

MINUTES OF THE 26TH MEETING OF STATE LEVEL EXPERT APPRAISAL COMMITTEE (SEAC) KERALA, HELD ON 20TH AND 21ST MARCH, 2014 AT HARITHASREE HALL, DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE CHANGE, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM

The twenty-sixth meeting of SEAC-Kerala was held on 20th and 21st March 2014 at Harithasree Hall, Department of Environment and Climate Change, Thiruvananthapuram. On day 1, 20th March 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. Harikumar - Member, SEAC
5. Dr. E.A. Jayson - Member, SEAC
6. Dr. K. Harikrishnan - Member, SEAC
7. Dr. Khaleel Chovva - Member, SEAC
8. Sri. John Mathai - 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 members. The Committee discussed on the validity of Environmental Clearance (EC) stipulated for the mining projects at present to the tune of life of mine or 30 years, whichever is earlier. The Committee felt that the same needs some regulations as in other states the lease period is accounted for validity of EC. It was suggested that there should be a review from the part of the proponent on the compliance of EC conditions every five years before the Committee and the Committee may conduct field visits, if necessary, as the case may be.

Thereafter, regular agenda items were taken up for deliberations:

Item No. 26.01 **Confirmation of the minutes of the 25th SEAC meeting, held on 20th & 21st March 2014 at Harithasree Hall, Department of Environment and Climate Change, Thiruvananthapuram.**

Confirmed.

Item No. 26.02 **Action taken report on the decisions of the 25th SEAC meeting**

Noted.

Item No. 26.03 **Environmental clearance for the quarry project in Sy. No. 275/1A at Thrippangottur Village and Panchayath, Thalassery Taluk, Kannur District, Kerala by M/s Pathikal Granites Private Limited (File No. 175/SEIAA/KL/3651/2013)**

The project proponent made a brief presentation of the project. The Committee found that a thodu is passing through the boundary of the project site, which initially fell in ESZ-1. The project site is part of a hill starting with a contour of 700 m. All along the boundary the slope is steep and it is a landslide prone area with very steep rectilinear slope. Another major concern of the Committee was that the class of land of the project site is 'thottam' as per the land records. The Committee was apprehensive as to whether the proponent has obtained pattayam for the said land bearing Sy. Nos. mentioned in the proposal and whether quarrying is a permissible activity in a land classified as 'thottam'. The Committee decided to examine whether the project site is given by Government to the proponent as pattayam for plantation purposes and to proceed further after ascertaining the same. As per the copy of possession certificate submitted by the proponent, Sy. No. 275/1A, coming to a total area of 6.07 hectares, is under the possession of the project proponent, Mr. M.M. George, Jiya George and Joyce George. The proponent has also provided copies of consent from Jiya George and Joyce George given to him to conduct quarrying activities in the said land. But consent from Mr. M.M. George is not provided and is hence directed to provide the same. The Committee also found that the total land area for which consent is given is 3.2380 hectares whereas the present proposal is for quarrying in 3.1650 hectares and sought clarification from the proponent regarding this. To this end the proponent stated that they have left sufficient set back from the adjoining boundaries on all sides, and deducting that set back from the area of 3.2380 hectares derives the present project area of 3.1650 hectares. However, the Committee was of the opinion that since the project site is part of a Sy. No. having large area, the proponent is directed to provide a map showing the proposed mining area marking exact distance from the survey boundary pillars. It was also found that in the copy of area survey plan provided, the area of plot A and plot C is given as 1.62 hectares and 2.8330 hectares respectively totalling to 4.45 hectares whereas the proposed quarrying area denoted in the same A and C is given as 3.1650 hectares. Hence the proponent is directed to provide a revised area survey plan clarifying the same. The Committee also found that the google image provided by the proponent was not recent. To this end the proponent stated that the same is the only image available with respect to the site at present. The Committee also found that even though the proponent has provided the proposed Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) activities linked with the present project, the institutions to which the same shall be extended is not specified and is hence directed to provide the same.

Considering the above, the item is DEFERRED FOR SITE VISIT to ascertain the tenure of land of the project site and to examine whether the project site is given by Government to the proponent as pattayam for plantation purposes. The proponent is further directed to submit the following clarifications/documents to SEAC for further consideration of the proposal:

1. Valid document to prove that the proponent has obtained pattayam for the land bearing Sy. Nos. mentioned in the proposal.
2. Consent from M.M. George given to the project proponent to conduct quarrying activities in the land owned by him.
3. Map showing the proposed mining area marking exact distance from the survey boundary pillars.
4. Revised area survey plan clearly marking the extent of area in the land bearing Sy. No. of the present project.

5. Details of proposed CSR activities linked with the present project specifically stating the institutions to which the same shall be extended.

Item No. 26.04 **Environmental clearance for the existing, ongoing and proposed Sri Kurumba Trust Projects in Sy. Nos. 100/1,2 & 85/1 at Vadakkenchery-1 Village, Vadakkencherry Grama Panchayath, Alathur Taluk, Palakkad District, Kerala by M/s Sri Kurumba Trust (File No. 186/SEIAA/KL/06/2014)**

The project proponent made a brief presentation of the proposal. The proponent has sought EC for the existing, ongoing and proposed Sri Kurumba Trust Projects and has stated that they have started construction of ongoing facilities for an area of less than 20,000 m² in October 2013 and have now applied for EC since the proposed facilities exceed a total built up area of 20,000 m². The Committee found that the proponent has not provided the cadastral map duly certified by Village Officer and is hence directed to provide the same in which proposed outlay/building plan is superimposed. The proponent has not mentioned in the proposal about the capacity of rain water storage tank but has mentioned that 5 numbers of tanks are proposed for the same. But in the proforma of salient features of the project the proponent has mentioned that a RWH of 2300 KL capacity and 9 tanks are proposed. The proponent was sought clarification on this. To this end the proponent stated that the 4 existing RWH structures in the campus and the proposed 5 tanks come to a total of 2300 KL. The Committee observed that some of the RWH structures are suggested in elevated portions of rocky areas and asked the proponent as to why they have selected such an elevated portion for the same. To this end the proponent stated that they have opted the location only for storage of 400 KL considering the topography of the site. However, the Committee suggested the proponent to enhance the RWH capacity as there is no dependable source of water as of now. The proponent is also directed to explore another dependable source of water other than the RWH. The Committee also found that there are water quality issues in the region as evident from the water quality analysis reports. To this end the proponent stated that they will use the water only after proper treatment and has provision for treatment of iron in the water by cascade aeration followed by Reverse Osmosis. The Committee suggested the consultant that 2012 revised BIS standards should be used for water quality analysis and reports thereon should be submitted hereafter.

The Committee observed that the storm water drainage should be directed towards the centre of the project site as per the topography whereas a health care unit is proposed in the area at present. It was also found that the girl's hostel is proposed in 130 m elevation and is proposed to be located in an isolated area. The Committee directed the proponent to look into these two and suitably address the same. It was also found that the playgrounds are proposed in rocky area. The Committee found the soil profile data provided by the proponent inadequate for assessment and hence directed to provide soil profile data of more locations. Another major concern of the Committee was that the proponent has not followed Rule 37 (5) of KPBR, as open spaces are not provided between the road and the building block. The width of internal road was also found to be less than 7m. Hence the proponent is directed to enforce Rule 37 (5) of KPBR.

Considering the above, SEAC felt that it can be recommended for Environmental Clearance if the following documents are submitted to SEAC for examination and reconsideration:

1. Cadastral map duly certified by Village Officer.
2. Cadastral map superimposing proposed outlay plan.

It is further decided to stipulate the following specific conditions:

1. Dependable source of water to be identified, developed and reported.

2. Rule 37 (5) of KPBR to be enforced.
3. Internal roads should have a minimum width of 7 metres.

Item No. 26.05 **Environmental clearance for the proposed quarry project in Survey Nos. 1457/1, 1461/1, 1462/1, 2, 1463/1,2 and 1465/1 at Madakkathara Village and Panchayath, Thrissur Taluk, Thrissur District, Kerala by M/s Mridhul Granites & Crusher (P) Ltd. (File No. 91/SEIAA/KL/1051/2013)**

Despite intimation from the Secretariat of SEAC/SEIAA, the project proponent was absent for presentation in the meeting for the second time also, and hence the proposal is DELISTED.

Item No. 26.06 **Environmental clearance for the quarry project in Sy. No. 946/2 pt. at Chittar Village & Panchayath, Ranni Taluk, Pathanamthitta District, Kerala by M/s Delta Aggregates & Sand Pvt. Ltd. (File No. 239/SEIAA/KL/969/2014)**

The project proponent made a brief presentation of the proposal. The proponent has stated that there are endemic species in the project site but the details of the same are not provided in the biodiversity assessment report. Hence the proponent is directed to provide the details of endemic species in the site. The Committee found that the Sy. No. mentioned in the proposal is in the name of the project proponent and Betsy Philip for M/s Cherupulichiyil Aggregates & Sand Pvt. Ltd. and for M/s Delta Aggregates & Sand Pvt. Ltd. But the proponent has not provided consent from Betsy Philip to conduct quarrying activities in Sy. No. owned by her for M/s Delta Aggregates & Sand Pvt. Ltd. and is hence directed to provide the same. The proponent has provided specific details of already done activities towards CSR, but details of proposed activities on the same are not provided. Hence the proponent is directed to provide the specific details of CSR linked with the present project specifically mentioning the amount and areas/institutions to which the same shall be extended.

After the presentation by the proponent, the item is DEFERRED FOR SITE VISIT and seeking the following additional clarifications from the proponent to be submitted to SEAC for further consideration of the proposal:

1. Details of endemic species in the project site.
2. Consent from Betsy Philip to conduct quarrying activities in Sy. No. owned by her for M/s Delta Aggregates & Sand Pvt. Ltd.
3. Specific details of CSR linked with the present project specifically mentioning the amount and areas/institutions to which the same shall be extended.

It is further decided that since the project area falls in ESZ-1 of WGEEP report and ESA of HLWG report, a final decision on the matter shall be taken only after final notification of MoEF with regard to Western Ghats is available.

Item No. 26.07 **Environmental clearance for the quarry project in Sy. Nos. 339/5, 339/6, 339/7, 339/7-2, 339/7-3, 339/7-4, 339/7-5, 339/7-6, 339/7-7, 339/14, 339/15, 339/16, 339/17, 339/18, 339/19, 339/20, 339/24, 339/25, 339/26, 340/9, 340/10, 340/11, 340/20, 340/20-1, 341/4, 341/5, 341/6, 341/7, 341/9-1, 341/9-2, 341/9-3, 341/9-4, 341/9-5, 341/10, 341/11, 341/12, 341/13, 342/2, 342/3, 343/9, 345/1, 345/1-3, 345/1-2, 345/1-16, 345/1-22, 345/1-6-1, 355/26, 341/2-1, 341/2-2 and 342/4 at Aruvikkara**

**Village & Panchayath, Nedumangad Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram
District, Kerala by M/s Metarock Pvt. Ltd. (File No.
235/SEIAA/KL/851/2014)**

The project proponent made a brief presentation of the proposal. The Committee found that this is an existing quarry working from 1996 and out of the total 14.76 hectares of land owned by the proponent, the lease area consists of 7.3401 hectares, which is partly Government (0.956 hectares) and partly private land. Sy. No. 342/4 in the present proposal is Government land and the proponent has provided the copy of NOC (valid up to 2013) issued to him by District Collector, Thiruvananthapuram for conducting quarrying activities in the said purambokke land having area of 95.60 ares. The Committee asked the proponent whether they will obtain renewal of NOC to conduct quarrying activities in the site. To this end the proponent stated that they have already obtained renewed NOC and agreed to produce copy of the same. The proponent has also not provided copy of land tax receipt for Sy. No. 339/19 and is hence directed to provide the same. The Committee also wanted to verify the former title deeds of the land under consideration of the present project to ascertain whether the land is assigned for plantation purposes or whether quarrying is permitted in the said land. Regarding proof of authorized signatory, the proponent has provided certificate from a Chartered Accountant regarding the authorized, issued and paid up share capital of the firm. But Committee directed that Certificate from Company Secretary regarding Board of Directors of the firm to be provided as proof of authorized signatory, after the receipt of which only it could be ascertained whether the resolution given as proof of authorized signatory is sufficient. The Committee was also doubtful as to whether many settlements are there around the project area and decided to ascertain the same during site visit. The proponent is also directed to provide stringent dust suppression measures and to leave 100 m safe buffer distance from nearby residences. It was also found that the area has high overburden thickness and hence the proponent is directed to specify the location for stacking the overburden. The major point of concern for the Committee was the presence of 380 mg/l sulphur content in the water sample, especially in stored rain water from the site, which showed high acidic values of 3.7. The Committee directed the proponent to recheck the values and to identify the source of sulphur and to make provisions to address the effects of the same. The proponent has provided the cadastral map duly signed by Village Officer but Sy. No. 356, which is not part of the present proposal, is also seen marked in the map and hence the proponent is directed to provide clarification in writing whether quarrying is proposed in that Sy. No. also. The following discrepancies are also found in the area survey plan submitted by the proponent and is hence directed to provide necessary clarifications/documents to clear the same:

- (i) The total area given in the table of the sy. plan is 896.51 ares. Sy. Nos. 339/23, 341/3, 341/9, 343/2, 343/3 and 343/19 which is not part of the present proposal is seen marked in the sy. plan. Also, the total area of these Sy. Nos. could not be calculated from the table given in the plan as these Sy. Nos. are not specifically given in the table.
- (ii) All the Sy. Nos. (with sub division number) mentioned in the proposal is given in the table of the area sy. plan but the Sy. Nos. 339/7-2, 339/7-3, 339/7-4, 339/7-5, 339/7-6, 339/7-7, 340/20-1, 341/9-1, 341/9-2, 341/9-3, 341/9-4, 341/9-5, 345/1-3, 345/1-2, 345/1-16, 345/1-22, 345/1-6-1, 341/2-1 and 341/2-2 which is part of the present proposal is not seen specifically *marked in the survey plan.*

The Committee also found that in the undertaking provided by the consultant regarding the responsibility of the proposal submitted Sy. Nos. 339/23-1, 339/23-2, 343/2, 343/3, 343/19, 356/5-2, 356/5-5 and 356/6 which are not part of the present proposal is also mentioned and hence the proponent is directed to provide fresh undertaking from the consultant undertaking the responsibility of the proposal submitted with only the Sy. Nos. mentioned in the proposal.

Considering the above, the item is DEFERRED FOR SITE VISIT to verify the former title deeds of the land under consideration of the present project to ascertain whether the land is assigned for plantation purposes or whether quarrying is permitted in the said land and to assess the proximity of settlements to the project area. The proponent is also directed to provide the following to SEAC for further consideration of the proposal:

1. Copy of renewed NOC obtained for quarrying in Government land bearing Sy. No. 342/4.
2. Copy of land tax receipt for Sy. No. 339/19.
3. Certificate from Company Secretary regarding Board of Directors of the firm.
4. Specify the location for stacking the overburden.
5. Details of provisions made for dust suppression.
6. Assurance in the form of affidavit that 100 m safe buffer distance shall be left from the nearby residences for quarrying activities.
7. Identify the source of sulphur detected in the water samples and provisions made to address the effects of the same.
8. Clarification in writing as to whether quarrying is proposed in Sy. No. 356, which is not part of the present proposal, as that Sy. No. is also seen marked in the cadastral map.
9. Necessary clarifications/documents regarding items (i) and (ii) above.
10. Fresh undertaking from the consultant undertaking the responsibility of the proposal submitted, incorporating only the Sy. Nos. mentioned in the proposal.

Item No. 26.08 **Environmental clearance for the quarry project in Sy. No. 1 pt. at Pullippadam Village, Mampad Panchayath, Nilambur Taluk, Malappuram District, Kerala by M/s Pullipadam Metal and Metal Sand Pvt. Ltd. (File No. 240/SEIAA/KL/970/2014)**

The project proponent made a brief presentation of the proposal. The Committee was apprehensive as to whether the project site is in the mid region of a steep hill, i.e. in the lower portion of the rectilinear slope, and wanted to ascertain the same during site visit. The Committee found that the project site is part of a large Sy. No. and hence wanted to verify the former title deeds of the land under consideration of the present project to ascertain whether the land is assigned for any other purposes than quarrying and whether it is assigned for any specific purpose only.

Considering the above, the item is DEFERRED FOR SITE VISIT to ascertain the topography of the site as to whether it is in a steep slope, and to verify the former title deeds of the land under consideration of the present project to ascertain how they possessed the land and whether the land is assigned unconditionally without specifying the purpose of utilization or for any specific purpose only.

Item No. 26.09 **Environmental clearance for the quarry project in Sy. Nos. 111/1 & 113/1 at Edavanna Village and Sy. No. 217 at Perakamanna Village, Eranad Taluk, Malappuram District, Kerala M/s Aranhikkal Granite Unit (File No. 241/SEIAA/KL/971/2014)**

The project proponent made a brief presentation of the proposal. The Committee found that out of the total 19.2487 hectares of land owned by the proponent, the lease area consists of 9.9499 hectares and asked whether the proponent has any plans to extend the mining activities to the rest of the area in future. To this end the proponent stated that no quarrying is proposed in the remaining portion of land as the overburden thickness is high in those areas. The Committee found that in the copies of land tax receipts provided by the proponent as proof of ownership of land, 'part' of Sy. Nos. 113/1 and 111/1 in the name of the proponent and Sy. No. 217/11 in the

name of 'proponent and others' is mentioned. But in Form 1 of the proposal, the 'part' of Sy. Nos. 113/1 and 111/1 are not mentioned and also instead of Sy. No. 217/11, Sy. no. 217 is mentioned. Further, the Committee noted that the total area with respect to the land tax receipts provided is coming to 9.33 hectares (inclusive of the area in Sy. No. 217/11) whereas the present proposal is for mining in 9.9499 hectares. Also, as per the copies of possession certificate provided, all Sy. Nos. mentioned in the proposal are in the name of the project proponent and the same comes to a total area of 13.89 hectares. But since as per the land tax receipt Sy. No. 217/11 belongs to the 'proponent and others' and as per the possession certificate, the Sy. No. 217 is given as 'part, clarification is sought from the proponent as to whether EC has to be considered for Sy. No. 217 or 217/11 or 217 pt. The proponent is also directed to provide detailed split up of the extent of area of the present proposal of 9.9499 hectares specifically stating the extent of area in each Sy. No. The proponent is also directed to submit a map showing the proposed mining area marking exact distance from the survey boundary pillars and the cadastre of the project site superimposed on google map. The Committee stated that only after obtaining the clarification from the proponent on the specific Sy. Nos. for which EC is sought, it could be ascertained as to whether consent from 'others' who owns Sy. No. 217/11 is required for conducting quarrying activities.

Considering the above, the item is DEFERRED FOR SITE VISIT and seeking the following additional clarifications/documents from the proponent to be submitted to SEAC for further consideration of the proposal:

1. Detailed split up of the extent of area of the present proposal of 9.9499 hectares specifically stating the extent of area in each Sy. No.
2. Map showing the proposed mining area (with extent of area) marking exact distance from the survey boundary pillars.
3. Cadastre of the project site superimposed on google map.

Item No. 26.10 **Environmental clearance for the quarry project in Sy. Nos. 149 and 186 at Kodyathoor Village & Panchayath, Kozhikode Taluk, Kozhikode District, Kerala M/s Power Stone Products (File No. 242/SEIAA/KL/972/2014)**

The project proponent made a brief presentation of the proposal. The Committee found that there is an existing mine in the area and asked the proponent regarding the reclamation activities done to that already mined area. To this end the proponent stated that 5 percent reclamation of that area is already done. The Committee sought the present status of working of the existing quarry. The proponent stated that the sprinklers and dust suppressions measures are in place to contain the dust emissions and that there is no separate space allocated for overburden storage since the existing old pit is being filled with the available overburden. The Committee observed the quality of water to be of very pure as seen from the water analysis reports provided by the proponent and was doubtful as to whether the data is reliable. Hence the proponent is directed to provide water analysis reports from four different locations of the project site. Since the total area in the Sy. nos. mentioned in the proposal is more than that of the proposed mining area, the proponent is directed to provide a map showing the proposed mining area marking exact distance from the survey boundary pillars. The proponent is also directed to provide specific proposal on Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) linked with the present project specifically showing the budget allocations and the areas/institutions to which the same shall be extended.

Considering the above, the item is DEFERRED FOR SITE VISIT and seeking the following additional clarifications/documents from the proponent to be submitted to SEAC for further consideration of the proposal:

1. Water analysis reports from four different locations of the project site.
2. Map showing the proposed mining area marking exact distance from the survey boundary pillars.
3. Specific proposal on Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) linked with the present project specifically showing the budget allocations and the areas/institutions to which the same shall be extended.

Item No. 26.11 Environmental clearance for the quarry project in Sy. Nos. 712/1, 712/5A, 712/5B, 713/2A pt., 713/2B pt., 713/6 pt., 713/3A, 713/3B, 713/5A, 713/5B and 713/1 at Arakuzha Village & Panchayath, Muvattupuzha Taluk, Ernakulam District, Kerala by M/s St. Mary's Granites (File No. 243/SEIAA/KL/973/2014)

The project proponent made a brief presentation of the proposal. The Committee found that there are litigations pending against the project – WA No. 1921/2013 in W.P. (C) 18719/2013 and 1923/2013 in W.P. (C) 22831/2013 in the Honourable High Court of Kerala wherein the final order was that the appellant can raise all the contentions before the RDO, who will pass order giving reasons. Accordingly, in pursuance of the directions contained in the judgements, Revenue Divisional Officer, Muvattupuzha, heard and examined the contentions raised by both parties on the basis of relevant documents and reports submitted by various departments and agencies. Subsequently, vide proceedings of the RDO, Muvattupuzha (No. A12-11113/12 dt. 06.01.2014) the stop memo issued from the office to the quarry project was withdrawn stating that the quarry owned by Mr. Sabu Varkey and M/s St. Mary's Granites is found to have all valid documents and also with directions that the quarry owners have to strictly follow all the statutory directions and conditions as prescribed under the law.

Examining the above facts, the Committee was of the opinion that the said litigations/allegations on which the final judgement has been given does not obstruct the proponent for consideration of Environmental Clearance. Regarding proof of ownership of land, the proponent has provided copies of land tax receipts and possession certificates for all Sy. Nos. mentioned in the proposal except Sy. Nos. 712/1, 712/5A, 712/5B and 713/2A pt. and is hence directed to provide the same. Also, as per the area survey plan approved by Village officer provided by the proponent, the total area proposed for mining comes to a total of 3.7525 hectares (with all Sy. Nos. mentioned in the proposal) whereas the proposed mining area as stated in the application comes to a total of 3.7819 hectares. Hence the proponent is directed to clarify the difference in area of 0.0294 hectares by providing a detailed split up on the extent of area coming under each survey numbers mentioned in the proposal. The Committee found that there is an irrigation canal passing near the project site and directed the proponent to leave a safe buffer distance of 250 m from the canal.

Considering the above, the item is DEFERRED FOR SITE VISIT and seeking the following additional clarifications/documents from the proponent to be submitted to SEAC for further consideration of the proposal:

1. Copies of land tax receipts and possession certificates for Sy. Nos. 712/1, 712/5A, 712/5B and 713/2A pt.
2. Assurance in the form of affidavit that a safe buffer distance of 250 m will be left from the nearby irrigation canal.
3. Detailed split up on the extent of area coming under each survey numbers mentioned in the proposal, since as per the area survey plan the total area proposed for mining comes to a total of 3.7525 hectares (with all Sy. Nos. mentioned in the proposal) whereas the proposed mining area as stated in the application comes to a total of 3.7819 hectares.

Item No. 26.12

Environmental clearance for the quarry project in Sy. Nos. 131/1, 137/1, 137/4-2, 137/2, 137/3, 137/4-5-2, 137/4-5, 137/4-3, 137/4-4, 137/4-6-3, 137/4-6-1, 137/4-6-4, 137/4-5-1, 136/5, 136/29, 131/2-3, 136/7, 138/1-2, 138/1-6, 132/5-3, 136/3, 132/3, 132/5-1, 132/5, 138/1, 138/1-3, 136/31, 136/30, 137/9, 138/7-1, 132/6, 132/6-1, 132/6-8, 136/20, 136/28, 128/3-2, 137/6, 137/7, 137/10, 138/1-5, 138/1-4, 137/4-6-2, 137/4-1, 136/25, 131/2-2, 131/3, 131/6-2, 136/24, 137/5, 137/8, 136/4, 130/3, 131/7, 131/4, 132/2-1, 132/5-2, 136/32, 135/1, 138/6, 137/4-6 and 128/3-1 at Kottangal Village & Panchayath, Mallappally Taluk, Pathanamthitta District, Kerala by M/s Peege Aggregates Pvt. Ltd. (File No. 244/SEIAA/KL/974/2014)

The project proponent made a brief presentation of the proposal. The Committee found that the area is having many dwelling units, especially western side which is highly populated, and was doubtful as to why such a large area which is rocky in nature was fragmented. The Committee was apprehensive as to whether the land was earlier a part of forest which was given to the local people for specific purposes and whether quarrying could be permitted in such an area. Hence the proponent is directed to provide the former title deeds of the land so as to substantiate how they possessed the land and to ascertain for what purpose the land should be utilized. The Committee also found that there is an NSS school and a temple in the near vicinity of the project site and wanted to ascertain the proximity of project site to those facilities. The Committee also observed that the eastern slope of the project site is very steep which may have a slope of 30° and wanted to ascertain whether quarrying could be permitted in the area. It was also found that the approach road to the project site is very narrow and hence the proponent is directed to maintain the approach road in such a way so as to facilitate the smooth movement of trucks and other vehicles. But the proponent stated that the approach road is 7 m wide and hence wanted to ascertain the same during site visit. Regarding proof of ownership of land, the proponent has provided copies of possession certificate for all Sy. Nos. mentioned in the proposal in the name of the proponent for M/s Peege Aggregates Pvt. Ltd. and M/s NPM Granites Pvt. Ltd, in the name of Smt. Clea Jose, in the name of Arun Philip Elias and in the name of Sri. Raveen Cherry Rajan. But in the affidavit given by Arun Philip Elias agreeing to transfer the property owned by him as lease to M/s Peege Aggregates Pvt. Ltd. and authorizing to mine and to do any kind of excavation of rock and its related material, Sy. Nos. 128/3-2, 137/4-6-2, 137/4-1 and 136/25 owned by him and which is part of the present proposal are not mentioned. Hence the proponent is directed to provide a fresh consent given to him by Arun Philip Elias for conducting mining activities in Sy. Nos. which are part of the present proposal and are owned by him (especially Sy. Nos. 128/3-2, 137/4-6-2, 137/4-1 and 136/25). Regarding proof of authorized signatory, the proponent has provided notarized copy of Certificate of Incorporation of M/s Peege Aggregates Pvt. Ltd. with 2 Directors (including the project proponent). But in the Certificate of Incorporation, the name of one of the directors is given as Mathew Naveen whereas the name of the proponent is Mr. Naveen Mathew Philip. To this end the proponent stated that both are one and the same person. However, the Committee directed the proponent to produce 'one and the same certificate' from the concerned Village Office to prove that Mathew Naveen and Naveen Mathew Philip is one and the same person.

Considering the above, the item is DEFERRED FOR SITE VISIT in order to ascertain the width of approach road, topography of the land, especially the eastern slope, proximity of the project site to the nearby temple & NSS school and also the nature of land as to whether quarrying could be permitted after ascertaining how the proponent possessed the land. The proponent is also directed to provide the following to SEAC for further consideration of the proposal:

1. Former title deeds of the land so as to substantiate how they possessed the land and to ascertain for what purpose the land should be utilized.
2. Assurance in the form of affidavit that the approach road to the project site shall be maintained in such a way so as to facilitate smooth movement of trucks and other vehicles.
3. Fresh consent from Arun Philip Elias for conducting mining activities in Sy. Nos. which are part of the present proposal and are owned by him (especially Sy. Nos. 128/3-2, 137/4-6-2, 137/4-1 and 136/25).
4. 'One and the Same certificate' from the concerned Village Office to prove that Mathew Naveen and Naveen Mathew Philip is one and the same person.

Item No. 26.13 Environmental clearance for the proposed Erikkulam Chinaclay Mining and Beneficiation project in Sy. Nos. 676/A & 681/1A at Madikkai Village and Panchayath, Hosdurg Taluk, Kasaragod District, Kerala by M/s Kerala Clays & Ceramic Products Ltd. (File No. 114/SEIAA/KL/1980/2013)

The Committee verified the additional clarifications/documents submitted by the proponent which were found to be satisfactory. The Committee also examined in detail the purpose of the project and found that the project involves mining and beneficiation of china clay, as stated by the proponent in the application. The Committee was of the opinion that since the project involves beneficiation and excavation of 40,000 MTA of china clay, it has to be considered as B1 category vide Activity 2 (b) in the Schedule of Activity in EIA Notification 2006, also in addition to 1 (a) and further considering 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'. Hence it is RECOMMENDED THAT THE PROJECT MAY BE CONSIDERED AS B1 CATEGORY and that the proponent may be directed to submit a proposed TOR for EIA and public hearing. It is further decided that while reconsidering the proposal, the proponent has to address the following in view of the site inspection conducted:

1. Cadastral map of the area with this and adjacent Sy. No. to be given.
2. Grade of the deposit to be given with the industrial use, preferably with quantity.
3. Assurance in the form of affidavit that green belt and fencing shall be provided all around the project area.
4. Assurance in the form of affidavit that rare plants seen in the area may be removed and relocated in Sy. No. 682/A.
5. Biodiversity protection plan to be provided.
6. Mining can cause depletion of water table in the vicinity. Hence a large sized RWH pit to be provided in the lower north-western part (say 100 m x 100 m size and reaching to a depth of 15 m below ground level). All the storm water from the area must be channelized into this pit. Provisions proposed for the same to be provided
7. Assurance in the form of affidavit that the overburden at the site and rejects from the plant at Nileswar must be used for back filling the pits.

Item No. 26.14 Environmental clearance for the building stone quarry project in Survey Nos. 78/2A at Kumaranellur Village, Kozhikode Taluk, Kozhikode District, Kerala by M/s Profile Granite (File No. 130/SEIAA/KL/2437/2013)

The Committee verified the additional clarifications/documents provided by the proponent which were found to be satisfactory. The proponent is further directed to provide a

map showing the No Development Zone with pillars demarcating a distance of 100 m from the HT line and 50 m from the road. The Committee also found that a complaint has been forwarded from MoEF pertaining to the quarries including the areas of the present project.

Considering the above, the item is DEFERRED and it is decided that the proposal shall be further considered and final decision taken only after analyzing the complaint and obtaining the reports thereof. In the mean time the proponent is directed to provide a map showing the No Development Zone with pillars demarcating a distance of 100 m from the HT line and 50 m from the road.

Item No. 26.15 **Environmental clearance for the proposed Housing project “Dewa Pier20” in Sy. No. 843 at Ernakulam Village, Cochin Corporation, Kanayannur Taluk, Ernakulam District, Kerala by M/s Dewa Projects Pvt. Ltd.(File No. 149/SEIAA/KL/2940/2013)**

The Committee verified the additional clarifications/documents submitted by the proponent and it was found that the proponent has provided all documents sought except the affidavit admitting violation done by them. Instead, it is stated by the proponent that since the existing construction carried out by them is less than the threshold limit of 20000 m² prescribed in the EIA Notification 2006, they have not violated the provisions of the said notification. However, the Committee found that the FAR of the project as given does not tally with the ground truth taking into account the maximum permissible FAR and hence the proponent is directed to provide the details of FAR at the date of sanctioning of building permit(s). During site inspection, the Committee found that the presence of continuous patches of mangroves in the vicinity makes the area fall in CRZ Zone I and hence insisted that a clearance from KCZMA is necessary. The Committee also observed that the quality of water from the bore well indicates that it cannot be put to any kind of use and hence alternate source of water is a must and that there is a need to enhance RWH capacity.

After verification of the additional clarifications/documents submitted by the proponent and in view of the site inspection conducted, the Committee found that certain clarifications which were sought earlier were not satisfactorily provided. Hence the item is DEFERRED and the proponent is directed to submit the following to SEAC for further consideration of the proposal:

1. KCZMA recommendations
2. The details of FAR at the date of sanctioning of building permit(s).
3. The description of the project site in the revenue records and the ground features do not tally. Hence valid document to clarify the same.
4. The building is erected on friction piles not resting on hard rock. The bore logs indicate clay till 60 m and in some cases with decayed wood indicating that the layers are prone to liquefaction during a moderate earthquake. Clarification is needed on the design parameters for the area falling in Seismic Zone III with high liquefaction potential.
5. Tall structures reaching to 90 m above ground and spread over the entire plot without any wind gap can obstruct the free movement of wind from the back waters side. It also obstructs the to and fro movement of birds in the sanctuary. Provisions to limit the height of buildings adjacent to the foreshore road.
6. Alternate source of water and provisions to enhance RWH capacity
7. Assurance in the form of affidavit that the width of the internal road shall be enhanced to 7.5 m at least.

Item No. 26.16 **Environmental clearance for proposed mining project in Sy. Nos. 229/1, 229/13, 229/9, 229/9-1, 234/10, 234/11, 234/3, 234/4, 234/5, 234/6, 234/8-2, 234/9-1, 238/12, 238/13-2, 238/16-2, 238/17-2, 240/10,**

240/11, 240/7, 240/7-1, 240/7-2, 240/8, 240/9, 241/10, 241/1-1, 241/1-2, 241/12-16, 241/12-17, 241/12-2, 241/13-1, 241/18, 241/2, 241/4, 241/5, 241/6, 241/7, 241/8, 241/8-1, 241/9-1, 242/1, 242/2, 242/4-2, 242/4-3, 242/5, 242/6, 242/7, 242/8, 245/4, 245/5, 245/6, 245/6-1, 245/6-2, 245/6-3 and 245/6-4 at Aruvikkara Village and Panchayath, Nedumangad Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram District, Kerala by M/s Travancore Blue Metal Industries (P) Ltd. (File No. 152/SEIAA/KL/3072/2013)

The Committee verified the additional clarifications/documents submitted by the proponent. The proponent was directed to provide consent given to him by owners of concerned survey numbers mentioned in the proposal for conducting quarrying activities in concerned survey numbers owned by them. But the proponent has provided consent(s) which states that the land is leased to the proponent for starting crusher and quarrying business, which the Committee found as not acceptable since the statement does not imply that the proponent is permitted to conduct quarrying activities in the concerned land owned by other persons. Hence the proponent is directed to provide consent from owners of concerned survey numbers mentioned in the proposal specifically stating that they are giving permission to the project proponent to conduct quarrying activities in the land (mention Sy. Nos. also) owned by them. As directed, the proponent has provided possession certificate of Sy. Nos. 234/8-2 and 241/13-1 in the name of K.B. Anesse, one of the directors of M/s Travancore Blue Metal Industries (P) Ltd. Even though the proponent was directed to provide the toposheet of 58 H/2, the proponent has not provided it stating that they are unable to submit the same since it is learnt from the Geological Survey of India that the said toposheet is a restricted map.

Further the Committee noted that a brief visit was made to the quarry of Travancore Blue Metals, Aruvikkara on 10th December 2013 by a subcommittee of SEAC consisting of Sri. John Mathai and Dr. C.N. Mohanan, Members of SEAC when the general set up and other details were taken from the proponent but detailed site visit could not be made due to time constraints and was decided to visit the site again at a later date. Considering the same, the Committee decided to REVISIT THE SITE and to further consider the proposal subject to satisfactory submission of the following by the proponent:

1. Consent from owners of concerned survey numbers mentioned in the proposal specifically stating that they are giving permission to the project proponent to conduct quarrying activities in the land (mention Sy. Nos. also) owned by them.

Item No. 26.17 Environmental clearance for the proposed quarry project in Sy. Nos. 684, 685, 688, 693/2, 692, 690, 691, 687, 688p, 689p, 690p and 700p at Desamangalam Village and Panchayath, Thalappilly Taluk, Thrissur District, Kerala by M/s B.P. Associates (File No. 153/SEIAA/KL/3073/2013)

The Committee verified the additional clarifications/documents submitted by the proponent and was found to be satisfactory. Hence the proposal is RECOMMENDED FOR ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE stipulating the following specific conditions in addition to the general conditions for mining projects:

1. Endemic species in the project site should be preserved.
2. Assurances given by way of affidavits should be followed.

The appraisal report was approved by SEAC for forwarding to SEIAA.

The meeting concluded at 6 pm on the first day (20th March 2014) with a vote of thanks by the Chairman. The members unanimously responded with thanks to the Chair.

On day 2 (21st March 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. Khaleel Chovva - Member, SEAC
3. Prof. (Dr.) K. Sajan - Member, SEAC
4. Dr. E.A. Jayson - Member, SEAC
5. Dr. C.N. Mohanan - Member, SEAC
6. Sri. Eapen Varughese - Member, SEAC
7. Sri. John Mathai - Member, SEAC
8. 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. 26.18 **Environmental clearance for the proposed quarry project in Sy. Nos. 91/1-7, 91/1-3, 91/1-4 and 91/1-2 at Enanalloor Village, Ayavana Panchayath, Muvattupuzha Taluk, Ernakulam District, Kerala by M/s Mudakkalil Granites Pvt. Ltd. (File No. 154/SEIAA/KL/3074/2013)**

The Committee verified the additional clarifications/documents submitted by the proponent and was found to be satisfactory. Further to the site inspection conducted by sub committee of SEAC and examining the report thereon, the proponent is directed to submit detailed plan of the following:

1. The area currently being exploited which has to be completed first.
2. The area for subsequent exploitation with a narrow land in between.
3. The restoration plan for the exploited area using part of the overburden.
4. Detailed plan to provide statutory distance between the quarry adjacent to the proponent's quarry.

The item is DEFERRED for submission of the above documents by the proponent for further consideration of the proposal.

Item No. 26.19 **Environmental clearance for the proposed quarry project in Sy. Nos. 515/3, 517/1, 532/2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 19, 20, 22 and 30 at Vellarada Village and Panchayath, Neyyattinkara Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram District, Kerala by M/s Blue Mount Sands & Aggregates Pvt. Ltd. (File No. 156/SEIAA/KL/3247/2013)**

The Committee verified the additional clarifications/documents submitted by the proponent and was found to be satisfactory. Further to the site inspection conducted by sub committee of SEAC and examining the report thereon, the Committee RECOMMENDED TO CONSIDER THE PROJECT AS B1 CATEGORY. It is further recommended that the proponent may be 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. 26.20 **Environmental clearance for the building stone quarry in Sy. Nos. 391/3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 393/2, 394/2, 3, 4, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 395/1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 396/3, 5, 6, 4, 397/4, 9, 397/1 & 397/10 at Vadasserikkara Village, Ranni Taluk, Pathanamthitta district, Kerala by M/s Wimrock Granite Pvt. Ltd. (File No. 104/SEIAA/KL/1689/2013)**

The Committee verified the additional clarifications/documents submitted by the proponent and found that as per the certificate issued from Village Officer, the project area is an arable forest land. Hence the Committee is of the opinion that it needs to be assessed whether quarrying activities are permissible in such an area. Hence the item is DEFERRED for taking a final decision only after the final notification on Western Ghats region delineating ESAs are issued by Government of India.

Item No. 26.21 **Amendment in Environmental Clearance issued for the development of Software complex “TCS Technopark” in Sy. Nos. 209, 210, 211, 213, 221, 223, 224, 225, 226, 302, 304 and 305 at Attippra Village, Thiruvananthapuram District, Kerala by M/s Tata Consultancy Services (TCS) Limited (File No. 205/SEIAA/KL/128/2014)**

The Committee found that the accreditation of M/s ABC Techno Labs India Pvt. Ltd., the consultant organization who prepared the proposal, is valid only up to 31.12.13 and it is stated in the communication letter from NABET that the said letter should not be used after expiry of the stated date. When sought clarification on this, the consultant organization provided copy of the communication letter from NABET according re-accreditation to them for the scope mentioned in the minutes of 14th Accreditation Committee meeting for re-accreditation of NABET held on 28.02.2014. After clearing the same, the consultant was allowed for making a brief presentation of the proposal. The proponent stated that the present project is envisaged as a training centre. The Committee asked the proponent as to whether they have obtained NOC from the Airports Authority of India. To this end the proponent stated that this project does not require clearance from the Airports Authority of India as the height of the building is only 33.05 m. However the Committee directed the proponent to submit the copy of NOC obtained from Airports Authority of India for the entire Technopark as part of the master plan. The Committee found that the details of parking as stated by the proponent during the presentation and the details on the same as mentioned in the proposal is different as the former is far less than as stated in the latter. Also, considering the increase in total built up area of the project and considering the requirement of one parking space for every 40 m² area or fraction thereof for buildings falling in E occupancy (i.e. commercial/office buildings), the proponent is directed to work out the parking facilities as per the EC of MoEF and submit drawings specifically denoting the areas, including 2880 car parking. It is also suggested to go in for mechanized parking. The Committee also observed that the proponent has worked out the requirement for RWH taking into account the average rainfall data of Thiruvananthapuram. The Committee was of the opinion that while calculating the RWH capacity, peak rainfall data should be accounted rather than the average rainfall data and the present RWH capacity proposed by the proponent is insufficient to cater the requirements. Hence the proponent is directed to revise the RWH calculation, maximize the

same and to develop their own source of water as the dependency on Technopark for water requirements is not reliable and advisable. The major concern of the Committee with respect to the project was the blocking of a stream on the eastern side by the proponent. The pond is seen shifted to another location of the project site and all the storm water will be captured into that pond. It is also found that the water from nearest paddy field also reaches the present plot as there occurred an elevation in water table due to blocking of the stream. At this juncture the Committee pointed out that in the adjacent area of IBS and other institutions landslide occurred because of elevation of water table due to blocking of stream. Hence the Committee directed the proponent to maintain the flow of the stream in order to avert similar incidences. The Committee found that the proponent has proposed to develop a green belt near the thodu and asked to provide the width of the same. The proponent also stated that they are planning to have tie-up with the Forest Department for doing avenue plantation.

Regarding proof of ownership of land the proponent has provided notarized copy of lease deed entered into between Technopark and M/s Tata Consultancy Services (TCS) Limited, wherein the former has given 26 acres of land under their possession to the latter. But in the schedule describing the Sy. Nos. of the leased out land, it is found that the Sy. Nos. mentioned in the proposal belong to Attipra and Pangappara Villages, whereas in the present application it is stated as only Attipra village and hence the proponent is sought clarification in writing regarding the same with valid document to support the same. When asked about the environmental monitoring plan for the present project, the proponent stated that the same will be outsourced and TCS is going to have separate environmental monitoring cell for itself apart from Technopark as a whole. The Committee found that the budget allocated by the proponent for environmental monitoring does not tally with his commitment towards monthly monitoring from various stations on different environmental parameters. The Committee found that as per the commitment made by the proponent it requires at least Rs. 10 lakhs to cater the requirements whereas the proponent has set aside only Rs. 1 lakh for the same. Hence the proponent is directed to rework the budget part of environmental monitoring. The proponent has also not provided the building plan of the project and the cadastral map in which the proposed outlay plan is superimposed and is hence directed to provide the same. The Committee also found that the conceptual plan provided by the proponent lacked clarity as the markings and facilities proposed were not clear in the plan. Hence the proponent is directed to provide a revised conceptual plan marking all the facilities, with proper legend. It was also found that even though the proponent has provided the landscape plan it does not clearly specify the floral species proposed to be planted and does not indicate their numbers in specific sites and is hence directed to provide the same. The Committee also directed the proponent to clear the discrepancy in providing the extent of vacant area / open to sky as 22,591 m² in the proposal and 69,176.5 m² as in checklist.

The Committee also found that even though the proponent has provided the certificate undertaking responsibility for the proposal submitted, in the same it is stated that they shall be fully accountable for any misleading information mentioned in the 'statement' which was not acceptable. Hence the proponent is directed to provide a fresh undertaking in stamp paper undertaking the responsibility for the proposal submitted, clearly mentioning the details of the project (including its location and survey numbers). Further, the proponent has also submitted joint undertaking of the environmental consultant and the project proponent for implementation of EMP and EC conditions but instead of EIA co-ordinator, the functional area expert has signed for the consultant organization. Hence the proponent is directed to provide the said undertaking duly signed by the EIA co-ordinator of the consultant organization. The Committee also found that the proponent has not specifically mentioned the names of beneficiaries to which the benefits of CSR shall be extended as part of the present project and is hence directed to provide specific details on the same. Further the Committee suggested spending at least Rs. 5 lakhs each to two schools in the vicinity of the project site – Thonnakkal Government U.P. School and Pothencode Government School. The proponent has also not specifically provided valid

document regarding disposal of waste, especially e-waste and is hence directed to provide the MoU with authorized recycler of waste. Also the proponent has not provided detailed plans for fire fighting and is hence directed to provide the same. Over and above all, the proponent is directed to provide an affidavit stating that they have obtained EC from MoEF in 2013 and have not started construction before that and has thus not violated the provisions of EIA Notification 2006. The Committee directed the proponent to redraft the proposal and submit the same since so many factual errors and contradictions were found in the proposal. The proponent is further directed to submit duly signed proforma of the salient features of the project and brief write up of the project.

Considering the above, the item is DEFERRED to verify the present status of redirected stream and to assess whether any violation has occurred, further directing the proponent to redraft the proposal incorporating the following:

1. Work out the parking facilities as per the EC of MoEF and submit drawings specifically denoting the areas, including 2880 car parking.
2. Revise RWH calculation, maximize RWH and develop own source of water.
3. A stream on the eastern side is blocked by the proponent. Keep the canal in original position, maintain and plan accordingly.
4. Width of green belt proposed near the thodu.
5. Clarification in writing regarding the location of the project site, with valid document to support the same as it is found in the schedule describing the Sy. Nos. of the leased out land that the Sy. Nos. mentioned in the proposal belong to Attipra and Pangappara Villages, whereas in the present application it is stated as only Attipra village.
6. NOC from Airports Authority of India, details of fire fighting system with drawings / maps as is necessary to be given.
7. Budget part for environmental monitoring to be reworked.
8. Building plan of the project.
9. Cadastral map in which the proposed outlay plan is superimposed.
10. Revised conceptual plan marking all the facilities, with proper legend.
11. Extent of vacant area / open to sky.
12. Fresh undertaking in stamp paper undertaking the responsibility for the proposal submitted, clearly mentioning the details of the project (including its location and survey numbers).
13. Actual beneficiaries and commitments towards CSR to be provided.
14. Joint undertaking of the consultant organization with the project proponent for implementation of EMP and EC conditions duly signed by the proponent and EIA co-ordinator of the consultant organization.
15. Landscape plan clearly indicating the species and number of plants proposed to be planted to be provided.
16. MoU with authorized recycler of waste.
17. Affidavit stating that the proponent has obtained EC from MoEF in 2013, has not started construction before that and has thus not violated the provisions of EIA Notification 2006.
18. Duly signed proforma of the salient features of the project and brief write up of the project.

Item No. 26.22 **Environmental clearance for river sand mining from Bharathapuzha, Chalakkudipuzha and Karuvannurpuzha in Thrissur District, Kerala submitted by District Collector, Thrissur (File No. 233/SEIAA/KL/783/2014)**

Mr. Mir Mohammed Ali IAS, Sub collector, Thrissur, attended the meeting on behalf of the project proponent, with due authorization vide proceedings no. H5-49648/2012 dt. 11.03.2014 of District Collector, Thrissur, the project proponent. The authorized representative made a brief presentation of the proposal. It was informed that the e-manal system ensuring

impartial sand distribution to the genuine needy public through issuance of sand passes is in place in the district. The proponent has sought EC for extracting 34,40,160 metric tonnes of sand from Bharathapuzha, Chalakkudipuzha and Karuvannurpuzha in Thrissur District. But the Committee found that the amount of sand to be extracted is 3,44,106 metric tonnes, as the proponent had already extracted 1,38,894 metric tonnes out of 4,83,000 metric tonnes of sand. To this end the proponent stated that the same is a typographical error from their part and they are seeking EC for extracting 3,44,106 metric tonnes of sand. The Committee asked the proponent as to how much quantity of sand they have lifted during the previous year. To this end it was stated that only 27 percent of the initially recommended quantity by CWRDM has been extracted during last year. However, the Committee stated that without obtaining a statement on the quantity of sand extracted during last two years from each kadavu it is difficult to suggest the quantity of sand that could be removed this year. The proponent is also directed to provide duly signed basic information on the salient features of the project.

Considering the above, the item is DEFERRED directing the proponent to provide the following for further consideration of the proposal:

1. Quantity of sand removed from each Panchayath for the last two years.
2. Utilization details of River Management Fund for the last two years.
3. Affidavit that online sand distribution system popularly known as e-manal shall only be resorted to ensure sustainable practices.
4. Basic information on the salient features of the project, duly signed by the proponent.

Item No. 26.23 Environmental clearance for removal of ordinary earth at Palamel Village, Mavelikkara Taluk, Alappuzha in Sy. Nos. 226/14 and 226/6 by Sajeena Anwar, Pandalam (File No. 157/SEIAA/KL/3421/2013)

The Committee verified the additional clarifications/documents submitted by the proponent and decided to RECOMMEND FOR ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE as per the usual conditions specified in O.M. No. L-11011/47/2011-IA.II(M) dt. 21.03.2013 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 Environmental Clearance shall be liable to be cancelled in any case of violation of

above guidelines.

The appraisal report was approved by SEAC for forwarding to SEIAA.

Item No. 26.24 **Environmental clearance for the proposed quarry project in Sy. Nos. 523/1, 523/3/2, 524/1, 524/3/1, 524/3/2, 524/3/3 and 526/1 at Purakkadi Village, Meenangadi Panchayath, Sulthan Batheri Taluk, Wayanad District, Kerala by M/s Krishnagiri Stone Crusher (File No. 159/SEIAA/KL/3488/2013)**

The Committee verified the additional clarifications/documents submitted by the proponent. Further to the site inspection conducted by sub committee of SEAC and examining the report thereon, the Committee decided to RECOMMEND FOR REJECTION OF EC based on the following grounds:

- The quarry activity in the centre of the valley has altered the hydraulic regime considerably leading to rapid lowering and depletion of ground water. The original land use is also affected by this activity.
- Canal network of Karappuzha is seen on the northern side of the valley for irrigating the fields but has not seen functional till date. However, when it may come to operation, having deep pits in the valley will be detrimental.

Item No. 26.25 **Environmental clearance for river sand mining in Kozhikode District, Kerala submitted by District Collector, Kozhikode (File No. 234/SEIAA/KL/846/2014)**

Mr. K.V. Muraleedharan, Deputy Collector (DM), Mr. Udayakumar P.M. and Mr. Rajeshkumar Valappil attended the meeting on behalf of the project proponent, with due authorization vide letter no. 2013/52227/11 D1 dt. 19.03.2014 of District Collector, Kozhikode, the project proponent. The authorized representative made a brief presentation of the proposal. The Committee found that the proponent has submitted the sand audit report of the year 2004-2005 and hence found it difficult to assess as to how much quantity of sand they have lifted during the previous year. The Committee stated that without obtaining a statement on the quantity of sand extracted during last two years from each kadavu it is difficult to suggest the quantity of sand that could be removed this year. The proponent was also asked whether river protection measures are done utilizing the fund derived by the distribution of sand. To this end the proponent stated that the fund raised by the selling of sand goes to the River Management Fund. Hence the proponent is directed to provide the details on the utilization of River Management Fund for the last two years. The Committee reminded the proponent that the said River Management Fund is to be used for maintaining the healthy ecosystem of the river, sustaining the adjoining areas, promoting biofencing, pollution abatement of water bodies, etc. and suggested that survey of rivers has to be conducted to demarcate the boundaries of river by river mapping to reduce encroachments.

Considering the above, the item is DEFERRED directing the proponent to provide the following for further consideration of the proposal:

1. Quantity of sand removed from each Panchayath for the last two years.
2. Utilization details of River Management Fund for the last two years.
3. Affidavit that online sand distribution system popularly known as e-manal shall only be resorted to ensure sustainable practices.

Item No. 26.26 **Environmental clearance for the proposed quarry project in Sy. Nos. 2, 14, 15 and 16/1 at Akathethara Village and Panchayath, Palakkad Taluk, Palakkad District, Kerala by M/s Royal Sand & Gravels Pvt. Ltd. (File No. 160/SEIAA/KL/3490/2013)**

The Committee verified the additional clarifications/documents submitted by the proponent which were found to be satisfactory. Further to the site inspection conducted by sub committee of SEAC and examining the report thereon, *the proponent is directed to provide a map showing a buffer distance of 50 m from the forest land on the north.* The proponent is also directed to file affidavits for the following to comply with the recommendations of SEAC site visit:

1. Quarry shall be limited to the stream on the eastern side to permit unhindered flow of the stream.
2. The stream shall be provided with low level check dams to trap silt.
3. Rain water harvesting facility shall be provided.
4. Overburden and top soil shall be stacked for restoration.

Considering the above, the item is DEFERRED seeking additional clarifications from the proponent.

Item No. 26.27 **Environmental clearance for the proposed Kannimangalam Granite Quarry at Kannimangalam in Sy. Nos. 45/1, 45/2, 46, 47 Part, 50/2, 51/1, 51/2, 51/3, 52 & 56/1 at Malayattoor Village, Malayattoor - Neeleswaram Panchayath, Aluva Taluk, Ernakulam District, Kerala by M/s Vijaya Quarry Works (File No. 115/SEIAA/KL/2181/2013)**

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) but has informed that the Honourable High Court has disposed the case and transferred to Honourable National Green Tribunal. It was further informed that the writ petition was not particularly against his quarry, instead, the petitioner demanded for stopping entire quarries in the spectrum and that even after a lapse of 5 months since the petition was disposed by the Honourable High Court, the petitioners have not moved in NGT, Chennai. However, the Committee was of the opinion that since the case is pending before Honourable NGT, the proposal could be further considered only if the proponent submits final verdict of the Court in that case. Hence the item is DEFERRED directing the proponent to provide final verdict from the Honourable NGT.

Item No. 26.28 **River Environmental clearance for sand mining from the rivers of Malappuram District viz. Bharathapuzha, Chaliyar and Kadalundi, Kerala submitted by District Collector, Malappuram (File No. 238/SEIAA/KL/940/2014)**

Sri. Amit Meena IAS, Sub Collector and Sub Divisional Magistrate, Perinthalmanna attended the meeting on behalf of the project proponent, with due authorization vide letter no. DM4-4827/14 dt. 17.03.2014 of District Collector, Malappuram, the project proponent. The authorized representative made a brief presentation of the proposal. The Committee found that the proponent has submitted recommendations of CWRDM, Kozhikode, for the financial years 2008-09 and 2009-10 on quarrying of river sand in Chaliyar river basin, for the financial years 2008-09 and 2009-10 on quarrying of river sand in Kadalundi river basin and for the financial years 2008-09 and 2009-10 on quarrying of river sand in Bharathapuzha river basin and hence found it difficult to assess as to how much quantity of sand they have lifted during the previous year. The Committee stated that without obtaining a statement on the quantity of sand extracted

during last two years from each kadavu it is difficult to suggest the quantity of sand that could be removed this year. The proponent was also asked whether river protection measures are done utilizing the fund derived by the distribution of sand. To this end the proponent stated that the fund raised by the selling of sand goes to the River Management Fund. Hence the proponent is directed to provide the details on the utilization of River Management Fund for the last two years. The Committee reminded the proponent that the said River Management Fund is to be used for maintaining the healthy ecosystem of the river, sustaining the adjoining areas, promoting biofencing, pollution abatement of water bodies, etc. and suggested that survey of rivers has to be conducted to demarcate the boundaries of river by river mapping to reduce encroachments. The Committee also found that the e-manal system is not introduced in the district yet and hence directed the proponent to initiate that system. To this end the proponent stated that they are planning to introduce e-manal system to prevent illegal sand mining and to promote effective distribution of sand to deserving consumers.

Considering the above, the item is DEFERRED directing the proponent to provide the following for further consideration of the proposal:

1. Quantity of sand removed from each Panchayath for the last two years.
2. Utilization details of River Management Fund for the last two years.
3. Affidavit that online sand distribution system popularly known as e-manal shall only be resorted to ensure sustainable practices.

Item No. 26.29 **Environmental clearance for the proposed Illithode Granite Quarry at Potta, Illithode in Sy. No. 301/1 at Malayattoor Village, Malayattoor - Neeleswaram Panchayath, Aluva Taluk, Ernakulam District, Kerala by M/s Vijaya Quarry Works (File No. 116/SEIAA/KL/2182/2013)**

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) but has informed that the Honourable High Court has disposed the case and transferred to Honourable National Green Tribunal. It was further informed that the writ petition was not particularly against his quarry, instead, the petitioner demanded for stopping entire quarries in the spectrum and that even after a lapse of 5 months since the petition was disposed by the Honourable High Court, the petitioners have not moved in NGT, Chennai. However, the Committee was of the opinion that since the case is pending before Honourable NGT, the proposal could be further considered only if the proponent submits final verdict of the Court in that case. Hence the item is DEFERRED directing the proponent to provide final verdict from the Honourable NGT.

Item No. 26.30 **Environmental clearance for removal of ordinary earth in Sy. No. 497/5 at Ezhamkulam Village, Adoor Taluk, Pathanamthitta District, Kerala by Sri. K. Sadanandan (File No. 231/SEIAA/KL/656/2014)**

Further to the intimation from the Secretariat of SEIAA/SEAC, the project proponent attended the SEAC meeting to provide necessary clarifications in person before the Committee on their application for removal of ordinary earth. The Committee found that the proponent has not provided valid document to prove the utilization of earth removed from Sy. No.497/5 for levelling the playground of College of Sree Narayana Institute of Technology. The proponent presented before the Committee the copy of letter from District Collector, Pathanamthitta reporting the present status of land, purpose for removal of earth and utilization of removed earth from the land bearing Sy. No. 497/5.

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 Environmental Clearance shall be liable to be cancelled in any case of violation of above guidelines.

The appraisal report was approved by SEAC for forwarding to SEIAA.

Item No. 26.31 **Environmental clearance for removal of ordinary earth in Sy. No. 197/9-1-1 at Iraviperoor Village, Thiruvalla Taluk, Pathanamthitta District, Kerala by Sri. Anil Kumar T.R. (File No. 232/SEIAA/KL/777/2014)**

Further to the intimation from the Secretariat of SEIAA/SEAC, the project proponent attended the SEAC meeting to provide necessary clarifications in person before the Committee on their application for removal of ordinary earth. The Committee found that in the forwarding letter from District Collector, Pathanamthitta, the Sy. No. of the project site is mentioned as 197/9-1, whereas in the application it is mentioned as 197/9-1-1 & in affidavit it is mentioned as Sy. No.197/9-1. Since the proponent has provided copy of land tax receipt in his name for Sy. No. 197/9-1-1, the Committee decided to recommend EC for Sy. No. 197/9-1-1. Further, the Committee noted that the total plot area proposed for removal of earth is given as 04.05 Ar in the forwarding letter from District Collector, whereas in the application in col.3, it is mentioned as 04.05 hectares and in the affidavit it is given as 0.0405 hectares. The proponent clarified that the same is a typographical error and the extent of area of the proposed project site is 04.05 ares. The applicant has also not mentioned in the application about the quantity of earth to be removed, but in the forwarding letter from District Collector, Pathanamthitta, the quantity of earth proposed to be removed is given as 234 m³. It was also found that the applicant has stated

in col. 32 of the application that he has obtained building permit for construction of house in the said plot and has not provided the details on the same. But the proponent provided the copy of approved building plan before the Committee at the time of the meeting.

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) 234 m³ of ordinary earth from 04.05 ares of land in Sy.No.197/9-1-1 can only be removed.
- (xiii) The Environmental Clearance shall be liable to be cancelled in any case of violation of above guidelines.

The appraisal report was approved by SEAC for forwarding to SEIAA.

Item No. 26.32 Environmental clearance for removal of ordinary earth in Sy. Nos. 364-9/6, 9/7, 9/12, 8/6, 8/22, 8/21, 6/29, 6/30 at Mulayam Village, Nadathara Panchayath, Thrissur Taluk, Thrissur District, Kerala by Mr. P.R. Rajesh (File No. 202/SEIAA/KL/94/2014)

Further to the intimation from Secretariat of SEAC/SEIAA, the proponent attended the SEAC meeting to provide necessary clarifications in person before the Committee on their application for removal of ordinary earth. The Committee found that in col.15.2 of the application, the proponent has stated that Government orders are in existence regarding the removal of earth from the site. To this end the proponent stated that the same is a mistake on their part and they have referred it since the project is for the infrastructural development of NABARD RIDF Thrissur Ponnani Kole wetlands, improvements to Herbert Canal IInd IIIrd reach and construction of Engine Thara in Thrissur Taluk. The Committee found that as per land tax receipt, all Sy. Nos. in the proposal belongs to Sethu and as per the copy of sale deed provided, Mr. Sethu owns 'part' of Sy. Nos. 364/9/6 and 9/7. But as seen in the form of Patta, the Pattadars of, Sy. No. 364/6/9 & 364/6/30 is Mr. Sankaran, Sy. No. 364/8/6 is Sarojini & Sy. No. 364/8/21 is Velayudhan. The

Committee also found that the proponent has provided copy of letter from Construction Engineer, Kerala Land Development Corporation Ltd., requesting to give permission to contractor Lijo Johny to remove and use 2000 m³ of earth from certain Sy. Nos. mentioned in the proposal for development of NABARD RIDF 19 Thrissur - Ponnani Kole Development Programme based on the request made to him by Mr. Lijo Johny. To this end the proponent stated that he proposes to sell the removed earth to contractor Mr. Lijo Johny. But even though the quantity of earth to be removed is 2000 m³, same as stated in the application, the said quantity is proposed to be removed from 2.5 acres of land in only some Sy. Nos. mentioned in the application along with some other Sy. Nos. not included in the application. To clarify the same, the proponent submitted copy of saakshyapathram from Village Officer, Mulayam certifying that the Sy. Nos. 364-9/6, 9/7, 9/12, 8/6, 8/22, 8/21, 6/29, 6/30 at Mulayam Village belongs to Mr. Sethu and that the land bearing those Sy. Nos. are not assigned for any specific purposes and that the said land does not come within the limits of Reserve Forest. The Committee verified the said saakshyapathram which showed detailed split up of extent of area coming under each Sy. No. mentioned in the proposal and ascertained that the total area comes to nearly 1 hectare. Since it was mentioned in the saakshyapathram that the land bearing Sy. Nos. mentioned in the proposal was given from Reserve Forest area, the Committee directed the proponent that ordinary earth should not be removed either from Government Purambokke or forest lands.

Considering the documents submitted along with the application, information provided therein and the additional clarifications provided by the proponent, the Committee decided to RECOMMEND 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 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) Ordinary earth should not be removed either from Government Purambokke or forest lands.
- (xiii) The Environmental Clearance shall be liable to be cancelled in any case of violation of above guidelines.

The appraisal report was approved by SEAC for forwarding to SEIAA.

Item No. 26.33 **Environmental clearance for removal of ordinary earth in Sy. No. 1681/5 at Aaloor Village, Mukundapuram Taluk, Thrissur District,**

The Committee verified the additional clarifications/documents submitted by the proponent. Considering the documents submitted along with the application, information provided therein and the additional clarifications provided by the proponent, the Committee decided to RECOMMEND FOR ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE as per the usual conditions specified in O.M. No. L-11011/47/2011-IA.II(M) dt. 21.03.2013 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 Environmental Clearance shall be liable to be cancelled in any case of violation of above guidelines.

The appraisal report was approved by SEAC for forwarding to SEIAA.

Item No. 26.34 Environmental clearance for river sand mining from Periyar river and Muvattupuzha in Ernakulam District, Kerala submitted by District Collector, Ernakulam (File No. 246/SEIAA/KL/979/2014)

The authorized representatives from Collectorate, Ernakulam attended the meeting on behalf of the project proponent, District Collector, Ernakulam. The authorized representative made a brief presentation of the proposal. The Committee found that the proponent has submitted river bank audit of Muvattupuzha river (up to 30th September 2013) done by Tropical Institute of Ecological Sciences, Interim report on the environmental impact on sand mining at Muvattupuzha river and Periyar river, Re-investigation report on the feasibility of sand mining from four kadavus of Okkal Grama Panchayath, Ernakulam district prepared by CESS and Sand auditing of Periyar. But with the documents submitted by the proponent, the Committee found it difficult to assess as to how much quantity of sand they have lifted during the previous year. The Committee stated that without obtaining a statement on the quantity of sand extracted during last two years from each kadavu it is difficult to suggest the quantity of sand that could be removed this year. The proponent was also asked whether river protection measures are done

utilizing the fund derived by the distribution of sand. To this end the proponent stated that the fund raised by the selling of sand goes to the River Management Fund. Hence the proponent is directed to provide the details on the utilization of River Management Fund for the last two years. The Committee reminded the proponent that the said River Management Fund is to be used for maintaining the healthy ecosystem of the river, sustaining the adjoining areas, promoting biofencing, pollution abatement of water bodies, etc. and suggested that survey of rivers has to be conducted to demarcate the boundaries of river by river mapping to reduce encroachments. The Committee also found that the *e-manal* system is not introduced in the district yet and hence directed the proponent to initiate that system.

Considering the above, the item is DEFERRED directing the proponent to provide the following for further consideration of the proposal:

1. Quantity of sand removed from each Panchayath for the last two years.
2. Utilization details of River Management Fund for the last two years.
3. Affidavit that online sand distribution system popularly known as *e-manal* shall only be resorted to ensure sustainable practices.

Item No. 26.35 Environmental clearance for the establishment of 80 MW coal based Thermal Power Plant (IPP on DFBOT basis) at HNL, Vellore premises by Hindustan Newsprint Limited (HNL) (File No. 230/SEIAA/KL/565/2014)

The project proponent made a brief presentation of the proposal. The Committee prima facie found that the proponent has not provided the checklist along with the application wherein many documents sought in the same were also not provided. Moreover, it was found that the undertaking in Form 1 is given in the letter head of HNL which is not acceptable as the same should be part of Form 1, the format of which as prescribed by the Ministry of Environment and Forests could not be changed. Hence the Committee directed the proponent to submit revised Form 1. Also, the proponent has stated in index that proposed terms of reference is provided but in the said page, details of the same are not provided. Further, the details provided in the application was insufficient for evaluating the project and hence the proponent is directed to provide Detailed Project Report (DPR) incorporating various aspects specific to the project and master plan of the project. Regarding proof of ownership of land, the proponent has provided copy of possession certificate for certain Sy. Nos. under the possession of HNL and it is stated in pre-feasibility report that the ownership of land is with HNL. But the details of Sy. Nos. of the present project is not furnished in Form 1 and hence it cannot be ascertained whether the land tax receipts produced along with the application pertains to the present project. Hence the proponent is directed to incorporate the specific details of the project site including its location with Sy. Nos. in the relevant columns of Form 1. It was also found that Mr. P.K. Bhuyan, General Manager (Works) of HNL has submitted the application and signed in Form 1, but in the address of correspondence, the name of Sri. K.K. Suresh Kumar, Managing Director/GM (Works) is given. The Committee sought clarification in writing from the proponent regarding the same and directed the proponent to provide valid proof of authorized signatory of the project. The proponent is also directed to provide specific details on CSR specifying the proposed activities linked with the present project along with details on the areas/institutions to which the same shall be extended.

Considering the above, the item is DEFERRED directing the proponent to submit the following to SEAC for further consideration of the proposal:

1. Duly filled in checklist, along with documents sought therein, as provided in the website of SEIAA.

2. Revised Form 1 incorporating the specific details of project site including its location with Sy.Nos., name of authorized signatory, etc. and with due authentication avoiding factual errors.
3. Detailed Project Report (DPR) incorporating various aspects specific to the project.
4. Master plan of the entire project area.
5. Clarification in writing as to the reason for submission of application by Mr. P.K. Bhuyan, General Manager (Works) of HNL and inclusion of Sri. K.K. Suresh Kumar, Managing Director/GM (Works) in the address of correspondence.
6. Valid proof of authorized signatory of the project.
7. Specific details on CSR specifying the proposed activities linked with the present project along with details on the areas/institutions to which the same shall be extended.

Item No. 26.36 **Environmental clearance for the quarry project in Sy. Nos. 29/2, 29/3 and 30/4 at Thekkada Village & in Sy. Nos. 470, 472/4/1, 474/1, ½, 472/5, 472/6, 469/4/3/4, 469/4/3/3, 469/4/2, 469/4/1/1, 469/4/1/2, 469/4/1/3 and 469/4 at Manickal Village, Nedumangad Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram District, Kerala by M/s Covenant Stones Pvt. Ltd. (File No. 237/SEIAA/KL/885/2014)**

The project proponent made a brief presentation of the proposal. The Committee found that the proponent has not provided the duly signed proforma on the salient features of the project and is hence directed to provide the same. The Committee found that the proponent has provided the biodiversity assessment report of M/s Metro Aggregates and Sand (I) Pvt. Ltd. in the application instead of M/s Covenant Stones Pvt. Ltd. and is hence directed to provide the biodiversity assessment report specifically for M/s Covenant Stones Pvt. Ltd. The distance of the mining area from the nearest human settlement is given as 0.073 km towards NW from the quarry as given in questionnaire and 0.073 km away from the site towards SE as given in pre-feasibility report. Hence the proponent is directed to provide the correct details of the nearest human settlement from the quarry. The proponent is also directed to provide specific details on CSR specifying the proposed activities linked with the present project along with details on the areas/institutions to which the same shall be extended. Regarding proof of ownership of land, the following discrepancies are found and the proponent is directed to provide clarifications/documents for the same.

- (i) Copy of lease agreement entered into between Mr. Phiji Philip, Director, M/s Cornerstone Rock Private Limited and Mr. Sabu Joseph, Managing Director, M/s Covenant Stones Pvt. Ltd. wherein the former has given permission to the latter to run quarries in the land bearing Sy. Nos. 469/4/3/4, 469/4/3/3, 469/4/2, 469/4/1/1, 469/4/1/2, 469/4/1/3 and 469/4 owned by him for a period of 15 years commencing from 23.12.2011 provided. ***But no valid document (i.e. land tax receipt/possession certificate) to prove that the said Sy. Nos. are under the possession of the firm not provided. Hence copies of land tax receipt/possession certificate for Sy. Nos. 469/4/3/4, 469/4/3/3, 469/4/2, 469/4/1/1, 469/4/1/2, 469/4/1/3 and 469/4 to be provided.***
- (ii) Copy of extract of Board Resolution of M/s Cornerstone Rock Private Limited authorizing Mr. Phiji Philip, Director of the firm to execute the above lease agreement on behalf of the company provided. ***But valid document to prove the directors of the firm is not provided and hence it cannot be ascertained as to whether the said authorization is valid.***
- (iii) Copy of lease agreement entered into between Mr. K.J. Samuel, Director, M/s Logistic Distribution Systems India Private Limited and Mr. Sabu Joseph, Managing Director, M/s Covenant Stones Pvt. Ltd. wherein the former has given permission to the latter to run quarries in the land bearing Sy. Nos. 29/2, 29/3 and 30/4 at Thekkada Village & in Sy. Nos. 470, 472/4/1 at Manickal Village, Nedumangad Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram District, Kerala

- owned by him for a period of 15 years commencing from 26.04.2011 provided. Copies of land tax receipts for Sy. Nos. 29/2, 29/3, 30/4 (in the name of Mr. K.J. Samuel), Sy. No. 29/3 (in the name of Richa Sabu Joseph) and Sy. Nos. 470 and 472/4/1 (in the name of the project proponent) provided. ***Since Sy. Nos. 470 and 472/4/1 are owned by the project proponent clarification to be provided as to why Mr. K.J. Samuel has mentioned those Sy. Nos. in the lease agreement executed by him. Consent from Richa Sabu Joseph given to the project proponent to conduct quarrying activities in Sy. No. 29/3 not provided.***
- (iv) Copy of extract of minutes of meeting of Board of Directors of M/s Logistic Distribution Systems India Private Limited authorizing Mr. K.J. Samuel, Director of the firm to execute the above lease agreement on behalf of the company provided. ***But in the lease deed and in the minutes some Sy. Nos. which are not part of the present proposal (Sy. Nos. 30/3-2-1, 30/2, 30/5, 30/3-2-1, 30/2-2, 30/4-1 of Thekkada Village, Nedumangad Taluk and Sy. No. 474/4-1 of Manickal Village, Nedumangad Taluk) is also included and hence clarification is required as to whether the proponent proposes to conduct quarrying activities in those Sy. Nos. in future. Also, valid document to prove the directors of the firm is not provided and hence it cannot be ascertained as to whether the said authorization is valid.***
- (v) Copy of the extract of Board Resolution of M/s Covenant Stones Private Limited authorizing Mr. Sabu Joseph, Managing Director of the firm to execute the lease agreement entered into between M/s Cornerstone Rock Private Limited and M/s Logistic Distribution Systems India Private Limited and to sign/make applications before SEIAA Kerala and to receive EC certificate on behalf of the firm provided. ***But in the table in the said resolution some Sy. Nos. which are not seen in lease agreements (Sy. Nos. 459/4-3-3, 472/5 and 472/6) and some Sy. Nos. which are not seen in the proposal (459/4-3-3 and 474/1/10) are mentioned, which needs clarification.***
- (vi) ***In the copy of affidavit provided as proof of ownership of land it is stated by the proponent that he owns certain Sy. Nos. But some Sy. Nos. (Sy. Nos. 469/4-1, 469/5 and 469/6) are not part of the present proposal. Also, some sy. nos. owned by him (Sy. Nos. 472/4/1, 472/5 and 472/6) are not given in the affidavit. This needs clarification.***
- (vii) ***In the cadastral map provided by the proponent, the 'part' of sy. nos. 29/3 and 30/4, as against that given in the proposal is shown.***
- (viii) ***In the area survey plan provided by the proponent, Sy. No. 474/1-1 which is not part of the present proposal is seen marked and the area of the same is not specifically mentioned. The total proposed mining area inclusive of this Sy. No. 474/1-1 is 8.9637 hectares and hence it has to be clarified as to why that Sy. No. is omitted in the present proposal. If this Sy. No. is not part of the present application, then the area of the same has to be reduced from the present proposed mining area.***

Considering the above, the item is DEFERRED FOR SITE VISIT and the proponent is directed to provide the following to SEAC for further consideration of the proposal:

1. Duly signed proforma on the salient features of the project.
2. Biodiversity assessment report specifically for M/s Covenant Stones Pvt. Ltd.
3. Copies of land tax receipt/possession certificate for Sy. Nos. 469/4/3/4, 469/4/3/3, 469/4/2, 469/4/1/1, 469/4/1/2, 469/4/1/3 and 469/4.
4. Correct details of the nearest human settlement from the quarry.
5. Specific details on CSR specifying the proposed activities linked with the present project along with details on the areas/institutions to which the same shall be extended.
6. Clarifications/documents to address items (i) to (vii) above regarding proof of ownership of land.

Item No. 26.37 Environmental clearance for the stone quarry project in Sy. Nos. 179, 180 and 1293 at Ayyankunnu Village, Thalassery Taluk, Kannur

Despite intimation from the Secretariat of SEAC/SEIAA, the project proponent was absent for presentation in the meeting for the second chance also, and hence the proposal is DELISTED.

Item No. 26.38 Environmental clearance for removal of ordinary earth in Sy. Nos. 157/2 and 157/4 at Thrissur Village and Taluk, Thrissur District, Kerala by President, Thrissur Service Co-operative Bank Ltd. No. R-1097 (File No. 247/SEIAA/KL/1015/2014)

Further to the intimation from the Secretariat of SEIAA/SEAC, the authorized representative of the project proponent (with due authorization) attended the SEAC meeting to provide necessary clarifications in person before the Committee on the application for removal of ordinary earth. The Committee found that the proponent has not submitted the location sketch of the project site duly signed by Village Officer. The Committee also found that the proponent has submitted the application under the official capacity of the President of Thrissur Service Co-operative Bank Ltd. No. R-1097 and not by name and hence directed the proponent to provide valid document to prove his official capacity. Secretary SEAC is authorized to verify the satisfactory receipt of the said document for onward transmission of the proposal to SEIAA. The Committee also found that the proponent has not provided the distance maintained on each side from adjacent plot and directed that 2 meter set back distances should be maintained from surrounding adjacent plots on 4 sides.

Considering the documents submitted along with the application, information provided therein and the additional clarifications provided by the authorized representative, 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) 2 meter set back distances should be maintained from surrounding adjacent plots on 4 sides
- (xiii) The Environmental Clearance shall be liable to be cancelled in any case of violation of

above guidelines.

The appraisal report was approved by SEAC for forwarding to SEIAA.

Item No. 26.39 **Environmental clearance for removal of ordinary earth in Sy. Nos. 1177 and 242/7 at Kottappuram Village, Erumappetty Panchayath, Thalappilly Taluk, Thrissur District, Kerala by Mr. Subash K. S. (File No. 248/SEIAA/KL/1040/2014)**

Further to the intimation from the Secretariat of SEIAA/SEAC, the project proponent attended the SEAC meeting to provide necessary clarifications in person before the Committee on the application for removal of ordinary earth. The Committee found that the extent of area and the quantity of earth proposed to be removed from the site is not clear in the application submitted by the proponent. Moreover the proponent is directed to address the following discrepancies noted in the application:

In the proceedings of District Collector, Thrissur, the quantity of earth to be removed is given as 10,000 m³ (in the application it is given as 10,000 cubic feet), for Sy. No. 1177/part (in the application it is given as Sy. No.1177) and Sy. No. 242/7. The total area coming under these two Sy. Nos. as per the said proceedings is 2 hectares whereas, in the application the total area for removal of earth is for 0.5018 hectares. Hence it has to be clarified whether 10,000 m³ or 10,000 cubic feet of earth is proposed to be removed from 0.5018 hectares or 2 hectares. Also, in the consent given by the owners of the Sy. Nos. mentioned in the proposal, the total area comes to 0.02 hectares only. The extent of area for Sy. No. 242/7 & 1177 as given in location sketch is 0.15.37 hectares & 01.84.94 hectares.

Considering the above, the item is DEFERRED FOR SITE VISIT and the proponent is directed to submit the above clarifications/documents to SEAC for further consideration of the proposal.

Item No. 26.40 **Environmental clearance for removal of ordinary earth in Sy. No. 701/01 at Aamballoor Village, Alagappa Nagar Panchayath, Mukundapuram Taluk, Thrissur District, Kerala by Smt. Rugmani Amma (File No. 249/SEIAA/KL/1044/2014)**

Despite intimation from the Secretariat of SEAC/SEIAA, the proponent failed to attend the meeting and hence the item is DEFERRED directing the proponent to be present in the next SEAC meeting failing which the application shall be delisted.

Item No. 26.41 **Environmental clearance for removal of ordinary earth in Sy. No. 124/1 at Aamballoor Village and Panchayath, Kanayannur Taluk, Thrissur District, Kerala by Father Augustine Bharanikulangara (File No. 250/SEIAA/KL/1062/2014)**

Further to the intimation from the Secretariat of SEIAA/SEAC, the project proponent attended the SEAC meeting to provide necessary clarifications in person before the Committee on their application for removal of ordinary earth. The Committee found that the proponent has provided all other documents except valid document to prove the utilization of removed earth proposed to sell outside. The project proponent is directed to submit document to prove the utilization of removed earth proposed to sell outside. Secretary SEAC is authorized to verify the same and forward to SEIAA. Accordingly the appraisal report was approved by SEAC for forwarding to SEIAA and it is decided to RECOMMEND 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 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 Environmental Clearance shall be liable to be cancelled in any case of violation of above guidelines.

Item No. 26.42 **Government Order No. G.O. (MS) No. 02/14/Env. dt. 21.02.2014 on the Integration of environmental safeguards on mining and quarrying of minor minerals for construction**

Noted

Item No. 26.43 **O.M. No. 1-4/2012-RE (Pt.) dt. 04.03.2014 of Ministry of Environment and Forests regarding High Level Working Group report on Western Ghats**

Noted

Item No. 26.44 **Any other item approved by Chair**

Item No. 26.44.01 **Mechanism of monitoring of ECs granted by SEIAA**

The Committee discussed on the directions from MoEF to put in place an appropriate mechanism to monitor the conditions stipulated in the ECs issued by SEIAA in respect of the projects in the state and decided to constitute separate monitoring committees for mining projects and all projects other than mining. It is decided that the convenor of the monitoring committee for mining project shall be an expert in mining and geology sector whereas the convenor of the monitoring committee for non-mining projects shall be an expert in town and country planning, with each committee having concerned experts from biodiversity and environmental quality sector.

Item No. 26.44.02 **MoEF Notification dt. 28.02.2014**

Noted.

Item No. 26.44.03 Govt. of Kerala circular no. 3568/A3/12/Envvt. Dt.12.03.2014 on the clarification regarding integration of environmental safeguards for mining of ordinary earth / brick earth

Noted.

Item No. 26.44.04 Environmental clearance for removal of ordinary earth in Sy. No. 247/6 at Panancherry Village, Thrissur Taluk, Thrissur District, Kerala by Mr. K.M Thomas (File No. 225/SEIAA/KL/440/2014)

The Committee verified the additional clarifications/documents submitted by the proponent. Considering the documents submitted along with the application, information provided therein and the additional clarifications provided by the proponent which were found to be satisfactory, the Committee decided to RECOMMEND 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 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 Environmental Clearance shall be liable to be cancelled in any case of violation of above guidelines.

The appraisal report was approved by SEAC for forwarding to SEIAA.

Item No. 26.44.05 Environmental clearance for removal of ordinary earth in Sy. No. 382/1 at Pullazhi Village, Thrissur Taluk, Thrissur District, Kerala by Smt. Sosanam T.D. (File No. 251/SEIAA/KL/1084/2014)

Mr. Truson, son of the project proponent attended the SEAC meeting with due authorization from the project proponent as she expressed her inability to attend the meeting on

medical grounds. The Committee found that the proponent has sought EC for removal of 5000 m³ of ordinary earth from 0.9581 hectares of land in Sy No. 382/1 of Pullazhi Village, Thrissur Taluk, Thrissur District, Kerala, as the surrounding plots are at 7 m below ground level of the said plot. But the proponent has stated in Col. 28 of the application that the proposed site for removal of earth is adjoining to wetland. The Committee found that the quantity of earth to be removed is large and the project site is near to wetland, as stated by the proponent. Hence it is decided to conduct site visit for further consideration of the proposal. Also it was found that as per the base tax register, the pattayam holder of Sy. No. 382/1 is Vadakkumnatham Devaswom and the proponent is directed to provide clarification in writing to be provided as to how they possessed the land and whether the present pattayam holder of the land is the project proponent. It was also found that as per the sale deed, the applicant owns only 'part' of Sy. No. 382/1 and hence the proponent is directed to provide location sketch marking the 'part' of Sy. No. 382/1 from which the earth is proposed to be removed and decided to consider EC for only that part of Sy. No. 382/1.

Considering the above, the item is DEFERRED FOR SITE VISIT to assess the proximity of project site to wetland and also directing the proponent to provide the following clarifications/documents to SEAC for further consideration of the proposal:

1. As per the base tax register, the pattayam holder of Sy. No. 382/1 is Vadakkumnatham Devaswom. Hence clarification in writing to be provided as to how they possessed the land and whether the present pattayam holder of the land is the project proponent.
2. As per the sale deed, the applicant owns only 'part' of Sy. No. 382/1. Hence location sketch marking the 'part' of Sy. No. 382/1 from which the earth is proposed to be removed to be provided.

Item No. 26.44.06 Environmental clearance for removal of ordinary earth in Sy. No. 464/1 at Chambakkulam Village and Panchayath, Kuttanad Taluk, Alappuzha District, Kerala by Sri. Thomas Kutty Cyriac (File No. 254/SEIAA/KL/1112/2014)

Further to the intimation from Secretariat of SEAC/SEIAA, the proponent attended the SEAC meeting to provide necessary clarifications in person before the Committee on their application for removal of ordinary earth. The proponent has sought EC for removal of 880 m³ of ordinary earth from 3.20 Ares of land in Sy. No. 464/1 of Chambakkulam Village and Panchayath, Kuttanad Taluk, Alappuzha District, Kerala. But SEAC found that the quantity of earth to be removed by the proponent is 1600 m³ and out of this, 720 m³ is to be put in the project proponent's property & 880 m³ to be used for dumping in other's property in Sy. Nos. 464/14-2 (Soumya), 463/2 (Rosamma), 465/1 (Alice Varghese) and Sy. No. 466/2 (Mathew Varghese). The proponent stated that he has mentioned about only 880 m³ of earth in the application since he proposes to take only that much quantity outside his plot whereas the remaining quantity shall be used for his own purpose. However, *the project proponent is directed to submit statement towards this & consent from above 4 persons that the removed earth shall be dumped in the plots owned by them.* Secretary SEAC is authorized to verify the documents and forward to SEIAA. Accordingly RECOMMENDED 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 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 Environmental Clearance shall be liable to be cancelled in any case of violation of above guidelines.

The Committee also approved the appraisal reports of the following projects:

1. River sand mining in Kannur District, Kerala, submitted by District Collector, Kannur (File No. 223/SEIAA/KL/400/2014)
2. Dredging in Azheekkal Port in Sy. No. 1 at Azhikkode North Village, Kannur District Kerala by Director of Ports (File No. 228/SEIAA/KL/528/2014)
3. Dredging in Ponnani Port in Sy. No. 13/09 at Ponnani Village, Malappuram District, Kerala by Director of Ports (File No. 229/SEIAA/KL/529/2014)
4. Removal of ordinary earth in Sy. No. 1421/1 at Amballur Village, Mukundapuram Taluk, Thrissur District, Kerala by Mr. E. M. Sunny (File No. 188/SEIAA/KL/3747/2013)
5. Removal of ordinary earth in Sy. No. 169/1 at Maadaayikonam Village, Mukundapuram Taluk, Thrissur District, Kerala by Mr. Roy Jose (File No. 215/SEIAA/KL/266/2014)
6. Removal of ordinary earth in Sy. No. 52/1 at Mararikkulam North Village, Cherthala Taluk, Alappuzha District, Kerala by Sri. V.K Subhakesan (File No. 224/SEIAA/KL/424/2014)
7. Removal of ordinary earth in Sy. No. 13/1 at Thangaaloor Village, Avannoor Panchayath, Thrissur Taluk, Thrissur District, Kerala by Mr. P.D. Vargheese (File No. 226/SEIAA/KL/443/2014)
8. Removal of ordinary earth at Nooranad Village, Mavelikkara Taluk, Alappuzha District, Kerala in Sy. No. 309/4 by Mr. Sunil Kumar S. (File No. 193/SEIAA/KL/45/2014)
9. Removal of ordinary earth in Sy. No. 864/1, 864/3 at Kalloor Village, Mukundapuram Taluk, Thrissur District, Kerala by Smt. Sisily (File No. 208/SEIAA/KL/213/2014)
10. Aerial passenger ropeway, Jatayupara Tourism project, in Re. Sy. Nos. 126/6, 126/7, 126/8, 127/1, 129/1, 129/2, 131/1, 131/2, 131/3, 131/4, 132/11, 135/9, 136, 137/3, 139/4 and 139/24 at Chadayamangalam Village and Panchayath, Kottarakkara Taluk, Kollam District, Kerala by M/s Guruchandrika Builders and Property Private Limited (File No. 227/SEIAA/KL/500/2014)
11. 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)

The meeting concluded at 5.30 pm on the second day (21st March 2014) with a vote of thanks by the Chair. The members unanimously responded with thanks to the Chair.
