OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY CONSERVATOR OF FORESTS, NAGPUR FOREST DIVISION, NAGPUR

BSNL SANCHAR LAXMI BHAVAN, KASTURCHAND PARK, NAGPUR-01,

Email-dycfnagpur@mahaforest.gov.in,PHONE NO.0712-2562250.

Subject: - Proposal for diversion of 99.95 ha. Land of Protected Forest for Manganese Ore Mining and allied works in Guguldoh Manganese Ore Block in Village Manegaon, Tahsil/Taluka Ramtek, District Nagpur, Nagpur District, State Maharashtra, vide Proposal No. FP/MH/MIN/42236/2016, dated 04.10.2019.

Desk-11/Forest Conservation/C R No. 459/2022-23 1458 Nagpur, Dated 10/02/2023

To,
Chief Conservator of Forests (T),
Nagpur Circle, Nagpur.

Reference:-
1. The Government of Maharashtra, Department of Revenue and Forests Letter No. FLD-2022/Case No.280/F-10, dated 17.11.2022.
2. The APCCF & Nodal Officer Letter No. Kaksh-17/Nodal/ID 12825/20/6/22-23, dated 18.11.2022
3. The CCF (T), Nagpur Letter No. Kaksh-10/Jamin/Prs.Kra.870/2022-23/3958, dated 18.11.2022.
4. M/s Shanti G.D. Ispat & Power Pvt Ltd, Raipur 's letter, Dated 12/12/2022.

Dear Sir,

The compliance of 4 points raised in reference letter No.1 done by User Agency their reference letter No.2 (Copy enclosed).

5 points of compliance report is as under:

Sr. No.	Observations	Clarification/ compliances
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	Out of 105 hecter 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 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?	As per the compliance report submitted by the User Agency, the block was vested with user agency under auction considering the availability of 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?	The User Agency submitted that, 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.

	Observations	Clarification/ explanation
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.	The DCF (T). Nagpur and CCF (T). Nagpur has recommended the project 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 transport allowed from 6 pm to 6 am. • Mining lease boundary falling in corridor section will be fenced with 6-8 feet meter chainlink 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.
5	PCCF (HOF) 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 proposed 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.	This point is pertains to APCCF & Nodal office.

Encl - As above

(Dr.Bharat Singh Hada)
Deputy Conservator of Forests
Nagpur Division, Nagpur

Copy submitted to: - Additional Principal Chief Conservator of Forest & Nodal Officer, M.S.Nagpur for information.
Copy to the President & CEO, Authorized Signatory, M/s. Shanti G.D. Ispat & Power Limited, Raipur for information and necessary action.