

**MINUTES (Approved) OF THE 15<sup>TH</sup> MEETING OF STATE LEVEL EXPERT APPRAISAL COMMITTEE (SEAC) KERALA, HELD ON 4<sup>TH</sup> MAY, 2013 AT HARITHASREE HALL, DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE CHANGE, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM**

The Fifteenth meeting of SEAC Kerala was held on 4<sup>th</sup> May 2013 at Harithasree Hall, Department of Environment and Climate Change, Thiruvananthapuram. Representatives of project proponents/consultants attended the meeting at relevant durations. 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. E.J. Joseph - Member, SEAC
5. Dr. K. Harikrishnan - Member, SEAC
6. Dr. V. Anitha - Member, SEAC
7. Dr. Khaleel Chovva - Member, SEAC
8. Dr. George Chackacherry - 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 and made a briefing on the status of proposals appraised by SEAC so far and was happy to note that pending proposals for its consideration are nil especially with regard to quarry projects received so far. The Committee took the opportunity to congratulate Dr. Khaleel Chovva on the discovery of a new species of plant *Rotala khaleeliana* from the lateritic hills of Kannur, Kerala, named after him.

The Committee expressed its serious apprehensions on uncontrolled allotment of Government land on lease for conducting quarrying activities. Hence a suggestion was put

forth by the Committee to identify areas appropriate for mining in a sustainable way and enlist those areas with minimum scope for resettlement and rehabilitation so that there arises no serious issues regarding the same. It was also decided to request Director, DoECC to address the Collectorates requesting data regarding area of land coming under Revenue Department which is eligible for quarrying activities. The Committee was also of the opinion that such an initiative may conserve a large area of Government land including many Eco-sensitive areas. After analysing the ground realities in the quarry sites following site inspections held at various places by the Committee, it was decided to add the following in the General Conditions of Environmental Clearance for mining projects:

1. The transportation of minerals should be done in covered trucks to contain dust emissions.

It was further decided to modify the present questionnaire incorporating the following details:

1. Distance of the project site from the adjacent quarry
2. Whether any litigation/complaints are pending regarding the present project (If any, details to be provided)
3. Direction of wind and its velocity (not less than one month data to be analyzed)
4. Mine lease area (in hectares)
5. Expected life of mine

Thereafter, regular agenda items were taken up for deliberations:

**Item No. 15.01** Confirmation of the minutes of the **14<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting, held on 6<sup>th</sup> April 2013 at Harithasree Hall, Department of Environment and Climate Change, Thiruvananthapuram**

Confirmed.

**Item No. 15.02** **Action taken report on the decisions of the 14<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting**

The item was noted.

The Committee also constituted a new subcommittee for field inspection of two sites of projects which were deferred in 14<sup>th</sup> SEAC for site visit - 1. Project site of M/s Malabar Highview Builders (P) Ltd. at Panniyankara Village, Kozhikode Taluk and Corporation, Kozhikode District on 17<sup>th</sup> May 2013 by a team consisting of Sri. P. Sreekantan Nair, Secretary SEAC; Sri. John Mathai, Dr. Harikumar and Dr. E.J. Joseph, Members of SEAC and 2. Project site of M/s Cognizant Technology Solutions Pvt. Ltd. at Puthencruz Village and Grama Panchayath, Kunnathunadu Taluk, Ernakulam District on 16<sup>th</sup> May 2013 by a team consisting of Sri. P. Sreekantan Nair, Secretary SEAC; Sri. John Mathai, Dr. Kurian Sajan, Dr. V. Anitha and Dr. E.A. Jayson, Members of SEAC.

**Item No. 15.03**      **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed quarry project in Sy. Nos. 351/1-1 part and 351/1-2 at Aikkaranad South Village, Poothrikka Panchayat, Kunnathunadu Taluk, Ernakulam District, Kerala by M/s Poovelil Aggregates (File No. 89/SEIAA/KL/1049/2013**

**Appraisal Report:**

M/s Poovelil Aggregates has applied for obtaining Environmental Clearance under EIA Notification dated 14-09-2006 for the proposed quarry project at Aikkaranad South Village, Poothrikka Panchayat, Kunnathunadu Taluk, Ernakulam District, Kerala. The details of the case are as under:

- The proposed quarry site is a private land and is in the name of M/s Poovelil Aggregates.
- The quarry is in operation since 1998 and the current proposal is for the existing quarry.
- The proposed project is for quarrying of 90,000 MTA of building stone from an area of 1.4920 hectares of land. The expected life of mine will be 3.4 years.
- The project comes under Activity 1(a) in the Schedule of EIA Notification 2006 and since it is below 50 hectares, it comes under B category.
- Vide para 3 of O.M. No. L-11011/47/2011-IA.II(M) dated 18<sup>th</sup> May 2012, the mining projects with lease area up to less than 50 hectares including projects of minor mineral with lease area less than 5 hectares would be treated as category 'B' as defined in the EIA Notification 2006.
- At the end of life of mine, excavated pit will be reclaimed and rehabilitated by plantation with native species so as to restore the natural ecosystem leaving no void.
- The proposed project activity involves about 100 percent of the pit area for exploring granite building stone.
- The proposed project does not involve any underground mining activities.
- The mining will be done by open cast semi mechanized method of mining.
- The bench height and width proposed is 5 m.
- The exploitation of mineral is being done from 51 m MSL to 22 m MSL in conceptual phase.
- Part of the proposed land is already under mining and there is no top soil and overburden in those areas.
- The run-off from the lease area will be suitably collected through channels and will be stored in storm water pond for further utilization in Mine/crusher/M Sand units.
- The sewage of 0.8 KLD generated from the mine office will be diverted to the septic tank followed by soak pit.
- The total water requirement is about 5 KLD. 1 KLD of water shall be withdrawn from the existing open well for domestic purpose. There exists a storm water collection pond for meeting the water requirements of M sand, crusher and other dust separation systems. The water required will be sourced from the storm water pond and open well. However the drinking water will be sourced from the existing open well which shall be purified in

mini RO plant. It is proposed to collect the storm water into the holding/siltation tank by constructing channels on the north and east side of the proposed pit area. The channels will be constructed with intermediate check dams to prevent soil erosion.

- The total power requirement of 75 kW will be drawn from diesel engine.
- There will be fugitive emissions generated during material handling, transportation, loading, unloading, among others that are proposed to be managed by regular water sprinkling on haul road, green belt development and avoiding overloading of vehicles.
- The explosives will be stored in the magazines in an isolated place and the licensed person will supervise / control the blasting operations.

The project proponent made a brief presentation of their proposal. The proposed project site falls within 9°58'41.73" N to 9°58'46.04" N and 76°26'54.26" E to 76°27'00.37" E. The proponent stated that they own 6 hectares of land in the project site from which 40 percent of minerals had already been removed with the lowest level of mining coming up to 22 m MSL and the remaining 40 percent is to be removed as part of the present proposal. The Committee raised concern as to why they have restricted the present proposal for quarrying activities for an area of 1.4920 hectares when they own 6 hectares of land and enquired whether they are proposing to carry on mining activities in the whole area at a later stage. To this end the proponent stated that at present they have a quarrying lease from Mining and Geology Department for an area of 0.7406 hectares valid up to November 2016 and quarrying lease for an area of 0.7514 hectares valid up to May 2022 totaling to an area of 1.4920 hectares and they do not have any future plans to take up further mining activities in the area apart from the present proposal and the ongoing mining activities at present. Moreover the documents submitted as a proof regarding possession and permission to conduct quarrying activities in the survey numbers mentioned in the proposal was not sufficient to prove the same and hence the proponent is asked to provide additional documents to clarify the same. Also, the proponent has not provided proof as to the registration of the firm owned by him even though he is the sole proprietor of the firm. The proponent stated that he shall provide copy of sales tax registration for the firm as a proof regarding the same.

The Committee raised concern on the unscientific way of mining going on at present as evident from the photographs provided. The proponent stated that they have done like that for the existing old quarry and has now decided to construct benches for doing the mining operations regarding the present proposal. The Committee observed that there is no scope for mining in the existing old quarry and directed the proponent to restore the existing pit. When asked about the adjoining road near the project site, the proponent stated that the approach road belongs to Panchayath and is tarred. The Committee was doubtful regarding this and directed the proponent to provide the present width of the road and its present condition.

The Committee was of the opinion to provide wind direction and velocity in the project site as the data may be helpful in identifying the movement of fly rock that may have a negative impact on the neighbouring residences otherwise. The Committee also raised concern regarding the proximity of residence at 106 m from the project site and enquired

whether there are any registered complaints/litigation regarding the project from the residents staying nearby. To this end the proponent stated that as to their knowledge there are no complaints registered regarding the project in any department so far as they have taken utmost care to avoid any difficulty to the public with the operation of the project. They also stated here that they are running a crusher unit which is a fully enclosed one in order to contain dust emissions and that they have already spent ` 5 lakhs towards Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR). At this juncture, the Committee directed the proponent to provide the proposed CSR activities interlinked with the present project and to set aside 2 percent of their annual profit towards CSR. The proponent committed ` 6 lakhs towards the same.

The Committee appreciated the new way of biodiversity listing along with the photographs of flora identified in the locality. The location sketch provided by the proponent lacked clarity and hence it was directed to provide a revised map marking the exact distance of the project site from the boundary pillars for filing purposes. The Committee also asked whether setting aside of ` 9 lakhs towards environmental monitoring will be really used for that purpose. To this end the proponent stated that they shall do the environmental monitoring at the post-environmental clearance scenario. The proponent mentioned here that authorized persons from Kerala State Pollution Control Board visit the existing quarry site at least twice a year and check whether the dust suppression systems, environmental monitoring system, among others, are in proper working order.

Further SEAC directed the project proponent to submit the following to SEAC secretariat for filing purposes:

1. Assurance in the form of affidavit that no more further quarrying activities shall be extended to any part of 6 hectares of land owned by the proponent other than in the area mentioned in the present proposal and the area in which mining is done at present.
2. Details on the width of the approach road and its present condition.
3. A revised map marking the exact distance of the project site from the survey boundary pillars precisely defining the proposed mining area.
4. Copy of possession certificate, land tax receipt and sale deed for Sy. No. 351/1-1 part.
5. Copy of sale deed for Sy. No. 351/1-2.
6. Consent from the present real owner(s) of Sy. No. 351/1-1 to conduct quarrying activities specifying the extent of area coming under that survey number.
7. Copy of sales tax registration for the firm.

### **Recommendations:**

The EMP and eco-restoration programmes submitted by the proponent are satisfactory. The proposal is RECOMMENDED for environmental clearance stipulating the following specific conditions in addition to the General Conditions stipulated for mining projects:

1. The existing pit should be completely reclaimed and eco-restoration should be taken up at the own cost of the project proponent.
2. Quarrying activities, at any later stages, should not be extended to any part of 6 hectares of land owned by the proponent other than conducting quarrying in the survey numbers mentioned in the present proposal and the area in which mining is done at present.
3. Mining should be done in a top to bottom manner creating benches of 5m x 5 m.

**Item No. 15.04**      **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed quarry project in Survey Nos. 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)**

The Committee verified the documents submitted by the proponent. The following defects were found in the documents/clarifications submitted by the proponent:

1. The cadastral map provided is not certified by Village Officer.
2. Master plan of the entire quarrying activities in the old quarry, the present and the future proposed mining area is not provided separately.
3. Size of check dam is not mentioned in the rain water harvesting plans provided.
4. In the vicinity map provided, a building is seen at 100 m, the type of which is not specified.
5. The assurance provided regarding maintenance of PPV levels is not acceptable as it is given for below 15 mm/sec whereas the proponent has committed before SEAC to be below 10 PPV.

The proposal is DEFERRED for reconsideration on satisfactory receipt of above items and the proponent is directed to rectify the defects and submit the same to Secretary SEAC with copies to all at SEAC for further consideration of the proposal.

**Item No. 15.05**      **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed quarry project in Survey Nos. 161/1, 163/3, 4, 177/1, 2, 7 at Alakodu Village and Panchayath, Thodupuzha Taluk, Idukki District, Kerala by M/s St. Martin Granites (File No. 90/SEIAA/KL/1050/2013)**

The project proponent made a brief presentation of their proposal. The proposed project site as mentioned in the proposal falls within 9°50'93.09" N to 9°51'03.51" N and 76°16'21.62" E to 76°46'57.02" E which the Committee found as erroneous from the presentation made by the project proponent. To this end the proponent stated that it is a mistake from their part and the proposed project site falls within 9°51'00.57" N to 9°51'03.51" N and 76°46'22.17" E to 76°46'30.15" E. On verification of the new GPS readings it is found that the proposed project site does not come under Eco Sensitive Zone-1 of WGEEP report. The copy of land tax receipts provided by the proponent as proof of

ownership of land lacked clarity and was hence directed to produce the original land tax receipts of all survey numbers mentioned in the proposal for verification and return. Moreover, the proponent has provided copy of possession certificate for Sy. No. 177/2-1 instead of Sy. No. 177/2. Hence, the Committee decided to consider EC in Sy. No. 177/2-1 in place of Sy. No. 177/2. The Committee raised concern on the proximity of Harijan colony to the East of the proposed lease boundary. To this end the proponent stated that at present there is a Government land between the Harijan colony and the proposed project site. Still the Committee was not convinced of it and wanted to ascertain the same. The project proponent has not linked the storm water drainage of the present project with the already existing one in the area owned by them and is directed to provide the storm water management plan incorporating the same. The Committee found a dam at a distance of 1.6 km from the project site and the proponent was directed to provide measures to prevent siltation there.

The Committee raised concern as to why they have restricted the present proposal for quarrying activities for an area of 3.8037 hectares when they own 8.90 hectares of land and enquired whether they are proposing to carry on mining activities in the whole area at a later stage. To this end the proponent stated that at present they have a quarrying lease from Mining and Geology Department valid up to April 2018 for an area of 3.1662 hectares and they do not have any plan to take up further mining activities in the area apart from the present proposal. However, the Committee sought assurance from the proponent regarding this and decided to consider Environmental Clearance only for an area of 3.1662 hectares on condition that any quarrying shall not be resorted to other areas later than this 3.1662 hectares.

The project proponent has not specifically mentioned the proposed CSR activities linked with the present project. So the Committee directed the proponent to provide specific proposal for CSR activities interlinked with the present project and to set aside 2 percent of their annual profit towards the same. The Committee suggested implementing a free insurance scheme to the inhabitants of the nearby Harijan colony under CSR to which the proponent readily agreed.

Considering the above, the proposal is DEFERRED for SITE INSPECTION and also for seeking additional clarifications from the proponent. It was also decided to conduct the site visit on 16<sup>th</sup> May 2013 by a subcommittee of SEAC consisting of Sri. P. Sreekantan Nair, Secretary SEAC; Sri. John Mathai, Dr. V. Anitha and Dr. E.A. Jayson, Members of SEAC. The proponent is directed to submit the following before SEAC for further processing of the application:

1. Assurance in the form of affidavit that quarrying shall be limited to Sy. Nos. 161/1, 163/3, 4, 177/1, 177/2-1 and 177/7 extending to an area of 3.1662 hectares and no other part later.
2. Assurance in the form of affidavit that 2 percent of the annual profit shall be set aside towards Corporate Social Responsibility for introducing free insurance scheme to the inhabitants of the nearby Harijan colony, as agreed before the Committee.

3. Revised storm water management plan interlinking the present proposal with the existing one.
4. Measures proposed to be adopted to prevent siltation at the nearby dam area.
5. Assurance in the form of affidavit that further quarrying activities shall not be extended to any part of 8.90 hectares of land owned by the proponent other than in the area mentioned in the present proposal and the area in which mining is done at present.
6. Assurance that sufficient distance as prescribed by KSEB shall be left from the High Tension KSEB tower line for conducting quarrying activities.
7. Original of land tax receipts of all survey numbers mentioned in the proposal, for verification.

**Item No. 15.06**      **Application for obtaining 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 Granites Products Pvt. Ltd. (File No. 49/SEIAA/KL/7178/2012)**

**Appraisal Report:**

M/s Poabs Granite Products Pvt. Ltd. has applied for obtaining Environmental Clearance under EIA Notification dated 14-09-2006 for the proposed quarry project at Ayyampuzha Village and Panchayath, Aluva Taluk, Ernakulam District, Kerala. The details of the case are as under:

- The proposed quarry site is a private land and is in the name of M/s Poabs Granite Products Pvt. Ltd.
- The proposed project is for quarrying of 2,85,000 MTA of building granite stone from an area of 4.8367 hectare of land. The expected life of mine will be 3.28 years (Pit-1) and 2 years (Pit-2).
- The project comes under Activity 1(a) in the Schedule of EIA Notification 2006 and since it is below 50 hectares, it comes under B category.
- Vide para 3 of O.M. No. L-11011/47/2011-IA.II(M) dated 18<sup>th</sup> May 2012, the mining projects with lease area up to less than 50 ha including projects of minor mineral with lease area less than 5 ha would be treated as category 'B' as defined in the EIA Notification 2006.
- The proposed project activity involves about 97 percent of the lease area for exploring granite building stone. At the end of life of mine, pits will be fully reclaimed and rehabilitated by plantation.
- The proposed project does not involve any underground mining activities.
- The mining will be done by open cast semi mechanized method of mining.
- The bench height and width proposed is 5 m.
- The ultimate depth of mine workings is estimated to be 185 m MSL. The exploitation of mineral is being done from 240-185 m MSL in conceptual phase.
- A total quantity of 17,306 m<sup>3</sup> of top soil and 22,521 m<sup>3</sup> of overburden (pit-1 and pit-2 together) will be removed from both pits during mining operations. The top soil shall be dumped separately at pre-determined place and subsequently will be utilized in spreading



over reclaimed areas for plantation. Overburden shall be utilized for laying internal haul roads and shall form base in reclamation/plantation.

- The sewage of 1 KLD generated from the mine office will be diverted to the septic tank followed by soak pit.
- The total water requirement for the proposed activity is about 5.50 KLD. The water required shall be sourced from storm water reservoir or tube well. However it is proposed to collect the storm water into the holding/siltation tank by constructing channels all around the foot of hill. The channels will be constructed with intermediate check dams to prevent soil erosion.
- The total power requirement of 150 kW will be drawn from diesel engine.
- There will be fugitive emissions generated during material handling, transportation, loading, unloading, etc. that are proposed to be managed by regular water sprinkling on haul road, green belt development and avoiding overloading of vehicles.
- The explosives will be stored in magazines in an isolated place and the licensed person will supervise / control the blasting operations.
- The mineral produced from the proposed mine will be sent to the crusher plant located at a distance of 285 m North from Pit-1 for crushing it to the required size before dispatching it to end use.
- The estimated project cost is ` 2.25 crores.

A brief description of the project was presented by the project proponent at the 11<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 9<sup>th</sup> January 2013. The proposed project site falls within the coordinates mentioned in Annexure 1 of the proposal at cf.pg. nos. 317-318 attached to this minutes as Annexure 1.

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.

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.

There is no other source of water to be expected in the mining area other than the rain water 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. The noise level data submitted by the proponent was satisfactory and within the prescribed limits.

The proposal was again considered by 15<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 4<sup>th</sup> May 2013, in view of additional clarifications provided by the proponent. The Committee verified the documents submitted by the proponent. The proponent was directed to submit the following item to SEAC secretariat for filing purpose:

1. Consent from Sri. Binu K. Mathew, since copies of possession certificates for Survey Numbers 372/1-2 and 164/1-187 provided are in the name of Binu K. Mathew who is not the Authorized Signatory of this project.

All other documents/clarifications provided by the proponent are found to be satisfactory.

### **Recommendations:**

The EMP and eco-restoration programmes submitted by the proponent are satisfactory. The proposal is RECOMMENDED for environmental clearance subject to the usual General Conditions for mining activities adding the condition that the transportation of minerals should be done in covered trucks to contain dust emissions.

**Item No. 15.07**      **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed quarry project in Survey Nos. 1457/1, 1461/1, 1462/1, 2, 1463/1,2 and 1465/1 at Madakkathara Village and Panchayath, Thrissur Taluk, Thrissur District, Kerala by M/s Mridhul Granites & Crusher (P) Ltd. (File No. 91/SEIAA/KL/1051/2013)**

The project proponent invited for presentation before SEAC is informed in writing (as Condition No. 7 in the intimation letter) that: “The Authorized Signatory should bring the original of the photo ID, produced along with the application, failing which proposal shall not be considered”. The present project proponent who is also the Authorized Signatory of the project failed to produce the same. Since the Authorized Signatory of the project has not brought original of photo ID proof produced along with the application despite instructions from the SEAC Secretariat, the proponent was not allowed for presentation before SEAC and the item was NOT CONSIDERED due to the failure from the part of the project proponent.

**Item No. 15.08**                      **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the quarry 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)**

**Appraisal Report:**

M/s Poabson Granite Products Pvt. Ltd. has applied for obtaining Environmental Clearance under EIA Notification dated 14-09-2006 for the proposed quarry project at Kariavattom Village, Vettathoor Panchayath, Perinthalmanna Taluk, Malappuram District, Kerala. The details of the case are as under:

- The proposed quarry site is a private land and is in the name of M/s Poabson Granite Products Pvt. Ltd.
- The proposed project is for quarrying of 2,70,000 MTA of building granite stone from an area of 4.4817 hectare of land. The expected life of mine will be 5.3 years.
- The project comes under Activity 1(a) in the Schedule of EIA Notification 2006 and since it is below 50 hectares, it comes under B category.
- Vide para 3 of O.M. No. L-11011/47/2011-IA.II(M) dated 18<sup>th</sup> May 2012, the mining projects with lease area up to less than 50 ha including projects of minor mineral with lease area less than 5 ha would be treated as category ‘B’ as defined in the EIA Notification 2006.
- The proposed project activity involves about 98 percent of the lease area for exploring granite building stone. At the end of life of mine, excavated pit will fully reclaimed and rehabilitated by plantation.
- The proposed project does not involve any underground mining activities.
- The mining will be done by open cast semi mechanized method of mining.
- The bench height and width proposed is 5 m and 6 m respectively.
- The ultimate depth of the mine workings is estimated to be 115 m MSL. The exploitation of mineral is being done from 250 – 115 m MSL in conceptual phase.
- A total quantity of 13,445 m<sup>3</sup> of top soil will be generated during mining operations. The top soil excavated from the quarry will be dumped separately at predetermined place and subsequently will be utilized in spreading over reclaimed areas for plantation.
- The sewage of 1 KLD generated from the mine office will be diverted to the septic tank followed by soak pit.
- The total water requirement for the proposed activity is about 5 KLD. The water required will be sourced from storm water pond. It is proposed to collect the storm water into the

holding/siltation tank by constructing channels all around the foot of hill. The channels will be constructed with intermediate check dams to prevent soil erosion.

- The total power requirement of 75 kW will be drawn from diesel engine.
- There will be fugitive emissions generated during material handling, transportation, loading, unloading, etc. that are proposed to be managed by regular water sprinkling on haul road, green belt development and avoiding overloading of vehicles.
- The explosives will be stored in magazines in an isolated place and the licensed person will supervise / control the blasting operations.
- The mineral produced from the proposed mine will be sent to the crusher plant located at a distance of 0.55 km North for crushing it to the required size before dispatching it to end use.

A brief description of the project was presented by the project proponent. The proposed project site falls within 11°0'16.7925" N & 11°0'22.7922" N and 76°16'34.5738" E & 76°16'47.3756"E. The following aspects of environmental significance were discussed and appropriate suggestions and mitigatory measures were provided, wherever necessary.

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

The proposal was reconsidered in the 15<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 4<sup>th</sup> May 2013, in view of additional clarifications provided by the proponent. The Committee verified the documents submitted by the proponent. SEAC directed the proponent to resubmit the storm water management plan with some more details of channels, for filing purpose:

All other documents/clarifications provided by the proponent is found to be satisfactory.

### **Recommendations:**

The EMP and eco-restoration programmes submitted by the proponent are satisfactory. The proposal is RECOMMENDED for environmental clearance subject to the usual General

Conditions for mining activities adding the condition that the transportation of minerals should be done in covered trucks to contain dust emissions.

**Item No. 15.09**      **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed quarry project in Survey Nos. 275/1-50-3, 275/1-50-4, 275/1-50-5, 275/1-50-2, 270/1A2, 275/1-50-2, 275/1-21-69, 566/10, 275/1-57, 275/1-49, 275/1-52, 275/1-49, 275/1-52, 275/1-10, 276/1-4, 566/1D and 276/1-11 at Iravon Village, Konni Panchayath, Kozhencherry Taluk, Pathanamthitta District, Kerala by M/s Mallelil Industries Pvt. Ltd. (File No. 92/SEIAA/KL/1052/2013)**

The project proponent invited for presentation before SEAC is informed in writing (as Condition No. 7 in the intimation letter) that: “The Authorized Signatory should bring the original of the photo ID, produced along with the application, failing which proposal shall not be considered”. The present project proponent who is also the Authorized Signatory of the project failed to produce the same. Since the Authorized Signatory of the project has not brought original of photo ID proof produced along with the application despite instructions from the SEAC Secretariat, the proponent was not allowed for presentation before SEAC and the item was NOT CONSIDERED due to the failure from the part of the project proponent.

**Item No. 15.10**      **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed quarry project in Survey Nos. 81 pt, 82 pt and 83 pt at Cherpulassery Village and Panchayath, Ottappalam Taluk, Palakkad District, Kerala by M/s Hywel Granites (File No. 93/SEIAA/KL/1053/2013)**

The project proponent made a brief presentation of their proposal. The proposed project site falls within 10°53'48.24" N to 10°53'57.63" N and 76°16'43.49" E to 76°16'53.00" E. The application for Environmental Clearance is for an area of 4.80 hectares out of the total area of 14.4272 hectares owned by the project proponent. The Committee raised concern as to why they have restricted the present proposal for quarrying activities for an area of 4.80 hectares when they own 14.4272 hectares of land and enquired whether they are proposing to carry on mining activities in the whole area at a later stage. To this end the proponent stated that the proposed project is a new quarry and assured that they do not have any future plans to take up further mining activities in the rest of the area apart from the present proposal. However, the Committee directed the proponent to submit assurance regarding this.

As proof of ownership of land, the proponent has provided the copy of possession certificate and land tax receipts for all Sy. Nos. wherein the Sy. No. 81 is under possession of Suma Joseph, Jismol Joseph and Others, Sy. No. 82 is under possession of Joseph Abraham and Sy. No. 83 is under possession of Jassin Joseph, authorized signatory of the project. The

proponent has also submitted the Consent (in original) in Rs. 100/- stamp paper from Suma Joseph, Jismol Joseph and Joseph Abraham to conduct quarrying activities in the concerned survey numbers owned by them. But the other owners (stated as “others” in possession certificate of Sy. no. 81) has not given their consent and it is not clear regarding the owners of this Sy. No. To this end the proponent stated that “others” refer to the son of the project proponent who is a minor. But the Committee directed to provide a proof substantiating the same.

The Committee found that the slope of the project site is towards North and as per the cadastral map provided the land was a wetland. Moreover, the west and south side of the project is at higher elevation with a valley in the centre. Hence it was suggested to provide a larger silt trapping mechanism realigning the present drainage system. The Committee was also doubtful as to whether there are settlements within 100 m of the proposed project area. But the proponent stated that the settlements are towards the road adjacent to the project site. However the Committee suggested leaving appropriate setback for quarrying activities from the settlements, if it is nearby, after ascertaining the same with a field visit.

The Committee was also not satisfied with the geology of the project site provided in the proposal as it was not site specific. The Committee stated that the geology provided is of Attappady block and directed to revise the same. The Committee also found that the legend of the master plan provided is wrong. Also, in the master plan, a pond connecting a canal is shown but its exit from the plot and the clarifier mechanism of pond water is not shown. The proponent was directed to revise the master plan incorporating the above details. The proponent was also directed to provide a sketch showing the mining area with boundary pillars as the one already provided lacks clarity.

The Committee found that a school is located at a distance of 3 km from the project site and suggested the proponent to extend CSR activities to the school as part of this project. The Committee directed to set aside 2 percent of their annual profit towards CSR activities while the proponent stated that they are willing to contribute 10 percent of their annual profit towards the same.

Considering the above, the proposal is DEFERRED for SITE INSPECTION to ascertain the proximity of the site to settlements, storm water management practices adopted, among others and seeking additional clarifications from the proponent. It was also decided to conduct the site visit on 17<sup>th</sup> May 2013 by a subcommittee of SEAC consisting of Sri. P.Sreekantan Nair, Secretary SEAC and Sri. John Mathai, Member of SEAC. The proponent is directed to submit the following before SEAC for further processing of the application:

1. Assurance in the form of affidavit that further quarrying activities shall not be extended to any part of 14.4272 hectares of land owned by the proponent other than in the area mentioned in the present proposal.

2. Proof regarding the ownership of Sy. No. 81 and consent to conduct quarrying activities from all the owners of that Sy. No.
3. Revised storm water management plan realigning the present drainage system incorporating a larger silt trapping mechanism.
4. Revised local geology of the site.
5. Revised master plan of the project with proper legend incorporating the exit point of the pond within the plot connecting the canal and the location of clarifier mechanism of pond water.
6. Sketch showing mining area with the boundary pillars.
7. Assurance in the form of affidavit that 10 percent of the annual profit of the firm shall be set aside towards Corporate Social Responsibility, as committed before SEAC.

**Item No. 15.11**      **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed quarry project in Survey Nos. 110/8, 111/3 pt, 112/4 pt and 110/5 at Koodal Village, Kalanjoor Panchayath, Adoor Taluk, Pathanamthitta District, Kerala by M/s Aswathy Granites Pvt. Ltd. (File No. 94/SEIAA/KL/1054/2013)**

**Appraisal Report:**

The project proponent made a brief presentation of their proposal. The proposed project site falls within 09°9'9.09" N to 09°9'26.59" N and 76°52'2.81" E to 76°52'22.06" E. The proponent stated that currently mining activity is in progress in part of the area (0.1821 hectare at Sy. No. 111/3 pt.) submitted for Environmental Clearance and which is part of Pit-1 of the project site. The application for Environmental Clearance is for an area of 4.5345 hectares (3.3455 hectares of own land and 1.1890 hectare of Government land on lease) wherein a total area of 21.8532 hectares is owned by the project proponent. The Committee had serious apprehensions as to why they have restricted the present proposal for quarrying activities for an area of 4.5345 hectares including a small portion of Government land when they own 21.8532 hectares of land of their own and why they have fragmented a contiguous area into three portions of Pit 1, 2 and 3. The Committee was of the opinion that valuable resources should be preserved for posterity and it stands for activities that goes well for a sustainable development. The Committee was of the opinion that the proponent has deliberately fragmented the land with an intention to acquire the Government land also on lease and found it unjustifiable as the proponent owns 21.8532 hectares of land and there arises no need of quarrying the Government land when they propose quarrying in 4.5345 hectares only which can be within their land of possession. The proponent was also asked whether they are proposing to carry on mining activities in the whole area at a later stage. To this end the proponent stated that they have a quarrying permit issued by Mining and Geology Department for an area of 0.1821 hectares valid up to December 2013 and has not assured that they do not have any future plans in exploring the remaining area.

**Recommendations:**

The proposal is recommended for REJECTION and the proponent may be directed to submit a fresh proposal involving contiguous area owned by them excluding Government land, if necessary.

**Item No. 15.12**      **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed quarry project in Survey Nos. 178/1, 178/11, 178/14, 178/16, 178/5-1, 178/5-2-1, 178/5-3-1, 178/5, 178/10, 178/12, 13, 166/15, 178/15, 184/8-3, 184/8-3-1, 178/15, 184/8-1, 167/4-1, 167/5-1, 166/6, 184/8-4, 184/8-2, 184/8, 178/12-1, 178/6, 178/8, 180/5-2, 178/8 and 178/3-2 at Anad Village and Panchayath, Nedumangad Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram District, Kerala by Josh Kuriakose (File No. 95/SEIAA/KL/1068/2013)**

Before allowing for presentation of the proposal by the project proponent, the Committee pointed out the following factual errors in the application submitted by the proponent which is a matter of serious concern:

1. Sri. Josh Kuriakose is not the owner of all the survey numbers as claimed by him in the affidavit in pg. no. 103 of the application. Therefore, the affidavit furnished by the proponent before a statutory authority (SEIAA Kerala) is against the facts.
2. Copy of the consent in stamp paper given by Arun Varghese and Varghese Joseph in pg. nos. 97-100 do not have the endorsement of the vendor on the back page of the stamp paper.
3. Certain survey numbers of the proposed area belongs to Thangalathil Granites wherein the consent of the Thangalathil Granites to conduct quarrying activities in the Survey numbers under its possession is not obtained by the proponent.
4. Varghese Joseph, Managing Partner has given consent on behalf of M/s Kottakkal Granites but no document is produced authorizing Varghese Joseph to give a consent on behalf of Kottakkal Granites.

In the meantime, complaints have been received in the Department of Environment and Climate Change from the PTA President of KKV U.P. School on the functioning of the said quarry. This also needs to be explored. (File No. DoECC/E3/Comp/7012/12)

Considering the above, especially the filing of an affidavit against to the facts, the proposal is REJECTED and the project proponent is directed to submit a fresh application avoiding all factual errors, if necessary.

**Item No. 15.13**      **Any other item approved by Chair**

The following three items - 15.13.1, 15.13.2 and 15.13.3, were considered as additional items under this.



**Additional Item No. 15.13.1**

**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)**

**Appraisal Report:**

M/s Ayles Properties and Developers Pvt. Ltd. has applied for obtaining environmental clearance under EIA Notification dated 14-09-2006 for the proposed Housing Project at Village Kakkanad, Municipality Thrikkakkara, Taluk Kanayannur, District Ernakulam, Kerala. The details of the case are as under:

- It is proposed to construct residential buildings with basement + Ground floor + 20 floors in a single block having 160 apartments and club house with first aid room. The maximum height of building is 63.45 m.
- The total plot area of the proposed project is 0.819 ha (8190 m<sup>2</sup>) having total built-up area of 26,674.02 m<sup>2</sup>.
- The total daily domestic water consumption for the proposed project would be 111.60 KL/day (taken @ 135 ltr. per capita per day for residential). The sources of water during operation phase for the proposed project are roof Rain Water (on rainy days for non-flushing requirement), wells (on non-rainy days for non-flushing requirement) and treated water from STP (for flushing and horticulture requirement).
- The proposed project has provision for storage of rain water to meet the non-flushing water requirement during rainy days. The fresh water requirement of about 73.20 KL/day will be met through rain water. The roof rain water storage tank of 1020 KL capacity and rain water collection pond of 1500 KL capacity will be used as source of water during rainy days.
- Solid waste generation from the project during construction phase will be about 30 kg/day and liquid effluent will be about 9 KL/day. Bio-bin system will be provided for the disposal of biodegradable solid waste and a sewage treatment plant will be installed for the treatment of sewage from the labour colony.
- The biodegradable waste along with sludge from STP would be sent to the biogas generation plant (of capacity of about 200 kg/day) to be developed within the premises. The biogas generated (expected to be about 5 kg/day) would be consumed within the site. The manure produced from the biogas generation facility would be used for green area development within the premises.
- The spent oil from the D.G. sets (defined as hazardous waste) will be sold to C.P.C.B. approved recyclers.
- The e-waste generated will be stored in an isolated room and will be sent to the authorized recyclers and will follow C.P.C.B. / MoEF Norms.
- Construction waste will be used for back filling purposes within the site.
- Total power requirement of 1200 kVA will be sourced through Kerala State Electricity Board (KSEB).
- Parking facilities is proposed for 178 cars.

- Total project cost is ` 33 crores.

A brief description of the project was presented by the project proponent at the 9<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 3<sup>rd</sup> November 2012. 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 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 Kadambrayar 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 m<sup>2</sup> 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 m<sup>2</sup> and 160 apartments. The project proponent was directed to clear this and to go ahead within the permissible limit.

The proposal was reconsidered at 14<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 6<sup>th</sup> April 2013. Committee verified the documents and additional clarifications submitted by the proponent. The condition mentioned in the assurance provided regarding the No Development Zone was not confirming with the one suggested by SEAC. 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 24000 m<sup>2</sup> for an approach road width of 8 m, as per the modified KMBR whereas they are proposing to have a total built-up area of 26,674.02 m<sup>2</sup> for which the approach road width should be 10 m. The proposal was again considered in 15<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 4<sup>th</sup> May 2013 to examine the additional clarifications/ documents provided by the proponent. The Committee verified all the documents which were found to be satisfactory.

### **Recommendations:**

The proposal is RECOMMENDED for Environmental Clearance stipulating the following specific conditions:

1. Sufficient distance should be left near the project site from the boundary of the thodu as No Development Zone as per the width of the thodu as shown in cadastral map.
2. The height of the constructions should be restricted as per the existing KMBR/KPBR and Regulations applicable to the area with respect to the existing width of the access road.
3. Before securing the occupancy certificate, the project proponent should 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.

### **Additional Item No. 15.13.2**

### **Approval of appraisal reports of M/s Hi-Tech Metals and The Mar Thoma Church Educational Society**

The Committee approved the appraisal reports of M/s Hi-Tech Metals and The Mar Thoma Church Educational Society after confirmation of the minutes of 14<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting

and decided to forward the same to SEIAA along with recommendations for issuance of Environmental Clearance.

**Additional Item No. 15.13.3**                      **Discussions on the preparation of appraisal reports**

The Committee held detailed discussions on the preparation of appraisal reports to be forwarded to SEIAA in the format developed by SEAC based on the suggestions from SEIAA. Further SEAC noted that it is not feasible to go on adding more and more requirements in the form of deliberations or recommendations or comprehensive reports or appraisal reports or summary of environment impact assessment or detailed notes or finite conclusions or brief summary etc in addition to detailed minutes. SEAC started to prepare detailed minutes with deliberations considering the initial suggestion from SEIAA. Also SEAC noted with great appreciation that whatever material/agenda notes are placed before SEIAA by the Secretary SEAC is the same as approved by SEAC even without any alterations in wordings. It also placed its appreciation to the functions of SEAC secretariat far exemplarily high than that was expected. It further noted the painstaking effort by the Director of Department of Environment and Climate Change (Secretary SEAC) and his limited team in keeping utmost transparency as well as in undertaking the EC processing without any pendency of proposals under consideration. SEAC also noted the written appreciations conferred on to the Secretary SEAC and his team from Mr. Gowda, an environmentalist from Bengaluru and his team that visited SEIAA/SEAC Secretariat for certain information under RTI Act. Keeping these in view, SEAC thought of being a helping hand to the SEAC Secretariat towards its attempts for achievements in a far reaching manner with negligible manpower and not to cause any hindrance which is likely to cause undue delay in processes. Therefore, SEAC decided the following procedures to be adopted in future cases:

1. For every proposal recommended for Environmental Clearance, the SEAC minutes will have two parts of (i) appraisal report (descriptive) and (ii) recommendations of SEAC. The tried out system of separate appraisal report shall be discontinued. This will ensure that the appraisal report of SEAC, being a part of SEAC minutes, appears in the public domain.
2. For every proposal other than that are recommended for Environmental Clearance, SEAC minutes shall have deliberations and recommendations in a single part as descriptive.

Hence the Committee requested SEIAA to consider SEAC minutes with deliberations and recommendations as appraisal report, because SEAC is finalizing the minutes after a painstaking appraisal process involving interaction and discussions with the proponent, seeking additional clarifications/documents and verification of the same for its satisfactory receipt, etc which usually take 30-45 minutes per proposal on an average and may sometimes go beyond one hour also.

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