the |
| 10 | Chief Wildlife Warden. | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
| 12. | Brief justification on the proposal | |
| | - | ting from high lands of Chhindwara district near village |
| | | ows down to Maharashtra from the hilly areas of |
| | | dependent on this river as one of the major source of |
| | | I. On account of interstate problems of sharing its water, |
| | • | antifying the availability of water as agreeable to both |
| | | nd submergence problem in Madhya Pradesh, the river |
| | could not be harnessed by any of the | |
| | | 60 ha area, 15.00 mm ³ water for expansion of Koradi |
| | Thermal Power station & 5.39 mm ³ | water for drinking purpose. |

| 13. | Rare and endangered species found in the area |
|-----|--|
| | The proposal indicates the presence of tiger, leopard, bison, sambar, cheetal, sloth bear, |
| | jackal, etc. |
| 14. | Opinion of the Chief Wildlife Warden |
| | The Chief Wildlife Warden has recommended the proposal with the condition that the |
| | project proponent will provide 2% of the project cost which shall be deposited with Chief |
| | Conservator of Forest & Field Director, Pench Tiger Reserve, Nagpur (Pench Tiger |
| | Conservation Foundation) for habitat development, protection and community upliftment in |
| | buffer zone villages, Eco-development & wildlife conservation activities of Pench Tiger |
| | Reserve. |
| 15. | Comments of Ministry |
| | 1) The total submergence area of the project is 1319.50 ha. out of this area 51.00 ha forest |
| | land in M.S. and 21.00 ha of forest land in M.P. is affected due to this project. |
| | 2) The MoEF, GOI has accorded conditional sanction for this diversion of 51+21=72.00 ha |
| | of forest land vide letter no.FN8-67/2009/FC dated 9 th December 2010. |
| | 3) The TOR for Environmental Clearance is approved by MoEF, GOI vide letter no.J- |
| | 12011/15/2008 dated 26 th June 2009. |
| | The Standing Committee may like to take a view on the proposal. |

| | | (7) |
|------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 1. | Name of the Proposal | Proposal for setting up retail outlet proposed by Indian Oil |
| | | Corporation, Bareilly Division, Bareilly, at private land |
| | | Khasara No.248 and 249 village Kripanathpur Tehsil |
| | | Dhanaura, Dist. JP Nagar on 141 km SH No-51 Badaun- Bilsi-Bijnor Road, within ESZ from Hastinapur WLS. |
| 2 | Name of the protected Area | Hastinapur Wildlife Sanctuary |
| Ζ | Name of the protected Area involved | Hastinapur whome Sanctuary |
| 3 | File No. | 6-144/2016 WL |
| 4 | Name of the state | Uttar Pradesh |
| 5 | Whether proposal is sub- | Not sub-judice |
| | judice | |
| 6 | Area of the protected area | 2079.00 km^2 |
| 7(a) | Area proposed for | The project is proposed outside the boundary of Hastinapur |
| | diversion/Denotification | Wildlife Sanctuary and protected forest land 0.935 ha is |
| | | involved. |
| 7(b) | Area so far diverted from | Nil |
| | the protected area(s) | |
| 8 | Name of the applicant | Indian Oil Corporation Ltd. |
| 0 | agency | |
| 9 | Total number of tree to be felled | No clearing of vegetation is required. |
| 10 | Maps depicting the | Yes |
| | Sanctuary and the | |
| | diversion proposal included | |
| | or not | |
| 11 | Recommendation of State Bo | |
| | 2015. | as recommended the proposal in its meeting held on 26 th May |
| 12 | | posal as given by the applicant agency |
| 12 | | outlet proposed by Indian Oil Corporation, Bareilly division |
| | | ed outside the boundary of Hastinapur Wildlife Sanctuary and |
| | protected forest land 0.935 has | · · · |
| 13 | Rare and endangered species | |
| | | stinapur Wildlife Sanctuary are antelope, Sambhar, Cheetal, |
| | - | ld cat, different types of birds, etc |
| 14 | Opinion of the Chief Wildlife | |
| | - | as recommended the proposal with the following mitigation |
| | measures & conditions suggest | |
| | | n measures for wildlife should be ensured as per standard |
| | practice in such cases. | - |
| | 2) Land shall not be used for | any purpose other than that specified in the proposal. |
| | | e concerned departments for establishing the project shall be |
| | complied with. | assed by the State Govt/Central Govt. and the directions |
| | 4) The instructions/orders p | assue by the state obvircential obvir, and the directions |

| | passed by Hon'ble High Court/Supreme Court from time to time regarding such projects shall be complied with. |
|----|--|
| | 5) User agency will ensure that the project personnel engaged in the project shall observe |
| | the provisions of the Wild Life (Protection) act, 1972 & Rules made thereafter. |
| | 6) Construction waste materials will not be thrown inside the sanctuary area or movement corridor of wildlife. |
| | 7) User Agency will take all precautions including technical measures to contain the noise and air pollution, protection from fire due to construction activities. |
| | 8) The project proponent shall obtain consent to establish and to operate from U.P. Pollution Control Board and effectively implement all the conditions stipulated therein. |
| | 9) Two GPS sets shall be provided for the survey and demarcation of the sanctuary boundaries of the Bijnor Forest Division. |
| | 10) No laborers' camp shall be established within the sanctuary/forest area or other sensitive area. |
| 15 | Comments of Ministry |
| | The Standing Committee may like to take a view on the proposal. |

| | | (8) | | | |
|-------------|---|---|--|--|--|
| 1. | Name of the Proposal | Proposal for the diversion of 0.47 ha of reserved forest land | | | |
| | _ | from Shivalik Elephant Reserve for construction of a new | | | |
| | | lane tunnel on NH-72 A (new 307) between km 33 and km | | | |
| | | 34 near Dat-Kali Temple in the Elephant Reserve Shivalik | | | |
| | | Forest Division Saharnpur. | | | |
| 2 | Name of the protected Area | Shivalik Elephant Reserve | | | |
| | involved | | | | |
| 3 | File No. | 6-145/2016 WL | | | |
| 4 | Name of the state | Uttar Pradesh | | | |
| 5 | Whether proposal is sub- | Not sub-judice | | | |
| | judice | | | | |
| 6 | Area of the protected area | 332.2946 km ² | | | |
| 7(a) | Area proposed for | 0.47 ha of reserved forest land | | | |
| | diversion/Denotification | | | | |
| 7(b) | Area so far diverted from | 25932.24 ha | | | |
| | the protected area(s) | | | | |
| 8 | Name of the applicant | National Highway, P.W.D Roorkee, Uttarakhand. | | | |
| | agency | | | | |
| 9 | Total number of tree to be | No clearing of vegetation is required. | | | |
| | felled | | | | |
| 10 | Maps depicting the | Yes | | | |
| | Sanctuary and the | | | | |
| | diversion proposal included | | | | |
| | or not | | | | |
| 11 | Recommendation of State Bo | | | | |
| | The State Board for Wildlife has recommended the proposal in its meeting held on 26 th May | | | | |
| | 2015. | | | | |
| 12 | | posal as given by the applicant agency | | | |
| | The project site is located on NH-72A in the state of Uttar Pradesh & Uttarakhand. The | | | | |
| | | and causes inconvenience to the commuters. This causes | | | |
| | | itat and adds to the air and sound pollution. The two-lanning | | | |
| | | tion and assist in free flow of traffic. | | | |
| 13 | Rare and endangered species | | | | |
| | * * | ence of elephant, goral, sambar, barking deer, leopard, etc | | | |
| 14 | Opinion of the Chief Wildlife | | | | |
| | | as recommended the proposal with the following mitigation | | | |
| | measures & conditions suggest | ed as under: | | | |
| | 1) Protection & mitigation m | easures for wildlife should be ensured as per guidelines of | | | |
| | Ministry of Environment & | z Forest (WL), Government of India. | | | |
| | • | oorkee, Uttarakhand should provide the funds for reduction in | | | |
| | | vation & eco-development activities of wildlife & habitat as | | | |
| | | of Environment & Forest, Government of India. | | | |
| | | for any purpose other than that specified in the proposal. | | | |

| | 4) Rules and regulation of the concerned departments for establishing the project shall be complied with. |
|----|---|
| | 5) The instructions/orders passed by the State Govt./Central Govt. and the directions passed by Hon'ble Courts from time to time regarding such project shall be complied with. |
| | 6) User agency will ensure that the project personnel engaged in the project shall observe the provisions of the Wildlife (Protection) Act, 1972 & Rules made thereafter. |
| | 7) The agency shall be responsible for any loss of flora & fauna in the surroundings. All possible measures should be taken to conserve the same. |
| | 8) Any condition stipulated by Standing Committee of NBWL, Government of India will be complied. |
| | 9) The user agency shall deposit 5% of the project cost for improvement of the wildlife habitat and conservation of the wildlife. |
| | 10. No laborers' camp shall be established within the area of the Elephant Reserve. |
| 15 | Comments of Ministry |
| 10 | NTCA has recommended the proposal with the following mitigation measures: |
| | 1) The diversion of forest land should be permitted to construct the new tunnel since it is |
| | the only viable solution to decongest the traffic load on the current tunnel. |
| | 2) As the tunnel itself is a mitigatory measures, and provides a feasible overpass for |
| | wildlife movement, the construction of tunnel on the highways crossing between forest |
| | patches should be encouraged. |
| | 3) Plantation of trees and shrubs should be done along the edges of tunnel to buffer traffic |
| | noise disturbance. |
| | 4) Drilling of tunnel should be allowed only during the day. |
| | 5) The laborers settlement for the construction of tunnel should not be allowed in the forest. |
| | 6) No temporary or permanent settlement or construction of any buildings, shops should be |
| | allowed in both sides of tunnel openings. |
| | 7) All the construction materials and debris should be removed by project execution |
| | agency. |
| | In addition with mitigation measures suggested by the Chief Wildlife, Uttar Pradesh are as |
| | under; |
| | 1) Protection & mitigation measure for wildlife should be ensured as per guidelines of MoEF&CC. |
| | 2) User agency PWD (NH) Roorkee, Uttarakhand should provide the funds for reduction in |
| | negative impact for conservation and Eco-development activities of wildlife and habitat as per guidelines of MoEF&CC. |
| | 3) The land shall not be used for any purpose other than the specified in the proposal. |
| | 4) Rules and regulation of the concerned department for establishing the project shall be complied with. |
| | 5) The instruction /orders passed by the State Govt/Central Govet and the directions passed |
| | by the Hon'ble Courts from time to time regarding such project shall be complied with. |
| | 6) User agency will ensure that the project personnel engaged in the project shall observe |
| | the provisions of the Wildlife (Protection) Act 1972 and rules mode thereafter. |
| | 7) The agency shall be responsible for any loss of flora and fauna in the surrounding. All |

| possible measures should be taken to conserve the same. |
|---|
| 8) Any condition stipulated by SC of NBWL, GOI will be complied. |
| 9) Any user agency shall deposit 5% of the project cost for improvement of the wildlife |
| habitat and conservation of the wildlife. |
| 10) No laborers' camps shall be established within the area of the Elephant Reserve. |
| The Standing Committee may like to take a view on the proposal. |

| | | (9) | | |
|--------|---|--|--|--|
| 1 | Name of the Proposal | The proposal for extension /re-notification of ASAN Field | | |
| | | Firing Range for Gazette Notification from 01.01.2016 to | | |
| | | 31.12.2025. Established since 1987. | | |
| 2 | Name of the protected Area | Rajaji National Park | | |
| 2 | involved | C 5/2017 WI | | |
| 3 | File No. | 6-5/2017 WL | | |
| 4 5 | Name of the State | Uttar Pradesh | | |
| 3 | Whether proposal is sub- judice | Not sub-judice | | |
| 6 | Area of the protected area | 744.096 sq.km | | |
| 7(a) | Area proposed for | 25885.64ha | | |
| . (4) | diversion/Denotification | | | |
| 7(b) | Area so far diverted from the | Power Grid | | |
| | protected area(s) | 1) 46.60 ha (Deharadun-Bagpat Transmission line) | | |
| | | 2) 34.1826 ha (Deharadun-Abdulpur Transmission line) | | |
| | | Indian Army | | |
| | | 3) 25885.64 ha for firing practice. | | |
| | | Total: 25966.422 ha | | |
| 8 | Name of the applicant agency | Indian Army | | |
| 9 | Total number of tree to be | No clearing of vegetation is required. | | |
| 10 | felled Mana deniating the Sanatuary | Yes | | |
| 10 | Maps depicting the Sanctuary and the diversion proposal | 105 | | |
| | included or not | | | |
| 11 | Recommendation of State Board for Wildlife | | | |
| | The State Board for Wildlife has recommended the proposal in its 7 th meeting held on 17 th | | | |
| | August 2016 with conditions. | | | |
| 12 | Brief justification on the proposal as given by the applicant agency | | | |
| | Field Firing Range area is required for training for Army in the National interest. T | | | |
| | | otted on lease for five years with lease renewed regularly to | | |
| | | ng practice since 1994. As per Govt of India Gazette | | |
| | to Indian Army for firing practice | 7-2(1)-09 dt 4 th November 2010 the said range was allotted | | |
| 13 | Rare and endangered species for | | | |
| 15 | | umbar, barking deer, hog deer, nilgai, wild pigs, sloth bears, | | |
| | - | ow-throated marten, hyena, jackal, fox, etc. | | |
| 14 | Opinion of the Chief Wildlife V | | | |
| | - | ecommended the proposal with the following conditions: | | |
| | | easures for wildlife should be ensured as per guidelines of | | |
| | Government of India. | | | |
| | ii) User agency Indian Army sh | ould provide the funds for reduction in negative impact for | | |
| | | pment activities of wildlife and habitat as per guidelines of | | |
| | - | Forest Government of India. | | |
| | iii) Land shall not be used for an | y purpose other than that specified in the proposal. | | |

| | iv) Rules and regulation of the concerned departments for establishing the project shall be complied with. |
|----|--|
| | v) The instructions /orders passed by the State Government/Central Government and the directions passed by Hon'ble High Court / Hon'ble Supreme Court/National Green Tribunal from time to time regarding such project shall be complied with. vi) User agency will ensure that the project personnel engaged in the project shall observe the provisions of the Wildlife (Protection) Act 1972 and Rules made there under. |
| | vii) Construction waste materials shall not be thrown inside the forest area or movement corridor of the wildlife. |
| | viii) User agency will take all precautions including technical measures to contain the noise and air pollutions and protection from fire due to project activities. |
| | ix) The project proponent shall obtain consent to establish and to operate from U.P. Pollution Control Board and effectively implement all the conditions stipulated therein. |
| | x) The project proponent shall undertake plantation work by planting the native species in the area adjacent to project area/sanctuary for which necessary finance will be provided by the user agency. |
| | xi) Amount of Net Present Value (NPV) shall be paid by the user agency as per rules. |
| | xii) No labourers' camp shall be established in the forest area or other sensitive area without prior permission of competent authority. |
| 15 | Comments of Ministry |
| | The proposal for renewal of lease vides Gazette Notification has strategic importance. |
| | The Standing Committee may like to take a view on the proposal. |

| 1 | Name of the Propo | osal | Proposal f | or Survey & Exp | oration of Uranium over 83 |
|------|--|---------------|---|---|--|
| 1 | | Jour | | | n 2 blocks of 3 and 4 km ² in |
| | | | | | on, Nagarjuna Sagar and 76 |
| | | | | | of each] in Amarabad Tiger |
| | | | | | Directorate for Exploration |
| | | | | | Region, Telangana. |
| 2 | Name of the protection involved | cted Area | Amarabad | Tiger Reserve | |
| 3 | File No. | | 6-163/2016 | 5 WL | |
| 4 | Name of the State | | Telangana | | |
| 5 | Whether proposal judice | is sub- | Not sub-ju | dice | |
| 6 | Area of the protec | ted area | 2166.37 kr | | |
| 7(a) | Area propos | | | | anium. The proposed area of |
| | diversion/Denotifie | cation | 700 falls (ATR) | within ESZ of t | he Amrabad Tiger Reserve |
| 7(b) | Area so far diverted from the protected area(s) | | e 2 projects (| (20.76 ha) | |
| 8 | Name of the applicant agency | | Atomic Mi | Atomic Minerals Directorate for exploration and research, | |
| | | | Department of Atomic Energy. | | |
| 9 | Total number of tree to be felled | | No clearing | g of vegetation is r | equired. |
| 10 | Maps depicting the Sanctuary and the diversion proposal | | Yes | | |
| | | | | | |
| | included or not | | | | |
| 11 | Recommendation | | | | 4 |
| | | or Wildlife | has recomme | ended the proposa | l in its meeting held on 6 th |
| | December 2016. | | | | |
| 12 | Brief justification | | | | |
| | Proposal for Survey & Exploration of Uranium over 83 km ² [over an area of 7 km ² in blocks of 3 and 4 km ² in Nidgul RF of WLM division, Nagarjuna Sagar and 76 km ² in | | | | |
| | block of 38 km ² of each] in Amarabad Tiger | | | | |
| | | | | | ina. The proposed area of |
| | | | | | Details of the blocks are as |
| | follows: | stillouted in | + 010CK3 d3 d | epicted in Flate 2. | Details of the blocks are as |
| | _ | Block | Area | Locality |] |
| | | | $\frac{11 \text{ cu}}{38 \text{ km}^2}$ | Amrabad | 4 |
| | | | 38 km^2 | Udimilla | 1 |
| | | | 3 km^2 | Narayanpur | 1 |
| | | | | ✓ 1 | - |
| | | | 4 km^2 | Narayanpur | |
| | | Block 4 | 4 km ² 83 km ² | Narayanpur | - |

| | spotted deer, sambar, chousingha, etc. | | |
|----|--|--|--|
| 14 | Opinion of the Chief Wildlife Warden | | |
| | The Chief Wildlife Warden has recommended the proposal with the following conditions: | | |
| | i) Only existing Cart tracks, Roads, Foot Paths in the Forest Areas shall be utilized for | | |
| | movement of vehicles, men and machinery. | | |
| | ii) There shall be no felling of trees or lopping of branches. | | |
| | iii) The clearance of bush growth shall be avoided or kept to bare minimum. | | |
| | iv) All activities shall be confined to day time and no work shall be taken up after sunset. | | |
| | v) The concerned field staff shall invariable accompany the team from user agency during | | |
| | investigation. | | |
| 15 | Comments of Ministry | | |
| | NTCA comments are awaited. | | |
| | The Standing Committee may like to take a view on the proposal. | | |

| | | (11) | | | |
|------|---|---|--|--|--|
| 1 | Name of the Proposal | Proposal for Construction of Shipyard and Allied | | | |
| | _ | Facilities at Ship Building Center, Krishna Gate, Naval | | | |
| | | Basic, Visakhapatnam, Andhra Pradesh | | | |
| 2 | Name of the protected Area | Kambalakonda Wildlife Sanctuary | | | |
| | involved | | | | |
| 3 | File No. 6-6/2017 WL | | | | |
| 4 | Name of the State | | | | |
| 5 | Whether proposal is sub- | Not sub-judice | | | |
| | judice | | | | |
| 6 | Area of the protected area | 7139 ha | | | |
| 7(a) | Area proposed for | Nil. | | | |
| | diversion/Denotification | The proposed project site falls in ESZ of Kambalakonda | | | |
| | | Wildlife Sanctuary at a distance 7.59 km | | | |
| 7(b) | Area so far diverted from the | Nil | | | |
| | protected area(s) | | | | |
| 8 | Name of the applicant agency | M/s Ship Building Centre, Visakhaptanam | | | |
| 9 | Total number of tree to be | No clearing of vegetation is required. | | | |
| | felled | | | | |
| 10 | Maps depicting the | Yes | | | |
| | Sanctuary and the diversion | | | | |
| 1.1 | proposal included or not | | | | |
| 11 | Recommendation of State Boar | | | | |
| | It is mentioned in Part V of the proposal that recommendation of SBWL will be submitted | | | | |
| 12 | in due course. | all og given hv the ennligent ogener | | | |
| 12 | Brief justification on the proposal as given by the applicant agencyProposed project is required 5.1975 ha for construction of shipyard facilities at ShipBuilding Centre (SBC), Visakhapatnam. The proposed project is within the existing ShipBuilding Centre. | | | | |
| | Positive Impact | | | | |
| | This proposal is required for the classified operational component of the Defence Project carried out by the Defence Research and Development Organization (DRDO), Indian Navy as follows: 1) Pre-launch operational complex 2) Shore protection jetty | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | Shore protection jetty Technical building complex | | | | |
| | 4) Utility building complex | | | | |
| | | erate direct employment and indirect employment of 4000 | | | |
| | people due to export and import | | | | |
| | Negative Impact | · | | | |
| | 8 | in ESZ of Kambalakonda Wildlife Sanctuary at a distance | | | |
| | | in Part-III that there is no significant negative impact of the | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | ect Authority is taking care of dust pollution issue with | | | |

| | The proposal is outside the sanctuary about a distance of 7.59 km within the boundary of Shipyard, Visakhapatnam. |
|----|---|
| 14 | Opinion of the Chief Wildlife Warden |
| | The Chief Wildlife Warden has recommended the proposal with the condition to deposit |
| | 20.0 lakh of project fund for wildlife habitat protection and improvement of Kambalakonda |
| | Wildlife Sanctuary. Greening of the open spaces in the Shipyard area. |
| 15 | Comments of Ministry |
| | The Standing Committee may like to take a view on the proposal. |

| | | (12) |
|------|---|---|
| 1 | Name of the Proposal | Laying of underground 12.75" diameter steel pipeline for transportation of Naptha from Jaipur to Panipat Refinery of IOCL |
| 2 | Name of the protected Area involved | Within 10 km radius and ESZ of Nahargarh Sanctuary |
| 3 | File No. | 6-22/2017 WL |
| 4 | Name of the State | Rajasthan |
| 5 | Whether proposal is sub-judice | Not sub-judice |
| 6 | Area of the protected area | Not Available |
| 7(a) | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | |
| 7(b) | | |
| 8 | Name of the applicant agency | Indian Oil Corporation Limited (IOCL) |
| 9 | Total number of tree to be felled | No clearing of vegetation/trees is required. |
| 10 | Maps depicting the Sanctuary and the diversion proposal included or not | Yes |
| 11 | Recommendation of State Board fe | or Wildlife |
| | The State Board for Wildlife has recommended the proposal in its meeting held of 22.10.2016 subject to following conditions: 2% of the proportionate cost of the project within 10 km of the boundary of Nahargar sanctuary will be deposited by the user agency for wildlife conservation and mitigation works. 1) No work shall be done before sunrise and after sunset in the Protected Area (PA) 2) No material of any kind should be extracted from PA. 3) No tree shall be cut in the PA. 4) No labourers' camping within 550 mtrs of the PA boundary. 5) No blasting within 500 m of PA boundary. 6) Waste material generated should be disposed outside the PA 7) Hear agency and project percental shall complute WL PA 1072 | |
| | 7) User agency and project personnel shall comply to WLPA, 1972 Brief justification on the proposal as given by the applicant agency | |
| 12 | | as given by the applicant agency |
| 12 | Brief justification on the proposal Proposed underground pipeline of existing pipelines viz. SMPL (24" d within the same of RoW these existin SMPL (24" dia) was laid in 1978 v WLS was not declared. MPPL(22" dia) was laid in 1988-89 | 12.75" dia is unavoidable and will be laid parallel to lia) and Mundra Panipat Pipe Line-MPPL (22" dia) and ng two pipelines. when no FC Act was applicable and ESZ of Nahargarh during which ESZ of Nahargarh WLS was not declared. |
| 12 | Brief justification on the proposal Proposed underground pipeline of existing pipelines viz. SMPL (24" d within the same of RoW these existin SMPL (24" dia) was laid in 1978 w WLS was not declared. | 12.75" dia is unavoidable and will be laid parallel to lia) and Mundra Panipat Pipe Line-MPPL (22" dia) and ng two pipelines. when no FC Act was applicable and ESZ of Nahargarh during which ESZ of Nahargarh WLS was not declared. llable. |

| | no rare/endangered/unique species of floral found in the area. | |
|----|---|--|
| 14 | Opinion of the Chief Wildlife Warden | |
| | The Chief Wildlife Warden has recommended the proposal with the following conditions: | |
| | i) No tree cut during the work. | |
| | ii) No labourers' camping within 500 m from boundary of PA. | |
| | iii) No blasting within 500 m from the boundary of PA. | |
| 15 | Comments of Ministry | |
| | The Standing Committee may like to take a view on the proposal. | |

| | | (13) | |
|------|---|---|--|
| 1 | Name of the Proposal | Proposal for modernization of existing manufacturing unit for increase of clinker and cement production; expansion in existing mines up to 8 MTPA and | |
| | | installation of new power plant of 17.5 MW within | |
| | | existing owned complex of M/s Mangalam Cement, village Modak, Dist. Kota, Rajasthan. | |
| 2 | Name of the protected Area involved Mukundra National Park | | |
| 3 | File No. | 6-23/2017 WL | |
| 4 | Name of the State | Rajasthan | |
| 5 | Whether proposal is sub- judice | Not sub-judice | |
| 6 | Area of the protected area | 75999.462ha | |
| 7(a) | Area proposed for | Nil. (Proposed pipeline passing at a distance of 8.5 km | |
| 7(h) | diversion/Denotification Area so far diverted from the | from Mukundra Hills TR) 0.351 ha | |
| 7(b) | Area so far diverted from the protected area(s) | 0.551 lla | |
| 8 | Name of the applicant agency | M/s Mangalam Cement Ltd. | |
| 9 | Total number of tree to be felled | No clearing of vegetation is required. | |
| 10 | Maps depicting the | Yes | |
| | Sanctuary and the diversion | | |
| | proposal included or not | | |
| 11 | Recommendation of State Board for Wildlife The SBWL has recommended the proposal in its 9 th meeting held on 20 th October 2016. | | |
| 12 | | | |
| 12 | Brief justification on the proposal as given by the applicant agency The proposed modernization and expansion of cement factory is outside the TR at 8.5km from the boundary of TR. | | |
| 13 | Rare and endangered species f | ound in the area | |
| | It is noted that the presence of wolf, leopards, tiger, sloth bear, hyena, jackal, jungle cat, sambhar, nilgai, chausingha, chinkara and hare several species birds and reptiles. | | |
| 14 | Opinion of the Chief Wildlife V | | |
| | | recommended the proposal with the mitigation measures | |
| | to be followed by user agency. $1 \rightarrow 20\%$ of average option of a set of | the marie of within 101mm of the hourdary of Kumhalaarh | |
| | 1) 2% of proportionate cost of the project within 10km of the boundary of Kumbalga WLS will be deposited by the user agency in the account of Rajasthan Protect | | |
| | | (RPACS) for wildlife conservation and mitigation works. | |
| | 2) No work shall be done before | , j | |
| | · | ld be extracted from the Protected Area. | |
| | 4) No tree shall be cut during th | e work. | |
| | | p within 1km of the Protected Area. | |
| | | thin 1km of the Protected Area boundary. | |
| | | I should be disposed outside the sanctuary area. | |
| | 8) The project personnel will abide with the provisions of the Wildlife (Protection) Act | | |

| | 1972. | |
|----|---|--|
| | 9) Greenbelt should be created by the User Agency on the periphery of the project area. | |
| | 10) Water harvesting structure for utilizing rain water and recharging of water should be | |
| | constructed by user agency for the project area. | |
| 15 | Comments of Ministry | |
| | The proposed expansion and modernization of cement factory situated at 8.5 km from the | |
| | boundary of Mukundra Hill NP. | |
| | The ESZ proposal of Mukundra Hills TR is yet to be received in the Ministry. | |
| | The Standing Committee may like to take a view on the proposal. | |

| | | (14) | |
|------|--|---|--|
| 1 | Name of the Proposal | Barmer-Pali Pipeline Project for 'Laying 18''dia natural gas pipeline originate from CAIRN's Rageswari Terminal near village Guda Malani, Tehsil/District Barmer and terminated at village Shivtalav, Tehsil Bali, | |
| 2 | Name of the protected Area | District Pali (connecting GIGL's MBPL mainline).' Kumbhalgarh Wildlife Sanctuary | |
| | involved | | |
| 3 | File No. | 6-24/2017 WL | |
| 4 | Name of the State | Rajasthan | |
| 5 | Whether proposal is sub- judiceNot sub-judice | | |
| 6 | Area of the protected area | 578 km ² | |
| 7(a) | Areaproposedfordiversion/Denotification | Nil. (Proposed pipeline passing at a distance of 5.05 km from the boundary of Wildlife Sanctuary) | |
| 7(b) | Area so far diverted from the protected area(s) | Nil | |
| 8 | Name of the applicant agency | Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Department, Govt. of Rajasthan | |
| 9 | Total number of tree to be felled | No clearing of vegetation is required. | |
| 10 | Maps depicting the | Yes | |
| | Sanctuary and the diversion | | |
| | proposal included or not | | |
| 11 | Recommendation of State Board for Wildlife The SBWL has recommended the proposal in its 9 th meeting held on 20 th October 2016. | | |
| 12 | Brief justification on the proposal as given by the applicant agency To meet the requirement of various parts of Rajasthan, Haryana, Punjab and Jammu & Kashmir, GIGL has proposed an approx. 1610 km underground natural gas pipeline network from Mehasana in Gujarat State to Bhatinda in Punjab State (MBPL trunk line). The mainline of 36"dia. Natural gas Mehasana-Bhatinda cross country pipeline passing through the ESZ of Kumbalgarh WLS and Todgarh Raoli WLS was recommend by the SC NBWL in its 31st meeting. Barmer-Pali pipeline project is proposed to enhance the capacity of original Mehasana-Bhatinda Natural gas pipeline network as a part of under Regulation of 12(1) of the PNGRB Regulation 2008. Accordingly, GIGL proposes for laying 18"dia. Natural gas pipeline originate from CAIRN's Rageswari Terminal near village Guda Malani, Tehsil/District Barmer and terminated at village Shivtalav, Tehsil Bali, District Pali (connecting GIGL's MBPL mainline). The pipeline shall be laid at a depth of 1.2 mtr below natural ground level. | | |
| 13 | Rare and endangered species f | ound in the area | |
| | | of wolf, leopards, sloth bear, hyena, jackal, jungle cat, | |
| | sambhar, nilgai, chausingha, chi | nkara and hare several species birds and reptiles. | |
| 14 | Opinion of the Chief Wildlife | Warden | |

| | The Chief Wildlife Warden has recommended the proposal with the mitigation measures | | |
|----|---|--|--|
| | to be followed by user agency. | | |
| | 1) 2% of proportionate cost of the project within 10km of the boundary of Kumbalgarh | | |
| | WLS will be deposited by the user agency in the account of Rajasthan Protected | | |
| | Areas Conservation Society (RPACS) for wildlife conservation and mitigation works. | | |
| | 2) No work shall be done before sunrise and after sunset. | | |
| | 3) No material of any kind should be extracted from the Protected Area. | | |
| | 4) No tree shall be cut during the work. | | |
| | 5) There shall be no labour camp within 1km of the Protected Area. | | |
| | 6) There shall be no blasting within 1km of the Protected Area boundary. | | |
| | 7) The waste material generated should be disposed outside the sanctuary area. | | |
| | 8) The project personnel will abide with the provisions of the Wildlife (Protection) Act, | | |
| | 1972. | | |
| | 9) Only underground pipeline will be allowed. | | |
| 15 | Comments of Ministry | | |
| | The proposed 18" dia natural gas pipeline is connecting pipeline to the main 36" dia | | |
| | natural gas pipeline from oil and gas field Rageswari in Barmer District of Rajasthan. | | |
| | The Standing Committee may like to take a view on the proposal. | | |

| | 1 | (15) |
|------|--|---|
| 1 | Name of the Proposal | Construction of new dry dock facility at Cochin Shipyard |
| | | Ltd. within the existing premises Ernakulam, Kerala. |
| 2 | Name of the protected Area | Mangalavanam Bird Sanctuary |
| | involved | |
| 3 | File No. | 6-26/2017 WL |
| 4 | Name of the State Kerala | |
| 5 | Whether proposal is sub- judice | Not mentioned in the proposal |
| 6 | Area of the protected area | 0.0274 Sq. Km |
| 7(a) | Area proposed for | Nil, the proposed site is 3.3 km away from the |
| | diversion/Denotification | Mangalavanam Bird Sanctuary |
| 7(b) | Area so far diverted from the | Not mentioned in the proposal |
| | protected area(s) | |
| 8 | Name of the applicant agency | M/s Cochin Shipyard Ltd |
| 9 | Total number of tree to be felled | Not mentioned in the proposal. |
| 10 | Maps depicting the Sanctuary | Yes |
| | and the diversion proposal | |
| | included or not | |
| 11 | Recommendation of State Boar | d for Wildlife |
| | The State Board for Wildlife reco | ommendation has not been enclosed. |
| 12 | Brief justification on the proposal as given by the applicant agency Cochin Shipyard Ltd. (CSL) proposes to construct a new dry dock of size of 320x75x13 m to handle repair/building activities of large vessels within the existing premises. The existing two dry docks having sizes of 270X45x12m and 255 X 43 X 9 m respectively. CSL is already having two dry docks of 255 and 270 M length and 44 M width for building and repair of Ships. However, very large ships like Capesize Bulk carriers & General cargo ships, Aframax & Suezmax tankers, Panamax & Post Panamax type container ships, LNG carriers, Rigs and higher versions of Aircraft carriers could not be accommodated in the above dry dock. Therefore we are planning to construct a new dry dock of size 320x75x13M within the existing shipyard premises for capacity creation for the above vessels and further expanding business activities. With the thrust of the Government's Make in India policy the proposed new Dry Dock would facilitate employment generation and growth of manufacturing sector in the country. | |
| 13 | Rare and endangered species for | |
| | The Mangalavanam Bird Sanctuary is a mangrove swamps and are common roosting places for the birds. Mangalavanam reportedly also supports 30 species of butterflies, four species of dragonflies, two species of damselflies, two species of amphibians, six species of mammals and four species of reptiles and otter etc. | |
| | of dragonflies, two species of | damselflies, two species of amphibians, six species of |
| 14 | of dragonflies, two species of | damselflies, two species of amphibians, six species of tiles and otter etc. |
| 14 | of dragonflies, two species of mammals and four species of rep Opinion of the Chief Wildlife V The Chief Wildlife Warden has <i>dock in a non-forestland fully ov</i> <i>3.3 km away from the proposed p</i> | damselflies, two species of amphibians, six species of tiles and otter etc. |

| | Sanctuary. So this project will not remove/destruct or damage habitat of any wildlife and no additional impact is expected on wildlife in any area. The site is away from the proposed ESZ of Mangalavanom bird Sanctuary". | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| | The Chief Wildlife Warden has recommended the proposal. | | |
| 15 | Comments of Ministry | | |
| (1) Proposal was processed online. SBWL minutes are not enclosed. The State forwarded the application to processing authority of this Ministry. (2) The proposal with respect to declaration of Eco-Sensitive Zone around Mang Sanctuary, was received in Ministry in 2013 and after comments of Wildlife In India, certain additional details were sought. The additional information was rette Wildlife Division in December 2016 and proposal was scrutinized for forw RE (ESZ) Division, MoEF&CC. However, in view of deficiencies in certain documentation of the proposal, the CWLW, Kerala has been requested for for the same which is awaited. The Standing Committee may like to take a view on the proposal. | | | |

41.4.3 Additional Agenda Items

List of proposals within/outside the protected areas. Fact sheets are at Annexure 41.4.3 (Pg No.

70 – 73)

| S.No | State | F.No. | Subject |
|------|-------------|---------------|---|
| 1 | Uttarakhand | 6-30/2017 WL | Setting up an Eco-tourism facility in village Binsar, M. Joljivi Tehsil, District Almora (inside Binsar Wildlife Sanctuary), Uttarakhand (Page No. 72). |
| 2 | Uttarakhand | 6-174/2016 WL | Proposal for extraction/collection of Sand/Bajri/boulder mine at village-Nawanbgarh, Tehsil-Vikas Nagar of Dehradun District and Uttarakhand State cover 1.913 ha area in respect of Asan Wetland Conservation, Uttarakhand (Page No. 73). |
| 3 | Rajasthan | 6-161/2016 WL | Proposal for Rejuvenation of Amanishah Nallah including Area Development (Nahargarh Wildlife Sanctuary) in Rajasthan. The proposed site is inside and outside Nahargarh Wildlife Sanctuary (Page No. 74, 75). |
| 4 | Rajasthan | 6-172/2016 WL | Proposal for permission of existing state highway 30 Sawaimadhopur-Shivpuri Road from 82/700 to 93/390 km in Swamadhopur district; inside Ranthambhore Tiger Reserve and within 10 km from its boundary (Page No. 76, 77). |
| 5 | Telanagana | 6-189/2016 WL | Diversion of 0.117 ha of forest land in Bellampally and Mancherial Divisions for laying pipeline and construction of structures in Segment 22/7 (Vemanapally) for providing safe drinking water under Telangana Drinking Water Supply Project (Page No. 78 , 79). |
| 6 | Telangana | 6-11/2017 WL | Diversion of 2.643 ha (0.22+2.421) of forest land in Kagaznagar and Bellampally divisions erstwhile Adilabad District presently in Komarambheem (Asifabad) and Mancherial districts for laying of pipeline in segment -22/5 (Dahegoan) under Telangana Drinking Water Supply Project in favour of Superintending Engineer, TDWSP (RWS&S) Circle, Nirmal, Telangana (Page No. 80, 81). |

| | (1) | | |
|------|--|--|--|
| 1 | Name of the Proposal | Setting up an Eco-tourism facility in village Binsar, | |
| | | M. Joljivi Tehsil, District Almora (inside Binsar | |
| | | Wildlife Sanctuary), Uttarakhand | |
| 2 | Name of the protected Area | Binsar Wildlife Sanctuary | |
| | involved | | |
| 3 | File No. | 6-30/2017 WL | |
| 4 | Name of the State | Uttarakhand | |
| 5 | Whether proposal is sub- judice | Not mentioned in the proposal | |
| 6 | Area of the protected area | 47.04 sq km | |
| 7(a) | Areaproposedfor1.819 ha private landdiversion/Denotification | | |
| 7(b) | | | |
| 8 | Name of the applicant agency | Spearhead Adventure Services Private Limited. | |
| 9 | Total number of tree to be felled | Proposal indicates that no clearing of vegetation is required. | |
| 10 | Maps depicting the | Yes | |
| | Sanctuary and the diversion | | |
| | proposal included or not | | |
| 11 | Recommendation of State Board for Wildlife The State Board for Wildlife has recommended the proposal in its meeting held on 9 th December 2016. | | |
| 12 | Brief justification on the proposal as given by the applicant agency The said ecotourism facility is merely adding three four pre fabricated structures as living spaces and is being proposed within the said private land where either there are pre existing structures or on bare land with no vegetation. This would have no impact on any wildlife even within the private enclave. It is important to add that the electricity requirement as well as the water requirement would be totally met by solar power and water harvesting structures by augmenting the current facilities. | | |
| 13 | Rare and endangered species f | ound in the area | |
| | The species found in the sanctuary are leopard, himalayan goral, chital musk deer, jungle cat, wild boar, black bear, red fox, gray langur, rhesus macaque, red giant flying squirrel and Indian muntjac, etc. | | |
| 14 | Opinion of the Chief Wildlife Warden Recommendation of the Chief Wildlife Warden is not mentioned in the proposal (part IV is not enclosed). | | |
| 15 | Comments of Ministry The Standing Committee may like to take a view on the proposal. | | |

| | | (2) | |
|------|---|---|--|
| 1 | Name of the Proposal | Proposal for extraction/collection of Sand/Bajri/boulder mine at village- Nawanbgarh, Tehsil-Vikas Nagar of Dehradun District and Uttarakhand State cover 1.913 ha | |
| | area in respect of Asan Wetland Conservation, Uttarakhand | | |
| 2 | Name of the protected AreaAsan Wetland Conservation Reserveinvolved | | |
| 3 | File No. 6-174/2016 WL | | |
| 4 | Name of the State | Uttarakhand | |
| 5 | Whether proposal is sub-judice | Not sub-judice | |
| 6 | Area of the protected area | 4.444 Sq. Km. | |
| 7(a) | Area proposed for | Nil, the proposed site is 7.80 km away from | |
| | diversion/Denotification | Asan Wetland Conservation Reserve. | |
| 7(b) | Area so far diverted from the | Nil | |
| | protected area(s) | | |
| 8 | Name of the applicant agencyShri Jagbir Singh, village Dharmawala Vikas | | |
| 9 | Total number of tree to be felled | No clearing of vegetation is required | |
| 10 | Maps depicting the Sanctuary Map is enclosed | | |
| | and the diversion proposal | | |
| | included or not | | |
| 11 | Recommendation of State Board for Wildlife | | |
| | The State Board for Wildlife has recommended the proposal in its meeting held on 23^{rd} February 2016. | | |
| 12 | Brief justification on the proposal as given by the applicant agency | | |
| | The project is a river bed mining project on Yamuna River. The mining area is | | |
| | located in village Nawab Garh, Vikasnagar tehsil of Dehradun district and | | |
| | Uttarakhand state over an area of 1.913 ha. The lease area is sanctioned to Shri | | |
| | Jagbir Singh, village Dharmawala Vikas Nagar, Dehradun, Uttarakhand & Shri | | |
| 13 | Jitendra Dhawan. Rare and endangered species fou | nd in the area | |
| 10 | | Conservation Reserve are ruddy shelduck, red | |
| | - | ard, bar headed goose, common coot and Indian | |
| | moorhen, etc. | , | |
| 14 | Opinion of the Chief Wildlife Wa | urden | |
| | - | recommended the proposal with the following | |
| | conditions: | | |
| | (1) No mining activity in the rainy | | |
| | (2) No mining activity in the nigh | | |
| | (3) Machines should not be allow | - | |
| 1 = | (4) Only manual mining should be | e allowed. | |
| 15 | Comments of Ministry | | |
| | The Standing Committee may like to take a view on the proposal. | | |

| 1 Name of the Proposal Proposal for Rejuvenation of Amanishah Nal including Area Development (Nahargarh Wild Sanctuary) in Rajasthan. The proposed site is inside a outside Nahargarh Wildlife Sanctuary. 2 Name of the protected Area involved Nahargarh Wildlife Sanctuary 3 File No. 6-161/2016 WL 4 Name of the State Rajasthan 5 Whether proposal is sub judice Not sub-judice 6 Area of the protected area 52.40 Sq Km 7(a) Area proposed for diversion/Denotification Total area of the project is 382.65 ha (i.e., project a under protected area (Nahargarh Wildlife Sanctuary) 38.25 ha and project area under protected and n protected area(s) 8 Name of the applicant agency Jaipur Development Authority 9 Total number of tree to be felled Not mentioned in the proposal |
|--|
| Sanctuary) in Rajasthan. The proposed site is inside a outside Nahargarh Wildlife Sanctuary.2Name of the protected Area involvedNahargarh Wildlife Sanctuary3File No.6-161/2016 WL4Name of the StateRajasthan5Whether proposal is sub judiceNot sub-judice6Area of the protected area52.40 Sq Km7(a)Area proposed diversion/DenotificationTotal area of the project is 382.65 ha (i.e., project a under protected area (Nahargarh Wildlife Sanctuary) 38.25 ha and project area under protected and n protected area 344.40 ha).7(b)Area so far diverted from the protected area(s)Nil8Name of the applicant agencyJaipur Development Authority9Total number of tree to beNot mentioned in the proposal |
| 2 Name of the protected Area involved Nahargarh Wildlife Sanctuary 3 File No. 6-161/2016 WL 4 Name of the State Rajasthan 5 Whether proposal is sub judice Not sub-judice 6 Area of the protected area 52.40 Sq Km 7(a) Area proposed for diversion/Denotification Total area of the project is 382.65 ha (i.e., project a under protected area (Nahargarh Wildlife Sanctuary) 38.25 ha and project area under protected and n protected area 344.40 ha). 7(b) Area so far diverted from the protected area(s) Nil 8 Name of the applicant agency Jaipur Development Authority 9 Total number of tree to be Not mentioned in the proposal |
| 2 Name of the protected Area involved Nahargarh Wildlife Sanctuary 3 File No. 6-161/2016 WL 4 Name of the State Rajasthan 5 Whether proposal is sub judice Not sub-judice 6 Area of the protected area proposed for diversion/Denotification Total area of the project is 382.65 ha (i.e., project a under protected area (Nahargarh Wildlife Sanctuary) 38.25 ha and project area under protected and n protected area 344.40 ha). 7(b) Area so far diverted from the protected area(s) Nil 8 Name of the applicant agency Jaipur Development Authority 9 Total number of tree to be Not mentioned in the proposal |
| involved 6 3 File No. 6-161/2016 WL 4 Name of the State Rajasthan 5 Whether proposal is subjudice Not sub-judice 6 Area of the protected area 52.40 Sq Km 7(a) Area proposed for diversion/Denotification Total area of the project is 382.65 ha (i.e., project a under protected area (Nahargarh Wildlife Sanctuary) 38.25 ha and project area under protected and n protected area 344.40 ha). 7(b) Area so far diverted from the protected area(s) Nil 8 Name of the applicant agency Jaipur Development Authority 9 Total number of tree to be Not mentioned in the proposal |
| 3 File No. 6-161/2016 WL 4 Name of the State Rajasthan 5 Whether proposal is sub judice Not sub-judice 6 Area of the protected area 52.40 Sq Km 7(a) Area proposed for diversion/Denotification Total area of the project is 382.65 ha (i.e., project a under protected area (Nahargarh Wildlife Sanctuary) 38.25 ha and project area under protected and n protected area(s) 7(b) Area so far diverted from the protected area(s) 8 Name of the applicant agency 9 Total number of tree to be Not mentioned in the proposal |
| 4 Name of the State Rajasthan 5 Whether proposal is sub judice Not sub-judice 6 Area of the protected area 52.40 Sq Km 7(a) Area proposed for diversion/Denotification Total area of the project is 382.65 ha (i.e., project a under protected area (Nahargarh Wildlife Sanctuary) 38.25 ha and project area under protected and n protected area 344.40 ha). 7(b) Area so far diverted from the protected area(s) Nil 8 Name of the applicant agency Jaipur Development Authority 9 Total number of tree to be Not mentioned in the proposal |
| 5 Whether proposal is sub judice Not sub-judice 6 Area of the protected area 52.40 Sq Km 7(a) Area proposed for diversion/Denotification Total area of the project is 382.65 ha (i.e., project a under protected area (Nahargarh Wildlife Sanctuary) 38.25 ha and project area under protected and n protected area 344.40 ha). 7(b) Area so far diverted from the protected area(s) Nil 8 Name of the applicant agency Jaipur Development Authority 9 Total number of tree to be Not mentioned in the proposal |
| judicejudice6Area of the protected area52.40 Sq Km7(a)Area proposed for diversion/DenotificationTotal area of the project is 382.65 ha (i.e., project a under protected area (Nahargarh Wildlife Sanctuary) 38.25 ha and project area under protected and n protected area 344.40 ha).7(b)Area so far diverted from the protected area(s)Nil8Name of the applicant agencyJaipur Development Authority9Total number of tree to beNot mentioned in the proposal |
| 6 Area of the protected area 52.40 Sq Km 7(a) Area proposed for diversion/Denotification Total area of the project is 382.65 ha (i.e., project a under protected area (Nahargarh Wildlife Sanctuary) 38.25 ha and project area under protected and n protected area 344.40 ha). 7(b) Area so far diverted from the protected area(s) 8 Name of the applicant agency 9 Total number of tree to be |
| 7(a) Area proposed diversion/Denotification for diversion/Denotification Total area of the project is 382.65 ha (i.e., project a under protected area (Nahargarh Wildlife Sanctuary) 38.25 ha and project area under protected and n protected area 344.40 ha). 7(b) Area so far diverted from the protected area(s) Nil 8 Name of the applicant agency Jaipur Development Authority 9 Total number of tree to be Not mentioned in the proposal |
| diversion/Denotification under protected area (Nahargarh Wildlife Sanctuary) 38.25 ha and project area under protected and n protected area 344.40 ha). 7(b) Area so far diverted from the protected area(s) Nil 8 Name of the applicant agency Jaipur Development Authority 9 Total number of tree to be Not mentioned in the proposal |
| 38.25 ha and project area under protected and n protected area 344.40 ha). 7(b) Area so far diverted from the protected area(s) 8 Name of the applicant agency 9 Total number of tree to be Not mentioned in the proposal |
| Protected area 344.40 ha). 7(b) Area so far diverted from the protected area(s) Nil 8 Name of the applicant agency Jaipur Development Authority 9 Total number of tree to be Not mentioned in the proposal |
| 7(b) Area so far diverted from the protected area(s) Nil 8 Name of the applicant agency Jaipur Development Authority 9 Total number of tree to be Not mentioned in the proposal |
| the protected area(s) 8 Name of the applicant agency 9 Total number of tree to be Not mentioned in the proposal |
| 8 Name of the applicant agency Jaipur Development Authority 9 Total number of tree to be Not mentioned in the proposal |
| agency Image: Provide the second se |
| 9 Total number of tree to be Not mentioned in the proposal |
| 1 1 |
| felled |
| |
| 10Maps depicting theYes |
| Sanctuary and the diversion |
| proposal included or not |
| 11 Recommendation of State Board for Wildlife |
| The State Board for Wildlife has recommended the proposal in its meeting held on .12Brief justification on the proposal as given by the applicant agency |
| |
| Amanishah Nallah originates from the Western slopes of Amer hills. It flo |
| through the west side of Jaipur City from North to South. It collects storm water fr |
| Nahrika Nallah, Ambabari, major portion of walled city and newly developed areas |
| Jaipur through Ganda Nallah, Sanganer Town and Pratap Nagar area. The Ganda Nal |
| and Jawahar Nallah are major tributaries of Amanishah Nallah. The Nallah on its v |
| collects municipal water, sewage, storm water and industrial waste from surround |
| areas. The bed slope of Nallah is very deep which results in soil erosion. Total difference is always from 0 to 47.5 km is 134 mtr |
| is elevation from 0 to 47.5 km is 134 mtr. Total length of the Nallah from starting point to its confluence with Dhoond Rive |
| 47.5 km. Difference in elevation from Zero chainage to 47.5 km chainage is 134 |
| which gives a slope of 1 in 354.48 m which is quite an unstable slope. This steep slope |
| needs tobe stabilized by means of providing pucca drop structures at various suita |
| locations. |
| The proposed rejuvenation project shall solve the problems of floods during rat |
| encroachment along the Nallah side, growing of vegetables & commercial crop on |
| Nallah bed with polluted water & unchecked use of the banks and the bed of the wa |
| channel as garbage dumps. It shall ultimately improve the drainage system of the c |

| The project also includes land scaping and create Green strip along both sides of the | | |
|--|--|--|
| nallah. However in the initial stretch of the nallah which flows through Nahargarh | | |
| Wildlife Sanctuary and forest area. | | |
| Rare and endangered species found in the area | | |
| The species found in the sanctuary are panther, jungle cat, indian fox, striped hyaena, | | |
| jackal, blue bull, etc. | | |
| Opinion of the Chief Wildlife Warden | | |
| The Chief Wildlife Warden has recommended the proposal with the following conditions: | | |
| (1) No pucca construction involving cement concrete or stone masonry shall be done in the area, only water flow shall be channelized through site clearance & earth work in cutting & embankment in an average top width of 75 meters. (2) No tree shall be out during the work | | |
| (2) No tree shall be cut during the work.(3) There shall be no camping by labourers within 500 meters from Wildlife Sanctuary boundary. | | |
| (4) There shall be no blasting within 500 meters from Wildlife Sanctuary boundary. | | |
| (5) No material of any kind should be extracted from the sanctuary area.(6) Construction work will not be allowed in the night. | | |
| | | (7) The user agency will follow the provisions of Wildlife (protection) Act, 1972. |
| (8) 5% of the project cost works in the area of sanctuary shall be provided by user | | |
| agency for the development of the sanctuary in the account of Rajasthan Protected | | |
| Areas Conservation Society. | | |
| Comments of Ministry | | |
| The Standing Committee may like to take a view on the proposal. | | |
| | | |

| | | (4) |
|------|--|---|
| 1 | Name of the Proposal | Proposal for permission of existing state highway 30 Sawaimadhopur-Shivpuri Road from 82/700 to 93/390 km in Swamadhopur district; inside Ranthambhore Tiger Reserve and within 10 km from its boundary |
| 2 | Name of the protected Area involved | Ranthambhore Tiger Reserve |
| 3 | File No. | 6-172/2016 WL |
| 4 | Name of the State | Rajasthan |
| 5 | Whether proposal is sub- judice | Not sub-judice |
| 6 | Area of the protected area | 170022.05 sq. km |
| 7(a) | Area proposed for diversion/Denotification | 3.717 ha of forest land |
| 7(b) | Area so far diverted from the protected area(s) | 222.895 ha |
| 8 | Name of the applicant agency | PWD, Rajasthan |
| 9 | Total number of tree to be felled | No clearing of vegetation is required. |
| 10 | Maps depicting the | Yes |
| | Sanctuary and the diversion | |
| 11 | proposal included or not | 1.0 - 337/1111/0 |
| 11 | Recommendation of State Boa | e proposal in its meeting held on 20 th October 2016. |
| 12 | | |
| 12 | Brief justification on the proposal as given by the applicant agency (a) The road connects Distt. Head quarter to M.P border and Khandar Tehsil /SDO Head quarter. This is only reach from KM 82/700 to KM 93/390 of road which required widening from 3.75 mtr to 7.00 mtr. (b) Strengthening and widening is proposed from Sawai Madhopur City to Bodal. (c) Out of required 7.483ha land, 3.717ha land is required from critical TR habitat. | |
| 13 | Rare and endangered species f | |
| | | ence of tiger, panther, sloth bear, wild boar, cheetal, |
| | • | ninkara, hyena, jackal, python, ducks, teals, storks, |
| 1.4 | patridges, quails, etc. | X 7 1 |
| 14 | measures to be followed by use agency need to follow while exe(1) 2% of proportionate cost of Tiger Reserve & Sawaimans | as recommended the proposal with the mitigation or agency. Further it has been mentioned that the user cuting the project: the project the critical tiger habitat of Ranthambhore singh sanctuary and within 10 km of its boundary will |
| | | ncy in the deposited by the user agency in the account reas Conservation Society (RPACS) for wild life works. |

| | (2) Damage to the masonry stone wall fence constructed by Forest Department at | | |
|----|--|--|--|
| | places should be repaired by user agency | | |
| | (3) Speed breakers need to be constructed by user agency at various places as prescribed by local forest officers. | | |
| | (4) No work shall be done before sunrise and after sunset in the protected area. | | |
| | (5) No material of any kind should be extracted from the sanctuary area. | | |
| | (6) No tree shall be cut during the work in the protected area. | | |
| | (7) There will be no laborers' camping within 1 km from the sanctuary boundary | | |
| | (8) There will be no blasting within 1 km from sanctuary boundary | | |
| | (9) The waste material generated should be disposed outside the sanctuary area by the | | |
| | user agency. | | |
| | (10) Signages for control of traffic volumes, speed, sound, information about the | | |
| | animals in the area, etc should be erected. | | |
| | (11) The user agency will follow the provisions of wild life (Protection) Act 1972. | | |
| 15 | Comments of Ministry | | |
| | Site inspection report is awaited from NTCA in response to this Ministry's request. | | |
| | The Standing Committee may like to take a view on the proposal | | |

| | | (5) |
|---------------|---|---|
| 1 | Name of the Proposal | Proposal for diversion of 22.258 ha of forestland in Warangal division (13.965 ha RF+ 2.583 ha ESZ) and WLM division Warangal (5.710 ha) for laying of pipeline and construction of structures in segment 20/2 (Eturunagaram) for providing safe drinking water under Telangana in favour of Superintending Engineer, TDWSP (RWS&S) Circle, Warangal. |
| 2 | Name of the protected Area | Eturnagaram Wildlife Sanctuary |
| 2 | involved File No. | 6-188/2016 WL |
| 3 4 | Name of the State | |
| <u>4</u> 5 | Whether proposal is sub- | Telangana Not sub-judice |
| 5 | judice | Not sub-Judice |
| 6 | Area of the protected area | 302.1153 Sq. Km |
| 7(a) | Area proposed for | 22.258 ha in Warangal North |
| | diversion/Denotification | 13.965 ha Warangal north ESZ |
| | | 2.583 ha & Warangal WLM |
| | | 5.71 ha of forest land for laying of pipelines and |
| | | construction of other structures. |
| 7(b) | Area so far diverted from the protected area(s) | Nil |
| 8 | Name of the applicant agency | Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Department, |
| | | Telangana Drinking water supply project. |
| 9 | Total number of tree to be felled | No clearing of vegetation is required. |
| 10 | Maps depicting the Sanctuary and the diversion proposal included or not | Yes |
| 11 | Recommendation of State Boar The State Board for Wildlife has December 2016. | d for Wildlife s recommended the proposal in its meeting held on 6 th |
| 12 | December 2010. Brief justification on the proposal as given by the applicant agency This project "TELANGANA DRINKING WATER SUPPLY PROJECT for laying of pipelines and construction of other structures for providing safe drinking water to Mulug, Constituency, Warangal district segment 20/3-Eturnagaram" is designed to supply drinking water to gram Panchayats, Urban Municipalities and to meet the needs of industries through distribution pipelines and balancing reservoirs. The scheme envisages lifting (pumping) water from sources and distribution in an optimized manner without affecting wildlife habitat. | |
| 13 | Rare and endangered species for The proposal indicates the prese gaurs, spotted deer, jackal, ducks | nce of tiger, wild dogs, panthers, storks, foxes, hyena, |
| 14 | Opinion of the Chief Wildlife V | |
| | | |

| | The Chief Wildlife Warden has recommended the proposal with the following |
|----|---|
| | conditions: |
| | (i) The user agency shall provide financial assistance of Rs.32.00 lakh to Forest |
| | Department for setting up of one Animal Rescue Center at Eturunagaram Wildlife |
| | Sanctuary. |
| | (ii) The User Agency shall also provide Rs.16.00 lakh for drilling of (2) Nos bore |
| | wells and installation of (2) nos. Solar pump sets (2 Nos. @ 8.00 lakhs each-Total |
| | 16.00 Lakhs) in the protected area for providing drinking water to wild animals. |
| | (iii)Local Community should be involved to create of employment for them. |
| | (iv)Improvements to Environment Education Centre at Eturnagaram with better |
| | displays, models, education material at a cost of Rs.25.00 lakh. |
| | (v) Nature camp facilities with seating arrangement for visitors at a cost of 10.00 lakh. |
| | Interpretation hall of Rs.5.00 lakhs for Eco-tourism visitors facilitates. |
| 15 | Comments of Ministry |
| | The Standing Committee my like to take a view on the proposal |

| | | (6) | | |
|------|--|--|--|--|
| 1 | Name of the ProposalDiversion of 2.643 ha (0.22+2.421) of forest land in Kagaznagar and Bellampally divisions erstwhile Adilabad District presently in Komarambheem (Asifabad) and Mancherial districts for laying of pipeline in segment-22/5 (Dahegoan) under Telangana Drinking Water Supply Project in favour of Superintending Engineer, TDWSP (RWS&S) Circle, Nirmal, Telangana. | | | |
| 2 | Name of the protected Area involved | Kawal Tiger Reserve | | |
| 3 | File No. | 6-11/2017 WL | | |
| 4 | Name of the State | Telangana | | |
| 5 | Whether proposal is sub- judice | Not sub-judice | | |
| 6 | Area of the protected area | 2015.422 km ² | | |
| 7(a) | Areaproposedfordiversion/Denotification | 2.643 ha of forest land | | |
| 7(b) | Area so far diverted from the protected area(s) | Nil | | |
| 8 | Name of the applicant agency | Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Department, Govt. of Telangana | | |
| 9 | Total number of tree to be felled | No clearing of vegetation is required. | | |
| 10 | Maps depicting the Sanctuary and the diversion proposal included or not | Yes | | |
| 11 | Recommendation of State Board for Wildlife The SBWL has recommended the proposal in its meeting held on 6 th December 2016. | | | |
| 12 | Brief justification on the proposal as given by the applicant agency The proposal will integrate with existing and ongoing sustainable water supply schemes. This flag ship programme of Govt of Telangana, is planned to meet the water needs of commercial entities, industrial units, special economic zones etc. The proposal for laying pipeline within the TR is part of integrated water supply scheme of State Govt. of Telangana. This segment covers Dahegoan and parts of Bejjurmandals of Sirpur Assembly constituency to mitigate drinking water scarcity in summer for drought and fluorosis problem in the area. The surface water collected from infiltration well proposed to construct in Komarambeem dam (near Ada village) and be pumped to head works at Dhanora and finally to distribute the potable water. Rare and endangered species found in the area | | | |
| 1.5 | The proposal indicates the pres | sence of tiger, panther, leopard, cheetal, nilgai, gour, singha, sloth bear, several species birds and reptiles. | | |
| 14 | Opinion of the Chief Wildlife The Chief Wildlife Warden h | Warden nas recommended the proposal with the mitigation | | |

| | measures to be followed by user agency. Further it has been mentioned that the user | |
|----|---|--|
| | agency need to follow while executing the project: | |
| | (1) The user agency shall not damage or disturb the flora, fauna and the wild life | |
| | habitat | |
| | (2) The work should be executed manually during the day time only without the use of | |
| | machinery. | |
| | (3) The user agency shall provide water for filling up water holes at locations indicated | |
| | by the DFO for meeting the drinking water needs of wild life animals during | |
| | summer season. | |
| 15 | Comments of Ministry | |
| | The proposed pipe line passes through Kawal TR as part of integrated water supply | |
| | scheme. | |
| | The Standing Committee may like to take a view on the proposal. | |

Agenda Item No.5

ANY OTHER ITEM WITH THE PERMISSION OF THE CHAIR



Government of India Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change (Wildlife Division)

> 6th Floor, Vayu Wing Indira Paryavaran Bhawan Jor Bag Road, Aliganj New Delhi-110003

F.No.6-159/2016 WL(40th Meeting) Dated:**3**th February 2017

To All Members, Standing Committee of NBWL.

Sub: Minutes of 40th Meeting of Standing Committee of NBWL.

Sir/Madam,

Kindly find enclosed copy of the minutes of the 40th Meeting of the Standing Committee of National Board for Wildlife held on <u>3rd January 2017 at 11.00 AM in "Teesta", 1st Floor,</u> <u>Vayu Block, Indira Paryavaran Bhawan, Jor Bagh, New Delhi-110003</u> under the chairmanship of Hon'ble Minister of State (Independent Charge) for Environment, Forest and Climate Change.

Yours faithfully,

(Rajasekhar Ratti) Scientist 'C'/Deputy Director (WL)

Encl: As above

Distribution:

- 1. Secretary, MoEF & CC
- 2. Director General of Forests & Special Secretary, MoEF & CC.
- 3. Member Secretary, NTCA, New Delhi.
- 4. Additional Director General of Forests (FC), MoEF&CC.
- 5. Additional Director General of Forests (WL), MoEF&CC.
- 6. Director, Wildlife Institute of India, Dehradun.
- 7. Director, GEER Foundation, Gandhinagar, Gujarat.
- 8. Prof. R.Sukumar, Central for Ecological Sciences, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore.
- 9. Dr. H.S. Singh, Gandhi Nagar, Gujarat.
- 10. Pr. Secretary (Forests), Government of Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad.

Copy to:

- 1. PS to Hon'ble MOS (I/C) E&F.
- 2. PPS to DGF&SS, MoEF&CC.
- 3. PPS to Addl.DGF(WL) and Member Secretary, Standing Committee (NBWL).
- 4. PPS to IGF(WL)/PS to DIG(WL)/PS to JD(WL).

Minutes of 40th Meeting of the Standing Committee of National Board for Wildlife held on 3rd January 2017

The 40th Meeting of the Standing Committee of National Board for Wildlife (SC-NBWL) was held on 3rd January 2017 in the Ministry of Environment, Forests and Climate Change (MoEFCC), under the chairmanship of Hon'ble Minister of State (Independent Charge) for Environment, Forests and Climate Change. List of participants is at **Annexure I.**

Hon'ble Chairman welcomed all participants to the 39th meeting and asked the Member Secretary to initiate the discussions on the agenda items.

Agenda Item No. 1: Confirmation of the minutes of the 39th Meeting of Standing Committee of National Board for Wildlife held on 23rd August 2016.

The Member Secretary informed the Committee that the minutes of the 39thmeeting of the Standing Committee of NBWL held on 23rd August 2016, were circulated to all members of the Standing Committee on 19th September 2016. However, no comments were received. Accordingly, the minutes of 39th meeting were confirmed.

Agenda Item No. 2: Action Taken Report (ATR)

35.4.5.1 Proposal for boundary alteration of Kolleru Wild Life Sanctuary, Andhra Pradesh.

The member secretary briefed the committee on the proposal and mentioned that the same was discussed in the 35th and 37th meetings of SC NBWL. A Working Group comprising of member Prof R. Sukumar, representative of Wild Life Institute of India, nominee of Wild Life Division of the Ministry and a representative of the State Forest Department of Andhra Pradesh was constituted to visit the area, brainstorm on all aspects of the proposal and suggest viable options, including rationalization of boundaries of the sanctuary, for conservation of the wetland and the sanctuary while ensuring that no hardships are caused to the bona fide owners of the lands in the area. The group has submitted the report recently.

Dr. R. Sukumar, on behalf of the Group, informed that the group visited the sanctuary and the surrounding areas and interacted with the state government and representatives of civic communities. He mentioned during field visits, the working group received several representations requesting for reduction of contour for +5 ft to +3 ft and exemption of private lands from sanctuary. Several Environmentalists also represented not to entertain any request for reduction in the contour level for sanctuary boundary. He described the present physiographical status of Kolleru Lake and Kolleru Sanctuary and all relevant aspects of hydrology and drainage, catchment area, villages and population, notification of sanctuary, private and D-Patta lands, encroachments, settlements, livelihoods and migrations, Supreme Court's Judgement, Azeez Committee report and finally resolution of Andhra Pradesh State Assembly Resolution.

He opined that the lake conservation issue is extremely complex with a long history of questionable administrative and management decisions taken by successive state governments in erstwhile Andhra Pradesh. He expressed that delineation of the boundary of wetland based on contour level may not be practical over a period in view of dynamic change of contour levels due to erosion, siltation and aquatic weeds in profusion. A substantial area of ziroyati lands was included in the sanctuary falling inside +5ft contour level at the time of notification, especially in the north-eastern part of the sanctuary. He reiterated the Azeez Committee report on discrepancies in the boundary and differences between revenue and forest records. The working group noted that these issues have neither been examined nor the action taken on recommendations of Azeez Committee by the Andhra Pradesh Government on resurvey of the boundaries of the sanctuary, water flows, all important bird areas, sources of pollution and present land use including ziroyati, D-Patta lands and encroachments. It has been noticed that uncontrolled illegal aquafarms have come up and socio-economic impact on livelihood of local farmers due to influx of entrepreneurs for both ziroyati and D-Patta lands has complicated the situation.

Further, he described the recommendations made in the report,

- No compromise with the ecological balance by drastic reduction in sanctuary area as per Andhra Pradesh State Assembly Resolution.
- Deletion of private Ziroyati lands from sanctuary, i.e., approx. 5533.3 ha located inside the north-eastern boundary of Kolleru WLS except major rivers/streams flowing within this area retaining 10 mtr either side of the stream/river by government to ensure the environmental water flow into sanctuary.
- Based on the authentic information on the extent of lands assigned to Scheduled Castes and Backward Class communities, the genuine D-Patta cooperative societies be accommodated adjoining the ziroyati lands to be deleted. Their process of rehabilitation should be ensured that these lands do not fall into hands of 'benami' owners.
- The government should be prepared to invest resources in R&R in order to resolve the rehabilitation cost of remaining ziroyati land owners.
- The above actions may be started after compilation of reliable data on the actual boundary of Kolleru WLS and preparation of integrated management plan.

- Within the rationalized boundaries of sanctuary, the important areas of bird congregation should be declared as core zones free of human disturbances and the rest buffer areas can be used for traditional fishing without construction of bunds.
- Ecologically Sensitive Zone (ESZ) should be declared upto present boundary or may be extended to a distance recommended by experts on wetland ecology.
- The State and Central together set up the Kolleru Lake Management Authority and explore funding mechanisms for sustainable management of the entire wetland to regulate hydrology, industrial effluents, untreated sewage from towns, fertilisers and pesticides.
- As entire water of Budameru river has been diverted to Polavaram-Pattiseema canal, the same amount of water flow should be compensated.

The CWLW, Andhra Pradesh requested the Standing Committee for consideration of State Assembly resolution to restore the livelihoods of the local farmers and poor. He mentioned that Upputeru, outlet of Kolleru lake which is under the control of government has been changed/modified over a period by the irrigation department. Due to increase in its depth, ingression of sea water is contaminating the fresh water lake and consequently weeds have come up on the lake bed. Hence, it is requested to include the Upputeru also within the sanctuary to regulate the sea water into the lake. The PCCF, Andhra Pradesh mentioned that the resurvey must be based on survey numbers as available in records of the government rather than contour levels in process of rationalisation.

The Chair opined that the recommendations of the Group should be communicated to the state for its comments.

36.4.2.1 Setting up 5.25 MTPA-Development of Floating storage and Re-gassification Unit (FSRU) facilities for import of LNG within the existing deep water port at Kakinada, Andhra Pradesh. The proposed site is 2.5 kms away from the boundary limits of Coringa Wildlife Sanctuary.

The member secretary briefed the Committee on the proposal and mentioned that according to Terms of Reference (TOR) for EC, impact on Marine Life would be assessed. Since the proposal is 2.0 kms from Coringa WLS, Impact Mitigation and Wildlife Conservation Plan is required to be submitted.

The CWLW, Andhra Pradesh stated that the report on the impact on Marine Life from the user agency is still awaited. Consequently, the Standing Committee decided to defer the proposal.

34.4.2.8 Residential & commercial project under slum rehabilitation authority, Mulund, near Veenanagar opposite LBS Marg, Mulund (West) Ta. Kurla by Ariisto Developers (This is an expansion project in a total area of 15.97 ha. of which 2.68 ha is already developed/occupied and partly constructed buildings. The major part 13.29 ha is proposed for new development)

The member secretary briefed the Committee on proposal and mentioned that the proposed expansion project was discussed in the 39th meeting of SC-NBWL. Based on the site re-verification report, it was found that the proposed site is adjoining the boundary of the National Park.

The CWLW, Maharashtra mentioned that the proposal is expansion to the existing development under slum rehabilitation project of government of Maharashtra. The existing development is adjoining the boundary of SGNP and fully occupied. Whereas the proposed expansion is away from the boundary and approved by the Mumbai Municipal Corporation and Environment Clearance was accorded by the SEIAA, Maharashtra with condition to develop green belt between NP boundary and development and providing funds of Rs 1.00 Cr for management of NP.

The Standing Committee, taking view of developments all along the NP boundary in the adjoining areas of proposed site, opined that some more area may be left between the NP boundary and proposed expansion. The representative of user agency mentioned that the existing slums and developments adjoining the proposed expansion were developed a long time ago. The proposed expansion is the economic housing slum rehabilitation project by the Government of Maharashtra. A green belt in 1.5 mts width and noise barriers shall be provided in the expansion project in compliance to the conditions of Environment Clearance. Further increase in green belt area will affect the economic-feasibility of the affordable housing scheme of the project. Increase in height of the tower affect the maintenance cost which will affect the concept of affordable housing. He added that the proposed development is quite away from the NP boundary as compared to the other developments adjoining it. The proposed expansion site was re-verified by the deferent regulatory authorities in process of according relevant permissions. The Chair asked Standing Committee to explore the possibility to add some more area for green belt from project site plan and recommend the proposal with the condition.

After discussions, the Standing Committee decided to recommend the proposal of expansion with the condition to develop green belt between NP boundary and project site along with other conditions of state.

39.1.4 Proposal for construction project of M/s Vihang Enterprises at Bhaidarpada survey no.220/1, 220/2, 220/3, 220/4, 220/5B, 221/1, 221/11, 217/29, 217/30/1, 217/30/4, 217/33, 217/34/195/1, 195/1, 219/1, 219/2 & 219/3 at village Bhayandarpada, Tal. Thane, Dist. Thane, Maharashtra.

The member secretary briefed the Committee on the proposal that the final notification for ESZ of Sanjay Gandhi NP has been now published as per which the proposed site is located outside the ESZ.

The CWLW, Maharashtra stated that considering the location of the site falling outside the ESZ, the State Board for Wildlife has decided to impose an amount of Rs 1 Cr. in lieu of earlier amount of Rs 5 Cr. for conservation and management of wildlife.

After discussions, considering the fact that the recommendation of SC NBWL is required as part of Environment Clearance for the projects located in ESZ, the Standing Committee opined that its recommendation is not required.

36.4.2.12 Construction of Singoli-Bhatwari Hydroelectric Project 99 MW by M/s L&T Uttaranchal Hydropower Limited. The proposed site falls within 10 kms from the boundary of Kedarnath Wildlife Sanctuary.

36.4.2.13 Construction of 171 MW Lata Tapovan Hydro Power Project of NTPC Ltd, Uttarakhand.

36.4.2.14 Construction of 520 MW (4x130) Tapovan Vishnugad Hydroelectric Project of NTPC Ltd, Uttarakhand. The proposed site falls outside Nanda Devi National Park at a distance of 7.5 km.

The member secretary briefed the Committee on proposal that the three proposals were deferred for pending comments from the Ministry of Water Resources. The comments of Ministry of Water Resources are still awaited.

After discussions, the Standing Committee decided to defer the proposals pending receipt of comments from the Ministry of Water Resources.

34.4.2.11 Proposal of Ms Stone International Pvt. Ltd Chechat for expansion and renewal of Kotah Stone (Building) production in Mining lease no.22/92 situated in village Chechat in Tehsil Ramganj Mandi, District Kota which lies at about 6.4 km aerial distance from the Darrah Wildlife Sanctuary/ Mukundra Hills National Park.

34.4.2.12 Proposal for renewal of existing lime stone mining lease No. 24/87 in village Pipakhedi, Tehsil Ramganj Mandi District Kota near Darrah Wildlife Sanctuary, Rajasthan by M/s Zahoor Ahmed, Abdul Majid. The proposed mining lease 8.5 km away from Darrah Wildlife Sanctuary.

34.4.2.13. Proposal of Ms Associated Stone industries (Kotah) limited for expansion and renewal of Kotah Stone production in mining lease No. 1/89 situated in Tehsil Ramganj mandi, District Kota, Rajasthan.

The member secretary briefed the Committee on proposal that the three proposals were recommended by the NTCA after the site visit but proposals were deferred by Standing Committee pending finalisation of ESZ proposal of Mukundra Hills TR from the state.

The Chief Wildlife Warden, Rajasthan mentioned that the matter would be resolved within a month on priority basis. The Chair asked the Member Secretary, NTCA to convene a meeting in a week and resolve the matter.

Consequently, the Standing Committee decided to defer the proposals pending finalisation of ESZ proposal of Mukundra Hills TR.

39.4.2.5 Proposal for International Amusement & Infrastructures Ltd for "Jaipur Mega Tourism City" a Recreational Project at village Daulatpura Kotra., Tehsil Amer District Jaipur, Rajasthan.

The member secretary briefed the Committee on proposal and mentioned that the proposal was deferred in 39th meeting by the Standing Committee for pending Environment Clearance from the state.

The CWLW, Rajasthan mentioned that the proposal may be deferred as the user agency has not furnished information till date.

After discussions, the Standing Committee agreed to defer the proposal pending the status of Environment Clearance.

39.4.2.7 Proposal for stone mining lease area 4 ha (private land) in Khasra No. 357 village Ghoora, Tehsil Rajnagar, Dist. Chhatarpur, Madhya Pradesh. The mining area is 6.67 km away from Panna Tiger Reserve.

The member secretary briefed the Committee on proposal and stated that the proposal was deferred in the 39th meeting to verify its location and ascertain if the project site is located inside the areas proposed to be added to Panna Tiger Reserve in lieu of the loss of Critical Tiger Habitat due to upcoming Ken-Betwa River interlinking project.

The IGF, NTCA mentioned that the mine location has not been ascertained as yet. The Committee asked the NTCA and Wildlife Institute of India to verify the location and furnish the report within one month.

39.4.2.9 Proposal of residential and commercial development construction project of M/s Oberoi Construction Ltd at Mulund CTS 475,475/1 to 11&Nahur CTS No. 546,546/1 to 2 village Nahur, Mulund (W), Mumbai

39.4.2.10 Proposal of residential and commercial development construction project of M/s Oberoi Construction Ltd at Mulund CTS 543, of village Nahur, Mulund(W), Mumbai

39.4.2.11 Proposed Residential and Commercial Project at S.No.7(hissa no1 to 14),8 (hissa no 1 to 37,39 to 42),9(hissa no 1to 17),10(hissa no 2 to 9,10A,10B,11 to 18),88(hissa no6),99 (hissa no.13,15),100(hissa no.3B,14 to 20, 24 to 30,31A,31B,32,33),101(hissa no 2,3),105(hissa no 1to20)of Village Bunkum, Thane (W), Dist. Thane, Maharashtra. By M/s Piramal Estate Pvt. Ltd.

39.4.2.12 Proposal of commercial and residential construction project at CTS No.491A/5, 491A/6 of M/s Topzone Mercantile Company at village Nahur, Tal.Kurla,Dist.., Mumbai Suburban. Maharashtra

39.4.2.13 Proposal for commercial and residential project by Viva holdings is situated on plot bearing New Survey no.54, 62, 63, 78, to 83 & 192,193 at village more, Tal. Vasai, Dist .Palghar, Maharashtra

39.4.2.14 Proposed Residential and Commercial Project S.No.120/7, 120/13/1, 120/13/2, 121/2, 121/3, 121/4, 121/5, 121/6, 121/7, 121/8, 121/9, 122/4, 122/5, 122/7, 122/8, 122/9 & 140/8 at village Kolshet, Tal. Thane, Dist. Thane, by M/s Akash Developers. Maharashtra

39.4.2.15 Proposed Residential and Commercial Project at S.No. 128,129/1, 129/2(a), 129/3, 129/4, 130, 131/1, 225 at village Kavesar, Tal. Thane, Dist. Thane, by M/s Sai Uma Corporation Builders and Developers. Maharashtra

39.4.2.16 Proposal of residential and commercial project is situated on plot bearing S.No.186, 364, at village Majiwade, Tal. Thane, Dist. Thane, Maharashtra by M/s Thane Municipal Corporation. Maharashtra

39.4.2.17 Proposal of residential and commercial development construction project of M/s Godrej Vikhroli Properties LLP at Village Vikhroli, Vokhroli (E), Mumbai. Maharashtra

39.4.2.18 Proposed Commercial Hospital Project at S.No.217 (H.no1,2),S.No.219, S.No.220(H.No.1,3,5),S.No.222,S.No.225(H.No.1,2,3,4,5),S.No.226(H.No.1,2,3,4,5),S.No.227. S.No.228 (H.No. 4) at village Majiwade,Tal Thane, Dist. Thane, Maharashtra

39.4.2.19 Proposed Residential and Commercial Project "Tropical Lagoon" at S. No 242/1(p) 244/16,240/1(p), 240(p), 239(p), 240/ (p), 180&H.No2, 176H. No.6, 176H.No.8, 178H.No.2, 240 at village Kavesar, Tal. Thane, Dist.Thane, Maharashtra by M/s Soham Real Estate Development Co. Pvt. Ltd.

39.4.2.20 Proposal of residential project of Mr. Jay Want Chogale on Survey No. 195H, No.2, 196 H.No.2 & S.No.197 (pt) &C.T.S. No. 2302/1A, 1B, 1C of village Dahisar at Borivali (East), Mumbai

39.4.2.21 Proposed residential and commercial project S.No.51/2 of village Vadavali and survey no.59/2, 59/3, 60, 61/3, 61/4A, 64/2, 64/3 (pt) at village Mogharpada, Thane (W), Dist. Thane, Maharashtra

39.4.2.22. Proposal of residential and commercial S.No. 3(67)/2, 3(67)/1, (17pt)1/4, (17/pt.)/1/5, (17/pt.)/1/11, (17/pt.)/1/12, 42(55)/1A, 42(55)/1B, at village Mogharpada & S.No.55/1, 55/2, 53/5, 53/4, 54/2, 53/1, 53/2, 52/1, 54/3, 54/1, 1/9, 55/6A), at village Vadavali, Thane(W), Dist. Thane, Mumbai, Maharashtra

The member secretary briefed the Committee on above 14 proposals and mentioned that after the issue of final notification of SGNP, all the proposed sites are located outside the ESZ.

The CWLW, Maharashtra stated that considering the location of the sites falling outside the ESZ, the State Board for Wildlife has decided to impose an amount of Rs 1 Cr. in lieu of earlier amount of Rs 5 Cr. for conservation and management of wildlife.

After discussions, considering the fact that the recommendation of SC NBWL is required as part of Environment Clearance for the projects located in ESZ, the Standing Committee opined that its recommendation is not required.

38.2.1.21 Proposal for diversion of 0.655 ha of forest land from Periyar Tiger Reserve for increasing the height of Kunnar Dam for providing water supply to Sabarimala, Kerala.

The member secretary briefed the Committee on the proposal and mentioned that the Standing Committee agreed to recommend the proposal in its 39th meeting subject to receipt of comments from NTCA. He added, it was clarified that all the extant regulations related to environment, forest laws including Forest (Conservation) Act 1980, and decisions of any court, as applicable, would be followed.

IG, NTCA presented the observations on site visit of a Committee constituted by NTCA in this regard. He mentioned that increase in height of dam is not required therefore not advisable. The existing water pipe lines could be repaired and made operational to restore the supply. He stated that there was need to augment the storage capacity at the temple site.

The Chair asked the Member Secretary, NTCA to convene a meeting of state authority, Field Director, Periyar TR and Travancore Devasam Board (TDB) to implement the said recommendations.

AGENDA ITEM NO.3

40.3.1 Agenda items proposed by members of NBWL 40.3.1.1 Agenda Item Proposed by Shri. H.S. Singh, Member NBWL

The member secretary requested Shri.H.S.Singh to brief on the policy issues proposed by him. Shri.H.S.Singh explained that Standing Committee recommends the projects/activities, on a case to case basis, subject to certain mitigation measures to minimise the adverse impact on wildlife. He lamented that there is no monitoring of the terms and conditions stipulated while recommending the projects/proposals. He further mentioned that the country needed to enhance the Protected Area network in accordance with Aichi Targets to 17% from 4.9%. He also mentioned that a network of marine protected areas needed to be created. The Member Secretary brought to notice that advisory has been issued to all CWLW of states to put effort to identify and notify such forest areas as Community Reserves. In this regard CWLW, Uttarakhand has already initiated.

After discussions, the Standing Committee decided to hold a separate meeting exclusively for the policy matters. The Committee also requested other members to submit policy proposals for consideration in that meeting.

40.3.3 Policy issues and Representations received from user agencies.

40.3.3.1 The Representation of State on the Recommendation of Standing Committee in its meeting 31st meeting held on 12th-13th August 2014 regarding 'Construction of New (BG) Railway Line between Agartala and Sabroom'- Amendment of conditions

The member secretary briefed the Committee on the request of state govt of Tripura to amend the conditions stipulated by the Standing Committee while granting permission in its 31st meeting based on the two-member committee recommendations.

The representative of the state explained the conditions and mentioned that project is under implementation. The amendment of conditions will ease the process of Stage -II clearance under Forest (Conservation) Act, 1980.

Condition 1: To de-notify 9.94 ha of forest land in Trishna WLS proposed for diversion for construction of New (BG) Railway Line

The Secretary questioned the representative of state how the change of legal status would facilitate the implementation of project, if the land is de-notified from the Sanctuary. However, Standing Committee opined that the recommendations of SC NBWL are in accordance with the

existing provisions of Forest (Conservation) Act, 1980 and Hon'ble Supreme Court Orders. Therefore, the forest land from Trishna WLKS cannot be de-notified.

Condition No2: To further de-notify approx.9.0 sq.km area of Trishna WLS which is situated East of proposed Railway Line within sanctuary.

It was explained to the State that no proposal on the diversion of 9 sq.km has been received in the Ministry. The earlier proposal was for diversion of 9.94 ha of forest from Trishna WLS. The State was asked to submit a fresh proposal for the same for the consideration of the Standing Committee.

Condition No3: To declare Bhairabnagar Bison Conservation area with area of about 13 sq.km as sanctuary (ideally as a part of the Trishna WLS).

The member secretary informed the Committee that as one of the two compliance conditions, Bhairabnagar Conservation are of 13 sq. km. was required to be upgraded into a sanctuary and added to existing Trishna WLS. The State has not initiated the process for upgrading the area into a sanctuary.

Condition No4: To establish 30 sq.km area of the Garjee RF as a conservation reserve and to manage it as an extended part of the Trishna Wildlife Sanctuary

The member secretary informed the Committee that second compliance condition was to declare 30 sq. km area of Garjee RF as a Conservation area.

After discussions, the Standing Committee clarified that the implementation of project could start as it is a strategic project for improving the connectivity. However, the State must initiate the requisite process for complying with conditions 3 and 4 in letter and spirit.

40.3.3.2 Proposal for denotification from Radhanagari Sanctuary for Savarde Minor Irrigation Project, Maharashtra.

The member secretary briefed the Committee on the proposal and mentioned that the Standing Committee, in its 23rd and 25th meeting, had forwarded the recommendations of Dr. Asad Rahmani to the State Govt. for its concurrence. The views of the State Govt. had been received recently.

The CWLW, Maharashtra mentioned that the proposal had been pending for long time and that he would convene a meeting with the user agency to know if it is interested in the project. After discussions, the Standing Committee decided to defer the proposal.

40.3.3.3 Proposal for bauxite mining lease area 206.37 ha at village Talagaon in Talulka Radhanagari and village Baveli in Taluka Gaganbawada, Dist Kolhapur, Maharashtra.

The member secretary briefed the Committee on the proposal and mentioned that proposed bauxite mining site is located at 2.5km from the boundary of Radhanagari WLS. The proposal was accorded Environment Clearance (EC) in 2008 and recommendation of Standing Committee is required as part of EC as the site is located within the 10km from the boundary of the Sanctuary. Earlier in 2009, the PCCF, Maharashtra rejected the proposal stating presence of important Wildlife Corridor and Sahyadri Ridge in the vicinity of the site. The member secretary added that it was fresh mining proposal and renewal of mining land lease. The user agency filed IA in W.P(C) 202/1995 for relief in the Hon'ble Supreme Court. The CEC recommended that the project cannot be implemented unless it is cleared by the Standing Committee of NBWL. In another IA filed by the user agency in year 2015 before the Supreme Court, the hon'ble Court directed the Standing Committee to consider the proposal in accordance with law and on its own merits.

The representative of user agency explained that the mining land lease would lapse as per the provisions of the relevant Act (for allocation of minerals and mines), if it is not renewed before 11.01.2017 and requested Standing Committee to recommend the renewal of mining land lease subject to the condition that mining would not be carried out without its recommendation of SC-NBWL following due procedure.

The Chair requested Secretary and DG&SS to examine the case for taking possible decision in accordance with law.

AGENDA ITEM NO.4

40.4.1 Proposals within the Protected Areas

40.4.1.1 Diversion of 1.65 ha of land from buffer zone of Nagarjuna Sagar-Srisailam Tiger Reserve and proposed area falls in the ESZ of Gundla Brahmeswaram Wild Life Sanctuary for widening from Single to Double lane of Nandyal-Atmakur Road in Kurnool District from Km 36/0 to 37/8 and 42/0 to 44/0 in favour to Executive Engineer, Roads & Buildings Department, Nandyal, Kurnool District, Andhra Pradesh

The member secretary briefed the Committee on the proposal. He mentioned that the proposal involved widening of road from single lane to double lane (km 36/0 to 37/8 and 42/0 to 44/0) inside the Gundla Brahmeswaram Wild Life Sanctuary and buffer zone of Nagarjuna Sagar TR. He added that NTCA has recommended the project with mitigation measures after due feasibility assessment carried by team of officers and scientists.

After discussions, considering the public utility of the project, the Standing Committee decided to recommend the proposal along with the conditions and mitigation measures suggested by NTCA and State Chief Wildlife Warden.

40.4.1.2 Diversion of 0.275 ha of forest land in Compt.No.85 & 86 of Pasuvemula R.F. of V.P. South Range, Markapur (WLM) division for laying of Optical Fiber Cable (OFC) for route length of 6111.39 Mtrs, along the existing Right of Way at Pylon Colony, Nagarjunasagar to Kothur Road, Macherala (along NH 565 from km 94/200 to 88/200), in favour of M/s PIcf, Defence Services, State Co-ordinator, Air Force Station, Suryalanka

The member secretary briefed the Committee on the proposal and stated that the proposal involves laying of 6111.39m of Optical Fibre Cable (OFC) along the existing road, within the right of way, in the Rajiv Gandhi WLS (which is part of Nagarjunasagar-Srisailam Tiger Reserve). He added that NTCA has recommended the proposal with mitigation measures and conditions after due feasibility assessment carried by team of officers and scientists.

After discussions, considering the strategic importance of the project for Indian Air Force, the Standing Committee decided to recommend the proposal along with the mitigation measures and conditions prescribed by NTCA and State Chief Wildlife Warden.

40.4.1.3 Diversion of 2.39 Ha of forest land in Nandikotkur RF & Guvvalakuntla-B RF, Atmakur WLM Division for formation of BT road from Sivapuram Gudem to Kolanu Bharathi Temple, in favour of Executive Engineer, PR Division, Kurnool, Andhra Pradesh. The member secretary briefed the Committee on the proposal and stated that the proposal involves up-gradation of the road (formation of BT road) involving a diversion of 2.39 ha inside the buffer zone of Nagarjunasagar Srisailam Tiger Reserve to facilitate better connectivity between Atmakur to Kolanu Bharathi Temple. He added that NTCA has recommended the project with mitigation measures and conditions after due feasibility assessment carried by team of officers and scientists.

After discussions, considering the public utility of the project for the devotees, the Standing Committee decided to recommend the proposal along with the mitigation measures and conditions prescribed by NTCA and State Chief Wildlife Warden.

40.4.1.4 Construction of 4-lane bridge over river Brahmaputra including viaduct and its approaches connecting Bongaon near Numaligarh on NH-37 and Gohpur on NH-52 under SARDP-NE in the State of Assam

The member secretary briefed the Committee on the proposal and mentioned that project involves construction of a 4 lane bridge, upstream of Kaziranga Tiger reserve, to connect NH-37 and NH52. He added that the project would reduce the traffic on NH-37 which is located south of Kaziranga TR. He said that NTCA has recommended the proposal with mitigation measures and conditions after due feasibility assessment carried by team of officers and scientists.

After discussions, considering the public utility and the benefits to Kaziranga TR (resulting from reduced traffic on NH-37) from the proposal, the Standing Committee decided to recommend the proposal along with the mitigation measures and conditions prescribed by NTCA and State Chief Wildlife Warden.

40.4.1.5 Diversion of 0.0533 ha of forest land from Son Gharial WLS and 0.5973 ha in Sanjay Dubari Sanctuary under Sanjay Tiger Reserve for construction of Intake Well in Banas River near Parsili in and overhead water tank at Badkadol along with laying of 8456 meter underground pipeline for water supply scheme of 31 villages of Majhuli block in Sidhi district, Madhya Pradesh

The member secretary briefed the Committee on the proposal and mentioned that the proposal involves construction of intake well in Banas River, overhead tank and water supply pipeline inside the Son Garial Sanctuary and Sanjay Dubri TR for providing drinking water supply to 31 villages. He mentioned that NTCA has submitted the comments on specific issues, minimum water requirement to maintain ecological flow of the river, quantum of water requirement for wildlife and local communities, alignment of proposed pipeline and details of tree felling. He added NTCA has sought details of proposal from WII for further assessment.

After discussions, considering the location of the proposal, quantum of water drawal and its availability, the Standing Committee decided to defer the proposal pending study on the specific aspects of the proposal.

40.4.1.6 Diversion of 2.625 ha of revenue land from Son Bird Sanctuary for construction of NH-3 and widening from 145.200 km to 146.950 km, Ghatigaon village in district Gwalior, Madhya Pradesh.

The member secretary briefed the Committee on the proposal and mentioned that the proposal involves construction of NH-3 and widening of NH-3 at Ghatigoan village for improvement of existing road and smoothening traffic flow. The project would involve felling of about 90 trees.

After discussions, considering the public utility of the project, the Standing Committee decided to recommend the proposal along with the conditions stipulated by State Chief Wildlife Warden and State Board for Wildlife.

40.4.1.7 Proposal for diversion of 39.75 ha of forest land from Nauradehi Wildlife Sanctuary in width of 30 m in km.66.200 to km. 77.700, km. 91.300 to km. 91.900 & km.93.000 to km.93.900 for widening of existing 2-lane to 4-lane of NH-12 from km.10.40 (junction of NH-7 bypass at Jabalpur) to Km.301.80 (near Bhojpur Junction) section Madhya Pradesh under NHDP Phase III.

The member secretary briefed the Committee on the proposal and mentioned that proposal involves widening and improvement with four lane configuration of the existing NH-12 inside the Nauradehi Wildlife Sanctuary. The State Chief Wildlife Warden has prescribed mitigation measures including animal under passes, chain-link fencing, artificial water bodies and other conditions. He added that Nauradevi sanctuary is a part of the area proposed to be added to Panna TR in lieu of diverted area for Ken-Betwa Link canal. Consequently, the NCTA would like to examine the implications of the proposal.

After discussions, the Standing committee decided to defer the proposal and requested NTCA to examine the proposal and furnish its comments at the earliest.

40.4.1.8 Proposal for diversion of 0.145 ha of forest land from Nauradehi Wildlife Sanctuary for construction of Harduwa reservoir canal, Madhya Pradesh

The member secretary briefed the Committee on the proposal and mentioned that proposal involved construction of pipeline for underground canal inside the Nauradehi Wildlife Sanctuary sanctuary. He added that Nauradevi sanctuary is a part of the area proposed to be added to Panna TR in lieu of diverted area for Ken-Betwa Link canal. Consequently, the NCTA would like to examine the implications of the proposal.

After discussions, the Standing committee decided to defer the proposal and requested NTCA to examine the proposal and furnish its comments at the earliest.

40.4.1.9 Diversion of 3.25 ha of forest land from Shoolpaneshwar Wildlife Sanctuary for construction of Karjan Right Bank High Level Recharge Dead Recharge and its Approach Canal, Gujarat

The member secretary briefed the Committee on the proposal and stated that proposal involves construction of right bank canal for providing irrigation facilities to the agriculture farms of the tribal farmers of Nandod Taluka of Narmada District. About 1000 ha of area of 10 villages will get water for irrigation.

After discussions, considering the public utility of the project for irrigation, the Standing Committee decided to recommend the proposal along with the conditions prescribed by State CWLW and State Board for Wildlife.

40.4.1.10 Proposal for diversion of 160.94 ha of forest land from Wan Sanctuary for Akola-Khandawa (176 km) Gauge conversion works between Railway km.645.0 to km 983.0 between Akot & Amlakhurd Railway Station passing through Wan Sanctuary of Melghat Tiger Reserve, Maharashtra of South Central Railway

The member secretary briefed the Committee on the proposal and mentioned that that proposal involves gauge conversion from existing meter to broad gauge of railway line railway line passing through Critical Tiger Habitat (CTH) of Melghat TR. The conversion would involve a diversion of 160.94 ha of forest area of Wan Sanctuary (Melghat Tiger reserve).

He added that in the due course of Forest Clearance process, a study was constituted by the Regional Office, Nagpur to examine the specific issues, effect of implementation of the project on Melghat TR, movements of wildlife along the railway line and mitigation measures, if alternatives are not possible. The CWLW has recommended the proposal with mitigation measure and conditions. The proposal was discussed and recommended by SBWL, Maharashtra in its meeting held on 5th April 2016. Further, he mentioned that the proposal was deferred in order to have a detailed impact/feasibility assessment with regard to feasibility of the project, vis-à-vis, tiger dispersal, and habitat connectivity for genetic exchange, protection threat at present and after the project impact by NTCA.

The user agency mentioned that the alternative route would involve felling of thousands of trees inside the forest area and would lead to cost escalation by several times. The Chair opined that the existing railway line may be upgraded instead of alternative route considering the huge loss of forest and escalation of project cost. After discussions, the Standing Committee agreed to recommend the proposal subject to mitigation measures and other conditions as may be suggested by the NTCA with assurance of implementation through MoU.

40.4.1.11 Proposal for diversion of 2.156 ha of forest land from Trishna Wildlife over a length of 1.81 km in chainage started from 66+200 km-66+460 km and 66+600 Km-68+150 Km for construction/widening of NH-44 road at Mouja-Garjee RF under, Tripura

The member secretary briefed the Committee on the proposal and stated that project involves widening (double laning) of 1.81 km length of NH-44 inside Trishna WLS. He mentioned that NH-44 is the only trunk road connecting Tripura with the rest of the country and is strategically important.

After discussions, considering the strategic importance and socio-economic benefits which would flow to the region, the Standing Committee decided to recommend the proposal along with the conditions prescribed by State CWLW and State Board for Wildlife.

40.4.1.12 Proposal for diversion of 161.76 ha of forest land from Changthang Cold Desert Wildlife Sanctuary for construction of road from Chusul-Dungti-Fukche-Demochok by BRO, Jammu & Kashmir

The member secretary briefed the Committee on the proposal and stated that proposal involves construction of road inside Changthang Cold Dessert WLS to provide better road connectivity to border posts with China. He added that road is strategically important for movement of logistics for Army. An area of 161.76 ha of forest would need to be diverted for the road.

After discussions, considering strategic importance of the road, the Standing Committee decided to recommend the proposal along with the conditions and mitigation measures prescribed by State CWLW and SBWL.

40.4.1.13 Proposal for diversion of 0.368 ha of forest land from Bhitarkanika Wildlife Sanctuary for construction of Jetty and Public Rain Shelter at Gupti, Odisha.

40.4.1.14 Proposal for diversion of 0.2 ha of forest land from Bhitarkanika Wildlife Sanctuary for construction of Jetty and Public Rain Shelter at Talchua, Odisha

The member secretary briefed the Committee on the proposal and mentioned that proposals involve construction of jetty and public rain shelter at Gupti and Talchua respectively in Bhitarkanika WLS. He added that project would facilitate the communication for local people. The State CWLW mentioned that the proposed rain shelters and jetties are very much essential for up-liftment of socio-economic growth and better communication of the local people.

After the discussions, considering the public utility of the projects, the Standing Committee decided to recommend the proposals along with the conditions and mitigation measures prescribed by State CWLW and SBWL.

40.4.1.15 Construction of Jagasu-Raunlak-Uniyana-Ransi-Gaundar-Shri Madhmaheshwar Motor Road under P.M.G.S.Y in district Rudraprayag, Uttarakhand. Total length 10.00 km (1.200 km passes in Kedarnath Wildlife Sanctuary)

The member secretary briefed the Committee on the proposal and mentioned that proposal involves construction of 1.2 km of road inside the Kedarnath WLS to connect the remote human habitations. State CWLW mentioned that road would provide motorable connectivity to unconnected habitations.

After discussions, considering the public utility of the project in providing connectivity to remote villages, the Standing Committee decided to recommend the proposal along with the conditions and mitigation measures prescribed by State CWLW and SBWL.

40.4.1.16 Diversion of 2.1035 ha of forest land from Ranenennur Black Buck Sanctuary for the construction of Upper Tunga Project (UTP) in Sy.No.76, 52 of Kudrihal, Sy.No.112 of Medleri, Sy.No. 10 of Yaklaspur and Sy.Nos. 151, 154, 158, 181 of Irani Village, Ranebennur Taluk, Haveri District, Karnataka

The member secretary briefed the Committee on the proposal and mentioned that the proposal involves construction of an irrigation aqueduct involving diversion of 2.1035 ha of forest area from Ranebennur Blackbuck Sanctuary. State CWLW mentioned that the proposed aqueduct is very essential for irrigation canal and for feeding drinking water to existing tanks.

After discussions, considering the public utility of the project for irrigation and drinking water to the local people, the Standing Committee decided to recommend the proposal along with the conditions and mitigation measures prescribed by State CWLW and SBWL.

- 40.4.1.17 Proposal for construction of 36.00 M Soti Bridge & Main Bridge at Chetawala Ghat, Ganga River near Bhikhund Hastinapur, Tehsil Mawana (district Meerut) and construction of 70.88 M Kala Sote Bridge of Ganga River at Chetawala Ghat Bhikhund, near village Narnour, Tehsil Chandpur, District Bijnor within the area of Hastinapur Wild Life Sanctuary, Uttar Pradesh.
- 40.4.1.18 Proposal for construction of approach road and Guide Bundh of Ganga river bridge at Chetawala ghat near bhikund Hastinapur Tehsil Mawana Dist. Meerut and Tahsil Chandpur Dist. Bijnor within the area of Hastinapur Wildlife Sanctuary, Uttar Pradesh.

The member secretary briefed the Committee on the proposal and mentioned that proposal involves construction of bridge over Ganga River and its approach road and guide bund respectively on non-forest area inside Hastinapur WLS. He added that the project road would provide better connectivity for local people.

After discussions, considering the public utility of the project for connectivity, the Standing Committee decided to recommend the proposals along with the conditions and mitigation measures prescribed by State CWLW and SBWL.

40.4.1.19 Proposal for construction of Ambulance road from Dhali Chowk to Druga Colony (Ward No.18-Shimla) part of which falls within Shimla Water Catchment Wildlife Sanctuary, Himachal Pradesh.

The member secretary briefed the Committee on the proposal and stated that proposal involves construction of 100m of new road and widening of 400m of existing road inside the Shimla Water Catchment WLS. He mentioned that project would provide better connectivity to the local people. No tree would need to be felled for the project.

After discussions, considering the public utility of the project for connectivity, the Standing Committee decided to recommend the proposal along with the conditions and mitigation measures prescribed by State CWLW and SBWL.

40.4.1.20 Diversion of 0.645 ha of forest land from Rajiv Gandhi National Park (Nagarahole Tiger Reserve) for laying of Optical Cables from H.D, Kote to Karnataka-Kerala border on State Highway SH-33 (Mysore-Manandavadi road) PWD CH 246/770 to 278/770 passing through D.B. Kuppe and Antharasanthe Wildlife Ranges for a total length of 21.50 kms, Karnataka

The member secretary briefed the Committee on the proposal and mentioned that the proposal involves laying Optical Fibre Cable (OFC) along the existing road, within the right of way, passing through Nagarhole Tiger Reserve. He added that NTCA has recommended the proposal along with mitigation measures and conditions after due feasibility assessment carried by team of officers and scientists.

After discussions, considering the public utility of the project for telecommunication, the Standing Committee decided to recommend the proposal along with the conditions and mitigation measures prescribed by NTCA, State CWLW and SBWL.

40.4.2 Proposals for taking up activities within 10 km from the boundaries of Protected Areas

40.4.1.1 Construction of a desalination plant of 1,25,000 ltrs capacity at Aerial bay (Diglipur) to cater for additional requirement of water of CGDHQ-9 and dependent ships and units, Andaman & Nicobar Islands

The member secretary briefed the Committee on the proposal and mentioned that the proposal involves construction of a desalination plant at Diglipur to meet the additional daily water requirements of Indian Coast Guard (dependent ships and units). He mentioned that the project would augment the availability of water for personnel of Coast Guard and is thus strategically important.

After discussions, considering the strategic importance of the proposal, the Standing Committee decided to recommend the proposal along with the mitigation measures to be taken up for protecting the marine life due to discharge of the desalination plant and other conditions stipulated by CWLW and State Board for Wildlife.

- 40.4.1.2 Construction of a 75mtr x15mtr (1125sqm) jetty as an extension of the existing Port Management Board (PMB) jetty at Mayabunder towards the seaward side for creating berthing facilities for Indian Coast Guard ships based/being based at Mayabunder and visiting ICG and Naval Ships on operational turnaround, Andaman & Nicobar Islands
- 40.4.1.3 Construction of a 75mtr x15mtr (1125sqm) jetty as an extension of the existing Port Management Board (PMB) jetty at Aerial Bay, Diglipur towards the seaward side for creating berthing facilities for Indian Coast Guard ships based/being based at Diglipur and visiting ICG and Naval Ships on operational turnaround, Andaman & Nicobar Islands

The member secretary briefed the Committee on the two proposals and mentioned that projects involve construction of jetties at Diglipur and Mayabunder to provide berthing facilities for Indian Coast Guard and Naval Ships. He mentioned that the proposed jetties are extension of existing jetties for reducing the congestion due to cargo and other civilian ships.

After discussions, considering the strategic importance of the projects, the Standing Committee decided to recommend the two proposals along with the mitigation measures and other conditions stipulated by CWLW and State Board for Wildlife.

40.4.1.4 Proposal for widening of NH-6 (Package-I) from Bahargora to Singara section (199.200 to km 310.806) from existing 2-lane carriageway to 4-lane carriageway, Odisha.

The member secretary briefed the Committee on the proposal and mentioned that the proposal involves widening of NH-6 from two-lane to four-lane of the stretch passing through buffer zone of Similipal TR as well as its ESZ. He mentioned that the proposal was recommended by the NTCA with due feasibility assessment carried by team of officers and scientists for the expansion in the Eco-sensitive zone of Similipal TR only. The ghat portion of road about 7.6 km passing through buffer zone of TR has not been recommended for widening. State CWLW added that widening in the buffer zone of TR in the ghat portion was recommended by state also. But adequate numbers of under passes are proposed as mitigation measures to be taken up during widening in the rest of the locations.

After discussions, considering the public utility of the road, the Standing Committee agreed to recommend the proposal along with the conditions stipulated by NTCA and CWLW.

40.4.1.5 Proposal for Stone Quarries Operation in Khaira Tahsil under Balasore district, Odisha. The proposed distance of 2.0 km away from Kuldiha Wildlife Sanctuary.

The member secretary briefed the Committee on the proposal and mentioned that the proposal involves operation of 97 Nos. of stone quarries located at a distance of 2 kms from the boundary of Kuldiha WLS at various distances from its boundary. All the quarries (individually) are less than 5.0 ha in area. He added that the proposal is required to seek the recommendation of SC-NBWL as part of environment clearance. The proposal was also referred to NTCA for comments.

The State CWLW mentioned that these quarries are located in the vicinity of Sarisua & Kaithagadia villages under Khaira Tahasil and spread over an area of 173.5ha. On other side of the hillock, a part of traditional elephant corridor, 'Similipal-Hadagarh-Kuldiha-Similipal' is situated. He added that the numbers of proposed quarries were reduced from initial 105 nos to 97 nos in view of wildlife corridor and other factors.

After discussions, considering the requirement of building construction material for ongoing infrastructural developments in the area and socio-economic benefits (which would flow by way of employment), the Standing Committee agreed to recommend the proposal subject to implementation of a Comprehensive Wildlife Management Plan in the region for mitigation of impact which would be caused by operation of all quarries and transportation of materials, to be prepared by State CWLW. The funds may be allocated from the Environment cost realised from the all quarries rationally in proportion to the quantity of production. A monitoring committee comprising of mines and environment department would be constituted for implementation of the plan. 40.4.1.6 Proposal for development of Delhi-Meerut express way and other connecting roads including 6/8 laning of NH-24 from km 0.000 to 49.923 (Hapur bypass) Nh-58 from km 6.800 (Delhi-UP Border) to 52.528 (Meerut Bypass) and Nh-235 from Km 0.360 to km 8.800 in the State of Delhi and Uttar Pradesh (design length 150.147 KM). The proposed site falls at a distance of about 4.5 km from Okhla Bird Sanctuary.

The member secretary briefed the Committee on the proposal and informed that proposal involves development of Delhi-Meerut Expressway and other connecting roads and project site is located at a distance of 4.5 km away from Okhla Bird Sanctuary. He mentioned that the ESZ of Okhla Bird Sanctuary had been notified and the ESZ varies from 100m to 1.00km.

After discussions, considering the fact that the recommendation of SC NBWL is required as part of Environment Clearance for the projects located in ESZ, the Standing Committee opined that its recommendation is not required.

40.4.1.7 Proposal for stone mining lease area 2.40 ha on private land on survey no.92/1, 92/2 and 92/3 an area of 2.817 ha on Private Land of M/s B R Goyal Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd, Indore (MP), which is falling within 10 km from the boundary of Ralamandal Wildlife Sanctuary, Madhya Pradesh.

The member secretary briefed the Committee on the proposal mentioned that the proposal involves renewal of existing mining operations of stone on private land of area 2.40 ha located at a distance of 5.5km from the boundary of Ralamandal WLS. He added that the proposal was recommended by SBWL.

After discussions, considering the requirement of building construction material for ongoing infrastructural developments in the area and socio-economic benefits (which would flow by way of employment), , the Standing Committee decided to recommend the proposal along with the conditions stipulated by State CWLW and SBWL.

40.4.1.8 Proposal for drilling of exploratory locations "DSAD, DSAF & RJAA" falling within 10 km radius of the ESZ of Panidihing Bird Sanctuary, Assam

The member secretary briefed the Committee on the proposal and mentioned that the proposal involves exploratory drilling by ONGC Ltd (Assam Asset) at three locations (1.75km, 2 km and 5.7 kms from the boundary of Panidihing WLS.

After discussions, considering the strategic importance of the project, the Standing Committee decided to recommend the proposal along with the conditions stipulated by State CWLW and SBWL.

40.4.1.9 Proposal for underground slurry pipeline corridor falling within 10 km radius (8.2 km away) from the boundary of Kanger National Park, Chattisgarh.

The member secretary briefed the Committee on the proposal and mentioned that the proposal involves construction of underground pipeline for transportation of slurry (iron ore concentrate) at a distance of 8.2 km from the boundary of Kanger NP, connecting to beneficiation plant which requires Environment Clearance.

After discussions, considering the importance of project for iron ore transportation, the Standing Committee decided to recommend the proposal along with the conditions stipulated by State CWLW and SBWL.

40.4.1.10 Construction of the road Kakardhari-Tarsoma and Bhartha-Gujjargauri, under Nepal Border Road construction project to connect BOPs Bharata, Suiya and Tarsoma in district Balrampur, Uttar Pradesh

The member secretary briefed the Committee on the proposal and mentioned that the proposal involves construction of border road along Indo-Nepal border to connect the Border-Outposts of SSB.

After discussions, considering the strategic importance of the road in facilitating movement of logistics, the Standing Committee decided to recommend the proposal along with the conditions prescribed by State CWLW and SBWL.

40.5 Agenda Items with permission of Chair

The CWLW Gujarat mentioned that the State of Gujarat sent the following proposals to Ministry in the year 2015. Till date the proposals were not placed before the Standing Committee. IGF (WL) replied that the proposals were sent to the old address of the Ministry in CGO Complex. Hence, the proposals did not reach the wildlife division.

- 40.5.1 Proposal for strengthening by laying B.T Surface on existing forest road of ½ to 7/50 and 8/9 to 9/6 km from Bardipada to Savarkhadi in Purna Wildlife Sanctuary, Gujarat
- 40.5.2 Proposal for Strengthening by Laying B.T Surface on existing forest Road of 0/0 to 3/80 Km from Bhujad to Bardipada in Purna Wildlife Sanctuary, Gujarat
- 40.5.3 Proposal for Strengthening by Laying B.T Surface on Existing Forest Road of to 0/0 to 7/0 km From Mahal to Charkhla Road in Purna Wildlife Sanctuary, Gujarat
- 40.5.4 Proposal for Strenathening by Laying B.T Surface on Existing Forest Road of ¹/₂ to 7/50 and 8/9 to 9/6 Km From Bardipada to Sawarkhadi Road Gujarat

40.5.5 Proposal for strengthening by laying B.T. Surface on existing forest road of 0/0 to 8/100 km from Chikhla to baridipada road via Bhangrapani, Gujarat

The representative of CWLW, Gujarat briefed the Committee on the proposals and mentioned that the above five proposals involve metalling (BT surfacing) of existing roads in the Purna WLS. These proposals were pending for want of a consolidated map. The required map was sent to Ministry.

IGF(WL) replied that a soft copy of the consolidated map was received on 2nd January 2017 and the proposals may be considered by the Standing Committee.

After discussions, considering the utility of the roads to the local people residing within the sanctuary, the Standing Committee agreed to recommend the proposal along with the conditions prescribed by State CWLW and SBWL.

40.5.6 Proposal for use of 1.68 ha. Land for Construction of Check dam on Balaram River in BalaramAmbji Sanctuary Gujarat

The representative of CWLW, Gujarat briefed the Committee on the proposal and mentioned that the proposal involves construction of check dam across the Balaram river within the Balaram -Ambaji WLS. He added that the said river is seasonal and the water stored in the check dam would be useful for wildlife in pinch periods.

After discussions, considering the utility of project in augmenting water availability for wildlife, the Standing Committee agreed to recommend the proposal along with the conditions prescribed by State CWLW and SBWL.

40.5.7 Replacement and laying of existing water pipeline of Junagadh Urban Water Supply scheme based on Hasnapur Dam Gujarat

The representative of CWLW, Gujarat briefed the Committee on the proposal and mentioned that the proposal involves laying and replacement of pipeline (including diameter change) from Hasnapur dam in the Girnar WLS to Junagad city to provide drinking water supply. An area of 0.1328ha of forest would need to be diverted from the sanctuary for the project.

After discussions, considering the public utility of the project, the Standing Committee agreed to recommend the proposal along with the conditions prescribed by State CWLW and SBWL.

40.5.8 Diversion of 0.0633ha of forest land from Girnar Wildlife Sanctuary for widening and strengthening of Junagadh Bhavanath road for Junagadh Municipal Corporation Gujarat

The representative of CWLW, Gujarat briefed the Committee on the proposal and mentioned that the proposal involves widening of approach road from Bavnath village to Girnar temple inside Girnar WLS.

After discussions, considering the utility of the project to the devotees, the Standing Committee agreed to recommend the proposal along with the conditions prescribed by State CWLW and SBWL.

405.9 Construction of Police Check-post on Girnar Hill near Datatrey Tunk, Gujarat.

The representative of CWLW, Gujarat briefed the Committee on the proposal and mentioned that the proposal involves construction of police check post at Girnar Hill involving a diversion of 0.0078 ha of forest land.

After discussions, considering need of the police check permanent police check post, the Standing Committee agreed to recommend the proposal with the conditions prescribed by CWLW and SBWL.

40.5.10 Construction of Datar Hill Sidi Road in Girnar Sanctuary, Gujarat

The representative of CWLW, Gujarat briefed the Committee on the proposal and mentioned that the proposal involves construction of road to facilitate connectivity for devotees within the Girnar Sanctuary.

After discussions, considering the utility of road in facilitating the connectivity to devotees, the Standing Committee agreed to recommend the proposal with the conditions prescribed by CWLW and SBWL.

40.5.11 De-silting of Welingdon Dam in Girnar Sanctuary Gujarat

The representative of CWLW, Gujarat briefed the Committee on the proposal and mentioned that the proposal involves de-silting of reservoir located inside the Girnar WLS.

After discussions, considering the utility of the project in enhancing the capacity of reservoir to store water, the Standing Committee agreed to recommend the proposal along with the conditions prescribed by State CWLW and SBWL.

40.5.12 Proposal for 11 KV Overhead electric line for giving continuous power supply to one no of village (Gadakiya) of Mendarda Taluka. Gujarat

The representative of CWLW, Gujarat briefed the Committee on the proposal and mentioned that the proposal involves construction of 11KV overhead electric transmission involving diversion of 0.77ha area from Gir Sanctuary to provide electricity to Gadakiya village of Mendarda Taluka.

After discussions, considering the public utility of the project, the Standing Committee agreed to recommend the proposal along with the conditions prescribed by State CWLW and SBWL.

The Chief Wildlife Warden, Rajasthan also requested to consider certain urgent proposals which could not be submitted to the Ministry. However, the Chair asked the CWLW to submit the proposals for the scrutiny in the Ministry before placing before SC NBWL.

32.4.2 (19) Proposal for Lakheri Chamovali mining lease of M/s ACC Limited, Lakheri Cement Works, Lakheri, Dist. Bundi (Rajasthan) for mining purpose of limestone, Rajasthan

CWLW, Rajasthan requested Chair for discussion of recommendation of SC NBWL in tis 31st meeting and issues related to de-notification of the area from the buffer zone of Ranthambore TR which was wrongly notified by the state. He mentioned that the State Govt. has been recommended and requested to de-notify the land from the TR, a linear strip of mining area and a part of land adjoining the road.

Representative of user agency mentioned that the SBWL, Rajasthan recommended the de-notification of said land in 2012 and after a long pursuance of the recommendation of NBWL and the issue remains unresolved. The mining lease supplies feed raw material to the cement factory which is in operation since 100 years. About 15000 employees are working in the factory. Now, factory is dependent on the material extracted from a part of the lease, about 50 ha. It is unpredictable that how long the factory can survive on the material available on this small part of lease. The outcome of the inspection by NTCA and expert committee had made recommendations like, construction of wall all along the mine boundary on the hill side and 8 years mining period. The user agency alleged that the decision of NTCA had made troubled the factory without any solution.

The Chair opined that the remarks made by the user agency are considerable as the factory and mining lease have been operated for such a long period and many people are sustaining their livelihood. Hon'ble Chief Minister of Rajasthan has also requested to resolve the issues. At this juncture, if NTCA defer the decision of the state, the Central Government should take a decision considering the ground realities and merits of the case. After discussions, **the Chair directed DGF&SS to examine all the issues and put up a report.**

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS OF THE 40th MEETING OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE OF NBWL HELD ON 3rd JANUARY 2017 ***

| | *** | |
|-----|--|----------------------|
| 1 | Shri Anil Madhav Dave Hon'ble Minister of State (Independent Charge) for Environment & Forests | Chairman |
| 2 | Shri Ajay Narayan Jha, Secretary, Environment, Forests and Climate Change | Invitee |
| 3 | Dr. Sharad Singh Negi, Director General of Forests & Special Secretary | Member |
| 4 | Shri B.S. Bonal, ADG(WL)Additional Charge & Member Secretary, NTCA | Member- Secretary |
| 5 | Dr V.B. Mathur Director, Wildlife Institute of India, Dehradun. | Member |
| 6 | Professor Raman Sukumar, Member, NBWL | Member |
| 7 | Dr. H.S. Singh, Member, NBWL | Member |
| 8 | Shri R.D. Kamboj, Director, GEER Foundation, Gujarat. | Member |
| 9 | Shri K.S. Reddy, PCCF & Chief Wildlife Warden, Andhra Pradesh | Invitee |
| 10 | Shri Siddharta Das, Pr.Chief Conservator of Forests(WL) cum Chief Wildlife Warden, Odisha | Invitee |
| 11 | Shri Ajay Kumar Khuntia, Executive Engineer, Parks & IWT South Division, Berhampur, Odisha | Invitee |
| 12 | Shri Jigmet Takpa, Chief Conservator of Forest (Wildlife), Ladakh, J&K. | Invitee |
| 13 | Col P.S.Tenatia, Col(Wbs), CE(P), Himenk Leh | Invitee |
| 14 | Shri Satyendra Prasad EE(C)NFSG, Joint Director, HQDGBR, Seema Sadak Bhawan, Delhi Cantt., New Delhi | Invitee |
| 15 | Shri P.L. Chauhan, Chief Conservator of Forests (Wildlife), Shimla | Invitee |
| 16. | Er. Mehboob Sheikh, Assistant Engineer, Muncipal Corporation, Shimla, Himachal Pradesh | Invitee |
| 17 | Shri Digvijay Singh Khati, Pr.Chief Conservator of Forests & Chief Wildlife Warden, Uttarakhand | Invitee |
| 18 | Shri Shailendra Singh, Addl.R.C., Government of Tripura | Invitee |
| 19 | Dr. Sunita Singh, Addl.PCCF(P&M), WL, Government of Maharashtra | Invitee |
| 20 | Shri Bhagwan, Pr.Chief Conservator of Forests(WL)/Chief Wildlife Warden, Maharashtra | Invitee |
| 21 | Shri Alok Kumar, Addl.PCCF(WL), Madhya Pradesh | Invitee |
| 22 | Shri K.D. Udapudi, Chief Conservator of Forests, Dharwad circle, Karnataka | Invitee |

| 23 | Shri Siddhanta Das, Pr.Chief Conservator of Forests(WL), Odisha | Invitee |
|----|---|---------|
| 24 | Shri H.S. Negi, IG, NTCA | Invitee |
| 25 | Shri Anil Kumar, Addl. Director General of Forests (FC) | Invitee |
| 26 | Shri Soumitra Dasgupta, Inspector General of Forests (WL) | Invitee |
| 27 | Shri Nishant Verma, DIG, NTCA | |
| 28 | Shri S.P. Vashishth, Deputy Inspector General of Forests(WL) | Invitee |
| 29 | Shri. Rajasekhar Ratti, Deputy Director (WL) | Invitee |
