

Minutes

The Minutes of the 128th Meeting of the Expert Appraisal Committee for Projects related to Infrastructure Development, Coastal Regulation Zone, Building/Construction and Miscellaneous projects held from 20th – 23rd November, 2013 in the Conference Hall, MMTC, Scope Complex, Lodhi Road, New Delhi.

1. Opening Remarks of the Chairman.

The Chairman welcomed the members to the 128th meeting of the Expert Appraisal Committee.

2. Confirmation of the Minutes of the 127th Meeting of the EAC held on 28th -30th October, 2013 at New Delhi.

Minutes of the 127th Meeting of the EAC held on 28th -30th October, 2013 at New Delhi were confirmed.

In item 4.26 'Environmental and CRZ Clearance for expansion of Port facility at Hazira, Surat, Gujarat by M/s Essar Bulk Terminal Ltd [F.No.11-46/2011-IA-III]', the "two turning of 600 sqm' shall be added as project component instead of 'a turning circle of 600 sqm' and conditions at (i) , (iii), (v), (xiii) and (xiv) shall be replaced with the following:

- (i) *Project Proponent shall appoint a consultant to look after and advice on the transportation of dangerous chemicals. Sensors for early detection of leakage of propylene and butadiene shall be provided at berths along with water sprinklers.*
- (iii) *Natural drainage system shall be maintained so that there is free flow to the existing mangroves. Mangrove plantation in 500 ha of land in consultation with GEC/Forests Department, Government of Gujarat.*
- (v) *Hazardous chemicals except the permissible Petroleum products shall not be stored within CRZ area. All the construction, storage shall be as per the CRZ Notification, 2011.*
- (viii) *The hazardous wastes generated shall be collected and disposed as per rules, disposable wastes shall be sent to authorized TSDF. MoU in this regard shall be submitted to the Ro, MoEF along with the six monthly monitoring report.*
- (xiv) *The dredging materials shall be utilised for reclamation and excess shall be disposed at the site identified by CWPRS.*

3. Consideration of old Proposals

3.1	CRZ Clearance for Pedder Road Viaduct, Maharashtra by M/s MSRDC [F.No.11-42/2010-IA.III] As presented by the Project Proponent, exponential increase of the daily traffic count over the years on the Pedder Road led to congestion and added to the pollution
-----	--

	<p><i>bare minimum trees to be cut, the information should be provided about their species and whether it also involved any protected or endangered species. Necessary green belt shall be provided on both side of the highway with proper central verge and cost provision should be made for regular maintenance.</i></p> <p>(iv) <i>There should be maximum utilization of fly ash and pond ash.</i></p> <p>(v) <i>Explore the possibilities of cooled mixed technology instead of hot mixed technology.</i></p> <p>(vi) <i>The additional ToR and General Guidelines as per the annexure-I and Annexure-II respectively to this Minutes shall also be considered for preparation of EIA/EMP.</i></p> <p>(vii) <i>Submit details on borrow areas as per OM dated 18/12/2012. The forms area should clearly indicate their dedication to the project, as that proper accounting of excavated soil can be done.</i></p> <p>(viii) <i>In view of scarcity of land in the NCR and the valuable agriculture land in the project area, the project Proponent should justify the requirement for all sections of the project based on realistic traffic flows and projections.</i></p> <p>(ix) <i>The sanctity of the Expressway and its insulation from other connected reads should be adequately ensured in the design and operation. Unintended traffic flows and benefits should be guarded against and clearly segregated</i></p> <p>(x) <i>Any further clarification on carrying out the above studies including anticipated impacts due to the project and mitigative measures, the Project Proponent can refer to the model ToR available on Ministry website “http://moef.nic.in/Manual/Highways”.</i></p> <p>Public hearing to be conducted for the project accordance with provisions of Environmental Impact Assessment Notification, 2006 and the issues raised by the public should be addressed in the Environmental Management Plan.</p> <p>A detailed draft EIA/EMP report should be prepared in accordance with the above additional TOR and should be submitted to the Ministry according to the Notification.</p>
4.26	<p>Environmental and CRZ Clearance for Vizhinjam International Container Transhipment Terminal at Vizhinjam by M/s Vizhinjam International Seaport Ltd [F.No.11-122/2011-IA-III]</p> <p>The 126th EAC in its meeting held in September, 2013 noted that the State Government had not adequately responded and provided comments on the various representations received w.r.t. the proposed project. The representations received on the meeting day, were also provided to the State Government. Principal Secretary, Environment, Kerala Government was, requested to respond to all these</p>

representations.

Numerous representations for and against the project were received by the EAC. The Chairman, during the 127th meeting checked whether any representations against the project were present and if they wished to make any further representations. None opposing the project were present. Two supporters of the project were present and they submitted their representations.

The Additional Chief Secretary, Government of Kerala provided comments on the various representations vide letter dated 17th October 2013. In their reply, it is stated that the representations which were received by the MoEF on 21st September 2013(after the Public hearing) and forwarded to the State Government have been reviewed by VISL and the State Government and it was noted that almost all the new representations are repetitions of the 235 representations received during the Public Hearing held on 29th June 2013,. These have been duly addressed in the relevant sections of the CEIA report, the consolidation of which is provided in Section 7.1.9 (page 7-26 to 7-71) of Volume I of CEIA report (Aug 2013). The State Government stated that the representations submitted after the Public Hearing are mainly on behalf of the resort owners whose land may have to be acquired for the project, and by their association, the Kerala Hotel & Restaurant Association (KHRA). The State Government informed that the CEIA study reveals that all the above resorts are located within 200M from the High Tide Line (HTL), in violation of the CRZ Notification,1991& 2011. The Hon.Supreme Court in its Judgement dated 8-08-2013 in SLP No.24390-24391 of 2013 filed by M/s Vaamika Island (Green Lagoon Resort) against the Judgement of the Hon.High Court of Kerala ordering demolition of the resort constructed violating the CRZ Notification, has held as under:

'24. Further the directions given by the High Court in directing demolition of illegal construction effected during their currency of CRZ notifications 1991 and 2011 are perfectly in tune with the decision of this Court in PiedadeFilomenaGonsalvesVs State of Goa and others(2004) 3 SCC 445, wherein this court has held that such notifications have been issued in the interest of protecting environment and ecology in the coastal area and the construction raised in violation of such regulations cannot be lightly condoned'

The project proponent and the State Government pleaded that the EAC should take note of the advantage of the mega benefit project development, vis-a-vis the inconvenience caused to any party. In that respect, the project proponent stated the advantages of the project to the country, state and locality far outweigh the apprehended social issues. It was pointed out that many of the resorts on whose behalf the petitions have been sent to MoEF are violators of CRZ against whom Government have directed the KCZMA to take action. They stated that such petitions from violators of environmental laws of the land may not get consideration from the authority charged with the responsibility of ensuring compliance with such laws. The State Government stated that it was a Green Port project, incorporating all the modern environmental and ecological safeguards. 5% of the project cost amounting to Rs. 140 crores has been set apart for social responsibility activities.

As regards the issues on behalf of fishing community, the Project Proponent

/State Government stated that an additional fishing harbour with 500m additional berth which could double the capacity of the existing fishing harbour, would benefit the fishing community immensely. The projects will solely benefit the fishing community and the locality. Such mega development projects of immense consequences to the community have been subjected to judicial scrutiny' in the environmental point of view in important cases reported as AIR 1992 Bom: 471 (Konkan Railway), AIR 2000 SCC 3751(Narmada Bachao Vs Union of India), etc where the development needs were held to be equally important as the environmental considerations. The Project Proponent stated that apprehensions in the petitions have been duly taken care of in the EIA report and the mitigation measures proposed would certainly take care of any genuine concern.

The project proponent also submitted point wise replies vide their letters dated 21st & 29th October 2013. The Project Proponent stated that out of 31 resorts in the vicinity, 29 are in violation of the CRZ Notification and the State Authorities have initiated action against them.

Indian Navy and Coast Guard officials also made a presentation in support of the project and highlighted its strategic importance considering that the site is at the tip of the Indian peninsula near the international shipping route, which is hardly 18 km away, where about 100 vessels are sailing daily. They also informed that the presence of foreign powers in the Indian Ocean and neighbouring countries makes the site strategically important from the national security perspective, for joint operation with the amphibian unit of the Indian Army and the Southern Air Command stationed at Thiruvananthapuram.

The project proponent in his presentation stated that this port located near to the international shipping route should be a strong competitor to the Colombo port, which at present is handling about 40% of the Indian transshipment cargo and Vizhinjam is poised to become the transshipment hub of India with 18m natural draft with no maintenance dredging, which can dock the largest (18000TEU) vessels, which no other Indian port can boast. They also stated that a dedicated cruise terminal will result in the transformation of Vizhinjam as the cruise hub of the country resulting in a quantum jump in tourism.

The proposal was examined by the EAC in its 127th meeting held in October, 2013. After deliberation, the EAC asked the Project Proponent to prepare a response subject wise on the issues raised during the public hearing and in the representations received subsequently.

The major issues raised in the various representations are, false data in Form-I, presence of endangered species not given, site is in CRZ-I area, Shoreline study focus on impacts after 1980 but needs to assess the changes in 1969-73 also, fishery and tourism related impacts not addressed /mitigated in final CEIA, Difficulties in crossing the ship channel and to fish in deep sea, Dredging might cause extensive damage & pollution, no specific parameters in ToR on tourism and impact on tourist was not studied, EIA study area was taken as 10 against 15 km, unscientific site selection, violation of CRZ/MoEF, ToR compliance, Pollution & social relevant impacts already being felt,

During the 128th meeting of EAC Mr. Cyriac Kodath and Mr. John Jacob Puthur, c/o Centre for Fisheries Studies, two representatives of Coastal Watch were present at the venue and submitted representations.

Project Proponent presented the details of all major issues in the 128th EAC meeting. It was stated that all the issues have already been raised and addressed during Public Hearing. The purpose of raising the same issues again was to delay the process of clearance. Project Proponent informed that economic viability has been carried out as suggested by EAC and findings are in favour of the project. The issues raised are in personal interest of certain Resorts. Project Proponent provided the information / clarification along with the references on each of the issues raised.

(i) Falsa data in Form –I, i.e. the presence of endangered species not given, site is in CRZ-I area: Project Proponent informed that the EIA study has confirmed that the proposed project stretch is not a nesting ground for turtles or any protected (RET) species, based on the field studies, social surveys, review of secondary data and historical data base & studies done by CMFRI station at Vizhinjam (refer section 4.5.3.7 of CEIA). The same was confirmed by the CRZ mapping report (CESS, April, 2013, p-9), which stated “The project area does not have any sensitive ecosystems such as mangroves, sand dunes, corals, etc. eligible to be categorised as CRZ IA”

(ii) Shoreline study: Shore line study carried out by Indian National Centre for Ocean Information Service (INCOIS), Government of India. The study categorically established that it is not in high erosion zone. Project Proponent informed that shoreline analysis are to be done with images of comparable resolution. 30 m resolution image of 1992 and 23 m resolution images of 1997, 2001, 2006 and 2011 were compatible (p-6 of shoreline report, Aug, 2013) and hence used for the shoreline analysis excluding the low resolution image (80m) image of 1973. Ground truthing was carried out as part of the shoreline studies. The 1969-73 satellite data are not available with comparable resolution. However, ground truthing is matching with the findings. Further the findings are in conformity with the ICMAM and NCSCM study. The copy of the shoreline change map prepared by NCSCM presented before EAC reveals that generally the site has rocky coast with pocket beaches with a small area having low erosion status towards the northern end of the proposed port boundary. The Topo sheet of Thiruvananthapuram and Kanyakumari Districts, No. 58H/3/SW, 58D /15/NE, prepared based on survey carried out in 1989-90, produced by the Project Proponent, showed that the proposed site has rocky shore. The Project Proponent submitted the Comprehensive EIA study along with the shoreline change and modeling studies was carried out as required. Further the CESS, who mapped the CRZ also confirmed the suitability of site for port construction as per the CRZ Notification, 2011.

Regarding the issues on deletion of pages from report on shoreline changes, project proponent informed that according to the ToR granted by MoEF, INCOIS, GoI was engaged and a standalone report was prepared. Asian Consulting Engineers (ACE) were also engaged who have included a section on shoreline changes in the Draft EIA. The method used by ACE was a crude method of sedimentation pattern analysis by comparing the Brightness values of the infrared band of the shoreline waters under different years. Project Proponent stated that comparison of 80 m low resolution image (1973) with 30/23m resolution images of 1990/2002/2011 used by ACE are not

compatible for shoreline analysis due to high difference in resolution. In fact, infrared band is not used for turbidity analysis because water will not reflect any radiation in the infrared band. Moreover, it requires radiometric correction to compare the temporal satellite data for digital signatures. The methodology followed by INCOIS is similar to the methodology followed by MoEF through NCSCM. In view of the above, the report portion in Section 4.3.7 in the Draft EIA was excluded in the final EIA report. A comparison of the above two methodologies was presented to the Committee. The EAC noted from the above comparison that the methodology followed by INCOIS is similar to the methodology followed by NCSCM and the findings are the same and also in conformity with the ground truthing. Further, Modelling studies show that there will not be any significant erosion due to the development of the Port.

(iii) Impact on Fishing activity and fishermen livelihood: Project Proponent informed that extensive stakeholder consultations with, 28 nos. of focus group discussions were carried out for fisheries sector. 22 coastal villages located up to 25 km North and 15 km on South were consulted. The exact number of fishermen affected due to the project were estimated and compensation will be provided to all eligible persons. Steps to safeguard the interests of the fisheries sector are included in the Resettlement Action Plan (RAP), Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and in the Integrated Fishing Community Management Plan (IFCMP). The project proponent has set apart Rs.7.1 crores as part of the compensation package for the fisheries sector (Table 7.17, CEIA Report, Aug, 2013), as livelihood restoration measures for mussel collectors, shore seine fishermen and others. As part of CSR activities in the fisheries sector an additional amount of Rs.41.30 crores has been set apart under (i) water supply scheme (7.3crores) (ii) new fishing landing centre (16crores) (iii) adoption of existing fishing harbor (5crores) (iv) sea food park(4crores) (iii) skill development centre(4crores) (iv) environmental sanitation(3crores) and (v) solid waste management(2crores),(CEIA Report,Aug,2013, Table 8.1). The Project Proponent has also submitted a stand alone report on Integrated Fishing Community Management Plan (October, 2013) based on the CEIA Report, Aug, 2013.

Regarding the issues raised with respect to difficulties in crossing the ship channel and to fish in deep sea, due to the development of port, Project Proponent informed that presently the fishing vessels are crossing about 100 ships daily in the international shipping route located hardly 18 Km from Vizhinjam coast. During the construction phase a maximum of 8 barges and during peak operation phase a maximum of 3 container/other vessels are only expected and that too approaching the port in slow speeds under navigational guidance. Hence, the difficulties will be marginal, if not nil.

Further, project proponent responded to the apprehended difficulty regarding long distance travel due to the project. The project proponent stated that the apprehension was not a major impact since the fishermen from the south of the proposed port have to circumvent the new breakwater only on two days in a year-prior to monsoon to dock their boats to Vizhinjam harbour and back to their home beach after monsoon. It was informed that Mussels re-colonisation on the outer BW is expected in 2-7 years after the commencement of Port construction. The beach existing near the fishing harbour will be maintained in the 300 m stretch between the proposed port and the existing fishing harbour and an additional fish landing centre is included as part of the proposed project in this 300 m stretch with berth along the outer phase of the proposed

breakwater.

(iv) Impact due to dredging: Project Proponent informed that Capital Dredging is a short time activity. The capital dredged material (7.6 Mm³) in full can be utilised for reclamation of berths, based on geotechnical studies and hence there was no need of offshore disposal or marine borrow areas This has been covered under of CEIA Report, Vol I, Aug, 2013. (p-2.24).

The annual sedimentation within the proposed port assessed is about 30000m³/year, implying no need of routine maintenance dredging. Further the sedimentation rate within the fishing harbour will get reduced from the current 3000m³/year to 400m³/year (Modelling Report, Aug, 2013, p-108)

(v) Impact on Wadge bank a fish breeding ground: Project Proponent informed that Wadge bank is located about 40 km away on the existing international shipping route, over which about 100 ships are sailing daily. Out of the above, only three ships are expected to deviate to Vizhinjam, and hence the concern of impact expected to be is nil or minor. Since the capital dredged material would be completely used for reclamation and maintenance dredging is not anticipated, there will not be any dredge disposal and impacts on that account are also ruled out. (CEIA, Aug, 2013, Fig.4.40).

(vi) Impact on Tourism: Project Proponent informed that only 8 resorts are to be acquired for the project(all located in CRZ NDZ) for all the Phases. No land is proposed to be acquired for the projects in Phase II & III in accordance with current masterplan. While finalising the masterplan it became absolutely necessary that a stretch of about 14 acres of land behind the Phase I berths lying within the 200M HTL (housing 8 resorts in CRZ NDZ) shall also be acquired for the project for the back up facilities (for all the three Phases of development) over and above the three resorts envisaged at the ToR approval stage. However this change has not affected the site selection analysis as is evident from Chapter 3 of CEIA Report, Aug, 2013, which analysed the site selection under three scenarios, viz: Original siting studies (2003), ToR stage (2011) & CEIA stage (2013) Further the CEIA study has addressed the impacts on tourism comprehensively and is complete in all respects including the impacts on tourism. Further a stand alone report titled “Tourism Impact Mitigation & Management Plan”, October,2013 was prepared by integrating the information in the CEIA Report, August,2013 and submitted to MoEF vide letter No. VISL/EC/MoEF/2013 dated 29th October 2013.

Compensation packages in accordance with the entitlement framework will be given to the resort owners as project proponent has set apart Rs.1.464 crores for livelihood restoration measures to the staff of the 8 resorts (CEIA, Aug, 2013, Table7.17). As part of CSR activities in the tourism sector, Rs.63 crores has been set apart, with Rs.58 crore for construction of cruise terminal (DPR, May,2013,Annexure 2), and Rs. 5 crore for tourism facilities (CEIA,Aug,2013, Table 8.1)..

Further the project proponent has set apart Rs.34 crores for Area Development Activities under CSR (CEIA, Aug, 2013, Table 8.1), for planned development of the region, to be implemented based on the ongoing study through CEPT University, Ahmedabad.

(vii) Site selection: Project Proponent informed that the CEIA report, 2013, Aug, 2013, Chapter 3 unequivocally justifies the site selection. The site analysis (section 3.2 of the CEIA report) shows that the site north of Vizhinjam was not suitable as the same is eroding and the coast is more dynamic especially till Kollam (as per the MoEF report Status of Shoreline Change Due to Erosion & Accretion, by Institute of Ocean Management, Anna University, Chennai & MoEF)

(viii) Violation /construction of approach road without prior CRZ/EC: Project Proponent informed that Vizhinjam International Seaport Limited (VISL), a fully owned Company of the Government of Kerala is mandated with the development of the Vizhinjam International Deepwater Seaport, which is of national and international importance. Accordingly VISL purchased land for the development of the project through a negotiated purchase basis, including land for a 2 Km long and 45 m wide port road. As part of the Kerala State Transport Project works of the Kovalam-Kaliyikkavila stretch, adjoining the proposed port road, the State Government initiated construction of a small temporary service road of 670 M length and 10 m width through the land in possession of VISL. The construction initiated on 16th August 2010 was stopped on 4th July 2012 after completing 550m, based on the revelation that part of the above stretch of road fell in the 200m/500m landward zone of the HTL as per the CRZ Notification,1991/2011. After the revelation, it was also decided that further construction activities shall only be taken up after obtaining the required clearance from Ministry of Environment & Forests (MoEF), Government of India. On completion of the EIA study, VISL has submitted the application for Environmental Clearance to the MoEF in August 2013. On compliance with section 5(i) of the MoEF office memorandum No. J-11013/41/2006-IA.II(I) dated 12th December 2012, the Board of Directors of the VISL has resolved to give a written commitment to MoEF that further construction activities will be taken up only after obtaining Environmental clearance. The copy of the resolution has been submitted to EAC of MoEF on 23rd Nov 2013, vide letter No.VISL/EC/MoEF/2013 along with the endorsement from the State Government.

(ix) Addition of Navy components: Project Proponent informed that Navy Berth and Coast Guard Berth were included in keeping with the requirement of Ministry of Defence on consideration of national security. The port layout and engineering aspects remain unchanged. GoK gave in principle approval for the Navy & Coast Guard proposals (vide Government of Kerala letter No.344/E1/2013/F&PD dated 23-03-2013 & No.11976/E1/2011/F&PD dated 04-04-2013). The impacts were covered in the EIA and Navy Officers also made a presentation on the proposed components during Public Hearing. Photographs of the Public Hearing were shown to the EAC.

(x) Quarry of raw materials for construction: Project Proponent informed that out of four quarry sites identified, two sites (existing quarries) were shortlisted.

(xi) Study area: Project proponent informed that according to the EIA Guidance Manual for Ports & Harbours, 2010, "*proponent should collect primary baseline data in the project area as well as the area falling within 5 km from the proposed project boundary and secondary data should be collected within 15 kms aerial distance from the project boundary, as specifically mentioned at part 9 (III) of Form I of EIA Notification 2006*". The present study has been done accordingly, the primary data generated (Air, Water, Noise, Soil, etc.) are in 10 km radius, and secondary data collected from the

whole district i.e. Thiruvananthapuram (PIA District). Further, the details of the sensitive areas from 15 Km radius are given in Table 4.2 of CEIA, Aug, 2013. The socio-economic survey has been carried out for a 15 km stretch on both sides of the project site along the coast. Shoreline studies have also been carried out for a 15 km stretch on both sides of the project site along the coast.

(xii)Viability: Project Proponent informed that a detailed study on the economic benefit of the project was carried out, which reiterated the economic viability of the project with an economic internal rate of return of 12.93% which justifies the investment (refer EIRR report, May, 2013 submitted vide letter No.VISL/EC/MoEF/2013 dated 29th October 2013). This has been computed based on financial model acceptable for all international projects. It was the acceptable scientific way of computation of cost benefits. The Project Proponent stated that the Project would bring overall economic benefit to the area, state, region, and the country and this has been addressed in the EIA report.

Regarding the issues raised by the opponents on 23rd November, 2013, Project Proponent reviewed the representations during the meeting and informed that all the concerns have been addressed in the CEIA report and subsequent submissions. All the mitigation measures suggested by the EIA, EMP will be followed strictly.

The EAC noted that the Project Proponent has assessed all likely impacts due to the project and arrived at a suitable EMP. Also responded properly to all the issues raised in the Public hearing as well as in various representations made against the project. Therefore the EAC has recommended for grant of Environmental/ CRZ clearance stipulating following conditions”:

- (i) *“Consent for Establishment” shall be obtained from State Pollution Control Board under Air and Water Act and a copy shall be submitted to the Ministry before start of any construction work at the site.*
- (ii) *Project Proponent shall carry out intensive monitoring with regular reporting six monthly on shore line changes to the Regional Office, MoEF.*
- (iii) *The capital dredged material (7.6 Mm³) shall be utilised for reclamation of berths.*
- (iv) *Additional fish landing centre shall be developed as part of the proposed Vizhinjam port for upliftment of fisheries sector.*
- (v) *The project shall be executed in such a manner that there is minimum disturbance to fishing activity.*
- (vi) *Steps would be taken to safeguard the interests of the fisheries sector as detailed in the Resettlement Action Plan (RAP), Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) and in the Integrated Fishing Community Management Plan (IFCMP; namely a component of Rs.7.1 crores as part of the compensation package for the fisheries sector, as livelihood restoration measures for mussel collectors, shore seine fishermen and*

others, Rs.41.30 crores as part of CSR activities in the fisheries sector under (i) water supply scheme (7.3crores) (ii) new fishing landing centre (16crores) (iii) adoption of existing fishing harbor (5crores) (iv) sea food park(4crores) (iii) skill development centre(4crores) (iv) environmental sanitation (3crores) and (v) solid waste management(2crores).

- (vii) Rail connectivity shall be parallel to the harbour road on elevated structures at +4/5.00 m level without affecting the entry to the existing harbor.
- (viii) Compensation packages in accordance with the Central/State Government norms shall be given to all the authorised-cum-affected (having valid clearances as applicable) resort owners.
- (ix) The port shall ensure that all ships under operation follow the MARPOL Convention regarding discharge or spillage of any toxic, hazardous or polluting material like ballast water, oily water or sludge, sewage, garbage etc. The emission of NOx and SOx shall remain within permissible limits
- (x) CSR activities shall cover villages within 10 km radius of the project.
- (xi) Oil spill Contingency Management Plan shall be put in place.
- (xii) All the recommendations of SCZMA shall be complied with.
- (xiii) The responses/commitments made during public hearing shall be complied with in letter and spirit.
- (xiv) All the recommendations of the EMP shall be complied with in letter and spirit. All the mitigation measures submitted in the EIA report shall be prepared in a matrix format and the compliance for each mitigation plan shall be submitted to MoEF along with half yearly compliance report to MoEF-RO.
- (xv) The Ministry will examine and take necessary action in accordance with the prevailing regulation against the construction of temporary service road by project proponent.
- (xvi) The project proponent shall bring out a special tourism promotion package for the area in consultation with the State Government and implement the same along with the project.
- (xvii) The project proponent shall place on its web site its response to the Public Hearing, and representations as presented to the EAC in the 128th Meeting held on 23rd November 2013, for information of the general public.