सत्यमेव जयते
महाराष्ट्र शासन

Office of The Principal Chief Conservator of Forest, (HoFF) Maharashtra State, Ramgiri Road, Civil Lines, Nagpur 440 001.

The Additional Principal Chief Conservator of Forests And Nodal Officer, Maharashtra State,
Ramgiri Road, Civil Lines, Nagpur 440 001.
0712-2556916
Email: apccfnodal@mahaforest@gov.in

Speed Post/Email

No.Desk-17/Nodal/Ngapur/I.D.12825/ 302 /23-24
Nagpur 440 001 Dt. 27/04/2023.

To,
The Principal Secretary (Forests),
Revenue and Forests Department,
Mantralaya, Mumbai-32.

Sub: Proposal for diversion of 99.95 ha Protected Forest land for Manganese Ore Mining and allied works in Guguldoh Block in Nagpur District of State of Maharashtra (FP/MH/MIN/42236/2016).

Ref: 1. Govt. of Maharashtra letter no.FLD-2022/C.R.280/F-10, dtd.17.11.2022.
2. Chief Conservator of Forests (T) Nagpur letter no.Desk-10/Land/C.R.870/22-23/1807, dtd.13.02.2023.

The Govt. of Maharashtra vide letter under reference 1 had raised Five (5) queries on the proposal mentioned under subject above. The Chief Conservator of Forests (T) Nagpur has submitted the query compliance vide letter under reference 2 to this office for onward submission. The details of conditions and remarks of the User Agency are as follows;

Sr. No.	Conditions	Compliance
1	Project requires 99.95 Reserve Forest and only 5.05 non-forest. Keeping in view the market rate of non-forest land is much more than the net present value of forest, whether the user agency has made efforts to select forest land	As per compliance report submitted by the Deputy Conservator of Forests (T) Nagpur and forwarded by Chief Conservator of Forests (T) Nagpur it is submitted that out of 105 hector land, 5.05 ha land proposed non-forest is revenue land (Government). As per the compliance report submitted by the User Agency, Mining is site specific and need to win the minerals from the land where it is situated. Further, user agency has been vested this mineral block under auction by the Government of Maharashtra pursuant to the MMDR, Act, 1957 and Mineral (Auction) Rules, 2015 so there is no choice but to acquire the land irrespective of its legal status.
2	Prior to request for 100 ha forest land, user agency should have done prospecting for availability of minerals. It is mentioned somewhere by user agency that prospecting has not be done and at	As per compliance report submitted by the Deputy Conservator of Forests (T) Nagpur and forwarded by Chief Conservator of Forests (T) Nagpur the block was vested with user agency under auction considering the availability of

Sr. No.	Conditions	Compliance
	few places it is mentioned that the prospecting has been done which create confusion. Please clarify a. If prospecting is done, whether permission under FC Act from Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate change has been sought or otherwise by user agency? b. If yes, how much area was covered for prospecting and out of which what is forest land area?	mineral. As per tender document issued by the Government of Maharashtra, the prospecting for mineral in this area has been done by Government of India agency the Geological Survey of India and hence no additional prospecting done by user agency. a. Geological Survey of India had obtained all the requisite approvals under the Forest (Conservation) Act, 1980. b. The area of 99.95 ha forest land of this Block might have been prospected by the Geological Survey of India as per applicable norms at that time.
3	Cutting of 35,703 trees are estimated in the project. Is it appropriate to cut in large number for the project?	As per compliance report submitted by the Deputy Conservator of Forests (T) Nagpur and forwarded by Chief Conservator of Forests (T) Nagpur, the estimated cutting of trees is from the entire Block under FC Act. However, only essential trees under excavation and mine infrastructure area would be cut as and when required. The tress falling under Safety Zone of 7.5 m around periphery under the Block shall be untouched and the number of trees to be felled out will be minimized. Moreover, plantation drive shall be undertaken simultaneously with the mining operation in the Block. Justification and Cost-Benefit-Ratio has already been provided in the proposal.
4	Proposed project is 5 km from buffer boundary of Pench Tiger Reserve and 3.5 km from ESZ boundary and falling in Tiger Corridor with presence of schedule 1 species including endangered animals. a. CCF (T) Nagpur expressed that opinion of Wild Life Institute. Whether the opinion of WII has been taken or otherwise. b. Whether the project will impact the tiger corridor c. Whether the non-compatible activities like mining will be appropriate in tiger corridor.	As per compliance report submitted by the Deputy Conservator of Forests (T) Nagpur and forwarded by Chief Conservator of Forests (T) Nagpur mentions that the project has been recommended by the Deputy Conservator of Forests (T) Nagpur and Chief Conservator of Forests (T) Nagpur subject to recommendation of the State Wildlife Board and the National Wildlife Board along with certain mitigation measures & following conditions - i) The project have Schedule I species as well as many other wildlife and project will affect corridor connectivity between Pench Tiger Reserve and NNTR. However keeping in view project of public interests and site specific, diversion of forest land will be recommended after 1. Technical study by WII and 2. Clearance under section 38 (O) (1), (g) of Wildlife (Protection) Act 1972. ii) The project should have following mitigation measures as suggested by Field Director, Pench Tiger Reserve, and Nagpur. • No Mining / No blasting / No

Sr. No.	Conditions	Compliance
		transport allowed from 6 pm to 6 am. • Mining lease boundary falling in corridor section will be fenced with 6-8 feet meter chain link fencing to avoid incident of trapping of wild life. • 7.5 meter safety zone around lease boundary within lease area will be developed as green belt for safety of the wild life from dust/ noise and vibrations. • Control Blasting with minimum duration during day time with keeping record for inspection for the forest staff. • Water sprinkling during mining/ haul roads and approach road. **b)** Yes, User agency had already moved separate proposal to obtain the recommendation of National Wildlife Board as per the directives under section 38 (O) (1), (g) of Wildlife (Protection) Act 1972. **c)** No, User agency has prepared the Mitigation Plan and incorporated in the WL proposal and same has been technically verified with additional measures by the Chandrapur Forest Academy of Administration, Development & Management. Copy of the Technical Verification of Mitigation Plan for Gugaldoh Manganese Ore Block is enclosed. A copy of Principal Chief Conservator of Forests (Wildlife) Maharashtra State, Nagpur's letter no.4731, dtd.16.03.2023 is enclosed for ready reference.
5	PCCF (HoFF) might not have recommended the project keeping in view the fact that the project is likely to impact forest resources and wild life in bigger scale. In case proposal is not to be recommended specific opinion need to be mentioned so that appropriate decision would be taken by Government of Maharashtra. APCCF & Nodal and PCCF-HoFF may give self-explanatory comments.	It is submitted that the User agency has prepared the Mitigation Plan and incorporated in the WL proposal and same has been technically verified with additional measures by the Chandrapur Forest Academy of Administration, Development & Management. Copy of the Technical Verification of Mitigation Plan for Gugaldoh Manganese was submitted to Additional Principal Chief Conservator of Forests (Wildlife) East Nagpur for onward submission with recommendation. Accordingly the Additional Principal Chief Conservator of Forests (Wildlife) East Nagpur has submitted the same with recommendation to Principal Chief Conservator of Forests (Wildlife) Maharashtra State, Nagpur. Principal Chief Conservator of Forests (Wildlife) Maharashtra State, Nagpur vide his letter no. 4731, dtd.16.03.2023 recommended

Sr. No.	Conditions	Compliance
		and submitted the same to Govt. of Maharashtra for SBWL permission. Revised Specific Recommendation of PCCF (HoFF) and covering letter no. 293, dtd.26.04.2023 of APCCF (Nodal) recommending the proposal are enclosed herewith.

Encl: As above

26/4/23

(Naresh Zurmure)
Addl. Principal Chief Conservator of Forests And Nodal Officer
Maharashtra State, Nagpur

Copy forwarded to Chief Conservator of Forests (T) Nagpur B.S.N.L. Laxmi Sanchar Building, Kastrurchand Park, Nagpur 440 001for favour of information and necessary action.

Copy forwarded to Deputy Conservator of Forests (T) Nagpur B.S.N.L. Laxmi Sanchar Building, Kastrurchand Park, Nagpur 440 001for favour of information and necessary action.