Minutes of the 48th Meeting of State level Environment Impact Assessment Authority, Jharkhand, held on 12th June, 2017.

The 48th meeting of the State Level Environment Impact Assessment Authority (SEIAA) was convened on 12/06/2017 in the office of SEIAA, Ranchi. The meeting was chaired by Shri S.E.H. Kazmi, Chairman, SEIAA, Jharkhand. The attendance in the meeting was as follows:-

1. Shri S.E.H. Kazmi, Chairman, SEIAA, Jharkhand, Ranchi.
2. Shri Jabber Singh, Member Secretary, SEIAA, Jharkhand, Ranchi.
3. Shri S.C. Narayan, Member, SEIAA, Jharkhand, Ranchi.

The minutes of 41st meeting of SEAC dated 16th – 17th January, 2017 and the minutes of 42nd meeting held on 20 – 21 April, 2017 were placed before the authority for consideration. It was observed that these minutes were submitted to the SEIAA after a lapse of almost 5 months and 2 months long delay respectively. Such undue delay in finalisation of the minutes after the meeting is a cause of concern. Hence the SEAC is directed to submit the recommendations/observations on the proposals submitted to it within a period of 5 working days after the meeting as provided in Appendix V Clause - 6 of the EIA notification 2006.

The decisions taken in the 48th SEIAA meeting are:–

1. **SEIAA considered the recommendations made by SEAC in its 41st meeting held on 16th and 17th January, 2017 (Part-B) to grant the EC to the following project proposal related to Stone Mining:-**

   I. Stone Mines & Crusher of M/s Shri Vianyak Construction at Village – Rewaratu, Tehsil - Satbarwa, Dist- Palamu, Jharkhand (9.50 Ha).

   The authority examined the recommendation made by SEAC. There is a mismatch of land use data mentioned in Form I and those given in the mine plan. The area of quarry is shown to be 6.19 ha. in Form I but in the mine plan the same is shown as 1.15 ha. (3.60 Acre). Similar discrepancy is found in area of green belt and other land use patterns. In the Environment Management Plan all the turning points on the map need to be marked with latitude/longitude. These are essential for the EMP. The EMP does not mention/explain the basis for calculation about dust suppression measures. Though mention of emission due to movement of vehicles has been made however the amount of total emission is not indicated in the EMP. The proposal is referred back to the SEAC for detail examination and recommendation.

2. **SEIAA considered the recommendations made by SEAC in its 42nd meeting held on 20th and 21st April, 2017 to grant the EC to the following project proposal related to Stone Mining:-**

   I. Majurahi Stone Deposit of M/s Maa Guru Construction at Village – Majurahi, Thana – Nawdiha Bazar, Dist – Palamu, Jharkhand (5.868 Ha/14.50 Acre).

   The authority examined the recommendation made by SEAC. It was observed that the issues related to environment needs to be addressed properly in the EMP. The longitude/latitude of all pillars especially at turning points have not been marked. These are essential as per guidelines for the preparation of EMP. No mention of emission due to vehicular traffic is made in Form I. Also the dust suppression measures are not justifying and Environmental Monitoring Programme is not integrated in the EMP. The proposal may be reexamined thoroughly by the SEAC in the light of above observations.

3. **SEIAA considered the recommendations made by SEAC in its 42nd meeting held on 20th and 21st April, 2017 to the following project proposal:-**

I. Laharjori Stone Deposit of M/s Agrima Infra engineering Pvt. Ltd. at Village – Laharjori, Thana – Margomunda, Dist – Deoghar, Jharkhand (7.24 Ha).

The project proponent has requested for withdrawal of application and the SEAC has recommended the same. The recommendation of SEAC is accepted.

II. Sponge Iron Plant of M/s Bihar Sponge Iron Limited at Village – Umesh Nagar, Tehsil – Chandil, Dist – Saraikela-Kharsawan, Jharkhand.

The recommendation made by SEAC in this case states that as per the office memorandum no.- J-11013/41/2006-IA-11 (I) (part) dated 22nd August, 2014 of MOEF & CC the generated data is valid up to three years and above proposal is pending for a long time. Due to absence of project proponent for presentation the application is long pending and such case is fit to be delisted therefore SEIAA agrees with the recommendation made by SEAC and decides to delist the proposal.

III. Biru Sand Mining Project of Shri Xaviyar Minz at Village – Biru, P.S.- Simdega, Dist – Simdega, Jharkhand (6.07 Ha).

The recommendation of SEAC in this case states that project proponent has submitted a false/erroneous affidavit dated 16.12.2015 claiming there is a no RF/PF within 500 meter periphery of the project site, but DFO Simdega vide letter no.- 1772, dated- 16.09.2015 intimated Assistant Mining Officer, Simdega that proposed site is 0 (zero) meter from notified forest. Meanwhile the project proponent vide letter no.- nil, dated – 22.12.2016 prayed to verify the distance of forest from applied mining lease area plot no.- 2195 (p) therefore SEIAA decided to ask the project proponent that the submitted map with letter no.- nil, dated – 27.12.2016 be verified by DFO Simdega and the same be resubmitted to the SEIAA for further action.

4. **Decision on matters related to :–**

i. **Chapandey Stone Mine of Shri Sanjay Kumar Bhalotia M/s Sanjay Mining & Minerals Trading Corporation at Mouza- Chapandey, P.S.- Ranga, District- Sahibganj, Jharkhand (8.38 Ha).**

SEIAA considered the application no.- nil, dated – 28.03.2017 of the project proponent. It was found that the PP has proposed to apply for grant of EC for an area of 14.69 acres and wants to submit revised Form I, PFR and other necessary documents.

Since it will require submission of new Form I and entirely new set of other documents hence it cannot be an extension of the earlier proposal even if the project proponent is the same. So the applicant shall be asked to move for a fresh proposal and the application dated 28.03.2017 stands rejected.

ii. **Fatehpur Stone Mine Project Hindustan Construction Pvt. Ltd., Village & Mouza - Fatehpur, Thana- Hiranpur, District- Pakur, Jharkhand (5.62 Ha)**

While considering the proposal it was brought to the notice of the SEIAA that RQP of the proposal is Mr. R. N. Singh, who is an Expert Member in State Level Expert Appraisal Committee. The Govt. may be requested to clarify that in such cases where the RQP is a member of SEAC or DEAC/DEIAA, whether it will violate "no conflict of interest assurance" given to the Govt. of Jharkhand by the members at the time of appointment.

Hence, the proposal may be taken in the next meeting after the opinion of the Govt. is duly sought in this regard.

iii. **The issue of minimum distance from forest in new/renewal cases of mining lease was discussed and it was decided to get the clarification from Ministry of Environment Forest and Climate Change Govt. of India in this regard. The Member Secretary SEIAA may personally visit the concerned officials to expedite the matter.**

iv. **While considering the procedure regarding submission of the compliance report it was noted that the earlier condition recommended by SEAC stated that six monthly compliance report should be submitted to JSPCB. As per the norms prescribed in EIA notification 2006 it is clearly stated that project management should submit compliance report to concerned authority. Environmental Clearance is the matter of State Level Environment Impact Assessment Authority so the earlier condition regarding compliance report submission needs to be changed therefore SEAC is asked to take appropriate action in this regard.**

v. Department of Forest Environment and Climate Change Government of Jharkhand OA. No.- 120/2016/EZ, Letter No.- 7/ पर्या० प्रदू० (वाद)- 16/2016 2097 व० प० राँची, दिनांक- 19.05.2017.

The above mentioned letter of Department of Forest Environment and Climate Change Government of Jharkhand was considered by SEIAA and it was decided to seek the legal opinion and act accordingly in this matter.

While considering the recommendation of SEAC in the matter of M/s Shri Vinayak Construction for stone mining (9.50 Ha), it was observed unanimously that there is a need to streamline the process for effective and faster disposals. Since the above proposal was sent for technical appraisal in the month of January, 2017 and the recommendation of SEAC were received after a long gap of about 5 months i.e.

29.05.2017. Such acts violate the norms prescribed in Appendix V Clause – 6 of EIA notification 2006.

EIA notification 2006 stated that the minutes of the EAC/SEAC meeting shall be finalised within 5 working days of the meeting and displayed on the website of the concerned regulatory authority, therefore SEAC is asked to take appropriate steps in light of above observations.

The meeting concluded with vote of thanks to the Chairman.

12/6/2017

Member
SEIAA

Member – Secretary
SEIAA

Chairman
SEIAA