

**MINUTES OF THE 8TH MEETING OF THE SEAC KERALA HELD ON
26.09.2012 AT THE HARITHASREE HALL,
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE CHANGE,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM**

The Eighth meeting of SEAC -Kerala was held at 9.30 am on 26th September 2012 at Harithasree Hall, Department of Environment and Climate Change, Thiruvananthapuram. Representatives of project proponents/consultants attended the meeting at relevant durations. The agenda items included five proposals - one building project and four quarry projects. The meeting commenced at 9.30 am and the following members of SEAC-Kerala were present in the meeting:

- | | | |
|-----|---|-----------------------|
| 1) | Dr. N.G.K.Pillai
ICAR Emeritus Scientist &
Former Director CMFRI | - Chairman, SEAC |
| 2) | Dr. Oommen.V.Oommen
Chairman, Kerala State Biodiversity Board &
CSIR Emeritus Scientist | - Vice Chairman, SEAC |
| 3) | Dr. E.J.Joseph | - Member, SEAC |
| 4) | Dr. P.S.Harikumar | - Member, SEAC |
| 5) | Dr. Khaleel Chovva | - Member, SEAC |
| 6) | Prof.(Dr.) K.Sajan | - Member, SEAC |
| 7) | Sri. John Mathai | - Member, SEAC |
| 8) | Sri. Eapen Varughese | - Member, SEAC |
| 9) | Dr. C.N.Mohanan | - Member, SEAC |
| 10) | Dr. V.Anitha | - Member, SEAC |
| 11) | Dr. K. HariKrishnan | - Member, SEAC |
| 12) | Sri. P.Sreekantan Nair
Director, Department of
Environment and Climate Change | - Secretary, SEAC |

The meeting was chaired by Dr.N.G.K.Pillai. He welcomed all the members. [In his introductory remarks briefed the status of the project proposal received so far and action taken on it.](#) The Committee had a serious discussion on the upcoming project proposals especially the quarry proposals and their related issues. In the meantime SEAC proposed to initiate a mission for assisting the Indian Railways in facilitating conversion of all unmanned level crossings in

Kerala to manned level crossings with the involvement of proponents seeking Environmental Clearance by committing themselves to the welfare of the people in Kerala under Corporate Social Responsibility. Then the Committee discussed the agenda items one by one and took the following decisions.

Thereafter, regular agenda items were taken up for deliberations:

Item No. 08.01 Confirmation of the Minutes of the 7th meeting of State Level Expert Appraisal Committee (SEAC) Kerala, held on 1st September, 2012 at HARITHASREE Hall, Department of Environment and Climate Change.

Confirmed.

Item No. 08.02 Action taken report on the decisions of the 7th SEAC meeting

The Committee noted the action taken report presented by the Member-Secretary SEAC all the items.

Item No. 08.03 Application for environmental clearance for the Proposed Commercial Project, PRESTIGE TMS SQUARE, in Survey Nos. 153/11A, 153/11B, 153/12A and 153/12B at Edapally South Village, Kanayannur Taluk, Ernakulam District, Kerala by M/s South Asian Plywood Mills (P) Ltd. (File No. 30/SEIAA/KL/2967/2012)

The project proponents made the presentation of their proposed project on the technical points and explained the environment management practices to be adopted during the construction and operational phases of the project. The proponent stated that the total roof area provided for RWH is 6000 m² which required clarification as only 3000 m² area is available in the proposed project plan for the same. Moreover, the available water will not be sufficient for RWH as it is a water scarce area. The proponent was asked regarding their plans to enhance the rain water storage. Committee asked the proponent to describe how the water scarce situation in Cochin area can be overcome and as to whether they had any alternative measures to ease the situation. The proponent explained the details of the proposed Rain Water Harvesting (RWH) structure put in place. The capacity of the RWH structure is 500 KL and the Committee suggested to increase the same to 750 KL. OR They proponent have provided two RWH structures of capacity 2500 KL each and the Committee suggested for an additional RWH structure of 50250 KL, capacity totaling to be of 750 KL of RWH. It was pointed out that the location of the RWH structure was not shown in the drawings and that it should be done. The Committee also suggested using the pavement water for non drinking purposes and to drastically reduce the dependency on KWA. The Committee was of the general opinion to avoid the statement in proposals that KWA has agreed to give sufficient water for the proposed project as no such assurance issued by KWA exist so far. Further it was noted that 40 pits for ground water

- Formatted: Font color: Black
- Formatted: Font color: Black, Superscript
- Formatted: Font color: Black
- Formatted: Font color: Black, Superscript
- Formatted: Font color: Black
- Formatted: Font color: Black, Not Highlight
- Formatted: Font color: Black
- Formatted: Font color: Black, Not Highlight
- Formatted: Font color: Black
- Formatted: Font color: Black
- Formatted: Font color: Black
- Formatted: Font color: Black, Not Highlight
- Formatted: Font color: Black
- Formatted: Font color: Black, Not Highlight
- Formatted: Font color: Black
- Formatted: Font color: Black, Not Highlight
- Formatted: Font color: Black
- Formatted: Font color: Black, Not Highlight
- Formatted: Font color: Black

recharge is suggested for surface run off. Committee asked the proponent to provide ~~portion of~~ the cadastral map ~~of the of the proposed site~~ and details of resurvey showing extent of plot ~~with~~ survey numbers and adjacent ~~plots-plots~~ and also demarcate extend extent of the plot with survey numbers. ~~Committee asked the proponent to describe how the water scarce situation in Cochin area can be overcome and as to whether they had any alternative measures to ease the situation. The proponent explained the details of the proposed Rain Water Harvesting (RWH) structure put in place. The capacity of the RWH structure is 500KL and the Committee suggested to increase the same to 750 KL. It was pointed out that the location of the RWH structure was not shown in the drawings and that it should be done. Committee asked the proponent to ensure a periodical monitoring of pollution levels in the area. They agreed with the suggestion and agreed to have a daily monitoring management plan. As stated by the proponent, the h~~Height of the building is about 46 m above ground level with 10 floors and each floor height is indicated to be 5 m. ~~Whether there is any plan of alteration in the internal dimensions needed clarification. The proponent stated here that this was as per the rules. The Committee raised concern over the proposed two basement floors. The Committee suggested a mechanized parking system. The soil section showed the presence of weak clayey strata below 4 m which is not safe for the construction of basement floors. - Also, considering the high liquefaction potential of the area, The the~~ Committee ~~stated that in view of the liquefaction potential suggested that~~ the lower basement floor may be avoided because in such a case the excavation may go beyond 5 m of ground water level. The Committee suggested a mechanized parking system considering that lower floor is proposed only for car parking. The Committee noted that water quality status of the bore well is good as per the proposal and suggested the proponent to conduct yield test for both the bore well and open well. The proponent was asked to minimize the usage of glass in the building. The Committee enquired whether they had started the work. The proponent stated that only test piling was done in the site. The Committee wanted them to provide all details of soil and bore well data. The proponent has stated in the proposal that there will be zero discharge from the STP of which the Committee was doubtful as to whether such a thing is practicable. The Committee further observed a general ~~statement stating as to~~ raising of plantation in the available open area. ~~to this end~~At this juncture the proponent was asked to give specification with details of species selected and the location where they will to be planted. and the location as to where they will be planted. The Committee further noted that ~~the proponent~~the proponent has also not provided the details of their Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) to which the proponent stated that they already had a CSR arrangement with the Cochin Corporation for greening of avenues at specific locations. The Committee found no such specific details in their proposal. The Committee ~~suggested to~~ the proponent to give their CSR fund to the Indian Railways for the construction of railway gates at unmanned level crossings for the welfare of the people of that particular area for their safety and security. The proponent agreed to this suggestion of the Committee and ~~has willed to extended~~ wholehearted ~~support to~~ support to this new venture-venture and to continue it even for annual maintenances.

Formatted: Font color: Black

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

The Committee resolved to request the applicant to furnish the following details before further processing. ~~The proponent is requested to comply with the following observations submit the following:~~

~~Committee suggested to avoid the lower basement floor and use avoiding the lower basement floor and suggested to provide an assurance for using a mechanized parking system for car parking. (To this point what proponent has to submit? Assurance or any plans?)~~

1. ~~Assurance that use of reflective glasses for decorative purposes shall be minimized.~~
2. ~~Details of soil and bore well data to be provided. (Details of soil data of borewell to be provided (As in Pillai sirs Correction))~~
3. ~~Water source as indicated is a well but the location is not illustrated in the map.~~
4. The dependable yield of both bore well and open the well to be provided.
5. Environmental quality analysis reports (air, soil, water and noise) done by an accredited laboratory shall be provided.
6. Committee suggested for an additional RWH structure of 500 KL capacity. A new conceptual plan showing the Location-location of RWH structures and proposed other sources of water to be provided. to be given in the drawings.
7. ~~Ensure Assurance periodical that periodical assurance of pollution monitoring shall be done.~~
8. Recalculate and submit the water budget of the proposed projects.
9. Detailed plan on treatment of sewage to be provided.
10. A proper environment management plan with details of discharge mechanism to be provided.
11. Cadastral map and details of resurvey showing extent of plot and adjacent plot to be provided demarcating the extent of plot with survey numbers.
12. Specification with details of species selected to be planted and the location as to where they will be planted for green area development to be provided.
13. Specific details on Corporate Social Responsibility to be provided.

The proposal is DEFERRED for reconsideration on receipt of the above details.

Item No. 08.04 Application for environmental clearance for the proposed quarry project in Survey nos. 21/6, 21/4, 10/2, 9/1-2, 9/1-3, 20/3, 23/7, 28/10-1, 23/5 at Thottapuzhassery Panchayath, Thiruvalla Taluk, Pathanamthitta District, Kerala by M/s Panachayil Industries (File No. 34/SEIAA/KL/6089/2012)

This is the first quarry proposal submitted to the Authority for Environmental Clearance and the Committee had some serious discussions on the environmental aspects of the quarry proposals. The Committee held elaborate discussions on various issues/problems related to the quarries in the State, prior to the presentation of the proposal by the project proponent. The Committee sought clarification from the proponent on the survey numbers as the proponent had

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Font: (Default) Comic Sans MS

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0 cm, Hanging: 0.63 cm

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0 cm, Hanging: 0.63 cm

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

produced supporting documents only for three survey numbers out of the nine mentioned in the proposal. The proponent explained that the Revenue Department had conducted a resurvey in that area and had allotted new resurvey numbers. The Committee sought clarification on as to whether the survey number (in the proposal) and resurvey number belong to the same area. The proponent has been asked to produce bit of resurvey map of that particular property. The Committee enquired on the present image status. The proponent produced a google image of the project site dated 2007 as it is the latest one available at present in the website. The proponent further clarified that there is not much change in that location. The Committee asked the proponent to submit a detailed report about the biodiversity of that area (including both flora and fauna)-. The Committee sought clarification from the proponent about the soil analysis report and further asked them to study and analyze the soil level and the soil fertility status. The Committee wanted to assess the ~~removal of~~ top soil expected to be removed and also the quantity of material available at the proposed site. The Committee suggested ~~to~~ the proponent to study the benches height, width and thickness of the soil. It was noted that the source of water is an open well. The Committee wanted details of the closure period of the project and asked the proponent to fill the mined area with sand and retain its land status. The suggestion from the Committee to maintain green belt to prevent air pollution from the site was also agreed upon by the proponent. The SEAC ~~suggested to~~ the proponent to give their CSR fund to the Indian Railways for the construction of railway gates at unmanned level crossings for the welfare and benefit of the local people of that particular area for their safety and security-. The proponent readily agreed with the Committee's suggestions.

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

Considering all the above, the SEAC directed the proponent to submit the following:

The proponent is requested to comply with the following observations:-

1. Details regarding the survey numbers and possession certificates of the property and proof as to whether the survey number (in the proposal) and resurvey number belong to the same area shall be provided. A resurvey map of the proposed project site to be provided.-
2. Submit an assessment report regarding the removal of the top soil from the quarry, the benches height, width and thickness of the soil.
3. Details regarding the available quantity of top soil expected to be removed. to be provided.
4. Assurance that Meteorology-meteorology and air quality status must shall be monitored on regular basis.
5. Assurance of prevention and protection of land by way of barricades and other preventive measures, refill the pit with sand and maintain green belt to prevent air and noise pollution.
6. Detailed description of the flora and fauna with special reference to rare, endemic and endangered species to be provided and the same to be certified by competent authority.
7. Details about the nearby water bodies to be provided.
8. Details of drilling, blasting, explosives to be provided.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0 cm, Hanging: 0.63 cm

9. Details regarding the benches height, width and thickness of the soil.

9-10. Details of the settlements, road facility, and water collection plans to be provided.

10-11. Assurance that mine depth shall not exceed below the water table.

11-12. Environmental quality analysis reports (air, soil, water and noise) done by an accredited laboratory shall be provided.

13. Analysis report of soil fertility status to be provided.

14. Details of the closure period of the project shall be provided.

The proposal has been DEFERRED for SITE INSPECTION and to reconsider on receipt of the above particulars.

Item No. 08.05 Application for environmental clearance for the proposed quarry project in Survey no. 266/15, 266/24, 266/16-1, 266/16-2, 271/7-1, 271/7-2, 271/7-3, 272/5, 267/5, 268/2-1, 268/2-2, 268/3-2-1, 268/3-2-2, 268/5-2, 268/6, 268/7, 269/9-2, 268/8-1, 268/8-2, 268/4, 268/4-2, 268/4-3, 271/4 and 271/5 at Chithara Village & Panchayat, Kottarakkara Taluk, Kollam District, Kerala by M/s Poabs Enterprises Pvt. Ltd.
(File No. 35/SEIAA/KL/6090/2012)

The proposal was discussed in detail. This is a case of a new mine. A brief description of the project was given by the proponent. The Committee sought clarification on the nearest railway line and also the nearest river boundary of the proposed project. The Committee enquired about the noise level limits in that area to which the proponent stated that it was as per the industrial limits. The proponent informed that storage of the blasting material will be in an isolated place supervised by a licensed explosive supervisor. The Committee asked the proponent to have a specification about the vibration of the proposed site and also asked them to rewrite the salient features of that particular area and to submit the geological status of the proposed site. The Committee noted here that this place is proximate to a forest region and so the proponent ~~must~~ may require to obtain a certificate from the State Forest Department. The Committee wanted to assess the ~~removal of~~ top soil expected to be removed from ~~of~~ that area and the quantity of material available at the proposed site. The Committee further enquired ~~about~~ on the crushing unit that was not mentioned in the proposal. The proponent clarified that the crushing ~~was within the quarry limits (was)~~ is done within the area of quarry itself by adopting a German based technology) and that they are using a German based technology (dry method) in a completely closed manner. The Committee necessitated a detailed study on the biodiversity status of the proposed site and the same to be authenticated ~~by an authorized agency~~. Further the proponent was told to submit a water quality status report of that area. The Committee sought clarification on the source of water in the proposed site to which the proponent replied that an adjoining reservoir (3 m or 4 m depth) in the quarry itself is the main source and that a check dam was already constructed in the lowest point of the water flow. The SEAC suggested the proponent to give their CSR fund to the Indian Railways to convert unmanned railway crossings

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

in and around that particular area to manned level crossings for the welfare of local people. The proponent agreed with this suggestion of the Committee.

The Committee resolved to request the applicant to furnish the following details ~~in the prescribed format~~ for taking further action on the project:

1. Environmental quality analysis reports (air, soil, water and noise) done by an accredited laboratory shall be provided.
2. Specification about the vibration of the proposed site to be provided.
3. Rewrite the salient features of the project area and submit the geological status of the proposed site.
4. Details regarding the geology of the proposed area.
5. Biodiversity study report specific to the project site may be got certified by the Biodiversity Monitoring Committees/Bhoomitrasena Clubs of the locality or by any subject expert from the nearby R&D organizations/Government/Aided colleges.
3. Detailed biodiversity study of the proposed project with detailed listing out the species status of the particular area
6. Details on the top soil expected to be removed from the area and the quantity of material available at the proposed site to be provided.
4. 7. Details of approach road must be noted clearly should be clearly provided.
5. 8. A certificate from the Kerala Forest Department on the status of this region.

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Font color: Auto

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

The proposal has been DEFERRED for SITE INSPECTION and receipt of the above particulars for further reconsideration.

Item No. 08.06 Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed quarry project in Survey no. 351/1 at Manakkad Village, Thodupuzha Taluk, Idukki District, Kerala by M/s United Granites and Metals (File No. 36/SEIAA/KL/6091/2012)

The project proponent gave a brief description of their proposal. This is a case of a new mine, adjacent to which ~~there~~ ~~there~~ is an existing mine. The Committee noted here that the google image depicts the area as a ~~Reserved~~ Forest. The proponent clarified that this ~~appears~~ forest as being rubber plantation. The Committee raised a question regarding ~~to~~ the ownership of the quarry. The proponent replied that there is an agreement of 15 years of lease from the owner. The Committee further enquired as to whether any ~~willingness letter~~ (or consent in writing) from the owner was available for conducting mining operations. The Committee necessitated a detailed study on the biodiversity status of the proposed site and the same to be authenticated ~~by~~ an authorized agency. Further the proponent was told to submit a water quality status of that area. The Committee sought clarification from the proponent on the soil analysis report and asked the proponent to analyze the soil level and the soil fertility status. Furthermore it was specified that the mine depth shall not exceed ~~below~~ the ~~ground~~ water table. The Committee sought clarification on how the life of a ~~quarry~~ (or mine) could be estimated. The proponent

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

clarified here that this was as per the mining and mineral rules. The SEAC suggested ~~to~~ the proponent to give their CSR fund to the Indian Railways for the construction of railway gates at unmanned railway crossings for the welfare of local people of that particular area. The Committee resolved to request the applicant to furnish the following details for taking further action on the project proposal:

1. Details about the ownership of the quarry and consent in writing from the owner for conducting mining operations to be provided.
2. Specify sStream location to be specified.
3. Assurance that mine depth shall not exceed below the water table.
4. Details of settlements and crushing unit to be provided.

—Environmental quality analysis reports (air, soil, water and noise) done by an accredited laboratory to be provided.

5.

6. Biodiversity study report specific to the project site may be got certified by the Biodiversity Monitoring Committees/Bhoomitrasena Clubs of the locality or by any subject expert from the nearby R&D organizations/Government/Aided colleges.

5.—Analysis report of soil fertility status to be provided. Details on the study vegetative status of the area.

7.

The proposal has been DEFERRED for SITE INSPECTION and receipt of the above particulars for further reconsideration.

Item No. 08.07 Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed quarry project in Survey nos. 459/2, 460/10, 460/12, 446/8, 462/5, 461/2, 461/3, 446/7, 460/2-2, 460/2-1 at Peroorkada Village, Thiruvananthapuram Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram District, Kerala by M/s Poabs Granites Pvt. Ltd. (File No. 37/SEIAA/KL/6092/2012)

The project proponent gave a brief description of their proposed project. The Committee had already visited the quarry as per the instructions from the High Court of Kerala in an earlier ~~instanee~~ occasion (due to a complaint filed against the quarry). The Committee enquired whether water from the Aruvikkara dam is being used for their concrete mixing purposes. The proponent ~~stated here~~ informed that the ready mix process is done using machinery without any water. The Committee enquired about-on the noise level status of the proposed quarry site. The proponent agreed to minimize the noise pollution with the help of modern technology. The Committee sought an explanation from the proponent on the complaint raised by the people on the other side of the river on having cracks in their buildings s due to quarrying activities. The proponent defended here and requested the Committee to make a closer examination of the quarry and ready mix unit, the activities of which does not show any ~~evidene~~ chances of causing a cracks

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: List Paragraph, Justified, Indent: Left: 0 cm, Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.5 cm + Indent at: 1.14 cm, Tab stops: 0.63 cm, Right

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: List Paragraph, Justified, Indent: Left: 0 cm, Numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0.5 cm + Indent at: 1.14 cm, Tab stops: 0.63 cm, Right

Formatted: Font color: Auto

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

Formatted: Not Highlight

to the nearby residences.- The SEAC suggested the proponent to give their CSR fund to the Indian Railways for railway gate construction at unmanned level crossings in Kerala for the welfare of local people ~~of that particular area~~ for their safety and security. The Committee resolved to request the applicant to furnish the following details for taking further action on the project:

1. Environmental quality analysis reports air, soil, water and noise) done by an accredited laboratory to be provided.~~to be provided.~~
2. Details of their water requirements and its source.
3. Details about the transportation of materials.

The proposal has been DEFERRED for further reconsideration on receipt of the above particulars ~~for further reconsideration.~~

At the end of the meeting, SEAC decided that a subcommittee shall conduct field visits ~~on 24th October 2012~~before the next meeting of SEAC to have an elaborate study and analyze the EIA report of the proposed quarry projects.

The meeting concluded at 5 pm with a vote of thanks by the Chair. The members unanimously responded with vote of thanks to the Chair.

Formatted: Not Highlight