

Following comments have been received from the Members of the Standing Committee of NBWL on the minutes of the 25th Meeting of Standing Committee of NBWL held on 13th June 2012. This will be presented in the next Meeting for confirmation of minutes.

S.No	Name of Member	Comments received
1.	Dr M.K. Ranjitsinh	In Item no. 4.1(2): On diversion of forest land in the Kutch Desert Sanctuary (Page 6), in the third last line after the phrase "---and limited utility" and before the words"..... as compared to the existing road network.." the following phrase may be inserted " of only 4 months in the monsoon, -- ".
2.	Ms. Prerna Bindra	<p>Before I reiterate the earlier corrected minutes, one thing I would like to point out about Item 4.1 (1): On the proposal involving erection of 2m x 2m structure within Tillanchang Sanctuary, Andaman and Nicobar Islands for temporary use by Indian Navy.</p> <p><i>In the minutes it is written that the committee has decided that there should be pilot testing. I do not recall the non-official members agreeing to the pilot testing as we all supported Dr Asad Rahmani's report.</i></p> <p>However, I would like to request some additional information on the above project. We will send a mail on some of the doubts on which I will be grateful if we can get clarification. Most particularly I would be grateful if you could clarify on whether the ordinance used will be of explosive nature. If it is, there is real danger of such explosives causing forest fires which could cause enormous damage to the flora and fauna.</p> <p>1. In the items, Agenda No. 1, 2.1(5) and Agenda 3.3.1, while the minutes have been correctly recorded I trust it is understood that these are the amendments that need to be made for the minutes of the 24th meeting of the Standing Committee, NBWL, since they pertain to the minutes of that particular meeting and were placed before us for approval. As you have noted, the Standing Committee had agreed to take these corrections on board and incorporate them in the said minutes. Therefore, I request you to kindly do the same. Needless to mention, they will continue to be recorded here as part of the proceedings of the 25th meeting of the SC, NBWL, as has been done.</p> <p>2. In the following item the fact that the Chief Wildlife Warden had asked for a period of three months for the declaration of Shyampur Range when urged on by the Hon'ble Chair to give a time line has not been recorded.</p> <p>Item 2[4.1 (25)]: Diversion of 6.07 ha of forest land from Rajaji National Park for establishment of Ayush Gram, Uttarakhand</p> <p><i>....The Hon'ble minister asked the Chief Wildlife Warden, Uttarakhand if this was so, and requested for a timeline by which Shyampur could be annexed to Rajaji. The Chief Wildlife Warden requested for three months' time...</i></p> <p>3. Item 4.1 (2): Diversion of 79.474 ha of forest land in Kutch Desert Wildlife Sanctuary and Wild Ass Sanctuary for construction of Gaduli to Hajipur-Odma-Khavda-Kunariya-Dholavira-Maovana-Gadakbet-Santalpur road</p> <p><i>Ms Prerna Bindra said that she supported the report of Dr Ranjitsinh, Dr</i></p>

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

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

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

...Ms. Prerna Bindra added that even before the requisite clearances were granted, the proponents had begun construction of the plant. There was clear violation of the Forest (Conservation) Act, 1980 and also violation of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986, as mentioned in the WII report. As the site was only 1.5 km away from the Kaimur Wildlife Sanctuary The Wildlife Protection Act had also been violated as work on the plant had started without the requisite permission from the NBWL...

Non-official members voiced that such blatant violation of the law should not be endorsed.

5. Agenda Item No. 4.2: 1. Proposal of M/s Shri A.X. Poi Palondicar for renewal of mining lease for production of Iron Ore with production capacity of 0.20 MTPA and expansion in capacity of Manganese ore from 0.010208 MTPA, Goa.

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

6 Item 5.2 to 5.14:

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

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

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

3.	Shri Kishor Rithe	<p>Item 2[4(B) (12)]: Proposal for denotification of land from Radhanagari Sanctuary for Sarvade minor irrigation project, Maharashtra.</p> <p>He also pointed out that Dr. Rahmani report has suggested / mentioned 1) cumulative impact study of all major and minor irrigation projects around Radhanagari WLS 2) Other potential threat..... in human-wildlife conflict..... Include-</p> <p>3) also consider the views of Gadgil committee report before final permission. On this, the chair informed the board that Gadgil committee report is yet under consideration.</p> <p>Item 4.1 (5): Proposal for development of skywalk for promotion of wildlife tourism at Bhalleydhunga involving 2.10 ha of Maenam Wildlife Sanctuary in South Sikkim.</p> <p>Please delete the following statements which I never stated.</p> <p><i>"He added that the allied activities that come up with the proposed skywalk could be more disturbing than the skywalk itself. He said that the traffic from Yang-Yang to Bhalleydhunga should be regulated. He stated that the proposal needed to be looked into carefully so that there was very little impact on wildlife in the area."</i></p> <p>8. Rationalization of the boundary of Koyana Wildlife Sanctuary, Maharashtra.</p> <p>The Committee after considering the requirement of the State Government decided to recommend the proposal for rationalization of the boundaries of thePlease include-</p> <p>Koyna Wildlife Sanctuary subject to the conditions that the area to be deleted, will still remain as part of the Sahyadri Tiger Reserve.</p>
4.	Dr Madhusudan M.D.	<p>The first is regarding the repair of the contour canal in the Anamalai Tiger Reserve, I had stated the following in my corrections, "Dr Madhusudan, NCF, Mysore informed that work on the canal was continuing as before although the Secretary, MoEF had written to the TN Government to facilitate a field assessment involving Drs TR Shankar Raman and AJT Johnsingh on behalf of the sC-NBWL. However, this committee of officers of different departments was yet to become functional." However, what is carried in the final minutes communicates exactly the opposite and states that, "no major work on the canal was continuing...", which I had not stated and is factually incorrect.</p> <p>The second is with regard to the rationalisation of boundaries for Koyana. An insertion I had made (in bold below), "The Committee after considering the requirement of the State Government decided to recommend the proposal for rationalization of the boundaries of the Koyana Wildlife Sanctuary subject to the condition that the five areas proposed for declaration of Wildlife Sanctuaries would be notified prior to denotification of the areas of Koyana Sanctuary, and that the areas deleted from within Sahyadri Tiger Reserve would be added to its buffer, and that the denotification will also be subject to the outcome of the court case on this matter pending before the Hon'ble High Court of Bombay and the I.A.</p>

		pending before the Central Empowered Committee." has not been carried. If I recall correctly, this point was also made by Mr Pardeshi, Principal Secretary (Forests), Govt of Maharashtra, in an email he too had circulated.
--	--	---
