

MINUTES (Approved) OF THE 11TH MEETING OF STATE LEVEL EXPERT APPRAISAL COMMITTEE (SEAC) KERALA, HELD ON 9TH JANUARY, 2013 AT HARITHASREE HALL, DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE CHANGE, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM

The Eleventh meeting of SEAC Kerala was held on 9th January 2013 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 fifteen projects including seven proposals for reconsideration. The meeting commenced at 9.30 am and the following members of State Level Expert Appraisal Committee (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. P.S. Harikumar - Member, SEAC
5. Dr. K. Harikrishnan - Member, SEAC
6. Dr. E.J. Joseph - Member, SEAC
7. Dr. E.A. Jayson - Member, SEAC
8. Dr. V. Anitha - Member, SEAC
9. Dr. Khaleel Chovva - Member, SEAC
10. Sri. John Mathai - Member, SEAC
11. Sri. Eapen Varughese - Member, SEAC
12. Sri. P. Sreekantan Nair - Secretary, SEAC
Director,
Department of Environment & Climate Change

Chairman, SEAC welcomed all the participants. In his introductory remarks, he briefed on the statistics of proposals received so far by the Secretariat of State Environment Impact Assessment Authority (SEIAA) and SEAC and their current status in the appraisal process. Secretary, SEAC informed the Committee that **all the proponents are now required to submit attested true copy of NABET accreditation certificate of the EIA**

Consultant organization with photo ID of the EIA Coordinator while submitting applications for Environmental Clearance, the original of which are to be produced for verification at the time of project presentation.

Thereafter, regular agenda items were taken up for deliberations:

Item No. 11.01 Confirmation of the Minutes of the 10th meeting of SEAC Kerala, held on 26th and 27th November 2012 at Harithasree Hall, Department of Environment and Climate Change, Thiruvananthapuram

Confirmed.

Item No. 11.02 Action taken report on the decisions of the 10th SEAC meeting

The Committee noted the item.

Item No. 11.03 Application for Environmental Clearance for the proposed quarry project in Re-Survey No. 172 at Kodyathoor Village and Panchayath, Kozhikode Taluk, Kozhikode District, Kerala by M/s Poabs Rock Products Pvt. Ltd. (File No. 48/SEIAA/KL/7176/2012)

A brief description of the project was presented by the project proponent. The proposed project site falls within 11°17'25.1124" & 11°17'15.74" N and 76°2'58.7895" & 76°1'0.5319" E. In general, the proponent was directed to modify the write up of proposal and to state specifically the local demand for the end use of product. The following aspects of environmental significance were discussed and appropriate suggestions and mitigatory measures were provided, wherever necessary.

Land:

The proposed quarry is an extension of the already quarried area falling in the southern flank of Mysorekunnu, east of Nelliparamba. The area is covered by rocky outcrops and thin immature soil cover. The general slope is towards South with moderate to steep angle of 20°. Further up, the slope gradually decreases. The Committee observed that since the upper reaches of the mine area is sloping with only thin soil cover, chances of **accelerated soil erosion is anticipated. So the Committee suggested for a protective wall in that area and the proponent stated that they have already provided a protective wall for the same. The proponent was also directed to provide a 20 m wide permanent continuous tree belt with deep root system on the upper area of the lease to mitigate this problem.** The Committee observed that **sheet flow is also expected during peak rainy days and that blasting during this period can dislodge debris. To mitigate this, the Committee suggested restricting quarrying activities during the drier months.** The Committee was also of the opinion to stack the top soil for future use of reclamation. The management of top soil provided by the proponent was also incorrect when compared with the figures given and hence was directed to provide revised details regarding the same.

The Committee suggested that the old quarry, the present and the future proposed mining area need to have a general master plan for optimum exploitation of the resources. The proponent was directed to provide a 500 m radius vicinity map of the area that is to scale so that measurements could be made on the map by the Committee members to dispel any doubts. The sketch given by Village Officer and the drawing submitted by the proponent did not match and hence the Committee found it difficult to evaluate the extent of mining area. So the proponent was directed to provide cadastral map duly certified by Village Officer in which the entire mine area (old, present and future proposed ones) is superimposed. The proponent was also directed to provide the perpendicular section across the slope of the contour as they have provided only two cross-sections parallel to the contours.

The Committee was of the opinion that the proponent has shown much lesser reserves than the actual reserves and hence directed to recalculate the reserves by taking section along the slope and submit the same. The Committee insisted to take up eco-restoration activities of already mined area and proposed for an organic farming venture which could become a model for others. The proponent was asked regarding the access roads to the mining area. The proponent stated that the entire access road towards the quarry is completely tarred. The nearest human habitation from the project site was at 210 m and hence the Committee sought the proponent to submit consent from them to conduct quarrying activities. **The proponent was also directed to give proper fencing to the magazines to prevent accidental entry of people.**

Air:

The ambient air quality provided by the proponent was not satisfactory and hence was directed to provide the monitoring data based on 24 hours sampling.

Water:

The Committee insisted on harvesting rain water for their day to day needs as no other water source could be expected in the area which is having an elevated upper slope. The proponent has not provided any plans for managing storm water and was directed to provide the same. **The Committee suggested that sheet flow of rain water on slopes need to be channelized to prevent erosion on the lower slopes. Garland drains have to be provided on lower slopes to mitigate this problem. Linear drainage channels along the slope to be maintained in the unmined areas. Provisions should be made to channelize this overland flow from above.** The proponent was also asked why their water requirement remained the same even after an increase in production capacity. To this end the proponent clarified that even though the production capacity is increased the number of workers remain the same and hence the water requirement also remains the same. **The Committee was not satisfied with the report on drinking water quality provided by the proponent and hence directed to provide action plans to improve the quality of water that has to be provided to the workers. The Committee suggested providing small check dams to trap silt and**

clarify water. Since the proponent has not shown the drainage channels in the hydrogeology and the description given thereon was not representative of the area, the proponent was directed to provide the site specific hydrogeology of the area.

Noise:

The Committee was apprehensive of the monitoring reports of ambient sound level submitted by the proponent as it showed values between 38 dB and 44 dB which was not a reliable figure as far as quarrying activities and the predicted values are concerned. The proponent was asked whether they have taken the reading when the quarrying activities were going on. To this end the proponent stated that they have taken the readings in the proposed mining location where the activities have not started yet. **The Committee insisted to submit a fresh ambient noise level monitoring data at a distance of 100 m to 200 m from the periphery of the mine area taken at the time of blasting and when the breakers are in action.** The Committee was also not satisfied with the noise reduction measures suggested by the proponent and hence directed to provide practical solution for the same and accordingly modify it in the Environment Management Plan. **It was suggested to maintain the PPV levels below 10 mm/sec as there are chances of ground amplification since the area is sloping and to specifically fix the blasting time.** The proponent was also asked to provide details regarding the blasting techniques and the maximum fly rock distance at present.

Considering the above, the proposal was DEFERRED seeking additional clarifications. In addition to scrupulously following the general conditions suggested for all mining projects, the Committee directed the proponent to provide the following for further consideration of the proposal:

1. Cadastral map duly certified by Village Officer in which the entire mine area (old, present and future proposed ones) is superimposed.
2. Valid copy of resolution passed by the Board of Directors regarding authorization of the project proponent.
3. The perpendicular section across the slope of the contour.
4. Recalculated actual quantity of expected reserves for the entire mine area by making a cross-section along the contour slopes.
5. Fresh air quality monitoring based on 24 hours sampling.
6. Site specific hydrogeology of the area.
7. Revised top soil management details.
8. Ambient noise level monitoring data from a distance of 100 m to 200 m from the periphery of the mine area taken during mining operations.
9. A comparative noise level data comparing the noise levels in the proposed mining area and the present mining area.
10. Master plan of the entire quarrying activities in the old quarry, the present and the future proposed mining area.

11. Plans for rain water harvesting to be provided.
12. Assurance that channels shall be provided on steep upper slopes and garland drains in the lower slopes to direct the rain water so as to manage the storm water and prevent erosion at lower slopes.
13. Assurance that linear drainage channels along the slope shall be maintained in the unmined areas and provisions shall be made to control this overland flow from above.
14. Storm water management plans to be provided. Haulage roads has to be given a slope to collect storm water and let it out into pits for screening the dust and clarification.
15. Perspective plan of hydrogeology showing drainage channels.
16. Assurance that permanent 20 m wide tree belt shall be maintained on the upper area of the lease.
17. Vicinity map of the site to scale at 500 m radius clearly marking human habitations, all dwelling units, facilities and land use.
18. Sources of water and action plans to improve the quality of water specifically mentioning treatment methods to be provided.
19. Consent from people residing nearby at a distance of 210 m for conducting quarrying activities.
20. Assurance that small check dams shall be provided to trap silt and clarify water.
21. Assurance that top soil shall be stacked for future use of reclamation.
22. Measures for reduction of noise and dust to be provided and modify the same in Environment Management Plan.
23. Assurance that PPV levels shall be maintained below 10 mm/sec and specific blasting time shall be stipulated.

Item No. 11.04

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 verified the No Objection Certificate (NOC) from the Airports Authority of India submitted by the proponent in the name of the Mr. Thomas John Muthoot, Managing Partner of M/s Muthoot Estate Investments with a height limit of 49 m AMSL and was satisfied with the same. The proposal is RECOMMENDED for environmental clearance stipulating the following specific conditions:

1. Local datum as given in the NOC of Airports Authority of India shall be binding on the project proponent.
2. Storm water from the plot must be directed to percolation ponds after clarification.
3. Silt fencing should be given during construction phase so as to avoid possible down slope movement of mud and other material during the rains and siltation of nearby lake.

Item No. 11.05 **Application for environmental clearance for the proposed Shopping Mall cum Hotel Project in Re-Survey No. 132/2, 132/3, 132/4, 132/13, 132/15 and 132/16, Resurvey Block No. 13, Thandapar No. 13662, at Maradu Desham, Maradu Village, Kanayannoor Taluk, Maradu Municipality, Ward No. 6, Ernakulam district by M/s Kool Home Builders (File No.31/SEIAA/KL/3044/2012)**

The Committee verified the documents submitted by the proponent and it was found that the proponent has submitted all other documents as directed by SEAC except the NOC from Southern Naval Command. The proposed height of the building as given in the proposal was 37.5 m whereas in the application for NOC submitted before Southern Naval Command the height was given as 47 m and clarification was sought from the proponent regarding this. To this end the proponent has given in writing that the additional 10 m given in the application for NOC is considering the basement floors whereas 37.5 m is the height above the ground level. The Committee was of the opinion that since all other documents submitted by the proponent are satisfactory the proposal is RECOMMENDED for environmental clearance stipulating the following specific conditions:

1. During excavation, slumping of material and floor of clayey material should not affect the adjacent plot.
2. The height of the building should be limited to the conditions specified by Southern Naval Command.
3. Seepage of water to the basement floor intended for parking shall be avoided.
4. No treated water should be left outside from STP so that zero discharge is ensured.
5. The entire structure shall be elevated by 2 m in order to avoid water logging at proposed car parking area suggested below ground level.
6. Use of reflective glasses for decorative purposes should not exceed 40% of the total area.

Item No. 11.06 **Application for Environmental Clearance for the proposed quarry project in Survey Nos. 373/1, 373/2, 378/2-2, 372/1-2 and 164/1-187 at Ayyampuzha Village and Panchayath, Aluva Taluk, Ernakulam District, Kerala by M/s Poabs Granite Products Pvt. Ltd. (File No. 49/SEIAA/KL/7178/2012)**

A brief description of the project was presented by the project proponent. The proposed project site falls within 10°14'50.0019" & 10°14'43.6486" N and 76°27'55.9521" & 76°27'43.3914" E. The following aspects of environmental significance were discussed and appropriate suggestions and mitigatory measures were provided, wherever necessary.

Land:

The proposed quarry is a hill with GT station which has to be preserved. Slope of the plot is towards west in Pit 1 and towards east in Pit 2. It was found that the proponent has sought permission for two separate pits in between of which there is an area owned by them where the mining activities are already going on. **The proponent was informed that they have to take the entire area under their possession as one block including the existing one and conduct the mining activities since fragmenting the project causes unplanned quarrying with loss of extractable reserves.** The survey plan provided by the proponent did not show the plots clearly and hence the proponent was directed to provide copy of cadastral map duly certified by Village Officer showing the plots in one sketch. **The total reserves are much more than the projected quantity as mentioned in the proposal and hence the proponent was directed to recalculate and resubmit the same.** It was directed to revise the conceptual mining plan submitted.

The proponent has not provided the thickness of overburden across the area as pockets of thick overburden is expected in the area and hence was directed to provide at least the data of few pits. The Committee also pointed out that the various maps submitted are not to scale and hence directed to submit revised maps to scale and insisted on maps to scale in future to make fair evaluation of the site. It was found that Pit-2 largely abuts against others property and southern side of Pit-1 has also similar disposition which is a matter of concern and hence the proponent was directed to provide a consent from the owner of the neighbouring plot since there is no buffer zone.

It was found that the space provided for overburden stack is in a sloping area and so the Committee suggested changing that location.

Air:

The ambient air quality provided by the proponent was satisfactory. Since the access roads to the quarry sites are tarred and proper measures have been taken to contain dust emissions **the negative impacts on air quality is comparatively less.**

Water:

There is no other source of water to be expected in the mining area other than the rain run off. So the proponent was directed to provide assurance that adequate safe drinking water shall be provided to the workers. Sheet flow expected has to be channelized to avoid any erosion at down slope. To mitigate this problem, construction of garland drains, trenches and check dams were suggested to be provided in the lower slopes. The proponent was also directed to provide practical mitigatory measures to preserve the adjoining cultivable land which is not owned by the proponent from run off. **It was also suggested to take appropriate measures to channelize storm water if local people can use**

it for agricultural purposes. Details of drainage channels and storm water management plans were not provided by the proponent.

Noise:

The noise level data submitted by the proponent was satisfactory and within the prescribed limits.

Considering the above, the proposal was DEFERRED seeking additional clarifications. In addition to scrupulously following the general conditions suggested for all mining projects, the Committee directed the proponent to provide the following for further consideration of the proposal:

1. Copy of cadastral map duly certified by Village Officer showing the plots in one sketch.
2. Valid copy of resolution passed by the Board of directors regarding authorization of the project proponent.
3. Copies of possession certificates for Survey Numbers 372/1-2 and 164/1-187.
4. Recalculated actual quantity of expected reserves for the entire mine area.
5. Revised conceptual mining plan.
6. Proper plans to channelize sheet flow to avoid any erosion at down slope.
7. Assurance that garland drains, trenches and check dams shall be provided on the lower slope with dissipation mechanism to channelize storm water especially during rainy season.
8. Perspective plan of hydrogeology showing drainage channels.
9. Details of overburden thickness.
10. All maps revised to scale.
11. Consent from the owner of the neighbouring plot to conduct quarrying activities.
12. Mitigatory measures to prevent run off into the adjoining cultivable land which is not owned by the proponent.
13. Elaborate storm water management plans.
14. Assurance that adequate safe drinking water shall be provided to the workers.
15. Details on de-silting plan.
16. Specifically mention new location for stacking overburden.
17. Site specific biodiversity listing of flora and fauna.
18. Vicinity map of the site to scale at 500 m radius clearly marking human habitation, all dwelling units, facilities and land use.

Item No. 11.07 **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed quarry project in Survey No. 59/2 at Kariavattom Village, Vettathoor Panchayath, Perinthalmanna Taluk, Malappuram District, Kerala by M/s Poabson Granite Products Pvt. Ltd. (File No. 50/SEIAA/KL/7241/2012)**

A brief description of the project was presented by the project proponent. The proposed project site falls within 11°0'22.7922" & 11°0'16.7925" N and 76°16'47.3756" &

76°16'34.5738" E. The following aspects of environmental significance were discussed and appropriate suggestions and mitigatory measures were provided, wherever necessary.

Land:

The proposed quarry is an elevated hillock with slopes to west and east. A portion of the entire area is leased out to conduct quarrying activities and the present proposal is for seeking environmental clearance for the eastern side of the site. It was found that quarry is in developmental stage further south and quarrying activities are already being done in the north in between a region having natural vegetation interspersed with rubber. The elevation of the site ranges from 280 m to 100 m.

The overburden is presently planned to be stored in an elevated area which may pose threat of slumping & erosion and hence the proponent was directed to relocate it suitably. The thickness of overburden was also not mentioned in the proposal. As in other cases **the quantity of actual mineable reserves was understated.** Section along the slope was also not given.

Air:

The ambient air quality provided by the proponent was satisfactory. Since proper measures have been taken to contain dust emissions the **negative impacts on air quality anticipated is comparatively less.**

Water:

The run off water needs channelization to arrest sheet flow at different levels. Since there is a stream to the east of the project site the proponent was told that the concentrated flow of water shall not be let into it.

Noise:

The noise level data submitted by the proponent was satisfactory and within the prescribed limits.

Considering the above, the proposal is DEFERRED seeking additional clarifications. In addition to scrupulously following the general conditions suggested for all mining projects, the Committee directed the proponent to provide the following for further consideration of the proposal:

1. Valid copy of resolution passed by the board of directors regarding authorization of the project proponent.
2. Proper plans to channelize sheet flow to avoid erosion down slope.
3. Perspective plan of hydrogeology showing drainage channels.
4. Elaborate storm water management plans.
5. Assurance that concentrated flow of water shall not be let into the nearby stream.

6. Specifically mention new location for stacking overburden.
7. Estimate of overburden thickness at least from a few random pits (based on its depth) with log.
8. Recalculated actual quantity of expected reserves for the entire mine area.
9. Section along the slope.
10. Vicinity map of the site to scale at 500 m radius clearly marking human habitation, all dwelling units, facilities and land use.

Item No. 11.08 **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed construction of Mall of Travancore at Pettah Village, Fort Zone, Thiruvananthapuram District, Kerala State, in Sy. Nos. 508/1-1, 508, 508/1, 507/1, 506/2, 506/1, 511/2, 511/1, 511/3, 511/4, 511, 507/2-3, 507/2-1, 507/2-3-1, 507/2-4, 507/2, 510/1, 509/1, 510/2, 510/3, 510/4, 512/2-1, 512/2-2, 512/1-2, 507/2-2 by M/s Malabar Commercial Plaza (P) Ltd. (File No. 22/SEIAA/KL/956/2012)**

The Committee verified the documents submitted by the proponent and it was found that the proponent has submitted all documents as directed by SEAC and was found satisfactory. Since the report of yield test submitted by the proponent stated that overdraft of ground water may lead to saline water intrusion the Committee directed the proponent to avoid overexploitation of ground water. The Kerala Coastal Zone Management Authority (KCZMA) granted CRZ clearance to the proposed construction of Mall of Travancore vide letter no. 976/A3/12/KCZMA/S&TD dt. 29.11.2012 subject to the usual terms & conditions in the CRZ Notification 2011 and also that no untreated wastewater shall be let into the canal and that the discharge from the STP should be recycled. The proponent also provided NOC from Airports Authority of India with a height specification of 22.65 m AMSL vide Ref. No. AAI/SR/NOC/RHQ dt. 29.03.2011. Hence the proposal is RECOMMENDED for integrated CRZ cum Environmental Clearance stipulating the following specific conditions:

1. Overexploitation of ground water should be avoided so that saline water intrusion does not occur.
2. Green belt development to be provided selecting the species suited to the locality.
3. Storage of rain water should be maximized to cater the entire water requirements of the project.
4. Should provide percolation pits in the site, as far as possible so as to direct all the storm water into these.
5. No untreated wastewater shall be let into the canal / public drain and that the discharge from the STP should be recycled.

Item No. 11.09 **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 Committee verified the documents submitted by the proponent and noted that the proponent has submitted all documents as directed by SEAC and was found satisfactory. The only matter that raised concern for the Committee was the proponent's dependency on Kerala Water Authority for the water requirements of their project. The Committee suggested finding some other alternate source of water as Kerala Water Authority will not be able to cater to their entire water requirements. At this juncture the Committee suggested enhancing the rain water harvesting capacity to at least 1000 KL. The proposal is RECOMMENDED for environmental clearance stipulating the following specific conditions:

1. Should provide rain water harvesting unit with capacity to at least 1000 KL.
2. The lower basement floor should be avoided and a mechanized system for car parking shall be adopted.
3. Periodical pollution monitoring shall be done.

Item No. 11.10 **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed quarry project in Survey No. 1982 at Vellikulangara Village, Mattathur Panchayath, Mukundapuram Taluk, Thrissur District, Kerala by M/s Blue Mountain Granites (File No. 60/SEIAA/KL/7649/2012)**

The proposed project site falls within 10°21'57.48"N and 76°25'09.49" E and is in close proximity to Chimmoni Wildlife Sanctuary. Since the project site falls in the proximity or within the protected forest Area, the proposal was DEFERRED directing the proponent to produce No Objection Certificate from the Forest Department for carrying out quarrying activities in the said area of proposal.

Item No. 11.11 **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed quarry project in Survey Nos. 332/4, 340/5, 340/4pt, 331/4, 331/6pt, 340/3, 340/3pt and 340/4pt at Pananchery Village, Pananchery Panchayath, Thrissur Taluk, Thrissur District, Kerala by M/s St. Basil Granites (File No. 61/SEIAA/KL/7682/2012)**

A brief description of the project was presented by the project proponent. During preliminary scrutiny of the proposal it was found that the survey no. 325/9p as given in the covering letter was not found in Form 1 and the proponent was directed to provide clarification regarding this in writing. The proposed project site falls within 10°34'29.6596" & 10°34'14.55" N and 76°21'47.2566" & 76°21'40.2541" E. The following aspects of

environmental significance were discussed and appropriate suggestions and mitigatory measures were provided, wherever necessary.

Land:

The proposed site is an isolated hillock in 100 m elevation. Mining had already been carried out in the area and the **Committee suggested minimizing the production capacity.** The details of residential buildings around the lease area were not provided by the proponent. **Since settlements are seen in the west, consent from the people in the dwelling units within 100 m from the quarry area has to be ensured by the proponent.** The proponent has also not provided the overburden thickness of the site.

Air:

The ambient air quality provided by the proponent was satisfactory. Since proper measures have been taken to contain dust emissions the **negative impacts on air quality anticipated is comparatively less.**

Water:

The stream on the eastern and western side of the project site needs protection from sheet erosion and hence proper storm water management plans has to be provided. The erosion problem is not severe in this case. The water quality reports showed that the quality of water is within the prescribed limits.

Noise:

The Committee was not satisfied with the monitoring reports of ambient sound level submitted by the proponent as it showed values far less than the predicted levels expected in a quarrying area. The Committee insisted on the submission of a fresh ambient noise level monitoring data at a distance of 100 m to 200 m from the periphery of the mine area taken at the time of blasting and when the breakers are in action. The Committee was also not satisfied with the noise reduction measures suggested by the proponent and hence directed to provide practical solution for the same and accordingly modify it in the Environment Management Plan. The proponent was also directed to provide the limit of PPV if residential units are at a distance of 200 m.

Considering the above, the proposal is DEFERRED FOR SITE INSPECTION to assess the ground realities of the project and seeking additional clarifications. In addition to scrupulously following the general conditions suggested for all mining projects, the Committee directed the proponent to provide the following for further consideration of the proposal:

1. Clarification in writing as to the exclusion of Survey No. 325/9p in Form 1.
2. Consent from Mrs. Laly Ouseph to conduct quarrying activities.

3. Ambient noise level monitoring data from a distance of 100 m to 200 m from the periphery of the mine area taken during mining operations.
4. Measures for reduction of noise and dust to be provided and modify the same in Environment Management Plan
5. Assurance that PPV levels shall be maintained below 10 mm/sec and specific blasting time shall be stipulated.
6. Proper plans to channelize sheet flow to avoid erosion down slope.
7. The limit of PPV if residential units are at a distance of 200 m
8. Perspective plan of hydrogeology showing drainage channels.
9. Estimate of overburden thickness at least from a few random pits (based on its depth) with log.
10. Elaborate storm water management plans.
11. Vicinity map of the site to scale at 500 m radius clearly marking human habitation, all dwelling units, facilities and land use.

Item No. 11.12 **Application for environmental clearance for the proposed building stone quarry project in Survey Nos. 446/1 (P) & 446/2 (P) at Kottangal Village, Mallapally Taluk, Pathanamthitta District, Kerala by M/s Amity Rock Products Pvt. Ltd. (File No. 59/SEIAA/KL/7644/2012)**

The Committee verified the documents submitted by the proponent and it was found satisfactory. The proposal is RECOMMENDED for environmental clearance stipulating the following specific conditions in addition to General Conditions for mining.

1. Bench height and width should be maintained at 5m
2. Periodical monitoring of environmental quality shall be done.
3. Specific methodology adopted for drilling and blasting that are provided in the proposal should be adhered to.
4. Blasting and drilling shall be done with utmost care/control so that noise will not get amplified.

Item No. 11.13 **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed quarry project at Block No. 34 in Survey Nos. 106/1, 106/2, 106/3, 106/4, 130/2, 130/3, 130/4-1 at Bharananganam Village, Bharananganam Panchayath, Meenachil Taluk, Kottayam District, Kerala by M/s Bharananganam Industries (File No. 62/SEIAA/KL/7683/2012)**

A brief description of the project was presented by the project proponent. During preliminary scrutiny of the proposal it was found that the proponent has submitted copies of possession certificates for all survey numbers except 106/2, 106/3 and 130/4-1 in the names of persons other than the project proponent. Hence the proponent was directed to provide copies

of possession certificate for the above mentioned survey numbers and consent from the owners of all survey numbers to conduct quarrying activities in land owned by them. Also the certificate from the Village Officer regarding the possession of survey numbers of the proposed quarry area lacked clarity and so the proponent was also directed to provide a copy of the same. The proposed project site falls within 9°45'54.5311" & 9°45'41.06" N and 76°44'11.4886" & 76°44'1.01" E. The following aspects of environmental significance were discussed and appropriate suggestions and mitigatory measures were provided, wherever necessary.

Land:

The land is having a very steep slope exceeding 35° which makes it tough terrain for a quarry. **The quantity of extractable material will be very limited as up to 45° excavation is only possible. Since there is Government land in the middle of the proposed mining area it has to be left as such with its slopes and other associated details.** The possibility of fly rock is high as the terrain being steep. As number of dwelling units is noted in the lower slopes, this being the hazard zone the proponent was directed to ensure that fly rock will not affect the settlements nearby. The proponent has not satisfactorily provided the site specific biodiversity listing of flora and fauna and was directed to provide the same.

Air:

The ambient air quality provided by the proponent was within the prescribed limits. Since proper measures have been taken to contain dust emissions the **negative impacts on air quality anticipated is comparatively less.**

Water:

Since the terrain is steeply sloping it will be difficult to control storm water. So proper storm water management plans has to be provided. The erosion problem may be very severe in this case. **The water quality reports showed that the quality of water is within the prescribed limits.**

Noise:

The Committee was not satisfied with the monitoring reports of ambient sound level submitted by the proponent as it showed values far less than the predicted levels expected in a quarrying area. The Committee insisted to submit a fresh ambient noise level monitoring data at a distance of 100 m to 200 m from the periphery of the mine area taken at the time of blasting and when the breakers are in action. The Committee was also of the opinion that noise amplification will be high in the area due to its location being on hill top. Hence the proponent was also directed to provide effective measures to contain noise and modify it appropriately in the Environment Management Plan. The

proponent was also directed to provide the limit of PPV if residential units are at a distance of 200 m.

Considering the above, the proposal is DEFERRED FOR SITE INSPECTION to assess the ground realities of the project including assessment of the feasibility of approach road and the terrain of the site and also seeking additional clarifications. In addition to scrupulously following the general conditions suggested for all mining projects, the Committee directed the proponent to provide the following for further consideration of the proposal:

1. Copies of possession certificate for the survey numbers 106/2, 106/3 and 130/4-1 and consent from the owners of all survey numbers to conduct quarrying activities in land owned by them.
2. Copy of the certificate from the Village Officer regarding the possession of survey numbers of the proposed quarry area.
3. Assurance in the form of affidavit that Government land in the middle of the plot shall be left as such with its slopes and other associated things.
4. Assurance in the form of affidavit that proper measures shall be provided to prevent fly rock without causing any harm to the nearby settlements and other installations.
5. Ambient noise level monitoring data from a distance of 100 m to 200 m from the periphery of the mine area taken during mining operations.
6. Measures for reduction of noise to be provided and modify the same in Environment Management Plan.
7. The limit of PPV if residential units are at a distance of 200 m
8. Proper plans to channelize sheet flow to avoid erosion down slope.
9. Elaborate storm water management plans.
10. Vicinity map of the site to scale at 500 m radius clearly marking human habitation, all dwelling units, facilities and land use.
11. Site specific biodiversity listing of flora and fauna to be provided.

Item No. 11.14 **Application for environmental clearance for the Quarry Project in Survey Nos. 146/2 at Velliyamattam Village, Kudayathoor Panchayath, Thodupuzha Taluk, Idukki District, Kerala by M/s Puliyananickal Granites (File No. 44/SEIAA/KL/7164/2012)**

The proposal was reconsidered based on the site visit conducted by the subcommittee and the submission of documents by the proponent. The Committee verified the documents submitted by the proponent which was found to be satisfactory. Certain observations made by the subcommittee of SEAC during site visit were conveyed to the proponent for addressing the problems they may confront during quarrying operations. The Committee was of the opinion that since the approach roads are narrow, 20 T trucks cannot be used for the transportation of materials and asked the proponent to use trucks with suitable tonnage capacity which the road can withstand. It was also suggested to trap, settle and clarify the overflow of water from the hilltop before diverting it out. Some quantity of this water after treatment and purification may

be used for drinking purposes for workers. The proponent was also told to retain the available overburden for restoration/reclamation even though it is negligible.

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

1. The approach road leading to quarry site should be tarred.
2. Trucks with less than 20 T capacities shall only be used for transportation of materials.
3. Desilting shall be provided to clarify water from the hilltop before diverting it out.
4. Drinking water of good quality shall be ensured for supply to the workers in the site.
5. Depth of mine shall not exceed below the basement level of the office building on the lower slope.
6. Blasting and drilling shall be done with utmost care/control so that noise will not get amplified.
7. Maximum rain water harvesting should have been adopted.
8. Proper fencing around the mining area should be provided.

Item No. 11.15 **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed quarry project in Re-Survey No. 2/p and 15/p Block 25 at Akathethara Village, Akathethara Panchayath, Palakkad Taluk, Palakkad District, Kerala by M/s Royal Sand & Gravels Pvt. Ltd. (File No. 66/SEIAA/KL/7903/2012)**

The proposed project site falls within 10°51'31.53" N and 76°37'59.78" E. Since the project site falls within Eco Sensitive Zone-1 of Western Ghats Ecology Expert Panel Report the proposal is RECOMMENDED FOR REJECTION of environmental clearance.

Item No. 11.16 **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 proposal was reconsidered by SEAC after the submission of resolution regarding violation by the project proponent and following the directions of SEIAA to inspect the site and report on the existence of any bore well in the site and to assess and report the present status of constructions and the extent of violations.

Considering the above, the proposal is DEFERRED FOR SITE VISIT by a subcommittee of SEAC consisting of Dr. Oommen V. Oommen, Vice Chairman SEAC, Sri. Eapen Varughese, Member SEAC and Sri. John Mathai, Member SEAC and for a report with the details to SEAC.

Item No. 11.17 **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed quarry project in Sy. Nos. 1/3, 1/4, 1/5, 1/7, 8/2, 8/4, 9/1, 9/2, 9/3, 9/7, 8/3 and 8/2-1 at Ramapuram Village, Ramapuram Panchayath, Meenachil Taluk, Kottayam District, Kerala by M/s Cochin Blue Metal Industries (Pvt.) Ltd. (File No. 67/SEIAA/KL/7904/2012)**

A brief description of the project was presented by the project proponent. The proposed project site falls within 9°50'38.76" N76°38'05.19" E. During preliminary scrutiny of the proposal it was found that the proponent has provided consent to conduct quarrying operations from the owner of only the Survey Number 8/3 and since it is found that other survey numbers mentioned in the proposal are owned by different persons as evident from the certificate of Village Officer, the proponent was asked regarding consent from the concerned owners of the land regarding all survey numbers mentioned in the proposal. The Committee pointed out that the toposheet of the proposed mine area stated by the proponent as 58C/4 was incorrect as it is originally toposheet no.C/10. The Committee found that the extent of property falls in two districts and asked the proponent to seek consent from the concerned district authorities for stacking of materials, if necessary. The following aspects of environmental significance were discussed and appropriate suggestions and mitigatory measures were provided, wherever necessary.

Land:

The proponent was also sought clarification regarding the bench height and width proposed which is given as 5 m and 6 m respectively in Form 1, and 6 m and 5 m respectively in details of mining plan. To this end the proponent stated that **the bench height and width proposed is 5 m and 6 m respectively**. The proponent was also asked regarding the ultimate depth of the mine workings estimated as 145 m MSL in Form 1, and 150 m MSL and up to 5 m BGL in details of mining. The proponent stated that **the ultimate depth of the mine workings estimated is 145 m MSL**. The location of two important temples in the north and south directions and many settlements to the east by the side of the road are not shown in the map. So the proponent was directed to provide a vicinity map of the project site to scale marking all dwelling units, land use, etc. within a radius of 500 m. The sketch given by Village Officer and the drawing submitted by the proponent did not match and hence the Committee found it difficult to evaluate the extent of mining area. So the proponent was directed to provide cadastral map duly certified by Village Officer in which the entire mine area (old, present and future proposed ones) is superimposed.

Air:

The ambient air quality provided by the proponent was within the prescribed limits. Since proper measures have been taken to contain dust emissions **the negative impacts on air quality anticipated is comparatively less.**

Water:

The proponent was asked regarding the rain water harvesting pond in the site and asked whether it was an abandoned pit. To this end the proponent stated that it is a man made pond used as a source of water. **The water quality reports showed that the quality of water is within the prescribed limits.**

Noise:

The Committee was not satisfied with the monitoring reports of ambient sound level submitted by the proponent as it showed values far less than the predicted levels expected in a quarrying area. The Committee insisted to submit a fresh ambient noise level monitoring data at a distance of 100 m to 200 m from the periphery of the mine area taken at the time of blasting and when the breakers are in action. The proponent was also directed to provide effective measures to contain noise and modify it appropriately in the Environment Management Plan. The proponent was also directed to provide the limit of PPV if residential units are at a distance of 200 m.

Considering the above, the proposal is DEFERRED seeking additional clarifications. In addition to scrupulously following the general conditions suggested for all mining projects, the Committee directed the proponent to provide the following for further consideration of the proposal:

1. Cadastral map duly certified by Village Officer in which the entire mine area (old, present and future proposed ones) is superimposed.
2. Ambient noise level monitoring data from a distance of 100 m to 200 m from the periphery of the mine area taken during mining operations.
3. Measures for reduction of noise to be provided and modify the same in Environment Management Plan.
4. The limit of PPV if residential units are at a distance of 200 m.
5. Vicinity map of the site to scale at 500 m radius clearly marking human habitation, all dwelling units, facilities and land use.

Item No. 11.18 **Suggestions of SEIAA Kerala at its 13th meeting**

1. SEAC discussed in detail the suggestions made by SEIAA Kerala at its 13th meeting held on 13.12.2012. As desired by SEIAA, the **SEAC decided to recommend for rejection of all the proposals coming under ESZ-1 of WGEEP report without further processing in view of NGT directions.** Regarding the SEAC appraisal report, **the Committee observed the following:**

- (i) **In MoEF, the EAC is forwarding only the recommendations** (as required in EIA Notification 2006) **and not any appraisal report.**

- (ii) **SEAC is the Appraisal body** (authorized to give recommendations) **whereas SEIAA is the Approval body** (authorized to take final decisions as to issuance/ rejection of Environmental Clearance).
 - (iii) **The detailed minutes of SEAC with deliberations highlighting project-specific and general conditions itself is an appraisal report.**
 - (iv) **If SEIAA Kerala require separate appraisal reports in addition to the minutes of the SEAC meeting, the following procedure shall be adopted for which SEAC shall not be responsible for any delays caused in disposing off application for Environmental Clearances.**
 - a) **SEAC Secretariat shall prepare the draft appraisal report of those proposals recommended by SEAC**
 - b) **Place it in the following SEAC meeting as an agenda item.**
 - c) **This draft Appraisal Report shall be further discussed in the SEAC meeting and incorporating suggestions from all the members, if necessary, shall be modified and placed in the SEAC meeting.**
 - d) **Shall be forwarded to SEIAA only after approval of SEAC and confirmation of the minutes thereafter.**
1. **Considering the suggestion made by SEIAA to form a 4-member ad-hoc subcommittee to examine additional clarifications/documents from the proponent, SEAC unanimously expressed their concern and its difficulty in forming a subcommittee as they hardly find time for additional sittings in their busy regular chores in addition to finding time for tedious field inspections that come on and off as part of appraisal of proposals for environmental clearance. Moreover, the Committee preferred to take decisions unanimously in its entirety and was of the opinion that the EIA Notification does not call for the formation of a subcommittee for approval/appraisal on behalf of SEAC. In order to dispose off environmental clearance applications at the earliest by avoiding delays, SEAC appreciates the stand taken by the SEIAA meeting under item KLA/11.09 to 11.12 which would have been followed as a precedence. In the meantime, SEAC decided the following procedure:**
- a. **SEAC Secretariat shall initially scrutinize all the requirements.**
 - b. **Place it as separate agenda items in the next SEAC meeting.**
 - c. **Request the proponents to send copies to all SEAC members well in advance.**
 - d. **Since SEAC do not have the practice of inviting the project proponents for a second time, it is not required.**

2. The Committee was also of the unanimous opinion that **asking for project cost along with a financial statement including funding source and details of insurance company, etc. from the proponent is irrelevant as far as environmental appraisal is concerned.**
3. The Committee sought clarification from the proponent on the apprehensions of SEIAA regarding the unchanged total water requirement even when there is an increase/decrease in production capacity (raised to all proponents and also among accredited consultant organizations). To this end the proponent clarified that **even though the production capacity is increased, the number of workers remains the same and hence the water requirement also remains the same** as water is not utilized for any other purposes.

Additional Item:

Item No. 11.19 Violation of CZR/Wetlands (Conservation & Management) Rules 2010 - Petition lodged by Sri. R. Bhadran, Kollam (File No. SEIAA/E4/4004/2012)

The matter was placed for consideration in the 7th meeting of SEAC. It was decided to have a site inspection by a subcommittee of SEAC consisting of Chairman, SEAC; Vice Chairman, SEAC; Secretary SEAC; Sri. Eapen Varughese, Member SEAC; Sri. John Mathai, Member SEAC and Dr. C.N. Mohanan, Member SEAC, after verification of documents by the respondent in the petition, M/s Heera Builders. Accordingly the respondent has submitted certain documents which on scrutiny was not found to be complete and satisfactory. Hence, the Secretary SEAC held a meeting with Deputy General Manager, Heera Construction Company (P) Ltd. on 21.12.2012 and directed him to provide additional documents / clarifications. So the Committee decided that a new subcommittee of SEAC consisting of Dr. Oommen V. Oommen, Vice Chairman SEAC; Sri. Eapen Varughese, Member SEAC and Sri. John Mathai, Member SEAC shall visit the site and report the ground realities.

The meeting concluded at 5.30 pm with a vote of thanks by the Chairman. The members unanimously responded with thanks to the Chair.