

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF STATE LEVEL EXPERT APPRAISAL
COMMITTEE, ORISSA HELD ON 12TH & 13TH OCTOBER, 2009**

The meeting of State Level Expert Appraisal Committee, Orissa was held on 12th & 13th October, 2009 in the Conference Hall of Orissa State Pollution Control Board, Bhubaneswar at 11.00 AM. Dr. Gagan Bihari Nityananda Chainy, Chairman, SEAC Orissa chaired the meeting. The following members were present in the meeting.

- | | | | |
|----|-------------------------------------|---|----------|
| 1. | Dr. Gagan Bihari Nityananda Chainy | - | Chairman |
| 2. | Professor (Dr.) Swoyam Prakash Rout | - | Member |
| 3. | Dr. Harekrishna Nayak, | - | Member |
| 4. | Dr. Moheshwar Patra, | - | Member |
| 5. | Sri Sasanka Sekhar Pattnaik, | - | Member |
| 6. | Dr. Surendra Nath Das, | - | Member |
| 7. | Prof. Kumar Das | - | Member |
| 8. | Dr. R.C. Mohanty, | - | Member |

The following issues were discussed and decided

1. The minutes of previous meeting was confirmed by the members and members expressed their concern regarding delay of proceedings.
2. **The letter of Dr. P.L. Ahujarai, Director, MoEF, Govt. of India letter No. j-11013/41/1007-IA-II(I) dt 25.09.09 regarding delay in environmental clearance was discussed and it was decided to examine the position and to send a status report on the subject to the SEIAA with a copy to Director, MoEF, for information.**
3. The committee decided to go for a field visit to some of the mines in Keonjhar district those have already obtained TORs from SEAC, Orissa for EIA study. The field visit will be made preferably in the 2nd or 3rd week of November, 2009

4. Next meeting of the committee will be held on 22nd October, 2009 for finalization of minutes of the meeting held on 12th & 13th, October, 2009.
5. Next meeting of the committee will be held on 11th and 12th November, 2009 for consideration of new proposals.
6. **CONSIDERATION OF OLD PROPOSALS :**

i) **CENTRAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES WELFARE HOUSING ORGANISATION, MINISTRY OF URBAN EMPLOYMENT & POVERTY ALLEVIATION, GOVERNMENT OF INDIA AT – BEGUNIABARAH, BHUBANESWAR, ORISSA**

This is a proposal for building and construction project consist of 13 blocks of S+4 and one block G+1 storied (community centre) with total Built up area 56941.95 sqm. The proposal was placed in the SEAC meeting held during 13-14th May, 2009. SEAC decided to consider grant of environmental clearance after receipt of the certain information/supportive data in the EMP. The project proponent has complied to the information sought. However, on further scrutinization, it was observed that the project proponent has not furnished BDA approved plan of the building project..

The SEAC decided to consider the environmental clearance of the project after getting copy of BDA approved plan from the project proponent

7. **CONSIDERATION OF NEW PROPOSALS :**

A total of 12 project proponents were invited for presentation of TOR and Environmental clearance proposals followed by discussion. The agenda-wise proceedings and recommendations of the committee are detailed below :

ITEM NO. 1

PROPOSAL OF BHANJAPALI IRON ORE MINE OF SRI J. N. PATNAIK, AT-BHANJAPALI, KOIRA BONAI, DIST – SUNDARGARH FOR ENHANCEMENT OF PRODUCTION OF IRON ORE UPTO 260000 TPA.

The proposal was considered by the SEAC to determine the Terms of Reference (TOR) for undertaking detailed EIA study for the purpose of obtaining environmental clearance in accordance with the provisions of the EIA notification, 2006. For this purpose, the proponent had submitted information in the prescribed format (Form-I) along with feasibility report.

The proposal is for enhancement of production capacity of Iron ore from 55994 TPA to 2,60,000 TPA. The mining lease area is 18 ha. Out of total mining lease area, 12.565 ha. is DLC forest and rest non forest land. The present lease was granted to Sri J. N. Patnaik on 29.2.96 for a period of 30 years. The mining operation commenced on 1.10.97. The mine working will be opencast semi mechanized involving drilling, blasting, excavation and transportation. The water requirement is 80 KLD and source of water is ground water.

During discussion following points are emerged

- i) There are 08 pits being worked since 1997. There is a confusion regarding which pit has been totally exhausted and backfilled ? Was there any mine closure plan approved earlier at the time of grant of lease? If so, has it been adhered to? This has to be addressed in detail.
- ii) Presently, the mine proponent has applied for an extension of 5years with enhanced production capacity (260,000TPA). Now also, they do not agree to start any mine closure. The mine proponent may apply for further extension after new exploration of reserves or as such abandon operations after the completion of their lease period. A detail proposal for mine filling, reforestation and dump removal operations shall be given by the mine proponent.

- iii) The actual production figures during 1997-98 to 2006-07 was more than double of the proposed / approved mining plan as approved by IBM. On clarification, the proponent told that it was because of screening of the earlier OB dumped. But the grade mentioned was same as the mined ones. This is not convincing. This shows that the proponent has over produced more than twice of their approved production level, which needs clarification.
- iv) Forest clearance status for >12 ha of DLC forest area in the ML area shall be provided.
- v) Status of the operation of the mine after year 2006-07 to be given.
- vi) The status of plantation is not very clear. A detailed report on the number of plants put/survived, plant type and location etc. may be furnished along with EIA/EMP.
- vii) Water requirement @80KLD to be met from ground water sources; no permission from competent authority other than a routine answer from CGWB that they have no objection. In view of a large number of mines in the area in operation and overall environmental damage, particularly to the forest, air and water environments, the proponent should have a permission from the State Govt, appropriate authority and submit a detailed water management plan and recharge plan at the time of submitting EIA/EMP.
- viii) Present level of dump management as regards their stability, runoff water management and plantation program shall be provided. The mine have not started plantation activity in any of the dumps since they keep their options open for further screening of the OB dumped. This may not be acceptable from environmental point of view. This has to be clarified.

The proposal may be considered for terms of reference provided the response of the project proponent to the aforesaid observations is to the satisfaction of the SEAC.

ITEM NO. 2

PROPOSAL OF PIPALPADAR AND SIRJAPALI SEMI PRECIOUS GEM STONE MINE OF M/S SANJUKTA GEMS FOR PRODUCTION OF PRECIOUS GEM STONE 42 KG 750 GM PER YEAR AT – KESINGA, DIST - KALAHANDI.

The proposal was considered by the SEAC to determine the Terms of Reference (TOR) for undertaking detailed EIA study for the purpose of obtaining environmental clearance in accordance with the provisions of the EIA notification, 2006. For this purpose, the proponent had submitted information in the prescribed format (Form-I) along with feasibility report.

The proposal is for production of Gems stone upto 42kg 750 gm per Annum. The mining lease area is 17.122 ha. which is under non forest area. The mining lease was granted in favour of Sanjukta Gems on 27th July, 2005 for 20 years. The mine working will be manual opencast without involving drilling & blasting. The water requirement is 16 KLD and source of water is ground water. 10 KLD of water will be required per day for the beneficiation plant.

Based on the information furnished and presentation made, the SEAC prescribed the following TORs for undertaking detailed EIA study

1. Profile of the project proponent and background to establish the financial and entrepreneurial competency to undertake the project
2. Duly attested & certified Mining Plan approved by IBM has to be submitted along with the copy of current lease deed
3. The study area shall encompass 10 km radius from the mine lease boundary.
4. Collection of one season (non-monsoon) primary baseline data on ambient air quality, water quality, noise level, soil and flora and fauna. Site-specific meteorological data should also be collected. The location of the monitoring stations should be justified.
5. Air quality modeling should be carried out for prediction of impact of the project and the existing mines in the vicinity on the air quality of the area focusing more in the villages within 3 kms from the mine. It should also take into account the

- impact of movement of vehicles for transportation of mineral, handling of minerals & OB including mining activity through volume source modeling. The details of the model used and input parameters used for modeling 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. The modeling should take into consideration the existing mines in the study area.
6. Availability of requisite quantity of water and its source to be furnished along with water balance.
 7. Necessary clearance from the Competent Authority for drawl of requisite quantity of water for the project should be provided.
 8. Details of water bodies and drainage of ML area may be specified
 9. The progressive reclamation plan, post mine land use and progressive greenbelt development plan shall be prepared in tabular form and submitted. Milestones for the above activity may be specified.
 10. Location of National Parks, Sanctuaries, Biosphere Reserves, wildlife corridors, Tiger/Elephant reserves (existing as well as proposed), and existence of rare and endangered flora and fauna if any, within 10 km of the mine lease should be clearly indicated. Necessary clearance, if any, as may be applicable to such projects due to proximity of the ecologically sensitive areas as mentioned above under the Wildlife (Protection) Act, 1972 and copy may be furnished.
 11. A detailed biological study of the study area (core zone & buffer zone- 10 km radius of the mining lease area) shall be carried out. Details of flora & fauna, duly authenticated separately for core & buffer zone should be furnished based on field survey indicating the schedule of the fauna present; in case of any schedule-I fauna found in the study area, necessary plan for their conservation should be prepared in consultation with the State Forest & Wildlife Department & details furnished. Necessary cost details for executing the conservation measures should be furnished & incorporated as part of the project cost.
 12. Occupational health impact and remedial measures thereof of the project may be studied.
 13. Baseline data for health status survey for all the employees including labourers and the residents of the nearby villages within 5 km distance may be carried out..
 14. Socio economic impact due to project activity to be assessed and based on the study, developmental activity proposed to be undertaken by the project proponent to be specified. As far as possible quantitative dimension to be given. Study should include Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and it should be carried out as the entry point activity as trust building measures.
 15. Welfare of mine workers is the prime responsibility of the project proponent. Various activities such as regular health checkups, first-aid, shelter for rest and meals, drinking water etc. are to be taken up at the project cost. Nearby mine owners may form a society and funds for welfare of mineworkers may be created. Besides various Govt. schemes and other sources may be explored. This aspect has to be covered in the EMP.

16. Public hearing points likely to be raised and commitment of the project proponent on the same may be included.
17. Plantation in at least 33% of the total area and its maintenance upto five years and regular follow up maintenance thereof has to be ensured; accordingly plan has to be submitted with EIA. [Plantation Scheme]. Total area for which afforestation has been proposed – plan stating how much plantation shall be taken up annually has to be submitted. Plantation of local species may be encouraged. Cost details of the afforestation/ plantation on backfilled reclaimed area to be furnished.
18. Management of OB solid waste generated during mining has to be addressed through incorporation of a concrete plan for the same.
19. Leachate study of the OB and Ore has to be conducted and addressed.
20. Depth of ground-water table and its recharging , run off management, rain water harvesting and treatment system for pumped out quarry water to be submitted.
21. Details of noise pollution control measures to be specified
22. Coloured maps depicting land use of the region showing sensitive / fragile features and detailed lay-out of the site clearly showing green-belt (existing & planned) should be furnished.
23. Satellite imagery of the location of mine should be submitted with demarcation of other proposed/in operation mines in nearby area. Location is also to be shown in Tehsil map procured from revenue department. This will be used as baseline information to compare the impact of mining in the area in future.
24. Details of air pollution control measures to be specified.
25. Details of pollution control measures for beneficiation plant to be specified.
26. Detailed IBM prospecting report as to the total reserve of the specified semi-precious stones and occurrence of no other kind of semi-precious or precious stones to be submitted.
27. During screening operation (manual), 136,500 m³ of OB to be generated and stacked over 2.27ha of area. Detailed geological/chemical analysis of the OB along with management of the dumps may be furnished.
28. 16KLD of ground water to be used, permission and management plan to be furnished.
29. Solid waste generated and dumped after screening in OB dumps should be for a specified period and thereafter definite approved mine closure plan as approved by IBM to be furnished.
30. Certificate to the effect that no forest land of any kind is involved in mining operation may be given.
31. Risk assessment and disaster management plan should be given.
32. EMP and post project monitoring program to be given.
33. Executive summary/ summary EIA report to be given.
34. Any litigation/ court case pending against the proposal should also be included.

ITEM NO. 3

PROPOSAL OF KARMA RE-ROLLERS PVT. LTD FOR RE-ROLLING MILLS FOR PRODUCTION CAPACITY 30000 TPA AT – KAPURSINGH, PIHURA, PS – GURUDIJHATIA, DIST – CUTTACK

The project proponent submitted prescribed Form -1 and pre-feasibility report along with the draft TOR. It is a proposal for installation of a rolling mill of capacity 30000 TPA at Kapursingh, Pihura, Gurudijhatia in the district of Cuttack. The applicant aided by the consultant presented the salient features of the project and the draft Terms of Reference for undertaking detailed EIA study.

The SEAC recommended inclusion of the following points in the TOR during the preparation of EIA/EMP.

1. Location of national parks and reserve forests within 10 km. radius should specifically be mentioned.
2. A list of industries containing name and category with production capacity within 10 km radius should be incorporated.
3. List of raw materials required and their sources should be included.
4. Site-specific meteorological data using temperature, relative humidity, hourly wind speed and direction and rainfall should be collected for one season other than monsoon as per standard guidelines.
5. Data on air emissions, wastewater generation and solid waste management for the existing plant should be incorporated.
6. Ambient air quality at 6 locations within the study area of 10 km. aerial coverage from project site with one AAQMS in downwind direction should be carried out.
7. Ground level concentration of pollutants from the stack emission based on site-specific meteorological features shall be determined..
8. Air quality modeling for particulate matter and other gaseous emissions from the shop floor needs to be done. Air Pollution Control System (APCS) for the control of emissions from the Induction Furnace to be specified.
9. Impact of the transport of the raw materials and end products on the surrounding environment should be assessed and provided.
10. An action plan to control and monitor secondary fugitive emissions from all the sources as per CPCB guidelines should be included.
11. Permission for the drawal of water from concerned authority and water balance data including quantity of effluent generated, recycled, reused and discharged is to be provided. Methods adopted/ to be adopted for the effluent treatment, if any with water conservation should be included.

CHAIRMAN, SEAC

8

SECRETARY, SEAC

12. Ground water monitoring, minimum at 8 locations and near solid waste dump zone should be made. Geological features and geo-hydrological status of the study area are also essential. The present ecological status (terrestrial and aquatic) of the proposed plant is also vital. This should be provided.
13. Action plan for solid / hazardous waste generation, storage, utilization and disposal shall be prepared and provided.
14. Risk assessment and damage control needs to be addressed. Onsite and off-site disaster management plan shall be prepared and included in the EMP.
15. Occupational health impact and remedial measures thereof of the project may be studied.
16. Green belt development plan in 33 % area and a scheme for rainwater harvesting have to be put in place.
17. Socio economic impact due to project activity to be assessed and based on the study, developmental activity proposed to be undertaken by the project proponent to be specified. As far as possible quantitative dimension to be given. Study should include Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and it should be carried out as the entry point activity as trust building measures
18. Detailed Environment management Plant (EMP) with specific reference to air pollution control system, water management, monitoring frequency, responsibility and time bound implementation plan shall be prepared and submitted..
19. EMP should include the concept of waste-minimisation, recycle / reuse / recover techniques, Energy conservation, and natural resource conservation.
20. EMP should include a clear map for plantation/green belt.
21. Due to heat generated in the reheating furnace and rolling operations, a lot of heat and water vapour will be generated in the workshop floor. Adoption of adequate measures should be spelt out instead of rotating the workers every hour as proposed. It is not going to solve the health hazards. International norms as regards to this problem like provision of sufficient exhaust and incoming vents as well as use of protection gears like heat-proof clothes, goggles, gloves, shoes etc. should be adopted.
22. The proponent has agreed to use only furnace oil of low sulfur content and eliminate use of pulverized coal or producer gas as mentioned in the proposal. Otherwise, the EIA/EMP may be prepared keeping these aspects in view in addition to storage, emissions, wastes etc. associated with fuel oil.
23. Approximate composition and quantity of the solid and liquid effluents to be generated in addition to emissions in the process along with proposed control measures may be specified keeping the prescribed industrial standards in view.
24. Public hearing points likely to be raised and commitment of the project proponent on the same may be included.
25. The mill is being put up in a virgin area though this sort of industry are generally put in industrial estates or areas marked for industrial development purposes; definite advantages are to be stated since the pollutants generated are to be paid special attention before discharging into the environment.

26. 45KLD water to be drawn from ground water sources; permission and management plan may be furnished. The plan states that no pollutant is foreseen although there will be oil/grease, metal splinters etc. incorporated in the effluents at the re-rolling floors.
27. The heat generated in heating the ingots to workable temperature and fuel oil used to be specified with quality and quantity. The source, stocking and emissions generated in the furnace to be paid special attention.
28. The fugitive emissions generated during water spray are also be quantified and their management plan to be given.
29. The unit shall provide registration certificate of industry from competent authority
30. Any litigation/ court case pending against the proposal should also be included.
31. Profile of project proponent and background to establish the financial and entrepreneurial competency to undertake the project

ITEM NO. 4

PROPOSAL OF TUSULA MINOR IRRIGATION PROJECT IN BARKOTE OF DEOGARH DISTRICT

The Executive Engineer of the project made a presentation on the proposal for consideration of SEAC.

Tusula MIP is an on going diversion scheme near Tusula village in Barkote block of Deogarh District in Orissa State. Administrative approval for Rs. 89.41 lakhs has been accorded vide letter No. 31254 dt. 5.9.03 of W.R. Deptt. for execution of the project under NABARD ASSISTANCE (RIDF-VII). The project has been designed to provide irrigation to 162.00 ha in kharif and 20.00 ha rabi ayacut through left side and right side distribution system of length 2.60 km and 3.87 km respectively. Forest land and non-forest for an area of 4.04 acres and 11.15 acres is required for construction of the project. The nearby villages are cronicly affected by drought. So after construction of the project the socio-economic condition of the villagers will be developed. There will be no environmental pollution during execution or after completion of this M.I. project. So, the project is categorized as "B₂" and does not require detailed EIA study.

The project site is nearer to the forest area. The distribution system is to be pass through village forest land for length of 0.80 km against the total length of 6.47 km. There is no tree cutting involve during execution of canal system. The construction of head works has been completed without damaging any vegetation. Blasting will not be required

during excavation of canals as the area comes under hard soil and gravelly soil zone. As such there is no adverse impact on the environment in execution of the project. The terms and conditions as applicable to avoid environmental pollution, if any, will be followed during construction of the project.

The SEAC observed that the Form-I has not been filled up properly and pre-feasibility report has not been submitted. The SEAC decided to consider the proposal for grant of environmental clearance after re-submission of the properly filled Form-I and pre-feasibility report.

ITEM NO. 5

PROPOSAL EXPANSION OF M/S. D. D. IRON & STEEL PVT. LTD STEEL PLANT BY INSTALLING ADDITIONAL 1X4.5 TON PER HEAT INDUCTION FURNACE FOR PRODUCTION OF INGOT 13,500 TPA INSIDE THE EXISTING PREMISES AT – PADJAMPALI, RAJGANGPUR DIST – SUNDARGARH

The project proponent submitted prescribed Form -1 and pre-feasibility report along with the draft TORs. It's a expansion **proposal for installation of 1x4.5 ton per heat** induction furnace for production of ingot 13,500 TPA inside the existing premises of M/s. D. D. Iron & Steel Pvt. Ltd, at Padjampali, Rajgangpur, dist - Sundargarh. The unit has existing 1x4.5 ton per heat induction furnace. Applicant aided by the consultant gave a presentation on the salient features of the project and the draft Terms of Reference for undertaking detailed EIA study.

The SEAC recommended inclusion of the following points in the TOR during the preparation of EIA/EMP.

1. Present land use should be prepared based on satellite imagery.
2. Location of national parks and reserve forests within 5 km. radius should specifically be mentioned.
3. A list of industries containing name and type in 5 km radius should be incorporated.
4. List of raw material required and source should be included.
5. Site-specific meteorological data using temperature, relative humidity, hourly wind speed and direction and rainfall should be collected.
6. Data on air emissions, wastewater generation and solid waste management for the existing plant should be incorporated.

7. Ambient air quality at 6 locations within the study area of 10 km., aerial coverage from project site with one AAQMS in downwind direction should be carried out.
8. Ground level concentration of pollutants from the stack emission based on site-specific meteorological features shall be determined..
9. Air quality modeling for particulate matter needs to be done. Air Pollution Control System (APCS) for the control of emissions from the Induction Furnace to be specified.
10. Impact of the transport of the raw materials and end products on the surrounding environment should be assessed and provided.
11. One season data for gaseous emissions other than monsoon season shall be provided.
12. An action plan to control and monitor secondary fugitive emissions from all the sources as per CPCB guidelines should be included.
13. Permission for the drawl of water from concerned authority and water balance data including quantity of effluent generated, recycled, reused and discharged is to be provided. Methods adopted/ to be adopted for the water conservation should be included.
14. Ground water monitoring minimum at 8 locations and near solid waste dump zone, Geological features and Geo-hydrological status of the study area are essential as also. Ecological status (Terrestrial and Aquatic) is vital. This should be provided.
15. Action plan for solid / hazardous waste generation, storage, utilization and disposal particularly Slag from IF, dust from APCS etc. shall be prepared and provided.
16. Risk assessment and damage control needs to be addressed. Onsite and off site disaster management plan shall be prepared and included in the EMP.
17. Occupational health impact and remedial measures thereof of the project may be studied.
18. Green belt development plan in 33 % area and a scheme for rainwater harvesting have to be put in place.
19. Socio economic impact due to project activity to be assessed and based on the study, developmental activity proposed to be undertaken by the project proponent to be specified. As far as possible quantitative dimension to be given. Study should include Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and it should be carried out as the entry point activity as trust building measures
20. Detailed Environment management Plant (EMP) with specific reference to air pollution control system, water management, monitoring frequency, responsibility and time bound implementation plan shall be prepared and submitted..
21. Public hearing points likely to be raised and commitment of the project proponent on the same may be included.

22. EMP should include the concept of waste-minimisation, recycle / reuse / recover techniques, Energy conservation, and natural resource conservation.
23. EMP should include a clear map for plantation/green belt.
24. The company proposes to put up additional (1.5tpa) Induction furnace for 13,500 TPA MS ingot production in their existing facilities of similar capacity at a cost of Rs.2.09 crores. Although they are in operation for sometime past, they do not have any baseline data on the environment parameters. Since the plant is located in an area already polluted and near highly polluting atmosphere, they should keep continuous record of the air pollutants released from their existing facilities in addition to the mandatory one-season data to be collected under TOR.
25. They propose to use coke dust, which should be clarified. Usually coke is produced in lumps and are they going to grind it to powder before charging into the induction furnace along with sponge iron?
26. They propose to use Ventury scrubber to remove air pollutants generated from their furnace. The emissions and effluents generated from their existing facility along with their analysis and control measures adopted are to be furnished. Its efficiency to remove SPM and other trace gas pollutants from the emission along with its technical specification may be provided.
27. The company foresees reduction in power consumption by 200KVA in their proposed expansion facility. Since the additional furnace and associated power consumption pattern is the same as their existing furnace, how do they propose to save power?
28. The unit shall provide registration certificate of industry from competent authority
29. Any litigation/ court case pending against the proposal should also be included.
30. Profile of project proponent and background to establish the financial and entrepreneurial competency to undertake the project

ITEM NO. 6

PROPOSAL OF EXPANSION OF SURGUTURIA IRON ORE MINE OF M/S. NARAYANI SONS PVT. LTD, AT – SURGUTURIA, BARBIL, KEONJHAR FOR EXPANSION IN PRODUCTION OF IRON ORE FROM 36000 TO 200165 TPA AND DOLERITE 500000 TPA OVER AN AREA OF 41.517 HA.

The project proponent informed that they would be unable to attend the meeting as their senior officer dealing with the matter is on leave. They also requested to defer the case to next meeting. The committee decided to consider the proposal in the next meeting of SEAC.

CHAIRMAN, SEAC

13

SECRETARY, SEAC

ITEM NO. 7.

PROPOSAL OF M/S. SHREE MADHAV ISPAT PVT. LTD, AT – SIRIAPALI, PO – PARAMANPUR, DIST – JHARSUGUDA FOR 2 X 4T INDUCTION FURNACE (INSIDE THE EXISTING PREMISES OF SPONGE IRON UNIT)

The project proponent submitted prescribed Form -1 and pre-feasibility report along with the draft TORs. It's a expansion **proposal for installation of 2x4 ton per heat** induction furnace for production of ingot 30,000 TPA inside the existing premises of sponge iron plant of M/s. Sree Madhav Ispat Pvt. Ltd at Siriapali, PO – Paramanpur, Dist – Jharsuguda . Applicant aided by the consultant gave a presentation on the salient features of the project and the draft Terms of Reference for undertaking detailed EIA study.

The SEAC recommended inclusion of the following points in the TOR during the preparation of EIA/EMP.

1. Present land use should be prepared based on satellite imagery.
2. Location of national parks and reserve forests within 10 km. radius should specifically be mentioned.
3. A list of industries containing name and type in 10 km radius should be incorporated.
4. List of raw material required and source should be included.
5. Site-specific meteorological data using temperature, relative humidity, hourly wind speed and direction and rainfall should be collected.
6. Data on air emissions, wastewater generation and solid waste management for the existing plant should be incorporated.
7. Ambient air quality at 8 locations within the study area of 10 km., aerial coverage from project site with one AAQMS in downwind direction should be carried out.
8. Ground level concentration of pollutants from the stack emission based on site-specific meteorological features shall be determined..
9. Air quality modeling for particulate matter needs to be done. Air Pollution Control System (APCS) for the control of emissions from the Induction Furnace to be specified.
10. Impact of the transport of the raw materials and end products on the surrounding environment should be assessed and provided.
11. One season data for gaseous emissions other than monsoon season shall be provided.

12. An action plan to control and monitor secondary fugitive emissions from all the sources as per CPCB guidelines should be included.
13. Permission for the drawl of water from concerned authority and water balance data including quantity of effluent generated, recycled, reused and discharged is to be provided. Methods adopted/ to be adopted for the water conservation should be included.
14. Ground water monitoring minimum at 8 locations and near solid waste dump zone, Geological features and Geo-hydrological status of the study area are essential as also. Ecological status (Terrestrial and Aquatic) is vital. This should be provided.
15. Action plan for solid / hazardous waste generation, storage, utilization and disposal particularly Slag from IF, dust from APCS etc. shall be prepared and provided.
16. Risk assessment and damage control needs to be addressed. Onsite and off site disaster management plan shall be prepared and included in the EMP.
17. Occupational health impact and remedial measures thereof of the project may be studied.
18. Green belt development plan in 33 % area and a scheme for rainwater harvesting have to be put in place.
19. Socio economic impact due to project activity to be assessed and based on the study, developmental activity proposed to be undertaken by the project proponent to be specified. As far as possible quantitative dimension to be given. Study should include Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and it should be carried out as the entry point activity as trust building measures
20. Detailed Environment management Plant (EMP) with specific reference to air pollution control system, water pollution control system, noise pollution control system, monitoring frequency, responsibility and time bound implementation plan shall be prepared and submitted..
21. EMP should include the concept of waste-minimisation, recycle / reuse / recover techniques, Energy conservation, and natural resource conservation.
22. EMP should include a clear map for plantation/green belt.
23. Public hearing points likely to be raised and commitment of the project proponent on the same may be included
24. The present levels of pollutants generated from their existing sponge iron unit along with management practices followed are to be specified since they are located in an already polluted zone.
25. Presently out of the total area of 55 acres, they are dumping wastes in 20 acres, which is quite large. In stead, they should use a part of this low lying 20 acres for storing runoff water/rainwater to be used for cooling after treatment or for other suitable purposes like horticulture. The waste dump of 18,000 T of char may be used up for their calorific value so that the storage and management of this highly polluting material need not be stored for long.

26. The water requirement of 100m³/day is proposed to be met from ground water sources. They have not specified their present level of consumption in addition to which this water is to be drawn. Necessary sanction of the appropriate authority like State Govt. water resources department should be taken. The total water management plan with requirement and recharge may be furnished.
27. The quantity of effluent to be generated and its treatment plan is to be furnished.
28. The existing facility is already using bag filters for dust suppression in their emissions. The efficiency and quantitative statement on dust generation and its end use may be given.
29. The DM plant used for water treatment needs periodic replacement of ion exchange resins. The amount to be disposed off per year is shown as 10-20 kg, which is much below the standard consumption/replacement pattern. A certificate to this effect from the firm supplying DM plant may be given.
30. Any litigation/ court case pending against the proposal should also be included.
31. Total capital cost and recurring cost per annum for environmental pollution control measures should be included.
32. Profile of project proponent and background to establish the financial and entrepreneurial competency to undertake the project

ITEM NO. 8

PROPOSAL OF GROUP HOUSING “M/S. VIPUL LIMITED” VIPUL GARDENS AT MOUZA SHANKARPUR, BHUBANESWAR

The proponent made a presentation on the proposal for consideration of the SEAC. The proposed development is a Building Project having multiple floors. There will be 10 towers and each tower with B+G + 14 floors shall amount to a total of 578 apartments. Total Plot Area is 9.775 Acre. Total built up area is 39557.98 sq.m. Green belt Landscaping and open space area is 42% of the total project area. The building is completely residential in nature. Bhubaneswar Development Authority has approved the building plan. The total water requirement is 473.5 KLD. Source of water will be Ground water during construction phase. The water requirement will be met from Municipal supply and ground water during operational phase. Around 379 KLD of waste water will be generated which will be treated in Sewage Treatment Plant (STP) of capacity 380 KLD. Treated water will be re-used for dual flushing, green belt and landscaping. Total

solid waste generation will be 1.66 MT/day. The power requirement is 2764 KW. Total cost of the project is Rs.100 crores.

SEAC decided to consider the environmental clearance of the project after getting clarification and compliance on the following points from the project proponent.

1. There is provision of only one Sewage Treatment Plant of 380KL capacity when the requirement is 378KL. The STP should have provision for at least 30% additional capacity. There should be provision for one more standby STP in case of putting the first one under contingency maintenance.
2. The technology specified has provisions for only air blowing and chlorine treatment, which is inadequate for treating sewage water, nor can the treated water be any use in absence of biological treatment. The proponent should consult a standard firm with suitable technology and personnel for putting up the STP of adequate capacity.
3. The proponent should state categorically and produce drawings to the effect that the water supplies and collection system in the complex will have separate provisions for bio-infected used water which needs rigorous treatment.
4. The water balance shows 160KLD water going into the sewer while it is stated elsewhere that zero discharge will be made to the public sewer.
5. The water requirement is huge and there is no specific provision for drawing water from the ground water bodies or municipal supplies. The proponents should have clear and proper understanding as to their source and should produce papers securing the supplies. Presently the area has neither municipal water supply pipelines nor sewers.
6. The proponent wants to discharge solid wastes through municipal disposal; there is no such understanding with the authorities. Moreover, this is a contentious issue even now and sub-judice. Before approval is accorded this aspect, the issue is to be seriously looked into.
7. The rainwater harvesting technology along with amount calculated is not clear. The proposal to collect rainwater from hard and soft ground surfaces is impractical. Adequate treatment process may be adopted before recharging.
8. Percentage of solar energy to be tapped for reducing energy load may be specified. It should also be from a standard manufacturer and adequate maintenance system put in place.
9. The project would require a huge amount of building materials. The amount of fly ash bricks to be used may be specified to reduce pressure on top soil consumption used for red conventional bricks.
10. The two diesel generators to be placed in the campus itself would require additional pollution control measures and as per law should have adequate chimney heights. Since the blocks are high, there will be attempts to put the

generators in a shed and emissions allowed to spread into the residential blocks. So specialists should be consulted for the purpose for better dispersal keeping CPCB guidelines in mind.

11. There is discrepancy in BDA approval letter and approved plan regarding the name of the owner. The proponent shall submit the approved plan and approval letter in favour of M/s Vipul Ltd who is the project proponent.

ITEM NO. 9

PROPOSAL OF MURGABEDA IRON ORE MINES OF M/S. D. R. PATNAIK TO INCREASE IRON ORE PRODUCTION FROM 0.12 MTPA TO 2.0 MTPA AT – MURGABEDA, DEOJHAR, DIST – KEONJHAR

The proponent made a presentation on the proposal for consideration of the SEAC. The proposal is for production of iron ore from 0.12 MTPA to 2.0 MTPA. The TOR for this project were prescribed on dtd. 25.11.08 by the Expert Appraisal Committee of MoEF, Govt. of India. The lease area is 15.378 ha which includes 10.481 ha. reserve forest, 0.02 ha village forest and 4.877 ha. non forest revenue land. The Murgabeda iron ore mine over 15.378 ha. was granted in favour of Sri N. Pattnaik & later it was transferred to the present lessee Sri D. R. Pattnaik. The lease deed for this mine was first executed for a period of 30 years with effect from 3.7.1976. The tenure of the lease expired on 2.7.06. Again the renewal application has been submitted on 24.5.05 for a period of 20 years.. The mine has applied for forest clearance. Mining plan is approved for the production quantity applied for environmental clearance. The public hearing was conducted on 29.6.09. No National Park/Sanctuary is located within 10 km of the mine lease area. Mine working will be opencast and mechanized involving drilling and blasting. Water requirement for the project is estimated to be 75 m³/day. The source is ground water. The mine working will not intersect groundwater table. Waste generation will be 1.1 lakh m³ during plan period The mine has earmarked 1.3 ha as OB dump area (Plan period). The mine has proposed garland drain, check dams and retaining wall to prevent wash out of loose material from dump area. Dump slope will be stabilized by putting

vegetation. The issue raised during public hearing were also presented and discussed during the meeting.

During the discussion the following points emerged.

1. Only one pit is being worked since its inception and so no back filling has been done nor can there be any mine closure plan implemented till the reserves are exhausted. As per present proposal for 5yrs lease, back filling should start by 2011-12, which is quite unlikely as per statement during presentation. This is a serious matter from environment point of view.
2. The lease transfer document from Shri N. Patnaik to Shri D.R.Patnaik could not be produced for examination. This may be furnished.
3. Forest clearance accorded on examination was found to have lapsed with no extension or fresh application pending for clearance. This needs proper examination. Status of compliance of Forest Clearance stipulated conditions to be furnished by project proponent. Status of forest clearance accorded by MoEF, Govt. of India in specific terms (vii) & (viii) regarding compliances of earlier forest clearance & Hon'ble Supreme Court order to be clarified.
4. The original lease was for a period of 30yrs which lapsed in July 2006. The proponent had applied for a further period of 20yrs, but IBM approved for two years (2005-07) after which the lessee has no authenticity to go for mining. Although they have applied for continuation along with mine closure plan, the position is unclear. Before considering final approval with rapid EIA reports, the mine plan duly approved by IBM may be furnished.
5. The ground water depth, as usual is stated to be 510 MRL, which is hardly 20m below the present workable depth of the open cast mines. In absence of an updated data on actual depth either through their own exploration or through authentic certificate, this small gap may be acceptable.
6. Topographic details are not given other than some unclear terms like sloping towards some direction. In absence of this, the dump wash off management and their stability can not be assessed.
7. Out of 8 air pollution monitoring stations, most buffer stations showed higher RSPM value, which is quite unlikely, especially when the large area under lease having two stations show lower RSPM values. No management plan for higher respirable dust has been envisaged.
8. The quantity of mine percolating water, especially during the rainy season is not specified; instead the discharge is shown as zero.
9. The consultant stated percolation of soil to be 31-45% without any physical characterization nor authentic analysis reports from credible sources.
10. As per GoO's latest guidelines, due fencing around the pit is to be undertaken. A proposal to this effect to be submitted.

11. A statement of the socio-economic measures to be undertaken during this phase with expenses foreseen may be furnished to the concerned DM for facilitating the measures.

The proposal may be considered for environmental clearance provided the response of the project proponent to the aforesaid observations is to the satisfaction of the SEAC.

ITEM NO. 10

PROPOSAL OF CHROME ORE BENEFICIATION PLANT M/S. FALCON MINERAL & CHEMICALS FOR PRODUCTION OF CAPACITY 2700 TPA AT LAITAGIRI, DIST – CUTTACK

The project proponent submitted prescribed Form -1 and pre-feasibility report along with the draft TORs. It's a proposed project for **CHROME ORE BENEFICIATION PLANT OF CAPACITY 2700 TPA, AT LAITAGIRI, DISTRICT – CUTTACK**. Applicant, aided by the consultant gave a presentation on the salient features of the project and the draft Terms of Reference for undertaking detailed EIA study.

During the discussion, the following points emerged :

1. Chrome ore, especially the fragile ones, contain Cr(VI) in soluble form and during beneficiation, shall contaminate the water environment. The place is virgin and nearby surface water bodies, agriculture land or even ground water over a period of time is likely to be contaminated with this carcinogenic compound. The proponent could not state any particular advantage of locating the facility in this historic place other than his own land in his own village, which is inadequate to justify the issue.
2. The firm has no idea on process details nor has it secured the process of beneficiation from some standard supplier/consultant having credibility in this line. Thus the process flow-sheet is unclear and ambiguous, which needs clarification with material and water balance in each process step. Special attention is to be paid to Cr(VI) balance in each stage.
3. The water requirement is 20 m³ per day and the source is stated to be ground water with no permission from competent authority.
4. The project cost is wrongly stated and needs correction to Rs.22 lakhs.
5. The tailing pond spread over one acre area has no provision for proper treatment of waste water before recirculation. Detailed process flow-sheet for the purpose needs to be furnished.

6. A filter press for removing adhering water to the final product has no specification as a result it is difficult to assess how much press water of what analysis will be discharged from it.
7. Their plan on safe storage or disposal of the tailings is to be furnished.

In view of the above shortcomings, the SEAC decided to reject the proposal for the proposed location. The proponent should apply afresh relocating the proposal for further consideration.

ITEM NO. 11

PROPOSAL OF M/S. INDIAN OIL CORPORATION LTD, FOR ENVIRONMENTAL CLEARANCE FOR RA & EIA STUDIES FOR SETTING UP OF PETROLEUM OIL TERMINAL AT JHARSUGUDA

The proponent did not attend the meeting. The committee decided to defer the case.

ITEM NO. 12

PROPOSAL OF CHROME ORE BENEFICIATION PLANT OF M/S. KAMYAB EXPORTS PVT. LTD FOR PRODUCTION OF CAPACITY CHROME ORE BENEFICIATION PLANT 12000 TPA AT BILTERUN, CUTTACK

The project proponent submitted prescribed Form -1 and pre-feasibility report along with the draft TORs. It's a proposed project for **CHROME ORE BENEFICIATION PLANT OF CAPACITY 12000 TPA, AT BILTERUN, DISTRICT – CUTTACK**. Applicant, aided by the consultant gave a presentation on the salient features of the project and the draft Terms of Reference for undertaking detailed EIA study.

During the discussion, the following points emerged.

1. The firm proposed to process 48,000 TPA low grade chrome ore to produce 12,000 TPA product with no clear idea on process details, pollutants involved, material or water balance etc.
2. Location of the proposed plant is prime area close to the NH-5. The process is highly polluting unless proper treatment and technical care is taken during processing, of which the consultant/proponent has no idea.
3. It has acquired three acres of land for the plant out of which one acre is meant for slime disposal. The amount of slime to be generated and its analysis is not clear.
4. The entire water requirement of 16 KLD is proposed to be drawn from ground water sources with no clear permission for doing so.

5. Treatment of effluents with only lime and alum addition is not acceptable. This will only further contaminate both surface and ground water.
6. Manufacturing red conventional bricks using the tailings are injurious to the environment and human health. This is not acceptable.
7. Issuing TOR may not be feasible in absence of technical details of the beneficiation plant with material and water balance with analysis of at least the most polluting chemical Cr(VI) at each stage.

In view of the above shortcomings, the SEAC decided to reject the proposal for the proposed location. The proponent should apply afresh relocating the proposed project for further consideration.

**(DR. GAGAN BIHARI NITYANANDA CHAINY)
CHAIRMAN, SEAC**

**(DR. SWOYAM PRAKASH ROUT)
MEMBER, SEAC**

**(DR. HAREKRISHNA NAYAK)
MEMBER, SEAC**

**(DR. MOHESHWAR PATRA)
MEMBER, SEAC**

**(SRI SASANKA SEKHAR PATNAIK)
MEMBER, SEAC**

**(DR. SURENDRA NATH DAS)
MEMBER, SEAC**

**(DR. R. C. MOHANTY)
MEMBER, SEAC**

**(PROF. KUMAR DAS)
MEMBER, SEAC**

CHAIRMAN, SEAC

22

SECRETARY, SEAC