

**MINUTES OF THE 44<sup>TH</sup> MEETING OF THE STATE ENVIRONMENT IMPACT ASSESSMENT AUTHORITY (SEIAA) KERALA HELD ON 13<sup>TH</sup> NOVEMBER 2015, 9.15 A. M. IN THE CHAMBER OF THE PRINCIPAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT (ENVIRONMENT & FORESTS) GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.**

Present:

1. Prof. (Dr.) K. P. Joy, Chairman, SEIAA
2. Dr. J. Subhashini, Member, SEIAA
3. Sri. P. Mara Pandiyan, I.A.S., Principal Secretary to Government & Member Secretary, SEIAA

The 44<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEIAA and the 10<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Authority as constituted by Notification No. S.O.804 (F) dated 19-3-2015 was held from 9.15 a.m. onwards on 13-11-2015 in the chamber of the Principal Secretary to Government (Member Secretary, SEIAA).

Chairman welcomed the Members. By way of introduction Chairman raised the issue of shifting to on line submission of applications for E.C. He informed that subsequent to the decision of Government to give functional freedom to SEIAA, the proposals now with the Government for facilities to SEIAA for functional freedom if not cleared early, the online process cannot be adopted. Member Secretary assured that necessary orders will be issued immediately after the file is received from Finance Department. SEIAA therefore decided to start, online processing with effect from 1<sup>st</sup> December 2015.

Several works are seen pending awaiting E.C., especially Railway and road works. These works are now not being considered on priority. Being the fag end of the financial year, SEAC/ SEIAA may consider all such cases on out of turn priority so that E.C. could be issued in month.

**Item No. 44.01      Confirmation of minutes of 43<sup>rd</sup> SEIAA meeting**

Confirmed

**Item No. 44.02      Action taken Report on minutes of 43<sup>rd</sup> meeting of SEIAA held on 16<sup>th</sup> October 2015.**

The Authority reviewed the arrangements made for introduction of the online submission of applications. It was decided to make the system operational with effect from 1-12-2015. The applications now received online may be examined and if fit to be referred to SEAC it may be sent to SEAC through online. The pending applications received offline will be considered on seniority basis. If adequate man power is provided, those can also be expedited. Authority decided that the applications received offline need not be made to submit it afresh as online.

Press release may be given on intimation of shifting to OSMEC from 1-12-2015. Notification may be hosted in the SEIAA web site also.

Computer systems as may be required for the OSMEC and for the additional project staff proposed may be arranged immediately.

**Item No. 44.03 SEIAA – Petitions on Environmental Clearance and general complaints on illegal quarries and other environmentally degrading activities (individual cases consolidated)**

Items 1, 3, 4 and 5- General decisions on such petitions to be conveyed to the petitioners.

Item 2- In W.P No. 30809/15 filed by the petitioner the Hon: High Court on 9-10-2015 issued stay order directing RDO, Moovattupuzha, to ensure that the adverse party is restrained from removing ordinary earth. Petitioner to be informed.

**Item No. 44.04 Removal of Ordinary earth/Brick earth Environmental Clearance issued-Applications for extension of period of validity of Environmental Clearance.**

Approved for extension of validity in all cases as proposed (6 months) except Sl.No. 7 (Mohanan Pillai). See Item No. 44.05 also.

**Item No. 44.05 (a) Environmental clearance for removal of Laterite in Sy.no. 300/2 at Thamarakulam Village and Panchayath, Mavelikkara Taluk, Alappuzha District, by Sri. Mohanan Pillai J. (File No. 465/SEIAA/EC3/3209/2014)**

**&**

**(b) Environmental clearance for removal of Laterite in Sy.no. 295/1/2, 294/1/2 at Thamarakulam Village and Panchayat, Mavelikkara Taluk, Alappuzha District, by Sri. Mohanan Pillai J. (File No. 466/SEIAA/EC3/3210/2014)**

Sri. Mohanan Pillai. J. has applied for extension of validity of the two E.Cs for mining of O.E without stating any reason. Smt. Prasanna, Kaustubham House, Kizhakkemuri, Mavelikkara has sent two petitions against the E.C granted. She has also informed that there is stay orders of the High Court in W.P No. 31231/2015.

The Authority decided to call for details of the stay order from Smt. Prasanna.

**Item No. 44.06**      **Environmental Clearance for removal of brick earth in Sy.No. 530/1 at Annallur Village, Mala Panchayat, Chalakkudi Taluk, Thrissur District, Kerala by Sri. K.C. Thomas (File No. 633/SEIAA/EC1/4860/2014)**

Delisted

**Item No.44.07**      **Environmental Clearance for removal of brick earth in Sy.nos. 403, 406 at Ayyanthole Village, Thrissur Corporation, Taluk and District, Kerala by Sri Babu Paul (File No. 688/SEIAA/EC1/5486/2014)**

Approved for issuance of Environmental clearance on usual conditions for mining of brick earth/ ordinary earth stipulated in O.M No. L.11011/47/2011-IA.II(M) dated 24-6-2013 of the Ministry of Environment & Forests, for removal of brick earth not exceeding 5000 m<sup>3</sup> as per recommendations of SEAC.

**Item No. 44.08**      **Environmental clearance for removal of ordinary earth in Sy. No. 99/9 at Rajakkad Village, Rajakkad Panchayath, Udumbanchola Taluk, Idukki District, Kerala by Sri. C. E. Sreedharan (File No. 795/SEIAA/EC3/1901/2015)**

Approved for issuance of Environmental clearance on usual conditions for mining of brick earth/ ordinary earth stipulated in O.M No. L.11011/47/2011-IA.II(M) dated 24-6-2013 of the Ministry of Environment & Forests, for removal of brick earth not exceeding 400 m<sup>3</sup> as per recommendations of SEAC.

**Item No. 44.09**      **Environmental clearance for removal of ordinary earth in Sy. No. 516/16, 19,9-1, 11, 14, 13 & 18 at Mulakkuzha Village, Mulakkuzha Panchayath, Chengannur Taluk, Alappuzha District, Kerala by Sri. Sunil Kumar (File No. 797/SEIAA/EC3/1963/2015)**

The application was for removal of 30000 m<sup>3</sup> of O.E. for railway works, whereas the quantity recommended by SEAC is only 9000 m<sup>3</sup>. The Authority took note

of the request of the Southern Railway authorities for clearing applications for E.C for railway works as the works are delayed for want of O.E. As a general issue pertaining to vital infrastructure for the development of the state it was resolved that in such important works if the concerned departmental authority certifies the actual requirement of O.E. for the particular work for which E.C. for removal of O.E is applied for, that much quantity may be allowed provided the extent of land and quantity available make it feasible, without serious adverse environmental impacts.

In the instant case if the railway authority in charge of the work certifies so the E.C for the applied quantity of O.E may be given.

**Item No. 44.10            Environmental clearance for removal of ordinary earth in Sy. No. 139/3 at Mulamthuruthi Village, Mulamthuruthi Panchayath, Kanayannur Taluk, Ernakulam District, Kerala by Sri. Yohannan (File No. 798/SEIAA/EC3/2031/2015)**

Approved for issuance of Environmental clearance on usual conditions for mining of brick earth/ ordinary earth stipulated in O.M No. L.11011/47/2011-IA.II(M) dated 24-6-2013 of the Ministry of Environment & Forests, for removal of ordinary earth not exceeding 9000 m<sup>3</sup> as per recommendations of SEAC.

**Item No. 44.11            Environmental clearance for removal of ordinary earth in Sy. No. 161/1 at Idukki Village, Vazhathoppe Panchayath, Idukki Taluk, Idukki District, Kerala by Fr. George Kuzhippallil (File No. 805/SEIAA/EC3/2198/2015)**

Approved for issuance of Environmental clearance on usual conditions for mining of brick earth/ ordinary earth stipulated in O.M No. L.11011/47/2011-IA.II(M) dated 24-6-2013 of the Ministry of Environment & Forests, for removal of ordinary earth not exceeding 400 m<sup>3</sup> as per recommendations of SEAC.

**Item No. 44.12            Environmental clearance for removal of red earth in Sy.no. 90 at Thycaud Village, Thiruvananthapuram Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram Corporation, Thiruvananthapuram District, Kerala by Dr. Sekhar. L. Kuriakose (File No. 892/SEIAA/EC1/3396/15)**

Approved for issuance of Environmental clearance on usual conditions for mining of brick earth/ ordinary earth stipulated in O.M No. L.11011/47/2011-IA.II(M) dated 24-6-

2013 of the Ministry of Environment & Forests, for removal of ordinary earth not exceeding 950 m<sup>3</sup> as per recommendations of SEAC.

**Item No. 44.13**                      **Application for Environmental Clearance for the levelling the land in Sy. No. 88/10 at Kodanthoor village, Thrissur Taluk, Thrissur District by Titty Mavis, Maliekkal House, Kanimagalam P.O., Thrissur-680027.(File No.937/SEIAA/EC1/3984/2015)**

Application for levelling of land. Does not involve removal or transportation of O.E. Permitted to withdraw the application.

**Item No. 44.14**                      **Environmental clearance for river sand mining in Bharathapuzha, Chalakudipuzha and Karuvannur Puzha of Thrissur District, Kerala by District Collector, Thrissur (File No.788 /EC1/2015/SEIAA)**

The applications for river sand mining allowed so far was considered under the Kerala Protection of River Banks and Regulation of Removal of Sand Act, 2001 and as B2 category, under EIA notification, but without Pre-Feasibility Report and Mining Plan as those are adequately covered in the sand audit report. Though such E.Cs have been challenged in the NGT, no adverse observations have been made so far. The length and breadth of stretches for river sand mining as proposed by the D.C have been given in the report of CWRDM. Insistence of minimum mining area, other than that specifically identified by CWRDM would not be advisable; in so far as that could enable excavation from stretches where sand deposit is not enough for removal. When statutory provisions ensuring the ecological restoration are there specifically for river sand that cannot be ignored. The proposal was considered in the 39<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEIAA held on 18<sup>th</sup> June 2015 wherein the decision was to inform SEAC to appraise the application with reference to the current sand audit report as per the law, and other documents as may be required for appraisal.

The proposal has again considered in 46<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC held on 29/30-09-2015 as agenda item No. 46.25 and the Committee observed that it has no power to deviate from the procedure contained in the MoEF OM No. J-13012/12/2013-IA-1I (I) dated 24<sup>th</sup> December, 2013 which itself was issued consequent to a Judgment by the Hon. Supreme Court. Hence it was decided not to change the decision (reject) taken by the Committee in its 39<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> May 2015.

The stand of SEAC will virtually make extraction of river sand impossible in the State. The Supreme Court Judgment (Deepak Kumar) was on the premise that there are no rules regulating mining of minor minerals. But in Kerala the ecologically benign Kerala Protection of River Banks and Regulation of Sand Mining Act was in force since 2001. There are NGT orders to the effect that Office Memorandums of MoEF repugnant to statutes (mainly EIA notification) are null and void. Asking the District Collectors to prepare Pre-Feasibility Report for mining of 5 hectares of river sand bar (a proposition well nigh impossible in Kerala) would go against the Act and further deteriorate the already degenerated riverine ecosystems. Especially as the stringent legal condition in the 2001 State Act and those stipulated in the Supreme Court Judgment in Deepak Kumar's case are being incorporated in the Environmental Clearances issued by SEIAA, going by the Office Memorandum of MoEF that is not as eco-friendly as the State Act, that encompasses all the required environmental conservation measures, would be counterproductive. The basic difference is that the O.Ms, EIA notification and Judgment deal with lease for mining whereas in Kerala there is no lease for river sand mining. If it is to adhere to the O.M of MoEF in letter and spirit, State Government may have to opt for lease of river sand beds as in the case of quarries, which would go against the Act-2001 and KMMC Rules 2015 (river sand is not included in KMMC Rules 2015).

Above all the whole issue of mining River sand in areas less than 5 hectares had been examined in detail by the NGT (NB) in O/A. No. 171/2013 filed by NGT Advocates Association. On 13.01.2015 the NGT delivered the Judgment which on river sand mining observes inter alia as under:

*“From the submission it is clear that no E.C would be granted for extraction of minor minerals, sand mining from any river bank where the area is less than 5 hectares. This will amount to a total prohibition of carrying on minor mineral activity of extraction of sand from river bed anywhere in the country. Such prohibition as we have already noticed cannot be imposed in exercise of executive powers in face of the notification of 2006, which places no such restriction. Furthermore it will depend upon geographical and ecological situations in a given case. India is a diverse country with varied geographical, ecological and environmental limitations and situations. If such direction is required to be imposed then it must be backed by proper data and objective application of mind. For instance in the State of Himachal Pradesh, which is symbolic of all hill states, may find it very difficult, to find a mining area equal to or more than 5 hectares on the river bed. It may be practically difficult to find an area where the area of sand mining is 5 hector or more. It was contended before us that if this restriction is to be imposed, the states there it would be very difficult for the State of Himachal Pradesh to permit any sand mining on the river bed in its entire state. For extraction of sand and other minor minerals, river/seasonal rivers are the main source in Himachal Pradesh. This argument has to be*

*considered with same merits. Again neither the O.M dated 24<sup>th</sup> December 2013 discuss any of these issues nor it provides any data which was the foundation for issuing such O.M. Therefore we find this restriction without any basis and is incapable of being imposed through an O.M. The minor mineral mining activity, other than sand mining on riverbed was permitted is the same that for such activity even areas less than 5 hectars could be considered for grant of E.C.'*

In view of the above among other and directions on the notification and O.Ms of MoEF, the NGT held and declared that the O.Ms dated 24<sup>th</sup> June 2013 and 24<sup>th</sup> December 2013 to the extent above indicated are invalid and inoperative being beyond the power of the delegated legislation. The O.M relied on by SEAC have no legs to stand on. Authority therefore decided to refer the case again to SEAC for approval to make recommendation at the earliest.

**Item No. 44.15      Environmental clearance for the proposed quarry project in Sy. Nos. 23/2, 23/2-1, 24, 24/1, 24/2 and 24/3 at Moonilavu Village, Moonilavu Panchayath, Meenachil Taluk, Kottayam district, by M/s P.V. Granites. (File No. 73/SEIAA/EC4/168/2013)**

Pursuant to implementation of the judgments in W.P 4174/2014 and 21259/2014, the issues regarding the working of the quarry as per the reference of SEIAA was placed in 35<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held on 17<sup>th</sup> & 18<sup>th</sup> October 2014. The Committee had visited the field as as per the Government Order G.O.(Rt) No. 152/12/Envtd dtd 29.10.2012. The study report of the impact of blasting operations by Sri. V. R. Sastry, Professor, National Institute of Rock Mechanics, Surathkal was submitted by the proponent. There was test blasting. No violation of EIA notification found. The Committee verified the objections raised by Sri. Kuttichan one by one and its views were furnished to SEAC. SEAC opined that the complaint raised by Sri. Kuttichan has no substance. The proposal was recommended for Environmental Clearance stipulating certain specific conditions: The 34<sup>th</sup> SEIAA, asked Sri. Kuttichan to attend the 35<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEIAA for hearing. Sri. Kuttichan who has been called a second time for personal hearing was absent that time also. However in the light of the new MMCR-2015, proponent was required to submit approved mining plan for appraisal by SEAC and additional recommendations if any.

The proponent submitted approved mining plan. Case was placed in the 39<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC held on 14/15-5/2015. The Committee appraised the proposal based on the Form I application, Mining Plan, Prefeasibility Report and other documents and decided to agree with the decision of the 35<sup>th</sup> meeting of the SEAC held on 17<sup>th</sup> & 18<sup>th</sup> October, 2014 and recommended for issuance of Environmental Clearance with the

following specific conditions in addition to the general conditions stipulated for mining projects.

- Blast timings should be restricted to the times of least traffic as 11- 11.30 a.m and 2- 2.30 p.m
- Periodic cleaning of RWH tank must be done.
- Committed Social Responsibilities shall be adhered to without any short fall.
- Mining should be restricted to the area specified in the survey plan of Village Officer.
- At the end of mining, the total mined area should not exceed 2.8009 hectares.
- Reclamation and eco-restoration should be done by planting indigenous tree species.

It was placed in the 38<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEIAA held on 18/06/2015. The Authority decided to give Sri. Kuttichan a final hearing for which registered notice was issued on 08/07/2015. Proponent was asked to submit no cluster certificate and a certificate to the effect that there is no forest or ESA within 200 meter. Those have since been produced.

Sri. Kuttichan was heard by Chairman and Member, SEIAA on 10/08/2015. Chairman wanted him to produce evidence for the statements made within one month from 10/08/2015, or else the petition would be dismissed as baseless. As per letter dated 20/08/2015, Sri. Kuttichan was informed of the decision in the hearing and asked to produce evidence before 09/09/2015.

Meanwhile the project proponent complained against Sri. Kuttichan that Sri. Kuttichan is pressurising to purchase his land at exorbitant price, and that he makes such complaint before other authorities to prevent issue of permits to the quarry. On 11/9/2015 Sri. Joshy Joshua, Managing Partner, P.V. Granites informed that he belongs to Malayaraya (ST) community and the land belongs to him. He stated that nobody can challenge his right to conduct quarry in his property. Sri. Kuttichan is filing frivolous complaints as they are not amenable to his illegal demand to purchase his property at exorbitant price. Any attempt to prevent him from conducting the quarry in his property will attract penal consequences under Section 3 (1) (v), 3 (1) (viii) and 3 (1) (ix) of the Prevention of Atrocities against Scheduled Tribes Act – 1989.

On 09/09/2015, Sri. Kuttichan produced a letter stating that the Village Officer, Moonnilavu declined to give S.T certificate in report of Sri. Joshy Joshua, as applied for by the former. He wanted SEIAA to get the S.T. certificate. The Authority examined the



statements and documents received for and against the quarry in the 42<sup>nd</sup> meeting held on 1-10-2015. In view of the incessant complaints, and directions of the Hon: High Court the Authority decided to visit the site for first-hand information and thereafter to give E.C. Pursuantly the Chairman and Member of SEIAA along with the Administrator visited the site on 9-10-2015.

The team inspected the mining area in detail. Total area is 20 acres out of which 3.59 ha are the mining area. Top soil and overburden are stacked separately, which does not pose any environmental or risk concerns. There are no streams originating from the site or nearby. The team found that quarrying operations are not going on in the quarry and the machineries are idling. P.W.D road is well beyond the security zone of the quarry and there appears no threat to the road or vehicles due to the mining activities at the site.

The main reason being the complaints against the quarry from neighbors especially Sri. Kuttichan, Paramthottu House, Moonnilavu. P.O, claiming to be a resident about 100 meters away from the quarry. It was found that the plot belonging to Sri. Kuttichan is away from the mining area opposite to the mine face and he is not residing there. His tharavad is the nearest residence. It is also more than 100 meters away from the periphery of the mining area. There are five land owners in between the quarry and Sri. Kuttichan's land. Other houses are situated at more than 250 meters from the quarry boundary. The proponent informed that there are only five houses within 500 meter circumference of the quarry. The quarrying is not in the direction of the house and land belonging to Kuttichan and his parents. There is the Panchayat road and the road to the quarry through the quarry owner's property in between the land belonging to Sri. Kuttichan and the site. There is also good tree cover in between. The land owner Sri. Joshi Joshua said that he is a member of Scheduled Tribe, and the Managing Partner of P.V Granites. According to him the land still belongs to him and the complaints of Sri. Kuttichan are concocted to make them purchase the latter's land at high price, which they declined.

When the team was about to leave the place a few people claiming to be natives approached the team and complained that the quarry is causing severe sound problems and fly rocks are being spread all over their property causing threat to their children and affecting their studies. Works in the quarry are going on late in to the night. Cracks have been formed in their houses due to the blasts.

The Committee examined the nearest house that belongs to a complainant Sri. P.N. Chacko, Paramthottam, Nellappara, Machazhy, his son Sijomon and immediate neighbor Sri. Soman, Plackkal were also present and they also had similar complaints. They said it is the sound of the breaker that is unbearable and splinters have fallen in their premises. There is also dust problem. The Committee examined the alleged cracks on the wall and found that the hairline cracks are there in between the lintel and slab. No serious cracks have been noted. Also it is admitted that the house was constructed in 2013, whereas the quarry is nonfunctional since 2012.

The quarry is a comparatively small one which may not pose grave environmental issues if mitigation measures are adopted. It is a permit quarry which was shut down before the permissible period was over. Permit quarries were allowed to function without E.C. till 2015. There is no authorisation of the SEIAA for the closure of the quarry for want of E.C. No other orders have been brought to notice of the Authority.

The Members feel that the complaint that sounds menace will be cause due to blasting, breaking and working of the machines could be true and has to be looked into. However it is a matter to be considered by the State Pollution Control Board as well. Blasting shall be as per the recommendation of SEAC.

The quarry shall not function between 6.00 p. m. and 8.00 a. m. If the timing condition fixed by the PCB is more stringent that will prevail.

Blasting shall be strictly in accordance with the conditions of the Mine Safety Directorate and Chapter 5 of the Mining Plan submitted.

Noise pollution shall be controlled adopting the measures undertaken in para 11.0 (D) (v) of the Mining Plan and conditions prescribed by the PCB.

The inspection team did not find any apparent situations that warrant denial of environmental clearance to the quarry.

It is recommended that Environmental Clearance may be given subject to the specific recommendations of SEAC and the above site specific conditions in addition to the general conditions stipulated for mining projects. Validity may be five years subject to inspection by SEIAA on annual basis and compliance of the conditions, subject to earlier

review of E.C, in case of violation or non-compliance of conditions or genuine complaints from residents within the security area of the quarry.

Sri. Sibi Thomas who has filed W.P. No. 20467/2014 in the High Court and secured an order on 9-7-2015 from the Hon. High Court restraining the proponent from quarrying in the subject property again filed W.P. 31116/2015 along with Sri. Jose Vazhayil seeking direction to the SEIAA to consider the representation filed by the petitioners against the quarry. On 13-10-2015 Hon. High Court disposed of the case directing SEIAA to consider the representation of the petitioners by SEIAA before finalising environmental clearance. It is seen that Sri. Sibi Thomas Kunnath and Jose Vazhayil are signatories in an undated mass representation against the quarry in which all the above situations have been stated and requested not to grant E.C. to P.V granites.

The Authority discussed the entire gamut of the case. The complaints in the petition have been examined in detail in the previous meetings of SEIAA and site verification has also been made. Sri. Kuttichan and other petitioners failed to prove any of their allegations against the quarry. The proponent has produced evidence to doubt the bonafides of Sri. Kuttichan. The project has been recommended twice by SEAC overruling such baseless allegations. The Authority therefore decided to grant E.C. to the proposed quarry project in Sy. Nos. 23/2, 23/2-1, 24, 24/1, 24/2 and 24/3 at Moonilavu Village, Moonilavu Panchayath, Meenachil Taluk, Kottayam district, by M/s P.V. Granites subject to the specific conditions recommended by SEAC, conditions suggested in the Inspection Report of SEIAA and the mitigation measures undertaken in the EMP in the PFR and Mining plan submitted.

**Item No. 44.16**

**Environmental clearance for the Building stone quarry project in Sy. Nos. 781/1-23-1 & 781/1-23-2 at Athikkayam Village, Ranni Taluk, Pathanamthitta District, Kerala by Sri. Tomy Abraham (File No. 121/SEIAA/EC4/2200/2013)**

As per the decision taken by 42<sup>nd</sup> SEIAA, site visit was conducted by Authority on 9-10-2015. The major observations are as follows:

The quarry is situated in an elevated and comparatively sparsely populated area in Chembanmudi in Naranammoozhi Grama Panchayat of Pathanamthitta District. Extent of

the mining area is 4.2755 hectares. The proponent informed that the quarry operations are stopped since March 2013, under orders of the Mining & Geology Department. The action was also on the basis of a judgment of the Hon: High court requiring environmental clearance and denial of D & O license by the Naranammoozhy Grama Panchayat.

The team inspected the mining area in detail. There is no mine pit formed as yet. Top soil and overburden are stacked outside the mining area. There are no streams originating from the site or nearby. There is a small stream which the operator says seasonal flowing along the eastern periphery of the existing mining area about 10 meters away. It is said that it would dry up during summer. It is not originating from the site and the mining in the mining area might not affect the stream. P.W.D road is about 700 meters away towards Vechoochira. The Chembanmudi hill where land slide occurred earlier is about 1½ kms as the crow flies. There are no residences or civil structures except that of the project proponent.

The inspection team did not find any apparent situations that warrant denial of environmental clearance to the quarry. However this being an elevated area the overburden and loose soil stalking in the mining area needs special care and it shall be prevented from slope failure and consequent land slip. The small stream / nallah near the site shall not be blocked in any manner at any time. Natural drainage that exists shall not be altered. Mining should be such that the stream is not disturbed in any manner and the depth shall not go below the level of the water flow in monsoon or the lowest limit of pit level being 245 m as allowed by the SEAC, whichever is higher. Proper retaining structures shall be constructed at the cost of the proponent with sufficient provision for surface and ground water drainage where there is possibility for debris flow, deposit in nallah or land slide. Structures with large water holding capacity shall not be formed in the site. Modification of the streams or drainage channels shall not be done. Blasting activity shall be strictly in accordance with the conditions of the Mine Safety Directorate and Chapters 2 Part A of the mining plans submitted, with special care to the threats if any that may cause to the hilly terrain as a whole.

The proponent explained that his equipments and machinery worth about 2.5 crores are idling and rusting for about 2½ years now, and his bank loans have become NPA that is creating serious financial problems to him and his family.

It is recommended that Environmental Clearance may be given subject to the specific recommendations of SEAC and the above site specific in addition to the general conditions stipulated for mining projects. Validity may be five years subject to inspection by SEIAA on annual basis and compliance of the conditions, subject to earlier review of E.C in case of violation or non-compliance of conditions or genuine complaints from residents within the security area of the quarry. No cluster certificate and affidavit on non-ESA status, etc. have been received.

The Authority considered the position and decided to grant E.C. to the quarry subject to all the site specific conditions proposed by SEAC and the inspection team of SEIAA. The mitigation measures undertaken in the PFR and Mining Plan will also be deemed to be part of the detailed E.C. to be issued. There will also be a condition that the bonafide complaints from people within the security area of the quarry will be a reason to reconsider the E.C. during its operation. Validity will be for five years subject to earlier review/ reconsideration as above.

**Item No. 44.17      Environmental clearance for the quarry project in Sy. Nos. 178/6, 178/7A, 178/7B3, 178/7B2, 178/7B1, 179/1-1, 179/8A1, 179/8A2, 179/8B1, 179/8B2, 179/8B3, 179/8A3/180/1-1, 180/1-2, 183/2-1 and 180/2-5 at Maneed Village & Panchayath, Muvattupuzha Taluk, Ernakulam District, Kerala by M/s R.M. Rocks & Sand (P) Ltd. (File No. 420/SEIAA/EC3/2969/2014)**

46<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC held on 29/30-9-2015 recommended the project subject to specific conditions. There is no proper impact assessment of loss of biodiversity and undertakings on mitigation measures. CSR activities should conform to such compensatory ecological activities. The proponent may be asked to submit details in these matters, before considering the case for issue of E.C. On 10/09/2015, Sri. Basil K. Varghese, Blayil Veedu, Palace Square, Chottanikkara put in a petition to the Chairman SEIAA, that 75 cents of Land comprised in Sy. No. 178/7B/2, 178/7B/3 and 178/7A is under his ownership and possession as per sale deed No. 1989/2002 of SRO, Piravom. Right of way of 12 feet has also been incorporated in the deed. But the road to his plot has been encroached upon by the project proponent, and excavated up to 6.5 m making it not fit for use. There is a civil case in this regard in the Munisiff's Court, Muvattupuzha. He requests that in view of the civil case and encroachment of his land, functioning of the quarry may be stopped.

However it is recorded in Form I application submitted by the proponent that no

litigation is pending is regard to the land in which the project is to be set up.

Authority decided to address Sri. Basil K. Varghese to submit a copy of the injunction order if any of the Munisiff's Court, Muvattupuzha. E.C. may be issued after the above undertakings/ documents are received and subject to the condition that if there is any court order, that will prevail.

**Item No. 44.18**                      **Environmental clearance for the quarry project in Sy. No. 211/6-2,5-2,1,2,3-2,4,10,9,8-2,5-4,3-1,5-1,5-5,6-1,7,8-1, 212/2,9,10,11-2,12,3,4-2,6,11-1, 249/8(p) & 249/4a at Ayyampuzha village, Aluva Taluk, Ernakulam District, Kerala by Sri. George Antony – Managing Director For M/s GK granites (File No. 521/SEIAA/KL/3825/2014)**

46<sup>th</sup> Meeting of SEAC held on 29/30-09-2015 appraised the proposal and recommend for issuance of Environmental Clearance with the following specific conditions, in addition to the general conditions stipulated for mining projects;

1. The entire lease area should be demarcated with visible pillars and fenced.
2. Desiltation/Water clarification mechanism should be provided before the water is let out. The deposited silt must also be cleaned periodically.
3. The top soil and overburden should be stacked in a designated place on the lower elevation. It must be preserved for the Eco restoration of the quarried segments.
4. There is a place of worship with peak activity during annual fair. It may be advisable to prohibit drilling and blasting in the quarry during those times.
5. To the extent possible local biodiversity management Committee shall be involved in the environmental management/restoration activities.
6. Reclamation and eco-restoration should be done by planting native species.

There is no proper impact assessment of loss of biodiversity and undertakings on mitigation measures. CSR activities should conform to such compensatory ecological activities. The proponent may be asked to submit details in these matters, before considering the case for issue of E.C. The Authority decided to grant E.C. to the quarry subject to receipt of the above undertakings/ documents and all the site specific conditions proposed by SEAC and the mitigation measures undertaken in the PFR and Mining Plan

will also be deemed to be part of the E.C. to be issued. There will also be a condition that if any complaint against the functioning the quarry during operation under E.C. is found to be true the E.C will automatically be cancelled.

**Item No. 44.19 Environmental clearance for the quarry project in Sy. No. 51/1,3,4,5,6, 53/2,3,4,5,6,7, 60/4,5,7 & 66/4 at Kizhakkambalam village, Kunnathunadu Taluk, Ernakulam District, Kerala by Sri. George Antony – Managing Director For M/s GK granites (File No. 522/SEIAA/KL/3826/2014)**

The 46<sup>th</sup> Committee of SEAC has appraised the proposal based on the Mining Plan, Prefeasibility Report, field inspection report and all other documents submitted along with the Form I application and decided to recommend for issuance of Environmental Clearance with the following specific conditions, in addition to the general conditions stipulated for mining projects.

1. The steep cut faces on the western side by the side of RWH pit should be fenced and left as danger zone without any quarry operations.
2. All the storm water must be led into the RWH pit. The deposited silt must also be cleaned periodically.
3. Considering the topography, garland drains need not be insisted upon.
4. In the absence of perennial streams in the vicinity, ultimate depth of mine will depend on the possible benches of 5 m width and 5 m height in the lease area. The nearest water body is a major stream in the valley at an elevation of + 5 m AMSL.
5. To the extent possible local biodiversity management Committee shall be involved in the environmental management/restoration activities.
6. Reclamation and eco-restoration should be done by planting native species.

The Authority decided to grant E.C to the quarry subject to all the site specific conditions proposed by SEAC and the mitigation measures undertaken in the PFR and Mining Plan will also be deemed to be part of the E.C to be issued. There will also be a condition that genuine complaints from people within the security area of the quarry will be a reason to reconsider the E.C. during its operation.

**Item No. 44.20 Environmental clearance for the quarry project in Sy. No. 240/3, 240/5, 240/7, 240/8, 240/9, 241/10(P), 241/11(P), 242/1-2, 242/1-3, 242/1-4, 242/2, 242/3-1, 242/3-2, 242/3-4, 242/3-5, 243/1-1(P), 243/1-2(P), 243/2-1,243/2-2, 243/2-3, 243/2-4,243/3-2,243/5-2, 244/1-(P),244/1-2(P),244/5-2(P), 246/3-2,246/3-3, 246/4-2, 246/4-3, 246/4-4, 246/5, 240/6, 241/4, 242/1-1, 242/3-3, 242/3-6,**

**243/3-1, 243/5-1, 244/5-1(P),246/4-1(P) at Ayyampuzha Village, Aluva Taluk, Ernakulam District, Kerala by Sri. George Antony – Managing Director, M/s Crystal granites (File No. 523/SEIAA/KL/3827/2014)**

The 46<sup>th</sup> Committee of SEAC has appraised the proposal based on the Mining Plan, Prefeasibility Report, field inspection report and all other documents submitted along with the Form I application and decided to recommend for issuance of Environmental Clearance with the following specific conditions, in addition to the general conditions stipulated for mining projects.

1. The entire lease area should be demarcated with visible pillars and fenced.
2. The cliff like face of the old workings near to the crusher unit to be provided with danger signs.
3. Desiltation/Water clarification mechanism should be provided before the water is let out. The deposited silt must also be cleaned periodically.
4. The top soil and overburden should be stacked in a designated place on the lower elevation. It must be preserved for the Eco restoration of the quarried segments.
5. There is a place of worship with peak activity during annual fair. It may be advisable to prohibit drilling and blasting in the quarry during those times.
6. To the extent possible local biodiversity management Committee shall be involved in the environmental management/restoration activities.
7. Reclamation and eco-restoration should be done by planting native species.

M&G Department and Government in Environment Department have issued stop memo against this quarry for want of E.C. Also there is an omnibus petition filed by Sri. Benny, C.C. and two others. The complaint relate to proximity to forest, false details in application, mining in excess area proximity to public road, pollution, etc which have been raised against the other quarries of the same management (G.K. Granites – 3 applications).



Authority assessed that the same complaint cannot be raised against four different quarries at different locations. Also the Sub Committee of SEAC which conducted the site inspection did not come across such situations.

There is no proper impact assessment of loss of biodiversity and undertakings on mitigation measures. CSR activities should conform to such compensatory ecological activities. The proponent may be asked to submit details in these matters, before considering the case for issue of E.C. The Authority decided to grant E.C. to the quarry subject to receipt of the undertakings/ documents as above and also subject to the general conditions of mining projects and the above specific conditions. If the complaints against the quarry during operation are found true the E.C. will be withdrawn.

**Item No. 44.21                      Environmental clearance for the quarry project in Sy. No. 302/6, 302/7.1, 302/7.2, 302/8, 302/1.2, 298/15, 298/14, 298/16, 298/13, 298/12, 302/2.2, 301/1, 301/2, 302/5.1 and 302/5.2.2 at Thiruvaniyoor Village, Kunnathunad Taluk, Ernakulam District, Kerala by Sri. Saji K. Alias. (Owner) for M/s Mariyem Industries (File No. 553/SEIAA/KL/4087/2014)**

The 46<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC held on 29/30-09-2015 appraised the application and recommended to grant E.C. subject to production of more realistic social responsibility programme before SEIAA and with the following specific conditions;

1. Fencing should be provided all around the lease area. The steep cut faces of the old workings should be further demarcated and fenced to be left as danger zone.
2. Over burden must be stored in the designated places and provided with protective support walls. The 20 m wide strip of depressed land with thick soil cover may be used for this purpose. Storage of OB in the elevated part as planned may be avoided.
3. Part of the drainage from the quarry is currently directed to the old pit that acts as RWH structure. However over flow is not provided. It may do in the form of a lined drain, draining to the north. The water from the RWH structure should be let out only after clarification/desilation for which a suitable structure is essential at the outlet.
4. The main haulage road formed in the quarry must be maintained in motorable condition. The approach road to the quarry from the main road is not maintained at all. This road should also be maintained in good motorable condition by the

proponent.

5. To the extent possible local biodiversity management Committee shall be involved in the environmental management/restoration activities.
6. Reclamation and eco-restoration should be done by planting native species.

During the pendency of the application, the following complaints from neighbouring members of public have been received by SEIAA:

Sl. No.	Complainant	Matter of Complaint
1.	A.C. Joy and 30 others Dated 24/07/2015	Mining under permit since 2008. Mining in 300 m depth, Anganvadi & Pazhukkamattom Church very close to the quarry. Pollution.
2.	Bhaskaran V.A. Vennithakidiyil House, Maneed P.O., Ernakulam-686726 Dated: 21/08/2015	No Exposed rock. Quarrying in 30m depth. Lateral support to his property has lost. Landslide can occur. Threat due to blasting. Adjacent quarries shut down pursuant to a High Court order dated 23/06/2011, but this one continues. There is injunction of Munisiff's Court Kolenchery against removal of earth. Dumped quarry wastes blocking right of way. 3 Writ Petitions are pending. Contaminated quarry wastes polluting paddy fields, streams and Irrigation Canal.
3.	Vinish M.V. Mullanthottiyil, Pazhukkamattam. Dated: 31/08/2015	Order of High Court in W.P. 12620/2015 filed by him, to have E.C. Wastes dumped in public road, stream being polluted. E.C may not be given.
4.	Joseph, Thadathil, Pazhukkamattam. Dated: 19/10/2015	Dist. Geologist cancelled permit on 09/02/2015. Illegally operating. Rubber trees are destroyed due to fly rocks and dust. Water in the well is polluted, causing serious health problems.
5.	Shiju V. Paulose, Veeppanath, Thiruvankulam Dated: 26/10/2015	Obtained Order in W.P. 11096/2015 from Kerala High Court that the proponent shall not carry out quarrying, without E.C. Mines Act and Regulations 1961 apply due to depth of Mining. Public evidence must be taken before giving E.C.
6.	Nature Lover's Forum, Thiruvankulam, (Shiju V. Poulouse)	No Mining Plan – Filed W.P. 22768/2014 against illegal earth removal. No fencing for the quarry.
7.	Roy Varghese, Chemmanam House, Maneed P.O., Dated: 31/08/2015	Property of his brother (NRI) is rendered useless. Ground water issues. Landslide in their property. Authority should visit the site and hear the neighbouring residents.
8.	Jojo P.K., PadinjarePeedikayil, Pazhukkemattam and 3 others Dated: 02/10/2015	Clearances obtained out of way. Cancer is spreading. Public hearing may be conducted.

9.	Bhaskaran V.A. Vennithakidiyil House, Maneed P.O., Dated: 26/10/2015	Complaints in Sl. No.2. reiterated. Mining land is assigned for agriculture. Conversion not possible – Does not have buffer distance of 50 m from his building. Suit with injunction on removal of earth pending – Another suit for removal of dumped O.B pending – SEAC did not consider his objections – He may be heard -
----	---	--

There are several judgments restraining the quarry from functioning without E.C. There is also some civil cases with injunction orders. However the Inspection Report does not mention that quarrying is below the general ground level at site. The Hon. High Court of Kerala in the Judgment dated 29/10/2015 in W.P. No. 32698/15 filed by Sri. Bhaskaran (vide Sl. No. 2&9) has directed that before finalising the matter, if not finalised so far, the objection raised by the petitioner as per his representation dated 21/08/2015 (Sl. No. 2) and 19/10/2015 (Sl.No. 9) shall be adverted by the third respondent (State of Kerala represented by Addl. Chief Secretary, Environment and Climate Change, Government Secretariat, Thiruvananthapuram. Since several complaints with regard to the functioning of the quarry have been received, SEIAA may conduct site inspection with notice to the complainants and enquire in to the genuineness of matters of complaints stated in column 3 above as Terms of Reference and report to SEIAA.

**Item No. 44.22**

**Environmental clearance for the quarry project in Sy. Nos. 163/2, 3 ,4, 7, 8, 164/1 ,4, 6, 9, 10, 18-A, 165/1A, 3 and 4 at Karavarom Village, Varkala Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram District, Kerala by Sri. Sreekumar, S. S., M/s. M.S. Building Products (File No. 763/SEIAA/EC1/447/2015)**

There was no consultant. The proponent himself presented his project before SEAC. SEAC appraised the proposal based on the Mining Plan, Prefeasibility Report, field inspection report and all other documents submitted along with the Form I application in its 46<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 29/30-09-2015 as agenda item No. 46.22 and decided to recommend for issuance of Environmental Clearance with the following specific conditions, in addition to the general conditions stipulated for mining projects.

1. Based on an overall evaluation of the site, the quarry operations may be recommended only in the northern block. The southern block is not recommended due to presence of
  - a) narrow band of Govt. land with a valley like configuration,
  - b) higher OB thickness,
  - c) presence of a row of dwelling units in the vicinity on the southern side and
  - d) as it is yet to be excavated

2. Fencing should be provided all around the lease area.
3. Over burden should be stored in the designated places (not here and there) and provided with protective support walls.
4. Storm water drainage from the upper part must be channelized properly and let out through well defined channels after clarification.
5. The RWH structure present as an abandoned quarry in the adjacent land may not be sufficient in the long run. A proper RWH body must be provided in the lease area with water clarification mechanism and maintained throughout. Periodic desiltation is mandatory.
6. The approach road is of very bad state due to frequent travel of trucks. There should be a collective effort by the nearby quarry owners to maintain the road motorable as they are used by the general public also.
7. To the extent possible local biodiversity management Committee shall be involved in the environmental management/restoration activities.
8. Reclamation and eco-restoration should be done by planting native species.

In view of the conditions proposed by SEAC, the Authority decided to ask the proponent to produce the certificate of current validity of the R.Q.P and to convey the conditions proposed by SEAC. Consideration of grant of E.C. will be thereafter.

**Item No. 44.23**                      **Quarry project of M/s Vajra Rock Mining Industries, in Koodal Village, Kalanjoor Panchayat, Adoor Taluk, Pathanamthitta district – E.C issued – Correction – reg. (File No. 4139/EC4/2015/SEIAA)**

Authority decided to modify the E.C as per proceedings No. 80/SEIAA/KL/182/2013 dated 23/05/2013 granted to M/s Vajra Rock Mining Industries, Koodal, Pathanamthitta to quarry 2,80,000 MTA of building stone intended to be sent to the crusher plant, to be sold for civil construction as the rock is of low quality (white), metal out of which is not in demand. The E.C. issued will be corrected and modified to the above extent.

**Item No. 44.24**                      **Environmental clearance for proposed housing project “Nautica” at Ernakulum in Sy. Nos. 1/7, 1/11, 39/6, 39/1, 2, 39/3, 39/5, 39/11, 39/12, 39/13, 39/7, 51/1, 51/14, 51/15 at Kumbalam Village and Kanayannur Taluk, Ernakulam District, Kerala by Sri. Siraj Mather for M/s Asten Realtors Pvt. Ltd.- Violation- E.C obtained from MoEF- Reg (File No. 545/SEIAA/KL/3958/2014)**

40<sup>th</sup> SEAC held on 27-28<sup>th</sup> May reported the case as violation to SEIAA for appropriate decision.

The Authority considered the recommendation in its 40<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 3/4--8-2015 and decided to initiate violation proceedings and to issue stop memo. On 20-8-2015 the proponent informed that he has already received E.C for the project. It is seen that while the application was pending with SEIAA, he submitted separate application to the MoEF and obtained E.C. as F.No. 21-159/2014-IA.III dated 18-6-2015. It may be noted that SEIAA was formed on 19-3-2015 whereby issue of the order after three months does not look in order. There is a statement in the E.C. that there is no violation case pending. Authority resolved to report the matter to MoEF that even as the SEIAA was seized of the violation the project was cleared by the Ministry.

**Item No. 44.25      Environmental Clearance to hospital complex project of M/s Perfect Health Care Services, Puthiyangadi, Edakkad desom, Kozhikode- Complaint to MoEF- Enquiry report-reg.**

MoEF made available an enquiry report on a complaint against the Hospital complex project of M/s Perfect Health Care Services, Puthiyangadi, Edakkad Desam, Kozhikkode. The project has E.C. vide proceeding No-09/SEIAA/KL394/2012 dated 16-07-2012. The Research office, MoEF, Regional office, Bengaluru along with officials of Pollution Control Board, Kozhikode conducted site visit and submitted report to the MoEF with the conclusion that the State Environmental Impact Assessment Authority, Kerala may be instructed to take a corrective measure in directing M/s Perfect Healthcare Services to ensure that water logging observed in the present inspection be rectified and the sufferings of the local residents be alleviated of the problems faced by them.

The E.C. was as the specific condition that the proponent shall submit detailed procedure adopted to prevent saline intrusion from Connolly canal and get it approved by SEAC before starting the construction works. It is stated that the specific condition in the E.C. on prevention of saline intrusion does not also seem to be carried out and direction of the Hon: Supreme Court to provide proper drainage system and to see that no water - logging occurs in and around the existing houses on accent of the constructions of compound wall as well as construction of the hospital is also reportedly not complied with.

The proponent has filed sworn affidavit that all the conditions stipulated in the E.C. would be scrupulously followed, but no reports on environmental compliance is seen filed so far. Authority therefore decided to direct the proponent to submit the compliance report with details of measures taken for implementation of the specific conditions in the E.C., Building Permit, and direction of Supreme Court, within one month.

**Item No. 44.26                      Environmental clearance for extraction of Ordinary earth for KLDC bund construction in kolelands-Grant of E.C-proposals of KLDC (File 445/EC2/2015/SEIAA)**

E.C. in respect of the five cases may be granted with validity for six months from the date of issue and that further extension if any will be only on the basis of the recommendation of KLDC. The conditions proposed by KLDC for extension of period of validity may be imposed in all cases of mining of O.E. for KLDC works, where E.C. has been granted and applications are received for extension of validity.

**Item No. 44.27                      Quarry project of M/s Aiswarya Granites in Block No. 27 Elamadu Village, Arkannoor P.O., Kottarakkara, Kollam district- -**

The SEAC appraised the item in its 44<sup>th</sup> meeting held on 12/13-8-2015, on the basis of Form I, Pre-Feasibility Report, Mine Plan and other details/documents furnished by the proponent; complaints raised against the project and decided to forward the applications to SEIAA, for taking appropriate action after considering the following aspects.

1. *The allegation raised against the proponent mainly, the veracity of the NOC issued by District Collector, Kollam.*
2. *Vigilance cases pending against the proponent.*
3. *Sri. Kabeer, A.A. who has raised allegation against the project may be given a personal hearing.*

*Complaints received regarding the proposal are also transferred to SEIAA for consideration.*

In the light of the above factual and legal situations available in the case as assessed by the Authority, the following points emerged for consideration;

1. The legality and admissibility of possession of land to be used for mining to be confirmed.
2. Whether the land assigned for rubber cultivation could be used for quarrying.
3. N.O.C from revenue authorities for quarrying in Government land involved, to be produced.
4. In the inspection report dated 15-11-2013 it is stated that 'Areas with rubber plantations and with deep overburden are included in the proposal'. Assurance from the proponent to be obtained that only the land comprised in the survey numbers and in the extent as allowed therein will be used for mining or industrial activity and the 11.23.71 ha will be set apart as of now for farming.
5. The categorisation issue has been considered by SEAC (as B1) and the Hon: High Court (as B2) only with reference to the land in possession at site by the proponent. It is admitted that several other quarries - some owned by the same persons- are working in the vicinity. The O.M No. J-13012/12/2013-IA-II(I) dated 24-12-2013 clarifies that :

Provided in case the mining lease area is likely to result in a cluster situation; i.e. periphery of one lease area is less than 500 m from the periphery of another lease area and the total lease area equals or exceeds 25 ha, the activity shall become category B1 project under the EIA notification 2006. In such a case, mining operations in any of the mining lease areas in the cluster will be allowed only if the environmental clearance has been obtained in respect of the cluster.'

Cluster situation as above has to be ruled out before considering the project as B2 as per orders of the High Court.

The SEAC had proposed site inspection twice. In the 31<sup>st</sup> meeting held on it has been decided as under;

*'Deferred for field visit to assess the total extent of the quarry, interaction with the petitioners and verification of revenue records regarding the extent and possession of land.'*

There is no recommendation on the eligibility or not for E.C. Recommendations on the basis of the earlier inspection has not been made. However the suggestions of SEAC in para 1 above are accepted and the matter referred to SEAC with the further terms of reference based on the points 1 to 5 in para 2 above, and those in 1,2,3 in para 1. The adverse parties including Sri. A.A. Kabeer may be heard by SEAC as part of the

appraisal process as per the above Terms of Reference and report submitted to SEIAA with recommendations thereon.

**Item No. 44 28      Environmental clearance for removal of Ordinary earth for Railway works- Priority-reg. (File No. 1503/EC2/2015/SEIAA)**

It is seen that 157000 m<sup>3</sup> of O.E. is needed for track doubling works in Haripad-Ambalapuzha sector alone. Railway Authorities have reported that this work is to be completed by this financial year, and it is very difficult to achieve the target without the earth work. Also to avoid lapse of funds urgent preference is to be given to the E.C. to facilities quarrying of earth.

Though the application was sent to SEAC with recommendation of Chairman to appraise the case on out of turn priority, it was returned to be put up for appraisal in the next meeting. In view of the importance and urgency of the Railway Development Work, SEIAA decided to issue E.C. to the three works, on production of the certificates from the concerned Railway Authority that the quantity of O.E. for which E.C. is applied for is actually required for the work at respective reaches.

Authority decided to request SEAC to consider the pending applications for removal of O.E. for Railway works in a special meeting to be held this month and recommendation made before 30/11/2015. It was also decided that applications for E.C. for removal of O.E. for Government works may be given priority with the quantity applied for to be granted, if the requisitioning Government authority has certified that the quantity applied for is actually required for the particular work for which E.C. for removal of O.E is applied for, provided the extent of land and quantity available make it feasible, without serious adverse environmental impacts.

The next meeting will be held at 9.30 a.m. on 4-12-2015 in the chamber of the Principal Secretary, Environment Department.

The meeting concluded at 11.30 a.m

Dr. K.P. JOY

**Chairman**

Dr. J. SUBHASHINI

**Member**

Sri. P. MARAPANDIYAN. I.A.S

**Member Secretary**