

MINUTES (Approved) OF THE 16TH MEETING OF STATE LEVEL EXPERT APPRAISAL COMMITTEE (SEAC) KERALA, HELD ON 31ST MAY & 1ST JUNE, 2013 AT HARITHASREE HALL, DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE CHANGE, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM

The sixteenth meeting of SEAC Kerala was held on 31st May and 1st June 2013 at Harithasree Hall, Department of Environment and Climate Change, Thiruvananthapuram. The meeting commenced at 9.30 am on 31st May 2013 and the following members of State Level Expert Appraisal Committee (SEAC) Kerala have participated:

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.A. Jayson - Member, SEAC
7. Dr. V. Anitha - Member, SEAC
8. Dr. George Chackacherry - Member, SEAC
9. Dr. C.N. Mohanan - Member, SEAC
10. Sri. John Mathai - Member, SEAC
11. Sri. P. Sreekantan Nair - Secretary, SEAC
Director,
Department of Environment & Climate Change

Chairman, SEAC welcomed all the participants and informed the honourable members the reason for convening the 16th meeting for two consecutive days, assigned mainly for framing a specific format of appraisal report, for mining and non-mining projects separately, and to follow the same for those proposals returned by SEIAA to SEAC and also in all future cases. The Committee discussed in detail the format of appraisal report and considering inputs from the members, a tabular framework is developed incorporating various parameters of environmental significance which are crucial in assessing the mining and non-mining projects.

The subcommittee members who conducted field inspection at various places, especially of quarry projects, briefly shared their experience regarding the same and raised their apprehensions that many of the real ground truth situations are revealed only during field visits.

The Committee also held detailed discussions on the inadequacy of manpower in the Secretariat of SEAC/SEIAA for its effective functioning and Secretarial assistance as the workload is increasing day by day as the applications for quarry projects is received in large numbers for processing of Environmental Clearance which has to be disposed off within a limited time frame completing all the formalities of screening, appraisal in SEAC and approval of SEIAA. SEAC felt the immediate requirement of minimum manpower, at least on temporary adhoc basis for the time being, to cater the technical, administrative and logistic support of these two important statutory bodies and to facilitate the regular meetings of the SEAC and Authority without fail. The Committee suggested engaging two Project Assistants having post graduation in Environmental Science or allied subjects to deal with the technical matters of SEAC/SEIAA and two Office Assistants with working knowledge in computer for assisting the various other activities of SEAC/SEIAA. It was decided to forward the request to SEIAA so as to engage two project assistants and two Office Assistants urgently on daily wage basis until regular posts are sanctioned by the Government.

The Secretary SEAC presented before the Committee the concerns raised by CREDAI on behalf of the builders regarding some conditions stipulated as specific conditions by the Committee during appraisal process. It was also informed that even though the builders are concerned on the issues raised by them they are satisfied with the speedy appraisal process in SEIAA/SEAC Kerala. The Committee discussed the following concerns raised and decisions taken:

1. Enhancing the Rain Water Harvesting capacity - *To this end the Committee stated that RWH requirement varies from terrain to terrain and the question of enhancing the RWH capacity is suggested by the Committee only when the existing dependable source of water, as stated by proponent in the proposal, is not sufficient to cater the requirements. Moreover, it is suggested in cases where there is genuine acute scarcity of water in the locality, which is likely to have adverse impacts on the surrounding environment of the project site and hence is site and project specific. Hence, to sort out the issue, the Committee recommended to add in the General Conditions of all construction projects that the project must have a Rain Water storage facility as prescribed in KMBR/KPBR. If ever any specific condition for RWH is stipulated for the project it shall prevail.*
2. The Committee is insisting to set aside certain amount towards Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) – *The Committee stated that as per the Companies Bill, 2011 amendment made by Govt. of India in March 2013, it is mandatory for companies to spend 2 percent of their average net profit in CSR activities and only companies reporting Rs. 5 Crore or more profits in the last 3 years have to expend the CSR. Hence it was suggested to add in the General Conditions of all construction projects that the “conditions specified in the Companies Bill, 2011 should be implemented for CSR”.*
3. To avoid basement floors in some cases, wherein the proponent has already got an approved building plan. – *The Committee explained that the construction of basement floors is strictly restricted based on the soil texture, degree of consolidation of strata, occurrence of water table near surface and where there are possibilities of directly affecting the free movement of ground water which may bring water scarcity in the adjacent areas. Hence the direction to avoid basement floors below 4 m of ground level is suggested in certain cases only when there are anticipated negative impacts by doing so. Therefore it is recommended that “number of basement*

floors shall be regulated in strict compliance to KPBR/KMBR/approved plans of LSGI unless otherwise specified”.

Thereafter, regular agenda items were taken up for deliberations:

Item No. 16.01 Confirmation of the minutes of the **15th SEAC meeting, held on 4th May 2013 at Harithasree Hall, Department of Environment and Climate Change, Thiruvananthapuram**

Confirmed.

Item No. 16.02 **Action taken report on the decisions of the 15th SEAC meeting**

The item was noted.

Item No. 16.03 **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 following additional clarifications / documents provided by the proponent as per the directions of SEAC and noted as follows:

1. The cadastral map certified by Village Officer – *Provided satisfactorily*
2. Master plan of the entire quarrying activities – *Master plan provided is satisfactory.*
3. Size of check dam – *Provided satisfactorily*
4. Master plan cum vicinity map provided – *The proponent was directed to provide the details of the type of building at 100 m from the project site which is not specifically given but a vicinity map cum master plan is given. – The master plan appears ok.*
5. The assurance regarding maintenance of PPV levels below 15 mm/sec – *Not acceptable since the proponent has committed before SEAC during appraisal that PPV levels shall be maintained below 10 PPV which has to be submitted, only after which the proposal shall be forwarded to SEIAA for further processing. In this case, the responsibility of the delay in appraisal process rests with the proponent.*

Further SEAC prepared the appraisal report of the proposal which shall be forwarded to SEIAA only after satisfactorily addressing items 4 and 5 above by the project proponent.

SEAC Agenda item No.	16.03
Name of project	Quarry project in Survey Nos. 172 at Kodyathoor Village and Panchayath, Kozhikode Taluk, Kozhikode District, Kerala by M/s Poabs Rock Products Pvt. Ltd.
Category/Subcategory & Schedule	B, 1 (a)
GENERAL	

Location	11°17'15.74" & 11°17'25.1124" N and 76°1'0.5319" & 76°2'5.8669" E
Area & capacity	4.8240 hectare ; 2,90,000 TPA
Life of mine proposed	6.75 years

ABOUT THE PROJECT

Environmental Parameters	Impacts	Specific conditions stipulated and rationale	Remarks
<p>Land:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed project activity involves about 100 percent of the pit area for exploitation of granite building stone. 2. A total quantity of 9600 m³ of top soil will be removed during mining operations. 3. Sheet flow is expected during peak rainy days and blasting during this period can dislodge debris. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Creation of pit by removal of material. 2. The management of top soil provided by the proponent was incorrect when compared with the figures given and hence was directed to provide revised details regarding the same. 3. To mitigate this, quarrying activities should be restricted during the drier months. 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 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Eco-restoration of quarried area 2. Topsoil and overburden to be stacked for future use of reclamation. (OK) 3. Avoid blasting in the rainy days. Blasting to be resumed only after the flow of water through channels are stopped. 	

	channelize this overland flow from above.		
<p>Geology:</p> <p>1. 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.</p>	<p>1. Since the upper reaches of the mine area is sloping with only thin soil cover, chances of accelerated soil erosion is anticipated.</p>	<p>1. A protective wall in that area to be provided.</p> <p>2. A 20 m wide permanent continuous tree belt with deep root system on the upper area of the lease to be provided.</p>	<p>1. The proponent has already made provisions for the same.</p> <p>2. The proponent has provided affidavit regarding the same.</p>
<p>Water:</p> <p>1. The total water requirement for the proposed activity is about 5 KLD. The water required shall be sourced from storm water reservoir or tube well.</p> <p>2. 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.</p> <p>3. The drinking water quality provided by the proponent was not satisfactory.</p>	<p>1. No other water source could be expected in the area which is having an elevated upper slope.</p> <p>2. Proper storm water management plans not provided.</p> <p>3. The proponent was directed to provide action plans to improve the quality of water that has to be provided to the workers and to provide small check dams to trap silt and clarify water.</p>	<p>1. Rain water harvesting units to be installed.</p> <p>2. Directed to provide storm water management plans.</p> <p>3. The proponent has provided assurance regarding the same.</p>	<p>1. The proponent agreed to collect the storm water into the check dam by constructing channels.</p> <p>2. Storm water management plans provided is satisfactory.</p> <p>3. The assurance provided is satisfactory.</p>

<p>Air Quality:</p> <p>1. 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.</p>			<p>1. The ambient air quality provided by the proponent is satisfactory.</p>
<p>Noise:</p> <p>1. Provided noise quality analysis data which was not satisfactory 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.</p>	<p>1. The proponent was directed to take 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.</p> <p>2. Noise reduction measures suggested by the proponent were not satisfactory.</p>	<p>1.</p> <p>2. Directed to provide practical solution to mitigate the noise generated and to provide assurance that the PPV levels shall be maintained below 10 mm/sec as there are chances of ground amplification since the area is sloping.</p>	<p>1. The noise level data submitted by the proponent was satisfactory and within the prescribed limits.</p> <p>2. Noise reduction measures suggested by the proponent is satisfactory. <i>The proponent has not so far provided the assurance regarding maintenance of PPV levels below 10 mm/sec.</i></p>
<p>Biodiversity:</p> <p>1. Provided biodiversity listing of flora and fauna</p> <p>a. Native Species</p>	<p>1. List of fauna submitted</p>		<p>1. The faunal list submitted by the proponent is</p>

<p>b. RET Species</p> <p>c. Invasive Species</p>			satisfactory
<p>Method of Quarrying:</p> <p>1.The proposed project does not involve any underground mining activities.</p> <p>2.The mining will be done by open cast semi mechanized method of mining.</p> <p>3.The bench height and width proposed is 5 m and 6 m.</p> <p>4.The ultimate depth of mine workings is estimated to be 210 m MSL.</p>	<p>1. OK</p> <p>2. Standard method of quarrying</p> <p>3. OK</p> <p>4. OK</p>	<p>1.</p> <p>2.</p> <p>3. Overall quarry slope not to exceed 45°</p> <p>4. Top to bottom approach</p>	
<p>Safety Aspects:</p> <p>1. <u>Blasting hazards</u></p> <p>a) PPV levels at 15 mm/sec as per DGMS</p> <p>b) Fly rock distance given as 250 m from blasting zone</p>	<p>a) Can impact adjacent dwelling units</p> <p>b) Can impact adjacent dwelling units</p>	<p>a) To be kept below 10 mm/sec for the safety of nearby dwelling units</p> <p>b) Fly rock should not cross the lease area</p>	
<p>Environmental Management Plan:</p> <p>❖ EMP is provided</p>			❖ OK
<p>Eco-restoration programmes:</p> <p>1. At the end of life of mine, excavated pit will be fully reclaimed and rehabilitated by plantation.</p>	<p>1. Eco-restoration with vegetative cover.</p>	<p>1. 10 percent of the pit in the deepest part to be used for storage of water. The rest to be refilled with the stacked top soil and overburden and covered with vegetation.</p>	

<p>Social Aspects:</p> <p>1. Nearest habitation - The nearest human habitation from the project site was at 210 m.</p> <p>2. Affected Settlements/Community</p> <p>3. Loss/disruption of livelihoods/physical displacement of people</p>	<p>1. No possible impacts on the settlements.</p> <p>2. Nil</p> <p>3. Nil</p>		<p>1. There will be no project-induced influx of people.</p>
<p>Corporate Social Responsibility:</p> <p>1. Detailed break up of CSR activities provided</p>			
<p>Waste Management:</p> <p>1.The sewage of 1 KLD generated from the mine office will be diverted to the septic tank followed by soak pit.</p>	<p>1. No significant impact.</p>		
<p>Compliance of Statutory Provisions/ Other Guidelines:</p>			
<p>Recommendations:</p>	<p>1. The transportation of minerals should be done in covered trucks to contain dust emissions.</p>		
<p>Details of Authorized signatory</p>	<p>Mr. Binu K. Mathew, Managing Director, M/s Poabs Rock Products Pvt. Ltd., Nellikkaparambu P.O., Gothembu Road, Calicut – 673602; Telephone No. 0495-2209304; Email: poabsrockproducts@yahoo.co.in</p>		
<p>Details of NABET approved EIA consultant organization</p>	<p>M/s Enkay Enviro Services, 24-B, Basement, Dadu Marg, Gopal Bari, Jaipur-302001; Tel. No. 0141-2363996/4023996; Fax No: 0141-5118996; E-mail: info@enkayenviro.com</p>		

Item No. 16.04

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)

SEAC discussed in detail and appraisal format was finalized.

SEAC Agenda item No.	16.04		
Name of project	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.		
Category/Subcategory & Schedule	B, 1 (a)		
GENERAL			
Location	The proposed project site falls within the coordinates mentioned in Annexure -1 of the minutes of the 15 th SEAC meeting which is attached hitherto.		
Area & capacity	4.8367 hectare; 2,85,000 MTA		
Life of mine proposed	3.28 years (Pit-1) and 2 years (Pit-2)		
ABOUT THE PROJECT			
Environmental Parameters	Impacts	Specific conditions stipulated and rationale	Remarks
<p>Land:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed project activity involves about 97 percent of the lease area for exploring granite building stone. A total quantity of 17,306 m³ of top soil and 22,521 m³ of overburden (pit-1 and pit-2 together) will be removed from both pits during mining operations. The survey plan provided by the proponent did not show the plots clearly and hence the 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Creation of pit by removal of material 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 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Eco-restoration of quarried area The same is given in Annexure 8 of additional clarifications submitted by the project proponent. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Satisfactory

<p>proponent was directed to provide copy of cadastral map duly certified by Village Officer showing the plots in one sketch.</p> <p>4. Pit-2 largely abuts against others property and southern side of Pit-1 has also similar disposition which is a matter of concern.</p> <p>5. The space provided for overburden stack is in a sloping area.</p> <p>6. Sheet flow expected has to be channelized to avoid any erosion at down slope.</p>	<p>provide at least the data of few pits.</p> <p>3.</p> <p>4. The proponent was directed to provide a consent from the owner of the neighbouring plot since there is no buffer zone.</p> <p>5. Suggested to change that location.</p> <p>6. 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</p>	<p>3.</p> <p>4. PPV levels, flyrock distance and ground vibration to be controlled.</p> <p>5.</p> <p>6. The issues are addressed in Annexure 10. Top to bottom approach makes the storm water to flow to the central pit from where it is channelized.</p> <p>Retaining walls are provided for protecting adjacent plots.</p> <p>The proponent is channelizing the water for agricultural needs primarily for self.</p>	<p>3. OK – Given as Annexure 1 of additional clarifications submitted by the project proponent</p> <p>4. No settlements nearby.</p> <p>5. Relocated to lower elevation.</p> <p>6. Satisfactory</p>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	for agricultural purposes.		
<p>Geology:</p> <p>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.</p> <p>2. The total reserves are much more than the projected quantity as mentioned in the proposal.</p>	<p>1. 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.</p> <p>2. The proponent was directed to recalculate and resubmit the same. It was directed to revise the conceptual mining plan submitted.</p>	<p>1. The project proponent has 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.</p>	<p>1.</p> <p>2. Satisfactory</p>
<p>Water:</p> <p>1. 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.</p> <p>2. 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</p>	<p>1. There is no other source of water to be expected in the mining area other than the rain water runoff.</p>	<p>1. The proponent was directed to provide assurance that adequate safe drinking water shall be provided to the workers.</p>	<p>OK</p>

erosion.			
<p>Air Quality:</p> <p>1. 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.</p>			<p>1. The ambient air quality provided by the proponent was satisfactory.</p> <p>2. 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.</p>
<p>Noise:</p> <p>1. Provided noise quality analysis data.</p>			<p>1. The noise level data submitted by the proponent was satisfactory and within the prescribed limits.</p>
<p>Biodiversity:</p> <p>1. Provided biodiversity listing of flora and fauna</p> <p>a. Native Species</p> <p>b. RET Species</p> <p>c. Invasive Species</p>	<p>1. List of fauna submitted</p>		<p>1. The faunal list submitted by the proponent is satisfactory.</p>
<p>Method of Quarrying:</p> <p>1. The proposed project does not involve any underground mining activities.</p> <p>2. The mining will be done by open cast semi mechanized method of mining.</p>			

<p>3. The bench height and width proposed is 5 m.</p> <p>4. 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.</p>			
<p>Safety Aspects:</p> <p>1. <u>Blasting hazards</u></p> <p>a) PPV levels at 15 mm/sec as per DGMS</p> <p>b) Fly rock distance given as 250 m from blasting zone</p>	<p>a) Can impact adjacent dwelling units</p> <p>b) Can impact adjacent dwelling units</p>	<p>a) To be kept below 10 mm/sec for the safety of nearby dwelling units</p> <p>b) Fly rock should not cross the lease area</p>	
<p>Environmental Management Plan:</p> <p>❖ EMP is provided</p>			Satisfactory
<p>Eco-restoration programmes:</p> <p>1. At the end of life of mine, pits will be fully reclaimed and rehabilitated by plantation.</p> <p>2. 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.</p>			Satisfactory
<p>Social Aspects:</p> <p>1. Nearest habitation – at 2 km East</p>	<p>1. As the nearest habitation is 2 kms</p>		<p>1. There will be no project-induced influx</p>

2. Affected Settlements/Community	away there are no affected communities / settlements nor the project bring about any physical displacement of people.		of people.
3. Loss/disruption of livelihoods/physical displacement of people			
Corporate Social Responsibility:			
Waste Management:			
1. The sewage of 1 KLD generated from the mine office will be diverted to the septic tank followed by soak pit.			
Compliance of Statutory Provisions/ Other Guidelines:			
Recommendations:	1.The transportation of minerals should be done in covered trucks to contain dust emissions.		
Details of Authorized signatory	Mr. Joseph Jacob, Managing Director, M/s Poabs Granites Products Pvt. Ltd., Kuttoor P.O., Thiruvalla, Pathanamthitta – 689106; Telephone No. 0469-2743300; Email: mail@poabs.com		
Details of NABET approved EIA consultant organization	M/s Enkay Enviro Services, 24-B, Basement, Dadu Marg, Gopal Bari, Jaipur-302001; Tel. No. 0141-2363996/4023996; Fax No: 0141-5118996; E-mail: info@enkayenviro.com		

Item No. 16.05 **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)**

SEAC discussed in detail and appraisal format was finalized.

SEAC Agenda item No.	16.05
Name of project	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.		
Category/Subcategory & Schedule	B, 1 (a)		
GENERAL			
Location	11°0'16.7925" N & 11°0'22.7922" N and 76°16'34.5738" E & 76°16'47.3756"E		
Area & capacity	4.4817 hectare; 2,70,000 MTA		
Life of mine proposed	5 years		
ABOUT THE PROJECT			
Environmental Parameters	Impacts	Specific conditions stipulated and rationale	Remarks
<p>Land:</p> <p>1. 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. The 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.</p> <p>2. The proposed project activity involves about 98 percent of the lease area for exploring granite building stone.</p>	<p>1. Creation of pit by removal of material</p> <p>2.</p>	<p>1. Eco-restoration of quarried area</p>	<p>1.</p> <p>2.</p> <p>3.</p>

<p>3. A total quantity of 13,445 m³ of top soil will be generated during mining operations.</p> <p>4. The overburden is presently planned to be stored in an elevated area which may pose threat of slumping & erosion. The thickness of overburden was also not mentioned in the proposal.</p>	<p>3. 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.</p> <p>4. The proponent was directed to relocate it suitably.</p>		<p>4. OK</p>
<p>Geology: Charnockite massive</p>	<p>No significant impact</p>		
<p>Water:</p> <p>1. The total water requirement for the proposed activity is about 5 KLD. The water required will be sourced from storm water pond.</p> <p>2. 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.</p> <p>3. The runoff water needs channelization to arrest sheet flow at different levels.</p>	<p>1. RWH is planned</p> <p>2. Storm water management with silt suppression is planned.</p> <p>3. 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 proponent was directed to resubmit storm water management plan</p>		<p>1.</p> <p>2. Revised storm water management plan submitted is satisfactory.</p>

	with some more details of channels.		
Air Quality: 1. 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.			1. 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.
Noise: 1. Provided noise quality analysis data.			1. The noise level data submitted by the proponent was satisfactory and within the prescribed limits.
Biodiversity: 1. Provided biodiversity listing of flora and fauna a. Native Species b. RET Species c. Invasive Species	1. List of fauna submitted		1. The faunal list submitted by the proponent is satisfactory.
Method of Quarrying: 1. The proposed project does	1. OK	1.	

<p>not involve any underground mining activities.</p> <p>2.The mining will be done by open cast semi mechanized method of mining.</p> <p>3.The bench height and width proposed is 5 m and 6 m respectively.</p> <p>4.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.</p>	<p>2. Standard method of quarrying</p> <p>OK</p> <p>OK</p>	<p>2.</p> <p>3. Overall quarry slope not to exceed 45°</p> <p>4. Top to bottom approach</p>	
<p>Environmental Management Plan:</p> <p>❖ EMP is provided</p>			Satisfactory
<p>Eco-restoration programmes:</p> <p>1. At the end of life of mine, excavated pit will fully reclaimed and rehabilitated by plantation.</p> <p>2. 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.</p>			Satisfactory
<p>Social Aspects:</p> <p>1. Nearest habitation</p> <p>2. Affected Settlements/Community</p> <p>3. Loss/disruption of livelihoods/physical displacement of people</p>			There are no adverse social impacts noted as the nearest habitation is at a distance of 1 km.
<p>Corporate Social Responsibility:</p>			

Waste Management: 1.The sewage of 1 KLD generated from the mine office will be diverted to the septic tank followed by soak pit.			
Compliance of Statutory Provisions/ Other Guidelines:			
Recommendations:	1.The transportation of minerals should be done in covered trucks to contain dust emissions.		
Details of Authorized signatory	Mr. K.A. Abraham, Managing Director, M/s Poabson Granite Products Pvt. Ltd., Kuttoor P.O., Thiruvalla, Pathanamthitta – 689016. Telephone No. 0469-2743300; Email: mail@poabs.com		
Details of NABET approved EIA consultant organization	M/s Enkay Enviro Services, 24-B, Basement, Dadu Marg, Gopal Bari, Jaipur-302001; Tel. No. 0141-2363996/4023996; Fax No: 0141-5118996; E-mail: info@enkayenviro.com		

Item No. 16.06 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)

SEAC discussed in detail and appraisal format was finalized.

SEAC Agenda item no.	16.06
Name of project	Proposed Housing Project at Village Kakkanad, Municipality Thrikkakkara, Taluk Kanayannur, District Ernakulam, Kerala by M/s Ayles Properties and Developers Pvt. Ltd.
Category/Subcategory & Schedule	Category B, 8(a)
GENERAL	
Location	Village Kakkanad, Municipality Thrikkakkara, Taluk Kanayannur, District Ernakulam, Kerala
Built up area	26,674.02 m ²

No. of floors	Basement + Ground floor + 20 floors in a single block		
Maximum height	63.45 m		
Proposed activities of construction	160 apartments and club house with first aid room		
ABOUT THE PROJECT			
Environmental parameters	Impacts	Specific conditions stipulated & Rationale	Remarks
<p>Land:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Create physical change in the existing land environment and land use 2. Any significant land disturbance resulting in erosion, subsidence & instability 3. Any alteration of natural drainage system 4. Health impacts that may be caused by debris & waste 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Creation of building 2. Negligible 3. Nil. Buffer distance provided from natural stream. 4. Negligible 		
<p>Water:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Is the Water requirement sufficiently addressed? 6. RWH and recycling proposed, is it sufficient 7. Any impact on ground water? 8. Storm water management in the site 9. Sewage management facilities 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Water scarcity is anticipated in the area. The proponent stated the potential sources of water for the project (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. 8. On the storm water drain on the eastern side adjacent there is a seasonal thodu 1.2 m wide crossing the road with a small bridge that carries rain water 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Store the required quantity of water in the sump on the south west portion within the project site. 	<p>OK with the yielding well of 48 KL/day.</p> <p>The water quality report submitted by the proponent is satisfactory.</p>

	to Chithrapuzha river. Provision is made to direct the overflow from rain water to this thodu.	8. Since the stream carries flood water, the plinth level should be kept at a higher level than the maximum flood level.	
Air: 10. Generation of dust, smoke, odours, gases 11. Significant increase in traffic & noise 12. Sufficient parking space provided?			
Topography: 13. Any obstruction of scenic amenity, landscape or view 14. Design affecting environment?			
Energy & social components: 15. Any adverse impacts on local community/ social infrastructure 16. Energy management 17. Fire & safety measures adopted			The project does not bring about any adverse social impacts.
Biodiversity: 18. Does it require extensive clearing or modification 19. Presence of any endangered species or red listed category 20. Likely displacement of fauna	18. 19. 20. No major displacement of fauna needed.		18. 19. 20. List of fauna provided is satisfactory
Any Others: 21. Any other waste likely to be	a. The proponent		1.Solid waste

<p>generated:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Solid waste Liquid waste Electronic waste Bio medical waste Garbage 	<p>has made provision for biogas generation plant coupled with STP and energy generation from 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.</p>		<p>management system provided is satisfactory.</p>
<p>Plans for Corporate Social Responsibility:</p> <p>22. Is CSR provided by the project proponent satisfactory?</p>	<p>The proponent has committed to enhance the capacity building for fire fighting and to assist the Government in buying a sky ladder which is very essential as to the safety of high rise buildings are considered.</p>	<p>The commitment shall be implemented</p>	
<p>Compliance Of Statutory Provisions/ Other Guidelines:</p> <p>23. Any approval required prior to EC</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> CRZ recommendations Forest clearances Airport Authority Fire & Rescue Any other 		<p>The Committee suggested that 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</p>	

		road. <i>(The proponent is eligible to construct only up to a total built up area of 16000 m² and 125 residential units, for an approach road width of 8 m, as per the existing KMBR whereas they are proposed to have a total built-up area of 26,674.02 m² and 160 apartments for which the width of approach road should be 10 m).</i>	
Recommendations:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 		
Details of Authorized signatory	Mr. Mahesh L., DGM-Planning, M/s Ayles Properties and Developers Pvt. Ltd., 41/349 B, Skyline house, Rajaji Road, Ernakulam, Cochin – 682035; Telephone No. 0484-2363695; Fax No. 91-484-2374176; Email: aylesproperties@gmail.com		
Details of NABET approved EIA consultant organization	M/s Environmental Engineers & Consultants Pvt. Ltd., A1 – 198, Janak Puri, New Delhi – 110058; Tel. No. 011-25507190; Telefax No: 011-25622604; E-mail: eecindia@yahoo.co.in		

Item No. 16.07 **Request from M/s Mridhul Granites & Crusher (P) Ltd.** (File No. 91/SEIAA/KL/1051/2013)

The Authorized Signatory of M/s Mridhul Granites & Crusher (P) Ltd. has submitted a request to allow them to amend the application already submitted for Environmental Clearance. In the request submitted, the proponent has stated that they intend to increase the mining area, as SEIAA Kerala has decided to avoid public hearing for mining lease area up to 10 hectares.

The explanation given by the proponent for amending the application has caused ambiguity regarding the actual total mining area owned by the proponent with intention of fragmentation of adjoining areas. Moreover, SEAC noticed that there is a mass petition pending with Centre for Earth Science Studies (CESS), Thiruvananthapuram in the name of Mr. Jose John, M/s Thrissur Granites who is the authorized signatory in the application for Environmental Clearance for the quarry project of M/s Mridhul Granites & Crusher (P) Ltd. The Committee wanted to ascertain as to whether both these firms are the same and the proponent has made any suppression of facts. Hence the item was DEFERRED and the Committee decided to process the application further, only on satisfactory receipt of the following items by SEAC from the project proponent:

1. Proof of ownership of M/s Thrissur Granites and M/s Mridhul Granites & Crusher (P) Ltd.
2. Details as to whether there are any litigation/complaints with respect to the present project submitted for Environmental Clearance. If there are no litigation/complaints with respect to the present project, the proponent should file an affidavit before SEAC regarding the same.
3. Details regarding the quarrying activities conducted by M/s Thrissur Granites specifically indicating the location with survey numbers and the statutory approvals obtained for the same.
4. Details of total mineable area under his possession and its present status.

Item No. 16.08 **Application for obtaining Environmental Clearance for the proposed additional tankage for motor spirit and facilities for receipt, storage and delivery through Tank lorries of ATF at Village Karavanthuruthy, Tehsil & District Kozhikode, Kerala by M/s Indian Oil Corporation Limited** (File No. 87/SEIAA/KL/447/2013)

SEAC discussed the proposal of M/s Indian Oil Corporation Limited, forwarded from MoEF, for obtaining Environmental Clearance for the proposed additional tankage for Motor spirit and facilities for receipt, storage and delivery through tanker lorries of ATF at Village Karavanthuruthy, Tehsil and district Kozhikode. The Committee noted that the repeated reminders sent to the project proponent over phone and in writing by the SEAC Secretariat informing to contact the office for rectifying the defects for further processing of EC application has not been responded to so far. Hence, the Committee endorsed to send a final reminder to M/s Indian Oil Corporation Limited to address the following shortcomings found on preliminary scrutiny of the proposal within 30 days failing which the application for Environmental Clearance shall be recommended for REJECTION and they have to apply afresh, if necessary.

1. Soft copy of EIA/EMP/RA is not submitted
2. Advertisement published in two local dailies for conducting Public Hearing not submitted.
3. Advertisement published in National daily for conducting Public Hearing not submitted.

4. MOM of Public Hearing not submitted.
5. DVD of the video recording of the proceedings of Public Hearing not submitted.
6. Land use details of the site based on satellite imagery is incomplete and vague.
7. Proposal for safety buffer zone around the proposed site do not have any map.
8. Details of the storage and technical specifications with safety aspects & standards is incomplete.
9. Details of river crossings drain crossings, railway/road crossing, etc. and method of digging/drilling for laying of pipeline is incomplete.
10. Documents submitted are not properly indexed and serially page numbered.

The item is DEFERRED for reconsideration only on satisfactory receipt of the above clarifications/documents within the stipulated time.

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

On day 2 (on 1st June 2013) the meeting commenced at 9.00 am and the following members of State Level Expert Appraisal Committee (SEAC) Kerala were present:

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. Dr. P.S. Harikumar - Member, SEAC
4. Dr. Khaleel Chovva - Member, SEAC
5. Dr. E.A. Jayson - Member, SEAC
6. Dr. V. Anitha - Member, SEAC
7. Dr. George Chackacherry - Member, SEAC
8. Dr. C.N. Mohanan - Member, SEAC
9. Sri. John Mathai - Member, SEAC
10. Sri. P. Sreekantan Nair - Secretary, SEAC
Director,
Department of Environment & Climate Change

The Chairman welcomed the members and thereafter, the remaining agenda items were taken up for deliberations:

Item No. 16.09 **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the quarry project in Survey Nos. 781/1-23-1 and 781/1-23-2 at Athikayam Village, Ranni Taluk, Pathanamthitta District, Kerala for a lease area of 2.2278 ha, by Tomy Abraham (File No. 96/SEIAA/KL/1270/2013)**

The project proponent made a brief presentation of the proposal. The Committee found that the proponent has submitted two separate applications, including this, for environmental clearance of two quarry projects which are contiguous areas but are separate leases, a part of which falls in ESZ1. The Committee directed the proponent to combine the adjacent areas as a single unit and submit a fresh proposal excluding the area coming under ESZ-1. It was also decided to DELIST the present proposal and accept the new proposal as a fresh one while it is filed. A site inspection by a subcommittee of SEAC is fixed for 22nd June 2013.

Item No. 16.10 **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the quarry project in Survey Nos. 781/1-23-1 and 781/1-23-2 at Athikayam Village, Ranni Taluk, Pathanamthitta District, Kerala for a lease area of 2.1286 ha, by Tomy Abraham (File No. 97/SEIAA/KL/1271/2013)**

The project proponent made a brief presentation of the proposal. The Committee found that the proponent has submitted two separate applications, including this, for environmental clearance of two quarry projects which are contiguous areas but are separate leases, a part of which falls in ESZ1. The Committee directed the proponent to combine the adjacent areas as a single unit and submit a fresh proposal excluding the area coming under ESZ-1. It was also decided to DELIST the present proposal and accept the new proposal as a fresh one while it is filed. A site inspection by a subcommittee of SEAC is fixed for 22nd June 2013.

Item No. 16.11 **Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the quarry project in Survey Nos. 436/1, 443/1, 443/1-3, 446/3, 446/3-1, 446/4, 447/1, 447/1-2, 447/1-3 and 448//2 at Kottangal Village, Mallapally Taluk, Pathanamthitta District, Kerala by M/s Amity Rocks Products (P) Ltd. (File No. 98/SEIAA/KL/1387/2013)**

The project proponent made a brief description of the project. While scrutinizing the proof of authorized signatory, the Committee found that the proponent has provided copy of certificate of incorporation of the firm which shows that K.J. Kuriakose is one of the Directors. But in the notarized authorization provided, instead of K.J. Kuriakose, Mr. Lissy Kuriakose has put signature. To this end the proponent stated that Lissy Kuriakose has taken over charge as one of the Directors in place of K.J. Kuriakose and that they shall provide proof regarding the same. Regarding proof of ownership of land, the proponent has provided an affidavit stating that the land bearing the Sy. Nos. mentioned in the proposal belongs to the firm, but the land is now only in possession of the firm only by transfer of the lease deed to the firm by Mr. Anu T. George in whose name the lease was issued. So the proponent is directed to provide a fresh notarized affidavit stating that the land bearing the survey numbers mentioned in the proposal is now in possession of M/s Amity Rock Products Pvt. Ltd. The Committee found that there is a small patch of forest land at a distance of 60 m adjoining the lease area boundary and hence directed to leave a 100 m buffer distance from

the forest boundary. The Committee found that the project proponent has not specifically stated the Corporate Social Responsibility relating to the present project and was directed to provide the details regarding the same. The cadastral map provided by the proponent does not clearly depict the proposed mining areas as it is difficult to identify the exact location of the project site and if the said survey numbers fall in the area. Hence the proponent is directed to provide a cadastral map duly certified by Village Officer in which block map of the proposed mining area is superimposed. The Committee was not satisfied with the data regarding local geology of the project site provided by the proponent and hence directed to resubmit it. It was also found that the 2-3 m overburden thickness and 25 cm topsoil as given in the proposal is incorrect as there is an amount of weathered rock. Hence the proponent is directed to provide data of 4-5 pits regarding the thickness of overburden. The proponent has also not clearly shown the storm water management with drainage channels in the contour plan submitted in which the contours in the northern side are also not shown clearly. Hence the proponent is directed to submit a revised contour plan. The expected quantity of waste generated shown in the proposal is found incorrect and hence directed to recalculate and submit the same.

The Committee also raised serious apprehensions on the 10 m x 10 m bench height and width proposed by the applicant. The Committee was of the opinion that since the topography of the land is a dissected one with a western slope, such a steep cutting may trigger a phenomenon called 'rebounding' in future which may have serious negative impacts. So the Committee insisted on maintaining a bench height and width of 5 m x 5 m as stipulated in the General Conditions for all mining projects. The Committee also raised concern as to whether the fly rock may affect the settlements nearby and hence directed to provide the exact distance of the project site from the nearby settlements, fly rock distance, wind direction and velocity and the PPV values.

The proponent has not submitted the biodiversity listing of flora in the region and is directed to provide the same specifically indicating the IUCN status of the same along with vernacular names also. The environmental quality analysis reports on air, water and noise submitted by the proponent is not satisfactory and hence it is directed to provide air, water and noise quality reports afresh. The post mine closure plan and the perspective plan provided by the proponent is not satisfactory and hence is directed to revise and submit the same. The proponent has also not provided the photographs of the project site showing its present status.

Over and above all, a lot many other factual errors and contradiction of statements were found in the proposal submitted which is intimated to the proponent then and hence the proponent is directed to provide a completely redrafted proposal avoiding factual errors, maintaining uniformity in facts and figures provided regarding similar parameters and incorporating details regarding total power requirement, quantity of sewage generation, nonel technology, exact GPS readings of the project site, among others.

1. Redrafted proposal avoiding factual errors.
2. Proof as to taking over charge as one of the Directors of the firm by Lissy Kuriakose in place of K.J. Kuriakose
3. Specific proposal for Corporate Social Responsibility relating to the present project.
4. Cadastral map duly certified by Village Officer depicting all Survey numbers of the property owned by the project proponent in which block map of the proposed mining area is superimposed.

5. Local geology of the site to be rewritten.
6. Details on overburden thickness of 4-5 pits
7. Revised contour plan clearly marking the contours in the northern side and the drainage channels provided and its position.
8. Biodiversity listing of flora and fauna specifically indicating the IUCN status of the species and also mentioning if there are any endemic, endangered, threatened or invasive species.
9. Details regarding the exact distance of the project site from the nearby settlements, fly rock distance and PPV.
10. Recalculate and submit the quantity of waste generated.
11. Data from Indian Meteorological Department regarding wind direction and velocity in the project site.
12. Fresh air and noise quality reports (in original) taken when blasting and quarrying activities are going on.
13. IS 5000 standards water quality analysis reports (in original)
14. Revised post mine closure plan.
15. Recent photographs of the project site taken with digital dates of the camera
16. Perspective plan of 500 m radius clearly marking human settlements with density of population, facilities and other land uses.
17. Fresh notarized affidavit stating that the land bearing the survey numbers mentioned in the proposal is now in possession of M/s Amity Rock Products Pvt. Ltd.
18. Details of Nonel technology proposed for drilling and blasting.
19. Assurance in the form of affidavit that a distance of 15 m shall be kept from the adjacent quarry without conducting quarrying activities.
20. Assurance in the form of affidavit that 100 m shall be left from the nearby forest boundary without conducting quarrying activities.
21. GPS readings of the project site
22. Notarized affidavit in original regarding the conditions mentioned in the checklist indicating the details of the project (like name, location, survey numbers, etc.)

The proposal is DEFERRED for SITE INSPECTION and seeking additional clarifications/documents from the project proponent. The proponent is directed to provide the same to Secretary SEAC, the satisfactory receipt on which the proposal shall be placed for further consideration before SEAC.

It is also decided that a subcommittee of SEAC shall visit the site on 22nd June 2013 which is also intimated to the proponent in person then and there.

Item No. 16.12 Any other item approved by Chair

Additional Item No. 16.12.1 Application for obtaining environmental clearance for the proposed quarry project in Sy. Nos. 23/2, 23/2-1, 24, 24/1, 24/2 and 24/3 at Moonilavu Village, Moonilavu Panchayath, Meenachil Taluk, Kottayam district, Kerala by M/s P.V. Granites (File No. 73/SEIAA/KL/168/2013)

The proposal was deferred by SEAC at its 13th meeting held on 2nd March 2013 to get a legal opinion from the Law Department of Government of Kerala to proceed further as it was known that a petition is pending before the Hon. High Court of Kerala regarding this project. Now, as per the decision taken in the 18th SEIAA meeting held on 23.05.2013, SEIAA observed that even though litigation is pending against the proponent, it did not prevent him from applying for EC. Hence SEIAA directed that the application shall be processed as per law by SEAC/SEIAA and hence may be further appraised by SEAC.

Taking into consideration the decision of SEIAA, SEAC decided to consider the proposal in its next meeting scheduled to be held on 6th July 2013 and to intimate the proponent accordingly.

With this, the agenda items for the day came to an end. Thereafter SEAC had a brief interactive session with Sri. Pradeep Kumar IAS, new Member Secretary of SEIAA, who is also the Principal Secretary, Environment Department. The Secretary SEAC heartily welcomed the Principal Secretary, Environment Department on behalf of the SEAC and explained on the set up of SEIAA as the decision authority (apex body) and SEAC as the recommendatory body. The Chairman SEAC made a brief account on the status of applications for prior Environmental Clearance received and actions taken so far. Vice-Chairman SEAC briefed upon the functioning of SEAC/SEIAA since its inception, its vision and mission and introduced SEAC members to the Member Secretary.

The Member Secretary addressed the SEAC members and discussed the various environmental issues of the present scenario. He stressed the necessity for strictly evaluating the compliance reports of those projects to which Environmental Clearance has been issued. He called for periodic monitoring of the same by the Department of Environment and Climate Change and to issue notice to those who have violated the EC conditions. He also suggested to include the period of validity of EC in all future EC certificates. Members expressed their gratitude to the Principal Secretary in sparing few valuable moments with SEAC in spite of his hectic schedules in Government.

The meeting concluded at 3.50 pm on the second day with a vote of thanks by the Chairman. The members unanimously responded with thanks to the Chair.