

PARIVESH FILES

CONSIDERATION/RECONSIDERATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE

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

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

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

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

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

monitored and mitigated appropriately.

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

Item No.2

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

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

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

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

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

Item No.3

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- 8. Geocoordinates of the land where compensatory afforestation is proposed should be submitted along with geo-tagged photographs of the site.*
- 9. Change the boundary pillars with concrete pillars with a minimum size of 10 cm x10 cm, marked with geo coordinates and submit geotagged photographs as proof.*
- 10. Overburden dump site should be done prior to the commencement of mining at the land available at lower elevation and the site should be protected with gabion walls.*
- 11. Drainage system incorporating garland canal, silt traps, siltation pond and outflow channel connecting to a natural drain should be provided prior to the commencement of mining. Two additional settling tanks should be constructed to ensure discharge of clear water.*
- 12. Garland drain, silt-traps, siltation ponds and outflow channel should be desilted periodically and geo-tagged photographs of the process should be included in the half yearly compliance report (HYCR).*
- 13. CER Plan should be implemented within the first 2 years and it should be operated and maintained till the mine closure plan is implemented.*
- 14. Transportation of mined material should not be done during the peak hours in the forenoon (8.00am to 10.00am) and afternoon (3.30pm to 5 pm).*
- 15. Adequate sanitation, waste management and rest room facilities should be provided to the workers.*
- 16. Adequate energy conservation measures proposed should be implemented including solar power installations for street light and office*
- 17. The Environment Management Cell (EMC) should include an Environment expert the proceedings of the monthly meeting of the Environment Management Cell (EMC) should be submitted along with the HYCR*
- 18. The drain water quality should be monitored regularly by an NABL accredited lab to ensure the discharge of only clear water to the natural stream.*
- 19. The Project Proponent shall take immediate measures to close the abandoned quarry in the Project site as per the final closure plan in the approved mining plan and as per KMMC Rules within 6 months and a report from District Geologist shall be produced to the effect that the final closure of quarry has been done as per the approved norms of*

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

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

monitored by SEAC at regular intervals.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

1. *The Project Proponent shall carry out quarrying as per the approved Mining Plan and the Specific Conditions mentioned hereafter. The Project Proponent should strictly follow the Kerala Minor Mineral Concession Rules 2015 and amendments thereby.*
2. *The EC shall be valid from the date of execution of permit/lease from the Department of Mining and Geology. The copy of the lease order should be provided to the SEIAA before commencing the mining activity.*
3. *Development of green belt should be initiated prior to the commencement of mining operation.*
4. *The impact of vibration due to blasting on the nearest houses and built structures should be monitored in terms of Peak Particle Velocity and amplitude for maximum charge per delay and included in the Half Yearly Compliance Report.*
5. *Drainage system incorporating garland canal, silt traps, siltation pond and outflow channel connecting to a natural drain should be provided prior to the commencement of mining. Additional two settling tanks should be constructed.*
6. *Garland drain, silt-traps, siltation ponds and outflow channel should be desilted periodically and geo-tagged photographs of the process should be included in the compliance report.*
7. *Retaining wall of appropriate height should be provided at the overburden dumping*
8. *CER Plan should be implemented within the first 2 Years and it should be operated and maintained till the mine closure plan is implemented.*
9. *Transportation of mined material should not be done during the peak hours in the forenoon (8.00am to 10.00am) and afternoon (3.30pm to 5 pm).*
10. *The haulage road should be developed prior to the commencement of mining and it should be maintained well with frequent sprinkling.*
11. *Adequate sanitation, waste management and rest room facilities should be provided to the workers.*
12. *Adequate energy conservation measures proposed should be implemented including solar power installations for street light and office*
13. *The Environment Management Cell (EMC) should include an Environment expert the proceedings of the monthly meeting of the Environment Management Cell (EMC) should be submitted along with the HYCR*
14. *The drain water quality should be monitored regularly by an NABL accredited lab and*

clear water should be flowed into the natural stream.

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

Item No.7

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

SIA/KL/MIN/155091/2020, 1816/EC6/2020/SEIAA (EC Proposal)

&

SIA/KL/MIN/38577/2019, 1402/EC2/2019/SEIAA (ToR proposal)

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

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

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

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

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

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

photographs should be provided along with HYCR.

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

rocks and suppress dust.

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

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

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

Item No.8

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

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

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

Item No.9

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

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

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

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

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

Item No.10

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Item No.11

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

CONSIDERATION OF TOR PROPOSALS

Item No.1

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

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

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

1. Breach potential study.

Item No.2

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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