Minutes of the 21st SEIAA Meeting held on 8th October, 2009

The 21st meeting of the State Level Environment Impact Assessment Authority was convened on 8th October, 2009 at 11.30 A M at the Authority's office in M.P. Pollution Control Building, Paryavaran Parisar, Bhopal chaired by Shri Subroto Banerji.

The following members attended the meeting:-

- 1. Shri M. Hashim, Member
- 2. Smt. Kalpana Srivastava, Member Secretary

(A) Cases recommended by SEAC for Environmental clearance

1. S.R. Renewable Energy Pvt. Ltd, Secundrabad, 10 MW Biomass based power plant in Dhamnod, Distt. Ratlam - M.P. Case no. 32/2008

The above case was recommended by SEAC for environmental clearance SEIAA observed that in the public hearing report the Addl. Collector, Ratlam has merely mentioned that one objector Shri Gowardhan Holia raised the issue of this area being a breeding ground for Kharmore bird (Lesser Florican), but the Addl. Collector has not refuted this contention.

Again the DFO, Ratlam, has given a no objection to the project, without making any mention of the issue of this area being a breeding ground of the Kharmore bird (Lesser Florican).

It is clear that these two officers are not in a position to refute this contention. The Kharmore bird (Lesser florican) is a highly endangered species of the birds listed in schedule I of part 3 of the Wild Life Protection Act 1972.

This case, therefore in the absence of a clear view expressed by both these authorities on this objection, stands rejected.

Sd/- Sd/- Sd/-

(Kalpana Srivastava)(M. Hashim)(Subroto Banerji)Member SecretaryMemberChairman

2. Seoni Renewable Energy Pvt Ltd, Hyderabad, 10 MW Biomass power project at village Raagaedyee, Distt-Seoni M.P. **Case no. 4/2008**

The above case was recommended by SEAC for the environmental clearance. SEIAA during scrutiny of the documents found that the project proponent has not submitted a NOC issued by competent authority of the Forest Deptt. containing the information about the location of the forest boundary from the project site.

Hence it was decided to send the case back to SEAC for reconsideration on the above ground.

(B) Cases recommended by SEAC for environmental clearance after reconsideration

 M/s Tricon projects India Pvt Ltd Mayur Vihar, Delhi, An Area Development Project. Construction of `Tricon city plotted Development project' at Datoda Khandwa Road, Indore – M.P Case No.275/2008

The above case was sent back to SEAC for reconsideration on the following grounds

- (i) Source of 2351 KLD ultimate water demand.
- (ii) Source of construction water deamnd of 25 to 30 KLD
- (iii) Builidng permission for club, school building not submitted by project proponent
- (iv) Ownership of land as per revenue records.

The project proponent submitted the following clarification to SEAC on all the above points.

- (i) NOC from CGWA to draw 1645 KLD water has been obtained, rest of the water will be met from treated waste water.
- (ii) Construction water will be purchased from the private water supplier.
- (iii) These buildings will be constructed in future if required as a part of facility to the residents. Necessary permissions will be taken before construction.
- (iv) Ownership documents have been submitted.

SEAC recommended the project for the environmental clearnace after reconsideration. SEIAA accepted the recommnedation of SEAC and decided to accord environmental clearance to the Area Development Project covered under 8(b) of the EIA notification.

Sd/- Sd/- Sd/- (Kalpana Srivastava) (M. Hashim) (Subroto Banerji)
Member Secretary Member Chairman

 M/s DLF Garden City Ltd, First Floor, Sayaji Plaza, MR-10, Vijay Nagar, Indore -M P, Construction of Integrated Township at village Sulakhedi and Mundla Bagh Teh. Sanwer, Distt. Indore M.P. Case No. 13/2008

The above case was sent back to SEAC for reconsideration on the following points.

- (i) Water demand envisaged is of 1360 KLD while permission to draw ground water issued by CGWA is for 225 KLD. Source of water to meet the difference in demand and supply.
- (ii) Source of water used for construction.

SEAC after getting reply from the project proponent recommended the project for prior environmental clearance.

The documents submitted by the project proponent mentioned that in first three years of the project the total demand for water shall not exceed 225 KLD. But it is not mentioned that how many units/area will be constructed to keep the demand for water within 225 KLD. The Project Proponent may be asked to provide the above information.

Hence it was decided to send the case back to SEAC for reconsideration on the above ground.

3. M/s M.P. Fire clay industries Jabalpur- M.P., Fire clay mine 10.926 h at Village Bagraj Teh-Kundam, Jabalpur - M.P. *Case no. 28/2008*

The above case was sent to SEAC for reconsideration on the ground of non submission of Forest Deptt. NOC and specific land reclamation plan. The Project Proponent has submitted the above information to SEAC.

SEAC has recommended the case after reconsideration for environmental clearance.

SEIAA accepted the recommendation of SEAC and decided to accord environmental clearance to the above project.

Sd/-(**Kalpana Srivastava**) (**N** Member Secretary

Sd/-(**M. Hashim**) Member

Sd/-(**Subroto Banerji**) Chairman 4. M/s Smt Gayatri Devi Bansal, Jaitwara-Satna-M.P, Gandhigram Ochre, Leterite and Iron ore mine, 9-47 ha. at Village Gandhigram, Talluka-Sihora, Jabalpur-M.P. Case no. 97/2008

The above case was sent back to SEAC for reconsideration to assess the adverse impact on ground water due to mining activity as raised during the public hearing.

SEAC after getting a reply from the project proponent has recommneded the above project for environmental clerance.

SEIAA while scrutinising the documents observed that the Forest Deptt. NOC has been issued by the Range Office and not by the Diviisonal Forest Officer, who is competent to issue the same. At the same time, the NOC issued is for 4 hect. while the mining lease area has an area of 9.47 hect.

SEIAA decided to send the case back to SEAC for reconsideration for getting the above two issues clarified before deciding the issue of Environmental Clearance.

(C) Cases recommended by SEAC for rejection

1. Hukumchand stone lime Co., Post Box No.69, Katni, Vijay Kumar Jain Nai Basti Katni M.P., Limestone mine 10.56 ha. at Vill-Bhattoora Teh-Maihar, Satna M.P. Case no. 139/2008

The above case was resubmitted at case no 253/2008 and was issued ToR. Hence SEAC recommended to delist the above case. SEIAA accepted the recommendation of SEAC and decided to delist the case.

2. Shri A.Jain, Director, Rajshree power & Ispat Pvt Ltd. 201, Second Floor Lal Ganga, Shopping Mall, G E Road, Raipur (CG), 10, MW Biomass based power project at Vi-Choma, Teh-Agar Distt-Shajapur- M.P. Case no. 239/2008.

The project proponent of the above case has informed that the proposed site of the project has been changed from village Choma to village Kherkhedi. He has also applied for prior enviornmental clearance for the new proposed location. Hence SEAC has recommneded rejection of the case.

SEIAA accepted the recommnedation of SEAC and decided to reject the case.

Sd/- Sd/- Sd/- (Kalpana Srivastava) (M. Hashim) (Subroto Banerji)
Member Secretary Member Chairman

3. Shri Shyam Patel, Distt-Badwani-M.P. S/o of Suresh Patel, Gram- Kundiya, Post-Pipaliya, Tehsil- Barwani, Distt-Badwani-M.P, Sand mine 5.786 hact. at Village-, Teh-Pendra, Distt-Barwani-M.P. Case no. 401/2009.

The Project Proponent did not attend the SEAC meeting after getting a number of chances. Hence SEAC has recommended to rejeect the case on the ground of not attending SEAC meeting.

SEIAA accepted the recommnedation of SEAC and decided to reject the case.

4. M/s Agarwal Distilleries Pvt Ltd, 202, Lebbik Regency, IInd floor above Apoorti Super Bazar 4/2, Old Palasia, Greater Kailsah Road, Indore M.P. Manufacturing of Potable Alcohol with installed capacity of 25 KLPD on grain base at Katkul Road, Teh- Barwaha, Distt-Kharqone-M.P. **Case no. 414/2009.**

Since the above case falls under `A' category and hence is in the perview of the Ministry of Environment and Forests. SEAC recommended to delist the case. SEIAA accepted the recommedation of SEAC and decided to delist the case. Case may be forwarded to the Appropriate Authority.

5. Shri Rajendra S/o Punam Chand Chouhan, Bakwadi, Distt-Badwani-M.P., Sand mine 8.215 hect. at Bhulgaon Teh-Rajpur, Distt-Badwani-M.P. **Case no. 295/2009.**

The Project Proponent did not attend the SEAC meeting after getting a number of chances. Hence SEAC has recommended to rejeect the case on the ground of not attending SEAC meeting.

SEIAA accepted the recommnedation of SEAC and decided to reject the case.

Meeting ended with a vote of thanks to the chair.

Sd/- Sd/- Sd/- (Kalpana Srivastava) (M. Hashim) (Subroto Banerji)
Member Secretary Member Chairman