

**MINUTES OF THE 153<sup>rd</sup> MEETING OF SEAC, KERALA HELD FROM 14<sup>th</sup> & 15<sup>th</sup> NOVEMBER 2023 IN THE CONFERENCE HALL, STATE LEVEL ENVIRONMENT IMPACT ASSESSMENT AUTHORITY, KERALA**

The meeting started at 10.00 AM on 14<sup>th</sup> November 2023. Dr. R. Ajayakumar Varma, Chairman, SEAC Kerala chaired the meeting. The Committee discussed the following agenda items in detail and took the following decisions:

**PHYSICAL FILES**

**Item No.153.01**      **Minutes of the 151<sup>st</sup> held on 16<sup>th</sup> to 18<sup>th</sup> October 2023 and 152<sup>nd</sup> meeting held on 31<sup>st</sup> October and 1<sup>st</sup> November 2023.**

The Committee noted and confirmed the minutes of the 151<sup>st</sup> & 152<sup>nd</sup> meeting of the SEAC.

**Item No.153.02**      **Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Najeembali M.K at Sy.Nos.1/1B-319, 1/1B-295, 1/1B-296, 1/1B-320, 1/1B-321, 1/1B-322, 1/1B-323, 1/1B-329, Block No.5 in Pulamanthole Village, Perinthalmanna Taluk, Malappuram – reg:- (File No. 1323/EC2/2019/SEIAA)**

**Decision:** As invited, the proponent, Sri. Najeembali M K and the RQP, Sri. Mahesh S were present. The RQP made the presentation of the EMP. The Committee observed that as per the specific conditions of the EC, the Project Proponent shall prepare an Environment Management Plan (EMP) covering the issues to address the environmental problems in the project region, indicating both physical and financial targets year-wise. The Committee observed that the EMP is not prepared in accordance with the specific conditions in the EC and the Proponent and RQP agreed to revise the EMP. **Therefore, the Committee decided to direct the project proponent to revise the EMP as per the stipulated Specific Condition No.1 in the EC dated 05.03.2021 and inform the decision to SEIAA.**

**Item No.153.03**      **Environmental Clearance for the Mining of Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Saji Sebastian, for an extent of a 1.7634 Ha at Sy. Nos: 66/1, 66/2A, 66/2A, 66/2B, 128/2A, 128/2 B3, 128/2B2, 128/3A, 128/3B2 in Arakkuzha Village, Muvattupuzha Taluk, Ernakulam (SIA/KL/MIN/146311/2020, 1712/EC3/2020/SEIAA)**

**Decision :** The Committee noted the Judgment dated 03.08.2023 of the Hon'ble High Court in WP (C) No. 25388/2023 and the direction of the 133rd SEIAA meeting held online on 26th October 2023. The Hon'ble Court disposed of the writ petition by directing the petitioner to file an affidavit before SEIAA undertaking that the building will be used only as a site office and will not be used for residential purposes during the project life. It is also

ordered that once the petitioner submits such an undertaking, SEIAA shall consider the application for Environmental Clearance and process the said application in accordance with law expeditiously. The project proponent submitted an affidavit dated 26.09.2023 stating that the built structure will be used for site office, mess hall, store room and crusher unit and will not be used for residential purpose during the project life. The Authority accepted the undertaking of the Project Proponent and referred the case to SEAC to give a fresh recommendation in the light of the Judgment dated 03.08.2023 of the Hon'ble High Court in WP(C) No. 25388/2023. The Committee noted that in the meantime the project proponent submitted a new proposal with no. SIA/KL/MIN/448582/2023 and File No. 2408/EC1/2023/SEIAA. **The Committee examined the proposal and evaluated the documents submitted and decided to invite the proponent for a presentation for taking further decision.**

**Item No.153.04**      **Complaint against quarrying operations owned by Mr. Ashly John Tharakan, Madaparambil House, South Mazhuvannur P.O., Mazhuvannur Village, Ernakulam - Complaint submitted by Shri. K.M. Mathew– Reg. (File No. 290/EC3/2021/SEIAA)**

**Decision :**      The Committee verified the proposal along with the complaint submitted by Shri. K.M. Mathew. The complaint mainly states that there is no NOC from the Water Resource Department. The Sub-Committee explained that at the time of field inspection held on 28.11.2022, the Sub-committee considered the NOC dated.23.09.2017 submitted by the project proponent and reported the same in the field visit report. Now, the complainant submitted a Letter dated 16.10.2023 stating that there is no NOC at present (06.07.2022). The Committee has not been provided with any NOC cancellation letter from the water resources department during the working period of the quarry (23.01.2018 to 22.01.2021).

As per SEIAA's direction of the 123<sup>rd</sup> SEIAA meeting held on 27th & 28th January 2023 to suggest suitable penal measures for environmental damages, the SEAC entrusted a sub-committee for assessing the environmental damages and report. The subcommittee vide emails dated 08.06.2023 & 16.10.2023 requested for the mining plan, but it was not found available with the SEIAA. It is reported to the Committee that SEIAA, vide letter dated 27.06.2023 & 25.10.2023 to the DC Ernakulam, sought a copy of the Mine Plan from from the DEIAA. But it is yet to be obtained. In the absence of an approved Mining Plan, Environmental Damage Assessment could not be undertaken. The Committee examined the complaint dated 16.10.2023 brought before the SEAC and found that it is not factual and without any evidence. **The Committee decided to submit the status before the SEIAA for further necessary action.**

**Item No.153.05**      **Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Muhammed Shareef for an area of 0.8786 Ha at Re. Sy No.82/1-20 in Puzhakkattiri Village, Perinthalmanna Taluk, Malappuram. (SIA/KL/MIN/158114/2020 , 1801/EC6/2020/SEIAA)**

**Decision:** The 118<sup>th</sup> meeting of the SEIAA rejected the proposal based on the recommendation of SEAC at its 131<sup>st</sup> meeting. Based on the direction of the H'ble High Court dated 02<sup>nd</sup> March 2023 in WP (C) No. 40448 of 2022 and on the basis of the report of NIT Suratkal, the 127<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEIAA held on 30<sup>th</sup> & 31<sup>st</sup> May 2023 decided to entrust SEAC to hear the petitioner and take appropriate decisions and recommend the same to SEIAA as per existing norms / rules considering the environmental condition of the project area. The 147<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEAC held on 21<sup>st</sup> & 22<sup>nd</sup> July 2023 heard the project proponent and observed that the study seems to have not considered the actual field condition with the drainage of the milli-watershed, significant thickness of soil, porosity-permeability condition of the thick soil column and the increasing magnitude of slope towards upper reaches beyond the project area in continuity with it. Based on discussions, the Committee decided to give two weeks time to the Proponent to submit detailed hearing note. The proponent submitted the hearing note on 31.07.2023. The Proponent vide Letter dated 02.08.2023 requested to give some more time to submit expert's study report with respect to the observations of the SEAC. The 148<sup>th</sup> meeting of the SEAC held on 8<sup>th</sup> to 9<sup>th</sup> August 2023 examined the hearing note and Certificates from the respective Village Officer and Panchayath Secretary. The Committee observed that the statement and the certificates regarding the milli watershed, however, are contradictory to the photographs of the area submitted by the Proponent. The statement regarding the drainage is not supported by the outflow generated in the catchment, the magnitude of drainage required and carrying capacity of the drains planned. The statement on the slope seems to be based on generalized values. The Committee also noted the request of the proponent dated 02.08.2023 to give some more time to submit the expert's study report with respect to significant thickness of the soil, porosity-permeability condition of the thick soil column and the increasing magnitude of the slope towards upper reaches beyond the project in continuity with it and decided to give one month time to submit the detailed study report. The project proponent submitted report of a study conducted by the Dept. of Civil Engineering, Govt. College, Thrissur on 27.10.2023. **The Committee examined the study report and decided to entrust a Sub-committee consisting of Dr. A. N Manoharan, Dr. Mahesh Mohan and Sri. V. Gopinathan for evaluating the study report of the Civil Engineering Dept., Govt Engineering College, Thrissur along with the report of NIT Suratkal and other document submitted by the Proponent.**

**Item No.153.06**      **Environmental Clearance issued to the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Aby Joy Pottas, Managing Partner, M/s Sion Exim Corp at Re-Sy No.93 in Raroth Village, Thamarassery Taluk, Kozhikode (File No.1328/EC1/2019/SEIAA)**

**Decision :** The Committee verified the matter with the direction of the 125<sup>th</sup> SEIAA meeting and the decision of the 142<sup>nd</sup> SEAC meeting to forward the complaint submitted by Sri.Sulthan Thomas Oommen, Kozhikode. The Committee examined the reply submitted by the project proponent to the allegations raised by the complainant. **Based on discussions, the Committee decided the following.**

1. To entrust Dr.Mahesh Mohan & Dr.Krishna Kumar for field inspection, ascertain the ground reality and report.
2. The Sub-committee shall verify all the complaints received against the project.
3. The SEIAA Secretariat shall provide copies of all the complaints to the Sub-committee at the earliest.

**Item No.153.07**

**EC issued to the Granite Building Stone quarry of M/s. Delta Aggregates & Sands Pvt. Ltd. for an extent of 3.7691 Ha. at Survey. Nos. 889/1-15-1 & 889/1-15, in Perunad Village, Ranni Taluk, Pathanamthitta - Interim order dated 25.10.2022 in WP(C ) No.33896 of 2022 filed by M/s. Delta Aggregates & Sands Pvt. Ltd (SIA/KL/MIN/163854/2020; 1773/EC1/2020/SEIAA)**

**Decision :** The Committee examined the proposal with the earlier decisions of various SEIAA/SEAC meetings. The 144<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting held in June 23 observed that the documents requested by the 141<sup>st</sup> SEAC meeting held in April 2023 regarding the ESA details submitted by the project proponent on 25.05.2023 is inadequate. The Certificate from Tahsildar regarding the ESA lacks cadastral map certified by the concerned Revenue Official and other documents submitted by the project proponent are not legible. Therefore the proponent was directed to submit the requested documents with a Certified Cadastral map as per the decision of the SEIAA in its 123rd meeting (Item 123.29). In response, the Proponent submitted the documents on 26.7.2023. The 149<sup>th</sup> meeting of the SEAC in August 23 examined the documents and observed that all the the Proponent has not submitted all the details as per the decision of the 123<sup>rd</sup> meeting of the SEIAA. The Authority vide letter dated 12.9.2023 and 28.10.2023 directed the Proponent to submit the details as sought earlier. The Project Proponent submitted the document on 2.11.2023 and the Committee examined the documents. It is found that the submitted documents are the same as those submitted earlier and the Cadastral map indicating the ESA details is not legible and there is no Certificate from the Tahsildhar. This Committee observed that the Project Proponent is not serious to comply with the directions of the SEIAA and wasting the time of the Committee by submitting the same document again and again which is not legible and authenticated. **In the circumstance, the Committee decided to bring the matter before the SEIAA for urgent consideration and further directions.**

The Committee also examined the complaint submitted by Sri.T.V.Shaji, on 17.10.2023 regarding the land related damages in the area after the commencement of mining. As per the Letter from the District Collector, Pathanamthitta dated 30.10.2023, in response to the Letter No. 2353/EC2/23 dated 18.10.2023 of the SEIAA, it is informed that the Complainants were directed to submit their complaints directly before the concerned appellate authorities or SEIAA as no permission is given from the office of the District Collector and that they obtained mining permission from the M&G Department and environmental clearance from the SEIAA. The District Collector also informed that the District Geologist is directed to submit a report to the SEIAA. **The Committee decided to bring this matter also before the SEIAA for further directions.**

**Item No.153.08**      **Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Jilson Joseph, at Re-Sy. No. 28 in Nedyenga Village, Taliparamba Taluk, Kannur - Judgment in WP (C) 397/2020 filed by Sri. Bijo Joseph - regarding the validity of EC. (File No.617/EC4/2021/SEIAA)**

**Decision :**      The Committee discussed the remarks of the Sub-committee and the Statement of Facts submitted in the WP (C) 397/2020 filed by Sri. Bijo Joseph. **The Committee observed that the case is still pending with the Hon'ble Court and hence decided to wait for the judgment.**

**Item No.153.09**      **Approval of District Survey Report (DSR) of Malappuram District for Sand Mining - reg:- (File No: 3162/A1/2021/SEIAA)**

**Decision :** As invited, Dr. Ansari, Scientist G (Rtd) and currently the EIA Co-ordinator and Er. Sravanth Tangellamudi, Scientist representing the CSIR-National Institute of Interdisciplinary Science and Technology (NIIST) and Dr.Shaji.J, GIS Specialist, Institute of Land & Disaster Management, Kerala attended the presentation of District Survey Report (DSR) for sand mining or river-bed mining from the rivers draining in Malappuram District (Chaliyar, Kadalundi, Bharathapuzha and Tirurpuzha). Er. Sravanth Tangellamudi, Scientist, NIIST made the presentation and Dr. Ansari provided certain of the clarifications sought. The Committee noted that report is prepared in compliance to the EIA Notification and in accordance with the Sustainable Sand Mining Management Guidelines, 2016 and Enforcement & Monitoring Guidelines for Sand Mining, 2020. **The Committee discussed various aspects of the report, obtained clarifications during the presentation and decided to approve the report subject to the following:**

1. Ascertain the sand demand based on cement supply figures instead of cement production within Kerala as the proxy variable while estimating the demand supply gap for sand in Malappuram district.
2. The provisions in “The Kerala Protection of River Banks and Regulation of Removal of Sand Act, 2001”, should be adopted for the protection of river banks and bio-physical environment systems of the river and for regulation to upkeep the biophysical environment.
3. The report form only the resource base for mining application and the environmental safeguards to be adopted shall be stipulated separately while appraising projects for environmental clearance.

**Item No.153.10**      **Preparation of draft guidelines for the Utilization of Environment Benefit Fund for the site-specific Environmental restoration activities as directed by Hon'ble Court.- reg:- (File No: 520/A1/2022/SEIAA)**

**Decision:** The Committee discussed the draft guidelines of EBF and appreciated the effort taken by DoECC for preparing the draft guidelines. The Committee observed that Hon NGT in the judgement dated 25-01-2022 in O.A. No.75/2021 (SZ) directed the District Collector, Kannur and the SEIAA – Kerala to file their compliance report regarding the directions issued by this Tribunal in respect of recovery of the environmental compensation and utilization of the same and creation of Environment Benefit Fund within a period of 4 (Four) Months. Further, the NGT (SZ) ordered on 12-10-2023 that the environmental compensation of Rs.1,58,00,000/- (Rupees One Crore Fifty-Eight Lakhs only) collected by the Department of Mines and Geology should be utilized only after getting appropriate instructions from the Kerala SEIAA. Hon. NGT listed the case for 30.11.2023 for filing the compliance report. Therefore, the Committee decided to recommend the guidelines subject to the following clarifications/corrections/modifications.

1. The constitution of the State-level Environmental Benefit Fund Managing Committee (SEBFMC), its guidelines and the decision to manage the EBF by the DoECC shall be brought to the notice of the Hon. NGT.
2. The Chairman or his nominee from the SEAC will represent the SEAC in SEBFMC.
3. Provision shall be incorporated to attract fund from other sources including CSR (after examining the permissibility), River Management Fund as well as other such sources so as to enhance the fund and justify the need of a new system at the state level and district level
4. The District-Level Environmental Monitoring Committee (DLEMC), by its name indicates only the monitoring of environmental restoration activities. There is requirement of a capable system at the district level to formulate ERPs and facilitate implementation, monitor progress and ensure completion/commissioning of ERPs. Therefore, it is desirable to rename the DLEMC as District Environmental Restoration Committee (DERC).
5. It is desirable to include one environmental scientist, one environmental engineer, one ecologist and one socio-economic expert in the Committees constituted at the State and District level based on merit, practical experience and attitude by the respective Chairpersons.
6. The scientists/technical experts, so included in the Committee shall constitute a Technical Cell for assisting the respective Committees who will report directly to the Convener and Chairperson of the respective committees.
7. The Environmental Scientist shall head the Technical Cell at the State level, DoECC and shall include the Environmental Officer, DoECC who are involved with environmental impact assessment aspects of the State.
8. The SEBFMC, DERC and their Technical Cell shall be reconstituted every five years
9. The DERC or SEBFMC shall identify the proposals through normative search including through the three-tier local governments and invite agencies such as government departments, government funded agencies, including academic institutions, non-governmental organizations with relevant experience and expertise. The willing organizations shall prepare the Project Implementation Plan (PIP) along with their demand for fund based on RFP provided by DERC/SEBFMC. The SEBFMC shall

provide final approval for the PIP based on the technical and financial feasibility of the PIP evaluated by the DERC/SEBFMC respectively.

10. The Section 3.2 (iii) shall be corrected as “A maximum of 15% may be transferred to the State-level core fund, which will be used to meet the administrative costs, including field inspection expenses and honoraria of non-official members of SEBFMC, DERC and the experts hired by the SEBFMC, if required”.
11. The DoECC at the State level and the Office of the Pollution Control Board at the District level shall function as the Secretariat of the SEBFMC and DERC.
12. The statement in Section 3.2, “The ERP must detail the direct and indirect damages caused to the environmental properties or goods due to the development activities in question, as well as recommendations for the best achievable remediation and restoration techniques and an action plan to patch up the damage caused” shall be modified by including the following statement in addition. “The ERP undertaken under the EBF shall not include the remediation plan and natural and community resource augmentation plan approved by the SEIAA as per OM dated 7.7.2021 and OM dated 28.1.2022 regarding the handling of cases involving violation of EIA Notification”

## **PARIVESH FILES**

### **Part 1**

## **CONSIDERATION/RECONSIDERATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE**

### **Item No.1**

**Environmental Clearance for the Proposed Commercial cum Assembly Building Project of Mrs. Ameena Begam and Mrs. Hajara Ibrahim at survey Nos. 566, 567, 568, 569, 582/24, in Kasaba village, Kozhikode Corporation, Kozhikode Taluk, Kozhikode**  
**SIA/KL/INFRA2/416303/2023, 2225/EC4/SEIAA/2023**

**Decision :** The Committee observed that the project was considered in 141<sup>st</sup>, 146<sup>th</sup>, 150<sup>th</sup> & 153<sup>rd</sup> meetings of SEAC and the Project Proponent was invited for presentation in 146<sup>th</sup>, 150<sup>th</sup> and 153<sup>rd</sup> meeting of SEAC but was absent. Besides, in the 141<sup>st</sup> meeting, the Committee verified the proposal and documents submitted by the proponent and observed the following shortcomings:

1. Details on water requirement, availability, source, source sustainability, and water balance are not provided with clarity.
2. The FAR of the project is noted for ascertaining feasibility.
3. The capital cost earmarked for the 60 KLD STP is not found adequate.
4. Appropriateness of MBBR technology for STP is not evaluated in comparison to other modern wastewater treatment technologies
5. Appropriateness of biogas plants alone for solid waste management need reexamination as there will be production of slowly degradable biowaste.
6. EMP need recision incorporating site-specific mitigation measures and budgetary provisions.

7. Plan for the utilization of at least 20% of the power requirement with solar power is not found provided.

**The Committee decided to recommend delisting of the application at the risk of the project proponent as they did not attend the presentation even though they were invited three times. The decision may be intimated to the Mining and Geology Department, KSPCB, DC Kozhikkode and the Panchayath Authorities.**

**Item No.2                      Environmental Clearance for Residential apartment project of Sri. Jeejo Simon, Director, M/s Masaaki Developers Pvt. Ltd. for an area of 0.8516 ha at Sy. Nos. 713/2 in Chembukavu Village, Thrissur Corporation, Thrissur (SIA/KL/INFRA2/428788/2023, 2286/EC6/2023/SEIAA)**

**Decision :**     The Committee discussed the field inspection report conducted on 18.08.2023. During the field visit the Sub-committee observed that the drainage is connected to the public drains on the southern entrance, which drains to the low-lying areas of the Southeastern side about 1km away. Hence details regarding the impact of discharge and the carrying capacity of the public drains need to be studied. An existing well seemed to be filled with ordinary earth and closed. The Committee decided to direct the project proponent to submit the following documents/details:

1. Detailed Drainage Plan incorporating the carrying capacity of the natural drain and the constructed drain, their adequacy and impact of discharge to the low lying areas
2. Additional treatment facility for biodegradable waste, details of proposed biogas plants, biogas bins including the capacity and location
3. Provision for recreational facilities provided as part of the project.
4. Clarification regarding the height of the building and permissibility of the building with such a height considering the zonal restrictions within the Corporation
5. Detailed CER proposal as per the guideline stipulated in the website of SEIAA.
6. Proposal for maintaining the existing well filled with earth or proposal for compensating the closure of the well.
7. Details as to how the building is designed to facilitate the differently abled citizens.

**The Committee decided to invite the project proponent for a presentation.**

**Item No.3                      Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone quarry project of Sri. Ziyad K.T., for an area of 0.9653 Ha. at Block No. 22, Re-Sy Nos. 122, 123/1, in Kolari Village, Iritty Taluk, Kannur (SIA/KL/MIN/130412/2019, 1647/EC4/2020/SEIAA)**

**Decision :**     The Committee discussed the field inspection report conducted on 28.07.2023. It is observed that the site falls in a medium hazard zone. During field verification, the Sub-committee observed that a first-order seasonal stream emerges from mid part of the project area and flows down towards the SW direction. There is a slope break at the mid-part of the



project area. Rock exposure is also observed in the central part of the area. **The Committee decided to direct the project proponent to submit the following additional documents;**

1. Digital Elevation Model of the area covering 500 m radius.
2. Soil thickness map of the area covering 500 m radius.
3. Soil properties particularly porosity and permeability
4. Stream discharge at various stages of the stream during monsoon and predicted impact of mining on the stream discharge.
5. Revised site-specific EMP incorporating detailed mitigation measures.
6. Modified CER as per the guideline uploaded in the SEIAA-Kerala website.
7. Revised plan for developing approach road.

**Item No.4**

**Environmental Clearance for Granite Building Stone of Sri. P.K. Unnikrishnan for an area of 0.9660 Ha at Block No. 20, Sy. No. 75/4 in Pirayiri Village, Palakkad Taluk & District (SIA/KL/MIN/138486/2020, 1984/EC1/2022/SEIAA)**

**Decision :** As invited, the proponent, Sri. P. K. Unnikrishnan and the RQP, Dr. Sakkir S. Pillai were present. The RQP made the presentation. As per the Mining Plan, the total mineable reserve is 1,72,993MT with an annual production of 45,700MTA. The mine life is 3 Years ( 4 years as per application). The field inspection was carried out on 15.06.2023. **The Committee decided to direct the project proponent to submit the following additional documents.**

1. There are three proposal under CER but proof of stakeholder consultation is submitted only for one. Therefore, submit the proof of stakeholder consultation for the rest of the two proposals.
2. NOC from KSEB considering nearness to 110 KV Electric line
3. Details of quarrying permits granted to the proponent earlier under CRPS.
4. Geo-tagged photo of OB dump site.
5. Depth to water table in the nearest open well along with distance to the well from the project boundary, geotagged photograph of the well and the ground elevation above MSL at the well site.
6. Revised drainage plan ensuring proper connectivity to natural drain.
7. Recent cluster certificate as the one submitted is of 2019.
8. Legible surface contour map based on the elevation data provided.
9. Exact production plan along with cross-section map considering that part of the area is already mined.
10. Letter from DFO, Palakkad, to ascertain the distance to the nearest wildlife sanctuary/national park

**Item No.5**

**Environmental Clearance for Granite Building stone of Sri. A Ravidran Proprietor, M/s Star Metals for an area of 1.2892Ha at Re Sy No 512/3 (Block No.12) in Kollengode-2 Village, Chittur Taluk, Palakkad (SIA/KL/MIN/146308/2020, 1611/EC1/2020/SEIAA)**

**Decision :** As invited, the proponent, Sri. A. Ravindran and the RQP, Dr. Nazar Ahamed K.V were present. The RQP made the presentation. As per the Mining Plan, the total mineable reserve is 378788 M T and the annual production is 37878 MT. Life of mine is 10 years. The highest and lowest elevation is 105 m & 80 m respectively. The nearest building is at 100.5 m. The project cost is 1.5 Crore. The distance to the medium hazard zone is 846 m and to the high hazard zone is 1.35 km. The Anamalai Tiger Reserve is at 13.8 km and Parambikulam Tiger Reserve is at 14.9 km. Field inspection was conducted on 13.04.2021 by the then SEAC. The ADS sought on 16.8.2021 was uploaded only on 18.8.2023. The Cluster Certificate submitted was dated 22.5.2019. The Committee sought recent cluster certificate to which the Proponent produced a Certificate from the Village Officer dated 18.11.2020 stating that there are no ongoing mining activities within 500m radius of the proposed site. The site form part of an abandoned mine, the details including the period during which the mine was operated is not found submitted.

The site is located at a distance of about 660m from Sithargund water falls and about 2200m from the Sithargund view point on the Nelliampathi Hills. There was a rock fall at Seetharkund, just below the view point adjacent to the POABS estate and above the Seetharkund footslope on 25.12.2012 which corresponded with an earth tremor in the Seetharkund area of Nelliampathy at 11.37 am on 25.12.2012 recorded in the Seismic observatory of Centre for Earth Science Studies, Trivandrum (CESS) located in the campus of Kerala Forest Research Institute at Peechi. Down the cliff, at the foot slope region of the Sitharkund escarpment, there were large number of active quarries, adjacent to the forest boundary which raised concern and stress on the stability of the cliff. As requested by the Divisional Forest Officer, Nemmara Forest Division, Palakkad, CESS conducted a study to provide scientific opinion about the rock slide occurred. The study suggested that it is necessary to impose certain restrictions on land based activities including prohibition of mining and quarrying in a buffer zone of width 5 km at the foot hills of Nelliampathy hills as the fringe areas of Palghat gap is highly fragile. **In this background and based on discussions, the Committee decided to direct the Proponent to submit the following documents.**

1. **Copy of all the permits/clearances/licenses by which the quarry was operated.**
2. **Report from the State Disaster Management Authority stating that quarrying activity will not lead to rock falls/slide in the cliff face of the Palghat gap near Sitharkund areas of Nelliampathy hills**

<b><u>Item No.6</u></b>	<b>Environmental Clearance for the building stone quarry, for an area of 1.8501 Ha at Block No.12 , Re-Survey No.120/5 in Kombanad Village, Kunnathunadu Taluk, Ernakulam. (SIA/KL/MIN/258433/2022, 2063/EC3/2022/SEIAA)</b>
-------------------------	--

**Decision :** As invited, the proponent, Sri.Shijo T.Paul and the RQP, Sri.C.Balaraman were present. The RQP made the presentation. As per the Mining Plan, the total mineable reserve is 622303 MT and the average annual production is 51859 TPA. The life of mine is

12 years. The nearest house is at 75 m from the proposed area. The highest and lowest elevation is 92 m & 52 m respectively. The depth to water table is reported to be 10m bgl. Therefore, mining has to be limited at 45m above MSL to prevent groundwater intersection. The distance to the medium hazard zone is 5.12 km and to the high hazard zone is 7.18 km. The total project cost is 2 Crore. The field inspection was conducted on 20.05.2023. The Committee observed that the baseline data submitted with the application is more than 4 years old as the application date is 28.2.2022 and monitoring date is 19.12.2017. **Since the Project Proponent has not complied with the conditions stipulated in the Clause 6 (iii) & (iv) of the Office Memorandum of the MoEF&CC dated 08.06.2022, the project cannot be appraised. The Committee decided to inform the Project Proponent accordingly.**

**Item No.7**

**Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Haris .C for an area of 1.0694 Ha at Block No.7, Re-Sy No.93/68, in Raroth Village, Thamarassery Taluk, Kozhikode SIA/KL/MIN/278375/2022 , 2078/EC4/2022/SEIAA**

**Decision :** As invited, the proponent, Sri. Haris. C and the RQP, Sri. Mahesh. S were present. The RQP made the presentation. As per the Mining Plan, the total mineable reserve is 385825 MT with an average annual production of 32000 MT for a mine life of 12 years. The highest and lowest elevation is 95 m and 40 m MSL respectively. The depth to water table is 8.2m bgl. Therefore, mining has to be limited to 35m above MSL to prevent intersection with ground water table. The nearest house is at 175 m. The distance to the medium hazard zone is 2.74 km and to the high hazard zone is 6.94 km. The total project cost is 1.03 Crore. The field inspection was conducted on 06.02.2023. The Malabar Wildlife Sanctuary is 9.44 km from the proposed area and the project proponent has submitted proof of application submitted to SCNBWL for Wildlife Clearance. **Based on discussions, the Committee decided to recommend EC for a period of 12 years subject to the following specific conditions in addition to the general conditions:**

1. The site suggested for compensatory afforestation is a plantation and therefore, alternate suitable site alongwith geo-tagged photographs and ownership details of land should be obtained prior to issuance of EC.
2. In order to prevent intersection with ground water table, the mining should be limited to 35m above MSL.
3. Development of green belt should be commenced using indigenous species of trees, plants and climbers prior to the commencement of mining and the geotagged photographs of the progress should be uploaded in the HYCR.
4. Drainage system incorporating garland canal, silt traps, siltation pond and outflow channel connecting to a natural drain should be provided prior to the commencement of mining.
5. The impact of vibration due to blasting on the houses and other built structures within 500m distance from the project boundary should be monitored in terms of Peak Particle Velocity and amplitude for maximum charge per delay and included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report.

6. Overflow water from the siltation pond should be discharged to the nearby natural drain after adequate filtration
7. Garland drain, silt-traps, siltation ponds and outflow channel should be desilted periodically and geo-tagged photographs of the process should be included in the half-yearly compliance report (HYCR).
8. Drainage water should be monitored at different seasons by an NABL accredited lab and clear water should only be discharged into the natural stream. Geotagged photographs of the drainage and sampling site should be submitted along with HYCR.
9. Overburden should be stored at the designed place and gabion wall should be provided for the topsoil and overburden storage sites
10. CER Plan should be implemented within the first 2 years and it should be operated and maintained till the mine closure plan is implemented.
11. Transportation of mined material should not be done during the peak hours in the forenoon (8.00am to 10.00am) and afternoon (3.30pm to 5 pm).
12. Adequate sanitation, waste management and rest room facilities should be provided to the workers.
13. Adequate energy conservation measures should be implemented including solar power installations.
14. Adequate facilities should be adopted to harvest the rainwater as per the guidelines issued by the Central Ground water Authority.
15. Environment Management Cell (EMC) should include one subject expert in environment management. The proceedings of the monthly meeting of the EMC should be submitted along with the HYCR.
16. Adequate number of avenue trees of indigenous species should be planted along both sides of the haulage road.
17. Geotagged Photographs of the progress of compensatory afforestation should be submitted along with HYCR

**Item No.8**

**Environmental Clearance for the Building Stone Quarry project of Sri. M. P. Kuriakose at Survey Nos.122/2 & 122/3 in Padichira Village, Sulthan Bathery Taluk, Wayanad.  
(SIA/KL/MIN/278782/2022, 1299/EC1/2019/SEIAA).**

**Decision :** As invited, the project proponent, Sri. M. P. Kuriakose and the RQP, Sri. Mahesh. S were present. The RQP made the presentation. As per the Mining Plan, the mineable reserve is 167263 MT with an annual production of 33500 MT. The life of mine is 5 years. The nearest building is at 101.4 m. The highest and lowest elevation is 760 m & 755 m respectively. The depth to water table is reported as 18m bgl in the application and 7.3m bgl at the spot with ground elevation of 731m. The distance to the medium hazard zone is 3.72 km and to the high hazard zone is 13.13 km. The total project cost is 1.21 Crore. The Committee observed that the Nagarhole National Park and Wayanad Wildlife Sanctuary are located within 10 km as against the information provided in the application form. A field inspection was carried out on 22.10.2022. Based on discussions, the Committee decided to direct the proponent to submit the following additional documents.

1. Recent Non-Cluster Certificate
2. Revalidated fresh baseline data monitored during non-monsoon period as per OM dated 8.6.2022 of the MoEf& CC
3. Compensatory afforestation plan with geotagged photographs of the proposed Site, ownership details of the land and species of trees proposed to be planted.
4. Details about the proposed OB dumping site and protection plan for the same
5. The proof of application submitted to the SCNBWL for Wild Life Clearance
6. Revised site-specific EMP with mitigation measures.
7. Revised CER as per the guidelines uploaded in the SEIAA-Kerala website
8. The depth of the water table measured in the nearest open well to the site with geotagged photographs
9. Clarification regarding the office building within 50m from the project boundary, shed without building number located at 24m away from the south west part of the project area boundary and another built structure at 21m from the project boundary
10. Geotagged photographs of permanently fixed Boundary Pillars

**Item No.9**                      **Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Unneenkutty for an area of 0.5192 Ha at Block No. 36 Re. Survey no. 347 in Kulukkallur Village, Pattambi Taluk, Palakkad (SIA/KL/MIN/411075/2022, 2241/EC1/2023/SEIAA)**

**Decision :** As invited, the project proponent, Sri. Unneenkutty and the RQP, Sri. V. K. Roy were present. The RQP made the presentation. As per the application, the total mineable reserve is 102914 MT. The proposed life of mine is 5 years. The project cost is 60 lakh. The nearest building is at 100.1 m. Depth to water table is 9 m below ground level. The highest and lowest elevation is 65 m & 56 m respectively. The distance to the medium hazard zone is 8 km and to the high hazard zone is 27.22 km. The Committee observed that the monitoring data submitted with the application is more than 4 years old as the application date is 17.12.2022 and date of baseline data is 16.10.2018. **Since the Project Proponent has not complied with the conditions stipulated in the Clause 6 (iii) & (iv) of the Office Memorandum of the MoEF&CC dated 08.06.2022, the project cannot be appraised. The Committee decided to inform the Project Proponent accordingly.**

**Item No.10**                      **Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Deepak Jose, Managing Director, M/s. Optimum Granites Pvt Ltd for an area of 2.1044 ha at Survey No. 274 in Thirumittacode -II Village, Pattambi Taluk, Palakkad (SIA/KL/MIN/415585/2023 , 1418/EC1/2019/SEIAA)**

**Decision :** The Committee discussed the field inspection report conducted on 01.08.2023. The mineable reserve is 6,03,813 MT and the production rate is 60,381 TPA. The mine life as per the mining plan is 10 years, but in the application, the mine life given is 34 years which is not justified as per the reserve and production plan. The maximum and minimum elevation are 160m and 115m above MSL respectively. The depth to water table reported in the

application is 13m bgl and in the FIR, it is 4-5m bgl. There are also large number of loose boulders in the site. The KML file is not readable. The Committee examined the response of the participants in the Public Consultation and noted that there were 15 responses against and 6 responses for the project. There were also 4 public complaints signed by more than 278 people. The public complaints are from Secretary of Pallipadam Mahallu Committee, Farmers Association, Thirumittacode Panchayat, President of Pallipadam Ward Congress Committee etc. **The Committee observed the following shortcomings:**

1. The life of mine is given as 10 years and 34 years in the application and states that this is as per Mine Plan.
2. Depth to water table measured in the nearest dugwell along with geo-tagged photographs, relative relief of the well location, distance of the well from the project boundary.
3. CER as per the guidelines uploaded in the SEIAA-Kerala website
4. Plan for management of boulders within the site without causing any accidents and also the possibility of accident due to boulder fall.
5. The KML file is not downloadable

**Based on discussions, the Committee decided to invite the Proponent for presentation. The Committee also entrusted the Sub Committee consisting of Dr. A.V. Raghun and Dr. K.N. Krishnakumar to evaluate the EIA report with reference to the ToR and adequacy of the reply given by the Proponent to the adverse response in the public consultation and public complaints and provide specific comments prior to the proposed presentation of the project before the SEAC.**

**Item No.11**                      **Environmental Clearance for the Clay Mining Project of Sri. Vinod Vasudevan for an area of 0.3602 Ha at Sy.Nos.312/PT1, 312/PT2, 342/1-1, 342/2-1, 342/1, 342/2-3 in Palur Village, Thalappilly Taluk, Thrissur (SIA/KL/MIN/417275/2023 , 2247/EC6/2023/SEIAA)**

**Decision :** As invited, the project proponent, Sri. Vinod Vasudevan and the RQP, Dr. Sakir S. Pillai were present. The RQP made the presentation. The average depth of mining is 4.5 m. The project cost is 35 lakh. The consultant informed that there is no requirement of approved Mining Plan. **The Committee decided to direct the Proponent to submit a clarification from the Mining & Geology regarding the non-requirement of Mining Plan.**

**Item No.12**                      **Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Sukumaran K, President, Ottappalam Taluk Karinkal Quarry Operators Industrial Co-operative Society Limited for an area of 0.8856 Ha at Block No. 36 Survey No : 468/3-9, 468/3-6 & 468/3-5 in Kulukkallur Village, Pattambi Taluk, Palakkad (SIA/KL/MIN/426226/2023, 2267/EC1/2023/SEIAA)**

**Decision :** As invited, the project proponent, Sri. Sukumaran, President, Ottappalam Taluk Karinkal Quarry Operators Industrial Co-operative Society Limited and the RQP, Sri. V. K. Roy were present. The RQP made the presentation. As per the application, the mineable reserve is 196455 MT. The life of mine is 5 years. The project cost is 80 lakh. No houses within 200 m. The highest elevation is 95m and the lowest elevation is 45 m respectively. The moderate hazard zone is at 16.20 km. The depth to water table is reported as 25 m AMSL which is not authenticated. The Committee noted the following shortcomings;

1. CER submitted is not as per the guideline published on the website of SEIAA-Kerala
2. Depth to water table measured in the nearest dugwell along with geo-tagged photographs, relative relief of the well location, distance of the well from the project boundary.
3. Survey map is not legible

The Committee also observed that the Proponent submitted his application on 28.1.2023 and submitted the baseline data of Air quality monitored on 28.1.2021, Water quality monitored on 28.1.2019 and Noise level monitored on 27.1.2019. In the application, the Proponent stated that the baseline data is monitored on 28.1.2021. **Therefore, the Committee decided to recommend delisting of the application due suppression of fact.**

**Item No.13**

**Environmental Clearance for the Granite (Building Stone) Quarry of Sri. Johnson George for an area of 5.2794 Ha, at Survey No. S.F. Nos. (Field No. 2159, 2160, 2162 Not Final) in Koodaranji Village, Thamarassery Taluk, Kozhikode  
SIA/KL/MIN/431789/2023, 1172(A)/EC4/SEIAA/2017**

**Decision :** The Committee discussed the field inspection report and observed that the proposed area is highly vulnerable from the point of view of land stability. Further the EIA document is not prepared with adequate details and most of the ToR are not addressed properly. 80% of the proposed area is in moderate hazard zone. In the FIR the Sub-committee mentioned that just above the western boundary connecting BP6 and BP1, the slope is extremely steep and the site extends from the ridge to almost to the lower slope. The terrain condition indicates the possibilities for landslides and soil erosion. During the Public consultation, 23 people spoke against and 13 people spoke for the proposed project. The main complaints are about (i) site is near highly populated area, (ii) area is landslide prone and there are past incidences of landslide in the area, (iii) damage to house due to fly rocks during 2011, (iv) expected high noise level and dust pollution, (v) expected siltation in agricultural land due to silt flow through the stream, (vi) area experienced landslide on August 15, 2012, (vii) site is near Malayora highway, (viii) nearness to Church of God, (ix) damage to the water tank of Cherupushpam water supply scheme located at a distance of 150m during 2012 landslide etc. Those who spoke for the project highlighted mainly the shortage of building materials, non-availability of materials nearby, possibility of having employment and livelihood to the local people etc. The Committee noted the following shortcomings and observations highlighted in the field inspection report.

- a. Two additional studies were proposed in the ToR, (i) Land stability study with special focus on landslide proneness of the area and (ii) Impact of any interventions in the

area including the previous mining activity. Regarding the first additional study, the Proponent got a study report namely Slope Stability Analysis Report by Dr. Ram Chandar Karra of National Institute of Technology, Suratkal. This study is essentially a stability analysis of benches based on Factor of Safety determined through modeling studies using rock properties determined on the field samples in the laboratory. Though the study stated that the terrain slope is high with overall slope angle on the eastern side is around  $47^{\circ}$  and on the western side is around  $51^{\circ}$  and thick soil column, the landslide proneness of the area has not been assessed. There are apprehensions about the landslides in the area highlighted during the Public Hearing. The EIA report ignored the second additional study regarding impact of any previous interventions stating that the area is virgin. However, there is an old mine within or adjacent to the proposed site and other major interventions including mining within the impact zone. Thus, both the additional studies stipulated in the ToR are not done as directed.

- b. As per ToR-7, the description of the prescribed operating process/procedures to bring into focus any infringement/deviation/violation of the environmental or forest Compliance norms/conditions, the hierarchical system or administrative order of the Company to deal with the environmental issues and for ensuring compliance with the EC conditions and the system of reporting of non-compliances/violations of environmental norms need detailing, which is not found in the EIA Report.
- c. As per ToR 8, details of slope study, blasting study and proposed safeguard measures are to be provided. However, it is found missing in the EIA report.
- d. As per ToR 9, the EIA report mentions about the top soil and overburden during the life of mine, but no other waste is addressed.
- e. As per ToR 10, it is required to encompass preoperational, operational and post operational phases in the report, which is not found provided.
- f. As per ToR 11, it is required to provide the details of the land for any Over Burden Dumps outside the mine lease, such as extent of land area, distance from mine lease, its land use. R&R issues, if any, etc. Since the mine lease area is not found suitable for storing/dumping top soil or overburden, no details as envisaged in the ToR is found provided.
- g. As per ToR 18, a detailed biological study of the study area [core zone and buffer zone (10 km radius of the periphery of the mine lease)] is needed. Details of flora and fauna, endangered, endemic and RET Species duly authenticated, separately for core and buffer zone should be furnished based on such primary field survey, clearly indicating the Schedule of the fauna present. In case of any scheduled-I fauna found in the study area, the necessary plan along with budgetary provisions for their conservation should be prepared in consultation with State Forest and Wildlife Department and details furnished. Necessary allocation of funds for implementing the same should also be made as part of the project cost. The report list out 18 species of trees, 30 species of herbs and 26 species of climbers in 10 km radius of the proposed project area. However, assessment of the floral diversity has not been carried out in accordance with the zonation as outline in the ToR. Also, the frequency of observation and the methodology undertaken for such evaluations are not given.



Similarly, the faunal diversity depicts the presence of 3 species of mammals, 2 species of reptiles, and 27 species of birds in 10 km radius of the proposed project site. The faunal diversity assessment report also lacks details with regard to the zonation of the area under study. The methodology followed for the assessment is also not given in the report.

- h. As per ToR 22, it is required to provided site-specific meteorological data which is not found given. Also, the mineralogical composition of PM<sup>10</sup>, particularly for free silica, is not found provided.
- i. As per ToR 23, the air quality modeling has been found carried out. However, the ground level concentration is found to be relatively low even though the proposed activity is mining and intensive transportation of the mined material. The reason for the low ground level concentration of the pollutant is not found provided.
- j. As per ToR 24, the water requirement for the Project may not be adequate as the mining operation is proposed in a large area. The source of water given in the application and EIA report are different. So details may be provided after detailed study on the source of water and requirement.
- k. As per ToR 26, it is required to provide description of water conservation measures and details of rainwater harvesting proposed to be adopted in the Project, but it is not dealt with in the EIA report with details. Only general statements are provided. Similarly, impact of the Project on the water quality, both surface and groundwater, need detailed assessment based on which necessary safeguard measures need to be suggested.
- l. As per ToR 31, it is required to provide a time bound Progressive Greenbelt Development Plan in a tabular form (indicating the linear and quantitative coverage, plant species and time frame) and submitted, keeping in mind, the same will have to be executed up front on commencement of the Project. It is also required to provided phase-wise plan of plantation and compensatory afforestation clearly indicating the area to be covered under plantation and the species to be planted. While suggesting the plant species, it is required to consider the ecological value and utility value to the local population with emphasis on local and native species and the species which are tolerant to pollution. The report recommends the planting of 1800 saplings belonging to 12 species in an area of 0.7364 Ha. The plant diversity assessment report (ToR 18) has not been taken into consideration for the selection of native species for planting activities, and the adaptability of some of the suggested species to such a habitat is doubtful. Also, the planting protocol suggested (area under planting and the number of saplings recommended for planting) is not in accordance with the topography of the area. A phase-wise plan for planting activities is missing in the report.
- m. As per ToR 32, it is required to provide the impact on local transport infrastructure due to the Project, but the projected daily movement does not seem to be matching with the production proposed for the mine. Further, the arrangements for improving the infrastructure is not addressed. It may be clarified whether the impact of Transportation study is done as per Indian Road Congress Guidelines.
- n. As per ToR 35, Occupational Health impacts anticipated of the Project and the proposed preventive measures are to be addressed in detail along with details of pre-

- placement medical examination and periodical medical examination schedules, project specific occupational health mitigation measures with required facilities proposed in the mining area. Such a detailing is not found provided in the EIA report.
- o. As per ToR 36, Public health implications of the Project and related activities for the population in the impact zone need to be systematically evaluated and remedial measures proposed along with budgetary allocations, but no such attempts have been found included in the report.
  - p. As per ToR 38, it is required to provide detailed environmental management plan (EMP) to mitigate the environmental impacts which, should inter-alia include the impacts of change of land use, loss of agricultural and grazing land, if any, occupational health impacts besides other impacts specific to the proposed Project. However, the EMP is not found addressing the environmental impacts and mitigation measures adequately.
  - q. As per ToR 39, Public Hearing points raised and commitment of the Project Proponent on the same along with time bound Action Plan with budgetary provisions to implement the same should be provided and also incorporated in the final EIA/EMP Report of the Project

The Committee observed that the following additional documents/details are necessary, if the project has to be considered further:

1. Meticulously revised EIA report as per the ToR approved incorporating all missing/relevant data, tables, annexures, eliminating faulty and ambiguous data and statements and other information.
2. The concerns raised during the Public Hearing are not addressed adequately and with details and plans
3. Revised site-specific and impact based EMP along with appropriate budgetary provisions
4. Certified recent location map incorporating all the built structures including residential houses within 200m radius
5. Revised CER as per the guidelines uploaded in the website of the SEIAA-Kerala
6. Authenticated copy of non-assignment certificate
7. Clarification regarding the top soil to be removed and stored for future use
8. Clarification regarding the ultimate mine depth as the details given in the mine plan shows that the mining will be conducted up to 125m above MSL, but the plates attached with the mine plan indicates that the mining will extend up to 90m above MSL.
9. Distance to the nearest wildlife sanctuary or such other ecologically sensitive zones based on authenticated data.
10. Photographs showing the boundary pillars fixed properly
11. Detailed drainage map for the project
12. Location and details of OB dumping site with proposed protection measures
13. Revised estimation of water requirement, water balance statement, proposed sources and their yield characteristics and sustainability
14. Source of water with consent letters, if not owned by the Proponent

15. Depth to the water table in the nearest dug wells along with geo-tagged photographs of the wells, distance to the well and the ground level relief of the location .
16. Geo-tagged location map of Compensatory Afforestation site along with site photographs, details of species proposed and ownership details
17. Plan for rainwater harvesting
18. Plan for energy conservation measures
19. Plan for sanitation and waste management

**The Committee decided to invite the project proponent for a presentation.**

**Item No.14**

**Environmental Clearance for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry project of Sri. K. Raveendran at Re-Survey Nos. 96/pt23 in Ambalathara Village, Hosdurg Taluk, Kasaragod (SIA/KL/MIN/433176/2023, 2312/EC2/2023/SEIAA)**

**Decision :** As invited the authorized person of the project proponent, Sri .Raghavan and the RQP, A.Mahammad Kunhi were present. The RQP made the presentation. As per the application, the total mineable reserve is 6560 MT and the mine life is 1 year. The project cost is 15 Lakh. The highest and lowest elevation is 91 m and 90 m respectively. The depth to water table is 11m bgl. The nearest house is at 155.3 m. **Based on the discussion, the Committee decided to recommend EC for mine life of one year subject to the following Specific Conditions in addition to General Conditions**

1. The excavation activity should not involve blasting.
2. The excavation activity should be restricted to 2m above the groundwater table at the site.
3. The excavation activity should not alter the natural drainage pattern of the area
4. The excavated pit should be restored by the project proponent for agriculture and other useful purposes.
5. Appropriate fencing all around the excavated pit should be made to prevent any mishap.
6. Measures should be taken to prevent dust emissions by covering excavated earth during transportation.
7. Safeguards should be adopted against health risks on account of breeding of vectors in the water bodies created due to the excavation of earth.
8. Workers/labourers should be provided with facilities for drinking water and sanitation.
9. A berm should be left from the boundary of adjoining field having a width equal to at least half the depth of the proposed excavation.
10. A minimum distance of 50m from any civil structure should be kept from the periphery of the project area.
11. No water logging should be allowed in the mine pit. Appropriate drainage should be ensured from the project area prior to the commencement of mining.
12. The drain should be provided with silt traps and siltation pond and the overflow water should be clarified and drained to the nearest natural drain without any hindrance.
13. The drainage system should be cleaned and desilted periodically to facilitate

unhindered drainage.

14. Measures incorporated in the CER should be implemented within 6 months from the date of EC.
15. Transportation of mined material should not be done during the peak hours in the forenoon (8.00am to 10.00am) and afternoon (3.30pm to 5 pm)

**Item No.15**

**Environmental Clearance for the Laterite building stone quarry project of Sri. Faizal. K. P in an area of 0.7040 Ha at Block No.33, Re.Sy.No.67/2 in Kuzhimman Village, Kondotty Taluk, Malappuram.  
(SIA/KL/MIN/433491/2023, 2303/EC6/2023/SEIAA)**

**Decision :** As invited, the project proponent, Sri. Faizal. K. P and the RQP, Dr. Nazar Ahamed K.V were present. The RQP made the presentation. As per the application, the mineable reserve is 73920 MT and mine life is 3 years. The project cost is 30 lakh. The highest and lowest elevation of the proposed site is 194 m & 184 m respectively. The site is located on the summit of a hill having very steep slope with the hill climbs to 194m above MSL from the nearest valley having relative relief of 25m above MSL. The depth to water table is 7m bgl. The nearest built structure is at 105 m from the project boundary, seems to be a shed seen in the mid slope region of the hill. Based on discussions, the Committee decided that after obtaining the following details required for further appraisal of the project, the Committee may consider the project once again to decide whether it is required to conduct field inspection or not. Accordingly, the **Committee directed the project proponent to submit the following documents:**

1. Site Specific EMP with mitigation measures and budget allocation for each activity.
2. Specific Plan for CER activities as per the guideline published in the SEIAA website
3. OB dumping site details with a protection plan as storage of overburden on the hill top is not desirable
4. Compensatory afforestation plan with geotagged photographs of the proposed site and ownership details of the land.
5. Certified legible Survey Map
6. Litho section as observed in five nearest dug wells to the project site

**Item No.16**

**Environmental Clearance issued by DEIAA, Thrissur to Sri.Kichu K.Ravi for the quarry project at Sy.No.53/2 in Venganellur Village, Thalappilly Taluk, Thrissur, Kerala– Judgment dated 24.11.2020 in WP(C) No.25848 of 2020- Revalidation of EC- reg :-  
Old File No.1028/EC6/2021/SEIAA)  
(SIA/KL/MIN/433891, File No.2317/EC6/2023/SEIAA)**

**Decision :** As invited, the proponent, Sri. Kichu K. Ravi and the RQP, C. Balaraman were present. The RQP made the presentation. The Environmental Clearance was issued by DEIAA, Thrissur as per Order No.B7/7683/2017/DEIAA/TSR dt.18.06.2018 for a period of five years. Based on the Judgment dated. 24.11.2020 in WP(C) No.25848 of 2020,

the Committee appraised the proposal for revalidation and conducted field inspection on 08.04.2022 and 06.05.2022. The Committee in its 141<sup>st</sup> meeting recommended revalidation of the EC for 22 years as per the life of mine certified by the District Geologist from the date of the original EC (18.06.2018) subject to certain specific conditions. The 127<sup>th</sup> meeting of the SEIAA decided that the Project Proponent has to submit fresh EC application in Parivesh Portal by including all the documents mentioned in the O.M. dated 28.04.2023 and the SEAC shall reappraise the project and recommend / reject with specific reasons, once the application is received from the project proponent. As per the O.M dated 28.04.2023, the proponent submitted an online application through Parivesh Portal on 20.06.2023. As per the application, the total mineable reserve is 3136250 MT. The mine life is 30 years. The nearest structure is at 211.7 m. The total project cost is 450 lakh. The distance to the medium hazard zone is 8.06 km and to the high hazard zone is 8.11 km. The Peechi Vazhani Wild Life Sanctuary is at 6.37. The CCR was received from MoEF&CC on 22.03.2023. The Committee noted that Sri. Joseph filed a WP(C) No.23471/2021 before the Hon'ble High Court against the project which is pending. There is also a complaint by Sri. Jimmy Dominic. **Based on discussions, the Committee decided to direct the Proponent to upload the following documents.**

1. Upload all the documents as mentioned in the OM dated 28.4.2023 in the Parivesh file except those already uploaded
2. Response to the complaints by Sri. Jimmy Dominc
3. Response to the WP(C) No.23471/2021 filed before the Hon'ble High Court by Sri. Joseph
4. Baseline data monitored within 3years period of the date of application
5. Clarification regarding the life of mine given in the approved mine plan (30 years) and life of mine certified by the District Geologist based on reappraisal (22.62 years)
6. Recent Non-Cluster Certificate
7. Depth to water table in the nearest dug well along with relative relief of the well location and distance to the well from the project boundary.
8. Proof of application submitted for wildlife clearance from the NBWL as Peechi-Vazhani WLS is located at 6.37 km from the project site
9. A compensatory afforestation plan along with geo-tagged location map, ownership details of the proposed land and the species proposed to be planted
10. Action plan for enhancement of solar power generation
11. Geo-tagged photographs of retaining walls provided to the OB dumps

**Item No.17**

**Environmental Clearance for the Laterite building stone quarry project of Sri. Hussain Babu at Sy.Nos.249/2-4, 249/2-15 in Edayur Village, Tirur Taluk, Malappuram. (SIA/KL/MIN/434152/2023, 2311/EC/2023/SEIAA)**

**Decision :** As invited, the proponent, Sri. Hussain Babu and the RQP, Dr.Nazar Ahamed K.V were present. The RQP made the presentation. As per the application, the mineable reserve is 58056.25 MT. The life of mine is 3 years. The project cost is 30 lakh. The nearest building is at 58.3 m. A school is at 847 m. The highest and lowest elevation is 147 m & 134

m respectively. **The Committee directed the project proponent to submit the following additional documents.**

1. Site-specific EMP with mitigation measures
2. Recently certified legible Survey Map
3. Depth to water table in the nearest dug well along with relative relief of the well site, distance from the project boundary and geo-tagged photographs of the well.
4. Litholog of couple of nearest dug wells to the project site

**Item No.18**

**Environmental Clearance for Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Sunil Chandran, Managing Director, M/s. Empire Crushers Private Limited for an area of 1.2784 Ha, at Block No.16, Re-Survey Nos.143/8-1, 143/9-1, 143/9- 2pt, 144/4pt, 144/14pt, 144/15pt in Anad Village, Nedumangadu Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram, (SIA/KL/MIN/434229/2023 , 2307/EC1/2023/SEIAA)**

**Decision :** As invited, the proponent, Sri. Sunil Chandran and the RQP, Sri.D.P.Sreekumar were present. The RQP made the presentation. As per the application, the mineable reserve is 301210 MT with an annual production 60242 MT. The life of mine is 5 years. The highest elevation is 170 m MSL and the lowest is 135 m MSL. The nearest building is at 103 m. The depth to water table reported is 5m bgl. The distance to the medium hazard zone is 8.28 km and to the high hazard zone is 11.6 km. The Peppara Wild Life Sanctuary is at 8.7 km. The project cost is Rs. 1.37 crore. **The Committee directed the project proponent to submit the following additional documents.**

1. Proof of application submitted to the NBWL for wildlife clearance
2. Compensatory afforestation plan with geotagged photographs of the proposed site and ownership details of the land.
3. Site-specific EMP with mitigation measures and budget allocation
4. Depth to water table in the nearest dug well along with relative relief of the well site, distance from the project boundary and geo-tagged photographs of the well.
5. Specific plan with activity details of CER with stakeholder consultation proof

**Item No.19**

**Environmental Clearance for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Lakshmanan P. P., for an area of 0.0971 Ha. in Block No. 139 at Survey No: 209/2 in Chuzhali Village, Thaliparamba Taluk, Kannur (SIA/KL/MIN/434404/2023, 2305/EC4/2023/SEIAA)**

**Decision :** As invited, the proponent, Sri.Lakshmanan P.P and the RQP, Sri.V.K.Roy were present. The RQP made the presentation. As per the application, the mineable reserve is 7646 MT and the mine life is 1 year. The project cost is 2.65 lakh. The depth to water table is 7m bgl and depth of mine is 6m bgl. A shed is at 70 m. **The Committee directed the project proponent to submit the following additional documents.**

1. Recently certified legible Survey Map

2. Depth to water table in the nearest dug well along with relative relief of the well site, distance from the project boundary and geo-tagged photographs of the well.
3. A heap of soil is accumulated near the project site. Plan for avoiding mishaps due to the same.
4. CER proposal as per the guidelines uploaded in the SEIAA-Kerala website

**Item No.20**

**Environmental Clearance for Granite Building stone Quarry of Sri. Eldho Issac for an area of 4.7023 Ha at Survey. No. 208/1 of Alanallur- III Village, Mannarkkad Taluk, Palakkad (SIA/KL/MIN/72951/2022, 1590/EC1/2019/SEIAA)**

**Decision :** The Committee discussed the evaluation report of the additional documents submitted by the project proponent and noted the following shortcomings;

1. Letter from DFO is not submitted. Instead, a letter from Public Information Officer is given. There is a National Park within 4.4 km of the proposed site.
2. Misleading answer was given during public hearing that water sample was taken from Puliyanthodu. Water and Hydrology Environment' Page 59 says Water sample was taken from Olippuzha 465 m NW. There was no reference about Puliyanthodu in the report. Clarification is needed on why misleading information was given in Public hearing.
3. Conclusions and recommendations are not there in the traffic study report. Provide findings and conclusions
4. ToR (26) describes water conservation measures proposed to be adopted in the Project. The Water Conservation measure provided in Chapter 4.5 (Page No-139-141) is about a RWH pit. Is it possible to construct a pit in the rocky terrain? Provide details of RWH.
5. EMP- Ecological assessment in the buffer zone once in two years and Socio-Economic Assessment once in three years are proposed under EMP monitoring. The purpose of Socio Economic Assessment once in three years needs to be explained.
6. In the public hearing people have mentioned about Livelihood loss of Honey bee farmers, and poultry farmers. The proponent has not addressed this concern. Provide clarification and solutions.
7. In the public hearing, many people raised concerns about Puliyanthodu. However, there was no mention of Puliyanthodu in the report. It is reported that many drinking water projects namely Chooli with 50 consumers, Kilayapadam with 60 consumers, and Pilachola with 80 consumers depend on this water body. Provide details about Puliyanthodu, protection measures, water shed strengthening activities etc.
8. Reexamine the report in response to ToR 5 and 7. Mining history of the area is not given.
9. Clarification regarding the operationa of quarries by the Proponent in and around the proposed site as per the indications in the Page 147 of the EIA report regarding extension of CSR support to the nearby villages

**Based on discussions, the Committee decided to seek clarificationa and additional details as above from the Project Proponent**

**Item No.21**

**Environmental Clearance for the apartment Project by Nest Realities Pvt. Limited, submitted by Sri. Rahul K R., Finance Manager, for an area of 0.7355 Ha at Sy No. 323/7 in Keezhmad Village, Aluva Taluk, Ernakulam.  
(SIA/KL/MIS/289728/2022, 2269/EC3/2023/SEIAA)**

**Decision :** As invited the authorized person of the project proponent, Sri. Roy Thomas, M/s. Nest Realities Pvt. Limited and the Consultant Smt. Sindhu. N. T, M/s. KITCO Limited were present. The Consultant made the presentation. The total built-up area is 24925.10 sq.m. The estimated project cost is 51.61 crores. The Committee observed that only 5.5% of the total energy requirement is proposed to be generated from solar which is inadequate. The CER as per the guidelines published in the SEIAA website is not provided. It is required that the EMP has to be revised including CER. The waste water generated is 86 KLD and hence increase the capacity of the STP proposed. The Committee noted the following shortcomings;

1. Clarification regarding nature of proposal, whether it is fresh or expansion
2. KML file and locational details of the site.
3. Proof of approval from local bodies for the existing building and the built-up area.
4. Inadequacy of Project cost.
5. Proposal for enhancing the proposed STP
6. Detailed CER proposal as per the guidelines uploaded in the SEIAA-Kerala website.
7. Site-specific EMP with mitigation measures and budget provision.
8. Proposed renewable energy details.
9. Additional solid waste management facility
10. Area of the existing building certified by Chartered Engineer

**The Committee decided to entrust Dr. A. V. Raghu & Dr. N. Ajithkumar for field inspection and report.**

**Part 2****Item No.1**

**Environmental Clearance for the proposed expansion of existing MES Medical College & Hospital by M/s The Muslim Educational Society at Sy. Nos. 147, 147/3, 147/4, 148/1-3, 148/1-4, 148/2, 148/2-1, 148/3-7, 148/3-8, 148/3-9 in Angadippuram Village and Sy. Nos. 19/3-1, 21/2-15, 21/2-16, 21/2-18, 21/3-5, 21/4-4, 21/4-6, 21/5-1, 21/5-2, 21/6-3, 21/6-4, 29/14-2, 2-/17-8, 32, /4-2, 33/14-1, 33/7-2, 33/8-1 in Puzhakkattiri Village, Perinthalmanna Taluk, Malappuram.  
(SIA/KL/INFRA2/404063/2022, 2133/EC6/2022/SEIAA)**

**Decision:** The Committee examined the documents submitted by the project proponent and found them satisfactory subject to the fact that the amount proposed for the CER activities should be above the amount expended towards charity in the previous year. It



should be accounted for separately and included in the half-yearly compliance report. **The Committee decided to invite the project proponent for a presentation.**

**Item No.2**            **Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Abdullah M.S., M/s Hastone Granites Pvt. Ltd, for an area of 0.9986 Ha.at Survey No. 112/11A3Pt in Balal Village, Vellarikund Taluk, Kasaragod (SIA/KL/MIN/136571/2020, 1745/EC2/2020/SEIAA)**

**Decision :**     The Committee examined the additional documents submitted by the project proponent and found them satisfactory. The total mineable resource is 1,41,635 MT. The highest and lowest elevation is 254 m & 185 m RL respectively. The distance to the medium hazard zone is 4.8 km and to the high hazard zone is 2.2 km. The life of mine is 3 years. The nearest built structure is at 189.6 m. The project cost is 1.5 crore. The field inspection was conducted on 02.01.2023. The Committee heard the presentation in its 150<sup>th</sup> meeting. The Complainant, Sri. Kunjiraman Vaidhyar vide affidavit dated.09.10.2023 stated that he is withdrawing the complaint dated 13.03.2020 submitted to SEIAA. **Based on discussions, the Committee decided to recommend EC for the mine life of 3 years subject to the following Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions:**

1. More than half of the area falls in moderate hazard zone and therefore, as given in HSAK, 2014, quarrying shall be permitted only after getting the approval of the District Level Crisis Management Committee for mining constituted vide G.O (Rt) No. 542/14/ID dated 26-05-2014
2. Development of green belt should be initiated prior to the commencement of mining using indigenous species.
3. The road with sufficient width for to and fro transportation shall be developed prior to the commencement of mining activities.
4. Drainage system incorporating garland canal, silt traps, siltation pond and outflow channel connecting to a natural drain should be provided prior to the commencement of mining.
5. The impact of vibration due to blasting on the houses and other built structures within 500m distance from the project boundary should be monitored in terms of Peak Particle Velocity and amplitude for maximum charge per delay and included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report.
6. Overflow water from the siltation pond should be discharged to the nearby natural drain after adequate filtration
7. Garland drain, silt-traps, siltation ponds and outflow channel should be desilted periodically and geo-tagged photographs of the process should be included in the half-yearly compliance report (HYCR).
8. Drainage water should be monitored at different seasons by an NABL-accredited lab and clear water should only be discharged into the natural stream. Geotagged photographs of the drainage and sampling site should be submitted along with HYCR.
9. Overburden should be stored at the designed place and gabion wall should be provided for the topsoil and overburden storage sites

10. CER Plan should be implemented within the first 2 years and it should be operated and maintained till the mine closure plan is implemented.
11. Transportation of mined material should not be done during the peak hours in the forenoon (8.00am to 10.00am) and afternoon (3.30pm to 5 pm).
12. Adequate sanitation, waste management and rest room facilities should be provided to the workers.
13. Adequate energy conservation measures should be implemented including solar power installations. At least 40% of the energy requirement shall be met from the solar power
14. Adequate facilities should be adopted to harvest the rainwater as per the guidelines issued by the Central Groundwater Authority.
15. Environment Management Cell (EMC) should include one subject expert in environment management. The proceedings of the monthly meeting of the EMC should be submitted along with the HYCR.
16. Adequate number of avenue trees of indigenous species should be planted along both sides of the haulage road.
17. Geotagged Photographs of the progress of compensatory afforestation should be submitted along with HYCR

**Item No.3**

**Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Muhammed Kutty for an area of 0.5379 Ha at Sy. No. 247/3 in Pattithara Village, Pattambi Taluk, Palakkad (SIA/KL/MIN/143575/2020, 1990/EC1/2022/SEIAA)**

**Decision :** The Committee examined the additional documents submitted by the project proponent and observed that the revised Project Cost is not specific and the video clip of the project area is not submitted. The Committee observed that the mining has to be limited to 85 m amsl considering the depth to the water table. Therefore, **the Committee decided to direct the project proponent to submit the following additional documents**

1. The ADS uploaded as per the direction of the decision in 148<sup>th</sup> meeting of the SEAC is not downloadable and therefore, it should be submitted again.
2. Revised project cost which includes all the essential components
3. Video showing the entire project area.
4. The details of the two sheds close to the project area.

**Item No.4**

**Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Jacob Barry for an area of 1.600 Ha at Re- survey No. 547 in Melarkode village, Alathur Village, Palakkad, Kerala (SIA/KL/MIN/163190/2020, 1750/EC1/2020/SEIAA)**

**Decision :** The Committee verified the additional documents submitted by the project proponent and observed that the mining has to be limited to 65 m amsl instead of 55 m amsl considering the groundwater intersection. The project proponent has submitted the proof of application to SCNBWL since the site is located 9 km from the Parambikulam Wild Life

Sanctuary. However, the letter dated 17.4.2023 from the Chief Wild Life Warden, Kerala states that as the project area is more than 1 km from the boundary of the protected area and outside the ESZ, it comes under the purview of the State Wild Life Board. The Committee observed that road leading to the quarry site, around 2 km is narrow, but the traffic plan doesn't give any proposal for widening the road or feasibility for transportation. **Hence the Committee decided to seek clarification from the project proponent on the above matter.**

**Item No.5**

**Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. K.C Krishnan. for an area of 0.6199 Ha at Re-Sy. Nos. 173/1 & 173/3 in Maruthonkara Village, Vatakara Taluk, Kozhikode SIA/KL/MIN/183677/2020 , 1849/EC4/2020/SEIAA**

**Decision :** The Committee as a final step sought the following two additional documents in its 147<sup>th</sup> meeting of the SEAC.

1. Proof of application submitted to the SCNBWL for Wildlife Clearance.
2. Plan for maintaining a buffer of 50m between the project area and built structures.

Regarding the proof of application submitted to SCNBWL, the project proponent vide his representation expressed his inability to provide the same. For the plan for maintaining a buffer of 50 m between project area and the built structure, to which the proponent has not submitted any details. In this circumstance, the Committee is unable to process the application and **hence decided to recommend to delist the application.**

**Item No.6**

**Environment Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Haridasan for an area of 3.5823 hectares at Re Survey Nos. 3/1047, 3/1419, 3/1416, 3/1418 in Engapuzha Village, Thamarassery Taluk, Kozhikode (SIA/KL/MIN/222256/2021, 1919/EC4/SEIAA/2021)**

**Decision :** The Committee examined the additional documents submitted by the project proponent and found them satisfactory. The total mineable reserve is 2539300 MT (126965 MTA) and the mine life is 20 years. The nearest residential building is at 135.9 m SW. The distance to the medium hazard zone is 1.09 km and the distance to the high hazard zone is 1.87 km. The total water requirement is 6 KLD. The total project cost is 320 lakh. The Malabar Wildlife Sanctuary is situated at 4.1 km. The proponent submitted proof of application submitted before NBWL. The field inspection was carried out on 04.09.2022. The presentation was done in the 150<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting. **Based on discussions, the Committee decided to recommend EC for the mine life of 20 years subject to the following Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions:**

1. Considering the depth to water table, the depth of mining should be limited to 70 m AMSL.
2. A temporary wall of height 5 m should be erected between BP.4 & BP.5 prior to commencement of mining

3. Boulders present in the central part of the project area should be removed after taking adequate safety measures prior to commencement of mining.
4. Garland canal, silt traps, siltation pond and overflow channel should be constructed as per the proposed plan and connection to the adjacent natural channel should be ensured.
5. The first order seasonal streamlet in the project area should be channelised properly through the garland canal.
6. Drainage system incorporating garland canal, silt traps, siltation pond and outflow channel connecting to a natural drain should be provided prior to the commencement of mining.
7. Development of green belt should be initiated prior to the commencement of mining using indigenous species.
8. Precautionary measures should be taken to prevent soil erosion.
9. The impact of vibration due to blasting on the houses and other built structures within 500m distance from the project boundary should be monitored in terms of Peak Particle Velocity and amplitude for maximum charge per delay and included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report.
10. Overflow water from the siltation pond should be discharged to the nearby natural drain after adequate filtration
11. Garland drain, silt-traps, siltation ponds and outflow channel should be desilted periodically and geo-tagged photographs of the process should be included in the half-yearly compliance report (HYCR).
12. Drainage water should be monitored at different seasons by an NABL accredited lab and clear water should only be discharged into the natural stream. Geotagged photographs of the drainage and sampling site should be submitted along with HYCR.
13. Overburden should be stored at the designed place and gabion wall should be provided for the topsoil and overburden storage sites
14. CER Plan should be implemented within the first 2 years and it should be operated and maintained till the mine closure plan is implemented.
15. Transportation of mined material should not be done during the peak hours in the forenoon (8.00am to 10.00am) and afternoon (3.30pm to 5 pm).
16. Adequate sanitation, waste management and rest room facilities should be provided to the workers.
17. Adequate energy conservation measures should be implemented including solar power installations. At least 40% of the energy requirement shall be met from the solar power
18. Adequate facilities should be adopted to harvest the rainwater as per the guidelines issued by the Central Ground water Authority.
19. Environment Management Cell (EMC) should include one subject expert in environment management. The proceedings of the monthly meeting of the EMC should be submitted along with the HYCR.
20. Adequate number of avenue trees of indigenous species should be planted along both sides of the haulage road.
21. Geotagged Photographs of the progress of compensatory afforestation should be submitted along with HYCR

**Item No.7**

**Environmental Clearance for Granite building stone quarry of Sri. C. H Sakkariya, President, Mannarkkad Taluk Karinkal Quarry Operators Industrial Cooperative Society Ltd for an area of 0.9741 Ha at Re Survey Nos. 70/10, 70/16, 242/15 in Pottassery-I Village, Mannarkkad Taluk, Palakkad  
(SIA/KL/MIN/263015/2022 , 2024/EC1/2022/SEIAA)**

**Decision :** The Committee verified the additional documents submitted by the project proponent and found them satisfactory. The total mineable reserve is 219693 MT. The mine life is 5 years. The highest and lowest elevation is 115 m and 105 m respectively. Considering the depth to water table, the depth of mining should be limited to 95 m AMSL. The hazard zone is at 4.1 km and the medium hazard zone is at 930 m. The nearest house is at 121.9 m. The total project cost is 1 crore. The field inspection was done on 28.09.2022. The Committee heard the presentation in its 140<sup>th</sup> meeting. As per the application, the baseline data collection is done on 18.5.2018 and the application is filed on 13.4.2022. Therefore, the baseline data is older than 3 years. **In the circumstance, the Committee decided to direct the Proponent to submit revalidated fresh baseline data monitored during non-monsoon period as per OM dated 8.6.2022 of the MoEf& CC**

**Item No.8**

**Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Krisha Kumar .E for an area of 0.9400 Ha at Sy.No.486 in Vadakkethara Village, Thalappilly Taluk, Thrissur  
SIA/KL/MIN/266526/2022 , 2040/EC6/2022/SEIAA**

**Decision :** The Committee verified the additional documents submitted by the project proponent and found them satisfactory. The total mineable reserve is 247950 MT with an annual production of 49590 MT. Mine life is 5 years. The project cost is 1.10 Crore. The highest and lowest elevations are 66m and 55m respectively. The nearest built structure is at 114.7m. The Moderate hazard zone is at 10.76km and high hazard zone is at 13.53 km from the project site. As per the letter of the Wildlife Warden, Peechi Division dated and 08.02.2023, 25.09.2023, it is stated that the proposed project is 11.1 km from the Peechi-Vazahni Wildlife Sanctuary and 3.7 km from Choolannur Peafowl Sanctuary. The proponent has submitted the proof of application to NBWL for Wild Life Clearance. The Committee heard the presentation in its 144<sup>th</sup> meeting. **Based on the discussion, the Committee decided to recommend EC for the mine life of 5 years subject to the following Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions;**

1. Considering the depth to water table, the depth of mining should be limited to 75 m AMSL.
2. Development of green belt should be initiated prior to the commencement of mining using indigenous species.
3. The Project proponent should get the mandatory Wildlife Clearance from the SCNBWL before the commencement of the mining activity.

4. Drainage system incorporating garland canal, silt traps, siltation pond and outflow channel connecting to a natural drain should be provided prior to the commencement of mining.
5. The impact of vibration due to blasting on the houses and other built structures within 500m distance from the project boundary should be monitored in terms of Peak Particle Velocity and amplitude for maximum charge per delay and included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report.
6. Overflow water from the siltation pond should be discharged to the nearby natural drain after adequate filtration
7. Garland drain, silt-traps, siltation ponds and outflow channel should be desilted periodically and geo-tagged photographs of the process should be included in the half-yearly compliance report (HYCR).
8. Drainage water should be monitored at different seasons by an NABL accredited lab and clear water should only be discharged into the natural stream. Geotagged photographs of the drainage and sampling site should be submitted along with HYCR.
9. Overburden should be stored at the designed place and gabion wall should be provided for the topsoil and overburden storage sites
10. CER Plan should be implemented within the first 2 years and it should be operated and maintained till the mine closure plan is implemented.
11. Transportation of mined material should not be done during the peak hours in the forenoon (8.00am to 10.00am) and afternoon (3.30pm to 5 pm).
12. Adequate sanitation, waste management and restroom facilities should be provided to the workers.
13. Adequate energy conservation measures should be implemented including solar power installations. At least 40% of the energy requirement shall be met from the solar power
14. Adequate facilities should be adopted to harvest the rainwater as per the guidelines issued by the Central Ground water Authority.
15. Environment Management Cell (EMC) should include one subject expert in environment management. The proceedings of the monthly meeting of the EMC should be submitted along with the HYCR.
16. Adequate number of avenue trees of indigenous species should be planted along both sides of the haulage road.
17. Geotagged Photographs of the progress of compensatory afforestation should be submitted along with HYCR

**Item No.9**

**Environmental Clearance for the granite building stone quarry at Survey Nos. 487/1/2/3, 487/1/3/B, 491/1/2/4,493/15/11,491/1/2/4, 493/15/11, 491/1/ 2/4/2, 491/1/2/4/2, 491/1/2/4/2 in Pallarimangalam Village, Kothamangalam Taluk, Ernakulam.  
(SIA/KL/MIN/282371/2022, 2130/EC3/2022/SEIAA)**

**Decision :** The Committee verified the additional documents submitted by the project proponent and found them satisfactory. The targeted annual production is 235697 TPA.

The life of mine is 9 years. The project cost is 3.5 crore. The highest elevation is 94 m and lowest elevation is 56 m above MSL. Considering the depth to water table, the depth of mining should be limited to 25 m AMSL, avoiding mining of the bottom last 4 benches. The field inspection of the site is already completed. As per the letter dated 28.04.2023 of Wildlife Warden, Idukki intimated that boundary pillar of the proposed project is 10.270km from the Thattekkad Wildlife Sanctuary as per aerial distance. The Committee decided to invite the Proponent for presentation for taking the final decision.

**Item No.10**                      **Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building stone Quarry of Sri. J. Madhusoodhanan for an area of 2.1449 Ha at Block No. 35, Re-Survey Nos. 352/7, 353/1, 353/2, 353/2-1, 353/3, 353/4, 353/8, 353/9, & 354/2 in Nedumangad Village, Nedumangad Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram (SIA/KL/MIN/401155/2022, 2123/EC1/2022/SEIAA)**

**Decision :** The Committee verified the additional documents submitted by the project proponent and found them satisfactory. The total mineable reserve is 683641MT and the proposed life of mine is 10 years as per the mine plan. The project cost is mentioned as Rs.62,15,000/-. The filed inspection has already been carried out and the Committee heard the presentation in its 150<sup>th</sup> meeting. The elevation difference prior to the mining is 75m to 150m above MSL. The depth of mining is 80m above MSL. There are three houses at a distance 107m, 117m and 118m respectively and Bdhrakal temple at a distance of 460m. Part of the project area was mined as per EC dated 24.3.2018 for four years by the DEIAA. As per the OM dated 8.6.2022, Certified Compliance Report (CCR) from the Integrated Regional Office (IRO) of the MoEF & CC is required. **Therefore, the Committee decided to direct the Proponent to submit the CCR from the IRO, MoEF & CC, Bangalore.**

**Item No.11**                      **Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Bobby Kuriakose for an area of 1.0553 Ha at Re-Sy Block No: 6, Re-Sy. Nos: 124/5-1-3, in Kodikkulam Village, Thodupuzha Taluk, Idukki. SIA/KL/MIN/404158/2022 , 2164/EC3/2022/SEIAA**

**Decision :** The Committee verified the additional documents submitted by the project proponent and **decided to defer the item for a detailed evaluation.**

**Item No.12**                      **Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Venesh S., for an area of 2.0110 Ha. in Block No. 66, at Re Survey Nos. 292/1194, 292/6358, 292/2642, 292/6357, 292/5700, 292/4163, 292/3209, 292/3455, 292/1619, 292/159, 292/3513, 292/1612, 292/747 in New Naduvil Village, Thaliparamba Taluk, Kannur (SIA/KL/MIN/407136/2022, 2156/EC4/2022/SEIAA)**

**Decision :** The Committee verified the additional documents submitted by the project proponent and found them satisfactory. **The Committee decided to entrust Dr. R. Ajayakumar Varma and Sri.V.Gopinathan for field inspection and report.**

**Item No.13**                      **Environmental Clearance for Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Abdul Nazar A for an area of 0.7562 ha at Re-Survey Nos. 98/2-1, 98/1, 98/1-1 in Nellanad Village, Nedumangad Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram District, Kerala (Re uploaded the previous proposal No.SIA/KL/MIN/161967/2020) SIA/KL/MIN/407637/2022 , 1747/EC1/2022/SEIAA**

**Decision :** The Committee examined the hearing notes submitted by the project proponent and **decided to defer the item for a detailed evaluation.**

**Item No.14**                      **Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry project of Sri. Jismon A. B., for an area of 0.9980 Ha. at Re-Survey Nos. 27, 28 & 28/1 in Erumeli South Village, Kanjirappally Taluk, Kottayam [SIA/KL/MIN/413982/2023, 2212/EC3/2023/SEIAA]**

**Decision :** The Committee examined the additional documents submitted by the project proponent. As per the Certificate dated 29.09.2023, the Village Officer stated that the delta quarry is at a distance of 523 m from the proposed project site. The Committee noted that the proposal lacked the details of the Compensatory afforestation plan. **The Committee decided to entrust Dr.K.N.Krishna Kumar & Dr.Mahesh Mohan for field inspection and report.**

**Item No.15**                      **Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Dileep Kumar at Survey Nos: 372/1A/3/8/8, 372/1A/4/9/11 in Kottappady Village, Kothamangalam Taluk, Ernakulam (SIA/KL/MIN/414973/2023, 2237/EC3/2023/SEIAA)**

**Decision :** The Committee verified the additional documents submitted by the project proponent and **decided to entrust Dr.Mahesh Mohan for detailed evaluation and report**

**Item No.16**                      **Environmental Clearance for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Satheesh for an area of 0.0970 Ha at Sy.No.23/15 in Kavanur Village, Ernad Taluk, Malappuram. (SIA/KL/MIN/419350/2023 , 2253/EC6/2023/SEIAA)**

**Decision :** The Committee verified the additional documents submitted by the project proponent and found satisfactory. The total mineable reserve is 6790 MT and life of mine is 1 year. The project cost is 10 lakh. The highest and lowest elevation is 44m and 40 m respectively. The nearest house is at 54.3 m. The Committee heard the presentation in its 149<sup>th</sup> meeting. **Based on discussions, the Committee decided to recommend EC for the**



**mine life of 1 year subject to the following Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions:**

1. The excavation activity should not involve blasting.
2. The excavation activity should be restricted to 2m above the groundwater table at the site.
3. The excavation activity should not alter the natural drainage pattern of the area
4. The excavated pit should be restored by the project proponent for agriculture and other useful purposes.
5. Appropriate fencing all around the excavated pit should be made to prevent any mishap.
6. Measures should be taken to prevent dust emissions by covering excavated earth during transportation.
7. Safeguards should be adopted against health risks on account of breeding of vectors in the water bodies created due to the excavation of earth.
8. Workers/labourers should be provided with facilities for drinking water and sanitation.
9. A berm should be left from the boundary of adjoining field having a width equal to at least half the depth of the proposed excavation.
10. A minimum distance of 50m from any civil structure should be kept from the periphery of the project area.
11. No water logging should be allowed in the mine pit. Appropriate drainage should be ensured from the project area prior to the commencement of mining.
12. The drain should be provided with silt traps and siltation pond and the overflow water should be clarified and drained to the nearest natural drain without any hindrance.
13. The drainage system should be cleaned and desilted periodically to facilitate unhindered drainage.
14. Measures incorporated in the CER should be implemented within 6 months from the date of EC.
15. Transportation of mined material should not be done during the peak hours in the forenoon (8.00am to 10.00am) and afternoon (3.30pm to 5 pm)

**Item No.17**

**Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building stone quarry of Sri. Sasidharan E.M for an area of 0.8533 hectares at Re Survey Nos.106/1, 106/4 in Kayakkodi village , Vatakara Taluk, Kozhikode  
SIA/KL/MIN/420061/2023 , 2285/EC4/2023/SEIAA**

**Decision :** The Committee examined the additional documents submitted by the project proponent and found satisfactory. The targeted annual production is 39900 MT. The life of mine is 5 years. The highest and lowest elevations are 30m MSL & 10 m MSL respectively. The depth to water table is 8.5m bgl. The project cost is 119.5 lakh. The medium hazard zone is at 1.8 km and the high hazard zone is at 2.89 km. The nearest house is at 53m. The presentation was done in 148<sup>th</sup> meeting. **Based on discussions, the Committee decided to**

**recommend EC for the mine life of 5 years subject to the following Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions:**

1. Development of green belt should be initiated prior to the commencement of mining using indigenous species.
2. Drainage system incorporating garland canal, silt traps, siltation pond and outflow channel connecting to a natural drain should be provided prior to the commencement of mining.
3. The impact of vibration due to blasting on the houses and other built structures within 500m distance from the project boundary should be monitored in terms of Peak Particle Velocity and amplitude for maximum charge per delay and included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report.
4. Overflow water from the siltation pond should be discharged to the nearby natural drain after adequate filtration
5. Garland drain, silt-traps, siltation ponds and outflow channel should be desilted periodically and geo-tagged photographs of the process should be included in the half-yearly compliance report (HYCR).
6. Drainage water should be monitored at different seasons by an NABL accredited lab and clear water should only be discharged into the natural stream. Geotagged photographs of the drainage and sampling site should be submitted along with HYCR.
7. Overburden should be stored at the designed place and gabion wall should be provided for the topsoil and overburden storage sites
8. CER Plan should be implemented within the first 2 years and it should be operated and maintained till the mine closure plan is implemented.
9. Transportation of mined material should not be done during the peak hours in the forenoon (8.00am to 10.00am) and afternoon (3.30pm to 5 pm).
10. Adequate sanitation, waste management and restroom facilities should be provided to the workers.
11. Adequate energy conservation measures should be implemented including solar power installations. At least 40% of the energy requirement shall be met from the solar power
12. Adequate facilities should be adopted to harvest the rainwater as per the guidelines issued by the Central Ground water Authority.
13. Environment Management Cell (EMC) should include one subject expert in environment management. The proceedings of the monthly meeting of the EMC should be submitted along with the HYCR.
14. Adequate number of avenue trees of indigenous species should be planted along both sides of the haulage road.
15. Geotagged Photographs of the progress of compensatory afforestation should be submitted along with HYCR

**Item No.18**

**Environmental Clearance for the Laterite building stone quarry of Sri. Narayanan. K., for an area of 0.0971 Ha, at Re-Survey Nos-11/1A in Kolathur Village, Kasaragod Taluk, Kasaragod (SIA/KL/MIN/420606/2023, 2274/EC2/2023/SEIAA)**

**Decision :** The Committee verified the additional documents submitted by the project proponent and **decided to defer the item for detailed scrutiny.**

**Item No.19**                      **Environmental Clearance for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Vishnu P.T for an area of 0.1566 Ha at Sy.No.418/1-230 in Edayur Village, Tirur Taluk, Malappuram  
SIA/KL/MIN/426500/2023, 2284/EC6/2023/SEIAA**

**Decision :** The Committee verified the additional documents submitted by the project proponent and **decided to defer the item for detailed scrutiny.**

**Item No.20**                      **Environmental Clearance for the Expansion of Technopark Phase III of Sri. John M Thomas, CEO, M/s Technopark in Attipra Village, Thiruvananthapuram Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram  
(SIA/KL/MIS/52532/2019 1555/EC1/2019/SEIAA)**

**Decision :** The Committee examined the additional documents submitted by the project proponent and **decided to entrust Er.M.Dileep Kumar and Dr. A. Bijukumar to scrutinize and evaluate the additional documents and submit specific comments. The Committee also decided to seek a legal opinion from the Legal Officer, SEIAA whether this proposal shall be considered for further appraisal based on the Judgment in Appeal No. 54 of 2021 dated 30.05.2023 against Dragonstone Realtors Pvt Ltd.**

**Item No.21**                      **Environmental Clearance for the Laterite building stone quarry of Sri. Abdul Vahid A. T for an area of 0.6637 Ha at Re-Survey No-54/1B (71) in Kuttikkattur Village, Kozhikode Taluk, Kozhikode  
SIA/KL/MIN/404425/2022 , 2149/EC4/2022/SEIAA**

**Decision :** The Committee discussed the field inspection report conducted on 30.07.2023 and **decided to defer the item for detailed scrutiny.**

**Item No.22**                      **Environmental Clearance for Laterite building stone quarry of Sri. Luka P.J, for an area of 0.9784 Ha at Re-Survey No.149/2,150/56 in Kadalundy Village, Kozhikode Taluk, Kozhikode  
SIA/KL/MIN/428190/2023, 2279/EC4/2023/SEIAA**

**Decision :** The Committee discussed the field inspection report conducted on 30.07.2023 and **decided to defer the item for detailed scrutiny.**

### **Part 3**

#### **Item No.1**

**Environmental Clearance for the Common Biomedical Waste Treatment Facility by IMAGE-IMA at Block No 26, Re. Sy No 340/1/19, 340/1/20, in KINFRA Park Enadimangalam Village, Adoor Taluk, Pathanamthitta District, Kerala  
SIA/KL/INFRA2/434354/2023, 2308/EC1/2023/SEIAA**

**Decision :** The Committee perused the item and observed that the Subcommittee entrusted with the field inspection in the subject matter has conducted field verification on 29.10.2023 and presented the findings of the field inspection. The Committee noted that the Kerala State Single Window Clearance Board (KSSWCB) chaired by the State Chief Secretary instructed the SEAC/ Sub Committee to expedite the proceedings and ensure that the SEAC report will be placed for consideration by SEIAA at its next meeting scheduled in the first week of November 2023. Considering the direction, the Sub Committee visited the site on 29.10.2023. Neither the EIA Coordinator nor the Functional Area Experts of the NABET accredited agency who prepared the EIA report were present during the site visit. Many of the ToR are not addressed in the EIA report and Gap analysis study details are not given in the report. The Sub Committee, primarily, observed that the proposed project will improve essential environmental service infrastructure and therefore, needs consideration as an environmental improvement project. The Sub Committee evaluated the EIA report and inspected the site. **The Committee discussed the salient aspects of the project and findings in the details and decided to direct the Proponet to submit the following additional documents:**

1. As per the letter dated 18.10.2022 of the MoEF & CC, it is stated that the grant of EC to BWWTf projects by SEIAA must be based on gap analysis studies undertaken by the concerned SPCB duly highlighting the difference in the BMW generated vis-s-vis the treatment capacity available. Accordingly, collect the details from the SPCB and submit the same.
2. The slope of the proposed site is steep and therefore, there is a requirement of carefully planned land modification. The contour map of the site and surrounding areas and engineering design for modifying the land, laying of roads, construction of different units envisaged in the project, drainage facilities, etc. are necessary to assess the environmental suitability of the site. Therefore, the proponent should be directed to submit the above details along with a detailed plan for land modification including the engineering feasibility of the site.
3. Details of waste characteristics and temporary storage facility as envisaged in ToR 5.
4. Details as per ToR 6 are not provided stating that it is not applicable. However, there will be requirements for chemicals and materials for facilitating the treatment of waste and discharge of pollutants from the treatment facility.
5. Details of the treatment process should be included in the project description in accordance with the BMW Rules, 2016 which is important to identify the impacts and their evaluation and mitigation.

6. Details of Incinerator (Stationery/ Rotating Drum), waste feeding mechanism (Manual/ Automatic) and gas cleaning systems proposed for control of particulate matter and various gases including TCDDs and TCDFs.
7. Plan for storage and disposal of incineration ash (hazardous waste ) .
8. Layout of the project should include all the components of the project including the drainage details, rainwater harvesting facility, storage of treated water etc.,
9. Details of present land use and impacts due to its removal and compensation plan
10. Soil analysis should include the porosity, permeability, water holding capacity and thickness of the soil to assess the vulnerability to slide and preventive measures
11. Details of good combustion practices proposed to be adopted in the proposed project to reduce the impact due to dioxin and furans as envisaged in ToR 21.
12. Possible Carbon footprint as envisaged in ToR 27.
13. Proposed odour control measures as envisaged in ToR 28.
14. Details of storage handling as envisaged in ToR 29.
15. Preprocessing and post processing details of rejects/inerts as envisaged in ToR 30.
16. There is a pond and connecting natural drain originating from the lower reaches of the land proposed to be used for the project. There are possibilities of accidental spillage of contaminants to the drainage system which will impact the downstream population severely. Therefore, details of hydrological and hydrogeological studies and the precautionary measures required for preventing such accidental contamination of water bodies should be provided as envisaged in ToR 32.
17. Impacts of the project activities on the water environment of the impact zone and their mitigation measures should be provided as envisaged in ToR 34.
18. Drainage plan details within the proposed project site and its immediate surroundings should be provided as envisaged in ToR 35.
19. A certificate from the local body or agency supplying water is not provided as envisaged in ToR 37.
20. A certificate of adequate power supply is not provided as envisaged in ToR 38.
21. The provision of rain water harvesting (RWH) is provided in the EIA report. However, it is not found included in the DPR or in the project cost. Therefore, revise the project cost incorporating the provision RWH facility also.
22. Clarification from the SPCB whether a Public Hearing is required as per OM No. J-11011/321/2016-II(I) dated 27.4.2018
23. The EIA report identified and analyzed only randomly selected impacts. The impacts of various activities of the project should be identified and analyzed and mitigation measures proposed for all the identified impacts.
24. In the EIA report, it is stated that the water requirement for the project is 115 KLD, 50 KLD from the KWA and 65 KLD from treated water. In the application, the water requirement is mentioned as 50 KLD and the source as tanker supply. There is a contradiction in the statement and it requires to be clarified.
25. Water balance statement incorporating the sources and usages for various purposes
26. It is stated in the application that the capacity of STP is 150 KLD and ETP is 25 KLD. In the EIA report, it is stated that ETP capacity is 200 KLD. The project is expected to have sewage generation as well as process discharge such as wash water. Therefore,

the characteristics of liquid waste will be different and accordingly the treatment process also may differ. Therefore, it is required to provide clarification regarding the liquid waste characteristics and quantity of discharge from different sources, treatment process, plant capacity, predicted quality of the treated water from the different treatment processes and their utilization potential so as to achieve the zero-discharge target.

27. Details of tertiary treatment proposed for wastewater (effluent and sewage) treatment in the unit and proposal for utilization / reuse of treated water as part of conservation of natural resource.
28. The EIA report stated that the domestic waste will be handed over to the municipal authorities, but the Gram Panchayat in which the site is located does not have adequate waste management facilities. Therefore, a plan for the management of domestic waste should be provided.
29. The EIA report is silent about parking facilities and solar power installations. The details of the two installations should be worked out and provided
30. Detailed CER plan in accordance with the guidelines uploaded in the Kerala-SEIAA website
31. The stack height given in the application is only 3.5m, which may not be correct. The details of the stack including its height based on pollution control board norms should be provided.
32. STP and ETP costs should be integrated into the project cost
33. Safeguard measures for possible accidental spillage of contaminants to the water body in the downstream area
34. Revised EMP incorporating site-specific mitigation measures and additional measures such as groundwater recharge, rainwater harvesting, stormwater management, solid waste management etc.

## **Item No.2**

**Environment Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry, M/s Perumannoor Granites Private Limited over an extent of 3.5238 Ha at Sy No. 611/1A/19W/17, 611/1A/19W/19, 611/1A/83/13/16, 611/1A/84/14/23 & 611/1A/196/73/2 in Keerampara Village, Kothamangalam Taluk, Ernakulam. (IA/KL/MIN/267357/2022, 2034/EC3/2022/SEIAA**

**Decision :** The Committee examined the additional documents submitted by the project proponent and found them satisfactory. The total Mineable reserve is 11,46,889.50 MT. The life of mine is 10 years. The highest and lowest elevation is 160 m and 125 m MSL. The lowest bench is at 115m MSL and the mine void will be 10m. The distance to the high hazard zone is 3.74 km. There are no built structures within 200m. The Thattekkad Bird Sanctuary is situated at 1.74 Kms and the proponent applied for Wild Life Clearance. The total project cost is 451.25 lakh. The field inspection has already been conducted. The Committee heard the presentation in its 136<sup>th</sup> meeting. As per the existing norms since the other quarries are having leases prior to 09.09.2013, there is no cluster situation. **Based on discussions, the**

**Committee decided to recommend EC for the mine life of 10 years subject to the following Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions:**

1. A portion of the site is in the moderate hazard zone and therefore quarrying shall be permitted only after getting the approval of the district level crisis management committee for mining constituted vide G.O (Rt) No. 542/14/ID dated 26-05-2014.
2. Development of green belt should be initiated prior to the commencement of mining using indigenous species.
3. Drainage system incorporating garland canal, silt traps, siltation pond and outflow channel connecting to a natural drain should be provided prior to the commencement of mining.
4. Garland drain, silt-traps, siltation ponds and outflow channel should be desilted periodically and geo-tagged photographs of the process should be included in the half-yearly compliance report (HYCR).
5. Drainage water should be monitored at different seasons by an NABL accredited lab and clear water should only be discharged into the natural stream. Geotagged photographs of the drainage and sampling site should be submitted along with HYCR.
6. There should not be any obstruction to the flow of water in the stream near BP5
7. The impact of vibration due to blasting on the houses and other built structures within 500m distance from the project boundary should be monitored in terms of Peak Particle Velocity and amplitude for maximum charge per delay and included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report.
8. Overburden should be stored at the designed place and gabion wall should be provided for the topsoil and overburden storage sites
9. CER Plan should be implemented within the first 2 years and it should be operated and maintained till the mine closure plan is implemented.
10. Transportation of mined material should not be done during the peak hours in the forenoon (8.00am to 10.00am) and afternoon (3.30pm to 5 pm).
11. Adequate sanitation, waste management and restroom facilities should be provided to the workers.
12. Adequate energy conservation measures should be implemented including solar power installations. At least 40% of the energy requirement shall be met from the solar power
13. Adequate facilities should be adopted to harvest the rainwater as per the guidelines issued by the Central Groundwater Authority.
14. Environment Management Cell (EMC) should include one subject expert in environment management. The proceedings of the monthly meeting of the EMC should be submitted along with the HYCR.
15. Adequate number of avenue trees of indigenous species should be planted along both sides of the haulage road.
16. Geotagged Photographs of the progress of compensatory afforestation should be submitted along with HYCR

**The meeting came to an end at 5.00 pm with a vote of thanks to the Chair.**

The Committee decided to convene its next meeting on 02<sup>nd</sup> December 2023 through an online platform.

Sd/-  
Suneel Pamidi, IFS  
Member Secretary, SEAC

Sd/-  
Dr.R. Ajayakumar Varma  
Chairman, SEAC

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS:**

Sl.No.	Name	31.10.2023	01.11.2023
1.	Dr.R.Ajayakumar Varma ( <b>Chairman</b> )	√	√
2.	Shri. Sheik Hyder Hussain	√	√
3.	Dr.A.Bijukumar.	X	X
4.	Dr.A.N.Manoharan	√	√
5.	Shri. M.Dileepkumar	X	√
6.	Smt. Beena Govindan	√	√
7.	Dr.C.C.Harilal	√	√
8.	Dr.K.VasudevanPillai	√	√
9.	Dr.MaheshMohan	√	√
10.	Dr.K.N.Krishna kumar	√	√
11.	Sri.V.Gopinathan	√	√
12.	Dr.A.V.Raghu	√	√
13.	Dr.N.Ajithkumar	√	√
14.	Sri.Suneel Pamidi, IFS ( <b>Member Secretary</b> )	X	√