

The 538<sup>th</sup> meeting of the State Expert Appraisal Committee (SEAC) was held on 06<sup>th</sup> January, 2021 under the Chairmanship of Dr. Praveen Chandra Dubey for the projects / issues received from SEIAA. The following members attended the meeting in person or through video conferencing –

1. Shri Raghvendra Shrivastava, Member.
2. Prof. (Dr.) Rubina Chaudhary, Member
3. Dr. A. K. Sharma, Member.
4. Prof. Anil Prakash, Member.
5. Prof. (Dr.) Alok Mittal, Member
6. Dr. Jai Prakash Shukla, Member.
7. Dr. Ravi Bihari Srivastava, Member.
8. Shri A.A. Mishra, Member Secretary.

The Chairman welcomed all the members of the Committee and thereafter agenda items were taken up for deliberations.

1. **Case No 7946/2020 Shri Malkhan Singh S/o Shri Sangram Singh, R/o Gambhir Road, Khedipura, Tehsil - Khirkiya, Dist. Harda, MP - 461441 Prior Environment Clearance for Stone Quarry in an area of 3.0 ha. (22,148 cum per annum) (Khasra No. 509), Village - Choukadi, Tehsil - Khirkiya, Dist. Harda (MP). EIA Consultant: M/s. Aseries Envirotek India Pvt. Ltd. Noida U.P.**

This is case of Stone Quarry. The application was forwarded by SEIAA to SEAC for appraisal. The proposed site (Khasra No. 509), Village - Choukadi, Tehsil - Khirkiya, Dist. Harda (MP) 3.0 ha. The project requires prior EC before commencement of any activity at site.

PP has submitted a copy of approved Mining Plan, DSR report, information in the lease's within 500 meters radius around the site and other requisite information in the prescribed format duly verified in the Collector Office letter no. 1121 dated: 06/10/2020 has reported that there are 04 more mines operating or proposed within 500 meters around the said mine with total area of 13.997 ha., including this mine.

Earlier this case was scheduled for presentation and discussion in 469<sup>th</sup> SEAC dated 17/12/2020 wherein ToR was recommended.

PP has submitted the EIA report vide letter dated 6/7/21 which was forwarded through SEIAA vide letter no. 1392 dated 12/07/21 and the same was scheduled in the agenda.

PP and their consultant presented the EIA before the committee in the 504<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting dated 23.07.2021. During presentation, PP submitted that there are 04 more mines operating or proposed within 500 meters radius around this mine with total area of 13.997 ha. Hence, EIA and public hearing is conducted after obtaining TOR. It was further observed that as per Google image based on coordinates provided by PP that a habitation located at >500 meter distance in the south-west direction of the lease. As per Google image it was also observed by committee that in the QL area agriculture practice were in progress and thus PP was asked to submit soil profile analysis of the lease area. Committee instructed PP that as main issues rose during public hearing such as blasting issue, dust pollution, mine water discharge, improper road etc shall be addressed properly. During appraisal it was also observed by the committee that there are several mistakes in the form-II submitted by PP and are not in line with the details provided in the EIA report. After presentation committee asked PP to submit response on following issues including irrelevant/misleading information provided in From-II, such as:

1. In point no. 07.1 “why complete minutes of public hearing are not uploaded on the web site”, please justify.
2. In point no. 13.1 details are wrongly mentioned, please revise.
3. In point no. 16- When manpower (permanent/temporary) is proposed in point no. 31, then how the waste water volume will be “Zero”.
4. In point no. 17- please provide relevant information for solid waste generation/management.
5. In point no. 35 (9 & 10) – 45,000 million cubic meters OB & top soil mentioned, please justify.
6. Properly address following issues raised during public hearing with plan/proposal:
  - Blasting issue with PPV study.
  - Proposal for tree plantation at public places and nearby school.
  - Proposal for fruit/fodder bearing tree saplings (such as Jackfruit, Custard apple, Mango, Guava, Munga, Orange etc) distribution in adjoining villages.
  - Provision of water sprinkling for dust suppression.
  - Provision of Curtain wall for dust suppression.
  - Mine water discharge and poor road conditions.

7. Proposal for plantation in adjoining forest land through concerned DFO forest and commitment that commensurate budget will be transferred to for plantation to DFO.
8. Patwari's report about the agricultural practices being carried out on this lease area during last 05 years.
9. Proposal for providing solar cookers / LPG gas cylinders under "Ujjwala Yojna" to mine workers under CER.
10. Commitment that plantation shall be carried out through Govt. agency (such as Van Vikas Nigam/Van Samiti under monitoring and guidance of Range officer / Gram Panchayat / Forest Department / Agricultural department by transferring proportionate funds to them.
11. Commitment that local palatable perennial grass species proposed for grassland development/fodder development shall be added in the species for grassland/fodder development and this activity shall be taken up through Local DFO on degraded land suitable for the purpose or through Gram Panchayat on suitable community land.
12. Commitment that dense plantation/ Wood Lot shall be developed (preferably using "Miyawaki Technique") in 7.5m barrier zone left for plantation with the concern CCF (R&E Circle Bhopal).
13. PP's commitment that activities proposed in the CER and plantation scheme will be completed within initial 03 years of the project and in the remaining years shall be maintained.
14. Proposal for CER activates should be based upon Gram Panchayat Annual Action Plan and commitment made during public hearing.

PP vide their letter dated 06/08/2021 submitted query reply hard copy as well as on Ministry's Parivesh Portal. The EMP and other submissions made by the PP were found to be satisfactory and acceptable, hence committee decided to recommend the case for grant of prior EC subject to the following special conditions in addition to the standard conditions at annexure 'A':

1. Production as per approved mine plan with quantity not exceeding for Stone 22,148 cum per annum.
2. A budgetary provision for Environmental management Plan of Rs. 12.55 Lakh as capital and Rs. 5.55 Lakh/year as recurring has proposed by PP.

3. As proposed, a minimum of 1200 trees /year shall be planted within three years in barrier zone, evacuation road, and village through local DFO or Gram Panchayat etc. as per the submitted plantation scheme.
4. All plantation in village shall be uploaded on “Vayudoot app” under Govt. of Madhya Pradesh “ANKUR YOJNA” by registering individual villagers .

The case was discussed in 685<sup>th</sup> Meeting of SEIAA dated 14/9/21 and it has been recorded that. After detailed discussion it was observed that EIA submitted by PP/Consultant have following shortcomings.

- The Khasra number and Name of PP in the attached Quality Test Report (Air, Water, Soil and Noise) is different than that of proposed mine as part of EIA report prepared and submitted by the consultant authorizes by PP.
- All issues raised during the public hearing should be checked properly in respect of all three sanctioned lease (Case no. 7944 and 7945) included in the cluster have to be clubbed & replied together and address in EC condition.
- In such case details of mine owned or being operated by the same owner should be collected and compliance to EC/MPPCB consent conditions shall be reviewed.
- Details of Land ownership/agreement and consent with private land owner shall also be reviewed.

In context to above it is decided to send the case along with technical file to SEAC for re-appraisal. As per the above decision you are requested to re-appraisal the case.

In this meeting SEAC 522 dated 27.10.21 the case was scheduled for PP reply w.r.t. concern raised by SEIAA in the 685<sup>th</sup> Meeting dated 14/9/21. The matter was discussed wherein PP submitted that following point's area as:

- Regarding the khasra number and the name of PP in all the attached Quality Test Report (Air, Water, Soil and Noise) is different than that of proposed mine as part of EIA Report Prepared by the consultant authorized by PP: PP submitted that due to cluster situation, We have consider one monitoring location within 500m radius i.e (Dilip Kaushal of Khasra No 555/1, Area 1.547 ha.). Monitoring period has been taken from Oct.2020-Dec.2020 to generate baseline data within 10km radius to cover all expected impacts of Air, Water, Soil and Noise. Total 10 sampling locations (including T-point) has been taken for Air and Noise, which is shown in Google image. Total 08 sampling location

has been taken for soil and ground water, and 02 sampling locations for surface water. Lease area of Malkhan Singh falls within 500m radius of Dilip Kaushal (as shown in Google image given in Next Slide) which represents same baseline data for Malkhan Singh. This baseline data has covered all expected impacts within the study area (10km radius). Due to typographical error, we are unable to write this cluster information and consideration of Dilip Kaushal monitoring data in the EIA/EMP reports of Malkhan Singh.

- During discussion PP submitted that in all the cases of cluster, common monitoring locations are selected to find out the concentration of various pollutants in given area and based on the findings through modeling predict GLC and its mitigation plan. Cases number 7946/20, 7944/20 and 7945/20 are located within 500 meters of each other and thus considering cluster situation 10 sampling locations for air quality monitoring were selected in core and buffer zone to obtain air quality of the study area. However, its mistake on our part that we have not mentioned this situation in our EIA reports. PP further submitted that this is the common practice adopted by all the consultants in the monitoring of cluster situation to save time and efforts.
- All issue raised during the Public Hearing should be checked properly in respect of all three sanctioned lease (Case No.- 7945 and 7946) included in the cluster have to be clubbed & replied together and address in EC conditions-. PP replied Issues Raised by local villagers during the public hearing are checked properly and addressed in EIA/EMP reports (Refer to page no. 115 to 127 of EIA report) and PH was conducted separately by Regional Office, MPPCB on same day at different time, that's why we had considered separate public hearing proceedings for each case.
- In such cases details of mines owned or being operated by the same owner should be collected and compliance shall also be reviewed. - PP has one more operational mine. Compliance report along with receiving copy is attached herewith (Annexure-2).
- Details of Land ownership/agreement and consent with private land owner shall also be reviewed. - Consent letter of land owner was already submitted at the time of application submitted in SEIAA with hard copy.

Committee after presentation discussed on the issue and agrees with the reply submitted by PP. Committee further observed that issues raised in the public hearing were discussed in length and as desired by committee, PP submitted response vide letter dated 06/08/21. The committee also deliberate that at the time of EIA appraisal issue raised in public hearing are discussed in length and PP is asked to incorporate

relevant suggestions/recommendations made during public hearing in the CER. For seeking compliance status of EC/CTO of other mines owned by the same owner, SEIAA may issue an OM so that at the time of granting TOR this condition shall be stipulated in all B1 categories of cases and in case of B2 projects, PP has to upload this information at the time of making application for EC. In the present scenario as per MoEF&CC OM, compliance of previous EC conditions is sought by SEAC only in the cases of expansion. In this case as per the query made in the 504<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting dated 23-07-21 PP has submitted reply which was discussed in the 510<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting dated 25-08-21 and found satisfactory & acceptable. Hence the committee after deliberations decided to stand by its earlier recommendation made in 510<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting dated 25-08-21.

The case was discussed in 693<sup>th</sup> SEIAA meeting dated 25/11/2021 & it was recorded that...

The case was discussed in 685<sup>th</sup> SEIAA meeting dated 14/9/2021 and it was recorded that...

- (1) This is a project pertaining to mining of Stone Quarry in an area of 3.0 ha. The activity is mentioned at S.No. 1(a) of the Schedule of EIA Notification 2006 as amended from time to time. The project is reported to be at a distance of more than 10 km from National Park/Wildlife Sanctuary/Biodiversity area etc., there is no forest boundary within 250m and thus it is not attracted by the general condition and falls by virtue of its location and mining lease area. The case was forwarded by SEIAA to SEAC for appraisal of EIA for environment clearance for the project. It was submitted that this is a proposed mine having valid lease period from 19/3/2020 to 10 years with production capacity of 22148 Cum per annum.
- (2) It was noted that PP has submitted a copy of approved Mining Plan, DSR report, information in the lease's within 500 meters radius around the site and other requisite information in the prescribed format duly verified in the Collector Office (Mining Division) Harda, vide letter No. 1121 dtd. 06/10/2020 has reported that there are 04 more mines operating within 500 meters around the said mine with total area of 10.997 ha. including proposed mine.
- (3) The Mining Lease has been granted in favour of Shri Malkhan Singh/S/o Shri Sangram Singh R/o Gambhir Road, Khedipura, Tehsil-Khirkiya, Dist. Harda, for 10 years over on area of 3.0 ha. The Mining Plan with progressive mine closure plan has been approved by Regional Director Geology & mines, Bhopal vide letter No.8791 dtd. 01/9/2020.

- (4) It was noted that as per DRO, Harda vide letter no. 7248 dtd. 25/9/2019, the National Park/Sanctuary is not located within 10 Km, radius from the mining site. Hence, the General Conditions are not attracted. It is also noted that there is no forest boundary within 250 m of the proposed mine.
- (5) The proposed plantation programme was examined and it was found that total 4000 saplings shall be covered under plantation program.
- (6) It was noted that the water requirement is 3.625 KLD (2.5 KKLD Dust Suppression + 0.375 KLD Green Belt+0.75 KLD for Domestic purpose) which shall be met from hired tanker supply.
- (7) It was also noted that the Public Hearing was carried out on 07/4/2021 at mine site Village – Choukadi, Tehsil – Khirkiya, Distt. Harda (M.P.) for the 03 different lease on the same day under the Chairmanship of Additional District Magistrate, Distt. Harda.
- (8) SEAC in its 510<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting dated 25/8/2021 has recommended the case with special condition mentioned in Annexure-A for Issuance of EC.

After detailed discussions it was observed that EIA submitted by PP/Consultant have following shortcomings:-

- The Khasra number and name of PP in the attached Quality Test Report (Air, Water, Soil and Noise) are different than that of the proposed mine as part of EIA report prepared and submitted by the consultant authorized by PP.
- All issues raised during the public hearing should be checked properly in respect of all three sanctioned lease (Case No. 7944 and 7945) included in the cluster have to be clubbed & replied together, and address in EC conditions.
- In such cases details of mines owned or being operated by the same owner should be collected and compliance to EC/MPPCB Consent conditions shall be reviewed.
- Details of Land ownership/agreement and consent with private land owner shall also be reviewed.

In context to above it is decided to send the case along with technical file to SEAC for re-appraisal.

The case was again recommended in 522<sup>nd</sup> SEAC meeting dated 27/10/2021 and it was recorded that...

Committee after presentation discussed on the issue and agrees with the reply submitted by PP. Committee further observed that issues raised in the public hearing were discussed in length and as desired by committee, PP submitted response vide

letter dated 06/08/21. The committee also deliberate that at the time of EIA appraisal issue raised in public hearing are discussed in length and PP is asked to incorporate relevant suggestions/recommendations made during public hearing in the CER. For seeking compliance status of EC/CTO of other mines owned by the same owner, SEIAA may issue an OM so that at the time of granting TOR this condition shall be stipulated in all B1 categories of cases and in case of B2 projects, PP has to upload this information at the time of making application for EC. In the present scenario as per MoEF&CC OM, compliance of previous EC conditions is sought by SEAC only in the cases of expansion. In this case as per the query made in the 504<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting dated 23-07-21 PP has submitted reply which was discussed in the 510<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting dated 25-08-21 and found satisfactory & acceptable. Hence the committee after deliberations decided to stand by its earlier recommendation made in 510<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting dated 25-08-21.

After detailed discussion, as per the Mining Officer, District Harda letter No. 1121 dated 06/10/2020 that there are more mines almost adjoining the proposed mine site including the mine of same owner (Shri Malkhan Singh). It is also observed that, on the basis of the Google image the area of adjoining mine site seems already excavated. Looking to the above site conditions, it is not clear, whether the EC was issued by DEIAA for the aforesaid excavated lease area if issued, then this case can be treated as case of expansion and what is the status of compliance of EC conditions. Hence it is decided to send the case back to SEAC for re-appraisal.

In the SEAC 538<sup>th</sup> meeting dated 06.07.2022 the case was scheduled for query presentation in the light of case send to SEAC for re-appraisal by SEIAA in 693<sup>rd</sup> meeting dated 25-11-21. The reply was presented Env. Consultant Shri Amar Singh Yadav from M/s. Aseries Envirotech India Pvt. Ltd. Lucknow, U.P on behalf of PP during presentation PP submitted following summary and clarification of the case:

- EC recommended in 511 SEAC meeting dated 26-08-21
- Case send to SEAC for re-appraisal in 685 SEIAA meeting dated 14-09-21.
- EC recommended in 522 SEAC meeting dated 27-10-21.
- Case send to SEAC for re-appraisal in 693 SEIAA meeting dated 25-11-21.
- Letter no. 2618-19/SEIAA/21 dated 17-12-21 along with technical file to SEAC.
- This is a new lease sanctioned vide letter no. 5933/ Mineral/s.no. 2/2020, Bhopal Dated: 04.07.2020, bearing Khasra no. 509 Part of 3.00ha.
- However, other mine which is in existence is of same PP and under operation since 2015 for which EC Letter Issued by SEIAA Letter No. 7911/SEIAA/2015,



Dated 19.11.2015. This mine is not going to expand its lease area or not going to increase the production.

- As per EIA notification 2006, “Expansion and modernization of existing projects or activities listed in the Schedule to this notification with addition of capacity beyond the limits specified for the concerned sector, that is, projects or activities which cross the threshold limits given in the Schedule, after expansion or modernization”.
- Thus both mines are separate projects and in this condition the new mine should not be considered as a case of an expansion of old mine.
- Compliance report of existing mine has been updated in MPSEIA web Site.

During presentation committee observed that in the online Form-II and other submissions in the EIA report have not correctly matched with the mentioned points/information. Committee takes this matter seriously and informed Env. Consultant to carefully upload EIA and avoid any such error in document uploading in future and asked Env. Consultant to submit entire copy of fresh EIA report which should properly match with mentioned serial numbers and contents. Then after the case shall be further considered.

Following are the points where information found mismatched in the online submitted EIA report.

#### 1. Shortcomings in the on line submitted EIA Report

In Form 2, Point 14.6 Water Level is wrongly written as 0.0??  
In Form 2, Point 35.5 GR/MR etc. are wrongly written  
In Soil, Water and Air Test reports of CEFT Pvt. Ltd. attached as Annexures are not legible.

#### Table 1:1 Compliance of ToR Condition (Pages 4 – 14)

S.No. 7	Figure No. 10.1 is not available on Page Number 130
S.No.10	Item number 2.3.7 is not available on Page Number 36
S.No.12	Required document is not attached on Page Number 202
S.No.31	Item no- 10.3 is not available on Page Number 135.
S.No.34	Table no- 2.7 is not available on Page Number 36 (There is no Table 2.7 in EIA)
S.No.35	Item number 10.6 is not available on Page Number 137
S.No.36	Item number 10.6 is not available on Page Number 137
S.No.37	Item number 10.6 is not available on Page Number 137
S.No.38	Section 10.2 is not available on Page Number 131.
S.No.41	Section 10.2 is not available on Page Number 131.
S.No.42	Item no 7.4 is not available on Page Number 120

S.No.43 Required information is not available on Page Number 124.

**Other Conditions (Page 16)**

S.No.IX Item no 10.3.1 is not available on Page Number 135.

**General Conditions (Page 18)**

S.No.1. Required details are not available on Page Number 247.

S.No.17. Item No. 10.6 is not available on Page Number 137

2. In the revised EIA report all the chapters, sections, tables and figure numbers should be thoroughly checked.
3. A revised copy of the EIA should be submitted to all members either through MPPCB or by post. The copy must reach at least 10 days prior to the meeting scheduled for this case.

**2. Case No 7944/2020 Shri Dilip Koushal S/o Shri Lekhram Koushal, Ward No. 5, Gomukh Road, Khirkiya, Dist. Harda Prior Environment Clearance for Stone Quarry in an area of 1.547 ha. (11,878 cum per annum) (Khasra No. 555/1), Village - Choukadi, Tehsil - Khirkiya, Dist. Harda (MP).EIA Consultant: M/s. Aseries Envirotek India Pvt. Ltd. Noida U.P.**

This is case of Stone Quarry. The application was forwarded by SEIAA to SEAC for appraisal. The proposed site (Khasra No. 555/1), Village - Choukadi, Tehsil - Khirkiya, Dist. Harda (MP) 1.547 ha. The project requires prior EC before commencement of any activity at site.

PP has submitted a copy of approved Mining Plan, DSR report, information in the lease's within 500 meters radius around the site and other requisite information in the prescribed format duly verified in the Collector Office letter no. 129 dated: 23/5/2020 has reported that there are 05 more mines operating or proposed within 500 meters around the said mine with total area of 18.097 ha., including this mine.

Earlier this case was scheduled for presentation and discussion in 469<sup>th</sup> SEAC dated 17/12/2020 wherein ToR was recommended.

PP has submitted the EIA report vide letter dated 06/7/21 which was forwarded through SEIAA vide letter no. 1400 dated 12/07/21 and the same was scheduled in the agenda.

PP and their consultant presented the EIA before the committee in the 504<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting dated 23.07.2021. During presentation, PP submitted this is a green field project and there are 05 more mines operating or proposed within 500 meters radius around this mine with total area of 18.097 ha. hence, EIA and public hearing is conducted after obtaining TOR. PP submitted that mining will be done by opencast semi-mechanized method with control drilling and controlled blasting using sand bags. Top soil will be scrapped & stacked for the subsequent plantation during the mining plan period. OB and waste generated of the total production, and will be used as road building materials. Blasting shall be only be carried out as per the approved mine plan. During appraisal it was also observed by the committee that there are several mistakes in the form-II submitted by PP and are not in line with the details provided in the EIA report. After presentation committee asked PP to submit response on following issues including irrelevant/misleading information provided in From-II, such as:

1. In point no. 07.1 “why complete minutes of public hearing are not uploaded on the web site”, please justify.
2. In point no. 13.1 details are wrongly mentioned, please revise.
3. In point no. 17- please provide relevant information for top soil generation/management.
4. In point no. 35 (9 & 10) – 9348 million cubic meters OB & 1380 top soil mentioned, please justify.
5. Properly address following issues raised during public hearing with plan/proposal:
  - Tree plantation at public places and in school premises with adequate protection measures.
  - Proposal for fruit/fodder bearing tree saplings (such as Jackfruit, Custard apple, Mango, Guava, Munga, Orange etc) distribution in adjoining villages.
  - Provision of water sprinkling for dust suppression.
  - Provision of Curtain wall for dust suppression.
  - Mine water discharge and poor road conditions.
6. Proposal for plantation in adjoining forest land through concerned DFO forest and commitment that commensurate budget will be transferred to for plantation to DFO.
7. Proposal for providing solar cookers / LPG gas cylinders under “Ujjwala Yojna” to mine workers under CER.

8. Commitment that plantation shall be carried out through Govt. agency (such as Van Vikas Nigam/Van Samiti under monitoring and guidance of Range officer / Gram Panchayat / Forest Department / Agricultural department by transferring proportionate funds to them.
9. Commitment that local palatable perennial grass species proposed for grassland development/fodder development shall be added in the species for grassland/fodder development and this activity shall be taken up through Local DFO on degraded land suitable for the purpose or through Gram Panchayat on suitable community land.
10. Commitment that dense plantation/ Wood Lot shall be developed (preferably using “Miyawaki Technique”) in 7.5m barrier zone left for plantation with the concern CCF (R&E Circle Bhopal).
11. PP’s commitment that activities proposed in the CER and plantation scheme will be completed within initial 03 years of the project and in the remaining years shall be maintained.
12. Proposal for CER activates should be based upon Gram Panchayat Annual Action Plan and commitment made during public hearing.

PP vide their letter dated 07/08/2021 submitted query reply hard copy as well as on Ministry’s Parivesh Portal. The EMP and other submissions made by the PP were found to be satisfactory and acceptable, hence committee decided to recommend the case for grant of prior EC subject to the following special conditions in addition to the standard conditions at annexure ‘A’:

1. Production as per approved mine plan with quantity not exceeding for Stone 11,878 cum per annum.
2. A budgetary provision for Environmental management Plan of Rs. 16.075 Lakh as capital and Rs. 4.70 Lakh/year as recurring has proposed by PP.
3. As proposed, a minimum of 1066 trees /year shall be planted within three years in barrier zone, evacuation road, and village through local DFO or Gram Panchayat etc. as per the submitted plantation scheme.
4. All plantation in village shall be uploaded on “Vayudoot app” under Govt. of Madhya Pradesh “ANKUR YOJNA” by registering individual villagers .

The case was discussed in 685<sup>th</sup> Meeting of SEIAA dated 14/9/21 and it has been recorded that. After detailed discussion it was observed that EIA submitted by PP/Consultant have following shortcomings.

- All issues raised during the public hearing should be checked properly in respect of all three sanctioned lease (Case no. 7945 and 7946) included in the cluster have to be clubbed & replied together, and address in EC condition.
- In such case details of mine owned or being operated by the same owner should be collected and compliance to EC/MPPCB consent conditions shall be reviewed.
- Details of Land ownership/agreement and consent with private land owner shall also be reviewed.

In context to above it is decided to send the case along with technical file to SEAC for re-appraisal. As per the above decision you are requested to re-appraisal the case.

In the SEAC 536<sup>th</sup> meeting dated 17.12.2021 the case was scheduled for PP reply w.r.t. concern raised by SEIAA in the 685<sup>th</sup> Meeting dated 14/9/21. The matter was discussed wherein PP submitted that following points area as :

- Issues Raised by local villagers during the public hearing should be checked properly and shall be addressed under EC Conditions. PP replied, issues raised by local villagers during the public hearing are checked properly and addressed in EIA/EMP reports (Refer to page no. 116 to 122 of EIA report) and PH was conducted separately by Regional Office, MPPCB on same day at different time, that's why we had considered separate public hearing proceeding for each case. PH Minutes also attached as Annexure-1.
- In such cases details of mines owned or being operated by the same owner should be collected and compliance shall also be reviewed. Same owner has one more operational mine.  
PP replied that the compliance of EC conditions (case no. 3438) has already been submitted by PP. (Annexure-2)
- Details of Land ownership/agreement and consent with private land owner shall also be reviewed. PP replied that PP has the land ownership of this mine (Khasra no. 555/1) Khasra Panchshala is attached (Annexure-3)

Committee after presentation discussed on the issue and agrees with the reply submitted by PP. Committee further observed that issues raised in the public hearing were discussed in length and as desired by committee, PP submitted response vide letter dated 07/08/21. The committee also deliberate that at the time of EIA appraisal issue raised in public hearing are discussed in length and PP is asked to incorporate relevant suggestions/recommendations made during public hearing in the CER. However, in this case no serious issues were raised during public hearing. For seeking compliance status of EC/CTO of other mines owned by the same owner, SEIAA may

issue an OM so that at the time of granting TOR this condition shall be stipulated in all B1 categories of cases and in case of B2 projects, PP has to upload this information at the time of making application for EC. In the present scenario as per MoEF&CC OM, compliance of previous EC conditions is sought by SEAC only in the cases of expansion. In this case as per the query made in the 504<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting dated 23-07-21 PP has submitted reply which was discussed in the 510<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting dated 25-08-21 and found satisfactory & acceptable. Hence the committee after deliberations decided to stand by its earlier recommendation made in 510<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting dated 25-08-21.

The case was discussed in 693<sup>th</sup> SEIAA meeting dated 25/11/2021 & it was recorded that...

The case was discussed in 685<sup>th</sup> SEIAA meeting dated 14/9/2021 and it was recorded that...

After detailed discussions it was observed that EIA submitted by PP/Consultant have following shortcomings.

- All issues raised during the public hearing should be checked properly in respect of all three sanctioned lease (Case no. 7945 and 7946) included in the cluster have to be clubbed & replied together, and address in EC condition.
- In such case details of mine owned or being operated by the same owner should be collected and compliance to EC/MPPCB consent conditions shall be reviewed.
- Details of Land ownership/agreement and consent with private land owner shall also be reviewed.

In context of Land ownership/agreement and consent with private land owner shall also be reviewed.

The case was again recommended in 522<sup>nd</sup> SEAC meeting dated 27/10/2021 and it was recorded that..

Committee after presentation discussed on the issue and agrees with the reply submitted by PP. Committee further observed that issues raised in the public hearing were discussed in length and as desired by committee, PP submitted response vide letter dated 07/08/21. The committee also deliberate that at the time of EIA appraisal issue raised in public hearing are discussed in length and PP is asked to incorporate relevant suggestions/recommendations made during public hearing in the CER.

However, in this case no serious issues were raised during public hearing. For seeking compliance status of EC/CTO of other mines owned by the same owner, SEIAA may issue an OM so that at the time of granting TOR this condition shall be stipulated in all B1 categories of cases and in case of B2 projects, PP has to upload this information at the time of making application for EC. In the present scenario as per MoEF&CC OM, compliance of previous EC conditions is sought by SEAC only in the cases of expansion. In this case as per the query made in the 504<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting dated 23-07-21 PP has submitted reply which was discussed in the 510<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting dated 25-08-21 and found satisfactory & acceptable. Hence the committee after deliberations decided to stand by its earlier recommendation made in 510<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting dated 25-08-21.

After detailed discussion, as per the Mining Officer, District Harda letter No. 1121 dated 06/10/2020 that there is 01 more mine located almost adjoining to the proposed mine sites including 02 proposed mine site of the same owner (Shri Dilip Koushal). It is also observed that, on the basis of the Google Image the area of adjoining mine site seems already excavated. Looking to the above site conditions, it is not clear, whether the EC was issued by DEIAA for the aforesaid excavated lease area? If issued, then this case can be treated as case of expansion and what is the status of compliance of EC conditions? Hence it is decided to send the case back to SEAC for re-appraisal.

In the SEAC 538<sup>th</sup> meeting dated 06.07.2022 the case was scheduled for query presentation in the light of case sent to SEAC for re-appraisal by SEIAA in 693<sup>rd</sup> meeting dated 25-11-21. The reply was presented Env. Consultant Shri Amar Singh Yadav from M/s. Aseries Envirotech India Pvt. Ltd. Lucknow, U.P on behalf of PP during presentation PP submitted following summary and clarification of the case:

- EC recommended in 511 SEAC meeting dated 26-08-21.
- Case sent to SEAC for re-appraisal in 685 SEIAA meeting dated 14-09-21. Letter no. 2094-95/SEIAA/21 dated 30-09-21 along with technical file to SEAC for reappraisal.
- EC recommended in 522 SEAC meeting dated 27-10-21.
- Case sent to SEAC for re-appraisal in 693 SEIAA meeting dated 25-11-21. Letter no. 2620-21/SEIAA/21 dated 17-12-21 along with technical file to SEAC.
- This is a new lease sanctioned vide letter no. Issued vide letter no. Issued vide letter no. 2464/ Mineral/s.no. 3/2018-19, Harda Dated: 28.02.2019, bearing Khasra no. 555/1 of 1.547 ha.
- However, 01 other mine is in existence of same PP (Shri Dilip Koushal) under operation since 2015 in which EC Letter is issued by SEIAA

LetterNo.7917/SEIAA/2015. This mine is not going to expand its lease area or not going to increase the production.

- Also, 01 other mine (**Case. No. 7945**) is new and has been applied for obtaining EC from SEIAA.
- As per EIA notification 2006, “Expansion and modernization of existing projects or activities listed in the Schedule to this notification with addition of capacity beyond the limits specified for the concerned sector, that is, projects or activities which cross the threshold limits given in the Schedule, after expansion or modernization”. Thus both mines are separate projects and in this condition the new mine should not be considered as a case of an expansion of old mine.
- Compliance report of existing mine has been updated in MPSEIA web Site.

During presentation committee observed that in the online Form-II and other submissions in the EIA report have not correctly matched with the mentioned points/information. Committee takes this matter seriously and informed Env. Consultant to carefully upload EIA and avoid any such error in document uploading in future and asked Env. Consultant to submit entire copy of fresh EIA report which should properly match with mentioned serial numbers and contents. Then after the case shall be further considered.

Following are the points where information found mismatched in the online submitted EIA report.

#### **1. Shortcomings in the on line submitted EIA Report**

Form 2, Point 35.5 GR/MR etc. are wrongly written  
Soil, Water and Air Test reports of CEFT Pvt. Ltd. attached as Annexures are not legible.

#### **Table 1:1 Compliance of ToR Condition (Pages 4 – 14)**

- S.No. 4. Figure number 3.2 & 3.3 is not available on Page Number 46 to 47.
- S.No. 5 Figure No. 3.3 is not available on Page Number 46 to 47
- S.No. 7 Figure No. 10.1 is not available on Page Number 133
- S.No. 7 Required information is not available in Annexure No-XI
- S.No. 8 Item number 2.5.6 is not available on Page Number 42
- S.No. 9 Item number 2.3.5 is not available on Page Number 37.
- S.No. 10 Figure number 3.2 & 3.3 is not available on Page Number 46-47



- S.No.10 Item number 2.3.7 is not available on Page Number 39
- S.No. 15 Table number 3.14 & 3.15 are not available on Page Number 85-86.
- S.No. 18 Table number 3.14 & 3.15 are not available on Page Number 85-86.
- S.No. 22 Item 3.1 is not available on Page Number 44
- S.No. 22 Figure number 3.17 is not available on Page Number 72
- S.No. 23 Item no- 4.3.4 is not available on Page Number 99 to 100.
- S.No. 24 Item no-2.4.2 is not available on Page Number 39.
- S.No. 26 Item no- 4.4 & 4.4.1 are not available on Page Number 106
- S.No. 27 Item no- 4.4 & 4.4.1 are not available on Page Number 106
- S.No.31 Item no- 10.3 is not available on Page Number 138.
- S.No. 32 Item no- 4.8 is not available on Page Number 109.
- S.No. 34 Item no- 2.3.7 is not available on Page Number 39
- S.No.35 Item number 10.6 is not available on Page Number 140
- S.No.36 Table 10.2 is not available on Page Number 134
- S.No.37 Table 10.1 is not available on Page Number 140
- S.No.38 Table 10.2 is not available on Page Number 134
- S.No. 39 Production capacity is wrong
- S.No.41 Table 10.1 is not available on Page Number 140
- S.No.42 Item no 7.4 is not available on Page Number 123
- S.No.43 Details of project benefits of project are not available on Page Number 127.

**Documents to be submitted (Page 15)**

- S.No.IX Required letter is not available on Page Number 255-256.

**Other Conditions (Page 16)**

- S.No. I Figure number 3.2 & 3.3 are not available on Page Number 46-47
- S.No. II Figure number 3.3 is not available on Page Number 47
- S.No. III Figure 2.6 is not available on Page Number 38
- S.No. V Item no 4.4.1 is not available on Page Number 106.
- S.No.IX Item no 10.3.1 is not available on Page Number 138.
- S.No. XII Item no-2.4.2 is not available on Page Number 39
- S.No. XIV Item no 4.8 is not available on Page Number 109.

**General Conditions (Page 18)**

- S.No.1 Required details are not available on Page Number 257 - 258
  - S.No. 2 Table number 3.13 & 3.14 are not available on Page Number 83
  - S.No.17. Item No. 10.6 is not available on Page Number 140
4. In the revised EIA report all the chapters, sections, tables and figure numbers should be thoroughly checked.
  5. A revised copy of the EIA should be submitted to all members either through MPPCB or by post. The copy must reach at least 10 days prior to the meeting scheduled for this case.

**3. Case No 7945/2020 Shri Dilip Koushal S/o Shri Lekhram Koushal, Ward No. 5, Gomukh Road, Khirkiya, Dist. Harda, MP - 461331 Prior Environment Clearance for Stone Quarry in an area of 1.558 ha. (11,878 cum per annum) (Khasra No. 555/3), Village - Choukadi, Tehsil - Khirkiya, Dist. Harda (MP).EIA Consultant: M/s. Aseries Envirotek India Pvt. Ltd. Noida U.P.**

This is case of Stone Quarry. The application was forwarded by SEIAA to SEAC for appraisal. The proposed site (Khasra No. 555/3), Village - Choukadi, Tehsil - Khirkiya, Dist. Harda (MP) 1.558 ha. The project requires prior EC before commencement of any activity at site.

PP has submitted a copy of approved Mining Plan, DSR report, information in the lease's within 500 meters radius around the site and other requisite information in the prescribed format duly verified in the Collector Office letter no. 130 dated: 23/5/2020 has reported that there are 05 more mines operating or proposed within 500 meters around the said mine with total area of 18.102 ha., including this mine.

Earlier this case was scheduled for presentation and discussion in 469<sup>th</sup> SEAC dated 17/12/2020 wherein ToR was recommended.

PP has submitted the EIA report vide letter dated 6/7/21 which was forwarded through SEIAA vide letter no. 1398 dated 12/07/21 and the same was scheduled in the agenda.

PP and their consultant presented the EIA before the committee in the 504<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting dated 23.07.2021. During presentation, PP submitted this is a green field project and there are 05 more mines operating or proposed within 500 meters radius around this mine with total area of 18.102 ha., hence EIA and public hearing is conducted after obtaining TOR. PP submitted that mining will be done by opencast semi-mechanized method with control drilling and controlled blasting using sand bags. Top soil will be scrapped & stacked for the subsequent plantation during the mining plan period. OB and waste generated of the total production, and will be used as road building materials. Blasting shall be only be carried out as per the approved mine plan. During appraisal it was also observed by the committee that there are several mistakes in the form-II submitted by PP and are not in line with the details provided in the EIA report. After presentation committee asked PP to submit response on following issues including irrelevant/misleading information provided in From-II, such as:

1. In point no. 07.1 "why complete minutes of public hearing are not uploaded on the web site", please justify.
2. In point no. 13.1 details are wrongly mentioned, please revise.

3. In point no. 17- please provide relevant information for top soil generation/management.
4. In point no. 35 (9 & 10) – 6900 million cubic meters OB & 0.00 million cubic meters top soil mentioned, please justify.
5. Properly address following issues raised during public hearing with plan/proposal:
  - Proposal for tree plantation at public places and nearby school.
  - Proposal for fruit/fodder bearing tree saplings (such as Jackfruit, Custard apple, Mango, Guava, Munga, Orange etc) distribution in adjoining villages.
  - Provision of water sprinkling for dust suppression.
  - Provision of Curtain wall for dust suppression.
  - Mine water discharge and poor road conditions.
6. Proposal for plantation in adjoining forest land through concerned DFO forest and commitment that commensurate budget will be transferred to for plantation to DFO.
7. Proposal for providing solar cookers / LPG gas cylinders under “Ujjwala Yojna” to mine workers under CER.
8. Commitment that plantation shall be carried out through Govt. agency (such as Van Vikas Nigam/Van Samiti under monitoring and guidance of Range officer / Gram Panchayat / Forest Department / Agricultural department by transferring proportionate funds to them.
9. Commitment that local palatable perennial grass species proposed for grassland development/fodder development shall be added in the species for grassland/fodder development and this activity shall be taken up through Local DFO on degraded land suitable for the purpose or through Gram Panchayat on suitable community land.
10. Commitment that dense plantation/ Wood Lot shall be developed (preferably using “Miyawaki Technique”) in 7.5m barrier zone left for plantation with the concern CCF (R&E Circle Bhopal).
11. PP’s commitment that activities proposed in the CER and plantation scheme will be completed within initial 03 years of the project and in the remaining years shall be maintained.
12. Proposal for CER activates should be based upon Gram Panchayat Annual Action Plan and commitment made during public hearing.

PP vide their letter dated 07/08/2021 submitted query reply hard copy as well as on Ministry's Parivesh Portal. The EMP and other submissions made by the PP were found to be satisfactory and acceptable, hence committee decided to recommend the case for grant of prior EC subject to the following special conditions in addition to the standard conditions at annexure 'A':

1. Production as per approved mine plan with quantity not exceeding for Stone 11,878 cum per annum.
2. A budgetary provision for Environmental management Plan of Rs. 16.034 Lakh as capital and Rs. 4.66 Lakh/year as recurring has proposed by PP.
3. As proposed, a minimum of 1000 trees /year shall be planted within three years in barrier zone, evacuation road, and village through local DFO or Gram Panchayat etc. as per the submitted plantation scheme.
4. All plantation in village shall be uploaded on "Vayudoot app" under Govt. of Madhya Pradesh "ANKUR YOJNA" by registering individual villagers .

The case was discussed in 685<sup>th</sup> Meeting of SEIAA dated 14/9/21 and it has been recorded that. After detailed discussion it was observed that EIA submitted by PP/Consultant have following shortcomings.

- The Khasra number and Name of PP in the attached Quality Test Report (Air, Water, Soil and Noise) is different than that of the proposed mine as part of EIA report prepared and submitted by the consultant authorizes by PP.
- All issues raised during the public hearing should be checked properly in respect of all three sanctioned lease (Case no. 7944 and 7946) included in the cluster have to be clubbed & replied together, and address in EC condition.
- In such case details of mine owned or being operated by the same owner should be collected and compliance to EC/MPPCB consent conditions shall be reviewed.
- Details of Land ownership/agreement and consent with private land owner shall also be reviewed context to above it is decided to send the case along with technical file to SEAC for re-appraisal.

In context to above it is decided to send the case along with technical file to SEAC for re-appraisal. As per the above decision you are requested to re-appraisal the case.

In the 522<sup>nd</sup> SEAC meeting dated 27-10-21 the case was scheduled for PP reply w.r.t. concern raised by SEIAA in the 685<sup>th</sup> Meeting dated 14/9/21. The matter was discussed wherein PP submitted that following points area as :

- The Khasra number and Name of PP in the attached Quality Test Report (Air, Water, Soil and Noise) is different than that of the proposed mine as part of EIA report prepared and submitted by the consultant authorizes by PP.

PP replied that due to cluster situation, We have consider one monitoring location within 500m radius i.e (Dilip Kaushal of Khasra No 555/1, Area 1.547 ha. and Dilip Kaushal of acre Area 1.558 ha. Monitoring period has been taken from Oct.2020-Dec.2020 to generate baseline data of 10km radius to cover all expected impacts of Air, Water, Soil and Noise. Total 10 sampling locations (including T-point) has been taken for Air and Noise, which is shown in Google. Total 08 sampling location has been taken for soil and ground water and 02 sampling locations for surface water. Lease area of Dilip Koushal of khasra no. 555/3 falls within 500m radius of Dilip Kaushal of khasra no. 555/1 (as shown in Google image in next slide) so we have considered same baseline data in this case. This baseline data has covered all expected impacts within the study area (10km radius). Due to typographical error, we are unable to write this cluster information and consideration of Dilip Kaushal.

- During discussion PP submitted that in all the cases of cluster, common monitoring locations are selected to find out the concentration of various pollutants in given area and based on the findings through modeling predict GLC and its mitigation plan. Cases number 7946/20, 7944/20 and 7945/20 are located within 500 meters of each other and thus considering cluster situation 10 sampling locations for air quality monitoring were selected in core and buffer zone to obtain air quality of the study area. However, its mistake on our part that we have not mentioned this situation in our EIA reports. PP further submitted that this is the common practice adopted by all the consultants in the monitoring of cluster situation to save time and efforts.
- All issues raised during the public hearing should be checked properly in respect of all three sanctioned lease (Case no. 7944 and 7946) included in the cluster have to be clubbed & replied together, and address in EC condition. PP replied that Issues Raised by local villagers during the public hearing are checked properly and addressed in EIA/EMP reports (Refer to page no. 116 to 122 of EIA report) and PH was conducted separately by Regional Office, MPPCB on

same day at different time, that's why we had considered separate public hearing proceeding for each case.

In such case details of mine owned or being operated by the same owner should be collected and compliance to EC/MPPCB consent conditions shall be reviewed. PP replied that the compliance of EC conditions (case no. 3438) has already been submitted by PP. (Annexure-2)

- Details of Land ownership/agreement and consent with private land owner shall also be reviewed context to above it is decided to send the case along with technical file to SEAC for re-appraisal. PP has the land ownership which is shown in Khasra Panchshala. (Annexure-3)

Committee after presentation discussed on the issue and agrees with the reply submitted by PP. Committee further observed that issues raised in the public hearing were discussed in length and as desired by committee, PP submitted response vide letter dated 07/08/21. The committee also deliberate that at the time of EIA appraisal issue raised in public hearing are discussed in length and PP is asked to incorporate relevant suggestions/recommendations made during public hearing in the CER. However, in this case no serious issues were raised during public hearing. For seeking compliance status of EC/CTO of other mines owned by the same owner, SEIAA may issue an OM so that at the time of granting TOR this condition shall be stipulated in all B1 categories of cases and in case of B2 projects, PP has to upload this information at the time of making application for EC. In the present scenario as per MoEF&CC OM, compliance of previous EC conditions is sought by SEAC only in the cases of expansion. In this case as per the query made in the 504<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting dated 23-07-21 PP has submitted reply which was discussed in the 510<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting dated 25-08-21 and found satisfactory & acceptable. Hence the committee after deliberations decided to stand by its earlier recommendation made in 510<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting dated 25-08-21.

The case was discussed in 693<sup>th</sup> SEIAA meeting dated 25/11/2021 & it was recorded that...

The case was discussed in 685<sup>th</sup> SEIAA meeting dated 14/9/2021 and it was recorded that...

SEAC in its 510<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting dtd. 25/8/2021 has recommended the case with special conditions mentioned in Annexure-A

After detailed discussions it was observed that EIA submitted by PP/Consultant have following shortcomings.

- The Khasra number and Name of PP in the attached Quality Test Report (Air, Water, Soil and Noise) is different than that of the proposed mine as part of EIA report prepared and submitted by the consultant authorizes by PP.
- All issues raised during the public hearing should be checked properly in respect of all three sanctioned lease (Case no. 7944 and 7946) included in the cluster have to be clubbed & replied together, and address in EC condition.
- In such case details of mine owned or being operated by the same owner should be collected and compliance to EC/MPPCB consent conditions shall be reviewed.
- Details of Land ownership/agreement and consent with private land owner shall also be reviewed context to above it is decided to send the case along with technical file to SEAC for re-appraisal.

In context to above it is decided to send the case along with technical file to SEAC for re-appraisal.

The case was again recommended in 522<sup>nd</sup> SEAC meeting dated 27/10/2021 and it was recorded that..

Committee after presentation discussed on the issue and agrees with the reply submitted by PP. Committee further observed that issues raised in the public hearing were discussed in length and as desired by committee, PP submitted response vide letter dated 07/08/21. The committee also deliberate that at the time of EIA appraisal issue raised in public hearing are discussed in length and PP is asked to incorporate relevant suggestions/recommendations made during public hearing in the CER. However, in this case no serious issues were raised during public hearing. For seeking compliance status of EC/CTO of other mines owned by the same owner, SEIAA may issue an OM so that at the time of granting TOR this condition shall be stipulated in all B1 categories of cases and in case of B2 projects, PP has to upload this information at the time of making application for EC. In the present scenario as per MoEF&CC OM, compliance of previous EC conditions is sought by SEAC only in the cases of expansion. In this case as per the query made in the 504<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting dated 23-07-21 PP has submitted reply which was discussed in the 510<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting dated 25-08-21 and found satisfactory & acceptable. Hence the committee after deliberations decided to stand by its earlier recommendation made in 510<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting dated 25-08-21.

After detailed discussion, as per the Minig Officer, District Harda letter No. 1121 dated 06/10/2020 that there us 01 more mine located almost adjoining to the proposed mine sites including 02 proposed mine site of the same owner (Shri Dilip Koushal), it is also observed that, on the basis of the Google image the area of adjoining mine site seems by DEIAA for the aforesaid excavated lease area if issued, then this case can be treated as case expansion and what is the status of compliance of EC conditions. Hence, it is decided to send the case back to SEAC for re-appraisal.

In the SEAC 538<sup>th</sup> meeting dated 06.07.2022 the case was scheduled for query presentation in the light of case send to SEAC for re-appraisal by SEIAA in 693<sup>rd</sup> meeting dated 25-11-21. The reply was presented Env. Consultant Shri Amar Singh Yadav from M/s. Aseries Envirotech India Pvt. Ltd. Lucknow, U.P on behalf of PP during presentation PP submitted following summary and clarification of the case:

- EC recommended in 511 SEAC meeting dated 26-08-21.
- Case send to SEAC for re-appraisal in 685 SEIAA meeting dated 14-09-21. Letter no. 2092-93/SEIAA/21 dated 30-09-21 along with technical file to SEAC for reappraisal.
- EC recommended in 522 SEAC meeting dated 27-10-21.
- Case send to SEAC for re-appraisal in 693 SEIAA meeting dated 25-11-21. Letter no. 2610-11/SEIAA/21 dated 17-12-21 along with technical file to SEAC - for re-appraisal.
- This is a new lease sanctioned vide letter no. Issued vide letter no. Issued vide letter no. 2466/ Mineral/s.no. 2/2018-19, Harda Dated: 28.02.2019, bearing Khasra no. 555/3 of 1.558 ha.
- However, 01 other mine which is in existence is of same PP is under operation since 2015 in which EC Letter was issued by SEIAA vide Letter No. 7917/SEIAA/2015. This mine is not going to expand its lease area or not going to increase the production.
- Also, 01 other mine (Case no. 7944) is new and has been applied in SEIAA in obtaining for EC (Under process).
- As per EIA notification 2006, “Expansion and modernization of existing projects or activities listed in the Schedule to this notification with addition of capacity beyond the limits specified for the concerned sector, that is, projects or activities which cross the threshold limits given in the Schedule, after expansion or modernization”.



- Thus both mines are separate projects and in this condition the new mine should not be considered as a case of an expansion of old mine.
- Compliance report of existing mine has been updated in MPSEIA web Site.

During presentation committee observed that in the online Form-II and other submissions in the EIA report have not correctly matched with the mentioned points/information. Committee takes this matter seriously and informed Env. Consultant to carefully upload EIA and avoid any such error in document uploading in future and asked Env. Consultant to submit entire copy of fresh EIA report which should properly match with mentioned serial numbers and contents. Then after the case shall be further considered.

Following are the points where information found mismatched in the online submitted EIA report.

- In Form 2, Point 35.5 GR/MR etc. is wrongly written.
- Soil, Water and Air Test reports of CEFT Pvt. Ltd. attached as Annexure are not legible.

**Table 1:1 Compliance of ToR Condition (Pages 4 – 14)**

S.No. 4.	Figure number 3.2 & 3.3 is not available on Page Number 46 to 47.
S.No. 5	Figure No. 3.3 is not available on Page Number 46
S.No. 7	Figure No. 10.1 is not available on Page Number 133
S.No. 8	Item number 2.5.6 is not available on Page Number 42
S.No. 9	Item number 2.3.5 is not available on Page Number 37.
S.No. 10	Figure number 3.2 & 3.3 is not available on Page Number 46-47
S.No.10	Item number 2.3.7 is not available on Page Number 39
S.No. 15	Table number 3.14 & 3.15 are not available on Page Number 85-86.
S.No. 18	Table number 3.14 & 3.15 are not available on Page Number 85-86.
S.No. 22	Item 3.1 is not available on Page Number 44
S.No. 22	Figure number 3.17 is not available on Page Number 72
S.No. 23	Item no- 4.3.4 is not available on Page Number 100.
S.No. 24	Item no-2.4.2 is not available on Page Number 40.
S.No. 26	Item no- 4.4 & 4.4.1 are not available on Page Number 106
S.No. 27	Item no- 4.4 & 4.4.1 are not available on Page Number 106
S.No.31	Item no- 10.3 is not available on Page Number 138.
S.No. 32	Item no- 4.8 is not available on Page Number 109.
S.No. 34	Item no- 2.3.7 is not available on Page Number 39
S.No. 34	Item no- 2.5.7 is not available on Page Number 43

S.No.35	Item number 10.6 is not available on Page Number 140
S.No.36	Table 10.1 is not available on Page Number 140
S.No.37	Table 10.1 is not available on Page Number 140
S.No.38	Table 10.2 is not available on Page Number 134
S.No. 39	Production capacity is wrong
S.No.41	Table 10.1 is not available on Page Number 140
S.No.42	Item no 7.4 is not available on Page Number 123
S.No.43	Details of project benefits of project are not available on Page Number 127.

**Documents to be submitted (Page 15)**

S.No.IX	Required letter is not available on Page Number 256.
---------	--

**Other Conditions (Page 16)**

S.No. I	Figure number 3.2 & 3.3 are not available on Page Number 47-48
S.No. II	Figure number 3.3 is not available on Page Number 47
S.No. III	Figure 2.3 is not available on Page Number 23
S.No. V	Item no 4.4.1 is not available on Page Number 106.
S.No.IX	Item no 10.3.1 is not available on Page Number 138.
S.No. XII	Item no-2.4.2 is not available on Page Number 40
S.No. XIV	Item no 4.8 is not available on Page Number 109.

**General Conditions (Page 18)**

S.No.1	Required details are not available on Page Number 256
S.No. 2	Table number 3.13 & 3.14 are not available on Page Number 83& 85
S.No.17.	Item No. 10.6 is not available on Page Number 140

- In the revised EIA report all the chapters, sections, tables and figure numbers should be thoroughly checked.
- A revised copy of the EIA should be submitted to all members either through MPPCB or by post. The copy must reach at least 10 days prior to the meeting scheduled for this case.

**4. Case No 8721/2021 M/s Saraswati Minerals, Shri Ghanshyam Tiwari, Prop., Pendra Road, Tehsil - Pendra, Dist. Gaurela-Pendra-Marwahi, CG. Prior Environment Clearance for Stone Quarry in an area of 1.50 ha. (25000 cum per annum) (Khasra No. 684/1), Village - Pamra, Tehsil - Pushprajgarh, Dist. Anuppur (MP) RQP Shri Ram Milan Pathak, Bhopal**

This is case of Stone Quarry. The application was forwarded by SEIAA to SEAC for appraisal. The proposed site (Khasra No. 684/1), Village - Pamra, Tehsil - Pushprajgarh, Dist. Anuppur (MP) 1.50 Ha. The project requires prior EC before commencement of any activity at site.

The case was presented by RQP Shri Ram Milan Pathak on behalf of PP in the 523<sup>rd</sup> SEAC meeting dated 28-10-21. During presentation, PP showed various documents such as lease sanction order, Gram Sabha, DFO NOC, Tehsildar Certificate, MO Certificate, Approved Mine Plan, Khasra Panchshala, P-II, DSR, EMP & PFR for appraisal of project before the committee. It was observed by Committee that as per Collector Office letter No. 1767 dated 03/9/21 has reported that there are 02 more mines operating or proposed within 500 meters around the said mine with total area of 4.8 ha., including this mine. As per Google image based on online KML file uploaded by PP the lease is located on the hillock, around 500 meters following sensitive features were observed of the lease area:

Sensitive Features	Approximate aerial distance from the lease area in meters	Direction	Remarks
Pucca Road	50	South	Controlled blasting with arrangements of sand bags and three rows of Plantation towards road side.

After presentation committee asked PP to submit response on following information such as:

1. Revised plantation species as suggested by committee and seed sowing in the barrier zone.
2. Revised CER adding proposal for development of Aushadhi Vatika (medicinal garden of perennial species) in the local Aganwadi, distribution of fodder (Napier grass) and fruit species to the villagers with physical & financial targets as suggested by the committee.

PP has submitted the response of above quarries same date vide letter dated 28.10.2021. The EMP and other submissions made by the PP were found to be satisfactory and acceptable, hence committee decided to recommend the case for grant of prior EC subject to the following special conditions in addition to the standard conditions at annexure 'A':

1. Production shall be as per mine plan with quantity not exceeding for Stone 25,000 cum per annum.
2. A budgetary provision for Environmental management Plan of Rs.8.42 Lakh as capital and Rs. 4.49 Lakh/year.
3. As proposed, a minimum of 1800 trees shall be planted as per the submitted plantation scheme and under CSR Rs. 01.60 Lakh/years is proposed.

The case was discussed in 694<sup>th</sup> SEIAA meeting dated 26/11/2021 & it was recorded that...

The case was recommended in 523<sup>rd</sup> SEAC meeting dated 28/10/2021 and it was recorded that...

The EMP and other submissions made by the PP were found to be satisfactory and acceptable, hence committee decided to recommends the case for grant of prior EC subject to the following special conditions in addition to the standard conditions at annexure 'A'

After detailed discussion and as per the Google Image it is observed by the authority that there is a pucca road at a distance of 50 m from the proposed mine site. After leaving the setback to 200 m. from the Pucca road in compliance of the distance criteria for permitting stone quarrying by CPCB and directions issued by Hon'ble NGT in OA No. 304/2019. There will be no minable area left this case hence.

The case was schedule for presentation wherein RQP Shri Ram Milan Pathak was presented the issue raised by SEIAA on behalf of PP. The Committee observed that w.r.t. the Policy decisions of 694<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEIAA held on dated 26/11/21 (forwarded by SEIAA vide letter no. 2590/SEIAA/2021, dated 15.12.2021) and 695<sup>th</sup> dated 09.12.2021 with reference to compliance of the distance criteria for permitting stone quarrying by CPCB and directions issued by Hon'ble NGT in OA No. 304/2019. The committees after detailed discussion on SEIAA vide letter no. 2590/SEIAA/2021, dated 15.12.2021 deliberated that these distance criteria shall be implemented for only those stone quarry and proposals which were received in SEAC after 1<sup>st</sup> January 2022 and distance criteria should not be implemented from the retrospective effect. Hence committee stand by earlier recommendation made in the 523<sup>rd</sup> SEAC meeting dated 28/10/2021.

**5. Case No 8713/2021 Shri Sushil Jat S/o Shri Ramkishor Jat, M.No. 69, Village - Sontalai, Tehsil & Dist. Harda, MP Prior Environment Clearance for Murrum Quarry in an area of 1.251 ha. (7205 cum per annum) (Khasra No. 88/6 Part), Village - Bangrul, Tehsil - Handiya, Dist. Harda (MP) RQP Shri Ram Milan Pathak, Bhopal**

This is case of Murrum Quarry. The application was forwarded by SEIAA to SEAC for appraisal. The proposed site (Khasra No. 88/6 Part), Village - Bangrul, Tehsil -

Handiya, Dist. Harda (MP) 1.251 Ha. The project requires prior EC before commencement of any activity at site.

The case was presented by RQP Shri Ram Milan Pathak on behalf of PP in the 523rd SEAC meeting dated 28-10-21. During presentation, PP showed various documents such as lease sanction order, Gram Sabha, DFO NOC, Tehsildar Certificate, MO Certificate, Approved Mine Plan, Khasra Panchshala, P-II, DSR, EMP & PFR for appraisal of project before the committee. It was observed by Committee that as per Collector Office letter No. 2590 dated 12/2/21 has reported that there are no more mines operating or proposed within 500 meters around the said mine. It was observed by the committee that it's a case of Murrum thus no blasting is proposed. As per Google image based on online KML file uploaded by PP around 500 meters following sensitive features were observed of the lease area:

Sensitive Features	Approximate aerial distance from the lease area in meters	Direction	Remarks
08 Trees	within lease		No tree felling is proposed
Road	100	West	Three rows of Plantation towards road side.

After presentation committee asked PP to submit response on following information such as:

1. PP's commitment that no tree felling is proposed.
2. Revised plantation species as suggested by committee and seed sowing in the barrier zone.
3. Revised CER adding proposal for development of Aushadhi Vatika (medicinal garden of perennial species) in the local Aganwadi, distribution of fodder (Napier grass) and fruit species to the villagers with physical & financial targets as suggested by the committee.

PP has submitted the response of above quarries same date vide letter dated 28.10.2021. The EMP and other submissions made by the PP were found to be satisfactory and acceptable, hence committee decided to recommend the case for grant of prior EC subject to the following special conditions in addition to the standard conditions at annexure 'A':

1. Production shall be as per mine plan with quantity not exceeding for Murrum 7205 cum per annum.

2. A budgetary provision for Environmental management Plan of Rs.7.50 Lakh as capital and Rs. 3.00 Lakh/year.
3. As proposed, a minimum of 2400 trees shall be planted as per the submitted plantation scheme and under CSR Rs. 0.80 Lakh/years is proposed.

The case was discussed in 694<sup>th</sup> SEIAA meeting dated 26/11/2021 & it was recorded that...

The case was recommended in 523<sup>rd</sup> SEAC meeting dated 28/10/2021 and it was recorded that...

The EMP and other submissions made by the PP were found to be satisfactory and acceptable, hence committee decided to recommends the case for grant of prior EC subject to the following special conditions in addition to the standard conditions at annexure 'A'

After detailed discussion and as per Google image it was observed there is one more mines located within the 500m periphery of the proposed mine site which is not considered in assessment of factual status of operated and sanctioned mines within the cluster.

The case was schedule for presentation wherein RQP Shri Ram Milan Pathak was present the issue raised by SEIAA on behalf of PP, during presentation in the Google image committee do not found any visible sign of any mining activity. Moreover, Collector Office letter No. 2590 dated 12/2/21 has also reported that there are no more mines operating or proposed within 500 meters around the said mine. Hence committee stand by earlier recommendation made in the 523<sup>rd</sup> SEAC meeting dated 28/10/2021.

**6. Case No 8727/2021 Shri Nilesh Rai S/o Shri Nathuram Rai, Sadar Bazar, Tehsil & Dist. Sagar, MP – 470002 Prior Environment Clearance for Stone Quarry in an area of 1.0 ha. (5275 cum per annum) (Khasra No. 23, 24), Village - Narwani, Tehsil - Sagar, Dist. Sagar (MP) RQP Shri Ram Milan Pathak, Bhopal**

This is case of Stone Quarry. The application was forwarded by SEIAA to SEAC for appraisal. The proposed site (Khasra No. 23, 24), Village - Narwani, Tehsil - Sagar, Dist. Sagar (MP) 1.0 Ha. The project requires prior EC before commencement of any activity at site.

The case was presented by RQP Shri Ram Milan Pathak on behalf of PP in the 523rd SEAC meeting dated 28-10-21. During presentation, PP showed various documents such as lease sanction order, Gram Sabha, DFO NOC, Tehsildar Certificate, MO Certificate, Approved Mine Plan, Khasra Panchshala, P-II, DSR, EMP & PFR for appraisal of project before the committee. It was observed by Committee that as per Collector Office letter No. 710 dated 06/4/21 has reported that there are no more mines operating or proposed within 500 meters around the said mine. As per Google image based on online KML file uploaded by PP, around 500 meters following sensitive features were observed of the lease area:

Sensitive Features	Approximate aerial distance from the lease area in meters	Direction	Remarks
Pucca Road	20 m	SE	Set back of 30 meters and Controlled blasting with arrangements of sand bags and three rows of Plantation towards road side.
National highway	110	West	Controlled blasting with arrangements of sand bags and three rows of Plantation towards road side.
Human settlement	215	East	Controlled blasting with arrangements of sand bags and three rows of Plantation towards road side.

After presentation committee asked PP to submit response on following information such as:

1. Revised surface map showing set back of 30 meters wrt pucca road at a distance of 28m in the SE side.
2. Revised plantation species as suggested by committee and seed sowing in the barrier zone.
3. Revised CER adding proposal for development of Aushadhi Vatika (medicinal garden of perennial species) in the local Aganwadi , distribution of fodder (Napier grass) and fruit species to the villagers with physical & financial targets as suggested by the committee.

PP has submitted the response of above quarries same date vide letter dated 28.10.2021. The EMP and other submissions made by the PP were found to be satisfactory and acceptable, hence committee decided to recommend the case for grant of prior EC

subject to the following special conditions in addition to the standard conditions at annexure 'A':

1. Production shall be as per mine plan with quantity not exceeding for Stone 5275 cum per annum.
2. A budgetary provision for Environmental management Plan of Rs.06.57 Lakh as capital and Rs. 3.11 Lakh/year.
3. As proposed, a minimum of 2400 trees shall be planted as per the submitted plantation scheme and under CSR Rs. 0.70 Lakh/years is proposed.

The case was discussed in 694<sup>th</sup> SEIAA meeting dated 26/11/2021 & it was recorded that...

The case was recommended in 523<sup>rd</sup> SEAC meeting dated 28/10/2021 and it was recorded that...

The EMP and other submissions made by the PP were found to be satisfactory and acceptable, hence committee decided to recommends the case for grant of prior EC subject to the following special conditions in addition to the standard conditions at annexure 'A'

After detailed discussion and as per the Google Image it is observed by the authority that the Pucca road at 20 m. in south-east direction of the proposed mining site. Thus, leaving 200 m of setback as a "no mining zone" in compliance of the distance criteria for permitting stone quarrying by CPCB and directions issued by Hon'ble NGT in OA No. 304/2019 (distance criteria for Non blasting is 100 m and for blasting is 200 m distance) there will be no minable area left.

The case was schedule for presentation wherein RQP Shri Ram Milan Pathak was present on behalf of PP.

The Committee observed that w.r.t. the Policy decisions of 694<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEIAA held on dated 26/11/21 (forwarded by SEIAA vide letter no. 2590/SEIAA/2021, dated 15.12.2021) and 695<sup>th</sup> dated 09.12.2021 with reference to compliance of the distance criteria for permitting stone quarrying by CPCB and directions issued by Hon'ble NGT in OA No. 304/2019.

The committees after detailed discussion on SEIAA vide letter no. 2590/SEIAA/2021, dated 15.12.2021 deliberated that these distance criteria shall be implemented for only



those stone quarry and proposals which were received in SEAC after 1st January 2022 and distance criteria should not be implemented from the retrospective effect. Hence committee stand by earlier recommendation made in the 523rd SEAC meeting dated 28/10/2021.

**7. Case No 8616/2021 M/s Madhav Infra Project, Shri Diwakar Pai, Authorized Person, Madhav Nagar, Plot No. 4, Near Panchratna Building, Sumanpura, Dist. Vadodara, Guj. - 390023 Prior Environment Clearance for Stone Quarry in an area of 3.868 ha. (1,25,000 cum per annum) (Private land, Khasra No. 136/3, 136/17, 156), Village - Khamkheda, Tehsil - Aron, Dist. Guna (MP)**

This is case of Stone Quarry. The application was forwarded by SEIAA to SEAC for appraisal. The proposed site (Khasra No. 136/3, 136/17, 156), Village - Khamkheda, Tehsil - Aron, Dist. Guna (MP) 3.868 Ha. The project requires prior EC before commencement of any activity at site.

The case was presented by RQP Shri Ram Vishal Shukla behalf of PP in the 511<sup>st</sup> SEAC meeting dated 26-08-21. During presentation, PP showed various documents such as lease sanction order, Gram Sabha, DFO NOC, Tehsildar Certificate, MO Certificate, Approved Mine Plan, Khasra Panchshala, P-II, DSR, PFR & EMP for appraisal of project before the committee. It was observed by Committee that as per Collector Office letter No. 913 dated 11/05/2021 has reported that there are no more mines operating or proposed within 500 meters around the said mine. PP further stated that it's a case of Stone mining and this lease was obtained under temporary permit (TP) for two years. During presentation as per Google image based on coordinates provided by PP Within 500 meters following sensitive features were observed of the lease area:

Sensitive Features	Approximate aerial distance from the lease area in meters	Direction
Human settlement	>500	NE
Pucca road	50	E & SE

During presentation, it was observed that some isolated houses are in existence on the south western side of the lease for which PP submitted that these are labour hutments which are in existence due to coal tar plant on the south west side of the lease. Since SEAC is appraising cases on the basis of documents and details uploaded online, thus all the mandatory information shall be precisely uploaded online for appraisal of case

and to avoid unnecessary delay. After presentation committee asked PP to submit response on following issues and revised/updated information in From-II, such as:

1. In point no. such as 13.0, 14.6, 16.1, 17.0 details are wrongly mentioned, please revise.
2. One pit existed just in the vicinity of the lease and also isolated labour houses in the west side lease in this context MO clarification shall be obtained.
3. Under CER scheme with physical targets:
  - ✓ Activities such as solar panels & white wash in school, awareness camps for Oral Hygiene, Diabetes and Blood Pressure, works related to plantation (distribution of fruit & fodder bearing trees) in concerned village shall be proposed.
  - ✓ No fuel wood shall be used as a source of energy by mine workers. Thus proposal for providing solar cookers / LPG gas cylinders under “Ujjwala Yojna” to them who are residing in the nearby villages, shall be considered.
  - ✓ PP’s commitment that activities proposed in the CER scheme will be completed within initial 03 years of the project and in the remaining years shall be maintained by them.
4. Under Plantation Scheme with budgetary allocations:
  - ✓ Comprehensive green belt plan as suggested by committee by adding native species like Babul, Khamar, Katang bamboo, Chirol and Neem etc) with commitment that entire plantation shall be carried out in the initial three years and will be maintained thereafter with causality replacement. Babool seeds can be sown through trenching method on the periphery of lease for added protection along the fencing. Proposal for distribution of fruit bearing species for nearby villagers shall also be incorporated in the plantation scheme and for which a primary survey for need assessment in concerned village shall be carried out.
  - ✓ Commitment that plantation shall be carried out preferably through Govt. agency (such as Van Vikas Nigam / Van Samiti under monitoring and guidance of Forest Range officer with work permission from DFO concerned / Gram Panchayat / Agricultural department or any other suitable agency having adequate expertise as per the budgetary allocations made in the EMP.
  - ✓ Commitment that high density plantation (preferably using “Miyawaki Technique or WALMI technique) shall be developed in 7.5m barrier zone left

- for plantation by CCF, Social Forestry Circle, Gwalior or any other competent agencies.
- ✓ Commitment that local palatable mixture of annual and perennial grass and fodder tree species shall be planted for grassland/fodder development on degraded forest land suitable for the purpose through Gram Panchayat on suitable community land in the concerned village area and handed over to Gram Panchayat after lease period.
  - ✓ Proposal for plantation in adjoining forest land through concerned DFO.

PP vide their letter dated 12/10/2021 uploaded online query reply and hard copy as well as on “Parivesh Portal”. Committee observed that PP has made necessary corrections in the proposal/documents. The EMP and other submissions made by the PP were found satisfactory and acceptable, hence committee decided to recommend the case for grant of prior EC subject to the following special conditions in addition to the standard conditions at annexure ‘A’:

1. Production of Stone as per mine plan with quantity not exceeding 1,25,000 cum per annum cum/year.
2. A budgetary provision for Environmental management Plan of Rs. 14.15 Lakh as capital and Rs. 4.54 Lakh/year as recurring has proposed by PP.
3. As proposed, a minimum of 4800 nos. of trees shall be planted as per the submitted plantation scheme.

The case was discussed in 694<sup>th</sup> SEIAA meeting dated 26/11/2021 & it was recorded that...

The case was recommended in 523<sup>rd</sup> SEAC meeting dated 28/10/2021 and it was recorded that...

The EMP and other submissions made by the PP were found to be satisfactory and acceptable, hence committee decided to recommends the case for grant of prior EC subject to the following special conditions in addition to the standard conditions at annexure ‘A’

After detailed discussion and as per the Google image it is observed by the authority that there is a Pucca road at 50 m in East & SE direction of proposed mining site. Thus looking the above sensitivity it is decided to send the case back to SEAC for re-appraisal.

The case was scheduled for presentation wherein RQP Shri Ram Vishal Shukla was presented the issue raised by SEIAA on behalf of PP. PP stated that it's a case of Stone mining and this lease was obtained under temporary permit (TP) for two years.

The Committee observed that w.r.t. the Policy decisions of 694<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEIAA held on dated 26/11/21 (forwarded by SEIAA vide letter no. 2590/SEIAA/2021, dated 15.12.2021) and 695<sup>th</sup> dated 09.12.2021 with reference to compliance of the distance criteria for permitting stone quarrying by CPCB and directions issued by Hon'ble NGT in OA No. 304/2019.

The committees after detailed discussion on SEIAA vide letter no. 2590/SEIAA/2021, dated 15.12.2021 deliberated that these distance criteria shall be implemented for only those stone quarry and proposals which were received in SEAC after 1st January 2022 and distance criteria should not be implemented from the retrospective effect. Hence committee stand by earlier recommendation made in the 523rd SEAC meeting dated 28/10/2021.

**8. Case No 8573/2021 Shri Vaibhav Jain S/o Shri Vimal Jain, Ambedkar Ward No. 12, Silwani, Dist. Raisen, MP - 464551 Prior Environment Clearance for Stone Quarry in an area of 1.0 ha. (8550 cum per annum) (Khasra No. 117/2 Part), Village - Ghoorpur, Tehsil - Silwani, Dist. Raisen (MP).**

This is case of Stone Quarry. The application was forwarded by SEIAA to SEAC for appraisal. The proposed site (Khasra No. 117/2 Part), Village - Ghoorpur, Tehsil - Silwani, Dist. Raisen (MP) 1.0 Ha. The project requires prior EC before commencement of any activity at site.

The case was presented by RQP Swati Namdeo on behalf of PP in the 507<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting dated 10/08/2021. During presentation, PP showed various documents such as lease sanction order, Gram Sabha, DFO NOC, Tehsildar Certificate, MO Certificate, Approved Mine Plan, Khasra Panchshala, P-II, DSR, EMP & PFR for appraisal of project before the committee. It was observed by Committee that as per Collector Office letter No. 52 dated 24/4/2021 has reported that there are 01 more mines operating or proposed within 500 meters around the said mine with total area of 3.429 ha., including this mine.

During presentation it was observed by the committee that as per Google image based on coordinates provided by PP two mines are in existence within 500 meters however,

MO has reported only one mine. PP submitted that other mine was sanctioned as TP and now not in operation. Committee after deliberation decided that PP may obtain clarification on above issue from the mining officer clearly stating the number of mines sanctioned within 500 meters, details of mines which are not in operation with reason for further consideration of this case.

The case was presented by RQP Swati Namdeo on behalf of PP in the 523<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting dated 28-10-21, wherein it was submitted that as suggested by SEAC they have obtained revised MO certificate issued vide letter no. 605 dated 27.08.21 wherein MO stated that another mine in 500 m was sanctioned during 23.11.19 to 18.07.21 on TP basis and right now is not in operation. Thus only 01 mine within 500 m. Committee after deliberation decided that this case shall be schedule for re-appraisal in the forthcoming SEAC meeting. As per Google image based on online KML file uploaded by PP, around 500 meters following sensitive features were observed of the lease area:

Sensitive Features	Approximate aerial distance from the lease area in meters	Direction	Remarks
Pucca Road	33 & 109	North & East	PP submitted that they have already left 17 m set back and Controlled blasting with arrangements of sand bags and three rows of Plantation is proposed towards road side.
Some Trees	within lease	-	No tree felling is proposed tree occupied area shall be dealt as non- mining area .
Human settlement	260	North	Controlled blasting with arrangements of sand bags and three rows of Plantation towards road side.

After presentation committee asked PP to submit response on following information such as:

1. Revised plantation species as suggested by committee and seed sowing in the barrier zone.
2. Revised CER adding proposal for plantation in the non mining area with physical & financial targets as suggested by the committee.

PP has submitted the response of above quarries same date vide letter dated 28.10.2021. The EMP and other submissions made by the PP were found to be satisfactory and acceptable, hence committee decided to recommend the case for grant of prior EC

subject to the following special conditions in addition to the standard conditions at annexure 'A':

1. Production shall be as per mine plan with quantity not exceeding for Stone 8550cum per annum.
2. A budgetary provision for Environmental management Plan of Rs.8.99 Lakh as capital and Rs. 1.20 Lakh/year.
3. As proposed, a minimum of 1280 trees shall be planted as per the submitted plantation scheme.

The case was discussed in 694<sup>th</sup> SEIAA meeting dated 26/11/2021 & it was recorded that...

The case was recommended in 523<sup>rd</sup> SEAC meeting dated 28/10/2021 and it was recorded that...

The EMP and other submissions made by the PP were found to be satisfactory and acceptable, hence committee decided to recommends the case for grant of prior EC subject to the following special conditions in addition to the standard conditions at annexure 'A'

After detailed discussion and as per the Google Image it is observed by the authority that there is a Pucca road at 33 m. in North-East direction of proposed minig site and existence of some trees. Thus after leaving 200 m from the Pucca Road as a "no Minng Zone" in compliance of the distance criteria for permitting stone quarrying by CPCB and directions issued by Hon;ble NGT in OA No. 304/2019 (distance criteria for Non blasting is 100 m and for blasting is 200 m distance) there will be no minable are left.

The case was scheduled for the presentation but neither the Project Proponent (PP) nor his representative was present to explain the query which might be raised or to make any commitment which may be desired by the committee during the deliberation. Committee decided to call the PP in subsequent meetings.

- 9. Case No 8701/2021 Shri Ajay Gupta S/o Shri Ramprakash Gupta, Tiwari Compound, Near Geeta Marriage Palace, ITI Road, Dist. Hoshangabad, MP - 464990 Prior Environment Clearance for Stone Quarry in an area of 1.982 ha. (25935 cum per annum) (Khasra No. 6/9/3, 6/9/4, 6/9/5), Village - Barhakheda, Tehsil - Goharganj , Dist. Raisen (MP)**

This is case of Stone Quarry. The application was forwarded by SEIAA to SEAC for appraisal. The proposed site (Khasra No. 6/9/3, 6/9/4, 6/9/5), Village - Barhakheda, Tehsil - Goharganj, Dist. Raisen (MP) 1.982 Ha. The project requires prior EC before commencement of any activity at site.

The case was presented by RQP Swati Namdeo on behalf of PP. During presentation, PP showed various documents such as lease sanction order, Gram Sabha, DFO NOC, Tehsildar Certificate, MO Certificate, Approved Mine Plan, Khasra Panchshala, P-II, DSR, EMP & PFR for appraisal of project before the committee. It was observed by Committee that as per Collector Office letter No.3745 dated 03.04.2021 has reported that there are 01 more mines operating or proposed within 500 meters around the said mine with total area of 4.812 ha., including this mine. As per Google image based on online KML file uploaded by it was observed by the committee that old pit in existence since 2013, PP submitted that it was very old mine pit they have got the lease in such condition and pit have shown in the surface map. Moreover, it was also observed by committee that 02 more mine are in existence within 500 meters for which PP submitted that one mine on the western side is very old and now not in operation since 2018 and this is why it is not stated in certificate and same can be verified from the past Google images. Around 500 meters following sensitive features were observed of the lease area:

<b>Sensitive Features</b>	<b>Approximate distance from the lease area in meters</b>	<b>Direction</b>	<b>Remarks</b>
Road	500	South – West	--
Human settlement	320	South – West	Controlled blasting with arrangements of sand bags and three rows of Plantation towards road side.
Natural drain	87	South	Provision of Garland drain & settling tanks.

After presentation committee asked PP to submit response on following information such as:

1. Lease Chronology shall be submitted by PP.
2. PP's commitment that plantation shall be carried out in the southern-western side of the lease in the first year of operation.

PP has submitted the response of above quarries same date vide letter dated 29.10.2021. The EMP and other submissions made by the PP were found to be satisfactory and acceptable, hence committee decided to recommend the case for grant of prior EC subject to the following special conditions in addition to the standard conditions at annexure 'A':

1. Production shall be as per mine plan with quantity not exceeding for Stone 25,935 cum per annum.
2. A budgetary provision for Environmental management Plan of Rs.11.63 Lakh as capital and Rs. 1.22 Lakh/year.
3. As proposed, a minimum of 2400 trees shall be planted as per the submitted plantation scheme and under CSR Rs. 0.70 Lakh/years is proposed.

The case was discussed in 694th SEIAA meeting dated 26/11/2021 & it was recorded that...

The case was recommended in 524th SEAC meeting dated 29/10/2021 and it was recorded that.

PP has submitted the response of above quarries same date vide letter dated 29/10/2021. The EMP and other submissions made by the PP were found to be satisfactory and acceptable, hence committee decided to recommends the case for grant of prior EC subject to the following special conditions in addition to the standard conditions at annexure 'A'

After detailed discussion, it is observed by the authority that there are 02 mines exist within the 500m periphery of the proposed mine site. Thus, the factual status of existing cluster should be examined. It is also noted on the basis of Ekal Praman Patra vide letter No. 3745 dated 03/4/2021 issued by Collector (Mining Division), Raisen submitted by PP that the proposed site comes under the notified ESZ of Ratapani Wildlife Sanctuary.

The case was scheduled for the presentation but neither the Project Proponent (PP) nor his representative was present to explain the query which might be raised or to make any commitment which may be desired by the committee during the deliberation. Committee decided to call the PP in subsequent meetings.

**10. Case No 8707/2021 Smt. Sakshi Singh W/o Shri Amar Singh, House No. 15, DK Cottage Phase-2, E-8, Arera Colony, Dist. Bhopal, MP Prior Environment Clearance for Murrum Quarry in an area of 3.0 ha. (25,500 cum per annum)**



**(Khasra No. 2P), Village - Mastipura, Tehsil - Huzur, Dist. Bhopal (MP), Env. Consultant- M/s. Aseries Envirotek India Pvt. Ltd. Noida, UP .**

This is case of Murrum Quarry. The application was forwarded by SEIAA to SEAC for appraisal. The proposed site (Khasra No. 2P), Village - Mastipura, Tehsil - Huzur, Dist. Bhopal (MP) 3.0 Ha. The project requires prior EC before commencement of any activity at site.

The case was presented by Env. Consultant Dr. R. K Pandey from M/s. Aseries Envirotek India Pvt. Ltd. Noida, U.P on behalf of PP in the 522nd SEAC meeting dated 27/10/2021. During presentation, PP showed various documents such as lease sanction order, Gram Sabha, DFO NOC, Tehsildar Certificate, MO Certificate, Approved Mine Plan, Khasra Panchshala, P-II, DSR & PFR for appraisal of project before the committee. It was observed by Committee that as per Collector Office (Ekal Pramanptara) letter No. 2559 dated 19/8/21 has reported that there are 01 more mines operating or proposed within 500 meters around the said mine with total area of 6.900 ha., including this mine. PP submits that since it is a Murrum Quarry no blasting is proposed. Mining shall be done through Opencast Semi Mechanized Method. As per Google image based on online KML file uploaded by PP, it was observed that Google image is opening at Pithampur, while location of the project is near Bhopal for which PP submitted that by mistake wrong KML file is attached by them and necessary precaution will be taken in future so that correct location is uploaded online and presenting the case as per co-ordinates provided in mine plan. Within 500 meters following sensitive features were observed of the lease area:

Sensitive Features	Approximate aerial distance from the lease area in meters	Direction	Remarks
Kachhi Road	Within road	-	PP submitted this area shall be dealt as no mining area.
Trees	Within lease	-	Trees management plan

It is a case of cluster of more than 5.0 ha. area therefore, committee recommended to issue standard TOR prescribed by the MoEF&CC for conducting the EIA along with following additional TOR's and general conditions as per Annex. D:-

1. Kachhi Road existing within lease thus its protection plan and proposal for non-mining area as per the rules shall be proposed in the EIA report.

2. Protection plan with proposal of three rows of plantation towards road side should be discussed in EIA report.
3. Detailed evacuation plan with transport route, required infrastructure and manpower is to be discussed in the EIA report.
4. Transportation plan & traffic management plan should be discussed in the EIA report.
5. The project proponent shall discuss the mitigation measures provided in MoEFCCs Office Memorandum No. Z-11013/57/2014-IA. II (M) dated 29th October 2014, titled “Impact of mining activities on Habitations-issues related to the mining Projects wherein Habitations and villages are the part of mine lease areas or Habitations and villages are surrounded by the mine lease area”, and shall be discussed in the EIA report.

The case was discussed in 693<sup>rd</sup> SEIAA meeting dated 25/11/2021 & it was recorded that...

The case was recommended for ToR in 522<sup>nd</sup> SEAC meeting dated 27/10/2021.

After detailed discussion, it is observed that there are some sensitive features such as presence of kachha road & some trees within the lease, and habitation nearby to the proposed site.

The case was discussed in this meeting wherein committee after deliberation decided that cases in SEAC are appraised on the basis environmental sensitivity around the lease area and if any such sensitivity is observed additional TOR point is prescribed for discussion in EIA report. In this case the sensitivity was also considered and necessary additional TOR points was recommended by the committee and in addition to this standard TOR points are also mentioned in the Annexed “D”.

**11. Case No 8708/2021 Shri Amar Singh S/o Shri Jitendra Singh, H.No. 15, D.K.Cottage Phase-2, E-8, Arera Colony, Dist. Bhopal, MP - 462003 Prior Environment Clearance for Murrum Quarry in an area of 3.90 ha. (30100 cum per annum) (Khasra No. 2P), Village - Mastipura, Tehsil - Huzur, Dist. Bhopal (MP) Env. Consultant- M/s. Aseries Envirotek India Pvt. Ltd. Noida, UP .**

This is case of Murrum Quarry. The application was forwarded by SEIAA to SEAC for appraisal. The proposed site (Khasra No. 2P), Village - Mastipura, Tehsil - Huzur, Dist. Bhopal (MP) 3.90 Ha. The project requires prior EC before commencement of any activity at site.

The case was presented by Env. Consultant Dr. R. K Pandey from M/s. Aseries Envirotek India Pvt. Ltd. Noida, U.P on behalf of PP in the 522nd SEAC meeting dated 27/10/2021. During presentation, PP showed various documents such as lease sanction order, Gram Sabha, DFO NOC, Tehsildar Certificate, MO Certificate, Approved Mine Plan, Khasra Panchshala, P-II, DSR & PFR for appraisal of project before the committee. It was observed by Committee that as per Collector Office (Ekal Pramanptara) letter No. 2560 dated 21/8/21 has reported that there are 01 more mines operating or proposed within 500 meters around the said mine with total area of 6.900 ha., including this mine. PP submits that since it is a Murrum Quarry no blasting is proposed. Mining shall be done through Opencast Semi Mechanized Method. As per Google image based on online KML file uploaded by PP, it was observed that Google image is opening at Pithampur, while location of the project is near Bhopal for which PP submitted that by mistake wrong KML file is attached by them and necessary precaution will be taken in future so that correct location is uploaded online and presenting the case as per co-ordinates provided in mine plan. After deliberation committee decided that being it is a case of cluster of more than 5.0 ha. area therefore, committee recommended to issue standard TOR prescribed by the MoEF&CC for conducting the EIA along with following additional TOR's and general conditions as per Annex. D:-

1. Detailed evacuation plan with transport route, required infrastructure and manpower is to be discussed in the EIA report.
2. Transportation plan & traffic management plan should be discussed in the EIA report.
3. The project proponent shall discuss the mitigation measures provided in MoEFCCs Office Memorandum No. Z-11013/57/2014-IA. II (M) dated 29th October 2014, titled "Impact of mining activities on Habitations-issues related to the mining Projects wherein Habitations and villages are the part of mine lease areas or Habitations and villages are surrounded by the mine lease area", and shall be discussed in the EIA report.

The case was discussed in 693<sup>rd</sup> SEIAA meeting dated 25/11/2021 & it was recorded that...

The case was recommended for ToR in 522<sup>nd</sup> SEAC meeting dated 27/10/2021.

After detailed discussion, it is observed that the habitation located nearby to the proposed site and a kuccha road passing within the lease area. It is also observe that there are some trees located within the proposed mine site. Looking to the above

sensitivity, it is decided to send the case back to SEAC for re-appraisal.

The case was discussed in this meeting wherein committee after deliberation decided that cases in SEAC are appraised on the basis environmental sensitivity around the lease area and if any such sensitivity is observed additional TOR point is prescribed for discussion in EIA report. In this case the sensitivity was also considered and necessary additional TOR points was recommended by the committee and in addition to this Standard TOR points are also prescribed in the Annexed “D”. Moreover, as per SEIAA direction in this case committee recommended following additional TOR points in addition to TOR points the 522<sup>nd</sup> SEAC meeting dated 27/10/2021.

1. Appropriate setbacks shall be considered and proposed in the surface map & production map etc. w.r.t. kuccha road passing within the lease area .
2. Some trees located within the proposed mine site hence, inventory of all existing trees with their girth and height details and if any tree is to be uprooted, then its proper management plan it should be clearly addressed in EIA.

**12. Case No 8726/2021 Shri Sandeep Sood S/o Late Shri Satyapal Sood, H.No. 37, Rohit Nagar, Phase-I, Bawadiya Kalan, Dist. Bhopal, MP - 462026 Prior Environment Clearance for Stone Quarry in an area of 1.0 ha. (3040 cum per annum) (Khasra No. 267, 270), Village - Malikhedi, Tehsil - Huzur, Dist. Bhopal (MP) M/s. Aseries Envirotek India Pvt. Ltd. Noida, UP .**

This is case of Stone Quarry. The application was forwarded by SEIAA to SEAC for appraisal. The proposed site (Khasra No. 267, 270), Village - Malikhedi, Tehsil - Huzur, Dist. Bhopal (MP) 1.0 Ha. The project requires prior EC before commencement of any activity at site.

The case was presented by Env. Consultant Dr. R. K Pandey from M/s. Aseries Envirotek India Pvt. Ltd. Noida, U.P on behalf of PP in the 522<sup>nd</sup> SEAC meeting dated 27/10/2021. During presentation, PP showed various documents such as lease sanction order, Gram Sabha, DFO NOC, Tehsildar Certificate, MO Certificate, Approved Mine Plan, Khasra Panchshala, P-II, DSR & PFR for appraisal of project before the committee. It was observed by Committee that as per Collector Office (Ekal Pramanptara) letter No. 2421 dated 06/8/21 has reported that there are 06 more mines operating or proposed within 500 meters around the said mine with total area of 23.800 ha., including this mine. As per Google image based on online KML file uploaded by PP it

was observed that, crusher is already installed within lease area and part of mine is filled with water. Committee deliberated that very less effective area is available for mining for which PP submitted that the part of lease on eastern side will not be mined out and mining will be carried out from the western side of the lease where crusher is installed. The crusher will be shifted on the other side of the lease and since the sanctioned production volume is only 3040 cum/year, same can be mined out from the available area. Around 500 meters following sensitive features were observed of the lease area:

Sensitive Features	Approximate aerial distance from the lease area in meters	Direction	Remarks
Kachcha Road	18	West	Protection plan with three rows of Plantation towards road side.

It is a case of cluster of more than 5.0 ha. area therefore, committee recommended to issue standard TOR prescribed by the MoEF&CC for conducting the EIA along with following additional TOR's and general conditions as per Annex. D:-

1. It is observed that due to already excavated area and installation of crusher within the sanctioned mine, safe and feasible mining is not possible thus PP shall explain wherefrom the stone mining will be carried out in EIA report.
2. Part of mine is filled with water hence, discuss mine de-watering plan in the EIA report,
3. Protection plan with proposal of three rows of plantation towards road side should be discussed in EIA report.
4. Detailed evacuation plan with transport route, required infrastructure and manpower is to be discussed in the EIA report.
5. Hydro- geological study should be carried out if any ground water intersection is proposed.
6. The project proponent shall discuss the mitigation measures provided in MoEFCCs Office Memorandum No. Z-11013/57/2014-IA. II (M) dated 29th October 2014, titled "Impact of mining activities on Habitations-issues related to the mining Projects wherein Habitations and villages are the part of mine lease areas or Habitations and villages are surrounded by the mine lease area", and shall be discussed in the EIA report.

The case was discussed in 693<sup>rd</sup> SEIAA meeting dated 25/11/2021 & it was recorded that...

The case was recommended for ToR in 522<sup>nd</sup> SEAC meeting dated 27/10/2021.

After detailed discussion it is observed by the authority that, the proposed mining site is located in Village – Malikhedi, in view of the news published in Danik Bhaskar dated 25/11/21 and 26/11/21 regarding illegal mining operations in the Village – Malikhedi, Hence Considering the sensitivity of the area as well as Bhoj Wetland-Ramsar site it is decided to send the case back to SEAC for re-appraisal to get specific recommendations pertaining to this case.

The case was discussed in this meeting wherein committee after deliberation decided that cases in SEAC are appraised on the basis environmental sensitivity around the lease area and if any such sensitivity is observed additional TOR point is prescribed for discussion in EIA report. In this case the sensitivity was also considered and necessary additional TOR points was recommended by the committee and some Standard TOR points are also mentioned in the Annexed “D”. Hence, as per SEIAA direction in this case committee recommended following additional TOR point w.r.t. as Bhoj Wetland-Ramsar site in addition to TOR points the 522<sup>nd</sup> SEAC meeting dated 27/10/2021.

1. Appropriate setbacks shall be considered and proposed in the surface map & production map etc. wrt Sensitive area like Human settlement/ public road / natural drain /River etc. .
2. Inventory of all existing trees with their girth and height details and if any tree is to be uprooted, then its proper management plan it should be clearly addressed in EIA.
3. Mine water discharge plan with details of garland drains and settling tanks should be detailed out on a map in the EIA report.
4. Study of mining impacts on the Ramsar site (Bhoj Wetland) existing within the study area.

Further, regarding illegal mining operations in the Village – Malikhedi decision shall be taken by SEIAA in consultation with the district authority to prohibit all the mining activities in the area.

**13. Case No 8731/2021 Shri Rajkumar Jaiswal S/o Shri Mahesh Jaiswal, Liza Talkies Chouraha, Tehsil & Dist. Sehore, MP - 466001 Prior Environment Clearance for**

**Stone Quarry in an area of 2.90 ha. (20001 cum per annum) (Khasra No. 401/1), Village - Rafiqueganj, Tehsil - Sehore, Dist. Sehore (MP) M/s. Aseries Envirotek India Pvt. Ltd. Noida, UP .**

This is case of Stone Quarry. The application was forwarded by SEIAA to SEAC for appraisal. The proposed site (Khasra No. 401/1), Village - Rafiqueganj, Tehsil - Sehore, Dist. Sehore (MP) 2.90 Ha. The project requires prior EC before commencement of any activity at site.

The case was presented by Env. Consultant Dr. R. K Pandey from M/s. Aseries Envirotek India Pvt. Ltd. Noida, U.P on behalf of PP in the 522<sup>nd</sup> SEAC meeting dated 27/10/2021. During presentation, PP showed various documents such as lease sanction order, Gram Sabha, DFO NOC, Tehsildar Certificate, MO Certificate, Approved Mine Plan, Khasra Panchshala, P-II, DSR & PFR for appraisal of project before the committee. It was observed by Committee that as per Collector Office (Ekal Pramanptara) letter No. 2343 dated 08/9/21 has reported that there are 16 more mines operating or proposed within 500 meters around the said mine with total area of 45.821 ha., including this mine. After deliberation committee decided that being it is a case of cluster of more than 5.0 ha. area therefore, committee recommended to issue standard TOR prescribed by the MoEF&CC for conducting the EIA along with following additional TOR's and general conditions as per Annex. D:-

1. Detailed evacuation plan with transport route, required infrastructure and manpower is to be discussed in the EIA report.
2. Transportation plan & traffic management plan should be discussed in the EIA report.
3. Hydro- geological study should be carried out if any ground water intersection is proposed.
4. The project proponent shall discuss the mitigation measures provided in MoEFCCs Office Memorandum No. Z-11013/57/2014-IA. II (M) dated 29th October 2014, titled "Impact of mining activities on Habitations-issues related to the mining Projects wherein Habitations and villages are the part of mine lease areas or Habitations and villages are surrounded by the mine lease area", and shall be discussed in the EIA report.

The case was discussed in 693<sup>rd</sup> SEIAA meeting dated 25/11/2021 & it was recorded that...

The case was recommended for ToR in 522<sup>nd</sup> SEAC meeting dated 27/10/2021.

After detailed discussion and as per the Google Image it is observed by the authority that the proposed site is located within the existing cluster of mines having total area of approximately 45.82 ha. Looking to the above sensitivity, the cumulative environmental impacts of the existing cluster of mines in surrounding area should be assessed before recommending ToR in this case.

The case was discussed in this meeting wherein committee after deliberation decided that cases in SEAC are appraised on the basis environmental sensitivity around the lease area and if any such sensitivity is observed additional TOR point is prescribed for discussion in EIA report. In this case the sensitivity was also considered and necessary additional TOR points was recommended by the committee and some Standard TOR points are also mentioned in the Annexed “D”. Hence, as per SEIAA direction in this case committee recommended following additional TOR points are recommended in addition to TOR points in the 522<sup>nd</sup> SEAC meeting dated 27/10/2021.

1. Cumulative impact of air, noise & traffic shall be incorporated in final EIA Report.
2. In the north –west direction , outside of the lease area where root stocks are observed PP shall proposes plantation in this area and this root stocks occupied area kept as intact for green belt development accordingly budgetary provision shall be mentioned in the EMP.
3. An evacuation plan for entire cluster with evacuation route shown on a map, location of school, hospital, habitation etc falling on the route should also be shown on the map. The plan should also include the type and condition of the road and a justification that road network is adequate to evacuate the proposed production from the cluster.
4. Transportation plan & traffic management plan should be discussed in the EIA report.

**14. Case No 8710/2021 Shri Balu Singh Chauhan S/o Shri Gulab Singh Chauhan, Village - Jamali,, Tehsil - Barode, Dist. Agar Malwa, MP -465550 Prior Environment Clearance for Stone Quarry in an area of 2.0 ha. (11970 cum per annum) (Khasra No. 995), Village - Jamali, Tehsil - Barode, Dist. Agar Malwa (MP) . EIA Consultant: Green Circle INC.Vadodara (Guj.)**

This is case of Stone Quarry. The application was forwarded by SEIAA to SEAC for appraisal. The proposed site (Khasra No. 995), Village - Jamali, Tehsil - Barode, Dist.



Agar Malwa (MP) 2.0 Ha. The project requires prior EC before commencement of any activity at site.

The case was presented by Consultant Shri Ram Raghav Soni from M/s. Green Circle INC., Vadodara (Guj.) behalf of PP in the 522<sup>nd</sup> SEAC meeting dated 27/10/2021. During presentation, PP showed various documents such as lease sanction order, Gram Sabha, DFO NOC, Tehsildar Certificate, MO Certificate, Approved Mine Plan, Khasra Panchshala, P-II, DSR & PFR for appraisal of project before the committee. It was observed by Committee that as per Collector Office (Ekal Praman-ptara) letter No. 998 dated 17/9/21 has reported that there are 02 more mines operating or proposed within 500 meters around the said mine with total area of 6.0 ha., including this mine. During presentation it was informed to the PP that they have not uploaded the summery of the project for which PP submitted that by mistake it has escape and they have attached the summery with the presentation along with the consultant accreditation certificate. As per Google image based on online KML file uploaded by PP, around 500 meters following sensitive features were observed of the lease area:

Sensitive Features	Approximate aerial distance from the lease area in meters	Direction	Remarks
Pucca Road	60	west	Protection plan with three rows of Plantation towards road side.
Human settlement	300	North	Controlled blasting with arrangements of sand bags and three rows of Plantation towards road side.

A

fter deliberation committee decided that being it is a case of cluster of more than 5.0 ha., area therefore, committee recommended to issue standard TOR prescribed by the MoEF&CC for conducting the EIA along with following additional TOR's and general conditions as per Annex. D:-

1. Protection plan with proposal of three rows of plantation towards road side should be discussed in EIA report.
2. Detailed evacuation plan with transport route, required infrastructure and manpower is to be discussed in the EIA report.
3. Transportation plan & traffic management plan should be discussed in the EIA report.
4. Hydro- geological study should be carried out if any ground water intersection is proposed.

5. The project proponent shall discuss the mitigation measures provided in MoEFCCs Office Memorandum No. Z-11013/57/2014-IA. II (M) dated 29th October 2014, titled “Impact of mining activities on Habitations-issues related to the mining Projects wherein Habitations and villages are the part of mine lease areas or Habitations and villages are surrounded by the mine lease area”, and shall be discussed in the EIA report.

The case was discussed in 693<sup>rd</sup> SEIAA meeting dated 25/11/2021 & it was recorded that...

The case was recommended for ToR in 522<sup>nd</sup> SEAC meeting dated 27/10/2021.

After detailed discussion and as per the Google image it is observed by the authority that there is a pucca road at a distance of 50m in the west direction of the proposed mine site. After leaving the setback of 200 m. from the pucca road in compliance of the distance criteria for permitting stone quarrying by CPCB and directions issued by Hon’ble NGT in OA No.304/2019. There will be no minable area left this case hence.

The Committee observed that w.r.t. the Policy decisions of 694<sup>th</sup> meeting of SEIAA held on dated 26/11/21 (forwarded by SEIAA vide letter no. 2590/SEIAA/2021, dated 15.12.2021) and 695<sup>th</sup> dated 09.12.2021 with reference to compliance of the distance criteria for permitting stone quarrying by CPCB and directions issued by Hon’ble NGT in OA No. 304/2019.

The committees after detailed discussion on SEIAA vide letter no. 2590/SEIAA/2021, dated 15.12.2021 deliberated that these distance criteria shall be implemented for only those stone quarry and proposals which were received in SEAC after 1<sup>st</sup> January 2022 and distance criteria should not be implemented from the retrospective effect. Hence committee stand by earlier recommendation made in the 522<sup>nd</sup> SEAC meeting dated 27/10/2021

#### **Discussion on Query Reply submitted by PP**

15. **Case No 8803/2021 Smt. Pushpa Bai Rajput W/o Shri Akash Rajput, Post- Bhapel, Tehsil-Sagar, Dist. Sagar, MP - 470001 Prior Environment Clearance for Stone Quarry in an area of 2.90 ha. (Stone - 19650 Cum per annum, Murrum - 16331**

**Cum per annum) (Khasra No. 115/1), Village - Chakroda, Tehsil - Sagar, Dist. Sagar (MP)**

This is case of Stone Quarry. The application was forwarded by SEIAA to SEAC for appraisal. The proposed site (Khasra No. 115/1), Village - Chakroda, Tehsil - Sagar, Dist. Sagar (MP) 2.90 Ha. The project requires prior EC before commencement of any activity at site.

The case was presented by RQP Shri Shirish Deulkar on behalf of PP in the 531<sup>st</sup> SEAC meeting dated 06-12-21. During presentation, PP showed various documents such as lease sanction order, Gram Sabha, DFO NOC, Tehsildar Certificate, MO Certificate, Approved Mine Plan, Khasra Panchshala, P-II, DSR, EMP & PFR for appraisal of project before the committee. It was observed by Committee that as per Collector Office (Ekle Praman-patra) letter No. 1562 dated 22.10.2021 has reported that there are no more mines operating or proposed within 500 meters around the said mine. As per Google image based on online KML file uploaded by PP, around 500 meters following sensitive features were observed of the lease area:

<b>Sensitive Features</b>	<b>Approximate aerial distance from the lease area in meters</b>	<b>Direction</b>	<b>Remarks</b>
Some Trees	Within lease	-	Tree inventory and their management plan.
Road	215	West	Protection plan with three rows of Plantation towards road side.
Kachha road	Crossing the lease	North	Along the road 10 m either side Shall be left non mining area and provide right to access to the local villagers.

After presentation the committee asked to submit following details:

1. A Kachha road is crossing the lease hence PP shall left 10 m along the road either side as non mining area and provide right to access to the local villagers.
2. Correct data of GW table in the 14.6 of the form II.
3. Justification of the irrelevant text in the 12.0 of the form II.
4. Gram Sabha NOC for water supply is not enclosed.

PP vide their letter dated 20/12/2021 uploaded online query reply and hard copy as well as on “Parivesh Portal”. The point wise query reply was presented by RQP on behalf of PP. Committee observed that PP has submitted a commitment wrt a kachha road is

crossing the lease hence PP shall left 50 m along the road either side as non mining area and provide right to access to the local villagers and other details . The Committee observed that PP shall left appropriate setbacks shall be considered and proposed in the surface map wrt pucca road & kachha road etc. and submit revised surface map.

PP has submitted the response of above quarries same date vide letter dated 06.01.2022, which was placed before the committee and the same found satisfactory. The EMP and other submissions made by the PP were found satisfactory and acceptable, hence committee decided to recommend the case for grant of prior EC subject to the following special conditions in addition to the standard conditions at annexure 'A':

1. Production shall be as per mine plan with quantity not exceeding for Stone – 19,650 Cum per annum, Murrum – 16,331 Cum per annum.
2. A budgetary provision for Environmental management Plan of Rs.22.92Lakh as capital and Rs. 03.58 Lakh/year.
3. As proposed, a minimum of 1900 trees shall be planted as per the submitted plantation scheme .
4. Under CER following activities were submitted by PP:

Sr., No	Description	Cost to be Incurred	Village
1.	Computer desktop with printer and computer table and chair for School.	85,000.00	Village- CHAKRODA. Somla
2.	10no.Black Board ,middle class books and 3pc carom board, volleyball set ( as per school demand) .	30,000.00	Three Village CHAKRODA, SOMLA, RATONA,
3.	One year News Paper Subscription for School.	5,000	Chakroda School.
	Total	120000.00	

**16. Case No 8821/2021 Shri Jalam Yadav S/o Shri Chotelal Yadav, Santkabir Ward Karila, Dist. Sagar, MP - 470001 Prior Environment Clearance for Murrum Quarry in an area of 2.70 ha. (8000 Cum per annum) (Khasra No. 01), Village - Amaoni, Tehsil - Sagar, Dist. Sagar (MP) RQP Shri Shirish Deulkar, Jabalpur.**

This is case of Murrum Quarry. The application was forwarded by SEIAA to SEAC for appraisal. The proposed site (Khasra No. 01), Village - Amaoni, Tehsil - Sagar, Dist. Sagar (MP) 2.70 Ha. The project requires prior EC before commencement of any activity at site.

The case was presented by RQP Shri Shirish Deulkar on behalf of PP 532<sup>nd</sup> SEAC meeting dated 07-12-21. During presentation, PP showed various documents such as lease sanction order, Gram Sabha, DFO NOC, Tehsildar Certificate, MO Certificate, Approved Mine Plan, Khasra Panchshala, P-II, DSR, EMP & PFR for appraisal of project before the committee. It was observed by Committee that as per Collector Office (Ekle Praman-patra) letter No. 389 dated 14/06/2020 has reported that there are no more mines operating or proposed within 500 meters around the said mine. During presentation PP submitted that since it is a Murrum Quarry no drilling & blasting is proposed. Mining shall be done through Opencast Semi Mechanized Method. During presentation it was observed by the committee that the on online KML file uploaded by PP only 01 coordinate of the lease area is provided and hence lease cannot be demarcated properly which is essential for appraisal. Thus committee asked PP to upload KML image based on all the lease coordinates for further appraisal of the case.

PP vide their letter dated 20/12/2021 uploaded online query reply and hard copy as well as on "Parivesh Portal". As per Google image based on online KML file provided by PP, it was observed that the lease area is locating on the verge of the hillock where surface elevation about 56 meters hence PP shall submit protection plan, also a natural drainage is passing in the south-east corner of the lease boundary. Around 500 meters following sensitive features were observed of the lease area:

Sensitive Features	Approximate aerial distance from the lease area in meters	Direction	Remarks
Natural drain	Within lease	South-east corner	Provision of Garland drain & settling tanks.

water impounding structure & water body	>130	SE	Provision of Garland drain & settling tanks.
Some sheds/ houses in foot hill	>110	North	Protection plan and three rows of Plantation.
Kachha Road	>150	North	Three rows of Plantation towards road side.
Pucca Road	>500	North	Three rows of Plantation towards road side.

After presentation the committee asked to submit following details:

1. Lease area is locating on the verge of the hillock where surface elevation about 56 meters hence PP shall submit protection plan and proposal of stone wall in the agriculture field in the north side with appropriate budgetary provision in the EMP.
2. Revised Plantation scheme as suggested by committee.
3. Revised CER- Propose proposal distribution of fruit bearing plant as suggested by committee during presentation.

PP has submitted the response of above query same date vide letter dated 06.01.2022, which was placed before the committee and the same found satisfactory. The EMP and other submissions made by the PP were found satisfactory and acceptable, hence committee decided to recommend the case for grant of prior EC subject to the following special conditions in addition to the standard conditions at annexure 'A':

1. Production shall be as per mine plan with quantity not exceeding for Murrum – 8000 Cum per annum.
2. A budgetary provision for Environmental management Plan of Rs.21.65 Lakh as capital and Rs. 02.90 Lakh/year.
3. As proposed, a minimum of 1900 trees shall be planted as per the submitted plantation scheme .
4. Under CER following activities were submitted by PP:

Sr., No	Description	Cost to be Incurred	Effected village
1.	Computer desktop set for Primary School and printer.	65,000.00	For Village- AMAONI,
2.	Music instruments, Stationary, books and sports kit for required by local school.	30,000.00	Village AMAONI, LALPURA
3.	One year News Paper Subscription for School.	5,000.00	Village- Amaoni
	Total	10000.00	

**17. Case No 8806/2021 Shri Vinay Jain S/o Shri Padam Chand Jain, 303- Badri, Vishal Plaza Road, High Court Lane, Gird, District- Gwalior, MP - 474009, Prior Environment Clearance for Stone Quarry in an area of 2.0 ha. (30,000 Cum per annum) (Khasra No. 1244), Village - Urhana, Tehsil - Banmore, Dist. Morena (MP) Env. Consultant Aseries Envirotek India Pvt. Ltd., Noida (U.P.)**

This is case of Stone Quarry. The application was forwarded by SEIAA to SEAC for appraisal. The proposed site (Khasra No. 1244), Village - Urhana, Tehsil - Banmore, Dist. Morena (MP) 2.0 Ha. The project requires prior EC before commencement of any activity at site.

The case was presented by Consultant Shri Amar Singh Yadav on behalf of PP in the SEAC 531<sup>st</sup> meeting dated 06.12.21. During presentation, PP showed various documents such as lease sanction order, Gram Sabha, DFO NOC, Tehsildar Certificate, MO Certificate, Approved Mine Plan, Khasra Panchshala, P-II, DSR, EMP & PFR for appraisal of project before the committee. It was observed by Committee that as per Collector Office (Ekle Praman-patra) letter No. 1137 dated 14.09.2021 has reported that there are 01 more mines operating or proposed within 500 meters around the said mine with total area 4.50 ha., including this mine. As per Google image based on online KML file uploaded by PP, it was observed that old pit is existed and pit have not

shown in the surface map, around 500 meters following sensitive features were observed of the lease area:

Sensitive Features	Approximate aerial distance from the lease area in meters	Direction	Remarks
Water body	60 & 80	South & SW	Provision of Garland drain & settling tanks.

ing presentation as per Google image it was observed by committee that in the north side 02 more mine are existed within 500 meters around the said mine however, M.O. stated that only 01 mine operating or proposed hence, PP was asked to submit M.O. clarification for another mine seen in the 500 meters and existence of a pit in the lease area further appraisal of this case.

PP vide their letter dated 20/12/2021 uploaded online query reply and hard copy as well as on “Parivesh Portal”. PP has submitted M.O. clarification for another mine seen in the 500 meters and existence of a pit in the lease area further appraisal of this case.

The case was scheduled for presentation wherein the case was presented by Env. Consultant Shri Amar Singh Yadav on behalf of PP wherein stated that vide letter no. 1504 dated 06.11.2021 M.O. stated that the lease area is undulated and pits/ excavation are quite old and no mining activity has carried out by current PP and pits are pre-existed.

After presentation the committee asked to submit following details:

1. Revised Plantation scheme as suggested by committee.
2. Revised CER- Propose proposal of Grazing land (fodder grass & tree) development as suggested by committee during presentation.

PP has submitted the response of above query same date vide letter dated 06.01.2022, which was placed before the committee and the same found satisfactory. The EMP and other submissions made by the PP were found satisfactory and acceptable, hence committee decided to recommend the case for grant of prior EC subject to the following special conditions in addition to the standard conditions at annexure ‘A’:



1. Production shall be as per mine plan with quantity not exceeding for Stone – 30,000 Cum per annum.
2. A budgetary provision for Environmental management Plan of Rs.8.42 Lakh as capital and Rs. 03.38 Lakh/year.
3. As proposed, a minimum of 2400 trees shall be planted as per the submitted plantation scheme .
4. Under CER following activities were submitted by PP:

	FOR SOCIAL WELFARE	
S. No.	Activity	Cost
1.	Develop play ground in nearest Primary school of Urhana village.	50,000
2.	Provide 10 tables and benches for students in Primary school of Urhana village.	30,000
TOTAL		80,000/-

18. **Case No 7321/2020 M/s Jai Mahakal Associates, Prop. Shri Vijay Goswami, 25, Dhanah Colony, Maharani Laxmi Bai Ward, Dist. Seoni, MP - 480661 Prior Environment Clearance for Sand Quarry in an area of 21.00 ha. (99,900 Cum per annum) (Khasra No. 671, 01, 507), Village - Sakri, Khursipar, Ardiya, Tehsil - Kevlari, Dist. Seoni (MP). EIA Consultant: M/s. Creative Enviro Services , Bhopal.**

This is case of Sand Quarry. The application was forwarded by SEIAA to SEAC for appraisal. The proposed site at (Khasra No. 671, 01, 507), Village - Sakri, Khursipar, Ardiya, Tehsil - Kevlari, Dist. Seoni (MP) 21.00 ha. The project requires prior EC before commencement of any activity at site.

PP has submitted a copy of approved Mining Plan, DSR report, information in the lease's within 500 meters radius around the site and other requisite information in the prescribed format duly verified in the Collector Office letter no. 114 dated 22/5/2020 has reported that there are no more mines operating or proposed within 500 meters around the said mine.

Earlier this case was scheduled for presentation and discussion in 447<sup>th</sup> SEAC dated 22/07/2020 wherein ToR was recommended. PP has submitted the EIA report forwarded through SEIAA on-line and the same was scheduled in the agenda.

PP has submitted the EIA report forwarded through SEIAA on-line and the same was scheduled in the agenda.

The EIA was presented by Env. Consultant Shri Umesh Mishra from M/s. Creative Enviro Services , Bhopal and their representatives on behalf of PP ,wherein PP stated that this is a case of river sand mining on Hirri River which is a tributary of Wainganga River. PP submitted that quarrying will be carried out by manual method and will be transported to the dump (outside the lease area) by trolleys, and further stored sand at the dump will be transported by truck/dumper to the destination. The depth of the mining will not exceed 1 M. The following lease details were submitted by the PP:

- It is proposed to excavate the sand by Manual Method opencast method with pit pattern. It is proposed to start production from upper side of river where stream water is not found. The proposed height of working pit will be 1.0m.
- Dry pit channel are proposed to be excavated within the active channel on dry intermittent or ephemeral stream beds.
- No washing, crushing, screening, stockpiling, or plant operations will occur at or below the streams "average high water elevation" or the dominant discharge. These and similar activities have the potential to release fine sediments into the stream, which could be harmful to local fish.
- No in stream mining shall be carried out during rainy season.
- Sand and gravel shall not be extracted within 200 to 500 meter from any crucial hydraulic structure such as pumping station, water intakes, and bridges.
- Sand and gravel will be extracted from the downstream of the sand bar at river bends. Retaining the upstream one to two thirds of the bar and riparian vegetation is accepted as a method to promote channel stability.
- Mining should be restricted to 2 meter depth from upper surface but one meter above of water level whichever less and 2 meter or 10 percent of the river width whichever less, away from the banks is.
- In the first year, a volume equal to the estimated annual replenishment could be extracted from the reach of channel. Replenishment (up to the elevation of the selected channel configuration) would need to occur before subsequent extraction could take place.
- An extraction site can be determined after setting the deposition level at 1 m above natural channel elevation.

**• REPLENISHMENT STUDY**

Factor	Details
River	Hirri
Catchment area (A)	1064km <sup>2</sup> or 411.01 mile <sup>2</sup>
Gradient of the river	2.0m/km
Average annual runoff	50inch
Average annual rainfall	46.10inch

During presentation as per Google image it was observed that the southern side adjoining land is having vegetation cover and shall not be used for sand evacuation for its protection thus proposed sand evacuation route on Google map shall be approved by the competent district authority. It was also observed that the part of the lease is submerged in the water. After presentation and deliberation, PP was asked to submit following information:

1. Through Google image it was observed that the southern side adjoining land is having vegetation cover and shall not be used for sand evacuation for its protection thus proposed sand evacuation route on Google map shall be approved by the competent district authority.
2. Revised production plan leaving submerged area.
3. Revised Plantation scheme for river bank area (Agave, Bulbils, Munja, Khus Grass), evacuation route and in the village as suggested by committee.
4. Revised EMP incorporating expenditure to be incurred on plantation etc..
5. PP shall propose physical targets based on public hearing under Corporate Environment Responsibility (CER) PP shall also submit a proposal for wild life rescue centre.

PP vide their letter dated 27/12/2021 uploaded online query reply and hard copy as well as on “Parivesh Portal”. The case was scheduled for the presentation but neither the Project Proponent (PP) nor his representative was present to explain the query which might be raised or to make any commitment which may be desired by the committee during the deliberation. Committee decided to call the PP in subsequent meetings.

**19. Case No 8518/2021 Shri Mahesh Patidar S/o Shri Kailash Patidar, H.No. 06, Block Ekta, Chinar Fortune City, Hoshangabad Road, Dist. Bhopal, MP - 462047 Prior Environment Clearance for Stone Quarry in an area of 4.0 ha. (3325 cum per annum) (Khasra No. 151, 152), Village - Rajeev Nagar, Tehsil - Huzur, Dist. Bhopal (MP).**

This is case of Stone Quarry. The application was forwarded by SEIAA to SEAC for appraisal. The proposed site at (Khasra No. 151, 152), Village - Rajeev Nagar, Tehsil - Huzur, Dist. Bhopal (MP) 4.0 Ha. The project requires prior EC before commencement of any activity at site.

PP has submitted a copy of approved Mining Plan, DSR report, information in the lease's within 500 meters radius around the site and other requisite information in the prescribed format duly verified in the Collector Office (Ekal Praman-Patr) letter no. 1162 dated 22/3/2021 has reported that there are no more mines operating or proposed within 500 meters around the said mine.

The case was scheduled for the presentation but neither the Project Proponent (PP) nor his representative was present to explain the query which might be raised or to make any commitment which may be desired by the committee during the deliberation. Committee decided to call the PP in subsequent meetings. Since the tenure of SEAC will be over on 09<sup>th</sup> April, 2021 and all such cases which are pending at SEAC will become category-I cases in the absence of SEAC. Thus case file is being sent to SEIAA for onward necessary action please. PP vide letter dtd 02/7/21 received in SEIAA office on 2/7/21 requested to relist the case by showing his interest to present the case. Therefore, it has been decided to relist the case and send the technical file to SEAC for appraisal.

The case was presented by RQP Swati Namdeo on behalf of PP in the 507<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting dated 10-08-21. During presentation it was observed by the committee that in an area of 4.00 ha sanctioned volume of Stone is only 3325 cum/year. PP further submitted that to carryout mining approx. 05 meters of OB is to be removed and stacked inside the lease as PP has not permission for its disposal. PP submitted that this OB will be used for maintenance of haul road. Committee observed that this proposal is technically not feasible because removal of approx. 05 meters OB and its stacking within the lease will involve financial cost and thus proposal becomes techno-

financially not suitable considering the proposed cost of EMP (approx. 17.00 lakhs). PP submitted that initially PP intends to get EC for this volume but later on may apply for expansion. Committee after deliberations decided that PP may submit revised EMP and OB management plan so that project becomes techno-financially acceptable. During appraisal it was also observed by the committee that there are several mistakes in the form-II submitted by PP. After presentation committee asked PP to submit response on following issues including irrelevant/misleading information provided in From-II, such as:

1. In point no. such as 13.1, 14.6, 16, 17, 35(04), 35(16) details are wrongly mentioned, please revise.
2. Revised EMP and OB management plan so that project becomes techno-financially acceptable.
3. Commitment that generated OB will not be disposed off through sale.
4. Under CER scheme with physical targets:
  - ✓ Proposal for CER activates should preferably be based upon Gram Panchayat Annual Action Plan and commitment made during public hearing (if public hearing is conducted)
  - ✓ Activities such as solar panels in school, awareness camps for Oral Hygiene, Diabetes and Blood Pressure, works related to plantation (distribution of fruit & fodder bearing trees) vaccination, cattle's health checkup etc. in concerned village shall be proposed.
  - ✓ No fuel wood shall be used as a source of energy by mine workers. Thus proposal for providing solar cookers / LPG gas cylinders under "Ujjwala Yojna" to them who are residing in the nearby villages, shall be considered.
  - ✓ PP's commitment that activities proposed in the CER and plantation scheme will be completed within initial 03 years of the project and in the remaining years shall be maintained shall be submitted with EIA report.
5. Under Plantation Scheme with budgetary allocations:
  - ✓ Commitment that plantation shall be carried out preferably through Govt. agency (such as Van Vikas Nigam/Van Samiti under monitoring and guidance of Forest Range officer / Gram Panchayat / Forest Department / Agricultural department or any other suitable agency having adequate expertise as per the budgetary allocations made in the EMP.

- ✓ Commitment that high density plantation (preferably using “Miyawaki Technique or WALMI technique) shall be developed in 7.5m barrier zone left for plantation by CCF, Social Forestry Circle or any other competent agencies.
- ✓ Commitment that local palatable perennial grass species shall be planted for grassland/fodder development on degraded forest land suitable for the purpose or through Gram Panchayat on suitable community land in the concerned village area.

PP has submitted the response of above quarries same date vide letter dated 23/09/2021, which was placed before the committee and the same was found satisfactory. The EMP and other submissions made by the PP were found to be satisfactory and acceptable, hence committee after deliberation found that The EMP and other submissions made by the PP were found to be satisfactory and acceptable, hence committee decided to recommend the case for grant of prior EC subject to the following special conditions in addition to the standard conditions at annexure ‘A’:

1. Production shall be as per mine plan with quantity not exceeding for Stone 3325 cum/annum.
2. A budgetary provision for Environmental management Plan of Rs. 9.88 Lakh as capital and Rs. 01.16 Lakh/year.
3. As proposed, a minimum of 4800 trees shall be planted within one year in the barrier zone, evacuation road and village as per the submitted plantation scheme.

The case was discussed in 679<sup>th</sup> SEIAA meeting dated 13/7/2021 and it has been recorded that.... “This case was discussed in 675<sup>th</sup> SEIAA meeting dated 08/04/2021 and it was recorded that. This case was recommended in 498<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting dtd. 06/4/2021 and it was recorded that.

“The case was scheduled for the presentation but neither the Project Proponent (PP) nor his representative was present to explain the query which might be raised or to make any commitment which may be desired by the committee during the deliberation. Committee decided to call the PP in subsequent meetings. Since the tenure of SEAC will be over on 09<sup>th</sup> April, 2021 and all such cases which are pending at SEAC will become category-I cases in the absence of SEAC. Thus case file is being sent to SEIAA for onward necessary action please.

As per above observation of SEAC, it has been decided to delist the case on the condition that if PP intends to present the case in SEIAA, it will then be relisted for

appraisal.

PP vide letter dtd. 02/07/2021 received in SEIAA office on 02/7/2021 requested to relist the case by showing his interest to present the case. Therefore, it has been decided to relist the case and send the technical file to SEAC for appraisal.

In view of above decision, the case is hereby relisted. The technical file is being sent for appraisal and you are requested to take the considered view on it.

Case sent back to SEAC for site visit in 690 SEIAA meeting dated 22-10-2021. Letter no. 2432-33/SEIAA/21 dated 08- 11-21 alongwith technical file to SEAC for re-appraisal the case. It was recorded that

*“after detailed discussion, it was observed by the committee that an area of 4.0 ha, the sanctioned volume of stone is only 3325 cum/year and it was further submitted by PP that to carry out mining approx. 5m of overburden is to be removed and stack inside the lease area. As PP has no permission for disposal .In the light of above, it was decided that the proposal doesn't appear to be technically feasible, hence the case is hereby send back to SEAC to carry out site visit in consultation with MO & re-appraisal”.*

The case was scheduled for the presentation in 529<sup>th</sup> date 24/11/21 but neither the Project Proponent (PP) nor his representative was present to explain the query which might be raised or to make any commitment which may be desired by the committee during the deliberation.

In context to above issues raised by SEIAA the case was scheduled for the presentation in the 533<sup>rd</sup> SEAC meeting dated 14-12-21 but wherein PP submitted wrt issue as *“an area of 4.0 ha, the sanctioned volume of stone is only 3325 cum/year approx. 5m of overburden is to be removed and stack inside the lease area”*

PP submitted following points as :

The waste material comprises of (Murrum+Weathered Stone) & 5% physical rejects during the sizing of Stone (Gitty). The estimated quantity of waste and rejects are as follows:-

Year	Murru (In Cubic Meter)	Weathered (In Cubic Meter)	5%Waste /Reject (In Cubic Meter)
(1st year)	2334 (1167Sq.m × 2m Depth )	3501 (1167Sq.m × 3m Depth )	175
(2nd year)	2334 (1167Sq.m × 2m Depth )	3501 (1167Sq.m × 3m Depth )	175
(3rd year)	2334 (1167Sq.m × 2m Depth )	3501 (1167Sq.m × 3m Depth )	175
(4th year)	2334 (1167Sq.m × 2m Depth )	3501 (1167Sq.m × 3m Depth )	175
(5th year)	2334 (1167Sq.m × 2m Depth )	3501 (1167Sq.m × 3m Depth )	175
Total	11670	17505	875

• **OVERBURDEN & WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN-**

Total OB generated/Year= **Murru + Weathered stone** =  $2334 \text{ M}^3 + 3501 \text{ M}^3 = 5835 \text{ M}^3$

And  $175 \text{ M}^3$  /Year of 5% Waste. =  $5835 \text{ M}^3 + 175 \text{ M}^3 = 6010 \text{ M}^3$

• **For maintenance of Approach Road**

Length of Road= 1 Km

Width of Road=6 m

Depth of Road= 0.5 m

• Requirement of OB to Maintain the Approach Road =

• Length X Width X Height of Road =  $1000\text{M} \times 6\text{M} \times 0.5\text{M} = 3000 \text{ M}^3$

• **For maintenance of Approach Road from village to school.**

Length of Road= 1 Km

Width of Road=6 m

Depth of Road= 0.5 m

• Requirement of OB to Maintain the Approach Road

= Length X Width X Height of Road =  $1000\text{M} \times 6\text{M} \times 0.5\text{M} = 3000 \text{ M}^3$

\*Same OB management will be adopted for 5 years consecutively.

Remaining OB =  $6010 - (3000+3000) = 10 \text{ M}^3$  which will be used in filling up low lying lands in the neighbouring area.

PP submitted the OB shall be used for maintenance of approach road, maintenance of Approach Road from village to school and will be used for filling of low lying area.



After presentation committee asked PP submit revised EMP mentioning budget for maintenance of approach road from village to school and for lease area to connecting transportation road.

PP vide their letter dated 27/12/2021 uploaded online query reply and hard copy as well as on “Parivesh Portal”, which was placed before the committee and the same found satisfactory. The EMP and other submissions made by the PP were found satisfactory and acceptable, hence committee decided to recommend the case for grant of prior EC subject to the following special conditions in addition to the standard conditions at annexure ‘A’:

1. Production shall be as per mine plan with quantity not exceeding for Stone - 3325 Cum per annum.
2. A budgetary provision for Environmental management Plan of Rs.10.88 Lakh as capital and Rs. 01.16 Lakh/year.
3. As proposed, a minimum of 4800 trees shall be planted as per the submitted plantation scheme.
4. Under CER following activities were submitted by PP:

B.	FOR CER	Amount in Rs
Village-Rajeev Nagar	1. Providing 1 Solar system in Govt. Middle School situated at Village Rajeev Nagar.	30,000
	1 Solar system	
	1KWp (4 pannels of 25watt each)	
	Cost	
	22200 rps /system	15,000
	Appliances can be run	
	4 LEDs Light, 4 Fan and 1 TV	
	2. Awareness camps for Oral Hygiene, Diabetes and Blood Pressure in Village –Rajeev Nagar (@7,500-Twice in a year)	
	3. Preparation of Grazing Land in Village –Rajeev Nagar.	5,000

	Location	Southern Region of the mine lease area. (Unused area)	
	Area to be covered in preparation of Grazing Land	0.500 Hectare	
	Species to be planted	Dichanthium ,Puniya (Sehima nervosum), Themeda . Etc.	
	4. Distribution of 500 Nos. of masks in Village –Rajeev Nagar		10,000
Total			60,000

**20. Case No. – 7695/2020 M/s Vanshika Construction, Authorized Person, Shri Ramlal Jhariya, Deori Rajmarg, Dist. Narsinghpur, MP - 487661 Prior Environment Clearance for Sand Quarry in an area of 3.173 ha. (20760 cum per annum) (Khasra No. 64), Village - Lodhi, Tehsil - Gohparu, Dist. Shahdol, (MP)**

This is case of Sand Quarry. The application was forwarded by SEIAA to SEAC for appraisal. The proposed site at (Khasra No. 64), Village - Lodhi, Tehsil - Gohparu, Dist. Shahdol, (MP) 3.173 Ha. The project requires prior EC before commencement of any activity at site.

PP has submitted a copy of approved Mining Plan, DSR report, information in the lease's within 500 meters radius around the site and other requisite information in the prescribed format duly verified in the Collector Office (Ekal Praman-Patr) letter no. 2601 dated: 14/09/2020 has reported that there are no more mines operating or proposed within 500 meters around the said mine.

Earlier this case was scheduled for presentation and discussion in 462<sup>nd</sup> SEAC dated 30/09/2020 wherein ToR was recommended. PP has submitted the EIA report forwarded through SEIAA on-line and the same was scheduled in the agenda.

The EIA was presented by Shri Manish Rao Kadam Env. Consl.- M/s. Ample Environ Pvt. Ltd. Hyderabad (Telangana) & PP Shri Ramlal Jhariya in the 533 SEAC meeting dated 14-12-21.. PP stated that this is a case of river sand mining on Jhanpar River which is a tributary of Banas River . During presentation it was further observed by the

committee that part of lease is submerged in water for which non mining zone shall be left for area which is under submergence. During presentation PP submitted following salient features of the lease :

- The mine lease of river sand mine on Chundi River is spread over an area of 3.173 ha in Village –Lodhi, Tehsil- Gohparu, Dist- Shahdol, State - Madhya Pradesh.
- The Letter of Intent for the lease has been granted to Project Proponent Vanshika Construction by The Madhya Pradesh State Mining Corporation Limited, Bhopal vide letter no. kramank/ret/2020/506 Bhopal, dated - 28/01/2020 as per the provisions of M.P. State Sand Mining Policy – 2019.
- Mine Plan and Replenishment Study Plan has been approved by Collector, Shahdol, Madhya Pradesh vide letter no. Kramank 19/khanij/2020/2325 shahdol, Dated 13/08/2020 for a production capacity of 20,760 m<sup>3</sup> per year.
- Cluster Certificate and NOC from Forest Department has been obtained for site vide letter no.kramank-19/khanij/2020/2601 Shahdol, dated 14/09/2020.
- Opencast Semi-mechanized and manually method for mining by scrapping in 2.0 m layers and loading on trucks/dumper will be adopted. No drilling & blasting is needed as the project is for sand mining.
- The mine site is a non-agricultural government land. The minerals will be transported to specific destination through tarpaulin covered trucks/dumpers by the purchaser.

### **Replenishment Capacity- Chundi River**

- Chundi River is the river of the shahdol District and located at the Northern Central part Shahdol District . It is originates near village Bhadrwahi in the Shahdol District. It is flows east to west and meets Son River near village Bhamraha.
- The Chundi River which is 55 kilometres (22 mi) long. The catchment area of Chundi river is 532.12 km<sup>2</sup>.
- On the basis of the geology and formations like shale, varieties of sandstone and Conglomerate, the catchment area is much favorable to generate large quantity of sand.
- The Average rainfall of Shahdol district is 1131.4 mm. The district receives high rainfall mostly during July to September which will be leads to the deposition of the sufficient quantity of the sand every year within the old working area.

- Dandy Bolton Formula has category stated use of the equation to predict sediment yield for a specific location would not be always correct because of the wide variability caused by local factors not considered in the equation development. Actual sediment yield from individual drainage basins may vary 10-fold or even 100-fold computed yields.
- On the basis of Dandy Bolton formula the Sediment Yield is 1310184 M. tons/Year.
- Hence it is concluded that the annual production capacity (20,760 cum in 3.173 ha) which will be excavated at the QL area will be replenished easily during monsoon season.

### **Plantation**

Afforestation will be taken up in the along River Bank and Approach road of, Gram Panchayat Bhawan, Aanganbadi, School as per submitted scheme. After presentation and deliberation, PP was asked to submit following information:

The EIA was presented by Shri Manish Kadam & Ashish Gupta Env. Consl.- M/s. Ample Environ Pvt. Ltd. Hyderabad (Telangana) on behalf of PP in the 533<sup>rd</sup> SEAC meeting dated 14-12-21 wherein PP stated that this is a case of river sand mining on Chundi River. During presentation, PP submitted that monitoring was carried out during February to May, 20 as due to COVID-19 lockdown period scheduled monitoring of April, 20 could not be performed. During appraisal it was also observed by the committee that part of lease is submerged in water and another stream is joining the lease from the southern side thus setback / mandatory safety distance shall be left as per Monitoring and enforcement Guidelines for sand mining, 2020 published by MoEF&CC. During appraisal it was observed by the committee that adjoining land is having vegetation cover and shall not be used for sand evacuation for its protection. After presentation and deliberation, PP was asked to submit following information:

1. PP commitment that water supply will be done through Panchayat after their approval.
2. Part of lease is submerged in water and another stream is joining the lease from the southern side thus setback / mandatory safety distance shall be left as per Monitoring and enforcement Guidelines for sand mining, 2020 published by MoEF&CC and revised surface plan shall be submitted.
3. Adjoining land is having vegetation cover and shall not be used for sand evacuation for its protection thus proposed sand evacuation route on Google map shall be approved by the competent district authority.

4. PP commitment that no mining will be carried out outside of allotted lease area as per the issue rose in public hearing.
5. Proposal for plantation on evacuation road where from evacuation of sand is proposed.
6. Revise plantation scheme & species with location –wise bifurcation as suggested by the committee.
7. EMP incorporating expenditure to be incurred on development sand evacuation route.
8. PP shall propose physical targets based on public hearing under Corporate Environment Responsibility (CER).

PP vide their letter dated 27/12/2021 uploaded online query reply and hard copy as well as on “Parivesh Portal”, wherein PP submitted following points:

- Revised surface map showing setback wrt part of lease is submerged in water and another stream is joining the lease from the southern side .
- Proposed sand evacuation route on Google map which is approved by Mining officer, Shahdol.
- Revised plantation scheme & species with location –wise bifurcation.

In this meeting the case was scheduled for query presentation during presentation committee observed that PP has submitted sand evacuation route on Google map , is approved by Mining officer, Shahdol while it has to be approved by competent district authority form Revenue department as from Tehsildar or SDM. Hence after deliberation committee asked PP to submit sand evacuation route on Google map shall be approved by the competent district authority as suggested then after their case shall be further considered.

21. **Case No 8768/2021 Smt. Meena Patel W/o Shri Kuldeep Patel, Plot No. B/18, Kasodhan Nagar, Madhotal, Opp. Society Garden, Dist. Jabalpur, MP - 482002 Amendment in Prior Environment Clearance for Murrum Quarry in an area of 2.20 ha. (11400 Cum per annum) (Khasra No. 184 Part), Village - Aithakhera, Tehsil - Jabalpur, Dist. Jabalpur (MP) (Prior EC was earlier issued by DEIAA Jabalpur vide letter no. 135 dated 08-11-2017 as Case No. 121/17. Shri Rakesh Choubey RQP.**

This is case of Stone Quarry. The application was forwarded by SEIAA to SEAC for appraisal. The proposed site (Khasra No. 135P), Village - Nakwar, Tehsil - Hanumana,

Dist. Rewa (MP) 2.0 Ha. The project requires prior EC before commencement of any activity at site.

The case was presented by RQP Shri Rakesh Choubey RQP on behalf of PP in the 529<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting dated 24-11-2021. During presentation PP stated that this is a case of “EC Amendment”, as mineral Murrum is to be written in place of stone, the earlier EC was issued by DEIAA. vide no. 135 dated 08.11.2017 at Khasra no. 184 for 2.20 ha. for Stone, capacity 11,400 sqm and plantation target as per EMP. PP submitted chronology of the project:

- The Aithakhera Stone Quarry Lease was granted to Smt. Meena Patel, W/o Shri Kuldeep Patel by state govt. vide letter no. 630/khanij/Q.L./2013-14 Jabalpur dated 23/04/2014 over 2.20 hect. Mining Plan was approved by DGM Jabalpur vide letter no.1592/Khani/N.kr.-2013/2014 Jabalpur, dated 05/05/2014 covering period upto 29/03/2020. DEIAA EC issued for excavation of stone on 08/11/2017. Granted area had meager presence of metal stone & abundance of Murrum observed by QL holder thereby lessee made an application for change of mineral in the QL area for which she made application on 01/07/2020 as a result Collector Jabalpur issued LOI for Murrum vide letter no. 1164/Khanij/29 QL/2014 Jabalpur dated 09/07/2020. Mining plan for murrum approved by DGM Jabalpur vide letter no 2249/Khanij/nk1425/2020 Dated 21/09/2020, after compilation of all documents application for amendment has been made in SEIAA.

Further, It was observed that as per M.O. vide letter dated 2323 dated 28.07.2021 stated that no mining is done since last 02 years. Previous lease was sanctioned for stone, however PP got the mineral amendment through competent authority and sanctioned issued vide no. 1164 dtd. 09.07.2021. Revised Mining Plan for Murrum is also approved vide letter 2249 dtd. 21.09.2021 for maximum production of 11,400 cum/year. After presentation PP was asked to submit MO certificate stating details of mines sanctioned/operating within 500 meters of this mine for further consideration of this case with status of compliance of plantation and CER activities wrt to target and achievements.

PP vide their letter dated 07/12/2021 submitted query reply. PP has submitted revised plantation scheme and M.O. certificate stating details of mines sanctioned/operating

within 500 meters and issues raised in the SEAC meeting as suggested by the committee

The case was scheduled again for presentation in the 533<sup>th</sup> date 14/12/21 but neither the Project Proponent (PP) nor his representative was present to explain the query which might be raised or to make any commitment which may be desired by the committee during the deliberation.

The case was scheduled for presentation wherein RQP Shri R.K. Choube presented the query reply behalf of PP wherein PP submitted that 02 mines are existing within 500 m with total area of 16.34 ha. of Stone and 01 mine of Murrum which has area of 2.20 ha. , PP further submitted that 02 mines of stone are homogeneous nature and this Murrum mine is of heterogeneous nature hence, this Murrum case shall be considered in B-2 category . The EMP and other submissions made by the PP were found to be satisfactory and acceptable, hence committee decided to recommend the case for grant of prior EC subject to the following special conditions in addition to the standard conditions at annexure 'A':

1. Production as per approved mine plan with quantity not exceeding for Murrum 11,400 cum per annum.
2. A budgetary provision for Environmental management Plan of Rs. 6.19 Lakh as capital and Rs. 2.15 Lakh/year as recurring has proposed by PP.
3. As proposed, a minimum of 2100 trees shall be planted as per the submitted plantation scheme.
4. Under CER PP has proposed following activities:

S. No.	Activity	Amount (Rs./yr.)	Year	Total
1.	One hall construction for imparting skill development/training program , Specially for under privileged people of the society	50000	Ist five yr.	50000

2.	Provisions for Repairing & Maintenance of boundary wall & colouring of school building at Govt. Higher Senior Secondary School of village Sioni tola & Govt. Primary School of Village Aithakheda	50000	Ist five yr.	50000
3.	Provisions for skill upliftment of women skills of nearby villages by distributing Sewing Machines and contribution of indoor game facilities at anganwari kendra of nearby villages i.e. Aithakheda	50000	Ist five yr.	50000
		<b>Total</b>		<b>1,50000.00</b>

**22. Case No. – 6393/2019 M/s Panoli Intermediates (India) Pvt. Ltd, F-108, Mohta Building, 4, Bhikhaji Kama Place, New Delhi – 110066. Prior Environment Clearance for Manufacturing of Synthetic Organic Chemicals Proposed Capacity 8,000 MTPA, at Plot No. 108B, 190, Meghnagar Industrial Area, Dist. Jhabua, MP.**

This is a case Prior Environment Clearance for Proposed Manufacturing of Synthetic Organic Chemicals (Capacity – 8000 MTPM) at Plot No. 108B, 190, AKVN Industrial Area, Village and Tehsil - Meghnagar, Dist. Jhabua, MP.

**BACKGROUND**

The case was presented by PP and their consultant in the 392<sup>nd</sup> SEAC meeting dated 29/08/2019 wherein committee deliberated that the existing dye & dyes intermediate industries in Meghnagar IA are unable to manage the wastes properly and situation in Meghnagar IA is critical. PP stated that the proposed manufacturing of dye & dyes intermediate will be based on hydrogenation based technique avoiding generation of iron sludge considering the current situation in Meghnagar I.A.

Earlier this case was scheduled for presentation and discussion in 425<sup>th</sup> SEAC dated 26/02/2021 wherein ToR was recommended.



PP has submitted the EIA report forwarded through SEIAA on-line and the same was scheduled in the agenda.

The case was scheduled for the presentation in 526<sup>th</sup> date 11/11/21 but neither the Project Proponent (PP) nor his representative was present to explain the query which might be raised or to make any commitment which may be desired by the committee during the deliberation.

The case was scheduled again for presentation but neither the Project Proponent (PP) nor his representative was present to explain the query which might be raised or to make any commitment which may be desired by the committee during the deliberation. PP was also absent in the 534<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting dated 15/12/21 & 526<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting date 11/11/21. Committee decided to give last chance to PP for making presentation in the subsequent meetings of SEAC after which the case shall be returned to SEIAA assuming that PP is not interested to continue with the project.

**23. Case No 8841/2021 M/s Arcon Mining Pvt. Ltd, Flat No. 101, Virendra Villas Apartment, Patel Nagar, Dist. Gwalior, MP - 474001 Prior Environment Clearance for Stone Quarry in an area of 1.090 ha. (12000 Cum per annum) (Khasra No. 2627/min-1, 2630/min-2&3, 2632/min-2&3, 2633, 2634/1-min2), Village - Bilaua, Tehsil - Dabra, Dist. Gwalior (MP) RQP Swati Namdeo, Bhopal**

This is case of Stone Quarry. The application was forwarded by SEIAA to SEAC for appraisal. The proposed site (Khasra No. 2627/min-1, 2630/min-2&3, 2632/min-2&3, 2633, 2634/1-min2), Village - Bilaua, Tehsil - Dabra, Dist. Gwalior (MP) 1.0 Ha. The project requires prior EC before commencement of any activity at site.

The case was again scheduled for the presentation in 534<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting dated 15/12/21 but neither the Project Proponent (PP) nor his representative was present to explain the query which might be raised or to make any commitment which may be desired by the committee during the deliberation. Committee decided to call the PP in subsequent meetings.

The case was scheduled again for presentation but neither the Project Proponent (PP) nor his representative was present to explain the query which might be raised or to make any commitment which may be desired by the committee during the deliberation.

PP was also absent in the 534<sup>th</sup> SEAC meeting dated 15/12/21. Committee decided to give last chance to PP for making presentation in the subsequent meetings of SEAC after which the case shall be returned to SEIAA assuming that PP is not interested to continue with the project.

**(A. A. Mishra)**  
**Member Secretary**

**(Dr. Praveen Chandra Dubey)**  
**Chairman**

**Following standard conditions shall be applicable for the mining projects of minor mineral in addition to the specific conditions and cases appraised for grant of TOR:**

**Annexure- 'A'**

**Standard conditions applicable to Stone/Murram and Soil quarries:**

1. Mining should be carried out as per the submitted land use plan and approved mine plan. The regulations of danger zone (500 meters) prescribed by Directorate General of Mines safety shall also be complied compulsorily and necessary measures should be taken to minimize the impact on environment.
2. The lease boundary should be clearly demarcated at site with the given co-ordinates by pillars and fenced from all around the site. Necessary safety signage & caution boards shall be displayed at mine site.
3. Arrangements for overhead sprinklers with solar pumps / water tankers should be provided for dust suppression at the exit of the lease area and fixed types sprinklers on the evacuation road. PP should maintain a log book wherein daily details of water sprinkling and vehicle movement are recorded.
4. Transportation of material shall only be done in covered & PUC certified vehicles with required moisture to avoid fugitive emissions. Transportation of minerals shall not be carried out through forest area without permissions from the competent authority.
5. Mineral evacuation road shall be made pucca (WBM/black top) by PP.
6. Necessary consents shall be obtained from MPPCB and the air/water pollution control measures have to be installed as per the recommendation of MPPCB.
7. Crusher with inbuilt APCD & water sprinkling system shall be installed minimum 100 meters away from the road and 500 meters away from the habitations only after the permissions of MP Pollution Control Board with atleast 04 meters high wind breaking wall of suitable material to avoid fugitive emissions.
8. Working height of the loading machines shall be compatible with bench configuration.
9. Slurry Mixed Explosive (SME) shall be used instead of solid cartridge.
10. The OB shall be reutilized for maintenance of road. PP shall bound to compliance the final closure plan as approved by the IBM.
11. Appropriate activities shall be taken up for social up-liftment of the area. Funds reserved towards the same shall be utilized through Gram Panchayat/competent authority.
12. Six monthly occupational health surveys of workers shall be carryout and all the workers shall be provided with necessary PPE's. Mandatory facilities such as Rest Shelters, First Aid, Proper Fire Fighting Equipments and Toilets (separate for male & female) shall also be provided for all the mine workers and other staff. Mine's site office, rest shelters etc shall be illuminated and ventilated through solar lights.
13. A separate bank account should be maintained for all the expenses made in the EMP and CER activities by PP for financial accountability and these details should be provided in Annual Environmental Statement. In case the allocated EMP budget for mitigative measures to control the pollution is not utilized fully, the reason of under utilization of budgetary provisions for EMP should be addressed in annual return.
14. To avoid vibration, no overcharging shall be carried out during blasting and muffle blasting shall be adopted. Blasting shall be carried out through certified blaster only and no explosive will be stored at mine site without permission from the competent authority.
15. Mine water should not be discharged from the lease and be used for sprinkling & plantations. For surface runoff and storm water garland drains and settling tanks (SS pattern) of suitable sizes shall be provided.
16. All garland drains shall be connected to settling tanks through settling pits and settled water shall be used for dust suppression, green belt development and beneficiation plant. Regular de-silting of drains and pits should be carried out. On garland trench locally available (tree species) seed sowing to be done.
17. PP shall be responsible for discrepancy (if any) in the submissions made by the PP to SEAC & SEIAA.
18. The amount towards reclamation of the pit and land in MLA shall be carried out through the mining department. The appropriate amount as estimated for the activity by mining department has to be deposited with the Collector to take up the activity after the mine is exhausted.
19. NOC of Gram Panchayat should be obtained for the water requirement and forest department before uprooting any trees in the lease area. PP shall take Socio-economic activities in the region through the 'Gram Panchayat'.
20. The leases which are falling <250 meters of the forest area and PP has obtained approval for the Divisional Level Commissioner committee, all the conditions stipulated by Divisional Level Commissioner committee shall be fulfilled by the PP.

21. The validity of the EC shall be as per the provisions of EIA Notification subject to the following: Expansion or modernization in the project, entailing capacity addition with change in process and or technology and any change in product - mix in proposed mining unit shall require a fresh Environment Clearance.
22. If it being a case of Temporary Permit (TP), the validity of EC should be only up to the validity of TP and PP has to ensure the execution of closure plan.
23. All the mines where production is > 50,000 cum/year, PP shall develop its own website to display various mining related activities proposed in EMP & CER along with budgetary allocations. All the six monthly progress report shall also be uploads on this website along with MoEF&CC & SEIAA, MP with relevant photographs of various activities such as garland drains, settling tanks, plantation, water sprinkling arrangements, transportation & haul road etc. PP or Mine Manager shall be made responsible for its maintenance & regular updation.
24. All the soil queries, the maximum permitted depth shall not exceed 02 meters below general ground level & other provisions laid down in MoEF&CC OM No. L-11011/47/2011-IA.II(M) dated 24/06/2013.
25. The mining lease holders shall after ceasing mining operation, undertake re-grassing the mining area and any other area which may have been disturbed due to their mining activities and restore the land to a condition which is fit for growth of fodder, flora , fauna etc. Moreover, a separate budget in EMP & CER shall maintained for development and maintenance of grazing land as per the latest O.M, of MoEF&CC issued vide letter F.No. 22-34/2018-IA. III, dated 16/01/2020.
26. The project proponent shall follow the mitigation measures provided in MoEF&CCs Office Memorandum No. Z-11013/57/2014-IA. II (M) dated 29th October 2014, titled "Impact of mining activities on Habitations-issues related to the mining Projects wherein Habitations and villages are the part of mine lease areas or Habitations and villages are surrounded by the mine lease area".
27. Any change in the correspondence address shall be duly intimated to all the regulatory authority within 30 days of such change.
28. Authorization (if required) under Hazardous and Other Wastes (Management and Transboundary Movement) Rules, 2016 should be obtained by the PP if required.
29. A display board with following details of the project is mandatory at the entry to the mine.
  - a. Lease owner's Name, Contact details etc.
  - b. Mining Lease area of the project (in ha.)
  - c. Production capacity of the project.
30. Dense plantation/ wood lot shall be carryout in the 7.5 meters periphery/barrier zone of the lease through concern CCF (social forestry) or concerned DFO or any other suitable agency and on mineral evacuation road & common area in the village through any suitable Govt. agency (such as Van Vikas Nigam / Van Samiti under monitoring and guidance of Forest Range officer with work permission from DFO concerned / Gram Panchayat / Agricultural department or any other suitable agency having adequate expertise as per the budgetary allocations made in the EMP.
31. Entire plantation proposed in barrier zone of lease area shall be carried out in the first year itself as per submitted plantation scheme and along the fencing seed sowing of Neem, Babool, Safed Castor etc. shall also be carried out.
32. Top soil shall be simultaneously used for the plantation within the lease area and no OB/dump shall be stacked outside the lease area. PP should take-up entire plantation activity within initial three years of mining operations and shall maintain them for entire mine life including casualty replacement. PP should also maintain a log book containing annual details of tree plantation and causality replacement and to take adequate precautions so as not to cause any damage to the flora and fauna during mining operations. PP shall explore the possibility for plantation in adjoining forest land in consultation with concerned DFO and commensurate budget shall be transferred for plantation to DFO.
33. Local palatable mixture of annual and perennial grass and fodder tree species shall be planted for grassland/fodder development on degraded forest land through forest department or on other community land available for grassland and fodder development through Gram Panchayat in concerned village and handed over to Gram Panchayat after lease period.
34. During initial three years before onset of monsoon season, minimum 100 saplings or maximum as per submitted plantation scheme and subsequently approved by the SEAC of fodder / native fruit bearing species shall be distributed in nearby villagers to promote plantation and shall be procured from social forestry nursery/ Government Horticulture nursery. This activity shall be carried out under Govt. of Madhya Pradesh "ANKUR YOJNA" by registering individual villagers on "Vayudoot app". Where ever Aushadhi Vatika (Medicinal Garden) is proposed by PP, a minimum of 50 saplings be planted considering 80% survival with proper protection measures in School or Aganwadi premises.
35. Adequate provisions of water for irrigating plantation shall be made by PP.
- 35.a Causality replacement from 1<sup>st</sup> year upto 5<sup>th</sup> year of plantation or upto lease period (whatever in less). Plantation maintenance from 11<sup>th</sup> year upto lease period.
36. To know the soil quality, type and depth of the lease area the trial pit shall be dug out in the barrier zone.

37. Activates proposed under CER should be based upon outcome of public hearing in category for B-1 projects. However in case of B-2 projects, CER shall be proposed based upon local need assessment and Gram Panchayat Annual Action Plan.

**Annexure- 'B'**

**Standard conditions applicable for the Sand Mine Quarries\***

1. District Authority should annually record the deposition of sand in the lease area (at an interval of 100 meters for leases 10 ha or > 10.00 ha and at an interval of 50 meters for leases < 10 ha.) before monsoon & in the last week of September and maintain the records in RL (Reduce Level) Measurement Book. Accordingly authority shall allow lease holder to excavate only the replenished quantity of sand in the subsequent year.
2. The lease boundary should be clearly demarcated at site with the given co-ordinates by pillars. Necessary safety signage & caution boards shall be displayed at mine site.
3. Arrangements for overhead sprinklers with solar pumps / water tankers should be provided for dust suppression at the exit of the lease area and fixed types sprinklers on the evacuation road. PP should maintain a log book wherein daily details of water sprinkling and vehicle movement are recorded.
4. Only registered vehicles/tractor trolleys with GPS which are having the necessary registration and permission for the aforesaid purpose under the Motor Vehicle Act and also insurance coverage for the same shall alone be used for said purpose.
5. Transportation of material shall only be done in covered & PUC certified vehicles with required moisture to avoid fugitive emissions. Transportation of minerals shall not be carried out through forest area without permissions from the competent authority.
6. Mineral evacuation road shall be made Pucca (WBM/black top) by PP.
7. Sand and gravel shall not be extracted up to a distance of 1 kilometer (1Km) from major bridges and highways on both sides, or five times (5x) of the span (x) of a bridge/public civil structure (including water intake points) on up-stream side and ten times (10x) the span of such bridge on down-stream side, subjected to a minimum of 250 meters on the upstream side and 500 meters on the downstream side.
8. Mining depth should be restricted to 3 meters or water level, whichever is less and distance from the bank should be 1/4<sup>th</sup> or river width and should not be less than 7.5 meters. No in-stream mining is allowed. Established water conveyance channels should not be relocated, straightened, or modified.
9. Demarcation of mining area with pillars and geo-referencing should be done prior to the start of mining.
10. PP shall carry out independent environmental audit atleast once in a year by reputed third party entity and report of such audit be placed on public domain.
11. No Mining shall be carried out during Monsoon season.
12. The mining shall be carried out strictly as per the approved mine plan and in accordance with the Sustainable Sand Mining Management Guidelines, 2016 and Enforcement & Monitoring Guidelines for Sand Mining, 2020 issued by the MoEF&CC ensuring that the annual replenishment of sand in the mining lease area is sufficient to sustain the mining operations at levels prescribed in the mining plan.
13. If the stream is dry, the excavation must not proceed beyond the lowest undisturbed elevation of the stream bottom, which is a function of local hydraulics, hydrology, and geomorphology.
14. After mining is complete, the edge of the pit should be graded to a 2.5:1 slope in the direction of the flow.
15. Necessary consents shall be obtained from MPPCB and the air/water pollution control measures have to be installed as per the recommendation of MPPCB.
16. Appropriate activities shall be taken up for social up-liftment of the area. Funds reserved towards the same shall be utilized through Gram Panchayat/competent authority.
17. Six monthly occupational health surveys of workers shall be carryout and all the workers shall be provided with necessary PPE's. Mandatory facilities such as Rest Shelters, First Aid, Proper Fire Fighting Equipments and Toilets (separate for male & female) shall also be provided for all the mine workers and other staff. Mine's site office, rest shelters etc shall be illuminated and ventilated through solar lights. All these facilities such as rest shelters, site office etc. Shall be removed from site after the expiry of the lease period.
18. A separate budget in EMP & CER shall maintained for development and maintenance of grazing land as per the latest O.M, of MoEF&CC issued vide letter F.No. 22-34/2018-IA. III, dated 16/01/2020 and these details should be provided in Annual Environmental Statement.
19. In case the allocated EMP budget for mitigative measures to control the pollution is not utilized fully, the reason of under utilization of budgetary provisions for EMP should be addressed in annual return.
20. PP shall be responsible for discrepancy (if any) in the submissions made by the PP to SEAC & SEIAA.

21. The amount towards reclamation of the pit and land in MLA shall be carried out through the mining department. The appropriate amount as estimated for the activity by mining department has to be deposited with the Collector to take up the activity after the mine is exhausted.
22. NOC of Gram Panchayat should be obtained for the water requirement and forest department before uprooting any trees in the lease area.
23. The leases which are falling <250 meters of the forest area and PP has obtained approval for the Divisional Level Commissioner committee, all the conditions stipulated by Divisional Level Commissioner committee shall be fulfilled by the PP.
24. The validity of the EC shall be as per the provisions of EIA Notification subject to the following: Expansion or modernization in the project, entailing capacity addition with change in process and or technology and any change in product - mix in proposed mining unit shall require a fresh Environment Clearance.
25. If it being a case of Temporary Permit (TP), the validity of EC should be only up to the validity of TP and PP has to ensure the execution of closure plan.
26. A separate budget in EMP & CER shall maintained for development and maintenance of grazing land as per the latest O.M dated 16/01/2020.
27. The project proponent shall follow the mitigation measures provided in MoEFCCs Office Memorandum No. Z-11013/57/2014-IA. II (M) dated 29th October 2014, titled "Impact of mining activities on Habitations-issues related to the mining Projects wherein Habitations and villages are the part of mine lease areas or Habitations and villages are surrounded by the mine lease area".
28. Any change in the correspondence address shall be duly intimated to all the regulatory authority within 30 days of such change.
29. A display board with following details of the project is mandatory at the entry to the mine.
  - a. Lease owner's Name, Contact details etc.
  - b. Mining Lease area of the project (in ha.)
  - c. Production capacity of the project.
30. Following conditions must be implemented by PP in case of sand mining as per NGT (CZ) order dated 19/10/2020 in OA NO. 66/2020 and SEIAA's instruction vide letter No. 5084 dated 09/12/2020.
  - i. The Licensee must use minimum number of poclains and it should not be more than two in the project site.
  - ii. The District Administration should assess the site for Environmental impact at the end of first year to permit the continuation of the operation.
  - iii. The ultimate working depth shall be 01 m from the present natural river bed level and the thickness of the sand available shall be more than 03 m the proposed quarry site.
  - iv. The sand quarrying shall not be carried out blow the ground water table under any circumstances. In case, the ground water table occurs within the permitted depth at 01 meter, quarrying operation shall be stopped immediately.
  - v. The sand mining should not disturb in any way the turbidity, velocity and flow pattern of the river water.
  - vi. The mining activity shall be monitored by the Taluk level Force once in a month by conducting physical verification.
  - vii. After closure of the mining, the licensee shall immediately remove all the sheds put up in the quarry and all the equipments used for operation of sand quarry. The roads/pathways shall be leveled to let the river resume its normal course without any artificial obstruction to the extent possible.
  - viii. The mined out pits to be backfilled where warranted and area should be suitable landscaped to prevent environmental degradation.
  - ix. PP shall adhere to the norms regarding extent and depth of quarry as per approved mining plan. The boundary of the quarry shall be properly demarcated by PP.
31. Species such as Khus Slips and Nagar Motha shall be planted on the river banks for bank stabilization and to check soil erosion while on mineral evacuation road & common area in the village through any suitable Govt. agency (such as Van Vikas Nigam / Van Samiti under monitoring and guidance of Forest Range officer with work permission from DFO concerned / Gram Panchayat / Agricultural department or any other suitable agency having adequate expertise as per the budgetary allocations made in the EMP.
32. Top soil shall be simultaneously used for the plantation within the lease area and no OB/dump shall be stacked outside the lease area. PP should take-up entire plantation activity within initial three years of mining operations and shall maintain them for entire mine life including casualty replacement. PP should also maintain a log book containing annual details of tree plantation and causality replacement and to take adequate precautions so as not to cause any damage to the

- flora and fauna during mining operations. PP shall explore the possibility for plantation in adjoining forest land in consultation with concerned DFO and commensurate budget shall be transferred for plantation to DFO.
33. Local palatable mixture of annual and perennial grass and fodder tree species shall be planted for grassland/fodder development on degraded forest land through forest department or on other community land available for grassland and fodder development through Gram Panchayat in concerned village and handed over to Gram Panchayat after lease period.
  34. During initial three years before onset of monsoon season, minimum 100 saplings or maximum as per submitted plantation scheme and subsequently approved by the SEAC of fodder / native fruit bearing species shall be distributed in nearby villagers to promote plantation and shall be procured from social forestry nursery/ Government Horticulture nursery. This activity shall be carried out under Govt. of Madhya Pradesh “ANKUR YOJNA” by registering individual villagers on “Vayudoot app”. Where ever Aushadhi Vatika (Medicinal Garden) is proposed by PP, a minimum of 50 saplings be planted considering 80% survival with proper protection measures in School or Aganwadi premises.
  35. Adequate provisions of water for irrigating plantation shall be made by PP.
  36. Activates proposed under CER should be based upon outcome of public hearing in category for B-1 projects. However in case of B-2 projects, CER shall be proposed based upon local need assessment and Gram Panchayat Annual Action Plan.

**Annexure- ‘C’**

**Standard conditions applicable for the Sand deposits on Agricultural Land/ Khodu Bharu Type Sand Mine Quarries\***

1. Mining should be done only to the extent of reclaiming the agricultural land.
2. Only deposited sand is to be removed and no mining/digging below the ground level is allowed.
3. The mining shall be carried out strictly as per the approved mining plan.
4. The lease boundary should be clearly demarcated at site with the given co-ordinates by pillars and necessary safety signage & caution boards shall be displayed at mine site.
5. Arrangements for overhead sprinklers with solar pumps / water tankers should be provided for dust suppression at the exit of the lease area and fixed types sprinklers on the evacuation road. PP should maintain a log book wherein daily details of water sprinkling and vehicle movement are recorded.
6. The mining activity shall be done as per approved mine plan and as per the land use plan submitted by PP.
7. Transportation of material shall only be done in covered & PUC certified vehicles with required moisture to avoid fugitive emissions. Transportation of minerals shall not be carried out through forest area without permissions from the competent authority.
8. Mineral evacuation road shall be made Pucca (WBM/black top) by PP.
9. For carrying out mining in proximity to any bridge and/or embankment, appropriate safety zone on upstream as well as on downstream from the periphery of the mining site shall be ensured taking into account the structural parameters, location aspects, flow rate, etc., and no mining shall be carried out in the safety zone.
10. No Mining shall be carried out during Monsoon season.
11. The mining shall be carried out strictly as per the approved mine plan and in accordance with the Sustainable Sand Mining Management Guidelines, 2016 issued by the MoEF&CC.
12. Necessary consents shall be obtained from MPPCB and the air/water pollution control measures have to be installed as per the recommendation of MPPCB.
13. Thick plantation shall be carryout on the banks of the river adjacent to the lease, mineral evacuation road and common area in the village. PP would maintain the plants for five years including casualty replacement. PP should also maintain a log book containing annual details of tree plantation and causality replacement and to take adequate precautions so as not to cause any damage to the flora and fauna during mining operations.
14. Appropriate activities shall be taken up for social up-liftment of the area. Funds reserved towards the same shall be utilized through Gram Panchayat/competent authority.
15. Six monthly occupational health surveys of workers shall be carryout and all the workers shall be provided with necessary PPE's. Mandatory facilities such as Rest Shelters, First Aid, Proper Fire Fighting Equipments and Toilets (separate for male & female) shall also be provided for all the mine workers and other staff. Mine's site office, rest shelters etc shall be illuminated and ventilated through solar lights.
16. A separate bank account should be maintained for all the expenses made in the EMP and CER activities by PP for financial accountability and these details should be provided in Annual Environmental Statement. In case the allocated EMP budget for mitigative measures to control the pollution is not utilized fully, the reason of under utilization of budgetary provisions for EMP should be addressed in annual return.
17. PP shall be responsible for discrepancy (if any) in the submissions made by the PP to SEAC & SEIAA.

18. The amount towards reclamation of the pit and land in MLA shall be carried out through the mining department. The appropriate amount as estimated for the activity by mining department has to be deposited with the Collector to take up the activity after the mine is exhausted.
19. NOC of Gram Panchayat should be obtained for the water requirement and forest department before uprooting any trees in the lease area.
20. The leases which are falling <250 meters of the forest area and PP has obtained approval for the Divisional Level Commissioner committee, all the conditions stipulated by Divisional Level Commissioner committee shall be fulfilled by the PP.
21. The validity of the EC shall be as per the provisions of EIA Notification subject to the following: Expansion or modernization in the project, entailing capacity addition with change in process and or technology and any change in product - mix in proposed mining unit shall require a fresh Environment Clearance.
22. If it being a case of Temporary Permit (TP), the validity of EC should be only up to the validity of TP and PP has to ensure the execution of closure plan.
23. A separate budget in EMP & CER shall maintained for development and maintenance of grazing land as per the latest O.M, of MoEF&CC issued vide letter F.No. 22-34/2018-IA. III, dated 16/01/2020.
24. The project proponent shall follow the mitigation measures provided in MoEFCCs Office Memorandum No. Z-11013/57/2014-IA. II (M) dated 29th October 2014, titled "Impact of mining activities on Habitations-issues related to the mining Projects wherein Habitations and villages are the part of mine lease areas or Habitations and villages are surrounded by the mine lease area".
25. Any change in the correspondence address shall be duly intimated to all the regulatory authority within 30 days of such change.
26. A display board with following details of the project is mandatory at the entry to the mine.
  - a. Lease owner's Name, Contact details etc.
  - b. Mining Lease area of the project (in ha.)
  - c. Production capacity of the project.
27. Species such as Khus Slips and Nagar Motha shall be planted on the nearby river banks for bank stabilization and to check soil erosion while dense plantation/ wood lot shall be carryout in the 7.5 meters periphery/barrier zone of the lease through concern CCF (social forestry) and on mineral evacuation road & common area in the village through any suitable Govt. agency (such as Van Vikas Nigam / Van Samiti under monitoring and guidance of Forest Range officer with work permission from DFO concerned / Gram Panchayat / Agricultural department or any other suitable agency having adequate expertise as per the budgetary allocations made in the EMP.
28. Dense plantation/ wood lot shall be carryout in the 7.5 meters periphery/barrier zone of the lease through concern CCF (social forestry) or concerned DFO or any other suitable agency and on mineral evacuation road & common area in the village through any suitable Govt. agency (such as Van Vikas Nigam / Van Samiti under monitoring and guidance of Forest Range officer with work permission from DFO concerned / Gram Panchayat / Agricultural department or any other suitable agency having adequate expertise as per the budgetary allocations made in the EMP.
29. Entire plantation proposed in barrier zone of lease area shall be carried out in the first year itself as per submitted plantation scheme.
30. Top soil shall be simultaneously used for the plantation within the lease area and no OB/dump shall be stacked outside the lease area. PP should take-up entire plantation activity within initial three years of mining operations and shall maintain them for entire mine life including casualty replacement. PP should also maintain a log book containing annual details of tree plantation and causality replacement and to take adequate precautions so as not to cause any damage to the flora and fauna during mining operations. PP shall explore the possibility for plantation in adjoining forest land in consultation with concerned DFO and commensurate budget shall be transferred for plantation to DFO.
31. Top soil shall be simultaneously used for the plantation within the lease area and no OB/dump shall be stacked outside the lease area. PP should take-up entire plantation activity within initial three years of mining operations and shall maintain them for entire mine life including casualty replacement. PP should also maintain a log book containing annual details of tree plantation and causality replacement and to take adequate precautions so as not to cause any damage to the flora and fauna during mining operations. Plantation in adjoining forest land shall be carried out through concerned DFO and commensurate budget shall be transferred for plantation to DFO.
32. Local palatable mixture of annual and perennial grass and fodder tree species shall be planted for grassland/fodder development on degraded forest land through forest department or on other community land available for grassland and fodder development through Gram Panchayat in concerned village and handed over to Gram Panchayat after lease period.



33. During initial three years before onset of monsoon season, minimum 100 saplings or maximum as per submitted plantation scheme and subsequently approved by the SEAC of fodder / native fruit bearing species shall be distributed in nearby villagers to promote plantation and shall be procured from social forestry nursery/ Government Horticulture nursery. This activity shall be carried out under Govt. of Madhya Pradesh “ANKUR YOJNA” by registering individual villagers on “Vayudoot app”. Where ever Aushadhi Vatika (Medicinal Garden) is proposed by PP, a minimum of 50 saplings be planted considering 80% survival with proper protection measures in School or Aganwadi premises.
34. Adequate provisions of water for irrigating plantation shall be made by PP.
35. Activates proposed under CER should be based upon outcome of public hearing in category for B-1 projects. However in case of B-2 projects, CER shall be proposed based upon local need assessment and Gram Panchayat Annual Action Plan.

**Annexure- ‘D’**

**General conditions applicable for the granting of TOR**

1. The date and duration of carrying out the baseline data collection and monitoring shall be informed to the concerned Regional Officer of the M.P Pollution Control Board.
2. During monitoring, photographs shall be taken as a proof of the activity with latitude & longitude, date, time & place and same shall be attached with the EIA report. A drone video showing various sensitivities of the lease and nearby area shall also be shown during EIA presentation.
3. An inventory of various features such as sensitive area, fragile areas, mining / industrial areas, habitation, water-bodies, major roads, etc. shall be prepared and furnished with EIA.
4. An inventory of flora & fauna based on actual ground survey shall be presented.
5. Risk factors with their management plan should be discussed in the EIA report.
6. The EIA report should be prepared by the accredited consultant having no conflict of interest with any committee processing the case.
7. The EIA document shall be printed on both sides, as far as possible.
8. All documents should be properly indexed, page numbered.
9. Period/date of data collection should be clearly indicated.
10. The letter /application for EC should quote the SEIAA case No./year and also attach a copy of the letter prescribing the TOR.
11. The copy of the letter received from the SEAC prescribing TOR for the project should be attached as an annexure to the final EIA/EMP report.
12. The final EIA/EMP report submitted to the SEIAA must incorporate all issues mentioned in TOR and that raised in Public Hearing with the generic structure as detailed out in the EIA report.
13. Grant of TOR does not mean grant of EC.
14. The status of accreditation of the EIA consultant with NABET/QCI shall be specifically mentioned. The consultant shall certify that his accreditation is for the sector for which this EIA is prepared. If consultant has engaged other laboratory for carrying out the task of monitoring and analysis of pollutants, a representative from laboratory shall also be present to answer the site specific queries.
15. On the front page of EIA/EMP reports, the name of the consultant/consultancy firm along with their complete details including their accreditation, if any shall be indicated. The consultant while submitting the EIA/EMP report shall give an undertaking to the effect that the prescribed TORs (TOR proposed by the project proponent and additional TOR given by the MOEF & CC) have been complied with and the data submitted is factually correct.
16. While submitting the EIA/EMP reports, the name of the experts associated with involved in the preparation of these reports and the laboratories through which the samples have been got analyzed should be stated in the report. It shall be indicated whether these laboratories are approved under the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 and also have NABL accreditation.
17. All the necessary NOC's duly verified by the competent authority should be annexed.
18. PP has to submit the copy of earlier Consent condition /EC compliance report, whatever applicable along with EIA report.
19. The EIA report should clearly mention activity wise EMP and CER cost details and should depict clear breakup of the capital and recurring costs along with the timeline for incurring the capital cost. The basis of allocation of EMP and CER cost should be detailed in the EIA report to enable the comparison of compliance with the commitment by the monitoring agencies.

20. A time bound action plan should be provided in the EIA report for fulfillment of the EMP commitments mentioned in the EIA report.
21. The name and number of posts to be engaged by the PP for implementation and monitoring of environmental parameters should be specified in the EIA report.
22. EIA report should be strictly as per the TOR, comply with the generic structure as detailed out in the EIA notification, 2006, baseline data is accurate and concerns raised during the public hearing are adequately addressed.
23. The EIA report should be prepared by the accredited consultant having no conflict of interest with any committee processing the case.
24. Public Hearing has to be carried out as per the provisions of the EIA Notification, 2006. The issues raised in public hearing shall be properly addressed in the EMP and suitable budgetary allocations shall be made in the EMP and CER based on their nature.
25. Actual measurement of top soil shall be carried out in the lease area at minimum 05 locations and additionally N, P, K and Heavy Metals shall be analyzed in all soil samples. Additionally in one soil sample, pesticides shall also be analyzed.
26. A separate budget in EMP & CER shall be maintained for development and maintenance of grazing land as per the latest O.M, of MoEF&CC issued vide letter F.No. 22-34/2018-IA. III, dated 16/01/2020.
27. PP shall submit biological diversity report stating that there is no adverse impact in- situ and on surrounding area by this project on local flora and fauna's habitat, breeding ground, corridor/ route etc. This report shall be filed annually with six-monthly compliance report.
28. The project proponent shall provide the mitigation measures as per MoEFCC's Office Memorandum No. Z-11013/57/2014-IA. II (M) dated 29th October 2014, titled "Impact of mining activities on Habitations-issues related to the mining Projects wherein Habitations and villages are the part of mine lease areas or Habitations and villages are surrounded by the mine lease area" with EIA report.
29. LPG gas shall be provided for camping labour under "Ujjwala Yojna".
30. In the project where ground water is proposed as water source, the project proponent shall apply to the competent authority such as Central Ground Water Authority (CGWA) as the case may be for obtaining, No Objection Certificate (NOC).
31. Consideration of mining proposals involving violation of the EIA Notification, 2006, the project proponent shall give an undertaking by way of affidavit to comply with all the statutory requirements and judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India dated 02/08/2017 in WP © No. 114 of 2014 in the matter of Common Cause V/s Union of India & others before grant of TOR/EC. The undertaking inter alia includes commitment of the PP not to repeat any such violation in future as per MoEF&CC OM No. F.NO. 3-50/2017-IA.III (Pt.) dated 30/05/2018.
32. The mining project proponents involving violations of the EIA Notification, 2006 under the provisions of S.O. 804 (E) dated 14/03/2017 and subsequent amendments for TOR/EC shall give an undertaking by way of affidavit to comply with all the statutory requirements and judgment of Hon'ble Supreme Court dated the 2<sup>nd</sup> August 2017 in Writ Petition (Civil) No. 114 of 2014 in the matter of Common Cause versus Union of India and Ors. Before grant of TOR/EC the undertaking inter alia include commitment of the PP not to repeat any such violation of future. In case of violation of above undertaking, the TOR/Environmental Clearance shall be liable to be terminated forthwith.
33. Under CER scheme commitments with physical targets shall be included in EIA report for:
  - ✓ Proposal for CER activities based upon commitment made during public hearing and COVID-19 pandemic.
  - ✓ Activities such as solar panels in school, awareness camps for Oral Hygiene, Diabetes and Blood Pressure, works related to plantation (distribution of fruit & fodder bearing trees) vaccination, cattle's health checkup etc. in concerned village shall be proposed.
  - ✓ No fuel wood shall be used as a source of energy by mine workers. Thus proposal for providing solar cookers / LPG gas cylinders under "Ujjwala Yojna" to them who are residing in the nearby villages, shall be considered.
  - ✓ PP's commitment that activities proposed in the CER scheme will be completed within initial 03 years of the project and in the remaining years shall be maintained shall be submitted with EIA report.
34. Under Plantation Scheme commitments with budgetary allocations shall be included in EIA report for :
  - ✓ Comprehensive green belt plan with commitment that entire plantation shall be carried out in the initial three years and will be maintained thereafter with causality replacement. Proposal for distribution of fruit bearing

- species for nearby villagers shall also be incorporated in the plantation scheme and for which a primary survey for need assessment in concerned village shall be carried out.
- ✓ Commitment that plantation shall be carried out preferably through Govt. agency (such as Van Vikas Nigam / Van Samiti under monitoring and guidance of Forest Range officer with work permission from DFO concerned / Gram Panchayat / Agricultural department or any other suitable agency having adequate expertise as per the budgetary allocations made in the EMP.
  - ✓ Commitment that high density plantation (preferably using “Miyawaki Technique or WALMI technique) shall be developed in 7.5m barrier zone left for plantation through concern CCF (social forestry) or concerned DFO or any other suitable agency.
  - ✓ To know the soil quality, type and depth of the lease area the trial pit shall be dug out in the barrier zone.
  - ✓ Commitment that local palatable mixture of annual and perennial grass and fodder tree species shall be planted for grassland/fodder development on degraded forest land suitable for the purpose through Gram Panchayat on suitable community land in the concerned village area and handed over to Gram Panchayat after lease period.
  - ✓ PP shall explore the possibility for plantation in adjoining forest land in consultation with concerned DFO and commensurate budget shall be transferred for plantation to DFO.
  - ✓ Where ever Aushadhi Vatika (Medicinal Garden) is proposed by PP, minimum 50 saplings be planted considering 80% survival.
  - ✓ Adequate provisions of water for irrigating plantation shall be made by PP.

**FOR PROJECTS LOCATED IN SCHEDULED (V) TRIBAL AREA , following should be studied and discussed in EIA Report before Public Hearing as per the instruction of SEIAA vide letter No. 1241 dated 30/07/2018.**

35. Detailed analysis by a National Institute of repute of all aspects of the health of the residents of the Schedule Tribal block.
36. Detailed analysis of availability and quality of the drinking water resources available in the block.
37. A study by CPCB of the methodology of disposal of industrial waste from the existing industries in the block, whether it is being done in a manner that mitigate all health and environmental risks.
38. The consent of Gram Sabah of the villages in the area where project is proposed shall be obtained.