



0191-2474553/0194-2490602

Ministry of Environment, Forest & Climate Change, Govt. of India.  
**J&K UT LEVEL EXPERT APPRAISAL COMMITTEE(JKEAC)**



Department of Ecology, Environment & Remote Sensing  
Paryavaran Bhavan, Gladeni, Transport Nagar, Narwal, Jammu Tawi(November-April)  
SDA Housing Colony, Bemina, Srinagar, Kashmir (May-October)  
Email: seacers@gmail.com, Website:www.parivesh.nic.in

## MINUTES OF MEETING

### MINUTES OF 47<sup>th</sup> MEETING OF THE JK EXPERT APPRAISAL COMMITTEE HELD ON 10<sup>th</sup> of July, 2021 VIA VIDEO CONFERENCING

In pursuance to meeting Notice issued vide No: EAC/JK/20/7994-8014 dated: 05/07/2021, the 47<sup>th</sup> meeting of JKEAC was held today, the 10<sup>th</sup> of July, 2021 via video Conferencing. The following members of JKEAC attended the meeting: -

S.No.	Name	Designation
1	Mr. S.C. Sharma, IFS(Rtd.)	Chairman
2	Mr. M.A Tak, IFS(Rtd.)	Member
3	Engineer BB Sharma	Member
4	Prof. Falendra Kumar Sudaan	Member
5	Mr. A.R. Makroo	Member
6	Prof. Anil Kr.Raina	Member
7	Mr. Humayun Rashid	Secretary

Secretary, JKEAC welcomed Chairman and other participating Members of JKEAC, Participating Project Proponents and the Consultants.

The meeting proceeded as per following sequence: -

#### AGENDA ITEM NO: 1

Title of the Case	Grant of Terms of Reference for Minor Mineral Block No-05, E-Nehama Bridge Downstream, Vishu Nallah, Village Nehama, D.H.Pora, Kulgam, with revised area 1.70 Ha. in favour of M/S Ashiq Hussain Khan S/o Shri. Mohd. Maqbool Khan R/o Danokandi Marg, Tehsil D.H.Pora, Kulgam, J&K U.T-192233. <a href="mailto:kulgamblock05@gmail.com">kulgamblock05@gmail.com</a>
Type of Project (Whether mining lease / STP/ Quarry Licence/ Brick Earth Mining)	River Bed Mining Lease (Area 1.70 Ha)

Category(B1/B2)	B1
Proposal Number	SIA/JK/MIN/62965/2021// SIA/JK/MIN/57779/2020
File Number	SEAC/JK/20/349
Name of Consultancy with date of validity	Oceao-Enviro Management Solutions India Pvt Ltd - <b>15/07/2021</b>
Presenter representative of consultant	Mr. Hemanshu Goel
Project Proponent/ Representative of Project Proponent	Neither Project Proponent nor his representative joined the meeting

### **CASE SUMMARY**

Area (ha)	Bid Cost (in lacs)	Project Cost (in lacs)	EMP cost proposed		CER budget proposed (in lacs)
			CAPITAL (in lacs)	RECURRING (in lacs)	
1.70	17.70	56.00	0.936	0.987	Nil

Mine Closure lacs plan proposed (in lacs)	Mining depth proposed in PFR (mts.)	Haulage Route (Kms)	Bulk density proposed	Cluster situation (Yes/No)
Not provided	<b>1.00</b>	0.26	<b>2.3</b>	Yes

### **PROJECT EVENT DATES**

Date of Letter of Intent (LoI)	LoI –Date of Extension, if any	LoI Date of Validity	Date of Mining Plan approval	Resizing of mining block – Date of recommendation, if applicable
16/07/2020	15/04/2021	31/08/2021	14/09/2020	10/03/2021

### **APPRAISAL PROCESS**

(To be filled by JKEAC during online appraisal)

### **STATUS OF DOCUMENTATION**

S. No.	Document	Status	Remarks of the Committee
1	Form 1	Submitted	Undertaking to be signed by the PP
2	PFR	Submitted	Needs revision

3	Approved Mine Plan	Submitted	Mine Plan needs to be revised for mining block area, mining depth, closure plan, surface plan, targeted mineral production, mining methodology etc.
4	District Survey Report	Not submitted	Needs revision for including replenishment data etc.

**NO OBJECTION CERTIFICATES**

S. No.	Department	Mining Block Recommended/ Not recommended	Remarks/ Reference
1	Irrigation Dept.	<b>Not recommended</b>	NOCs issued by Deputy Commissioner Kulgam vide No. DCK/ Estt/ 2021-22/91, dated 12/04/2021
2	Flood Control Dept.	Recommended	
3	Fisheries Dept.	Recommended	
4	Forest Dept. (if required)	Recommended	
5	Wildlife Protection Dept (If required)	Recommended	
6	Pollution Control Board	Recommended	
7	Revenue Dept.	Recommended	
8	PHE Dept.	<b>Not recommended</b>	
9	Soil Conservation Dept.	Recommended	

**OBSERVATION IN RESPECT OF MINING SITE WHEN VIEWED ON MULTIDATE GOOGLE EARTH IMAGE PLATFORM USING KML /KMZ FILE EMAILED/UPLOADED BY THE PROJECT PROPONENT/CONSULTANT**

S.no.	Features observed	Within Mining site boundary (Yes/No)	Outside mining site boundary (Yes/No)	Upstream from mining block (Mts.)	Downstream From mining block (Mts.)	Remarks
1	Features indicative of any Illegal mining.	No	No			
2	Bridge with midstream piers, if any, located within mining area/ within 500 mts. from the ends of mining block.	No	No			

3	Bridge with only abutments, if any, located within mining area/ within 500 mts. from the ends of mining block.	No	No			
4	Foot bridge with only abutments on two banks, if any located within mining area/ within 500 mts. from the ends of mining block.	No	No			
5	Green patch (Cropland / trees /orchard etc. if any located within mining block/adjacent to mining block or within 500 mts. from the mining block.	No	No			
6	Structures of any kind (buildings /Flood control/ protection works/ electric installations, if any located within/adjacent/ in close vicinity to mining block or within 500 mts. of the mining block.	No	No			
7	Irrigation canal headworks/ khul inlets, if any located within mining block or	No	Yes	-	48	Reservations expressed by stake holder dept.

	within 500 mts. of the mining block.					
<b>8</b>	Active water channels, if any crossing the mining block.	<b>yes</b>	<b>yes</b>			<b>Area under active water channel needs to be excluded</b>
<b>9</b>	National Park/Wildlife Sanctuary/ESZ, if any located in close vicinity of the mining block and distance thereof from the mining block.	-	-	-	-	
<b>10</b>	Forest land, if any located in close vicinity of the mining block. If yes, the distance thereof from the ends of mining block.	-	-	-	-	
<b>12</b>	Any other relevant feature of interest or condition which is critical to grant of ToRs/EC to the proposed project	-	-	-	-	

**SPECIFIC OBSERVATION(S) OF JKEAC:**

- a) Mining depth exceeding 1 m below the NSL cannot be agreed in view of non-availability of replenishment data
- b) Use of bulk density @ 2.3 is not agreed to. The figure/value be either based on actual measurements at the mine site or be restricted to maximum value of 2.
- c) Mining plan on page 2 mentions that the project falls under B2 category.
- d) Scanned undertaking in Form 1 uploaded on portal by the PP is without his signature.
- e) There are contradictory figures given for the EMP cost in submitted documents and the PPT
- f) The EMP budget proposed is too meagre/ inadequate vis. a vis. the requirement.
- g) The CER cost is missing.
- h) Mining depth of 2 mt. is mentioned on page 33 of the EMP
- i) Irrigation and PHE/Jalshakti Departments have not issued NoCs for the project keeping in view consequential/ potential adverse impact of mining activity on their existing projects.**

- j) Mine closure Plan does not provide detailed budget.
- k) Use of JCBs/Excavators has been proposed in mining methodology which can't be allowed.
- l) Revised surface plan not approved by competent authority

**RECOMMENDATION OF JKEAC:**

In view of the deliberations and insight gained during the above cited appraisal process, the Committee rejected the case for grant of Terms of Reference for preparation of EIA/EMP specifically keeping in view the anticipated /potential adverse environmental fallout of mining activity on availability of water for irrigation and water supply schemes in the area

**AGENDA ITEM NO: 2**

Title of the Case	Grant of Terms of Reference for Minor Mineral Block No- 25, Y-Ashmuji Bridge Downstream, Vishu Nallah, Village Ashmuji Tehsil Kulgam District Kulgam , Revised area 1.70 Ha.) in favour of M/S Shabir Ahmad Sheikh S/o Shri. Ghulam Mohi ud Din Sheikh R/o Near Airtel Tower, Bhan, District – Kulgam and UT- J&K–192231 <a href="mailto:kulgamblock25@gmail.com">kulgamblock25@gmail.com</a>
Type of Project  (Whether mining lease / STP/ Quarry Licence/ Brick Earth Mining)	River Bed Mining Lease (1.70Ha)
Category(B1/B2)	B1
Proposal Number	SIA/JK/MIN/62972/2021/ SIA/JK/MIN/57482/2020
File Number	SEAC/JK/20/315
Name of Consultancy with date of validity	Oceao-Enviro Management Solutions India Pvt Ltd - <b>15/07/2021</b>
Presenter representative of Consultant	Mr. Hemanshu Goel
Project Proponent/ Representative of Project Proponent	Shabir Ahmad

**CASE SUMMARY**

Area (ha)	Bid Cost (in lacs)	Project Cost (in lacs)	EMP cost proposed		CER budget proposed (in lacs)
			CAPITAL (in lacs)	RECURRING (in lacs)	
1.70	66.70	57.3	0.936	0.987	Nil

Mine Closure lacs plan proposed (in lacs)	Mining depth proposed in PFR (mts.)	Haulage Route (Kms)	Bulk density proposed	Cluster situation (Yes/No)
0.15	1.0	0.58	2.3	yes

### PROJECT EVENT DATES

Date of Letter of Intent (LoI)	LoI –Date of Extension, if any	LoI Date of Validity	Date of Mining Plan approval	Resizing of mining block – Date of recommendation, if applicable
16/07/2020	15/04/2021	31/08/2021	31/08/2020	10/03/2021

### APPRAISAL PROCESS

(To be filled by JKEAC during online appraisal)

#### STATUS OF DOCUMENTATION

S. No.	Document	Status	Remarks of the Committee
1	Form 1	Submitted	Undertaking to be signed by the PP
2	PFR	Submitted	Needs revision
3	Approved Mine Plan	Submitted	Mine Plan needs to be revised for mining block area, mining depth, closure plan, surface plan, targeted mineral production, mining methodology etc.
4	District Survey Report	Not submitted	Needs revision for including replenishment data etc.

#### NO OBJECTION CERTIFICATES

S. No.	Department	Mining Block Recommended/ Not recommended	Remarks/ Reference
1	Irrigation Dept.	Recommended	NOCs issued by Dy Commissioner Kulgam vide No. DCK/Estt/2021-22/91 dated 12/04/2021 and
2	Flood Control Dept.	Recommended	
3	Fisheries Dept.	Recommended	
4	Forest Dept. (if required)	Recommended	
5	Wildlife Protection Dept (If required)	Recommended	
6	Pollution Control Board	Recommended	

7	Revenue Dept.	Recommended	No. DCK/Estt /2021-22/321 dated 7/06/2021
8	PHE Dept.	Recommended	
9	Soil Conservation Dept.	Recommended	

**OBSERVATION IN RESPECT OF MINING SITE WHEN VIEWED ON MULTIDATE GOOGLE EARTH IMAGE PLATFORM USING KML /KMZ FILE EMAILED/UPLOADED BY THE PROJECT PROPONENT/CONSULTANT**

S.no.	Features observed	Within Mining site boundary (Yes/No)	Outside mining site boundary (Yes/No)	Upstream from mining block (Mts.)	Downstream From mining block (Mts.)	Remarks
1	Features indicative of any Illegal mining.	No	No			
2	Bridge with midstream piers, if any, located within mining area/ within 500 mts. from the ends of mining block.	No	No			
3	Bridge with only abutments, if any, located within mining area/ within 500 mts. from the ends of mining block.	No	No			
4	Foot bridge with only abutments on two banks, if any located within mining area/ within 500 mts. from the ends of mining block.	No	No			
5	Green patch (Cropland / trees /orchard etc. if any located within mining	No	No			



	block/adjacent to mining block or within 500 mts. from the mining block.					
<b>6</b>	Structures of any kind (buildings /Flood control/ protection works/ electric installations, if any located within/adjacent/ in close vicinity to mining block or within 500 mts. of the mining block.	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>			
<b>7</b>	Irrigation canal headworks/ khul inlets, if any located within mining block or within 500 mts. of the mining block.	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>	-	-	
<b>8</b>	Active water channels, if any crossing the mining block.	<b>yes</b>	<b>yes</b>			Area under active water channel needs to be excluded
<b>9</b>	National Park/Wildlife Sanctuary/ESZ, if any located in close vicinity of the mining block and distance thereof from the mining block.	-	-	-	-	
<b>10</b>	Forest land, if any located in close vicinity of the mining block. If yes, the distance thereof from the ends of mining block.	-	-	-	-	

<b>12</b>	Any other relevant feature of interest or condition which is critical to grant of ToRs/EC to the proposed project	-	-	-	-	
-----------	---	---	---	---	---	--

**SPECIFIC OBSERVATION(S) OF COMMITTEE, IF ANY:**

- a) Mining depth exceeding 1 m below the NSL cannot be agreed in view of non-availability of replenishment data
- b) Use of bulk density @ 2.3 is not agreed to. The figure/value be either based on actual measurements at the mine site or be restricted to maximum value of 2.
- c) Area reduction of mining block proposed by G&M Dept. to 1.70 Ha agreed by JKEAC.
- d) Targeted mineral production also needs to be revised accordingly.
- e) Mining plan on page 2 mentions that the project falls under B2 category which needs to be corrected while revising the mining plan
- f) Scanned undertaking in Form 1 by the PP is without his signature
- g) Project cost in Form 1 and PFR is shown as 57.3 lacs when the bid cost alone is 66.70 lacs. Therefore, project cost needs to be revised in PFR.
- h) There are contradictory figures given for the EMP cost in submitted documents and the Ppt.
- i) The EMP cost is too meagre needs to be revised with appropriate budget.
- j) The CER cost is missing.
- k) Though as per annexure to letter No. DCK/Estt/2021-22/91 dated 12/04/2021 and No. DCK/Estt/2021-22/321 dated 7/06/2021 NOCs have been issued by all the stake holders, yet the NOC from Fisheries Dept. and Irrigation Dept. has not been appended which are very important and need to be produced while applying for EC.

**RECOMMENDATION OF JKEAC**

In view of the deliberations and insight gained during the above cited appraisal process, the Committee recommended the case for grant of Terms of Reference as per **Annexure-A** to these Minutes of Meeting subject to: -

- a. Mining Depth of **1m in aggregate** due to non-availability of replenishment data.
- b. Mining Area **1.70 Ha** after exclusion of green patch/active water channel/Flood protection structures/safe distance to bridge/irrigation canal headway etc.
- c. Condition that the project proponent obtains a detailed report from the Executive Engineer Irrigation Dept. to the effect that the mining activity will not have any adverse impact on irrigation canals /kuhls.
- d. Condition that the PP obtains a detailed report from Asstt. Director, Fisheries Dept., Kulgam to the effect that the mining activity will not have any adverse impact on fish life in the stream.
- e. Condition, the haulage route does not traverse through the active water channel.
- f. Condition, the bulk density is restricted to max.2 in absence of actual measurements.
- g. Revision of mining plan/PFR with revised area, revised coordinates, revised surface plan, and revised calculation of minor mineral production at maximum 1m depth in

aggregate in the light of deliberations of the JKEAC and its de-novo approval by the competent authority prior to grant of ToR or as decided by the JKEIAA.

### AGENDA ITEM NO: 3

Title of the Case	Grant of Terms of Reference for Minor Mineral Block-10 J-Ching Adigan Bridge Downstream Vishu Nallah, Village: Chingi Adigan Tehsil : D.H Pora District : Kulgam, Revised area 4.99 Ha. in favour of M/S Mushtaq Ul Islam S/o Gh. Mohi ud Din Bhat R/o Karimabad, Tehsil - Pulwama, District-Pulwama U.T- J&K-192301 <a href="mailto:pulwamablock10@gmail.com">pulwamablock10@gmail.com</a>
Type of Project (Whether mining lease / STP/ Quarry Licence/ Brick Earth Mining)	River Bed Mining Lease (4.99Ha)
Category(B1/B2)	B1
Proposal Number	SIA/JK/MIN/62988/2021// SIA/JK/MIN/57824/2020
File Number	SEAC/JK/20/339
Name of Consultancy with date of validity	Oceao-Enviro Management Solutions India Pvt Ltd - 15/07/2021
Presenter representative of consultant	Mr. Hemanshu Goel
Project Proponent/ Representative of Project Proponent	Neither Project Proponent nor his representative joined the meeting

### CASE SUMMARY

Area (ha)	Bid Cost (in lacs)	Project Cost (in lacs)	EMP cost proposed		CER budget proposed (in lacs)
			CAPITAL (in lacs)	RECURRING (in lacs)	
4.99	16.10	166.00	0.93	0.98	<b>NIL</b>

Mine Closure lacs plan proposed (in lacs)	Mining depth proposed in PFR (mts.)	Haulage Route (Kms)	Bulk density proposed	Cluster situation (Yes/No)
0.15	1.0	1.52	2.3	yes

### PROJECT EVENT DATES

Date of Letter of Intent (LoI)	LoI –Date of Extension, if any	LoI Date of Validity	Date of Mining Plan approval	Resizing of mining block – Date of recommendation, if applicable
16/07/2020	15/04/2021	31/08/2021	14/09/2020	10/03/2021

### **APPRAISAL PROCESS**

(To be filled by JKEAC during online appraisal)

#### **STATUS OF DOCUMENTATION**

S. No.	Document	Status	Remarks of the Committee
1	Form 1	Submitted	Undertaking to be signed by the PP
2	PFR	Submitted	Needs revision
3	Approved Mine Plan	Submitted	Mine Plan needs to be revised for mining block area, mining depth, closure plan, surface plan, targeted mineral production, mining methodology etc.
4	District Survey Report	Not submitted	Needs revision for including replenishment data etc.

#### **NO OBJECTION CERTIFICATES**

S. No.	Department	Mining Block Recommended/ Not recommended	Remarks/ Reference
1	Irrigation Dept.	Not Recommended	Annexure to letter No. DCK/Estt/2021-22/91 dated 12/04/2021 and No. DCK/Estt/2021-22/321 dated 7/06/2021 issued by Dy Commissioner Kulgam do show NOCs issued by stake holder depts. excepting Irrigation Dept. yet, the individual NOCs appended with the letters do not indicate the Block 10 and therefore needs clarification
2	Flood Control Dept.	Recommended	
3	Fisheries Dept.	Recommended	
4	Forest Dept. (if required)	Recommended	
5	Wildlife Protection Dept (If required)	Recommended	
6	Pollution Control Board	Recommended	
7	Revenue Dept.	Recommended	
8	PHE Dept.	Recommended	
9	Soil Conservation Dept.	Recommended	

**OBSERVATION IN RESPECT OF MINING SITE WHEN VIEWED ON MULTIDATE  
GOOGLE EARTH IMAGE PLATFORM USING KML /KMZ FILE EMAILED/UPLOADED  
BY THE PROJECT PROPONENT/CONSULTANT**

<b>S.no.</b>	<b>Features observed</b>	<b>Within Mining site boundary (Yes/No)</b>	<b>Outside mining site boundary (Yes/No)</b>	<b>Upstream from mining block (Mts.)</b>	<b>Downstream From mining block (Mts.)</b>	<b>Remarks</b>
<b>1</b>	Features indicative of any Illegal mining.	No	No			
<b>2</b>	Bridge with midstream piers, if any, located within mining area/ within 500 mts. from the ends of mining block.	No	No			
<b>3</b>	Bridge with only abutments, if any, located within mining area/ within 500 mts. from the ends of mining block.	No	No			
<b>4</b>	Foot bridge with only abutments on two banks, if any located within mining area/ within 500 mts. from the ends of mining block.	No	No			
<b>5</b>	Green patch (Cropland / trees /orchard etc. if any located within mining block/adjacent to mining block or within 500 mts.	No	yes			Mining block already resized for excluding the green patch

	from the mining block.					
<b>6</b>	Structures of any kind (buildings /Flood control/ protection works/ electric installations, if any located within/adjacent/ in close vicinity to mining block or within 500 mts. of the mining block.	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>			
<b>7</b>	Irrigation canal headworks/ khul inlets, if any located within mining block or within 500 mts. of the mining block.	<b>No</b>	<b>yes</b>	-	-	
<b>8</b>	Active water channels, if any crossing the mining block.	<b>yes</b>	<b>yes</b>			Area under active water channel needs to be excluded
<b>9</b>	National Park/Wildlife Sanctuary/ESZ, if any located in close vicinity of the mining block and distance thereof from the mining block.	-	-	-	-	
<b>10</b>	Forest land, if any located in close vicinity of the mining block. If yes, the distance thereof from the ends of mining block.	-	-	-	-	
<b>12</b>	Any other relevant feature of interest or condition which is critical to grant	-	-	-	-	

	of ToRs/EC to the proposed project					
--	------------------------------------	--	--	--	--	--

**SPECIFIC OBSERVATION(S) OF COMMITTEE, IF ANY:**

- a) Mining depth exceeding 1 m below the NSL cannot be agreed in view of non-availability of replenishment data
- b) Use of bulk density @ 2.3 is not agreed to. The figure/value be either based on actual measurements at the mine site or be restricted to maximum value of 2.
- c) Area reduction of mining block proposed by G&M Dept. agreed by the Committee.
- d) Mining plan on page 2 mentions that the project falls under B2 category which needs to be corrected in revised mining plan
- e) Form 1 undertaking by the PP is without his signature on portal
- f) The EMP cost is too meagre for a project with budget of 166 lacs
- g) Irrigation Dept. has not issued NoCs for the project.**
- h) Mine closure Plan without detailed budget.
- i) JCB/Excavator proposed in mining methodology not agreed to by the Committee.
- j) The CER budget is missing.
- k) Individual NOCs as referred in the Annexure to Dy. Commissioner's letter cited above don't mention mining block 10 except in letter from Executive Engineer Irrigation Dept.

**RECOMMENDATION OF JKEAC**

In view of the deliberations and insight gained during the above cited appraisal process, the Committee rejected the case for grant of Terms of Reference for preparation of EIA/EMP specifically keeping in view the anticipated /potential adverse environmental fallout of mining activity on availability of water for irrigation and water supply schemes in the area

**AGENDA ITEM NO: 4**

Title of the Case	Grant of Terms of Reference for River Bed Mining Project Block No.-13, Mini Secretariat Shopian U/Stream Nallah Rambaria, village-Arhama, Tehsil-Shopian, District-Shopian, J&K. (reduce working area 4.82 Ha.) in favour of M/S Abdul Hamid Wagay S/o Sh. Ghulam Nabi Wagay R/o: - Narapora, District – Shopian, Jammu & Kashmir U.T.–192302 <a href="mailto:hopianblock13@gmail.com">hopianblock13@gmail.com</a>
Type of Project (Whether mining lease / STP/ Quarry Licence/ Brick Earth Mining)	River Bed Mining Lease (4.82Ha)
Category(B1/B2)	B1

Proposal Number	SIA/JK/MIN/62983/2021// SIA/JK/MIN/55070/2020
File Number	SEAC/JK/20/208
Name of Consultancy with date of validity	Oceao-Enviro Management Solutions India Pvt Ltd - <b>15/07/2021</b>
Presenter representative of consultant	Mr. Hemanshu Goel
Project Proponent/ Representative of Project Proponent	Neither Project Proponent nor his representative joined the meeting

### CASE SUMMARY

Area (ha)	Bid Cost (in lacs)	Project Cost (in lacs)	EMP cost proposed		CER budget proposed (in lacs)
			CAPITAL (in lacs)	RECURRING (in lacs)	
4.82	26.20	160.00	0.93	0.98	NIL

Mine Closure lacs plan proposed (in lacs)	Mining depth proposed in PFR (mts.)	Haulage Route (Kms)	Bulk density proposed	Cluster situation (Yes/No)
0.15	1.0	2.50	2.3	yes

### PROJECT EVENT DATES

Date of Letter of Intent (LoI)	LoI –Date of Extension, if any	LoI Date of Validity	Date of Mining Plan approval	Resizing of mining block – Date of recommendation, if applicable
27/03/2020	15/04/2021	31/08/2021	09/06/2020	09/03/2021

### APPRAISAL PROCESS

(To be filled by JKEAC during online appraisal)

### STATUS OF DOCUMENTATION

S. No.	Document	Status	Remarks of the Committee
1	Form 1	Submitted	Undertaking to be signed by the PP
2	PFR	Submitted	
3	Approved Mine Plan	Submitted	Mine Plan needs to be revised for mining block area, mining depth, closure plan, surface plan, targeted mineral production, mining methodology etc.



4	District Survey Report	Not submitted	Needs revision for including replenishment data etc.
---	------------------------	---------------	--

### NO OBJECTION CERTIFICATES

S. No.	Department	Mining Block Recommended/ Not recommended	Remarks/ Reference
1	Irrigation Dept.	<b>Recommended</b>	Dy. Commissioner's letter dated 10/04/21 and letter 07/04/2021 do not mention the NOC in favour of mining block 13. However, some NOCs of stake holder depts. have been attached which lack specific details
2	Flood Control Dept.	-	
3	Fisheries Dept.	-	
4	Forest Dept. (if required)	<b>Recommended</b>	
5	Wildlife Protection Dept (If required)	-	
6	Pollution Control Board	<b>Recommended</b>	
7	Revenue Dept.	<b>Recommended</b>	
8	PHE Dept.	<b>Recommended</b>	
9	Soil Conservation Dept.	-	

### OBSERVATION IN RESPECT OF MINING SITE WHEN VIEWED ON MULTIDATE GOOGLE EARTH IMAGE PLATFORM USING KML /KMZ FILE EMAILED/UPLOADED BY THE PROJECT PROPONENT/CONSULTANT

S.no.	Features observed	Within Mining site boundary (Yes/No)	Outside mining site boundary (Yes/No)	Upstream from mining block (Mts.)	Downstream From mining block (Mts.)	Remarks
1	Features indicative of any Illegal mining.	No	No			
2	Bridge with midstream piers, if any, located within mining area/ within 500 mts. from the ends of mining block.	No	No			
3	Bridge with only abutments, if any,	No	No			

	located within mining area/ within 500 mts. from the ends of mining block.					
<b>4</b>	Foot bridge with only abutments on two banks, if any located within mining area/ within 500 mts. from the ends of mining block.	No	No			
<b>5</b>	Green patch (Cropland / trees /orchard etc. if any located within mining block/adjacent to mining block or within 500 mts. from the mining block.	No	yes			Mining block already resized for excluding the green patch
<b>6</b>	Structures of any kind (buildings /Flood control/ protection works/ electric installations, if any located within/adjacent/ in close vicinity to mining block or within 500 mts. of the mining block.	No	No			
<b>7</b>	Irrigation canal headworks/ khul inlets, if any located within mining block or within 500 mts. of the mining block.	No	No	-	-	
<b>8</b>	Active water channels, if any	yes	yes			Area under active water channel

	crossing the mining block.					needs to be excluded
9	National Park/Wildlife Sanctuary/ESZ, if any located in close vicinity of the mining block and distance thereof from the mining block.	-	-	-	-	
10	Forest land, if any located in close vicinity of the mining block. If yes, the distance thereof from the ends of mining block.	-	-	-	-	
12	Any other relevant feature of interest or condition which is critical to grant of ToRs /EC to the proposed project	-	-	-	-	

**SPECIFIC OBSERVATION(S) OF COMMITTEE, IF ANY:**

- a) Mining depth exceeding 1 m below the NSL cannot be agreed in view of non-availability of replenishment data
- b) Use of bulk density @ 2.3 is not agreed to. The figure/value be either based on actual measurements at the mine site or be restricted to maximum value of 2.
- c) Area reduction of mining block proposed by G&M Dept. to 4.82 ha agreed by JKEAC.
- d) Targeted mineral production also needs to be revised accordingly.
- e) The EMP cost shown in ppt does not match the EMP budget in submitted documents.
- f) On page no: 28 of the EMP document, the mining depth is mentioned to be 2 meters which needs to be corrected as 1m.
- g) CER budget is not provided.
- h) The EMP budget is too meagre for a project with cost of Rs 160 lacs and needs to be revised.
- i) Detailed mine closure Plan budget is not given.
- j) Most of the documents especially surface plan uploaded on portal are not legible and need to be reloaded with freshly scanned legible docs.
- k) Signature of PP missing in undertaking on Form 1
- l) NOCs of block 13 from stakeholder depts missing from the single window clearance communication from Dy Commissioner, Shopian District. Also, NOCs issued by some depts. attached are without specific details and categorical inputs.
- m) Revised surface plan not approved by competent authority as on date

## RECOMMENDATION OF JKEAC

In view of the deliberations and insight gained during the above cited appraisal process, the Committee recommended the case for grant of Terms of Reference as per **Annexure-A** to these Minutes of Meeting subject to: -

- a. Mining Depth of 1m in aggregate due to non-availability of replenishment data
- b. Mining Area 4.82Ha after exclusion of green patch/active water channel/Flood protection structures/safe distance to bridge/irrigation canal headway etc.
- c. Condition that the project proponent obtains a detailed and categorical NOC from the Executive Engineer, Irrigation Dept. indicating the position (Geocoordinates) of the Canal head vis-vis the mining block to the effect that the mining activity will not impact any infrastructure and the delivery system.
- d. Condition that the project proponent obtains a detailed and categorical NOC from Assistant Director, Fisheries Dept. concerned specifying therein that the mining activity in the designated mining block shall not have any adverse impact on fish fauna in the area.
- e. Condition, the bulk density is restricted to max.2 in absence of actual measurements.
- f. Condition, the haulage route does not traverse through the active water channel.
- g. Revision of mining plan with revised area, revised coordinates, revised surface plan, and revised calculation of minor mineral production at maximum 1m depth in aggregate in the light of deliberations of the JKEAC and its de-novo approval by the competent authority prior to grant of ToR or as decided by the JKEIAA.

## AGENDA ITEM NO: 5

Title of the Case	Grant of Terms of Reference for Nallah Bed Mining Project, Minor Mineral Block-17, Q-Kulgam Bridge Upstream Vishu Nallah. Village: Kulgam Tehsil: Kulgam District: Kulgam, Revised Area 1.20 Ha. in favour of M/S Mushtaq Ahmad Khanday S/o Sh. Lalud Din Khanday R/o: Near Masjid Shareef Bhan, District-Kulgam, UT-J&K-192231 <a href="mailto:kulgamblock17@gmail.com">kulgamblock17@gmail.com</a>
Type of Project (Whether mining lease / STP/ Quarry Licence/ Brick Earth Mining)	River Bed Mining Lease (1.20 Ha)
Category(B1/B2)	B1
Proposal Number	SIA/JK/MIN/62996/2021// SIA/JK/MIN/57493/2020
File Number	SEAC/JK/20/316
Name of Consultancy with date of validity	Oceao-Enviro Management Solutions India Pvt Ltd - 15/07/2021

Presenter representative of consultant	Mr. Hemanshu Goel
Project Proponent/ Representative of Project Proponent	Neither Project Proponent nor his representative joined the meeting

### **CASE SUMMARY**

Area (ha)	Bid Cost (in lacs)	Project Cost (in lacs)	EMP cost proposed		CER budget proposed (in lacs)
			CAPITAL (in lacs)	RECURRING (in lacs)	
1.20	54.80	85	0.93	0.98	NIL

Mine Closure lacs plan proposed (in lacs)	Mining depth proposed in PFR (mts.)	Haulage Route (Kms)	Bulk density proposed	Cluster situation (Yes/No)
0.15	1.0	0.52	2.3	yes

### **PROJECT EVENT DATES**

Date of Letter of Intent (LoI)	LoI –Date of Extension, if any	LoI Date of Validity	Date of Mining Plan approval	Resizing of mining block – Date of recommendation, if applicable
16/07/2020	15/04/2021	31/08/2021	31/08/2020	10/03/2021

### **APPRAISAL PROCESS**

(To be filled by JKEAC during online appraisal)

#### **STATUS OF DOCUMENTATION**

S. No.	Document	Status	Remarks of the Committee
1	Form 1	Submitted	Undertaking to be signed by the PP
2	PFR	Submitted	Needs revision
3	Approved Mine Plan	Submitted	Mine Plan needs to be revised for mining block area, mining depth, closure plan, surface plan, targeted mineral production, mining methodology etc.
4	District Survey Report	Not submitted	Needs revision for including replenishment data etc.

### **NO OBJECTION CERTIFICATES**

S. No.	Department	Mining Block Recommended/	Remarks/ Reference
--------	------------	---------------------------	--------------------

		Not recommended	
1	Irrigation Dept.	-	Communication from Dy. Commissioner, Kulgam issued vide No. DCK/Estt/2021-22/364 dated 15/06/2021 makes mention of NOCs issued in favour of the mining block by all stake holders but the annexures containing actual NOCs do not mention block 17 except PHE Dept. which has issued a revised conditional NOC
2	Flood Control Dept.	-	
3	Fisheries Dept.	-	
4	Forest Dept. (if required)	-	
5	Wildlife Protection Dept (If required)	-	
6	Pollution Control Board	-	
7	Revenue Dept.	-	
8	PHE Dept.	CONDITIONALLY RECOMMENDED	
9	Soil Conservation Dept.	-	

**OBSERVATION IN RESPECT OF MINING SITE WHEN VIEWED ON MULTIDATE GOOGLE EARTH IMAGE PLATFORM USING KML /KMZ FILE EMAILED/UPLOADED BY THE PROJECT PROPONENT/CONSULTANT**

S.no.	Features observed	Within Mining site boundary (Yes/No)	Outside mining site boundary (Yes/No)	Upstream from mining block (Mts.)	Downstream From mining block (Mts.)	Remarks
1	Features indicative of any Illegal mining.	No	yes		200	As per image of 10/2018. Not visible on latest image of 2020
2	Bridge with midstream piers, if any, located within mining area/ within 500 mts. from the ends of mining block.	No	yes		500	Mining block already resized
3	Bridge with only abutments, if any,	No	No			

	located within mining area/ within 500 mts. from the ends of mining block.					
<b>4</b>	Foot bridge with only abutments on two banks, if any located within mining area/ within 500 mts. from the ends of mining block.	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>			
<b>5</b>	Green patch (Cropland / trees /orchard etc. if any located within mining block/adjacent to mining block or within 500 mts. from the mining block.	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>			
<b>6</b>	Structures of any kind (buildings /Flood control/ protection works/ electric installations, if any located within/adjacent/ in close vicinity to mining block or within 500 mts. of the mining block.	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>			
<b>7</b>	Irrigation canal headworks/ khul inlets, if any located within mining block or within 500 mts. of the mining block.	<b>No</b>	<b>No</b>			
<b>8</b>	Active water channels, if any	<b>No</b>	<b>yes</b>			Area under active water channel

	crossing the mining block.					needs to be excluded
<b>9</b>	National Park/Wildlife Sanctuary/ESZ, if any located in close vicinity of the mining block and distance thereof from the mining block.	-	-			
<b>10</b>	Forest land, if any located in close vicinity of the mining block. If yes, the distance thereof from the ends of mining block.	-	-			
<b>12</b>	Any other relevant feature of interest or condition which is critical to grant of ToRs /EC to the proposed project	-	-			

**SPECIFIC OBSERVATION(S) OF COMMITTEE, IF ANY:**

- a) Mining depth exceeding 1 m below the NSL cannot be agreed in view of non-availability of replenishment data
- b) Use of bulk density @ 2.3 is not agreed to. The figure/value be either based on actual measurements at the mine site or be restricted to maximum value of 2.
- c) Area reduction of mining block proposed by G&M Dept. to 1.20 ha agreed by JKEAC.
- d) Targeted mineral production also needs to be revised accordingly.
- e) Form 1 uploaded on portal without signatures of the project proponent
- f) Bid cost of Rs 63 lacs has been wrongly shown on page 11 of PFR which needs to be corrected and updated version be submitted and uploaded on the portal.
- g) CER budget is not provided.
- h) The EMP budget is too meagre for a project with cost of 85 lacs and needs to be revised.
- i) The detail budget for mine closure is not given.
- j) There are contradictory figures given for the EMP cost. In the ppt. the uploaded EMP document.
- k) On page 25 of the EMP document the mining depth is mentioned to be 2.5 meters which needs to be corrected and updated version uploaded on the portal.



## RECOMMENDATION OF JKEAC

In view of the deliberations and insight gained during the above cited appraisal process, the Committee recommended the project for grant of Terms of Reference as per **Annexure-A** to these Minutes of Meeting subject to: -

- a. Mining Depth of **1m in aggregate** due to non-availability of replenishment data.
- b. Mining Area **1.20ha** after exclusion of green patch/active water channel/Flood protection structures/safe distance to bridge/irrigation canal headway etc.
- c. Condition that the project proponent obtains a detailed and categorical NOC from the Executive Engineer, Irrigation Dept. indicating the position (Geocoordinates) of the Canal headway vis-vis the mining block to the effect that the mining activity will not impact any infrastructure and the delivery system.
- d. Condition that the project proponent obtains a detailed and categorical NOC from Assistant Director, Fisheries Dept. concerned specifying therein that the mining activity in the designated mining block shall not have any adverse impact on fish fauna in the area.
- e. Condition, the PP also obtains categorical NOC from the Executive Engineer, Flood Control Dept to the effect that the mining activity will not impact any Flood Protection infrastructure in the area.
- f. Condition, the haulage route does not traverse through the active water channel.
- g. Condition, the bulk density is restricted to max.2 in absence of actual measurements.
- h. Revision of mining plan with revised area, revised coordinates, revised surface plan, and revised calculation of minor mineral production at maximum 1m depth in aggregate in the light of deliberations of the JKEAC and its de-novo approval by the competent authority prior to grant of ToR or as decided by the JKEIAA.


## OBSERVATIONS ABOUT CONDUCT OF CONSULTANT

(Excellent/Good /Average/Poor)

S. No.	Component	Rating
1	Submission of the documents	Average
2	Emailing of kml /kmz file and ppt	Poor
3	Presentation of factual details of cases	Average
4	Field knowledge of the case	Poor
5	Formulation of PFR, EMP, CER etc.	Average
	<b>Overall professional conduct during proceedings</b>	<b>Average</b>

Lastly, the minutes of the meeting of the 45<sup>th</sup> JKEAC were confirmed and the meeting ended with vote of thanks to the Chair and the members.

**Annexure-A as per above cases**



**(Humayun Rashid)**  
**SECRETARY**  
**JKUT level Expert Appraisal Committee**

NO:EAC/JK/20/8015-027

Dated:13.07.2021

Copy by email to:

1. The Member Secretary, J&K Environment Impact Assessment Authority (JKEIAA), /PCCF/Director, Ecology, Environment and Remote Sensing, J&K Govt., Jammu for favour kind information and necessary action please.
2. Sh. S. C. Sharma, Chairman, J&K Expert Appraisal Committee, (JKEAC) 331 Shastri Nagar, Jammu-180004 for favour of kind information.
3. Sh. M.ATak, Member, J&K Expert Appraisal COMMITTEE, (JKEAC) 124 Mominabad (Near Jakfed), Anantnag Kashmir,-192101 for favour of kind information.
4. Sh. Braj Bhushan Sharma, Member, J&K Expert Appraisal COMMITTEE, (JKEAC) 278/2 Channi Himmat, Jammu for favour of kind information.
5. Professor Shakeel Ahmad Romshoo, Member, J&K Expert Appraisal Committee, (JKEAC) Department of Earth Sciences Kashmir University Srinagar-190006 for favour of kind information and necessary action please.
6. Sh. Abdul Rashid Makroo, Member, J&K Expert Appraisal COMMITTEE, (JKEAC) H/No. 9 Lane No 11 Sector C, Gulshan Nagar Nowgam Bypass, Srinagar-190019 for favour of kind information please.
7. Professor Arvind Jasrotia Member, J&K Expert Appraisal COMMITTEE, (JKEAC) 33/D Sainik Colony Jammu-180011 for favour of kind information please.
8. Dr. Ghulam Mohammad Dar, Member, J&K Expert Appraisal COMMITTEE, (JKEAC) Main Campus IMPA&RD, M.A Road, Srinagar-190001 for favour of kind information please.
9. Sh. Irfan Yasin, Member, J&K Expert Appraisal COMMITTEE, (JKEAC) Bagh-e-Hyderpora, Bypass, Srinagar for favour of kind information please.
10. Professor Anil Kumar Raina, Member, J&K Expert Appraisal COMMITTEE, (JKEAC) Department of Environmental Science University of Jammu, Jammu-180006 for favour of kind information please.
11. Professor M. A. Khan, Member, J&K Expert Appraisal COMMITTEE, (JKEAC) Khan House, A-27 Milatabad, Peerbagh "B" Srinagar for favour of kind information please.
12. Dr.Falendra Kumar Sudan, Member, J&K Expert Appraisal COMMITTEE, (JKEAC) Professor Department of Economics University of Jammu, Jammu for favour of kind information please.
13. Sh. Sheikh Sajid, PA for information and with direction to upload the minutes on the environmental clearance portal at [parivesh.nic.in](http://parivesh.nic.in).
14. Concerned File.

## **Annexure-A**

### **GENERAL TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR PREPARATION OF EIA/EMP WITH RESPECT TO RIVER BED MINING PROJECT**

#### **STANDARD TERMS OF REFERENCE**

- 1) Year-wise production details should be given, clearly stating the highest production achieved in any one year.
- 2) A copy of the document in support of the fact that the Proponent is the rightful lessee of the mine should be given.
- 3) All documents including approved mine plan, EIA and Public Hearing should be compatible with one another in terms of the mine lease area, production levels, waste generation and its management, mining technology etc. and should be in the name of the lessee.
- 4) All corner coordinates of the mine lease area, superimposed on a High-Resolution Imagery/toposheet, topographic sheet, geomorphology and geology of the areas should be provided. Such an Imagery of the proposed area should clearly show the land use and other ecological features of the study area (core and buffer zone).
- 5) Information should be provided on high resolution satellite image on with geological map of the area, geomorphology of land-forms of the area, existing minerals and mining history of the area, important water bodies, streams and rivers and soil characteristics.
- 6) Details about the land proposed for mining activities should be given with information as to whether mining conforms to the land use policy of the State; land diversion for mining should have approval from State land use board or the concerned authority.
- 7) It should be clearly stated whether the proponent Company has a well laid down Environment Policy approved by its Board of Directors? If so, it may be spelt out in the EIA Report with description of the prescribed operating process/procedures to bring into focus any infringement/deviation/ violation of the environmental or forest norms/ conditions? The hierarchical system or administrative order of the Company to deal with the environmental issues and for ensuring compliance with the EC conditions may also be given. The system of reporting of non-compliances / violations of environmental norms to the Board of Directors of the Company and/or shareholders or stakeholders at large may also be detailed in the EIA Report.
- 8) Issues relating to Mine Safety, including subsidence study in case of underground mining and slope study in case of open cast mining, blasting study etc. should be detailed. The proposed safeguard measures in each case should also be provided.
- 9) The study area will comprise of 10 km zone around the mine lease from lease periphery and the data contained in the EIA such as waste generation etc. should be for the life of the mine / lease period.
- 10) Land use of the study area delineating forest area, agricultural land, grazing land, wildlife sanctuary, national park, migratory routes of fauna, water bodies, human settlements and other ecological features should be indicated. Land use plan of the mine lease area should be prepared to encompass

preoperational, operational and post operational phases and submitted. Impact, if any, of change of land use should be given.

11) Details of the land for any Over Burden Dumps outside the mine lease, such as extent of land area, distance from mine lease, its land use, R&R issues, if any, should be given.

12) A Certificate from the Competent Authority in the State Forest Department should be provided, confirming the involvement of forest land, if any, in the project area. In the event of any contrary claim by the Project Proponent regarding the status of forests, the site may be inspected by the State Forest Department along with the Regional Office of the Ministry to ascertain the status of forests, based on which, the Certificate in this regard as mentioned above be issued. In all such cases, it would be desirable for representative of the State Forest Department to assist the Expert Appraisal Committee's.

13) Status of forestry clearance for the broken-up area and virgin forestland involved in the Project including deposition of net present value (NPV) and compensatory afforestation (CA) should be indicated. A copy of the forestry clearance should also be furnished.

14) Implementation status of recognition of forest rights under the Scheduled Tribes and other Traditional Forest Dwellers (Recognition of Forest Rights) Act, 2006 should be indicated.

15) The vegetation in the RF / PF areas in the study area, with necessary details, should be given.

16) A study shall be got done to ascertain the impact of the Mining Project on wildlife of the study area and details furnished. Impact of the project on the wildlife in the surrounding and any other protected area and accordingly, detailed mitigative measures required, should be worked out with cost implications and submitted.

17) Location of National Parks, Sanctuaries, Biosphere Reserves, Wildlife Corridors, Ramsar site Tiger/ Elephant Reserves/(existing as well as proposed), if any, within 10 km of the mine lease should be clearly indicated, supported by a location map duly authenticated by Chief Wildlife Warden. Necessary clearance, as may be applicable to such projects due to proximity of the ecologically sensitive areas as mentioned above, should be obtained from the Standing COMMITTEE of National Board of Wildlife and copy furnished.

18) A detailed biological study of the study area [core zone and buffer zone (10 km radius of the periphery of the mine lease)] shall be carried out. Details of flora and fauna, endangered, endemic and RET Species duly authenticated, separately for core and buffer zone should be furnished based on such primary field survey, clearly indicating the Schedule of the fauna present. In case of any scheduled-I fauna found in the study area, the necessary plan alongwith budgetary provisions for their conservation should be prepared in consultation with State Forest and Wildlife Department and details furnished. Necessary allocation of funds for implementing the same should be made as part of the project cost.

19) Proximity to Areas declared as 'Critically Polluted' should also be indicated and where so required, clearance certifications from the prescribed Authorities, such as the SPCB or State Mining Department should be secured and furnished to the effect that the proposed mining activities could be considered.

20) R&R Plan/compensation details for the Project Affected People (PAP) should be furnished. While preparing the R&R Plan, the relevant State/National Rehabilitation & Resettlement Policy should be kept in view. In respect of SCs /STs and other weaker sections of the society in the study area, a need based sample survey, family-wise, should be undertaken to assess their requirements, and action programmes prepared and submitted accordingly, integrating the sectoral programmes of line

departments of the State Government. It may be clearly brought out whether the village(s) located in the mine lease area will be shifted or not. The issues relating to shifting of village(s) including their R&R and socio-economic aspects should be discussed in the Report.

21) One season (non-monsoon) [i.e. March-May (Summer Season); October-December (post monsoon season) ; December-February (winter season)] primary baseline data on ambient air quality as per CPCB Notification of 2009, water quality, noise level, soil and flora and fauna shall be collected and the AAQ and other data so compiled presented date-wise in the EIA and EMP Report. Site-specific meteorological data should also be collected. The location of the monitoring stations should be such as to represent whole of the study area and justified keeping in view the pre-dominant downwind direction and location of sensitive receptors. There should be at least one monitoring station within 500 m of the mine lease in the pre-dominant downwind direction. The mineralogical composition of PM10, particularly for free silica, should be given.

22) Air quality modelling should be carried out for prediction of impact of the project on the air quality of the area. It should also take into account the impact of movement of vehicles for transportation of mineral. The details of the model used and input parameters used for modelling should be provided. The air quality contours may be shown on a location map clearly indicating the location of the site, location of sensitive receptors, if any, and the habitation. The wind roses showing pre-dominant wind direction may also be indicated on the map.

23) The water requirement for the Project, its availability and source should be furnished. A detailed water balance should also be provided. Fresh water requirement for the Project should be indicated.

24) Necessary clearance from the Competent Authority for drawl of requisite quantity of water for the Project should be provided.

25) Description of water conservation measures proposed to be adopted in the Project should be given. Details of rainwater harvesting proposed in the Project, if any, should be provided.

26) Impact of the Project on the water quality, both surface and groundwater, should be assessed and necessary safeguard measures, if any required, should be provided.

27) Based on actual monitored data, it may clearly be shown whether working will intersect groundwater. Necessary data and documentation in this regard may be provided. In case the working will intersect groundwater table, a detailed Hydro Geological Study should be undertaken and Report furnished. The Report inter-alia, shall include details of the aquifers present and impact of mining activities on these aquifers. Necessary permission from Central Ground Water Authority for working below ground water and for pumping of ground water should also be obtained and copy furnished.

28) Details of any stream, seasonal or otherwise, passing through the lease area and modification / diversion proposed, if any, and the impact of the same on the hydrology should be brought out.

29) Information on site elevation, working depth, groundwater table etc. Should be provided both in AMSL and bgl. A schematic diagram may also be provided for the same.

30) A time bound Progressive Greenbelt Development Plan shall be prepared in a tabular form (indicating the linear and quantitative coverage, plant species and time frame) and submitted, keeping in mind, the same will have to be executed up front on commencement of the Project. Phase-wise plan of plantation and compensatory afforestation should be charted clearly indicating the area to be covered under plantation and the species to be planted. The details of plantation already done should be given.

The plant species selected for green belt should have greater ecological value and should be of good utility value to the local population with emphasis on local and native species and the species which are tolerant to pollution.

31) Impact on local transport infrastructure due to the Project should be indicated. Projected increase in truck traffic as a result of the Project in the present road network (including those outside the Project area) should be worked out, indicating whether it is capable of handling the incremental load. Arrangement for improving the infrastructure, if contemplated (including action to be taken by other agencies such as State Government) should be covered. Project Proponent shall conduct Impact of Transportation study as per Indian Road Congress Guidelines.

32) Details of the onsite shelter and facilities to be provided to the mine workers should be included in the EIA Report.

33) Conceptual post mining land use and Reclamation and Restoration of mined out areas (with plans and with adequate number of sections) should be given in the EIA report.

34) Occupational Health impacts of the Project should be anticipated and the proposed preventive measures spelt out in detail. Details of pre-placement medical examination and periodical medical examination schedules should be incorporated in the EMP. The project specific occupational health mitigation measures with required facilities proposed in the mining area may be detailed.

35) Public health implications of the Project and related activities for the population in the impact zone should be systematically evaluated and the proposed remedial measures should be detailed along with budgetary allocations.

36) Measures of socio-economic significance and influence to the local community proposed to be provided by the Project Proponent should be indicated. As far as possible, quantitative dimensions may be given with time frames for implementation.

37) Detailed environmental management plan (EMP) to mitigate the environmental impacts which, should inter-alia include the impacts of change of land use, loss of agricultural and grazing land, if any, occupational health impacts besides other impacts specific to the proposed Project.

38) Public Hearing points raised and commitment of the Project Proponent on the same along with time bound Action Plan with budgetary provisions to implement the same should be provided and also incorporated in the final EIA/EMP Report of the Project.

39) Details of litigation pending against the project, if any, with direction /order passed by any Court of Law against the Project should be given.

40) The cost of the Project (capital cost and recurring cost) as well as the cost towards implementation of EMP should be clearly spelt out.

41) A Disaster management Plan shall be prepared and included in the EIA/EMP Report.

42) Benefits of the Project if the Project is implemented should be spelt out. The benefits of the Project shall clearly indicate environmental, social, economic, employment potential, etc.

43) Besides the above, the below mentioned general points are also to be followed:

a) Executive Summary of the EIA/EMP Report

- b) All documents to be properly referenced with index and continuous page numbering.
- c) Where data are presented in the Report especially in Tables, the period in which the data were collected and the sources should be indicated.
- d) Project Proponent shall enclose all the analysis/testing reports of water, air, soil, noise etc. using the MoEF & CC/NABL accredited laboratories. All the original analysis/testing reports should be available during appraisal of the Project.
- e) Where the documents provided are in a language other than English, an English translation should be provided.
- f) The Questionnaire for environmental appraisal of mining projects as devised earlier by the Ministry shall also be filled and submitted.
- g) While preparing the EIA report, the instructions for the Proponents and instructions for the Consultants issued by MoEF&CC vide O.M. No. J-11013/41/2006-IA.II(I) dated 4th August, 2009, which are available on the website of this Ministry, should be followed.
- h) Changes, if any made in the basic scope and project parameters (as submitted in Form-I and the PFR for securing the TOR) should be brought to the attention of MoEF&CC with reasons for such changes and permission should be sought, as the TOR may also have to be altered. Post Public Hearing changes in structure and content of the draft EIA/EMP (other than modifications arising out of the P.H. process) will entail conducting the PH again with the revised documentation.
- i) As per the circular no. J-11011/618/2010-IA.II(I) dated 30.5.2012, certified report of the status of compliance of the conditions stipulated in the environment clearance for the existing operations of the project, should be obtained from the Regional Office of Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, as may be applicable.
- j) The EIA report should also include (i) surface plan of the area indicating contours of main topographic features, drainage and mining area measurements, (ii) geological maps and sections and (iii) sections of the mine pit and external dumps, if any, clearly showing the land features of the adjoining area.

#### **SPECIFIC TERMS OF REFERENCE**

1. To submit a detailed site **appreciation note/Executive Summary** supported with a video and photographs, describing in detail the physical features of the mining site and structures viz. bridges, canal headworks, Zamindari Khuls if any existing within a reach of 500mts. from the downstream and the upstream ends of the mining block. The appreciation note will also describe the environmental settings i.e. agricultural lands if any located on the two banks, green patches in close vicinity of the mining block. The site appreciation note shall form an integral part of the EIA report as per decision of JKEIAA taken in its 38<sup>th</sup> Meeting.
2. The mining shall be restricted to 3/4th of the width of the river/riverlet or 7.5 m(inward) from river bank but upto 10% of the width of the river. While calculating targeted mineral production and while formulating the mining plan, the project proponent shall ensure that the area for removal of minerals shall not exceed 60% of the mine lease area, and any

- deviation or relaxation in this regard shall be adequately supported by the scientific report in accordance with Sand Mining Monitoring & Enforcement Guidelines of 2020.
3. Before conducting Public Hearing, the G&M Dept. shall temporarily mark the boundaries of the mining block in consultation with the concerned Revenue Authority and the JKPCB so that locals know during the public Hearing where the mining block is located on ground as per decision of JKEIAA taken in its 38<sup>th</sup> Meeting.
  4. A comprehensive chapter be included in the EIA report on Cost Benefit Analysis of the mining activity in the mining block underlining the environmental and social costs.
  5. Impact of mining activity on adjacent agricultural land with particular reference to run off, soil erosion and top-soil loss due to change in topography.
  6. Details of Gradient of riverbed and 3-D view draped on the satellite image
  7. Details of excavation schedule & sequential mining plan with a maximum mine depth of 1 mtr.
  8. Details of transportation of mined out materials with respect to axle load specified for the road as per the Indian Road congress for both the ways (loaded as well as unloaded trucks) load and its impact on the environment.
  9. Impact on mining activity on the existing land use in the study area.
  10. Impact of mining on aquatic life.
  11. NOCs from HoD/competent authority of Irrigation and Flood Control Dept. and Fisheries Dept. OR as specifically asked for in minutes of meeting should be obtained and submitted while applying for EC.
  12. The quantification of river bed material be based on excavation only upto a **maximum depth of 1 m** in the riverbed or 1 m above water table whichever comes first to safeguard ecological conditions in view of non-availability of replenishment data in DSR.
  13. A digitalised surface plan showing coordinates, physical measurements, river gradient and inter-cross sections at different intervals should be a mandatory part of mining plan
  14. Specific measures to be undertaken to mitigate the impact of mining activity on the habitat and migration of fish in the river/stream and concurrence thereof from the Fisheries Department.
  15. The Photography and videography of the mining block shall be part of the Terms of Reference.
  16. The maps shall be submitted on a scale of 1: 3000 and 1: 1500 within 10 kms. Radius
  17. The shortest extraction route leading to the main road but with minimum interference with human settlements should be identified and described in detail. This along with the map and its KML file be part of an exclusive chapter in the EMP with adequate budget.
  18. Dust suppression measures should be prescribed in the EIA/EMP with adequate budget
  19. Post project monitoring plan should be included in the study.
  20. Occupational health impacts should be assessed and plan for implementation of COVID-19 SOPs in the mining activity should be detailed.
  21. The Consultant while presenting field data in the EIA report, should ensure that the site-specific date-wise datasheets duly attested by the local panchayat head with his name, signatures and stamp and attested by District Mineral Officer with seal and signature are included in the EIA report.
  22. The data displayed on air quality monitoring stations should be captured with digital camera displaying the date on the photograph so captured and same should be submitted in support of the date-wise data sheets. These digital photographs should be submitted in soft as well as appended with the EIA report.



23. The impact of mining activity on the neighbouring villages needs to be studied and extraction road need to be such that it has least crossing through village settlements.
24. Mining shall be proposed manually minimally supported by semi-mechanized methods excluding heavy machinery like JBC or L&T hydraulic excavators etc.
25. While formulating the EIA/EMP documents, the mining guidelines of 2016 and 2020 issued by the MoEF&CC shall be strictly followed.
26. The prescribed TORs would be valid for a period of four years for submission of the EIA/EMP reports, as per the S.O. No. 751(E) dated 17th of Feb., 2020.