MINUTES OF THE PUBLIC HEARING FOR PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF ORANGE SMART CITY (OSC) TO BE DEVELOPED BY PROJECT PROPONENT M/S ORANGE SMART CITY INFRASTRUCTURE PVT. LTD., (OSCIPL) AT TALUKA – PEN, DIST – RAIGAD

The public hearing for proposed development of integrated Industrial Township as "ORANGE SMART CITY (OSC)" at Taluka - Pen, Dist- Raigad to be developed by M/s Orange Smart City Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd. Navi Mumbai, was conducted on 11-07-2017 at 11.00 a.m. at Agari Samaj Hall, Pen, Tal- Pen, Dist- Raigad.

Following were the panel members for conducting public hearing as per the Board's Office Order E-51 of 2017 under letter no.BO/JD(WPC)/PH/B-2575, dated 30/06/2017.

1) Shri. Kiran Panbude - **Chairman,**
   Additional District Magistrate, Raigad
   (Representative of District Magistrate,
   Raigad

2) Dr. A. N. Harshawardhan - **Member**
   Regional Officer, MPCB, Raigad
   (Representative of the MPCB, Mumbai)

3) Shri S. L. Waghmare **-Convener**
   Sub Regional Officer, Raigad-II,
   MPCB, Raigad

The Convener of the Public Hearing Committee and Sub Regional Officer, MPCB Raigad-II, welcomed Hon'ble Chairman, Project officials, Environmentalists, Journalists and General Public and informed that, as per Environment Impact Assessment (EIA) Notification of Ministry of Environment, Forest, Climate Change, Govt. of India (MoEFCC, GoI) dated 14th September, 2006, as amended, on 1st December, 2009, it is mandatory to conduct prior public hearing to certain projects which are covered in the schedule of the said Notification . The Sub Regional Office, MPCB, Raigad-II was in receipt of application of project proponent M/s Orange Smart City Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd., Navi Mumbai for conducting public hearing for developing Orange Smart City, Tal – Pen, Dist-Raigad. The Convener further informed that, as per said Notification, the project falls under Category A 7 (c).

Convener of the meeting further informed that the aim of conducting public hearing is to make local people aware the likely impact of the proposed Integrated Township on environment.

Mrs. Vaishali Patil, resident of Pen, Tal. Pen, Dist. Raigad objected on the copy of the Detail Report of the Environment Impact assessment. She said that this is season of sowing paddy in Konkan region. Hence though they are sixteen hamlets of Adivasi i.e. Schedule Tribes, nobody could attend the public hearing. This public hearing should have been conducted on project site only. As per EIA Notification, 2006,

the Annexure IV is also not attached to the report. As per directives of Environment Department, Govt. of Maharashtra dated 25/03/2015, any report/letter should be made available to common people in local language only. As per the EIA notification 2006, detailed report should have been made available to the villagers 30 days advance of the public hearing. This hearing is illegal.

Shri. Sanjay Dangar, Balavali, Tal. Pen, Dist. Raigad has also noted that the place of public hearing is not mentioned in letter along with EIA report submitted to various Grampanchyats. The public hearing is conducted without following the due process of law,

Member of Legislative Assembly, Maharashtra Shri. Dhairyshil Patil informed that the efforts were made by other project proponent to develop Kanchangiri project. Land has been acquired to set up Special Economic Zone. But both these projects have not been completed. If the proposed Township is beneficial to the local people and if there is no adverse impact on the environment, then only local people will support the project.

Some villagers were demanding to defer the public hearing. Committee informed that this Committee has no right to defer the public hearing. The Committee is constituted to carry the public consultation and the suggestions and/or objections made will be sent to Expert Committee of Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change

(MoEFCC) Govt. of India (GoI) for consideration. The local people appealed to co-operate to conduct the public hearing.

The Convener, further informed that as per EIA Notification, 2006, one month advance public notice was published in the local newspapers on 09/06/2017 in 'The Raigad Times' for Marathi and in 'The Indian Express' for English in which the venue & date of public hearing was mentioned. He said that copies of EIA report and executive summery were also made available at MoEFCC, Nagpur and at various offices of Govt. of Maharashtra i.e. District Magistrate Office, Raigad, Sub Divisional Office, Tal-Pen, Dist-Raigad, Zilla Parishad, Raigad, District Industries Centre, Raigad, Sub Regional Office, Raigad-II, Regional Office, MPCB, Raigad and at Head Office of MPCB, Mumbai, Environment Department, Govt. of Maharashtra, Mumbai and Grampanchayat offices at Borgaon, Shene, Ambeghar, Virani, BelvadeKh, BelvadeKh, Balavali, Kopar, Ambivali, Govirle, Walak, Padole, Mungoshi, Hamrapur, Tal-Pen, Dist-Raigad. The public in general were appealed to send any objection / suggestion regarding the above project. The office of Sub Regional Officer, MPCB, Raigad-II, 6th Floor, Raigad Bhavan, Sector 11, CBD Belapur, Navi Mumbai has not received any suggestions/objections. Convener of the meeting appealed Chairman of the Committee to allow to start the proceedings of public hearing.

The Chairman of Committee welcomed all and directed representative of company to present the project details in Marathi. Further representative of the company, presented details of the project including area, location, phases involved the details about pollution control devices and environment management plan of the project, etc., in local language Marathi. He further appealed general public to give objection / suggestion if any, about the project after technical presentation of the unit.

The Environment Consultant appointed by the company, presented the project. The presentation given includes the details of phases/location of proposed project, the details of activities involved in the project, the details of employment generation, the details of environmental study, industrial safety & social economy, CSR plan of the company etc.

After completion, Chairman of the Committee and Member appealed general public to give their objections/suggestions for the proposed project.

A) <u>Mrs. Vaishali Tai Patil, resident of Pen, Tal. Pen, Dist. Raigad.</u>

Mrs. Vaishali Tai Patil objected that -

1) As per the Notification of MoEFCC, GoI dated 14th September, 2006, it is mandatory to make available the copies of detail EIA report in vernacular language (Marathi) well before 30 days of the public

hearing. However the detailed report is not made available 30 days prior to the hearing.

2) There are discrepancies in informaties in Executive Summary and in the presentation.

3) Most of Grampanchayat offices has not received the copies of Executive Summary well before 30 days advance.

4) The project proponent's has not mentioned number of job opportunities created by the project. The project proponent has mentioned the total figure of laborers and future job opportunities.

5) The project proponent has not obtained "Consent to Establish," from MPCB. Project proponent informs that there may be change in the plan of the project. Hence if project plan is changed, then will project proponent conduct the public hearing again?

6) The project proponent did not inform the sources of water for the project.

7) Most of local people from Schedule Tribe Communities (Adivasi Community) could not attend the hearing due to the paddy sowing season. There are sixteen Adivasi hamlets (Vastis), they could not attend the hearing.

8) The page numbers in the report are not correct. Either the page numbers have been deleted or not written.

9) As per the EIA Notification, 2006, EIA should be conducted for an area of 10 Kms radius of the proposed project. It was alleged that the Environment Advisor of the project have not visited the area. Proponent should give proof of the fact that they have visited the Grampanchayat office and conducted the meeting with officials of Gram Panchayat and local people.

10) All the details mentioned in the EIA report are not included in the Executive Summary Report.

11) Hence the public hearing should be postponed and local people should be provided with complete EIA report in vernacular language. The next public hearing should be conducted on the project site only as per the directives of MoEFCC.

12) The project proponent did not inform the exact sources of water for the project. Hence local people fears that Proponent will lift the water from Hetvane or Ambegaon dam which will affect the drinking water system of the local people.

13) Convener has not mentioned the venue of public hearing in the letter which they have sent to Grampanchyats.

14) It is suggested that after the meeting of public hearing, the summary/minutes/points of the meeting will have to be read before the public in the meeting only.

B) Shri. Sanjay Dangar, resident of Balavali, Tal. Pen, Dist. Raigad:-

Shri Sanjay Dangar, resident of the Balavali, objected that –

1) Township will be developed on four sites which are not contiguous. Hence these sites will have to be connected by roads . But construction of road and availability of land for construction of road is not mentioned in the report.
2) The Patalganga, Balganga and Bhogeshwari rivers which flows in the vicinity of project have become highly polluted rivers due to discharge of industrial effluent from the existing chemical units. If the new hazardous and chemical factories allowed to develop in the project area, the effluent will be discharged in the river. The project proponent did not inform the treatment of treated domestic and industrial effluent.
3) The ancient Badaruddin Darga is just adjacent to the project. Nothing is mentioned about the Darga in the presentation and in the report.
4) The efforts were made in the past by the other project proponent for the development and they left the project. The local people fears that this total project will be handed over to another company. The local people are already suffering due to pollution of chemical factories and there will be increase in the pollution and new project proponent will not honour the promises made by the present proponent.

Here, Project proponent answered that existing roads will be used for connectivity purpose. If the local people request &co-operates, the road will be developed. Otherwise, the road project will be declared as separate project.

C) Dilip Mukund Patil, Resident of Kane, Tal. Pen, Dist. Raigad

Shri. Dilip Mukund Patil, resident of Kane opined that -

1) In this presentation, it is mentioned that no village will be relocated or displaced. A detail of population of the project and floating population is not mentioned. This is not clear whether this project will be beneficial to local people.

Project proponent answered that the no village will be relocated or displaced due to the project. Moreover, this project will bring prosperity in the vicinity of the project.

D) Shri. Dhairyashil Patil, MLA

1) This is not a first attempt for the development of the project site. Previously, the efforts were made by other project proponents by planning to develop Kanchangiri Complex and for development of Special Economic Zone (SEZ). Both the project were abandoned. It is noted that after huge investment, the SEZ project, which is established in other parts of country, can give only 3% job opportunities. The people have sighed of relief as SEZ project is abandoned. Now, the project proponent M/s Orange Smart City

Infrastructure Pvt. Ltd., desires to develop Integrated Township. The project proponent has appointed an environment consultant for the preparation of EIA study. Naturally, the EIA study will be in favour of the project only.

2) As per the EIA report, the population of the proposed city may be 3,00,000 (Three lakhs only). There may be more than 4,50,000 souls in the proposed project, hence the local people have to face civic issues.

3) The inception of the project will affect the drinking water sources of the Pen City. There may be decrease of nearly 2,000 hector irrigated land/area. The EIA report mentions that 36.0 MLD drinking water will require for the proposed project. But he feels that more quantity of water will be required than mentioned. The sewage of Pen City is already released in Bhogeshwari River. After township comes up sewage will be discharged in the Bhageshwari River.

4) In the EIA report, it is mentioned that the water will be lifted from Hetwane dam. This point is missing in the presentation. The water of Hetwane dam is reserved only for irrigation purposes and local people will oppose the lifting of water for this project. The water of Ambegaon dam which is exclusively reserved for Pen City and hence project proponent will not be allowed to lift the water from Ambegaon Dam.

5) Due to this project, the local agriculture may be hampered.

6) While acquiring the land in 2007, the project proponent has already issued Indemnity Letter of job opportunities, from whom the land for the project was bought. After ten years, nothing is done. As per the policy, if at all the project is not implemented within five years, the land/plot has to be handed over to the owner of the plot.

7) The project proponent has not considered the study/findings of KasturiRangan Committee, though the project area falls under Western Ghat. UNESCO has already declared Western Ghat as World Natural Heritage and declared more than 139 plants and animals as "highly sensitive protective species."

8) This public hearing shall be cancelled &shall be re-conduct it.

E) Shri. Vikas Mhatre, resident of Koproli, Tal. Pen, Dist. Raigad

1) Shri. Vikas Mhatre supported the views expressed by Vaishali tai Patil and local MLA Shri. Dhairyashil Patil. He expressed the opinion that project proponent is promising the vague job opportunities to local youths as the requirement of manpower and labor is not bifurcated.

2) He further expressed the opinion that the project will require additional land.

3) Shri. Mhatre asked to Environment Consultant for the information of the Proprietor and Board of Directors of the project. Environment Consultant were unable to answer the same.

F) Shri. PromodPatil, Member,Zilla Parishad Raigad-

1) Name of the project is Orange City, which is in English. This needs to be changed to Marathi. The company should consider conducting the public hearing in individual villages. However, if the project is going to benefit the people we will support it.

G) Shri. Jinesh Shirsath, resident of Antola, Tal. Pen, Dist. Raigad.

1) It is mentioned that hazardous waste will be generated. If the project is a residential project how will hazardous waste be generated and if it is generated how it will be managed. Seasonal study for EIA is not carried out. In presentation, it is mentioned that the plan may change a bit but it is not mentioned in EIA report.

H) Koshitai Pawar, Sarpanch, Balavali, Tal. Pen, Dist. Raigad-

1) The report has been submitted in English, it should be submitted in Marathi. We can't read English. Water source will be affected.

I) Shri. Madan Patil, resident of

1) Shri. Madan Patil asked whether project proponent will buy construction materials from outside? It is informed that construction materials will

be purchased from Authorized mines. He suggested that contract shall be given to the local people.

J) Shri. Sanjay Naik, resident of Ambivali, Tal. Pen, Dist. Raigad.

1) The total EIA report should be made available in Marathi and another public hearing should be arranged.

K) Shri. Sanjay Dangar, resident of Balavali, Tal. Pen, Dist. Raigad.

1) The project is proposed at four locations which are at a distance of 3 to 7 km and there is limited connectivity to reach this location. Will the company acquire land through government to strengthen the connectivity?

2) Historical monuments have not been mentioned in the report.

Reply: -company representative clarified that the the road shown in the plans are along the ODR (other district roads).The company will use existing roads for connectivity purpose till such time that this road may be widen by the government at the later stage.

After going through suggestion, objections of the public hearing, representative of the company explained water calculations, numbers of job opportunities to be created for locals in initial phase. Environment Consultant of company briefed about disposal method of hazardous

waste if generated, method used for sampling to collect data for EIA report etc and also noted the suggestions made by the local peoples.

Chairman of the Committee informed that written objections have been received by the Committee and it will sent along with the minutes of pubic hearing.

As agreed, Chairman of the Committee read all the objections/suggestions made during the meeting and discussed the issues.

Objections received by the Committee and MPCB office will be sent along with the proceedings of the meeting with objections, also suggestions given in the meeting along with video recording will be sent to Ministry of Environment, Forest & Climate Change, Govt. of India. Chairman of Committee concluded the meeting extending thanks to all.

(**S. L. Waghmare**)
Convener
and Sub Regional Officer,
MPCB, Raigad II

(**Dr. A.N. Harshawardhan**)
Member,
and RegionalOfficer,
MPCB, Raigad.

(**Kiran Panbude**)
Chairman,
Public Hearing Committee and
Addl.District Magistrate,Raigad