

**MINUTES OF THE 121st MEETING OF THE STATE LEVEL
ENVIRONMENT IMPACT ASSESSMENT AUTHORITY (SEIAA)
KERALA, HELD ON 29th & 30th DECEMBER 2022 IN THE CONFERENCE
HALL, SEIAA KERALA.**

Present:

- 1. Dr. H. Nagesh Prabhu IFS (Retd), Chairman, SEIAA, Kerala**
- 2. Sri. K. Krishna Panicker, Member, SEIAA**
- 3. Dr. V. Venu IAS, Member Secretary, SEIAA**

The 121st meeting of the SEIAA, Kerala was held on 29th & 30th December 2022 at the Conference Hall, SEIAA, Kerala, Thiruvananthapuram. The meeting started at 10.30 AM on 29th December 2022. Dr. H. Nagesh Prabhu, Chairman, SEIAA Kerala chaired the meeting. Dr. Venu V. IAS, Member Secretary, SEIAA and Sri. K. Krishna Panicker, Expert Member, SEIAA attended the meeting. The Authority considered the agenda for the 121st meeting and took the following decisions:

Physical Files

Item No.121.01 **Minutes of the 120th meeting of SEIAA held on 25th & 26th November 2022**

Noted

Item No.121.02 **Action Taken Report on 119th meeting of SEIAA**

Noted

Item No.121.03 **Review of pending Court Cases before the Hon'ble NGT & Hon'ble High Court**

Action taken by Legal officer is appreciated. Legal Officer has to update the statement by incorporating the observations made by Authority and regularly report such facts to the Administrator about the timely action to be taken on the cases filed before different Courts in the prescribed format.

Item No.121.04 **Application for EC for Marath Enterprises and Crushers Pvt. Ltd in Survey Nos. 197/2(p), 198/8(p), 198/9(p) 198/2(p), 198/10(p) & 205/2(p) Koppam Village, Pattambi Taluk, Palakkad District, Kerala Judgment dated 26.08.2021 in WP (C) No.14476/2021 & judgment dated 22.08.2022 in WP(C) No.25902 of 2022 filed by M/s Marath Enterprises and Crushers Pvt. Ltd) SIA/KL/MIN/273506/2022, 310/SEIAA/KL/1693/2014**

The Authority perused the item and noted the request of the Project Proponent dated 23.12.2022 to exempt the public hearing. The Authority observed that the Project Proponent had was granted EC from SEIAA on 11.06.2017 which was quashed by Hon'ble High Court vide judgment in W.P (C) No. 18383/2018, and then all the files were forwarded to DEIAA for further processing. Authority noted that the EC issued by SEIAA was quashed by the Hon'ble Court and after the high court judgment, the norms for the EC application and its appraisal for mining projects have changed remarkably. Since a cluster situation exists, (more than of 5 ha within 500m radius), as per OM dated 12.12.2018 of MoEFCC public hearing & EIA study are mandatory. The Authority also observed that SEAC after considering judgements in various WP(C)s and due appraisal of documents, has recommended for submission of ToR for EIA study and preparation of EMP.

Considering all these facts, the Authority observed that there are no provisions/ norms to consider the representation of the Project Proponent and hence decided to direct the Project Proponent to apply for ToR and conduct EIA study & public hearing, which are mandatory as per existing norms. The Project Proponent may be intimated accordingly.

Item No.121.05

**Environmental Clearance issued to the Granite Building Stone Quarry of M/s A-One Sands Pvt. Ltd in Block No.23, Re survey No.452, 441/1, 441/2, 435, 440/1, 440/2, 436 in Muthalamada-I Village, Chittur Taluk, Palakkad District- Interim Order dated 01.02.2022 in WP(C) No.3305 of 2022(K)
SIA/KL/MIN/187395/2020; 747/EC1/180/2015/SEIAA**

The Authority deliberated the item and noted the contents of letter of Divisional Forest Officer (DFO), Nenmara, Palakkad dated 30.11.2022. The Authority observed that the application submitted for wildlife clearance was rejected on the basis of various ecological factors as detailed in the inspection note of DFO Nenmara dated 29.08.2022. The DFO has also recommended to reject the Environmental Clearance issued for the project dated 08.10.2021. Vide Judgment in WP(C) No.3305/2022 (K) dated 1.02.2022 of Hon'ble High Court of Kerala, the Project Proponent was granted an interim stay on condition for obtaining Clearance from the National Board for Wild Life.

As per the legal opinion of Standing Counsel dated 09.12.2022, it is observed that the matter with regard to the correctness of OM dated 08.08.2019 of MoEFCC, in which the Wildlife Clearance from SCNBWL becomes mandatory for mining projects located within 10km radius of National Parks and Wildlife Sanctuaries is pending Division Bench of Hon'ble High Court of Kerala for further adjudication because of different views expressed in single bench Judgements. Now, the Authority also noticed that the project area falls in an ESA village and clarification is sought from MoEFCC about issue of EC for mining projects in ESA villages and the reply yet to be received.

In these circumstances, the Authority decided the following:

- 1) Request MoEF&CC to file an appeal against the Judgment in WP(C) No. 3305 of 2022 dated 01.02.2022 before the Hon'ble Supreme court of India/Hon'ble High Court of Kerala, in case the OM has to be defended in the best interest of protecting National Parks and Sanctuaries in the country /State of Kerala.**
- 2) As the matter with regard to the correctness of OM dated 08.08.2019 of MoEFCC is pending before Division Bench of Hon'ble High Court of Kerala, for further adjudication, because of different views expressed in two single bench**

Judgements, Authority decided wait for the Jugdement of the division bench and inform the same to Project proponent.

- 3) Issue a Show Cause Notice for cancellation of conditional EC on the basis of the report of DFO, Nenmara, Palakkad.**

Item No.121.06 **Environmental Clearance issued for the proposed Commercial Complex (Hotel, Convention Centre & Shopping Mall) project, M/s LULU International Shopping Mall Pvt. Ltd., Thiruvananthapuram District - Clarification sought regarding CER/CSR commitments (File No.1047/EC1/899/SEIAA/2016)**

Deferred for further scrutiny of the proposal.

Item No.121.07 **Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Nino K Thomas at Re-Survey Block No. 31, Re-survey. Nos. 394/2, 461/1 & 461/4, Vadasserikkara Village, Ranni Taluk, Pathanamthitta, Kerala (SIA/KL/MIN/44488/2019; 1474/EC1/2019/SEIAA)**

As intimated by the Authority, on behalf of Sri. Nino K. Thomas, Sri. Raju K. Thomas father of Sri. Nino K. Thomas attended for hearing before the Authority. After hearing, the Authority directed the Project Proponent to submit a detailed hearing note within 7 days with necessary supporting documents to substantiate his claim.

Item No.121.08 **Granite Building Stone Quarry of Shri. Nino K Thomas" over an extent of 2.7213 Ha. (6.7243 Acres) at Re-Survey Block No. 31, Re-survey. Nos. 457/1, 457/2, 457/3, 457/4, 457/4-1, 457/5, 457/6 & 457/7, Vadasserikkara Village, Ranni Taluk, Pathanamthitta, Kerala (SIA/KL/MIN/132322/2019; 1635/EC1/2020/SEIAA)**

As intimated by the Authority, on behalf of Sri. Nino K. Thomas, Sri. Raju K. Thomas father of Sri. Nino K. Thomas attended for hearing before the Authority. After hearing, the Authority directed the Project Proponent to submit a detailed hearing note within 7 days with necessary supporting documents to substantiate his claim.

Item No.121.09 **Application for transfer of Environmental Clearance issued to Sri. V. P. Ramankutty, Managing Partner, M/s Kulappully Granites in Survey No. 4/3, of Vaniyamkulam-2 Village, Ottapalam Taluk, Palakkad District**
(SIA/KL/MIN/29304/2022; 1809/EC1/2020/SEIAA)

The Authority noted the request of Sri. Deepak N. D to transfer the EC in favour of him due to the demise of the Project Proponent, Sri. V. P. Ramankutty. After verifying the documents, the Authority decided to direct Sri. Deepak N. D to submit a notarized affidavit stating that all the partners have no objection to transfer the EC to the Sri. Deepak N.D. the applicant.

Item No.121.10 **Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Jayesh Thomas in Block No. 31, Re. Survey Nos. 317/10, 317/11, 317/3, 317/12 in Vadasserikkara Village, Ranni Taluk, Pathanamthitta, Kerala**
SIA/KL/MIN/291136/2022; 2111/EC1/2022/SEIAA

Deferred for seeking clarification from MoEFCC as decided in the 119th SEIAA meeting held on 26th & 27th October 2022.

Item No.121.11 **Environmental Clearance issued from DEIAA, Thiruvananthapuram for the granite building stone quarry project in Uzhumalakkal Village, Nedumangad Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram District by Smt. Shaila Nasar, Director, M/s Al-Nassar Granites Pvt. Ltd - Judgment dated 30.11.2020 in WP (C) No. 26372/2020 - Revalidation of EC.**
(File No. 2793/EC1/2020/SEIAA)

The Authority deliberated the item and noted the decision of SEAC meeting. The Authority observed that EC was issued in 04.04.2017 and at that time also, the applicability of wildlife clearance to mining projects within 10 km buffer zone to protected areas is applicable and the Project Proponent had to obtain the mandatory Wildlife Clearance before starting the mining operation. The Authority noted that, as per the EC conditions, the Project Proponent has to obtain all the statutory clearances / licences from the concerned authorities prior to commence

the mining. However, the Project Proponent has been functioning the quarry without Wildlife Clearance, which is a clear violation of EC condition.

The Authority observed that the draft notification regarding the ESZ of Peppara Wildlife Sanctuary was issued on 25.03.2022 and the EC was issued on 04.04.2017 and during that period the OM dated 02.12.2009 of MoEFCC was applicable, which was later superseded by O.M dated 08.08.2019 and 16.07.2020. Hence, the Project Proponent has to obtain the mandatory wildlife clearance and reply of the Project Proponent to the Show Cause Notice is not acceptable. The Authority accepted the SEAC recommendation and decided the following.

1. **Issue stop memo to the project proponent with copy to District Geologist and concerned Local Self Government.**
2. **Issue a Show Cause Notice for cancellation of EC for not obtaining Wild life clearance before starting mining operations.**

Item No.121.12 **Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Shri. Pradeep. N. S, Managing Partner, M/s. K L Granites in Re-Survey Block No: 35, Re-Survey Nos. 368/3, 368/4, 374/3 (Patta Land) & 369/1 (Government land), Pulimath Village, Chirayinkeezhu Taluk, Thiruvananthapuram – Rejection proceedings issued order dated 09.02.2021 - Judgment dated 02.09.2022 in WP(C) No. 13746 of 2021 (SIA/KL/MIN/43756/2019; 1454/EC1/2019/SEIAA)**

The Authority perused the item and examined the hearing note submitted by the Project Proponent. The Authority observed that the proposal was rejected by the 106th SEIAA as per the recommendation of SEAC that “there was no proper access road to the proposed site and found that the narrow access road was passing through residential areas and having curves making it difficult for material convenience”. Now the Project Proponent has submitted the boulder removal plan and the consent from all the nearby households.

Authority decided to refer the proposal to SEAC for reconsideration in the light of the documents submitted by the Project Proponent.

Item No.121.13 **Environmental Clearance issued to the Granite Building Stone Quarry of M/s Adani Vizhinjam Port Pvt Ltd (AVPPL) in Re-Survey No. 341/6 (pt) at Koodal Village, Konni Taluk,**

**Pathanamthitta, Kerala – Letter received from Secretary, Kalanjoor Grama Panchayat
(SIA/KL/MIN/61070/2019; 1441/EC1/2019/SEIAA)**

The Authority deliberated the item and noted the Letter dated 14.12.2022 of the Secretary, Kalanjoor Grama Panchayat. The Authority observed that allegation of the Secretary, Kalanjoor Grama Panchayat was devoid of any merit. The EC was issued after EIA study and public hearing. EIA report was also made available to the Local Self Government and the Grama panchayat officials who attended public hearing.

Since, the EC was issued after fulfilling all the mandatory procedures as per EIA Notification 2006 and following the existing norms, there is no need to relook the matter unless otherwise there is any violation of the EC conditions. A reply in this regard shall be given to the Panchayat authorities.

Item No.121.14 **Judgement in WP(C) No. 12147/2020(P) dated 09.09.2020 filed by A. K. Joseph, Arackal House, Mundathadam, Parappa, Kasaragod, 671533 Jimmy Alex, Manjakunnel, Parappa P.O, Kasaragod, 671533, Vinayan V.K , District Environmental Samithi, Parappa, Kasaragod & Judgement in WP(C) No. 15745/2020(P) dated 18.08.2020 filed by K. P. Balakrishnan, Kanathil Parambil, Moolakayam, Parappa, Kasaragod, Pramod K, Parappa, Kasaragod, Sudhakaran. M, Edavil Veedu, Parappa, Kasaragod and U. V. Mohammed Kunhi, Valappil Kammadath, Parappa, Kasaragod (1992/EC2/2020/SEIAA)**

The Authority deliberated the item and noted the request of the Project Proponent dated 06.12.2022 to reexamine the decision of SEAC and to provide an opportunity for hearing before SEAC. The Authority observed that the 134th SEAC recommended to cancel the EC with immediate effect and address the Mining and Geology Department to take actions against the violations of the EC Conditions and mine plan by the Project Proponent. Considering the request of the Project Proponent, the Authority decided to refer the case back to SEAC to give a definite recommendation after hearing the Project Proponent.

Item No.121.15 **Environmental Clearance for Transfer of Environment Clearance issued for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Mr. M D Sreenivasan to M/s. Shivsa Granites LLP
(SIA/KL/MIN/294754/2019; 1452/EC2/2019/SEIAA)**

The Authority deliberated the item and noted the contents of ~~with~~ all the documents submitted by the transferee to transfer the EC issued vide order No. 1452/EC2/2019/SEIAA dated 16.07.2022. The Authority decided to transfer of EC to Mr. Sunil Kumar, Partner, M/s Shivsa Granites LLP. Necessary order shall be issued.

Item No.121.16 **Environmental Clearance for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry project of Sri. Pradeep K in Re Survey Nos: 587/46, 587/47, 587/48, 587/49, 588/3, of Kunathoor Village, Kunathoor Taluk, Kollam, Kerala
(SIA/KL/MIN/265356/2022, 3476/EC4/2019/SEIAA)**

The Authority deliberated the item and noted the decision of 133rd meeting of SEAC. The Authority noticed that the condition for submitting the Half Yearly Compliance Report was not mentioned in the EC issued and hence decided to inform SEAC not to insist to submit the CCR in this proposal. The Authority also decided that in all future cases of Laterite Building Stone quarry projects the Project Proponent has to submit the Half Yearly Compliance Report to IRO, MoEFCC and Parivesh Portal. For extension of such ECs, the Project Proponent should submit the mandatory CCR from the IRO, MoEFCC, Bangalore.

Item No.121.17 **Judgment of Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in WP(C) No. 5093 of 2022 dated 23.02.2022 filed by Sri. Nizamudheen K.S.
&
Judgment of Hon'ble High Court of Kerala in WP(C) No. 15258 of 2022 dated 06.05.2022 filed by Sri. Nizamudheen K.S
(File No: 538/SEIAA/EC3/3881/2014)**

The Authority deliberated the item—and noted the request of the Project Proponent to cancel the EC. The Authority noted that the 133rd SEAC observed that the maps uploaded along with the mining plan submitted by the Project Proponent was not legible. The elevation details provided in the mining plan and that in the drainage map are different. The cluster certificate dated 14.7.2022 indicates the project area as 0.6070 Ha. Besides, the survey numbers in the EC order and that in the cluster certificate are different. Further, the Project Proponent has not submitted the survey map that shows the distance to nearby built structures, revised scheme of mining, depth to the groundwater table, etc. The Certified Compliance Report from the Regional Office of the MoEF & CC, Bangalore is also missing. The Committee decided to defer the application till the Project Proponent submits the application with all required details and documents.

The Authority observed that the SEIAA has complied with the directions of Hon'ble High Court by providing opportunity to submit the application as directed by the Hon'ble Court. Since, the Project Proponent has requested for the cancellation of existing EC, the Authority agreed to the request of the Project Proponent. The Project Proponent should carry out the mandatory mine closure activities as per KMMC Rules, otherwise, future applications of the Project Proponent before SEIAA will not be considered.

Item No.121.18 **Environmental Clearance for Granite Building Stone Quarry of M/s. Jesus Granites Pvt. Ltd. over an area of 1.4962 Hectare, situated in Survey No. 916/1-2, 916/1-2-2, 916/3-4, 917/1, 1122/1 of Kallorkad Village, Muvattupzha Taluk of Ernakulam District and Kerala (SIA/KL/MIN/277815/2022; File No: 2050/EC3/2022/SEIAA)**

&

Item No.121.19 **Environmental Clearance for Granite Building Stone Quarry of M/s. Jesus Granites Pvt. Ltd. over an area of 1.4781 Hectare, situated in Survey No. 911/1-5, 916/3, 916/3-2, 916/3-3, 916/3-4 of Kallorkad Village, Muvattupzha Taluk of Ernakulam District and Kerala (SIA/KL/MIN/276958/2022; File No: 2049/EC3/2022/SEIAA)**

The Authority deliberated the item and noted the decision of 134th SEAC meeting, which sought advice from SEIAA on whether separate applications for EC in the adjacent plot can be considered or not. The Authority noticed that the two quarries belonging to single owner are adjacent to each other and if the two projects are considered as a single unit the environmental mitigation measures are more effective and there will be more production, which benefits the Project Proponent too. Hence the Authority directed the Project Proponent to consider it as a single unit and submit the EIA/EMP for further appraisal. The SEAC shall appraise the project as and when the Project Proponent submits the required EIA/EMP.

Item No.121.20

**Violation of Environmental Clearance Conditions by Granite Building Stone Quarry owned by Shri. Jeemon Mathew - Reported by Secretary Manakkad Grama Panchayat - DEIAA, Idukki issued EC
(File No. 0090/EC3/2022/SEIAA)**

The Authority deliberated the item and noted that no reply was received from the District Geologist, Idukki till date on the complaint forwarded as per the decision of 113th SEIAA. The Authority decided to issue a letter to the Director, Mining & Geology by attaching the request of the Secretary, Manakkad Grama Panchayat for expediting the matter. The copy of the letter may be marked to the District Geologist & the Secretary, Manakkad Grama Panchayat for necessary action.

Item No.121.21

**Environmental Clearance issued to the mining of Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Eldho Kuruvilla, for an extent of a 8.7668 Ha in Re-Survey Nos. 283, 282/3-1, 282/3- 3pt. of Mazhuvannoor Village & Re Survey Nos. 284/1-2, 284/1-3, 284/2-2Pt., 284/2- 3pt., 285/4, 283/2-5-2, 283/2-3-2, 282/1-3-1-2 in Block No. 28 of Arackappady Village, Kunnathunad Taluk, Ernakulam, Kerala.
(SIA/KL/MIN/144152/2020, 1392/EC2/2019/SEIAA)**

The Authority perused the item-and noted the contents the copy of letter to the Authority from IRO, MoEFCC, which was addressed to the District Collector, Ernakulam, for information

and necessary action. The Authority noted that no reply has been received from the District Collector, Ernakulam on the complaints forwarded on various dates. The Authority decided to forward a reminder to the District Collector requesting to give the reply to MoEFCC within 15 days with a copy to SEIAA for necessary actions, if any.

Item No: 121.22

Environmental Clearance for the Proposed Building Stone Quarry Project in Re-survey No. 168, Karukutty Village & Karukutty Grama Panchayat, Alwaye Taluk, Ernakulam, Kerala by Mr. Saji Vadakkekara (Proprietor), M/s Planters Aggregates - Judgment dated 11-09-2021 in WP (C) 16230 of 2021 filed by M/s Planters Aggregates - Revalidation of EC (File No. 1065/SEIAA/EC3/1912/2016)

The Authority perused the item and observed that as per the direction of the Hon'ble Court in Judgment dated 11.09.2021 in WP(C) No.16230 of 2021, the SEAC had appraised the proposal, conducted field verification on 18.06.2022 and then the 131st SEAC meeting recommended the project for revalidation of EC with a project life of 30 years from the date of issuance of original EC (22.12.2017). As per the request of the Project Proponent an opportunity of hearing was given during the 120th meeting of SEIAA and the Authority verified the hearing notes submitted by the Project Proponent and found no reasons to deny the EC, as mentioned in the complaint.

Authority decided to revalidate the EC initially for a period of 5 years for the quantity mentioned in the approved Mining Plan and then to extend the EC period to cover project life of 30 years, from the date of issuance of original EC i.e. 22.12.2017, subject the following additional Specific Conditions in addition to the Specific and General Conditions already issued. The revalidation is subject to the review by SEAC at the end of five years, to verify whether the Project Proponent has caused any damage to the Environment in the Project Region by violating any EC conditions.

- 1. Buffer Zone with a width of 7.5m should be maintained all around the Project area*
- 2. Green belt along Buffer Zone should be strengthened by planting vegetation of indigenous species*

3. *Garland Canal with silt traps, siltation pond and outflow channel covering the entire project area and connectivity to the nearest natural drain should be provided.*
4. *More number of Avenue trees should be planted and nurtured*
5. *The cleaning and desiltation of silt traps, siltation pond and outflow channel should be done periodically and geotagged photographs of the process should be included in the HYCR*
6. *Over flow water from siltation pond should be discharged to the nearby natural drain after adequate filtration*
7. *Overburden should be stored at the designed place and it should be protected with retaining/protective wall of appropriate size.*
8. *In the wake of occurrence of large scale landslides in the state, as per the information provided by the Department of Mining & Geology, it is directed to use only NONEL (Non Electrical) technology for blasting to reduce the vibration of the ground, which is one of the causative factors that triggers landslides, formation of cracks in the surrounding buildings and disturbance to human and wildlife.*
9. ***Blasting mats should be used during rock blasting to contain the blast, prevent fly rocks and suppress dust.***
10. *The violation of EC condition may lead to cancellation of EC and action under The Environment (Protection) Act 1986.*

Item No.121.23

**Environmental Clearance for the mining of Granite Building Stone Quarry Project at Survey No.78/2A Kumaranellur Village, Kozhikode Taluk, Kozhikode District, Kerala. (Judgment in WP (C) No.10301/2021 filed by Sri.Habeebu Rahiman P.M, M/s Profile Sand - regarding the validity of EC.
(File No. 130/SEIAA/KL/2437/2013)**

The Authority deliberated the item and noted the contents of the letter of Project Proponent dated 31.10.2022, requesting to withdraw the application for revalidation and the decision of 134th SEAC meeting. The Authority observed that the SEAC had conducted the field inspection on 01.10.2022 for the second time to verify the observations of 116th SEIAA. SEAC recommended that the proponent is not eligible for revalidation as the environmental clearance

was issued for entire mine life mentioned in the approved mining plan. Hence, the Authority accepted the request of the project proponent to withdraw the revalidation application.

Authority also decided to inform SEAC to appraise the extension application separately and furnish definite recommendation based on field inspection and compliance status of original EC.

Item No.121.24 **Environmental clearance for the quarry project in Sy.No. 78/2A Pt at Kumaranellur Village, Karassery Panchayath, Kozhikode Taluk, Kozhikode District, Kerala by Sri. Habeebu Rahiman P.M (Judgment in WP(C) No.12391/2020 filed by Sri. Habeebu Rahiman P.M, Kozhikode - regarding the validity of EC).
(File No.646/EC4/4949/2014/SEIAA)**

The Authority deliberated the item and noted the contents of letter of Project Proponent dated 31.10.2022, requesting to withdraw the application for revalidation and the decision of 134th SEAC meeting. The Authority observed that the SEAC had conducted the field inspection on 01.10.2022 for the second time to verify the observations of 116th SEIAA. SEAC recommended that the proponent is not eligible for revalidation as the environmental clearance was issued for entire mine life mentioned in the approved mining plan. So the Authority accepted the request of the project proponent to withdraw the revalidation application.

Authority also decided to inform SEAC to appraise the extension application separately and furnish definite recommendation based on field inspection and compliance status of original EC.

Item No.121.25 **Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project in Sy.No.1618 (Not final) at Koodaranji Village, Koodaranji Panchayth, Thamarassery Taluk, Kozhikode District. (Judgment in WP (C) No.9574/2021 filed by Sri.Abdul Muneer.C, M/s Indo Black Stone - regarding the validity of EC).
(File No.862/SEIAA/EC4/2991/2015)**

The Authority deliberated the item and noted the decision of 134th SEAC meeting. The Committee after verification of the documents and hearing note and the withdrawal request of the Project Proponent dated 31.10.2022, found that there is no reason to accept the contentions in

the hearing note and hence decided to adhere to the earlier decision to recommend rejection of the revalidation proposal due to the non-compliance of EC condition.

The Authority decided to accept the recommendation of SEAC to reject the proposal due to the following non-compliance of EC conditions.

- 1. Proper drainage system in accordance with the slope is not maintained; hence erosion/siltation is higher.*
- 2. Proper benches as per the EC conditions are not maintained and hence the slope of the quarry face is more than 45° at places*
- 3. The garland canal and the drainage systems are not maintained properly.*
- 4. The extent of erosion and consequent siltation is higher due to inadequate protective measures.*
- 5. Green belt development in the buffer zone is inadequate.*
- 6. Loose soil and overburden are spread over the existing benches and nearby places.*
- 7. Overburden dumping site is not managed properly.*
- 8. Area falls in the moderate hazard zone and suitable environmental management initiatives are not taken by the Project Proponent.*

Authority further decided the following as the EC conditions remain non-complied:

- 1. The Project Proponent should follow the procedure to surrender the EC as detailed in OM of the MoEF & CC dated 29.3.2022 as recommended by SEAC.***
- 2. The SEAC shall assess the environmental damage that occurred due to the non-compliance of the EC condition and report the District geologist to recover the same.***
- 3. The District Geologist shall take necessary action for the violation of KMMC Rules and mine plan, if any.***

ItemNo.121.26 Complaint against the quarry project at Peringome Village, Payyannur Taluk, for the quarry of M/s Southern Granites - reg [File No.1120/EC/SEIAA/KL/2017]

The Authority perused the item and noted the contents of the letter No. DCKNR/11154/2020-DM6 dated 02.12.2022 of the District Collector, Kannur. The Authority

observed that there is a violation of EC conditions and the Half Yearly Compliance Reports were also not submitted by the Project Proponent. The Authority decided to forward a letter to the Project Proponent enquiring about the submission of the Half Yearly Compliance Reports with proof. Authority also decided to inform the Mining & Geology Department to take appropriate action against the Project Proponent for the violation of KMMC Rules, if any.

Item No.121.27 Application for Environmental Clearance by Mr. Mathew, M/s Alacode Granites for mining of Granite Building Stone Quarry project in Survey No 292/1 A of Vellad Village, Thaliparamba Taluk, Kannur, Kerala (File No. 1277(A)/EC2/2019/SEIAA)

The Authority perused the item and noted the decision of 134th SEAC to reject the proposal. The Authority examined the request of the Project Proponent dated 21.10.22 and observed that the SEAC had evaluated the report of NIT, Suratkal and assessed the details of the project including the field inspection report, other studies and reports etc., and finally recommended to reject the proposal. As the decision of the SEAC was taken after completing all the mandatory appraisal procedures before its recommendation, there is no need to consider the request of the Project Proponent to conduct one more field visit. Hence, the Authority decided to agree with the recommendation of SEAC and rejected the project proposal due to the following reasons.

1. The site falls in the middle portion of an elongated and highly steep slope with significant overburden thickness and hence very fragile.
2. The site falls in the medium hazard zone in continuation to the very near high hazard zone as per the landslide hazard zonation map and hence the terrain is very fragile and hazard prone.
3. The slope condition, steepness of slope in the upper and lower portion of site, soil characteristics, overburden thickness, surface and subsurface hydraulic characteristics and the high magnitude and high intensity rainfall characteristics of the area enhances the hazard potential of the site and surrounding areas.

4. Land based hazards such as soil piping and landslides are reported in the nearby places of similar terrain characteristics and therefore high magnitude and high intensity human interventions such as quarrying will enhance the hazard potential.

Item No.121.28 Reconsideration of Rejected Environmental Clearance for Granite building stone quarry Project at Re-Sy Block No. 2, Re.Sy.No.114pt in Chekkyad Village, Vadakara Taluk, Kozhikode, Kerala (SIA/KL/MIN/140734/2020; 1429/EC3/2019/SEIAA)

The Authority perused the item and noted the decision of 134th SEAC meeting. The Committee verified the documents submitted by the Project Proponent and found that the modified mining plan is not approved by Mining and Geology Department. The Project Proponent stated that he will leave out the area in the moderate hazard zone as buffer zone and mining will not be done in that area. However, the hill is highly elevated with steep slope and the proposed area is in the moderate hazard zone in continuation to high hazard zone with deep soil condition and hence it is not feasible to allow mining in the location. The SEAC further observed that the revised condition as informed by the Project Proponent is not acceptable and based on the Precautionary Principle, the Committee recommended to reject the proposal. **Hence the Authority decided to reject the proposal as recommended by SEAC on the basis of the observations made by SEAC.**

The Authority also observed that the approval of Mining Plan is the mandate of Mining and Geology Department and SEIAA has no role to intervene the matter.

Item No: 121.29 Environmental Clearance for the proposed laterite building stone quarry project in Re.Sy.No.113/21 (113/2) at Mavoor Village, Kozhikode Taluk, Kozhikode, Kerala by Sri. Suresh.T- Judgment dated 03.03.2022 in WP©No.7019/2022- (File No.1737/EC4/2020/SEIAA)

The Authority deliberated the item and noted that EC was issued on 05.10.2021 for the period of two years from the date of issue of permit from the Department of Mining & Geology. The Authority observed that based on the complaint against the EC, the Sub-Committee of SEAC conducted the field visit on 29.09.2022 and recommended the EC for two years with some additional safeguard conditions. The Committee in its 134th SEAC meeting noted that the complainant, Smt. Sreeja has withdrawn the complaint and recommended the EC for two years. **The Authority observed that there is no need to issue new EC and hence decided to include the following specific conditions to the EC already issued by SEIAA on 05.10.2021.**

1. Strengthen the southern boundary by terracing or contour bunding and submit geo-tagged photographs as proof.
2. Connect the drainage to the local drain and submit geo-tagged photographs of the compliance as proof.
3. Shift the OB dump on the uphill of the western boundary to the designated OB dumping site or to the mined-out areas and submit geo-tagged photographs as proof.
4. Provide appropriate fencing all around the excavated pit to prevent any mishap and strengthen the fencing, especially on the western and southern boundary.

An erratum shall be issued in this effect.

Item No.121.30 **Complaint against the laterite building stone quarry project of Smt. Prajeena Parayil in Block No. 210, Re-Sy No. 2/106 in Padiyoor Village, Iritty Taluk, Kannur, Kerala**
(SIA/KL/MIN/187772/2020; 1857/EC4/2020/SEIAA)

The Authority deliberated the item and noted the contents of the letter no. DCKNR/11216/2022-DM6 dated 02.12.2022 from the District Collector, Kannur stating that many complaints have been received against the laterite stone quarry and an investigation was conducted on 05.11.2011 by a District Level Committee and the report was forwarded to SEIAA for further clarification. The Authority decided to forward the report to SEAC to examine the report of the Sub Collector and suggest additional safety measures if any.

Item No.121.31 **Complaint against the laterite building stone quarry project of Smt. Prajeena Parayil in Block No. 87, Re-Sy. No. 35/1638 at Nuchiyad Village, Iritty Taluk, Kannur, Kerala.**
(SIA/KL/MIN/187777/2020; 1856/EC4/2020/SEIAA)

The Authority deliberated the item and noted letter no. DCKNR/11216/2022-DM6 dated 02.12.2022 from the District Collector, Kannur stating that many complaints have been received against the laterite stone quarry and an investigation was conducted on 05.11.2011 by a District Level Committee and the report was forwarded to SEIAA for further clarification. The Authority decided to forward the report to SEAC to examine the report of the Sub Collector and suggest additional safety measures if any.

Item No.121.32 **Environmental Clearance for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Ravi Paleri in Re. Sy. No. 275/1A pt, in Triprangottur Village, Thalassery Taluk, Kannur, Kerala**
(SIA/KL/MIN/126728/2019; 1782/EC4/2020/SEIAA)

The Authority deliberated the item and noted that the Project Proponent had filed WP(C) No. 40316/2022 before the Hon'ble High Court with a prayer to stay the operation of Exts. P4, P10 and P11 (the minutes of SEAC, SEIAA & Order of Rejection) and all further proceeding thereon, pending disposal of the writ petition. The Authority decided to direct the Standing Counsel to defend the Case before the Hon'ble High Court and await for the judgment.

Item No.121.33 **Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Habeebullah M. A. in Thirumeni Village, Thaliparamba Taluk, Kannur, Kerala**
[File No. 2051/EC4/SEIAA/2022]

The Authority perused the item and noted that the Hon'ble High Court in its Judgment dated 22.11.2022 in WP (C) No. 33867/2022 directed SEIAA to give an opportunity of hearing to the petitioner. As directed by the Hon'ble High Court the Authority decided to give an

opportunity of hearing the petitioner in the forthcoming SEIAA meeting. The intimation regarding the same shall be given well in advance.

Item No:121.34 **Environmental Clearance for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. K. Sudhakaran, Managing Partner, M/s Kanakakunnu Stone Industries & M-Sand for an area of 3.450 ha, in Sy. No. 292/1A in New Naduvil Village, Thaliparamba Taluk, Kannur.**
File No. 2381/EC4/2022/SEIAA

The Authority deliberated the item and noted that the Hon'ble High Court directed SEIAA to consider the matter afresh in accordance to law, within four months from the date of receipt of the file from the District Collector. The documents were transferred to SEIAA vide File No. 163 /ECA /KNR /2018 /DEIAA dated 17.09.2022 of DC, Kannur. However, as per the existing norms, the EC applications should be submitted through PARIVESH Portal of MoEFCC. Hence the Authority decided to direct the Project Proponent to apply afresh in PARIVESH portal for Environmental Clearance and SEAC shall consider the proposal giving priority.

Item No.121.35 **Environmental Clearance for Laterite Building Stone Quarry project of Sri. Moyimonul Rasheed in Re-Sy No. 44/1, 41/1 at Thalikulathur Village, Kozhikode Taluk, Kozhikode, Kerala - (Contempt Case filed by Sri. Chandhukutty in violation of the Judgment dated 28.02.2020 in WP (C) No. 5572/2019)**
(SIA/KL/MIN/150010/2020; 1627/EC4/2020/SEIAA)

The Authority perused the item and noted that the Contempt Case No. 2129/201 was disposed by the Hon'ble High Court vide Order dated 24.11.2022 to grant EC by affording a hearing to the Project Proponent and the Petitioners. The Authority heard the Project Proponent, the Petitioner and the Panchayat Authority in its 114th meeting, perused the hearing notes submitted and refer the case back to SEAC for conducting field inspection and for definite recommendations. The Authority also noted the decisions of various SEAC meetings and the field inspection report of the Sub-Committee and observed that the 134th meeting of SEAC

recommended EC for a project period of 2 years subject to certain specific conditions in addition to the general conditions.

The Authority decided to issue Environmental Clearance for the project period of 2 (two) years, for the quantity mentioned in the approved Mining Plan, subject to the following Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

- 1. The Project Proponent shall carry out quarrying as per the approved Mining Plan and the Specific Conditions mentioned hereafter. The Project Proponent should strictly follow the Kerala Minor Mineral Concession Rules 2015 and its amendments thereby.*
- 2. The EC shall be valid from the date of execution of the permit/lease from the Department of Mining and Geology. A copy of the lease order should be provided to the SEIAA before commencing the mining activity.*
- 3. The validity of EC may be limited as per the mine plan but the quantity to be extracted may be limited to a total of 40,075 MT only.*
- 4. The overland drainage channel will have to be laid prior to the commencement of mining as per the plan and details submitted and it should be managed with utmost care by preventing any obstructions to the flow and periodical removal of the silt deposited.*
- 5. The mine pit should not be used as percolation pond or for storage of water. The entire storm water from the site should be drained out through the drainage system developed.*
- 6. Sprinkling of water should be done on the un surfaced road prior to each movement of truck. The Project Proponent should undertake a phased restoration and shall complete this work along with the completion of the mining operations.*
- 7. As it is a fully exposed, elevated hard terrain, a Horti-Sylvi approach with initially fast-growing trees like Subabul on the overburden followed by a cashew or bamboo plantations should be adopted.*
- 8. The filled-up pits with the waste/OB materials to be covered with freshly removed soil mixed with sufficient organic matter to ensure fast raising of the plantation.*
- 9. As per OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30th September 2020, under Corporate Environmental Responsibility (CER) the Project Proponent shall prepare an Environment Management Plan (EMP) as directed by SEAC during appraisal, covering the issues to address the environmental problems in the project region, indicating both physical and financial targets year wise. The EMP shall be implemented in consultation*

with Local Self Govt. Institutions. The indicated cost for CER shall be 2% of the project cost depending upon the nature of activities proposed. The follow up action on implementation of CER shall be included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report which will be subjected to field inspection at regular intervals. A copy of the approved EMP shall be made available to the concerned Panchayat for information and implementation support.

- 10. In the wake of occurrence of large scale landslides in the state, as per the information provided by the Department of Mining & Geology, it is directed to use only NONEL (Non Electrical) technology for blasting to reduce the vibration of the ground, which is one of the causative factors that triggers landslides, formation of cracks in the surrounding buildings and disturbance to human and wildlife.*
- 11. As per the directions contained in the OM F.No.22-34/2018-IA.III dated 16th January 2020 issued by MoEFCC, in obedience to the directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court the Project Proponent shall, undertake re-grassing the mining area and any other area which may have been disturbed due to his mining activities and restore the land to a condition which is fit for growth of fodder, flora, fauna etc. The compliance of this direction shall be included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report which will be monitored by SEAC at regular intervals.*
- 12. The violation of EC condition may lead to cancellation of EC and action under The Environment (Protection) Act 1986.*

The petitioner Sri. Chandukuty shall also be informed the decision of SEIAA.

Item No.121.36 **Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of M/s Geo Enterprises in Re-Sy No. 29 Part of Sivapuram Village, Thamarasser Taluk, Kozhikode, Kerala.**
(SIA/KL/MIN/127262/2019; 1861/EC4/2019/SEIAA)

The Authority perused the item and noted the decision of 134th SEAC meeting. The Authority noticed that the present quarry was being mined for the last 12 years without valid EC. The Hon'ble NGT vide order dated 04.05.2022 in O.A No. 294/2022 constituted a Joint Committee to verify the factual position look into the grievance of the applicants and take

remedial action in accordance with law within one month from the date of receipt of Judgement. The Joint Committee yet to be submit the report. The Sub-Committee of SEAC conducted site visit on 04.09.2022 and based on that the SEAC in its 134th meeting recommended to delist the application till an order from Hon'ble NGT is received.

In the above circumstances, the Authority decided the following:

- 1) To delist the proposal for EC in the Parivesh Portal till the receipt of final judgement from the Hon'ble NGT.**
- 2) As per EIA Notification, prior EC is mandatory for all the mining projects irrespective of the area. Hence an explanation shall be obtained from the State Pollution Control Board on the issuance of Integrated Consent to Operate to the project without EC.**
- 3) The Director, Mining & Geology shall also be intimated to take action against those who were responsible for the issuance of permit/lease to the quarry without a valid EC.**
- 4) Wait for the receipt of the Joint Committee Report for further decision.**

Item No.121.37 **Environmental Clearance for the proposed Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Ashraf P. in Re.Sy.No.172 in Kodyathur Village, Kozhikode Taluk, Kozhikode, Kerala (SIA/KL/MIN/138725/2020; 1653/EC4/2020/SEIAA)**

The Authority deliberated the item and noted the decision of 134th SEAC meeting. The Authority decided to direct the SEAC to ascertain the cluster situation based on the S.O. 2269(E) dated 01.07.2016 of MoEFCC. The Authority also opined that SEAC has the discretion to insist public hearing and EIA study for a particular project considering the fragility of the area, proximity to other quarries, habitats, etc, even though it does not attract cluster condition.

Item No.121.38 **Environmental Clearance for the Quarry Project of Sri. Abdul Azeez, Managing Director, M/s Manjeri Bricks and Metals Pvt. Ltd in B/No. 45, Sy Nos. 276/2, 281/2 at Anakayam Village, Anakayam Panchayat and Sy. No. 244 at Manjeri Village, Manjeri Municipality, Ernadu**

**Taluk, Malappuram – Request to recall the rejection Order and to reconsider the proposal for revalidation of EC - reg :-
(File No. 537/SEIAA/EC/3880/2014)**

The Authority perused the item and noted the actions taken by SEAC in its various meetings. The Project Proponent was given an opportunity of hearing during the 114th SEIAA meeting and after verifying the hearing notes, directed to place the proposal in SEAC for one more presentation. The Project Proponent attended the presentation during the 131st and 134th SEAC meeting. The Authority noticed that SEAC had observed discrepancy in the area and survey numbers for which the EC was issued and the lease sanctioned, and recommended to reject the application for revalidation of EC with valid observations.

Authority agreed to the recommendation of SEAC to reject the proposal and inform the same to the Project Proponent quoting the reasons for rejection as mentioned in the 131st SEAC meeting.

**Item No.121.39 Environmental Clearance for the quarry project of Sri. Mayin Haji, M.C., M/s Calicut Granites (P) Ltd in Sy Nos. 266/1, 266/2, 253/5, 253/15, 253/16 and 253/17 at Cherukavu Village, Kondotty Taluk, Malappuram – Judgment dated 19.01.2021 in WP(C) No. 1123/2021 - Revalidation of EC – reg : -
(File No.676/SEIAA/KL/5356/2014)**

The Authority perused the item and noted the judgement in WP(C) No. 33286 of 2022 dated 20.10.2022 and the recommendation of SEAC in its 134th meeting. The Authority observed that as per the O.M dated 12.12.2018 of MoEFCC based on the NGT Order dated 13.09.2018 in O.A. No. 186 of 2016 “providing for EIA, EMP and therefore, public consultation for all areas from 5 to 25ha falling member Category B-2 at par with Category B-1 by SEIAA/SEAC as well as for cluster situation wherever is not provided; and if a cluster or an individual lease size exceeds 5ha, the EIA /EMP be made applicable in the process of grant of prior environmental clearance....”. However, the vide Judgement of said WP(C) dated 20.10.2022, the Hon’ble Court has stayed the resolution of 131.06 of SEAC and admitted the submission of the Petitioner that public hearing is not warranted for extending for the project of life in the mining plan, which

seems to be against the direction of the Hon'ble NGT and the Office Memorandum of MoEFCC.

Hence, the Authority decided the following:

- 1. Necessary steps shall be taken by the Standing counsel to vacate the interim stay of the Hon'ble High Court. The Legal Officer, SEIAA shall prepare a detailed counter explaining the importance of Public hearing and preparation of EIA report and EMP to safe guard the environment as made out in the NGT order.**
- 2. SEAC shall relook the decision taken in its 134th meeting.**

**Item No.121.40 Environmental Clearance for the Quarry Project of Sri. Madappan Abdul Rasheed, Managing Director, M/s. Oasis Dale Aggregate Products Pvt. Ltd in Sy.Nos.43/2 & 43/3 of Venganellur Village, Thalappilly Taluk, Thrissur – Judgment dated 18.11.2020 in WP(C) No. 25286 of 2020 – Revalidation of EC- reg :-
(File No. 2719/EC6/2021/SEIAA)**

The Authority perused the item and noted the decisions of various SEAC meetings, the field inspection report of the Sub-Committee and the CCR received from IRO, MoEF& CC, Bangalore. The SEAC in its 134th meeting has recommended the revalidation of EC with the project life of 17 years from the date of original EC i.e., 31.05.2017 subject to certain additional Specific Conditions in addition to the Specific Conditions in the original EC.

The Authority decided to revalidate the EC initially for a period of 5 years and then to extend the EC period to cover the project life of 17 years, from the date of issuance of original EC (31.05.2017), subject to the review by SEAC at the end of every five year, to verify whether the Project Proponent has violated any of the EC conditions and thereby caused any damage to the Environment in the project region by violating EC conditions. The revalidation of EC is subject to the Terms and Conditions in the original EC in addition to the General Conditions and the following Additional Specific Conditions.

- 1. The OB stored around the quarry at uphill side should be protected by providing terraces along with planting indigenous species. The lower slopes of the terraces shall be protected with geo- textiles and strengthened by planting suitable*

plants/fodder grass. Geo-tagged photographs of the same should be included in the HYCR.

- 2. The abandoned benches should be backfilled with soil and afforested and the height and width of the benches should always be maintained as per the mining plan.*
- 3. A new OB dumping site at the lower side near the north-west should be set up with retaining wall for protection.*
- 4. The buffer zone should not be used as road and green belt should be developed and strengthened with indigenous species of trees all along the buffer zone*
- 5. The green belt should be maintained on a regular basis and the status of the green belt should be uploaded along with geo-tagged photographs in the HYCR*
- 6. Implementation of the Compensatory afforestation plan should be commenced at the proposed site immediately and geo-tagged photographs as proof should be submitted.*
- 7. Garland canal, silt traps, siltation ponds, outflow channel to the nearest natural drain should be planned and implemented covering the entire project area and the overland flow should be collected and discharged to a natural stream in the valley region of the landscape through bottom and side-sealed drainage channel.*
- 8. Extreme care should be taken to prevent any blockage or diversion of surface drain in and around the project area*
- 9. The garland canal, catchwater drains, silt traps, water holding and clarifier pond and outflow channel should be cleaned and desilted periodically such that there should not be any hindrance to overland flow and geo-tagged photographs of the process should be included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report.*
- 10. No blasting should be done during the days of moderate and heavy rains considering high land fragility of the region*
- 11. **-Blasting mats should be used during rock blasting to contain the blast, prevent fly rocks and suppress dust.***
- 12. The time of blasting should be different from that of the adjacent quarry.*
- 13. Planting of trees of local species on both sides of the road within the project site should be completed prior to commencement of mining.*

14. *Mined out benches should be filled with topsoil and greening effort should be taken up in such areas. Indigenous species of plants should be given preference in the greening programme.*
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. *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).*
17. *Adequate sanitation, waste management and rest room facilities should be provided to the workers*
18. *Adequate energy conservation measures should be implemented including solar power installations.*
19. *The Project Proponent shall take immediate measures to close the abandoned quarry in the Project site as per the final closure plan in the approved mining plan and as per KMMC Rules within 6 months and a report from District Geologist shall be produced to the effect that the final closure of quarry has been done as per the approved norms of department of Mining and Geology. The compliance of this condition should also be reported in the HYCR.*

Item No. 121.41 **Application for the transfer of Environmental Clearance issued to Sri. Abdul Noushad M.H for the quarry project in Sy.No.158/1, 158/2, 158/3, 159 in Venganellor Village, Thalappilly Taluk, Thrissur (SIA/KL/MIN/294470/2022, File No.2150/EC6/2022/SEIAA)**

The Authority noted the request of Smt. Asurabi, W/o (Late) Abdul Noushad M.H, to transfer the EC in favour of her. After verifying the documents and having convinced of the reasons for transfer, the Authority agreed to transfer the EC issued to Sri. Abdul Noushad M.H for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project in Sy Nos.158/1, 158/2, 158/3, 159 in Venganellor Village, Thalappilly Taluk, Thrissur District to Smt. Asurabi, W/o (Late) Abdul Noushad M. H as per Clause 11 of EIA Notification 2006. The necessary orders in this regard shall be issued.

Item No.121.42 **Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry project of Sri. A. M. Muhammed Ali, M/s. Mubaraq Granites in Sy. No. 93/1 pt, 94 pt, 95 pt, 96 pt of Perakamannna Village, Ernad Taluk, Malappuram – Request for Revalidation (File No. 902/SEIAA/EC1/3463/2015)**

The Authority deliberated the item and noted the order of the District Collector dated 22.11.2022. The District Collector has granted operational clearance to the project vide said order. Hence the Authority decided to refer the case back to SEAC to verify the compliance status of the EC conditions and give definite recommendations to modify the EC conditions. The SEAC shall call for additional documents, conduct field visit, if required before recommendation.

Item No.121.43 **Environmental clearance for the proposed building stone quarry project in Survey No. Q 02/1065 pt in Melmuri Village, Ernad Taluk, Malappuram District, Kerala by Mr.Musthafa Palakkan – Submission of EMP in compliance with the EC condition (File No. 1265/EC2/2019/SEIAA)**

The Authority deliberated the item and noted the decisions of the previous SEIAA/ SEAC meeting. Environmental Clearance was issued to the quarry project on 18.01.2020 with a Specific Condition that the Project Proponent shall submit an Environment Management Plan (EMP) as per S.O 2269 (E) dt.01.07.2016 of MoEF& CC to the satisfaction of SEAC within 6 months. The 126th meeting of SEAC held on 11th to 13th April 2022 examined the Environment Management Plan submitted by the Project Proponent in detail and certain short comings were noted.

The 114th meeting of SEIAA held on 25th & 26th May & 1st June 2022 decided to inform the Project Proponent to submit a revised EMP to the satisfaction of SEAC by attending all the observation made by SEAC within two months. Till date the Project Proponent has not submitted the revised EMP for revalidation of EC as directed by the Authority.

In the above circumstances, the Authority viewed the derelictions of the Project Proponent seriously and decided the following:

- 1) Issue a Stop Memo to the Project Proponent. Copy of the same shall be forwarded to Mining and Geology Department for necessary action.**
- 2) Issue a Show Cause Notice for the cancellation of EC. The Project Proponent should submit the explanation for the Show Cause Notice within 15 days from the date of Notice.**

Item No.121.44

**Environmental Clearance for mining of Laterite Building Stone of Sri. Sidheeq T. P., in Block No. 13, Re-Survey No. 384/1 of Muthuvalloor Village, Kondotty Taluk, Malappuram, Kerala
(File No. 1345/A2/2019/SEIAA)**

The Authority deliberated the item and noted the request of the Project Proponent dated.15.12.2022 informing that he is unable to proceed with the project since the actual owner is not willing to renew the lease contract. Hence Authority decided to delist the project with an intimation to the Project Proponent and the Mining and Geology Department.

Item No. 121.45

**Application for the transfer of Environmental Clearance issued to Sri. K. Muhammed for the quarry project in Re-Sy Nos. 168/, 282 in Anakkayam Village, Ernad Taluk, Malappuram
(SIA/KL/MIN/295247/2022, File No.1160/EC/SEIAA/KL/2017)**

The Authority noted the request of Sri. Suhaib K. to transfer the EC in favour of him. After verifying the documents and having convinced of the reasons for transfer, the Authority agreed to transfer the EC issued to Sri. K. Muhammed for The Granite Building Stone Quarry project in Re-Sy Nos. 168/, 282 in Anakkayam Village, Ernad Taluk, Malappuram District to Sri. Suhaib K., S/o Sri. K. Muhammed as per Clause 11 of EIA Notification 2006. The necessary orders in this regard shall be issued.

Item No. 121.46 **Mining activities in Ponmukham Hill spread over Vallapuzha, Nellore and Chalavara villages in Ottapalam and Pattambi Taluks in Palakkad District – request for Expert Inspection regarding.**
(File No. 2802/A2/2022/SEIAA)

The Authority deliberated the item and noted the request of the District Collector, Palakkad to conduct an inspection and furnish a report on the mining activities in Ponmukham hill spread over Vallapuzha, Nellore and Chalavara villages in Ottapalam and Pattambi Taluks in Palakkad District. Further, in the same locality, a quarry is also operating in Survey No. 59/1 in Ottapalam Taluk, Nellore Village with Environmental Clearance issued by DEIAA Palakkad on 28.04.2018. The Authority also noticed that due to complaint, the District Geologist had issued stop memo to the said quarry.

The Authority decided to refer the case to SEAC to conduct a site inspection in the said quarry and report. The District Collector may entrust any NABET Accredited Agencies to conduct EIA / EMP study of the entire region as SEAC does not have mandate and facilities to carry out such studies.

Item No.121.47 **Environmental Clearance for Building Stone Quarry Project in Survey Nos. 59/1-1,86/4 in Block No. 79 in Kootikkal Village, Kanjirapally Taluk, Kottayam District**
(SIA/KL/MIN/60903/2019; 2438/EC1/2019/SEIAA)

The Authority deliberated the item and noted the decision of 134th SEAC meeting. The Authority decided to close the physical file and to delist the online file in the Parivesh portal, since the proposed project area is in an ESA village, till a clarification is received from MoEF&CC

Item No.121.48 **Environmental Clearance for the proposed Building Stone Quarry project of Mr. Shri. Sumith Goyal, Managing Director, M/s. RDS Project Ltd in Re-Sy No. 74/1D of Kuttoor Village, Payyannur Taluk, Kannur District**

The Authority deliberated the item and noted that the Project Proponent has remitted the Environmental Compensation fund to the account maintained by KSPCB. Authority also noted that the Government has issued orders ~~by~~ for creating the Environment Benefit Fund under Reserve Funds of the Public Accounts division of the State. However, the operational procedures, the ownership and the utilization of the fund for the benefit of the environment, etc are not specific.

In the above circumstances, the Authority decided as follows:

- 1) The Finance Officer, SEIAA shall enquire and report the operational procedures, transfer of fund, utilization of the fund, etc in the next meeting.**
- 2) Draft guidelines shall be prepared by SEAC for the effective utilization of the Environment Benefit Fund and placed in the next SEIAA meeting for the perusal of the Authority..**
- 3) Inform KSPCB to transfer the fund to the Environment Benefit Fund Head of Account as and when SEIAA requests for the same .**

Item No.121.49 Minutes of the meeting held on 22nd December, 2022 in the Chamber of Additional Chief Secretary, Environment Department, Government of Kerala. (File No.3278/EC2/2022/SEIAA)

Additional Chief, Secretary, Environment Department, Government of Kerala convened a meeting for accelerating the appraisal process for ensuring the timeline stipulated in the EIA notification.. It is observed that conducting field visits for all projects irrespective of the project area is causing delays. Therefore, it was decided to explore more advanced digital technologies and GIS tools to understand the project location.

After a detailed discussion, the following decisions were taken in the meeting.

- 1) A standard format for the parameters to be analyzed through digital tools should be prepared by the GIS team in the DoE&CC and sent to SEIAA for approval.

- 2) Agencies that can prepare reports about these identified parameters can be shortlisted and empaneled.
- 3) Hands-on training on GIS is to be given to the members of SEIAA/ SEAC to familiarize them with the procedure.
- 4) The projects having an area below 5 ha can be appraised using digital tools alone without visiting the Project site. However, the SEAC is at liberty to visit the field depending on the need.

The Authority perused and discussed the item in the meeting and agreed to the recommendations except with a suggestion to modify item 4 as follows:

“The projects having an area below 5 ha can be appraised with the support of digital tools. However, the SEAC is at liberty to visit the field depending on the need”

Additional Agenda

Item No 121.50 Revision of Processing fee for EC applications:

The Processing fee levied along with the project proposals-was fixed as per G O (MS) No 15/2014 Env't dated 26-11-2014. Later the processing fee for projects with less than 1 Ha area was modified as per GO (MS) No 05/2017/Env't dated 28/04/2017. Market value of mined out materials were have also appreciated considerably during these years. Further establishment charges for appraising projects have also increased. Hence the rates require revision as proposed below. The authority discussed the issue in detail and found that these rates are to be revised considering the cost escalation etc. Hence the Authority decided to request Government of Kerala to modify/revise the present rates which was fixed in way back in 2014, as proposed below.

| No | Item | Present | Proposed |
|----|--|---------------|---------------|
| 1 | Processing fee for processing applications for environmental clearance of projects other than mining | Rs. 2.00 Lakh | Rs. 3.00 Lakh |

| | | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| 2 | Processing fee for processing applications for environmental clearance of mining projects of area more than 10 Ha | Rs. 2.50 Lakh | Rs. 5.00 Lakh |
| 3 | Processing fee for processing applications for environmental clearance of mining projects of area less than 10 Ha but more than 5 Ha | Rs. 2.00 Lakh | Rs. 4.00 Lakh |
| 4 | Processing fee for processing applications for environmental clearance of mining projects of area less than 5 Ha but more than 1 Ha | Rs. 1.00 Lakh | Rs. 2.00 Lakh |
| 5 | Processing Fee for projects less than 1 Ha | Rs 5000 for each 10 Are or part there of | Rs 10000 for each 10 Are or part there of |

Item No 121.51 Revision of Honorarium and Sitting Fee to Chairmen SEIAA and SEAC and members of SEIAA and SEAC:

Government of India in the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change (MoEFF&CC) vide Notification No. S.O. 984(E) dated 3rd March, 2022 have re-constituted the SEIAA and SEAC in the state of Kerala for the next three years. It may be noted that the Chairman and Members of the SEIAA and SEAC have to process large number of developmental projects for environmental clearance within the stipulated time-lines based on screening of applications, evaluation of the project feasibility report, Environmental Impact Assessment report, Environmental Management Plan and detailed environmental appraisal through field level inspections, study of primary and secondary data available for the area in which the projects are proposed. In addition, there are also legal and social issues and complaints to be addressed , by the Chairmen and Members of the SEIAA and SEAC in a time-bound manner.

The application for Environmental Clearance of projects are significantly increasing year after year and hence the work load of the Chairmen and Members of SEIAA and SEAC have also increased manifold. . Further, with the abolition of DEIAA and DEAC, all proposals are to be appraised at state level instead at district level and this has increased workload of SEIAA and SEAC manifold. Now MoEF&CC have delegated more powers to SEIAA in few cases this has added to the work load further.

It is to be noted that after the meetings and field inspection the Chairmen of SEIAA and SEAC and members of SEIAA and SEAC have to put additional effort after office hours to prepare the minutes and field reports to facilitate the issue of ECs in time so that developmental activities in the state will not suffer.

A perusal of the remuneration being paid by the MoEF&CC and the SEIAA of other states like Tamilnadu, shows that, the remuneration paid by Kerala is relatively low and not in commensurate with the time, effort, and expertise put in by them. In Tamilnadu Chairman, SEIAA , Member SEIAA and Chairman, SEAC are paid Rs 10,000/- as sitting fee/day and members pf SEAC are paid Rs 7,500/ day (copy of the G O is enclosed). The allowances and honorarium for SEIAA/ SEAC Chairman and members were fixed way back in 16.03.2017 as per GO(MS) No.02/2017/Env. Since then pay and allowances in other sectors have increased considerably. Hence the Honorarium to the Chairmen of SEIAA and SEAC and sitting fee for members has to be increased to match the increased workload and living cost. The Authority decided to recommend the following to the Government for kind consideration.

| No | Item | Present | Proposed |
|----|---|--------------------|--------------------|
| 1 | Sitting fee to Chairmen and Members of SEIAA and SEAC | Rs. 5000/- per day | Rs. 8000/- per day |
| 2 | Honorarium to Chairmen of SEIAA and SEAC | Rs. 50,000/- month | Rs. 75000/- month |

Administrator, SEIAA shall take up this with Government of Kerala for appropriate orders.

PARIVESH FILES

CONSIDERATION/RECONSIDERATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE

Item No.1 **Environmental Clearance for the Offshore Oil and Gas Exploration, Development and Production in Oil and Gas Exploratory Block: KK-OSHP-2018/1 (SIA/KL/IND2/215978/2021; 2020/EC2/2022/SEIAA)**

Sri. B.N. Sahoo, Chief General Manager, Oil India, Ltd., submitted an application for Environmental Clearance via PARIVESH Portal on 21/06/2021, for the Offshore Oil and Gas Exploration, Development and Production in Oil and Gas Exploratory Block: KK-OSHP-2018/1 of Entire Block Area 3519.69 sq.km lies in Arabian Sea of the West Coast of Kerala, Kollam Taluk, Kollam, Kerala. As per SO 236 (E) dated 16-01- 2020 of MoEF & CC all projects in respect of off-shore and onshore oil and gas exploration are categorized as ' B2' projects.

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEAC meetings held on different dates. Authority noticed that the SEAC had appraised the proposal based on Form 2, Pre-Feasibility Report, additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal. After the due appraisal, the SEAC in its 134th meeting, recommended EC, subject to certain Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

The Authority decided to issue Environmental Clearance for the period of 10 years (vide OM dated 13-12 2022), for the Offshore Oil and Gas Exploration, Development and Production in Oil and Gas, subject to the following Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

- 1. All the marine related regulations should be complied with strictly.*
- 2. Marine biodiversity status of the area should be recorded prior to the commencement of drilling and measures for safeguarding the marine biodiversity should be adopted.*
- 3. The adverse impact on the livelihood of the fishing community, if any, should be*

monitored and mitigated appropriately.

- 4. Appropriate safeguards for preventing disturbance to benthic habitat should be adopted prior to the commencement of drilling.*
- 5. Spots of operation should be away from the marine mammal migration and feeding and breeding grounds*
- 6. Drilling activity should not be planned during the spawning periods of corals and ecologically and economically important species.*
- 7. The water quality of the project site may get affected due to accidental spillage of chemicals/oil/lubricants from the routine operational activities. Therefore, usage of only low toxicity chemicals should be ensured on board of the rig and transportation vessels.*
- 8. Drilling, wash water and oily water should be treated to conform to limits notified as per MARPOL Regulations, before disposal into sea. The treated effluent should be monitored regularly.*
- 9. The oil spill emergency response system should be strengthened with shorter response time especially during the spawning season.*
- 10. The layout of the subsea infrastructure should be designed to avoid sea bed features.*
- 11. Noise is likely to be generated during the operation phase due to the operation of rigs, generators, etc and rubber padding/noise isolators should be provided for equipment/machineries.*
- 12. CER as per norms should be extended for benefitting the fishing community and details should be submitted with HYCR.*
- 13. Project Proponent shall take all necessary clearances from all regulatory authorities related to this project before commencing the work.***
- 14. The violation of EC condition may lead to cancellation of EC and action under The Environment (Protection) Act 1986.*

Item No.2

Environmental Clearance for the Granite Quarry of Sri. Mathew Daniel in Sy. No: 340/1/99-1, 340/1/99-2, 340/1/102/2-1, 340/1/100/3, 340/1/100-4, 340/1/100-1, 340/1/100-2, 340/1/102-2, 340/1/103-1 at Enadimangalam Village, Adoor Taluk, Pathanamthitta, Kerala.

(SIA/KL/MIN/127122/2019; 1562/EC1/2019/SEIAA)

Sri. Mathew Daniel submitted application for EC via PARIVESH on 13.12.2019 for the Granite Quarry in Sy. No: 340/1/99-1, 340/1/99-2, 340/1/102/2-1, 340/1/100/3, 340/1/100-4, 340/1/100-1, 340/1/100-2, 340/1/102-2, 340/1/103-1 at Enadimangalam Village, Adoor Taluk, Pathanamthitta District, Kerala for an extent of 2.2392 Ha.

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEAC meetings held on different dates. Authority noticed that the SEAC had appraised the proposal based on Form 2, Pre-Feasibility Report, Mining Plan, additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal, and the Field Inspection Report. After the due appraisal, the SEAC in its 134th meeting, recommended EC with the project life of 12 years, subject to certain Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

Authority examined the proposal and found that the mineable reserve and mine life projected in the mining plan require some more clarifications. Hence Authority decided to inform the proponent to attend a hearing along with the RQP during the next meeting of SEIAA to clarify these issues.

Item No.3

**Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry project of Sri. Sudheesh A T in Re Survey Nos: 151/1, 151/7, of Kaniyambatta Village, Vythiri Taluk, Wayanad, Kerala
(ToR - SIA/KL/MIN/39920/2019, 1466/EC2/2019/SEIAA)
(SIA/KL/MIN/131090/2019, 1571/EC2/2019/SEIAA)**

Sri. Sudheesh A T, submitted an application for Environmental Clearance via PARIVESH Portal on 14/12/2019, for the mining of Granite Building Stone Quarry, for an area of 1.5875Ha. in Re-Sy No. 151/1, 151/7, of Kaniyambattai Village, Vythiri Taluk, Wayanad, Kerala.

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEAC meetings held on different dates. Authority noticed that the SEAC had appraised the proposal based on Form 2, Pre-Feasibility Report, Mining Plan, additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal, and the Filed Inspection Report. After the due appraisal, the

SEAC in its 134th meeting, recommended EC with the project life of 5 years, subject to certain Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

The Authority decided to issue Environmental Clearance for the project life of 5 (five) years, for the quantity mentioned in the approved Mining Plan, subject to the following Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

- 1. The Project Proponent shall carry out quarrying as per the approved Mining Plan and the Specific Conditions mentioned hereafter. The Project Proponent should strictly follow the Kerala Minor Mineral Concession Rules 2015 and amendments thereby.*
- 2. The EC shall be valid from the date of execution of permit/lease from the Department of Mining and Geology. The copy of the lease order should be provided to the SEIAA before commencing the mining activity.*
- 3. Since the quarry site is located within a distance of 10 km from Wayanad Wild Life Sanctuary, as per OM dated 8.8.2019 of MoEF&CC, Clearance from Standing Committee of the National Board for Wildlife is mandatory for mining activity. Hence the Project Proponent is directed to obtain Clearance from Standing Committee of the National Board for Wildlife before starting any activity at the site.*
- 4. Authority makes it amply clear that EC issued does not necessarily imply that Wildlife clearance shall be granted to the Project Proponent and that the proposal for Wildlife clearance will be considered by the respective Authorities on its merit and decision taken accordingly. The investment made in the project if any based on this EC in anticipation of clearance from Wildlife angle shall be entirely at the cost and risk of the Project Proponent and MoEF&CC and SEIAA shall not be responsible in this regard in any manner.*
- 5. The approach road should be widened to a width of at least 7 m and developed prior to the commencement of mining and it should be maintained well and dust-free by providing sprinkler arrangements.*
- 6. Development of green belt using species recommended in the biodiversity assessment report should be initiated prior to the commencement of mining.*
- 7. Compensatory afforestation prior to commencement of mining by planting of local species of trees as described in the biodiversity assessment report in the available land*

owned by the proponent, preferably at the lower elevated portion for compensating the lack of feasibility o develop green belt along 100 m length of the buffer zone.

- 8. Geocoordinates of the land where compensatory afforestation is proposed should be submitted along with geo-tagged photographs of the site.*
- 9. Change the boundary pillars with concrete pillars with a minimum size of 10 cm x10 cm, marked with geo coordinates and submit geotagged photographs as proof.*
- 10. Overburden dump site should be done prior to the commencement of mining at the land available at lower elevation and the site should be protected with gabion walls.*
- 11. 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. Two additional settling tanks should be constructed to ensure discharge of clear water.*
- 12. 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).*
- 13. CER Plan should be implemented within the first 2 years and it should be operated and maintained till the mine closure plan is implemented.*
- 14. 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).*
- 15. Adequate sanitation, waste management and rest room facilities should be provided to the workers.*
- 16. Adequate energy conservation measures proposed should be implemented including solar power installations for street light and office*
- 17. The Environment Management Cell (EMC) should include an Environment expert the proceedings of the monthly meeting of the Environment Management Cell (EMC) should be submitted along with the HYCR*
- 18. The drain water quality should be monitored regularly by an NABL accredited lab to ensure the discharge of only clear water to the natural stream.*
- 19. The Project Proponent shall take immediate measures to close the abandoned quarry in the Project site as per the final closure plan in the approved mining plan and as per KMMC Rules within 6 months and a report from District Geologist shall be produced to the effect that the final closure of quarry has been done as per the approved norms of*

department of Mining and Geology. The compliance of this condition should also be reported in the HYCR.

- 20. A copy of the EC shall be marked to IGF (WL), MoEF&CC, PCCF and Chief wild life Warden, Kerala, SEAC, District Collector, Palakkad and Director Mining and Geology, Department of Industries GOK, besides others for information and necessary further action.*
- 21. **Blasting mats should be used during rock blasting to contain the blast, prevent fly rocks and suppress dust.***
- 22. The Project Proponent should comply with the OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30th September 2020, under Corporate Environmental Responsibility (CER).The indicated cost for implementation of CER activities is 2 % of the total project cost. The Project Proponent should implement the Environment Management Plan (EMP) along with CER as directed by SEAC during appraisal, covering the issues to address the environmental problems in the project region from the beginning of the project itself. The EMP/CER shall be implemented in consultation with Local Self Govt. Institutions. The year wise physical and financial targets implemented as part of EMP/CER shall be included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report, which will be subjected to field inspection at regular intervals. A copy of the approved EMP/CER shall be made available to the concerned Panchayat for information and implementation support.*
- 23. In the wake of occurrence of large scale landslides in the state, as per the information provided by the Department of Mining & Geology, it is directed to use only NONEL (Non Electrical) technology for blasting to reduce the vibration of the ground, which is one of the causative factors that triggers landslides, formation of cracks in the surrounding buildings and disturbance to human and wildlife.*
- 24. As per the directions contained in the OM F.No.22-34/2018-IA.III dated 16th January 2020 issued by MoEF&CC, in obedience to the directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court the Project Proponent shall, undertake re-grassing the mining area and any other area which may have been disturbed due to his mining activities and restore the land to a condition which is fit for growth of fodder, flora, fauna etc. The compliance of this direction shall be included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report which will be*

monitored by SEAC at regular intervals.

25. The violation of EC condition may lead to cancellation of EC and action under The Environment (Protection) Act 1986.

Item No. 4 **Environmental Clearance for the Building Stone Quarry project of Sri. Safarulla K in Re Survey Nos: 320/1 & 321/2 of Vorkady Village, Manjeshwaram Taluk, Kasargod, Kerala
(SIA/KL/MIN/134824/2020, 1729/EC2/2020/SEIAA)**

Sri. Safarulla K, submitted an application for Environmental Clearance via PARIVESH Portal on 03/01/2020, for the mining of Granite Building Stone Quarry, for an area of 0.1920 Ha. in Re-Sy Nos. 320/1 & 321/2, of Vorkady Village, Manjeshwaram Taluk, Kasargod, Kerala.

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEAC meetings held on different dates. Authority noticed that the SEAC had appraised the proposal based on Form 2, Pre-Feasibility Report, Mining Plan, additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal, and the Filed Inspection Report. After the due appraisal, the SEAC in its 134th meeting, recommended EC with the project life of 2 years, subject to certain Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

The Authority decided to refer the proposal to SEAC to get a clarification on how a scientific mining is possible after leaving the buffer zone in such a small area of just 0.1920 ha.

Item No.5 **Environment Clearance for mining of Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of M/s. Kadanadu Granites, for an area of 0.7452 Ha. in Block No. 30, Re-Sy. Nos. 327, 1-1 & 327/1-1-1, Kadanadu Village, Meenachil Taluk, Kottayam, Kerala
(SIA/KL/MIN/136866/2020; File No: 1719/EC3/2020/SEIAA)**

Sri. Mathew Cyriac, Managing Partner, M/s. Kadanadu Granites, Kadanadu Post, Kottayam District, 686 653, submitted an application for Environmental Clearance via PARIVESH Portal on 10th June 2020, for the mining of Granite Building Stone Quarry Project

of, for an area of 0.7452 Ha. in Block No. 30, Re-Sy. Nos. 327, 1-1 & 327/1-1-1, Kadanadu Village, Meenachil Taluk, Kottayam, Kerala.

The Authority noted the action taken by SEAC in its 120th, 122nd, 126th, 128th, 130th & 134th meetings held on different dates. The Committee in its 134th meeting examined the proposal and discussed the details pertaining to the proposal. It is observed that the proposed site is located in a very steep slope on the mid slope region and the area falls in medium hazard zone. Considering the severe land fragility of the area, where the site is located, the Committee decided to recommend to SEIAA to reject the application based on Precautionary Principle.

The Authority agreed to the recommendation of SEAC to reject the proposal and inform the same to the Project Proponent quoting the reasons for rejection.

Item No.6 Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri Kumaran N.M. in Re-Sy Nos. 316/4, 320/6 in Thiruvalloor Village, Vadakara Taluk, Kozhikode, Kerala

(SIA/KL/MIN/143918/2020; 1367/EC2/2019/SEIAA)

Sri. Kumaran N.M, Nampoorikandi Meethal House, Thiruvallur P.O, Vadakara, Kozhikode-673541 submitted an application for Environmental Clearance through PARIVESH on 18.02.2020 for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project for an area of 0.5463 Ha, in Re.Sy.Nos.316/4, 320/6 in Thiruvalloor Village, Vadakara Taluk, Kozhikode, Kerala.

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEAC meetings held on different dates. Authority noticed that the SEAC had appraised the proposal based on Form 2, Pre-Feasibility Report, Mining Plan, additional details/documents obtained from the Project Proponent during appraisal, and the Filed Inspection Report. After the due appraisal, the SEAC in its 134th meeting, recommended EC with the project life of 5 years, subject to certain Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

The Authority decided to issue Environmental Clearance for the project life of 5 (five) years, for the quantity mentioned in the approved Mining Plan, subject to the following Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

1. *The Project Proponent shall carry out quarrying as per the approved Mining Plan and the Specific Conditions mentioned hereafter. The Project Proponent should strictly follow the Kerala Minor Mineral Concession Rules 2015 and amendments thereby.*
2. *The EC shall be valid from the date of execution of permit/lease from the Department of Mining and Geology. The copy of the lease order should be provided to the SEIAA before commencing the mining activity.*
3. *Development of green belt should be initiated prior to the commencement of mining operation.*
4. *The impact of vibration due to blasting on the nearest houses and built structures should be monitored in terms of Peak Particle Velocity and amplitude for maximum charge per delay and included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report.*
5. *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. Additional two settling tanks should be constructed.*
6. *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 compliance report.*
7. *Retaining wall of appropriate height should be provided at the overburden dumping*
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. *The haulage road should be developed prior to the commencement of mining and it should be maintained well with frequent sprinkling.*
11. *Adequate sanitation, waste management and rest room facilities should be provided to the workers.*
12. *Adequate energy conservation measures proposed should be implemented including solar power installations for street light and office*
13. *The Environment Management Cell (EMC) should include an Environment expert the proceedings of the monthly meeting of the Environment Management Cell (EMC) should be submitted along with the HYCR*
14. *The drain water quality should be monitored regularly by an NABL accredited lab and*

clear water should be flowed into the natural stream.

- 15. An abandoned quarry with about 15 to 25m vertical wall is located within the project area. The boundary of the abandoned quarry has to be safeguarded by providing fencing around it and the Project Proponent has to implement proper mine closure plan within one year and proof of mine closure should be included in the HYCR.*
- 16. Blasting mats should be used during rock blasting to contain the blast, prevent fly rocks and suppress dust.***
- 17. The Project Proponent should comply with the OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30th September 2020, under Corporate Environmental Responsibility (CER). The indicated cost for implementation of CER activities is 2 % of the total project cost. The Project Proponent should implement the Environment Management Plan (EMP) along with CER as directed by SEAC during appraisal, covering the issues to address the environmental problems in the project region from the beginning of the project itself. The EMP/CER shall be implemented in consultation with Local Self Govt. Institutions. The year wise physical and financial targets implemented as part of EMP/CER shall be included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report, which will be subjected to field inspection at regular intervals. A copy of the approved EMP/CER shall be made available to the concerned Panchayat for information and implementation support.*
- 18. In the wake of occurrence of large scale landslides in the state, as per the information provided by the Department of Mining & Geology, it is directed to use only NONEL (Non Electrical) technology for blasting to reduce the vibration of the ground, which is one of the causative factors that triggers landslides, formation of cracks in the surrounding buildings and disturbance to human and wildlife.*
- 19. As per the directions contained in the OM F.No.22-34/2018-IA.III dated 16th January 2020 issued by MoEF&CC, in obedience to the directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court the Project Proponent shall, undertake re-grassing the mining area and any other area which may have been disturbed due to his mining activities and restore the land to a condition which is fit for growth of fodder, flora, fauna etc. The compliance of this direction shall be included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report which will be monitored by SEAC at regular intervals.*
- 20. The violation of EC condition may lead to cancellation of EC and action under The Environment (Protection) Act 1986.*

Item No.7

Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. V. J. Chacko, M/s. Amala Granite Products for an area of 2.4929 Ha in Survey Nos: 14/6(P), 14/7(P), 14/8(P), 14/9(P) and 14/10(P) at Parlikkad Village, Thalappilly Taluk, Thrissur.

**SIA/KL/MIN/155091/2020, 1816/EC6/2020/SEIAA (EC Proposal)
&
SIA/KL/MIN/38577/2019, 1402/EC2/2019/SEIAA (ToR proposal)**

Sri. V. J. Chacko, M/s. Amala Granite Products, Vadakkethala, Pindani House, Chettupuzha P.O., Thrissur District submitted an application in SEIAA through PARIVESH on 21.12.2019 for Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry for an area of 2.4929 Ha in Survey No: 14/6(P), 14/7(P), 14/8(P), 14/9(P) and 14/10(P) at Parlikkad Village, Thalappilly Taluk, Thrissur District.

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEAC meetings held on different dates. Authority noted that the SEAC had appraised the proposal based on Form 2, Pre-Feasibility Report, Mining Plan, additional details/documents obtained from the proponent during appraisal, and the Field Inspection Report. After the due appraisal, the SEAC in its 129th meeting recommended EC for a Project Life of 8 years with certain Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

The Authority noted that for the sustainable management of quarry operations, the approved mining plan is revised every five years till the project life of mine as per KMMC Rules, incorporating scheme of activities to be carried out for the next 5 years.

The Authority decided to issue Environmental Clearance initially for a period of 5 years, and then to extend the EC period to cover the project life of 8 years, from the date of issuance of original EC, subject to the review by SEAC at the end of five years, to verify whether the Project Proponent has violated any of the EC conditions and thereby caused any damage to the Environment in the project region by violating EC conditions. Considering the depth of the water table, the depth of mining is limited to a maximum of 50 m AMSL and hence the mineable reserve is limited to 8,11,600 MT.

The EC is subject to General Conditions and the following Additional Specific Conditions.

- 1. The Project Proponent shall carry out quarrying as per the approved Mining Plan and the Specific Conditions mentioned hereafter. The Project Proponent should strictly follow the Kerala Minor Mineral Concession Rules 2015 and amendments thereby.*
- 2. The EC shall be valid from the date of execution of permit/lease from the Department of Mining and Geology. The copy of the lease order should be provided to the SEIAA before commencing the mining activity.*
- 3. The ultimate depth of mining should be limited to a maximum of 50m above MSL limiting to 2m above the groundwater table. Accordingly, the maximum number of benches should be limited to 8, maximum mineable quantity should be limited to 8,11,600 MT and the production plan should be maximum of 1,01,450 ton per annum.*
- 4. The EC issued will be subject to a review by SEAC after 5 years through filed verification to ensure that mining is carried out sustainably as per the EC conditions.*
- 5. Since the quarry site is located within a distance of 10 km from Peechi- Vazhani Wildlife Sanctuary, as per OM dated 8.8.2019 of MoEF&CC, Clearance from Standing Committee of the National Board for Wildlife is mandatory for mining activity. Hence the Project Proponent is directed to obtain Clearance from Standing Committee of the National Board for Wildlife before starting any activity at the site.*
- 6. Authority makes it amply clear that EC issued does not necessarily imply that Wildlife clearance shall be granted to the Project Proponent and that the proposal for Wildlife clearance will be considered by the respective Authorities on its merit and decision taken accordingly. The investment made in the project if any based on this EC in anticipation of clearance from Wildlife angle shall be entirely at the cost and risk of the Project Proponent and MoEF&CC and SEIAA shall not be responsible in this regard in any manner.*
- 7. Planting of trees for the development of green belt should be done prior to the commencement of mining and the green belt should be nurtured and maintained*
- 8. Compensatory afforestation should be done prior to the commencement of mining with indigenous species of trees and the geocoordinates of the afforested place with*

photographs should be provided along with HYCR.

- 9. Garland drain along with silt traps, siltation pond of appropriate volume and outflow channel should be provided covering the entire project area. The siltation pond should be provided at the lowest portion of the project area with the outflow channel connected to natural drain.*
- 10. Garland drain, silt-traps, siltation ponds, and outflow channel should be desilted periodically to prevent any obstruction to the drainage system. Geo-tagged photographs of periodic cleaning of garland canal, siltraps, siltation pond and outflow channel should be included in the half-yearly compliance report.*
- 11. A retaining wall of appropriate height should be provided for the overburden dumping site.*
- 12. Transportation of mined material should not be done during the peak hours in the forenoon (8.00am to 10.30am) and afternoon (3.30pm to 5 pm).*
- 13. Haulage road should be maintained well with frequent sprinkling of water.*
- 14. The impact of vibration due to blasting on the nearest houses and built structures should be monitored in terms of Peak Particle Velocity and amplitude for maximum charge per delay and included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report.*
- 15. Measures incorporated in the CER should be implemented in total during the first two years and they should be operated and maintained during the subsequent years till the mine closure plan is implemented in total.*
- 16. In the interest of residential buildings located at a distance of 51-200 m radius from the quarry site, the Project Proponent shall attend the following:*
 - a. An impact vibration study has to be carried out through a reputed agency and the Impact of vibration due to blasting on the nearest houses and built structures should be monitored in terms of Peak Particle Velocity and amplitude for maximum charge per delay within 3 months of commencing quarry operations and included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report. This study must be monitored by a committee which includes concerned ward member of Grama Panchayat and a representative of residents within 200 mts radius. The corrective measures have to be taken to minimize the vibration effect if any as suggested by the agency engaged for the study and the monitoring committee.*
 - b. Blasting mats should be used during rock blasting to contain the blast, prevent fly*

rocks and suppress dust.

- c. Priority should be given to the needs of local residences while implementing CER activities. If the need be the EMP approved shall be modified to accommodate these changes under intimation to SEAC*
 - d. One of the local residents shall be made member of the Environmental management cell and their grievances shall be heard and addressed.*
- 17. A copy of the EC shall be marked to IGF (WL), MoEF&CC, PCCF and Chief wild life Warden, Kerala, SEAC, District Collector, Palakkad and Director Mining and Geology, Department of Industries GOK, besides others for information and necessary further action.*
- 18. Blasting mats should be used during rock blasting to contain the blast, prevent fly rocks and suppress dust.*
- 19. The Project Proponent should comply with the OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30th September 2020, under Corporate Environmental Responsibility (CER). The indicated cost for implementation of CER activities is 2 % of the total project cost. The Project Proponent should implement the Environment Management Plan (EMP) along with CER as directed by SEAC during appraisal, covering the issues to address the environmental problems in the project region from the beginning of the project itself. The EMP/CER shall be implemented in consultation with Local Self Govt. Institutions. The year wise physical and financial targets implemented as part of EMP/CER shall be included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report, which will be subjected to field inspection at regular intervals. A copy of the approved EMP/CER shall be made available to the concerned Panchayat for information and implementation support.*
- 20. In the wake of occurrence of large scale landslides in the state, as per the information provided by the Department of Mining & Geology, it is directed to use only NONEL (Non Electrical) technology for blasting to reduce the vibration of the ground, which is one of the causative factors that triggers landslides, formation of cracks in the surrounding buildings and disturbance to human and wildlife.*
- 21. As per the directions contained in the OM F.No.22-34/2018-IA.III dated 16th January 2020 issued by MoEF&CC, in obedience to the directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court*

the Project Proponent shall, undertake re-grassing the mining area and any other area which may have been disturbed due to his mining activities and restore the land to a condition which is fit for growth of fodder, flora, fauna etc. The compliance of this direction shall be included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report which will be monitored by SEAC at regular intervals.

22. *The violation of EC condition may lead to cancellation of EC and action under The Environment (Protection) Act 1986.*

Item No.8

Environmental Clearance for the mining of ordinary clay by Sri. Sebastian Thomas from an area of 0.2509 Ha in Sy. Nos. 528/Pt 1, Analloor Village, Chalakkudy Taluk, Thrissur District

(SIA/KL/MIN/251981/2022; 2048/EC6/2022/SEIAA)

The Authority deliberated the Agenda item and noticed that the NOC submitted by the proponent on 13.12.2022 is obtained from the Agriculture Officer who is not the Competent Authority to issue the same as per the Kerala Conservation of Paddy Land and Wetland Act, 2008. Hence Authority decided to direct the proponent to submit the NOC from the Revenue Divisional Officer.

Item No.9

Environmental Clearance for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri.K.Abdul Gafoor for an area of 0.6184 Ha in Sy No-152/3-10, 152/5-3 in Payyanad Village, Ernad Taluk, Malappuram District, Kerala

(SIA/KL/MIN/252014/2022, 2071/EC6/2022/SEIAA)

Sri. K. Abdul Gafoor, S/o Karuvadan Mohammed, Karuvadan House, Payyanad post, Manjeri, Malappuram submitted an application for Environmental Clearance through PARIVESH on 15.08.2022 for the Laterite Building Stone Quarry Project for an area of 0.6184 Ha in Sy No-152/3-10, 152/5-3, Payyanad Village, Ernad Taluk, Malappuram, Kerala.

The Authority noted the action taken by SEAC in its 132nd & 134th meetings held on different dates. The Committee in its 134th meeting heard the presentation and found that there are two sheds within 50 m and one shed is at 13m. Another building under construction is 30m. Under these circumstances, Committee decided to reject the proposal.

Authority agreed to the recommendation of SEAC to reject the proposal and inform the same to Project Proponent quoting the reasons for rejection.

Item No.10

Environment Clearance for Granite Building Stone Quarry of Sri. Johny Roy, M/s. Ronco Granite Private Limited for an area of 3.8316 Ha. at Sy. Nos.526/4B3, 527/2A2, 527/2A3, 527/5-1-2, 527/5-2-3, 527/5-3-2, 527/5-4-2, 527/5-5-2, 527/5-6-2, 529/1B-2 of Thirumarady Village, Muvattupuzha Taluk, Ernakulam District, Kerala.

(SIA/KL/MIN/44736/2019; File No: 1486/EC3/2019/SEIAA)

Sri. Johny Roy, M/s. Ronco Granite Private Limited, 199/VII, Chirayil Building, M. C. Road, Ettumanoor P.O., Kottayam submitted an application for Environmental Clearance *via* PARIVESH Portal on 04/11/2019, for the mining of Granite Building Stone Quarry for an area of 3.8316 Ha. in Sy. Nos.526/4B3, 527/2A2, 527/2A3, 527/5-1-2, 527/5-2-3, 527/5-3-2, 527/5-4-2, 527/5-5-2, 527/5-6-2, 529/1B-2 of Thirumarady Village, Muvattupuzha Taluk, Ernakulam, Kerala.

The Authority perused the proposal and noted the decisions of various SEAC meetings held on different dates. Authority noted that the SEAC had appraised the proposal based on Form 2, Pre-Feasibility Report, Mining Plan, additional details/documents obtained from the proponent during appraisal, and the Field Inspection Report. The complaint from Eliyarmala Samrakshana Samithi, forwarded by KSDMA is also verified by the Committee by conducting another field inspection. 129th SEAC meeting decided to recommend EC with Project Life of 9 years. 116th SEIAA meeting decided to refer back the proposal to SEAC for specific technical/scientific justification for recommendation, in the light of the report of KSDMA.

132nd meeting of the SEAC noted the decision of 116th SEIAA and decided to entrust Dr. K N Krishnakumar & Dr. Mahesh Mohan for field inspection and report. After the field inspection and due appraisal, the SEAC in its 134th meeting recommended EC for a Project Life of 9 years with a

condition that ***the mining should be limited to maximum depth of 120m above MSL and the 10 years of life of mine proposed in the Mine Plan get reduced to 9 years*** along with certain Specific Conditions in addition to the General Conditions.

The Authority noted that for the sustainable management of quarry operations, the approved mining plan is revised every five years till the project life of mine as per KMMC Rules, incorporating scheme of activities to be carried out for the next 5 years.

The Authority decided to issue Environmental Clearance initially for a period of 5 years, for the quantity mentioned in the approved mining plan, and then to extend the EC period to cover the project life of 9 years, from the date of issuance of original EC, subject to the review by SEAC at the end of five years, to verify whether the Project Proponent has violated any of the EC conditions and thereby caused any damage to the Environment in the project region by violating EC conditions.

The EC is subject to General Conditions and the following Additional Specific Conditions.

1. *The Project Proponent shall carry out quarrying as per the approved Mining Plan and the Specific Conditions mentioned hereafter. The Project Proponent should strictly follow the Kerala Minor Mineral Concession Rules 2015 and amendments thereby.*
2. *The EC shall be valid from the date of execution of permit/lease from the Department of Mining and Geology. The copy of the lease order should be provided to the SEIAA before commencing the mining activity.*
3. ***The mining should not be done beyond the depth of 120m above MSL and hence life of mine is 10 years proposed in the Mine Plan get reduced to 9 years.***
4. *The EC issued will be subject to a review by SEAC after 5 years through filed verification to ensure that mining is carried out sustainably as per the EC conditions.*
5. *The portion off the boundary pillar no. 3 is very steep and therefore an increased buffer zone of 15 m should be provided between BP3 and BP4.*
6. *The built structure (located at a distance of 45m from the site marked as site office in the survey map) in the adjacent plot which was reported to be owned by the proponent should be removed before mining. An affidavit to this effect should be provided by the proponent.*

7. *The road to the project area should be widened to permit two-way traffic and photograph of the widened road should be submitted prior to the commencement of mining.*
8. *The garland canal, silt traps, siltation pond and outflow channel connecting natural drain should be provided prior to the commencement of mining to ensure adequate drainage of the area.*
9. *The garland drain, silt traps, siltation pond, and outflow channel should be desilted and cleaned periodically and geotagged photographs should be incorporated in the half yearly compliance report.*
10. *Green belt development in the buffer should be done in the first year of the project itself and it should be nurtured and maintained in subsequent years*
11. *Measures incorporated in the CER should be implemented in total during the first two years and they should be operated and maintained during the subsequent years till the mine closure plan is implemented in total.*
12. *Transportation of mined material should not be done during the peak hours in the forenoon (8.30am to 10.30am) and afternoon (3.30pm to 5 pm).*
13. *The OB dumping site should be provided with protection wall.*
14. *The width of the buffer zone should be enhanced from 7.5 m to 15m along the boundary from BP2-BP3-BP4-BP-5-BP6-BP7-BP8- BP8 considering the steepness of the adjacent terrain.*
15. *A temporary wall of height 3m may be erected all around the mine boundary providing main entry and intermittent emergency exit ways.*
16. *The compliance of EC conditions should be reviewed after 5 years.*
17. *Blasting mats should be used during rock blasting to contain the blast, prevent fly rocks and suppress dust.*
18. *The Project Proponent should comply with the OM no F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated 30th September 2020, under Corporate Environmental Responsibility (CER). The indicated cost for implementation of CER activities is 2 % of the total project cost. The Project Proponent should implement the Environment Management Plan (EMP) along with CER as directed by SEAC during appraisal, covering the issues to address the environmental problems in the project region from the beginning of the project itself. The EMP/CER shall be implemented in consultation with Local Self Govt. Institutions. The year wise physical and financial targets implemented as part of EMP/CER shall be included in the*

Half Yearly Compliance Report, which will be subjected to field inspection at regular intervals. A copy of the approved EMP/CER shall be made available to the concerned Panchayat for information and implementation support.

- 19. In the wake of occurrence of large scale landslides in the state, as per the information provided by the Department of Mining & Geology, it is directed to use only NONEL (Non Electrical) technology for blasting to reduce the vibration of the ground, which is one of the causative factors that triggers landslides, formation of cracks in the surrounding buildings and disturbance to human and wildlife.*
- 20. As per the directions contained in the OM F.No.22-34/2018-IA.III dated 16th January 2020 issued by MoEF&CC, in obedience to the directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court the Project Proponent shall, undertake re-grassing the mining area and any other area which may have been disturbed due to his mining activities and restore the land to a condition which is fit for growth of fodder, flora, fauna etc. The compliance of this direction shall be included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report which will be monitored by SEAC at regular intervals.*
- 21. The violation of EC condition may lead to cancellation of EC and action under The Environment (Protection) Act 1986.*

Item No.11

**Environmental Clearance for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Mr.Abdul Rasack.P for an area of 2.1509 Ha in Survey No. 95/9-3, 95/7-4 in Mankada Village, Perinthalmanna Taluk, Malappuram District, Kerala
(SIA/KL/MIN/161069/2020, 1799/EC6/2020/SEIAA)**

As intimated by SEIAA, the proponent, Sri. Abdul Rasack P and on behalf of Sri. Abdu Haji (petitioner), Adv. Abdussalam P.M have attended for hearing and explained their averments. The Authority after hearing directed them to submit the hearing note within 7 days for further decision to be taken in the next SEIAA meeting.

**CONSIDERATION/RECONSIDERATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL
CLEARANCE(Extension/Amendment/Corrigendum)**

Item No.1 **Granite Building stone quarry of “Sri. Saji K Alias, M/s Mariyem Industries, Kuzhikandathil House, Thiruvaniyoor P O, Ernakulam At Survey No: 302/6, 302/7-1, 302/7-2, 302/8, 302/1- 2, 298/15, 298/14, 298/16, 298/13, 298/12, 302/2-2, 301/1, 301/2, 302/5-1, 302/5-2-2, in Thiruvaniyoor Village, Muvattupuzha Taluk, Ernakulam District, Kerala State - Extension of EC**

Judgment in IA. No. 2/2022 dated 23-02-2022 in WP(C) No. 15475/2016 (H) filed by Sri. Saji K. Elais, Kuzhikandathil House, Thiruvaniyoor P.O., Ernakulam-682 308

(SIA/KL/MIN/262617/2022 File No. 553/SEIAA/KL/4087/2014)

The Authority perused the item and noted the decisions of various SEAC meetings and the field inspection report of the Sub-Committee of SEAC. The Committee in its 133rd SEAC meeting recommend to SEIAA to issue stop memo with immediate effect and initiate action for violating EC conditions. As per the direction in the Judgment dated 04.11.2022 of Hon’ble High Court in WP(C) No. 35464 / 2022, the 120th SEIAA meeting held on 25th & 26th November 2022 heard the proponent and directed him to submit the hearing note.

On verification of the hearing note submitted by the Project Proponent on 02.12.2022, the Authority observed that the request for extension of EC cannot be considered due to grave irregularities committed by the Project Proponent. Under the circumstances, the Authority decided the following

- 1) The application for extension shall be rejected**
- 2) Issue Stop Memo to the quarry with EC No. 43/2018**
- 3) The District Geologist, Ernakulam may be provided with the findings of SEAC and he may be requested to take appropriate action against violation noticed in both the quarries . The action taken report may be submitted to SEIAA within two months.**

CONSIDERATION OF TOR PROPOSALS

Item No.1

**ToR Application for the Granite Building Stone Quarry Project of Sri. Vinod Bhaskar, for an area of 0.5910 ha in Survey No. 391/5/4/10, Varappetty Village, Kothamangalam Taluk, Ernakulam, Kerala
(SIA/KL/MIN/403837/2022, File No: 2127/EC3/2022/SEIAA)**

Sri. Vinod Bhaskar, Vattakaithayil (House) Enanalloor (P.O) Ernakulam submitted an application for ToR via PARIVESH Portal on 03/11/2022 for the Building Stone Quarry Project for an area of 0.5910 Ha located at Survey no.391/5/4/10 Varappetty Village, Kothamangalam Taluk, Ernakulam, Kerala.

The Authority noted that SEAC in its 134th meeting examined the proposal and decided to recommend Standard ToR for conducting EIA study and evolving EMP with certain additional study. The Authority decided to approve the Standard Terms of Reference with the following additional aspects for EIA Study as recommended by SEAC.

1. Breach potential study.

Item No.2

**Application for ToR for the Common Biomedical Waste Treatment Facility of IMAGE-IMA at Adoor in Endaimangalam Village, Adoor, Pathanamthitta, Kerala
(SIA/KL/INFRA2/404217/2022; 2125/EC1/2022/SEIAA)**

Indian Medical Association (IMA) Kerala, State Head Quarters, Anayara P.O, Thiruvananthapuram applied for ToR via PARIVESH on 03.11.2022 for the Common Biomedical Waste Treatment Facility of IMAGE-IMA at Adoor in Endaimangalam Village, Adoor, Pathanamthitta District, Kerala. The proposed Common Biomedical Waste Treatment Facility, where bio-medical waste, generated from the health care establishment in the southern districts of Thiruvananthapuram, Kollam, Alappuzha, and Pathanamthitta in Kerala is suitably

treated as per the prescribed procedure and norms. The proposed capacity is 20,000Kg/day (20TPD).

The Authority noted that SEAC in its 133rd meeting recommended the Standard ToR with certain additional aspects. However, the studies recommended by the SEAC was pertaining to mining projects, which seems to be typographical error. Therefore, the Authority clarified the matter with SEAC Chairman, and decided to delete the additional studies recommended by SEAC.

The Authority decided to approve the Standard Terms of Reference to conduct EIA Study, subject to the conditions that the study should be based on the Letter of MoEFCC vide D.O No.20/4/2021-HSMD dated 18.10.2022, which recommended Gap Analysis Study, highlighting the difference in the BMW generated vis-à-vis the treatment capacity available in the State.

**Sd/-
Dr. H. Nagesh Prabhu IFS (Retd)
Chairman, SEIAA**

**Sd/-
Dr. V. Venu IAS
Member Secretary, SEIAA**

**Sd/-
Sri. K.Krishna Panicker
Member, SEIAA**