

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF STATE LEVEL EXPERT APPRAISAL  
COMMITTEE, ORISSA HELD ON 19<sup>TH</sup> & 20<sup>TH</sup>, NOVEMBER, 2010**

The meeting of State Level Expert Appraisal Committee, Orissa was held during **19<sup>th</sup> & 20<sup>th</sup> NOVEMBER, 2010** in the Conference Hall of Orissa State Pollution Control Board, Bhubaneswar at 11.00 AM. Sri Sasanka Sekhar Patnaik, Member, SEAC Orissa chaired the meeting. The following members were present in the meeting.

- |    |                                     |   |        |
|----|-------------------------------------|---|--------|
| 1. | Sri Sasanka Sekhar Patnaik          | - | Member |
| 2. | Professor (Dr.) Swoyam Prakash Rout | - | Member |
| 3. | Dr. Harekrishna Nayak,              | - | Member |
| 4. | Dr. Moheshwar Patra,                | - | Member |
| 5. | Prof. Kumar Das                     | - | Member |
| 6. | Dr. R.C. Mohanty,                   | - | Member |
| 7. | Dr. S. N. Das                       | - | Member |

1. The minutes of SEAC meeting held on 8<sup>th</sup>, 9<sup>th</sup> & 10<sup>th</sup> November, 2010 was confirmed by the members.
2. The SEAC decided to hold the SEAC meeting on 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> December 2010 for consideration of new and old proposals.
3. The SEAC also decided to go for site visit of some construction projects on 29<sup>th</sup> Nov, 2010 as well as screening of new proposals and consideration of old proposals on 30<sup>th</sup> Nov. 2010.
4. **The proponent of LIFT CANAL SYSTEM OF UPPER INDRAVATI IRRIGATION PROJECT IN THE DISTRICT OF KALAHANDI WITH CCA – 25,484 HA** was unable to attend the presentation meeting held on 9<sup>th</sup> - 10<sup>th</sup> Nov, 2010 as the letter of intimation was misplaced in their office and requested to consider their project in the next SEAC meeting. Subsequently, the proponent requested on 20<sup>th</sup> Nov, 2010 to allow them for presentation of their proposal before the SEAC. The Chairman allowed the proponent to present their proposal before the SEAC on 20<sup>th</sup> Nov, 2010 as additional item.

The agenda-wise proceedings and recommendations of the committee are detailed below:

**Day One : 19<sup>th</sup> Nov,10**

**ITEM NO. 1 :**

**SCOPING FOR CONSTRUCTION OF BAIRAGIHALUA MI PROJECT IN THE DISTRICT OF RAYAGADA WITH CCA – 200 HA. (TORS).**

The Asst. Engineer, MI Division, Rayagada of the project presented the project before SEAC.

**The Committee observed the following**

1. The Form-I and other enclosed documents have been prepared in an amateurish manner. The Asst. Engineer who presented the proposal was not authorized by the Project Proponent nor he was in a position to take decisions or accept suggestions or offer clarifications.
2. There was no Power Point presentation. The copies of the relevant documents including Form-I and its enclosures were not sent to any of the Members. The members were presented with only one hard copy having hazy descriptions and so the Members were not in a position to understand details of the project.
3. The Official presenting the proposals expressed that they are under an impression that TOR is not necessary for MI projects and so they have not prepared the TOR documents seriously.

**After detailed discussion, the committee decided the following:**

1. The Project proponent or an authorized representative, preferably a senior engineer familiar with the project details, should present the proposal in a power point presentation. Hard copies of the project proposals should reach the Chairman and Members of the SEAC at least one week before the presentation.
2. The Project Proponent would prepare all the Project Reports including Form-I in consultation with a concerned environmental expert. These documents should be prepared as per guidelines of MoEF and should have all the essential features including a clear image of the location of the projects along with CCA, Catchment area, drainage pattern, elevations/topography and location of forests, water bodies and other geological features appearing in a Toposheet in a larger scale as far as possible.
3. The proposals in the present form are not suitable for consideration and the Proponent may resubmit the proposal in a modified form as suggested.
4. The following points may be taken into consideration and relevant documents may be submitted along with above documents to speed up the process of appraisal:
  - a) Evidence of Public Consultation in the form of Gram Sabha/ Palli Sabha resolution to show that the local people have a necessity and demand for such a project in the area.

- b) Environmental sensitivity including survey of flora, fauna, endangered species, wild-life corridors etc. in at least 5km buffer zone of the MI project.
- c) Budgetary allocation for amelioration of the environment in and around the project area amounting to at least 2% of the project cost.
- d) Provision for taking protective measures for degraded land/forests in the catchment area of the project.
- e) Flow rate in the rivulet/nala of which the weir is proposed during at least four months (monsoon rains) to ensure assured water supply to the proposed CCA during Kharif crops.
- f) Forest diversion clearance, if any, for the proposed embankment and distribution canals.

**ITEM NO. 2:**

**SCOPING FOR CONSTRUCTION OF RELIKUPANALLA MI PROJECT AT VILLAGE DUMBURIGURHA IN THE DISTRICT OF RAYAGADA WITH CCA – 150 HA. (TORS)**

The Asst. Engineer, MI Division, Rayagada of the project presented the project before SEAC.

**The Committee observed the following**

1. The Form-I and other enclosed documents have been prepared in an amateurish manner. The Asst. Engineer who presented the proposal was not authorized by the Project Proponent nor he was in a position to take decisions or accept suggestions or offer clarifications.
2. There was no Power Point presentation. The copies of the relevant documents including Form-I and its enclosures were not sent to any of the Members. The members were presented with only one hard copy having hazy descriptions and so the Members were not in a position to understand details of the project.
3. The Official presenting the proposals expressed that they are under an impression that TOR is not necessary for MI projects and so they have not prepared the TOR documents seriously.

**After detailed discussion, the committee decided the following:**

1. The Project proponent or an authorized representative, preferably a senior engineer familiar with the project details, should present the proposal in a power point presentation. Hard copies of the project proposals should reach the Chairman and Members of the SEAC at least one week before the presentation.
2. The Project Proponent would prepare all the Project Reports including Form-I in consultation with a concerned environmental expert. These documents should be prepared as per guidelines of MoEF and should have all the essential features including a clear image of the location of the projects along with CCA, Catchment area, drainage pattern, elevations/topography and location of forests, water bodies and other geological features appearing in a Toposheet in a larger scale as far as possible.

3. The proposals in the present form are not suitable for consideration and the Proponent may resubmit the proposal in a modified form as suggested.
4. The following points may be taken into consideration and relevant documents may be submitted along with above documents to speed up the process of appraisal:
  - a) Evidence of Public Consultation in the form of Gram Sabha/ Palli Sabha resolution to show that the local people have a necessity and demand for such a project in the area.
  - b) Environmental sensitivity including survey of flora, fauna, endangered species, wild-life corridors etc. in at least 5km buffer zone of the MI project.
  - c) Budgetary allocation for amelioration of the environment in and around the project area amounting to at least 2% of the project cost.
  - d) Provision for taking protective measures for degraded land/forests in the catchment area of the project.
  - e) Flow rate in the rivulet/nala of which the weir is proposed during at least four months (monsoon rains) to ensure assured water supply to the proposed CCA during Kharif crops.
  - f) Forest diversion clearance, if any, for the proposed embankment and distribution canals.

### **ITEM NO 3**

#### **SCOPING FOR CONSTRUCTION OF TUNKHAL MI PROJECT AT VILLAGE TUNKHAL IN THE DISTRICT OF KORAPUT WITH CCA – 40 HA**

The Asst. Engineer, MI Division, Rayagada of the project presented the project before SEAC.

#### **The Committee observed the following**

1. The Form-I and other enclosed documents have been prepared in an amateurish manner. The Asst. Engineer who presented the proposal was not authorized by the Project Proponent nor he was in a position to take decisions or accept suggestions or offer clarifications.
2. There was no Power Point presentation. The copies of the relevant documents including Form-I and its enclosures were not sent to any of the Members. The members were presented with only one hard copy having hazy descriptions and so the Members were not in a position to understand details of the project.
3. The Official presenting the proposals expressed that they are under an impression that TOR is not necessary for MI projects and so they have not prepared the TOR documents seriously.

#### **After detailed discussion, the committee decided the following:**

1. The Project proponent or an authorized representative, preferably a senior engineer familiar with the project details, should present the proposal in a power

- point presentation. Hard copies of the project proposals should reach the Chairman and Members of the SEAC at least one week before the presentation.
2. The Project Proponent would prepare all the Project Reports including Form-I in consultation with a concerned environmental expert. These documents should be prepared as per guidelines of MoEF and should have all the essential features including a clear image of the location of the projects along with CCA, Catchment area, drainage pattern, elevations/topography and location of forests, water bodies and other geological features appearing in a Toposheet in a larger scale as far as possible.
  3. The proposals in the present form are not suitable for consideration and the Proponent may resubmit the proposal in a modified form as suggested.
  4. The following points may be taken into consideration and relevant documents may be submitted along with above documents to speed up the process of appraisal:
    - a) Evidence of Public Consultation in the form of Gram Sabha/ Palli Sabha resolution to show that the local people have a necessity and demand for such a project in the area.
    - b) Environmental sensitivity including survey of flora, fauna, endangered species, wild-life corridors etc. in at least 5km buffer zone of the MI project.
    - c) Budgetary allocation for amelioration of the environment in and around the project area amounting to at least 2% of the project cost.
    - d) Provision for taking protective measures for degraded land/forests in the catchment area of the project.
    - e) Flow rate in the rivulet/nala of which the weir is proposed during at least four months (monsoon rains) to ensure assured water supply to the proposed CCA during Kharif crops.
    - f) Forest diversion clearance, if any, for the proposed embankment and distribution canals.

#### **ITEM NO. 4**

#### **SCOPING FOR CONSTRUCTION OF KUMARPADU MI PROJECT AT VILLAGE KUMARPADA IN THE DISTRICT OF KORAPUT WITH CCA – 50 HA. (TORS)**

The Asst. Engineer, MI Division, Rayagada of the project presented the project before SEAC.

#### **The Committee observed the following**

1. The Form-I and other enclosed documents have been prepared in an amateurish manner. The Asst. Engineer who presented the proposal was not authorized by the Project Proponent nor he was in a position to take decisions or accept suggestions or offer clarifications.
2. There was no Power Point presentation. The copies of the relevant documents including Form-I and its enclosures were not sent to any of the Members. The

members were presented with only one hard copy having hazy descriptions and so the Members were not in a position to understand details of the project.

3. The Official presenting the proposals expressed that they are under an impression that TOR is not necessary for MI projects and so they have not prepared the TOR documents seriously.

**After detailed discussion, the committee decided the following:**

1. The Project proponent or an authorized representative, preferably a senior engineer familiar with the project details, should present the proposal in a power point presentation. Hard copies of the project proposals should reach the Chairman and Members of the SEAC at least one week before the presentation.
2. The Project Proponent would prepare all the Project Reports including Form-I in consultation with a concerned environmental expert. These documents should be prepared as per guidelines of MoEF and should have all the essential features including a clear image of the location of the projects along with CCA, Catchment area, drainage pattern, elevations/topography and location of forests, water bodies and other geological features appearing in a Toposheet in a larger scale as far as possible.
3. The proposals in the present form are not suitable for consideration and the Proponent may resubmit the proposal in a modified form as suggested.
4. The following points may be taken into consideration and relevant documents may be submitted along with above documents to speed up the process of appraisal:
  - a) Evidence of Public Consultation in the form of Gram Sabha/ Palli Sabha resolution to show that the local people have a necessity and demand for such a project in the area.
  - b) Environmental sensitivity including survey of flora, fauna, endangered species, wild-life corridors etc. in at least 5km buffer zone of the MI project.
  - c) Budgetary allocation for amelioration of the environment in and around the project area amounting to at least 2% of the project cost.
  - d) Provision for taking protective measures for degraded land/forests in the catchment area of the project.
  - e) Flow rate in the rivulet/nala of which the weir is proposed during at least four months (monsoon rains) to ensure assured water supply to the proposed CCA during Kharif crops.
  - f) Forest diversion clearance, if any, for the proposed embankment and distribution canals.

## **ITEM NO. 5**

### **SCOPING FOR CONSTRUCTION OF CHIKAMBO MI PROJECT AT VILLAGE CHIKAMBO IN THE DISTRICT OF KORAPUT WITH CCA – 40 HA. (TORS)**

The Asst. Engineer, MI Division, Rayagada of the project presented the project before SEAC.

#### **The Committee observed the following**

1. The Form-I and other enclosed documents have been prepared in an amateurish manner. The Asst. Engineer who presented the proposal was not authorized by the Project Proponent nor he was in a position to take decisions or accept suggestions or offer clarifications.
2. There was no Power Point presentation. The copies of the relevant documents including Form-I and its enclosures were not sent to any of the Members. The members were presented with only one hard copy having hazy descriptions and so the Members were not in a position to understand details of the project.
3. The Official presenting the proposals expressed that they are under an impression that TOR is not necessary for MI projects and so they have not prepared the TOR documents seriously.

#### **After detailed discussion, the committee decided the following:**

1. The Project proponent or an authorized representative, preferably a senior engineer familiar with the project details, should present the proposal in a power point presentation. Hard copies of the project proposals should reach the Chairman and Members of the SEAC at least one week before the presentation.
2. The Project Proponent would prepare all the Project Reports including Form-I in consultation with a concerned environmental expert. These documents should be prepared as per guidelines of MoEF and should have all the essential features including a clear image of the location of the projects along with CCA, Catchment area, drainage pattern, elevations/topography and location of forests, water bodies and other geological features appearing in a Toposheet in a larger scale as far as possible.
3. The proposals in the present form are not suitable for consideration and the Proponent may resubmit the proposal in a modified form as suggested.
4. The following points may be taken into consideration and relevant documents may be submitted along with above documents to speed up the process of appraisal:
  - a) Evidence of Public Consultation in the form of Gram Sabha/ Palli Sabha resolution to show that the local people have a necessity and demand for such a project in the area.
  - b) Environmental sensitivity including survey of flora, fauna, endangered species, wild-life corridors etc. in at least 5km buffer zone of the MI project.
  - c) Budgetary allocation for amelioration of the environment in and around the project area amounting to at least 2% of the project cost.

- d) Provision for taking protective measures for degraded land/forests in the catchment area of the project.
- e) Flow rate in the rivulet/nala of which the weir is proposed during at least four months (monsoon rains) to ensure assured water supply to the proposed CCA during Kharif crops.
- f) Forest diversion clearance, if any, for the proposed embankment and distribution canals.

## **ITEM NO. 6**

### **SCOPING FOR CONSTRUCTION OF MALAB MI PROJECT AT VILLAGE MALAB IN THE DISTRICT OF KORAPUT WITH CCA – 40 HA.(TORS)**

The Asst. Engineer, MI Division, Rayagada of the project presented the project before SEAC.

#### **The Committee observed the following**

1. The Form-I and other enclosed documents have been prepared in an amateurish manner. The Asst. Engineer who presented the proposal was not authorized by the Project Proponent nor he was in a position to take decisions or accept suggestions or offer clarifications.
2. There was no Power Point presentation. The copies of the relevant documents including Form-I and its enclosures were not sent to any of the Members. The members were presented with only one hard copy having hazy descriptions and so the Members were not in a position to understand details of the project.
3. The Official presenting the proposals expressed that they are under an impression that TOR is not necessary for MI projects and so they have not prepared the TOR documents seriously.

#### **After detailed discussion, the committee decided the following:**

1. The Project proponent or an authorized representative, preferably a senior engineer familiar with the project details, should present the proposal in a power point presentation. Hard copies of the project proposals should reach the Chairman and Members of the SEAC at least one week before the presentation.
2. The Project Proponent would prepare all the Project Reports including Form-I in consultation with a concerned environmental expert. These documents should be prepared as per guidelines of MoEF and should have all the essential features including a clear image of the location of the projects along with CCA, Catchment area, drainage pattern, elevations/topography and location of forests, water bodies and other geological features appearing in a Toposheet in a larger scale as far as possible.
3. The proposals in the present form are not suitable for consideration and the Proponent may resubmit the proposal in a modified form as suggested.



4. The following points may be taken into consideration and relevant documents may be submitted along with above documents to speed up the process of appraisal:
  - a) Evidence of Public Consultation in the form of Gram Sabha/ Palli Sabha resolution to show that the local people have a necessity and demand for such a project in the area.
  - b) Environmental sensitivity including survey of flora, fauna, endangered species, wild-life corridors etc. in at least 5km buffer zone of the MI project.
  - c) Budgetary allocation for amelioration of the environment in and around the project area amounting to at least 2% of the project cost.
  - d) Provision for taking protective measures for degraded land/forests in the catchment area of the project.
  - e) Flow rate in the rivulet/nala of which the weir is proposed during at least four months (monsoon rains) to ensure assured water supply to the proposed CCA during Kharif crops.
  - f) Forest diversion clearance, if any, for the proposed embankment and distribution canals.

#### **ITEM NO. 7**

#### **SCOPING FOR CONSTRUCTION OF ERUKUBADI MI PROJECT AT VILLAGE ERUKUBADI IN THE DISTRICT OF KORAPUT WITH CCA – 80 HA. (TORS)**

The Asst. Engineer, MI Division, Rayagada of the project presented the project before SEAC.

#### **The Committee observed the following**

1. The Form-I and other enclosed documents have been prepared in an amateurish manner. The Asst. Engineer who presented the proposal was not authorized by the Project Proponent nor he was in a position to take decisions or accept suggestions or offer clarifications.
2. There was no Power Point presentation. The copies of the relevant documents including Form-I and its enclosures were not sent to any of the Members. The members were presented with only one hard copy having hazy descriptions and so the Members were not in a position to understand details of the project.
3. The Official presenting the proposals expressed that they are under an impression that TOR is not necessary for MI projects and so they have not prepared the TOR documents seriously.

#### **After detailed discussion, the committee decided the following:**

1. The Project proponent or an authorized representative, preferably a senior engineer familiar with the project details, should present the proposal in a power point presentation. Hard copies of the project proposals should reach the Chairman and Members of the SEAC at least one week before the presentation.

2. The Project Proponent would prepare all the Project Reports including Form-I in consultation with a concerned environmental expert. These documents should be prepared as per guidelines of MoEF and should have all the essential features including a clear image of the location of the projects along with CCA, Catchment area, drainage pattern, elevations/topography and location of forests, water bodies and other geological features appearing in a Toposheet in a larger scale as far as possible.
3. The proposals in the present form are not suitable for consideration and the Proponent may resubmit the proposal in a modified form as suggested.
4. The following points may be taken into consideration and relevant documents may be submitted along with above documents to speed up the process of appraisal:
  - a) Evidence of Public Consultation in the form of Gram Sabha/ Palli Sabha resolution to show that the local people have a necessity and demand for such a project in the area.
  - b) Environmental sensitivity including survey of flora, fauna, endangered species, wild-life corridors etc. in at least 5km buffer zone of the MI project.
  - c) Budgetary allocation for amelioration of the environment in and around the project area amounting to at least 2% of the project cost.
  - d) Provision for taking protective measures for degraded land/forests in the catchment area of the project.
  - e) Flow rate in the rivulet/nala of which the weir is proposed during at least four months (monsoon rains) to ensure assured water supply to the proposed CCA during Kharif crops.
  - f) Forest diversion clearance, if any, for the proposed embankment and distribution canals.

#### **ITEM NO. 8**

#### **SCOPING FOR CONSTRUCTION OF TANKUPADAR MI PROJECT AT VILLAGE TANKUPADAR IN THE DISTRICT OF RAYAGADA WITH CCA – 798 HA. (TORS)**

The Asst. Engineer, MI Division, Rayagada of the project presented the project before SEAC.

#### **The Committee observed the following**

1. The Form-I and other enclosed documents have been prepared in an amateurish manner. The Asst. Engineer who presented the proposal was not authorized by the Project Proponent nor he was in a position to take decisions or accept suggestions or offer clarifications.
2. There was no Power Point presentation. The copies of the relevant documents including Form-I and its enclosures were not sent to any of the Members. The members were presented with only one hard copy having hazy descriptions and so the Members were not in a position to understand details of the project.

3. The Official presenting the proposals expressed that they are under an impression that TOR is not necessary for MI projects and so they have not prepared the TOR documents seriously.

**After detailed discussion, the committee decided the following:**

1. The Project proponent or an authorized representative, preferably a senior engineer familiar with the project details, should present the proposal in a power point presentation. Hard copies of the project proposals should reach the Chairman and Members of the SEAC at least one week before the presentation.
2. The Project Proponent would prepare all the Project Reports including Form-I in consultation with a concerned environmental expert. These documents should be prepared as per guidelines of MoEF and should have all the essential features including a clear image of the location of the projects along with CCA, Catchment area, drainage pattern, elevations/topography and location of forests, water bodies and other geological features appearing in a Toposheet in a larger scale as far as possible.
3. The proposals in the present form are not suitable for consideration and the Proponent may resubmit the proposal in a modified form as suggested.
4. The following points may be taken into consideration and relevant documents may be submitted along with above documents to speed up the process of appraisal:
  - a) Evidence of Public Consultation in the form of Gram Sabha/ Palli Sabha resolution to show that the local people have a necessity and demand for such a project in the area.
  - b) Environmental sensitivity including survey of flora, fauna, endangered species, wild-life corridors etc. in at least 5km buffer zone of the MI project.
  - c) Budgetary allocation for amelioration of the environment in and around the project area amounting to at least 2% of the project cost.
  - d) Provision for taking protective measures for degraded land/forests in the catchment area of the project.
  - e) Flow rate in the rivulet/nala of which the weir is proposed during at least four months (monsoon rains) to ensure assured water supply to the proposed CCA during Kharif crops.
  - f) Forest diversion clearance, if any, for the proposed embankment and distribution canals.

**ITEM NO. 9**

**SCOPING FOR CONSTRUCTION OF KARANGA MI PROJECT AT VILLAGE KARANGA IN THE DISTRICT OF RAYAGADA WITH CCA – 140 HA. (TORS)**

The Asst. Engineer, MI Division, Rayagada of the project presented the project before SEAC.

**The Committee observed the following**

1. The Form-I and other enclosed documents have been prepared in an amateurish manner. The Asst. Engineer who presented the proposal was not authorized by the Project Proponent nor he was in a position to take decisions or accept suggestions or offer clarifications.
2. There was no Power Point presentation. The copies of the relevant documents including Form-I and its enclosures were not sent to any of the Members. The members were presented with only one hard copy having hazy descriptions and so the Members were not in a position to understand details of the project.
3. The Official presenting the proposals expressed that they are under an impression that TOR is not necessary for MI projects and so they have not prepared the TOR documents seriously.

**After detailed discussion, the committee decided the following:**

1. The Project proponent or an authorized representative, preferably a senior engineer familiar with the project details, should present the proposal in a power point presentation. Hard copies of the project proposals should reach the Chairman and Members of the SEAC at least one week before the presentation.
2. The Project Proponent would prepare all the Project Reports including Form-I in consultation with a concerned environmental expert. These documents should be prepared as per guidelines of MoEF and should have all the essential features including a clear image of the location of the projects along with CCA, Catchment area, drainage pattern, elevations/topography and location of forests, water bodies and other geological features appearing in a Toposheet in a larger scale as far as possible.
3. The proposals in the present form are not suitable for consideration and the Proponent may resubmit the proposal in a modified form as suggested.
4. The following points may be taken into consideration and relevant documents may be submitted along with above documents to speed up the process of appraisal:
  - a) Evidence of Public Consultation in the form of Gram Sabha/ Palli Sabha resolution to show that the local people have a necessity and demand for such a project in the area.
  - b) Environmental sensitivity including survey of flora, fauna, endangered species, wild-life corridors etc. in at least 5km buffer zone of the MI project.
  - c) Budgetary allocation for amelioration of the environment in and around the project area amounting to at least 2% of the project cost.
  - d) Provision for taking protective measures for degraded land/forests in the catchment area of the project.
  - e) Flow rate in the rivulet/nala of which the weir is proposed during at least four months (monsoon rains) to ensure assured water supply to the proposed CCA during Kharif crops.

- f) Forest diversion clearance, if any, for the proposed embankment and distribution canals.

## **ITEM NO. 10**

### **SCOPING FOR CONSTRUCTION OF SIKABANDHA MI PROJECT AT VILLAGE LOHARAGUDI IN THE DISTRICT OF RAYAGADA WITH CCA – 130 HA. (TORS)**

The Asst. Engineer, MI Division, Rayagada of the project presented the project before SEAC.

#### **The Committee observed the following**

1. The Form-I and other enclosed documents have been prepared in an amateurish manner. The Asst. Engineer who presented the proposal was not authorized by the Project Proponent nor he was in a position to take decisions or accept suggestions or offer clarifications.
2. There was no Power Point presentation. The copies of the relevant documents including Form-I and its enclosures were not sent to any of the Members. The members were presented with only one hard copy having hazy descriptions and so the Members were not in a position to understand details of the project.
3. The Official presenting the proposals expressed that they are under an impression that TOR is not necessary for MI projects and so they have not prepared the TOR documents seriously.

#### **After detailed discussion, the committee decided the following:**

1. The Project proponent or an authorized representative, preferably a senior engineer familiar with the project details, should present the proposal in a power point presentation. Hard copies of the project proposals should reach the Chairman and Members of the SEAC at least one week before the presentation.
2. The Project Proponent would prepare all the Project Reports including Form-I in consultation with a concerned environmental expert. These documents should be prepared as per guidelines of MoEF and should have all the essential features including a clear image of the location of the projects along with CCA, Catchment area, drainage pattern, elevations/topography and location of forests, water bodies and other geological features appearing in a Toposheet in a larger scale as far as possible.
3. The proposals in the present form are not suitable for consideration and the Proponent may resubmit the proposal in a modified form as suggested.
4. The following points may be taken into consideration and relevant documents may be submitted along with above documents to speed up the process of appraisal:
  - a) Evidence of Public Consultation in the form of Gram Sabha/ Palli Sabha resolution to show that the local people have a necessity and demand for such a project in the area.

- b) Environmental sensitivity including survey of flora, fauna, endangered species, wild-life corridors etc. in at least 5km buffer zone of the MI project.
- c) Budgetary allocation for amelioration of the environment in and around the project area amounting to at least 2% of the project cost.
- d) Provision for taking protective measures for degraded land/forests in the catchment area of the project.
- e) Flow rate in the rivulet/nala of which the weir is proposed during at least four months (monsoon rains) to ensure assured water supply to the proposed CCA during Kharif crops.
- f) Forest diversion clearance, if any, for the proposed embankment and distribution canals.

#### **ITEM NO. 11**

#### **SCOPING FOR CONSTRUCTION OF DHEPAGUDA MI PROJECT AT VILLAGE DHEPAGUDA IN THE DISTRICT OF RAYAGADA WITH CCA – 110 HA. (TORS)**

The Asst. Engineer, MI Division, Rayagada of the project presented the project before SEAC.

#### **The Committee observed the following**

1. The Form-I and other enclosed documents have been prepared in an amateurish manner. The Asst. Engineer who presented the proposal was not authorized by the Project Proponent nor he was in a position to take decisions or accept suggestions or offer clarifications.
2. There was no Power Point presentation. The copies of the relevant documents including Form-I and its enclosures were not sent to any of the Members. The members were presented with only one hard copy having hazy descriptions and so the Members were not in a position to understand details of the project.
3. The Official presenting the proposals expressed that they are under an impression that TOR is not necessary for MI projects and so they have not prepared the TOR documents seriously.

#### **After detailed discussion, the committee decided the following:**

1. The Project proponent or an authorized representative, preferably a senior engineer familiar with the project details, should present the proposal in a power point presentation. Hard copies of the project proposals should reach the Chairman and Members of the SEAC at least one week before the presentation.
2. The Project Proponent would prepare all the Project Reports including Form-I in consultation with a concerned environmental expert. These documents should be prepared as per guidelines of MoEF and should have all the essential features including a clear image of the location of the projects along with CCA, Catchment area, drainage pattern, elevations/topography and location of forests, water bodies and other geological features appearing in a Toposheet in a larger scale as far as possible.

3. The proposals in the present form are not suitable for consideration and the Proponent may resubmit the proposal in a modified form as suggested.
4. The following points may be taken into consideration and relevant documents may be submitted along with above documents to speed up the process of appraisal:
  - a) Evidence of Public Consultation in the form of Gram Sabha/ Palli Sabha resolution to show that the local people have a necessity and demand for such a project in the area.
  - b) Environmental sensitivity including survey of flora, fauna, endangered species, wild-life corridors etc. in at least 5km buffer zone of the MI project.
  - c) Budgetary allocation for amelioration of the environment in and around the project area amounting to at least 2% of the project cost.
  - d) Provision for taking protective measures for degraded land/forests in the catchment area of the project.
  - e) Flow rate in the rivulet/nala of which the weir is proposed during at least four months (monsoon rains) to ensure assured water supply to the proposed CCA during Kharif crops.
  - f) Forest diversion clearance, if any, for the proposed embankment and distribution canals.

## **ITEM NO. 12**

### **SCOPING FOR CONSTRUCTION OF KODAMA MI PROJECT AT VILLAGE KODAMA IN THE DISTRICT OF RAYAGADA WITH CCA – 230 HA. (TORS).**

The Asst. Engineer, MI Division, Rayagada of the project presented the project before SEAC.

#### **The Committee observed the following**

1. The Form-I and other enclosed documents have been prepared in an amateurish manner. The Asst. Engineer who presented the proposal was not authorized by the Project Proponent nor he was in a position to take decisions or accept suggestions or offer clarifications.
2. There was no Power Point presentation. The copies of the relevant documents including Form-I and its enclosures were not sent to any of the Members. The members were presented with only one hard copy having hazy descriptions and so the Members were not in a position to understand details of the project.
3. The Official presenting the proposals expressed that they are under an impression that TOR is not necessary for MI projects and so they have not prepared the TOR documents seriously.

#### **After detailed discussion, the committee decided the following:**

1. The Project proponent or an authorized representative, preferably a senior engineer familiar with the project details, should present the proposal in a power

- point presentation. Hard copies of the project proposals should reach the Chairman and Members of the SEAC at least one week before the presentation.
2. The Project Proponent would prepare all the Project Reports including Form-I in consultation with a concerned environmental expert. These documents should be prepared as per guidelines of MoEF and should have all the essential features including a clear image of the location of the projects along with CCA, Catchment area, drainage pattern, elevations/topography and location of forests, water bodies and other geological features appearing in a Toposheet in a larger scale as far as possible.
  3. The proposals in the present form are not suitable for consideration and the Proponent may resubmit the proposal in a modified form as suggested.
  4. The following points may be taken into consideration and relevant documents may be submitted along with above documents to speed up the process of appraisal:
    - a) Evidence of Public Consultation in the form of Gram Sabha/ Palli Sabha resolution to show that the local people have a necessity and demand for such a project in the area.
    - b) Environmental sensitivity including survey of flora, fauna, endangered species, wild-life corridors etc. in at least 5km buffer zone of the MI project.
    - c) Budgetary allocation for amelioration of the environment in and around the project area amounting to at least 2% of the project cost.
    - d) Provision for taking protective measures for degraded land/forests in the catchment area of the project.
    - e) Flow rate in the rivulet/nala of which the weir is proposed during at least four months (monsoon rains) to ensure assured water supply to the proposed CCA during Kharif crops.
    - f) Forest diversion clearance, if any, for the proposed embankment and distribution canals.

### **ITEM NO. 13**

#### **SCOPING FOR CONSTRUCTION OF BHATAPUR MI PROJECT AT VILLAGE BHATAPUR IN THE DISTRICT OF RAYAGADA WITH CCA – 480 HA. (TORS)**

The Asst. Engineer, MI Division, Rayagada of the project presented the project before SEAC.

#### **The Committee observed the following**

1. The Form-I and other enclosed documents have been prepared in an amateurish manner. The Asst. Engineer who presented the proposal was not authorized by the Project Proponent nor he was in a position to take decisions or accept suggestions or offer clarifications.
2. There was no Power Point presentation. The copies of the relevant documents including Form-I and its enclosures were not sent to any of the Members. The



members were presented with only one hard copy having hazy descriptions and so the Members were not in a position to understand details of the project.

3. The Official presenting the proposals expressed that they are under an impression that TOR is not necessary for MI projects and so they have not prepared the TOR documents seriously.

**After detailed discussion, the committee decided the following:**

1. The Project proponent or an authorized representative, preferably a senior engineer familiar with the project details, should present the proposal in a power point presentation. Hard copies of the project proposals should reach the Chairman and Members of the SEAC at least one week before the presentation.
2. The Project Proponent would prepare all the Project Reports including Form-I in consultation with a concerned environmental expert. These documents should be prepared as per guidelines of MoEF and should have all the essential features including a clear image of the location of the projects along with CCA, Catchment area, drainage pattern, elevations/topography and location of forests, water bodies and other geological features appearing in a Toposheet in a larger scale as far as possible.
3. The proposals in the present form are not suitable for consideration and the Proponent may resubmit the proposal in a modified form as suggested.
4. The following points may be taken into consideration and relevant documents may be submitted along with above documents to speed up the process of appraisal:
  - a) Evidence of Public Consultation in the form of Gram Sabha/ Palli Sabha resolution to show that the local people have a necessity and demand for such a project in the area.
  - b) Environmental sensitivity including survey of flora, fauna, endangered species, wild-life corridors etc. in at least 5km buffer zone of the MI project.
  - c) Budgetary allocation for amelioration of the environment in and around the project area amounting to at least 2% of the project cost.
  - d) Provision for taking protective measures for degraded land/forests in the catchment area of the project.
  - e) Flow rate in the rivulet/nala of which the weir is proposed during at least four months (monsoon rains) to ensure assured water supply to the proposed CCA during Kharif crops.
  - f) Forest diversion clearance, if any, for the proposed embankment and distribution canals.

## **ITEM NO. 14**

### **SCOPING FOR CONSTRUCTION OF ANDHARINALLA MI PROJECT AT VILLAGE SAHADA IN THE DISTRICT OF RAYAGADA WITH CCA – 142 HA.(TORS)**

The Asst. Engineer, MI Division, Rayagada of the project presented the project before SEAC.

#### **The Committee observed the following**

1. The Form-I and other enclosed documents have been prepared in an amateurish manner. The Asst. Engineer who presented the proposal was not authorized by the Project Proponent nor he was in a position to take decisions or accept suggestions or offer clarifications.
2. There was no Power Point presentation. The copies of the relevant documents including Form-I and its enclosures were not sent to any of the Members. The members were presented with only one hard copy having hazy descriptions and so the Members were not in a position to understand details of the project.
3. The Official presenting the proposals expressed that they are under an impression that TOR is not necessary for MI projects and so they have not prepared the TOR documents seriously.

#### **After detailed discussion, the committee decided the following:**

1. The Project proponent or an authorized representative, preferably a senior engineer familiar with the project details, should present the proposal in a power point presentation. Hard copies of the project proposals should reach the Chairman and Members of the SEAC at least one week before the presentation.
2. The Project Proponent would prepare all the Project Reports including Form-I in consultation with a concerned environmental expert. These documents should be prepared as per guidelines of MoEF and should have all the essential features including a clear image of the location of the projects along with CCA, Catchment area, drainage pattern, elevations/topography and location of forests, water bodies and other geological features appearing in a Toposheet in a larger scale as far as possible.
3. The proposals in the present form are not suitable for consideration and the Proponent may resubmit the proposal in a modified form as suggested.
4. The following points may be taken into consideration and relevant documents may be submitted along with above documents to speed up the process of appraisal:
  - a) Evidence of Public Consultation in the form of Gram Sabha/ Palli Sabha resolution to show that the local people have a necessity and demand for such a project in the area.
  - b) Environmental sensitivity including survey of flora, fauna, endangered species, wild-life corridors etc. in at least 5km buffer zone of the MI project.
  - c) Budgetary allocation for amelioration of the environment in and around the project area amounting to at least 2% of the project cost.

- d) Provision for taking protective measures for degraded land/forests in the catchment area of the project.
- g) Flow rate in the rivulet/nala of which the weir is proposed during at least four months (monsoon rains) to ensure assured water supply to the proposed CCA during Kharif crops.
- h) Forest diversion clearance, if any, for the proposed embankment and distribution canals.

## **ITEM NO. 15**

### **SCOPING FOR CONSTRUCTION OF KUMBHARABADI MI PROJECT AT VILLAGE MUMBHARBADI IN THE DISTRICT OF RAYAGADA WITH CCA – 100 HA.(TORS)**

The Asst. Engineer, MI Division, Rayagada of the project presented the project before SEAC.

#### **The Committee observed the following**

1. The Form-I and other enclosed documents have been prepared in an amateurish manner. The Asst. Engineer who presented the proposal was not authorized by the Project Proponent nor he was in a position to take decisions or accept suggestions or offer clarifications.
2. There was no Power Point presentation. The copies of the relevant documents including Form-I and its enclosures were not sent to any of the Members. The members were presented with only one hard copy having hazy descriptions and so the Members were not in a position to understand details of the project.
3. The Official presenting the proposals expressed that they are under an impression that TOR is not necessary for MI projects and so they have not prepared the TOR documents seriously.

#### **After detailed discussion, the committee decided the following.**

1. The Project proponent or an authorized representative, preferably a senior engineer familiar with the project details, should present the proposal in a power point presentation. Hard copies of the project proposals should reach the Chairman and Members of the SEAC at least one week before the presentation.
2. The Project Proponent would prepare all the Project Reports including Form-I in consultation with a concerned environmental expert. These documents should be prepared as per guidelines of MoEF and should have all the essential features including a clear image of the location of the projects along with CCA, Catchment area, drainage pattern, elevations/topography and location of forests, water bodies and other geological features appearing in a Toposheet in a larger scale as far as possible.
3. The proposals in the present form are not suitable for consideration and the Proponent may resubmit the proposal in a modified form as suggested.

4. The following points may be taken into consideration and relevant documents may be submitted along with above documents to speed up the process of appraisal:
  - a) Evidence of Public Consultation in the form of Gram Sabha/ Palli Sabha resolution to show that the local people have a necessity and demand for such a project in the area.
  - b) Environmental sensitivity including survey of flora, fauna, endangered species, wild-life corridors etc. in at least 5km buffer zone of the MI project.
  - c) Budgetary allocation for amelioration of the environment in and around the project area amounting to at least 2% of the project cost.
  - d) Provision for taking protective measures for degraded land/forests in the catchment area of the project.
  - e) Flow rate in the rivulet/nala of which the weir is proposed during at least four months (monsoon rains) to ensure assured water supply to the proposed CCA during Kharif crops.
  - f) Forest diversion clearance, if any, for the proposed embankment and distribution canals.

#### **ITEM NO. 16**

#### **SCOPING FOR CONSTRUCTION OF LAXMIPUR MI PROJECT AT VILLAGE LAXMIPUR IN THE DISTRICT OF RAYAGADA WITH CCA – 202 HA.(TORS)**

The Asst. Engineer, MI Division, Rayagada of the project presented the project before SEAC.

#### **The Committee observed the following**

1. The Form-I and other enclosed documents have been prepared in an amateurish manner. The Asst. Engineer who presented the proposal was not authorized by the Project Proponent nor he was in a position to take decisions or accept suggestions or offer clarifications.
2. There was no Power Point presentation. The copies of the relevant documents including Form-I and its enclosures were not sent to any of the Members. The members were presented with only one hard copy having hazy descriptions and so the Members were not in a position to understand details of the project.
3. The Official presenting the proposals expressed that they are under an impression that TOR is not necessary for MI projects and so they have not prepared the TOR documents seriously.

#### **After detailed discussion, the committee decided the following:**

1. The Project proponent or an authorized representative, preferably a senior engineer familiar with the project details, should present the proposal in a power point presentation. Hard copies of the project proposals should reach the Chairman and Members of the SEAC at least one week before the presentation.

2. The Project Proponent would prepare all the Project Reports including Form-I in consultation with a concerned environmental expert. These documents should be prepared as per guidelines of MoEF and should have all the essential features including a clear image of the location of the projects along with CCA, Catchment area, drainage pattern, elevations/topography and location of forests, water bodies and other geological features appearing in a Toposheet in a larger scale as far as possible.
3. The proposals in the present form are not suitable for consideration and the Proponent may resubmit the proposal in a modified form as suggested.
4. The following points may be taken into consideration and relevant documents may be submitted along with above documents to speed up the process of appraisal:
  - a) Evidence of Public Consultation in the form of Gram Sabha/ Palli Sabha resolution to show that the local people have a necessity and demand for such a project in the area.
  - b) Environmental sensitivity including survey of flora, fauna, endangered species, wild-life corridors etc. in at least 5km buffer zone of the MI project.
  - c) Budgetary allocation for amelioration of the environment in and around the project area amounting to at least 2% of the project cost.
  - d) Provision for taking protective measures for degraded land/forests in the catchment area of the project.
  - e) Flow rate in the rivulet/nala of which the weir is proposed during at least four months (monsoon rains) to ensure assured water supply to the proposed CCA during Kharif crops.
  - f) Forest diversion clearance, if any, for the proposed embankment and distribution canals.

**ITEM NO. 17**

**SCOPING FOR CONSTRUCTION OF GOIGUDA MI PROJECT AT VILLAGE GOIGUDA IN THE DISTRICT OF RAYAGADA WITH CCA – 250 HA. (TORS)**

The Asst. Engineer, MI Division, Rayagada of the project presented the project before SEAC.

**The Committee observed the following**

1. The Form-I and other enclosed documents have been prepared in an amateurish manner. The Asst. Engineer who presented the proposal was not authorized by the Project Proponent nor he was in a position to take decisions or accept suggestions or offer clarifications.
2. There was no Power Point presentation. The copies of the relevant documents including Form-I and its enclosures were not sent to any of the Members. The members were presented with only one hard copy having hazy descriptions and so the Members were not in a position to understand details of the project.

3. The Official presenting the proposals expressed that they are under an impression that TOR is not necessary for MI projects and so they have not prepared the TOR documents seriously.

**After detailed discussion, the committee decided the following:**

1. The Project proponent or an authorized representative, preferably a senior engineer familiar with the project details, should present the proposal in a power point presentation. Hard copies of the project proposals should reach the Chairman and Members of the SEAC at least one week before the presentation.
2. The Project Proponent would prepare all the Project Reports including Form-I in consultation with a concerned environmental expert. These documents should be prepared as per guidelines of MoEF and should have all the essential features including a clear image of the location of the projects along with CCA, Catchment area, drainage pattern, elevations/topography and location of forests, water bodies and other geological features appearing in a Toposheet in a larger scale as far as possible.
3. The proposals in the present form are not suitable for consideration and the Proponent may resubmit the proposal in a modified form as suggested.
4. The following points may be taken into consideration and relevant documents may be submitted along with above documents to speed up the process of appraisal:
  - a) Evidence of Public Consultation in the form of Gram Sabha/ Palli Sabha resolution to show that the local people have a necessity and demand for such a project in the area.
  - b) Environmental sensitivity including survey of flora, fauna, endangered species, wild-life corridors etc. in at least 5km buffer zone of the MI project.
  - c) Budgetary allocation for amelioration of the environment in and around the project area amounting to at least 2% of the project cost.
  - d) Provision for taking protective measures for degraded land/forests in the catchment area of the project.
  - e) Flow rate in the rivulet/nala of which the weir is proposed during at least four months (monsoon rains) to ensure assured water supply to the proposed CCA during Kharif crops.
  - f) Forest diversion clearance, if any, for the proposed embankment and distribution canals.

**ITEM NO. 18**

**SCOPING FOR CONSTRUCTION OF NEHURUPANGA MI PROJECT AT VILLAGE NEHURUPANGA IN THE DISTRICT OF RAYAGADA WITH CCA 660 HA. (TORS)**

The Asst. Engineer, MI Division, Rayagada of the project presented the project before SEAC.

**The Committee observed the following**

1. The Form-I and other enclosed documents have been prepared in an amateurish manner. The Asst. Engineer who presented the proposal was not authorized by the Project Proponent nor he was in a position to take decisions or accept suggestions or offer clarifications.
2. There was no Power Point presentation. The copies of the relevant documents including Form-I and its enclosures were not sent to any of the Members. The members were presented with only one hard copy having hazy descriptions and so the Members were not in a position to understand details of the project.
3. The Official presenting the proposals expressed that they are under an impression that TOR is not necessary for MI projects and so they have not prepared the TOR documents seriously.

**After detailed discussion, the committee decided the following:**

1. The Project proponent or an authorized representative, preferably a senior engineer familiar with the project details, should present the proposal in a power point presentation. Hard copies of the project proposals should reach the Chairman and Members of the SEAC at least one week before the presentation.
2. The Project Proponent would prepare all the Project Reports including Form-I in consultation with a concerned environmental expert. These documents should be prepared as per guidelines of MoEF and should have all the essential features including a clear image of the location of the projects along with CCA, Catchment area, drainage pattern, elevations/topography and location of forests, water bodies and other geological features appearing in a Toposheet in a larger scale as far as possible.
3. The proposals in the present form are not suitable for consideration and the Proponent may resubmit the proposal in a modified form as suggested.
4. The following points may be taken into consideration and relevant documents may be submitted along with above documents to speed up the process of appraisal:
  - a) Evidence of Public Consultation in the form of Gram Sabha/ Palli Sabha resolution to show that the local people have a necessity and demand for such a project in the area.
  - b) Environmental sensitivity including survey of flora, fauna, endangered species, wild-life corridors etc. in at least 5km buffer zone of the MI project.
  - c) Budgetary allocation for amelioration of the environment in and around the project area amounting to at least 2% of the project cost.
  - d) Provision for taking protective measures for degraded land/forests in the catchment area of the project.
  - e) Flow rate in the rivulet/nala of which the weir is proposed during at least four months (monsoon rains) to ensure assured water supply to the proposed CCA during Kharif crops.

- f) Forest diversion clearance, if any, for the proposed embankment and distribution canals.

## **ITEM NO. 19**

### **SCOPING FOR CONSTRUCTION OF LUCHIPADA MI PROJECT AT VILLAGE HARIGUDA IN THE DISTRICT OF RAYAGADA WITH CCA – 100 HA. (TORS)**

The Asst. Engineer, MI Division, Rayagada of the project presented the project before SEAC.

#### **The Committee observed the following**

1. The Form-I and other enclosed documents have been prepared in an amateurish manner. The Asst. Engineer who presented the proposal was not authorized by the Project Proponent nor he was in a position to take decisions or accept suggestions or offer clarifications.
2. There was no Power Point presentation. The copies of the relevant documents including Form-I and its enclosures were not sent to any of the Members. The members were presented with only one hard copy having hazy descriptions and so the Members were not in a position to understand details of the project.
3. The Official presenting the proposals expressed that they are under an impression that TOR is not necessary for MI projects and so they have not prepared the TOR documents seriously.

#### **After detailed discussion, the committee decided the following:**

1. The Project proponent or an authorized representative, preferably a senior engineer familiar with the project details, should present the proposal in a power point presentation. Hard copies of the project proposals should reach the Chairman and Members of the SEAC at least one week before the presentation
2. The Project Proponent would prepare all the Project Reports including Form-I in consultation with a concerned environmental expert. These documents should be prepared as per guidelines of MoEF and should have all the essential features including a clear image of the location of the projects along with CCA, Catchment area, drainage pattern, elevations/topography and location of forests, water bodies and other geological features appearing in a Toposheet in a larger scale as far as possible.
3. The proposals in the present form are not suitable for consideration and the Proponent may resubmit the proposal in a modified form as suggested.
4. The following points may be taken into consideration and relevant documents may be submitted along with above documents to speed up the process of appraisal:
  - a) Evidence of Public Consultation in the form of Gram Sabha/ Palli Sabha resolution to show that the local people have a necessity and demand for such a project in the area.
  - b) Environmental sensitivity including survey of flora, fauna, endangered species, wild-life corridors etc. in at least 5km buffer zone of the MI project.



- c) Budgetary allocation for amelioration of the environment in and around the project area amounting to at least 2% of the project cost.
- d) Provision for taking protective measures for degraded land/forests in the catchment area of the project.
- e) Flow rate in the rivulet/nala of which the weir is proposed during at least four months (monsoon rains) to ensure assured water supply to the proposed CCA during Kharif crops.
- f) Forest diversion clearance, if any, for the proposed embankment and distribution canals.

## **ITEM NO. 20**

### **SCOPING FOR CONSTRUCTION OF KUMBHARSILLA MI PROJECT AT VILLAGE GOUDAGUDA IN THE DISTRICT OF RAYAGADA WITH CCA – 100 HA. (TORS)**

The Asst. Engineer, MI Division, Rayagada of the project presented the project before SEAC.

#### **The Committee observed the following**

1. The Form-I and other enclosed documents have been prepared in an amateurish manner. The Asst. Engineer who presented the proposal was not authorized by the Project Proponent nor he was in a position to take decisions or accept suggestions or offer clarifications.
2. There was no Power Point presentation. The copies of the relevant documents including Form-I and its enclosures were not sent to any of the Members. The members were presented with only one hard copy having hazy descriptions and so the Members were not in a position to understand details of the project.
3. The Official presenting the proposals expressed that they are under an impression that TOR is not necessary for MI projects and so they have not prepared the TOR documents seriously.

#### **After detailed discussion, the committee decided the following:**

1. The Project proponent or an authorized representative, preferably a senior engineer familiar with the project details, should present the proposal in a power point presentation. Hard copies of the project proposals should reach the Chairman and Members of the SEAC at least one week before the presentation.
2. The Project Proponent would prepare all the Project Reports including Form-I in consultation with a concerned environmental expert. These documents should be prepared as per guidelines of MoEF and should have all the essential features including a clear image of the location of the projects along with CCA, Catchment area, drainage pattern, elevations/topography and location of forests, water bodies and other geological features appearing in a Toposheet in a larger scale as far as possible.
3. The proposals in the present form are not suitable for consideration and the Proponent may resubmit the proposal in a modified form as suggested.

4. The following points may be taken into consideration and relevant documents may be submitted along with above documents to speed up the process of appraisal:
  - a) Evidence of Public Consultation in the form of Gram Sabha/ Palli Sabha resolution to show that the local people have a necessity and demand for such a project in the area.
  - b) Environmental sensitivity including survey of flora, fauna, endangered species, wild-life corridors etc. in at least 5km buffer zone of the MI project.
  - c) Budgetary allocation for amelioration of the environment in and around the project area amounting to at least 2% of the project cost.
  - d) Provision for taking protective measures for degraded land/forests in the catchment area of the project.
  - e) Flow rate in the rivulet/nala of which the weir is proposed during at least four months (monsoon rains) to ensure assured water supply to the proposed CCA during Kharif crops.
  - f) Forest diversion clearance, if any, for the proposed embankment and distribution canals.

**Day Two : 20<sup>th</sup> November, 2010**

**ITEM NO. 21**

**SCOPING FOR CONSTRUCTION OF MUDRABEDA M.I. PROJECT AT VILLAGE MUKTAPUR IN THE DISTRICT OF KEONJHAR WITH CCA – 170 HA. (TORS)**

The proponent did not come for the presentation meeting. The committee decided to defer the proposal to next meeting. However, the committee observed the following.

1. The Form-I and other enclosed documents have been prepared in an amateurish manner.
2. The copies of the relevant documents including Form-I and its enclosures were not sent to any of the Members.
3. They have not prepared the TOR documents seriously.

**After detailed discussion, the committee decided the following:**

1. The Project proponent or an authorized representative, preferably a senior engineer familiar with the project details, should present the proposal in a power point presentation. Hard copies of the project proposals should reach the Chairman and Members of the SEAC at least one week before the presentation.
2. The Project Proponent would prepare all the Project Reports including Form-I in consultation with a concerned environmental expert. These documents should be prepared as per guidelines of MoEF and should have all the essential features including a clear image of the location of the projects along with CCA, Catchment area, drainage pattern, elevations/topography and location of forests, water bodies and other geological features appearing in a Toposheet in a larger scale as far as possible.

3. The proposals in the present form are not suitable for consideration and the Proponent may resubmit the proposal in a modified form as suggested.
4. The following points may be taken into consideration and relevant documents may be submitted along with above documents to speed up the process of appraisal:
  - a) Evidence of Public Consultation in the form of Gram Sabha/ Palli Sabha resolution to show that the local people have a necessity and demand for such a project in the area.
  - b) Environmental sensitivity including survey of flora, fauna, endangered species, wild-life corridors etc. in at least 5km buffer zone of the MI project.
  - c) Budgetary allocation for amelioration of the environment in and around the project area amounting to at least 2% of the project cost.
  - d) Provision for taking protective measures for degraded land/forests in the catchment area of the project.
  - e) Flow rate in the rivulet/nala of which the weir is proposed during at least four months (monsoon rains) to ensure assured water supply to the proposed CCA during Kharif crops.
  - f) Forest diversion clearance, if any, for the proposed embankment and distribution canals.

#### **ITEM NO. 22**

#### **SCOPING FOR CONSTRUCTION OF MANKADACHUA MI PROJECT AT VILLAGE BASANTAPUR IN THE DISTRICT OF KEONJHAR WITH CCA – 78 HA. (TORS)**

The proponent did not come for the presentation meeting. The committee decided to defer the proposal to next meeting. However, the committee observed the following.

1. The Form-I and other enclosed documents have been prepared in an amateurish manner.
2. The copies of the relevant documents including Form-I and its enclosures were not sent to any of the Members.
3. They have not prepared the TOR documents seriously.

#### **After detailed discussion, the committee decided the following:**

1. The Project proponent or an authorized representative, preferably a senior engineer familiar with the project details, should present the proposal in a power point presentation. Hard copies of the project proposals should reach the Chairman and Members of the SEAC at least one week before the presentation.
2. The Project Proponent would prepare all the Project Reports including Form-I in consultation with a concerned environmental expert. These documents should be prepared as per guidelines of MoEF and should have all the essential features including a clear image of the location of the projects along with CCA, Catchment area, drainage pattern, elevations/topography and location of forests, water bodies and other geological features appearing in a Toposheet in a larger scale as far as possible.
3. The proposals in the present form are not suitable for consideration and the Proponent may resubmit the proposal in a modified form as suggested.

4. The following points may be taken into consideration and relevant documents may be submitted along with above documents to speed up the process of appraisal:
  - a) Evidence of Public Consultation in the form of Gram Sabha/ Palli Sabha resolution to show that the local people have a necessity and demand for such a project in the area.
  - b) Environmental sensitivity including survey of flora, fauna, endangered species, wild-life corridors etc. in at least 5km buffer zone of the MI project.
  - c) Budgetary allocation for amelioration of the environment in and around the project area amounting to at least 2% of the project cost.
  - d) Provision for taking protective measures for degraded land/forests in the catchment area of the project.
  - e) Flow rate in the rivulet/nala of which the weir is proposed during at least four months (monsoon rains) to ensure assured water supply to the proposed CCA during Kharif crops.
  - f) Forest diversion clearance, if any, for the proposed embankment and distribution canals.

#### **ITEM NO. 23**

#### **SCOPING FOR CONSTRUCTION OF HUNDULA MI PROJECT AT VILLAGE HUNDULA IN THE DISTRICT OF KEONJHAR WITH CCA – 315 HA. (TORS)**

The proponent did not come for the presentation meeting. The committee decided to defer the proposal to next meeting. However, the committee observed the following.

1. The Form-I and other enclosed documents have been prepared in an amateurish manner.
2. The copies of the relevant documents including Form-I and its enclosures were not sent to any of the Members.
3. They have not prepared the TOR documents seriously.

#### **After detailed discussion, the committee decided the following:**

1. The Project proponent or an authorized representative, preferably a senior engineer familiar with the project details, should present the proposal in a power point presentation. Hard copies of the project proposals should reach the Chairman and Members of the SEAC at least one week before the presentation.
2. The Project Proponent would prepare all the Project Reports including Form-I in consultation with a concerned environmental expert. These documents should be prepared as per guidelines of MoEF and should have all the essential features including a clear image of the location of the projects along with CCA, Catchment area, drainage pattern, elevations/topography and location of forests, water bodies and other geological features appearing in a Toposheet in a larger scale as far as possible.
3. The proposals in the present form are not suitable for consideration and the Proponent may resubmit the proposal in a modified form as suggested.

4. The following points may be taken into consideration and relevant documents may be submitted along with above documents to speed up the process of appraisal:
  - a) Evidence of Public Consultation in the form of Gram Sabha/ Palli Sabha resolution to show that the local people have a necessity and demand for such a project in the area.
  - b) Environmental sensitivity including survey of flora, fauna, endangered species, wild-life corridors etc. in at least 5km buffer zone of the MI project.
  - c) Budgetary allocation for amelioration of the environment in and around the project area amounting to at least 2% of the project cost.
  - d) Provision for taking protective measures for degraded land/forests in the catchment area of the project.
  - e) Flow rate in the rivulet/nala of which the weir is proposed during at least four months (monsoon rains) to ensure assured water supply to the proposed CCA during Kharif crops.
  - f) Forest diversion clearance, if any, for the proposed embankment and distribution canals.

#### **ITEM NO. 24**

#### **SCOPING FOR CONSTRUCTION OF NAYAKOTE MI PROJECT AT VILLAGE NAYAKOTE IN THE DISTRICT OF KEONJHAR WITH CCA – 100 HA. (TORS)**

The proponent did not come for the presentation meeting. The committee decided to defer the proposal to next meeting. However, the committee observed the following.

1. The Form-I and other enclosed documents have been prepared in an amateurish manner.
2. The copies of the relevant documents including Form-I and its enclosures were not sent to any of the Members.
3. They have not prepared the TOR documents seriously.

#### **After detailed discussion, the committee decided the following:**

1. The Project proponent or an authorized representative, preferably a senior engineer familiar with the project details, should present the proposal in a power point presentation. Hard copies of the project proposals should reach the Chairman and Members of the SEAC at least one week before the presentation.
2. The Project Proponent would prepare all the Project Reports including Form-I in consultation with a concerned environmental expert. These documents should be prepared as per guidelines of MoEF and should have all the essential features including a clear image of the location of the projects along with CCA, Catchment area, drainage pattern, elevations/topography and location of forests, water bodies and other geological features appearing in a Toposheet in a larger scale as far as possible.
3. The proposals in the present form are not suitable for consideration and the Proponent may resubmit the proposal in a modified form as suggested.

4. The following points may be taken into consideration and relevant documents may be submitted along with above documents to speed up the process of appraisal:
  - a) Evidence of Public Consultation in the form of Gram Sabha/ Palli Sabha resolution to show that the local people have a necessity and demand for such a project in the area.
  - b) Environmental sensitivity including survey of flora, fauna, endangered species, wild-life corridors etc. in at least 5km buffer zone of the MI project.
  - c) Budgetary allocation for amelioration of the environment in and around the project area amounting to at least 2% of the project cost.
  - d) Provision for taking protective measures for degraded land/forests in the catchment area of the project.
  - e) Flow rate in the rivulet/nala of which the weir is proposed during at least four months (monsoon rains) to ensure assured water supply to the proposed CCA during Kharif crops.
  - f) Forest diversion clearance, if any, for the proposed embankment and distribution canals.

**ITEM NO. 25**

**SCOPING FOR CONSTRUCTION OF DUDHUPOSI MI PROJECT AT VILLAGE DUDHUPOSI IN THE DISTRICT OF KEONJHAR WITH CCA – 84 HA. (TORS)**

The proponent did not come for the presentation meeting. The committee decided to defer the proposal to next meeting. However, the committee observed the following.

1. The Form-I and other enclosed documents have been prepared in an amateurish manner.
2. The copies of the relevant documents including Form-I and its enclosures were not sent to any of the Members.
3. They have not prepared the TOR documents seriously.

**After detailed discussion, the committee decided the following:**

1. The Project proponent or an authorized representative, preferably a senior engineer familiar with the project details, should present the proposal in a power point presentation. Hard copies of the project proposals should reach the Chairman and Members of the SEAC at least one week before the presentation.
2. The Project Proponent would prepare all the Project Reports including Form-I in consultation with a concerned environmental expert. These documents should be prepared as per guidelines of MoEF and should have all the essential features including a clear image of the location of the projects along with CCA, Catchment area, drainage pattern, elevations/topography and location of forests, water bodies and other geological features appearing in a Toposheet in a larger scale as far as possible.
3. The proposals in the present form are not suitable for consideration and the Proponent may resubmit the proposal in a modified form as suggested.
4. The following points may be taken into consideration and relevant documents may be submitted along with above documents to speed up the process of appraisal:

- a) Evidence of Public Consultation in the form of Gram Sabha/ Palli Sabha resolution to show that the local people have a necessity and demand for such a project in the area.
- b) Environmental sensitivity including survey of flora, fauna, endangered species, wild-life corridors etc. in at least 5km buffer zone of the MI project.
- c) Budgetary allocation for amelioration of the environment in and around the project area amounting to at least 2% of the project cost.
- d) Provision for taking protective measures for degraded land/forests in the catchment area of the project.
- e) Flow rate in the rivulet/nala of which the weir is proposed during at least four months (monsoon rains) to ensure assured water supply to the proposed CCA during Kharif crops.
- f) Forest diversion clearance, if any, for the proposed embankment and distribution canals.

#### **ITEM NO. 26**

#### **SCOPING FOR CONSTRUCTION OF UKCHABEDA MI PROJECT AT VILLAGE BASANTPUR IN THE DISTRICT OF KEONJHAR WITH CCA – 78 HA. (TORS)**

The proponent did not come for the presentation meeting. The committee decided to defer the proposal to next meeting. However, the committee observed the following.

1. The Form-I and other enclosed documents have been prepared in an amateurish manner.
2. The copies of the relevant documents including Form-I and its enclosures were not sent to any of the Members.
3. They have not prepared the TOR documents seriously.

#### **After detailed discussion, the committee decided the following:**

1. The Project proponent or an authorized representative, preferably a senior engineer familiar with the project details, should present the proposal in a power point presentation. Hard copies of the project proposals should reach the Chairman and Members of the SEAC at least one week before the presentation.
2. The Project Proponent would prepare all the Project Reports including Form-I in consultation with a concerned environmental expert. These documents should be prepared as per guidelines of MoEF and should have all the essential features including a clear image of the location of the projects along with CCA, Catchment area, drainage pattern, elevations/topography and location of forests, water bodies and other geological features appearing in a Toposheet in a larger scale as far as possible.
3. The proposals in the present form are not suitable for consideration and the Proponent may resubmit the proposal in a modified form as suggested.
4. The following points may be taken into consideration and relevant documents may be submitted along with above documents to speed up the process of appraisal:
  - a) Evidence of Public Consultation in the form of Gram Sabha/ Palli Sabha resolution to show that the local people have a necessity and demand for such a project in the area.

- b) Environmental sensitivity including survey of flora, fauna, endangered species, wild-life corridors etc. in at least 5km buffer zone of the MI project.
- c) Budgetary allocation for amelioration of the environment in and around the project area amounting to at least 2% of the project cost.
- d) Provision for taking protective measures for degraded land/forests in the catchment area of the project.
- e) Flow rate in the rivulet/nala of which the weir is proposed during at least four months (monsoon rains) to ensure assured water supply to the proposed CCA during Kharif crops.
- f) Forest diversion clearance, if any, for the proposed embankment and distribution canals.

**ITEM NO. 27**

**SCOPING FOR CONSTRUCTION OF TALADIHI MI PROJECT AT VILLAGE SAMAGIRI IN THE DISTRICT OF KEONJHAR WITH CCA – 140 HA.(TORS)**

The proponent did not come for the presentation meeting. The committee decided to defer the proposal to next meeting. However, the committee observed the following.

1. The Form-I and other enclosed documents have been prepared in an amateurish manner.
2. The copies of the relevant documents including Form-I and its enclosures were not sent to any of the Members.
3. They have not prepared the TOR documents seriously.

**After detailed discussion, the committee decided the following:**

1. The Project proponent or an authorized representative, preferably a senior engineer familiar with the project details, should present the proposal in a power point presentation. Hard copies of the project proposals should reach the Chairman and Members of the SEAC at least one week before the presentation.
2. The Project Proponent would prepare all the Project Reports including Form-I in consultation with a concerned environmental expert. These documents should be prepared as per guidelines of MoEF and should have all the essential features including a clear image of the location of the projects along with CCA, Catchment area, drainage pattern, elevations/topography and location of forests, water bodies and other geological features appearing in a Toposheet in a larger scale as far as possible.
3. The proposals in the present form are not suitable for consideration and the Proponent may resubmit the proposal in a modified form as suggested.
4. The following points may be taken into consideration and relevant documents may be submitted along with above documents to speed up the process of appraisal:
  - a) Evidence of Public Consultation in the form of Gram Sabha/ Palli Sabha resolution to show that the local people have a necessity and demand for such a project in the area.
  - b) Environmental sensitivity including survey of flora, fauna, endangered species, wild-life corridors etc. in at least 5km buffer zone of the MI project



- c) Budgetary allocation for amelioration of the environment in and around the project area amounting to at least 2% of the project cost.
- d) Provision for taking protective measures for degraded land/forests in the catchment area of the project.
- e) Flow rate in the rivulet/nala of which the weir is proposed during at least four months (monsoon rains) to ensure assured water supply to the proposed CCA during Kharif crops.
- f) Forest diversion clearance, if any, for the proposed embankment and distribution canals.

#### **ITEM NO. 28**

#### **SCOPING FOR CONSTRUCTION OF PUTUGAON MI PROJECT AT VILLAGE PUTUGAON IN THE DISTRICT OF KEONJHAR WITH CCA – 120 HA. (TORS)**

The proponent did not come for the presentation meeting. The committee decided to defer the proposal to next meeting. However, the committee observed the following.

- 1. The Form-I and other enclosed documents have been prepared in an amateurish manner.
- 2. The copies of the relevant documents including Form-I and its enclosures were not sent to any of the Members.
- 3. They have not prepared the TOR documents seriously.

#### **After detailed discussion, the committee decided the following:**

- 1. The Project proponent or an authorized representative, preferably a senior engineer familiar with the project details, should present the proposal in a power point presentation. Hard copies of the project proposals should reach the Chairman and Members of the SEAC at least one week before the presentation.
- 2. The Project Proponent would prepare all the Project Reports including Form-I in consultation with a concerned environmental expert. These documents should be prepared as per guidelines of MoEF and should have all the essential features including a clear image of the location of the projects along with CCA, Catchment area, drainage pattern, elevations/topography and location of forests, water bodies and other geological features appearing in a Toposheet in a larger scale as far as possible.
- 3. The proposals in the present form are not suitable for consideration and the Proponent may resubmit the proposal in a modified form as suggested.
- 4. The following points may be taken into consideration and relevant documents submitted along with above documents to speed up the process of appraisal:
  - a) Evidence of Public Consultation in the form of Gram Sabha/ Palli Sabha resolution to show that the local people have a necessity and demand for such a project in the area.
  - b) Environmental sensitivity including survey of flora, fauna, endangered species, wild-life corridors etc. in at least 5km buffer zone of the MI project.
  - c) Budgetary allocation for amelioration of the environment in and around the project area amounting to at least 2% of the project cost.
  - d) Provision for taking protective measures for degraded land/forests in the catchment area of the project.

- e) Flow rate in the rivulet/nala of which the weir is proposed during at least four months (monsoon rains) to ensure assured water supply to the proposed CCA during Kharif crops.
- f) Forest diversion clearance, if any, for the proposed embankment and distribution canals.

#### **ITEM NO. 29**

#### **SCOPING FOR CONSTRUCTION OF RANIJORE IRRIGATION PROJECT IN SARANDAPALI VILLAGE IN THE DISTRICT OF BARGARH WITH CCA – 4125 HA. (TORS).**

The proponent intimated that they received the letter of intimation late i.e. on 18.11.2010 for which TOR, PFR, application form in shape of booklet and power point presentation was not possible to submit to the Expert Members within the scheduled time period. Further, they intimated that the concerned Chief Engineer and Consultant are out of headquarters to outside the State on official transaction. They requested that another suitable date for discussion and presentation before the State Level Expert Appraisal Committee may please be fixed. The committee decided to consider the request of the proponent and deferred the proposal to next meeting. However, the committee observed the following.

1. The Form-I and other enclosed documents have been prepared in an amateurish manner. .
2. They have not prepared the TOR documents seriously.

#### **After detailed discussion, the committee decided the following:**

1. The Project proponent or an authorized representative, preferably a senior engineer familiar with the project details, should present the proposal in a power point presentation. Hard copies of the project proposals should reach the Chairman and Members of the SEAC at least one week before the presentation.
2. The Project Proponent would prepare all the Project Reports including Form-I in consultation with a concerned environmental expert. These documents should be prepared as per guidelines of MoEF and should have all the essential features including a clear image of the location of the projects along with CCA, Catchment area, drainage pattern, elevations/topography and location of forests, water bodies and other geological features appearing in a Toposheet in a larger scale as far as possible.
3. The proposals in the present form are not suitable for consideration and the Proponent may resubmit the proposal in a modified form as suggested.
4. The following points may be taken into consideration and relevant documents may be submitted along with above documents to speed up the process of appraisal
  - a) Evidence of Public Consultation in the form of Gram Sabha/ Palli Sabha resolution to show that the local people have a necessity and demand for such a project in the area.

- b) Environmental sensitivity including survey of flora, fauna, endangered species, wild-life corridors etc. in at least 5km buffer zone of the MI project.
- c) Budgetary allocation for amelioration of the environment in and around the project area amounting to at least 2% of the project cost.
- d) Provision for taking protective measures for degraded land/forests in the catchment area of the project.
- e) Flow rate in the rivulet/nala of which the weir is proposed during at least four months (monsoon rains) to ensure assured water supply to the proposed CCA during Kharif crops.
- f) Forest diversion clearance, if any, for the proposed embankment and distribution canals.

### **ITEM NO. 30**

#### **SCOPING FOR CONSTRUCTION OF MAHULPUT M.I. PROJECT AT VILLAGE MAHULPUR IN THE DISTRICT OF KORAPUT WITH CCA – 130 HA. (TORS)**

The Asst. Engineer, MI Sub-Division, Koraput of the project presented the project before SEAC.

#### **The Committee observed the following**

1. The Form-I and other enclosed documents have been prepared in an amateurish manner. The Asst. Engineer who presented the proposal was not authorized by the Project Proponent nor he was in a position to take decisions or accept suggestions or offer clarifications.
2. There was no Power Point presentation. The copies of the relevant documents including Form-I and its enclosures were not sent to any of the Members. The members were presented with only one hard copy having hazy descriptions and so the Members were not in a position to understand details of the project.
3. The Official presenting the proposals expressed that they are under an impression that TOR is not necessary for MI projects and so they have not prepared the TOR documents seriously.

#### **After detailed discussion, the committee decided the following:**

1. The Project proponent or an authorized representative, preferably a senior engineer familiar with the project details, should present the proposal in a power point presentation. Hard copies of the project proposals should reach the Chairman and Members of the SEAC at least one week before the presentation.
2. The Project Proponent would prepare all the Project Reports including Form-I in consultation with a concerned environmental expert. These documents should be prepared as per guidelines of MoEF and should have all the essential features including a clear image of the location of the projects along with CCA, Catchment area, drainage pattern, elevations/topography and location of forests, water bodies and other geological features appearing in a Toposheet in a larger scale as far as possible.
3. The proposals in the present form are not suitable for consideration and the Proponent may resubmit the proposal in a modified form as suggested.

4. The following points may be taken into consideration and relevant documents may be submitted along with above documents to speed up the process of appraisal:
  - a) Evidence of Public Consultation in the form of Gram Sabha/ Palli Sabha resolution to show that the local people have a necessity and demand for such a project in the area.
  - b) Environmental sensitivity including survey of flora, fauna, endangered species, wild-life corridors etc. in at least 5km buffer zone of the MI project.
  - c) Budgetary allocation for amelioration of the environment in and around the project area amounting to at least 2% of the project cost.
  - d) Provision for taking protective measures for degraded land/forests in the catchment area of the project.
  - e) Flow rate in the rivulet/nala of which the weir is proposed during at least four months (monsoon rains) to ensure assured water supply to the proposed CCA during Kharif crops.
  - f) Forest diversion clearance, if any, for the proposed embankment and distribution canals.

#### **ITEM NO. 31**

#### **SCOPING FOR CONSTRUCTION OF MUNDAGUDA M.I. PROJECT AT VILLAGE MUNDAGUDA IN THE DISTRICT OF KORAPUT WITH CCA – 94 HA. (TORS)**

The Asst. Engineer, MI Sub-Division, Koraput of the project presented the project before SEAC.

#### **The Committee observed the following**

1. The Form-I and other enclosed documents have been prepared in an amateurish manner. The Asst. Engineer who presented the proposal was not authorized by the Project Proponent nor he was in a position to take decisions or accept suggestions or offer clarifications.
2. There was no Power Point presentation. The copies of the relevant documents including Form-I and its enclosures were not sent to any of the Members. The members were presented with only one hard copy having hazy descriptions and so the Members were not in a position to understand details of the project.
3. The Official presenting the proposals expressed that they are under an impression that TOR is not necessary for MI projects and so they have not prepared the TOR documents seriously.

#### **After detailed discussion, the committee decided the following:**

1. The Project proponent or an authorized representative, preferably a senior engineer familiar with the project details, should present the proposal in a power point presentation. Hard copies of the project proposals should reach the Chairman and Members of the SEAC at least one week before the presentation.
2. The Project Proponent would prepare all the Project Reports including Form-I in consultation with a concerned environmental expert. These documents should be

- prepared as per guidelines of MoEF and should have all the essential features including a clear image of the location of the projects along with CCA, Catchment area, drainage pattern, elevations/topography and location of forests, water bodies and other geological features appearing in a Toposheet in a larger scale as far as possible.
3. The proposals in the present form are not suitable for consideration and the Proponent may resubmit the proposal in a modified form as suggested.
  4. The following points may be taken into consideration and relevant documents may be submitted along with above documents to speed up the process of appraisal:
    - a) Evidence of Public Consultation in the form of Gram Sabha/ Palli Sabha resolution to show that the local people have a necessity and demand for such a project in the area.
    - b) Environmental sensitivity including survey of flora, fauna, endangered species, wild-life corridors etc. in at least 5km buffer zone of the MI project.
    - c) Budgetary allocation for amelioration of the environment in and around the project area amounting to at least 2% of the project cost.
    - d) Provision for taking protective measures for degraded land/forests in the catchment area of the project.
    - e) Flow rate in the rivulet/nala of which the weir is proposed during at least four months (monsoon rains) to ensure assured water supply to the proposed CCA during Kharif crops.
    - f) Forest diversion clearance, if any, for the proposed embankment and distribution canals.

### **ITEM NO. 32**

#### **SCOPING FOR CONSTRUCTION OF BARIAGUDA MI PROJECT AT VILLAGE BARIAGUDA IN THE DISTRICT OF KORAPUT WITH CCA – 130 HA. (TORS)**

The Asst. Engineer, MI Sub-Division, Koraput of the project presented the project before SEAC.

#### **The Committee observed the following**

1. The Form-I and other enclosed documents have been prepared in an amateurish manner. The Asst. Engineer who presented the proposal was not authorized by the Project Proponent nor he was in a position to take decisions or accept suggestions or offer clarifications.
2. There was no Power Point presentation. The copies of the relevant documents including Form-I and its enclosures were not sent to any of the Members. The members were presented with only one hard copy having hazy descriptions and so the Members were not in a position to understand details of the project.
4. The Official presenting the proposals expressed that they are under an impression that TOR is not necessary for MI projects and so they have not prepared the TOR documents seriously.

**After detailed discussion, the committee decided the following:**

1. The Project proponent or an authorized representative, preferably a senior engineer familiar with the project details, should present the proposal in a power point presentation. Hard copies of the project proposals should reach the Chairman and Members of the SEAC at least one week before the presentation.
2. The Project Proponent would prepare all the Project Reports including Form-I in consultation with a concerned environmental expert. These documents should be prepared as per guidelines of MoEF and should have all the essential features including a clear image of the location of the projects along with CCA, Catchment area, drainage pattern, elevations/topography and location of forests, water bodies and other geological features appearing in a Toposheet in a larger scale as far as possible.
3. The proposals in the present form are not suitable for consideration and the Proponent may resubmit the proposal in a modified form as suggested.
4. The following points may be taken into consideration and relevant documents may be submitted along with above documents to speed up the process of appraisal:
  - a) Evidence of Public Consultation in the form of Gram Sabha/ Palli Sabha resolution to show that the local people have a necessity and demand for such a project in the area.
  - b) Environmental sensitivity including survey of flora, fauna, endangered species, wild-life corridors etc. in at least 5km buffer zone of the MI project.
  - c) Budgetary allocation for amelioration of the environment in and around the project area amounting to at least 2% of the project cost.
  - d) Provision for taking protective measures for degraded land/forests in the catchment area of the project.
  - e) Flow rate in the rivulet/nala of which the weir is proposed during at least four months (monsoon rains) to ensure assured water supply to the proposed CCA during Kharif crops.
  - f) Forest diversion clearance, if any, for the proposed embankment and distribution canals.

**ITEM NO. 33**

**SCOPING FOR CONSTRUCTION OF TILLEYE MI PROJECT AT VILLAGE TILLEYE IN THE DISTRICT OF MAYURBHANJ WITH CCA – 500 HA. (TORS)**

The Asst. Engineer, MI Sub-Division, Mayurbhanj of the project presented the project before SEAC.

**The Committee observed the following**

1. The Form-I and other enclosed documents have been prepared in an amateurish manner. The Asst. Engineer who presented the proposal was not authorized by the Project Proponent nor he was in a position to take decisions or accept suggestions or offer clarifications.

2. There was no Power Point presentation. The copies of the relevant documents including Form-I and its enclosures were not sent to any of the Members. The members were presented with only one hard copy having hazy descriptions and so the Members were not in a position to understand details of the project.
3. The Official presenting the proposals expressed that they are under an impression that TOR is not necessary for MI projects and so they have not prepared the TOR documents seriously.

**After detailed discussion, the committee decided the following:**

1. The Project proponent or an authorized representative, preferably a senior engineer familiar with the project details, should present the proposal in a power point presentation. Hard copies of the project proposals should reach the Chairman and Members of the SEAC at least one week before the presentation.
2. The Project Proponent would prepare all the Project Reports including Form-I in consultation with a concerned environmental expert. These documents should be prepared as per guidelines of MoEF and should have all the essential features including a clear image of the location of the projects along with CCA, Catchment area, drainage pattern, elevations/topography and location of forests, water bodies and other geological features appearing in a Toposheet in a larger scale as far as possible.
3. The proposals in the present form are not suitable for consideration and the Proponent may resubmit the proposal in a modified form as suggested.
4. The following points may be taken into consideration and relevant documents may be submitted along with above documents to speed up the process of appraisal:
  - a) Evidence of Public Consultation in the form of Gram Sabha/ Palli Sabha resolution to show that the local people have a necessity and demand for such a project in the area.
  - b) Environmental sensitivity including survey of flora, fauna, endangered species, wild-life corridors etc. in at least 5km buffer zone of the MI project.
  - c) Budgetary allocation for amelioration of the environment in and around the project area amounting to at least 2% of the project cost.
  - d) Provision for taking protective measures for degraded land/forests in the catchment area of the project.
  - e) Flow rate in the rivulet/nala of which the weir is proposed during at least four months (monsoon rains) to ensure assured water supply to the proposed CCA during Kharif crops.
  - f) Forest diversion clearance, if any, for the proposed embankment and distribution canals.

## **ITEM NO. 34**

### **SCOPING FOR CONSTRUCTION OF ASTAJHARAN MI PROJECT AT VILLAGE ASTAJHARAN IN THE DISTRICT OF MAYURBHANJ WITH CCA – 60 HA. (TORS)**

The Asst. Engineer, MI Sub-Division, Mayurbhanj of the project presented the project before SEAC.

#### **The Committee observed the following**

1. The Form-I and other enclosed documents have been prepared in an amateurish manner. The Asst. Engineer who presented the proposal was not authorized by the Project Proponent nor he was in a position to take decisions or accept suggestions or offer clarifications.
2. There was no Power Point presentation. The copies of the relevant documents including Form-I and its enclosures were not sent to any of the Members. The members were presented with only one hard copy having hazy descriptions and so the Members were not in a position to understand details of the project.
3. The Official presenting the proposals expressed that they are under an impression that TOR is not necessary for MI projects and so they have not prepared the TOR documents seriously.

#### **After detailed discussion, the committee decided the following:**

1. The Project proponent or an authorized representative, preferably a senior engineer familiar with the project details, should present the proposal in a power point presentation. Hard copies of the project proposals should reach the Chairman and Members of the SEAC at least one week before the presentation.
2. The Project Proponent would prepare all the Project Reports including Form-I in consultation with a concerned environmental expert. These documents should be prepared as per guidelines of MoEF and should have all the essential features including a clear image of the location of the projects along with CCA, Catchment area, drainage pattern, elevations/topography and location of forests, water bodies and other geological features appearing in a Toposheet in a larger scale as far as possible.
3. The proposals in the present form are not suitable for consideration and the Proponent may resubmit the proposal in a modified form as suggested.
4. The following points may be taken into consideration and relevant documents may be submitted along with above documents to speed up the process of appraisal:
  - a) Evidence of Public Consultation in the form of Gram Sabha/ Palli Sabha resolution to show that the local people have a necessity and demand for such a project in the area.
  - b) Environmental sensitivity including survey of flora, fauna, endangered species, wild-life corridors etc. in at least 5km buffer zone of the MI project.
  - c) Budgetary allocation for amelioration of the environment in and around the project area amounting to at least 2% of the project cost.



- d) Provision for taking protective measures for degraded land/forests in the catchment area of the project.
- e) Flow rate in the rivulet/nala of which the weir is proposed during at least four months (monsoon rains) to ensure assured water supply to the proposed CCA during Kharif crops.
- f) Forest diversion clearance, if any, for the proposed embankment and distribution canals.

### **ITEM NO. 35**

#### **SCOPING FOR CONSTRUCTION OF ARJUNBILLA MI PROJECT AT VILLAGE ARJUNBILLA IN THE DISTRICT OF MAYURBHANJ WITH CCA – 55 HA. (TORS)**

The Asst. Engineer, MI Sub-Division, Mayurbhanj of the project presented the project before SEAC.

#### **The Committee observed the following**

1. The Form-I and other enclosed documents have been prepared in an amateurish manner. The Asst. Engineer who presented the proposal was not authorized by the Project Proponent nor he was in a position to take decisions or accept suggestions or offer clarifications.
2. There was no Power Point presentation. The copies of the relevant documents including Form-I and its enclosures were not sent to any of the Members. The members were presented with only one hard copy having hazy descriptions and so the Members were not in a position to understand details of the project.
3. The Official presenting the proposals expressed that they are under an impression that TOR is not necessary for MI projects and so they have not prepared the TOR documents seriously.

#### **After detailed discussion, the committee decided the following:**

1. The Project proponent or an authorized representative, preferably a senior engineer familiar with the project details, should present the proposal in a power point presentation. Hard copies of the project proposals should reach the Chairman and Members of the SEAC at least one week before the presentation.
2. The Project Proponent would prepare all the Project Reports including Form-I in consultation with a concerned environmental expert. These documents should be prepared as per guidelines of MoEF and should have all the essential features including a clear image of the location of the projects along with CCA, Catchment area, drainage pattern, elevations/topography and location of forests, water bodies and other geological features appearing in a Toposheet in a larger scale as far as possible.
3. The proposals in the present form are not suitable for consideration and the Proponent may resubmit the proposal in a modified form as suggested.
4. The following points may be taken into consideration and relevant documents may be submitted along with above documents to speed up the process of appraisal:

- a) Evidence of Public Consultation in the form of Gram Sabha/ Palli Sabha resolution to show that the local people have a necessity and demand for such a project in the area.
- b) Environmental sensitivity including survey of flora, fauna, endangered species, wild-life corridors etc. in at least 5km buffer zone of the MI project.
- c) Budgetary allocation for amelioration of the environment in and around the project area amounting to at least 2% of the project cost.
- d) Provision for taking protective measures for degraded land/forests in the catchment area of the project.
- e) Flow rate in the rivulet/nala of which the weir is proposed during at least four months (monsoon rains) to ensure assured water supply to the proposed CCA during Kharif crops.
- f) Forest diversion clearance, if any, for the proposed embankment and distribution canals.

### **ITEM NO. 36**

#### **SCOPING FOR CONSTRUCTION OF OSADOLA MI PROJECT AT VILLAGE OSADOLA IN THE DISTRICT OF MAYURBHANJ WITH CCA – 100 HA. (TORS)**

The Asst. Engineer, MI Sub-Division, Mayurbhanj of the project presented the project before SEAC.

#### **The Committee observed the following**

1. The Form-I and other enclosed documents have been prepared in an amateurish manner. The Asst. Engineer who presented the proposal was not authorized by the Project Proponent nor he was in a position to take decisions or accept suggestions or offer clarifications.
2. There was no Power Point presentation. The copies of the relevant documents including Form-I and its enclosures were not sent to any of the Members. The members were presented with only one hard copy having hazy descriptions and so the Members were not in a position to understand details of the project.
3. The Official presenting the proposals expressed that they are under an impression that TOR is not necessary for MI projects and so they have not prepared the TOR documents seriously.

#### **After detailed discussion, the committee decided the following:**

1. The Project proponent or an authorized representative, preferably a senior engineer familiar with the project details, should present the proposal in a power point presentation. Hard copies of the project proposals should reach the Chairman and Members of the SEAC at least one week before the presentation.
2. The Project Proponent would prepare all the Project Reports including Form-I in consultation with a concerned environmental expert. These documents should be prepared as per guidelines of MoEF and should have all the essential features including a clear image of the location of the projects along with CCA, Catchment area, drainage pattern, elevations/topography and location of forests, water

bodies and other geological features appearing in a Toposheet in a larger scale as far as possible.

3. The proposals in the present form are not suitable for consideration and the Proponent may resubmit the proposal in a modified form as suggested.
4. The following points may be taken into consideration and relevant documents may be submitted along with above documents to speed up the process of appraisal:
  - a) Evidence of Public Consultation in the form of Gram Sabha/ Palli Sabha resolution to show that the local people have a necessity and demand for such a project in the area.
  - b) Environmental sensitivity including survey of flora, fauna, endangered species, wild-life corridors etc. in at least 5km buffer zone of the MI project.
  - c) Budgetary allocation for amelioration of the environment in and around the project area amounting to at least 2% of the project cost.
  - d) Provision for taking protective measures for degraded land/forests in the catchment area of the project.
  - e) Flow rate in the rivulet/nala of which the weir is proposed during at least four months (monsoon rains) to ensure assured water supply to the proposed CCA during Kharif crops.
  - f) Forest diversion clearance, if any, for the proposed embankment and distribution canals.

#### **ITEM NO. 37**

#### **SCOPING FOR CONSTRUCTION OF BAGHIA MI PROJECT AT VILLAGE BAGHIA IN THE DISTRICT OF MAYURBHANJ WITH CCA – 330 HA. (TORS)**

The Asst. Engineer, MI Sub-Division, Mayurbhanj of the project presented the project before SEAC.

#### **The Committee observed the following**

1. The Form-I and other enclosed documents have been prepared in an amateurish manner. The Asst. Engineer who presented the proposal was not authorized by the Project Proponent nor he was in a position to take decisions or accept suggestions or offer clarifications.
2. There was no Power Point presentation. The copies of the relevant documents including Form-I and its enclosures were not sent to any of the Members. The members were presented with only one hard copy having hazy descriptions and so the Members were not in a position to understand details of the project.
3. The Official presenting the proposals expressed that they are under an impression that TOR is not necessary for MI projects and so they have not prepared the TOR documents seriously.

#### **After detailed discussion, the committee decided the following:**

1. The Project proponent or an authorized representative, preferably a senior engineer familiar with the project details, should present the proposal in a power

- point presentation. Hard copies of the project proposals should reach the Chairman and Members of the SEAC at least one week before the presentation.
2. The Project Proponent would prepare all the Project Reports including Form-I in consultation with a concerned environmental expert. These documents should be prepared as per guidelines of MoEF and should have all the essential features including a clear image of the location of the projects along with CCA, Catchment area, drainage pattern, elevations/topography and location of forests, water bodies and other geological features appearing in a Toposheet in a larger scale as far as possible.
  3. The proposals in the present form are not suitable for consideration and the Proponent may resubmit the proposal in a modified form as suggested.
  4. The following points may be taken into consideration and relevant documents may be submitted along with above documents to speed up the process of appraisal:
    - a) Evidence of Public Consultation in the form of Gram Sabha/ Palli Sabha resolution to show that the local people have a necessity and demand for such a project in the area.
    - b) Environmental sensitivity including survey of flora, fauna, endangered species, wild-life corridors etc. in at least 5km buffer zone of the MI project.
    - c) Budgetary allocation for amelioration of the environment in and around the project area amounting to at least 2% of the project cost.
    - d) Provision for taking protective measures for degraded land/forests in the catchment area of the project.
    - e) Flow rate in the rivulet/nala of which the weir is proposed during at least four months (monsoon rains) to ensure assured water supply to the proposed CCA during Kharif crops.
    - f) Forest diversion clearance, if any, for the proposed embankment and distribution canals.

### **ITEM NO. 38**

#### **SCOPING FOR CONSTRUCTION OF DULKINALLA MI PROJECT AT VILLAGE KARTIASAHI IN THE DISTRICT OF MAYURBHANJ WITH CCA – 55 HA. (TORS)**

The Asst. Engineer, MI Sub-Division, Mayurbhanj of the project presented the project before SEAC.

#### **The Committee observed the following**

1. The Form-I and other enclosed documents have been prepared in an amateurish manner. The Asst. Engineer who presented the proposal was not authorized by the Project Proponent nor he was in a position to take decisions or accept suggestions or offer clarifications.
2. There was no Power Point presentation. The copies of the relevant documents including Form-I and its enclosures were not sent to any of the Members. The

members were presented with only one hard copy having hazy descriptions and so the Members were not in a position to understand details of the project.

3. The Official presenting the proposals expressed that they are under an impression that TOR is not necessary for MI projects and so they have not prepared the TOR documents seriously.

**After detailed discussion, the committee decided the following:**

1. The Project proponent or an authorized representative, preferably a senior engineer familiar with the project details, should present the proposal in a power point presentation. Hard copies of the project proposals should reach the Chairman and Members of the SEAC at least one week before the presentation.
2. The Project Proponent would prepare all the Project Reports including Form-I in consultation with a concerned environmental expert. These documents should be prepared as per guidelines of MoEF and should have all the essential features including a clear image of the location of the projects along with CCA, Catchment area, drainage pattern, elevations/topography and location of forests, water bodies and other geological features appearing in a Toposheet in a larger scale as far as possible.
3. The proposals in the present form are not suitable for consideration and the Proponent may resubmit the proposal in a modified form as suggested.
4. The following points may be taken into consideration and relevant documents may be submitted along with above documents to speed up the process of appraisal:
  - a) Evidence of Public Consultation in the form of Gram Sabha/ Palli Sabha resolution to show that the local people have a necessity and demand for such a project in the area.
  - b) Environmental sensitivity including survey of flora, fauna, endangered species, wild-life corridors etc. in at least 5km buffer zone of the MI project.
  - c) Budgetary allocation for amelioration of the environment in and around the project area amounting to at least 2% of the project cost.
  - d) Provision for taking protective measures for degraded land/forests in the catchment area of the project.
  - e) Flow rate in the rivulet/nala of which the weir is proposed during at least four months (monsoon rains) to ensure assured water supply to the proposed CCA during Kharif crops.
  - f) Forest diversion clearance, if any, for the proposed embankment and distribution canals.

**ITEM NO. 39**

**SCOPING FOR CONSTRUCTION OF HATIMODA MI PROJECT AT VILLAGE HATIMODA IN THE DISTRICT OF MAYURBHANJ WITH CCA – 100 HA. (TORS)**

The Asst. Engineer, MI Sub-Division, Mayurbhanj of the project presented the project before SEAC.

### **The Committee observed the following**

1. The Form-I and other enclosed documents have been prepared in an amateurish manner. The Asst. Engineer who presented the proposal was not authorized by the Project Proponent nor he was in a position to take decisions or accept suggestions or offer clarifications.
2. There was no Power Point presentation. The copies of the relevant documents including Form-I and its enclosures were not sent to any of the Members. The members were presented with only one hard copy having hazy descriptions and so the Members were not in a position to understand details of the project.
3. The Official presenting the proposals expressed that they are under an impression that TOR is not necessary for MI projects and so they have not prepared the TOR documents seriously.

### **After detailed discussion, the committee decided the following:**

1. The Project proponent or an authorized representative, preferably a senior engineer familiar with the project details, should present the proposal in a power point presentation. Hard copies of the project proposals should reach the Chairman and Members of the SEAC at least one week before the presentation.
2. The Project Proponent would prepare all the Project Reports including Form-I in consultation with a concerned environmental expert. These documents should be prepared as per guidelines of MoEF and should have all the essential features including a clear image of the location of the projects along with CCA, Catchment area, drainage pattern, elevations/topography and location of forests, water bodies and other geological features appearing in a Toposheet in a larger scale as far as possible.
3. The proposals in the present form are not suitable for consideration and the Proponent may resubmit the proposal in a modified form as suggested.
4. The following points may be taken into consideration and relevant documents may be submitted along with above documents to speed up the process of appraisal:
  - a) Evidence of Public Consultation in the form of Gram Sabha/ Palli Sabha resolution to show that the local people have a necessity and demand for such a project in the area.
  - b) Environmental sensitivity including survey of flora, fauna, endangered species, wild-life corridors etc. in at least 5km buffer zone of the MI project.
  - c) Budgetary allocation for amelioration of the environment in and around the project area amounting to at least 2% of the project cost.
  - d) Provision for taking protective measures for degraded land/forests in the catchment area of the project.
  - e) Flow rate in the rivulet/nala of which the weir is proposed during at least four months (monsoon rains) to ensure assured water supply to the proposed CCA during Kharif crops.

- f) Forest diversion clearance, if any, for the proposed embankment and distribution canals.

#### **ITEM NO. 40**

#### **SCOPING FOR CONSTRUCTION OF SANKHABHANGA MI PROJECT AT VILLAGE SANKHABHANGA IN THE DISTRICT OF MAYURBHANJ WITH CCA - 300 HA. (TORS)**

The Asst. Engineer, MI Sub-Division, Mayurbhanj of the project presented the project before SEAC.

#### **The Committee observed the following**

1. The Form-I and other enclosed documents have been prepared in an amateurish manner. The Asst. Engineer who presented the proposal was not authorized by the Project Proponent nor he was in a position to take decisions or accept suggestions or offer clarifications.
2. There was no Power Point presentation. The copies of the relevant documents including Form-I and its enclosures were not sent to any of the Members. The members were presented with only one hard copy having hazy descriptions and so the Members were not in a position to understand details of the project.
3. The Official presenting the proposals expressed that they are under an impression that TOR is not necessary for MI projects and so they have not prepared the TOR documents seriously.

#### **After detailed discussion, the committee decided the following:**

1. The Project proponent or an authorized representative, preferably a senior engineer familiar with the project details, should present the proposal in a power point presentation. Hard copies of the project proposals should reach the Chairman and Members of the SEAC at least one week before the presentation.
2. The Project Proponent would prepare all the Project Reports including Form-I in consultation with a concerned environmental expert. These documents should be prepared as per guidelines of MoEF and should have all the essential features including a clear image of the location of the projects along with CCA, Catchment area, drainage pattern, elevations/topography and location of forests, water bodies and other geological features appearing in a Toposheet in a larger scale as far as possible.
3. The proposals in the present form are not suitable for consideration and the Proponent may resubmit the proposal in a modified form as suggested.
4. The following points may be taken into consideration and relevant documents may be submitted along with above documents to speed up the process of appraisal:
  - a) Evidence of Public Consultation in the form of Gram Sabha/ Palli Sabha resolution to show that the local people have a necessity and demand for such a project in the area.

- b) Environmental sensitivity including survey of flora, fauna, endangered species, wild-life corridors etc. in at least 5km buffer zone of the MI project.
- c) Budgetary allocation for amelioration of the environment in and around the project area amounting to at least 2% of the project cost.
- d) Provision for taking protective measures for degraded land/forests in the catchment area of the project.
- e) Flow rate in the rivulet/nala of which the weir is proposed during at least four months (monsoon rains) to ensure assured water supply to the proposed CCA during Kharif crops.
- f) Forest diversion clearance, if any, for the proposed embankment and distribution canals.

#### **ITEM NO. 41**

#### **SCOPING FOR CONSTRUCTION OF GHAGARDA MI PROJECT AT VILLAGE KRUSHNAPUR IN THE DISTRICT OF MAYURBHANJ WITH CCA - 28 HA. (TORS)**

The Asst. Engineer, MI Sub-Division, Mayurbhanj of the project presented the project before SEAC.

#### **The Committee observed the following**

1. The Form-I and other enclosed documents have been prepared in an amateurish manner. The Asst. Engineer who presented the proposal was not authorized by the Project Proponent nor he was in a position to take decisions or accept suggestions or offer clarifications.
2. There was no Power Point presentation. The copies of the relevant documents including Form-I and its enclosures were not sent to any of the Members. The members were presented with only one hard copy having hazy descriptions and so the Members were not in a position to understand details of the project.
3. The Official presenting the proposals expressed that they are under an impression that TOR is not necessary for MI projects and so they have not prepared the TOR documents seriously.

#### **After detailed discussion, the committee decided the following:**

1. The Project proponent or an authorized representative, preferably a senior engineer familiar with the project details, should present the proposal in a power point presentation. Hard copies of the project proposals should reach the Chairman and Members of the SEAC at least one week before the presentation.
2. The Project Proponent would prepare all the Project Reports including Form-I in consultation with a concerned environmental expert. These documents should be prepared as per guidelines of MoEF and should have all the essential features including a clear image of the location of the projects along with CCA, Catchment area, drainage pattern, elevations/topography and location of forests, water bodies and other geological features appearing in a Toposheet in a larger scale as far as possible.



3. The proposals in the present form are not suitable for consideration and the Proponent may resubmit the proposal in a modified form as suggested.
4. The following points may be taken into consideration and relevant documents may be submitted along with above documents to speed up the process of appraisal:
  - a) Evidence of Public Consultation in the form of Gram Sabha/ Palli Sabha resolution to show that the local people have a necessity and demand for such a project in the area.
  - b) Environmental sensitivity including survey of flora, fauna, endangered species, wild-life corridors etc. in at least 5km buffer zone of the MI project.
  - c) Budgetary allocation for amelioration of the environment in and around the project area amounting to at least 2% of the project cost.
  - d) Provision for taking protective measures for degraded land/forests in the catchment area of the project.
  - e) Flow rate in the rivulet/nala of which the weir is proposed during at least four months (monsoon rains) to ensure assured water supply to the proposed CCA during Kharif crops.
  - f) Forest diversion clearance, if any, for the proposed embankment and distribution canals.

#### **ITEM NO. 42**

#### **SCOPING FOR CONSTRUCTION OF INDUPUR MI PROJECT AT VILLAGE INDUPUR IN THE DISTRICT OF MAYURBHANJ WITH CCA – 110 HA. (TORS)**

The Asst. Engineer, MI Sub-Division, Mayurbhanj of the project presented the project before SEAC.

#### **The Committee observed the following**

1. The Form-I and other enclosed documents have been prepared in an amateurish manner. The Asst. Engineer who presented the proposal was not authorized by the Project Proponent nor he was in a position to take decisions or accept suggestions or offer clarifications.
2. There was no Power Point presentation. The copies of the relevant documents including Form-I and its enclosures were not sent to any of the Members. The members were presented with only one hard copy having hazy descriptions and so the Members were not in a position to understand details of the project.
3. The Official presenting the proposals expressed that they are under an impression that TOR is not necessary for MI projects and so they have not prepared the TOR documents seriously.

#### **After detailed discussion, the committee decided the following:**

1. The Project proponent or an authorized representative, preferably a senior engineer familiar with the project details, should present the proposal in a power point presentation. Hard copies of the project proposals should reach the Chairman and Members of the SEAC at least one week before the presentation.

2. The Project Proponent would prepare all the Project Reports including Form-I in consultation with a concerned environmental expert. These documents should be prepared as per guidelines of MoEF and should have all the essential features including a clear image of the location of the projects along with CCA, Catchment area, drainage pattern, elevations/topography and location of forests, water bodies and other geological features appearing in a Toposheet in a larger scale as far as possible.
3. The proposals in the present form are not suitable for consideration and the Proponent may resubmit the proposal in a modified form as suggested.
4. The following points may be taken into consideration and relevant documents may be submitted along with above documents to speed up the process of appraisal:
  - a) Evidence of Public Consultation in the form of Gram Sabha/ Palli Sabha resolution to show that the local people have a necessity and demand for such a project in the area.
  - b) Environmental sensitivity including survey of flora, fauna, endangered species, wild-life corridors etc. in at least 5km buffer zone of the MI project.
  - c) Budgetary allocation for amelioration of the environment in and around the project area amounting to at least 2% of the project cost.
  - d) Provision for taking protective measures for degraded land/forests in the catchment area of the project.
  - e) Flow rate in the rivulet/nala of which the weir is proposed during at least four months (monsoon rains) to ensure assured water supply to the proposed CCA during Kharif crops.
  - f) Forest diversion clearance, if any, for the proposed embankment and distribution canals.

#### **ITEM NO. 43**

#### **SCOPING FOR CONSTRUCTION OF SIMNALLA MI PROJECT AT VILLAGE KELOPOSI IN THE DISTRICT OF MAYURBHANJ WITH CCA – 60 HA. (TORS)**

The Asst. Engineer, MI Sub-Division, Mayurbhanj of the project presented the project before SEAC.

#### **The Committee observed the following**

1. The Form-I and other enclosed documents have been prepared in an amateurish manner. The Asst. Engineer who presented the proposal was not authorized by the Project Proponent nor he was in a position to take decisions or accept suggestions or offer clarifications.
2. There was no Power Point presentation. The copies of the relevant documents including Form-I and its enclosures were not sent to any of the Members. The members were presented with only one hard copy having hazy descriptions and so the Members were not in a position to understand details of the project.

3. The Official presenting the proposals expressed that they are under an impression that TOR is not necessary for MI projects and so they have not prepared the TOR documents seriously.

**After detailed discussion, the committee decided the following:**

1. The Project proponent or an authorized representative, preferably a senior engineer familiar with the project details, should present the proposal in a power point presentation. Hard copies of the project proposals should reach the Chairman and Members of the SEAC at least one week before the presentation.
2. The Project Proponent would prepare all the Project Reports including Form-I in consultation with a concerned environmental expert. These documents should be prepared as per guidelines of MoEF and should have all the essential features including a clear image of the location of the projects along with CCA, Catchment area, drainage pattern, elevations/topography and location of forests, water bodies and other geological features appearing in a Toposheet in a larger scale as far as possible.
3. The proposals in the present form are not suitable for consideration and the Proponent may resubmit the proposal in a modified form as suggested.
4. The following points may be taken into consideration and relevant documents may be submitted along with above documents to speed up the process of appraisal:
  - a) Evidence of Public Consultation in the form of Gram Sabha/ Palli Sabha resolution to show that the local people have a necessity and demand for such a project in the area.
  - b) Environmental sensitivity including survey of flora, fauna, endangered species, wild-life corridors etc. in at least 5km buffer zone of the MI project.
  - c) Budgetary allocation for amelioration of the environment in and around the project area amounting to at least 2% of the project cost.
  - d) Provision for taking protective measures for degraded land/forests in the catchment area of the project.
  - e) Flow rate in the rivulet/nala of which the weir is proposed during at least four months (monsoon rains) to ensure assured water supply to the proposed CCA during Kharif crops.
  - f) Forest diversion clearance, if any, for the proposed embankment and distribution canals

**ITEM NO. 44**

**SCOPING FOR CONSTRUCTION OF KHANDACHIRA MI PROJECT AT VILLAGE KHANDACHIRA IN THE DISTRICT OF MAYURBHANJ WITH CCA - 55 HA. (TORS)**

The Asst. Engineer, MI Sub-Division, Mayurbhanj of the project presented the project before SEAC.

**The Committee observed the following**

1. The Form-I and other enclosed documents have been prepared in an amateurish manner. The Asst. Engineer who presented the proposal was not authorized by the Project Proponent nor he was in a position to take decisions or accept suggestions or offer clarifications.
2. There was no Power Point presentation. The copies of the relevant documents including Form-I and its enclosures were not sent to any of the Members. The members were presented with only one hard copy having hazy descriptions and so the Members were not in a position to understand details of the project.
3. The Official presenting the proposals expressed that they are under an impression that TOR is not necessary for MI projects and so they have not prepared the TOR documents seriously.

**After detailed discussion, the committee decided the following:**

1. The Project proponent or an authorized representative, preferably a senior engineer familiar with the project details, should present the proposal in a power point presentation. Hard copies of the project proposals should reach the Chairman and Members of the SEAC at least one week before the presentation.
2. The Project Proponent would prepare all the Project Reports including Form-I in consultation with a concerned environmental expert. These documents should be prepared as per guidelines of MoEF and should have all the essential features including a clear image of the location of the projects along with CCA, Catchment area, drainage pattern, elevations/topography and location of forests, water bodies and other geological features appearing in a Toposheet in a larger scale as far as possible.
3. The proposals in the present form are not suitable for consideration and the Proponent may resubmit the proposal in a modified form as suggested.
4. The following points may be taken into consideration and relevant documents may be submitted along with above documents to speed up the process of appraisal:
  - a) Evidence of Public Consultation in the form of Gram Sabha/ Palli Sabha resolution to show that the local people have a necessity and demand for such a project in the area.
  - b) Environmental sensitivity including survey of flora, fauna, endangered species, wild-life corridors etc. in at least 5km buffer zone of the MI project.
  - c) Budgetary allocation for amelioration of the environment in and around the project area amounting to at least 2% of the project cost.
  - d) Provision for taking protective measures for degraded land/forests in the catchment area of the project.

- e) Flow rate in the rivulet/nala of which the weir is proposed during at least four months (monsoon rains) to ensure assured water supply to the proposed CCA during Kharif crops.
- f) Forest diversion clearance, if any, for the proposed embankment and distribution canals.

#### **ITEM NO. 45**

#### **SCOPING FOR CONSTRUCTION OF TIKARBATI MI PROJECT AT VILLAGE TIKARBATI IN THE DISTRICT OF MAYURBHANJ WITH CCA – 75 HA. (TORS)**

The Asst. Engineer, MI Sub-Division, Mayurbhanj of the project presented the project before SEAC.

#### **The Committee observed the following**

1. The Form-I and other enclosed documents have been prepared in an amateurish manner. The Asst. Engineer who presented the proposal was not authorized by the Project Proponent nor he was in a position to take decisions or accept suggestions or offer clarifications.
2. There was no Power Point presentation. The copies of the relevant documents including Form-I and its enclosures were not sent to any of the Members. The members were presented with only one hard copy having hazy descriptions and so the Members were not in a position to understand details of the project.
3. The Official presenting the proposals expressed that they are under an impression that TOR is not necessary for MI projects and so they have not prepared the TOR documents seriously.

#### **After detailed discussion, the committee decided the following:**

1. The Project proponent or an authorized representative, preferably a senior engineer familiar with the project details, should present the proposal in a power point presentation. Hard copies of the project proposals should reach the Chairman and Members of the SEAC at least one week before the presentation.
2. The Project Proponent would prepare all the Project Reports including Form-I in consultation with a concerned environmental expert. These documents should be prepared as per guidelines of MoEF and should have all the essential features including a clear image of the location of the projects along with CCA, Catchment area, drainage pattern, elevations/topography and location of forests, water bodies and other geological features appearing in a Toposheet in a larger scale as far as possible.
3. The proposals in the present form are not suitable for consideration and the Proponent may resubmit the proposal in a modified form as suggested.
4. The following points may be taken into consideration and relevant documents may be submitted along with above documents to speed up the process of appraisal:
  - a) Evidence of Public Consultation in the form of Gram Sabha/ Palli Sabha resolution to show that the local people have a necessity and demand for such a project in the area.

- b) Environmental sensitivity including survey of flora, fauna, endangered species, wild-life corridors etc. in at least 5km buffer zone of the MI project.
- c) Budgetary allocation for amelioration of the environment in and around the project area amounting to at least 2% of the project cost.
- d) Provision for taking protective measures for degraded land/forests in the catchment area of the project.
- e) Flow rate in the rivulet/nala of which the weir is proposed during at least four months (monsoon rains) to ensure assured water supply to the proposed CCA during Kharif crops.
- f) Forest diversion clearance, if any, for the proposed embankment and distribution canals.

### **ADDITIONAL ITEM**

#### **SCOPING FOR CONSTRUCTION OF LIFT CANAL SYSTEM OF UPPER INDRAVATI IRRIGATION PROJECT IN THE DISTRICT OF KALAHANDI WITH CCA – 26,248 HA. (TORS).**

The upper Indravati project is a multi-purpose Project consisting of Hydro-Electric and Irrigation on the western edge of the Eastern Ghats of Orissa. The Upper Indravati Project is located in Nabarangapur and Kalahandi Districts in the Southern portion of the state of Orissa. It has four dams, on the main stream of the Indravati River and three of its tributaries and eight dykes, to close saddles where the reservoir would overflow. It was approved by the Planning Commission in May 1978 for an estimated cost of Rs. 208.10 crores. Impounded water is used to generate 600 MW of electric power, after which it will be used to irrigate 1,09,312 ha. (revised 1,28,012 ha). The scheme envisages trans-basin diversion of water of the Indravati River (Godavari basin) in its upper reaches into Mahanadi basin.

After generation, the power house release is being utilized for irrigation in Kalahandi District by three canal systems. The details are as follows.

Sl No.	Name of the canal system	Original C.C.A. in Ha	Revised C.C.A. in Ha	Present status
1	Left Canal system up to river Tel	49085	49085	Completed
2	Right canal system upto river Sagada	27195	27195	Completed
3	Lift canal system	33092	26248	To be taken up

It is proposed to have an intake structure cum pump house located on left bank along the fringes of the existing Hati Barage near village Mangalpur of Jaipatna Tahasil of Kalahandi District. Rising main of 160m and Gravity main of 4.64km long are then proposed for lifting of water to total head of 32m to irrigate 26,248 ha of land by lift main canal of 45 km length and pipe distribution network.

Environment clearance to the Upper Indravati Multipurpose Project was accorded by the Department of Science and Technology, Government of India vide its No.3/2/78-HC-1/ENV, dated 22.01.1979.

Environmental clearance to the Upper Indravati Extension Project was accorded by the Ministry of Environment and Forests, Government of India vide its No.J.12011/8/99/IAI dated 24.12.2002.

**This Environment Impact Assessment study was designed to encompass the areas likely to be influenced by execution of lift Canal System and within those areas, the natural and human resources likely to be affected, directly or indirectly by this project, the geographic areas considered in this assessment study includes the irrigation structures, including the barrage pool on the River Hati and the ayacut areas bounded by Lift main canal and left main Canal.**

**The proponent applied for environmental clearance for construction of Upper Indravati Lift Canal System to MOEF, Govt. of India as category 'A' Project. The MOEF Govt. of India observed the following:**

- 1. The proposal does not involve construction of any new barrage/diversion structure, which may cause submersion.**
- 2. The EIA notification, 2006 has been amended on 01.12.2009. As per the amended Notification, irrigation projects not involving submergence or inter-state domain shall be appraised by the SEIAA as category 'B' projects.**

**In view of the above reasons, the MOEF Govt. of India returned the proposal to the proponent with the request to submit it to the SEIAA for consideration.**

The Chief Engineer of the project submitted filled in application FORM-I and prefeasibility report. Considering the information furnished and presentation made by the Chief Engineer, the SEAC prescribed the following TORs for undertaking detailed EIA study:

1. Hydrology, Design of reservoir and other components including a clear map showing the sites corresponding to reservoir boundaries including its depth should be given.
2. The unit shall furnish location Map, Topo sheet, Contour of entire area, Index map, submergence plan, cross section of barrage, flow diagram, catchments of upstream and downstream.
3. Complete information on month-wise filling and drawal with respect to crop water need should be provided with reference to overflow water over spillway.
4. The study area should include the following aspects:
  - Entire Command Area.
  - Area within 10 km radius of the main Project Components
5. Collection of one season (non-monsoon) primary baseline data on ambient air quality, water quality, noise level, soil and flora and fauna and site-specific meteorological data should also be collected. The location of the monitoring stations should be justified.
6. 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 study area 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 thereof, may be furnished
7. The Dept. of Water Resources being primarily responsible for the framing, execution and maintenance of the project, they should take special care on the

- following aspects of environmental management though other GoO agencies are responsible for their respective execution:
- a) De-weeding of reservoir and ayacuts to keep those free from blocking and organic pollution.
  - b) Compensatory afforestation though money will be deposited with the Forest Dept.
  - c) Lining may be taken up in the main canals to prevent loss of water due to leaks and percolation as far as possible.
  - d) Analysis of downstream water particularly for nutrients, insecticides and pesticides (wash-offs from agriculture) at least in 3-4 points periodically, especially during Rabi crops as a part of the after project environment management plan.
8. Survey of flora and fauna along with conservation measures including peripheral soil conservation measures to avoid extensive siltation, should be done by a competent body.
9. The Project Proponent shall prepare EMP taking into account the followings:
- Environmental safeguards (management) during construction activities.
  - Management to arrest salinity / alkalinity in the wake of irrigation.
  - Action plan for control of irrigation include water logging, salinity etc including strategies and policies with choice of species / crop for optimum use of water for agriculture to reduce adverse impacts of excessive irrigation including water logging.
  - Action plan for command area development in respect of irrigation potential.
  - Land use management with special emphasis on water logging problem.
  - Soil fertility management plan.
  - Action plan for release of assured lean season flow
  - Creation of Green Belt/afforestation along the banks of the canal system in consultation with the State Forest Department.
  - Conservation and preservation of endemic, rare and endangered species of flora and fauna (in consultation with State Wildlife Department).
  - Fishery Management, plan for the conservation / management of fishes.
  - Muck disposal plan (Suitable sites for dumping of excavated material should be identified in consultation with the State Pollution Control Board and Forest Department).
  - Public Health Delivery System including the provisions for drinking water facility for the local community if required under the scheme.
  - Sanitation & Solid Waste Management Plan for domestic waste from colonies and labor camps etc.
  - Water quality Management during construction and post construction periods.



- Environmental monitoring program (with physical & financial details covering all the aspects from EMP).
10. **The specifications of pumps being used for lifting water to a higher level with power consumption and source to be included.**
  11. **Budgetary allocation for amelioration of the environment in and around the project area amounting to at least 2% of the project cost.**
  12. **Flow rate in the power canal and total water flow of which water is proposed to be lifted during the whole year to ensure assured water supply to the proposed CCA.**
  13. **Forest diversion clearance for the proposed canal system.**
  14. Any litigation/ court case pending against the proposal should also be included.
  15. Occupational health impact and remedial measures thereof for the project may be studied.
  16. Socio-economic impact due to project activity may be assessed and based on the study, developmental activity proposed to be undertaken by the project proponent to be specified and 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.
  17. Points raised/likely to be raised during public hearing and commitment of the project proponent on the same may be included.

**This Terms of References (TORs) is valid for a period of two years from the date of issue of TORs for submission of the EIA/EMP report after public consultation.(This is in conformity with the MoEF, Govt. of India office memorandum No. J-11013/41/2006-IAII(I) dt. 22.3.10).**

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

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

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

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

**(Dr. S. N. Das)  
MEMBER, SEAC**

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

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

**(SRI. S. DAS )  
SECRETARY, SEAC**

