MINUTES

575th MEETING

STATE LEVEL ENVIRONMENT IMPACT ASSESSMENT AUTHORITY-TAMIL NADU

Ť.

Date: 06.12.2022

.4

e - 1

MINUTES OF THE 575th MEETING OF THE STATE LEVEL ENVIRONMENT IMPACT ASSESSMENT AUTHORITY HELD ON 06.12.2022.

| Agenda No | Description | File No. | Minutes |
|--------------|--|-------------|--|
| a) | Confirmation of the minutes of the 574 th meeting of the Authority held on 29.11.2022. | | The minutes of the 574 th meeting of the Authority held on 29.11.2022 was confirmed. |
| b) | The Action taken on the decisions of the 574 th meeting of the Authority held on 29.11.2022. | | The Member Secretary informed that 574 th Minutes uploaded in Parivesh wesbsite and action taken report will be putup ensuing meeting. |
| 1. | Proposed Rough stone quarry lease area over an extent of 1.40.0 Ha at S.F.Nos. 284/2A1 (P) & 284/2A2 (P) Iduvai Village, Tiruppur South Taluk, Tiruppur District, Tamil Nadu by Thiru.K.Balasubramaniam - For Environmental Clearance | 8668 | The authority noted that this proposal was placed for appraisal in this 330 th meeting of SEAC held on 17.11.2022 and SEAC noted that the EIA coordinator/PP had conducted the public hearing even before obtaining ToR from SEIAA. Public hearing carried out on Draft EIA/EMP study report without a ToR is not valid for acceptance. SEAC also noted that TNPCB had conducted public hearing for this proposal even before ToR was issued. The Committee, therefore, decided to request SEIAA to obtain explanations from TNPCB, PP and EIA- Coordinator for this serious lapse, in the first place, before proceeding further in the matter. After detailed discussion, the Authority requested MS-SEIAA to obtain Explanation from TNPCB, PP and EIA- Coordinator for this serious lapse. |

MEMBER SECRETARY

MEMBER

CHAIRMAN SEIAA-TN

2

| 2. | Proposed Earth Quarry over an 9380 | SEAC has furnished its recommendations to |
|----|------------------------------------|---|
| | area of 1.74.5 Ha at Survey No. | the Authority for granting Environmental |
| | 12/1, 17/15B, 17/16A, i8/3B, | Cicarance to the Project subject to the |
| | 18/4, 18/11, 18/12A, 18/12B. | conditions stated therein. After detailed |
| | 18/13A, 18/13B & 18/14A in | discussion. SEIAA decided to grant |
| | Thattchakadu Village, | Environmental Clearance for the quantity as |
| | Bhuvanagiri Taluk, Cuddalore | per the mine plan approved by the |
| | District, Tamil Nadu by Thiru. | Department of Geology & Mining subject to |
| | S.Sivaraj-For Environmental | the conditions as recommended by SEAC in |
| | Clearance | ad lition to the following conditions& |
| | | conditions stated vide Annexure A. |
| | | 1. Restricting the ultimate depth of |
| | | mining up to 2m BGL and quantity of |
| | | 16,200 cu.m of Earth (removing the |
| | | section XY-AB) are permitted for |
| | | mining over a period of two years |
| | | considering the environmental impacts |
| | | due to the mining, safety precautionary |
| | | measures of the working personnel and |
| | | following the principle of the |
| | | sustainable mining. |
| | | 2. As per the MoEF& CC office |
| | | memorandum F.No.22-65/2017- |
| | | IA.III dated: 30.09.2020 and |
| | | 20.10.2020 as accepted by the Project |
| | | proponent the revised CER cost of Rs. |
| | | 2.06 lakhs and the amount shall be |
| | | spent for the Government Model |
| | | Higher Secondary School, B.Mutlur |
| | | village before obtaining CTO from |
| | | TNPCB. |
| 1 | | |

. . .

MEMBER SECRETARY

.

MEMBER

CHAIRMAN SEIAA-TN

•

| | | · | |
|----|------------------------------------|---|------------|
| 3. | Proposed Rough Stone & gravel 93 | 94 SEAC has furnished its recommenda | itions to |
| | quarry lease over an extent of | the Authority for granting Environ | ımental |
| | 1.61.0 Ha at Survey No. 3/9, 3/11, | Clearance to the Project subject | to the |
| | 6/1 & 6/2 in Eraiyur Village, | conditions stated therein. After | detailed |
| | Vanur Taluk, Viluppuram | discussion, SEIAA decided to | grant |
| | District, Tamil Nadu by Thiru. M. | Environmental Clearance for the qua | untity as |
| | Dhamodharan -For | per the mine plan approved | by the |
| | Environmental Clearance | Department of Geology & Mining su | ibject to |
| | | the conditions as recommended by S | EAC in |
| | | addition to the following cond | litions& |
| | | conditions stated vide Annexure A. | |
| | | i. As per the MoEF& C | C office |
| | | memorandum F.No.22- | 65/2017- |
| | | IA.III dated: 30.09.202 | 20 and |
| | | 20.10.2020 as accepted by the | e Project |
| | | proponent the revised CER c | ost is Rs. |
| | | 5.20 lakhs and the amount | shall be |
| | | spent for the Government | Higher |
| | | Secondary School, Eraiyur | Village, |
| | | Villupuram District as co | mmitted, |
| | | before obtaining CTO from T | NPCB. |
| 4. | Proposed Rough stone and Gravel 91 | The Authority noted that vide minu | tes dated |
| | Quarry lease over an Extent of | 17.11.2022 of 330 th meeting of SI | EAC, the |
| | 0.78.0 Ha in S.F.Nos. 11/1A1(P) | Committee has furnished | d its |
| | & 244/3B(P) at Naranapuram and | recommendation for the gr | rant of |
| | Iduvai Village of Palladam & | Environmental Clearance to the | project |
| | Tiruppur Taluk, Tiruppur District, | subject to the conditions stated ther | ein. |
| | Tamil Nadu by | The Authority, after detailed dis | cussions |
| | Thiru.R.Palanisamy – For | decided to call for the following a | dditional |
| | Environmental Clearance. | particulars from the Project Propon | ent: |
| | | 1. Letter from AD/Mines sta | ating the |
| | | details of the existing pl | it in the |
| | 1 1 | 1 | |

and a second second

MEMBER SECRETARY

MEMBER



4

| | | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
|----|--------------------------------------|---|
| | | mine lease area and copy of last |
| | | transport permit issued. |
| | | 2. Valid mine plan approval letter as |
| | | the letter submitted by the |
| | | Proponent is dated 12.01.2017 |
| 5. | Proposed Rough Stone and gravel 9322 | The authority noted that the subject was |
| | quarry Lease over an extent of | appraised in 330 th SEAC meeting held on |
| | 1.59.5 Ha at S.F.No. 74/2A, | 17.11.2022. SEAC has furnished its |
| | 74/2B, 74/2C, 74/2D, 74/2E, | recommendations for granting |
| | 74/2F, 74/2G, 74/2H, 74/2I, | Environmental Clearance subject to the |
| | 74/2J, 74/2K & 74/2L in | conditions stated therein. |
| | Chinnakallipatti Village, | After detailed discussion, the Authority |
| | Mettupalayam Taluk, | taking into account the safety aspects, to |
| | CoimbatoreDistrict, Tamil Nadu | ensure sustainable, scientific and |
| | by Thiru. K.Satheeshkumar - For | systematic mining and with reference to |
| | Environmental Clearance | specific condition (I) of SEAC, decided to |
| | | grant Environmental Clearance for the |
| | | quantity of 92,150m ³ of rough stone and |
| | | 7476m ³ of gravel by restricting the depth |
| | | upto 37 m below ground level for a period |
| | | of 5 years as per the mine plan approved by |
| | | the Department of Geology & Mining |
| | | subject to the standard conditions as per |
| | | Annexure - (I) of SEAC minutes, other |
| | | normal conditions stipulated by |
| | | MOEF&CC & all other specific conditions |
| | | as recommended by SEAC in addition to |
| | | the following conditions and the conditions |
| | | in Annexurc 'A' of this minutes. |
| | | 1. As per the MoEF& CC office |
| | | memorandum F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III |
| | | dated: 30.09.2020 and 20.10.2020 |

. •

,

.

MEMBER SECRETARY

MEMBER

IAIRMAN SEIAA-TN

| Proposed Rough Stone & Gravel quarry lease over an extent of 1.20.0 Ha at S.F.No. 227/1B(Part) at Velampalayam Village, Palladam Taluk, Tiruppur District, Tamil Nadu by Thiru M. Subramaniam – For Environmental Clearance. | 8236 | The authority noted that the subject was appraised in 330 th SEAC meeting held on 17.11.2022. SEAC has furnished its recommendations to the Authority for granting Environmental Clearance to the Project subject to the conditions stated therein. After detailed discussion, the Authority with reference to specific condition (I) of SEAC, SEIAA decided to grant Environmental Clearance for a quantity of 56,570m ³ of Rough Stone and 1,080 m ³ of Gravel up to a depth of 27m BGL in section XY-AB, 22m BGL in Section XY-CD and 12m in section XY-EF as per the mine plan, for a period of 5 years approved by the Department of Geology & Mining subject to the conditions as recommended by SEAC in addition to the following conditions and conditions stated therein |
|---|--|---|
| | · · · | vide Annexure 'A' |
| Proposed Earth quarry lease over an extent of 2.30.0 Ha at S.F.No. 602/1A5 at Vettangudi Village, Sirkali Taluk, Mailaduthurai District, Tamil Nadu by Thiru. B. | 8299 | The authority noted that the subject was appraised in 330 th SEAC meeting held on 17.11.2022. Based on the presentation made by the PP, SEAC noted that the proposed mine lease area is abutting Buckingham Canal on the western |
| | quarry lease over an extent of1.20.0 Ha at S.F.No. 227/1B(Part)atVelampalayamVillage,PalladamTaluk,TiruppurDistrict, Tamil Nadu by Thiru M.Subramaniam–ForEnvironmental Clearance. | 1.20.0 Ha at S.F.No. 227/1B(Part) at Velampalayam Village, Palladam Taluk, Tiruppur District, Tamil Nadu by Thiru M. Subramaniam – For Environmental Clearance. Proposed Earth quarry lease over an extent of 2.30.0 Ha at S.F.No. 602/1A5 at Vettangudi Village, Sirkali Taluk, |

and the second second

للر MEMBER SECRETARY

MEMBER

CHAIRMAN SEIAA-TN

| Gopalakrishnan – | For | side and Bay of Bengal shore line on the |
|-------------------------|-----|---|
| Environmental Clearance | e. | Eastern Side. Hence, SEAC decided to call for |
| | | the following additional details; |
| | | 1. The proposed mine lease area may |
| | | fall under CRZ area under CRZ |
| | | notification, 2011 as amended. |
| | | Hence, the project proponent is |
| | | requested to furnish the CZMA |
| | | mapping prepared by competent |
| | | authority such as IRS, Anna |
| | ļ | university etc. Further, if the |
| | | proposal falls under CRZ area, |
| | | recommendation of the CZMA may |
| | | be submitted as per the O.M issued |
| | | by the MOEF&CC. GoI, New Delhi |
| | | vide F.No.IA3-12/1/2022-IA.III |
| | | dated 26.04.2022. |
| | | 2. The proponent shall furnish letter |
| | | obtained from DFO regarding the |
| | | existence of any Reserved Forest |
| | | nearby. |
| | | 3. In the light of the Judgment issued by |
| | | the Hon'ble Madurai Bench of |
| | | Madras High Court in W.P.(MD) |
| | | Nos.20903 of 2016, 23452, 24495, |
| | | 17370 and 18035 of 2019 dated |
| | | 12.02.2021, and in terms of Director |
| | | of Geology and Mining letter No. |
| | | 7240/MM6/2019 Dt. 30.7.2021, (1) |
| | | the mineral composition of the |
| | | proposed mineral (Earth) to be |
| | | quarried shall be tested in any of the |
| | | following laboratories and the results |
| and - | | |
| MEMBER SECRETARY | | MUTER CHAIRMAN |
| 2 | / / | SEIAA-TN |

× .



,

submitted to the Committee and (2) the proponent should produce a letter from the Department of Geology and Mining stating that the location of quarry site does not lie adjoining to the rivers, streams, canals etc., and also does not come under any notified/declared protected zones.

÷.

- a) Department of Geology and Mining, Govt of Tamil Nadu, Industries Department, Alandur road, Guindy Industrial Estate, Chennai – 600032.
- b) Department of Applied Geology, University of Madras, Guindy Campus, Chennai – 600025.
- c) Department of Geology, CEG
 Campus, Anna University, Chennai –
 600025.

On receipt of the aforesaid details, the proposal will be considered for further deliberations.

In addition to the above queries, the proponent shall submit the following details

- What is the vegetation surrounding the area since there are two different shades of green patches seen in the vicinity of the proposed mine lease area.
- As per the Coastal Zone Management Plan, Sheet No. C 44 B 15 / SW Map No: TN 82, Fisherman settlement exists within 300m radius from the proposed mine lease area. Hence, the

SEIAA-TN

MEMBER SECRETAR

8

| | | ······································ |
|---------|--|---|
| | | proponent is requested to submit report regarding the impacts on the livelihoods of fisherman community in the vicinity. 3. A stream passes inside the proposed mine lease area. Hence, the proponent is requested to provide details regarding the methodology of working. Further, the impact on the stream due to the proposed mining activity. In view of the above. SEAC shall examine the above-mentioned queries in addition to the queries raised by SEAC. Hence, Authority decided to request the Member Secretary, SEIAA to communicate the minutes to the project proponent. |
| 8. | Proposed Rough Stone & Gravel quarry lease over an extent of 1.52.0 Ha at S.F.No. 192/2A, 192/2B & 192/2C at Velampalayam Village, Palladam Taluk, Tiruppur District, Tamil Nadu by Thiru. A. Venkatachalam – For Environmental Clearance. | The authority noted that the subject was appraised in 330 th SEAC meeting held on 17.11.2022. SEAC has furnished its recommendations to the Authority for granting Environmental Clearance to the Project subject to the conditions stated therein. After detailed discussion, the Authority with reference to specific condition (I) of SEAC, SEIAA decided to grant Environmental Clearance for a quantity of 1,11,255 m ³ of Rough Stone and 13,120 m ³ of Gravel and decided to restrict the depth up to 27m BGL in section XY-AB(Existing – 15m & Proposed – 12m) and 27m BGL in Section |

:

MEMBER SECRETARY

-

MEMBER

CHAIRMAN SEIAA-TN

.

.

| | | | XY-CD as per the mine plan, for a period of 5 years approved by the Department of Geology & Mining subject to the conditions as recommended by SEAC in addition to the following conditions and conditions stated therein vide Annexure 'A' |
|-----|--|------|---|
| 9. | Proposed Rough Stone & Gravel quarry lease over an extent of 1.20.0 Ha at S.F.No. 98/2(P) at Poomalur Village, Palladam Taluk, Tiruppur District, Tamil Nadu by Thiru M. Ramasamy – For Environmental Clearance. | 8642 | The authority noted that the subject was appraised in 330 th SEAC meeting held on 17.11.2022. Based on the presentation and the documents furnished by the Proponent, the SEAC decided to call for additional details 1. The PP shall submit Certified Compliance Report. On receipt of the aforesaid details, the proposal will be considered for further deliberations. In the view of the above, SEIAA accepts the decision of SEAC and decided to request Member Secretary to communicate the minutes of 330 th SEAC to the project proponent. |
| 10. | Proposed Rough Stone and Gravel quarry lease over an extent of 2.50.0 Ha at S.F.No. 26/3F(P) at Gedhalandoddi Village, Shoolagiri Taluk, Krishnagiri District, Tamil Nadu by Thiru. M. | 8873 | The authority noted that the subject was appraised in 330 th SEAC meeting held on 17.11.2022. During the presentation, EIA coordinator informed that PP was absent for the meeting. Hence, the proposal was not taken up for |

< 5 °

. .

In the view of the above, SEIAA accepts the decision of SEAC and decided to request

CHAIRMAN SEIAA-TN

MEMBER

For

appraisal.

Naveenkumar

MEMBER SECRETARY

Environmental Clearance.

| | | | Member Secretary to communicate the minutes of 330 th SEAC to the project proponent. |
|-----|---|------|---|
| 11. | Proposed Rough Stone & Gravei quarry lease over an extent of 1.83.0 Ha at S.F.No. 252/1, 252/2 & 252/3 at Veppilai Village, Kadaiyampatti Taluk, Salem District, Tamil Nadu by Thiru. R. Munirathinam – For Environmental Clearance. | 9055 | The authority noted that the subject was appraised in 330th SEAC meeting held on 17.11.2022. Based on the presentation made by the proponent, SEAC noted the following The proposed mine lease area is located at a distance of approximately 460m from the Thoppaiyaru Reservoir in the Thoppur valley. Further, the proposed mine lease area is situated in the Manakondamalai which is rich in ecosystem. Further, the proposed mine lease area is in the downstream side of the catchment area which appears to be a watershed which will in turn have implications on the contribution of surface runoff to the reservoir. Hence, based on the above facts and after the deliberations, the Committee decided not to recommend the proposal. In the view of the above, SEIAA accepts the decision of SEAC and decided to request |
| | | | Member Secretary, SEIAA-TN to grant rejection letter to proponent as per the 330 th SEAC minutes. |
| 12. | Proposed Grey Granite Quarry lease over an extent of 1.88.06 Ha at S.F.No. 223/1A2,1B2, | 1 | The authority noted that the subject was appraised in 330 th SEAC meeting held on 17.11.2022. |

MEMBER SECRETARY

MEMBER

CHAIRMAN SEIAA-TN

| | C & | SEAC has furnished its recommendations to |
|--|--------------|---|
| 224/2D at Sendarapalli Vill | lage, | the Authority for granting Environmental |
| Bargur Taluk, Krishn | agiri | Clearance to the Project subject to the |
| District, Tamil Nadu by | M/s. | conditions stated therein. After detailed |
| Vatsin Granites – | For | discussion, the Authority with reference to |
| Environmental Clearance. | | specific condition (I) of SEAC, SEIAA |
| | | decided to grant Environmental |
| | | Clearance for a ROM – 28,675 m ³ , |
| | | production quantity of 10,036 m ³ Grey |
| | | Granite @ 35% Recovery and Granite |
| | | waste – 18,639 m^3 up to a depth of 13m |
| | | BGL as per the mine plan, for a period of |
| | Ì | 5 years approved by the Department of |
| | | Geology & Mining subject to the |
| | | conditions as recommended by SEAC in |
| | | addition to the following conditions and |
| | - | conditions stated therein vide Annexure |
| | | *A' |
| | | 1. The Environmental Clearance granted |
| | | is for the production quantity of |
| | | Granite which amounts to 10,036 m ³ |
| | | only. |
| | | 2. The proponent shall increase the |
| | | recurring cost for Green Belt |
| | | Development to Rs.100 per sapling for |
| | | maintenance. |
| 13. Proposed Rough Stone &Gr | | The suther its noted that the subject |
| $1 \rightarrow 13$. I CHOONED KOUPH MOHE AAT | ł | The authority noted that the subject was appraised in 330 th SEAC meeting held on |
| | | $+ \alpha_{1}\alpha_{1}\alpha_{2}\alpha_{3}\alpha_{4}\alpha_{4}\alpha_{5}\alpha_{4}\alpha_{5}\alpha_{5}\alpha_{5}\alpha_{5}\alpha_{5}\alpha_{5}\alpha_{5}\alpha_{5$ |
| quarry Lease over an exten | | |
| quarry Lease over an exten 0.52.0 Ha at S.F.No. 213/2. | A in | 17.11.2022. SEAC has furnished its |
| quarry Lease over an exten 0.52.0 Ha at S.F.No. 213/2. Velampalayam Village, Palla | A in Idam | 17.11.2022. SEAC has furnished its recommendations for granting |
| quarry Lease over an exten 0.52.0 Ha at S.F.No. 213/2. | A in Idam | 17.11.2022. SEAC has furnished its |

i i

Jul, MEMBER SECRETARY

,

MEMBER

CHAIRMAN

SEIAA-TN

| | | | · |
|--------|----------------------------------|------|--|
| | Nadu by Tmt.P.Krishnaveni – For | | The authority noted from the KML file that a |
| | Environmental Clearance | | school and a textile mill are located within a |
| | | | radius of 1km from the proposed site. Hence, |
| | | | the authority after detailed deliberations, |
| | | | decided to consider the proposal after |
| | | | obtaining the following from the project |
| | | | proponent: |
| | | | i) Impact of mining on school and the |
| | | | textile mill shall be studied from a |
| | | | reputed institute other than the |
| | | | NABET consultant. |
| | | | ii) The proponent shall furnish details |
| | | | on the methodology proposed to |
| | | | alert the school children and mill |
| | | | employees during blasting/mining |
| | | | operations. |
| | | | iii) Impact of mining on the |
| i | | | agricultural fields, humus, water |
| | | | body, surface/underground |
| | | | drainage, biodiversity in the |
| | | | vicinity of the proposed site shall |
| | | | be studied from a reputed Institute |
| | | | other than the NABET consultant. |
| 14. | Proposed Rough Stone & Gravei | 7838 | The authority noted that the subject was |
| | quarry Lease over an extent of | | appraised in 330th SEAC meeting held on |
| | 1.53.5 Ha at S.F.No. 63/1A2 & | | 17.11.2022. Based on the presentation and |
| . | 64/1(P) in Velampalayam | | details furnished by the project proponent, the |
| | Village, Paliadam Taluk, | | Committee decided to direct the PP to submit |
| | Tiruppur District, Tamil Nadu by | | a detailed study on the structures located |
| | Thiru.P.Venkatachalam – For | | around the proposed site. The structures |
| | Environmental Clearance | | within the radius of (i) 50 m, (ii) 100 m, (iii) |
| | | | 200 m and (iv) 300 m shall be enumerated |
| | | | 200 m and (iv) 300 m shall be enumerated |

MEMBER SECRETARY

MEMBER

CHAIRMAN SEIAA-TN

| [| | | |
|-----|--------------------------------|------|---|
| | | | with details such as dwelling houses with |
| | | | number of occupants, places of worship, |
| | | | industries, factories, sheds, etc. |
| | | | Authority, after detailed discussions, decided |
| | | | to obtain the following details from the project |
| | | | proponent in addition to those called by |
| | | | SEAC: |
| | | | i) Impact of mining on the |
| | | | agricultural fields, humus, water |
| | | | body, surface/underground |
| | | | drainage, biodiversity in the |
| | | | vicinity of the proposed site shall |
| | | | be studied from a reputed Institute |
| | | | other than the NABET consultant. |
| | | | ii) A revised letter obtained from the |
| | | | Village Administrative Officer |
| | | | stating the habitations, river |
| | | | bodies, temples, schools/colleges, |
| | | | and other structures of importance, |
| | | | etc situated in a radius of 300m |
| | | | from the proposed site since the |
| | | | one already furnished mentions |
| | | | only houses. |
| | | | |
| 15. | Proposed Rough Stone & Gravel | 8447 | The authority noted that the subject was |
| | quarry Lease over an extent of | | appraised in 330 th SEAC meeting held on |
| | 4.85.0 Ha at S.F.No. 478/2, | | 17.11.2022. Based on the presentation and |
| | 479/2B(P), 480/1A(P), 480/2B, | | details furnished by the project proponent, the |
| | 480/2C(P), 480/2D(P), 482/1, | | Committee noted that the data furnished in the |
| | 482/2(P) & 483(P) in | | EIA report submitted by the proponent is |
| - | Chinnakallipatti Village, | | improper/irrelevant. Hence, after detailed |
| | Mettupalayam Taluk, Coimbatore | | discussions, the Committee decided to |
| | District, Tamil Nadu by | | consider the proposal after the submission of a |
| | L | L | |

the second se

MEMBER SECRETARY

MEMBER

CHAIRMAN SEIAA-TN

| | Thiru.S.Palanisamy For | properly revised EIA report by the |
|-----|-----------------------------------|---|
| | Environmental Clearance | Proponent/consultant. |
| | | Authority, after detailed discussions, decided |
| | | to obtain the following details from the project |
| | | proponent in addition to those called by |
| | | SEAC: |
| | | i. Impact of mining on the agricultural |
| | | fields, humus, water body, |
| | | surface/underground drainage, |
| | | biodiversity in the vicinity of the |
| | | proposed site shall be studied from a |
| | | reputed Institute other than the |
| | | NABET consultant. |
| 16. | Proposed Rough Stone & Gravel 875 | 55 The authority noted that the subject was |
| | quarry Lease over an extent of | appraised in 330 th SEAC meeting held on |
| | 7.00.0 Ha at S.F.No. 635/1A, | 17.11.2022. Based on the presentation and |
| | 635/2A, 740, 800/2(P) & 801(P) | details furnished by the project proponent, the |
| | in Marudur Village, | Committee decided to obtain the following |
| | Mettupalayam Taluk, Coimbatore | details from the project proponent to consider |
| | District, Tamil Nadu by M/s. | the proposal for appraisal: |
| | Venkateswara Blue Metals – For | 1. The details of total land area |
| | Environmental Clearance | owned/leased by the proponent for |
| | | quarrying. |
| | | 2. Drone videography showing the |
| | | fencing work carried out in the |
| | | currently proposed area and in the |
| | | area for which EC has been |
| | | obtained earlier. |
| | | 3. Details of safety barrier of 7.5 m |
| | | maintained with tree plantations in |
| | | the existing quarry and proposed |
| | | iease areas. |

.

MENBER SECRETARY

MEMBER



| | | | Deeme addressed t |
|----|--------|-------------|--|
| | | 4. | Drone videography images |
| | | ļ | showing (a) the existence of trees |
| | | | planted & green belt development |
| | | | activities carried out in compliance |
| | | | with the conditions as indicated in |
| | | | the previous EC issued on |
| | | | 25.07.2016; (b) existence of |
| | | | garland drainage already |
| | | | constructed for the existing & |
| | | | proposed quarry. |
| | | 5. | The existence of the structures |
| | | | within the radius of (i) 50 m, (ii) |
| | | | 100 m, (iii) 200 m and (iv) 300 m |
| | | | shall be enumerated with details |
| | | | such as dwelling houses whether it |
| | | | belongs to the owner (or) not |
| | | | belongs to the owner; with number |
| | | | of occupants, places of worships, if |
| | | | any, industries, factories, sheds, |
| | | 1 | etc. |
| | | Authority | , after detailed discussions, decided |
| | | to obtain t | the following details from the project |
| | | proponent | t in addition to those called by |
| | i F | SEAC: | • • |
| | r | i) | Impact of mining on the |
| | | | agricultural fields, humus, water |
| | | | body, surface/underground |
| | | | |
| | | | - |
| | | | vicinity of the proposed site shall |
| | | | be studied from a reputed Institute |
| | | | other than the NABET consultant. |
| | | ii) | A thorough study/assessment on |
| | | | the inventory of vegetation |
| al | Scur | of anna) | mad |

CHAIRMAN SEIAA-TN

MEMBER SECRETARY

MEMBER

16

| 17. | Proposed Rough Stone and gravel quarry Lease over an extent of 1.20.0 Ha at S.F.No. 142/5 in | 9404 | situated around a radius of 500m from the proposed project site. iii) Details on the nearest elephant corridor to the project site. Does the proposed project impact elephant activity? The authority noted that the subject was appraised in 330 th SEAC meeting held on 17.11.2022. SEAC has furnished its |
|-----|--|--------|---|
| | Karasanur Village, Vanur Taluk, | | recommendations for granting |
| | Viluppuram District, Tamil Nadu | | Environmental Clearance subject to the |
| | by Mr. V.R.Selvakumar - For | | conditions stated therein. |
| | Environmental Clearance | | After detailed discussion, the Authority |
| | | | with reference to specific condition (I) of |
| | | | SEAC, decided to grant Environmental |
| 1 | | | Clearance for the quantity of 72,673m ³ of |
| | | | Rough Stone & 3612 m ³ of Gravel with |
| | | | restricted depth upto 35 metres below |
| | | | ground level as per the revised mine plan |
| | | | approved by the Department of Geology & |
| | | | Mining for a period of 5 years subject to the |
| | | | standard conditions as per Annexure - (I) of SEAC minutes, other normal conditions |
| | | | stipulated by MOEF&CC & all other |
| | | | specific conditions as recommended by |
| | | | SEAC in addition to the following |
| | | | conditions and the conditions in Annexure |
| | | | 'A' of this minutes. |
| İ | | | 1. As per the MoEF& CC office |
| | | l 1 | memorandum F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III |
| | | | dated: 30.09.2020 and 20.10.2020 |
| | | 1 | accepted by the Project proponent, the |

CHAIRMAN SEIAA-TN

MEMBER SECRETARY

Hur MEMBER

| 18. | Proposed Rough Stone and Gravel quarry project over an extent of 0.72 Ha in S.F.No. S.F.No. 7/3B & 7/4B at Sukkampalayam Village, Palladam Taluk, Tiruppur District, Tamil Nadu by Thiru. V. P. Senthilkumar- For Environmental Clearance. | | revised CER cost is Rs. 5 lakhs and the amount shall be spent for the activities detailed in the SEAC minutes before obtaining CTO from TNPCB. The authority noted that this proposal was placed for appraisal in 330 th meeting of SEAC held on 17.11.2022 and the SEAC decided to remit back the proposal to SEIAA. After detailed discussion the authority decided to obtain the following details from the PP, (i) The PP shall submit reason for |
|-----|--|------|---|
| 19. | Proposed quartz & Feldspar project over an extent of 2.11.0Ha in S.F.No. 1501B/2(P) & 1502(p), Sengurichi Village, Dindigul East Taluk, Dindigul District, Tamil Nadu by Thiru. M. Selvamani - For Environmental Clearance. | 8596 | withdrawing the proposal. The authority noted that the subject was appraised in 330 th SEAC meeting held on 17.11.2022. During the meeting the PP has not turned up. Therefore, SEAC decided to defer the proposal. In the view of the above, SEIAA accepts the decision of SEAC and decided to request Member Secretary to communicate the minutes of 330 th SEAC to the project proponent. |
| 20. | Proposed Rough stone & Gravel project over an extent of 1.01.5 Ha in S.F.No. 199/1A2, Poomalur Village, Palladam Taluk, Tiruppur District, Tamil Nadu by Thiru. R Sivakumar - For Environmental Clearance. | 8638 | SEAC has furnished its recommendations to the Authority for granting Environmental Clearance to the Project subject to the conditions stated therein. After detailed discussion, SEIAA decided to grant Environmental Clearance for the quantity as per the mine plan approved by the Department of Geology & Mining subject to the conditions |

a far 👘 👘

MEMBER SECRETARY /

.

MEMBER

CHAIRMAN SEIAA-TN

| | | as recommended by SEAC in addition to the |
|-----|--|---|
| | | following conditions & conditions stated vide |
| | | Annexure A. |
| | | 1. Restricting the ultimate depth of |
| | | mining up to 40m BGL and quantity of |
| | | 223397cu.m of Rough stone are |
| | | permitted for mining over a period of |
| | | five years considering the |
| | | environmental impacts due to the |
| | | mining, safety precautionary measures |
| | | of the working personnel and |
| | | following the principle of the |
| | | sustainable mining. |
| | | 2. As per the MoEF& CC office |
| | | memorandum F.No.22-65/2017- |
| | | IA.III dated: 30.09.2020 and |
| | | 20.10.2020 as accepted by the Project |
| | | proponent the revised CER cost of Rs. |
| | | 5 Lakhs and the amount shall be spent |
| | | for the Government Higher Secondary |
| | | School, Kannarpalayam Village |
| | | before obtaining CTO from TNPCB. |
| | December of the second of | |
| 21. | Proposed Rough stone project 8 | the Authority for granting Environmental |
| | over an extent of 3.11.0 Ha in | Clearance to the Project subject to the |
| | S.F.No. 77/1B & 421/2B Part Chikkarampalayan Village, | conditions stated therein. After detailed |
| | Chikkarampalayam Village, Mettupalyam Taluk, Coimbatore | discussion, SEIAA decided to grant |
| | District, Tamil Nadu by M/s. Sri | Environmental Clearance for the quantity as |
| | Blue Metals- For Environmental | per the mine plan approved by the Department |
| | Clearance. | of Geology & Mining subject to the conditions |
| | | as recommended by SEAC in addition to the |
| | | |

MEMBER SECRETARY

MEMBER

CHAIRMAN SEIAA-TN

•

| <u>. </u> | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | |
|--|---------------------------------------|--|
| | | following conditions & conditions stated vide |
| | | Annexure A. |
| | | 1. Restricting the ultimate depth of |
| | | mining up to 40m BGL and quantity of |
| | | 223397cu.m of Rough stone are |
| | | permitted for mining over a period of |
| | | five years considering the |
| | | environmental impacts due to the |
| | | mining, safety precautionary measures |
| | | of the working personnel and |
| | | following the principle of the |
| | | sustainable mining. |
| | | 2. As per the MoEF& CC office |
| | | memorandum F.No.22-65/2017- |
| | | IA.III dated: 30.09.2020 and |
| | | 20.10.2020 as accepted by the Project |
| | | proponent the revised CER cost of Rs. |
| | | 5 Lakhs and the amount shall be spent |
| | | for the Government Higher Secondary |
| 1 | | School, Kannarpalayam Village |
| | | before obtaining CTO from TNPCB. |
| 22. | Proposed Rough stone over an 863 | 39 The Authority after detailed discussion with |
| | extent of 1.03.5ha comprising | reference to specific condition (1) of SEAC, |
| | S.F.No. 211/1A of | SEIAA decided to grant Environmental |
| | Velampalayam Village, Palladam | Clearance for a period of 5 years confining to |
| | Taluk, Tiruppur District, Tamil | the ultimate depth of mining upto 47m BGL & |
| | Nadu by Thiru.E.Marimuthu - for | the total production quantity of for the revised |
| | Environmental Clearance | quantity of 42,590 m ³ of Rough Stone and the |
| | | annual peak production shall not exceed |
| | | 19,305 m ² of Rough Stone as per approved |
| | | mining plan issued by the Department of |
| | | Geology & Mining subject to the standard |
| · | | |

김 수 문제

MEMBER SECRETARY

.

•

MEMBER

6

CHAIRMAN SEIAA-TN

| | - | | |
|-----|---|------|--|
| | | | conditions as per Annexure - (1) & all other specific conditions as recommended by SEAC & other normal conditions stipulated by MOEF&CC in addition to the following conditions & Conditions stated vide Annexure 'A'. 1. As per the MOEF & CC office memorandum F.No.22-65/2017-IA.III dated: 30.09.2020 and 20.10.2020 accepted by the Project proponent, the revised CER cost is Rs. 5 Lakhs and the amount shall be spent for the committed activities before SEAC such as 1. Renovation of Existing toilet., 2. Providing benches and desks to the class rooms., 3.Carrying out plantation in around school., 4.Providing Environmental related books to school library. & 5. White wash to School class rooms to the Panchayat Union Primary School, Moonumadai before obtaining CTO from TNPCB |
| | · | | books to school library. & 5. White wash to School class rooms to the Panchayat Union Primary School, |
| | | | Inspector of Directorate General of Mines Safety, Chennai before obtaining CTO from TNPCB |
| 23. | Proposed Rough Stone and Gravel Quarry over an extent of 2.47.5Ha at S.F.Nos.75 of Chikkarampalayam village, | 8709 | The authority noted that this proposal was placed in 330 th meeting of SEAC held on 17.11.2022 and the SEAC decided to ask for the following additional details from the PP. |

MEMBER SECRETARY

MEMBER

HAIR MAN SEIAA-TN

| | Mettupalayam Taluk, Coimbatore | i. Revised quantity after formation and |
|-----|------------------------------------|---|
| | District, Tamil Nadu by | stability alignment of benches |
| | Thiru.C.N.Mani - for | including photographs shows the |
| | Environmental Clearance. | fencing & Green belt development. |
| | | ii. Certified compliance report. |
| | | On receipt of the above details, SEAC would |
| | | further deliberate on this project and decide |
| | | the further course of action. |
| | i | In view of the above, the authority after |
| | | detailed discussion decided to call for the |
| | | certain additional particulars from the project |
| | | proponent in addition to the said additional |
| | | particulars sought by the SEAC as follows |
| | | i. Details of impact of proposed mining |
| | | activity including soil erosion on the |
| | | abutting Canal @50m (Western |
| | | Direction), Belladhi Lake @ 600m |
| | | (North Western Direction) & Odai @ |
| | | 450m & 600m (Western & North |
| | | Western Direction) as per KML file |
| | | and mitigation measures for the same. |
| | | ii. Details of elephant corridors nearby |
| | | the proposed mining area. If any the PP |
| | | shall furnish details of impact and |
| | | mitigation measures for the same. |
| 24. | Proposed Rough Stone & Gravel 8185 | 5 SEAC has furnished its recommendations to |
| | quarry lease over an extent of | the Authority for granting Environmental |
| | 1.48.0 Ha atS.F.Nos. 224/1B | Clearanceto the Project subject to |
| | (Part) & 224/2 (Part) of | theconditions stated therein. After detailed |
| | Velampalayam Village, | discussion, SEIAA decided to grant |
| | PalladamTaluk, Tiruppur | Environmental Clearance for the quantity as |
| | District, Tamil Nadu by | per the mine plan approved by the |

a de la composición de

MEMBER SECRETARY

•

Sanoround MEMBER

CHAIRMAN SEIAA-TN

| | | | · · · |
|-----|---------------------------------|----------|---|
| | | | |
| | Thiru.N.Balashanmugam - Fer | | Department of Geology & Mining subject to |
| | Environmental Clearance | | the conditions as recommended by SEAC in |
| | | | addition to the following conditions& |
| | | | conditions stated vide Annexure A. |
| | | | 1. Restricting the ultimate depth of |
| | | | mining upto 30m BGL and quantity of |
| | | | 87,795cu.m of Rough stone are |
| | | | permitted for mining over a period of |
| | | | five years considering the |
| | | | environmental impacts due to the |
| | | | mining, safety precautionary measures |
| | | | of the working personnel and |
| | | | following the principle of the |
| | | | sustainable mining. |
| | | | 2. As per the MoEF& CC office |
| 3 | | | memorandum F.No.22-65/2017- |
| | | | IA.III dated: 30.09.2020 and |
| | | | 20.10.2020 as accepted by the Project |
| | | | proponent the revised CER cost is |
| | | | Rs.5.0 lakhs and the amount shall be |
| | | | spent on the committed activities for |
| | | ł | Government School, before obtaining |
| | | | CTO from TNPCB. |
| 25. | Proposed Rough Stone & Gravel | 8263 | The Authority noted that SEAC has called |
| 20. | quarry lease over an extent of | 1 | for certain additional particulars from the |
| | 2.57.0 Ha at S.F.Nos. 228/2 at | | Project Proponent. The Authority, decided |
| | Velampalayam Village, Palladam | | to request the Member Secretary, SEIAA |
| 1 | Taluk, Tiruppur District, Tamil | 1 | TN the communicate the SEAC minutes to |
| | Nadu by Thiru. Lord Edwinson | 1 | the Proponent. |
| | (Formerly by late Thiru. A. | | |
| | Kumar) – For Environmental | | |
| | Clearance | 1 | |
| 1 | | <u> </u> | |

MEMBER SECRETARY

MEMBER

CHAIRMAN SEIAA-TN

.

| 26. | Proposed Rough Stone & Gravel | 1 | The Authority noted that SEAC has called |
|---------|------------------------------------|--------------|--|
| | Quarry lease over an extent of | i | for certain additional particulars from the |
| | 0.89.5Ha in S.F.Nos.17/1A1B of | ļ | Project Proponent. The Authority, decided |
| | Velampalayam Village, Palladam | | to request the Member Secretary, SEIAA |
| | Taluk, Tiruppur District, Tamil | | TN the communicate the SEAC minutes to |
| | Nadu by Tmt.B.Radhika – For | | the Proponent. |
| | Environmental Clearance. | | |
| 27. | Proposed Rough stone & Gravel | 8184 | The authority noted that this proposal was |
| | quarry lease over an extent of | | placed in 330 th meeting of SEAC held on |
| | 1.21.5ha at S.F.No.58/1 in | | 17.11.2022 and the SEAC decided to direct |
| | Velampalayam Village, Palladam | | the PP to submit a detailed study on the |
| | Taluk, Tiruppur District, Tamil | | structures located around the proposed site. |
| | Nadu by Thiru.P.Venkatachalam | | The structures within the radius of (i) 50 m, |
| | for Environmental Clearance | | (ii) 100 m, (iii) 200 m and (iv) 300 m shall be |
| | | | enumerated with details such as dwelling |
| | | | houses with number of occupants, places of |
| | | | worship, industries, factories, sheds, etc, |
| | | | On receipt of the additional details, SEAC will |
| | | | further examine the proposal. |
| | | | In view of the above, the authority decided to |
| | | | request the Member Secretary, SEIAA to |
| | | | communicate the SEAC minutes to the project |
| | | | proponent held on 17.11.2022. |
| 28. | To consider the proposal for the | 8 243 | The authority noted that the subject was |
| <i></i> | grant of Environmental Clearance | UL7J | earlier appraised in 303 rd SEAC meeting held |
| | for the Proposed Rough stone & | | on 18.08.2022 and further SEAC has |
| | Gravel Quarry lease over an | | |
| | extent of 0.71.5Ha in S.F.Nos. | | |
| | | | Authority for granting Environmental |
| | 383/1 (P) & 383/2A2A1(P) of | | Clearance in 303 rd SEAC Meeting. |
| | Morattupalayam Village, | | Subsequently, the proposal was placed in |
| | Uthukuli Taluk, Tiruppur District, | | 548 th SEIAA meeting held on 01.09.2022. |
| | | | Authority after detailed deliberation decided |

MEMBER SECRETARY

MEMBER

CHAIRMAN

SEIAA-TN

- '

| Tamil Nadu by | to call for additional details from the |
|----------------------|--|
| Thiru.K.Senthilkumar | proponent |
| | 1. The proponent is requested to furnish |
| | the certified compliance report for |
| | the quarrying activity carried out |
| | earlier in the proposed mine lease |
| | area. |
| | Subsequently, the proponent had submitted |
| | the Certified Compliance Report to the O/o |
| | SEIAA on 20.10.2022. Based on the reply |
| | furnished by the PP, the proposal was placed |
| | in the 566 th Authority meeting held on |
| | 01.11.2022. The Authority after detailed |
| | deliberations noted that |
| | 1. As per OM No. IA3-22/10/2022- |
| | 1A.111 dated 08.06.2022 which |
| | mandates the requirement of Certified |
| | Compliance Report (CCR) on the |
| | conditions stipulated in the ECs to the |
| | existing projects/activities from the |
| | concerned Integrated Regional |
| | Offices (IR0s) of MoEF&CC for |
| | consideration of expansion proposals |
| | for grant of Environment Clearance |
| | under the provisions of ElA |
| | Notification, 2006. |
| | On the receipt of CCR, SEIAA noted that |
| | certain conditions have not been complied |
| | Hence, SEIAA decided that SEAC shall |
| | examine the above submitted Certified |
| | Compliance Report for grant of |
| | Environmental Clearance and furnish the |
| | remarks to SEIAA. |
| | Skywrrangel Inde |

OHAIRMAN SEIAA-TN

,

| In the view of the above, the authority decided |
|---|
| to refer back the proposal to SEAC to examine |
| with the above-mentioned points and furnish |
| the remarks to SEIAA. |

Annexure-'A'

- The AD/DD, Dept. of Geology & Mining shall ensure operation of the proposed quarry after the submission slope stability study conducted through the reputed research & Academic Institutions such as NIRM, IITs, NITS Anna University, and any CSIR Laboratories etc.
- 2. The AD/DD, Dept. of Geology & Mining & Director General of Mine safety shall ensure strict compliance and implementation of bench wise recommendations/action plans as recommended in the scientific slope stability study of the reputed research & Academic Institutions as a safety precautionary measure to avoid untoward accidents during mining operation.
- 3. No trees in the area should be removed and all the trees numbered and protected. In case trees fall within the proposed quarry site the trees may be transplanted in the Greenbelt zone. The proponent shall ensure that the activities in no way result in disturbance to forest and trees in vicinity. The proponent shall ensure that the activity does not disturb the movement of grazing animals and free ranging wildlife. The proponent shall ensure that the activity does not disturb the activity does not disturb the biodiversity, the flora & fauna in the ecosystem. The proponent shall ensure that the activities do not disturb the resident and migratory birds. The proponent shall ensure that the activities do not disturb the vegetation and wildlife in the adjoing reserve forests and areas around.
- 4. The proponent shall ensure that the operations do not result in loss of soil biological properties and nutrients.
- 5. The activity should not result in CO₂ release and temperature rise and add to micro climate alternations.
- 6. The proponent shall ensure that the activity does not disturb the water bodies and natural flow of surface and ground water, nor cause any pollution, to water sources in the area.
- 7. The proponent shall ensure that the activities undertaken do not result in carbon emission, and temperature rise, in the area.
- 8. The proponent shall ensure that Monitoring is carried out with reference to the quantum of particulate matter during excavation; blasting; material transport and also from cutting waste dumps and haul roads.

CHAIRMAN SEIAA-TN

26

- The proponent shall ensure that the activities do not disturb the agro biodiversity and agro farms. Actions to be taken to promote agro forestry, mixed plants to support biodiversity conservation in the mine restoration effort.
- 10. The proponent shall ensure that activity does not deplete the indigenous soil seed bank and disturb the mycorrizal fungi, soil organism, soil community nor result in eutrophication of soil and water.
- 11. The activities should not disturb the soil properties and seed and plant growth. Soil amendments as required to be carried out, to improve soil heath
- 12. Bio remediation using microorganisms should be carried out to restore the soil environment to enable carbon sequestration.
- 13. The proponent shall ensure that all mitigation measures listed in the EIA/EMP are taken to protect the biodiversity and natural resources in the area.
- 14. The proponent shall ensure that the activities do not impact the water bodies/wells in the neighboring open wells and bore wells. The proponent shall ensure that the activities do not in any way affect the water quantity and quality in the open wells and bore wells in the vicinity or impact the water table and levels. The proponent shall ensure that the activities do not disturb the river flow, nor affect the Odai, Water bodies, Dams in the vicinity.
- 15. The proponent shall ensure that in the green belt development more indigenous trees species (Appendix as per the SEAC Minutes) to be planted.
- 16. The proponent shall ensure the area is restored and rehabilitated with native trees as recommended in SEAC Minutes (in Appendix).
- 17. The proponent shall ensure that the mine restoration is done using mycorrizal VAM, vermincomposting, Biofertilizers to ensure soil health and biodiversity conservation.
- 18. The proponent shall ensure that the topsoil is protected and used in planting activities in the area.
- 19. The proponent should ensure that there is no disturbance to the agriculture plantations, social forestry plantations, waste lands, forests, sanctuary or national parks. There should be no impact on the land, water, soil and biological environment and other natural resources due to the mining activities.
- 20. The proponent shall ensure that topsoil to be utilized for site restoration and Green belt alone within the proposed area.
- 21. The proponent shall ensure that the activities do not impact green lands/grazing fields of all types surrounding the mine lease area which are food source for the grazing cattle.
- 22. The project proponent shall store/dump the granite waste generated within the earmarked area of the project site for mine closure as per the approved mining plan.

MEMBER SECRETAR

Sh strat MEMBEI

Directions for Reclamation of mine sites

- 1. The mining closure plan should strictly adhere to appropriate soil rehabilitation measures to ensure ecological stability of the area. Reclamation/Restoration of the mine site should ensure that the Geotechnical, physical, chemical properties are sustainable that the soil structure composition is buildup, during the process of restoration.
- 2. The proponent shall ensure that the mine closure plan is followed as per the mining plan and the mine restoration should be done with native species, and site restored to near original status. The proponent shall ensure that the area is ecologically restored to conserve the ecosystems and ensure flow of goods and services.
- 3. A crucial factor for success of reclamation site is to select sustainable species to enable develop a self-sustaining eco system. Species selected should easily establish, grow rapidly, and possess good crown and preferably be native species. Species to be planted in the boundary of project site should be un palatable for cattle's/ goats and should have proven capacity to add leaf-litter to soil and decompose. The species planted should be adaptable to the site conditions. Should be preferably pioneer species, deciduous in nature to allow maximum leaflitter, have deep root system, fix atmospheric nitrogen and improve soil productivity. Species selected should have the ability to tolerate altered pit and toxicity of and site. They should be capable of meeting requirement of local people in regard to fuel fodder and should be able to attract bird, bees and butterflies. The species should be planted in mixed association.
- 4. For mining area reclamation plot culture experiments to be done to identify/ determine suitable species for the site.
- Top soil with a mix of beneficial microbes (Bacteria/Fungi) to be used for reclamation of mine spoils. AM Fungi (Arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi), plant growth promoting Rhizo Bacteria and nitrogen fixing bacteria to be utilized.
- 6. Soil and moisture conservation and water harvesting structures to be used where ever possible for early amelioration and restoration of site.
- 7. Top soil is most important for successful rehabilitation of mined sites. Topsoil contains majority of seeds and plant propagation, soil microorganism, Organic matter and plant nutrients. Wherever possible the topsoil should be immediately used in the area of the for land form reconstruction, to pre mining conditions.
- 8. Over burdens may be analyzed and tested for soil characteristics and used in the site for revegetation. Wherever possible seeds, rhizome, bulbs, etc of pioneering spices should be collected, preserved and used in restoring the site.

MEMBER SECRETAR



CHAIRMAN SEIAA-TN

- Native grasses seeds may be used as colonizers and soil binders, to prevent erosion and allow diverse self- sustaining plant communities to establish. Grasses may offer superior tolerance to drought, and climatic stresses.
- 10. Reclamation involves planned topographical reconstruction of site. Care to be taken to minimize erosion and runoff. Topsoils should have necessary physical, chemicals, ecological, properties and therefore should be stored with precautions and utilized for reclamation process. Stocked topsoil should be stabilized using grasses to protect from wind. Seeds of various indigenous and local species may be broad casted after topsoil and treated overburden are spread.
- 11. Alkaline soils, acidic soils, Saline soils should be suitably treated/amended using green manure, mulches, farmyard manure to increase organic carbon. The efforts should be taken to landscape and use the land post mining. The EMP and mine closure plan should provide adequate budget for reestablishing the site to pre-mining conditions. Effective steps should be taken for utilization of over burden. Mine waste to be used for backfilling, reclamation, restoration, and rehabilitation of the terrain without affecting the drainage and water regimes. The rate of rehabilitation should be similar to rate of mining. The land disturbed should be reshaped for long term use. Mining should be as far as possible be ecofriendly. Integration of rehabilitation strategies with mining plan will enable speedy restoration.
- 12. Efforts should to taken to aesthetically improve the mine site. Generally there are two approaches to restoration i.e Ecological approach which allows tolerant species to establish following succession process allowing pioneer species to establish. The other approach i.e plantation approach is with selected native species are planted. A blend of both methods may be resorted to restore the site by adding soil humas and mycorrhiza.
- 13. Action taken for restoration of the site should be specifically mentioned in the EC compliances.

MEMBER SECRETARY

MEMBER

SEIAA-TN