

Proceedings of the 54th SEIAA meeting held on 6th August 2012
at Room No. 709, M.S Building, Bangalore.

Members present: -

- | | | |
|-----------------------|---|--------------------------|
| 1. Dr. H.S. Ramesh | - | Chairman (SEIAA) |
| 2. Dr. H.R. Raj Mohan | - | Member (SEIAA) |
| 3. Sri Kanwerpal | - | Member Secretary (SEIAA) |

The Chairman welcomed the members and initiated the discussion. The following subjects were discussed and decisions were taken as there under.

Deferred Projects:

Construction Projects:

1. "Sobha Global Mall", Residential and Commercial (Mixed Use) at Municipal No. 19/2, Minerva Mills Compound, Gopalpura, Mysore Deviation Road, Bangalore by M/s Sobha Developers Ltd. (SEIAA 209 CON 2011)

It is a proposal for construction of Residential Apartment of 356 flats with 5 Basement + Lower & Upper Ground floor + 36 Upper floor and Commercial building with 5 Basement + Lower & Upper Ground floor + 3 Upper floor on an area of 47226.42 Sq.m and Built up area 2,63,807.597 Sq.m. The total water requirement is 608 KLD and the investment is of Rs. 390 crores. The total parking provided is for 3815 cars.

The project proponent has obtained environmental clearance from MoEF, GoI vide No. 21-354/2006-IA.III dated: 28.09.2007 for the following details: Plot area 64,906.98 Sqm and built up area of 2,89,600 sqm with 4 basement level parking and 3 level podiums. The commercial complex consists of retail shopping, restaurants, cinemas, office and service apartments. The hotel tower has 16 floors and office tower has 12 floors. Total water requirement of 683.98 KLD and STP proposed of 660 KLD. PCU 3404; total project cost Rs. 212 Crores. Total solid waste generation is 2500 Kg/day.

Project Details: (a) Land: Total plot area: 47,226.42 Sqm (Vacant land); Total built up area: 2,63,807.597 Sqm. The project consists of one L-shaped tower with residential and commercial wings. The residential wing consists of 356 flats with configuration of 5B+G+34 UF. The commercial wing consists of 5B+Lower Ground Floor (LGF) +Upper Ground Floor (UGF) + 3 UF. The commercial components are: (i) Hyper Market situated at LGF (ii) 2 retail outlets situated at UGF and 1st floor (iii) Food Court and Family Entertainment located at 2nd floor (iv) Multiplex & Club House situated at 3rd floor. The basements are used for parking facilities. The residential & commercial wings are bridged at first floor. (b) Greenery: Landscape area: 13154.56 Sqm (33% of plot area). (c) Water Requirement: Total water requirement is 680.75 KLD; Source of water: BWS&SB. (d) Soil: Total excavated soil: 4,53,150.60 Cum; Backfilling Quantity: 89,214.56 Cum and landscaping quantity: 3,946.36 Cum within the project site; excess soil will be used for road formation and filling low laying area. (e) Sewage: Total quantity generated: 33.08 KLD (Residential) and 279.59 KLD (Commercial) KLD, treated in proposed 2 STP of design capacity 300 KLD & 340 KLD; (f) Solid Waste: Total generated: 1009.35 Kg/day (Residential) + 3629 Kg/day (Commercial); Organic waste: 6054.6 Kg/day (Residential) + 1451.6 Kg/day (Commercial) treated in organic convertor and product used as manure. Inorganic waste: 403.74 Kg/day (Residential) + 2177.4 Kg/day (Commercial) will be sent for recycling. (g) Power Requirement: Total Requirement: 11593 KW from BESCOM; Power Backup: 1 X 1600 KVA, 4 X 2500 KVA, 2

The proponent had submitted the information vide letter dated 31.07.2011.

The Authority perused the information submitted by the proponent and took note of the recommendation of the SEAC during the meeting held on 26.08.2011.

The Authority desired to know the cumulative impact of the existing industry and the proposed industry on the environment and the action taken for safe disposal of fly ash. After discussion, the Authority decided to get the following information:

- (a) Details of industries within the radius of 10 Kms from the project site and the cumulative impact including the proposed activity on the environment in terms of air pollution, water pollution, impact on road infrastructure and socio economic aspects.
- (b) Compliance on the suggestions of the public hearing held for the existing industry and the proposed activity.
- (c) Compliance on the EC/CFO of the existing industry.
- (d) Proposal for safe disposal of fly ash in accordance with Fly Ash Notification, S.O. 763 (E) dated 14.09.1999 and amendments thereon.

The Authority also decided to invite the proponent to the Authority meeting to provide further clarification, if any.

The proponent has submitted the information vide letter dated 27.06.2012. The proponent has been invited to the meeting.

The Authority perused the information furnished by the proponent. The proponent remained absent. The Authority noted that information sought vide Authority letter dated 05.09.2011 has been submitted on 26.06.2012, after lapse of almost 10 months. The information furnished does not reveal the detailed compliance on the EC / CFO issued for the existing unit. It is observed from the information that the development of greenbelt is very poor.

The Authority after discussion, decided to provide one more opportunity to the proponent to appear before the Authority and furnish information / clarification on the project. The Authority decided to defer the subject to the next meeting and to invite the proponent.

2. Development of Barge/vessel Loading facility from 4.9 MTPA of cargo volume in which 3 MTPA of iron ore and 1.5 MTPA of Thermal Coal , Kasarkod Tonka village, Honnavar Taluk Uttara Kannada District by M/s Honnavar Port Private Limited (HPPL) (SEIAA 22 IND 2011)

It is proposal for Development of Barge/vessel loading facility of capacity 4.9 MT in which 3.0 MTPA of iron ore and 1.5 MTPA of thermal coal. It is proposed to develop straight berth with length of 440 m with the backup area of 25 Hectares. The proposed project attracts CRZ Notification, 2011 for their foreshore facilities. The investment is Rs. 513 Crores.

M/s. Honnavar Port Pvt. Ltd., have applied for EC for their newly proposed development of barge/vessel loading facility at Coastal Sand Spit (25 Hectares) (without RS No.) Kasarakod Tonka,

Honnavar Taluk, Uttarakannada District under activity 7 (e) of EIA Notification, 2006 schedule under category –B (General condition apply) requiring EC from SEIAA. Proposed Barge/Vessel loading facility at Honnavar will handle 4.5 MTPA of cargo volume in which 3.0 MTPA of iron ore and 1.5 MTPA of thermal coal. It is proposed to develop straight berth with length of 440 m with the backup area of 25 Hectares. The proposed project attracts CRZ Notification, 2011 for their foreshore facilities.

The project involves construction activities namely: breakwaters (southern break water: 880 m and Northern break water: 755 m), berths (440 m long, 16m wide), dredging, approach channel [length of approach channel :1345m, width of the channel -75 m and depth of the channel : (-) 4.6 m CD], Turning circle (diameter of the turning circle -200 m, dredged to a depth of 4.6m), reclamation, internal road/rail network, external road/rail network, cargo storage and handling facilities, utilities, amenities and services. The project also involves reclamation works carried out in the backup area for providing landslide facilities about 0.5 million cum of material will be used for reclamation. Dredging will be carried out at berthing area, turning circle, approach channel. The estimated dredging quantity is about 0.55 million m³. Stockyard will be provided for storage of coal and iron ore. New rail and road will be proposed to transport the cargo from the Barge/vessel loading facility. Berths are proposed to be located along the left bank of Sharavati river and Barge/vessel entrance is proposed through existing river mouth.

Water requirement: construction phase: 15 KLD; operation phase: 7 KLD (raw water requirement will be sourced from Karnataka Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Agency which includes supply to Barge/vessels, port staff and users. In addition to that the water required for dust suppression system and fire fighting will be sourced from Sharavathi River. Power Requirement: 1 MVA sourced from Honnavar Substations (KSEB); Sewage: Treated in STP proposed. Sewage sludge from the STP shall be utilized in the green belt area. Sludge generated from oil water separator will be disposed off as per Karnataka Pollution Control Board/CPCB guidelines or norms. Project Surrounding details: Reserve Forest-14 Km, Minor Forest-10 Km, Ecology (mangroves) – 2 Km; Arabian Sea – adjoining west. Hospital and educational institutions are located within 1.5 Kms of the project site. The project site falls in seismic zone III (moderate risk); Other Details: the proponent has submitted proposed ToRs.

The subject was placed in the 73rd SEAC meeting held on 20.08.2011 and the project proponent and environmental consultant present explained the proposed ToRs for EIA as per the EIA Notification. He informed that Directorate of P&IWTD has signed lease agreement with HPPL. Alternative analysis done with the present proposal found viable to develop barge/vessel facility. Berth of length 440 m is proposed to handle 4 barge/vessels of 5,000 T simultaneously. The consultant informed that erosion and accretion on the sea side is there along with spit formation. Bathymetry studies done for 10 years, 5 years and recent. The project is connected to sea port at Karwar 60 Km away. The proponent informed that the dredged material is used for reclamation purpose. The Committee observed that the project attracts provision of CRZ Notification, January 2011 of MoEF for its foreshore facilities.

After deliberation, the Committee decided to categorize the project under B1 and to issue additional ToRs along with the model ToRs for the preparation of EIA along with the public consultation by the proponent addressing the following issues.

1. Details of handling, uploading, transportation of export material.
2. Details of materials proposed to be imported.
3. Breeding season of fish and their abundance.
4. Identification of mangroves in backwaters and the impact of the project on the flora and fauna in the mangroves.
5. Impact of dredging on fish breeding and the juveniles

The proponent has submitted the EIA on 29.02.2012 with response to the ToRs issued on 13.09.2011.

The subject was placed in the 80th SEAC meeting held on 17.03.2012 and the proponent and environmental consultant present explained the EIA. The proponent informed that the proposed facility was planned earlier to handle 4.5 MTPA (3 MTPA of iron ore and 1.5 MTPA of coal). In the later stages due to prohibition on export of iron ore, the handling capacity is enhanced to 4.9 MTPA (2.7 MTPA of coal, 1 MTPA of iron ore and 1.2 MTPA of General Cargos) and accordingly EIA report has been submitted vide letter dated 29.02.2012 in continuation of letter dated 15.02.2012. The public consultation for the development of the barge/vessel loading facility was held on 27.01.2012. They have applied for CRZ clearance before KSCZMA and seek environmental clearance from SEIAA first. The Committee observed that the EIA study submitted does not address points (2) to (5) of the additional ToRs proposed by the Committee. River quality studies have not been done since project is located near the estuary and dissolved oxygen depends on the salinity. Salinity intrusion at the nearest intake in Sharavathi River is to be given. The list of plants provided in the landscape plan is not specific as the entire project is located in mangrove area.

The Committee decided to get the site inspected on 31.03.2012 by a sub committee consisting of the SEAC members namely Dr. G. Srinikethan, Dr. Manoj Kumar, Dr. C. G. Kushalappa, Dr. Bela Zutshi and Dr. Usha. N. Murthy as the project is first of its kind in the state. The site inspection will mainly focus on the (1) Location of the project with respect to salinity and its impact on flora and fauna (2) Identification of mangroves in backwaters and the impact of the project on the flora and fauna in the mangroves (3) Impact of the project on marine life.

After deliberation, the Committee decided to recall the proponent for presentation after obtaining the following information from the proponent with site inspection report from the subcommittee.

1. Details of materials proposed to be imported.
2. Breeding season of fish and their abundance.
3. Identification of mangroves in backwaters and the impact of the project on the flora and fauna in the mangroves.
4. Impact of dredging on fish breeding and the juveniles.
5. River quality studies.
6. Salinity intrusion at the nearest intake in Sharavathi River.
7. Social commitment plan for Rs. 1.5 Crores/year for 5 years (letter not given).

The project proponent has submitted his replies on 03.04.2012 in response to this office letter dated: 29.03.2012.

The subject was placed in the 81st SEAC meeting held on 07.04.2012 and the subcommittee members submitted the site inspection report and the same is reproduced as below:

Report of site inspection to Honnavar Port by SEAC team members on 31-3-2012.

As per the communication from Secretary, SEAC, the following subcommittee visited the proposed Honnavar Port (P) Ltd. site near Honnavar town on 31st March 2012 at 10.00 am. The visiting team was accompanied by Mr. Masih, Director Operations, Honnavar Port (P) Ltd., Capt. Suryaprakash Technical Consultant and representatives for L& T Romboll Hyderabad and experts who prepared EIA from the proponent side. Proponent and environmental consultant showed the physiographic features of the site and explained the proposed activities to be done at the site.

1. Dr. G. Srinikethan, Member, SEAC
2. Dr. Kushalappa C. G., Member, SEAC
3. Dr. Bela Zutshi, Member, SEAC
4. Dr. Manoj Kumar, Member, SEAC
5. Dr. Usha N. Murthy, Member, SEAC

During site visit the experts present from consultant side did not give convincing response for the queries made by subcommittee members. Following are the observations made during the visit for which an elaborative study needs to be done before the project is considered for appraisal.

1. Basis for selection of the site port need to be clarified and if any alternative sites were considered is not clear. The proposed site is in the sea and does not have a survey number. Proponent informed that revenue department will provide the survey number soon and this issue is crucial since clearance cannot be provided to a site without survey number.
2. Since the area is under CRZ examination needs to be undertaken to see if the proposal has to be presented for CRZ review committee and get clearance for the proposed activity.
3. For any accidental spills – model studies needs to be undertaken for river and sea.
4. Consultant present did not give satisfactory answer for the values and parameters selection reported in water quality results and hence to be reworked.
5. Consultant did not provide justification for site selection for monitoring of air, noise and water quality- It was also found that critical and sensitive areas like islands with habitation were not considered for monitoring. Give the details of tidal wave studies.
6. Typical input data and output result for all models used in EIA needs to be reported – Data used for the model need to be elaborated and any assumptions and limitations made to be provided in the report.
7. Water intake location for use by the workers for proposed project and existing water quality & changes expected near the intake due to the proposed activity along with details of other competitive users near the location to be provided.
8. Salinity measurements in the estuarine/ river portion to be studied in detail and impact of proposed activities on salinity intrusions towards river/ estuarine side needs to be predicted.
9. Water quality studies in critical areas of Sharavathi and other river need to be undertaken.
10. For air modeling studies impact of line sources (road/ rail/ ship movement) needs to be included.
11. Impact studies for proposed road and railway line on local environment needs to be undertaken.
12. Since the dredged material will be dumped into sea its impact on marine ecology needs to be undertaken.
13. For wastewater generated in the proposed activity a sewage treatment system to be proposed.

14. Some of the critical and sensitive areas were identified during site visit (island of Mavinkurve, Mangroves near road bridge, inland travel) for which impact studies need to be undertaken.
15. The report submitted by experts and forest officers to the Deputy Commissioner on coastal erosion in Pavinkurve area which is within the project area has to be taken into consideration before issuing clearance.

Comments on ecological issues:

1. The ToR was approved during September 2011 but baseline marine and terrestrial studies were undertaken from March to May 2011 and the three month study is too short a period to assess the impact of a project on this magnitude on the ecology, environment and livelihood of communities. Post monsoon data is not included in the report. As indicated by some of the participants in the public hearing local resource persons were not involved in undertaking studies and hence many critical issues have not been addressed properly.
2. Under environmentally sensitive areas within 10 km from site boundary which are used by protected, important or sensitive species of flora or fauna for breeding, nesting, foraging, nesting, overwintering, migration there is no mention about the following :
 - i. Mangrove formations in the estuary, which are protected under CRZ Notification- under Zone-1, as inviolable areas not mentioned. The report mentions considerable area under mangroves in the land use details within the project impact area but no details are provided regarding the number and extent of mangroves upstream the two rivers.
 - ii. Over 100 species of birds are associated with the estuary, of which at least 40% are migrants from northern latitudes that arrive for over-wintering. The details of resident birds breeding in the estuary and surroundings is not mentioned. The estuary and mudflats and marshy islands provide abundant feeding grounds for the birds and numerous fishes and other organisms and impact on these habitats is not provide. Hence impact of the proposed project on avifauna needs to be redone involving local experts.
 - iii. Sharavathi River has 64 species fresh water fishes including the newly described Batasio Sharavatiensis an endangered fish and additionally there are many rare, endangered and threatened fishes from the project impact area. Fishes reported from study area largely ignores the estuarine fish of Sharavathi, which are very unique and is important source of livelihoods of many and a good trade of which is carried out.

The list given is just a general list of marine fishes. Hence detailed study of the fish resources, impacts of the project on their population and livelihood of locals need to be undertaken involving local experts.

3. The floristic inventory provided is based on secondary data which lists 286 plants from the district but the district has close to 2000 plants of which around 1200 could be present in Honnavar Taluk. Rather than providing general check list for the entire district detailed plant inventory from the project impact area needs to be provided by local experts focusing on plant diversity in the different forest types mentioned in the land use especially mangroves and estuarial plants.
4. Under areas containing important high quality or scarce resources only reserved forest 14 km away mentioned but there is reserve forests within 1km in Kasarkod and a forest nursery . Basavadurga Island is also located located within the project core area with good vegetation cover.

Sharavathi estuary is a near pristine ecosystem of largely fresh water that is present from Mavinkurve island towards interior and also along Badagani river. Such unique habitats of low salinity to fresh water conditons do not exist in other coastal estuarine areas. Studies undertaken is too short and hence the studies realted to impact of the project on the unique marine flora and fauna is not exhaustive. Hence a detailed study needs to be undertaken invloving local experts to address these issues. The proponent and consultants have agreed to undertake studies based on the suggestions provided by the committee during the site visit.

The subcommittee informed the Committee that the project is coming up in reclaimed land formed due to accretion in water. The survey numbers of the port land is required for environmental clearance appraisal. The proponent has informed that survey is going on in the project area. The proponent needs to submit the survey numbers officially. There are several lacunas in the project proposal such as:

- Salinity not measured.
- Basis for fixing air sampling stations.
- Model studies have to be done by CWPRS for tidal influence.
- Flora/fauna and mangrove have not been done.
- ToR issued in September 2011 and EIA submitted in March 2012.
- There is no post monsoon study.
- Environmental clearance can be considered based on CRZ clearance by KCZMA.

The Committee noted that the ToRs for the preparation of the EIA by the proponent were issued based on the model ToRs published by M/s. ASCI assigned by MoEF, GoI for preparation of EIA guidelines/manual. The Secretary, SEAC informed the Committee that proponent has made application for CRZ clearance before KCZMA and the same will be placed in the next meeting of KCZMA wherein the Regional Director (Environmental) will be present.

The Committee after deliberations decided to obtain the details/documents as per the inspection report submitted by the subcommittee from the project proponent and recall the proponent for presentation in the SEAC meeting.

The proponent has submitted the information on 10.05.2012 in response to this office letter dated: 10.04.2012.

The proponent and environmental consultant present explained the queries raised by the Committee during the SEAC meeting held on 25/26.05.2012. The proponent informed that survey of the project site is already completed and the list of survey numbers will be submitted to the Committee. The proponent informed further that the subject is placed before the KSCZMA on 28.05.2012 for consideration for CRZ clearance. After deliberation the Committee decided to recommend the proposal to SEIAA for issue of environmental clearance after obtaining the following information from the proponent and subject to the condition that the project proponent obtains CRZ clearance.

1. Copy of the Revenue Department letter regarding survey numbers. .
2. Traffic impact on the landward side from the project.
3. Impact of the project on the riverine habited Island.

4. Incorporation of the already published data on the project area (if available).

The proponent has submitted the above information on 19.06.2012.

The Authority perused the reply submitted by the proponent and took note of the recommendation of the SEAC during the meeting held on 06.07.2012. The Authority also noted that the project has been recommended by the Karnataka State Coastal Zone Management Authority during the meeting held on 28.05.2012. The Authority further observed that the establishment of the project is linked to the measures to be proposed by Central Water and Power Research Station (CWPRS), Pune. The Authority also opined that this being a harbour project certain issues pertaining to impact of breakwater, disposal of dredged material, etc require clarity. The Authority therefore decided to get the following information for further consideration of the project.

- (a) Details of the guidelines of CWPRS.
- (b) Details of breakwaters and their impact on the marine environment.
- (c) Quantification of dredged material and its safe disposal.
- (d) Issues raised in the public hearing and action taken to address them.

The Authority also decided to invite the proponent to the meeting.

The proponent has submitted the information vide letter dated 27.06.2012. The proponent has been invited to the meeting.

The Authority perused the information furnished by the proponent. The proponent appeared before the Authority and briefly explained about the project.

The proponent explained about the company and the proposed activity. The proponent informed the Authority that the Central Water and Power Research station have addressed a letter to the Director of Fisheries, Government of Karnataka on 14.06.2012 and have clarified that the breakwaters proposed by HPPL will meet the requirement of the fishermen for safe access to the sea and the fishing harbour. Therefore, building separate breakwater and inlet across the sand spit by the Fisheries Department will not be technically correct and need to be dropped. The proponent maintained that the proposed harbour facility will not come in the way of operation of Honnavar Fishing Harbour, instead it will facilitate easy movement of fishing vessels. The proponent while responding to disposal of dredged material submitted that, out of 3.9 Million cum about 1 Million cum will be used for reclamation / increase the level of available 44 Ha. of land and the remaining 2.9 Million Cum will be disposed off at the designated offshore area which has been decided based on numerical modeling. The disposal will be at a distance of 2 Kms inside the sea from the northern breakwater.

The proponent during the discussion informed that the proposed capacity of the harbour is about 4.9 Million Tons per Annum of which 2.7 Million Tons per Annum is of coal and 1 Million Tons per Annum of iron ore is proposed to be handled. General cargo, granite, fertilizer, molasses, steel products, sugar are other cargoes also proposed to be handled.

The Authority sought to know measures proposed for safe handling and storage of iron ore and coal which would cause considerable environmental damage. The proponent informed that coal and iron ore will be stored in open place like in any other ports. The proponent maintained that the

best practices that are being followed in major ports of the country for handling of coal and iron ore will be in place to ensure that the impact of handling and storage of these cargo is bare minimum and the ill-effect is mitigated suitably.

While responding to the stack height of coal and iron ore, the proponent informed that a maximum of 10 meters height is contemplated. The Authority expressed an apprehension that at 10 meters height it would create severe impact on the air environment due to heavy gusty wind breeze. The proponent submitted that in order to prevent such a situation arrangements for sprinkling of water on the stock at regular intervals will be undertaken.

The Authority suggested to explore the possibility of covering the coal and iron ore storage area at the top and also to explore the possibility of storage hanger. The proponent submitted that no other ports in the country have provided such an infrastructure. However, the facilities that are required as per the MoEF guidelines and conditions imposed by MoEF while issuing the Environmental Clearance to ports and harbours will be adhered to.

The Authority suggested that the proponent can get details of facilities and procedure that is being followed by Coal India for safe handling and storage of coal.

The Authority after discussion, decided to issue Environmental Clearance subject to submission of the following information:

- (a) Details of best practices that are being adapted by Coal India for safe handling and storage of coal.
- (b) Measures proposed for prevention and abatement of air, water and soil pollution due to handling and storage of coal and iron ore.
- (c) Commitment with regard to adapting pollution control measures and best practices that are being insisted by the Ministry of Environment and Forests and practiced in other ports of the country.
- (d) Specific social commitment plan with activity, budget and time frame.

Fresh Projects:

Construction Projects:

1. New Hostel Building, Centre for Campus Management & Development, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore (SEIAA 60 CON 2009)

Indian Institute of Science has submitted an application for environmental clearance for their new hostel building proposal at the campus with a built up area of 49,249 Sqm. The project cost is Rs. 68.56 Crores. It is proposed to demolish the old building. Water consumption is 192 KLD, sourced from BWSSB. The fresh water requirement for domestic purpose is 134 KLD and recycled water for flushing purpose is 58 KLD totalling 192 KLD for hostel block. The Institute has a centralized STP of 500 KLD capacity. The wastewater generated of 153 KLD is treated in this STP.

The corrigendum sought is for "2 Basement + Lower Ground Floor + Upper Ground Floor +13 Upper Floors" instead of "2 Basement + Ground +13 Upper Floors". No change in the built up area is sought.

The Authority perused the request and noted that there is no change in the total built up area. The Environmental Clearance has been issued as per the configuration mentioned in Form 1. Since the configuration in the presentation reveals lower ground floor and upper ground floor, the Authority decided to issue corrigendum as sought for.

Meeting concluded with thanks to the Chair.

(Dr. H.S.Ramesh)
Chairman,
SEIAA, Karnataka

(Dr. H.R.Rajmohan)
Member,
SEIAA, Karnataka.

(Kanwerpal)
Member Secretary,
SEIAA, Karnataka.