

Proceedings of the 289th SEAC Meeting held on 12th and 13th January- 2023

Members present in the meeting

1.	Shri. Venugopal V	Chairman
2.	Dr. Shekar H.S	Member
3.	Dr. J.B Raj	Member
4.	Shri. Nanda Kishore	Member
5.	Dr. S.K. Gali	Member
6.	Shri. Dinesh MC	Member
7.	Shri. Devegowda Raju	Member
8.	Shri. Sharanabasava Chandrashekhar Pilli	Member
9.	Shri. J G Kaveriappa	Member
10.	Shri. Mahendra Kumar M C	Member
11.	Shri. B V ByraReddy	Member
12.	Dr. Sarvamangala R. Patil	Member
13.	Shri. B. Ramasubba Reddy	Member
14.	Sri. R Gokul, IFS	Member Secretary


Officials present

1	Kirankumar B S	Sc O-1
2	Suhas H S	Sc O-1

The Chairman welcomed the members and initiated the discussion. The proceedings of the 288th SEAC meeting held on 21st, 22nd & 23rd of December 2022 was read and confirmed.

Directions required from SEIAA for appraising proposals in SEAC,

- In order to maintain uniformity in Screening & Scoping while categorizing mining proposals as per EIA Notification, 2006, as a Violation Category, the Committee after discussion decided to obtain clear directions from SEIAA regarding the cutoff date that needs to be considered in order to categorize a proposal as violation based on the earlier workings.***
- In respect of MoEF & CC O.M dated 07.07.2021 regarding SoP for Identification and handling of Violation cases under EIA 2006, the Committee after discussion had decided to obtain directions from SEIAA regarding the procedure to be adopted while processing violation case in mining proposals as per SoP, when the violation had occurred on Government land.***



Fresh Projects

EIA Projects

289.1 Sand Block No. BLY OSB 13 Project at Sy. No. 505 (PART) of Hacholli Village, Siraguppa Taluk, Ballari District (34-00 Acres) by M/s. Karnataka State Minerals Corporation Ltd. - Online Proposal No.SIA/KA/MIN/406939/2021 (SEIAA 422 MIN 2021)

About the project:-

Sl.No.	PARTICULARS	INFORMATION															
1	Name & Address of the Projects Proponent	M/s. Karnataka State Minerals Corporation Ltd.															
2	Name & Location of the Project	Sand Block No. BLY OSB 13 Project at Sy. No. 505 (PART) of Hacholli Village, Siraguppa Taluk, Ballari District (34-00 Acres)															
		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Points</th> <th>Longitude</th> <th>Latitude</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A</td> <td>E-76° 59' 11.2"</td> <td>N-15° 47' 49.2"</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B</td> <td>E-76° 59' 14.9"</td> <td>N-15° 47' 46.4"</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C</td> <td>E-76° 58' 55.9"</td> <td>N-15° 47' 22.6"</td> </tr> <tr> <td>D</td> <td>E-76° 58' 51.9"</td> <td>N-15° 47' 26.0"</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Points	Longitude	Latitude	A	E-76° 59' 11.2"	N-15° 47' 49.2"	B	E-76° 59' 14.9"	N-15° 47' 46.4"	C	E-76° 58' 55.9"	N-15° 47' 22.6"	D	E-76° 58' 51.9"	N-15° 47' 26.0"
Points	Longitude	Latitude															
A	E-76° 59' 11.2"	N-15° 47' 49.2"															
B	E-76° 59' 14.9"	N-15° 47' 46.4"															
C	E-76° 58' 55.9"	N-15° 47' 22.6"															
D	E-76° 58' 51.9"	N-15° 47' 26.0"															
3	Type Of Mineral	Sand Block															
4	New / Expansion / Modification / Renewal	New															
5	Type of Land [Forest, Government Revenue, Gomal, Private / Patta, Other]	Government															
6	Area in Acres	34-00 Acres															
7	Annual Production (Metric Ton / Cum) Per Annum	69,744 Tons/annum for 3 years &1,04,618 Tons/annum for 2 years(including waste)															
8	Project Cost (Rs. In Crores)	Rs. 1.00 Crore (Rs. 100 Lakhs)															
9	Proved Quantity of mine/ Quarry- Cu.m / Ton	2,09,236Tons(including waste)															
10	Permitted Quantity Per Annum - Cu.m / Ton	68,349Tons/annum for 3 years &1,02,526Tons/annum for 2 years(excluding waste)															
11	CER Activities:	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Location (CER)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2022-23</td> <td>Afforestation on both side of TB river towards north of Hacholli sand block no 13 for 1 kms (5m each side)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2023-24</td> <td>Afforestation on both side of TB river north Hacholli sand block no 13 for 1 kms (5m each side)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Location (CER)	2022-23	Afforestation on both side of TB river towards north of Hacholli sand block no 13 for 1 kms (5m each side)	2023-24	Afforestation on both side of TB river north Hacholli sand block no 13 for 1 kms (5m each side)									
Year	Location (CER)																
2022-23	Afforestation on both side of TB river towards north of Hacholli sand block no 13 for 1 kms (5m each side)																
2023-24	Afforestation on both side of TB river north Hacholli sand block no 13 for 1 kms (5m each side)																
12	EMP Budget	Rs. 1.50 Lakhs (Capital Cost) & Rs. 1.50Lakhs (Recurring cost)															
13	Forest NOC	13.01.2022															
14	Quarry plan	19.01.2022															
15	Cluster Certificate	25.03.2021															




16	Notification	17.08.2020
17	DTF	31.07.2020
18	P.H.	07.06.2022
19	JIR	3 mtrs
20	Irrigation NoC	06.01.2022

The proposal is for River Bed Sand Mining and SEIAA had issued ToR on 06.12.2021 and Public hearing was conducted on 07.06.2022.

There is an existing cart track road to a length of 470 meters connecting the lease area to the all-weather black topped road and the committee informed that the mining operation should be commenced after cement concreting the approach road as per standard norms and the committee informed the proponent to grow trees all along the approach road and in the banks of the river, to strictly implement bund protection works, dust mitigation measures and not to use any machinery for excavation of sand as per Hon'ble NGT (SZ) Directions in O.A 194/2020 dated 15.09.2022 and also not to carry out in-stream mining and the proponent agreed for all. Proponent informed the committee that they had obtained DMG approved replenishment report for the proposed sand quarry considering the catchment area and rain fall details. Further the committee sought clarification for dry weather flow, for which the proponent submitted google earth images of February, March and April 2022 showing dry weather flow and informed the committee mining operations would be carried out only in dry weather conditions.

The proponent has collected baseline data of air, water, soil and noise and all are within the permissible limits. The proponent informed that all mitigative measures will be taken to ensure that the parameters will be maintained within the permissible limits. In the proposed project, the proponent agreed to follow the conditions stipulated in sustainable sand mining guidelines 2016 and Enforcement & Monitoring guidelines 2020. Further Committee informed the proponent, to implement wildlife conservation plan after getting it approved by competent authority and to comply with the observations/requests in Public Hearing and the proponent agreed.

The committee noted that the baseline parameters are found to be within permissible limits and the committee by considering the proved mineable reserve of 2,09,236 Tones (including waste) as per the approved quarry plan, the committee after discussion decided to recommend the proposal to SEIAA for issue of Environmental Clearance for an annual production of 69,744 Tons/annum for 3 years & 1,04,618 Tons/annum for 2 years (including waste), after due replenishment every year and with a condition to abide by the Sustainable sand mining guidelines 2016 and Enforcement & Monitoring Guidelines 2020 and adhere by the Hon'ble NGT Directions in O.A 194/2020 dated 15.09.2022 and any violation against the Directions of Hon'ble NGT Directions in O.A 194/2020 dated 15.09.2022 the proponent to be held responsible.

Action: Member Secretary, SEAC to forward the proposal to SEIAA for further necessary action.




289.2 Nagalapura Sand Block Project at Sy. No.145 (P) of Nagalapura Village, Siraguppa Taluk, Ballri District (15-00 Acres) by M/s. Karnataka State Minerals Corporation Ltd. - Online Proposal No.SIA/KA/MIN/406504/2021 (SEIAA 423 MIN 2021)

About the project:-

Sl.No.	PARTICULARS	INFORMATION															
1	Name & Address of the Projects Proponent	M/s. Karnataka State Minerals Corporation Ltd.															
2	Name & Location of the Project	Nagalapura Sand Block Project at Sy. No.145 (P) of Nagalapura Village, Siraguppa Taluk, Ballri District (15-00 Acres)															
		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Points</th> <th>Longitude</th> <th>Latitude</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A</td> <td>E-76° 56' 41.2"</td> <td>N-15° 40' 56.9"</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B</td> <td>E-76° 56' 44.4"</td> <td>N-15° 40' 58.3"</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C</td> <td>E-76° 56' 53.0"</td> <td>N-15° 40' 41.8"</td> </tr> <tr> <td>D</td> <td>E-76° 56' 49.8"</td> <td>N-15° 40' 40.4"</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Points	Longitude	Latitude	A	E-76° 56' 41.2"	N-15° 40' 56.9"	B	E-76° 56' 44.4"	N-15° 40' 58.3"	C	E-76° 56' 53.0"	N-15° 40' 41.8"	D	E-76° 56' 49.8"	N-15° 40' 40.4"
Points	Longitude	Latitude															
A	E-76° 56' 41.2"	N-15° 40' 56.9"															
B	E-76° 56' 44.4"	N-15° 40' 58.3"															
C	E-76° 56' 53.0"	N-15° 40' 41.8"															
D	E-76° 56' 49.8"	N-15° 40' 40.4"															
3	Type Of Mineral	Nagalapura Sand Block															
4	New / Expansion / Modification / Renewal	New															
5	Type of Land [Forest, Government Revenue, Gomal, Private / Patta, Other]	Government															
6	Area in Acres	15-00 Acres															
7	Annual Production (Metric Ton / Cum) Per Annum	28,535 Tons/annum for 3 years & 42,802 Tons/annum for 2 years(including waste)															
8	Project Cost (Rs. In Crores)	Rs. 0.50 Crores (Rs. 50 Lakhs)															
9	Proved Quantity of mine/ Quarry- Cu.m / Ton	85,604Tons(including waste)															
10	Permitted Quantity Per Annum - Cu.m / Ton	27,964 Tons/annum for 3 years & 41,946Tons/annum for 2 years(excluding waste)															
11	CER Activities:	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Location (CER)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2022-23</td> <td>Afforestation on both side of Hagari river near Nagalapura for 0.5 kms (5 mtrs on each side = 0.5 Ha)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2023-24</td> <td>Afforestation on both side of Hagari river near Nagalapura for 0.5 kms (5 mtrs on each side = 0.5 Ha)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Location (CER)	2022-23	Afforestation on both side of Hagari river near Nagalapura for 0.5 kms (5 mtrs on each side = 0.5 Ha)	2023-24	Afforestation on both side of Hagari river near Nagalapura for 0.5 kms (5 mtrs on each side = 0.5 Ha)									
Year	Location (CER)																
2022-23	Afforestation on both side of Hagari river near Nagalapura for 0.5 kms (5 mtrs on each side = 0.5 Ha)																
2023-24	Afforestation on both side of Hagari river near Nagalapura for 0.5 kms (5 mtrs on each side = 0.5 Ha)																
12	EMP Budget	Rs. 1.80 Lakhs (Capital Cost) & Rs. 1.50 lakhs (Recurring cost)															
13	Forest NOC	08.12.2021															
14	Quarry plan	19.01.2022															
15	Cluster Certificate	25.03.2021															
16	Notification	17.08.2020															

17	DTF	31.07.2020
18	P.H.	07.06.2022
19	JIR	3 mtrs
20	Irrigation NoC	06.01.2022

The proposal is for River Bed Sand Mining and SEIAA had issued ToR on 06.12.2021 and Public hearing was conducted on 07.06.2022.

There is an existing cart track road to a length of 830 meters connecting the lease area to the all-weather black topped road and the committee informed that the mining operation should be commenced after cement concreting the approach road as per standard norms and the committee informed the proponent to grow trees all along the approach road and in the banks of the river, to strictly implement bund protection works, dust mitigation measures and not to use any machinery for excavation of sand as per Hon'ble NGT (SZ) Directions in O.A 194/2020 dated 15.09.2022 and also not to carry out in-stream mining and the proponent agreed for all. Proponent informed the committee that they had obtained DMG approved replenishment report for the proposed sand quarry considering the catchment area and rain fall details. Further the committee sought clarification for dry weather flow, for which the proponent submitted google earth images of March and April 2022 showing dry weather flow and informed the committee mining operations would be carried out only in dry weather conditions.

The proponent has collected baseline data of air, water, soil and noise and all are within the permissible limits. The proponent informed that all mitigative measures will be taken to ensure that the parameters will be maintained within the permissible limits. In the proposed project, the proponent agreed to follow the conditions stipulated in sustainable sand mining guidelines 2016 and Enforcement & Monitoring guidelines 2020. Further Committee informed the proponent, to implement wildlife conservation plan after getting it approved by competent authority and to comply with the observations/requests in Public Hearing and the proponent agreed.

The committee noted that the baseline parameters are found to be within permissible limits and the committee by considering the proved mineable reserve of 85,604 Tones (including waste) as per the approved quarry plan, the committee after discussion decided to recommend the proposal to SEIAA for issue of Environmental Clearance for an annual production of 28,535 Tons/annum for 3 years & 42,802 Tons/annum for 2 years (including waste), after due replenishment every year and with a condition to abide by the Sustainable sand mining guidelines 2016 and Enforcement & Monitoring Guidelines 2020 and adhere by the Hon'ble NGT Directions in O.A 194/2020 dated 15.09.2022 and any violation against the Directions of Hon'ble NGT Directions in O.A 194/2020 dated 15.09.2022 the proponent to be held responsible.

Action: Member Secretary, SEAC to forward the proposal to SEIAA for further necessary action.




289.3 Suguru Sand Block Project at Sy. Nos.2(P) to 12(P) of Suguru Village, Shorapur Taluk, Yadgiri District (50-00 Acres) by M/s. Hutti Gold Mines Company Ltd. - Online Proposal No.SIA/KA/MIN/404170/2021 (SEIAA 420 MIN 2021)

About the project:-

Sl.No.	PARTICULARS	INFORMATION															
1	Name & Address of the Projects Proponent	M/s. Hutti Gold Mines Company Ltd.															
2	Name & Location of the Project	Suguru Sand Block Project at Sy. Nos.2(P) to 12(P) of Suguru Village, Shorapur Taluk, Yadgiri District (50-00 Acres)															
		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Points</th> <th>Longitude</th> <th>Latitude</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A</td> <td>E-76° 49' 29.57"</td> <td>N-16° 25' 34.34"</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B</td> <td>E-76° 49' 30.38"</td> <td>N-16° 25' 30.78"</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C</td> <td>E-76° 48' 33.43"</td> <td>N-16° 25' 21.69"</td> </tr> <tr> <td>D</td> <td>E-76° 48' 32.08"</td> <td>N-16° 25' 25.43"</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Points	Longitude	Latitude	A	E-76° 49' 29.57"	N-16° 25' 34.34"	B	E-76° 49' 30.38"	N-16° 25' 30.78"	C	E-76° 48' 33.43"	N-16° 25' 21.69"	D	E-76° 48' 32.08"	N-16° 25' 25.43"
Points	Longitude	Latitude															
A	E-76° 49' 29.57"	N-16° 25' 34.34"															
B	E-76° 49' 30.38"	N-16° 25' 30.78"															
C	E-76° 48' 33.43"	N-16° 25' 21.69"															
D	E-76° 48' 32.08"	N-16° 25' 25.43"															
3	Type Of Mineral	Suguru Sand Block															
4	New / Expansion / Modification / Renewal	New															
5	Type of Land [Forest, Government Revenue, Gomal, Private / Patta, Other]	Government.															
6	Area in Acres	50-00 Acres															
7	Annual Production (Metric Ton / Cum) Per Annum	2,08,818 Tons/ Annum (including waste)															
8	Project Cost (Rs. In Crores)	Rs. 1.75 Crores (Rs. 175 Lakhs)															
9	Proved Quantity of mine/ Quarry-Cu.m / Ton	2,08,818 Tons(including waste)															
10	Permitted Quantity Per Annum - Cu.m / Ton	1,87,936 Tons/ Annum (excluding waste)															
11	CER Activities:	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Location (CER)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2022-23</td> <td>Afforestation on either side of Krishna river for 1 kms (5 mtrs on each side = 1.00 Ha)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2024-25</td> <td>Afforestation on either side of Krishna river for 1 kms (5 mtrs on each side = 1.00 Ha)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Location (CER)	2022-23	Afforestation on either side of Krishna river for 1 kms (5 mtrs on each side = 1.00 Ha)	2024-25	Afforestation on either side of Krishna river for 1 kms (5 mtrs on each side = 1.00 Ha)									
Year	Location (CER)																
2022-23	Afforestation on either side of Krishna river for 1 kms (5 mtrs on each side = 1.00 Ha)																
2024-25	Afforestation on either side of Krishna river for 1 kms (5 mtrs on each side = 1.00 Ha)																
12	EMP Budget	Rs. 3.00 Lakhs (Capital Cost) & Rs. 2.25Lakhs (Recurring cost)															
13	Forest NOC	12.11.2021															
14	Quarry plan	02.02.2022															
15	Cluster Certificate	19.02.2021															
16	Notification	09.11.2020															
17	DTF	06.11.2020															

18	P.H.	14.06.2022
19	JIR	3 mtrs
20	Irrigation NoC	08.08.2022

The proposal is for River Bed Sand Mining and SEIAA had issued ToR on 06.12.2021 and Public hearing was conducted on 14.06.2022.

There is an existing cart track road to a length of 1500 meters connecting the lease area to the all-weather black topped road and the committee informed that the mining operation should be commenced after cement concreting the approach road as per standard norms and the committee informed the proponent to grow trees all along the approach road and in the banks of the river, to strictly implement bund protection works, dust mitigation measures and not to use any machinery for excavation of sand as per Hon'ble NGT (SZ) Directions in O.A 194/2020 dated 15.09.2022 and also not to carry out in-stream mining and the proponent agreed for all. Proponent informed the committee that they had obtained DMG approved replenishment report for the proposed sand quarry considering the catchment area and rain fall details. Further the committee sought clarification for dry weather flow, for which the proponent submitted google earth images of March and April 2022 showing dry weather flow and informed the committee mining operations would be carried out only in dry weather conditions.

The proponent has collected baseline data of air, water, soil and noise and all are within the permissible limits. The proponent informed that all mitigative measures will be taken to ensure that the parameters will be maintained within the permissible limits. In the proposed project, the proponent agreed to follow the conditions stipulated in sustainable sand mining guidelines 2016 and Enforcement & Monitoring guidelines 2020. Further Committee informed the proponent, to implement wildlife conservation plan after getting it approved by competent authority and to comply with the observations/requests in Public Hearing and the proponent agreed.

The committee noted that the baseline parameters are found to be within permissible limits and the committee by considering the proved mineable reserve of 2,08,818 Tones (including waste) as per the approved quarry plan, the committee after discussion decided to recommend the proposal to SEIAA for issue of Environmental Clearance for an annual production of 2,08,818 Tons/annum for 5 years (including waste), after due replenishment every year and with a condition to abide by the Sustainable sand mining guidelines 2016 and Enforcement & Monitoring Guidelines 2020 and adhere by the Hon'ble NGT Directions in O.A 194/2020 dated 15.09.2022 and any violation against the Directions of Hon'ble NGT Directions in O.A 194/2020 dated 15.09.2022 the proponent to be held responsible.

Action: Member Secretary, SEAC to forward the proposal to SEIAA for further necessary action.




289.4 Gugal Sand Block Project at Sy. Nos.7, 8, 9 & 10 of Gugal Village, Devadurga Taluk, Raichur District (25-00 Acres) by M/s. Hutti Gold Mines Company Ltd. - Online Proposal No.SIA/KA/MIN/404179/2021 (SEIAA 428 MIN 2021)

About the project:-

Sl.No.	PARTICULARS	INFORMATION															
1	Name & Address of the Projects Proponent	M/s. Hutti Gold Mines Company Ltd.															
2	Name & Location of the Project	Gugal Sand Block Project at Sy. Nos.7, 8, 9 & 10 of Gugal Village, Devadurga Taluk, raichur District(25-00 Acres) <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Points</th> <th>Longitude</th> <th>Latitude</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A</td> <td>E-77°09' 14.35"</td> <td>N-16°28' 08.75"</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B</td> <td>E-77°09' 19.42"</td> <td>N-16°28' 10.60"</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C</td> <td>E-77°09' 30.35"</td> <td>N-16°27' 52.94"</td> </tr> <tr> <td>D</td> <td>E-77°09' 25.26"</td> <td>N-16°27' 51.08"</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Points	Longitude	Latitude	A	E-77°09' 14.35"	N-16°28' 08.75"	B	E-77°09' 19.42"	N-16°28' 10.60"	C	E-77°09' 30.35"	N-16°27' 52.94"	D	E-77°09' 25.26"	N-16°27' 51.08"
Points	Longitude	Latitude															
A	E-77°09' 14.35"	N-16°28' 08.75"															
B	E-77°09' 19.42"	N-16°28' 10.60"															
C	E-77°09' 30.35"	N-16°27' 52.94"															
D	E-77°09' 25.26"	N-16°27' 51.08"															
3	Type Of Mineral	Gugal Sand Block															
4	New / Expansion / Modification / Renewal	New															
5	Type of Land [Forest, Government Revenue, Gomal, Private / Patta, Other]	Government															
6	Area in Acres	25-00 Acres															
7	Annual Production (Metric Ton / Cum) Per Annum	1,04,409 Tons/ Annum (including waste)															
8	Project Cost (Rs. In Crores)	Rs. 1.00 Crores (Rs. 100 Lakhs)															
9	Proved Quantity of mine/ Quarry- Cu.m / Ton	1,04,409Tons(including waste)															
10	Permitted Quantity Per Annum - Cu.m / Ton	83,527 Tons/ Annum (excluding waste)															
11	CER Activities:	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Location (CER)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2022-23</td> <td>Plantation on both sides of river Krishna for 1 km (5 m on each side = 1 ha) towards south of Gugal sand block.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2023-24</td> <td>Plantation on both sides of river Krishna for 1 km (5 m on each side = 1 ha) towards south of Gugal sand block.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2024-27</td> <td>3 years maintenance</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Location (CER)	2022-23	Plantation on both sides of river Krishna for 1 km (5 m on each side = 1 ha) towards south of Gugal sand block.	2023-24	Plantation on both sides of river Krishna for 1 km (5 m on each side = 1 ha) towards south of Gugal sand block.	2024-27	3 years maintenance							
Year	Location (CER)																
2022-23	Plantation on both sides of river Krishna for 1 km (5 m on each side = 1 ha) towards south of Gugal sand block.																
2023-24	Plantation on both sides of river Krishna for 1 km (5 m on each side = 1 ha) towards south of Gugal sand block.																
2024-27	3 years maintenance																
12	EMP Budget	Rs. 2.00 Lakhs (Capital Cost) & Rs. 2.00Lakhs (Recurring cost)															
13	Forest NOC	10.01.2022															
14	Quarry plan	11.11.2020															
15	Cluster Certificate	18.02.2021															
16	Notification	30.07.2020															
17	DTF	03.07.2020															
18	P.H.	14.06.2022															

19	JIR	3.15 mtrs
20	Irrigation NoC	26.04.2022
21	LoI	19.08.2020

The proposal is for River Bed Sand Mining and SEIAA had issued ToR on 06.12.2021 and Public hearing was conducted on 14.06.2022.

There is an existing cart track road to a length of 1000 meters connecting the lease area to the all-weather black topped road and the committee informed that the mining operation should be commenced after cement concreting the approach road as per standard norms and the committee informed the proponent to grow trees all along the approach road and in the banks of the river, to strictly implement bund protection works, dust mitigation measures and not to use any machinery for excavation of sand as per Hon'ble NGT (SZ) Directions in O.A 194/2020 dated 15.09.2022 and also not to carry out in-stream mining and the proponent agreed for all. Proponent informed the committee that they had obtained DMG approved replenishment report for the proposed sand quarry considering the catchment area and rain fall details. Further the committee sought clarification for dry weather flow, for which the proponent submitted google earth images of February and March 2022 showing dry weather flow and informed the committee mining operations would be carried out only in dry weather conditions.

The proponent has collected baseline data of air, water, soil and noise and all are within the permissible limits. The proponent informed that all mitigative measures will be taken to ensure that the parameters will be maintained within the permissible limits. In the proposed project, the proponent agreed to follow the conditions stipulated in sustainable sand mining guidelines 2016 and Enforcement & Monitoring guidelines 2020. Further Committee informed the proponent, to implement wildlife conservation plan after getting it approved by competent authority and to comply with the observations/requests in Public Hearing and the proponent agreed.

The committee noted that the baseline parameters are found to be within permissible limits and the committee by considering the proved mineable reserve of 1,04,409Tones (including waste) as per the approved quarry plan, the committee after discussion decided to recommend the proposal to SEIAA for issue of Environmental Clearance for an annual production of 1,04,409 Tons/annum for 5 years (including waste), after due replenishment every year and with a condition to abide by the Sustainable sand mining guidelines 2016 and Enforcement & Monitoring Guidelines 2020 and adhere by the Hon'ble NGT Directions in O.A 194/2020 dated 15.09.2022 and any violation against the Directions of Hon'ble NGT Directions in O.A 194/2020 dated 15.09.2022 the proponent to be held responsible.

Action: Member Secretary, SEAC to forward the proposal to SEIAA for further necessary action.




289.5 Choudeshwarhal Sand Block Project at Sy. Nos.27/8, 31/4, 31/5, 31/6, 32/3, 33/2, 34/2 of Choudeshwarahal Village, Shorapur Taluk, Yadagiri District (35-00 Acres) by M/s. Hutti Gold Mines Company Ltd. - Online Proposal No.SIA/KA/MIN/404141/2021 (SEIAA 429 MIN 2021)

About the project:-

Sl.No.	PARTICULARS	INFORMATION															
1	Name & Address of the Projects Proponent	M/s. Hutti Gold Mines Company Ltd.															
2	Name & Location of the Project	Choudeshwarhal Sand Block Project at Sy. Nos.27/8, 31/4, 31/5, 31/6, 32/3, 33/2, 34/2 of Choudeshwarahal Village, Shorapur Taluk, Yadagiri District (35-00 Acres)															
		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Points</th> <th>Longitude</th> <th>Latitude</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A</td> <td>E-76° 51' 50.91"</td> <td>N-16° 27' 44.12"</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B</td> <td>E-76° 51' 55.59"</td> <td>N-16° 27' 42.29"</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C</td> <td>E-76° 51' 43.93"</td> <td>N-16° 27' 10.68"</td> </tr> <tr> <td>D</td> <td>E-76° 51' 40.11"</td> <td>N-16° 27' 12.33"</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Points	Longitude	Latitude	A	E-76° 51' 50.91"	N-16° 27' 44.12"	B	E-76° 51' 55.59"	N-16° 27' 42.29"	C	E-76° 51' 43.93"	N-16° 27' 10.68"	D	E-76° 51' 40.11"	N-16° 27' 12.33"
Points	Longitude	Latitude															
A	E-76° 51' 50.91"	N-16° 27' 44.12"															
B	E-76° 51' 55.59"	N-16° 27' 42.29"															
C	E-76° 51' 43.93"	N-16° 27' 10.68"															
D	E-76° 51' 40.11"	N-16° 27' 12.33"															
3	Type Of Mineral	Sand Quarry															
4	New / Expansion / Modification / Renewal	New															
5	Type of Land [Forest, Government Revenue, Gomal, Private / Patta, Other]	Government															
6	Area in Acres	35-00 Acres															
7	Annual Production (Metric Ton / Cum) Per Annum	1,46,172 Tons/ Annum (including waste)															
8	Project Cost (Rs. In Crores)	Rs. 1.50 Crores (Rs. 150 Lakhs)															
9	Proved Quantity of mine/ Quarry- Cu.m / Ton	1,46,172 Tons(including waste)															
10	Permitted Quantity Per Annum - Cu.m / Ton	1,31,555 Tons/ Annum (excluding waste)															
11	CER Activities:																
	Year	Location (CER)															
	2022-23	Afforestation on either side of Choudeshwarhal sand block for 1 kms (5 mtrs on each side = 1 Ha)															
	2023-24	Afforestation on either side of Choudeshwarhal sand block for 1 kms (5 mtrs on each side = 1 Ha)															
12	EMP Budget	Rs. 4.0 Lakhs (Capital Cost) & Rs. 2.25Lakhs (Recurring cost)															
13	Forest NOC	12.11.2021															
14	Quarry plan	22.12.2020															
15	Cluster Certificate	19.02.2021															
16	Notification	09.11.2020															
17	DTF	06.11.2020															

18	JIR	3 mtrs
19	P.H.	14.06.2022
20	Irrigation NoC	08.08.2022
21	LoI	26.11.2020

The proposal is for River Bed Sand Mining and SEIAA had issued ToR on 06.12.2021 and Public hearing was conducted on 14.06.2022.

There is an existing cart track road to a length of 1000 meters connecting the lease area to the all-weather black topped road and the committee informed that the mining operation should be commenced after cement concreting the approach road as per standard norms and the committee informed the proponent to grow trees all along the approach road and in the banks of the river, to strictly implement bund protection works, dust mitigation measures and not to use any machinery for excavation of sand as per Hon'ble NGT (SZ) Directions in O.A 194/2020 dated 15.09.2022 and also not to carry out in-stream mining and the proponent agreed for all. Proponent informed the committee that they had obtained DMG approved replenishment report for the proposed sand quarry considering the catchment area and rain fall details. Further the committee sought clarification for dry weather flow, for which the proponent submitted google earth images of March & April 2022 showing dry weather flow and informed the committee mining operations would be carried out only in dry weather conditions.

The proponent has collected baseline data of air, water, soil and noise and all are within the permissible limits. The proponent informed that all mitigative measures will be taken to ensure that the parameters will be maintained within the permissible limits. In the proposed project, the proponent agreed to follow the conditions stipulated in sustainable sand mining guidelines 2016 and Enforcement & Monitoring guidelines 2020. Further Committee informed the proponent, to implement wildlife conservation plan after getting it approved by competent authority and to comply with the observations/requests in Public Hearing and not to disturb existing irrigation pumps and the proponent agreed.

The committee noted that the baseline parameters are found to be within permissible limits and the committee by considering the proved mineable reserve of 1,46,172Tones (including waste) as per the approved quarry plan, the committee after discussion decided to recommend the proposal to SEIAA for issue of Environmental Clearance for an annual production of 1,46,172 Tons/annum for 5 years (including waste), after due replenishment every year and with a condition to abide by the Sustainable sand mining guidelines 2016 and Enforcement & Monitoring Guidelines 2020 and adhere by the Hon'ble NGT Directions in O.A 194/2020 dated 15.09.2022 and any violation against the Directions of Hon'ble NGT Directions in O.A 194/2020 dated 15.09.2022 the proponent to be held responsible.

Action: Member Secretary, SEAC to forward the proposal to SEIAA for further necessary action.




289.6 Haranagiri Sand Block Project at Sy. Nos. 170(P), 171 & 172 of Haranagiri Village, Ranebennur Taluk, Haveri District.(12-00 Acres) by M/s. Hutti Gold Mines Company Ltd. - Online Proposal No.SIA/KA/MIN/404215/2021 (SEIAA 432 MIN 2021)

About the project:-

Sl.No.	PARTICULARS	INFORMATION																					
1	Name & Address of the Projects Proponent	M/s. Hutti Gold Mines Company Ltd.																					
2	Name & Location of the Project	Haranagiri Sand Block Project at Sy. Nos. 170(P), 171 & 172 of Haranagiri Village, Ranebennur Taluk, Haveri District(12-00 Acres) <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Points</th> <th>Longitude</th> <th>Latitude</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A</td> <td>E-75° 43' 00.54"</td> <td>N-14° 46' 36.59"</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B</td> <td>E-75° 43' 05.25"</td> <td>N-14° 46' 34.16"</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C</td> <td>E-75° 43' 11.42"</td> <td>N-14° 46' 29.16"</td> </tr> <tr> <td>D</td> <td>E-75° 43' 09.19"</td> <td>N-14° 46' 26.04"</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E</td> <td>E-75° 43' 02.97"</td> <td>N-14° 46' 30.81"</td> </tr> <tr> <td>F</td> <td>E-75° 42' 58.16"</td> <td>N-14° 46' 33.42"</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Points	Longitude	Latitude	A	E-75° 43' 00.54"	N-14° 46' 36.59"	B	E-75° 43' 05.25"	N-14° 46' 34.16"	C	E-75° 43' 11.42"	N-14° 46' 29.16"	D	E-75° 43' 09.19"	N-14° 46' 26.04"	E	E-75° 43' 02.97"	N-14° 46' 30.81"	F	E-75° 42' 58.16"	N-14° 46' 33.42"
Points	Longitude	Latitude																					
A	E-75° 43' 00.54"	N-14° 46' 36.59"																					
B	E-75° 43' 05.25"	N-14° 46' 34.16"																					
C	E-75° 43' 11.42"	N-14° 46' 29.16"																					
D	E-75° 43' 09.19"	N-14° 46' 26.04"																					
E	E-75° 43' 02.97"	N-14° 46' 30.81"																					
F	E-75° 42' 58.16"	N-14° 46' 33.42"																					
3	Type Of Mineral	Chandapura Sand Block																					
4	New / Expansion / Modification / Renewal	New																					
5	Type of Land [Forest, Government Revenue, Gomal, Private / Patta, Other]	Government																					
6	Area in Acres	12-00 Acres																					
7	Annual Production (Metric Ton / Cum) Per Annum	50,116 Tons/ Annum (including waste)																					
8	Project Cost (Rs. In Crores)	Rs. 0.75 Crores (Rs. 75 Lakhs)																					
9	Proved Quantity of mine/ Quarry- Cu.m / Ton	50,116 Tons(including waste)																					
10	Permitted Quantity Per Annum - Cu.m / Ton	45,104Tons/ Annum (excluding waste)																					
11	CER Activities: <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Location (CER)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2022-23</td> <td>Afforestation on opposite side of Haranagiri sand block for 1 kms (5 mtrs on each side = 1 Ha)</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2024-25</td> <td>Afforestation on opposite side of Haranagiri sand block further for 1 kms (5 mtrs on each side = 1 Ha)</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Year	Location (CER)	2022-23	Afforestation on opposite side of Haranagiri sand block for 1 kms (5 mtrs on each side = 1 Ha)	2024-25	Afforestation on opposite side of Haranagiri sand block further for 1 kms (5 mtrs on each side = 1 Ha)															
Year	Location (CER)																						
2022-23	Afforestation on opposite side of Haranagiri sand block for 1 kms (5 mtrs on each side = 1 Ha)																						
2024-25	Afforestation on opposite side of Haranagiri sand block further for 1 kms (5 mtrs on each side = 1 Ha)																						
12	EMP Budget	Rs. 2.0 Lakhs (Capital Cost) & Rs. 1.25Lakhs (Recurring Cost)																					
13	Forest NOC	12.03.2022																					
14	Quarry plan	07.12.2020																					
15	Cluster Certificate	27.07.2021																					
16	Notification	17.08.2020																					
17	DTF	13.08.2020																					
18	P.H.	29.06.2022																					
19	JIR	3 mtrs																					

20	Irrigation NoC	21.04.2022
----	----------------	------------


The proposal is for River Bed Sand Mining and SEIAA had issued ToR on 06.12.2021 and Public hearing was conducted on 29.06.2022.

There is an existing cart track road to a length of 2000 meters connecting the lease area to the all-weather black topped road and the committee informed that the mining operation should be commenced after cement concreting the approach road as per standard norms and the committee informed the proponent to grow trees all along the approach road and in the banks of the river, to strictly implement bund protection works, dust mitigation measures and not to use any machinery for excavation of sand as per Hon'ble NGT (SZ) Directions in O.A 194/2020 dated 15.09.2022 and also not to carry out in-stream mining and the proponent agreed for all. Proponent informed the committee that they had obtained DMG approved replenishment report for the proposed sand quarry considering the catchment area and rain fall details. Further the committee sought clarification for dry weather flow, for which the proponent submitted google earth images of February & April 2022 showing dry weather flow and informed the committee mining operations would be carried out only in dry weather conditions.

The proponent has collected baseline data of air, water, soil and noise and all are within the permissible limits. The proponent informed that all mitigative measures will be taken to ensure that the parameters will be maintained within the permissible limits. In the proposed project, the proponent agreed to follow the conditions stipulated in sustainable sand mining guidelines 2016 and Enforcement & Monitoring guidelines 2020. Further Committee informed the proponent, to implement wildlife conservation plan after getting it approved by competent authority and to comply with the observations/requests in Public Hearing and the proponent agreed.

The committee noted that the baseline parameters are found to be within permissible limits and the committee by considering the proved mineable reserve of 50,116Tones (including waste) as per the approved quarry plan, the committee after discussion decided to recommend the proposal to SEIAA for issue of Environmental Clearance for an annual production of 50,116Tons/annum for 5 years(including waste), after due replenishment every year and with a condition to abide by the Sustainable sand mining guidelines 2016 and Enforcement & Monitoring Guidelines 2020 and adhere by the Hon'ble NGT Directions in O.A 194/2020 dated 15.09.2022 and any violation against the Directions of Hon'ble NGT Directions in O.A 194/2020 dated 15.09.2022 the proponent to be held responsible.

Action: Member Secretary, SEAC to forward the proposal to SEIAA for further necessary action.



289.7 Chandapura Sand Block Project at Sy. No. 2(P) of Gramathana & Sy.No.47 Chandapura of Gramathana & Chandapura Village, Ranebennur Taluk, Haveri District (30-00 Acres) by M/s. Hutti Gold Mines Company Ltd. - Online Proposal No.SIA/KA/MIN/404396/2021 (SEIAA 433 MIN 2021)

About the project:-

Sl.No.	PARTICULARS	INFORMATION															
1	Name & Address of the Projects Proponent	M/s. Hutti Gold Mines Company Ltd.															
2	Name & Location of the Project	Chandapura Sand Block Project at Sy. No. 2(P) of Gramathana & Sy.No.47 Chandapura of Gramathana & Chandapura Village, Ranebennur Taluk, Haveri District (30-00 Acres)															
		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Points</th> <th>Longitude</th> <th>Latitude</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A</td> <td>E-77° 09' 14.35"</td> <td>N-16° 28' 08.75"</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B</td> <td>E-77° 09' 19.42"</td> <td>N-16° 28' 10.60"</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C</td> <td>E-77° 09' 30.35"</td> <td>N-16° 27' 52.94"</td> </tr> <tr> <td>D</td> <td>E-77° 09' 25.26"</td> <td>N-16° 27' 51.08"</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Points	Longitude	Latitude	A	E-77° 09' 14.35"	N-16° 28' 08.75"	B	E-77° 09' 19.42"	N-16° 28' 10.60"	C	E-77° 09' 30.35"	N-16° 27' 52.94"	D	E-77° 09' 25.26"	N-16° 27' 51.08"
Points	Longitude	Latitude															
A	E-77° 09' 14.35"	N-16° 28' 08.75"															
B	E-77° 09' 19.42"	N-16° 28' 10.60"															
C	E-77° 09' 30.35"	N-16° 27' 52.94"															
D	E-77° 09' 25.26"	N-16° 27' 51.08"															
3	Type Of Mineral	Chandapura Sand Block															
4	New / Expansion / Modification / Renewal	New															
5	Type of Land [Forest, Government Revenue, Gomal, Private / Patta, Other]	Government															
6	Area in Acres	30-00 Acres															
7	Annual Production (Metric Ton / Cum) Per Annum	1,65,522 Tons/ Annum (including waste)															
8	Project Cost (Rs. In Crores)	Rs. 1.50 Crores (Rs. 150 Lakhs)															
9	Proved Quantity of mine/ Quarry- Cu.m / Ton	1,65,522 Tons(including waste)															
10	Permitted Quantity Per Annum - Cu.m / Ton	1,32,522Tons/ Annum (excluding waste)															
11	CER Activities:																
	Year	Location (CER)															
	2022-23	Afforestation on both side of Tungabhadra river southeast of Chandapura sand block for 1.50 kms (5 mtrs on each side = 1.50 Ha)															
	2024-25	Afforestation on both side of Tungabhadra river northwest of Chandapura sand block for 1.50 kms (5 mtrs on each side = 1.50 Ha)															
12	EMP Budget	Rs. 2.00 Lakhs (Capital Cost) & Rs. 1.00Lakhs (Recurring Cost)															
13	Forest NOC	12.03.2022															
14	Quarry plan	09.11.2020															
15	Cluster Certificate	27.07.2021															
16	Notification	17.08.2020															

17	DTF	13.08.2020
18	P.H.	27.06.2022
19	JIR	3 mtrs
20	Irrigation NoC	21.04.2022
21	LoI	06.10.2020

The proposal is for River Bed Sand Mining and SEIAA had issued ToR on 06.12.2021 and Public hearing was conducted on 27.06.2022.

There is an existing cart track road to a length of 2000 meters connecting the lease area to the all-weather black topped road and the committee informed that the mining operation should be commenced after cement concreting the approach road as per standard norms and the committee informed the proponent to grow trees all along the approach road and in the banks of the river, to strictly implement bund protection works, dust mitigation measures and not to use any machinery for excavation of sand as per Hon'ble NGT (SZ) Directions in O.A 194/2020 dated 15.09.2022 and also not to carry out in-stream mining and the proponent agreed for all. Proponent informed the committee that they had obtained DMG approved replenishment report for the proposed sand quarry considering the catchment area and rain fall details. Further the committee sought clarification for dry weather flow, for which the proponent submitted google earth images of February, March & April 2022 showing dry weather flow and informed the committee mining operations would be carried out only in dry weather conditions.

The proponent has collected baseline data of air, water, soil and noise and all are within the permissible limits. The proponent informed that all mitigative measures will be taken to ensure that the parameters will be maintained within the permissible limits. In the proposed project, the proponent agreed to follow the conditions stipulated in sustainable sand mining guidelines 2016 and Enforcement & Monitoring guidelines 2020. Further Committee informed the proponent, to implement wildlife conservation plan after getting it approved by competent authority and to comply with the observations/requests in Public Hearing and the proponent agreed.

The committee noted that the baseline parameters are found to be within permissible limits and the committee by considering the proved mineable reserve of 1,65,522Tones (including waste) as per the approved quarry plan, the committee after discussion decided to recommend the proposal to SEIAA for issue of Environmental Clearance for an annual production of 1,65,522Tons/annum for 5 years(including waste), after due replenishment every year and with a condition to abide by the Sustainable sand mining guidelines 2016 and Enforcement & Monitoring Guidelines 2020 and adhere by the Hon'ble NGT Directions in O.A 194/2020 dated 15.09.2022 and any violation against the Directions of Hon'ble NGT Directions in O.A 194/2020 dated 15.09.2022 the proponent to be held responsible.

Action: Member Secretary, SEAC to forward the proposal to SEIAA for further necessary action.

289.8 Residential Apartment with club house Project at Sy. Nos.32, 33, 34, 35, 36/3, 36/4 and 42 of Alahalli Village, Uttarahalli Hobli, Bangalore South Taluk, Bengaluru Urban District by M/s. NCC Urban Infrastructure Ltd. - Online Proposal No.SIA/KA/INFRA2/407188/2022 (SEIAA 165 CON 2022)

About the project:-

Sl. No	PARTICULARS	INFORMATION
1	Name & Address of the Project Proponent	Sri. J.S.R. Raju, Director M/S. NCC Urban Infrastructure Ltd At "NCC Urban Windsor" 3 rd Floor, Opposite to Jakkur Aerodrome, New Airport Road, Bengaluru-560064.
2	Name & Location of the Project	Residential Apartment with Club house Sy. Nos.32, 33, 34, 35, 36/3, 36/4 and 42 of Alahalli Village, UttarahalliHobli, Bangalore South Taluk, Bengaluru Urban Distric.
3	Type of Development	
	a. Residential Apartment / Villas / Row Houses / Vertical Development / Office / IT/ ITES/ Mall/ Hotel/ Hospital / other	Residential Apartment with Club house Category 8(a) as per EIA Notification 2006.
	b. Residential Township/ Area Development Projects	Not Applicable
4	New/ Expansion/ Modification/ Renewal	New
5	Water Bodies/ Nalas in the vicinity of project site	Avalahalli Lake is adjacent to the project site
6	Plot Area (Sqm)	19,120.81 Sqm
7	Built Up area (Sqm)	73,190.41 Sqm.
8	FAR • Permissible • Proposed	2.25 2.24
9	Building Configuration [Number of Blocks / Towers / Wings etc., with Numbers of Basements and Upper Floors]	2B+G+17UF Club house: G+2UF
10	Number of units/plots in case of Construction/Residential Township/Area Development Projects	272 No's
11	Height Clearance	As per CCZM permissible top elevation is 1035m AMSL and proposed top elevation is 962.50m AMSL
12	Project Cost (Rs. In Crores)	157.5 Crores.
13	Disposal of Demolition waste and	NA

	or Excavated earth	
14	Details of Land Use (Sqm)	
a.	Ground Coverage Area	5,489.43Sqm
b.	Kharab Land	-
c.	Total Green belt on Mother Earth for projects under 8(a) of the schedules of the EIA notification, 2006	6,309.87Sqm
d.	Paved area	4,546.23 Sqm
e.	Others Specify	Road widening area - 677.68 Sqm Service and Open areas - 2,098.60 Sqm
f.	Parks and Open space in case of Residential Township/ Area Development Projects	--
g.	Total	19,120.81 Sqm
15	WATER	
I.	Construction Phase	
a.	Source of water	STP treated water for construction purpose & Tanker water for domestic purpose.
b.	Quantity of water for Construction in KLD	10 KLD
c.	Quantity of water for Domestic Purpose in KLD	5 KLD
d.	Wastewater generation in KLD	4 KLD
e.	Treatment facility proposed and scheme of disposal of treated water	Mobile STP.
II.	Operational Phase	
a.	Total Requirement of Water in KLD	Fresh 126 KLD
		Recycled 64 KLD
		Total 190KLD
b.	Source of water	BWSSB
c.	Wastewater generation in KLD	162 KLD
d.	STP capacity	170 KLD
e.	Technology employed for Treatment	Sequence Batch Reactor (SBR) Technology
f.	Scheme of disposal of excess treated water if any	Available treated water – 154 KLD (95% of sewage water) For flushing – 64 KLD For gardening – 32 KLD For Car washing – 15 KLD Other construction purpose - 43 KLD
16	Infrastructure for Rainwater harvesting	
a.	Capacity of sump tank to store Roof run off	350 Cum (2 Days storage)
b.	No's of Ground water recharge pits	32no's
17	Storm water management plan	Separate and independent rainwater drainage system will be provided for collecting rainwater from terrace and paved area, lawn

		& roads.
18	WASTE MANAGEMENT	
	I. Construction Phase	
	a. Quantity of Solid waste generation and mode of Disposal as per norms	Quantity – 10Kg/day Solid waste will be generated and collected manually and handed over to local body for further processing
	II. Operational Phase	
	a. Quantity of Biodegradable waste generation and mode of Disposal as per norms	Quantity –256Kg/day Organic wastes will be segregated & collected separately and processed in organic waste converter Sludge generated from STP of capacity 8.1Kg/day will be reused as manure for greenery development purposes.
	b. Quantity of Non- Biodegradable waste generation and mode of Disposal as per norms	Quantity – 383kg/day Recyclable waste will be given to the waste collectors for recycling for further processing.
	c. Quantity of Hazardous Waste generation and mode of Disposal as per norms	Waste oil of 462.52 l/annum will be generated from the DG sets will be collected in leak proof barrels and handed over to the authorized waste oil recyclers.
	d. Quantity of E waste generation and mode of Disposal as per norms	E-Wastes will be collected & stored in bins and disposed to the authorized & approved KSPCB E-waste processors.
19	POWER	
	a. Total Power Requirement - Operational Phase	BESCOM – 1900 kVA
	b. Numbers of DG set and capacity in KVA for Standby Power Supply	1X500 kVA and 1X 380 kVA
	c. Details of Fuel used for DG Set	Diesel
	d. Energy conservation plan and Percentage of savings including plan for utilization of solar energy as per ECBC 2007	Energy conservation devices such as Solar energy, Copper wound transformer are proposed in the project and total savings is 22.3%.
20	PARKING	
	a. Parking Requirement as per norms	590 ECS
	b. Level of Service (LOS) of the connecting Roads as per the Traffic Study Report	LoS : B
	c. Internal Road width (RoW)	8m wide
21	CER Activities	Beautification of Avalahalli Lake by implementing stone pitching and plantation around the lake.
22	EMP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction phase • Operation Phase 	Construction phase – 12.06 lakh Operational Phase – 267 lakh

The proposal is for construction of Residential building in an area which is earmarked for residential use as per RMP of BDA.

The committee during appraisal sought clarification for drain and water body as per village map, proposed provisions for rainwater harvesting. The proponent informed that as per village map 30mtr buffer from the edge is proposed for the water body in east and for the drains passing inside the plot area proponent informed that as per RTC no B Kharab in the proposed site area and A Kharab is regularized. For harvesting rain water, they have proposed tank of 350cum for runoff from rooftop and for runoff from landscape and paved areas 32nos recharge pits proposed within the project site area. Further the committee informed the proponent to install smart metering for individual units for conservation of water for which the proponent agreed.

The proponent informed to grow total of 262 trees in the project site area. The proponent has collected baseline data of air, water, soil and noise and all are within the permissible limits. The proponent committed to take precautionary measures during and after construction to maintain the environmental parameters within permissible limits in the proposed project and agreed to comply with the ECBC and NBC guidelines for the proposed construction and adhere to the by-laws stipulated by the governing authority for buffers and setbacks.

The committee noted that the baseline parameters are found to be within permissible limits and informed the proponent to leave buffers/setbacks as per zoning regulations and harvest maximum rainwater in the proposed project area. The committee after discussion decided to recommend the proposal to SEIAA for issue of EC.

Action: Member Secretary, SEAC to forward the proposal to SEIAA for further necessary action.

289.9 River Sand Quarry Project at Sy. No. 1 of Charvaka Village, Kadaba Taluk & Dakshina Kannada District (5-27 Acres) by Sri Vijaya Kumar Sorake - Online Proposal No.SIA/KA/MIN/404776/2022 (SEIAA 469 MIN 2022)

The proponent remained absent without intimation. The committee decided to defer the appraisal of the project.

Action: Member Secretary, SEAC to put up before SEAC until for upcoming meetings.

289.10 Ordinary Sand Mining Project at Sy. Nos.118/1, 118/2, 119/1, 119/2 & 120 of Manneri Village, Badami Taluk, Bagalkot District (5-20 Acres) by Sri Chetankumar V Naikar - Online Proposal No.SIA/KA/MIN/408739/2022 (SEIAA 532 MIN 2022)

About the project:-

Sl.No.	PARTICULARS	INFORMATION
1	Name & Address of the Projects Proponent	Sri Chetankumar V Naikar
2	Name & Location of the Project	Ordinary Sand Mining Project at Sy. Nos.118/1, 118/2, 119/1, 119/2 & 120 of Manneri Village, Badami Taluk, Bagalkot District (5-20 Acres)

Corner Point No	Latitude	Longitude
A	N 15° 50' 11.5"	E 75° 41' 51.9"
B	N 15° 50' 12.6"	E 75° 41' 56.0"
C	N 15° 50' 13.0"	E 75° 41' 55.9"
D	N 15° 50' 12.2"	E 75° 41' 52.3"
E	N 15° 50' 13.1"	E 75° 41' 53.9"
F	N 15° 50' 20.1"	E 75° 42' 06.9"
G	N 15° 50' 18.7"	E 75° 42' 05.4"
H	N 15° 50' 17.5"	E 75° 42' 03.5"
I	N 15° 50' 15.0"	E 75° 42' 00.5"
J	N 15° 50' 12.9"	E 75° 41' 58.9"
K	N 15° 50' 11.9"	E 75° 41' 58.3"
L	N 15° 50' 10.8"	E 75° 41' 53.3"

3	Type Of Mineral	Ordinary Sand Quarry
4	New / Expansion / Modification / Renewal	New
5	Type of Land [Forest, Government Revenue, Gomal, Private / Patta, Other]	Patta
6	Area in Acres	5-20 Acres(2.529Ha)
7	Annual Production (Metric Ton / Cum) Per Annum	22,704 Tons/ Annum (including waste)
8	Project Cost (Rs. In Crores)	Rs. 1.40 Crores (Rs. 140 Lakhs)
9	Proved Quantity of mine/ Quarry-Cu.m / Ton	68,112 Tons(including waste)
10	Permitted Quantity Per Annum - Cu.m / Ton	22,704 Tons/ Annum (including waste)
11	CER Activities:	
	Year	Corporate Environmental Responsibility (CER)
	1st	Providing solar power panels and Health camp in nearby community places to the GHPS of Manneri village
	2nd	Conducting E-waste drive campaigns in the Manneri village
	3rd	Rain water harvesting pits to the GHPS of Manneri village
12	EMP Budget	Rs. 51.67 Lakhs (Capital Cost) & Rs. 6.46 Lakhs (Recurring cost)
13	Forest NOC	19.03.2021
14	Quarry plan	11.10.2022
15	Cluster Certificate	07.10.2022
16	Revenue NOC	10.03.2021
17	DTF	13.07.2021
18	JIR	3 mtrs

The proposal is for sand quarry project in patta land and as per the DMG letter dated 04.01.2022 there is no river bed sand mining in a radius of 5km from the proposed site area.

As per the cluster sketch there are no other leases within 500 meter radius from this lease and the total area of the present lease is 5-20 Acres and hence the project is categorized as B2.

There is an existing cart track road to a length of 870 meters connecting lease area to the all weather black topped road and the committee informed that the mining operation should be commenced after asphaltting the approach road to the quarry as per IRC norms and to strictly

implement mine closure plan effectively after mining operation and also to grow trees all along the approach road/both sides of halla during the first year of operation, for which the proponent agreed.

The proponent has collected baseline data of air, water, soil and noise and all are within the permissible limits. The proponent informed that all mitigative measures will be taken to ensure that the parameters will be maintained within the permissible limits.

The committee noted that the baseline parameters are found to be within permissible limits and the committee as per the approved quarry plan, recommended the proposal for proved mineable reserve of 68,112 Tones (including waste) and estimated the life of the quarry as 3 years. The committee after discussion decided to recommend the proposal to SEIAA for issue of Environmental Clearance for an annual production of 22,704 Tones/annum(including waste).

Action: Member Secretary, SEAC to forward the proposal to SEIAA for further necessary action.

289.11 Kuknoor Grey Granite Quarry Project at Sy.No. 84/2 of Kukanoor Village & Taluk, Koppal District (2-20 Acres) by Sri Ramesh Raju Vegesna - Online Proposal No.SIA/KA/MIN/404405/2022 (SEIAA 507 MIN 2022)

About the project:

Sl.No.	PARTICULARS	INFORMATION																		
1	Name & Address of the Projects Proponent	Sri Ramesh Raju Vegesna																		
2	Name & Location of the Project	Kuknoor Grey Granite Quarry Project at Sy.No. 84/2 of Kukanoor Village & Taluk, Koppal District (2-20 Acres)																		
		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3">DGPS READINGS OF BOUNDARY PILLARS</th> </tr> <tr> <th>POINT NAME</th> <th>LATITUDE</th> <th>LONGITUDE</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>BP-A</td> <td>N15°29'47.36562"</td> <td>E76°00'41.12569"</td> </tr> <tr> <td>BP-B</td> <td>N15°29'47.82445"</td> <td>E76°00'42.37459"</td> </tr> <tr> <td>BP-C</td> <td>N15°29'40.20127"</td> <td>E76°00'43.69938"</td> </tr> <tr> <td>BP-D</td> <td>N15°29'48.35952"</td> <td>E76°00'41.90028"</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	DGPS READINGS OF BOUNDARY PILLARS			POINT NAME	LATITUDE	LONGITUDE	BP-A	N15°29'47.36562"	E76°00'41.12569"	BP-B	N15°29'47.82445"	E76°00'42.37459"	BP-C	N15°29'40.20127"	E76°00'43.69938"	BP-D	N15°29'48.35952"	E76°00'41.90028"
DGPS READINGS OF BOUNDARY PILLARS																				
POINT NAME	LATITUDE	LONGITUDE																		
BP-A	N15°29'47.36562"	E76°00'41.12569"																		
BP-B	N15°29'47.82445"	E76°00'42.37459"																		
BP-C	N15°29'40.20127"	E76°00'43.69938"																		
BP-D	N15°29'48.35952"	E76°00'41.90028"																		
3	Type Of Mineral	Grey Granite Quarry																		
4	New / Expansion / Modification / Renewal	New																		
5	Type of Land [Forest, Government Revenue, Gomal, Private / Patta, Other]	Patta																		
6	Area in Acres	2-20 Acres																		
7	Annual Production (Metric Ton / Cum) Per Annum	7,467 Cum/ Annum (including waste)																		
8	Project Cost (Rs. In Crores)	Rs. 0.15 Crores (Rs. 15 Lakhs)																		
9	Proved Quantity of mine/ Quarry-Cu.m / Ton	52,656 Cum (including waste)																		

10	Permitted Quantity Per Annum - Cu.m / Ton	2,240 Cum/ Annum (Recovery) 5,227 cum/annum (waste)
11	CER Activities: Propose take up 500 No. of additional plantation on either side of the approach road from quarry location to Kukanoor Village Road	
12	EMP Budget	Rs. 2.87 Lakhs (Capital Cost) & Rs. 1.40Lakhs (Recurring Cost)
13	Forest NOC	17.08.2021
14	Quarry plan	17.10.2022
15	Cluster Certificate	14.10.2022
16	Revenue	19.04.2021
17	DTF	28.09.2021

As per the cluster sketch there are 04 leases including the present lease within 500 meter radius from this lease out of which 02 leases are exempted from cluster as the leases were granted prior to 09.09.2016 and the total area of remaining lease including the present lease is 6-30 Acres and hence the project is categorized as B2.

There is an existing cart track road to a length of 980 meters connecting lease area to the all weather black topped road and the committee informed that the quarrying operation should be commenced after asphaltting the approach road to the quarry as per IRC standard norms & should grow trees all along the approach road during the first year of operation, for which the proponent agreed.

The proponent has collected baseline data of air, water, soil and noise and all are within the permissible limits. The proponent informed that all mitigative measures will be taken to ensure that the parameters will be maintained within the permissible limits.

The committee noted that the baseline parameters are found to be within permissible limits and the committee as per the approved quarry plan, recommended the proposal for proved mineable reserve of 52,656 Cum(including waste) and estimated the life of the quarry as 8years. The committee after discussion decided to recommend the proposal to SEIAA for issue of Environmental Clearance for an annual production of 7,467 Cum/ Annum (including waste)

Action: Member Secretary, SEAC to forward the proposal to SEIAA for further necessary action.

Environment violation: In the light of files referred back by authority, Chairman opined - EC for minor mineral of less than 5 ha (new and leases for renewal) was made mandatory by MOEF during 2012. This was necessitated on the orders of Supreme Court. Subsequently, NGT ordered that existing operating mines of less than 5ha to obtain EC and till such time they have to stop mining activity. NGT also fixed dates for submitting application for obtaining EC for existing operating mines. Applications submitted thereafter to be treated as violation cases.

As such there are two different cut of dates to make EC mandatory for mineral if less than 5 ha -one for new and another for existing operating mines.




Further, there are discrepancies about cut off dates for new and existing leases. SEAC, is a technical appraisal body comprising technical experts. It is accepted procedure to accept the report given by appropriate Govt. authority and in this case it is DMG. It is not appropriate to decide about violation based on google image and further Committee is not equipped to ascertain Violation and decide based on google view. Scrutiny of applications based on cut off dates for new leases and existing leases to be done at the time of receipt of application by the authority. SEAC to assess the quantum of violation in terms of damages to environment and fix penalty in such violation cases in the absence of clarity on cut off dates, it is difficult for SEAC to appraise cases as Violation or Non Violation cases. Here, treating as Violation or Non violation case is based on cut off dates issued by MOEF and applications to be scrutinized accordingly at the time of receipt of application. Committee desires, based on various Court directions, Notifications, OMs issued by MOEF, SEIAA to fix cut of dates for new and existing minor mineral leases with less than 5 ha. Application to be segregated accordingly at the time of receipt of applications. Proponent to be informed, if the application to be considered under violation and applicability of SOP in such cases.

289.12 Building Stone Quarry Project at Sy.Nos.59/3, 13, 14 & 20 of Ambewadi Village, Belgaum Taluk, Belgaum District (7-10 Acres) (2.947 Ha) by Sri Maganlal Bhimaji Patel - Online Proposal No.SIA/KA/MIN/400839/2022 (SEIAA 297 MIN 2021)

The Proposal was earlier considered in 287th SEAC Meeting and the committee had recommended the proposal to SEIAA for issue of E.C. The authority in its 227th meeting referred back the proposal informing,

“ The Authority perused the proposal and took note of the recommendation of SEAC. Further, the Authority noted the complaint received vide email (Premkumar332sd@gmail.com) dated 08th December 2022. The details are as follows;

- 1. Distance between the project site and the nearby road is 33m, this road connect the nearby village and is used by the public. Proper buffer must be left.*
- 2. Within the applied lease area there is a crusher area if we check the latest google image and crushed material is also stocked inside the project site.*
- 3. Karnataka-Maharashtra State boundary is within 5km from the project boundary which is not mentioned in the form 1.*
- 4. Attiveri Bird Sanctuary is within the 10 km buffer from the project site. The distance between the project site and the Sanctuary is 5.87km*

The Authority after discussion and examination of the kml file uploaded in the 'portal is of the opinion that there might be a crusher inside the site and hence decided



to get the present status of the crusher, exact location of the crusher with coordinates and details of permissions from competent authority for setting up the crusher if the crusher is inside the proposed site for further consideration. Further, Attiveri bird sanctuary is 110 kms from the site and there is no wildlife sanctuary within 10 kms.

The Authority after discussion decided to refer file back to SEAC. The SEAC to shall examine the issues raised in the complaint and obtain requisite clarification/documents from Project Proponent / Govt. departments if necessary”.

The committee in the present meeting obtained clarification as below from project proponent / consultant for the complaint received,

1. *Complaint:Distance between the project site and the nearby road is 33m, this road connect the nearby village and is used by the public. Proper buffer must be left.*

Reply: The proponent informed that, distance between project site and nearby road 33mt as per village map and its only used by farmers to go to their agriculture field.

2. *Complaint:Within the applied lease area there is a crusher area if we check the latest google image and crushed material is also stocked inside the project site.*

Reply: The proponent informed that, in two units of crusher, one is crushing of size stones which is outside the proposed area and other unit consist of conveyor belt area of 7.5mt is in the buffer zone of the proposed area and presently is not in operation.

3. *Complaint:Karnataka-Maharashtra State boundary is within 5km from the project boundary which is not mentioned in the form 1.*


Reply: The proponent informed that Karnataka Maharashtra State boundary is about 6km from proposed area.

4. *Complaint:Attiveri Bird Sanctuary is within the 10 km buffer from the project site. The distance between the project site and the Sanctuary is 5.87km*

Reply: The proponent informed that the Attiveri bird sanctuary is 110 km from the proposed area and no wild life sanctuary with in 10 km.

The committee noted the clarification given by the proponent. The committee after discussion decided to defer the appraisal in for want of clarification for the compliant received with regard to road and crusher from DMG.

Action: Member Secretary, SEAC to putup before SEAC after submission of clarification sought.



289.13 Building Stone Quarry Project at Sy. No. 149 (P) of Hosagadde Village, Sakleshpur Taluk, Hassan District (2-38 Acres) by Sri Lakshmi Enterprises - Online Proposal No.SIA/KA/MIN/405025/2022 (SEIAA 463 MIN 2022)

The Proposal was earlier considered in 287th SEAC Meeting and the committee had recommended the proposal to SEIAA for issue of E.C. The authority in its 227th meeting referred back the proposal informing,

" The Authority perused the proposal and took note of the recommendation of SEAC. Further, the Authority noted the complaint received vide email (Premkumar332sd@gmail.com) dated 08th December 2022. The details are as follows;

- 1. There are nearby settlements within 200 m buffer from the project site, thus proper buffer should be left inside the site for blasting.*
- 2. The north-west part of project site is worked before obtaining the Environmental Clearance as In the Historical satellite image the workings are varying from 2021 to 2022. Hence this project is in violation to the EIA Notification, 2006*

The Authority perused the complaint and noted the contents of the same. The Authority also examined the documents of this proposal in the light of the complaint received and decided to refer the file back to SEAC. Therefore, the SEAC shall look into the issues raised in the complaint diligently and obtain requisite clarifications/documents from the Project Proponent or any other Govt. departments as necessary".

The committee in the present meeting obtained clarification as below from project proponent / consultant for the complaint received,


- 1. Complaint:There are nearby settlements within 200 m buffer from the project site, thus proper buffer should be left inside the site for blasting.*

Reply: The proponent informed that, there is no public structure within 200m and as per KML, S-Report issued by DMG there are scattered houses present in 250mtr from the applied area and also from Revenue NoC there is no objection from villagers.

- 2. Complaint:The north-west part of project site is worked before obtaining the Environmental Clearance as In the Historical satellite image the workings are varying from 2021 to 2022. Hence this project is in violation to the EIA Notification, 2006*

Reply: The proponent informed that, no working is carried out, however, outside the applied area some soil is removed (in the year 2017) as per the historical google image, for site clearance and levelling was done in 2021-22 for approach road to visiting officers from various departments.

The committee noted the clarification given by proponent and informed that the committee had received a complaint on 12.01.2023 signed by local villagers of Honkaravalli village Hosakote Hobli Allaru Taluk Hassan District, requesting not to give permission for the



proposed project because of below mentioned reasons. The committee served a copy of the complaint to the proponent for which the proponent submitted the following reply,

1. *Complaint: For the proposed quarry and crusher in Hosagadde village sy. No 82 and 149 is adjacent to our Honkaravalli village and within a distance of 25mt to 75mtr there are 10 houses and within a distance of 200mtr there are 22 houses and within 500mtr there are about 40 to 50 houses and all the families residing in these houses are basically depending on agriculture.*

Reply: The proponent informed that, there are no residential houses, within 200m radius from the boundary of the above proposed quarry. They have some industrial sheds, within 200m radius and all these industrial sheds are in their patta land. As per the inspection report (Form-S) issued by the Dept. of Mines & Geology, some scattered houses are present at a distance of 250m from the applied area. Further, as per Revenue NOC, there are no objections from the villagers. Also, they have already obtained Form B1 and CFE from KSPCB, for installation of Stone Crusher, towards south side of the proposed quarry area. As per the Safer Zone guidelines for stone crushers, it shall be min. 500m away from revenue village, temple and schools. Sy. No. 82, is located on North Side of the proposed quarry area, and is a govt. land, part of which belongs to forest.

2. *Complaint: The proposed quarry and crusher location is proposed adjacent to, road from Hoskote to Sakaleshpura Taluk Bandihalli Village boundary via Honnaravalli to join Nidanuru, as per village map.*

Reply: The proponent informed that, there are no public roads, within 200m from the boundary of the above proposed quarry. There are some mud roads, leading to coffee estates, agricultural patta lands etc and they have already obtained Form B1, and CFE from KSPCB. As per the Safer Zone guidelines for stone crushers, it shall be min. 200m away from NH/ SH and min. 100m away from MDR and other roads.

3. *Complaint: The waste water from the proposed crusher reaches to the agriculture tank which is at a distance of 100mtr and excess water from this tank reaches to government reservoir (tank) and all domestic animals and farmers depend on this.*

Reply: The proponent informed that, in the proposed stone crusher and M-Sand unit (towards south of the proposed quarry area) water requirement for manufacturing process, as per the CFE issued by KSPCB, is only 10 KLD and waste water will be completely recycled through the steeling tanks. Further, for the domestic sewage, they are constructing a septic tank & soak pit (as mentioned in the CFE). Hence, there will not be any kind of water outflow from the crusher & M-Sand unit.

4. *Complaint: From the proposed project location within a distance of 400mtrs there are Anganwadi Kendra and temples used by locals.*



Reply: The proponent informed that, As per KMMCR, the minimum distance required for carrying-out blasting is only 200m and the said Anganwadi Kendra is at about 400m which is greater than 200m, from the quarry area.

5. Complaint: *At a distance of about 10mtr to 500mtr from the proposed project site area, there are around 80-100 farmers work in agriculture fields.*

Reply: The proponent informed that, they are proposing wet drilling and controlled blasting in proposed quarry, to reduce the dust generation, As Low As Reasonably Practicable (ALARP). Further, surrounding the above proposed quarry, they have their own patta land of approx. 16 acres.

6. Complaint: *From the proposed site area at a distance of about 10mtr there is Shri Kadu Malleshwara temple and villagers of Honkaravalli and Hiduvanahalli celebrate (Jathara) every year during Basavajayanthi.*

Reply: The proponent informed that the temple shown in the photographs, is in their own patta land. It is not any public temple and doing jathra is not at all practiced.

7. Complaint: *In Hosagadde village sy. No. 82, there is more than 100 acres of Forest Area having varieties of important plants and trees and this area is modified into Elephant resting place (proposed crusher area is about Forest land is at a distance of 10-50mtrs)*

Reply: The proponent informed that, As per the NOC issued by the Forest Dept., Hosagadde Section-4 forest is at 36m from the proposed quarry. Also, the Forest NOC is given stipulating the conditions like, 1) if the movement of elephants increases, then NOC will be withdrawn; 2) quarrying shall not be carried-out beyond 6 PM and no electric lights shall be used; 3) only controlled blasting shall be carried-out. They are going to abide by these conditions.

8. Complaint: *In Hosagadde village sy. No. 149 there is about 8 Acres of Government land and the propose project proponent is illegally planning to start crusher and quarry operations.*

Reply: The proponent informed assure that, they will not encroach any Govt. land.

9. Complaint: *Already in regions of Allur – Sakaleshpura there is Elephant menace and due to the proposed crusher operations in sy. No. 82 adjacent to Forest land, Elephant menace will increase.*

Reply: The proponent informed that, as per the NOC issued by the Forest Dept., Hosagadde Section-4 forest is at 36m from the proposed quarry. Also, the Forest NOC, is given stipulating the conditions like, 1) if the movement of elephants increases, then NOC will be



withdrawn; 2) quarrying shall not be carried-out beyond 6 PM and no electric lights shall be used; 3) only controlled blasting shall be carried-out. They are going to abide by these conditions and restrict quarrying activities, between 8 AM to 5 PM only.

Further the proponent submitted markings on google map indicating temporary shed present at a distance of 150mtr – 200mtr on their own lands and informed that they will be removed and justified the distance based on joint inspection report carried on 25.11.2021 by Revenue, Forest, DMG and KSPCB in respect to proposed crusher location which is adjacent to proposed quarry location in sy.no 149 and informed that there are no NH/SH, MDR/OR, village, temple, school within 500mtrs and submitted undertaking for the same. The proponent informed that had not carried out any quarrying activities in the proposed survey number which can be confirmed from the google images.

The committee after discussion accepted the clarification given by the proponent. The committee after discussion decided to reiterate the decision taken in 287th SEAC meeting.

Action: Member Secretary, SEAC to forward the proposal to SEIAA for further necessary action.

289.14 Building Stone Quarry Project at Sy. No.125/2 of Arepura Village, Gundlupet Taluk, Chamarajanagar District (1-00 Acre) by Sri R M Mahadevappa - Online Proposal No.SIA/KA/MIN/405010/2022 (SEIAA 471 MIN 2022)

The Proposal was earlier considered in 287th SEAC Meeting and the committee had recommended the proposal to SEIAA for issue of E.C. The authority in its 227th meeting referred back the proposal informing,

“ The Authority perused the proposal and took note of the recommendation of SEAC. Further, the Authority noted the complaint received vide email (Premkumar332sd@gmail.com) dated 08th December 2022. The details are as follows;

- 1. The eastern part of project site is worked before obtaining the Environmental Clearance as In the Historical satellite image the workings are visible. Hence this project is in violation to the EIA Notification, 2006*
- 2. In forest NOC there is no mention of the type of land of the proposed site and regarding the proposed forests in the survey no 125.*
- 3. Bandipura wildlife sanctuary is 4.668 kms.*

The Authority perused the complaint and noted the contents of the same. The Authority also examined the documents of this proposal in the light of the complaint received and decided to refer the file back to SEAC. Therefore, the SEAC shall look into the issues raised in the complaint diligently and obtain requisite clarifications/documents from the Project Proponent or any other Govt. departments as necessary”.

The committee in the present meeting obtained clarification as below from project proponent / consultant for the complaint received,

- 1. Complaint: The eastern part of project site is worked before obtaining the Environmental Clearance as In the Historical satellite image the workings are visible. Hence this project is in violation to the EIA Notification, 2006*

The proponent informed that, eastern part of the worked area belongs to sy.no. 128 of Arepura village which is kharab land and local people have carried out quarrying activity in above said survey number earlier.

East part of the present proposal is also considered to extract the mineral to the depth of 10 feet and later they came to know after podi for the sy. No. 125/2.

2. *Complaint: In forest NOC there is no mention of the type of land of the proposed site and regarding the proposed forests in the survey no 125.*

Reply: The proponent informed that they have obtained Forest NoC and in annexure 1 of Forest NoC, Sl.no. 4(g) it states that the proposed land is Patta land.

3. *Complaint: Bandipura wildlife sanctuary is 4.668 kms.*

Reply: The proponent informed that, as per Forest NoC the proposed project site is located outside the Bandipur Tiger Reserve at a distance of 4.668km outside from Bandipur Tiger project D-line and outside the Eco Sensitive Zone of 1.365 Km.

The committee noted the clarification given by the proponent. The committee after discussion decided to defer the appraisal in want of clarification from DMG with respect to old workings.

Action: Member Secretary, SEAC to put up before SEAC after submission of clarification sought.

289.15 Building Stone Quarry Project at Sy.Nos. 432/1, 432/3 of Ucchangidurga Village, Harapanahalli Taluk, Vijayanagara District (3-00 Acres) by Sri S. Hanumanthappa - Online Proposal No.SIA/KA/MIN/403078/2022 (SEIAA 426 MIN 2022)

The Proposal was earlier considered in 287th SEAC Meeting and the committee had recommended the proposal to SEIAA for issue of E.C. The authority in its 227th meeting referred back the proposal informing,

" The Authority perused the proposal and took note of the recommendation of SEAC. Further, the Authority noted the complaint received vide email (Premkumar332sd@gmail.com) dated 08th December 2022. The details are as follows;

- 1. The project site is worked before obtaining the Environmental Clearance as In the Historical satellite image the workings are visible. Hence this project is in violation to the EIA Notification, 2006 and must be submitted under violation category.*
- 2. If we search the proponents name in the portal, One more file under same name and same location and same sy nos was submitted and was delisted by the SEIAA stating in ADS as "The committee 262nd Meeting informed the proponent that the proposal needs to be considered as B1 category and TORs need to be issued. However the proponent did not agree for conducting EIA. Hence the committee decided to reject the proposal" the Proposal No is SIA/KA/MIN/198671/2021 and File No is SEIAA 80 MIN 2021. And this proposal cluster sketch is different than that the old uploaded one.*

The Authority perused the complaint and noted the contents of the same. The Authority also examined the documents of this proposal in the light of the complaint received and decided to refer the file back to SEAC. The SEAC shall look into the issues raised in the complaint diligently and obtain requisite clarifications/documents from the Project Proponent or any other Govt. departments as necessary”.

The committee in the present meeting obtained clarification as below from project proponent / consultant for the complaint received,

1. *Complaint: The project site is worked before obtaining the Environmental Clearance as In the Historical satellite image the workings are visible. Hence this project is in violation to the EIA Notification, 2006 and must be submitted under violation category.*

Reply: The proponent informed that the proposed area is patta land and surrounded by several operating quarries. There is no working carried out in the proposed area, however some soil / mined material were dumped by the adjoining quarries in 2020 and it was removed later and some mining equipment are parked in the applied area as per historical satellite image.

2. *Complaint: If we search the proponents name in the portal, One more file under same name and same location and same Sy.Nos. was submitted and was delisted by the SEIAA stating in ADS as “The committee 262nd Meeting informed the proponent that the proposal needs to be considered as B1 category and TORs need to be issued. However the proponent did not agree for conducting EIA. Hence the committee decided to reject the proposal” the Proposal No is SIA/KA/MIN/198671/2021 and File No is SEIAA 80 MIN 2021. And this proposal cluster sketch is different than that the old uploaded one.*

Reply: The proponent informed that as per cluster sketch dated 03.10.2020 there are 18 quarries including the proposed area. Of the 18 quarries, 11 quarry leases are existing and remaining 7 are newly notified areas, out of this 11 existing leases, 6 leases with total extent of 12.25 Acres have obtained EC prior 15.01.2016 and remaining 5 leases, 1 lease with area of 1.00 Acre has stopped working from 08.01.2019, as it is more than 3 years exempted from cluster, for the 4 leases including the propose lease total extent is 11.40 Acres, which is less than the threshold of 5Ha and hence considered as B2 project.

Further, the proponent submitted letter from DMG dated 12.01.2023, informing that no mining activities are carried out in Sy. No. 432/1, 432/3 for extent of 3.00 Acres.

The committee after discussion accepted the clarification given by the proponent. The committee after discussion decided to reiterate the decision taken in 287th SEAC meeting.

Action: Member Secretary, SEAC to forward the proposal to SEIAA for further necessary action.



289.16 Building Stone Quarry Project at Sy. No.224/3 of Hosuru Village, Brahmavara Taluk, Udupi District (1-00 Acre) by Sri Sijo Jacob- Online Proposal No.SIA/KA/MIN/403378/2022 (SEIAA 432 MIN 2022)

The Proposal was earlier considered in 287th SEAC Meeting and the committee had recommended the proposal to SEIAA for issue of E.C. The authority in its 227th meeting referred back the proposal informing,

“ The Authority perused the proposal and took note of the recommendation of SEAC. Further, the Authority noted the complaint received vide email (Premkumar332sd@gmail.com) dated 08th December 2022. The details are as follows;

- 1. The project site is worked before obtaining the Environmental Clearance as in the Historical satellite image the workings are varying from 2016 to 2022. Hence this project is in violation to the EIA Notification, 2006*
- 2. The distance between the Someshwara Wildlife Sanctuary and the project site is 8.08km*
- 3. In the surface plan it is shown as workings in northwest portion which means that the site is already worked without EC and hence it is a case of violation*

The Authority perused the complaint and noted the contents of the same. The Authority also examined the documents of this proposal in the light of the complaint received and decided to refer the file back to SEAC. The SEAC shall look into the issues raised in the complaint diligently and obtain requisite clarifications/documents from the Project Proponent or any other Govt departments as necessary”.

The committee in the present meeting obtained clarification as below from project proponent / consultant for the complaint received,

- 1. Complaint: The project site is worked before obtaining the Environmental Clearance as in the Historical satellite image the workings are varying from 2016 to 2022. Hence this project is in violation to the EIA Notification, 2006*

Reply: The proponent informed that, they had removed some size stones, from our patta land, unknowingly, for construction of our own house. The size stones extracted from our patta land were exclusively used by us and not sold outside. Since, it was extracted without permission from the Dept. of Mines & Geology, they have imposed a penalty of Rs. 50,000/- and they have already paid the same and submitted the copy of the notice issued by Dept. of Mines & Geology.

- 2. Complaint: The distance between the Someshwara Wildlife Sanctuary and the project site is 8.08km*

Reply: The proponent informed that, the project site is at about 8.04km from the boundary of Someshwara Wildlife Sanctuary and is outside the notified ESZ (vide Gazette No. S.O. 2942 (E), dated 28th Aug. 2020 and informed that they will submit the distance certificate from Chief Wildlife Warden to SEIAA, before taking the EC.

3. Complaint: *In the surface plan it is shown as workings in northwest portion which means that the site is already worked without EC and hence it is a case of violation*

Reply: The proponent informed that, as mentioned in Point No. 1 above, they have extracted some size stones, for construction of four own house and already paid the penalty to the Dept. of Mines & Geology. The mined-out area, towards the NW portion, has been shown in the surface plan.

The committee noted the clarification given by the proponent. The committee after discussion decided to defer the appraisal for want of clarification from DMG informing that the material removed without permission is for their own bonafide purpose and distance certificate from DFO regarding Someshwara Wildlife Sanctuary and the project site.

Action: Member Secretary, SEAC to put up before SEAC after submission of clarification sought.

289.17 Building Stone Quarry Project at Sy. No. 54 of Sankanahalli Village, Nagamangala Taluk & Mandya District (2-12 Acres) by Sri Venkataramu - Online Proposal No.SIA/KA/MIN/403667/2022 (SEIAA 437 MIN 2022)

The Proposal was earlier considered in 287th SEAC Meeting and the committee had recommended the proposal to SEIAA for issue of E.C. The authority in its 227th meeting referred back the proposal informing,

"The Authority perused the proposal and took note of the recommendation of SEAC. Further, the Authority noted the complaint received vide email (Premkumar332sd@gmail.com) dated 08th December 2022. The details are as follows;

- 1. Eco-sensitive zone of Melikote Wildlife Sanctuary is within 10km from the project site. The distance between the proposed site and Sanctuary is 5.69 km*
- 2. The project site is worked before obtaining the Environmental Clearance as In the Historical satellite image the workings are varying from 2016 to 2019 and from the site photos also we can see the worked area filled with water. Hence this project is in violation to the EIA Notification, 2006*

The Authority perused the complaint and noted the contents of the same. The Authority also examined the documents of this proposal in the light of the complaint received and decided to refer the file back to SEAC. The SEAC shall look into the issues raised in the complaint deligently and obtain requisite clarifications/documents from the Project Proponent or any other Govt. departments as necessary".

The committee in the present meeting obtained clarification as below from project proponent / consultant for the complaint received,

- 1. Complaint: Eco-sensitive zone of Melikote Wildlife Sanctuary is within 10km from the project site. The distance between the proposed site and Sanctuary is 5.69 km*

Reply: The proponent informed that the proposed project site, is at about 5.80 km from the boundary of the Melukote Wildlife Sanctuary and is outside the notified ESZ, as per MoEFCC Gazette No. S. O. 3084 (E), dated 19th Sept. 2017. They have already applied for the distance certificate from Chief Wildlife Warden and submitted copy of acknowledgement for the same.

2. *Complaint: The project site is worked before obtaining the Environmental Clearance as In the Historical satellite image the workings are varying from 2016 to 2019 and from the site photos also we can see the worked area filled with water. Hence this project is in violation to the EIA Notification, 2006*

Reply: The proponent informed that the proposed area is a Govt. land, notified on 16-10-2021, under Rule 3F of KMMCR, 1994. Regarding the old workings, they had sought clarification from the Dept. of Mines & Geology, wherein it is stated that some illegal quarrying was done in the above applied area and 2 FIRs have already been registered by the Dept. of Mines & Geology, on the illegal quarrying, vide FIR No. 0014/2016 dated 29-01-2016 and FIR No. 0142/2016 dated 25-06-2016 and submitted copy of the endorsement issued by the Dept. of Mines & Geology.

The committee noted the clarification given by the proponent. The committee after discussion decided to defer the appraisal and decided to seek directions from SEIAA regarding handling violation cases in Govt. Lands, in view of this proponent claiming that he has not committed any violation.

Action: Member Secretary, SEAC to forward the proposal to SEIAA for necessary directions.

289.18 Building Stone Quarry Project at Sy. No. 19 of Nageshanahalli Village, Koppal Taluk, Koppal District (2-34 Acres) by Sri Prakash - Online Proposal No.SIA/KA/MIN/403942/2022 (SEIAA 446 MIN 2022)


The Proposal was earlier considered in 287th SEAC Meeting and the committee had recommended the proposal to SEIAA for issue of E.C. The authority in its 227th meeting referred back the proposal informing.

"The Authority perused the proposal and took note of the recommendation of SEAC. Further, the Authority noted the complaint received vide email (Premkumar332sd@gmail.com) dated 08th December 2022. The details are as follows;

1. *The project site is worked before obtaining the Environmental Clearance as In the Historical satellite image the workings are visible and we can see the sheets of rocks are excavated. Hence this project is in violation to the EIA Notification, 2006*

2. *There is a nala towards east if we consider the village map of the project site for which proper buffer must be provided*

The Authority perused the complaint and noted the contents of the same. The Authority also examined the documents of this proposal in the light of the complaint received and decided to refer the file back to SEAC. The SEAC shall look into the issues raised in the



complaint diligently and obtain requisite clarifications/documents from the Project Proponent or any other Govt. departments as necessary”.

The committee in the present meeting obtained clarification as below from project proponent / consultant for the complaint received,

1. *Complaint: The project site is worked before obtaining the Environmental Clearance as In the Historical satellite image the workings are visible and we can see the sheets of rocks are excavated. Hence this project is in violation to the EIA Notification, 2006*

Reply: The proponent informed that, there is no mining carried out in the proposed area and agreed to get clarification from DMG regarding the same.

2. *Complaint: There is a nala towards east if we consider the village map of the project site for which proper buffer must be provided*

Reply: The proponent informed that, as per village map there is water course located at 34mtr towards east from the lease area but there is no physical nala towards east.

The committee noted the clarification given by the proponent. The committee after discussion decided to defer the appraisal in want of clarification from DMG with respect to old workings.

Action: Member Secretary, SEAC to put up before SEAC after submission of clarification sought.

289.19 Building Stone Quarry Project at Sy. No.10A/2A of Ugginakere Village, Kalaghatagi Taluk, Dharawada District (1-12 Acres) by Sri Basavanneppa T Gokul - Online Proposal No.SIA/KA/MIN/290404/2022 (SEIAA-378 MIN 2022)

The Proposal was earlier considered in 287th SEAC Meeting and the committee had recommended the proposal to SEIAA for issue of E.C. The authority in its 227th meeting referred back the proposal informing,

“The Authority perused the proposal and took note of the recommendation of SEAC. Further, the Authority noted the complaint received vide email (Premkumar332sd@gmail.com) dated 08th December 2022. The details are as follows;

1. *The project site is worked before obtaining the Environmental Clearance as In the Historical satellite image the workings are varying from 2015 to 2022. Hence this project is in violation to the EIA Notification, 2006.*
2. *Shape of the applied lease area is different in the different documents; GPS points are varying thus the extent of the site is also varying*

The Authority perused the complaint and noted the contents of the same. Further, the Authority also examined the documents of this proposal and it was observed there are some discrepancies in the kml file and shape of the lease boundary (GPS points). Therefore, the Authority decided to refer file back to SEAC. The SEAC shall examine

the issues raised in the complaint deligrntly and obtain requisite clarification/documents from Project Proponent /Govt. departments as necessary”.

The committee in the present meeting obtained clarification as below from project proponent / consultant for the complaint received,

1. Complaint: *The project site is worked before obtaining the Environmental Clearance as In the Historical satellite image the workings are varying from 2015 to 2022. Hence this project is in violation to the EIA Notification, 2006.*

Reply: The proponent informed that, they had a quarry lease earlier, vide QL No. 641, over an extent of 0-20 Acres, from 25-10-2006 to 24-10-2016 and as per audit report issued by the Dept. of Mines & Geology dated 17.11.2022, for the said QL No. 641.

2. Complaint: *Shape of the applied lease area is different in the different documents; GPS points are varying thus the extent of the site is also varying*

Reply: The proponent informed that, during initial application as per applied lease sketch, the GPS readings were wrongly notified, pursuant to that, they have got the GPS readings, rectified by the Dept. of Mines & Geology and submitted the revised GPS readings, as approved by the Dept. of Mines & Geology. Accordingly, they have revised the drawings (surface/ geological plan & sections; production & Development plan & sections etc.) and got them approved by the Dept. of Mines & Geology.

Map Schedule

Topo sheet No.	P.O.	Latitude	Longitude
43 1/25, 1/15, 1/15 & 1/15	Boundary point-A	18° 19' 18.32"	81° 2' 48.28"
	Boundary point-B	18° 19' 18.31"	81° 2' 48.28"
	Boundary point-C	18° 19' 18.32"	81° 2' 48.28"
	Boundary point-D	18° 19' 18.32"	81° 2' 48.28"
	Boundary point-E	18° 19' 18.32"	81° 2' 48.28"
	Boundary point-F	18° 19' 18.32"	81° 2' 48.28"
	Boundary point-G	18° 19' 18.32"	81° 2' 48.28"
	Boundary point-H	18° 19' 18.32"	81° 2' 48.28"
	Boundary point-I	18° 19' 18.32"	81° 2' 48.28"
	Boundary point-J	18° 19' 18.32"	81° 2' 48.28"
Reference points	Reference point-1	18° 19' 18.32"	81° 2' 48.28"
	Reference point-2	18° 19' 18.32"	81° 2' 48.28"

[Signature]
 MEMBER SECRETARY
 SEAC

[Signature]
 Senior Geologist
 Department of Mines & Geology
 Dhanuvar: District
 Dhanuvar

The committee noted the clarification given by the proponent. The committee after discussion decided to defer the appraisal in want of clarification from DMG informing that no mining activities were carried out in the proposed area after the expiry of old lease with QL No. 641.

Action: Member Secretary, SEAC to put up before SEAC after submission of clarification sought.

[Signature]

[Signature]

289.20 Shahabad Stone (Cherty Limestone) Quarry Project at Sy.No.462/*/7 of Honagunta Village, Shahabad Taluk Kalaburagi District (1-20 Acres) by Sri Azeem Miyan - Online Proposal No.SIA/KA/MIN/291161/2022 (SEIAA 388 MIN 2022).

The Proposal was earlier considered in 287th SEAC Meeting and the committee had recommended the proposal to SEIAA for issue of E.C. The authority in its 227th meeting referred back the proposal informing,

"The Authority perused the proposal and took note of the recommendation of SEAC. Further, the Authority noted the complaint received vide email (Premkumar332sd@gmail.com) dated 08th December 2022. The details are as follows;

"The project site is worked before obtaining the Environmental Clearance as in the Historical satellite image the worked benches are varying from 2015 to 2022 which shows that the site is worked. Hence this project is in violation to the EIA Notification, 2006."

The Authority perused the complaint and noted the contents of the same. The Authority also examined the documents of this proposal in the light of the complaint received and decided to refer the file back to SEAC. The SEAC shall look into the issues raised in the complaint diligently and obtain requisite clarifications/documents from the Project Proponent or any other Govt. departments as necessary".

The committee in the present meeting obtained clarification as below from project proponent / consultant for the complaint received,

Complaint: The project site is worked before obtaining the Environmental Clearance as in the Historical satellite image the worked benches are varying from 2015 to 2022 which shows that the site is worked. Hence this project is in violation to the EIA Notification, 2006.


Reply: The proponent informed that there is an existing pit of about 3 meters depth in an extent of 02 guntas, within the proposed area, on Eastern side of the applied area, in which, some soil has been removed for agricultural purposes and justified the same as per the Dept. of Mines & Geology, Kalaburagi. Letter dated 23.12.2022.

The committee noted the clarification given by the proponent. The committee after discussion decided to defer the appraisal in want of clarification from DMG as per latest Google images informing that no mining activities are carried out in the proposed area.

Action: Member Secretary, SEAC to put up before SEAC after submission of clarification sought.

289.21 Building Stone Quarry Project at Sy. No. 126/*/5 of Melakunda village, Kalaburagi Taluk & District (2-00 Acres) by Sri Hanamanth - Online Proposal No.SIA/KA/MIN/288103/2022 (SEIAA 396 MIN 2022)

The Proposal was earlier considered in 287th SEAC Meeting and the committee had recommended the proposal to SEIAA for issue of E.C. The authority in its 227th meeting referred back the proposal informing,



"The Authority perused the proposal and took note of the recommendation of SEAC. Further, the Authority noted the complaint received vide email (Premkumar332sd@gmail.com) dated 08th December 2022. The details are as follows;

In the site itself they have setup crusher as may be seen from the photos enclosed in the presentation copy attached online. So permission for the same must be shown and the details of those in the surface plan must be shown

The Authority perused the complaint and noted the contents of the same. The Authority also examined the documents of this proposal in the light of the complaint received and decided to refer the file back to SEAC. The SEAC shall look into the issues raised in the complaint diligently and obtain requisite clarifications/documents from the Project Proponent or any other Govt departments as necessary".

The committee in the present meeting obtained clarification as below from project proponent / consultant for the complaint received,

Complaint: In the site itself they have setup crusher as may be seen from the photos enclosed in the presentation copy attached online. So permission for the same must be shown and the details of those in the surface plan must be shown

Reply: The proponent informed that there is an existing crusher at about 30m, outside the lease boundary, on SE side. The photos in the presentation uploaded in the portal are showing the crusher, which is actually outside and taken from the QL Boundary. The crusher location is clearly visible in the Google image/KML.

The committee noted the clarification given by the proponent. The committee after discussion decided to defer the appraisal in want of clarification from DMG as per latest Google images informing that no mining activities are carried out in the proposed area.

Action: Member Secretary, SEAC to put up before SEAC after submission of clarification sought.

289.22 Building Stone Quarry Project at Sy. No. 127 of Bennanayakanahalli Village, Tiptur Taluk, Tumkur District (5-20 Acres) by M/s. Tirumala Enterprises - Online Proposal No. SIA/KA/MIN/402452/2022 (SEIAA 417 MIN 2022)

The Proposal was earlier considered in 287th SEAC Meeting and the committee had recommended the proposal to SEIAA for issue of E.C. The authority in its 227th meeting referred back the proposal informing,

" The Authority perused the proposal and took note of the recommendation of SEAC. Further, the Authority noted the complaint received vide email (Premkumar332sd@gmail.com) dated 08th December 2022. The details are as follows;

- 1. The actual extent of the area is 05-20 Acres, but in the cover page of Per-feasibility report the area is mentioned as 2-00 Acres. The extent of area is mentioned as different in different documents.*



2. *There is a Police firing practise ground in the east of the applied area, the distance between the ground and project area is less than 200m. Thus, the buffer zone for blasting should be left inside the site in the eastern side of the applied area. We can also see there is a dam in the north of the applied area, both the dam and Police firing ground using the same approach road for transportation.*
3. *In the forest NOC 1st point it is written that the site is a land bank and there is no confirmation from Tahsildar and still no sketch has been prepared which means that the land might be a land bank area. Need to be confirmed.*

The Authority perused the complaint and noted the contents of the same. The Authority also examined the documents of this proposal in the light of the compliant received and decided to refer the file back to SEAC. The SEAC shall look into the issues raised in the complaint deligitly and obtain requisite clarifications/documents from the Project Proponent or any other Govt. departments as necessary."

The committee in the present meeting obtained clarification as below from project proponent / consultant for the complaint received,

1. *Complaint: The actual extent of the area is 05-20 Acres, but in the cover page of Per-feasibility report the area is mentioned as 2-00 Acres. The extent of area is mentioned as different in different documents.*

Reply: The proponent informed that, by oversight in the Pre-feasibility report cover page was mentioned as 2-00 Acres, instead of 5-20 Acre and submitted Pre-feasibility report covering page.

2. *Complaint: There is a Police firing practice ground in the east of the applied area, the distance between the ground and project area is less than 200m. Thus, the buffer zone for blasting should be left inside the site in the eastern side of the applied area. We can also see there is a dam in the north of the applied area, both the dam and Police firing ground using the same approach road for transportation.*

Reply: The proponent informed that as per the NOC issued by the Revenue Dept., there are no public structures, rivers, bridges, tanks/ reservoirs, streams, temples, public roads, railway track, cart tracks, pedestrian track, school/ colleges, power lines and village, urban area and any type of government structures at a distance 200m from the applied area.

Further the proponent submitted joint inspection report of DMG, KSPCB, Forest and Revenue departments dated 09.06.2022, related to the proposed stone crusher towards east next to the proposed site, which informs that there are no NH/SH, MDR/OR, villages, temples, schools within 200mtrs from the proposed lease area.

3. *Complaint: In the forest NOC 1st point it is written that the site is a land bank and there is no confirmation from Tahsildar and still no sketch has been prepared which means that the land might be a land bank area. Need to be confirmed.*



Reply: The proponent informed that, as per the Forest NOC, the total extent of the Sy. No. 127, is 357-00 Acres, out of which the land bank area is only 33.60 Ha. i.e. 83-01 Acres, the remaining area of 273-39 Acres is non-forest land. Further, in the Forest NOC dated 26.11.2021, Point No. 3, it is mentioned that the proposed extent of 5-20 Acres in Sy. No. 127, there are no Neduthopu, Reserve Forest, Deemed Forest, C&D lands etc. Proposed Area is Patta Land and land conversion has been obtained from the Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur, on 25-03-2022.

The committee after discussion accepted the clarification given by the proponent. The committee after discussion decided to reiterate the decision taken in 287th SEAC meeting.

Action: Member Secretary, SEAC to forward the proposal to SEIAA for further necessary action.

289.23 Building Stone Quarry Project at Sy. No. 95/2(P) of Hosagadde Village Sakleshpur Taluk Hassan District (10-01 Acres) by Sri Shiva Stone Crusher & M-sand Unit - Online Proposal No.SIA/KA/MIN/402498/2022 (SEIAA 418 MIN 2022)

The Proposal was earlier considered in 287th SEAC Meeting and the committee had recommended the proposal to SEIAA for issue of E.C. The authority in its 227th meeting referred back the proposal informing,

" The Authority perused the proposal and took note of the recommendation of SEAC. Further, the Authority noted the complaint received vide email (Premkumar332sd@gmail.com) dated 08th December 2022. The details are as follows;

- 1. The shape of the notified area is not matching with the notified sketch, points via; N, O & P are showing mismatches. Along with this the extent of the site is also varying. Corrected GPS points should be attached and the surface plans should be changed accordingly.*
- 2. In production cross section the pink colour bench line and the block hatch shows that the mining is proposed inside the buffer zone (ref Section A-A green lines).*
- 3. In the production cross section, the benches are overlapping with each other which is unscientific.*
- 4. In forest NOC para 6 they have mentioned that there is Elephant corridor nearby the site and hence wildlife clearance must be obtained.*

The Authority perused the complaint and noted the contents of the same. The Authority also examined the documents of this proposal in the light of the complaint received and decided to refer the file back to SEAC. The SEAC shall look into the issues raised in the complaint diligently and obtain requisite clarifications/documents from the Project Proponent or any other Govt. departments as necessary"

The committee in the present meeting obtained clarification as below from project proponent / consultant for the complaint received,



1. Complaint: *The shape of the notified area is not matching with the notified sketch, points via; N, O & P are showing mismatches. Along with this the extent of the site is also varying. Corrected GPS points should be attached and the surface plans should be changed accordingly.*

Reply: The proponent informed that they have rectified GPS Points, and revised plans & sections and obtained approval from DMG.

S. P. No.	Latitude	Longitude
A	N 12° 55' 14.44"	E 75° 52' 40.42"
B	N 12° 55' 14.80"	E 75° 52' 43.30"
C	N 12° 55' 13.70"	E 75° 52' 44.10"
D	N 12° 55' 15.20"	E 75° 52' 44.17"
E	N 12° 55' 15.10"	E 75° 52' 45.30"
F	N 12° 55' 15.60"	E 75° 52' 46.90"
G	N 12° 55' 16.06"	E 75° 52' 46.56"
H	N 12° 55' 16.19"	E 75° 52' 47.69"
I	N 12° 55' 15.87"	E 75° 52' 48.29"
J	N 12° 55' 15.57"	E 75° 52' 48.86"

K	N 12° 55' 14.68"	E 75° 52' 49.32"
L	N 12° 55' 13.76"	E 75° 52' 49.69"
M	N 12° 55' 12.55"	E 75° 52' 50.27"
N	N 12° 55' 12.48"	E 75° 52' 49.17"
O	N 12° 55' 11.79"	E 75° 52' 48.86"
P	N 12° 55' 12.33"	E 75° 52' 47.44"
Q	N 12° 55' 11.38"	E 75° 52' 46.99"
R	N 12° 55' 11.73"	E 75° 52' 46.45"
S	N 12° 55' 10.51"	E 75° 52' 45.94"
T	N 12° 55' 10.70"	E 75° 52' 45.17"
U	N 12° 55' 08.90"	E 75° 52' 44.20"
V	N 12° 55' 07.10"	E 75° 52' 44.20"
W	N 12° 55' 07.60"	E 75° 52' 43.30"
X	N 12° 55' 08.20"	E 75° 52' 43.30"
Y	N 12° 55' 08.20"	E 75° 52' 41.40"

2. Complaint: *In production cross section the pink colour bench line and the block hatch shows that the mining is proposed inside the buffer zone (ref Section A-A green lines).*

Reply: The proponent informed that Production sections are correct and no changes are required.

3. Complaint: *In the production cross section, the benches are overlapping with each other which is unscientific.*

Reply: The proponent informed that there is no overlapping of the benches and due to Black & white colour during printing, its seen like benches are overlapping. In colour print-out there is clarity.

4. Complaint: *In forest NOC para 6 they have mentioned that there is Elephant corridor nearby the site and hence wildlife clearance must be obtained.*

Reply: The proponent informed that, they will abide to the conditions mentioned in Forest NoC.

The committee noted the clarification given by proponent and informed that the committee had received a complaint on 12.01.2023 signed by local villagers of Honkaravalli village Hosakote Hobli Alluru Taluk Hassan District, requesting not to give permission for the

proposed project because of the below mentioned reasons. The committee served a copy of the compliant to the proponent for which the proponent submitted the following reply,

1. *Complaint:For the proposed quarry and crusher in Hosagadde village sy. No 82 and 149 is adjacent to our Honkaravalli village and within a distance of 25mt to 75mtr there are 10 houses and within a distance of 200mtr there are 22 houses and within 500mtr there are about 40 to 50 houses and all the families residing in these houses are basically depending on agriculture.*

Reply: The proponent informed that, the said sy. No. 82 & 149 are more than 500m away from our above proposed quarry hence not applicable for the present proposal.

2. *Complaint:The proposed quarry and crusher location is proposed adjacent to, road from Hoskote to Sakaleshpura Taluk Bandihalli Village boundary via Honnaravalli to join Nidanuru, as per village map.*

Reply: The proponent informed that the boundary of K Hosakote village is more than 700mtr away from our above project quarry and hence not applicable to the proposed project.

3. *Complaint:The waste water from the proposed crusher reaches to the agriculture tank which is at a distance of 100mtr and excess water from this tank reaches to government reservoir (tank) and all domestic animals and farmers depend on this.*

Reply: The proponent informed that, in the proposed stone crusher and quarry location is more that 700mtr away from our proposed quarry and hence not applicable to the proposed project.

4. *Complaint:From the proposed project location within a distance of 400mtrs there are Anganwadi Kendra and temples used by locals.*


Reply: The proponent informed that, as per KMMCR, the minimum distance required for carrying-out blasting is only 200m and the said Anganwadi Kendra is located at about 400m which is greater that 200m, from the quarry area and hence not applicable to the proposed project.

5. *Complaint:At a distance of about 10mtr to 500mtr from the proposed project site area, there are around 80-100 farmers work in agriculture fields.*

Reply: The proponent informed that, the issue is about sy. No. 82 & 149, which is more than 500m away from our above proposed quarry location and hence not applicable to the proposed project.

6. *Complaint:From the proposed site area at a distance of about 10mtr there is Shri Kadu Malleshwara temple and villagers of Honkaravalli and Hiduvanahalli celebrate (Jathara) every year during Basavajayanthi.*

Reply: The proponent informed that the temple is more than 700mtr away from proposed project and hence not applicable to the proposed project



7. Complaint: *In Hosagadde village sy. No. 82, there is more than 100 acres of Forest Area having varieties of important plants and trees and this area is modified into Elephant resting place (proposed crusher area is about Forest land is at a distance of 10-50mtrs)*

Reply: The proponent informed that, the sy. No. 82 is more than 500m away from the proposed project site and hence not applicable to the proposed project.

8. Complaint: *In Hosagadde village sy. No. 149 there is about 8 Acres of Government land and the propose project proponent is illegally planning to start crusher and quarry operations.*

Reply: The proponent informed that, the sy. No. 149 is more than 700m away from the proposed project site and hence not applicable to the proposed project.

9. Complaint: *Already in regions of Allur – Sakaleshpura there is Elephant menace and due to the proposed crusher operations in sy. No. 82 adjacent to Forest land, Elephant menace will increase.*

Reply: The proponent informed that, as per the NOC issued by the Forest Dept., Hosagadde Section-4 forest is at 650m from the proposed quarry. Also, the Forest NOC, is given stipulating the conditions like, 1) if the movement of elephants increases, then NOC will be withdrawn; 2) quarrying shall not be carried-out beyond 6 PM and no electric lights shall be used; 3) only controlled blasting shall be carried-out. They are going to abide by these conditions and restrict quarrying activities, between 8 AM to 5 PM only.


The committee after discussion accepted the clarification given by the proponent and after discussion decided to reiterate the decision taken in 287th SEAC meeting with a condition to abide by the conditions mentioned in Forest NoC.

Action: Member Secretary, SEAC to forward the proposal to SEIAA for further necessary action.

289.24 Building Stone Quarry Project at Sy. No. 144/4 (P) of Hosagadde Village, Sakleshpur Taluk, Hassan District (1-12 Acres) by Sri Shiva Stone Crusher & M-sand Unit - Online Proposal No.SIA/KA/MIN/402500/2022 (SEIAA 419 MIN 2022)

The Proposal was earlier considered in 287th SEAC Meeting and the committee had recommended the proposal to SEIAA for issue of E.C. The authority in its 227th meeting referred back the proposal informing,

“ The Authority perused the proposal and took note of the recommendation of SEAC. Further, the Authority noted the complaint received vide email (Premkumar332sd@gmail.com) dated 08th December 2022. The details are as follows;



1. *There are ponds near the site area within 200m buffer zone in the south-west and eastern side of the project site. Thus, proper buffer inside the site should be taken for blasting and mining purpose.*
2. *In forest NOC para 6 they have mentioned that there is Elephant corridor nearby the site and hence wildlife clearance must be obtained.*

The Authority perused the complaint and noted the contents of the same. The Authority also examined the documents of this proposal in the light of the compliant received and decided to refer the file back to SEAC. The SEAC shall look into the issues raised in the complaint deligently and obtain requisite clarifications/documents from the Project Proponent or any other Govt. departments as necessary”.

The committee in the present meeting obtained point wise clarification as below for the complaint received from project proponent / consultant,

1. *Complaint:There are ponds near the site area within 200m buffer zone in the south-west and eastern side of the project site. Thus, proper buffer inside the site should be taken for blasting and mining purpose.*

Reply: The proponent informed that, the irrigation Pond on SW side in 230m away from lease boundary and in 470m away on Eastern side.

2. *Complaint:In forest NOC para 6 they have mentioned that there is Elephant corridor nearby the site and hence wildlife clearance must be obtained.*

Reply: The proponent informed that, they will abide to the conditions mentioned in Forest NoC.

The committee noted the clarification given by proponent and informed that the committee had received a complaint on 12.01.2023 signed by local villagers of Honkaravalli village Hosakote Hobli Alluru Taluk Hassan District, requesting not to give permission for the proposed project because of the below mentioned reasons. The committee served a copy of the compliant to the proponent for which the proponent submitted the following reply,

1. *Complaint:For the proposed quarry and crusher in Hosagadde village sy. No 82 and 149 is adjacent to our Honkaravalli village and within a distance of 25mt to 75mtr there are 10 houses and within a distance of 200mtr there are 22 houses and within 500mtr there are about 40 to 50 houses and all the families residing in these houses are basically depending on agriculture.*

Reply: The proponent informed that, the said sy. No. 82 & 149 are more than 500m away from our above proposed quarry hence not applicable for the present proposal.

2. *Complaint:The proposed quarry and crusher location is proposed adjacent to, road from Hoskote to Sakaleshpura Taluk Bandihalli Village boundary via Honnaravalli to join Nidanuru, as per village map.*

Reply: The proponent informed that the boundary of K Hosakote village is more than 700mtr away from our above project quarry and hence not applicable to the proposed project.



3. Complaint: *The waste water from the proposed crusher reaches to the agriculture tank which is at a distance of 100mtr and excess water from this tank reaches to government reservoir (tank) and all domestic animals and farmers depend on this.*

Reply: The proponent informed that, in the proposed stone crusher and quarry location is more that 700mtr away from our proposed quarry and hence not applicable to the proposed project.

4. Complaint: *From the proposed project location within a distance of 400mtrs there are Anganwadi Kendra and temples used by locals.*

Reply: The proponent informed that, as per KMMCR, the minimum distance required for carrying-out blasting is only 200m and the said Anganwadi Kendra is located at about 400m which is greater that 200m, from the quarry area and hence not applicable to the proposed project.

5. Complaint: *At a distance of about 10mtr to 500mtr from the proposed project site area, there are around 80-100 farmers work in agriculture fields.*

Reply: The proponent informed that, the issue is about sy. No. 82 & 149, which is more than 500m away from our above proposed quarry location and hence not applicable to the proposed project.

6. Complaint: *From the proposed site area at a distance of about 10mtr there is Shri Kadu Malleshwara temple and villagers of Honkaravalli and Hiduvanahalli celebrate (Jathara) every year during Basavajyanthi.*

Reply: The proponent informed that the temple is more than 700mtr away from proposed project and hence not applicable to the proposed project.

7. Complaint: *In Hosagadde village sy. No. 82, there is more than 100acres of Forest Area having varieties of important plants and trees and this area is modified into Elephant resting place (proposed crusher area is about Forest land is at a distance of 10-50mtrs)*

Reply: The proponent informed that, the sy. No. 82 is more than 500m away from the proposed project site and hence not applicable to the proposed project.

8. Complaint: *In Hosagadde village sy. No. 149 there is about 8Acres of Government land and the propose project proponent is illegally planning to start crusher and quarry operations.*

Reply: The proponent informed that, the sy. No. 149 is more than 700m away from the proposed project site and hence not applicable to the proposed project.



9. Complaint: *Already in regions of Allur – Sakaleshpura there is Elephant menace and due to the proposed crusher operations in sy. No. 82 adjacent to Forest land, Elephant menace will increase.*

Reply: The proponent informed that, as per the NOC issued by the Forest Dept., Hosagadde Section-4 forest is at 650m from the proposed quarry. Also, the Forest NOC, is given stipulating the conditions like, 1) if the movement of elephants increases, then NOC will be withdrawn; 2) quarrying shall not be carried-out beyond 6 PM and no electric lights shall be used; 3) only controlled blasting shall be carried-out. They are going to abide by these conditions and restrict quarrying activities, between 8 AM to 5 PM only.

The committee after discussion accepted the clarification given by the proponent and after discussion decided to reiterate the decision taken in 287th SEAC meeting with a condition to abide by the conditions mentioned in Forest NoC.

Action: Member Secretary, SEAC to forward the proposal to SEIAA for further necessary action.


289.25 Building Stone Quarry Project at Sy. No. 26 of H. Thimmapura Village, Tarikere Taluk, Chikkamagalur District (QL No. 522) (1-00 Acre) by Sri Shanmugam R - Online Proposal No.SIA/KA/MIN/267123/2022 (SEIAA 176 MIN 2022): Expansion

The Proposal was earlier considered in 287th SEAC Meeting and the committee had recommended the proposal to SEIAA for issue of E.C. The authority in its 227th meeting referred back the proposal informing,

“The Authority perused the proposal and took note of the recommendation of SEAC. Further, the Authority noted the complaint received vide email (Premkumar332sd@gmail.com) dated 08th December 2022. The details are as follows;

- 1. Applied quarry lease area falls within 10 kms from the default ESZ of Bhadra Wildlife Sanctuary (draft)*
- 2. The lease area extent is 01-20 acres in 24-11-2015 EC report and 01-00 acre at sketch dated on 16-06-2017.*
- 3. There is a nala as per the village map in the north-west of the project site for which a proper buffer must be provided.*
- 4. Site is worked in the buffer zone after obtaining EC and hence it is a case of violation.*

The Authority perused the complaint and noted the contents of the same. The Authority also examined the documents of this proposal in the light of the complaint received and decided to refer the file back to SEAC. The SEAC shall look into the issues raised in the complaint diligently and obtain requisite clarifications/documents from the Project Proponent or any other Govt departments as necessary”.



The committee in the present meeting obtained clarification as below from project proponent / consultant for the complaint received,

1. Complaint: *Applied quarry lease area falls within 10 kms from the default ESZ of Bhadra Wildlife Sanctuary (draft)*

The proponent informed that as per MoEFCC Gazette Notification dated 08/08/2019 on Bhadra Wildlife Sanctuary ESZ(draft), the proposed site is at about 13.36km from boundary of Bhadra Wildlife Sanctuary, which is out of 10km ESZ of boundary and hence Wildlife clearance is not required.

2. Complaint: *The lease area extent is 01-20 acres in 24-11-2015 EC report and 01-00 acre at sketch dated on 16-06-2017.*

Reply: The proponent informed that area is revised by DMG, during S & D sketch preparation. However there is no increase in the lease area. Lease is executed for 1-00 Acre only.

3. Complaint: *There is a nala as per the village map in the north-west of the project site for which a proper buffer must be provided.*

Reply: The proponent informed that the nala is outside the lease area on NE side and Northern side. No Nala within the lease area.

4. Complaint: *Site is worked in the buffer zone after obtaining EC and hence it is a case of violation.*

Reply: The proponent informed that the quarry lease area is an elevated area, surrounded by other operating quarries. The weathered rock of loose nature in the upper layers and as there are other operating quarries, adjoining to the above lease area and from the safety point of view (to avoid collapse during drilling vibrations), they had trimmed part of the buffer zone to remove the weathered loose rock, which looks like working.

The committee noted the clarification given by the proponent. The committee after discussion decided to defer the project to get amendment to earlier EC in view of change in extent and Certified Compliance Report for 1-00 Acres and clarification from DMG informing whether any mining activities have been carried out in the proposed site area.

Action: Member Secretary, SEAC to put up before SEAC after submission of clarification sought.

289.26 Building Stone Quarry Project at Sy.No.26 of H. Thimmapura Village, Tarikere Taluk, Chikkamagalur District (QL No. 524) (1-00 Acre) by Sri H. Halesh Kumar - Online Proposal No.SIA/KA/MIN/263753/2022 (SEIAA 144 MIN 2022)

The Proposal was earlier considered in 287th SEAC Meeting and the committee had recommended the proposal to SEIAA for issue of E.C. The authority in its 227th meeting referred back the proposal informing,

“ The Authority perused the proposal and took note of the recommendation of SEAC. Further, the Authority noted the complaint received vide email (Premkumar332sd@gmail.com) dated 08th December 2022. The details are as follows;

- 1. According to the sketch the applied area is in Thimmapura, but the uploaded GPS boundary is wrong. The shape of the applied area is different in the notified sketch and the quarry plan. The Extent of the site is 1 acre but according to the given GPS points the extent of the area is 0.52 acre.*
- 2. Site is worked in the buffer zone even after getting EC which is a violation of EC conditions.*

The Authority perused the Complaint and noted the contents. The Authority also verified the documents and it was observed there are some discrepancies in the kml and GPS readings in the Notified Sketch. The Authority decided to refer file back to SEAC. The SEAC to look into issues raised in the complaint diligently and obtain requisite clarification/documents from Project Proponent /Govt. departments as necessary”.

The committee in the present meeting obtained clarification as below from project proponent / consultant for the complaint received,

- 1. Complaint:According to the sketch the applied area is in Thimmapura, but the uploaded GPS boundary is wrong. The shape of the applied area is different in the notified sketch and the quarry plan. The Extent of the site is 1 acre but according to the given GPS points the extent of the area is 0.52 acre.*

Reply: The proponent informed that approved lease sketch is matching with the plates in the approved quarry plan, which are duly signed by Senior Geologist, Dept. of Mines & Geology. The extent of the site, as per GPS readings/ KML is 0.97 Acre, i.e. 1-00 Acre only (approx.)

- 2. Complaint:Site is worked in the buffer zone even after getting EC which is a violation of EC conditions.*

Reply: The proponent informed that no working is done in the Buffer zone, as per the KML (Google map)

The committee noted the clarification given by the proponent. The committee after discussion decided to defer the project for clarification from DMG informing whether any mining activities have been carried out in buffer zone.

Action: Member Secretary, SEAC to put up before SEAC after submission of clarification sought.



289.27 Building Stone Quarry Project at Sy. No. 95/3 (P) of Yarebore Kaval Village, Hassan Taluk & District (1-08 Acres) by Sri Dinesh C - Online Proposal No.SIA/KA/MIN/291078/2022 (SEIAA 386 MIN 2022)

The Proposal was earlier considered in 287th SEAC Meeting and the committee had recommended the proposal to SEIAA for issue of E.C. The authority in its 227th meeting referred back the proposal informing,

“The Authority perused the proposal and took note of the recommendation of SEAC. Further, the Authority noted the complaint received vide email (Premkumar332sd@gmail.com) dated 08th December 2022. The details are as follows;

- 1. The DMG has not given correct extended 500m buffer cluster sketch as there are many leases in the cluster recent one among which is the proposal of Krishnagouda with 01-00-acre, Proposal Number: SIA/KA/MIN/285658/2022 and File No: SEIAA 347 MIN 2022, this site was uploaded recently and for which already EC has been granted on 19/09/2022. Proper 500m buffer zone should include in the cluster sketch and the distance between applied lease area and the Krishnegowda site, which is 387.85m in the northern side must also be shown.*
- 2. The project site is worked before obtaining the Environmental Clearance as In the Historical satellite image the workings are varying from 2015 to 2022. Hence this project is in violation to the EIA Notification, 2006*
- 3. There is a nala and a lake as per the village map towards south for which proper buffer must be provided. We also see that there is no site photos attached in any of the documents.*

The Authority perused the complaint and noted the contents of the same. The Authority also examined the documents of this proposal in the light of the complaint received and decided to refer the file back to SEAC. The SEAC shall look into the issues raised in the complaint diligently and obtain requisite clarifications/documents from the Project Proponent or any other Govt. departments as necessary”.

The committee in the present meeting obtained clarification as below from project proponent / consultant for the complaint received,

- 1. Complaint: The DMG has not given correct extended 500m buffer cluster sketch as there are many leases in the cluster recent one among which is the proposal of Krishnagouda with 01-00-acre, Proposal Number: SIA/KA/MIN/285658/2022 and File No: SEIAA 347 MIN 2022, this site was uploaded recently and for which already EC has been granted on 19/09/2022. Proper 500m buffer zone should include in the cluster sketch and the distance between applied lease area and the Krishnegowda site, which is 387.85m in the northern side must also be shown.*

Reply: The proponent informed that cluster letter for the present proposal was issued on 12/08/2022 and EC proposal was uploaded on 30/08/2022 (Hard copy submitted on 06/09/2022). EC for other quarry with 1-00Acre extent, was issued on 19/09/2022. Hence not

included in the cluster sketch, Even if it is included, the total extent in cluster is to be 2-08 Acres, less that threshold of 5-00Ha.

2. Complaint: *The project site is worked before obtaining the Environmental Clearance as In the Historical satellite image the workings are varying from 2015 to 2022. Hence this project is in violation to the EIA Notification, 2006*

Reply: The proponent informed that in the proposed area, previously there was a crusher & stock yard of the proponent, which to be dismantled and relocated, while executing quarry lease.

The proponent submitted S-report issued by the Dept. of Mines & Geology as per their inspection on 09.05.2022 and had informed that the proposed area is a virgin land.

3. Complaint: *There is a nala and a lake as per the village map towards south for which proper buffer must be provided. We also see that there is no site photos attached in any of the documents.*

Reply: The proponent informed that as per the inspection report (Form-S) issued by the Dept. of Mines & Geology as per their inspection on 09.05.2022, in north and south portion of the applied area, there are 2 small streams, were on the village map, but when inspected, the applied area, those 2 streams are not found. There is no any other public structure within a distance of 200m.

The committee noted the clarification given by the proponent. The committee after discussion decided to defer the project to clarification from DMG with respect to google image, informing whether any mining activities have been carried out in buffer zone.

Action: Member Secretary, SEAC to put up before SEAC after submission of clarification sought.

289.28 Ornamental Granite (Grey Granite) Quarry Project at Sy. Nos. 49 & 50 of Kakkihalli Village, Kukanoor Taluk, Koppal District (4-06 Acres) by Sri Mahendra Kumar Naik - Online Proposal No.SIA/KA/MIN/403020/2022 (SEIAA 425 MIN 2022)

The Proposal was earlier considered in 287th SEAC Meeting and the committee had recommended the proposal to SEIAA for issue of E.C. The authority in its 227th meeting referred back the proposal informing,

" The Authority perused the proposal and took note of the recommendation of SEAC. Further, the Authority noted the complaint received vide email (Premkumar332sd@gmail.com) dated 08th December 2022. The details are as follows;

1. *The DMG has not represented the Ornamental Stone (Grey Granite) Quarry of Sri. R Gururaj in 500m buffer in the cluster sketch, which is not exempted. This Sri. R Gururaj file was uploaded in the portal and has proposal number SIA/KA/MIN/203647/2021 and File No.*

SEIAA 143 MIN 2021 EC was granted on 20.11.2021 and this site is within 500m from the proposed site.

2. *There is some litigation in the site and as per the district task force committee decision once the court issue is resolved then the whole area can be considered for quarrying. In the form 1 point no. 24 also there is no mention of the litigations.*
3. *Also the site is worked towards South east portion if we check the latest google image.*

The Authority perused the complaint and noted the contents of the same. The Authority also examined the documents of this proposal in the light of the compliant received and decided to refer the file back to SEAC. The SEAC shall look into the issues raised in the complaint diligently and obtain requisite clarifications/documents from the Project Proponent or any other Govt. departments as necessary”.

The committee in the present meeting obtained clarification as below from project proponent / consultant for the complaint received,

1. *Complaint: The DMG has not represented the Ornamental Stone (Grey Granite) Quarry of Sri. R Gururaj in 500m buffer in the cluster sketch, which is not exempted. This Sri. R Gururaj file was uploaded in the portal and has proposal number SIA/KA/MIN/203647/2021 and File No. SEIAA 143 MIN 2021 EC was granted on 20.11.2021 and this site is within 500m from the proposed site*

Reply: The proponent informed that pursuant to the 227th SEIAA meeting, they had sought clarification from the Dept. of Mines & Geology, Koppal on the status of the quarry of Sri. R. Gururaj, and DMG have issued an endorsement dated 19.12.2022 stating that, due to some technical issues, the quarry license of Sri. R. Gururaj hasnot been sanctioned and there is no change in cluster letter and cluster map issued earlier.

2. *Complaint: There is some litigation in the site and as per the district task force committee decision once the court issue is resolved then the whole area can be considered for quarrying. In the form 1 point no. 24 also there is no mention of the litigations.*

Reply: The proponent informed that earlier they had given permission (GPA) in favour of one of our relatives viz. Sri. ThukaramPatteppa L, to utilize 2-00 Acres of the above proposed land, for extraction of granite. Based onthat, he had obtained the Quarrying License from the Dept. of Mines & Geology, vide QL No.656, for a period of 10 years, w.e.f. 04-06-2004 (valid until 03-06-2014). The said QL No. 656, wascancelled by the Director, Dept. of Mines & Geology, vide their order dated 30-09-2013, for non-payment of dues payable tothe DMG. The said Sri. Thukaram Patteppa L, has submitted a revision petition with theHon’ble Revision Authority, Secretary to Govt., C & I Department (Mines), GoK, vide Revision Petition No. Rev. Pet. No: CI 19 MRC 2014 and the Hon’ble Revision Authority has upheld the decision of the Director, Dept. of Mines & Geology.



Further, Sri. Thukaram Patteppa L, has challenged the decision of the Director of the Dept. of Mines & Geology and the Hon'ble Revision Authority, with the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka, vide W.P. No. 19170/2014 (GM-MM-S) and WRIT PETITION No.28232E014 (GM-MM-S). Both these WPs were given judgement on 10th July 2014, wherein the Hon'ble High Court of Karnataka and dismissed the WPs filed by Sri. Thukaram Patteppa L, and stated that the decision of the Director of Dept. of Mines & Geology and the Hon'ble Revision Authority, are as per law.

3. *Complaint: Also the site is worked towards South east portion if we check the latest google image*

Reply: The proponent informed that in the proposed area, over an extent of 2-00 Acres, quarry working permission was granted for extraction of granitic gneiss, in favour of one of our relatives viz. Sri. Thukaram Patteppa L, vide QL No. 656, for a period of 10 years, w.e.f. 04-06-2004 (valid until 03-06-2014). The said QL No. 656, was cancelled by the Director, Dept. of Mines & Geology, vide their order dated 30-09-2013.

The committee after discussion accepted the clarification given by the proponent and after discussion decided to reiterate the decision taken in 287th SEAC meeting subject to the condition as per final court orders as mentioned in C&I notification.

Action: Member Secretary, SEAC to forward the proposal to SEIAA for further necessary action.

289.29 Pink Granite Quarry Project at Sy. Nos. 48/1/2, 48/1/3, 48/1/5 & 48/1/6 of Kadur Village, Kushtagi Taluk, Koppal District (6-09 Acres) by M/s. Shashikiran Granites - Online Proposal No.SIA/KA/MIN/268836/2022 (SEIAA 191 MIN 2022)

The Proposal was earlier considered in 287th SEAC Meeting and the committee had recommended the proposal to SEIAA for issue of E.C. The authority in its 227th meeting referred back the proposal informing.

"The Authority perused the proposal and took note of the recommendation of SEAC. Further, the Authority noted the complaint received vide email (Premkumar332sd@gmail.com) dated 08th December 2022. The details are as follows;

1. *If we check the google image, then it can be confirmed that the site is worked in the buffer zone even after obtaining the EC and this is a violation of EC.*

The Authority perused the complaint and noted the contents of the same. The Authority also examined the documents of this proposal in the light of the complaint received and decided to refer the file back to SEAC. The SEAC shall look into the issues raised in the complaint diligently and obtain requisite clarifications/documents from the Project Proponent or any other Govt departments as necessary.

In the present meeting the proponent remained absent without intimation. The committee decided to defer the appraisal of the project.

Action: Member Secretary, SEAC to put up before SEAC until for upcoming meetings

289.30 Building Stone Quarry Project at Sy. No. 26(Part) H.Thimmapura village Tarikere Taluk & Chikkamagaluru District (1-15 Acres) by M/s. Ashoka Buildcon Limited - Online Proposal No.SIA/KA/MIN/404556/2022 (SEIAA 453 MIN 2022)

The Proposal was earlier considered in 287th SEAC Meeting and the committee had recommended the proposal to SEIAA for issue of E.C. The authority in its 227th meeting referred back the proposal informing,

“ The Authority perused the proposal and took note of the recommendation of SEAC. Further, the Authority noted the complaint received vide email (Premkumar332sd@gmail.com) dated 08th December 2022. The details are as follows;

- 1. Distance between the project site and the Bhadra Wildlife Sanctuary is 7.90km, proper buffer of 10km should be kept from the Wildlife Sanctuary as this wildlife sanctuary is in draft stage proper distance from the Bhadra range officers must be obtained.*
- 2. In forest NOC there is no mention of the type of land of the proposed site and also there is no mention regarding the deemed, reserved, state forests in the survey no 26.*
- 3. There are many leases already proposed in the Thimmapura village in this agenda itself and the cluster sketch of all the proposals in the Thimmapura village are not matching.*

The Authority perused the Complaint and noted the contents. Further, the Authority also verified the documents and it was observed the there are some discrepancies in the cluster certificates (SEIAA 176 MIN 2022, SEIAA 95 MIN 2022, SEIAA 144 MIN 2022 and SEIAA 453 MIN 2022). Therefore, the Authority decided to refer file back to SEAC. The SEAC shall examine the issues raised in the complaint deligrntly and obtain requisite clarification/documents from Project Proponent /Govt. departments as necessary”.

The committee in the present meeting obtained clarification as below from project proponent / consultant for the complaint received,

- 1. Complaint:Distance between the project site and the Bhadra Wildlife Sanctuary is 7.90km, proper buffer of 10km should be kept from the Wildlife Sanctuary as this wildlife sanctuary is in draft stage proper distance from the Bhadra range officers must be obtained.*

Reply: The proponent informed that as per Forest NOC dated 17.11.2022, Bhadra wildlife sanctuary is at 11.15km from the applied area, which is more than the default ESZ of 10 km. Hence distance certificate from Chief Wildlife Warden is not required.

- 2. Complaint:In forest NOC there is no mention of the type of land of the proposed site and also there is no mention regarding the deemed, reserved, state forests in the survey no 26.*

Reply: The proponent informed that as per recent forest NOC dated 17/11/2022, it is mentioned that it is not a deemedforest area and not any kind of forest land.



3. Complaint: *There are many leases already proposed in the Thimmapura village in this agenda itself and the cluster sketch of all the proposals in the Thimmapura village are not matching.*

Reply: The proponent informed that as per Cluster Sketch issued by Dept. of Mines & Geology, vide letter dated 21-10-2022, there are 28 existing leases and 2 newly notified areas. Of the 28 existing leases, 27 leases are exempted from cluster effect, due to the fact that, the leases are executed prior to 09th Sept. 2013 or have obtained the EC before 15th Jan. 2016. Only 1 existing lease and the 2 newly notified areas (incl. the present proposed area of 1-15 Acres), have a combined area of 4-15 acres, which is less than the threshold of 5 Ha. Hence, categorized as under B2. The different cluster sketches for different quarries were considered in the same SEIAA meeting, as per the cluster letter/sketch issued on 29-10-2021, in respect of Sri. Halesh Kumar (SEIAA 144 MIN 2022), Sri. D B Manjunath (SEIAA 95 MIN 2022) and Sri. R. Shanmugam (SEIAA 176 MIN 2022), there were 28 existing leases and difference is that, the 2 newly notified areas were not mentioned, as the notifications for the same were issued on 30-09-2022, i.e. in the year 2022 and also submitted cluster sketch dated 10.01.2023 issued from DMG informing the above.

The committee after discussion accepted the clarification given by the proponent and after discussion decided to reiterate the decision taken in 287th SEAC meeting.



Action: Member Secretary, SEAC to forward the proposal to SEIAA for further necessary action.

289.31 Building Stone Quarry Project at Sy. No. 77/10 (P) of Mallappanahalli village Hassan Taluk & District (1-35 Acres) by Sri Vikram B. - Online Proposal No.SIA/KA/MIN/404716/2022 (SEIAA 464 MIN 2022)

The Proposal was earlier considered in 287th SEAC Meeting and the committee had recommended the proposal to SEIAA for issue of E.C. The authority in its 227th meeting referred back the proposal informing.

"The Authority perused the proposal and took note of the recommendation of SEAC. Further, the Authority noted the complaint received (Sri. Mahalingayya) vide letter dated 08th December 2022. The detail"s are as follows;

"There are 2 proposals uploaded in the PARIVESH 2.0 portal of Sri Vikram Bhadrappa one having Proposal No, and file number shown above in reference and one more file is uploaded which is pending for reply from PP. The cluster sketch uploaded in the Parivesh of the pending file which has proposal no. SIA/KA/MIN/404719/2022 and file no. SEIAA 491 MIN 2022 is completely different from the cluster sketch uploaded in the proposal no. SIA/KA/MIN/404716/2022 and File No. SELAA 464 MIN 2022 even though both the projects are within 500m from the site. In the cluster sketch of proposal no. 404719 there are 7 fresh proposals and the total extent of all these leases including the Rajkamal Builders will exceed 5 Ha and hence this proposal no. 404716 which is considered in this SEIAA meeting must also be considered under the cluster situation as one file of Tumkur named Sri Palaksha SEIAA 07 MIN 2021 and Sri Jayamma SELAA 08



MIN 2021 was also consider under cluster situation even though there was no existing leases in the cluster sketch and all proposed leases were considered under cluster.

This proposal of Sri Vikram Bhadrappa must also be considered under cluster as all the 7 proposals which are mentioned in cluster sketch of proposal no. SIA/KA/MIN/404719/2022 and file no. SELAA 491 MIN 2022 are already submitted for EC and Hence ToR must be issued for all these projects.

The Authority perused the complaint and noted the contents of the same. The Authority also examined the documents of this proposal in the light of the compliant received and decided to refer the file back to SEAC. The SEAC shall look into the issues raised in the complaint deligently and obtain requisite clarifications/documents from the Project Proponent or any other Govt. departments as necessary”.

The committee in the present meeting obtained clarification as below from project proponent / consultant for the complaint received,

Complaint: There are 2 proposals uploaded in the PARIVESH 2.0 portal of Sri Vikram Bhadrappa one having Proposal No, and file number shown above in reference and one more file is uploaded which is pending for reply from PP. The cluster sketch uploaded in the Parivesh of the pending file which has proposal no. SIA/KA/MIN/404719/2022 and file no. SEIAA 491 MIN 2022 is completely different from the cluster sketch uploaded in the proposal no. SIA/KA/MIN/404716/2022 and File No. SELAA 464 MIN 2022 even though both the projects are within 500m from the site. In the cluster sketch of proposal no. 404719 there are 7 fresh proposals and the total extent of all these leases including the Rajkamal Builders will exceed 5 Ha and hence this proposal no. 404716 which is considered in this SEIAA meeting must also be considered under the cluster situation as one file of Tumkur named Sri Palaksha SEIAA 07 MIN 2021 and Sri Jayamma SELAA 08 MIN 2021 was also consider under cluster situation even though there was no existing leases in the cluster sketch and all proposed leases were considered under cluster.

This proposal of Sri Vikram Bhadrappa must also be considered under cluster as all the 7 proposals which are mentioned in cluster sketch of proposal no. SIA/KA/MIN/404719/2022 and file no. SELAA 491 MIN 2022 are already submitted for EC and Hence ToR must be issued for all these projects.

Reply: The proponent informed that initially there were 7 notifications issued including the present proposal and we had applied for EC for all the 7 proposals. After consulting other proponents, they had withdrawn the following proposals, (01) Sri. Nithyananda M D SIA/KA/MIN/404634/2022, SEIAA 460 MIN 2022 (02) Sri. Nithyananda M D SIA/KA/MIN/404657/2022, SEIAA 461 MIN 2022 (03) Sri. Yogisha R SIA/KA/MIN/404682/2022, SEIAA 462 MIN 2022 (04) Sri. Somasekhar H P SIA/KA/MIN/404721/2022, SEIAA 468 MIN 2022 (05) Sri. Vikram B SIA/KA/MIN/404719/2022, SEIAA 491 MIN 2022, after which the total cluster area is 11-30Acres less that the threshold of 5Ha, hence categorized as B2.

The committee after discussion accepted the clarification given by the proponent and after discussion decided to reiterate the decision taken in 287th SEAC meeting.

Action: Member Secretary, SEAC to forward the proposal to SEIAA for further necessary action.

289.32 Building Stone Quarry Project at Sy.No.77/6(P) of Mallappanahalli Village, Hassan Taluk & District (1-35 Acres) by Sri R. Yogish - Online Proposal No.SIA/KA/MIN/404722/2022 (SEIAA 465 MIN 2022)

The Proposal was earlier considered in 287th SEAC Meeting and the committee had recommended the proposal to SEIAA for issue of E.C. The authority in its 227th meeting referred back the proposal informing.

The Authority perused the proposal and took note of the recommendation of SEAC. Further, the Authority noted the complaint received (Sri. Mahalingayya) vide letter dated 08th December 2022. The details are as follows;


"There are 7 proposals uploaded in the PARIVESH 2.0 portal of the same village from which one file is having Proposal No. and file number shown above in reference has come to the SEIAA meeting for B2 category and one more file is uploaded which is pending for reply from PP. The cluster sketch uploaded in the Parvesh of the pending file which has proposal no: SIA/KA/MIN/404719/2022 and file no. SEIAA 491 MIN 2022 is completely different from the cluster sketch uploaded in the proposal no. SIA/KA/MIN/404722/2022 and File No.: SEIAA 465 MIN 2022 even though both the projects are within 500 m from the site. In the cluster sketch of proposal no. 404719 there are 7 fresh proposals and the total extent of all these leases including the Rajkamal Builders will exceed 5 Ha and hence this proposal no. 404722 which is considered in this SEIAA meeting must also be considered under the cluster situation as one file of Tumkur named Sri Palaksha - SEIAA 07 MIN 2021 and Smt.Jayamma - SEIAA 08 MIN 2021 was also consider under cluster situation even though there was no existing leases in the cluster sketch and all proposed leases were considered under cluster.

This proposal of Sri Raju Yogisha must also be considered under cluster as all the 7 proposals which are mentioned in cluster sketch of proposal no.SIA/KA/MIN/404682/2022 and file no.SEIAA 465 MIN 2022 are already submitted for EC and Hence ToR must be issued for all these projects.

The Authority perused the complaint and noted the contents of the same. The Authority also examined the documents of this proposal in the light of the compliant received and decided to refer the file back to SEAC. The SEAC shall look into the issues raised in the complaint deligently and obtain requisite clarifications/documents from the Project Proponent or any other Govt. departments as necessary."

The committee in the present meeting obtained clarification as below from project proponent / consultant for the complaint received,

Complaint:There are 7 proposals uploaded in the PARIVESH 2.0 portal of the same village from which one file is having Proposal No. and file number shown above in reference has come to the SEIAA meeting for B2 category and one more file is uploaded which is pending for reply from PP. The cluster sketch uploaded in the Parvesh of the pending file which has proposal no: SIA/KA/MIN/404719/2022 and file no. SEIAA 491 MIN 2022 is completely different from the cluster sketch uploaded in the proposal no. SIA/KA/MIN/404722/2022 and File No.: SEIAA 465 MIN 2022 even though both the projects are within 500 m from the site. In the cluster sketch of



proposal no. 404719 there are 7 fresh proposals and the total extent of all these leases including the Rajkamal Builders will exceed 5 Ha and hence this proposal no. 404722 which is considered in this SEIAA meeting must also be considered under the cluster situation as one file of Tumkur named Sri Palaksha SEIAA 07 MIN 2021 and Smt.Jayamma SEIAA 08 MIN 2021 was also consider under cluster situation even though there was no existing leases in the cluster sketch and all proposed leases were considered under cluster.

This proposal of Sri Raju Yogisha must also be considered under cluster as all the 7 proposals which are mentioned in cluster sketch of proposal no. SIA/KA/MIN/404682/2022 and file no. SEIAA 465 MIN 2022 are already submitted for EC and Hence ToR must be issued for all these projects.


Reply: The proponent informed that initially there were 7 notifications issued including the present proposal and we had applied for EC for all the 7 proposals. After consulting other proponents, they had withdrawn the following proposals, (01) Sri. Nithyananda M D SIA/KA/MIN/404634/2022, SEIAA 460 MIN 2022 (02) Sri. Nithyananda M D SIA/KA/MIN/404657/2022, SEIAA 461 MIN 2022 (03) Sri. Yogisha R SIA/KA/MIN/404682/2022, SEIAA 462 MIN 2022 (04) Sri. Somasekhar H P SIA/KA/MIN/404721/2022, SEIAA 468 MIN 2022 (05) Sri Vikram B SIA/KA/MIN/404719/2022, SEIAA 491 MIN 2022, after which the total cluster area is 11-30 Acres less than the threshold of 5Ha, hence categorized as B2.

The committee after discussion accepted the clarification given by the proponent and after discussion decided to reiterate the decision taken in 287th SEAC meeting.

Action: Member Secretary, SEAC to forward the proposal to SEIAA for further necessary action.

Meeting Concluded with vote of thanks to all.


Member Secretary, SEAC
Karnataka


Chairman, SEAC
Karnataka