Objection to Proposed CDM for 12.5 MW Jhalakoti Hydro Power Project in the Bhilangana Block of Uttarakhand, India

The people of at least four affected villages in the Bhilangana Block are unanimously opposed to the Jhala Koti Hydro Power project and have engaged in a sustained agitation against it since January 2011. Upon visiting the project site between June 16th and June 20th 2012, meeting with citizens of Koti Village, Buda Kedar, Agunda Village, and Jala, local representatives, a local engineer of Uttarakhand Renewable Energy Development, company employees, and a thorough reading of the PDD version 01 dated 22/05/2012, we find the project's application for CDM to be deeply problematic and we urge the UNFCCC not to grant validation to the 12.5 MW Jhala Koti Hydro Power Project. The basis of our conclusion is as follows:

1. Berkeley Energy that has bought this project (the legal validity of this deal is yet to be established) and its website says, "Berkeley Energy has offices in London and Delhi and a presence in Manila. It is authorised and regulated by the United Kingdom Financial Services Authority." Sudhir Gupta, whose name figures on page 28 of the PDD also figures on Berkeley Energy team, see: http://www.berkeley-energy.com/index.php?page=team. In fact in response to our email to Mr Gupta, the response also included the name of TC Kundi, that figures at no 1 in the Berkeley Energy team at the above link. However, this information is not available to any of the stake holders, including the affected people, state government or others.

2. Renewable Energy Asia Fund is being managed by Berkeley Energy, as the website of the Belgian Investment Company says, “The Renewable Energy Asia Fund ("REAF") aims at renewable energy infrastructure investments in Asia... The Fund is managed by Berkeley Energy, a private equity fund manager specialising in renewable energy infrastructure investments in developing markets in Asia.” The BIO is a child of the Belgian Ministry for Development Cooperation. As the website of BIO says, “BIO was incorporated by the law of 3 November 2001, published in the “Moniteur Belge” (Belgian Official Journal) of 17 November 2001, at the initiative of the Minister for Development Cooperation.” The Capital of the BIO company is held by the Belgian Ministry for Development Cooperation and Belgian Corporation for International Investment in 50-50% ratio. BIO website says, ‘BIO has been a member of EDFI (European Development Finance Institutions) since 2001. EDFI is an association of 15 European bilateral Development Finance Institutions... BIO has signed a collaboration agreement with the CDE, (Centre for the Development of Companies)... In addition to European counterparts, BIO also participates in investment projects with other donors such as the International Finance Corporation (IFC), the

---

African Development Bank or specialised vehicles. ‘BIO has invested Euro 6 million in REAF\(^5\) and the money for the Jhala Koti Gunsola Hydro company comes from this fund. To summarise, the project also gets funds from Official Development Assistance money from a Belgian govt agency and thus would be debarred from getting CDM money. The fact that these links are neither made public to various stake holders, nor officially intimates, makes the problem more acute in making the company invalid.

3. The PDD is vague. Although it mentions the massive size of the desilting chamber with 65 m length, 90 m width and 45 m depth, it fails to mention other key aspects of the project: What is the Full Reservoir Level, the Minimum Draw Down Level, and the river bed level? What is the length of the river from where the submergence starts to where the water comes back to the river? What is the nature of fisheries that will be lost? What is the catchment area of the project? How much forest land is needed to construct tunnels leading to the power house and other components of the project? How will the project affect other projects that are along the stretch of the project and those that are downstream? Will the project generate peaking power? What will be the volume of the water that will be stored by the weir in non-monsoon seasons? The impact of the project can thereby not be assessed fairly and should not be granted validation until these crucial details are provided as part of the validation process, and are included in the public stakeholder meeting.

4. Such projects, when they operate as peaking stations in non-monsoon months, tend to suddenly release huge quantities of water when the project generates power, and almost none during the rest of the hours when it does not generate power. This creates a lot of problems for the people using the river downstream from the tail race channel. There have been several incidents of death of people, cattle and other damages due to such sudden release of water. The project has neither done the assessment of the peaking power generation, nor given a list of measures that it will take to ensure that those who suffer these impacts will be compensated, nor to ensure that there are no accidental deaths and damages. This is a serious infirmity of the project.

5. The distance between the site of the Jhala Koti weir and the power house is perceived to be at least 5-8 km (the exact distance is unknown because the PP has failed to mention it in the PDD). Along the Dharam Ganga, between the proposed site of the weir and the proposed site of the power house, there are three villages. All are utilizing the Dharam Ganga River to power the traditional turbines which are used to produce rice, spices, flour and oil. Further, the Pradhan (local council) of Agunda Village with the aid of the UNDP Livelihood Initiative have constructed a Community-managed multi-purpose micro hydropower project that provides 40 kw (50 KVA) of electricity to the Agunda Village, and also mechanical power for milling rice, wheat, oil and wool processing. It has been set up by Jan Samarthan, a non-governmental organization, with

support from the UNDP, FRG and MNRE. It also irrigates 60-70 fields through an irrigation channel that belongs to the state government but is managed by the people and gets water from the micro hydro project (see Appendix 1). The local people get electricity from the micro hydro station and pay at the rate of Rs 2 per unit. From this they are able to grow crops twice a year. The community also now plans to increase the capacity of this unit to 100 Kw and also increase the capacity of the irrigation channel. The expanded project plans to provide electricity to the people for cooking too so that the firewood now being used for cooking can be replaced by electricity and thus reduce the greenhouse gas (GHG) emission and also help protect the forests. Seeing as how Agunda is downstream from the proposed project, locals fear that the latter would cause irreversible harm to their livelihood initiatives. As it is, the people complain that in the non-monsoon season there is not enough water to both produce electricity and irrigate the fields. The PDD has failed to present a concrete, alternate plan for the compensation, livelihood, irrigation and provision of other facilities that the project affected peoples are enjoying now, and thus the project fails to meet CDMs standards of social responsibility and should not be considered for validation.

6. The figure of a design discharge of 5.96 cumecs that is provided on p.5 of the PDD is a virtual impossibility, as, according to recent tests conducted by Yogeshwar Kumar, Engineer, the current flow of the river is a mere 1,200 l/sec (1.2 cumec). The company should be required to study the flow of the Dharam Ganga during non-monsoon seasons and provide accurate statistics in its PDD about how much water it will store and release during both monsoon and non-monsoon seasons.

7. The people of Koti Village, organized into a small cooperative, are in the process of constructing a 200 KW project under the guidance of UREDA which would eventually be used for the electrification of four villages and one hamlet. The water that locals are planning to use for the execution of this project would be significantly reduced by the construction of the upstream Jhala Koti Hydro Power Project, especially during the nine non-monsoon months. The PP has not mentioned this in their PDD and thereby fails to meet standards of sustainability that govern the CDM process.

8. When we visited the project site in month of June, the water flow in the River Dharam Ganga was low and the river was shallow (see Appendix 2). Both local movement leader Dherendra Nautiyal and UREDA engineer, Shiv Singh Maher, claim that the water in the Dharam Ganga is not enough to support the hydro power project in question. The PP should be required to make transparent the data and qualitative findings of its so-called “environmental and social impact” assessment, referred to on p.26 of the PDD instead of making broad claims like “no particular

6 For details see: erc.undp.org/evaluationadmin/downloaddocument.html?docid=4405
cause of concern can be identified. Additionally an independent impact assessment should be conducted to evaluate the downstream impacts of the dam, on fisheries and livelihood, and validity of the wide suspicion that the water of the river Dharam Ganga is not enough for the project in question.

9. As stated above, the Jhala Koti HEP project will require the construction of several kilometers of tunnel/pipeline between the weir and the power house—locals and UREDA Junior Engineer, Mr. Shiv Singh Maher, say that the head and tail race channels will need to be constructed through densely forested and steep, mountainous land and partly through the agricultural land, affecting the local people and their livelihood. A road will also need to be constructed leading up to the site of the weir and the power house, creating further damage. The resulting deforestation of the trees and the disturbance of the geological foundation will have an immediate and long term impact on the stability of the land. According to locals, the area is already prone to earthquakes, landslides, and every year during monsoon season there are tremendous floods in the area. In 2002 there was a disastrous flood in which 8 lives were lost from Agunda village, and two were lost from Koti Village. Many of the traditional water mills were submerged. Additionally, people have witnessed the destruction of local homes with excessive blasting during construction of nearby 22.5 MW Bhilangana HEP project. All of these points have been formally raised by locals in petitions to the local government, state governments, and to the project developer months before the PDD was created, yet the company has failed to consider the consequences of its project construction. Seeing as how the PP has completely omitted mention of the regional seismicity and disaster management in its PDD, the project should therefore be considered hazardous to the welfare of the local people and be disqualified from CDM consideration.

10. On page 25 the PDD mentions that a stakeholder meeting was "conducted to account for the views of the people impacted either directly or indirectly due to the project activity. This has been carried out at all levels of stakeholders" and (on p. 26) "queries raised by stakeholders were answered satisfactorily". Yet when members of SANDRP met with a group of a dozen locals in Village Koti including two members of the Pradhan (village council), a dozen locals of Agonda Village, other local leaders belonging to Buda Kedar along with UREDA engineer, Mr. Maher, between June 16th and June 20th, 2012, all agreed unanimously that the stakeholder process referred to in this PDD is fictitious and should not be considered a "consultation".

11. Local people have an unclear idea about who is pursuing the project—the project once belonged to Rattan Singh Gunsola a leader of the powerful political party BJP, with whom the locals have had several hostile encounters. Now, according to an onsite employee at the Jhala Koti site office in Ghanshali, the project has been sold to Berkeley Energy Solutions, a UK-American multinational company, and Mr. Gunsola no longer has ownership nor management over the
project. The local people know nothing of the foreign company, Berkeley Energy, nor do they know where the funds for the Jhala Koti Project will come from. In fact, many locals believe that Mr. Gunsola is still the project owner.

12. If the Jhala Koti Gunsola Hydro Power project has indeed been transferred to Berkeley Energy Solutions, the company is required by the Central Government to avail a transfer clearance. The company has not followed this process, nor have they mentioned the project transfer in their PDD. The project is therefore in violation of Indian law and should be disqualified from CDM consideration.

13. The site office that is listed as Hotel Shikari, Chamyla Road, Ghanshali on boards placed at the project site (see Appendix 3) is uninhabited except for one accountant who also appears to be working full time as a shopkeeper in a nearby utility store (to whom we have referred in point seven). There are neither project documents nor legitimate studies available for local people who would like to know more about the project, thereby placing the project in violation of the standards for social accountability promoted by CDM.

14. Recently, in March 2012 a mass of people from the affected villages and Buda Kedar town gathered in protest of Gunsola’s Jhala Koti project. According to locals, hundreds of affected people blocked the road when the SDM and the project developer were traveling from Agunda Village to the Jhala site. The gathering was largely attended by women—one local woman of Budakedar on June 18th 2012 told us that Rattan Gunsola (then project developer) threatened the “ladies (of the area) that if [they] didn’t let the work start, they would bring police officers and have them beaten with batons”. The ladies did not back down.

15. The 73rd Amendment to the Constitution of India (1992), endows the gram panchayat (village council) with such powers and authority as may be necessary to enable them to function as units of self-government especially in matters of watershed management, development, land improvement, etc. If any outside developer wishes to pursue endeavors in the aforementioned categories, they must first take the permission of the gram panchayat. Since affected village councils have openly protested the Jhala Koti projects and the panchayat of affected Village, Bishan, has even gone as far to pass a unanimous resolution on 14th March, 2012 against the proposed project, it would be a constitutional violation for the PP to continue to pursue the project. (See Appendix 4).

16. Local representatives and social workers submitted an extensive list of objections regarding the Jhala Koti Hydro Power Project to the Chief Minister of Uttarakhand, District Magistrate, Deputy

8 http://indiacode.nic.in/coiweb/amend/amend73.htm
District Magistrate, Union Minister for Environment and Forests, Union Power Minister, Irrigation Minister of Uttarakhand, Chairman of Uttarakhand Power Corporation Limited, and Rattan Singh Gunsola in January 2012 on behalf of 750 families from Koti, Rasagaya, Agunda, and Titruna Villages. The points of contention are summarized below:

1. The canals will be entirely without water and this will affect thousands of acres of fertile land that the families depend on and will not be able to be irrigated and will not be productive
2. By destroying the river access to the canals, access to clean and safe drinking water for houses and cattle will be denied
3. Many households depend on watermills to sustain their livelihoods, and these will be disrupted too if water access is denied. The people of these villages will also be deprived of the grinding and milling facilities.
4. Due to this project, long standing traditional ways of living that include riverine agriculture, sand, gravel, fish, wood based work and micro hydro related works will come to an end
5. Our children will lose access to enjoying playing in the rivers and will not be able to learn to swim and also lose access to a natural resource
6. By stopping the flow of Dharamganga, many households will not be able to practice their religious rituals. Even the funeral rituals will not be performed as water to extinguish the flames after cremation and for other related rituals will not be available.
7. This area is an ancient and sacred pilgrimage area. The people of the region depend on some income from this pilgrimage, besides the agriculture. The stopping of perennial flow of water in the river will reduce the attraction of the pilgrims to the area. This will deprive the people of their income and also source of cultural enrichment.
8. This project will also impact the grazing and feeding habits of animals. The distance of access to the forest for the women would also increase. All this will also increase the tendency and incidence of migration of young males for employment outside.
9. Due to this project, we will lose entitlements to our resources, will increase responsibilities. The hold of the outside capital will increase, people’s anger will increase, poor people’s time will be wasted in agitations.
10. These projects are completely inappropriate in this region in the climate change and environmental context.
11. For your information, this area is susceptible to landslides, earthquakes, cloud burst and other natural calamities. This kind of projects is like inviting more such natural calamities and would only increase the problems of the people of this region.

The letter goes on to state, “We have sat together and deliberated on the impacts already visible of the under operation 3 MW Thati Churena (Chani) project operated by the Gunsola Hydropower Generation Pvt Ltd and in our general meeting decided with full understanding and
knowledge that such projects may increase the revenue of government, but the damage to the environment and the natural resources of the Himalayas will be irreparable. These projects that destroy the life and livelihoods of 750 poor families to increase the comforts of the already rich people will be unjust...We respectfully pray to you that by immediately cancelling Jhala Koti, Agunda Thati and other hydropower projects, you will help us overcome the serious crisis we are facing” (see Appendix 5). It would thereby be an insult and a violation of the constitutional rights of local villagers who are striving to save their land and river if the project were to receive CDM validation.

17. Local people had no awareness that the project was applying for CDM, nor were they aware of the existence of the UNFCCC. When we explained the process of CDM and read parts of the PDD to locals, they were disturbed that the company was claiming to benefit the local people before an international audience, when the ground reality was so troublesome. Thus, in the presence of the SANDRP team and local elected village leader, M. Devi Pratap, the people of Koti Village have written an objection to the UNFCCC in protest of the PP’s application for CDM in which they have stated, “[the developer] has fraudulently prepared this project (proposal) using his financial and political clout, without consent from the village assemblies (legal entities as per India’s constitution, at village level, whose consent is required for taking up any project affecting the village) of village Koti, Agunda, Thati and Ragsaya etc.” (See Appendix 6 for the Hindi and English versions of the letter from Koti to the UNFCCC).

18. When speaking to locals the SANDRP team noticed that locals were particularly anguished by the fact that a former pradhan of Ragsaya (one of the affected villages), Mr. Basant Lal, was chosen to be the sole stakeholder for the project (see p.26 of PDD). According to locals, Mr. Lal, no longer an elected representative, has no right (not legally, nor informally) to give consent for the five affected villages. The people of his village, Ragsaya have openly opposed the dam (see Appendix 6). Thus, his comments such as, the project poses “no danger or chance of harm to any village/villagers” and “the water availability to the villagers will be ensured” carry no weight in the face of a unanimous opposition backed by at least 750 families in the area. The process the PP has engaged in for stakeholder engagement is fraudulent and should disprove the project’s qualification for availing of CDM status.

19. On p.25 of the PDD, the PP states, “PP intimated the stakeholders regarding the meeting through news paper advertisement in the local newspaper “Dainik Jagran” on 27/03/2012 and in an English newspaper “Hindustan Times” on 28/03/2012. PP also sent an individual intimation to District administration and village administration for the same. Also, public notices were provided at various common access places like gram panchayats, etc.” When members of SANDRP team asked locals on June 17th, 2012 if they were informed of the above consultation, it
was told that the local village councils (of Koti, Agunda, Buda Kedar, or Tirthrona—all of which are opposed to the dam), were not informed of the stakeholder meeting referred to on p.25. Further, they said that the Hindustan Times paper does not reach even the nearest town, and Dainik Jagran is also not read by locals unless they are traveling to Rishikesh or a larger metropolitan place, as the publication does not reach their remote areas. So even if the date of the stakeholder meeting was published in the newspaper (which the PP has shown no evidence of), the locals would not have known of it in advance. Local representatives were not informed nor invited to a meeting regarding the project, but they do recount a private meeting that happened in April 2012 between the ex-pradhan of Ragsaya, Mr. Basant Lal and the developer, in which “Mr. Lal betrayed his people”. This is just more evidence of the project’s socially negative impacts, and it shows that developer has failed to address the local overwhelming opposition to the project at hand.

20. In India, if any development work requires the acquisition of forest land, the law mandates that the project authority obtain forest clearance from the Ministry of Environment and Forests (MoEF) after being approved by the Forest Advisory Committee (FAC) (or if the requirement for land is under 5 ha from the respective state government). Between the site of the Jhala Koti weir and the power house there is at least 8 km, most of which is forested—thus it is likely that the project will require forest land, not only for the construction of the tunnels, but also for construction of the power house and as a buffer zone to the dam. The PP has omitted details regarding both forest land and impact the project would have on forest wildlife. This should immediately disqualify the project from CDM consideration.

21. In the PDD, there is no proof of methodology used by the company to adhere to the Scheduled Tribes and Other Traditional Forest Dwellers (Recognition of Forest Rights) Act (2006), which recognizes the “right to hold and live in the forest land...for habitation or for self-cultivation for livelihood by a member or members of a forest dwelling Scheduled Tribe or other traditional forest dwellers”. Additionally, indigenous peoples are conferred the right to “own, access to collect, use, and dispose of minor forest produce...which has been traditionally collected within or outside village boundaries”. Yet the fact that the PP will need to acquire forest land for the Jhala Koti project but has failed to specify in its PDD how much forest land will be acquired, for what use it will be taken, and whether and how they have followed the rules and regulations of the aforementioned Forest Rights Act (2006) is of grave concern. Nor does the PDD specify what will be the loss of rich and diverse flora and fauna of the region. Thereby, the PP is in violation of the Forest Rights Act (2006), which stipulates that the forest dwelling people are the primary decision makers when it comes to the fate of the forest, the forest products, and the rivers that pass through them. This neglect for the Indian law and disrespect of traditional tribal structures discredits the project’s eligibility for CDM status.
22. According to Dherendra Nautiyal, local leader and regional coordinator of the movement against Jhala Koti dam, Rattan Gunsola, who was formerly the owner of Jhala Koti HEP, is currently operating a 3 MW hydroelectric power (HEP) project in Chhani Village. The experience of Chhanni HEP has left a bad taste in the mouths of locals. The project is a mere 3 MW, yet it has brought the Bal Ganga River and Dharam Ganga Rivers to a halt during non-monsoon seasons due to the low flow at the confluence of the two rivers.

23. This has led to a number of grave problems in the surrounding villages. For example, the traditional last rites ceremony performed by locals who reside near the two rivers (Dharam Ganga and Bal Ganga) involves the application of river water to the funeral pyre. According to locals, instead of being able to access the water freely as they always have, the locals are now forced to ask permission from the developer to release water from the dam. Often their requests remain unanswered for hours, and as a result locals have experienced extreme trauma.

24. Locals complain that while the electricity generated from this project is going to a national grid and locals are not provided any power from the project, the dam has stopped the flow of two rivers (Bhalganga and Dharamganga). This has posed significant problems to the functioning of small scale hydro projects like the traditional gharat, or hydro powered wind turbines, which were previously (before the construction of Gunsola’s project in Chhani) used to make flour and oil. Locals of Koti, Agonda, and Tithrona fear that a similar situation will happen as a result of the Jhala Koti dam without a critical consideration of the loss of livelihood and overall welfare of the area.

25. In order to prove that the project faces an investment barrier, according to p. 11 of the PDD, “the prime financial indicator that has been used is the Internal Rate of Return of the project cash flows i.e. the Equity IRR.” The PP has listed a “default” IRR of 11.75% and a 17.90 % benchmark. Both of these figures are of doubtful credibility. Recently 12 MW Pakke Bung IV Hydro Power Project has applied to UNFCCC for CDM validation. Although it is considered to be in the same scale of the Jhala Koti 12.5 MW project by the CDM standards (hydro power projects under 15 MW are considered small), Pakke Bung IV has listed the benchmark IRR as 12.75%. How can the benchmark IRR for two projects in the same scale and providing power to the same grid (NEWNE) fluctuate by more than 5%? Further, for the years 2009-2014, the Central Electrical Regulatory Commission of India has promised at least 15.5% returns on equity and 16% for power projects completed on schedule. This is specifically to attract investment, as stated in their 2009 policy. Thus, the stated “default” IRR for the project is inapplicable. As the project does not face any existing barriers and understates its IRR to appear financially less attractive, the project does not qualify for CDM.
26. Further, the calculations provided in the PDD fail to include various government subsidies which are available for the purpose of constructing small hydro power projects. As displayed on the official website of Ministry of New and Renewable Energy (MNRE), the government has provided a formula to calculate Central Financial Assistance for the construction of small hydro power projects, which is available to all projects:

\[ 1.50 \text{ crore } \times (C)^{0.646} \]

*C being the capacity of the project in MW

Using this formula, one finds that the total amount of subsidy available to Jhala Koti Gunsola Power Private Ltd comes out to be 76.7 million rupees (approximately 1.36 million USD) for the construction of the Jhala Koti Hydro Power project. This is a significant amount of public funding and may have been neglected in the PP's investment analysis in order to overstate the addiitonality of the project.

27. In addition to the Rs. 7.67 crore available under the aforementioned Grid-Interactive Power Programme the central government has established a department under the MNRE specifically to deal with small hydro power projects (the Small Hydro Power Division of the MNRE). In 2009 the Ministry revealed a Small Hydro Power Programme to promote SHP projects of 25 MW capacity or less. In this, the government offers resources to identify SHP project sites, help in upgrading existing SHP stations, financial aid for setting up ventures in the private/cooperative/joint sectors, and support for training, business meets, and further development of SHP. In addition to the benefits offered in the SHP Programme, Small Hydro Power (SHP) projects in both the public and private sectors enjoy complete exemption from: public hearings (the main vehicle for citizens to express dissent to development works in India), Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), and other standard regulations such as environmental clearance and Environmental Management Programme. Thus, contrary to what the PP has stated in the PDD, there are no existing barriers to the execution of the Jhala Koti HEP project. Keeping all of the above considerations in mind, CDM credits are clearly superfluous to the economic viability of the project.

28. The fact that throughout the country various small hydro power projects have been operating for decades without CDM is proof that there are no barriers to the functioning of this project. In the state of Uttarakhand, alone, there are at least 11 small hydro power projects in operation\(^9\). Many of these are operating without CDM credits. This is proof that the project does not require CDM credits and is non-additional.

\[^9\] http://www.uttarakhandjalvidyut.com/cms_ujvnl/under_operation2.php
29. The local people feel that the most appropriate way to develop the remote areas in Uttarakhand that cannot easily be fed with large grid connected projects, are through sub megawatt hydro power projects. In the state of Uttarakhand there are at least 12 of such projects in operation and many more planned by UREDA (on December 3rd, 2010 UREDA registered a CDM Project which will entail the construction of 29 Bundled Micro Hydel Power Projects of 3.115 MW capacity in the state of Uttarakhand). Further, the Bhilangana Block has a rich history and culture of utilizing the gharat (traditional water turbine) for all kinds of daily necessities like grinding of spices, oil and grains. In the past 3-4 decades, locals have managed to upgrade the traditional gharat for larger scale use, in irrigation projects and electricity generation (See Appendices 7 & 8). Therefore, the claim that the alternative to the project would be generation of electricity from grid-based fossil fuel energy is totally false. CDM credits should be limited to the proven technology that is locally applicable and has a lasting positive social outcome (like sub megawatt hydro and solar power)—CDM should not be granted to projects that are non-additional, business as usual, lack transparency, cause environmental and social havoc, and disrespect the local governance, history, and livelihood such as the project at hand.

Thus, we conclude that the proposed project does nothing to contribute to the sustainable development of the Bhilanganga Block, and if the project were to receive CDM or CERs, the UNFCCC would certainly be hard pressed to regain their reputation in the Bhilangana Block or the Uttarakhand state as a whole.

June 23rd, 2012

Dherendra Nautiyal, regional movement coordinator, Buda Kedar, District-Tehi, Uttarakhand, India
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Appendix 1

Above is a photograph of the shallow waters present at the proposed weir site.
Above is a photo of Agunda 40 KW small hydel power project, which also provides irrigation to 60-70 fields and electricity to the entire Agunda village.
Above is a photo of Agunda 40 KW small hydel power project, which also provides irrigation to 60-70 fields and electricity to the entire Agunda village.
Above is a close up of the details pertaining to Agunda 40 KW small hydel power project generator.
Irrigated fields of Agunda benefitting from a community-run 40 KW hydel project.
Appendix 3

Misleading project board belonging to Jhalakoti Hydro Power Pvt. Ltd.
प्रति सल्य योग्य (प्रस्ताव सं.-03)

शासा दिनांक 14 मार्च 2012 को, ग्राम पंचायत विभाग की बैठक में, जो ज्योति प्रसाद भट्ट (प्रधान-ग्राम पंचायत विभाग) की अध्यक्षता की गई। इस बैठक में सभी समस्याओं को पूरा किया गया कि विभाग और या इसके निकट "पुनर्निर्माण बैठक" के उत्तर प्रकाश नहीं। इस प्रस्ताव को लागू किया गया, परंतु आयोग के कार्य का पूरा-पूरा निर्देश करते हैं। इस बैठक में प्रतिवेदन अनुमतियों नहीं।

संख्या क्रम

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>संख्या</th>
<th>नाम</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>श्री जीतेन्द्र उपाध्याय</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>शिवराज सिंह बज्रोहा</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>शिव कुमार उपाध्याय</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>समर कुमार सिंह गुप्ता</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>राम धर्मी चौधरी</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>श्री जीतेन्द्र उपाध्याय</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>शिवराज सिंह बज्रोहा</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>शिव कुमार उपाध्याय</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>समर कुमार सिंह गुप्ता</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(16) श्री जीतेन्द्र उपाध्याय
Above is a scanned copy of the Panchayati resolution against proposed 12.5 MW Jhala Koti Hydro Power Project.
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केंद्रीय संयोजन कार्यवाहक कार्यालय

नागरिक संयोजन कार्यवाहक अधिकारी

हिंदी गांधारी (248125)

भूमि आर्मी अधिकारी

गुजरात सरकार

टिमिक- 10-12-2011

प्रेमी — प्रमुख शिक्षक, संजय, कांठी, मनोज, दीपा और प्रियंका को प्रसन्न करना।

प्रेमी — भ्रमण की सहायक नहीं सहभागी पर गुजरात न्यायिक प्रणाली प्रति दिन हमारे निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को बदला या निर्देश को ब�ला या निर्देश को बदला यা
Dec 15, 2011  
To:  
Shri Bhuvanchandra Kandudi  
Chief Minister, Uttarakhand  
From: Assembly of people of villages Koti, Ragsaya, Agunda, and Titruna  
Subject: About cancellation of Jhala Koti, Thati Agunda and other hydropower projects to be constructed by the Gunsola Hydropower Generation Pvt Ltd on Dharam Ganga river, a tributary of Bal Ganga River  
Respected sir,

We would like to respectfully and earnestly submit on behalf of all the people of the above mentioned villages that all the projects of Gunsola hydropower company limited should be immediately cancelled in public interest. 750 poor families of these villages whose livelihood depends on agriculture and cattle breeding will be badly affected by the projects.

On completing and operating these projects:

1. The canals will be entirely without water and this will affect thousands of acres of fertile land that the families depend on and will not be able to be irrigated and will not be productive.
2. By destroying the river access to the canals, access to clean and safe drinking water for houses and cattle will be denied.
3. Many households depend on watermills to sustain their livelihoods, and these will be disrupted too if water access is denied. The people of these villages will also be deprived of the grinding and milling facilities.
4. Due to this project, long standing traditional ways of living that include riverine agriculture, sand, gravel, fish, wood based work and micro hydro related works will come to an end.
5. Our children will lose access to enjoying playing in the rivers and will not be able to learn to swim and also lose access to a natural resource.
6. By stopping the flow of Dharamganga, many households will not be able to practice their religious rituals. Even the funeral rituals will not be performed as water to extinguish the flames after cremation and for other related rituals will not be available.
7. This area is an ancient and sacred pilgrimage area. The people of the region depend on some income from this pilgrimage, besides the agriculture. The stopping of perennial flow of water in the river will reduce the attraction of the pilgrims to the area. This will deprive the people of their income and also source of cultural enrichment.
8. This project will also impact the grazing and feeding habits of animals. The distance of access to the forest for the women would also increase. All this will also increase the tendency and incidence of migration of young males for employment outside.
9. Due to this project, we will lose entitlements to our resources, will increase responsibilities. The hold of the outside capital will increase, people's anger will increase, poor people's time will be wasted in agitations.
10. These projects are completely inappropriate in this region in the climate change and environmental context.

11. For your information, this area is susceptible to landslides, earthquakes, cloud burst and other natural calamities. This kind of projects is like inviting more such natural calamities and would only increase the problems of the people of this region.

We have sat together and deliberated on the impacts already visible of the under operation 3 MW Thati Churena (Chani) project operated by the Gunsola Hydropower Generation Pvt Ltd and in our general meeting decided with full understanding and knowledge that such projects may increase the revenue of government, but the damage to the environment and the natural resources of the Himalayas will be irreparable. These projects that destroy the life and livelihoods of 750 poor families to increase the comforts of the already rich people will be unjust.

We respectfully pray to you that by immediately cancelling Jhala Koti, Agunda Thati and other hydropower projects, you will help us overcome the serious crisis we are facing.

Signed by:

Panna Lal Singhvan
Birendra Prasad Nautiyal
Surendra Nath
Mina Rana
Vinesh Chendra Bhatt
Kirti Singh Rawat
Jai Prakash Rana
Upendra Singh Negi
Sadanand Semwal
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[Handwritten text in Hindi]
English Translation of the Hindi Original

To:
UNFCCC
Respected UNFCCC,
We would like to inform you about the Jhalakoti hydropower project that Mr Ratansinh Gunsola has fraudulently prepared this project (proposal) using his financial and political clout, without consent from the village assemblies (legal entities as per India’s constitution, at village level, whose consent is required for taking up any project affecting the village) of village Koti, Agunda, Thati and Ragasya etc.
Hence if this project is taken up, the people of above mentioned village get no water from the (Dharam Ganga) river. Our drinking water, irrigation water needs, our customs from birth to death as per the Hindu religion are dependent on this river.
Hence we would like to convey to you that you should not provide any financial help to this project in the form of CDM. We can provide you all the necessary evidence as to why this project is being opposed.
Dated: June 17, 2012
Signed by:
1. V K Brijmohan
2. Mrs Devi Pratap, elected member of village government, Koti village
3. Dwarika Bhatt, social worker, Koti Village
4. Dhirendra Nautiyal, former elected head of village Thati, Budha Kedar, Tehri Garhwal
5. Jay Prakash Rana, At and Post Thati, Budha Kedar, Tehri Garhwal
Above is a photo of a 30+ year old canal that was constructed by Koti locals for the purpose of irrigation.
Above is a traditional gharat (a small scale, hydro powered grain and oil seed grinder) found in the project affected Agunda Village