

**MINUTES OF THE 25TH MEETING OF STATE LEVEL EXPERT APPRAISAL
COMMITTEE (SEAC) KERALA, HELD ON 14TH AND 15TH FEBRUARY, 2014 AT
HARITHASREE HALL, DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE CHANGE,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM**

The twenty-fifth meeting of SEAC-Kerala was held on 14th and 15th February 2014 at Harithasree Hall, Department of Environment and Climate Change, Thiruvananthapuram. On day 1, 14th February 2014, the meeting commenced at 9.30 am 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 - Member, 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. V. Anitha - Member, SEAC
6. Dr. K. Harikrishnan - Member, SEAC
7. Dr. Khaleel Chovva - Member, SEAC
8. Dr. George Chackacherry - Member, SEAC
9. Dr. C.N. Mohanan - 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. A brief discussion was held on the present status of proposals under various stages of processing with SEIAA Kerala for Environmental Clearance. SEAC noted that the proposals which are prima facie acceptable for placing in SEAC shall henceforth be sent to SEAC members by the SEAC/SEIAA Secretariat and the existing practice of doing the same by the proponents shall be discontinued as per the decision of SEIAA. Under the circumstances, in order to ensure speedy processing of applications, early dispatch of proposals to members for evaluation and to reduce pendency, the Committee felt that preliminary scrutiny of the applications received should be done immediately on receipt of the same. A subcommittee of SEAC consisting of Dr. Oommen V. Oommen, Dr. C.N. Mohanan, Sri. Eapen Varughese, Dr. Harikrishnan, Sri. John Mathai and one representative from the Directorate of Environment and Climate Change, may be considered for entrusting the same. It was further decided that the subcommittee shall meet

once in a week, preferably on Saturdays and decide upon as to whether the application is prima facie acceptable or not, as and when the new procedure is adopted.

Thereafter, regular agenda items were taken up for deliberations:

Item No. 25.01 **Confirmation of the minutes of the 24th SEAC meeting, held on 5th February 2014 at Harithasree Hall, Department of Environment and Climate Change, Thiruvananthapuram**

Confirmed.

Item No. 25.02 **Action taken report on the decisions of the 24th SEAC meeting**

Noted.

Item No. 25.03 **Quarry project of M/s Mridhul Granites and Crusher (P) Ltd. (91/SEIAA/KL/1051/2013)**

Despite intimation from the Secretariat of SEAC/SEIAA, the project proponent was absent for the presentation. Hence the item is DEFERRED insisting that the proposal shall be delisted if the proponent fails to be present for presentation in the next meeting.

Item No. 25.04 **Quarry Project of M/s Metro Aggregates and Sand (I) Pvt. Ltd. (171/SEIAA/KL/3501/2013)**

The project proponent made a brief presentation of the proposal. The Committee observed with concern that Mukkunnimala Reserve Forest is about 240 m from the project site and as stated by the proponent, there are three functional quarries in the Mukkunnimala region. The Committee asked the proponent as to why he has submitted application only for an area of 9.8760 hectares when he owns 62 acres of land. To this end the proponent stated that out of the total area owned by him, under the name of different companies, only 9.8760 hectares have resources and the remaining area is not suitable for extracting resources. However the Committee directed the proponent to provide the ownership details of entire 62 acres of land owned by him. The Committee asked the proponent as to whether they have conducted any quarrying activities in the site, as seen from the google image. To this end the proponent stated that quarrying activities was already done by the earlier owner of the land and hence is not a new one. The Committee reminded the proponent that even though the earlier owner has extracted the resources from the site, the responsibility lies with the present owner to restore the site. The proponent is asked to provide google map specifically marking the total area owned by the proponent demarcating the proposed mining area for which the present application is submitted along with the present land use in the entire area owned by him. The proponent has not provided the depth of water table in the site and is directed to provide the same. Regarding the activities proposed towards CSR, the proponent has stated that they shall continue the same activities this year also as done in the last year. To this end the proponent is directed to provide documentary evidence regarding the amount already spent towards CSR.

Considering the above, the item is DEFERRED FOR SITE VISIT especially to ascertain the quarrying activities in the Mukkunnimala region and directing the proponent to provide the following to SEAC for further processing of the application:

1. Ownership details of entire 62 acres of land owned by the proponent.
2. Google map specifically marking the total area owned by the proponent demarcating the proposed mining area for which the present application is submitted.

3. Present land use in the entire area owned by the proponent.
4. Depth of water table in the site.
5. Documentary evidence regarding the amount already spent towards CSR.

Item No. 25.05 Quarry Project of M/s. G.K. Granites (173/SEIAA/KL/3649/2013)

The project proponent made a brief presentation of the proposal. The Committee found that the proponent has not provided the area survey plan duly certified by Village Officer but has instead provided a copy of the same. It was also found that the proponent has submitted another application (under the name of the firm M/s Crystal Granites Ltd. with file no. 177/SEIAA/KL/3653/2013) which bears survey numbers contiguous with the area of the present application and hence directed the proponent to submit a single application for the entire contiguous area owned by him. It was also found that in Form 1, in the place of providing details of Sy. Nos. of the project site, it is stated to refer Table 1 of Enclosure – 4, which is not traceable.

Considering the above, it is decided to REJECT and DELIST the application as the supporting documents were not original especially the Area Survey Plan of Village Officer. The Consultant organization has thus failed in their part of submitting proposal as per the guidelines of SEIAA Kerala, the details of which are already available in the website of the Authority.

Item No. 25.06 Quarry Project of M/s. Pathikal Granites Pvt. Ltd. (175/SEIAA/KL/3651/2013)

Despite intimation from the Secretariat of SEAC/SEIAA, the project proponent was absent for the presentation. Hence the item is DEFERRED insisting that the proposal shall be delisted if the proponent fails to be present for presentation in the next meeting.

Item No. 25.07 Quarry Project of M/s. Crystal Granites Ltd (177/SEIAA/KL/3653/2013)

The Committee found that the proponent of the project is the same as that of M/s G.K. Granites with file No. 173/SEIAA/KL/3649/2013 discussed under agenda item no. 25.05. It was also found that the said application bears survey numbers contiguous with the area of the present application and hence the Committee directed the proponent to submit a single application for the entire contiguous area owned by him. It was also found that in Form 1, in the place of providing details of Sy. Nos. of the project site, it is stated to refer Table 1 of Enclosure – 4, which is not traceable. The Committee also found that the proponent has not provided the area survey plan duly certified by Village Officer but has instead provided a copy of the same.

Considering the above, it is decided to REJECT and DELIST the application as the supporting documents were not original especially the Area Survey Plan of Village Officer. The Consultant organization has thus failed in their part of submitting proposal as per the guidelines of SEIAA Kerala, the details of which are already available in the website of the Authority.

Item No. 25.08 Master Plan Development of an I.T/I.T.E.S SEZ township Construction Project of M/s. Smart city (Kochi) Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd. (184/SEIAA/KL/3792/2013)

The project proponent made a brief presentation of the proposal. The project comes under Category 8 (b) of the Schedule of EIA Notification 2006. The Committee asked the proponent as to what all changes they have made in the land use after obtaining Environmental Clearance for Phase I of the project. To this end the proponent stated that 50 percent of piling work is completed by 31st January 2014 and they are planning to complete the structure by December 2014 pertaining to the EC obtained for the first phase. The Committee evaluated the EIA report submitted by the

proponent based on the model ToR proposed by MoEF and approved the same. The Committee appreciated the proponent's effort in presenting a clear cut master plan of the project. The proponent stated that there is a sacred grove (called as Edachira Kaavu) in about 20 cents of land in the revenue porambokke outside the project site which is not managed by any one as of now. The proponent assured that they shall take every possible measure to maintain and conserve the serenity of the region. As stated by the proponent, a part of the project site is low lying area which is not wet land and the character of the land is recorded as Jenmam bhoomi in land documents. In that land, an area is set aside as lotus pond which can act as a buffer during flooding as some sort of meandering is expected in the area during heavy rains. Soft landscaping of 10 m wide area with suitable species to absorb the impact of flooding, like some sort of biofencing is also being planned as no construction of retaining wall or any other masonry structure is proposed for the project. It is also proposed to have thick belt of shelter plantation on the SW side of land B. It is proposed to have decentralized WTP for every parcel of land. The proponent has stated that they have left 7 acres of land in the project site for disposal and treatment of waste. The Committee asked whether it is sufficient for such a mega project expecting lot of facilities in it. To this end the proponent stated that as per the calculations, 1 hectare of land is only required for processing 100 MT of waste and for 30 MT of proposed waste generation for the project only 3 acres of land is required for which they have additionally provided 4 acres against the actual requirement. The proponent has also stated that the processing of 30 T of waste shall be done in different processing units instead of a single unit. The proponent has stated that sufficient set back has been left from HT KSEB tower line and GAIL gas pipe line located within the project site, which the Committee wanted to ascertain during site visit. The proponent has stated that no plot boundaries are envisaged in the present project and the project has started with the road network. Dedicated cycling zones around the building are also proposed. It was also stated that the labour colony is located in the site of Phase 5 development with STP and other facilities for the same and is designed in such a way that it will remain undisturbed and could be efficiently utilized till Phase 5, which is the final phase of the project envisaged to be completed in 2020. The Committee found that some of the values of water quality of samples taken from within the site exceeded the prescribed limits and hence directed the proponent to provide the details to address the same. SEAC directed the proponent to conserve every drop of water in the site as there was concern since the water requirement for the project is entirely dependent of Kerala Water Authority and RWH. The proponent stated that no ground water abstraction is envisaged for the project. At this point, the Committee stated that nothing has been mentioned by the proponent about improving the nearby Kadamprayar river and Edachira canal and using that water for their requirement. The project proponent agreed that they shall look into the same and do the needful as part of CSR.

The proponent has provided the list of 18 species of endemic plants in the project site along with the details of indicator species and stated that they shall conserve the same within the butterfly garden, the concept of earmarking a specific area for nectar plants and host plants for butterflies, as 47 species of butterflies were spotted in the site during ecological assessment. However the Committee sought assurance from the proponent that the endemic species of plants within the site shall be preserved. It was also directed to do the biodiversity assessment once in every five years especially with respect to the amphibians, butterflies, lichens and endemic plants in the area. The proponent stated that dredging is required for the project as two numbers of jetty services are proposed in the project. ***The Committee stated that dredging for clearing the channel shall be permitted and the same shall be mentioned in the Environmental Clearance.*** Regarding CSR activities, the proponent stated that they have set aside approximately Rs.15 crores for spending towards CSR during construction phase and the activities which are proposed is made after conducting community need assessment study in the area. The Committee sought assurance from the proponent regarding the same. At this juncture the Committee suggested to the proponent to think about an objective as to providing proper housing facility to the poor in and around the project site and also a water way from Kakknad to Smart City. The Committee asked the proponent as to

why they have not mentioned anything about the Fire and Rescue system proposed for the mega project. To this end the proponent stated that a Fire Station is proposed in the Infopark Phase 2 site which is in front of the present project site. Overall, the Committee was satisfied with the proposed master plan of the project and lauded the effort from the part of the proponent in bringing out the real essence of the project from environmental angle.

Considering the above, the item is DEFERRED FOR SITE VISIT to ascertain the ground realities, especially the nature of land as to whether there is any wetland, location of HT KSEB tower line and GAIL gas pipe line with respect to the project site and directing the proponent to provide the following to SEAC for further processing of the application:

1. Details of proposed measures to be taken to maintain the water quality standards within the prescribed limits.
2. Assurance in the form of affidavit that the endemic species of plants within the site shall be preserved.
3. Assurance in the form of affidavit that CSR activities, as committed before the Committee shall be implemented.

Item No. 25.09 **DD Diamond Valley Project of M/s. Desai Homes Builders & Real Estate Developers (185/SEIAA/KL/05/2014)**

The project proponent made a brief presentation of the project. The Committee found that the proponent has done some piling work in the project site and hence directed to provide an affidavit stating the extent of work done by them in the project site at present. The proponent agreed to provide the same and stated that no work is done in the site at present. The Committee also found that the present amount set aside by the proponent towards CSR is very less with respect to the project cost and hence directed to enhance the amount and to provide revised details on the same. The proponent is also directed to increase the width of outer road to 7 m from the present 5.5 m and also to follow rule 33(5) of KPBR which does not permit construction of road adjoining the building block. Assurance to that effect is sought from the proponent. The proponent stated that 45 dry days of water storage is proposed for the project and the Committee found that to be satisfactory. However, regarding the waste treatment the Committee suggested the proponent to introduce composting and biogas plant simultaneously in all projects without entirely depending on the biogas plant.

Considering the above, the item is DEFERRED FOR SITE VISIT to ascertain whether the proponent has done any construction activities, which amounts to any serious violation and directing the proponent to provide the following to SEAC for further processing of the application:

1. Affidavit stating the extent of work done by them in the project site at present.
2. Revised details on the amount set aside towards CSR enhancing the present proposed amount.
3. Assurance in the form of affidavit that the width of outer road shall be increased to 7 m and that rule 33(5) of KPBR shall be scrupulously followed.

Item No. 25.10 **Sri Kurumba Trust Projects of M/s. Sri. Kurumba Trust (186/SEIAA/KL/06/2014)**

Despite intimation from the Secretariat of SEAC/SEIAA, the project proponent was absent for the presentation. Hence the item is DEFERRED insisting that the proposal shall be delisted if the proponent fails to be present for presentation in the next meeting.

Item No. 25.11 **Building Stone Quarry Project of M/s. J and S Granites Company (200/SEIAA/KL/86/2014)**

The project proponent made a brief presentation of the project. The documents provided by the proponent did not clearly demarcate the proposed mining area and hence the proponent is directed to provide cadastral map of the entire area in which the proposed mining area is superimposed. The Committee found that out of the 60 acres of land, the proponent owns less than 20 acres and the remaining land is owned by other family members. The Committee raised concern as to whether the area is contiguous and decided to ascertain the same during site visit. The Committee was also not satisfied with the environmental quality analysis reports provided by the proponent and hence directed to provide the primary data on the same taken from four different locations of the project site, especially the water analysis.

Considering the above, the item is DEFERRED FOR SITE VISIT to assess whether the contiguous area is fragmented for EC application just to get it included as B2 category and directing the proponent to provide the following to SEAC for further processing of the application:

1. Cadastral map of the entire area in which the proposed mining area is superimposed.
2. Primary data on environmental quality analysis.
3. Water quality analysis reports on samples taken from four different locations of the project site.

Item No. 25.12 **Proposed development of Software complex TCS Techno Park of M/s Tata Consultancy Services Ltd. (205/SEIAA/KL/128/2014)**

Despite intimation from the Secretariat of SEAC/SEIAA, the proponent failed to circulate the proposal to the members of SEAC without which the evaluation of the same was not possible. Hence the item is DEFERRED to be considered in the next meeting.

Item No. 25.13 **Proposed Stone Quarry Project of M/s Reena Metals (210/SEIAA/KL/221/2014)**

Despite intimation from the Secretariat of SEAC/SEIAA, the proponent failed to circulate the proposal to the members of SEAC without which the evaluation of the same was not possible. Further it was found that the environmental consultant has not produced valid authorization from the EIA co-ordinator to make a presentation before the Committee on his behalf. Hence the item is DEFERRED to be considered in the next meeting.

Item No. 25.14 **Proposed Building Stone Quarry Project of M/s. SKG Granites and Quarries Pvt. Ltd. (211/SEIAA/KL/250/2014)**

The project proponent made a brief presentation of the project. The Committee found that the proponent has sought environmental clearance for conducting quarrying activities only in 9.7429 hectares when he owns 50 acres of land. To this end the proponent stated that he does not have intention to extend the mining area to any other part of land owned by him other than the present project area. The Committee sought assurance from the proponent regarding this. As evident from photographs provided by the proponent, the overburden is thick as against the quantity of overburden mentioned in the proposal and it was decided to ascertain the same during site visit. The proponent has stated that the nearest house is located at a distance of 150 m from the project site and there are no local problems in the region with respect to the project.

Considering the above, the item is DEFERRED FOR SITE VISIT to assess the overburden thickness of the area and directing the proponent to provide the following to SEAC for further processing of the application:

1. Assurance in the form of affidavit that mining shall not be extended to any other part of land owned by the proponent other than in 9.7429 hectares of land bearing Sy. Nos. Sy Nos. 540/1-1-126, 540/1-1, 540/1-1/411, 540/1-1, 540/1-1-129/2338, 540/1-1-126/2339, 540/1-1-127, 540/1-1-

126/2329, 540/1-1-128/2330, 540/1-1-129 and 540/1-1-128/2335 at Aruvappulam Village, Kozhenchery Taluk, Pathanamthitta District, Kerala.

2. Revised details on the overburden thickness of the site.

Item No. 25.15 **Proposed Building Stone Quarry Project of M/s. Mathalikunnel Quarry**
(212/SEIAA/KL/251/2014)

The project proponent made a brief presentation of the project. The Committee found that the earlier application submitted by the proponent for the same area was rejected and delisted for want of valid proof of ownership of land by the proponent. Hence it was decided to examine the land documents in detail. Further it was found that there is another working quarry on the northern slope adjacent to this quarry. The proponent stated that the same is owned by another person. However, the Committee wanted to ascertain during site visit the number of working quarries surrounding the project site. The proponent is also directed to provide the detailed split up of the proposed CSR activities specifically mentioning the areas/institutions to which the same shall be extended, with documentary evidence of the already done CSR activities.

Considering the above, the item is DEFERRED FOR SITE VISIT to ascertain during site visit the number of working quarries surrounding the project site and also directing the proponent to provide the detailed split up of the proposed CSR activities specifically mentioning the areas/institutions to which the same shall be extended, with documentary evidence of the already done CSR activities.

Item No. 25.16 **Proposed Building Stone Quarry Project of M/s. Mundengara Granites**
(213/SEIAA/KL/252/2014)

The project proponent made a brief presentation of the project. The Committee found that the proposed project is dimension and building stone quarry project wherein no blasting is required for extraction as large blocks are required for the same instead of fragments. Dimension stone is devoid of all geological aberrations like cleavage, joint, fissure, etc. and is used for ornamental purposes. The Committee found that the proponent has provided the biodiversity listing of flora and fauna concentrating on 10 km radius of the project site and hence directed to provide site specific biodiversity listing with due authentication by the concerned expert. The proponent is also directed to provide the bench system for mining as the rock is very steep and cliff like and since the same is not practiced now. The proponent is also directed to provide the detailed split up of the proposed CSR activities specifically mentioning the areas/institutions to which the same shall be extended, with documentary evidence of the already done CSR activities.

Considering the above, the item is DEFERRED FOR SITE VISIT and directing the proponent to provide the following to SEAC for further processing of the application:

1. Site specific biodiversity listing of flora and fauna with due authentication by the concerned expert.
2. Detailed split up of the proposed CSR activities specifically mentioning the areas/institutions to which the same shall be extended, with documentary evidence of the already done CSR activities.

Item No. 25.17 **Building Stone Quarry Project of M/s. BETA Granites Pvt. Ltd**
(216/SEIAA/KL/274/2014)

The project proponent made a brief presentation of the proposal. The proponent has not provided a detailed mine closure plan and is directed to provide the same. The proponent stated that the excavated pit will be backfilled using the left over waste material of excavation and green belt species shall be planted for eco-restoration. The Committee sought assurance from the proponent regarding this and also directed to provide detailed eco-restoration plan including the details of area

proposed to be restored. The proponent has also not provided the cadastral map duly certified by Village Officer marking the survey numbers of the project site and is hence directed to provide the same.

Considering the above, the item is DEFERRED FOR SITE VISIT and directing the proponent to provide the following to SEAC for further processing of the application:

1. Detailed mine closure plan.
2. Assurance in the form of affidavit that green belt species shall be planted for eco-restoration.
3. Detailed eco-restoration plan including the details of area proposed to be restored.
4. Cadastral map duly certified by Village Officer marking the survey numbers of the project site.

Item No. 25.18 Quarry project of M/s Chelupara granites (217/SEIAA/KL/276/2014)

The proponent was not allowed to make a presentation before the Committee as it was found that the application submitted has lot of factual errors like, in Form 1, the proponent has stated the location as Kodyathur Village, Kozhikode Taluk, **Malappuram District**, Kerala. Also, the soft copy submitted by the proponent is not in tune with the hard copy submitted and photographs of same location are repeatedly given as for different locations.

Considering the above, the application is REJECTED AND DELISTED directing the proponent to submit a fresh application if necessary, following the guidelines of SEIAA Kerala as given in its website.

The meeting concluded at 8 pm on the first day (14th February 2014) with a vote of thanks by the Chairman. The members unanimously responded with thanks to the Chair.

On day 2 (on 15th February 2014) the meeting commenced at 9.30 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 - Member, SEAC
Chairman, Kerala State Biodiversity Board &
CSIR Emeritus Scientist
3. Dr. Khaleel Chovva - Member, SEAC
4. Prof. (Dr.) K. Sajan - Member, SEAC
5. Dr. V. Anitha - Member, SEAC
6. Dr. E.J. Joseph - Member, SEAC
7. Dr. K. Harikrishnan - Member, SEAC
8. Dr. C.N. Mohanan - Member, SEAC
9. Sri. Eapen Varughese - Member, SEAC
10. Dr. George Chackacherry - Member, SEAC
11. Sri. P. Sreekantan Nair - Secretary, SEAC
Director,

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

Item No. 25.19 **Hotel cum apartment project of M/s Artech Realtors (P) Ltd.**
(221/SEIAA/KL/329/2014)

The project proponent made a brief presentation of the proposal. The Committee found that three endemic species of plants were identified in the project site. The proponent was asked as to how they are going to preserve the biodiversity of the region. To this end the proponent stated that they are utilizing only 12 percent of the land for construction of the building out of the 65 percent of the total land area. Rest of the area shall be utilized for landscaping and butterfly garden with host and nectar plants for butterflies is proposed giving thrust to conservation of endemic species. A good number of trees shall be retained as part of landscape management. The Committee found that there is cliff within the project site and hence directed the proponent to leave it undisturbed and protect by slope stabilization method and to leave 50 m set back from the same as per CRZ conditions. Hence the presently proposed parking area has to be shifted. The Committee also found that the project has obtained NOC from Airports Authority of India for a maximum height of 80.25 m AMSL and hence directed the proponent to restrict the height as per the same. The proponent stated that storage of rain water to a tune of 9000 KL and bore well in non-CRZ areas is proposed. But the Committee directed the proponent not to construct bore well in the area.

Considering the application submitted by the proponent, information provided therein and clarifications provided by the proponent in person before the Committee during the presentation, the proposal is RECOMMENDED for ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE under the usual General Conditions for non-mining projects along with the following specific conditions:

1. Constructions should not be made in areas where provisions of CRZ Notification 2011 applies. In case of any dispute, decisions of KCZMA shall prevail.
2. Constructions are not allowed in any area other than that described as purayidam in revenue records.
3. Height should be restricted as per NOC from Airport Authority of India and Fire and Rescue Services.
4. The cliff area should be kept undisturbed, protected and a set back distance of 50 m should be made from it.
5. Bore well should not be constructed.
6. Disposal of sewage should not be made to CRZ areas.

Item No. 25.20 **Quarry project of M/s Karimala granites & Aggregates Pvt. Ltd.**
(222/SEIAA/KL/349/2014)

The project proponent made a brief presentation of the project. In the application and as stated by the consultant, the nearest house to the project site is located at a distance of 106 m but the proponent stated that the same is at a distance of 200 m from the project site. The Committee decided to ascertain the same during site visit. The Committee found from the google image that the project site is having dense vegetation predominated by rubber plantation indicating thick overburden and very fertile top soil.

Considering the details provided in the application, the information provided by the proponent and verifying the documents submitted by the proponent, the item is DEFERRED FOR SITE VISIT to assess the proximity of human settlements to the project site & overburden thickness in the site and directing the proponent to submit the following for further consideration of the proposal:

1. Map clearly demarcating the total area owned by the proponent and the proposed mining area with survey numbers.
2. Details on green belt development.
3. Perspective plan of 500 m radius clearly marking human settlements with density of population, facilities and other land uses.
4. Cadastral map duly certified by Village Officer.
5. Land use map/conceptual plan including all facilities marking distances from each facility.
6. Photographs of the existing quarry.
7. Revised mine closure plan after removing the pond proposed in the present plan.
8. Revised site specific biodiversity listing of flora and fauna duly authenticated by concerned expert.
9. Environmental quality analysis reports of four different locations of the project site.
10. Detailed split up of the proposed CSR activities specifically mentioning the areas/institutions to which the same shall be extended, with documentary evidence of the already done CSR activities.

Item No. 25.21 Removal of ordinary earth by Shri. Sunil Kumar. S
(193/SEIAA/KL/45/2014) (*Reconsideration*)

Considering the documents submitted along with the application, information provided therein and the additional clarifications provided by the proponent, the proposal is RECOMMENDED for issuance of Environmental Clearance as per the usual conditions specified in O.M. No. L-11011/47/2011-IA.II(M) dt. 24.06.2013 of Ministry of Environment and Forests on mining of ‘brick earth’ and ‘ordinary earth’ having lease area less than 5 hectares as follows, as the purpose of ordinary earth removal is for agricultural purposes only:

- (i) The activity shall not involve blasting.
- (ii) The maximum depth of removal of earth should not go beyond 2 m from the general ground level of the site, which should be prominently marked before initiating the work.
- (iii) Removal of earth should be restricted to 2 m above to the ground water table at the site.
- (iv) The excavation activity shall not alter the natural drainage pattern of the area.
- (v) The borrowed/excavated pit shall be restored by the project proponent for useful purpose(s) as specified in the application.
- (vi) Appropriate fencing all around the borrowed/excavated pit shall be made to prevent any mishap.
- (vii) Measures shall be taken to prevent dust emission by covering of borrowed/excavated earth during transportation.
- (viii) Safeguards shall be adopted against health risks on account of breeding of vectors in the water bodies created due to borrowing/excavation of earth.
- (ix) Workers / labourers shall be provided with facilities for drinking water and sanitation.
- (x) A berm shall be left from the boundary of adjoining field having a width equal to at least half the depth of proposed excavation.
- (xi) A minimum distance of 15 m from any civil structure shall be kept from the periphery of the excavation area.
- (xii) The purpose of ordinary earth removal should be for agricultural purposes only.
- (xiii) The Environmental Clearance shall be liable to be cancelled in any case of violation of above guidelines.

Item No. 25.22 Removal of ordinary earth by Mrs. Leela W/o Mohanan
(197/SEIAA/KL/49/2014) (*Reconsideration*)

Despite intimation from SEAC/SEIAA Secretariat the proponent failed to attend the meeting for the second chance and hence it is decided to DELIST the application.

Item No. 25.23 **Removal of ordinary earth by Shri. Balakrishnan (201/SEIAA/KL/92/2014) (Reconsideration)**

Despite intimation from SEAC/SEIAA Secretariat the proponent failed to attend the meeting for the second chance and hence it is decided to DELIST the application.

Item No. 25.24 **Removal of ordinary earth by Smt. Sisily (208/SEIAA/KL/213/2014) (Reconsideration)**

Further to the intimation from the SEAC/SEIAA Secretariat the proponent attended before the Committee in person to provide necessary clarifications. The Committee found that even though the proponent has sought permission to remove ordinary earth from land bearing Sy. Nos. 864/1 and 864/3 at Kalloor Village, Mukundapuram Taluk, Thrissur District, Kerala, the proponent has provided supporting documents regarding removal of earth from Sy. No. 864/1 alone and hence the proposal is recommended by SEAC for Environmental Clearance as per the usual conditions specified in O.M. No. L-11011/47/2011-IA.II(M) dt. 24.06.2013 of Ministry of Environment and Forests on mining of 'brick earth' and 'ordinary earth' having lease area less than 5 hectares with condition that the ordinary earth shall be removed from Sy. No. 864/1 only. The proponent is also directed to produce a certificate before initiating the work that the removed earth shall be utilized for tile making. The proponent has asked for removal of 2460 m³ of ordinary earth from 0.3541 hectares and 0.5605 hectares of land in Sy. Nos. 864/1 and 864/3 respectively but now permission is granted to remove ordinary earth only Sy.No. 864/1.

Considering the documents submitted along with the application, information provided therein and the additional clarifications provided by the proponent, the proposal is RECOMMENDED FOR ISSUANCE OF ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE as per the usual conditions specified in O.M. No. L-11011/47/2011-IA.II(M) dt. 24.06.2013 of Ministry of Environment and Forests on mining of 'brick earth' and 'ordinary earth' having lease area less than 5 hectares as follows:

- (i) The activity shall not involve blasting.
- (ii) The maximum depth of removal of earth should not go beyond 2 m from the general ground level of the site, which should be prominently marked before initiating the work.
- (iii) Removal of earth should be restricted to 2 m above to the ground water table at the site.
- (iv) The excavation activity shall not alter the natural drainage pattern of the area.
- (v) The borrowed/excavated pit shall be restored by the project proponent for useful purpose(s) as specified in the application.
- (vi) Appropriate fencing all around the borrowed/excavated pit shall be made to prevent any mishap.
- (vii) Measures shall be taken to prevent dust emission by covering of borrowed/excavated earth during transportation.
- (viii) Safeguards shall be adopted against health risks on account of breeding of vectors in the water bodies created due to borrowing/excavation of earth.
- (ix) Workers / labourers shall be provided with facilities for drinking water and sanitation.
- (x) A berm shall be left from the boundary of adjoining field having a width equal to at least half the depth of proposed excavation.
- (xi) A minimum distance of 15 m from any civil structure shall be kept from the periphery of the excavation area.
- (xii) *The ordinary earth shall be removed from Sy. No. 864/1 only.*
- (xiii) The proponent should produce a certificate that the removed earth shall be utilized for tile making, before initiating the work.

(xiv) The Environmental Clearance shall be liable to be cancelled in any case of violation of above guidelines.

Item No. 25.25 **Removal of ordinary earth by Shri. Eliyas (209/SEIAA/KL/214/2014) (Reconsideration)**

Despite intimation from SEAC/SEIAA Secretariat the proponent failed to attend the meeting for the second chance and hence it is decided to DELIST the application.

Item No. 25.26 **EC application for ordinary earth removal by Smt. Thankamma (220/SEIAA/KL/323/2014) (Reconsideration)**

Despite intimation from SEAC/SEIAA Secretariat the proponent failed to attend the meeting for the second chance and hence it is decided to DELIST the application.

Item No. 25.27 **Aerial ropeway project at Jadayupara (227/SEIAA/KL/500/2014) (Reconsideration)**

Considering the application submitted by the proponent, information provided therein, further clarifications provided by the proponent in person before the Committee during the presentation and on verification of the additional clarification which was found to be satisfactory, the proposal is RECOMMENDED FOR ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE under the usual General Conditions for non-mining projects and along with the following specific conditions:

1. The conceptual plan submitted should be strictly adhered to.
2. Safety measures specified in the proposal should be scrupulously followed.

Item No. 25.28 **Proposed housing project by M/s Green Vistas Infrastructure Projects (32/SEIAA/KL/3045/2012) (Reconsideration)**

The Committee found that the proponent has started construction without obtaining prior Environmental Clearance and has thus violated the provisions of EIA Notification 2006. The proponent has filed an affidavit to the effect that violation as per EIA Notification has occurred and shall not be repeated. SEAC found that Ministry of Environment & Forests have issued clarifications on the activities which can be undertaken without prior Environmental Clearance, vide O.M. No. J-11013/41/2006-IA.II(I) dated 19th August 2010, wherein it is stated that: 'No activity relating to any project under this Notification including civil construction, can be undertaken at site without obtaining prior environmental clearance except fencing of the site to protect it from getting encroached and construction of temporary shed(s) for the guard(s)'. Hence the violation has to be processed as per the 12th December 2012 orders from MoEF and reported to the State Government / District Magistrate. In view of the site inspection conducted and on verification of the additional documents provided by the proponent, the Committee RECOMMENDED FOR INITIATING VIOLATION PROCEEDINGS and for reconsideration thereafter the violation procedures are complete.

Item No. 25.29 **Additional tankage for motor spirit by M/s Indian Oil Corporation Ltd. (87/SEIAA/KL/447/2013) (Reconsideration)**

The Committee verified the additional documents submitted by the proponent and RECOMMENDED FOR ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE on the usual general conditions for non-mining projects and the following specific conditions:

1. Green belt to be provided on the boundaries of the eastern half where settlement is seen.
2. Fire and safety measures should be ensured during construction stage also.

Item No. 25.30 **Quarry project of M/s Malleil Industries (92/SEIAA/KL/1052/2013)**
(Reconsideration)

Considering the application submitted by the proponent, information provided therein and further clarifications provided by the proponent, the proposal is RECOMMENDED FOR ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE under the usual General Conditions for mining projects and along with the following specific conditions:

1. Quarrying has to be limited to the elevated portion of Sy. No. 275 only where the overburden thickness is less than 1.5 m.
2. A safe buffer distance of 100 m should be maintained from the temple on the eastern side.
3. Height of the existing cuttings should be reduced by quarrying from the other side.
4. The boundary of quarry area to be fenced to have at least 100 m safe distance from the settlement on western side.
5. The crusher should be located in the area 100 m away from the settlement with minimum dust and noise generation.
6. Should have a well defined main access road.

Item No. 25.31 **Construction project of M/s Al Abeer Educity**
(106/SEIAA/KL/1722/2013) (Reconsideration)

The Committee found that the proponent has requested for omission of Sy. No. 145/2B from the present proposal stating that the said Sy. No. is not owned by them and inclusion of the said Sy. No. in the present project was an inadvertent error from the part of the concerned Village Officer. The proponent has also provided necessary clarification from the Village Officer regarding the same. Hence it is decided to place the request before SEIAA for final decision. The Committee verified the other documents submitted by the proponent and RECOMMENDED FOR ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE on the usual general conditions for non-mining projects and the following specific conditions:

1. Specific measures should be provided for storage of radioactive isotopes below ground.
2. Two seats to be reserved for eligible students of BPL family for free education for MBBS as agreed in the CSR component.

Item No. 25.32 **China clay mining & beneficiation project by M/s Kerala Clay & Ceramic products Ltd (114/SEIAA/KL/1980/2013) (Reconsideration)**

The Committee verified the additional clarifications/documents submitted by the proponent and felt that the same requires detailed examination. Hence the item is DEFERRED to be considered in the next SEAC meeting.

Item No. 25.33 **Quarry proposal of Kannimangalam granite quarry by M/s Vijaya Quarry Works (115/SEIAA/KL/2181/2013) (Reconsideration)**

The Committee found that the proponent has not submitted the final orders from the Honourable High Court of Kerala on the W.P. (Civil) 28087/2011 (S) and hence decided to KEEP THE PROJECT IN ABEYANCE till a final verdict on the same is made available by the proponent.

Item No. 25.34 **Quarry proposal of Illithode granite quarry by M/s Vijaya quarryworks (116/SEIAA/KL/2182/2013)(Reconsideration)**

The Committee found that the proponent has not submitted the final orders from the Honourable High Court of Kerala on the W.P. (Civil) 28087/2011 (S) and hence decided to KEEP THE PROJECT IN ABEYANCE till a final verdict on the same is made available by the proponent.

Item No. 25.35 **Quarry proposal of M/s Valluvanad Quarries & Granites Pvt Ltd**
(119/SEIAA/KL/2185/2013) (*Reconsideration*)

In view of the site inspection conducted, information provided in the application and further clarifications provided by the proponent, the proposal is RECOMMENDED FOR ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE under the usual General Conditions for mining projects and along with the following specific conditions;

1. 10 m distance to be kept on the southern side from the village boundary.
2. Minimum 100 m safe distance should be maintained between the houses and the quarry.
3. Tree belts are to be provided on the boundaries, especially on the eastern part.

Item No. 25.36 **Quarry project of M/s Kavumkal Granite (P) Ltd.**
(122/SEIAA/KL/2201/2013) (*Reconsideration*)

Following the site inspection and considering the petitions received from the local inhabitants against the project, it is RECOMMENDED TO CONSIDER THE PROJECT AS CATEGORY B1. The proponent is directed to have public hearing conducted with the approved ToR for mining projects and further addressing the concerns of people in the EIA report and EMP.

Item No. 25.37 **Quarry project of M/s Palakkal Granite Products Pvt. Ltd.**
(137/SEIAA/KL/2567/2013) (*Reconsideration*)

The Committee verified the additional clarifications/documents submitted by the proponent. The item is DEFERRED directing the proponent to produce certificate from the forest officials as to whether forest land is included in the Sy. No. 172 (P) at Kodyathur Village, Kozhikode Taluk, Kozhikode District, Kerala.

Item No. 25.38 **Hospital project of Believers Church** (142/SEIAA/KL/2743/2013)
(*Reconsideration*)

In view of the field inspection conducted by the subcommittee and on verification of the additional clarifications provided by the proponent, SEAC RECOMMENDED THE PROJECT FOR ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE stipulating the following specific conditions in addition to the general conditions for non-mining projects:

1. The stream diversion should be regularized in the revenue records and certificate produced.
2. The extent of bhoosthithi vazhi should also be regularized in revenue records.
3. A buffer distance of 5 m has to be provided on either side of the internal stream and the land may be provided with riparian vegetation.
4. Tertiary sandstones exposed should not be isolated or covered with non-permeable material.
5. Paddy fields in possession of the proponent must be used for paddy cultivation and should not be reclaimed.

Item No. 25.39 **Medical trust Institute of Medical sciences** (143/SEIAA/KL/2744/2013)
(*Reconsideration*)

In view of the field inspection conducted by the subcommittee and on verification of the additional clarifications provided by the proponent, SEAC RECOMMENDED THE PROJECT FOR

ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE stipulating the following specific conditions in addition to the general conditions for non-mining projects:

1. A buffer distance of at least 10 m to be kept as No Development Zone on the side of the thodu.
2. No part of the streams in the site should be reclaimed.
3. The hierarchy of width of internal roads must be maintained.

Item No. 25.40 **Quarry project of Panachayil Industries (145/SEIAA/KL/2746/2013)**
(Reconsideration)

On verification of the additional clarifications provided by the proponent, SEAC RECOMMENDED THE PROJECT FOR ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE under the usual general conditions for mining projects.

Item No. 25.41 **Quarry project of Sahara granites (146/SEIAA/KL/2747/2013)**
(Reconsideration)

In view of the site inspection conducted, information provided in the application and on verification of the clarifications provided by the proponent, the proposal is RECOMMENDED FOR ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE under the usual General Conditions for mining projects and along with the following specific conditions:

1. Buffer distance of 15 m to be kept along the village boundary.
2. Overburden stacked on the southern side should be reduced to a lower slope.
3. As agreed in CSR, the periodical maintenance of Erimayur-Kunnathur road and Alathur-Kunnathur road should be made free of cost.

Item No. 25.42 **Quarry project of Aswathy Granites (147/SEIAA/KL/2748/2013)**
(Reconsideration)

The Committee verified the documents submitted by the proponent and found it genuine. The proposal is RECOMMENDED FOR ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE as stated in the 21st SEAC meeting on the usual general conditions for mining projects and the specific conditions as follows:

1. A buffer zone of 100 m should be left from the side of the temple.
2. Approach road should be widened and hard surfaced for facilitating transport of hard rock and machinery.
3. Eco-restoration should be made in the already mined pit now in possession of the proponent.

Item No. 25.43 **Quarry project of M/s Excel granites (150/SEIAA/KL/2973/2013)**
(Reconsideration)

In view of the site inspection conducted, information provided in the application and on verification of the clarifications provided by the proponent, the proposal is RECOMMENDED FOR ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE under the usual General Conditions for mining projects and along with the following specific conditions:

1. A buffer distance of 15 m should be maintained from the taluk boundary.
2. The boundary pillars should not be tampered.

Item No. 25.44 **Quarry project by M/s Mudakkalil Granites Pvt. Ltd.**
(154/SEIAA/KL/3074/2013) (Reconsideration)

The Committee verified the additional clarifications/documents submitted by the proponent and felt that the same requires detailed examination. Hence the item is DEFERRED to be considered in the next SEAC meeting.

Item No. 25.45 **Quarry project M/s Royal Sand Gravels Pvt. Ltd.**
(160/SEIAA/KL/3490/2013) (*Reconsideration*)

The Committee found that site visit regarding the project is pending following the decision taken by SEAC in its 23rd meeting. Hence the item is DEFERRED FOR SITE VISIT for further consideration of the proposal.

Item No. 25.46 **Quarry Project by M/s Malleil Industries Pvt. Ltd.**
(161/SEIAA/kl/3491/2013) (*Reconsideration*)

The Committee found that the application was considered in the 23rd SEAC meeting held on 6th and 7th January 2014 as agenda item no. 23.05 and was deferred for site visit which shall be conducted after the survey number boundaries of each plot is demarcated in the field and the same is reported to SEAC by the proponent and seeking additional clarifications from the proponent. *Site visit is not conducted yet as the proponent has not reported to SEAC after the survey number boundaries of each plot is demarcated in the field.* Hence the item is DEFERRED.

Item No. 25.47 **Any other item approved by Chair**

Item No. 25.47.01 **O.M. No. J-13012/12/2013-IA-II (I) dt. 24.12.2013 of Ministry of Environment and Forests on Guidelines for consideration of proposals for grant of Environmental Clearance EIA Notification 2006 and its amendments regarding categorization of Category ‘B’ projects/activities into Category ‘B1’ and Category ‘B2’**

The Committee discussed in detail the contents of the O.M. No. J-13012/12/2013-IA-II (I) dt. 24.12.2013 of Ministry of Environment and Forests on Guidelines for consideration of proposals for grant of Environmental Clearance EIA Notification 2006 and its amendments regarding categorization of Category ‘B’ projects/activities into Category ‘B1’ and Category ‘B2’. It was found that as per the said O.M. of MoEF, B2 projects of mining of minor minerals (except sand mining) shall have to appraised on the basis of Form 1, pre-feasibility report, mining plan approved by the authorized agency of the concerned State Government. Now the proponents have to submit these three and since Government of Kerala has not declared such an agency, the mining plan submitted by the accredited agency prepared by sectoral expert may be appraised by the SEAC.

The meeting concluded at 4.30 pm on the second day (15th February 2014) with a vote of thanks by the Chair. The members unanimously responded with thanks to the Chair.
