

MINUTES OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL PUBLIC HEARING FOR PROPOSED COMMISSIONING OF BERTHING JETTY, CONVEYOR CORRIDOR WITH STORAGE & BACKUP FACILITIES AND APPROACH ROAD FOR CEMENT GRINDING UNIT AND FLY ASH /SLAG PROCESSING UNIT AT VILLAGE SHAHABAJ AND SHAHAPUR, TALUKA-ALIBAG, DISTRICT-RAIGAD, MAHARASHTRA BY PROJECT PROPONENT M/S ADANI CEMENTATION LTD., (ACL)

The Public Hearing for proposed commissioning of Berthing Jetty, Conveyor Corridor with Storage & Backup Facilities and Approach Road for Cement Grinding Unit And Fly Ash/Slag Processing Unit at Village Shahabaj and Shahapur, Taluka-Alibag, District-Raigad, Maharashtra by Project Proponent M/s Adani Cementation Ltd., (ACL) was conducted on Monday, the 18th April, 2022 at Jay Mangal Karyalaya, Pandawa Devi, At Post – Poynad, Tal – Alibag, Dist – Raigad at 12.30 noon.

Shri R. S. Kamat, Sub Regional Officer – Raigad-2, MPCB, Raigad Bhavan, Navi Mumbai and Convener of the Environment Public Hearing Committee welcomed Dr. Padamshree Bainade, Additional District Magistrate, Raigad and Chairperson of the Environment Public Hearing Committee; Shri Vidyasagar Killedar, Incharge Regional Officer-Raigad, MPCB, Navi Mumbai and Member of the Environment Public Hearing Committee; Environmentalists, NGOs, Journalists and Company Officials and local people/participants who were present and informed that as per the Environment Impact Assessment Notification of Ministry of Environment, Forest & Climate Change, Govt. of India, (i.e. MoEF & CC, Gol) dated 14th September, 2006 as amended on 1st December, 2009, it is mandatory to conduct prior public consultation to certain projects which are covered in the schedule of the said Notification.

Convener of the Public Hearing Committee welcomed all and requested all the participants to follow strict guidelines of Ministry of Environment, Forest & Climate Change, Govt. of India, New Delhi's Office Memorandum dated 14-09-2020. The thermal checking and use of sanitizer is kept at the entrance of the pandol and now it is compulsory to wear a mask and follow the social distancing amongst the persons in the meeting hall.

Convener further informed that as per the Environment Impact Assessment Notification of Ministry of Environment, Forest & Climate Change, Govt. of India, (i.e. MoEF & CC, Gol) dated 14th September, 2006 as amended on 1st December, 2009, it is mandatory to conduct prior public consultation to certain projects which are covered in the schedule of the said Notification.

He informed that Maharashtra Pollution Control Board was in receipt of application from Project Proponent M/s Adani Cementation Ltd., (ACL) for their proposed

commissioning of Berthing Jetty, Conveyor Corridor with Storage & Backup Facilities and Approach Road for Cement Grinding Unit And Fly Ash/Slag Processing Unit at Village Shahabaj and Shahapur, Taluka-Alibag, District-Raigad, Maharashtra.

The Convener further informed that this existing project is established outside the Industrial Zone and as per EIA Notification, 2006 the category of project falls under Category 7 (e) which requires to obtain prior Environmental Clearance from the Environment, Forest and Climate Change Department, Govt of India, New Delhi for which prior environmental consultation is mandatory.

Convener informed that the aim of conducting prior public consultation is to make aware, local people who can be participant in the hearing and they should know the developmental activities and Environment Management Plan of the unit.

Project Proponent had submitted online prescribed application alongwith pre-feasibility report to the Impact Assessment Division, Ministry of Environment, Forest & Climate Change, Govt. of India, New Delhi and it has been considered and given online approval on 13.12.2018 Amendment 09.10.2019 and 06.12.2021.

District Collector, Raigad approved the date of public hearing on Monday, the 18th April, 2022 at 12.30 noon and as per the Notification dated 14-09-2006 issued by Ministry of Environment, Forest & Climate Change, Govt. of India, (MoEF & CC, GoI), New Delhi and subsequent amendment on 01-12-2019, Member Secretary, Maharashtra Pollution Control Board, Mumbai has constituted Public Hearing Panel vide Board's Office Order No. E- 26 of 2022 under letter no. BO/JD (WPC)/PH/B- 22040-FTS-0025 , dated 01.04.2022:-

- | | |
|---|-----------------|
| 1) District Magistrate-Raigad
or his representative not below
the rank of an Additional District
Magistrate | Chairman |
| 2) Representative of Maharashtra
Pollution Control Board, Mumbai -
Regional Officer – Raigad,
MPCB, Raigad Bhavan, Navi Mumbai | Member |
| 3) Sub Regional Officer- Raigad-2
MPCB, Raigad Bhavan, Navi Mumbai | Convener |

As per said Notification, 30 days' advance public notice was published by Sub Regional Officer, Raigad-2, MPCB Raigad in the Local Newspaper in Daily Sakal and Daily Krishwal for Marathi and in National Newspaper daily The Indian Express for English

on 17th March, 2022. The public were appealed to send their suggestions, views, doubts or objections regarding the proposed unit.

Also copy of EIA report and executive summary were made available in Marathi and in English at various notified Government offices i.e. Ministry of Environment, Forest & Climate Change, Zonal Office, West Central Zone, New Secretariat Building, Ground Floor, East Wing, Civil Line, Nagpur-440 001; District Collector Office, Raigad; Additional District Collector Office, Raigad; Chief Executive Officer, Zilla Parishad Office, Raigad; General Manager, District Industries Centre Office, Raigad; Tahasildar, Tahasildar Office-Pen, Tal – Pen, District – Raigad; Chief Officer, Nagar Parishad Office-Pen, District-Raigad;

Gram Panchayat Offices – Mouje Shahabaj and Shahapur; Poynad; Ghaswasd; Daman Pada; Kamal Pada; Walwad and Pejari, Tal – Alibag, Dist – Raigad;

Group Gram Panchayat Offices -

Mouje Vadakhal, Beneghat, Wave, Kolve, Dolvi, Tal -Pen, Dist – Raigad;

Environment & Climate Change Department, Govt. of Maharashtra, 15th Floor, New Administrative Building, Mantralaya, Mumbai; Head Office, Maharashtra Pollution Control Board, Mumbai; Regional Officer-Raigad, MPCB, Raigad Bhavan, 6th Floor, CBD Belapur, Navi Mumbai; Sub Regional Officer-Raigad-2, MPCB, Raigad Bhavan, 6th Floor, CBD Belapur, Navi Mumbai; and on the website of MPCB. The public in general were appealed to send any suggestion or objection regarding the proposed project. MPCB is in receipt of few objections in writing and by email which have been noted.

Convener informed that participants can raise their views, suggestions/objections for the proposed project in environmental angle only orally as well as in writing also.

Convener informed that this Committee is constituted to know the views, opinions, suggestions or objections of the local people and it does not take any decision of sanction, recommendation or rejection of the project. The suggestions/objections raised during the meeting will be included in the minutes of the meeting. The video shooting of the meeting as it is along with minutes of the meeting and Final EIA report will be submitted with the approval of Chairperson of the Committee through Head Office MPCB to Ministry of Environment, Forest & Climate Change, Govt. of India, New Delhi for further decision.

Convener requested Chairperson to inform Project Proponent to start the presentation.

With the permission of the Chairman, the Project Officer made a presentation on the entire Environmental Management Plan (EMP) for the proposed project. He informed about the geographical location of the proposed project, possible impact on the

environment due to the proposed project, and the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) prepared for it.

Project Officer informed that Rupees 2.5 crores capital investment have been ear-marked for EMP and Recurring expenditure for the EMP will 1.0 crores annually.

After the Presentation, Environment Public Hearing Committee informed the participants to raise views, suggestions or objections regarding the proposed plant in environmental angle only. While raising the suggestions or objections, full name and village should be informed.

FOLLOWING PARTICIPANTS HAVE TAKEN PART IN THE DISCUSSIONS AND ANSWERS GIVEN BY PROJECT CONSULTANT/PROJECT PROPONENT/ENVIRONMENT PUBLIC HEARING COMMITTEE

At the beginning of the meeting, when local person Shri Naresh Mhatre & Others, Shahabaj, Tal. Alibag, Dist. Raigad people came to the public hearing hall, an official of the project insulted them. The local people were angry and demanded to remove him from the meeting. As per the Order of the Chairperson, the concerned officer apologized and was instructed to leave the meeting hall.

1) Shri Anil Parshuram Patil, Residence – Shahpur, Tal -Alibag, Dist – Raigad :-

Shri Anil Patil stated that I am a farmer from Shahapur and Secretary of the Farmers' Struggle Committee-

- a) He said that Reliance Energy project was coming up in 2006. We raised environmental objections against the project. After that, some issues were raised by the Environment, Forest & Climate Change Department, Government of India, New Delhi. We had filed a Public Interest Litigation (PIL) in the Mumbai High Court and the project had to be withdrawn as the polluting project Shahapur could not be commissioned;
- b) The Tata Enviro Power Project was scheduled to arrive here. Some citizens of Shahapur wanted it. They have acquired in MIDC also. But in the last 10-15 years, the project has not started yet;
- c) MIDC started acquiring land at Shahapur in 2011. The compensation was not disclosed, but three years later, the notice was set aside;
- d) The fourth project now belongs to the Adani Group, where Conveyor Belt and Jetty will be installed. It will be commissioned at Survey No.596, Shahpur. Survey no. 595 is reserved for cattle grazing. There are mangroves forest and thousands of mangroves shrubs, bushes are there. We are not against the project, but our

problems should be solved. For installation of Conveyor Belt and Jetty, 150 mangroves trees will have to be cut. How and where those mangroves trees will be replanted, it should be informed. Because Project Proponent had promised to plant ten trees for one tree. If the area where the trees will be planted has been measured, then the information should be made available.

Shri Anil Patil further informed that Maharashtra Coastal Zone Management Authority (i.e. MCZMA) in its 149th meeting held on 4th December, 2020 observed that Conveyor Corridor, Approach Road of this project falls under CRZ-I area. Jetty also falls in CRZ-I. Shri Patil informed that all the points should be clarified by the Project officials. Otherwise, we will Appeal at Environment Appellate Authority, Govt. of India. He further objected that the Conveyor Corridor is at survey no. 596,598,601,602, 346 in Shahabad are in the "Reserved Forest Area" of Maharashtra Government. There are mangroves and cattle grazing land. The site of the proposed project is in a buffer zone of 50 meters of Reserved Forest. The Project Proponent cannot touch mangroves without the prior permission of the Hon'ble High Court.

As per CRZ, 2011, it was expected to clarify in the Presentation that there will be no change in the environment in the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) report. It is not given. Similarly, the report does not mention the impact of the project on the fishing of the local fishermen, the pollution of the sea water due to cement milling and the measures to be taken against it.

Project Proponent are expected to give explanations on various issues like CRZ, 2011. According to CRZ, protection of coastline is mandatory by Law. Shri Patil said that even if the project gets Environmental Clearance (EC), we local people will Appeal against it.

Chairperson, Environment Public Hearing Committee asked Project Proponent to answer on each point as raised.

Project Environment Consultant informed that proposed port is small. We will not fill it. The barrage will not be built. The water flow will not be obstructed as the jetty is of Tressal type. While answering regarding mangroves, he said that the project cannot be sanctioned without following the strict guidelines as prescribed by the Government of India.

At that time, the participants strongly demanded information about the place details for conservation of mangroves. The Environmental Consultant of the project said that the fixing of place done by CAMPA (i.e. Compensatory Afforestation Fund Management and Planning Authority) and Social Forestry Department takes further action in this regard.

The Chairperson instructed the Environmental Consultant that the question is raised that how the terms and conditions of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Report will be complied. It should be answered.

The Environmental Consultant answered that the Government of India first takes Undertaking from the company to comply with the terms and conditions of EIA and Maharashtra Pollution Control Board keeps vigil on it.

2) **Mrs. Karuna Dhumal, Pezari, Tal. Alibag, Dist. Raigad, Mahila Representative, Sangharsh Samiti :-**

Mrs. Dhumal asked Environment Consultant whether you have submitted an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) report to the Government. The Environmental Consultant answered in the affirmative.

At that time Mrs. Dhumal replied that the report is not complete. This report is made on behalf of the company. This report is not in the interest of Bhumiputras/sons of soil. This report is a betrayal of our Bhumiputras. We do not agree with this report.

3) **Shri Mohan Dhumal, Residence Shahabaj, Tal-Alibag, Dist – Raigad:-**

He said that I am Bhumiputra and I have given 10.5 acres of land for the project. We welcome the company. Only Maharashtra Pollution Control Board should ensure that pollution does not occur. It is more important for our children to have employment opportunities.

4) **Shri Kumar Baikar, Kamalpada, Tal-Alibag, Dist – Raigad:-**

I have given my 15 acres of land to the company," he said. I support this project. The children of the village will get employment.

5) **Dr. Pravin Keshav Dhumal, Chairman, Tal-Alibag, Dist – Raigad Vistar Virodhi Sangharsh Samiti :-**

Dr. Pravin Dhumal stated that we, the farmers, are opposing this project. We are not against the project, but we are against giving government land to private industry. Because we have agricultural land, our livelihood has been running on this land for generations. Therefore, we oppose to give these lands to private industry. If they want to buy land, buy land from Survey No. 203 to Survey No. 596.

The concept of Mangroves/Kandalvan Tourism has been introduced. So how you can destroy the mangroves project? In the report, there is mention of Dharamtar Creek. A few days ago, an American study group enjoyed a Mangroves/Kandalvan safari.

The Project Environmental Consultant said that all your suggestions, objections, views have been recorded. You will be answered by the company. We will not seize anyone's land. As far as the jetty is concerned, there will be no farmland. Answers have been given regarding water front and mangroves. The local people are assured that nothing will be done without your prior permission.

6) **Shri Dwarkanath Patil, Kamalpada, Tal -Alibag, Dist – Raigad:-**

All information provided by the company is bogus. Government report states that Gut no. 335, 336 is a place near the sea. I have government document. This will require permission from the Government of India.

If these adjoining land groups are closed, where will the water go, now there are ponds dug. If the Environmental Impact Assessment Report of this company is sent to the Gram Panchayat, then it has not been discussed in the Gram Sabha. Ignorant, poor farmers have not been informed about this project.

He further objected that one acre and fifty seven plots of land in Shahabaj Gut number 346 and seven acres in the same survey number and 24 Arc. the land has been allotted to the Forest Department. There are not 150 mangroves, but 1,50,000 mangroves and the Project Proponent cannot be told how to cultivate them.

7) **Shri Rupesh Patil, Residence-Shahabaj, Tal-Alibag, Dist-Raigad :-**

Shri Rupesh Patil objected that the Project Environment Consultant has reported pollution to the Government. So let's answer what they did, then we give our evidence.

The Environmental Consultant replied that we have prepared the Terms of Reference (ToR) twice and the full report has been submitted to the Maharashtra Pollution Control Board. He informed them about the measures to be taken to prevent pollution

Chairperson appealed participants to ask further questions. At that time, Shri Patil accused that environmental consultant is giving misleading and wrong answers. He said that if a public hearing is to be held, all questions need to be answered.

8) **Mrs. Karuna Pravin Dhumal, Pezari, Tal. Alibag, Dist. Raigad, Mahila Representative, Sangharsh Samiti :-**

Mrs. Karuna Dhumal asked if the Adani company is going to build the jetty, how the land acquisition will be done? She opined that our Bhumiputras are uneducated, they should not be deceived. Who will buy the land?

The Project Officer replied that we have purchased the land for the project. As far as the jetty is concerned, we will not buy any private land for the jetty. If required in future, it will be purchased only after discussions with the farmers. At this time Mrs.

Karuna Dhumal advised local farmers to be careful and not to sell their lands. Land should be sold only in compliance with the terms and conditions of the Government.

9) Shri Rajendra Patil, Residence -Pen, Tal-Pen, Dist-Raigad:-

Shri Rajendra Patil objected that even though the project site is densely forested, only 0.64 hectare is shown in the presentation. How can there be only 150 mangroves in a dense forest? He further objected that the entire project falls under CRZ-1, 2, 3 and 4.

The Maharashtra Coastal Zone Management Authority (MCZMA) has indicated in its 145th meeting that the project should be shifted at other site due to dense mangrove forest. Then, on which issue in the 149th meeting, MCZMA gave permission.

He further asked how the slag generated during the manufacturing process could be processed and disposed off? Did the company have enough storage capacity?

The project report itself mentions that mangroves will have to be deforested, the soil will have to be changed, and water will be polluted. This water pollution will completely destroy agriculture.

The company's waste material will fill the water. So agriculture fields will become barren. Fishing will be affected. Due to JSW, Thousands of Acres land in Pen taluka have become barren. A petition has been filed in the National Green Tribunal (NGT) for the same. We've been fighting for the last eight years.

The Environmental Consultant replied that six hectares of land has been purchased and classified. 2 hectares of it is for water front. Local fishing has been recorded there.

Provision has been made for compensation to the fishermen who will be affected by the project. The participants asked whether any report on the compensation matter is prepared.

Almost all the participants loudly expressed their displeasure over the issue and said that about 4,500 fishermen are fishing in Alibag taluka. The participants at the time asked how many fishermen were listed.

The Project Officer said that the area where our project is coming up and where the fishermen affected, will be compensated. The list of affected fishermen will be obtained from the Fisheries Department, Govt. of Maharashtra.

While replying to the letter regarding mangroves, it is informed that the Jetty is of Tressal type. First, the Pillars are erected into the sea and a jetty is built on it.

Project Officer further informed that they will not fill. Similarly, a Conveyor also has columns. It is not coming to the ground. So, the loss of mangroves will be minimal.

10) Mrs. Samita Rajendra Patil, Residence – Pen, Tal-Pen, Dist – Raigad :-

Mrs. Samita Patil objected and said that they have been fighting for the last eight years due to the sufferings they are facing of conveyor belt. She stated that do not talk about conveyor belts, talk about how the mangroves can be saved.

She further objected that the cattle grazing land do not get to landless farmers, but how industrialists get the same. She alleged that it is heard that the land at Gut No. 596, would be taken over by this industry.

At that time, some of the participants mentioned the conveyor belt of another company i.e. JSW company. Chairperson suggested to raise the suggestions or objections regarding the proposed project of the public hearing. The participants here objected that if the project falls in CRZ-1, 2, 3, the project could not take place.

The Project Officer replied that we have only gut no.600 and gut no.602 in Shahapur. He further replied that MCZMA directed us in its 145th meeting to think about other alternative sites.

The Project Proponent replied that the site was approved by MCZMA only after studying other alternative sites. The Project Proponent further said that the terms and conditions laid down by MCZMA, Department of Environment, Maharashtra Pollution Control Board, and Revenue Department will be strictly followed.

11) Shri Pravin Mhatre, Residence – Wave, Tal -Pen, Dist – Raigad :-

Shri Pravin Mhatre stated that the freight for this company will be by ship and it will be through Dharamtar creek, Amba creek. Just now the project officer said that we are going to remove the silt from Dharamtar creek. Therefore, the surrounding four gram panchayats have about 2100-2200 acres of land. The barrage on that farm have been broken by two previous companies. So far 2100-2200 acres of land has become completely barren. The new jetty will run by barges. The farmers of this area will get the benefit of this jetty. If farmers in other areas are not getting the benefit, then we are against this jetty. We will welcome this project only if it benefits all the farmers.

The project officer replied that it is possible to remove 30,000.0 M³ of silt/sludge every year. The silt/sludge will be used to fill the company's premises and the remaining silt will be dumped 30 km away from Alibag, the place authorized by the Competent-Authority. On the other hand, it will not be thrown anywhere.

12) Shri Suhas Narayan Patil, Residence-Shahapur, Tal-Alibag, Dist – Raigad :-

Shri Suhas Patil asked the Chairperson that whether the Government has sanctioned a lot of land for the proposed project? He further asked whether the Government has given permission for the said project? If the project does not own the land for the proposed project, then how will the project work? Hence, this public hearing is illegal.

Shri Suhas Patil further expressed his opinion that local people and farmer brothers expressed their views on this project. Some voted in favour of the project, while others opposed it. However, despite the public hearing on the environment, the Chairperson and officers of the Maharashtra Pollution Control Board are not giving the answer, but the company officials are giving the answer.

At this time, Chairperson replied that she had come to the public hearing as Chairperson to hear the side of the local people and to hear the company's Environmental Management Plan (EMP) and the Chairperson is not expected to say anything.

Member, Environment Public Hearing Committee informed that it is mandatory to certain industries to obtain Environmental Clearance (EC).

For this, first the concerned project has to prepare an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) report as per the Environmental Impact Assessment Notification, 2006 as issued by Ministry of Environment, Forest & Climate Change, Govt. of India, New Delhi. Certain projects have to obtain prior permission for carrying EIA study and survey from Central Government or from State Government. It is imperative to study the potential impact of the proposed project in the radius of 10.0 k.m. of the project on the environment.

Member informed that after the completion of the study, the next step is to conduct a public hearing and the Member Secretary, Maharashtra Pollution Control Board constitutes a Public Hearing Committee. It is mandatory to hold the public hearing under the chairmanship of the District Magistrate or his representative and as representatives of Maharashtra Pollution Control Board, Regional Officer attends the meeting as Member of the Committee and concerned Sub Regional Officer as Convener.

These public hearings are for the local people to raise their environmental suggestions, views or objections regarding the proposed project. The opinion of the local people is submitted to the Central or State Government. The Expert Committee at the Central or State Environment Department takes further decision. This public hearing is only for registering your environmental concerns, suggestions or objections to the proposed project.

At that time, Shri Suhas Patil suggested that the local farmers should be informed first about the pollution control system of the project.

At that time, the Chairperson said that the minutes of the public hearing would be made available to the local people after following due procedure. The transparent process is implemented. Video shooting of the entire public hearing is being taken. Similarly, the proceedings of this meeting are being written.

Shri Suhas Patil further said that if there is no problem of pollution from the project, it will provide employment opportunities to the local people, then I personally support the project, because the local youth need employment.

The project officer said the question was about employment opportunities. As shown in the presentation, 40 persons can get direct employment opportunities during the construction phase. So, it can indirectly benefit 400 people.

After the installation and operation of the project, 10 people can get direct employment opportunities, while 100 people will indirectly benefit from it. Only local people will be given job opportunities in the project.

13) Shri Pravin Mhatre, Residence-Dhamanpada, Tal-Alibag, Dist – Raigad :-

Shri Praveen Mhatre said that all my land is in Shahapur creek. He said that during the construction phase 40 persons will get direct employment and 400 persons will get indirect employment, and after operation of the project, only 10 persons will get employment in the project and indirectly 100 persons will get indirect employment. This means that everyone will know how the project will benefit the local people.

He further asked that if the Environmental Consultant has studied the environment and aquatic life of the area, then an explanation should be given as to how many species of fish are found in the creek.

The Project Officer said that there are about 50 species of fresh water fish. Shri Mhatre said that the names of fish Rohu, Katla, Mrigal and Jitada mentioned in the report, all are these fresh water fish on which our livelihood depends and if this project employs only ten people; we do not want such a project. Similarly, the silt from the project will be dumped in the project and adjacent areas and it will spoil the fertile land.

At that time, the Project Officer replied that as much capacity as possible, the silt would be dumped in our premises and the additional/remaining silt would be disposed at a distance of 30 km. away from the project site, which is approved by the Competent-Authority.

Shri Mhatre further informed that thousands of acres of farmland are becoming barren due to the destruction of mangroves barrages.

At that time, Chairperson of the Environmental Public Hearing Committee informed the project officials about the purpose of Shri Mhatre's question that he is asking questions about the barges that will come, which will break the mangroves barrages, due to which the salt water will enter in their agricultural land.

The project officer replied that care will be taken while constructing the jetty. There will be no big ships, but small barges. If any loss occurs here, it will loss of company also. Hence, care will be taken. The Environment Team of the Company will be working here.

Shri Mhatre stated this is our simple question that whether there will be a concrete protective wall? The Project Officer replied in the affirmative. The Project Officer said that Rs 50 lakh has been ear-marked as shown in the presentation and excess amount will be spent if required.

Chairperson remarked that "Protective Embankment" should be constructed as per CRZ norms and materials.

The Project Officer replied that the directives as issued by the Government from time to time would be followed and efforts would be made to protect the environment and not to harm anyone.

Shri Mhatre asked how many fishermen and farmers will be affected due to this project?

The Project Officer replied that as per the earlier answer to this question, the number of affected persons would be taken from the Fisheries Department and they would be compensated accordingly.

Shri Mhatre alleged that the jetty project will be polluter and detrimental to local farmers. The aquatic life here is more likely to be destroyed. The project will be constructed by breaking the mangroves barrages. Hence, we oppose this project.

The Environmental Consultant said that the project is of Rs. 172/- Crore. The utmost care will be taken to protect the environment and all issues will be resolved through discussion. The jetty will be on the water, only part of the conveyor belt will be on the ground.

14) Shri Sanjaykumar Patil, Residence-Shahapur, Tal -Alibag, Dist – Raigad:-

He objected that there is a dense forest of mangroves in the project area. Wild animals are also observed. Can a jetty can be built there?

Shri Patil asked if there are so many mangroves in the government own land belt from Shahabaj to Shahapur, where it is not impossible for a person to go, can you cut so many mangroves as per the rules?

Could you tell the length and width of the fenced Protected Track from Shahabaj to Shahapur?

The Environmental Consultant said that Project Management will not work in violation of any Government regulations. The jetty will be on the water, only part of the conveyor belt will be on the ground.

At that time, Shri Sanjay Kumar Patil said that we are not against the project. But if the mangroves can't be cut , say so, and if mangroves can be cut, cut it by showing Government rules. Show the government letter if permission is granted.

Project Officer promised that all the directives as issued by Govt. of India from time to time will be strictly followed while commissioning the jetty. Also, the doubts raised regarding existence of mangroves and commissioning of jetty is already informed.

Shri Sanjay Kumar Patil stated that we are fishermen of Shahabaj, Shahapur, Dhamanpada. Maharashtra Government also does not have data on how many fishermen are here who carry fishing? And how did you get here? He said that Project Proponent should carry a scientific survey first. He further asked is there any answer to what they do fishing, how they do fishing? A committee was appointed for fishermen on 26-3-2021. Has its report been received?

15) Dr. Vaishali Patil, Co-ordinator, Tal. Pen, Dist. Raigad, Konkan Vikas Co-ordinator Committee and Konkan Prakalp Samiti, Representative of Adivasi Samiti, Worker Committee :-

She stated that from the beginning (Shri Anil Patil) till now, various 36 objections have been registered by the locals. I support all these 36 objections, because they are the objections of the farmers.

She said that her first objection is –

- a) I have not seen such an Environmental Public Hearing, EIA –i.e. Environment Impact Assessment, it is expected that this EIA should be made available to the local people/PAPs (Project Affected Persons) in their local language in detail.

Here, the detailed EIA report should have been made available in Marathi. It is not made available. The Government through Project Proponent (Company) and from Project Proponent to MPCB, the report which is made available to us is "Summary Report of EIA" and not "full report of EIA. Hence, my first objection is the public consultation which is arranged on the basis of EIA report, when it is not made available to local people and farmers, then how this public hearing meeting is convened?

- b) The second objection is in the public hearing of the environment of the farmers who have revolted and established the Kul Kayada/Clan Act. And not only Agari, Koli, Kunabi, Maratha, Bhoi, but also Adivasis live on this land. When the Agaris cultivates in fields, the Adivasis get wages. Our tribesmen say that when crabs comes to you, we get bread, when fish comes to you, our dining chulhas burns.
- c) So, this is not just a question of this land, but of the twelve Balutedars (previous social system) in the district. If the agriculture fields of farmers have vanished, if fishing activities of fishermen is vanished, if Swamp Land (Khajan lands) have gone, the tribals will starve to death, so I support these demands.
- d) In the public hearing, the Project officer is expected to give scientific answers to the objections raised by the farmers on the basis of EIA. Here, one official speaks on one side, while the other assures on behalf of the company, what a public hearing?
- e) These farmers are- farmers who have studied EIA. The farmers have objections that would embarrass lawyers. They are raising objections by pointing on the act of Project Proponent at loopholes in the law. However, my objection is that in this public hearing, the technical answers are not given to the objections raised by the participants.
- f) The EIA report on which the public hearing was held was prepared by an agency appointed by Adani. The Adani Group has paid for it. How the farmers side will be in the report?
- g) Whatever the conflict, the livelihood on the jetty and the lives of the local people living here for generations, the potential adverse effects on fishing, the agriculture, the tribals here will be affected. The jetty will be used for transportation and what will be brought - cement. The EIA said that the jetty would be used for transport to bridge the gap between supply and demand. So the demand for cement is not from the farmers.

According to a government report, India is producing an excess of 3,000 million tonnes of cement. Cement production is the highest in the world in both Vietnam and India. We want industry, we want employment.

But an entrepreneur whose name is not good, hence does not want a polluting project. When the project starts, only ten people will get employment opportunities in this industry. This Adani conglomerate has harmed the farmers and the environment in the country.

A project which our country does not need, a project which is not demanded by the local people, a project which will lead to the exodus of local fishermen, farmers and tribals. Similarly, we support the objections that have been reported so far. However, this public hearing should be canceled and a legal public hearing should be held.

16) Shri Ambadas Patil, Residence – Shahapur, Tal - Alibag, Dist – Raigad :-

The project officials are not giving satisfactory answers to the environmental questions raised at the meeting. Therefore, the local people are worried whether the project is sustainable or will go away later. Upcoming projects must first be sustainable.

The project officer said that this project will be a sustainable one. Similarly, this project will be Environmentally Sustainable. All environmental standards will be followed. Similarly, improvements will be made from time to time.

At this point, the Chairperson said that the questioner's opinion is whether the project will be run efficiently, because many companies come to a standstill and close down.

At this time, the Project Officer said that this project is a sustainable project. When the company is investing heavily in this project, it will try for sustainable project only.

Chairperson opined that if the officers and employees of the company continue to function efficiently, then the company can be sustainable.

17) Shri Umesh Patil, Residence – Shahapur, Tal-Alibag, Dist-Raigad:-

He thanked the project officials for answering the questions properly. He further questioned whether the permission of the local administration was sought while preparing the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) report. If they have some environmental issues, did they report it? Did you take support of local people during the survey? Did you take the report of District Health Officer? Similarly, whether the local people's representatives were taken into confidence. Project officials said there is a specific process for setting up any project. Public hearing is an important stage for the local

people, the people's representatives. The public hearing process has to be completed with the witness of the District Administration. At public hearings, local people have the opportunity to raise objections, suggestions regarding the project. We are carrying out the process accordingly.

Shri Umesh Patil asked that if the report is not signed by Gram Panchayat officer, then whether the report can be accepted.

Here the Chairperson remarked that the questioner is saying when you have completed the survey, did you get the permission of the local people there? Did those officials know about it?

The Project Officer said that as per the directives of the Govt. of India, 10 km radius of the project site, we have conducted studies and surveys in 117 villages in the periphery.

At that time, the participants started talking together expressing their displeasure. It was suggested by the Chairperson that if there are any doubts or questions about the study in the report, they should be asked. If the study is wrong, if the data is wrong then suggestions or objections should be registered.

18) Shri Sandip Jadhav, Residence Pen, Tal. Pen, Dist-Raigad-

Shri Sandeep Jadhav said that we are local people. Recently, the Project's Environmental Consultant said that a survey has been conducted in 117 villages. Then the names of 117 villages in the 10 k.m. area should be mentioned. He further pointed out that in a village within a radius of 10 km, there are many youths who have taken ITI, diploma, degree - engineering.

The Project Officer said that local youth would be given priority in the project. At that time, the Chairperson suggested that if a job in the project requires specific skills, the information about it should be provided.

At that time, the Chairperson suggested that the answer should be given by the Project Management that training would be organized for job placement in the project and those who would develop skills would be given opportunity.

19) Mrs. Bhagyashree Nandan Patil, Member of Shahapur Grampanchayat, Tal

Alibag, Dist. Raigad:-

The layout does not show any direction, does not mention the survey number, so it is not clear where the project is coming from. However, my demand is that the Government should go to the actual site and measure the project location, as well as answer the written objection raised.

Chairperson instructed Project officials to make available a copy of the project plan showing the direction to the concerned woman.

She asked the question whether the permission of the local people was taken when you conducted the survey, study. The report contains incomplete information, wrong information.

The Project Officer replied that the EIA survey and report has been prepared by the Chennai based Institute.

At the time, the Chairperson said there is no provision in the Law for prior permission to conduct surveys. It is mandatory to provide a copy of EIA.

Participants objected that the company is in Shahabaj-Shahapur, while the survey is conducted by the company in Chennai. They said that even if they took 64 guntas, the effects of it would be more in other places.

The Project Officer replied that the planned project is small. There will be 4-5 barges. Therefore, this project will not adversely affect the area.

At that point, Mrs. Bhagyashree Patil started objecting to the report again. Chairperson appealed to the people to report any errors in the data. Air quality, if the figures seem wrong, appealed to register objections.

21) Pankaj Prakash Chavarkar, Residence Poynad, Tal-Alibag, Dist – Raigad –

The report is false. This is because the photos shown during the survey are incorrect.

22) Shri Mitesh Patil, Residence – Shahapur, Tal – Alibag, Dist – Raigad –

He said the local people had submitted written objections. However, the answers to this written objection should be given in written form by the MPCB.

Member, Environment Public Hearing Committee informed that the written answers from the Project Proponent for the suggestions, objections received by email and in the public hearing committee will be submitted to concerned person. The written answers given by the Project Proponent will be sent along with the minutes of the meeting and Final EIA report to Govt. of India for necessary action.

23) Shri Mitesh Patil, Residence – Shahapur, Tal – Alibag, Dist – Raigad informed that yesterday I showed the place to the officials of Pollution Control Board. They should say few words in the meeting about the survey he did.

Convener, Environment Public Hearing Committee informed that they have inspected the site of the proposed project yesterday. Local people informed that the road

leading to the proposed project (Approach Road), which is under the jurisdiction of the government, as it gets salty water, will now be closed. Similarly, the project site is a government site.

24) Shri Nilesh Mhatre asked the question that when you had gone to inspect, who was with you? The organizers replied that it was Mr. Nandan Patil and R. S. Patil.

25) At this moment, Shri Mitesh Patil asked the question that the proposed site is at Darya Jang zone. Then, whether project can be commissioned at Darya Jang. We have written letter of Govt. Chairperson informed that this is Jetty Project and jetty will be in the water.

26) Shri Mitesh Patil objected that two public hearings have been kept in a single day, hence people are confused.

Chairperson, opined that the public hearing was held to clear up misunderstandings. She directed the Project Officers to provide clarification.

Project officers said that the application for jetty and storage capacity was made in 2018. The application for cement production was made in 2021. At that time, the Ministry of Environment and Forests of the Government of India was asked to combine the two projects.

27) Shri R. S. Patil, Shahapur, Tal. Alibag, Dist. Raigad:-

Whether the sites of both these projects have been surveyed? If yes, the government map should be shown.

This time the Project Officer said it is with him. Chairperson directed to provide hard copy to the concerned person.

28) Shri Mangesh Bhagat, Shahapur, Tal. Alibag, Dist. Raigad :-

He asked how many people would be given employment opportunities in the project? The second question he asked to Maharashtra Pollution Control Board was whether there was any measure to install HVS.

The Project Officer said that now the public hearing of the jetty is going on, information about it will be given. He said that during the construction phase, 40 people will get direct employment and 400 people will get indirect employment.

Participants expressed their opposition to the project as it is polluting.

Chairperson, Environment Public Hearing Committee directed Member to conclude the meeting.

While concluding the meeting, Member of the Environment Public Hearing Committee said that this Public Hearing is arranged for proposed commissioning of Berthing Jetty, Conveyor Corridor with Storage & Backup Facilities and Approach Road for Cement Grinding Unit And Fly Ash/Slag Processing Unit at Village Shahabaj and Shahapur, Taluka-Alibag, District-Raigad, Maharashtra by Project Proponent M/s Adani Cementation Ltd., (ACL) by MPCB and District Collector's Office, Raigad.

Many suggestions, objections have been raised by the local people in the meeting and it will be included in the minutes of the meeting. Similarly, suggestions / objections in writing have been submitted by many persons in the meeting and they will be made available after receiving the reply from the Project Proponent. Written suggestions, objections, final Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) report and minutes of the meeting with the approval of the Chairperson will be submitted to the Department of Environment, Forests and Climate Change, Government of India, New Delhi through MPCB Headquarters. An Expert Committee will take further decision in this regard. Member thanked all the participants and on behalf of Chairperson announced that the meeting is concluded.

The meeting ended extending thanks to the Chair.

Enclosed herewith 190 written suggestions/objections received.



(R. S. Kamat)

Convener,

Environment Public Hearing Committee

And

Sub Regional Officer, Raigad-2,
Maharashtra Pollution Control Board,
Navi Mumbai



(Vidyasagar Killedar)

Member,

Environment Public Hearing Committee

And

I/c Regional Officer, Raigad,
Maharashtra Pollution Control Board,
Navi Mumbai



(Dr. Padmashri Bainade)

Chairperson,

Environment Public Hearing Committee

And

Additional District Magistrate, Raigad,
Dist – Raigad