

MINUTES (Approved) OF THE 9TH MEETING OF STATE LEVEL EXPERT APPRAISAL COMMITTEE (SEAC) KERALA, HELD ON 3RD NOVEMBER, 2012 AT HARITHASREE HALL, DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE CHANGE, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM

The ninth meeting of SEAC Kerala was held on 3rd November 2012 at Harithasree Hall, Department of Environment and Climate Change, Thiruvananthapuram. Representatives of project proponents/consultants attended the meeting at relevant durations. The agenda included the evaluation of one new project and reconsideration of thirteen old proposals. The meeting started at 9.30 am and the following members of SEAC Kerala were present in the meeting:

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

Chairman, SEAC welcomed all the participants. In his opening remarks he briefed the current status of proposals received by SEIAA. It was also noted that the SEAC Kerala came into existence through Government of India Notification on 3rd November 2011. The members then had a retrospective discussion on the functioning of SEAC. Serious discussions were made on the present process of issuance of Environmental Clearance (EC) and the conditions stipulated thereof which is noted as very brief and the Committee was of the opinion that the pattern followed by MoEF regarding the same may be followed to a

certain extent as to putting separate conditions for construction and operation phase of a project. It was also decided to monitor whether the project proponent is following the conditions stipulated in EC including the uploading of EC in their official website. The Committee also raised concern on SEIAA's apprehensions on the performance of SEAC and was of the opinion that if recommendations given by SEAC are not taken in its true spirit, in future it shall make only observations instead of recommendations, as the results are not identified and reflected even after the painstaking appraisal process. The Committee was also of the opinion that it should be made mandatory for the project proponent to submit an assurance in the form of affidavit that before securing the occupancy certificate, they shall submit an affidavit to the Local Self Government (LSG) Department that whatever commitments made before the SEAC and recommendations made by the SEAC/ SEIAA shall be fully complied with and at any later stage, if found not complied with, the authorized signatory of the proponent including his successors shall be personally held responsible. It was also decided to bring this before the Authority for inclusion in the General Conditions while issuing EC.

The Chairman shared with the members his experience on field inspections conducted on quarry sites which was very informative and also gave much exposure to the modern technologies used in such activities to contain dust emissions and noise pollution to a certain extent. Hence he urged all the members to join quarry visits in future which may help them to identify the real issues related with mining activities and give practical solutions to the proponent accordingly during the appraisal process. He made a brief account of his quarry visits wherein he could see the most modern quarry and crusher unit at Chithara, Kollam. He stated that quarrying activities have become very refined nowadays, under the supervision of veterans in the field, even by associating retired hands from Kolar mine fields. He also pointed out that the owners of the quarry own land adjacent to quarry site and are doing agriculture and organic farming in an appreciable manner. At this juncture, the Committee unanimously suggested on insisting the project proponents related to quarrying activities to take up eco-restoration activities, citing Eden Gardens in UK and CESS in Kerala as an example. The location of CESS was once an abandoned clay mine which was reclaimed and beautified to the present status which shows that eco-restoration is possible. Hence it was decided to make eco-restoration mandatory for all mining projects at the cost of the person undertaking mining activities.

The Committee also suggested some guidelines to be followed by those who are engaged in quarrying activities. It suggested barbed wire fencing around the mining area and to provide warning alarms indicating the time of blasting which has to be done at specific intervals. If the proponent has an earlier quarried land adjacent to the new proposed one he shall be liable for eco-restoration of the previously mined area. The SEAC also decided to suggest to all quarry proponents to help the Indian Railways convert unmanned railway crossings to manned level crossings near about their quarry towards societal welfare as part of their Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR). It was also decided to intimate all the project proponents of mining that a midterm evaluation will be done once in 3 years by the Committee for ensuring that all the conditions stipulated by SEAC are satisfactorily complied with. The Committee urged to take up eco-restoration activities as mandatory and suggested for reclamation by planned terraced mining at an angle of 45°. In future, there should not be

any abandoned quarry causing hardship to people of Kerala. It was also suggested to tar the access roads to the quarry to contain dust emissions that may arise during transportation of materials. The Committee also suggested for an expert scientific write-up on the methodology of drilling and blasting and also to provide the geometry of drill holes.

The Chairman on behalf of the Committee congratulated Dr. Oommen V. Oommen, the Vice-Chairman, SEAC, and Dr. Khaleel Chovva for taking part in the Conference of Parties 2012 held at Hyderabad, organised by UNEP, wherein 188 countries participated. The Vice-Chairman gave a brief account of the high level segment meeting that lasted for 19 days wherein 2011-2020 was declared as the biodiversity decade and the developed countries deciding to contribute US \$ 40000 crores to developing and under developed countries for taking up the steps for biodiversity conservation.

Thereafter, regular agenda items were taken up for deliberations:

Item No. 09.01 Confirmation of the **Minutes of the 8th meeting of State Level Expert Appraisal Committee (SEAC) Kerala, held on 26th September 2012 at Harithasree Hall, Department of Environment and Climate Change, Thiruvananthapuram**

Confirmed.

Item No. 09.02 **Action taken report on the decisions of the 8th SEAC meeting**

The Committee noted the item.

Item No. 09.03 **Application for environmental clearance for the proposed Housing Project in Survey Nos. 699/2, 3, 4, 5, 7 & 8 at Village Kakkanad, Municipality Thrikkakkara, Taluk Kanayannur, District Ernakulam, Kerala by M/s Ayles Properties and Developers Pvt. Ltd. (File No. 38/SEIAA/KL/7082/2012)**

A brief description of the project was presented by the project proponent. The proponent was asked whether the land adjacent to the plot was acquired for road widening to which the proponent stated that at present they have left 8 m wide road and no land acquisition is required as they can widen it further to 9.5 m. The Committee asked whether the project site is a filled up land as the soil investigation report showed 1.5 m filled up earth. To this end the proponent stated that the land is categorized as purayidam in land documents. On the storm water drain on the eastern side adjacent to the project site the proponent explained it as a seasonal thodu 1.2 m wide crossing the road with a small bridge that carries rain water to Chithrapuzha river and that they had also made provision to direct the overflow from rain water to this thodu. The Committee suggested that since the stream carries flood water, the plinth level should be kept at a higher level than the maximum flood level. The Committee lauded the initiative taken by the proponent in introducing biogas generation plant coupled with STP and energy generation from that. The proponent was asked to provide the details of the biogas plant. The proponent explained that they propose to use the BARC-model modified version of biogas generation plant wherein integrated unit of solid waste and STP is provided. Since sludge is generated everyday and the entire quantity cannot be used as manure all the time, the same will be fed into the biogas plant. The biogas produced can be

used for electricity generation which in turn can be used to run electric gadgets and thus making the entire system self sufficient and viable. The proponent was asked to confirm whether the project site comes under the residential zone. The proponent was also asked on how they are going to solve the water scarcity problem in the area. They briefed on their water usage pattern and the potential sources of water (like treated water from STP, rain water, ground water and water supplied by KWA within the city limits). The treated water from STP shall be used for gardening and car washing. The proponent has not specified the location of RWH structure and pond intended for storage of water in the conceptual plan and was directed to show the same in conceptual plan. The Committee suggested for a more practical approach for usage and conservation of water to prevent problems arising out of water shortage in future. To this the proponent stated that Chithrapuzha river and Kadambayar is water abundant all through the year and any steps to utilize that water sustainably to solve the water scarcity issues is yet to be fulfilled. When asked on their CSR to be taken up by the proponent, they stated that they are ready for enhancing the capacity building for fire fighting and assist the Government in buying a sky ladder which is very essential as to the safety of high rise buildings are considered. The Committee found the bore well data to be satisfactory of having a good yield as per the yield test report provided but was doubtful regarding the same as yield cannot be so good based on the bore hole data and the soil type. Hence, the proponent was directed to verify the bore well data and submit a new report on yield test. The Committee found the water quality report submitted by the proponent to be satisfactory. The Committee also suggested storing the required quantity of water in the sump on the south west portion within the project site.

The Committee found a road up to the boundary as is evident in the plan submitted and asked the proponent as to whether they have maintained a safe distance with the nearby plot prescribed as per the rules. The proponent stated that a 50 m distance is left from the adjacent plot. The Committee also raised concern as to whether any provision is made for monitoring the quality of treated water. The proponent answered that it shall be ensured that monitoring shall be done once in a month. It was found that a rain water pond is provided at the entrance which was shallow and maintained for ornamental purpose with a fountain.

In spite of the above, the major flaw the Committee found with the project was that the proponent was eligible to construct only up to a total built up area of 16000 m² and 125 residential units, for an approach road width of 8 m, as per the existing KMBR whereas they are proposed to have a total built-up area of 26,674.02 m² and 160 apartments. The project proponent was directed to clear this and to go ahead within the permissible limit. The proponent agreed to wait till the modification in KMBR comes through and only then proceed with the project. The Committee resolved to request the applicant to furnish the following details before SEAC for further processing.

1. Assurance that sufficient distance shall be left near the project site as No Development Zone as to the width of the thodu as shown in cadastral map.
2. Landscape plan with index of species of plants to be planted.
3. Conceptual plan specifying the location of RWH structure and pond.

4. An assurance in the form of affidavit that, before securing the occupancy certificate, the project proponent shall submit an affidavit to the LSG Department that whatever commitments made before the SEAC and recommendations made by the SEAC/ SEIAA shall be fully complied with and at any later stage, if found not complied with, the authorized signatory of the proponent shall be personally held responsible, should be submitted by the proponent.

Based on the above observations, the proposal has been DEFERRED.

Item No. 09.04 **Application for environmental clearance for the proposed construction of a Housing Project, at Kazhakuttom Village, Trivandrum Taluk, Trivandrum District, Kerala, in Sy.Nos. 40/10, 40/10-1, 37/11 & 40/17 by M/s Nikunjam Constructions Private Limited (File No. 8/SEIAA/KL/393/2012)**

The Committee held detailed discussions on the request of the project proponent to waive the condition that tube wells should not be constructed in the proposed area and only open wells be resorted to. The Committee observed that bore wells in the nearby area (Ex: Technopark) has caused saline intrusion corrupting the aquifer and reiterated that open wells are the only alternative in the site. The Committee was also of the opinion that as per the soil investigation report, up to 12 m there is dense sand and up to 40 m there is sand and hence there is every possibility of ground water recharge by rain water. Since the underlying strata is sandy and water table is seen at a depth of around 5 m it is also assured that the open wells will definitely yield water and is feasible and hence there arises no question of insisting for a bore well.

Considering the above, the proposal is RECOMMENDED for environmental clearance stipulating the following specific conditions:

1. Resolution passed by the Board of Directors stating that violation has occurred and shall not be repeated in future, shall be provided.
2. Clearance from National Highway Authority shall be obtained, if necessary.
3. Bore wells should not be constructed in the site.
4. Assurance to be provided in the form of affidavit that width of the inside road shall be enhanced, specifying the width, for the free movement of rescue vehicles in an emergency situation.
5. An assurance in the form of affidavit that, before securing the occupancy certificate, the project proponent shall submit an affidavit to the LSG Department that whatever commitments made before the SEAC and recommendations made by the SEAC/ SEIAA shall be fully complied with and at any later stage, if found not complied with, the authorized signatory of the proponent shall be personally held responsible, should be submitted by the proponent.
6. Violation proceedings may be recommended to State Government.

Item No. 09.05

Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed construction of Residential Project at Village Attipra, District Thiruvananthapuram, Kerala in Sy. Nos. 526/7, 526/16, 526/1-1, 526/1, 526/20, 526/21, 526/19, 526/6, 525/15, 525/14, 525/14-1, 544/1-1, 525/2-1-1, 544/1, 526/27 and 526/28 by M/s Muthoot Estate Investments (File No. 17/SEIAA/KL/630/2012)

The Committee found that the proponent has submitted a copy of the acknowledgement received in receipt of their application dated July, 2011 and sought clarification on that as to why they have not received clearance yet. The proponent stated that they have applied for NOC from AAI in the name of present owner recently as on September 2012. Hence the Committee directed the proponent to submit the copy of acknowledgement received in receipt of their application submitted recently. The proposal was DEFERRED and the proponent was directed to provide NOC from AAI in the name of the present owner of the land/proponent of the proposal.

Item No. 09.06

Application for environmental clearance for the proposed construction of a Resort cum Villa Project at Paruthippara of Ramanattukara Village, Kozhikode District, Kerala, in Sy. Nos.2/1, 2/2A, 3/1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 9/4, 5, 10, 11/1, 2& 12/1 by M/s Waterline Hotels Pvt. Ltd. (File No. 15/SEIAA/KL/628/2012)

The project proponent has submitted all the documents as directed by SEAC. The committee examined the documents submitted by the proponent and was found satisfactory. Hence RECOMMENDED the same for environmental clearance.

Item No. 09.07

Application for environmental clearance for the proposed construction of Residential Project (“OCEANA”) at Village Ernakulam, Taluk Kanayannur, Corporation of Cochin, District Ernakulam, Kerala in Sy. Nos. 843 by M/s Centurions Housing and Constructions Pvt. Ltd. (File No. 20/SEIAA/KL/718/2012)

The Committee verified the documents submitted by the proponent. The proponent has provided a letter from KCZMA correcting the survey number which they have earlier quoted wrongly in their recommendation. The proponent was questioned on the expiry of validity period of NOC issued by the Southern Naval Command. To this the proponent stated that they had renewed the NOC with a validity period up to 2014. SEAC directed the proponent to produce the copy of the same. The proposal is RECOMMENDED for environmental clearance stipulating the following specific conditions:

1. Copy of renewed NOC obtained from Southern Naval Command to be provided.
2. Assurance to be provided in the form of affidavit that the width of the common entry and exit shall be made at least to a minimum of 7 m.

Item No. 09.08 **Application for environmental clearance for the construction of Fishery Harbour at Thanur, Malappuram, Kerala**
(File No. 27/SEIAA/KL/2666/2012)

The Deputy Chief Engineer who is at present holding the additional charge of Chief Engineer in the Harbour Engineering Department (HED) made a brief presentation of the proposal. The proponent stated that 75% of the funding for the proposed project is from the Central Government. The proponent mentioned the source of water but has not submitted the dependable yield test for which they have stated that the same will be done during the execution of open well. But the Committee insisted to conduct yield study before starting the construction of harbour to make sure that sufficient water is available for use. On the quantity of maintenance dredging sediment the proponent stated that it was 22000 m³/year. SEAC raised concern on the probable oil spills from vessel movements and quoted the alarming effects of oil spills on the harbour sites like that on the estuarine side in Ashtamudi lake. The Committee lauded the project to be developed as an EU approved clean fishing harbour. The Committee suggested certain strategies to improve the shoreline as there will be erosion on southern side of the proposed harbour up to some level. The proponent was asked as to how they are going to conduct the operations of the harbour. To this the proponent stated that they are considering three options viz., (a) to entrust it to some private parties (b) to entrust with a Society as in the case of Munambam fishing harbour or (c) to manage themselves. The Committee noted the second option as the best, as the Society at Munambam had already proved and showed a better option in the management of fishing harbours. The provision for cold storage and 2 or 3 ice plants has also been given.

The proponent stated that they have set aside Rs. 8.7 lakhs for green area development but the details of plants as to the species to be planted and the location were not exactly given. The Committee was of the opinion that suitable salt tolerant species suitable to the locality may be selected and the green belt development should be done simultaneously with the construction activity or even before that. The proponent was also directed to replace the present pattern of green patches as depicted in the conceptual plan with the green belt. On their Corporate Social Responsibility, they stated that the project in itself contributes to the welfare of the socially and economically backward fisher folk at large. Still, after implementation of the project, some infrastructural facilities (for eg. Schools, medical units, among others) will be developed within the project site. In the proposal, parking area of 900 m² is provided behind the auction hall and so the Committee suggested to provide for a more convenient arrangement for parking as the harbour may have to accommodate more number of refrigerators, trucks and other vehicles. It was also suggested that the maintenance of breakwater and sea wall on either side of the breakwater shall be included in the cost of the project. The Committee was of the opinion that construction of breakwater may create erosion on some other segment of the area and hence the proponent was suggested to address any additional erosion that may occur in future and if found eroded they shall take necessary steps to contain the same. Considering the above, the proposal is RECOMMENDED for environmental clearance stipulating the following specific conditions:

1. Dependable yield of the well water based on yield test to be conducted and source developed accordingly.
2. Siltation phenomenon in the channel and nearby harbour areas to be addressed properly.

3. Assurance to be provided in the form of affidavit that oil spills from vessel movements shall be addressed.
4. Assurance in the form of affidavit that new erosion zones that may possibly occur due to the construction of breakwater shall be protected.
5. The maintenance cost of breakwater and sea wall on either side of the breakwater shall be included in the cost of the project.
6. Separate provision shall be given for fuel station and cold storage.
7. Adequate amount of clean drinking water should be provided onboard fishing vessels for undertaking multiday fishing.
8. Maintenance dredging should also be made a part of the project.
9. The details of tree species selected for green area development (preferably salt tolerant species) which is site specific and the details as to where it is going to be planted, (preferably as a green belt, instead of the isolated patches as shown in the present proposal), to be provided before initiating the works at site.

Item No. 09.09 **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed Service Apartments cum Tourist Village Project, “SAILOR’S COVE”, at RS No. 5/3 in Pallikunnu Village and Panchayat and RS No. 178/4, 178/5, 179/5, 179/6 in Chirakkal Village and Panchayat, District Kannur, Kerala by M/s MIR Builders & Developers Pvt. Ltd. (File No. 25/SEIAA/KL/2122/2012)**

The Committee verified the documents submitted by the proponent. It was found that the width of the access road to the proposed project site is only 7 m and hence as per Rule 37 of KPBR the maximum number of floors permissible is only four and above this it cannot be permitted. Hence, the proposal was DEFERRED and it was decided to communicate the project proponent that either they have to limit their construction to four floors or they have to modify the proposal accordingly.

Item No. 09.10 **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed expansion of Residential Township ‘Sahara Grace’ Project at Village Kakkanad, Seaport Airport Road, Thrikkakara, Ernakulam District, Kerala in Sy. Nos. 536/5, 536/6, 535/1, 535/3, 535/4, 540/3, 533/6, 533/7, 533/8, 534/3, 540/1, 533/1, 533/9, 533/10, 533/11, 533/12, 533/13, 533/14 & 533/15 by M/s Sahara India Commercial Corporation Limited (File No.12/SEIAA/KL/397/2012)**

The proposal was reconsidered on the basis of field visit conducted by the subcommittee of SEAC and the additional clarifications / documents submitted by the proponent. But the Committee was not convinced even after their field visit as to which portion, the proponent is planning for expansion. Moreover since the project had earlier got EC from MoEF, the Committee was of the opinion that it shall be appropriate for MoEF to consider any alteration in EC conditions. Hence recommended to refer it to MoEF for considering the alterations requested by the proponent in the EC already issued by MoEF.

Item No. 09.11 **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the construction of a Residential cum Commercial Project at Vazhakkala Village, Kanayannur Taluk, Ernakulam District, Kerala in Re-Sy. No. 42/1, Block No. 9 by M/s Joyalukkas India Pvt. Ltd. (formerly Joy Alukkas Traders (India) Pvt. Ltd.)**
(File No. 21/SEIAA/KL/871/2012)

On verification of the documents submitted by the proponent, the proposal is RECOMMENDED for environmental clearance stipulating the following specific conditions:

1. Assurance that the place left in the front region of the project site as shown in the drawing is part of the road.
2. Assurance that fencing shall be done all around the tower line.

Item No. 09.12 **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed Housing Project in Re-Survey No. 359/3 at Village Kakkanad, Municipality Thrikkakkara, Taluk Kanayannur, District Ernakulam, Kerala by M/s Green Vistas Infrastructure Projects**
(File No. 32/SEIAA/KL/3045/2012)

The Committee held discussion on the proposal which was referred back to SEAC by SEIAA. The Committee was of unanimous opinion that the proposal cannot be considered until the proponent produces a valid proof of their ownership of land. Moreover, the construction of 2 blocks which is already done is a violation as they crossed the permissible FAR of 2.5 to 4. Since such discrepancies were found in the proposal the Committee DEFERRED the proposal and decided to communicate the project proponent to submit the following documents before SEAC for reconsideration:

1. Proof of ownership of land
2. Statutory approvals for the already constructed blocks.
3. The present status of construction and details of FAR.

Item No. 09.13 **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)

The proposal was examined and discussed in detail. The proponent was directed to take up eco-restoration activities at their own cost as the major objective towards their commitment to environment. The proponent was also asked to provide a technical and scientific write up on drilling and blasting in future. The proponent stated that barbed wire fencing is provided in the quarry site and one delayed blasting is done per day. The Committee also suggested to add in Form 1 details of interlinked project as value addition is done in the project site by way of crusher unit. Based on the new proforma and questionnaire suggested

by SEAC the proposal which was resubmitted by the proponent is RECOMMENDED for environmental clearance stipulating the following specific conditions:

1. Assurance in the form of affidavit that eco-restoration including the mine closure plan shall be done at the expenses of the project proponent on completion of mining.
2. Quantity of overburden and their storage shall be provided before initiating activities.
3. Plan clearly showing the internal roads within the project site to be submitted before initiating activities.
4. Specific methodology adopted for drilling and blasting and also the geometry of drill holes to be given before initiating activities.
5. Garland drains to be provided in the lower slopes around the core area to channelise storm water.
6. Debris/ silt traps to be provided to prevent entry of dust and quarry wastes entering the main streams.

Item No. 09.14

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 appraised based on the new proforma and questionnaire submitted by the proponent as directed by SEAC. The Committee reiterated the need for eco-restoration and warned the proponent that no quarry after mining shall be left as abandoned one. The proposal is RECOMMENDED for environmental clearance stipulating the following specific conditions:

1. Assurance that the approach roads to the project site shall be tarred.
2. Assurance in the form of affidavit that eco-restoration including the mine closure plan shall be done at the own cost of the project proponent.
3. Specific methodology adopted for drilling and blasting as well as the geometry of drill holes to be provided before initiating activities.
4. Garland drains to be provided in the lower slopes around the core area to channelise storm water.
5. Debris/ silt traps to be provided to prevent entry of dust and quarry wastes entering the main streams.

Item No. 09.15

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 proposal was appraised based on the new proforma and questionnaire submitted by the proponent as directed by SEAC. The proponent stated that they have a crusher unit located

near the quarry and their product is 'A' sand. The proposal is RECOMMENDED for environmental clearance stipulating the following specific conditions:

1. Assurance in the form of affidavit that the overburden thickness shall be managed within the site and the old quarries shall be reclaimed and restored appropriately.
2. Assurance in the form of affidavit that eco-restoration including the mine closure plan shall be done at the own cost of the project proponent.
3. Specific methodology adopted for drilling and blasting including the technical details regarding the geometry of drill holes to be provided before initiating activities.
4. Garland drains to be provided in the lower slopes around the core area to channelise storm water.
5. Debris/ silt traps to be provided to prevent entry of dust and quarry wastes entering the main streams.

Item No. 09.16 **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 proposal was appraised based on the new proforma and questionnaire submitted by the proponent as directed by SEAC. The proposal is RECOMMENDED for environmental clearance stipulating the following specific conditions:

1. Assurance in the form of affidavit that the overburden thickness shall be managed within the site and the old quarries shall be reclaimed and restored appropriately.
2. Assurance in the form of affidavit that eco-restoration including the mine closure plan shall be done at the own cost of the project proponent.
3. Specific methodology adopted for drilling and blasting including the technical details regarding the geometry of drill holes to be provided before initiating any activity.
4. Garland drains to be provided in the lower slopes around the core area to channelise storm water.
5. Debris/ silt traps to be provided to prevent entry of dust and quarry wastes entering the main streams.

The meeting concluded at 4.30 pm with a vote of thanks by the Chairman. The members unanimously responded with thanks to the Chair.