

**REPLY TO THE QUERIES**  
*of*  
**ENVIRONMENTAL PUBLIC HEARING**  
*for*  
**PROPOSED TERMINAL CAPACITY ENHANCEMENT AT BERTH 5A & 6A**  
**OF MORMUGAO PORT TRUST**

*by*  
**M/s. SOUTH WEST PORT LIMITED, MORMUGAO HARBOUR, GOA**

**CONSULTANTS:**  
**WAPCOS INDIA LTD., NEW DELHI**  
**(A Government of India Undertaking)**

**PROPOSED TERMINAL CAPACITY ENHANCEMENT AT BERTH 5A & 6A OF MORMUGAO PORT TRUST**

**BY**

**M/s. SOUTH WEST PORT LIMITED, MORMUGAO HARBOUR, GOA**

<b>1. Avinash Tavares, Fatorda</b>		
a.	He stated that there are gross errors in the EIA report. He submitted as follows;	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•The EIA study is stated to be over a 10 KM radius area; however, sensors have been placed within 5 km radius. EIA report is thus flawed as the data presented is over a small area of less than 4 kms radius and not the entire 10 kms.</li> </ul>	The project site is uniquely placed on the northern face of the SADA headland and is surrounded by sea (immediately in the north and in the south). The possible source of air pollution is from Port Terminal operation is particulate matter of fugitive origin, which is controlled largely by the pollution measures implemented at site. Further, these very low concentration emissions, if any, is not likely to travel over larger distances under normal atmospheric conditions. Accordingly, the AAQ baseline stations have been located within 5 km radius or there about of the project site, to catch the low intensity pollutions, if any, before the air pollutions are dispersed.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•AAQ measurements are done during summer ie. in March – May 2016. Such a study should not be done in summer but should be done during winter when pollution levels are at the highest. During Winter Pollution is the Highest in Mormugao and people fall sick due to pollution and smog in the Air. Wind direction study has been intentionally not been conducted and is missing from the EIA. WAPCOS intentionally selected these months and omitted the wind pattern studies in order to collect the lowest possible readings.</li> </ul>	The EIA study was carried out in accordance with ToR issued by the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change (MoEFCC).
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Misleading Ambient Guidelines: (Table 3.1 of the EIA Report) Average readings are compared to daily limit of the Indian standards and not annual average of Indian standards of Ambient Air. According to the readings of particulates and NO2 in table 3.1 exceed the annual average Ambient Air Quality. It is evident that WAPCOS try to misinterpret the data by comparing it to 24 hours permissible limits. This is an intentional misrepresentation of data.</li> </ul>	The study has been for a three months' period, therefore NAAQS annual mean has not been compared with, which is as per standard practice.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Indian Ambient Standards are inadequate as world standards for P10 is 50 and in India it is 100. The same applies for all other pollutants. Even at current levels of Indian Standards, Indians are at risk</li> </ul>	Comments not directed to the project proponent.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•P2 &amp; P10 standards are four times and three times higher than standards prescribed by WHO and even Australia from where coal is being imported has more stringent standards.</li> </ul>	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•WAPCOS claim that dust pollution will be low because of high moisture content coal is imported. This is false since the input high ash and low moisture coal which is cheaper ( page 4.16 and 5.6 of the EIA Report) Handling of such coal results in dust pollution.</li> </ul>	The statement is wrongly quoted. We stand by the statement made in the EIA report.
b.	The impact of the proposed project on the water environment has not been stated in the study. For example, the lead content in the EIA report shows that the Port waters are 260% higher than the level in sea water. Safe parameters of heavy metals contamination in the water is not given in the report.	The water environment is considered in the report and the parameters as laid down by the ToR issue by the MoEF is listed in the EIA, report. Since SWPL is not in control of the waterside operations, and heavy metal if any would be the cumulative of all the material handling since the inception of the port, SWPL would be not in a position to answer the same.
c.	Soil testing has been done only around the port area and not in the affected area in a 10 km radius. Soil has not been tested for presence of heavy metals like mercury and arsenic presence.	Nature of activities in the proposed project is a presently on-going process, and no change of the activity is proposed except increase in the efficiency of handling, bringing in consequential increase in the annual throughput. Therefore, since there is no change in the process, this is not likely to make any impact on the soils of the impact area. Soil analysis has been carried out to establish soil quality baseline.
d.	The impact of coal dust that will be generated during operation of the proposed project has not been assessed.	Ambient air analysis carried out as part of the EIA as well as other routine monitoring carried out by the project proponent and Goa State Pollution Control Board indicate the ambient air standards are within stipulated margin in and around the Terminal. There shall not be any significant impact in the operation phase of the project as all the emission control measures will be operated and AAQ standards will be met. The emission control measures are given in the chapter 4; Impact Assessment & Mitigation Measures, Section 4.3.4, page no. 4.14.
e.	Inefficient water sprinkling	Water sprinkling is carried out using modern equipments sufficient to curtail fugitive emissions.
f.	The size of water droplets must be equal or less than the particulate matter size. However, the sprinklers used by the company are of normal size and are hence ineffective in controlling the dust pollution. Wetting agents are not used which is required since many coal are hydrophobic and not easily wetted by water. Smaller particles can remain in the Air for several days and can spread by the wind over wide areas or long distances from the original source. Therefore, all of Goa is at risk of Coal Pollution from the Port. The additional coal trains as an increase capacity will increase a particulate concentration in the	The terminal is provided with AQUA DYNE water fogging system, in the hoppers, which receives the unloaded material from the ship, at the Junction towers and in the conveying systems. Since this works on the Fogging technology, the water droplets are of stipulated size and type to effectively control the finest fugitive emissions. In the stack yard area the stocks are under cover, and only are opened at the time of stacking and reclaiming, the sprinkling is carried under such conditions and therefore increased moisture contents limits the emissions completely.

	Air by around 20-40% by train traffic alone. (Refer to his written submission for details). Further there has been no baseline study of persons living within the study area and suffering from lung related diseases (since the Port existed for the last 10 years).	
g.	He stated that EIA report states that the sludge produced from the settling tanks which has fuel value can be distributed among villagers. He also states that this sludge is extremely hazardous as it is acidic and filled with toxins and heavy metals. Burning of sludge as fuel it is extremely hazardous for the health of the Villagers and in particular Children. This shows the casual approach of MPT in handling coal waste.	The water sprinkled on the coal mostly gets absorbed by the coal and flow is nearly absent. The coal heaps are continuously covered, rain water does not come in contact with coal heap. Hence the quantity of leachate is very less. The occasional leachate flows into the dump pond where the coal particle settles. The sludge resulted are cleaned periodically and disposed as per norms. No distribution of sludge cakes carried out in our facility. In any case EIA only records inform of advisory and not for mandatory implementation.
h.	The percentage of coal settling is also not carried out by the project proponent.	The coal is settled in the dump pond provided for this purpose.
i.	Disaster Management Plan if there is torrential rain such as the Disaster that recently took place at Adani's Abott point Coal Port in Australia or if there is a sinking ship (such as the Adani's ship that sank off Mumbai Coast) is not in place	The cargo is placed under complete waterproof coverage including during monsoon. There is no possibility of rain water meeting with the cargo under storage conditions. Hence, the latchet flow is not possible.  The marine waterside activity is controlled by the MPT, since the conservancy of the port is vested on them. SWPL has not control on navigation, ship manoeuvring and other allied activities.
j.	Besides the ballast water management guidelines are not in place at the Port and the suggestion in the EIA report (no dumping of Blast water will be allowed) is contradictory to Mormugao Port Rules 1966 which states that discharging Blast water shall do so only at such Berths as the Dy. Conservator may direct as well as emission control levels are not spelt out by the project proponent.	Ballast water guidelines are communicated to the vessels by MPT and the same are enforced strictly as known to us.
k.	He states that MPT must not expand the Port till the area is declared as Emission Control Area or ECA to control sulphur levels SOx, NOx etc as the Vasco Bay is Eco Sensitive.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
l.	The impact of increase emissions from increased trucks and trains to the Port has not been considered in the EIA.	There is no road transportation of cargo in the Project at present and the same is not proposed in the proposed modernization phase as well. The covering of train cargo cars is carried out immediately and automatically, after the loading operation using the in-motion wagon loading system with all round rope sealing thus not leaving any possibility of any escapement of cargo. This is a zero-exception and zero error activity, carried out with utmost stringency by the project proponent.

m.	Impact on fishing activities have not been considered since MPT in its proceedings of 24th Board of Trustees, 4th Meeting dated 08/09/2010 page 33 para 7.21 where the MPT Chairman stated that Khariawada fishing Jetty will be moved out in a year and half. He also stated that hopefully there will be no fishing lane in Zuari.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
n.	Disaster Management Plan does not factor in the risk posed by proximity to Ammonia / Naphtha tanks.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
o.	Therefore, the Rapid EIA conducted by WAPCOS is inadequate since the project will be operational throughout the year. It is evident that the project is extremely hazardous and environmentally unviable and therefore must be scraped.	WAPCOS is a NABET accredited consultant, with experience in wide range of projects. The EIA is meticulously carried out in the framework of the ToR.
p.	The EIA report prepared by WAPCOS has several discrepancies pointed out by him (refer to written submissions). It won't be wrong to suggest that the report is biased towards the PP with several sins of omission and commission all of which warrants or vigilance inquiry against WAPCOS.	The EIA report has been prepared based on appropriate and project specific scoping, additional ToR for EIA issued by the MoEFCC, sector specific EIA Guidance Manual and sector specific standard ToRs published by the MoEFCC.
<b>2. Judith Almeida</b>		
a.	She raised serious objection for failure of Government to provide drinking water to the public present for the public hearing. She stated that they do not want water provided by the PP. She also stated that not take away their dignity. She stated that they were not allowed to bring their water bottles to the public hearing and were forced to leave water outside the Stadium.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
b.	She stated that the GSPCB has failed to control dust pollution by mining companies all these years and they will be not be able to control coal handling pollution, which would be undertaken after expansion	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
c.	She stated that the trees in Goa will be watered with coal dust and the entire greenery would be lost	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
d.	She requested the PCB to first control and stop pollution caused by mining activity and industrial activity before granting permission for more coal handling in Goa. She also requested the MoEF to ensure that unless the damage which has already occurred has been undone no proposal of the project proponent can be entertained. She states that she rejects and objects the expansion or any other till then.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
<b>3. Siddharth Karapurkar</b>		

a.	The EIA report does not make any mention of double tracking of railways that is being proposed by the project proponent however, permission have been sought from the Forest Dept by the project proponent.	The project proponent has not proposed any double tracking of railway. The facility is independent of the doubling of the tracks as the spare capacity of the present tracks would be sufficient to take care of the present proposal.
b.	These proposed railway tracking will result in demolition of over 100 houses	Comment is not relevant to the Project.
c.	Covering of transported ore with tarpaulin is not effective.	The covering of train cargo cars is carried out immediately and automatically, after the loading operation using the in-motion wagon loading system with all round rope sealing thus not leaving any possibility of any escapement of cargo. This is a zero escapement and zero error activity, carried out with utmost stringency by the project proponent.
d.	There is no mention of Dabolim Airport which would be affected due to coal handling	Dabolim airport is mentioned in Chapter 1: Introduction, section 1.4.1, page no. 1-6. The Airport is too far to be effected by the SWPL Terminal operations.
e.	Provision of double railway tracking will result in division of villages	Comment is not relevant to the Project.
f.	The cost effect of thermal energy is much higher as compared to Solar Energy & instead of encouraging green energy we are encouraging pollution industry.	Comment is not relevant to the Project.
g.	Proposal of the company will result in coal pollution and is in violation of the Prime Ministers Swach Bharat Programme	Comment is not relevant to the Project.
h.	Increase in transportation of coal will result in burning of diesel by the roadways causing of more pollution both of sound and air	There is no road transportation of cargo in the Project at present and the same is not proposed in the proposed modernization phase as well.
i.	He also stated that the Prime Minister in his international convention had signed an agreement to reduce 40% fossil fuel, so why to bring coal into the State ?	Comment is not relevant to the Project.
<b>4. Fiola Rego (Former Councillor of Vasco Municipality) Khariwada Vasco</b>		
a.	The coal being imported in Goa is not being used in Goa but it is being transported to Karnataka for use in steel plants. This coal should be imported through ports in Karnataka and not Goa	This project is modernization of an existing Port Terminal in operation since 2004.
b.	Dredging activity at Khariwada will result in collapse of houses	The project proponent has not proposed any dredging as part of the proposed modernization. The modernisation and consequential increase in capacity is independent of the dredging activity.
c.	During winter due to heavy wind huge amount of dust enters houses in Khariwada as such residents of Vasco have to keep the windows of their houses closed.	The coal stacks are provided with two level protection, with complete covering of the stacks with sprinkling of water, when either stacking or reclaiming operation is in progress. Secondly, the area is surrounded with wind barriers of adequate size, to prevent any

		emissions from the stacks.
d.	A study of the Port water done by MPT indicates pollution of the water	Comment is not specific and not in the purview of the proponent of this project.
e.	The proposal of MPT to transport coal by trucks during the night is not practical as coal pollution will also take place during night and affect the residents and their health	Please refer our response to 3.h above.
f.	MPT should transport coal through closed containers	Please refer our response to 3.c above.
g.	Spraying of water to control coal dust is not feasible as once the ground gets dried , the dust particulates begin to flow in the atmosphere	Please refer our response to 4.c above.
h.	Sewage from MPT Quarters is flowing into the open. If MPT cannot control sewage from its quarters, will it be able to control sludge from the coal handling operations	Comment is not relevant to the Project.
i.	The presentation by the company does not have any details about health effects of coal handling on the people of Vasco	The EIA study submitted is strictly in accordance with the ToRs issues by the MoEFCC.
<b>5. Savio Correia, Mangore Hill Vasco</b>		
a.	The present Project Proponent is only speaking about the environmental impact due to their proposed operation and not about the cumulative impact of all the other projects in neighbouring berths and geographical areas.	The EIA study was carried out in accordance with ToR issued by the MoEFCC. The data collected for impact assessment was carried out as per standards and norms laid down by the MoEFCC.
b.	PP has misrepresented and suppressed material environmental fact and committed fraud on the EAC at scoping stage.	At scoping stage, assessments of environmental facts are envisaged vehemently depending on the scale and scope of the project. The detailed environmental impact assessment is carried out based on the ToR issued.
c.	There is a false statement made in Form I Appendix 9 of the project proponent that there is no impact on the environment caused to surrounding activity hence the EIA study is misleading of the Project Proponent and the present Public Hearing should be cancelled.	The present proposal is for modernisation and consequential increase in productivity. Due to better equipment and practices the pollution levels are likely to reduce. In addition, it is located in an operating port with regular monitoring for ambient condition. Hence there was no suppression of any facts and we stand by the EIA prepared as per the ToR approved by MoEFCC.
d.	He refers to Form I, Appendix I para 2 regarding use of natural resources	No major civil construction is envisaged in the proposal, and hence the use of natural resources will be minimal, if not zero.
e.	With reference to use of water (para 2.2); the company proposes to use 700 KLD of water per day, i.e. 7,00,000 litres of water is sought to be used by the company for spraying on coal heaps inspite of water shortage in the State of Goa and the city of Vasco in particular	A projected quantity of 700 kld water for dust suppression was mentioned in the Form 1. The quantity was optimised to 500 kld as mentioned in the EIA report, section 5.3.2, page 5-15. The Port Terminal presently uses 200-250 kld treated sewage from the STP of MPT. The additional quantity of water for dust suppression is proposed to be sourced from the presently operational 2300 kld CETP

		at Baina operated by PWD.
f.	With reference to the TOR document issued to the company by the MoEF; dated 19/06/2015 para 3, he stated that the TOR states that the company should consider using covered shed with geodetic parabolic dome. He stated that the company as per the presentation made has only proposed to cover the coal stack with tarpaulin and has not even considered covering covered storage of coal nor has they carried out study on this issue as directed by MoEF.	Engineering feasibility for a pre-engineered covered structure is underway, as this is a functional facility; there are challenges in the execution and erection of the covered shed. The same will be presented to the EAC, MoEFCC at the time of EIA presentation and take up construction based on the feasibility and approvals of the MOEFCC.
g.	He stated that the company has carried out covered storage at Jaighad because their computer systems get corrupted because of dust and questioned as to why similar efforts are not done in Vasco making it look like as if computers are more important than human life	Comment is not relevant to the Project. However, contrary to the citation, our Jaigarh facility is covered fully from all sides and there is no escapement of fugitive emissions. In fact, is followed as model in the country.
h.	He stated that the rakes of the company will be transporting coal by railway over a distance of no more than 415 KM. The company has not considered the environmental impact of this transportation in the EIA report because the wagons pass through the fragile western ghats. With regard to the rail transportations he suggests the following measures,	Railway transport of cargo is an ongoing operation since start of the terminal. Railway transport is not in the scope of the project proposal and is under taken by the Indian railways.
	•He stated that metal/fibre glass lids should be fitted to the rail racks transporting the coal as per best world practices	Please refer our response to 3.c above.
	•Covering of the wagons with tarpaulin is unacceptable.	Please refer our response to 3.c above.
	•He stated that the parasitic load after cleaning the coal begins to fly over and over again as there is no mechanism to clean up the wagon racks once they are uploaded	The wagons are completely emptied at the respective destination by wagon tippler mechanism. No residual cargo remains in the train cargo cars in their return journey. Many a times they carry return cargo and such cargos would be contaminated if the wagons are not completely emptied.
	•The Company should install monitoring stations along the railway line through which its racks pass that should be financed by the company and maintained by the GSPCB.	Project proponent will comply to GSPCB's directions in this regard.
i.	Increase in coal handling will result in increase in number of rakes causing traffic congestion at railway level crossing. He suggests construction of road over bridges over all major manned road crossings along the railway line.	Railway transportation and traffic management across the tracks is not in domain and control of the project proponent.
j.	He stated that the company has a pathetic record in complying with environmental norms. He stated that the State Govt has informed the Assembly that it is not satisfied with the environmental compliance done by the company and in this regard the Board has directed the Project Proponent to reduce its existing coal handling capacity. In this scenario he questioned the wisdom in moving this proposal for	Comments not directed to the project proponent.

	increasing coal handling capacity by the Project Proponent. No further expansion ought to be permitted unless source apportionment study is done by Goa State Pollution Control Board and PP's existing coal handling operations are certified to be within environmental norms.	
	•The project site falls under CRZ area. Clearance / recommendations of Goa Coastal Zone Management Authority (GCZMA) have not been obtained.	SWPL has applied to GCZMA for CRZ clearance.
	•Environmental Impact on Bio-diversity Heritage site at Chicalim-Sancoale Bay has not been assessed.	The proposal is modernisation of an existing operation. No new area or water front is involved. Hence, the impact though evaluated and assessed, not included in the EIA and will be included in the final EIA report.
	•PP has neglected to submit certified report of status of compliance of conditions stipulated in EC for existing operation, expressly mandated under MoEF circular no. F. No. J-11011/618/2010-IA-II(I) dated 30.05.2012.	The EC compliance is carried out regularly as per norms. The RO, MoEFCC, Bangalore is in the process of issuing the certified compliance report.
k.	With reference to the 1st EC dated 24/01/2001 granted by the MoEF to the Project Proponent, the company is required to obtain local and State Government licences/approval for construction activity, and to have a green buffer and to submit regular compliance reports to the MoEF. He stated that this has not been done and the company has violated the first EC, and there is no possibility of they abiding any of the conditions to be laid down by the EC in future too.	The EC issued to the company on 24 <sup>th</sup> January, 2001 mentioned in its condition (i) "All construction design/drawings related to construction activities must have the approval of the concerned Government departments/agencies of the state Govt. of Goa.". As the project was located within the notified industrial area of Mormugao Port Trust, stated permissions from any other department of the Goa Government were not applicable.  With regard to Green belt development, we would like to bring the following to attention, 1. Greenbelt comprising 1400 m <sup>2</sup> (approximately) including 700 trees has been raised on the project site. 2. The requirements of Green Belt developments is generally worked out for the complete port area. Segregation of the same for each berth many a times not possible, because of operational exigencies. However, all efforts to make the area green and entrap fugitive emission is being made.
<b>6. Adv. Shridharan</b>		
a.	Two years back after the High Court matter filed by the concerned citizens of Vasco, it is seen that the pollution levels vary. He objected to the location of the AAQM stations installed by them as the locations at which the stations are placed is not ensuring provision of accurate ambient data. He stated that stations located at the fire station,	Comments not directed to the project proponent.

	electricity dept office and MPT institute in particular are being blocked by trees and buildings and hence AAQM done here is inaccurate and inconclusive.	
b.	He questioned the capability of the GSPCB in doing AAQM and also objects to the Board's decision to discontinue AAQM at the locations decided by NEERI.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
c.	He stated that the judgement of the Hon High Court should be followed in totality by the GSPCB, Coal handling operators and all departments.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
<b>7. Terrance George, Bambolim.</b>		
a.	He questions as to whether, the EIA report has been provided to all the villages that are located within 10 Km zone of the proposed project. He stated that this is pre-requisite of the EIA notification and that some of the villages that fall within the 10 Km radius have been not been provided with the copies of the EIA report. The Chairman of the Public Hearing stated that has objections regarding failure to submit copies of EIA Report to certain villages will be recorded and placed before the EAC and the MoEF.	A list of 19 villages in mentioned in the EIA report, section 3.20.1, page no 3-77.  Copies of the EIA report have been placed by GSPCB at locations provided for in the EIA Notification, 2006.
b.	Chairman, Public Hearing Panel's intervening Comment: The Chairman of the Public Hearing stated that has objections regarding failure to submit copies of EIA Report to certain villages will be recorded and placed before the EAC and the MoEF.	-
c.	Mr. Terrance George informed/stated that the Public Hearing should not continue as affected villages are not represented. He also stated that the vernacular copy of the EIA Report has not been provided to the villagers and that the provisions of the EIA Notification are violated and as such the Public Hearing should not proceed.	Copies of the EIA report have been placed by GSPCB at locations provided for in the EIA Notification, 2006 and distributed in the project area. As per the norms, executive summary of the draft EIA report as per appendix IIIA of EIA notification 2006 is provided in the vernacular language.
d.	Chairman, Public Hearing Panel's intervening Comment: The Chairman stated that all objections raised by Mr. George are taken note of and will be placed before the MoEF. He further stated that adequate publicity was given regarding today's Public Hearing and the EIA report and summary both in print and electronic media including scrolls on local television networks	-
e.	Mr. George stated that he reiterates the demand for cancellation of today's Public Hearing also because the EIA report for today's Public Hearing is not uploaded on the Boards website.	The observation is not correct. Procedure for the Public Hearing as mentioned in the EIA Notification, 2006 has been followed.
f.	He stated that para 2.2 of the EIA report is being violated.	No violation of the Para 2.2 of the EIA report, which speaks about the Capital Dredging Project being taken up separately. We reiterate that

		the proposed modernisation is with or without the capital-dredging project, which has no bearing in the present development
g.	He further stated that the present public hearing should be postponed as all the affected villages have not been supplied with copies of EIA report and executive summary.	All documents required to be distributed by the GSPCB was carried out. Some documents were also kept at notified locations for reference as per procedure given in the EIA Notification, 2006.
	Chairman, Public Hearing Panel's intervening Comment. The Chairman however relied upon para 2.4 of the procedure for conduct of public hearing and stated that since the draft EIA report as per appendix III of EIA Notification has been already made available and since no representation has been received demanding for the report to be provided in the vernacular language, the public hearing would continue.	-
<b>8. Fr. Eremito</b>		
a.	He stated that he agrees with the submissions made by Terrance George and he is submitting this submissions to the panel under protest.	Comment is not relevant to the Project.
b.	He stated that totally the people of Vasco and the surrounding areas are totally against the proposed coal hub.	No coal hub is proposed as part of the project modernisation.
c.	He stated that the coal pollution caused in Vasco City is very serious. He stated that the project is being supported by the government to serve the interest of a few individuals.	Comment is not specific.
d.	He stated that tourism is the main source of revenue for the State and if there is increase in coal handling it will result in increased coal dust pollution and will destroy tourism and that no study has been done to assess the impact of coal pollution on tourism. He stated that this activity will have adverse effect on Dabolim Airport too and the various person in the travel and tourism sector.	Please refer our response to 1.d and 3.d above.
<b>9. Vikram, Baina</b>		
a.	He stated that as off today at this moment there is no tarpaulin covering at the coal stacks at MPT. He requested the Panel Members to accompany him immediately at MPT to see the open violation or failure to cover coal stacks with tarpaulin by the coal handling companies.	The observation is not correct. We always keep the stacks covered except at the time of stacking and reclaiming which is carried out under water sprinkling.
b.	He stated that local inhabitants of Vasco are suffering due to coal pollution and that Government Departments are not assisting them.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.

<b>10. Adv. Glerk D'Souza, President of Save Vasco Citizens Committee</b>		
a.	He stated that the coal handling companies have failed to control pollution caused due to coal handling over many years.	Please refer our response to 1.d and other relevant replies.
b.	He refers to the letter issued to him by the GSPCB in July 2005 that most of the coal handled in Goa is being sent to Karnataka.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
c.	He objects to any further handling/expansion of coal in Vasco city.	No response is offered.
<b>11. Alexio Reginaldo, MLA</b>		
a.	He stated that berth No. 10 & 11 are still operating.	Comment is not relevant to the Project.
b.	He stated that the presentation made by the Project Proponent is childish. He stated that the officers of the GSPCB should act fearlessly and give unbiased reports indicating the levels of pollutions in Vasco.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
c.	He requested all the local Goan Officers of the Government and the Pollution Control Board to consciously do their job.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
d.	He opposes the proposal to turn Goa into a coal hub.	The proposed modernisation is not envisages to turn Goa into a Coal Hub.
<b>12. Rony D'Souza, Fisherman</b>		
a.	He stated that the fishermen community has raised numerous objections of handling the coal in Vasco by coal handling companies as it affects their business. He stated that handling of wood chips and gypsum is also causing severe pollution in Vasco city and surrounding areas.	Comment is not specific to this project.
b.	He asked the Panel members to clarify as to whether the activity of coal handling will continue or will stop.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
c.	Chairman, Public Hearing Panel's intervening Comment: The Chairman submitted that panel will only record and convey all the objections raised by the public to the MoEF and EAC who will take a final decision on whether to grant permission for the project.	-
<b>13. Chandrashekar Vast, Vasco</b>		
a.	He stated that the Project Proponent and other coal handling	Comment is not specific.

	companies do not carry out pollution control measures. He stated that in order to favour a few industrialists the Government is turning Vasco into a coal hub.	
b.	He stated that the Government challans two wheelers for causing pollution but cannot control or fine coal handling companies for causing pollution.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
c.	He opposed the proposal of the Project Proponent.	No response is offered.
<b>14. Floriano Lobo, President of Goa Environment Protection</b>		
a.	He stated that the Project Proponent is unable to control pollution caused due to its existing coal handling activity and that they will not be able to control pollution caused due to increased coal handling activity.	Please refer our response to 1.d
b.	He stated that he is continuing to make submissions to the panel under protest as the draft EIA report is not provided in vernacular language.	Please refer our response to 7.c
c.	He stated that coal handling activity in Goa has been continued from 1961 and is continuously causing pollution. He informed that the people of Vasco will come on the streets if coal handling is not stopped.	The coal handling by SWPL follows all prescribed norms and pollution controls are in place.
d.	He stated that the Central Government should not threaten the people of Vasco by forcing upon them this coal handling project in Goa.	Comment is not relevant to the Project.
e.	He stated that due to this adamant attitude of the Central Government Goa needs to be liberated from India.	Comment is not relevant to the Project.
<b>15. Olencio Simoes, General Secretary, Goencha Ramponkarancho Ekvott</b>		
a.	He stated that the draft EIA report of the Project Proponent is not provided for public scrutiny and as required under provision 2.2 of the EIA Notification.	Please refer our response to 7.c
b.	He stated that the draft EIA report should have been provided to the public and the affected villages in vernacular languages.	Please refer our response to 7.c
c.	The Project Proponent has not considered the impact of the proposed project on the surrounding villages that fall within the 10 Km radius. He stated that the public hearing should be postponed until all affected villages within 10 Km radius are notified as per the EIA Notification and further, the draft EIA report is made available to the people in local language.	EIA has been carried out for an impact boundary of 10 km. Please refer our response to 7.a & 7.c
d.	Chairman, Public Hearing Panel's intervening Comment:	-

	The Chairman stated that it has already been decided that the Public Hearing would continue and that all objections will be recorded and submitted to MoEF for decision.	
e.	Mr Simoes stated that he objected to the fact that the Collector left the meeting half way and handed over charge to continue the meeting to the Additional Collector.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
f.	He strongly objected to the Collectors decision to go ahead with the Public Hearing in the absence of draft EIA report in Konkani.	Please refer our response to 7.c
g.	He objected to the EIA report that is prepared by WAPCOS as it has not considered many relevant issues.	Comment is not specific.
h.	He has requested that the decision to overrule his objection to continue the public hearing be recorded and submitted to the MoEF for scrutiny of the Court.	No response is offered.
i.	He stated that there has been no measures undertaken to control dust pollution caused due to coal handling at berth no. 5A & 6A.	Please refer our response to 1.d
j.	He stated that the coal pollution is so severe that vision of the fishermen is affected. He stated that in spite of the media highlighting coal pollution due to coal handling at MPT and South West Port, GSPCB has not issued any directions to the Companies.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
k.	He stated that large amount of contaminated coal water is discharged into the sea after being used by the Project Proponent for dust suppression. This polluted water is discharged into the sea and results in large black patches in the sea, killing the flora and fauna.	The observation is not correct. Water is sprayed over bulk cargo in a controlled manner and it is entrained/absorbed in the cargo. No effluent from the Port Terminal is discharged into the sea. The leachate if any is collected in a dump (settling) Pond, where the sediments settles. The settled solids then collected periodically and safely disposed.
l.	He stated that there is no proposal for the treatment of 7 lakh litres of water that is going to be used by the Project Proponent for dust suppression.	Please refer our response to 5.e
m.	He stated that using of such large quantity of water will result in water shortage for the common people.	Please refer our response to 5.e
n.	He stated that removal/handling of coal from Berth No. 5A & 6A is resulting in flowing of coal dust into the water that is affecting the local fishermen. There is no mention of measures for controlling coal spillage into the sea.	Please refer our response to 15.k
o.	He stated that the loading of coal into trucks by JSW is resulting in dust pollution. He stated that the village roads on which trucks carrying coal from JSW/ Project Proponent are in bad condition. He questioned as to whether there is enough infrastructure to handle additional coal transport from the proposed project.	Please refer our response to 3.h
p.	He stated that there is no proposal for compensating the loss to the	Please refer our response to 15.k

	local marine life and livelihood of local people/fishermen that will be caused due to increased coal handling.	There is no link between fish catch with on ground handling of material.
q.	He stated that there is no provision made for disaster management in respect of disasters that can occur due to the proposed project be it on account of fire or cyclone.	EIA Report, Chapter 6: Risk Analysis and Disaster Management Plan deals with natural and man-made calamities, and a preparedness and response plan for the same.
r.	He stated that the draft EIA report submitted with regard to dredging activity by MPT initially stated that the dredging in question was capital dredging but subsequently, it became maintenance dredging. He stated that due to this faulty report by WAPCOS, MPT was fined 50 crores. He objects to the acceptance of the EIA report prepared by WAPCOS in the case of the present Project Proponent.	Comment is not relevant to the Project.
<b>16. Siddhesh Bhagat, Navelim</b>		
a.	He stated that the Project Proponent could not provide drinking water to the people at the present hearing but is planning on using 7 lakhs litres of water in its proposed project.	Comment is not relevant to the Project. However, the water to be used for pollution control is proposed to be sourced from the CEPT of PWD with a daily capacity of 2300 KLD.
b.	He stated that the EIA report and the Project Proponents presentation is silent on the measures that will be taken to prevent adverse effects on the health of the people of Vasco. He stated that granting of permission for the present project will result in turning Vasco into a coal hub.	Please refer our response to 1.a & 1.d  No Coal Hub is proposed. The increase in the capacity is only consequential to the modernisation of the facility.
c.	He requested the Chairman to ensure that the submissions of the Public are effectively conveyed to the MoEF.	No response is offered.
<b>17. Sydney Furtado</b>		
a.	He stated that fishing trawlers anchor to berth No. 11 at MPT. He stated that he appreciates the GSPCB for stopping coal handling operations at berth no 10 & 11.  He stated that companies of Adani and Jindal are operating their coal handling operations without any pollution control measures.	Comment is not relevant to the Project.  Please refer our response to 1.d
b.	He objected to expanding/increasing coal handling in Vasco and stated that coal handling should be phased off.	No response is offered.
c.	He stated that the agency that has prepared the draft EIA report relied upon in today's public hearing is inefficient inaccurate and studies done	WAPCOS Ltd., a Govt. of India Undertaking is a NABET accredited consultant, recognised by the MoEFCC, with experience in wide range

	by them are a shame.	of projects. The EIA is meticulously carried out in the framework of the ToRs issued by the MoEFCC and as per the standard manual and guidelines.
d.	He stated that the levels of pollution in Vasco city are very high and this has been continuing for many years. He stated that many of the pollution control measures required to be complied with by the companies including creation of a green buffer is not being implemented.	The observation is not correct.  Please refer to our response at 5.n. Adequate measures as indicated above are in place and described in the answer addressed under various replies above.
e.	He stated that the companies of JSW (present Project Proponent) and Adani are refusing to transport coal with covered containers.	The statement is not correct. Please refer our response to 3.c
f.	He stated that during the monsoons the local fishermen has observed that the entire river turns black due to runoff from coal handling activity. He requested the PCB to initiate action and ensure that coal activity is phased off.	The coal stacks are covered with water proof sheets and protected at the sites from collapse by crash barriers. Hence, no flow is envisaged from the coal dump. During rainy, if any, they are collected in the dump pond/settling tank. Therefore, runoff from coal handling is highly remote.
<b>18. Gandhi Henriques, Vasco</b>		
a.	He stated that the present public hearing is being held on account of judgement dated 02/09/2016 from the NGT.	The observation is not correct. The proposed project was never referred to NGT.
b.	He stated that NGT had obtained an EC from the MoEF for dredging activity. However, the NGT set aside the EC.	Comment is not relevant to the Project.
c.	He objected to the fact that public hearings are scheduled over three days.	Comment is not relevant to the Project.
d.	He stated that if as informed by MPT to the NGT that 60% of the work has been completed than why the present public hearing is held.	Comment is not relevant to the Project.
e.	He stated that in the event the objections of the people are upheld as to whether MPT would restore the area to its original condition.	Comment is not relevant to the Project.
f.	He strongly objects further enhancement of coal handling activity at MPT.	No response is offered.
<b>19. Swati Kerkar, Keri-Ponda</b>		
a.	She opposes the proposed project as she says that this project will turn Vasco into a coal hub.	We do not agree to the contention that Vasco is turning in to a coal Hub. The increase in the output is on account of increased efficiency

		and replacement of old equipment.
b.	She stated that the GSPCB cannot control pollution due to mining activity as can be seen in the Sonshi issue and will not be able to control pollution due to coal handling.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
c.	She stated that if the authorities do not act, people of Vasco will agitate.	No response is offered.
d.	She stated that the GSPCB has failed to control pollution in the State and has also failed to control coal pollution.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
e.	She stated that such projects as the one is presented by JSW are being forced upon the public by the State and Central Government.	No response is offered.
f.	She requested the concerned activities to act in favour of the Public.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
g.	She strongly opposed the proposed project of the Project Proponent.	No response is offered.
<b>20. Dominic Noronha</b>		
a.	He opposed grant of approval for the proposed project of the Project Proponent.	No response is offered.
b.	He stated that the EIA report relies upon data from the 2011 census, which is old data and should not be relied upon, because we are now in the year 2017 for which fresh data should have been collected by the project proponent.	Census data of 2011 has been referred as secondary data for environmental baseline, which is as per EIA Guidance Manual and is an accepted practice. As no direct significant social impact is scoped for the EIA, primary data has not been collected.
c.	He sought to know the names of the 19 villages in which the EIA study has been carried out.	The names as mentioned in the EIA report, Chapter 3 Environmental Baseline Status were read out by the Project Proponent.
d.	The names of the Villages had been read out to him by Project Proponent.	Please refer our response to 20.c
e.	He stated that the EIA report does not specifically mention the names of villages it has studied thereby rendering the report ineffective.	Socio-economic profile of the project area is given in EIA report, Chapter 3, section 3.20, page no. 3-77.
f.	The EIA report does not mention the socio economic impact on the local people.	Socio-economic impact of the project is given in EIA report, Chapter 4 Impact Assessment and Mitigation Measures, section 4.4, page no. 4-17.
g.	He stated that the local village panchayats which were part of the study of the EIA report have not given their approval for the same.	Approval from local authorities is not a requirement for EIA, especially when it is inside the notified port area.
h.	He further stated that the local authorities have not submitted their approval for the proposed project.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
i.	He requested the Goan local Officers of the Government to verify the carrying capacity of the State to have such industries.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.

<b>21. Simon Pereira, Vasco</b>		
a.	He stated that the Adani Company has obtained a mine in Australia and due to illegal operation of the mine they were fined heavily by the Australian Government.	Comment is not relevant to the Project.
b.	He stated that comparatively, the Indian Government has never fined Adani Company for environmental pollution.	Comment is not relevant to the Project.
c.	He stated that on lines of action taken by the Australian Government similar action should be taken by the State Government and an opinion poll on this issue should be held of all the villagers located within 10 km of the project.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
d.	He stated that conducting of public hearing is a waste of time, money and effort.	No response is offered.
e.	He requested the Chairman to consider as to why there is such serious objection to coal handling by the Project Proponent by the people of Vasco.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
f.	He stated that the company carries out sprinkling of water on coal stacks to control pollution but such sprinkling of water is only to control fires that ignite due to heat.	The observation is not correct. The coal in the stack catches fire only when the coal contains high percentage of Sulphur stored for longer period. The SWPL terminal mainly handles coke and thermal coal, so there is very less chance of catching fire. In any case, maximum dwell time of the coal at the terminal is not in excess of 10 days. So chance of fire further reduces. Hence, the water sprinkling is carried out for pollution control and not for extinguishing fire.
g.	Vasco is a sitting on a time bomb as it is surrounded with Naphtha tanks, Ammonia tanks and coal stacks. He stated that if the authorities fail to act the People of Vasco will approach the courts of law.	No response is offered as not relevant to the project.
h.	He strongly opposed granting for the proposed project.	No response is offered.
<b>22. Rupesh Shinkre</b>		
a.	He stated that Prime Minister of our Country in 2015 declared at the Paris Convention that India would limit the use of fossil fuels, to preserve and conserve the same for the future.	Comment is not relevant to the Project.
b.	He stated that use of fossil fuel as sought to be done by the Project Proponent will result in adverse climate change and global warming.	Comment is not relevant to the Project.
c.	He stated that the Project Proponent seeks to increase handling of coal	Comment is not relevant to the Project.

	by over 400 % of its present handling capacity. He stated that this amounts to a gross violation of the Prime Ministers undertaking made at the Paris Convention on climate change.	
d.	He stated that in terms of the Prime Ministers undertaking at the Paris Climate Convention will require the phasing out of coal handling in Goa and not increase.	Comment is not relevant to the Project.
e.	He stated that the EIA report overlooks the aspect of climate change and global warming.	No response is offered.
f.	He stated that there was no need for conducting three projects as neither of the projects can exist in isolation and all are core dependent on each other. He based this statement on para 2.2 of the WAPCOS report.	As mentioned in the EIA report, Chapter 2. Project Description, section 2.2 <i>"The consequential capacity enhancement shall be achieved by the increasing operational efficiency of the existing mechanised material handling system and equipment by enhancing the existing conveyor speed and improving the rake loading turnaround time. Thus the increase capacity is the direct result of the better and more efficient handling methods"</i> .  The proposed project is not dependant on the capital dredging proposed by MPT, however it will benefit from the same as large size vessels could call on the SWPL Terminal.
g.	He stated that the State Government has attempted to cheat the people of Goa by conducting three public hearings.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
h.	He stated that the proposed project is being carried out not for the benefit of the people of Goa but for the benefit of certain industries.	No response is offered.
i.	He stated that the precautionary principle must be applied while considering the present project.	No response is offered.
j.	He stated that Goa's carrying capacity for such industries has never been done nor has the Government done a study to verify the sustainability of the proposed project.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
k.	He further relied upon the judgements passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court which stressed that Public Health is more important than profit of the individual Companies i.e. judgment regarding banning of vehicle with diesel engines of 2000 CC capacities, banning entry of trucks in the national capital beyond certain age limit, conversion from BS3 engine to BS4 engine are an eye-opener leading an example to follow on the precept of right to life & environment.	Comment is not relevant to the Project.
l.	He once again objects grant of approval for the proposed project as it is in the interest of the environment or the people.	Comment is not specific.

<b>23. Sebastian Rodrigues, Department of Humanities and Social Sciences, BITS Pilani, Goa Campus, Zuarinagar.</b>		
a.	He stated with reference to chapter 1 of the EIA report, he objects to the statement that MPT has served the State of Goa for the past 125 years and be questioned as to whether its services to erstwhile Portuguese could in any way be a part of a State of Goa.	Comment is not relevant to the Project.
b.	He stated that it appears that the JSW's proposed project is only to supply coal to units in Karnataka at the cost of Goa's environment, in the nature of a corridor.	This project is modernization of an existing Port Terminal in operation since 2004.
c.	He stated that the EIA report does not indicate as to how the proposed project serves public interest of the people of Goa.	The matter is covered in the EIA report, Chapter 4 Impact Assessments and Mitigation Measures, section 4.4, Page no. 4-17
d.	He stated that a cumulative EIA report requires to be done and not an independent EIA report as if the project is independent of the other two projects scheduled for hearing tomorrow and the day after.	<p>The EIA study was carried out in accordance with ToR issued by the MoEFCC.</p> <p>The facility is located inside a notified port area, where ambient monitoring of air quality is continuously recorded at multiple stations. These readings give the cumulative impact of all operation and formed the baseline for the EIA study.</p> <p>As mentioned in the EIA report, Chapter 2. Project Description, section 2.2 <i>"The consequential capacity enhancement shall be achieved by the increasing operational efficiency of the existing mechanised material handling system and equipment by enhancing the existing conveyor speed and improving the rake loading turnaround time. Thus the increase capacity is the direct result of the better and more efficient handling methods"</i>.</p> <p>The proposed project is not dependant on the capital dredging proposed by MPT, however it will benefit from the same as large size vessels could call on the Port Terminal.</p>
e.	He stated that MPT has carried out activity of dredging without EC or approval from the authorities.	Comment is not relevant to the Project.
f.	He stated that increase of coal handling by JSW cannot be allowed as they are unable to control pollution caused due to their present coal handling capacity.	Please refer our response to 1.d
g.	He stated that the life of people of Vasco should not be compromised for the benefit of a few industrialists.	Comment is not specific.
h.	He stated that if the present project is permitted, Goa will become a corridor of coal transportation.	No comments offered.
i.	He stated that there are no proper reports pertaining to ground water	The matter is covered in the EIA report, Chapter 3, Environmental

	analysis in the EIA report.	Baseline Status, section 3.11, page no. 3-10
j.	He stated that many of the affected villages that come into 10 Km radius of the proposed project do not have access to the EIA report nor has they been subject of study in the EIA report.	Please refer response 7.c
k.	He stated that barges transporting ores on the river Mandovi and Zuari are being washed in the middle of the river causing water pollution.	Comment is not relevant to the Project.
l.	He requested the GSPCB to take action on discharge of effluents during transportation of coal and ore in the rivers.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
m.	He stated that the source of water that is proposed to be used for spraying on coal stacks has to be ascertained.	Please refer our response to 5.e
n.	He stated that Goa should avoid lending in the same environmental mess as China is in, as some parts of China have not seen the sun for last many years.	Comment is not relevant to the Project.
o.	He stated that the quantity of water proposed to be used for pollution control measures should be ascertained.	Please refer our response to 5.e
p.	With reference to the Environment Management Plan in the EIA report, he stated that all such waste will be handed over to the Goa Municipal Corporation which does not exist.	The word 'Goa Municipal Corporation' as mentioned in Chapter 5. Environment Management Plan, section 5.2.6, page no. 5-5 is an inadvertent error and it will be replaced with 'Mormugao Municipal Council' in the final EIA report.
q.	He stated that the report has not suggested steps for containment of oil spills.	No oil cargo is presently being handled, nor it is proposed to be handled as a part of capacity enhancement. SWPL is not involved in the water side operation and port conservancy is the responsibility of the port trust. So oil spill contingency is not part of the SWPL responsibility.
r.	He stated that in light of what he has stated so far he opposes grant of approval for the proposed project.	No response is offered.
<b>24. Dolvin Braganza, Majorda</b>		
a.	She stated that such project will result in destruction in biodiversity of the local area and even a fox which is commonly seen would be a thing of past.	EIA report, Chapter 3 Environmental Baseline Status, in various sections covers the details of the marine and terrestrial biodiversity study. The project is operational since 2004 at the proposed site. The increase in the capacity is only consequential to the modernisation of the facility and no additional waterfront or land is to be utilised.
b.	She strongly opposes grant of approval for the proposed project.	No response is offered.
<b>25. Adv. Fr. Micheal E. Fernandes, Vasco</b>		

a.	He stated that it was the duty of the Project Proponent to supply copy of all documents and reports including EIA reports to the affected people.	Please refer our response to 7.a & 7.c
b.	He stated that this failure renders the present public hearing ineffective.	Please refer our response to 7.a & 7.c
c.	He stated that there is severe air pollution in Vasco pollution due to coal handling.	Comment is not specific and not directed to the project proponent.
d.	He stated that there has been no efforts to verify the impact on the health of the people due to pollution caused due to coal handling activities.	Please refer our response to 4.c
e.	He stated that a few economically powerful people are causing large scale pollution due to unplanned industrial activities with the active support of the political class.	Comment is not specific.
f.	He stated that the interest of the public is not considered. He stated that the cumulative impact of all three projects should be considered and not individually. He questioned as to what action the Pollution Control Board has taken to control pollution caused due to coal handling operations in Vasco city.	Please refer our response to 23.d Comments not directed to the project proponent.
g.	He stated that there have been no steps or study undertaken to assess the impact on the health of local people by the project proponent.	Please refer our response to 4.c
h.	He stated that the for the proposed activity of the project would result in adverse effect on the marine environment and ecology.	Comment is not specific.
i.	He stated that report does not make a mention of the danger posed through Indian Oil tanks located at Vasco due to the proposed activity of expansion of coal handling activity by JSW/Project Proponent.	Please refer our response to 15.q
<b>26. Abhijit Salkar, Vasco</b>		
a.	He refers to Chapter 8 (8.4.2) of the EIA report. He stated that the clause say that only three AAQM stations are proposed to be established close to the construction site only after operation of the unit. He objects to this as there should be minimum 12 stations and monitoring should be done during construction.	The word 'construction' as mentioned in Chapter 8 (8.4.2) is an inadvertent error and it will be replaced with 'operation' in the final EIA report.  Three monitoring stations to be placed near to the area of operation are felt adequate to cover impacts of operation phase. However, we are open to GSPCB's directions in this regard.
b.	He objects AAQM is being done by GSPCB as there is not transparency in their proceeding. He recommends that monitoring should be done by NGO's	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
c.	He stated that adequate finance should be made for the monitoring more than the stipulated 12 lakhs.	The cost of AAQ monitoring as mentioned in EIA report, Chapter 8. Environmental Monitoring Programme, section 8.4.2, page 8-4 is an

		estimate. Additional provision for the monitoring may be made as required.
d.	He objected the locations of the three AAQM and says that there are specific guidelines for location of AAQM that should be followed.	Please refer our response to 26.a
e.	He states that in the event the AAQM fails there should be consequences to be faced by the project proponent.	No response is offered.
<b>27. Udhav Pol, Headland, Sada</b>		
a.	He stated that the dusty coal that is proposed and is currently being handled at MPT has been refused at tuticorim Port and not accepted in any other port except MPT.	Comment is not relevant to the Project.
b.	He stated that the height of the stacked coal at MPT and the speed of conveyor moving the coal is more than the height of the wind breaking walls rendering them inefficient.	Please refer our response to 1.d and 1.f In addition to the wind shield provided around the stack yard are about 4 m higher than the coal stacks (which are covered). The conveyors are covered wherever possible. Hence the pollution measures are adequate as indicated by the ambient air quality results.
c.	He strongly opposes grant of approval for the proposed project and seeks a complete ban on coal handling at MPT.	No response is offered.
<b>28. Rui Costa Araujo, Chicalim</b>		
a.	He stated that the coal handling activities results in dumping of coal in various water bodies. This coal pollution is also polluting the Chicalim bay which is home to unique window pane oysters.	Please refer our response to 1.d Please refer our response to 15.k No pollution of water is presently carried out and nor possible.
b.	He stated that expansion of coal handling activity by the project proponent will result in pollution of the Chicalim Bay.	Please refer our response to 1.d Please refer our response to 15.k
c.	He stated that EIA report has to be set aside as it has violated guidelines of MoEF and is not in terms of EIA Notification.	The EIA study was carried out in accordance with ToR issued by the MoEFCC.
d.	He stated that EIA report contains false submissions pertaining to benthic organism and life.	Comment is not specific. However, in the EIA report, Chapter 3 Environmental Baseline Status, section 3.17.8, page no. 3-55 details the benthic study carried out in the study area.
e.	He further stated that the Chicalim Bay is an ecologically sensitive area; however, this is not mentioned in the EIA report.	This is an operating facility with no significant change in operation. The sensitivity of Chicalim Bay was evaluated and impact was assessed. This will be included in the final EIA report.
f.	The presence of corals near Grande Island is not mentioned in the EIA report. He objects to the proposed project of the Project Proponent as	The observation is not correct. The fact that corals have been recently discovered at Grande island

	it is a part of overall proposal to increase coal handling activities and dredging activity by the MPT that will cause serious environmental pollution.	has been duly mentioned in the EIA report, Chapter 3 Environmental Baseline Status, section 3.17.10, page no. 3-61. However, Grande island is at a distance of about 10 km from the proposed project by sea distance. It is too far away from the proposed project site to have any kind of significant adverse impact.
g.	He stated that the EIA report has failed to make a quantitative assessment of the air pollution that will be caused due to the operation of the present project.	Please refer our response to 1.a at various sub points and 1.d
h.	He objected the EIA report and grant of any approval for the proposed project of the Project Proponent. He seeks that the EIA report be scrapped and a comprehensive EIA report covering all three projects should be prepared and submitted.	Please refer our response to 23.d
<b>29. Sanjay Redkar, Vasco</b>		
a.	He refers to Form I pertaining to the project proponent of the project.	Form 1 is submitted for obtaining Terms of Reference for EIA from the MoEFCC at the initial stage of the EIA cycle. The EIA may contain information revised/updated information about the project without materially changing the project components and profile.
b.	He stated that the draft EIA report contradicts Form I.	Form 1 is submitted for obtaining Terms of Reference for EIA from the MoEFCC at the initial stage of the EIA cycle. The EIA may contain information revised/updated information about the project without materially changing the project components and profile.
c.	He stated that sr. No. 10 of Form I; Vasco is less than 3 Km and not about 4 Km.	The distance from the project site as mentioned in the Form 1 is approximate distance and not definitive.
d.	He stated that the dredging is interlinked to the project however, this does not match with the Sr. No. 17 where the answer is sates as "no".	The proposed project is not dependant on the capital dredging proposed by MPT.
e.	Sr. No. 11 "Dredging "is stated as no. however there is already a mention in the draft EIA that the depth is to be increased to 19.8 m from 14 m and that this public hearing is an aftermath of the order passed by NGT as the MPT had carried out dredging upto 60%.	Please refer our response to 22.f
f.	There is no study made on impact on humans on coal pollution.	Please refer our response to 1.a, bullet no. 2 and 1.d
g.	He objects to the statement that there will be no effect on human life due to operation of the proposed project as referred in sr. no 3.2 of Form I.	Please refer our response to 1.a, bullet no. 2 and 1.d
h.	He objects to the company's submission in Form 1 that there will be no impact of environmentally sensitive areas and ecologically sensitive zone. refer sr. no. 3.1	This is modernization of an existing Port Terminal in operation since 2004. Modernization of the operation will accompany installation of more effective, integrated and efficient APCMs. No incremental adverse impact on the environment including sensitive elements is

		envisaged.
i.	He objects to the submission in Form 1 Sr. No. 3.4 as "no" of the vulnerable groups of the people who will be affected by the project. Eg. Hospital patients, children, elderly, etc.	Please refer our response to 29.h
j.	With reference to the undertaking given by the Project Proponent since most of the above points are false, the draft EIA has to be quashed/or nullified as these are false.	The EIA report has been prepared based on appropriate and project specific scoping, additional ToR for EIA issued by the MoEFCC, sector specific EIA Guidance Manual and sector specific standard ToRs published by the MoEFCC.
k.	He objects to the grant of approval for the proposed since Form I has been submitted with false information.	Please refer our response to 29.h
l.	He states that more than 100 thousand people reside in and around Vasco da Gama and project site and there will be direct effect on the health of the people due to dust air pollution.	Please refer our response to 1.a & 1.d
m.	He states that the Municipal council of Vasco has objected to transportation of coal in Vasco city due to the health hazards being caused in Vasco on 4 <sup>th</sup> Jan 2016 by a resolution through a special meeting.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
n.	He states that the three projects for which public hearing is scheduled are interlinked. The common similarity is that the deepening of the channel is a common requirement of all three projects as they all require increase in depth from 14 m to 19.8 m. of the channel.	Please refer our response to 29.d
o.	Overall he raised his protest against the project of increasing the coal handling capacity .	No response is offered.
p.	As submitted in sr. no 7 of Form I of defence installations there are defence installations within a distance of 15 Km and are also as near as 1-2 Km within their project site.	Please refer our response to 29.h
q.	Sr. no. 8 of Form I states 'no'. He submits that hospitals, schools, places of worship, community facilities, etc. are within the distance of 15 Kms.	Please refer our response to 29.h
r.	He states that four of the five monitoring stations are located about 50 -100 meters above the site. However, none of the stations are located in Vasco city where the wind blows through the city.	Please refer our response to 1.a
s.	He states that the draft EIA report should be rejected on account of the discrepancies as stated above in Form I.	No response is offered.
t.	He states that the EIA report submits that there is no dense population	The proposal is an ongoing operation. The consequential increase due to modernisation and changing of aging equipments.
u.	He states that there is a dense population around the project site and the project proponent has made false statement.	No response is offered.
v.	He raised his objections for the project.	No response is offered.

<b>30. Peter Andrade, Vasco</b>		
a.	He stated that the EIA report does not incorporate the findings of the AAQM conducted by the GSPCB. He stated that the AAQM report mentioned in the EIA report are inaccurate and are done by location AAQM stations in locations that do not effectively record the levels of air pollution.	Please refer our response to 1.a at various sub points
b.	He stated that the submission that there is no fishing activity in the vicinity of the proposed project is false. He stated that the report is silent on the extent of fishing vessels and activity at the Kariwada jetty is not contained in the EIA report.	The observation is not correct. No fishing is allowed in the Port area and near the channel due to security reasons as the Port is ISPS compliant.
c.	He objected to the statement in the EIA report that there are no turtle nesting sites in the vicinity of the proposed project. He stated that there is clear evidence that turtles breed and lay eggs at Baina beach. He stated that this indicates that improper study has been conducted.	The observation is not correct. Isolated and random egg laying events are not classified as turtle breeding grounds.
d.	He stated that they cannot deny the fact that there is coal pollution in Vasco and surrounding area due to the presence of coal dust in the area.	Please refer our response to 1.a & 1.d
e.	He requested that the EIA report submitted by the Project Proponent be rejected and entire coal handling be stopped.	No response is offered.
<b>31. Parshuram Shetye, Vasco</b>		
a.	He stated that the three projects are one single project however, public hearings are scheduled on three separate days. This is being done intentionally to harass and trouble the people of Vasco.	The observation is not correct. The Terms of Reference for the proposed projects have been obtained separately from the MoEFCC.  Also refer our response 22.f
b.	He stated that there is no health study or survey by the Project Proponent on the impact of coal handling activities on the people of Vasco.	Please refer our response to 1.a & 4.c
c.	He stated that the GSPCB in spite of receiving various complaints regarding coal pollution in Vasco city has failed to act or delayed in acting and has permitted the pollution to continue. In this context he says that it is not possible for Pollution Board to control pollution after increase in coal handling.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
d.	He stated that people of Vasco do not require freebees or doles from coal handling companies and want coal handling in Vasco to be stopped.	No response is offered.

e.	He vehemently opposed to the approval of the grant of permission to the Project Proponent.	No response is offered.
<b>32. Avertano Miranda, Panaji</b>		
a.	He stated that it is important to know that there are absolutely no persons present at the personal hearing who support this project and all have strongly opposed this.	No response is offered.
b.	He stated that the coming up of this project will render a threat to the defence establishments located in Vasco.	Comments not specific. However, the project proponents mention here that the operations at the berth are carried out since 2004 and the capacity enhancement would be carried out in the same water front and land ward side area. The project does not envisage any road transportation.
c.	He requested that drinking water be provided to the participants at the next two public hearings.	Comment is not relevant to the Project.
d.	He vehemently opposed to the approval of the grant of permission to the Project Proponent.	No response is offered.
<b>33. Suresh Barve, Vaddem Vasco</b>		
a.	He stated that the queries raised by the public are not being answered by the Chairman and the Panel Member.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
b.	Chairman, Public Hearing Panel's intervening Comment: The Chairman informed him that all queries and objections raised by the public will be communicated to MoEFCC for decision in the matter for grant of approval to the Project Proponent.	-
c.	He stated that the EIA report and summary report was not made available to him by the Chicalim Panchayat and he wanted action to be taken against village panchayat Secretary.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
d.	He stated that the EIA report has not been made available to the local Panchayat in local language i.e. Konkani/Marathi.	Please refer our response to 7.c
e.	He stated that Secretary of Village Panchayat, Shri. Narayan Azgaonkar refused to give him EIA report on his request. The Secretary has harassed him and requested the Board to initiate action in the matter.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
<b>34. Parshuram Sonurlekar</b>		

a.	He stated that the EIA report is silent on the method for monitoring of noise pollution.	The observation is not correct. The matter is covered in the EIA report, Chapter 3 Environmental Baseline Status, section 3.16, page no. 3-26. Noise data is collected from 7 stations as mentioned in the EIA using weighted sound pressure level meter.
b.	He stated that units of Adani and Jindal operate their plants only at night. He sought to know as to whether any special permission has been granted by the Government or the Pollution Control Board for night operation of the units.	The Port terminal is a round the clock operation.
c.	He stated that the NGT has directed Adani and Jindal to grow a green belt plantation in the vicinity.	With regard to Green belt development, SWPL i.e. company of the Jindal group, would like to bring the following to attention, 1. Greenbelt comprising 1400 m <sup>2</sup> (approximately) including 700 trees has been raised on the project site. 2. The requirements of Green Belt developments is generally worked out for the complete port area. Segregation of the same for each berth many a times not possible, because of operational exigencies. However, all efforts to make the area green and entrap fugitive emission is being made.
d.	He seeks to know whether the plantation has been carried out.	Please refer our response to 34.c
e.	He conveyed his serious objection to the approval of the present project.	No response is offered.
<b>35. Abhijit Prabhudesai Vasco</b>		
a.	He refers to judgement by NGT in Appeal No 10/2016 filed by Old Cross Fishing Society;	No response is offered.
b.	He stated that the NGT has directed the MoEF to first consider whether capital dredging can be considered in isolation to cargo handling operations.	Comment is not relevant to the Project. Further we mention that the project proposed by SWPL is independent to the dredging to be carried out by MPT. Please refer to our response 22.f
c.	He stated that without complying with the above the public Hearing could not have been held.	Comment is not relevant to the Project.
d.	He stated that Form I has not been made available on the GSPCB website or at any other forum. This is in violation of guidelines of MoEF.	Comments not directed to the project proponent
e.	He stated that MoEF guidance manual has not been compiled by the Project Proponent or the consultant while preparing the EIA report.	WAPCOS is a NABET accredited consultant, with experience in wide range of projects. The EIA is meticulously carried out in the framework of the ToR. The EIA report has been prepared based on appropriate and project specific scoping, additional ToR for EIA issued by the MoEFCC, sector specific EIA Guidance Manual and sector

		specific standard ToRs published by the MoEFCC.
f.	He stated that compliance statement as required to be submitted has not been prepared and as such the EAC could not have granted TOR.	As per the approved ToR, application has been made to RO, MoEFCC, Bangalore to obtain the certified compliance report and submit for project appraisal.
g.	The issue pertaining to double tracking of railways indicates that wildlife and forest clearance will be required to be submitted. However, the same is not finding a mention in the Form I.	The project proponent has not proposed any double tracking of railway. The facility is independent of the doubling of the tracks as the spare capacity of the present tracks would be sufficient to take care of the present proposal. Thus the project doesn't need to obtain wildlife and forest clearances.
h.	He stated that data and maps required to be submitted by the Project Proponent to the EIA are not made available.	The EIA report has been prepared based on appropriate and project specific scoping, additional ToR for EIA issued by the MoEFCC, sector specific EIA Guidance Manual and sector specific standard ToRs published by the MoEFCC.
i.	The Guidelines of EIA are clearly flaunted.	Comment is not specific.
j.	However, the EIA report states that railways and road facility have to be enhanced.	The observation is not correct. The project proponent has not proposed any additional railway tracking. There is no road transportation of cargo in the Project at present and the same is not proposed in the proposed modernization phase as well.
k.	The guidelines state that an existing alternative has to be submitted in the report. The alternate infrastructure exists in the form of ports on the east coast. The EIA is silent on this aspect.	The Port terminal is in operation since 2004. Alternatives sites for project are applicable for greenfield projects.
l.	He stated that primary data has not been collected except of a two day study on marine biology in the EIA report.'	The observation is not correct. Information about primary survey carried out for the project giving period and duration of surveys is given in the EIA report, Chapter 3 Environmental Baseline Status. Please refer section 3.15, page no. 3-17 for the information about AAQ survey. Also noise data is collected during the study
m.	The manual requires baseline data of land and demographic data to be part of the EIA report. However, the EIA report is silent on this aspect.	The observation is not correct. Please refer our response to 20.b
n.	He stated that contour maps and topographical study are missing from the EIA report. Though the same is required as per the guidelines.	The EIA report has been prepared based on appropriate and project specific scoping. No change in the landscape of the Port terminal is proposed, therefore the contour maps and topographic survey are not scoped as necessary for the EIA study.
o.	The geological details are not mentioned in the EIA report.	As the proposed project is not envisaged to have any impact on the geology of the site or its surroundings, geological details are not scoped as necessary for the EIA study.
p.	The geotechnical properties of soil upto a depth of 10 meters is not	Comment is not relevant to the Project.

	carried out below the area to be dredged.	
q.	There is no application of mind relating to standards of water in the study area.	Comment is not specific.
r.	Sampling of water quality at certain depths as per the guidelines has not been done in the EIA report.	The observation is not correct. Study for marine water quality is covered in the EIA report, Chapter 3 Environmental Baseline Status, section 3.17.2, page no. 3-36 where results for surface and bottom samples of marine waster are presented.
s.	Field studies done in the EIA report are not done with any scientific basis.	Comment is not specific.
t.	Study on flora and fauna as mandated in the MoEF guidelines have not been done nor has any data being collected in the study area as per the EIA report.	The observation is not correct. Details of flora and fauna is covered in the EIA report, Chapter 3 Environmental Baseline Status, section 3.18, page no. 3-63 onwards.
u.	There is no study done of the residential area, schools, hospitals, etc. of the area around the project site.	Comment is not specific
v.	Relevant socio economic data does not figure in the EIA report and the data available is based on 2011 census.	Please refer our response to 20.b
w.	None of the road and railways close to the site have been considered.	Comment unclear
x.	He stated that the Dabolim Airport operations will be adversely affected by this project.	Please refer our response to 3.d
y.	The report does not contain any Impact assessment of the project on the fishermen and marine environment.	The observation is not correct. The matter is dealt with in the EIA report, Chapter 4 Impact Assessment and Mitigation Measures, section 4.3.2, page no. 4-12 (marine biology), and section 4.4, page no. 4-17 (socio economic impacts).
z.	Proper cost benefit analysis has not been done.	Cost benefit analysis is to be carried out only if included as part of the issued additional ToR by the MoEFCC in accordance with EIA Notification, 2006 (amended), Appendix III, Sr. 9,
aa.	He stated that Form I is filled with false submissions.	The comment is not specific.
bb.	He stated that the ownership of the land on which this project is coming up is pending before the Hon'ble High Court. However, in form I it is stated that there is no legal issues pending.	The land is leased from MPT. We have no legal cases pending for the same.
cc.	In Form I, it is stated that dredging is not required for the project however, dredging is already done by MPT.	Comment is not relevant to the Project. No dredging is proposed as a part of the project proposed by SWPL
dd.	He stated that expansion of coal handling capacity will require enhanced/ expansion of infrastructure.	The project is operational sine 2004 at the proposed site. The increase in the capacity is only consequential to the modernisation of the facility and no additional waterfront or land is to be utilised.
ee.	He stated that coal handling has a direct relation with respiratory diseases. However, the Project proponent has denied the same in Form I.	Please refer our response to 1.d, 4.c and 7.c

ff.	The Project proponent has denied that the project will cause any impact on human living conditions; however, this is false as the project will have a direct impact on the life of the fishermen and residents of Vasco city.	
gg.	The old Goa heritage site falls within 15 Km radius of the project site which is concealed by the project proponent.	Please refer our response to 29.h
hh.	The Project proponent has denied that the site falls within a densely populated area which is a blatant lie as the site is within Vasco city.	The observation is not correct. The site lies in the notified industrial area of MPT, which is away from Vasco city.
ii.	The Project proponent has denied that in the existing project causes pollution. This is false as record of the PCB clearly indicates that the existing coal handling activity at JSW causes pollution.	The observation is not correct. Please refer our response to 1.d and various points discussed above
jj.	Decisions for increase in coal handling and infrastructure for the same has been concealed from the people amounting to a violation of the provision of the constitution of Goa.	The observation is not correct. Comment is not specific.
kk.	The Project proponent has a very bad track record. Firstly, the JSW was charged for illegal allocation of a coal block. Secondly, criminal proceedings have been filed against JSW for cutting of mangroves, Thirdly, 8 banks have filed proceedings for recovery of 7000 crores which JSW owes to them.	Comment is not relevant to the Project.
ll.	OSHAS has fined JSW over 1 lakh Dollars for violation.	Comment is not relevant to the Project.
mm.	JSW has adequate infrastructure on the east coast of India and are operating on the west coast purely for profit.	Comment is not relevant to the Project. The existing logistics of transport of coal from berth 5A & 6A is operational by SWPL since 2004.
nn.	The EIA report states that fish catch is dropping drastically and in this case the proposed project should not come up as it will reduce the catch further.	The observation is not correct. The information given in the EIA report, Chapter 3 Environmental Baseline Status, table 3.42, page no. 3-75 clearly indicated an increase in marine fish production for the period 2011 to 2015 (Source: Directorate of Fisheries, Govt. of Goa).
oo.	Double tracking of railways is anti-people and against public interest.	Comment is not relevant to the Project.
pp.	Geological data does not figure in the EIA report. The hill side at Sada is on the verge of collapse.	The comments are arbitrary and incorrect. No construction is envisaged at Sada.
qq.	The procedure followed for today's hearing has no legal sanctity.	No response is offered.
rr.	EIA report is completely silent on the issue of climate change.	Please refer our response to 1.a
ss.	He further states that the Project proponent has falsely stated in Form I that no other similar activity exists in the vicinity. This is a false statement as the next berth located adjacent to the site is being operated by coal handling company i.e. Adani.	Entry in the Form 1 is an inadvertent error and it will be corrected in the final EIA report. However, data collected at site was the cumulative effect of all operations, hence baseline data was not compromised.
tt.	The consultant WAPCOS has carried out EIA study for all the three projects scheduled for public hearing. All three reports are identical.	WAPCOS is a NABET accredited consultant, with experience in wide range of projects

uu.	The EIA report contains baseless statements without reference and the method of data collection is flawed. He requested that MoEF black list the consultant.	No response is offered.
vv.	The baseline data regarding marine life is silent on endangered marine life.	The observation is not correct. Sensitive and endangered coastal life forms such as corals, turtles, dugongs, sea weeds, certain mangroves, etc. have been duly discussed in the respective sections in the EIA report, Chapter 3 Environmental Baseline Status, sections 3.17.9, page no. 3-61 onwards.
ww.	The EIA report lists out only 90 species while there are 400 species in the fauna at this area.	The EIA Report, Chapter 3 Environmental Baseline Status, sections 3.18.2, page no. 3-66 onwards has listed representative macro fauna species covering amphibian, reptilian, avian and mammalian phyla as per good scientific practice.
xx.	The secondary data like NIO report on fisheries and pollution in Zuari river is not considered by the Project proponent.	The EIA study was carried out in accordance with ToR issued by the MoEFCC.
yy.	The PM 2.5 and PM 10 readings in the EIA report are fabricated.	No response is offered. The data was collected and analysed by approved agencies.
zz.	The EIA report is silent on the precautionary principle and sustainability. He states that this indicates the consultant bias.	The EIA study was carried out in accordance with ToR issued by the MoEFCC.
aaa.	He conveys his serious objection to the approval of the present project.	No response is offered.
<b>36. Inacio Dias, Navelim</b>		
a.	He states that the Project proponent has done the EIA report through a fraudulent agency who should be investigated and black listed.	WAPCOS is a NABET accredited consultant, with experience in wide range of projects
b.	He states that Form I has been filed by the Project Proponent very casually. He states that the PCB should have reviewed the EIA report before today's public hearing.	No response is offered.
c.	He further states that the proposed project should be scrapped.	No response is offered.
d.	He recommended Abhijit Prabhudessai should be appointed in the PCB as the Officers of GSPCB are incompetent and complemented Abhijit Prabhudesai for the intricate study and revelations unveiled in opposition to the said projects.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
e.	He states that the PCB should furnish its comments on the proposed project to the MoEF and should not merely forward the minutes of today's hearing.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
<b>37. Maggie Silveira, President Bharat Mukti Morcha, Goa Unit</b>		

a.	She states that the Project proponent and the Government officials are colluding to destroy Goa.	No response is offered.
b.	She claims that the GSPCB has intentionally fixed three consecutive public hearings so as to harass the people of Vasco.	No response is offered.
c.	She states that the proposed activity will use huge quantity of water running into thousands of crores of litres of water.	Comment is not specific.
d.	She states that the proposed project has no benefit to the people of Goa.	No response is offered.
e.	She states that the Report of EIA is a fraudulent document.	EIA report is prepared through WAPCOS is a NABET accredited consultant, with experience in wide range of projects
f.	She states that the GSPCB should have assessed the report prior to today's hearing.	No response is offered.
g.	She stated that water is a necessity not a luxury. Water is a free gift to us all. To put off the fire Jindal will require 3 lakhs litres of water per day 3,00,000 x 30 days equals to 90,00,000 litres of water if you further multiply by 365 days it comes to 3,28,50,00,000 litres of water.	SWPL will not use any potable for dust suppression. The source of water is mentioned in our response 5.e
h.	She stated that in a ward when a Water tanker comes, family does not get 200 litres of water. So also the school children in schools do not have water for toilets, as Jindals will be using water for destruction of humanity.	SWPL will not use any potable for dust suppression. The source of water is mentioned in our response 5.e
<b>38. Jose Philip D'Souza, Khariwada Vasco</b>		
a.	He objects to the action of the Police in preventing the public from carrying drinking water to the venue.	Comment is not relevant to the Project.
b.	He states that people from all over Goa have come to Vasco to support the Public of Vasco in their fight against coal handling units. However, local MLA of Vasco and MMC Chairman have failed to remain present.	Comment is not relevant to the Project.
c.	For many years and till today Vasco is suffering from air pollution and today even the sea is polluted.	A generic statement. The possible source of air pollution is from Port Terminal operation is particulate matter of fugitive origin, which is controlled largely by the pollution measures implemented at site. Further, these very low concentration emissions, if any, is not likely to travel over larger distances under normal atmospheric conditions. No effluent from the Port Terminal is discharged into the sea
d.	He states that the local fishermen inhabited Vasco before the arrival of MPT. However, today MPT is harassing the locals of Vasco.	Comment is not relevant to the Project.
e.	The water in the sea near Kharewada is completely polluted due to coal	The observation is not correct. Water is sprayed over bulk cargo in a

	handling activity.	controlled manner and it is entrained/absorbed in the cargo. No effluent from the Port Terminal is discharged into the sea. The latched if any is collected in a dump (settling) Pond, where the sediments settles. The settled solids then collected periodically and safely disposed.
f.	He states that if Adani commences full operation pollution in Vasco will increase by 200%.	Comment is not relevant to the Project.
g.	He states that now wooden chips are being handled at Berth no. 11. Pollution from these chips is affecting the health of the local fishermen.	Comment is not relevant to the Project.
h.	The activity of dredging for which public hearing is fixed tomorrow will result in landslides in the area.	Comment is not relevant to the Project.
i.	Priority of the Government should be to ensure health of the public and not to foster corporate interest.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
j.	He states that another proposal for handling of material is coming up behind Kharewada.	Comment is not relevant to the Project
k.	He objects to continuous pollution in Vasco due to the coal handling.	No response is offered.
l.	He states that people of Vasco will not rest till coal handling is stopped in Vasco.	No response is offered.
m.	He requests that all the views of the public should be noted and submitted to the MoEF.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
n.	He states that priority should be for stopping of coal pollution in Vasco.	No response is offered.
o.	Coal dust is also the cause for large number of accidents in Vasco.	Comment is not specific.
p.	People will launch a massive agitation if coal pollution is not stopped.	No response is offered.
q.	He conveys his serious objection to the approval of the present project.	No response is offered.
<b>39. John Fernandes, Benaolim</b>		
a.	He objects to police presence at the gate.	No response is offered.
b.	He alleges that the police are protecting the corporate.	No response is offered.
c.	He states that the presentation made at the start of the meeting is made by the consultant, He seeks to know why MPT Officials are not present for today's meeting.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
d.	He questioned as to why there have to be 3 separate public hearings in respect of the projects.	The Terms of Reference for the proposed projects have been obtained separately from the MoEFCC. Also refer our response 22.f
e.	He objects to the failure of the project proponent to reply to queries of the public	The written replies to queries is submitted to GPCB
f.	He objects to separation at the venue with the public sitting separately from the panel members, officials and the project proponent officials.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.

g.	He applauded the efforts of the fishermen Union in approaching the NGT.	No response is offered.
h.	He states that the poor fishermen and marine environment will be destroyed due to the objection of the proposed project.	Please refer our response to 15.k, 15.p
i.	He objects to the EIA report on account of all its fraudulent submissions and objects to the conduct of WAPCOS in preparing the report.	Please refer our response to 36.a
j.	He states that the report of EIA is filled with incorrect data and facts. The report is silent on the impact of the proposed project on the life of the common man/fishermen.	The observation is not correct. Also refer our response 17.c Also refer our response 35.y
k.	He states that the reports in the EIA report indicate that the air, water and soil are not polluted is false.	Comment is not specific.
l.	With regards to the CSR by the project proponent cannot compensate the people for the amount of environmental pollution caused due to the proposed project.'	No response is offered.
m.	He states that the project proponent is harming the environment by enhancing its use of coal i.e. fossil fuel.	No response is offered.
n.	He disagreed with the findings in the report that there is no immediate threat to territorial ecology and that the proposal does not involve dredging and reclamation. He states that a rail track is being specially built for them to transport coal to Karnataka.	The project proponent has not proposed any dredging or reclamation as part of the proposed modernization. No ecology will be disturbed. The modernisation and consequential increase in capacity is independent of the dredging activity and confined to on shore activity alone. SWPL has not proposed any railway track.
o.	He states that the State is permitting the corporation to do as they wish in Goa.	No response is offered.
p.	He states that not a single person at the public hearing has spoken in favour of the project.	No response is offered.
q.	As such he strongly opposes the proposed project and seeks immediate steps to all coal handling.	No response is offered.
r.	Coal used for industries out of Goa should not be handled and transported through Goa.	No response is offered.
s.	There are no health studies done in the area by the project proponent.	EIA study is as per the approved ToR and MoEFCC guidelines
t.	He states that Goans will agitate if coal pollution is not stopped immediately.	No response is offered.
u.	He conveys his whole hearted objection to the proposed project and to all coal handling at MPT.	No response is offered.
<b>40. Cyril Fernandes : Alto Chicalim</b>		

a.	He states that it is unfair that EIA report and executive summary has not been submitted to all affected Village Panchayats that come within the 10 Km radius of the proposed project. He objects to the decision of the Chairman not to postpone the Public hearing on the above ground as the said villages have been deprived of their right to submit their views today. It is in violation of EIA Guidelines of Public hearing and public hearing is done without proper notice and providing of draft EIA Report for all effective Panchayats within study area.	Please refer our response to 7.b and 7.c
b.	He stated that the earlier 2 hearings were postponed due to fixing of wrong date by the GSPCB while the second hearing was postponed due fixing the hearing at a small venue.	No response is offered.
c.	He stated that the public was always willing to participate in the hearings.	No response is offered.
d.	He stated that because the public did not raise the objections above within the 30 days' notice period, they were not disqualified from raising the objections today.	No response is offered.
e.	He states that the PCB has been lethargic in failing to submit reports to the affected villages.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
f.	He states that the primary area for study should have been 5 Kms from project site while secondary area should be 10 Kms from the project site.	Please refer our response to 1.a and its sub points
g.	This is not done in the EIA report (chapter 1.6) and as such this report should be rejected outright.	WAPCOS is a NABET accredited consultant, with experience in wide range of projects. The EIA is meticulously carried out in the framework of the ToR. The EIA report has been prepared based on appropriate and project specific scoping, additional ToR for EIA issued by the MoEFCC, sector specific EIA Guidance Manual and sector specific standard ToRs published by the MoEFCC.
h.	He stated that dredging sought to be done by MPT is linked to this project like an umbilical cord.	Please refer our response to 22.f
i.	The present Project Proponent is already involved in the business of coal handling and should have undertaken for radius of 15 Kms.	The EIA is meticulously carried out in the framework of the ToR.
j.	There are discrepancies in the details pertaining to wind directions in the EIA report and no wind rose diagrams were provided.	The observation is not correct. Details of wind speed and direction is given in the Chapter 3 Environmental Baseline Status, Section 3.3 Meteorology, page no. 3-3 onwards which is based on climatological data collected from IMD for Mormugao station from year 1981 to 2010.
k.	With regards to AAQM reports give a wrong picture as they have been done in violation of MoEF guidelines for a period of 3 months instead of one year. Hence, AAQM cannot be relied upon.	The study has been for a three months' period, therefore NAAQS annual mean has not been compared with, which is as per standard practice.
l.	EIA report has faulty primary data, does not mention turtle nesting at	The observation is not correct.

	Baina Beach and gives wrong statistics of fishermen's population.	Isolated and random egg laying events are not classified as turtle breeding grounds. Details of fish production and fisher folk in the study area is given in Chapter 3 Environmental Baseline Status, Section 3.19 Fisheries, page no. 3-72 onwards which is based on information from Director of Fisheries, Govt. of Goa.
m.	He listed out a number of villages that have been left out from the EIA study and hence, the impact of the proposed project on the said villages.	Please refer our response to 20.e & 20.f
n.	At chapter 4 para 2.2, the project proponent states that the proposed project does not involve dredging reclamation and construction in the sea.	The observation is correct. Please refer our response to 22.f
o.	He has objected to this and stated that dredging is essential to this project.	Please refer our response to 22.f
p.	With regard to para 4.3 of chapter 4 pertaining to impacts during operational phase, it is stated that the following will be disposed namely; disposal of jetty related waste, ship generated waste, escapement of cargo, effluent from coal and stack yard, domestic effluent and berth washing runoff. Further with regard to mitigation measures the Project proponent states that (4.11 of the report) it is stated that all runoff/coal water will be treated in a settling pond and subsequently the sludge generated will be given to the villagers to use as domestic fuel and further he requested the GSPCB official to submit as to whether the Project proponent possess effluent tanks for the past 10 years and whether any sludge was generated and sold to the villagers as stated by them in their EIA Report and sough list of names of such villagers to whom they have sold such sludge	The observation is not correct. Chapter 4 Impact Assessment and Mitigation Measures, Section 4.3 states " <i>disposal of jetty related waste, ship generated waste, escapement of cargo, effluent from coal and stack yard, domestic effluent and berth washing runoff</i> " not as present or prevalent sources of pollution, but possible sources of pollution. Measures to avoid/eliminate the pollution and specific management plan to handle any episodic pollution event is detailed in the section. Chapter 4 Impact Assessment and Mitigation Measures, Section 4.3, page no. 4-11 duly mentions settling tank.  No distribution of sludge cakes carried out in our facility. In any case EIA only records inform of advisory and not for mandatory implementation.
q.	GSPCB representative's intervening comment: GSPCB official stated that he will submit a written submission tomorrow.	■
r.	Coal will be stacked in coal stations of specific height. he seeks to know from GSPCB officials whether stations are covered and the height of the site.	The coal stacks are provided with two level protection, with complete covering of the stacks with sprinkling of water, when either stacking or reclaiming operation is in progress. Secondly, the area is surrounded with wind barriers of adequate size, to prevent any emissions from the stacks.
s.	He stated that the report admits that the air pollution will be caused due to handling of coal.	Comment is not specific.
t.	He stated that specific air modelling and wind rose study required to be done over a period of one year and not three months.	Required modelling was part of EIA study. The wind rose given in the EIA report is based on the long term data.

u.	Project Proponent stated in EIA report that there is no fishing activity in the vicinity.	The observation is not correct. No fishing is allowed in the Port area and near the channel due to security reasons as the Port is ISPS compliant.
v.	It is submitted that there is a false statement saying that Vasco Fishing jetty is not existing in close proximity to their project.	Comment is not specific.
w.	He stated that project proponent should be held criminally liable for the false submissions.	No response is offered.
x.	He further stated that the project proponent statement that there will be no impact on marine life and fish is disputed by him.	Please refer our response to 15.k There is no link between fish catch with on ground handling of material
y.	He refers to page no. 5 to 14; the report states that there will be no specific leachate generation from spraying of water on coal stacks, He seeks details from GSPCB official on the amount of water used by the Project Proponent for spraying on coal stacks at berth no. 5A & 6A over the last 10 years.	Please refer our response to 15.k
z.	He objected to the statement of the Project Proponent report that water will be required periodically for dousing of fire in the stack.	Please refer our response to 21.f
aa.	He seeks comments of GSPCB on this para in the EIA report.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
bb	He stated that he objected to the submission that stacks of coal are covered with tarpaulin and seeks to know from the GSPCB official if there is an existing practice followed by the Project Proponent or is a new proposal of the Project Proponent.	Please refer our response to 40.r
cc.	He stated that coal dust contain heavy metal contamination that will affect the health of Vasco public and the Environment.	Please refer our response to 4.c.
dd.	He stated that the proposed green belt in the EIA report is a cut paste job of an earlier report.	Since the Port Terminal area is specified, there is already an existing greenbelt at the site and the greenbelt is being raised. The density of foliage is proposed to be increased by planting shrubs and tall canopy trees (e.g. <i>P. longifolia</i> ). The budget for greenbelt enrichment is given in the Chapter 5 Environmental Management Plan, Section 5.36, page no. 5-23.
ee.	He desires the figures put by the project proponent in chapter wise the cost estimate for the project is not mentioned anywhere in the report.	The observation is not correct.
ff.	With regard to CSR he requested the Project proponent officials to inform the public as to how much of finance is devoted to CSR.	It was informed by the Project proponent officials that 2 % of the total profit is required to be spent on CSR.
gg.	He states that if the company does not make a profit, how will the Project proponent pay for CSR on environment protection.	It was informed by the project proponent that expenses for EMP were different from CSR and the proponent would carry out EMP irrespective of whether the company was making profit or otherwise.
hh.	He raises serious objection to the figure stated in the chapter 9 pertaining to amount to be spent towards CSR.	No response is offered.
ii.	He objects to the Project Proponent submits that EMP is not listed to	EMP and CSR budget is allocated separately

	CSR.	
jj.	He states that as the GSPCB has failed to protect the environment, the public are forced to come out in large numbers to protect their environment.	No response is offered.
kk.	He also objected to conducting of 3 separate Public hearings on 3 separate days.	-
ll.	Chairman, Public Hearing Panel's intervening Comment: This is done on basis of Court judgement.	-
mm.	He states that there are several violations by the Project Proponent with the TOR. They are;	
	a. TOR no. 3 :- There is no study on the quantum of leachate.	Water is sprayed over bulk cargo in a controlled manner and it is entrained/absorbed in the cargo, leachate, if any is collected in the settling tank.
	b. TOR no. 4 :- Details of cargo handling and no submission of data by the Project Proponent	The observation is not correct. Please refer Chapter 5 Environmental Management Plan, section 5.3, page no. 5-5 onwards which described cargo wise EMPs. Engineering feasibility for a pre-engineered covered structure is underway, as this is a functional facility; there are challenges in the execution and erection of the covered shed. The same will be presented to the EAC, MoEFCC at the time of EIA presentation and take up construction based on the feasibility and approvals of the MOEFCC.
	c. TOR no. 8 :- Details of fishing activity due to the project. He opposes the Project proponent submission that there is no impact on fishing	No fishing is allowed in the Port area and near the channel due to security reasons as the Port is ISPS compliant. Please refer Chapter 3 Environmental Baseline Status, section 3.19 which deals with Fisheries in detail. There is no link between fish catch with on ground handling of material.
	d. TOR no. 10 :- Re; AAQM has been done for only 3 months instead of one year as per MoEF guidelines	The EIA study was carried out in accordance with ToR issued by the Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change.
	e. TOR no. 11 :- Pending litigations details. Project Proponent has failed to inform regarding the NGT case regarding dredging	The NGT case is regarding dredging. The proposed project of SWPL does not envisage any dredging activity
	f. TOR :- Road and rail connectivity. Project Proponent admits that road and rail connectively is required for enhance transportation of increased handling of coal. However, the Project proponent has not submitted data on the impact on this increased transportation particularly on the western ghats.	There is no road transportation of cargo in the Project at present and the same is not proposed in the proposed modernization phase as well. The covering of train cargo cars is carried out immediately and automatically, after the loading operation using the in-motion wagon loading system with all round rope sealing thus not leaving any

		possibility of any escapement of cargo. This is a zero-exception and zero error activity, carried out with utmost stringency by the project proponent.
nn.	Violation on general violations of MoEF. Dates on which sampling was done is not mentioned. It is not possible to do a study on marine biology in 2 days as submitted by the Project Proponent.	The observation is not correct. Dates of environmental baseline monitoring are duly mentioned in Chapter 3 Environmental Baseline Status, section 3.15, page no. 3-17. As mentioned in Chapter 3 Environmental Baseline Status, section 3.17, page no. 3-27, 3-28, marine sample collection was carried out from seven stations at different depths in two days. Filed parameters were carried out at the site and the samples were preserved and taken for analysis which took several days. This is as per MoEFCC approved methodology and EIA standard practice.
oo.	He objects to the Project Proponents submission that the project does not fall within 5 Kms of an ecologically sensitive area. He states that the Chicalim Bay facilitates the 5 Kms radius and the window pane oysters found there are protected species which is not brought to the notice of the MoEF or is the report. Hence, the report requires to be scrapped.	The fact that corals have been recently discovered at Grande island has been duly mentioned in the EIA report, Chapter 3 Environmental Baseline Status, section 3.17.10, page no. 3-61. However, Grande island is at a distance of about 10 km from the proposed project by sea distance. It is too far away from the proposed project site to have any kind of significant adverse impact. Sensitive and endangered coastal life forms such as corals, turtles, dugongs, sea weeds, certain mangroves, etc. have been duly discussed in the respective sections in the EIA report, Chapter 3 Environmental Baseline Status, sections 3.17.9, page no. 3-61 onwards.
pp.	He stated that a study on the corals found within the study area. He submits that facility TOR have been issued due to fraudulent Form – I submitted by the PP.	Please refer our response to 40.oo above
qq.	With regard to Disaster Management, he seeks a clarification from the Chairman who is also Member Secretary of the South Goa Disaster Management Team on the disaster management plan in case of a fire at the oil tanks. He claimed that the PP has not disclosed that there are 28 Petroleum Storage Tanks on the border of the project site.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
rr.	Chairman, Public Hearing Panel's intervening Comment: Chairman informed that there are onsite and offsite plan for disaster management is in place	
rr.	He sought to provide details regarding the readiness of the Disaster Management team for a disaster in Vasco.	Chairman informed that there are onsite and offsite plan for disaster management is in place
ss.	He stated that Vasco is on a time bomb and disaster management as to be priority. He stated that there is a huge Ammonia tanks that is 10 mtrs. away from the stacks and that there is a huge fire hazard in	The observation is not correct. Coal is not a hazardous commodity as per MSIHC Rules, 1989. Firefighting arrangements in the SWPL Terminal comprise TAC

	the area.	conforming/approved annular fire water hydrant system provided with fire and foam monitors, completely capable of containing any kind of fire within the battery limit of the Terminal.
tt.	He refers to MoEF manual for ports and harbour and he stated that in terms of the above guidelines the PP was required to submit details regarding protected ecological and other sensitive areas that fall within 15 kms range..	WAPCOS is an accredited consultant, with experience in wide range of projects. The EIA is meticulously carried out in the framework of the ToR issued by the MoEFCC and as per the standard manual and guidelines.
uu.	He stated that Old Goa church, Salim Ali Bird sanctuary, Reis Magos Fort megalities cases in Chicalim, Our Lady of Health church at Sancoale and Verna Megalities all fall within the 15 kms radius.	This is modernization of an existing Port Terminal in operation since 2004. Modernization of the operation will accompany installation of more effective, integrated and efficient APCMs. No incremental adverse impact on the environment including sensitive elements is envisaged.
vv.	He stated that with regard to ecological sensitive areas, he pointed to the Chicalim bay, Mandovi Bay falling within 5 and 10 kms within project site.	Please refer our response to 40.uu
ww.	He stated that they have also failed to point out the defence installations, Goa International Airport, INS Gomantak, INS Hansa, MTR at Bambolim are also within 15 km radius.	Please refer our response to 40.uu
xx.	He stated that Headland Sada is a densely populated area on border of the port, Panaji city, Vasco Town all fall within 10 km range of the site.	Please refer our response to 40.uu
yy.	He states that NIO a CISR research laboratory falls within 10 km radius. He questioned why NIO was not being contacted to conduct this EIA report?	NIO is not an NABET accredited institute to carry out the EIA study for Ports & Harbours.
zz.	He stated that the District Jail, Indian Maritime Institute, biological area is all located within 10 kms radius. The PP has failed to inform regarding all this institutions., there are large number of schools in the close vicinity of the project and a number of hospitals that are located within the area.	Please refer our response to 40.uu
aaa.	The PP has also failed to list out the large number of beaches that fall within the study area and do not found mention the EIA report. He also pointed out that under 'Areas susceptible to natural hazards' such would be headland sada as it is susceptible to landslides.	Please refer our response to 40.uu No present or proposed activity in the SWPL Terminal are likely to cause landslides.
bbb.	There are 28 Petroleum storage tanks and 5000 T ammonia tank in close vicinity of the proposed project and this has not informed by the PP.	Please refer our response to 40.ss
ccc.	He stated that the EIA report is a fraud and as such the EIA has to be re-done.	Please refer our response to 40.tt
ddd.	He strongly opposes the grant of permission to the project.	No response is offered.
eee.	He stated that the coal issue will lead to a Law and Order problem if the proposed project is passed.	No response is offered.

fff.	He stated that the Adani and JSW are handling 15 MT of coal while Vedanta will commence 5 MT of coal and Adani will also seek expansion.	No response is offered.
ggg.	Cruise Boats and coal handling cannot co-exist. He stated that the MPT should concentrate on cruise boats and not on coal handling. He pointed out that Mormugao Municipal Council has resolved to stop coal transportation in the city. He demanded that GSPCB should intervene in the matter.	No response is offered.
hhh.	He requested the Chairman to permit him an opportunity to make a power point presentation as the opportunity for a presentation was allowed to the PP. He said his requesting so on grounds of fair play. Since the PP has been offered the facility of PPT time the project positivity to the notice of Public, the stakeholders also be given similar and equal opportunity to enlighten the public on the negative impact on the project. He requested the Board to take up the issue with the MOEF	No response is offered.
<b>41. Adv. Sunil Lawrence</b>		
a.	He states that there is huge coal pollution being caused due to the coal handling operation at Vasco.	Comment is not specific.
b.	He states that a detailed study on marine ecology in consultation with local fishermen should be closed.	In the EIA report, Chapter 3 Environmental Baseline Status, section 3.17 details the study of marine ecology. All the hydro chemical and biological parameters of the marine environment are discussed in the section.
c.	He requested to know the AAQM readings from the monitoring done by the Board for the past 3 months.	Not relevant to the project.
	GSPCB's representative intervening Comment: GSPCB officials informed that the AAQM reports for the month from December to May is high.	■
d.	Project proponent has not explained the same from where the large quantity of water required by them is going to be sourced from.	Please refer our response to 5.e
e.	He seeks immediate action from GSPCB to stop coal pollution in Vasco.	No response is offered.
f.	Coal is highly inflammable and is a grave fire risk.	The observation is not correct. The coal in the stack catches fire only when the coal contains high percentage of Sulphur stored for longer period. The self-weight of the Coal stack ignites the coal. The SWPL terminal mainly handles coke and thermal coal, so there is very less chance of catching fire. In any case, maximum dwell time of the coal at the terminal is not in excess of 10 days. So chance of fire further

		reduces. Hence, the water sprinkling is carried out for pollution control and not for extinguishing fire.
g.	No study done on traffic situation.	No road transport is envisaged in the project.
h.	Tourism and fishing are pillars of our economy and both are being affected by coal pollution.	This is modernization of an existing Port Terminal in operation since 2004. Modernization of the operation will accompany installation of more effective, integrated and efficient APCMs. No incremental adverse impact on the environment including sensitive elements is envisaged.
i.	WAPCOS has custom made the EIA report which is a fraud on the people of Goa.	WAPCOS is a NABET accredited consultant, with experience in wide range of projects. The EIA is meticulously carried out in the framework of the ToR. The EIA report has been prepared based on appropriate and project specific scoping, additional ToR for EIA issued by the MoEFCC, sector specific EIA Guidance Manual and sector specific standard ToRs published by the MoEFCC.
j.	He objects to the grant of approval to the proposed project.	No response is offered
<b>42. Shankar Polji, Mormugao</b>		
a.	He objects to the seating arrangement made by the organising of the Public Hearing.	No response is offered
b.	He objects to non-presence of the MPT Officials.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
c.	He seeks to inform the Central Government that it cannot force project upon Goa.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
d.	He states that people of Mormugao taluka are the worst affected.	Comment is not specific.
e.	He states that it is the fault of the Government Officials and politicians for the present news that Vasco is in a they have permitted and coal handling in Vasco.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
f.	He objected to continuing of the public hearing after illegalities were pointed out.	No response is offered
g.	He states that there is collusion between the Project proponent Officials and government Officials.	No response is offered
h.	He states that the public has not received any reply from either the Project proponent and the Government Authorities.	It was communicated by the Chairman of the Public Hearing Panel that the responses of the project proponent will be given at the end of the public hearing.
i.	There is a huge traffic risk in Sada due to movement of coal trucks.	Please refer our response to 35.j
j.	He stated that due to the attitude of the Central Government, the people of Goa will one day demand independence from India.	No response is offered
k.	He states that the Government is a thief and people of Mormugao have	No response is offered

	not got justice.	
l.	He objects to holding of public hearing on 3 consecutive days.	No response is offered
m.	He states that Mormugao MLA is in collusion with the Project Proponent.	No response is offered
n.	He stated that the government should not deal with polluted cargo.	No response is offered
o.	He requests the Central government not to trouble the people of Mormugao by granting approval to the Project Proponent project.	No response is offered
p.	He states that sperm count is affected due to coal pollution.	No response is offered
q.	He seeks to know why no public hearing was held when people from Baina and Khariwada were removed.	Comment is not relevant to the Project
r.	He states that the roads in Vasco and Sada will not be able to manage the extra trucks that will ply on the roads due to enhanced handling of coal, if the Project proponent project is approved.	Please refer our response to 35.j
s.	He requested the Government to understand the problems of Vasco and not to force the people to agitate.	No response is offered
t.	He requested the Government to consider the danger of Ammonia tanker.	Comment is not relevant to the Project
u.	He stated that in spite of all the public opposing the project, he is aware that the project will get approval.	No response is offered
v.	He stated that if the 3 projects are cleared there will be continuous agitation.	No response is offered
w.	He suggested that the government pays the public who attend the public hearing.	No response is offered
x.	He states that all the 3 proposed projects should be scroled and Adani and Jindal should be removed from Vasco and clean cargo should be dealt with by the MPT.	No response is offered
y.	He also blames the local MLA for the coal problem in Vasco.	No response is offered
z.	He seeks to know why the project proponent in going to be provided with 7 lakh litres of water when people of Sada are provided only 1 hour of water per day.	Please refer our response to 5.e
<b>43. Jayesh Shetgaonkar, Sada</b>		
a.	He states that the local people do not want coal handling in Vasco.	No comments are offered.
b.	He states that Goans are not employed in these type of companies and in the project proponents unit.	The observation is not correct. About 60% of employees working in the SWPL Terminal belong to Goa.
c.	Coal is slow poison to all the Vasco locals. He says that he will go to the police station to file criminal cases for the slow poisoning of Vasco locals.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.

d.	He states that GSPCB should not have gone ahead to hold the public hearing after checking the track record of the project proponent and the balance record is managing pollution due to coal handling.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
e.	He states that the entire public hearing is a waste of time, money and effort.	No comments are offered.
f.	He states that GSPCB has not been able to handle the garbage problem in Vasco. How they will be able to solve the coal pollution problem in Vasco.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
<b>44. Chandrashekar Vast</b>		
	He objects to the Chairman's statement that an opinion poll be taken to determine the issue as to whether coal handling operations shall be held in Vasco.	No response is offered
<b>45. Terrence George</b>		
	He clarified that 3 separate public hearing cannot be held on one day after a Court Judgement. However, he states in this case the NGT judgement itself states that the proposed dredging activity of MPT cannot be considered in isolation.	No response is offered
<b>46. Jacinto Dsouza, Khariwada Vasco</b>		
a.	He fully opposes the project of the project proponent.	No response is offered
b.	He states that MPT and the coal handling issue is creating health hazards for children in Vasco.	Please refer our response to 4.c
c.	He states that 1000 traditional fishermen are affected and fish catch is affected.	The observation is not correct.
d.	He states that all coal pollution is being faced by residents of Vasco.	The observation is not correct.
e.	He says there is no justification for permitting increase in coal handling capacity of the Project proponent.	No response is offered
f.	He sought a clarification from the GSPCB Official on the monitoring done by the Board and why no action was taken by the Board.	No response is offered
	GSPCB's representative intervening Comment: Board official stated that the levels are found to be high and that the Board issued directions to the project proponent for 25% reduction in coal handling capacity.	-

g.	He questioned the logic of the Board in organising the public hearing for expansion when it has directed the project proponent to reduce the handling of 5 million tons of coal by 25%.	No response is offered
h.	He stated that MPT should give a lease of its berth to locals and not outsiders.	No response is offered
i.	He stated that coal is a disease given to Vasco locals by MPT and the government. He sought to know how many jobs for locals will be created by the starting of the project proponent's project.	The modernization will not lead to any significant potential for manpower recruitment. However, presently about 60 % of manpower is from local population.
j.	He stated that MPT does not employ goans and if there are no employment benefits to local goans, then why the people of Vasco be made to suffer coal pollution due to operation of coal handling facilities of JSW.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.  The employment to the local goans at SWPL is about 60%
k.	He sought the details of action taken by the Board on pollution of the sea water	Comments not directed to the project proponent
l.	He further stated that fish have also been contaminated with coal and that fine coal particles cannot be controlled.	Please refer our response to 15.p
m.	He further stated that coal handling is responsible for traffic mess on Vasco roads due to truck transportation. Infact, he stated that his own friend Akshay Thari was killed in a road accident involving a coal carrying truck.	There is no road transportation of cargo in the Project at present and the same is not proposed in the proposed modernization phase as well.
n.	He stated that he strongly objects to the grant of any approval to the project proposal of the Project Proponent.	No response is offered
<b>47. Savio Correia, Mongor Hill, Vasco</b>		
a.	He stated that he wants to raise a point of order. He stated that yesterday at 11.30 pm, decision was taken to continue yesterday's public hearing today at 10.30 am. However, notice of Public Hearing is that today the public hearing is fixed for another project i.e. Deepening of Channel/Dredging by MPT.	Comments not directed to the Project Proponent
b.	A notice should be issued by GSPCB deferring or postponing today's hearing.	Comments not directed to the Project Proponent
c.	He stated that today's public hearing by MPT is being monitored by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India.	Comments not directed to the Project Proponent
d.	Today's hearing of MPT's project is very important	Comments not directed to the Project Proponent
e.	He stated that if today's hearing id deferred in time or date, a notice indicating the same must be issued.	Comments not directed to the Project Proponent
f.	Chairman, Public Hearing Panel's intervening Comment: Collector stated that on account of the point of order raised by the person	-

	yesterday's hearing will be continued on Saturday i.e 29/04/2017 at 10.30 am, This has been opposed by Mr. Correia who stated that he strongly objects to the decision of the Chairman to postpone yesterday's hearing to Saturday i.e. 29/04/2017.	
<b>48. Suresh Bhave</b>		
a.	He stated that the Chairman cannot adjourn yesterday's hearing to Saturday after agreeing to postpone it to today last night.	No comments offered
	Chairman, Public Hearing Panel's intervening Comment: The decision to continue the proceedings that were halted yesterday was consensual but if the public itself do not want the same to be continued so let it be so.	-
<b>49. Savio Correia, Mongor Hill, Vasco</b>		
a.	He came back and clarified that he has not stated that the public hearing be postponed, rather he has stated that the public hearing of yesterday should be continued as decided yesterday night. Further, the minutes of yesterday's public hearing are required to be confirmed and cannot be confirmed after 4 days	No comments offered
	Chairman, Public Hearing Panel's intervening Comment: He would defer today's public hearing regarding MPT's project for an hour. He would now commence yesterday's hearing as had been assured and thereafter the notified hearing scheduled today would be taken up.	-
<b>50. Advocate Aires Rodrigues</b>		
a.	He requested that the Project Proponent representatives introduce themselves.	The representatives introduced themselves as follows. a) Mr. R.R. Patra, Vice President, JSW Infrastructure b) Mr. Anthony Fernandes, Unit in-charge, SWPL
b.	He stated that the public hearing is conducted in most disorganised manner	No response is offered.
c.	He stated that he will speak in general regarding all 3 projects for which public hearing will be held.	Statement of the speaker. The relevant points directed to project proposed by SWPL will be replied appropriately.
	He seeks clarification from the Chairman as to whether MPT is a part of the public hearing	Comments not directed to the Project Proponent

	Chairman, Public Hearing Panel's intervening Comment: Chairman held that MPT is not party to this public hearing, as the Project Proponent is JSW/SWP limited.	-
d.	Adv. Aires stated that MPT is a necessary party in this public hearing.	No comments are offered.
e.	He further stated that the Public hearing is of SWP and not JSW and sought to know on what basis JSW representative is present on SWP behalf without any authority letter. He demanded that the Chairman direct JSW representative to vacate the public hearing	The representative of JSW Infrastructure voluntarily withdrew although SWP Limited is a subsidiary of JSW.
f.	He stated people of Goa have lost credibility in MPT, hence, the large audience for today's and yesterday's public hearing.	Comments not directed to the Project Proponent
g.	He stated that MPT has not initiated any action on the case of rape of a 7 year girl in its school.	Comments not directed to the Project Proponent
h.	He stated that the present State Government had assured to live by the legacy of Late Mathany Saldanha but it has failed to do so. He stated that Goa is a small State and unplanned development is causing large scale destruction of Environment and Social fabric.	Comments not directed to the Project Proponent
	He stated that State Government is out to finish Goa. He pointed out that during the BRICS summit movement of coal was stopped in Vasco, so as to portray that goans breath fresh air.	Comments not directed to the Project Proponent
j.	He sought to know from MPT why coal movement was stopped during the summit. He questioned whether fresh air was only for the rich and powerful.	Comments not directed to the Project Proponent
k.	He stated that unplanned reckless development will destroy Goa. He requested MPT to think of Goa. He also requested Chairman not to take the people of Goa for granted, he stated that the people of Goa will not tolerate any further destruction of its environment. He stated that the GSPCB who is without a Chairman, will be impartial and will not be guided by the politicians in Goa.	Comments not directed to the Project Proponent
<b>51. S.A.Kamat, Chicalim</b>		
a.	He stated that coal pollution has caused deposition of coal dust on the floor of his house. He stated that the 2 issues regarding expansion of coal handling at berth 5A and 6A by SWP is directly linked to deepening of the channels by MPT. He stated that that if pollution by operation of berth 5A and 6A is not controlled then deepening of channel is a waste of money. He stated that the company will require Rs.8 to Rs.10/-per ton for controlling pollution due to coal dust but what is spent is just about	Please refer our response to 22.f

	Rs.1/- per ton. He alleged that the GSPCB and the coal handling companies are in collusion.	
b.	He requested that the companies stop spending money on CSR and spend money to control pollution and give proper breathing air to us.	SWPL has all the pollution mitigation measures in place and is considering the upgradation of the equipments. CSR is carried out separately.
<b>52. Kennedy Afonso : Convenor Goans for Goa, Cavelossim</b>		
a.	He asked as to whether Goa needs coal. Do goans need coal to cook or does Goa's industries need coal. As the answer is no than why do and why should Goan soil be used to reap benefits by the industries who aren't from Goa.	No response is offered.
b.	He stated that the GSPCB is not in a position to handle EIA and had failed in the case of public hearing of Mopa Airport.	Comment is not relevant to the Project.
c.	He stated that the coal is being brought into Goa to fill pockets of Adani and Jindal and results is Goan's suffering from dust pollution.	No response is offered.
d.	He stated that if Goa does not need coal then the present exercise of public hearing must be scrapped.	No response is offered.
e.	He stated that MPT is now Money Port Trust. He stated that ore stacked at MPT is operated without a dome.	Comments not directed to the Project Proponent
f.	He stated that the MPT Chairman's statement that more water will be used for sprinkling is flawed. He stated that coal handling and pollution caused by it has resulted in cancer that is increased day by day.	Comments not directed to the Project Proponent
g.	Increased coal handling at Berth No. 5A and 6A will be result in pollution across the full State of Goa as it is to be transported by rail and road as well.	Please refer our response to 3.c, 3.h & 35.j
h.	He stated that in 2012 the High Court has ordered closure of berths no. 10 and 11 when at the time only 5MT of coal was being handled. He stated that new proposal for handling much beyond handling capacity would result in severe air pollution.	Comments not directed to the Project Proponent
i.	He stated that the company is seeking to transport coal through Goan villages to Karnataka. He stated that the companies wanting coal should install ports in Karnataka as all the coal is for industries in Karnataka.	This project is modernization of an existing Port Terminal in operation since 2004.
j.	He stated that Union Minister, Nitin Gadkari statement that dredging at MPT is only for maintenance is false.	No response is offered. Comment is not relevant to the Project.
k.	He stated that Goans were cheated during the Mopa agitation, however he stated that this time the locals will agitate.	Comments not directed to the Project Proponent
<b>53. Edwin Mascarenhas : Chicalim.</b>		

a.	He requested that all people sitting on dais should be directed to introduce themselves and their designation as they are not taking part in the discussion and have not given any replies to the queries of the public.	No response is offered.
b.	Chairman, Public Hearing Panel's intervening Comment: The Chairman stated that an earlier speaker has already carried out this exercise and continuous introduction would not meet the ends of today's continuous hearing.	-
c.	He stated that so called representative of the PP should participate in the public hearing and should reply to the peoples queries. He stated that the Chairman and the GSPCB should not reply for the PP.	PP has committed to submit the replies in writing.
d.	He stated that the baseline study for enhancing 5A and 6A do not give details regarding water required and Form I says that nearly 7 lakh litres of water is required to curtail and control pollution.	Please refer our response to 5.e. Chapter 5 Environmental Management Plan, Section 5.3.2, page no. 5-13 mentions the water environment. Water balance diagram is depicted on page 5-15 of the EIA report
e.	He explained the various steps involved from unloading / loading / transportation which results in spillage of Coal which is creating pollution in the Air due to generation of dust as well as the Particulate Matter spreading in the air. For example, one million tons of coal comes into the Port as per the Bill of Landing, the quantity of Coal that is lost in handling is minimum 1% which translates into 10,000 MT which also includes the losses in transportation by rail from Mormugao to Torangallu in Bellari District, as also the Coal that cannot be mechanically handled from the hatches of the ship and which remains in the hatches and is washed out in the Sea causing huge Pollution. No study has been done on this baseline study which should have been incorporated in the EIA report.	The statement is not correct. unloading / loading / transportation of coal is done mechanically thereby minimising any loses. The details are mentioned in our reply 1.f and 3.c  The trains are covered which obviate any spillage. The loss is transport and spillage is minimal as it is point to point handling. Loss in transit many times happen due to evaporation of moisture.  Please refer our response to 1.d
<b>54. Dinesh Dias</b>		
a.	He refers to Form I of the draft EIA proposal of the Project Proponent and compared with it with Form I of MPT for deepening of channel. He requested the PP to look at the Part III regarding Environmental Sensitivity. It speaks of aerial distance of 15 kms from the boundary of the proposed project. At Sr. No. 7 PP states that there are no defence installation in close proximity of the project including the airport which is a blatant lie on the part of the South West Port (SWP).	Please refer our repose 40.uu  Though there will be no impact on the installation due to an operating facility being being modernised in the final EIA report.
b.	At Sr, No. 8 of the PP it is stated that there are no thickly populated areas within 15 kms radius of the project, while Form I of MPT project does mention a few areas.	Please refer our repose 50.a
c.	He stated that in Form I of PP (5A and 6A) at Sr. No. 9 he says it states	Please refer our repose 50.a

	that there are no schools or religious structures etc in 15 kms distance. However Form I of MPT's project gives details of a few schools, hospitals and religious structures, so obviously Form I of the PP is wrong and above all by not mentioning the World Heritage Sites i.e. the Old Goa Church	
d.	He stated that in Form I of PP Sr. No. 10 it is stated that there are no important areas containing resource of agriculture, fisherers, tourism, etc. However in MPT's Form I it states that a few tourist destinations exists but ironically has not included the Chicalim bay and Grande island have to be scheduled species.	Please refer our repose 50.a
e.	He stated that in Form I Sr. No. 11 submitted by the PP it states that there are no areas likely to be polluted within 15 kms radius from the project site which is a false statement as the port and its surrounding areas are subject to pollution for last so many years.	Please refer our repose 50.a
f.	He stated that information submitted by the PP in Form I is false and in terms of the undertaken given, the project clearances given should be rejected	Please refer our repose 50.a
g.	He sought to know why JSW and Adani have failed to pay green cess levied by the State Government. He was informed by the GSPCB officials that matter is subjudice before the High Court.	The matter is subjudice before High court
	GSPCB's representative intervening Comment: He was informed by the GSPCB officials that matter is subjudice before the High Court.	-
h.	He stated that in the EIA report it is stated that wagons carrying coal are covered. However he stated that during an inspection of railway doubling project in Cansaulim, coal carrying wagons by MLA (local) and railway authorities in Cansaulim it was seen that covering is inadequate which the SWR authorities blamed on MPT and SWP.	The project proponent has not proposed any double tracking of railway. The facility is independent of the doubling of the tracks as the spare capacity of the present tracks would be sufficient to take care of the present proposal. The covering of train cargo cars is carried out immediately and automatically, after the loading operation using the in-motion wagon loading system with all round rope sealing thus not leaving any possibility of any escapement of cargo. This is a zero-exception and zero error activity, carried out with utmost stringency by the project proponent.
i.	He stated that only if cape size vessels come to the port, can 5A and 6A capacity be expanded. He stated that, for this the channel has to be widened. However in Form I, PP states that channel will not be deepened or widened.	Please refer our response to 22.f The Project Proponent has not proposed any dredging along the channel for deepening or widening.
j.	He sought a clarification from the PP on whether the expansion of 5A and 6a is linked to MPT's project for widening of the channel.	Please refer our response to 22.f
k.	He stated that that there is a specific mention of ecological sensitivity of Chicalim bay where schedule species is found and Grande island in MPTs	The observation is not correct. The fact that corals have been recently discovered at Grande island

	EIA report has failed to make a mention of the same. Surprisingly the consultant for both the EIA is the same. Rocky intertidal zone for Cabode-Ram, Siridao and Dona Paula where sea weed is found in abundance is mentioned in one EIA report but not in the PP EIA report.	has been duly mentioned in the EIA report, Chapter 3 Environmental Baseline Status, section 3.17.10, page no. 3-61. However, Grande island is at a distance of about 10 km from the proposed project by sea distance. It is too far away from the proposed project site to have any kind of significant adverse impact. Sensitive and endangered coastal life forms such as corals, turtles, dugongs, sea weeds, certain mangroves, etc. have been duly discussed in the respective sections in the EIA report, Chapter 3 Environmental Baseline Status, sections 3.17.9, page no. 3-61 onwards.
i.	He stated that the consultant WAPCOS a public sector undertaking requires to explain as to how data in the EIA report for the Government of India undertaking differs from the data in the EIA report of the project proponent (5A-6A).	Primary data on air and water environment is collected at the same time by the consultant and reported on need basis based on the analysis of environmental matrix for impact assessment.
<b>55. <u>Rupesh Shinkre.</u></b>		
a.	EIA report at point no. 2.2 of PP states that the port will be able to handle large vessels only if dredging and widening activity of the channel is carried out by the MPT. This indicates that the submission made by the PP that expansion of 5A and 6A is not linked to dredging and deepening of the channel by MPT is a blatant lie.	We reiterate our response at 22.f As mentioned in the EIA report, Chapter 2. Project Description, section 2.2 <i>"The consequential capacity enhancement shall be achieved by the increasing operational efficiency of the existing mechanised material handling system and equipment by enhancing the existing conveyor speed and improving the rake loading turnaround time. Thus the increase capacity is the direct result of the better and more efficient handling methods"</i> .  The proposed project is not dependant on the capital dredging proposed by MPT, however it will benefit from the same as large size vessels could call on the SWPL Terminal.
<b>56. <u>Sudeep Dalvi, Mapusa</u></b>		
a.	He stated that the Chairman and the panel have already decided to grant approval for the project.	No response is offered.
b.	He stated that Goan Officers should not support the companies.	No response is offered.
c.	He stated life of Vasco locals will be destroyed with increasing coal handling and transportation.	There is no road transportation of cargo in the Project at present and the same is not proposed in the proposed modernization phase as well. Also please refer to our response to 1d, 4c and 7c

d.	He stated future generation will suffer from carcinogenic diseases and impure air due to increased coal handling and transportation.	SWPL terminal is provided with AQUA DYNE water fogging system, in the hoppers, which receives the unloaded material from the ship, at the Junction towers and in the conveying systems. Since this works on the Fogging technology, the water droplets are of stipulated size and type to effectively control the finest fugitive emissions. In the stack yard area the stocks are under cover, and only are opened at the time of stacking and reclaiming, the sprinkling is carried under such conditions and therefore increased moisture contents limits the emissions completely.
e.	He stated that the government officials will be responsible for future generation environmental pollution problem.	No response is offered.
f.	He stated that entire Goa will rise in agitation due to increasing destruction of Goa due to indifferent attitude of Goan Officials.	No response is offered.
<b>57. Suresh Bharve</b>		
	Chairman, Public Hearing Panel's intervening Comment: Chairman informed Suresh Barve who sought to speak that he had already spoken yesterday and would not be given a chance to speak again at the same hearing.	-
<b>58. Lumia Almeida, Seraulim</b>		
a.	Trains carrying coal through Seraulim village causing respiratory diseases to the locals. She states that lot of locals get asthma and have to visit hospital.	Rail transport is being carried out since the inception of the project. The covering of train cargo cars is carried out immediately and automatically, after the loading operation using the in-motion wagon loading system with all round rope sealing thus not leaving any possibility of any escapement of cargo. This is a zero-exception and zero error activity, carried out with utmost stringency by the project proponent.
b.	She says that increase in handling of coal and transportation of coal by rail will destroy the villages and villages.	Please refer our response to 58.a
c.	She stated that the State Government is out to destroy Goa.	No response is offered.
<b>59. Sankalp Amonkar, Baina Vasco.</b>		
a.	He stated that he is voicing he's position to the project under protest.	No response is offered.
b.	He stated that since yesterday the public hearing is being conducted and the public hearing is a stage managed show being done	No response is offered.

c.	He refers to the presentation by the project proponent and says that the Project proponent only showered praises on the PP.	No response is offered.
d.	He stated that the presentation of the project proponent is wrong as a local yesterday confirmed that pollution is being caused as on date at MPT without even the coal heaps being covered with tarpaulin.	Please refer our response to 4.c
e.	He stated that there is a severe shortage of water in Vasco and the proposal to use 7 lakh litres of water for dust suppression by not providing drinking water to the locals who are craving for water should be discouraged. He states that all coal imported in Goa is sent to Karnataka and is not of any use to Goa.	Please refer our response to 5.e
f.	He stated that Karnataka should develop its own infrastructure.	Comment is not relevant to the Project.
g.	He stated that some children suffer from breathing defects due to coal pollution including his own daughter.	Please refer our response to 1.a & 4.c
h.	He stated that people of Vasco do not want coal handling in Goa	No response is offered.
i.	He stated that the CSR done by the Project proponent is of no use.	No response is offered.
j.	He stated that the people of Vasco have not requested for CSR from the Project Proponent and the snippy doles roled out in the form of CSR which includes a hearse van only adds to the irony of the fact that after inhaling pollution the resultant death would be taken care of by the PP through the hearse van.	The statement is not correct. SWPL has ear marked a budget and spends 2% of the profit for CSR activities. Various CSR activities undertaken by SWPL include: donations to schools for infrastructure development, procuring various study materials, beautification of the local parks, various activities like distribution of dustbins and construction of toilets under the Swachh Bharat Abhiyan etc. SWPL has not donated any Hearse Van.
k.	He stated that the Project Proponent should not carry on with Public Hearing and it should be stopped and that he fully opposes coal handling in Goa and the proposed project of the Project Proponent.	No response is offered.
<b>60. Dr Jorson Fernandes, Loutolim</b>		
a.	He stated that there is no safe threshold for coal dust. Mercury, lead, Nickel, Chromium and radio isotopes and other heavy and poisonous metals are found in coal dust that get carried away with coal dust.	The observation is not correct. The statement has been made without any scientific reference.
b.	He enquired as to who is checking the coal cargo prior to entry into the Port. He stated that if baggage is checked at the airport, all coal cargo should also be checked before entry into Ports.	No response is offered.
c.	Fine coal dust particulates cause a range of health problems. Fine coal dust is also called respirable dust. Inhalation of this dust causes severe respiratory problems.	Comment is not specific. Please refer our response to 1.a & 4.c
d.	Exposure to coal dust is very dangerous	Comment is not specific.
e.	He questioned the GSPCB as to whether it is equipped to check the coal	Comments not directed to the project proponent.

	dust particles that is present in Vasco Air.	
f.	GSPCB representative's intervening comment: GSPCB official informed that the Board proposes to do a source apportion study to get answer to the question.	-
g.	He stated that it is inconceivable that GSPCB is unable to determine the extent of coal dust at this stage and in allowing the coal cargo to be handled.	No comments offered
h.	He stated that GSPCB has failed to control pollution at Cuncolim caused due to Hazardous Waste pollution and he doubted that same failure of GSPCB would continue to control coal dust will result in a similar situation in Vasco.	Comment is not relevant to the Project
i.	Fine dust particles have to be monitored continuously and details of monitoring be made public. He stated that spikes in environment of coal dust pollution must be mentioned.	The ambient air quality is mentioned in the EIA
j.	An agency for monitoring coal dust has to be appointed/established. Authority in designated hospitals have to be appointed and established to treat coal dust related illness.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
k.	Autistic cases are on the rise / increase in Goa which has to be investigated.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
l.	GSPCB should do a study on pollution of drinking water due to coal pollution.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
m.	He stated that coal dust pollution causes emission of Mercury in the environment. 114 pounds of Lead and 4 pounds of Cadmium in Human Tissue can cause damage to the nervous system.	SWPL ensures minimal pollution in the prescribed limits. No comments offered.
n.	Damage to nervous system and cardio vascular system and respiratory system is caused due to air pollution.	No comments offered.
o.	Coal dust pollution is leading to high incident to heart attacks	No comments offered.
p.	The Air Act needs to be modified	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
q.	The GSPCB should make efforts to control coal dust pollution by seeking amendment to Water and Air Act.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
r.	Pregnant woman exposed to coal pollution lead to defects in new born children.	No comments are offered.
s.	Soil and Water Pollution is caused due to coal pollution	No comments are offered.
t.	Industrial Bronchitis is caused due to coal dust pollution	No comments are offered.
u.	Reduction of dust exposure and use of coal by Project Proponent should be adopted by the Project proponent or else coal handling should be stopped.	Appropriate PPEs (face mask, goggles and protective clothing) are issued to the workers operating in high dust areas. Areas where Critical instrumentation control areas are located away from the areas of operations and have been given barrier protection by means of HAPA filtration to reduce occupational exposures.
v.	Analysis is a precursor	Comment is not specific.

w.	He stated that PESTELI (Political Economic Social Technological Environmental Legal Industrial Policy) analysis has not been done nor any study on coal dust emission during transportation.	Comment is not relevant to the Project.
x.	300 Kgs of coal dust is spilled from each wagon during transportation and it is unimaginable what would be the question of spillage in the ensuing transportation.	Statement is not correct. The rail wagons are fully covered ensuring zero spillage.
y.	Heavy metals in coal are not being checked for impact of coal	Comment is not specific.
z.	In absence of the above, coal handling should not be allowed.	No comments are offered.
aa.	He questioned if Goa Government has an industrial policy and whether it was received. He stated that Public participation is essential whilst forming industrial policy.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
<b>61. Abhijit Prabhudesai</b>		
a.	He stated that the public hearing has to be compiled and minutes have to be confirmed. He further stated that the Project Proponent has to submit clarification to queries raised by the public.	No comments are offered.
	Chairman, Public Hearing Panel's intervening Comment: Chairman informed that the Public Hearing is yet to be concluded for the minutes to be read out and confirmed.	-
<b>62. Olencio Simoes</b>		
a.	He objects to recording of names for speaking at the Public Hearing.	No response is offered.
b.	He raised this as a point of order	No response is offered.
<b>63. Parshuram Shetye, Vasco</b>		
a.	He raised a point of order that Chairman cannot curtail the public of constitutional right of the public to speak at the public hearing.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
b.	The process of writing of names is not as per the EIA Notification. He stated that the Chairman cannot avoid the mandate of the EIA Notification	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
c.	He strongly objects to the conduct of the Chairman and states that the EIA Notification is being violated and he states that the present proposal should be quashed. He also objects to the failure of the Authority videograph the objection raised by him.	No comments are offered.
	Chairman, Public Hearing Panel's intervening Comment: Chairman has stated that in order to take the proceedings to its logical end the names of the speaker's has to be recorded so as to enable them to speak on 29/04/2017. He stated that the public hearing has been adjourned to the 29/04/2017.	-

d.	Mr. Shetye challenged the decision of the Chairman to adjourn the public hearing to 29/04/2017 stating that there is no provision of law to adjourn the public hearing in such a manner. He stated that such act of the Chairman would tantamount to an insult of the public. He demands that the constitution right of the public to speak at the public hearing be upheld.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
e.	He stated that only if there is a default and on part of the project proponent or GSPCB in holding the public hearing then only the public hearing can be postponed. He reiterated his point of constitutional order of right of hearing.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
f.	He stated that the speaker has been denied his right to speak at today's public hearing.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
g.	He stated that the Collector/Chairman is violating the provision of the EIA notification by adjourning the public hearing to 29/04/2017. He stated that he is being forced to vacate the venue by the Chairman and being deprived of his right to speak. He also stated that he has not got a reply to his query as to why the names of the people who desire to speak have to register their names and further as to under what provision of law the Public Hearing is being adjourned to 29/04/2017.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
<b>64. Sandeep Dalvi</b>		
	Chairman called out Sandeep Dalvi to speak	He was not present.
<b>65. Lumena Almeida</b>		
	Chairman called out Lumena Almeida to speak	She was not present
<b>66. Sankalp Amonkar</b>		
	Chairman called out Sankalp Amonkar to speak	He was not present.
<b>67. Edwin Mascarenhas</b>		
	Chairman called out Edwin Mascarenhas to speak	He was not present.
<b>68. Dinesh Dias</b>		
	Chairman called out Dinesh Dias to speak	He was not present.
<b>69. Jose Philip D'Souza</b>		
a.	He raised a point of order. He condemned the statement of Chairman of MPT that all people who are opposing Public Hearing are outsiders. This statement is an insult to Goans and the same has to be withdrawn and he has to apologize to Goans and he demanded an apology.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
b.	Chairman is trying to divide Goans.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
	Chairman, Public Hearing Panel's intervening Comment:	-

	Chairman has called upon the representative of MPT to convey the sentiments to the Chairman of MPT	
<b>70. Savio Correia, Mangor Hill, Vasco</b>		
a.	He states the Chairman i.e. Collector, South Goa was not present at yesterdays Public Hearing proceedings	No response is offered.
b.	He refused to but the statement of MPT's Chairman.	Comments not directed to the project proponent
c.	He states public Hearing is a dialogue between PP and Public.	No response is offered.
d.	He states if MPT refuses to withdraw the statement of the Chairman the entire Public Hearing is vitiated as there is no sense in moderating the Public Hearing.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
e.	Press note is issued during pending of Public Hearing and violates the proceedings of Public Hearing.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
f.	MPT Chairman has by his statement raises objection to Chairman permitting public from out of Vasco to address the Public Hearing.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
g.	He requests the MPT to apologize for the statement and stated that he is acting on the directions of Adani and Jindal.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
h.	He states that Pubic Hearing cannot continue till MPT apologize	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
<b>71. Udhav Pol</b>		
	Chairman called out Udhav Pol to speak	He was not present.
<b>72. Nazir Khan</b>		
	Chairman called out Nazir Khan to speak	He was not present.
<b>73. Edwin D'Souza, Vasco Khariwada</b>		
a.	He states he is an affected person	No response is offered.
b.	He is submitting under protest. Public is not being permitted to speak freely.	No response is offered.
c.	Residents of Khariwada are forced to eat and drink coal.	No response is offered.
d.	Without having initial permission how can PP be permitted to expand.	SWPL has applied to the MoEFCC for obtaining the Terms of Reference for the capacity enhancement to be carried out at the berths. The Public Hearing is conducted as a compliance to the condition of the additional ToR. The actual work will commence only after obtaining the statutory clearances.
e.	PP should stop all coal handling and he opposes grant of approval to Projects	No response is offered.

<b>74. Mr. Jack D'Silva- Goan, Vasco.</b>		
a.	He is submitting under protest.	No response is offered.
b.	His house is on the seashore	Comment is not specific.
c.	He states that he is a Goan and not an outsider.	No response is offered.
d.	Yesterday the MPT Chairman was requested to come and address the Public , he refused saying he was busy yet he had time to give a statement on newspaper.	No response is offered.
e.	Chairman of MPT has insulted Goans.	
f.	Pollution due to existing Coal handling and 5A & 6A is out of control and as such how can PP be permitted to expand.	Comment is not specific.
g.	As a concerned Goan , he states that the invisible coal particles caused due to Coal Pollution caused due to PP operations is entering lungs of people and causing health hazards.	Please refer our response to 1.a & 4.c
h.	MPT is claiming development as reason for expansion but development cannot be at the cost of peoples livelihood and life.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
i.	Mercury levels in sea is increasing due to coal pollution in water contaminating the fish which locals consume.	The observation is not correct. The comment is not specific.
j.	GSPCB has accepted that PP is causing pollution due to its operations and has directed them to reduce the operation by 25%.	No comments as the necessary compliance to the direction with replies was carried out by project proponent.
k.	He seeks to know the number of times the GSPCB has directed the PP to reduce its pollution and whether they have accepted the Boards directions.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
l.	GSPCB representative's intervening comment: Boards representative states that on findings pollution level to be high they have issued directions to reduce the operations.	-
m.	He demands that the Board direct the MPT and PP to close operations fully if the levels of Pollution are high.	No response is offered.
n.	Delay on GSPCB is destroying the health of Vasco locals.	No response is offered.
o.	He strongly condemns the statement of Chairman of MPT to term Vasco locals as outsiders.	No response is offered.
p.	He demands GSPCB should take immediate action against the PP does coal pollution.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
q.	If you salute your duty you don't have to salute anybody because if you pollute your duty you have to pollute everybody.	No response is offered.
<b>75. Gracious Coutinho, Vasco.</b>		
a.	He is the Secretary of Old Cross Fishing Society	Introduction of the speaker
b.	He says that he has lots to speak but he cannot as he is being limited to	No response is offered.

	Speak for 5 minutes	
c.	He opposed coal handling in Vasco	No response is offered.
d.	He stated that his friend had died due to lung infection. He says even his father died from Lung Cancer.	No response is offered.
e.	Vasco faces severe water shortage because MPT uses 7 million litres of Water causing Vasco residents to suffer from lack of water.	Please refer our response to 5.e
f.	Transportation of Coal by trucks in Vasco is not being controlled and monitored by GSPCB. He can see coal on roads of Vasco.	Please refer our response to 35.j
g.	He states that entire Vasco bay is filled with coal leading to drop in fish catch and requested GSPCB to act.	Please refer our response to 15.k & 15.p
h.	He states that fishermen cannot get labour as they cannot live in Vasco due to coal pollution, and they leave the place after a year or so.	No response is offered.
i.	He has more to say but is stopping due to lack of time.	No response is offered.
j.	He seeks to know when the Public Hearing for the dredging would commence as he wants to come back to address	No response is offered.
	Chairman, Public Hearing Panel's intervening Comment: The Chairman told him that the same would be commencing at 2:45p.m.	-
k.	He demands that name of speakers be read out as entered in the register maintained.	No response is offered.
l.	Chairman, Public Hearing Panel's intervening Comment: He is informed by the Chairman that he will be permitted to speak at 2:30 p.m. on the dredging issue first.	-
<b>76. Suresh Naik, Vasco</b>		
a.	He strongly opposes Coal dust that is being caused due to operation of JSW and Adani as permitted by MPT.	No response is offered.
b.	Large number of accidents are being caused due to dust pollution. Coal dust lowers visibility causing accidents.	Pls. refer our response 1.a, 1.d & 4.c
c.	He states that the Collector and GSPCB is not taking any action to stop coal dust pollution. He demanded to know as to what has been GSPCB has been taken action is taken to stop coal dust pollution.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
d.	GSPCB states it has directed Coal handling Companies to reduce Coal dust pollution by 25%.	No comments as the necessary compliance to the direction with replies was carried out by project proponent.
e.	People in Vasco are forced to use masks to avoid dust pollution. He demanded GSPCB should state if they will issue masks to the Public?	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
f.	He seeks to know from GSPCB whether coal dust pollution has reduced as on date and as per latest analysis done by GSPCB i.e. AAQM done in Vasco.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
g.	GSPCB officials failed to answer and as such is not doing its duty.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
h.	As per GSPCB report on noise monitoring done as per demand of public at	We are unaware of the date, time and location of the mentioned data

	Public Hearing, GSPCB has done noise monitoring which indicates that during operation of one plant the noise level is 75dB which is exceeding the levels if both plants operate.	collection. Thus we refrain from offering any comment.
i.	He requested the Board representative to disclose whether he is authorised to answer the queries of the Public on receipt from the podium.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
	Chairman, Public Hearing Panel's intervening Comment: Chairman clarified that GSPCB official is authorised.	-
j.	He stated that as GSPCB is refusing to answer they support Adani & Jindal.	No response is offered.
k.	He states the system as failed	No response is offered.
l.	He states the Chairman has failed to effectively conduct the Public Hearing.	No response is offered.
m.	Chairman, Public Hearing Panel's intervening Comment: Chairman stated that he is conducting the Public Hearing as per the EIA Notification.	-
n.	He sought to know under what law people are being given only 5 minutes to speak.	-
	Chairman, Public Hearing Panel's intervening Comment: Chairman states that he is giving time limit so as to enable all people who are registered to speak. He stated that written objections can be given.	-
<b>77. Peter Andrade</b>		
	Chairman, Public Hearing Panel's intervening Comment: Chairman stated that Peter Andrade has already spoken on the first day. i.e. on 26/04/2017 at the Public Hearing.	-
<b>78. Custodio D'Souza, Khariawada</b>		
a.	Old Goan Society Chairman & Goa against Coal Conveyor.	Introduction by the speaker
b.	He sought to know how many minutes he will get to speak.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
c.	Chairman, Public Hearing Panel's intervening Comment: Chairman stated that he will get 6 minutes to speak.	-
d.	He states that he wants the order of Collector passed on point of order raised regarding time limit for speaking.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
e.	Chairman, Public Hearing Panel's intervening Comment: Chairman states that he has passed an order stating that people will speak for 5 -6 minutes only.	-
f.	He states that order was passed at the start of today's proceedings and sought to know the provisions of Law under which the order regarding limit of time was passed.	No response is offered.

g.	He stated that Chairman is refusing to answer and is forcing him to speak for 6 minutes	No response is offered.
h.	He states that people have come to speak about their grievances which cannot be limited in 5 minutes.	No response is offered.
i.	He demanded that the Chairman give his Order in writing on the time limit for speaking and also read out the minutes of Public Hearing so far.	No response is offered.
j.	He sought to know how 3 persons are sitting on the podium.	No comments
k.	Chairman, Public Hearing Panel's intervening Comment Collector stated that as per EIA Notification either the Collector or Additional Collector & representative of the GSPCB have to preside over the meeting. He stated that Additional Collector is helping him to record the Minutes.	-
l.	He sought to know who is the Chairman of the Public Hearing Committee ?	No response is offered.
m.	He stated that Additional Collector effectively conducted the public hearing and today Collector is creating hurdles and imposing time limit.	No response is offered.
n.	Chairman, Public Hearing Panel's intervening Comment: Chairman informed him his time limit is crossed and asked him to stop down.	-
<b>79. Archanjo Gurzao</b>		
	Chairman called out Archanjo Gurzao to speak	He was not present.
<b>80. Pooja Mitra</b>		
	Chairman called out Pooja Mitra to speak	She was not present
<b>81. Deu Kankonkar</b>		
	Chairman called out Deu Kankonkar to speak	He was not present.
<b>82. Enrico Dias</b>		
	Chairman called out Enrico Dias to speak	He was not present.
<b>83. Salvador Fernandes</b>		
	Chairman called out Salvador Fernandes to speak	He was not present.
<b>84. Priscilla Fernandes</b>		
	Chairman called out Priscilla Fernandes to speak	She was not present

<b>85. Custodio D'Souza, Khariawada</b>		
a.	He refused to leave the Podium to let Maxie Correia to speak after he was called up to address the Public Hearing.	No response is offered.
b.	Chairman, Public Hearing Panel's intervening Comment: Chairman permitted him an additional 5 minutes to speak and the said that he would subsequently have to leave.	-
c.	He sought to know under what provision the Collector has decided to limit speakers to speak.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
d.	He demanded to give 2 hours to speak, however the Chairman stated that he will get only 5 minutes to speak.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
e.	He stated that he refused to leave the podium and stated that he would have to be evicted forcefully the Chairman request.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
f.	MPT Chairman stated that outsiders are coming to the Public Hearing and speaking and that no Vasco residents are objecting. He rejects that and says that he is a Vasco resident. He demanded to know who is the representative of MPT present at the Public Hearing are.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
g.	He demanded that MPT Chairman be summoned to clarify his statement.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
h.	He demanded that the Collector issue an order and evict him.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
i.	He states that the Collector, South Goa has by attending today's Public Hearing has started a law & order problem at today's Public Hearing.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
j.	He demands that all public should be given an equal opportunity to speak. He states the issue is Public Hearing is a serious one and pertains to Vasco & Goan future.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
k.	He requests the Collector to state under which provision of law the collector has permitted people to submit objections upto 02/05/2017.	No response is offered.
l.	Chairman, Public Hearing Panel's intervening Comment: Collector states that he is following the procedure laid down as per EIA Notification. He states that he has prescribed the time limit in order to enable all public to get an opportunity to speak.	-
m.	He demands to know the amount of time the PP has taken to submit its presentation. He states that Collector is discriminating between the PP and the Public.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
n.	He states that time limit of 5 minutes for speaking by public should have been issued on the first day of the Public Hearing. He requested to know why Additional Collector did not mention 5 minutes for speaking yesterday.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
o.	Chairman, Public Hearing Panel's intervening Comment: Chairman states that 20 minutes have been consumed by him and yet he	-

	has not started his submissions.	
p.	He states that as per todays notice issued by GSPCB on todays paper, there is no mention of the 5 minute time limit and hence he wants to know whether the time limit is fixed by the collector or some other person.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
q.	He states the time limit of 5 minutes should have been informed yesterday and not today by the Chairman at 10:30 a.m.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
r.	He states he cannot continue his submissions unless he is given an answer by the Collector regarding the order & law under which the collection has prescribed 5 minutes time limit.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
p.	Custodio D'Souza states he is being evicted by force by the Police and the Collector.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
<b>86. Maxie Correia, Vaddem</b>		
a.	He is submitting under protest	No comments are offered
b.	He questioned why the Police are stationed at the Public Hearing	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
c.	Police are threatening the Public.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
d.	He states that he is a Cancer Patient. He states that he is suffering with the public in the podium while officials are sitting in comfort.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
e.	He submits under protest he seeks to know if any representatives of MPT is present on the dais.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
f.	Chairman, Public Hearing Panel's intervening Comment: Chairman stated all 3 projects are different from each other.	-
g.	Introduction of PP	JSW officials submitted their names and designation. (1) R.R. Patra – Vice President (2) Anthony Fernandes – Unit In charge
h.	He requests the representatives of JSW to state as to whether any steps have been taken by JSW to help people who suffer critical sickness due to coal pollution.	JSW representative stated that all objection of the Public will be taken note of record and replied at the end of the Public Hearing later.
i.	Chairman, Public Hearing Panel's intervening Comment: Chairman stated that the objection of the public will be noted and sent to EAC for decision.	-
j.	He asks the Chairman if he will be responsible for a law and order problem due to conduct of Public Hearing.	No comments offered
k.	Chairman, Public Hearing Panel's intervening Comment: Chairman stated that the project is not approved and that it is at conceptual stage which will be considered by EAC only after evaluating public objections.	-
l.	He questioned whether JSW is covering its coal stacks.	JSW representative have submitted that they provide tarpaulin cover

		on the coal stockpiles. C and conveyor belts in the SWPL Terminal are covered. where it can be done and that JSW is considering installing a covered shed. Since this is an operating port, engineering challenges are being addressed to install a longitudinal covered shed. Please refer our response to 5.e
m.	He asked the JSW representative to state when did the JSW do a mock drill regarding Disaster Management last?	The representative stated that a written reply will be submitted. SWPL carries out all its safety mock drills as per the general practices and the norms, including periodical safety workshops for awareness.
n.	He stated JSW has no plan for disaster management in case of explosion of fuel and ammonia tanks.	Not in the purview of the project proponent. A disaster management plan for SWPL is in place. The Disaster Management Plan deals with natural and man-made calamities, and a preparedness and response plan for the same. Pls. refer our response 40.ss
o.	He demands a reply on this point to the public from JSW.	Please refer our response to 86.h
p.	He states the Chairman is obstructing the smooth conduct of the Public Hearing.	No response is offered.
q.	It is noted that the JSW is not replying to the queries of the Public.	Please refer our response to 86.h
r.	He states if the JSW is going to use 7 million litres of water than what will happen to the water supply of the locals. He states the source of 7 million litres of water is not stated in the EIA report.	About 500 kld as mentioned in the EIA report, section 5.3.2, page 5-15 will be needed for the project. The Port Terminal presently uses 200-250 kld treated sewage from the STP of MPT. The additional quantity of water for dust suppression is proposed to be sourced from the presently operational 2300 kld CETP at Baina operated by PWD. No potable water will be used for sprinkling.
s.	JSW does not employ local goans in their unit.	Pls. refer our response 46.i & 46.j
t.	He requests that all his submissions be noted. He states that that as Collector of the District he should also answer to the public queries.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
u.	He reiterates that he is submitting under protests as time limit is being imposed. Yesterday's proceedings were conducted with huge time given to public speakers	No response is offered.
<b>87. Cedric D'Souza, Raia</b>		
a.	He stated that he is speaking on the protest reason being the Chairman gave only 5 minutes.	No response is offered.
b.	He states that JSW representative are not replying to the Public queries	Please refer our response to 86.h
c.	He stated that the EIA report was not given to some of the affected panchayats.	Please refer our response to 7.b and 7.c
d.	Chairman, Public Hearing Panel's intervening Comment: Chairman states that villages that are within 10 kms are required to be submitted and these villages have been given copies. Chairman states	-

	that the EAC will decide on this issue and can either call the villagers for hearing or can direct a Public hearing for the affected villages. He states that his duty is to record the public views and submit it to the EAC for decision.	
e.	GSPCB representative's intervening comment: GSPCB official introduced himself as Dr. Mohan Girap and stated that he is attending the Public Hearing on behalf of GSPCB.	-
f.	He referred to a request made on 26/04/2017 for conduct of noise monitoring at the Project Proponents unit earlier by the GSPCB to check levels of noise monitoring. Comment of GSPCB GSPCB replied was prepared by the Board and the report indicates that the level is 75 dB.	We are unaware of the date, time and location of the mentioned data collection. Thus we refrain from offering any comment.
g.	He wanted to know what action PCB will take on the issue.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
h.	GSPCB representative's intervening comment: GSPCB representative stated that he will have to check the records and action will be initiated after processing of the report.	-
i.	He questioned whether the Consent to Operate will be withdrawn, the time frame in which it will be done.	No response is offered.
j.	GSPCB representative's intervening comment: GSPCB representative states that it will be done after following due procedure.	-
k.	He stated that as public are given time limit to speak, GSPCB should have to act as per a time schedule.	No response is offered.
l.	GSPCB representative's intervening comment: GSPCB representative stated that he will reply to the complaint in one day time.	-
m.	He requested the Project Proponent to inform whether MPT hospital is built. He requests the GSPCB to state where the MPT hospital exist just in front of the hospital which is filled with heaps of waste.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
n.	He states that even third world countries plan their ports and terminals far away from populated areas.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
o.	He seeks to know the Disaster Management Plan of District Collector.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
p.	Chairman, Public Hearing Panel's intervening Comment: Chairman states that a disaster management plan exists.	-
q.	He questions as to whether the runoff from coal carrying ships of large size and from the jetty have been considered.	Please refer our response to 17.f and other relevant points.
r.	He states that he opposes expansion of 5A and 6A and other two projects and inefficient action of GSPCB.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
s.	He also questioned that there was no proper equipment for disaster	Comment is not relevant to the Project.

	contingency as there was grounding in April 2016, of a Tug Boat and a Pontoon and the Disaster Management team had taken a week to clear it. He also stated that they are lucky since there was no pollution but they cannot be riding on luck all the time, as the big Cape size vessels causing pollution could be quick and catastrophic. A perfect example was a grounding of River Princess of Coast Candolim Beach which took 12 years to clear.	The activities are in the preview of the concessaire, Mormugao Port Trust.
<b>88. Madeline Pereira</b>		
a.	She states that she is a cancer patient and a senior citizen.	-
b.	She stated that she sat at the public hearing venue for the past 3 days. She has decided to speak to oppose the atrocities that are being planned for Vasco by the Project Proponent.	Comment is not specific.
c.	She states that she has grown up in Vasco and has learnt to swim on Vasco beach	Comment is not specific
d.	She states that earlier there was a beach at Vasco which has now been dredged and destroyed by MPT.	Comment is not specific
e.	She stated that MPT, Adani and Jindal have destroyed Vasco beach and ecology.	Comment is not specific
f.	Vasco beauty is destroyed.	Comment is not specific
g.	She objects to police presence at the Public Hearing and says the police are threatening.	No response is offered.
h.	She says citizen of Vasco have come for public hearing to fight for their lives, future and children and not to create a law and order situation.	No response is offered.
i.	She requests the Project Proponent not to cause coal revolution in Vasco.	Comment is not specific
j.	She states that the submission and presentation made by the public so far clearly shows how MPT and coal handling companies are going to destroy Goa as they have no clean plan for preserving Vasco's ecology.	Comment is not specific
k.	Exposure to coal dust can lead to Autism in children.	Please refer our response to 1.a & 4.c
l.	She thanked all the speaker for their brilliant presentation that has put the Project Proponent and the Collector and GSPCB to know that the said project is not good for the general public.	Comment is not specific
m.	She states that what she is speaking for all the three projects and her submission are required to be recorded in all three public hearing proceedings.	Statement of the speaker. The relevant points directed to project proposed by SWPL will be replied appropriately.
n.	She states there are a large number of children are suffering from pulmonary diseases.	Please refer our response to 1.a & 4.c
o.	She questioned the Project proponent as to why Vasco residents are	No response is offered.

	being tortured. She stated that Vasco people have to breath in coal dust for the benefit of the nation.	
p.	She knows a number of Vasco residents who have died due to coal pollution.	No response is offered.
q.	She stated that before the public hearing could start, during the pendency of the notice period, coal was washed upon the beach in Vasco indicating pollution by the Project Proponent.	No response is offered. No such incidences have occurred from the terminals operated by SWPL.
r.	She states that coal from the Project Proponent's operations is entering people's houses.	
s.	She says Goan mud is red but earth of Vasco is black.	No response is offered.
t.	She states if Project Proponent are allowed to import more coal then coal pollution will increase and will not stop	Modernization of the operation will accompany installation of more effective, integrated and efficient APCMs. SWPL Terminal is committed to adhere to all pollution standards stipulated by the MoEFCC and GSPCB.
u.	With increase in import of coal, there will be increase in height of coal stacks that will not be able to be covered.	As in the proposed modernization, the height of stacker will not increase, the stack height will also not increase. The increase in capacity of the Terminal is proposed to be executed by lower dwell time of cargo in the Terminal and faster evacuation rates.
v.	She states that the people of Vasco are being gagged and prevented from speaking.	No response is offered.
w.	She asks why Sonshi mining activity is stopped and why same action cannot be done in Vasco.	Comment is not relevant to the Project.
x.	She demands back clean air in Vasco as it is their constitutional right.	No comments are offered.
y.	She states that people of Vasco have a right to clean air.	No comments are offered.
z.	Goa was pristine during the Portuguese period and remember the late poet Manoharbai Sarde.	Comment is not relevant to the Project.
aa.	She stated Vasco residents are dominated by coal handling tycoons	No response is offered.
bb	She states the Portuguese setup up a fish plant in Vasco as it was getting good catch of fish which has now been short because of the pollution caused in the river that has resulted in loss of fish catch.	The Coal stacks are covered with water proof sheets and protected at the sides from collapse by crash barriers. Hence, no flow is envisaged from the coal dump. In case of any flow, they collected in the dump pond/settling tank, so question of direct discharge in to the sea is not possible. There is no link between fish catch with on ground handling of material.
cc.	She states that coal is being imported to Goa for benefit of other States.	No comments are offered.
dd.	She credits Mr. Custodio for going to Court and exposing the MPT's act of illegal dredging the channel and for going to Court for getting it quashed.	No comments are offered.
ee.	She states that dredging of the river Zuari amounts to raping of the river.	No comments are offered.
ff.	She objects to Police being present in close vicinity of the podium.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.

<b>89. Francisco Gonsalves</b>		
a.	He permits Nazir Khan, Vasco.	
b.	He seeks the translator who gave the project proponents presentation to come to the dais	The Konkani translator introduces himself as Dr. Bhushan Bhave.
c.	He requested the translator to explain how he could submit a presentation of Project Proponent in a few minutes while public gave a presentation of 2 hours.	The translator stated that he delivered the presentation on behalf of the project proponent based on instructions given to him by SWPL.
d.	He states that not a single MLA from Mormugao Constituency is present for the Public Hearing. He seeks to know from the MLA's their stand on the issue of Coal Pollution and support to the project.	No response is offered.
e.	He sought to know from the representative of GSPCB how much pollution is caused from the Chimney of a fast food unit ?	Comment is not relevant to the Project. Comments not directed to the project proponent.
	GSPCB representative's intervening comment: Representative of GSPCB stated that it cannot be quantified.	-
f.	He stated that the GSPCB acts against small businesses for operating without permissions on the basis of a complaint, while it takes no action against coal handling against units like MPT Adani and JSW but only issues meaningless notices.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
g.	He states Children of Vasco fall sick with Asthma due to Coal Pollution and the GSPCB has not acted.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
h.	he states that vide letter no. 1/20/15-PCB/Tech/1091 dated 16/02/2016, PCB has informed that the Board has issued Directions to M/s. MPT. SWPL and Adani to carry out following:	
	(1) No over loading of trucks should be carried out .	No road transport is carried out by SWPL
	(2) Coal height should be less than 5 mts, he states coal has crossed from than 5 mtrs height, but no action has been taken.	The coal is stacked upto permissible height. Also a wind breaking wall of 12m is constructed to avoid emission.
	(3) Sprinkling should be carried out at coal stackyards. He seeks to know whether there is any compliance to the Boards directions.	Water sprinkling is carried out at the coal stackyards.
	(4) Coal stacks should be covered with tarpaulin covers. He states that the 3 Companies have not complied with Boards directions and yet no action is taken.	We always keep the stacks covered except at the time of stacking and reclaiming which is carried out under water sprinkling
	(5) Trucks should be covered with tarpaulin. He alleges that Coal and woodchips trucks are not covered.	No road transport is carried out
	(6) He states that no flow meters have been installed for sprinkling system. He alleges that this is not done	Flow meters are installed and flow is regulated
	(7) AAQM data and weekly monitoring data to GSPCB weekly.	Monthly monitoring report is submitted to GSPCB
k.	He questioned the JSW officials whether this is being done.	Anthony Fernandes (incharge of SWPL) representative of JSW states that as per Consent condition they submit monthly report to GSPCB.

l.	He states that JSW submits a monthly report and not a weekly report.	This is done as per the condition in the consent
m.	He states that as per the letter the Board is required to receive a weekly report but the same is not done. He wanted to know that till date how many complaints have been received by the GSPCB from the people of Vasco against Coal Pollution.	Weekly if desired could be submitted. Not relevant to the project.
	GSPCB representative's intervening comment: The GSPCB official states that the record will be checked and the compliance will be informed accordingly.	-
n.	He states that he has also written to the PMO office regarding this issue. The PMO has directed the office of the Chief Secretary to act. He states that if PMO office has replied to this letter, than why State Government Authorities are not replying to him.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
o.	He seeks action on the MPT / JSW officials who have failed to come prepared for today's public hearing.	No comments are offered.
p.	He objects to grant of approval to the Project of JSW.	No comments are offered.
q.	He states local MLA is not opposing the Project as he has received benefits from the unit.	No comments are offered.
<b>90. Vasant Naik</b>		
	Chairman called out Vasant Naik to speak	He was not present.
<b>91. Mohamad Yusuf Khan</b>		
	Chairman called out Mohamad Yusuf Khan to speak	He was not present.
<b>92. Parshuram Shetye</b>		
a.	He raises a point of order and requests the Collector to print the public register, to speak at the Public Hearing.	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
		Collector declares lunch break to reassemble at 2:45p.m.
<b>93. Vasant Naik</b>		
	Chairman called out Vasant Naik to speak	He was not present.
<b>94. Abdul Rehman Sheikh</b>		
	Chairman called out Vasant Naik to speak	He was not present.

<b>95. Mohamed Yusuf Khan</b>		
	Chairman called out Mohamed Yusuf Khan to speak	He was not present.
<b>96. Henry D’Mello</b>		
	Chairman called out Henry D’Mello to speak	He was not present.
<b>97. Nicholau Satibero</b>		
	Chairman called out Nicholau Satibero to speak	He was not present.
<b>98. Mr Araujo spoke in place of Nicholau Estibeiro</b>		
a.	He stated that he has been here for the last three days. Today is the adjournment hearing. He stated that his submissions towards enhancement of coal handling is as under;	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• He stated that the condition at the Berths is pathetic and its own employees are not provided with protective wear. The Project proponent should provide the employees with personal protection.</li> </ul>	SWPL provides safety helmets, face mask and other safety measures to the employees. The coal stacks are always covered with tarpaulin and also water sprinkling is carried out from time to time to minimise fugitive and dust emission. SWPL has erected a wind shield to obstruct and contain the dispersion of dust. Also mechanised broom vehicles are deployed on the berths for berth cleaning.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• He further stated that the Project proponent is stacking coal beyond recommended stack height totally exposed without covering.</li> </ul>	The observation is not correct. The coal is stacked upto permissible height. Also a wind breaking wall of 12m is constructed to avoid emission. We always keep the stacks covered except at the time of stacking and reclaiming which is carried out under water sprinkling.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• He stated that the water used for sprinkling flows into the river thereby polluting the sea water and the fish.</li> </ul>	The Coal stacks are covered with water proof sheets and protected at the sides from collapse by crash barriers. Hence, no flow is envisaged from the coal dump. In case of any flow, they collected in the dump pond/settling tank, so question of direct discharge in to the sea is not possible. There is no link between fish catch with on ground handling of material.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• He stated that the sprinkling water is raw sewage totally smelling and the residents residing nearby have to bear this.</li> </ul>	The Port Terminal presently uses 200-250 kld treated sewage from the STP of MPT for sprinkling.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• He submitted that the presentation of EIA is totally fraud.</li> </ul>	Please refer our response to 36.a and various other points above.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• He also stated that during wood chip handling there is spillage and these are washed into the sea.</li> </ul>	The terminals 5A & A do not handle any wood chips

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• He stated that the Project proponent operates in violation of Human Rights</li> </ul>	No response is offered.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• He questioned as to whether the air flows within the radius of 10 Kms or whether fresh air is generated after 10 Kms radius of the site.</li> </ul>	Comment is not specific.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• He questioned whether the trucks and trains moving through other cities are not contributing to pollution.</li> </ul>	There is no road transportation of cargo in the Project at present and the same is not proposed in the proposed modernization phase as well. Railway transport of cargo is an ongoing operation since start of the terminal. All the rakes are covered during movement.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• He stated that a case should be filed against the JSW, MPT, Adani and GSPCB.</li> </ul>	No response is offered.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• He stated that when he approached three times to the GSPCB for the reports of inspection of coal handling, he was told to approach the Member Secretary of the Board for the same. He further stated that some of the officials informed him that the levels were high. He questioned the representative of the GSPCB as to what is the percentage of pollution.</li> </ul>	Comments not directed to the project proponent.
	GSPCB representative's intervening comment: The GSPCB Official informed Mr. Araujo that the data is available on the website of the Board.	-
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• He stated that the project proponent has not mentioned the benefits that the company will gain from this proposed project in the EIA report.</li> </ul>	The observation is not correct. Please refer Chapter 1 Introduction, Section 1.3 Project Profile, page no. 1-5 which deals with the matter of benefits of the project to the project proponent.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• He stated that the site is a reclaimed land and it takes a month to fill it up.</li> </ul>	The statement is not correct. The proposed project is to be carried out in the existing operations only. No additional waterfront or land is to be acquired. The project does not involve any reclamation.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• He questioned as to who is responsible for the health of the people; i.e Whether GSPCB, Adani, JSW or MPT. He further questioned as to who is responsible for the medical bills of the people who are affected due to coal handling activity</li> </ul>	Please refer our response to 1.a & 4.c No response is offered.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• He stated that he strongly condemns the act of the elected members as they did not attend the public hearing. He questioned as to whom they represent? Whether JSW, Adani or MPT. He stated that it is a shame for them for protecting such devils.</li> </ul>	No response is offered.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• He strongly objected to grant of approval for the proposal of the Project proponent.</li> </ul>	No response is offered.
<b>99. Abhijit Prabhudesai, Vasco</b>		

a.	He stated that at the first day of the hearing 26/04/2017, the project proponent refused to answer any question posed to them by the public and stated that they will be answering the questions later in the day. However, he stated that these questions were not answered till today by the Project Proponent.	The PP is required to submit written submissions of the answer to the queries. This is being done.
b.	Further he stated that he wanted to know all the questions that were raised by the public on the first day.	The recorded minutes were read out to the public in Konkani and English, thus all the questions/ queries and suggestions made during the proceedings of the public hearing over the three days were informed to all present at the venue.
c.	He further sought for time from the Collector for the public to make corrections in the minutes.	No comments
d.	Chairman, Public Hearing Panel's intervening Comment: The Chairman informed that they would be given time upto 06/05/2017 to carryout necessary amends.	

The Project Proponent was directed by the Chairman to submit a clarification to the Public on their grievances.

**Authorised Representative of the Project Proponent submitted as follows:**

- 1) The minutes have been duly recorded.
- 2) SWPL is duty bound by procedure given in the EIA Notification to provide information or clarification sought during the public hearing and will do so in writing.
- 3) The following 5 major clarifications are placed before the Public.
  - SWPL does not undertaken any coal transportation by public road and they will not be doing it in the proposed capacity enhancement.
  - The present rail infrastructure is sufficient to take the consequential additional cargo. No rail doubling has been proposed by us as part of the project.
  - Presently, SWPL are using MPT treated sewage water for the current operations of dust suppression. For the proposed enhancement, they will utilize the 2300 KLD CETP water at Baina operated by the PWD.
  - Presently, SWPL are covering their Cargo with tarpaulin all year round. Being a Brownfield Project there are engineers challenge to put a hard longitudinal cover, Engineering feasibility for the same is underway.
  - SWPL has not proposed any dredging as part of our Project. The proposed project is independent of the capital dredging project of MPT, and will be implemented with or without dredging.