

Proposed Project of: Proposed Development of Fishing Jetty, Multipurpose General Cargo Berths and POL Terminal at Mormugao Port.

Project Proponent: M/s. Mormugao Port Trust, Headland – Sada, Goa.

REPLY TO THE QUERIES OF ENVIRONMENTAL PUBLIC HEARING HELD ON 05/10/2018, 06/10/2018 and 08/10/2018 AT SAG, GROUND AT CHICALIM, VASCO-GOA.

ANNEXURE - I

Preliminary Objection Raised by Public During EPH:

Sr. No.	Objection/Query Raised by Public	Reply to Query by MPT
1.0	Shri. Sherwyn Corriea, Mangor Hill, Vasco.	
1.1	EIA report submitted by the MPT and it shows that the whole project is not prepared for Goa.	EIA Report is prepared based on the specific TOR issued by MoEF& CC to the proposed project
1.2	The Project is a part of a larger plan to turn MPT into a Coal Hub.	The present project is an independent activity and coal/coke is not be handled at this location
1.3	What this document does not say or conceals, is that this project is only a small piece of the larger jigsaw puzzle that has been prepared for Goa.	No concealment of facts. The present project is an independent activity and document prepared takes account all possible impacts.
1.4	Sagarmala report projects the total Coal handling at Mormugão Port at 51 million tonnes per annum by 2030 i.e just 12 years from now.	Subject project has nothing to do with coal & coke handling.
1.5	He stated that instead of having piece meal public hearing for these deliberately broken down projects there should be one big public hearing for all these projects together, so that the people of Goa can understand the cumulative impact of all these pieces in the jigsaw puzzle.	Public Hearing has been conducted according to the ToR approved by MoEF
1.6	He stated that he is interested to know what is in it for Goan youth in this larger project as well as this specific project in terms of employment and socio-economic benefits. He said when we talk of sustainable development, we have to weigh the long-term socio-	EMP is a site specific plan prepared to attain a sustainable approach and suppress contemplated adverse environmental impacts to the maximum extent possible. All the proposed developments planned in this proposal namely, Fishing harbour, passenger jetty

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	economic benefits as against the environmental impact, study of which has not been done in this EIA report	and POL jetty will contribute to the socio economic development of the region and generate employment opportunities.
1.7(a)	He stated that he was researching on this topic, and he came across an EIA report prepared by the very same EIA consultant i.e ULTRA TECH for the proposed Veraval Fishery Harbour Phase-II, it was prepared for the Fisheries Dept. Govt. of Gujarat. He stated that the cost of that project is Rs. 152 crore as compared to Rs. 680 crore for the project under scrutiny. But, for the project in Gujarat, the estimated employment is 200 people during construction phase. On what basis did you come to this figure of 70 people, during construction stage, could the Project proponent share it with them?	The assessment of possible Employment generation during the construction phase of the project will be verified.
1.7 (b)	What is the exact employment figure that is envisaged or estimated during operational phase?	Refer to reply at 1.7(a).
1.7(c)	Did the Project proponent carry out any study on the employment pattern in the study area?	Employment pattern for the Project is assessed in two phases: 'Construction phase' and 'Operational phase'. The details will be included in the Final EIA Report.
1.7 (d)	If so, can the project proponent tell in which part of the EIA report is it mentioned?	Please see para 7.1, page 144 of the draft EIA report
1.8	He stated that he would like to ask the EIA consultants, that do you envisage Goan youth standing outside the berth selling 'Chai' and Pakodas'?	No remarks.
1.9	He stated that he was checking out the background of the EIA consultant i.e ULTRA TECH and he came across a rapid EIA study for promotion of tourism at Muttom Lighthouse in District Kanyakumari, Tamil Nadu. It was prepared in February 2017 for Directorate of Lighthouse and Lightships Govt. of India. Para 7.2 and	The EIA report is prepared based on the Standard Guidelines & Format mandated by the "EIA Notification of 2006 / NABET (Quality Council of India)" and as per the Project specific TOR issued by the MOEF & CC.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	<u>7.3</u> of this EIA has been copy pasted in <u>para 7.1 and 7.2</u> of the EIA report of the project in scrutiny.	
1.10	He questioned as how can the employment potential of a lighthouse tourism project in Kanyakumari be identical, to a POL and fishing jetty in Goa? He stated that it only confirms his doubt that there has been no study at all as far as employment opportunities are concerned.	The assessment of Employment generated during the construction phase & operation phase of the project will be verified and elaborated in the Final EIA Report.
1.11	He stated that he can safely assume that the tangible employment for Goan youth that will be generated is ZERO, and if that is so, then what is the benefit for Goan youth? Why should he even have such a project?	Project benefits are incorporated in Chapter 7.
1.12	He stated that EIA report that is prepared for MPT which itself admits that even direct employment will be through sub-contractors which is not through MPT the project-proponent, talking about MPT as an employer, the less said the better.	The overall Employment "generated/provided" is through the implementation of the project.
1.13	He stated that out of 14 persons appointed by MPT to various posts on regular basis from 01-01-2017 till date, he has found only 4 Goans on the list.	No remarks.
1.14	He questioned as for whose benefit is all the so-called development? Is it for the benefit of a handful of corporate like Jindal, Adani and Vedanta? Is it to satisfy a short-stout man sitting in Transport Bhavan, Delhi?	No remarks.
1.15	He stated that in, Verna Industrial Estate, lakhs of sq. meters of Comunidade land were forcefully acquired for setting up industries that were supposed to provide employment for Goan youth. It is well known today that 2 out of every 3 persons employed in Verna are non-Goans.	No remarks.
1.16	He asked what is happening in Verna today will, surely be repeated in Mopa.	No remarks.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	Are these projects put together a kind of subtle ethnic cleansing designed to reduce Goans to minority in their own state?	
1.17	He stated that the proposed project is an encroachment on the public beach at Vasco Bay. He has perused the plans of the projects that are appended to the draft EIA report. About 2/3 rd of this beach will be annihilated by this project.	The project is implemented within the jurisdiction of MPT. Location of various components of this project such as Fishing jetty, Passenger jetty, etc. is based on the consensus reached with various stake holders including the Government of Goa.
1.18	He stated that a beach is a public property and belongs to the Commons. He stated that it is held by the govt. on behalf of "We the People", under the doctrine of Public Trust, no one, including govt. itself can deny the public to any part or parcel of a public beach.	Refer to reply at 1.17.
1.19	He said that this beach at Vasco Bay has to be preserved for posterity and for the future generation of Vasokars and Goenkars in general.	Refer to reply at 1.17.
1.20	He said that he want to highlight, is that this EIA report is totally silent on Corporate Social Responsibility or CSR. CSR is a statutory and mandatory requirement for all corporates and commercial organizations. It is also a statutory requirement in any EIA study to enable the public to know the tangible benefits of the project. But, the EIA report is completely silent on this aspect.	The EIA report is prepared based on the standard Guidelines & Format mandated by the "EIA Notification of 2006 / NABET (Quality Council of India)" and as per the Project specific TOR issued by the MOEF & CC.
1.21	He stated that he wants to make it clear that he is not against a modern fishing jetty. He has been to the fish-landing jetty many times and he knows that a modern spacious state of the art jetty is a need of the hour for our trawler owners and boatkars.	No remarks.
1.22	He stated that the people of Vasco will not tolerate MPT's high-handedness. He said that he for one will resort to	No remarks.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	every democratic and legal means to ensure that the environment and the commons of Vasco, are preserved and protected for future generations.	
2.0	Shri. Abhijit Prabhudessai, Curtorim.	
2.1	MPT's approach to the EIA study has been to conceal the objectives and aims of the project to the extent that the title of the study itself is false. MPT falsely says that the project is for fishing jetty, general cargo, passenger jetty, etc. It is clear from the contents of the EIA report itself and from the statements made by MPT in previous Public Hearings that the aim is to move the POL Terminal from Berth 8 for Vedanta's coal handling.	The present project is an independent activity and there is no falsification in the study or title of the report.
2.2	MPT has taken the level of concealment to such level that entire study is fraudulent.	Refer to reply at 2.1.
2.3	MPT's concession agreement with Vedanta for coal handling at berth 8 & 9 is concealed.	Refer to reply at 2.1.
2.4	Entire EIA report is false and conceals the aims of what MPT intends to do. The arrogance of MPT is clear as in compliance to standard TOR at Point 9, in reply to a query whether any R&R is involved, MPT states "Project is located within Port limits and no R&R is involved".	The draft EIA report is prepared on the basis of the EIA Notification of 2006. The present Project does involvesome limited R&R and this will be elaborated in the Final EIA Report. This is based on the understanding reached with the fishing community and Govt. of Goa.
2.5	He asked MPT, does it mean thousands of fishermen living in the Vasco Bay and using it for operating their fishing boats are illegal in the eyes of MPT?	Please see 2.4 above.
2.6	He said his query was directly related to the socio economics and survival of fishermen.	Construction of Fishing Jetty and Passenger Launch Jetty is basically for the benefit of the local stakeholders including Goan fishermen.
2.7	Point 3 of Standard TOR is regarding present land use pattern. MPT's reply states that entire land belongs to MPT.	Prior to the commencement of the construction work, MPT will take all

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	Does it mean that MPT plans to go ahead without taking approval of Government i.e. GCZMA, TCP, CRZ, Municipality and the Collector South Goa?	necessary permissions from various State and Central Statutory Authorities.
2.8	Specific TOR, point 3, directs MPT to obtain recommendations from GCZMA, but MPT has not done such a simple task and states in the compliance statement, "Proposal will be submitted to SCZMA after public hearing". He said that the reason was that MPT was trying to conceal the NGT order's stating that no projects may be allowed in the CRZ in the States where CZMP under the CRZ Notification 2011 has not been prepared. Goa has not prepared the CZMP and therefore MPT knows that GCZMA would have asked for the project not to be pursued until the CZMP is prepared. MPT could not have held this Public Hearing without the recommendations of GCZMA. Hence, holding of this Public Hearing is illegal. This Public Hearing is in contempt of the NGT orders.	As per the CRZ Notification of 2011, the project is reviewed by the GCZMA after going through the revised EIA prepared to include all concerns raised during the Public Hearing. Obviously, the question of any so called "concealment" does not arise.
2.9	This project is a part of Sagarmala project which aims to increase the coal handling at MPT from present levels of over 12 MTPA to 51 MTPA. Any responsible project proponent would have honestly put forth before MOEF and EAC that the entire coal expansion project is going to cause massive environmental damage due to double tracking of railways, construction of highways, berth expansions and capital dredging, but MPT has decided to commit fraud on the MoEF and people of Goa. The only reasons for this fraud are the Private Corporations who are going to benefit by this project to save a few Rupees on transportation. The eastern	Refer to reply at 2.1.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	coast of India has many ports that already have capacity and can very well be used for handling the coal that is required at Steel and Power plants planned at Karnataka. But MPT is prepared not only to sacrifice the environment of Goa but to also commit fraud and criminal misrepresentations for the vested interests of private corporations.	
2.10	<u>UN declaration</u> -UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People requires Free, Prior and Informed Consent of indigenous people before proposing such a project. Under Act 32 of the UN Declaration, there is higher protection for the Rights of Indigenous People to land, resources and territory, or when hazardous items/activities are to be brought within their territories, as is in the present case. MPT intends to bring POL right in middle of Vasco Bay which has been inhabited by traditional fisherman for thousand of years. The consent of the indigenous fishermen of Vasco is required to be taken prior to making this proposal by MPT. He asked MPT to reply whether they agreed that the failure to take Free, Prior, Informed Consent of the fishing communities makes this EIA Report null and void?	<p>Location of various components of this project such as Fishing jetty, Passenger jetty, etc is based on the consensus reached with various stake holders including the Government of Goa.</p> <p>POL Berths are common in all major Ports of the world such as MPT, and MPT has already been handling such a facility at Berth No. 8 safely and without any incident of concern. Moreover, the layout of the proposed new facilities is in accordance to the necessary safety regulations. All other precautions and emergency facilities mandated by the PESO shall be incorporated in the proposed Project.</p>
2.11	Para 1.4 of the EIA report stating that further deepening of the channel is in process is a lie, as NGT has stopped the dredging processes and a court matter is going on in this respect. A major study is being done to find out what is the damage done due to the illegal capital dredging carried out by MPT.	Deepening project of the channel is to be taken after getting all mandatory clearances.
2.12	MPT has lied in the Form I and TOR Compliance that there is no court matter in this regard, when the capital	There is no pending court matter for this project.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	dredging matter that is an integral part of this project is continuing before the NGT.	
2.13	MPT is trying to portray this project for benefit of fishermen of Vasco. The entire Vasco bay is presently totally under the possession of the fishermen of Vasco Bay. But, this project aims to snatch half of Vasco bay from fishermen and it is going to displace both the traditional and the trawler fishermen in a major way. Once MPT takes over the area, it will be lost forever to the fishermen. The EIA report states that the area to the south of Vasco bay, which is densely populated with fishermen, is going to be required for back-up offices, roads and infrastructure, which will also displace the fishermen. By planning to use the new jetty for other uses such as general cargo, passengers, POL, etc, the fishermen are going to be displaced even further. Further, every operation of the ships in the Vasco Bay will further hamper the fishermen operations. The fishermen are already lacking enough area and space, yet this project aims at taking more areas from them.	There will no dislocation of fishing activities, on the contrary there will be a state of art fishing jetty with modern shore facilities which will benefit the fishermen.
2.14	This EIA study and project a big fraud against indigenous community as MPT plans to take over half of their area and strict criminal action should be taken against MPT Management.	This allegation is baseless and false.
2.15	The EIA Report proposes the building of a compound wall next to the settlements of the fishermen to ensure safety and security purpose. This would be in the nature of putting the fishermen in a prison, and would further displace them.	Construction of compound wall is to separate the Port Operational Area from the area occupied by the fishing community. The construction of such compound walls is compulsory for all sensitive Public installations such as a Port from security and safety angles.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

2.16	Deepening of breakwater berth is included as a part of the project though it has no relationship with the rest of this project and therefore seems to have been added here as an afterthought. This only goes to strengthen our arguments that all the ongoing projects and clearances being sought by MPT are for one project and that MPT has broken down the project into small components only to defeat the purpose of EIA Notification. If a project is broken down into smaller component, it gives the project inevitability, since for the appraisal of any component for environmental impact, the rest of the project is a fait accompli. The EAC cannot scrutinize the project as they are given a small part of the project and the rest of the project is assumed to be approved. The EIA Notification works only if the project is appraised as a single project.	The EIA study includes deepening of breakwater berth and berths 10 & 11. These are part of the approved ToR.
2.17	The Report of the Working Group for Port Sector for 12 th Five Year Plan, which had the MPT Chairman as a member, identified and recognised Vasco as a Port City. The Port is located within the Vasco City.	No remarks.
2.18	The Report also states that MPT is among the 4 most Vulnerable Ports in the Country in terms of Hazardous Cargoes.	This is not true.
2.19	The Report recommends under para 15.11.9, every Port Trust should prepare a time bound action plan to shift Hazardous Cargo to safer havens. MPT has a mandate from 2012 to move all hazardous cargoes away from Vasco, such as LPG, Ammonia, Coal, POL, etc.	This is not true.
2.20	In spite of having this clear mandate, not only is MPT allowing the hazardous cargo to continue being handled, but it	Please see the answer at 2.10.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	wants to increase instead of shifting hazardous cargo. The present proposal plans to bring the POL Terminal into a more dangerous location than before. Earlier POL location was more accessible and had better evacuation access. The EIA Report completely fails to address the safety concerns of having the POL berth at the end of a narrow jetty so close to dense populations and also thousands of fishermen on the adjoining jetty with no protection, evacuation or even fire fighting access.	Further, necessary fire and safety provisions will be made as per OISD-156 standards.
2.21	EIA report does not make any reference to the dangers of POL Terminal location in the safety and disaster management studies.	Refer to reply at 2.20.
2.22	As per the Report of the Working Group for the 12 th 5 year Plan, MPT was recommended to be used for Cruise Tourism. This is in line with the policies of the State and Union Governments to promote tourism. But due to the handling of coal, iron ore, hazardous and dirty cargoes, cruise companies will not send their ships to Mormugao Port.	MPT has been promoting cruise tourism in a big way. There is a dedicated cruise berth at MPT. A cruise terminal building has also been recently constructed. MPT handled a record 39 cruise vessels during FY 2016-17 and 32 in FY 2017-18. In the next 5 years, this number is anticipated to increase to 100. Regular Domestic Cruise Ship Service has also commenced from Goa to Mumbai and back, from October this year.
2.23	He put forth an alternative model of development for MPT to consider, a sustainable, green model that would bring prosperity and vibrant economic growth for Vasco City and neighbouring villages. For this, we have to remove all the dirty and hazardous cargo from Mormugao Port and dedicate the first few berths for Cruise Vessels and passenger ships. Berths 7 to 9 can be used for general cargo, while berth 11 must be given to the fishermen. This will create rapid economic growth and tremendous employment opportunities for Vasco	No remarks.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	City, fishermen and neighbouring villages. MPT to respond why are we going towards dirty coal when we have such a clean and sustainable alternate model of development?	
2.24	As per Chapter 3 & 4 of the EIA report, the baseline data is completely inadequate. Flora and fauna lists are incomplete. Impact on fishermen is not studied at all. Socio economic impacts are missing from the report.	Baseline data was collected during March to May 2017 as per the standard procedure laid down by MoEF& CC. Socio Economic impacts will be reviewed and elaborated if necessary in the Final EIA Report.
2.25	One of the only two breeding places in the world of window pane oysters is very close to the project site but the EIA Report fails to even mention this. This highly ecologically and economically important site would be destroyed if this project is allowed. Large populations of marine mammals near Vasco Bay, coral reefs at Grande Island – impact studies are not done.	As stated earlier, this project will not have any adverse impact on Window Pane Oysters located in Chicalim Bay. However, any missing but relevant baseline data compiled from the Study Area will be included in the Final EIA. Impact on Zauri estuary including Vasco Bay area is included in Chapter 4.5 and impact on coral reefs of Grande island, if any, will be included in the revised EIA report. Additional Rapid Marine Impact Assessment Report carried out by NIO will also be incorporated in the Final submission.
2.26	NIO study report is not appended to the report although it is a part of the TOR. No data from this report is available in the Report, and therefore it is not possible for the people to ascertain the acceptability of the data collection and to know and evaluate the impact assessment carried out by NIO.	NIO study report will be appended to the Final EIA Report .
2.27	The EIA Report does not provide legible layout plans. All layouts Figures 2.1 onwards are illegible. The layout plans are most important for appraisal of the project and its impact and without the plans, the EIA Report cannot be understood. For example, because in Page 31 the figure 2.5 of the report is illegible, the impact on the fishing community cannot be	All Layout Plans with will be revised to proper resolution and size for easy legibility and clear depiction in the Final EIA Report. Moreover, during EPH detailed legible plans were circulated and explained to the public.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	ascertained. Because the boundary of the project, the lengths and descriptions of the jetties, etc cannot be read it is impossible to know the impact on the fishermen, safety, disaster management, the environment, etc. This is a fatal flaw in the Report. Public Hearing is being held with the people in the dark and without the people having the necessary information, specifically the layout plans not being legible.	
2.28	Para 3.7.5 of the EIA report states that high concentration of heavy metals exist in the sediments in the Mormugao Harbour region due to past MPT activities. If capital dredging is carried out, the heavy metals will rise into the water column above, causing huge toxic pollution. This massive pollution will end up entering into our food chain. The EIA Report fails to respond to its own admission and there is no plan on how to manage this toxic pollution due to proposed dredging.	As regards, heavy metal the concentration of iron is showing high values. This is phenomena due to mining activities in Goa. Apart from this, barge repair activity could also contribute to increase in lead levels. In the main Port area, maintenance dredging is undertaken every year and therefore heavy metal deposition will be comparatively less.
2.29	Page 37 of the EIA Report states that when Jetty is to be used for higher capacity vessels, that mooring dolphins may be provided with suitable depths, but there is no indication of number of dolphins and the dredged depth. The EIA study is incomplete without this information or the consideration of the impact due to the mooring dolphins and the dredging.	This is only a suggestion. However, there is no proposal for mooring dolphins.
2.30	None of the aspects of past water & environmental pollution have been made in the EIA report.	Available secondary sources of information relevant to the project area will be included in the Final EIA report.
2.31	NGT matter on ecological damages to Vasco Bay' – EIA report makes no reference to the ecological damage already taken place. Though MPT is in possession of data of the damage due	There is no NGT report so far as the ecological damage to Vasco is concerned.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	to its past activities on the water quality, ecology and environment, yet none of this data is indicated, therefore, as a result, Baseline data is completely inadequate and EIA study is completely incorrect.	
2.32	Standard TOR condition 11 requires the project proponent to 'Submit the status of shore line change at the project site', to which MPT has replied 'NSCSM has carried out shoreline changes of Goa. Mormugao region is stable coast. Detailed map is attached as Appendix VII'. MPT has blatantly lied saying that the Mormugao Coast is stable because the map attached to the EIA Report as Appendix VII itself shows that Vasco Beach has the highest level of erosion. All of us are aware that a few decades ago the Vasco Beach was much wider and people of Vasco could use the beach extensively for recreation. The traditional fishermen also had enough space for their activities. However, MPT's dredging activities have severely eroded the Vasco beach and it is well aware of this fact. MPT is intentionally concealing this most relevant information. If the alternate development model suggested is adopted, it will also give us an opportunity to restore Vasco Beach to its original glory, so that the traditional fishermen and the residents of Vasco can use the beach for their livelihoods and recreation respectively, as commons – the highest land tenure.	National Centre for Sustainable Coastal Management (NCSCM) has carried out a detailed study on shoreline changes in Goa and published a map showing the same. This map is attached as Appendix VII in the Draft EIA and the same clearly categorizes the shoreline of Mormugao Port area and Vasco Beach region (Khariwada) as stable coast with low to medium accretion. From this as well from the perusal of comparable Google images (taken during the same time of the year under low tide condition) of last decade, it is apparent that the Vasco Beach is a stable entity. The beach portion available to the general public has reduced over the years due to mushrooming illegal constructions and slums built very close to the HTL.
3.0	Ms. Diana Tavares, Madel, Margao.	
3.1	Ground I- False FORM I – She stated that the Form I completely misrepresents the facts by changing the scope of the project itself. The	The present project is an independent activity. No coal handling will be done at this location. There is no misrepresentation of facts. However, the

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	project is for coal expansion and not for fishing jetty or POL Terminal, since these are existing facilities that are being usurped and relocated respectively. The project is for expansion of coal handling at MPT and the entire project must be studied as one entity for its environmental impact.	EIA has taken into account all possible impacts envisaged in a major Port such as the MPT.
3.2	Ground II- Inadequate TOR – She stated that the MOEF and EAC have not applied their minds to the facts before them, since they are simultaneously processing other applications for Environmental Clearances at the same time, all of which are related to the same coal expansion project. Despite knowing the facts that these applications are for parts of the same coal expansion project, they have allowed MPT to proceed with TORs that completely destroy the objective of the EIA Notification 2006.	No comments
3.3	Ground III - FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH THE TOR - She stated that the attached table shows how even the highly inadequate TOR has not been complied with. Read out few TORs points and its compliance and her observation listed below:	EIA studies has been carried out according to approved ToR.
3.3 (a)	She stated that the project proponent failed to consider the 12 th Five year plan recommendations to move dirty and hazardous cargo away from the Vasco city.	No remarks.
3.3 (b)	The land use is certainly changed, both for the massive reclamation from bay to jetties and for the Vasco beach, back –up areas, roads, etc.	There is no change in land use plan
3.3 (c)	The Permission as required from the GCZMA, Municipal Authority, Collector and TCP Department; land use for fishing, etc.	The project will be executed only after obtaining all the statutory clearances prescribed under the relevant State and Central laws.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

3.3 (d)	The Contour maps are illegible and hence not readable.	All maps in the draft EIA will be replaced with clear and legible maps of appropriate scale. Bigger scale maps were provided during the public hearing.
3.3 (e)	The Source of reclamation material and transportation details are not given.	The earth material necessary for reclamation will be procured from licensed quarries. Mode of transportation will be by road or barges. The necessary corrections if required will be incorporated in the Final EIA Report.
3.3 (f)	The Project Proponent has totally ignored the ongoing massive works for highway constructions and railway double tracking for this coal project.	Not relevant for this project
3.3 (g)	The project will certainly displace the local residents for the roads and back up areas, however, the gravity of the displacements cannot be gauged without legible layout plans (plans are illegible), the HTL/LTL map in 1:4000 scale superimposing the project layouts have been prepared and is attached as Appendix II is not legible.	"HTL/LTL" and other CRZ lines are demarcated through the Institute of Remote Sensing, Anna University (Chennai), which is one of the expert Agencies authorized for this purpose by the MOEF & CC (GOI). The IRS, Anna University has accomplished the task with in situ ground survey. There will be very few dwelling houses to be located which will be done within the same area. This is according to the understanding reached by all stake holders
3.3 (h)	The shoreline at Vasco Bay is shown in the Map to be greatly eroded, but the EIA report does not consider the map, or the ground reality of the need to restore the Vasco Beach.	Please refer 2.32
3.3 (i)	The layout of project presented in Chapter 2.3 is not legible.	All maps in the draft EIA will be replaced with clear and legible maps of appropriate scale. Legible larger scale maps were produced during the public hearing.
3.3 (j)	The details of cargo handling, storage given in Chapter 2.1 is inadequate.	Sufficient details are given in Chapter 2.1 as regards cargo handling and storage.
3.3 (k)	Very few details are given of the fishing activities which are insufficient to understand the adverse impact. No specific study on impacts of construction and piling on marine life. False reply is given that the project does not involve development for local	This project is not related to coal handling. Impacts during construction and piling will be reviewed if necessary in Final EIA report.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	fishermen but their displacement is on account of the coal project.	
3.3 (l)	The MPT Oil Spill Contingency Response Plan attached as Appendix V is inadequate.	The MPT Oil Spill Contingency Response Plan attached as Appendix V is the approved plan
3.3(m)	The Bathymetry data is highly inadequate, the date of the chart is not given. The CWPRS, Pune carried out hydrodynamic modelling studies. Detailed reports attached as Appendix III is based on 1977 data.	Bathymetry survey is provided only as a guidance to understand the depth of sea bed below Chart datum. As such the Bathymetry data given is adequate. Hydrodynamic Report of CWPRS will be included in the Final EIA Report.
3.3 (n)	The Baseline data on environmental quality along with projected incremental load due to the proposed project / activities is insufficient and inadequate and no analysis of the impact is done of the same (EIA/EMP report).	Baseline study is covered in Chapter 3. Impact Mitigation Methodology and project specific EMP, are presented in Chapter 4 and Chapter 8.
3.3(o)	The Ambient Air Quality Monitoring carried out during the period of March'17 till May 17 given in Chapter 3.9 is before the TOR was issued.	On 29 August 2017, MoEF & CC issued an OM indicating the validity of TOR and collection of Baseline data at any stage within a given time slot. The present EIA has complied with the same. This OM will be attached to the revised EIA report.
3.3(p)	There is no reference to the shore line erosion, heavy metal pollution, impact of dredging, displacement of fisher folk, etc.	Shoreline change study map was prepared by NCSCM. No adverse impact reported. Impact of dredging and heavy metals has been covered in the report. No displacement of fishing activities.
3.3(q)	The safety audit should have rejected the proposal for placing lakhs of lives at risk and for creating potential risks of a massive disaster due to lack of access to the POL terminal.	No comments
3.3(r)	The Greenbelt Plan of MPT attached at annexure VIII shows that the greenbelt is almost non-existent and is absolutely inadequate. There are litigations pending against the project regarding the dredging matter before the NGT, as there is an ecological damage caused by illegal dredging by MPT.	Refer to reply at 2.8. As far as Green belt is concerned the information is correct. There are no litigations against this project.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

3.3(s)	The total <u>Project cost will be 645.65 with which all the issues</u> can be resolved. The fisherman are being displaced and losing their lands; the only benefits are for the coal handling private corporations; there will be employment loss due to adverse impact on fishing and tourism. The Part IV, Compliance statement of EC lays specific conditions, item II – the leachates are taken to a tank before being allowed to overflow into the Vasco Bay, causing unprecedented poisoning of the waters and food chain.	The Project cost indicated is Rs.679 crores. No fisherman will be displaced. No coal handling activity is envisaged in the present project. The Leachate will be collected in a dedicated tank and the same will be transported and treated in the ETP.
3.3(t)	There is no treatment of the leachate at all. The SCZMA recommendations should be available for the Public Hearing. The <u>Physico-chemical</u> parameters of both marine and surface water are not done at all. The details of the monitoring reports represented in chapter 3.7 are not analysed and compared and the MPT has tried to suppress critical data by not doing the required comparison.	In Chapter 3, physico-chemical parameters of both marine and surface water, which are analysed with prescribed methodologies, are presented. These will be compared with available standard levels found in similar waters and presented in the Final EIA Report.
3.3(u)	The high erosion experienced by Vasco Bay due to past dredging by MPT is not considered at all. The site selection for disposal of dredging material and the study by CWPRS is superficial and irrelevant due to old data used.	Shoreline change map is prepared by NCSCM (CHENNAI) which states that Vasco bay has a stable shoreline. Recent CWPRS study will be included in Final EIA report.
3.3(v)	The CWPRS, Pune has carried out hydrodynamic modelling studies, detailed reports attached as Appendix III is based on 1977 data. The Mitigation measures adopted to reduce pollution, presented in Chapter 4.6 and Chapter 8.1 are wrongly analysed, since the coal handling is not considered.	The present Project does not envisage any coal handling.
3.3(w)	The Marine biodiversity impact assessment report and management plan prepared by National Institute of	The Rapid Marine biodiversity impact assessment report and management plan prepared by National Institute of

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	Oceanography is not attached or made available which is a failure to comply with the TOR since this report should have been made available for the Public to review and give comments.	Oceanography will be attached to the Final EIA report.
3.3(x)	The layout Plan of the existing and proposed greenbelt attached as Annexure VIII is totally inadequate as there is almost no green belt.	Refer to reply at 3.3(r).
3.3(y)	There is no tabular chart with index for point wise compliance of the TORs which are not complied with.	The TOR is given in a tabular format with point wise items and their compliance, presented Chapter wise.
4.0	David Rodrigues, Raia, Goa.	
4.1	He stated that there is massive destruction due to the ongoing and future construction of NH-4, NH-4A for the coal project.	Not relevant to this project
4.2	He stated that there is massive destruction due to the ongoing and future construction of NH-4, NH-4A for the coal project.	Not relevant to this project
4.3	He cited that the coal to be handled at MPT after expansion needs to be transported to the proposed steel and power plants that need it, which are mostly located in Karnataka.	Not relevant to this project
4.4	He pointed out that the NH-4A and NH-4 passing through the villages, forests, agricultural lands and Western Ghats in Mormugao, Salcete, Ponda, Dharbandora and Sanguem talukas of Goa are being widened only for this purpose.	Not relevant to this project
4.5	He stated that this widening is being done by keeping the people in the dark and by concealing the objectives behind this massive destruction and strong protests by local communities against the destruction of hills, forests, wildlife, agricultural lands, settlements and water bodies of their villages are being bulldozed.	Not relevant to this project

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

4.6	He stated that the construction is being deviously carried out in small sections in order to sidestep the EIA Notification and avoid carrying out any EIA studies. He pointed out that this highway construction/expansion is an integral part of the Sagarmala project and the subject EIA study should have included the same.	Not relevant to this project.
4.7	He pointed out that the NH-4A section beyond Loutolim village has to cross the Zuari River to Borim village for which a bridge is being proposed. This bridge and highway construction in Borim village will totally destroy the environment, economies and society of the village and will be a death warrant for the residents, as it is completely against the environmental and socio-economic development of the village.	Not relevant to this project
4.8	He also pointed out that the bridge and highway will completely displace the tribal farmers and fishermen of the village living and cultivating rice and catching fish along the Zuari River and the highway route and will destroy the food security of the village, along with the health of the residents.	Not relevant to this project
4.9	He stated that the bridge concerned linking Lotoulim with Borim is the missing link. He also pointed out that there were 7 alignments from which the best and feasible was to be taken into consideration but the studies done by Ultratech, a Mumbai based company had falsely done the studies.	Not relevant to this project
4.10	He brought to notice and stated that there were no ground zero/ physical studies like soil testing done on all the 7 alignments. The 7 th alignment was taken into consideration as per the PWD and Ultratech engineers where they only did soil testing on the 7 th	Not relevant to this project

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	alignment. Rest, 6 alignments were falsely reported in their voluminous studies.	
4.11	He stated that this again was confirmed by the Ultratech engineers/workers. The concerned bridge in question is supposed to be 60 metres wide acquiring 80 metres of land below the bridge where they will displace a large number of village inhabitants. He stated that this was brought to the notice of the engineers when the soil testing was being done (as per the reports prepared by Ultratech shows only 3 houses which will be displaced on the 7 th alignment which is wrong and false.)	Not relevant to this project
4.12	He even questioned about the notification not given in the local newspapers and brought to notice that all this is being done without taking the villagers into confidence.	Not relevant to this project. For this project all procedures for adequate publicity were complied with in consultation with the GSPCB.
4.13	He pointed out that the soil testing was done in his and the neighbouring properties without the permission of the owner and stated it to be an absolute felony.	Not relevant to this project
4.14	He stated that the socio-economic development of the Borim village and of all the villages, towns and cities of Goa requires the immediate closure of the coal handling at MPT, and definitely not its expansion.	Not relevant to this project
4.15	He pointed out that the NH-4 continues to run through thick forests and protected areas of Western Ghats and its proposed expansion will cause devastation of the highly sensitive, erosion-prone and vulnerable Western Ghats. The environmental security of the country, the survival of the Western Ghats, one of the eight hottest of the Biodiversity Hotspots of the World, its tigers and other wildlife,	Not relevant to this project

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	and the water security of numerous States of India requires the NH-4A and NH-4 expansion projects to be stopped and scrapped, as they are being forced upon us without any studies or application of mind - only for this ill-advised Sagarmala project for expansion of coal handling and transportation through Goa.	
4.16	He stated that the proposed bridge and highway for the transportation of coal will have a deadly impact on the Borim village as it will destroy large lands of the village including his properties and would also result in the demolition of many homes.	Not relevant to this project
4.17	He pointed out that the coal transportation by trucks through the village will give rise to tremendous pollution due to the emissions from the truck engines and the coal dust from the coal being transported. The coal dust and emissions from the engines will also pollute the fields, water bodies and lands with disastrous long term impacts on the food chains and environment as a whole.	Not relevant to this project
4.18	He stated that the Sagarmala project, of which the proposal under consideration is a part, has been kept secret from the people of Goa, though it aims to completely destroy our villages and lives.	All aspects of the project has been kept in the public domain
4.19	He stated that the Government and MPT have intentionally denied the local communities of Goa all information regarding the Sagarmala project. The indigenous population of the Borim village has also not been consulted. The fishing communities of Goa will lose their livelihoods and be displaced by Sagarmala project, but have been kept in the dark.	Refer to reply at 4.18.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

4.20	He concluded by stating that this intentional denial of information and participation in decision-making makes this entire project illegal in view of the Constitutional and International commitment to obtain Free, Prior and Informed Consent of indigenous and local communities before such projects are planned affecting their rights and lives.	Refer to reply at 4.18.
4.21	He requested for the rejection of the proposal and to direct MPT not to pursue the coal expansion plans but to instead use the Port for sustainable growth of Goa by handling green cargo, cruise tourism and people friendly and pollution-free cargos.	No comments
4.22	He stated that after his deliberations, the representative of Ultratech claimed to be unaware of the alignment report and denied being a part of it in terms of preparing it.	ULTRA-TEC is an Environment Consultancy Firm & Laboratory accredited by NABET (QCI). ULTRATECH has clarified that they have not prepared any other report as regards the alignment of bridge construction in Goa.
4.23	He stated that he acquired the voluminous report by filing an RTI and would like to produce the same in answer to Ultratech when asked for.	Refer to reply at 4.22.
5.0	Shri Savio Correia, Mangor Hill, Vasco-Goa	
5.1	He stated that he is a resident of Mangor Hill, Vasco da Gama Goa and an advocate by profession. He resides at aerial distance of 1 km from the project site and is Member of Goa State Environment Protection Council (GEPC) chaired by H.E. Governor of Goa.	No remarks
5.2	At the outset, he made it clear that he was making his submissions under protest. He, alongwith four other citizens of Vasco had submitted a representation dated 26.09.2018 addressed to Collector & District Magistrate South Goa and Member	The reply to the representation dated 26.09.2018 is separately addressed.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	<p>Secretary Goa State Pollution Control Board by name pointing out to selection of an inconvenient venue, several gross procedural irregularities in run-up to the public hearing and – without prejudice to the foregoing – demanding provision of certain basic facilities for the public at the venue. He said that the authorities have turned a deaf ear to his representations. He submits that this hearing is not being conducted in the true spirit of public consultation envisaged under EIA Notification 2006. Hence he is making his submissions under protest that he requested to be noted.</p>	
5.3	<p>His first submission is on the ownership issue. He said that as per the PP’s presentation, the project site area is about 65,000 to 70,000 square metres. His point is that the project proponent i.e. Mormugao Port Trust does not have ownership title neither to the land nor the water area of the project site that entitles them to carry out the proposed development. He states that the Vasco Bay beach (locally known as “Khariwada” beach) and waters of River Zuari is held by the Government of Goa as declared by Section 14 (1) of Goa Land Revenue Code 1968 under the doctrine of public trust.</p>	<p>The project is within the notified limits of MPT declared as per the Major Port Trust Act 1963.</p>
5.4	<p>He had gone through the voluminous draft EIA Report; he could not find any reference to any ownership title of the PP to the land in question. If anyone wants to carry out any construction or development, the first document that one has to produce is of ownership title. Without ownership title, nothing can go forward. In this case, there should have been either a land acquisition order, or Government</p>	<p>Please see reply at 5.3</p>

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	<p>grant, or a sale deed, or a gift deed or a lease deed or any other document showing transfer of property that is known to law in India. Unfortunately, the EIA Report does not disclose anything. No survey numbers of the land and/or water areas under the project site are mentioned. There is no reference to any ownership or title document in the Draft EIA Report at all. Issue of ownership goes to the root of the matter. When the PP has not satisfied this basic requirement, there is no point in looking into any aspect of the project, maybe environmental or socio-economical etc. Vasco Bay river water area is held by the Government of Goa under Section 14 (1) of Land Revenue Code. He cited ownership documents of the PP that would give an idea of what they owned. Government of Goa through Collector of South Goa District granted an area of 16,29,795 sq metres to MPT on 09.07.2001 under Section 21 of Goa Land Revenue Code that deals with grant of Government lands. MPT paid an amount of about Rs. 8 Crore plus registration fees. His submission is that if at all MPT is owner of anything, it is only these 16,29,795 sq metres. This area does not include Khariwada beach or River Zuari water area at Vasco Bay where the proposed project will come up. He requested the PP's representatives to show him which part of the grant gave them the ownership right to the project site.</p>	
5.5	<p>He had sought information on this point from the project proponent under RTI Act in 2015 for details of the land owned in Mormugao taluka. In its RTI reply, MPT furnished him detailed list of all their properties with survey</p>	Refer the reply at 5.3.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	<p>numbers. The total area of land owned by MPT was shown as 546.66 acres. Even this list did not include the project site area. He requested the author of the information i.e. the Chief Engineer of the PP who was present to show him which part of the RTI information includes Khariwada beach and Vasco Bay or the 65,000 sq metres of the project site.</p>	
5.6	<p>He said that he again sought specific information from the project proponent under RTI Act earlier this year and read out his RTI queries. He had asked for certified copy of MPTs ownership documents to the land and/or water area at Vasco Bay/Kharewaddo beach where on the development of POL Berth, Fishing Harbour etc project is proposed, and for survey numbers of the above land and/or water area allotted by City Survey, Vasco. In reply, he was furnished copies of three notifications of port limits issued by Ministry of Shipping issued under Major Ports Act 1963. He submitted that a notification of port limits did not convey ownership title to the Port.</p>	Refer the reply at 5.3.
5.7	<p>He said that he again sought specific information from the project proponent under RTI Act earlier this year and read out his RTI queries. He had asked for certified copy of MPTs ownership documents to the land and/or water area at Vasco Bay/Kharewaddo beach where on the development of POL Berth, Fishing Harbour etc project is proposed, and for survey numbers of the above land and/or water area allotted by City Survey, Vasco. In reply, he was furnished copies of three notifications of port limits issued by Ministry of</p>	Refer the reply at 5.3.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	Shipping issued under Major Ports Act 1963. He submitted that a notification of port limits did not convey ownership title to the Port.	
5.8	Feeling that the CPIO Chief Engineer may not be aware of ownership documents, he filed a first appeal before Deputy Chairman MPT where he specifically demanded ownership title documents of MPT to the project site land and water area. The appeal was disposed by Deputy Chairman Mr. GP Rai vide order dated 21.04.2018 with the remarks “. . . <i>it is observed that all the information as desired vide your RTI application dated 17.02.2018 has been already communicated to you vide above referred letter and therefore your contention of providing incomplete, false and misleading information and concealing of facts by CPIO is not acceptable. In view of above, the appeal stands dismissed for lack of grounds</i> ”. Thus, there was a confirmation at the highest level of management of MPT that, other than the port limit notifications, it does not possess any ownership title documents to these 65000 square metres.	Refer the reply at 5.3.
5.9	He brought to the notice a reply to an Assembly LAQ tabled by Aleixo Reginaldo Lourenco MLA (Unstarred LAQ no. 011 answered on 22.02.2018 titled “Allocation of Land to Mormugao Port Trust”). He read out the questions and the replies. He stressed on the sub-question (c), “ <i>whether the area allotted/granted included any part of river/water body alongside Mormugao Port operational area</i> ”, the answer given by Hon’ble Revenue Minister was “ No ”. It means that other than the 16,29,795 sq metres, not an inch of area was allotted by the State	No comments

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	Government to MPT. The LAQ reply further stated that reclamation done by MPT was without prior permission of the State Government, and that State Government had granted approval for survey of about 5,78,000 sq metres of land reclaimed from the Zuari River. He submitted that this 5,78,000 sq metres was in illegal possession of MPT.	
5.10	In yet another LAQ reply (Starred LAQ 016C tabled by Jose Luis Carlos Almeida MLA answered on 25.07.2018), the reply of the Government through Hon'ble Revenue Minister is that the land whereupon the Vasco fishing jetty is standing, belongs to the Government of Goa.	No comments
5.11	He submitted that MPT's claim of ownership on basis of port limit notifications is based on and erroneous and misconceived notion of the law. He read out provisions of Section 2 (q) of Major Ports Act. Section 2 (q) defines " <i>port</i> " to mean <i>any major port to which the Act applies within such limits as may, from time to time, be defined by the Central Government for the purposes of this Act by notification in the Official Gazette, and, until a notification is so issued, within such limits as may have been defined by the Central Government under the provisions of the Indian Ports Act.</i>	Refer the reply at 5.3.
5.12	Quoting from Joanna Oldendorff's case decided by the House of Lords, he submitted that " <i>Port Limits</i> " is the area within which a port authority exercises its various powers relating to the movements and conduct of ships. Citing the Baltic Code 2014, he submitted that a " <i>Port</i> " means any area where vessels load or discharge	No comments

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
 REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	<p><i>cargo and shall include, but not be limited to, berths, wharves, anchorages, buoys and offshore facilities as well as places outside the legal, fiscal or administrative area where vessels are ordered to wait for their turn no matter the distance from that area.</i> He went on to submit that port limits is for administrative and regulatory jurisdiction of a port for better governance, it did not <i>ipso fact</i> confer ownership rights to the concerned port over the area within the port limits except if the land is specifically owned by the Port. He drew a comparison with Municipal limits or Panchayat limits.</p>	
5.13	<p>He read out Section 14 (1) of Goa Land Revenue Code clearly declares that <i>all lands, public roads, lanes and paths and bridges, ditches, dikes and fences on or beside the same, the bed of the sea and of harbours and creeks below the high water mark, and of rivers, streams, nallahs, lakes and tanks, and all canals and water courses, and all standing and flowing water and all rights in or over the same or appertaining thereto, which are not the property of any person, are and are hereby declared to be the property of the Government subject to right of way, and all other rights, public and individual, legally subsisting.</i> He further referred to Section 2 (13) that defined "Government" to mean "<i>Government of Goa</i>". He further submitted that Section 14 (1) of Goa Land Revenue Code was in consonance with the doctrine of public trust.</p>	No comments. The ownership of land and water remain with the Port.
5.14	<p>He quoted Supreme Court's decision in MC Mehta v. Kamal Nath: "<i>Our legal system - based on English Common</i></p>	No comments

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	<i>Law - includes the public trust doctrine as part of its jurisprudence. The State is the trustee of all natural resources which are by nature meant for public use and enjoyment. Public at large is the beneficiary of the sea-shore, running waters, airs, forests and ecologically fragile lands. The State as a trustee is under a legal duty to protect the natural resources. These resources meant for public use cannot be converted into private ownership".</i>	
5.15	His stand that waters of River Zuari are vested in Government of Goa is vindicated by the grant of land by the Government of Goa to MPT in 2001. The granted area included " <i>area reclaimed by Mormugao Port Trust</i> " admeasuring 2,55,038 sq metres. He submits that this is a clear admission that river area that was reclaimed was held by the Government of Goa, which in turn granted the same to MPT under the terms of order dated 09.07.2001. If the river area (and hence the reclaimed land) was owned by MPT as claimed, he questioned whether MPT agree to grant its own land to itself? Likewise, the area granted by Goa Government includes the area of 50 yards within the operational area.	No comments. The ownership of land and water remain with the Port.
5.16	Concluding his submissions on the point, Adv S Correia stated that MPT is not the owner of Khariwada beach and River Zuari waters at Vasco Bay where this project is proposed. He submitted that MPT does not own even a square inch of the 65000 or 70000 sq metres of land that comprises the project site. That being so, the entire proposal collapses at the root itself.	No comments. Please refer reply at 5.3.
5.17	His second point was regarding the ill-considered and imprudent siting and re-location of the POL Berth near	For POL jetty, necessary permission from PESO has been obtained. Necessary fire

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	densely inhabited town of Vasco da Gama.	and safety provisions will be made as per OISD-156 standards.
5.18	He quoted from Draft EIA Report which states that the " <i>existing Berth No. 8 (Oil Berth) and Berth No. 9 (Iron Ore Berth) and Barge Berths area have been leased to private operator for 'Redevelopment of Existing Berth Nos. 8, 9 and Barge Berths for Handling Multipurpose General Cargo on DBFOT Basis. Existing Berth Nos. 10 & 11 have also reached optimum utilization and occupancy of these berths is more than 80%. Mormugao Port has a total operational area of 250 acres which is grossly inadequate to cater to the ever increasing trade demands. MPT therefore proposed to develop a POL berth with facilities to handle liquid hydrocarbons (High Speed Diesel, SKO, ATF etc.) and liquefied gases (LPG/LNG) at Vasco Bay</i> ". The world over, including in India, new oil terminals, refineries and tank-farms are being located away from densely populated residential areas. However, for some mysterious reasons, MPT seems to be bucking this global trend.	No comments. Please refer 5.17.
5.19	While the existing POL Berth at Berth no. 8 is located at aerial distance of 1.73 km from Vasco town centre (i.e. Mormugao Municipality building), the proposed POL Berth will be at a distance of only about 473 m. The draft EIA Report discloses population details within the study area must have been got from census authorities. Vasco town is the central business/commercial district of Mormugao municipal area. Census data only reflects the number of permanent residents at a particular place. Vasco town, besides the permanent residents, it also has	Refer the reply at 5.17.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	commercial and government offices, bus-stand, railway station, schools, churches, temples, hospitals, hotels, cinema theatres, markets, shopping areas etc. The actual number of people present during peak hours in Vasco town must be taken into account.	
5.20	He questioned the EIA Consultant regarding serial no. 1 of table titled TOR Compliance regarding reasons for site selection etc, where response given is that since project site is within Mormugao Port area, alternative sites not considered. He questioned whether EIA Consultant was given the freedom to look out for and recommend an alternative site or was he told that "this is the project; you give us a good positive report on this location". If at all he has suggested alternative sites to locate the POL Berth, which were those and why did you not recommend those sites? At least nothing is reflected in the EIA Report. He asked MPT representatives whether it would not be sensible to retain the POL Berth at its present location at Berth no. 8. He asked "Can the peanuts revenue earned from a PPP project with Goa Sea Port Ltd override the interests of public safety?"	EIA report has been prepared as per the approved ToR for the said location.
5.21	PP will claim that it has obtained PESO clearance for the proposed petroleum berth. But is a PESO clearance is not a consolation or guarantee that fire accidents will not occur? In last one year, major fire accidents were reported in Mumbai, one at Butcher Island and other at Chembur. Both these installations had PESO clearance. PESO clearance does not mean that accidents will not happen. Why is MPT bent on bringing this	No comments

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	menacing hazardous cargo right to the doorstep of Vasco? <i>"MPT is already slow poisoning us with coal dust, now you are bringing this petrol tanker berth right on the doorstep". "Is it a ploy to drive the people of Vasco out of their homes?" "Why is precautionary principle not being applied here?"</i> he questioned.	
5.22	<p>His next submission was regarding gross discrepancies in location of the development/project. Existence of a public beach (Khariwada beach) and its encompassment within the project area is concealed in layout plans.</p> <p>At Table 1.1 of Draft EIA Report at page, the project location is stated as <i>"Vasco Bay, Mormugao, South Goa"</i>. No survey numbers given. In para 1.1.1 under caption "Geographic Location", it is stated that <i>"Vasco Bay is at northern limit of Vasco da Gama town and lies to the east of existing port facilities. This beach is approximately 850m long with the western-most end occupied by a small commercial fish landing jetty. The eastern end of the beach has a small temple and crematorium"</i>. Then at serial no. 18 of Table 1.1 under "sand dunes", the details furnished is <i>"Nearest minor beach (Khariwada) is abutting the project site"</i>. He questioned both PP and EIA Consultant, after the project is implemented, how much of this beach will be left?</p>	Please see the drawing for the layout plan. No sand dunes at the Khariwado beach.
5.23	He submits that the information regarding location of the project is false and misleading. Firstly, no survey numbers of the land or water area have been furnished. Secondly, the details given at serial no. 18 of Table 1.1 gives a misleading impression that	No concealment of facts in the report

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	the minor beach (Khariwada) is outside the project area. It says that project is "adjoining Khariwada beach" when actually it includes two-thirds of the beach. A perusal of the layout plans at Figures 2.3, 2.5, 2.7, 2.9 etc confirms his doubt show that about 2/3 rd of the Vasco Bay beach is coming within the project area. The said figures/layout plans conceal the existence of the beach.	
5.24	Another important requirement in the EIA Report was that coordinates of each vertex of the project area ought to have been disclosed in the draft EIA Report, to enable the public to know where exactly the project was coming up.	The project area has been demarcated and depicted with reference to the existing Port structures and a single GPS coordinate is earmarked to pinpoint and trace the boundaries of the project.
5.25	He submits that there are gross discrepancies in the location of the project, and that the layout plans conceal the existence of the public beach and its encompassment within the project area.	The allegation is baseless and false.
5.26	6.His next point was that no study on impact of geomorphological changes and land subsidence due to capital dredging was done at draft EIA stage.	Studies on Impact on shore lines has been carried out through NIO. There will not be land subsidence due to the capital dredging.
5.27	The project admittedly involves capital dredging of approx 1.62 Mm ³ . In addition, the "Re-development of Berths 8, 9 & Barge Berths" project mooted by MPT (that is just about 300 metres from this project) envisages another 3.72 Mm ³ of dredging quantity. Hence, the proposed aggregate dredging quantity of both projects is 5.34 Mm ³ within Vasco Bay. Dredging quantity of proposed capital deepening of approach channel and turning circles is another 15 Mm ³ .	No comments
5.28	However, under the section dealing with mitigation measures to minimize negative impact of dredging, the EIA	The statement made is baseless. Rumdawada and Jetty area are not going to be affected due to dredging.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	<p>study has ignored the steep rocky area just 400 metres away to the South-West of the Vasco Bay that has hundreds of houses. The locality is known as "Rumdawada" and "Jetty". The steep slopes have seen landslides in recent past particularly during monsoons. As per his estimates on recent visit to the site, the width of the slope is about 120m and level difference between the Main Vasco – Harbour Road and the parallel Sada – Shipbuilding Institute road on top of the hill is about 40 metres. Thus the slope is about 33%. This can also be confirmed from Google Earth. The EIA study of the redevelopment project does not rule out the possibility of excavation of rock in course of dredging.</p>	
5.29	<p>Vasco da Gama town is a comparatively young town developed in the last 100 years. Prior to that, the area was marshy land. He asked the EIA Consultant the depth of soil testing done, to which the reply given was "one metre". Adv. Correia stated that one encounters black clayey soil at depth of about 2.00 metres below GL and groundwater at about 2.50 metres in the city area. He was speaking from his own experience of having constructed two multi-storied buildings along Swatantra Path, Vasco. He submits that scooping out 5.34 Mm³ of sediment at one go coupled with cutting/excavation of basement rock would make this steep hill slope highly vulnerable to instability and collapse. Consequent landslides are bound to cause a catastrophe and huge loss to human life and property.</p>	<p>The Port has come into existence since 1885. The statements are baseless.</p>
5.30	<p>Likewise, the Vasco town area is bound to experience land subsidence</p>	<p>This is not true.</p>

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	and lateral ground movement towards the dredged area besides similar geomorphological changes. This would lead to catastrophic consequences including buildings developing cracks. There are several multi-storied buildings in Vasco town. The Indian Naval area on the eastern side would also be at high risk. All this is not considered in the EIA study.	
5.31	He stated that has prepared a map/plan of Google Earth showing the dredging spots, location of Rumdawada, Vasco town, the naval area and how the land subsidence and lateral ground movement will take place; he will attach this plan to his written synopsis.	This is not true.
5.32	He submits that it is prudent and necessary that the cumulative impact of geomorphological changes and land subsidence due to capital dredging must be studied by an institution of national repute, and its findings be incorporated in the final EIA study report.	Past experience of nearly six decades in periodic "capital/maintenance" dredging activities at the MPT as well as the scientific studies conducted by the NIO, CWPRS and National Centre for Sustainable Coastal Management (NCSCM) indicate that the shoreline of Vasco/MPT is stable and not prone to subsidence.
5.33	His next submission was that source of construction materials, particularly soil required for reclamation is not disclosed in Draft EIA Report nor any study done on environmental impact at the source. Exact quantity of material required for reclamation is not stated.	The licensed Quarries will be the source for reclamation material. The quantity of reclamation material to be brought from outside will be around 120000 CuM.
5.34	Quantity of material required for reclamation not stated. The Draft EIA Report estimates 35000 cu. m. of stone, 1,25,000 cu. m. of aggregate and 60,000 cu. m of sand. The reclamation area is estimated at around 65,000 sq metres. Although the EIA study states that dredged spoils from two locations would be	As above

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	used for reclamation to the extent of 25%, it admits that 75% of the reclamation material would have to be sourced from elsewhere. He wanted to know from the EIA Consultant the exact quantity of material for reclamation and the source of this material. The main material would be <i>murram</i> or soil that would involve hill-cutting.	
5.35	However, the exact quantity and source of this excess material is not stated. The environmental impact at the source of this material (<i>murram</i> or soil) has not been considered at all. Likewise, the source of the stones, aggregate and sand for the project and its environmental impact has not been stated anywhere in the report.	Please refer 5.34
5.36	He submits that declaring the estimated quantity of soil required for reclamation and an environmental impact study at the source of the materials is essential for a proper EIA study.	Material is to be brought from licensed quarries.
5.37	Next he questioned as to why is LPG Handling not allowed at proposed POL Berth and whether it was because PESO was unconvinced with safety aspects of the proposed berth.	No comments
5.38	He asked a specific question to MPT whether PESO had approved LPG handling at the POL Berth.	PESO has withheld the clearance for LPG pending the submission of additional information. Handling of LPG will be undertaken only on receipt of the required safety and statutory clearance.
5.39	He stated that at Para 1.1 of the Draft EIA Report, it is stated that " <i>Mormugao Port Trust (MPT), Goa intends to construct, commission POL berth with facilities to handle liquid hydrocarbons (motor spirit, high speed diesel, etc.) and liquefied gases (LPG) at Vasco Bay, Mormugao Port, Goa.</i> "	No comments

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	LPG handling is an integral part of the project.	
5.40	He quoted from RTI documents furnished by PESO that stated that permission for LPG handling at the proposed POL Berth was not given by PESO. From the records (particularly notings) furnished to him, it is very clear that PESO was not convinced with the safety aspects of the POL Berth and turned down MPT's proposal for LPG handling.	Refer reply at item 5.38 of this document.
5.41	He submits that, in view of this, the very credibility of siting of the POL Berth is called to question. The PESO rejection speaks louder than words, and indicates its doubts about the siting of the POL Berth near densely populated areas. At the very least, the PP ought to have disclosed this fact during its presentation at the PH, which it failed to do. It can only be concluded that PESO is not convinced with the siting of the POL Berth near densely populated areas.	PESO has given the preliminary clearance for POL Berth.
5.42	He wanted to see a clear statement from the Project Proponent regarding PESO's rejection of the proposal for LPG handling and the reasons for the same in the Final EIA Report. It is essential to disclose this in the spirit of public consultation envisaged under EIA Notification 2006.	Summary of preliminary clearance will be incorporated in the Final EIA report.
5.43	Next, he referred to several structures shown on the project layout plan and wanted to know how many of them are there, who is occupying them and how they are proposed to be rehabilitated. MPT representative stated that MoU was signed with some fishing associations which take care of rehabilitation, and that it is the responsibility of the State Government to rehabilitate the structures.	The Rehabilitation and Resettlement (R & R) is to be taken care of in accordance to the MOU signed by the stake holders. Only a small number of Khariwada residents are likely to be affected by the Project. This is to be done in consultation with stakeholders & GoG.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	According to Adv.Correia, around 350 plots of 50 sq metres are proposed for rehabilitation. He insisted that this plot scheme ought to have been part of the EIA. PP's representative stated that 12 houses have to be rehabilitated; to this Adv Correia said that it means that the issue of rehabilitation and resettlement has been concealed in the Draft EIA report.	
5.44	Adv. Correia stated that he was not satisfied with the reply given by the PP's representatives.	No comments
5.45	The Chair intervened to state that he was recording that this was a major deficiency that was noted, and requested Adv Correia to continue.	No comments
5.46	Next, Adv Correia spoke on legality of the MoU dated 22.12.2016. He questioned the PP's representative on several irregularities in execution of the MoU. On being questioned by Adv Correia, PP's representative confirmed that Old Cross Canoe Owners Society had not signed the MoU, that GFBOA seal was not there on last page, signature of GFBOA President was not attested by two witnesses, and that GFBOA President had not signed on all pages, that the document had not been registered with Sub-Registrar nor has Notary attested execution of the document.	No comments
5.47	Adv. Correia questioned the legality of the document and stated that it was not worth the paper it was written on. Hence, any of the parties could wash their hands off.	This is not true.
5.48	Next, he submitted that a modern fishing harbour is the need of the hour for Vasco's fishing community. It must be constructed near the existing fish landing jetty, without any intervention of MPT. He wishes to state that he fully	No comments

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	supports the construction of a modern fishing harbour exclusively for the fishermen and trawler owners of Vasco, without any intervention or interference of/by Mormugao Port Trust (MPT). The existing landing jetty is highly congested and does not possess even the basic facilities.	
5.49	After visiting the site, he is of the opinion that the said modern fishing harbour could be located near the existing jetty and extended about 350 metres to the east. He has prepared a sketch on Google Earth picture showing berthing quay of about 350 metres length and a finger pier of about 75 metre length with outfitting quay and net mending quay on either side, that is attached to his written synopsis.	No comments
5.50	The selection of the site would also ensure that a substantial part of the Vasco Bay (Khariwada) beach remains available and accessible for the public. Ownership of land would not be an issue as the land belongs to the Government of Goa. All other environmental and legal issues in the present project would be avoided. He requests the Project Proponent and/or EIA Consultant to consider this alternative siting for the fishing harbor in the Final EIA Report.	No comments. The ownership of land and water remains with Port. No alternative site proposed for Fishing Jetty.
5.51	He concluded that the so-called EIA study of the proposed project is a sham and has been done in a careless, casual and nonchalant manner. The issue of ownership, which goes to the root of any development or project, has been malafidely sidetracked for the sole reason that MPT does not have ownership title to the land and/or water area of the project site. There are glaring discrepancies in the	EIA studies have been conducted by Consultants accredited by "NABET/NABL" and as per the TOR approved by MOEF & CC. The allegations are baseless.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	location of the project. Alternate sites have not been considered. PP has suppressed and misrepresented material environmental facts and submitted false and misleading information. EIA study is replete with contradictions and bald and unsubstantiated statements and ignoring major and critical issues and concerns, some of which he has enumerated above. Lastly, he submits that the Draft EIA Report and other documents submitted by the project proponent have no credibility at all and ought not to be considered in grant of EC.	
5.52	He suggests that a site visit by the EAC or its sub-group to appreciate the issues in loco.	No comments
5.53	He stated that he would be filing a written synopsis of his submissions alongwith documents.	No comments
6.0	Shri. Avinash Tavares, Margao.	
6.1	He started with his objections to the project assigned except for the fishing jetty.	No Remarks.
6.2	He stated that the consultant has made many mistakes. He further stated that the consultant has mislead.	This is not true.
6.3	Referring to page 8 he stated that the report states that "at present iron exported constitutes to the 39% of the total iron exports. He questioned the Project Proponent whether there is any iron export at present.	Report was prepared in November 2017 and at that time iron ore was exported. Percentage mentioned in the EIA Report represents iron ore handled prior to November 2017.
6.4	Referring to table 1.1, he stated that there is a box referring to the ecologically sensitive areas. It stated that only Dr. Salim Ali Wildlife Sanctuary, Coral reefs of Grande Island, Mangroves in a few patches of Zuari actuary are stated to be in the Ecologically Sensitive area. He sought	Ecologically sensitive areas are as per CRZ Notification of 2011, i. e. CRZ-1-A

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	to know as source of the reference if this information. As Mormugao falls under ecologically sensitive area, the project should not have been considered as per the said study by Dr. Gadgil on Western Ghats.	
6.5	Referring to point no. 8, the Draft EIA report is silent on villages and other ports located within 10 Kms of the study area, as it refers only to Vasco city. However, Mr. Tavares informed that the same information should have been made available in the Executive Summary.	The said information is provided in Tables 3.21 to 3.24. Information will be included in Executive Summary.
6.6	He also pointed out to the number of Reservoirs and water bodies located within the radius of the study area as the EIA report finds a mention of very few.	"Major/important" water bodies and reservoirs which were observed are mentioned in the EIA report.
6.7	As regards to the queries raised regarding the Critically Polluted Area (CPA).	Neither the project site nor the study area is notified as CPA by CPCB.
6.8	Information regarding salt pans and the Mangroves located in the northern portion of the study area has not been referred to in the report. Thus, Mr. Tavares informed that the information provided is misleading to the reality on site.	The occurrences of such stretches are very scanty and are not major. Major and important sensitive areas are mentioned in the EIA report.
6.9	In response to a query raised regarding decrease in POL cargo at Berth no 8 as per the Sagarmala Report, the MPT agreed to the fact. Further as regards to the financial implications while proposing to shift the existing POL Berth to its new location considering the future demand, Mr. Tavares wanted to know the reason for the same. He doubted the purpose of shifting the existing POL Berth to its new location only to free up Berth no 8, 10 & 11 available for other cargo handling to which the MPT replied stating that they are	All the liquid bulk cargo handled at berths 8, 10 and 11 will now be handled at this new berth. Provision has also been made for growth in POL traffic.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	exploring the future prospect to handle other liquid cargo in addition to Petroleum and not limiting to the existing handling.	
6.10	Mr. Tavares on referring to page 292 of the Sagarmala report, he informed that the current efficiency of the POL at Berth 8 is only 20% and the demand is very low. In view of this fact as well as to explore the possibility of Iron and Coal handling at Berth 8, the necessity of shifting the existing POL Berth can be considered. This fact has not been referred in the draft EIA report.	Please refer to reply at 6.9.
6.11	As regards to the economic and infrastructure study being conducted on increase level of fishing activity at the jetty, the consultant replied that the CICEF, Bangalore has conducted such study based on the information provided by the Department of Fisheries of Goa and the report can be made available.	The CICEF, Bangalore has conducted such a study based on the information provided by the Department of Fisheries of Goa.
6.12	He informed that the said draft EIA report lacks information regarding passenger details as well as the requirement for the enhanced handling of passengers at the newly proposed passenger jetty/Cruise Berth and indicates the intend of MPT to privatise the Berths from economic perspective as a part of Sagarmala Project.	The Passenger Cruise terminal is proposed to facilitate berthing of all sizes of passenger vessels to promote tourism.
6.13	Mr. Tavares also sought clarification with specific respect to safety aspect of the proposed fishing jetty close to liquid cargo handling berth as per International Ship and Port facility Security Code (ISPS Code)	The traditional fishermen will be provided a separate entry channel for their trawlers to enter and berth at the proposed new fishing jetty. As such the safety aspect has been taken care of while designing a plan for construction of the said jetty as well as the water channel. In addition the proposed activity also includes construction of a 10 ft wall that separates

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

		the proposed relocation of POL Berth and the new fishing jetty, for enhanced safety.
6.14	He also informed that the proposed fishing jetty lacks cold storage facility but instead includes Ice plant which will not serve the purpose of fish storage prior to its dispatch in open market. He also desired to know the total electricity and water consumption.	The fishing jetty plan and facilities has been approved by CICEF and agreed by trawler owners' association. The proposed fishing jetty would require 142 KLD of water (as referred on page 46 of the draft EIA report) while the power will be sourced from the Goa Electricity Department. The phase wise quantity will be clarified in the Final EIA Report.
6.15	Referring to page 68, figure 3.9 of the report, Mr. Tavares informed that the use of bathymetric map to arrive at a conclusion referred in the report	Fig. 3.9 of EIA report shows the bathymetry of project area. This bathymetry presents the depth of water during tides and is utilized for calculating reclamation and dredging volumes.
6.16	Mr. Tavares also brought to the notice the CPCB prescribed limits to be adopted for PM 2.5 and PM 10 parameters on daily as well as average basis considering the fact that the study period was restricted for 3 months between March 2017 to May 2017. And as such the daily peak value of 60 micro gram per meter cube in case of PM 2.5 should be used and not the annual average as has been referred in the draft EIA report. Thus the statistics and the interpretation thereof as regards to particulate matter levels is misleading. Further he reiterated that a concentration of PM 2.5 on daily average is 60 micro gram per meter cube which is to be considered as a peak while computing a daily average. The similar pattern has been referred with respect to PM 10 levels in the said report which is misleading.	In Chapter 3, the recorded Ambient Air Quality parameters in the study area (such as PM10, PM2.5, SO ₂ , NO _x , & CO levels recorded during study period) are compared with CPCB standards, 2009. Monitoring was carried out during March 2017 to May 2017. Hence the recorded values are compared with daily average permissible limits prescribed by CPCB. PM 2.5 values are compared with 60µg/m ³ &PM 10 values are compared with 100µg/m ³ standards, which are prescribed by CPCB.
6.17	Referring to page no. 119, He desired to know the treatment capability as well as various facilities currently available with the Health Care Institutes incase a probability of	Clause No. 3.13.6 of EIA report refers to Health Care facilities, which include prominent hospitals in Goa, such as Goa Medical College, Manipal Hospital, SMRC, Rajagiri Victor Hospital, etc., where most

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	disaster. He also clarified after referring annexure 1 on page 575, the probability of people getting affected as well as their evacuation route based on the simulation study as referred in the blast zone has not been studied.	modern treatments are available. Similarly, as per quantitative risk assessment study report, predominant wind direction is south-west and due to this, in the event of any fire the facilities in the upwind direction will have partial effect. The other recommendations are also enlisted in the quantitative risk assessment study report. Based on the report, PESO will put conditions and the same shall be adhered to for securing the permission.
6.18	On referring to page 123, he stated that the draft EIA report is silent on dredging impact on biodiversity with specific reference to seaweeds and its quantification to understand the mitigative measures proposed in the Environment management plan.	Impact and mitigation study on dredging activity has been included and will be reviewed if necessary in the Final EIA report.
6.19	He also desired to know the impact on land during the construction phase as well as the utility of excavated material for its better reuse for coastal erosion replenishment.	Dredging Spoils will be disposed off on the spoil ground identified scientifically and demarcated by the CWPRS, Pune. Good material can be used for reclamation.
6.20	After referring to page 127 and page 133 of the draft report, he stated that the draft EIA report has not mentioned the possible impact due to displacement of fisheries resources as well as not mentioned likelihood of traffic management scenario during the construction and post construction phase which may lead to increase in air pollution.	Those impacts and mitigation measures which have not been dealt with in the draft EIA (if any) will be included in the Final EIA report under Chapter 4.
6.21	He also stated that the design of the proposed greenbelt to minimise noise and dust pollution has not been referred and informed the discrepancy in the information provided with regard to the location of greenbelt development on the proposed reclaimed land. Thus he reiterated that the proposed green belt development	The location and proposed development of green belt as per the project requirement has already been identified and shown in the draft EIA. The same will be reviewed and based on the requirement necessary changes will be incorporated in Final EIA report.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	plan has not been indicated in the final layout map at Annexure 8.	
6.22	He also brought to the notice that the draft HTL/LTL demarcation map referred on page 269 and believed to have been prepared by Institute of Remote Sensing Anna University, Tamil Nadu and the said map is not clear with specific reference to identification of survey numbers to understand the implication of this map.	The Draft CRZ map will presented at an appropriate scale so as to make it very clear.
6.23	Further he pointed out the applicability of Microsoft Software for the preparation of multi component analysis to understand the financial implications due to the proposed activities.	All studies has been done in accordance with the approved ToR issued by MoEF&CC.
6.24	The EIA report is very silent on the existing fire fighting facilities based on the HAZOP study which has referred that the said facilities are very inadequate to address the potential risk. Thus he insisted to provide and augment the existing fire fighting mechanism before proposing any additional projects on site.	The draft EIA report mentions the type of fire-fighting facility required for the POL berth, based on the HAZOP study.
6.25	On referring to page 146 -147 he desired to seek clarification with respect to the existing Environment Management plan for MPT.	Question not clear. MPT has an approved EMP which is been followed.
6.26	He also objected to the reference of study report prepared by CWPRS as regards to its usage in estimating wave dynamic and sediment movement pattern (wave tranquillity and simulation study) in the current proposal as referred on page 274, appendix 3, the said study was conducted for a earlier project title Capital Dredging, to which issuance of EC is still pending. Thus he informed that the said study is irrelevant and	Tranquillity and siltation studies for Vasco bay project has been done which will form part of the final report. The CWPRS study on capital dredging was included to indicate the location of the spoil ground

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	cannot be made applicable in case of present project perspective.	
6.27	He objected to the report referred by the consultant on the siltation study which was prepared by CWPRS in year 2015 and as such is invalid to refer it while understanding the impact scenario due to current proposed activities. However, it was clarified that no additional disposal sites have been identified under the current project scenario.	CWPRS study completed in the year 2015 and which is included in the EIA report identifies disposal grounds for spoils from capital dredging activity. The same disposal grounds will be utilized for disposal of capital dredging spoils generated in the present project.
6.28	He also brought on record the discrepancy with specific reference to wave/current directions as referred on page 311 (figure 16 A & B) which is moving towards north while Oil Spill Contingency Plan referred on page 434-435 refers it as wave direction towards south. This is a misleading information to conceal the factual position of higher erosion due to the proposed dredging. However, Mr. Tavares said that the said Simulation study has been conducted using 2D model and not 3D model to understand the sediment movement pattern.	The Simulation study carried out at the Project site is a localised phenomenon which may vary within certain bounds depending on the season and prevailing hydrodynamic conditions at the site from time to time. The facility available at CWPRS, Pune utilizes a2D model instead of a 3D model and the results of the same are matching with the site conditions. Hence the outcome of the study vis-à-vis the results at the site are in close approximation.
6.29	He also elaborated on Integrated Disaster Management Plan as well as MPT's liability which has not been clarified in the present draft Report.	The disaster management plan is an approved document which is followed in case of any disaster.
6.30	He was surprised, on referring to page 525 with respect to quantitative Risk assessment due to handling of liquid cargo, that the Consultant has inserted a disclaimer not to undertake the responsibility in case of any disaster.	The EIA consultant has undertaken a detailed QRA & HAZOP Study as per OISD 156 guidelines in which risks and mitigation measures are provided and the same shall be adhered to after commencement of project.
6.31	He also sought clarification in respect of conclusions referred on page 531 with specific reference to on site and off site disaster evacuation plan which has not been referred in the draft EIA Report. As it fails to elaborate on the	On site and off site disaster evacuation plan will be reviewed and necessary additions, if necessary, will be incorporated in the Final EIA report.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	impact on human health due to possible leakage of toxic substance.	
6.32	He disputes the figure of fatalities, i.e. 13 nos, as arrived at by MPT during their exercise done for estimation of fatalities in case of a disaster.	Based on the simulation studies a figure has been arrived at and on detailed analysis and scrutiny PESO will issue the necessary steps to be taken while implementing the project. MPT will handle cargo only on receipt of all the permissions required.
6.33	Referring to table no 7 regarding Tolerable Risk, Mr. Tavares objected to the use of European Standards for risk assessment.	In the EIA Report, it has been stated that the risk acceptance criteria is yet to be defined in India and IS 15656; code of practice for hazard identification and risk analysis, the risk criteria adopted has been shown in case of other countries. Therefore, to achieve the risk acceptance criteria ALART principle has been followed. This is in order.
6.34	He stated that all disaster Management reports in the EIA report are fudged. He demanded that the Disaster Management Authority should look into the matter.	The Port has an approved Disaster Management Plan which will form part of the Final EIA Report.
6.35	He stated that he desires that Vasco is a safe area and says that a lot of accidents have taken place but fortunately outside the port area.	No remarks.
6.36	He sought assurance from MPT that they will conduct a drill with the local fisherman since the POL berth is already existing.	The necessary periodical mock drill will be carried out taking into confidence the Disaster Management Authority.
6.37	He sought to know from MPT whether they have any off-site evacuation plan in case of any accident takes place near the facility.	Please refer to the reply at item 6.34.
6.38	He stated that the impact of a potential disaster at the POL berth on tourism or on passenger ships at the have not been evaluated.	Anticipated risk and impacts are envisaged and depicted in HAZOP study report which is attached as Annexure V of EIA report.
6.39	He requested MPT to train the local fire fighters on potential disasters that can occur on the port.	All measures for safety and emergency preparedness required for the project will be taken on record and incorporated during operational phase.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

6.40	He sought to know from MPT whether the area earmarked for canoes will be sufficient.	As per the records available with Fisheries Department of GoG, the area earmarked for canoes is sufficient.
6.41	With regards to earmarked areas for Canoes in the EIA report, he questioned MPT to states as to whether the area earmarked is sufficient. MPT replies that local enquiry reveals that 250 trawlers and 110 canoes are available.	Please refer to reply at 6.40.
6.42	He states that area earmarked for canoes by MPT in the report is inadequate as per the Google map.	Please refer to reply at 6.40.
6.43	He states that ultimately rehabilitation of fisherman and mooring of their canoes will lie of state Government.	No remarks.
6.44	He states that MPT has not conducted a socio-economic study.	A Socio-Economic study has been carried out by Ultra-Tech, and the same is incorporated in Chapter 3
6.45	He states that MPT is misleading the Government and MoEF with this draft EIA report	False and baseless allegations.
7.0	Shri. Dinesh Dias, Salvador de Mundo.	
7.1	MPT agreed to change the draft EIA report title in order to include Development of Passenger Jetty Launch Jetty and Port Craft Jetty Deepening of breakwater berth.	Title has to be identical to that of the approved ToR.
7.2	The Consultant also agreed to make the above changes in the "Declaration by Experts"	Please refer 7.1
7.3	On being questioned the consultant provided details of their appointment and agreed that they were awarded the tender in February 2017 and commenced work in March 2017 even though the TOR was issued by MoEF & CC only on 8 th May 2017. He was unable to explain how a tender was floated and they responded to it even though the scope of work was not fully determined. The "Specific Conditions" specified in the TOR was not known to	The present EIA consultant was appointed through a tendering process of pre-qualification open only for NABET approved consultants for Ports and Harbour Sector. Lowest financial offer is the sole criteria for selection among prequalified bidders. Tender process started in the month of January 2017. The bid has been quoted based on the standard ToR.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	either MPT or the Consultant on the date the tender was floated.	
7.4	MPT acknowledged that NIO had prepared the "Marine Biodiversity Impact Assessment Report and Management Plan" for these projects but the same were not attached to the Draft EIA Report.	The Consultant agreed to attach the NIO Report and Plan in the Final EIA Report.
7.5	MPT / Consultant accepted that the land of the temporary fishing jetty belongs to the State Government but this fact was not mentioned in the Draft EIA report.	This statement is false
7.6	MPT /Consultant accepted that there would be a requirement for Relocation and Rehabilitation of people due to this project, but these details were not mentioned in the EIA report.	There will Only a few cases of relocation which is to be done within the same area and carried as per the understanding between the stakeholders including Govt. of Goa.
7.7	Mr. Dias questioned Mr. Joglekar whether this Public Hearing can continue without the CZMP plan. Mr. Joglekar clarified that the parallel processing of CRZ plan is going on. GCZMA will process the plan as an Authority. Every attempt is made for preparation of plan after taking into consideration all legal aspects so the public hearing can take place simultaneously.	No remarks.
7.8	He further stated that MPT has annexed a postage stamp size map in the EIA report and it is very difficult to ascertain anything. However, it could be referred to. Mr. Dias agreed to it.	A map of appropriate scale will be annexed in the Final EIA Report. Bigger scale maps were made available during the public hearing.
7.9	Referring to page 32, last line of 1.6, Mr. Dias questioned where the suitable recommendations are.	The recommendations are as per the CRZ plan.
7.10	He stated that the annual report of the GSPCB states that Vasco and specifically the area around the Port is the most polluted area in the State of Goa. But the EIA report does not make any mention that it is highly polluted.	It is pointed out that as per the official ambient air quality monitoring station of GSPCB at the Electricity Fuse Call in Vasco, is less polluted than the cities of Mapusa, Panaji and Ponda. The GSPCB Air Pollution monitoring station at the MPT Fire Station which is very close to the

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

		sources of air pollution is already declared as a source monitoring station within the operational area of the Port. As such it does not represent the ambient air quality to which the residents of Vasco are subjected to.
7.11	Referring to page 34, Mr. Dias stated that there was a divergence in table 2.1 and table 2.4 so far as figures for the past years 2015 – 16 and 2016-17 were concerned. but Mr. Dias stated that the forecast figures for the preceding years vastly differed from actuals and hence the actual figures attained should have been disclosed in Table 2.4, with disclosure so that the future forecast can be verified to ascertain if they are realistic figures or grossly overstated in order to justify the project.	Table 2.4 pertains to traffic forecast figures whereas Table 2.1 depicts the actual cargo handling figures.
7.12	Mr. Dias pointed out that on page 37, point 2.2.1, the Outer Channel is stated to be 6.8 Kms long from A-1 zone to the turning circle whereas at other places in the EIA report it is stated to be 5.2 Kms long.	The figure 6.8 Km is correct. If any other figure is mentioned by oversight, the same will be corrected in the Final EIA Report.
7.13	Mr Dias stated that dredging of Berth No. 10 & 11 and area around them was covered under the earlier capital dredging Project.	No. these areas were not covered
7.14	Mr. Dias questioned what is the distance between A-0 and A-1 zones of the Outer Channel.	He distance between the starting points of A0 and A1 is about 3.40 kms
7.15	Mr. Dias referring to page 9 questioned about the land ownership documents and acquisition status.	There is no dispute about the ownership of land and water areas. Please refer the reply at 5.3 of this document.
7.16	To a query as regards to water bodies covered in the EIA Report.	Any additional relevant information will be provided in the Final Report, if required.
7.17	Referring to page 46, Mr. Dias stated that a clear picture should be made available to the public.	Please refer the reply at 7.8 of this document.
7.18	Mr. Dias asked about the length and breadth of the proposed new Road.	The proposed new road has a width of 12 m as per the demand of the boat owners, and the figures of 10 m appearing on

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

		page 617 and 8 m on page 620 will be rectified in the revised EIA Report.
7.19	Mr. Dias stated that the EIA report states that the compound wall will be constructed around the residential houses. He sought to know whether this means that the people will have to live in a jail.	Construction of compound wall is to separate port area and existing area occupied by fishing community. This demarcation is from security and safety angle. The compound walls will be around the MPT plots i.e. A-2 and A-3 and in this regard the local fishermen have been consulted. Please refer to reply at 2.15.
7.20	Mr. Dias sought to know what is the distance between the Berths 10& 11 and the Temporary fishing jetty.	This is around 40 m.
7.21	Referring to page 53, Mr Dias asked to clarify on the last line of second last para regarding slip distance of 350 meters.	The distance between the proposed POL Berth and Berth No. 10 & 11 is 350 m.
7.22	He stated that at page 56 general and coastal cargo has not mentioned the type of cargo that will be handled.	At general and coastal cargo Berth general cargo such as coils, steel slabs, steel rods, containers, granite blocks, fertilisers, food grains, etc. will be handled. MPT categorically stated that they will not handle coal & coke at Berths 10 & 11 or at the Coastal and General Berths, planned in the Project.
7.23	Referring to page 268, 269, he sought clarifications on CRZ mapping. He stated that Zuari is referred to as 'Zuari Creek'. He stated that MPT is deliberately misleading the people. He stated that its a bay and not a creek.	This will be corrected in the Final EIA Report.
7.24	Mr Dias referred to first para of page 277 regarding Wave Tranquillity Study by CWPRS wherein CWPRS confirmed that they commenced initial work on the basis of MPT letter dated 06/08/2014. The interim findings were conveyed to MPT vide CWPRS letter dated 02/11/2015 in para 2. He stated that this interim report was prepared much before the capital dredging for deepening of the Outer and Internal Channels had been done. Now that 65% of the dredging was complete, it	CWPRS study in the year 2015, which is included in EIA report, identifies disposal grounds for capital dredging spoils. The same disposal ground will be utilized for disposal of capital dredging material from the proposed present Project.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	was imperative that a fresh study be done because the depth had gone down from 14.5 to 19.8 meters and the ground realities had changed to a great extent.	
7.25	At page 281 (3.0) Mr. Dias asked how the Outer Channel length increased by 3.5 kms and how it gets extended.	This is because the A-0 zone was dredged in order that ships could smoothly and safely enter the approach channel. However, this issue is beyond the subject of the present project
7.26	Mr. Dias stated that Berth 10 & 11 is adjoining berth 8& 9 that will be handling coal hereafter due to PPP with Vedanta. He asked whether this is informed to consultant and read from WAPCOS EIA report for redevelopment of Berths 8, 9 & barge unloading (pages 6-7 to 6-9) on the danger of coal fire and coal dust explosion. There was no mention of this danger in the current EIA report. Existing surroundings are to be seen while preparing report.	This issue does not pertain to present Project.
7.27	Referring to page 6.5 he asked for incorporation of WAPCOS recommendations of CRS in report. He stated that one year passed and that no work is done till date. Grand Island is rich in coral.	This is a part of compliance to EC and once EC is obtained the PP will be complying with it.
7.28	Mr. Dinesh stated that a cumulative effect study of dredging across all the projects has to be done. He stated that due to non availability of reliable long term fishery data it is difficult to predict impact of dredging on Estuarine fishery as per WAPCOS report and therefore a yearlong study has to be conducted. He further stated that MPT cannot absolve itself from its responsibilities	All conditions of EC will be complied with. The PP is duty bound to conduct any Study that involves compliance with EC conditions.
8.0	Shri. Ronny D'souza, Dongrim, Vasco.	
8.1	He elaborated on fishing jetty and its effect.	No remarks.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

8.2	He stated that the fishing Boat owners have spent 40yrs fighting for a fishing jetty. But till date nothing has been done for construction of fishing jetty. Even today nobody objected for fishing jetty. He stated that they had several meetings with Ministers, MPT, GSPCB, Vasco Municipalities and this showed the plan of the jetty and made changes. They brought to notice various points and requested not to join the jetty project with other projects. Earlier MPT Chairman had mentally harassed them to make us leave the place. Even State Government did not help them, though land belonged to State Government.	No remarks.
8.3	The jetty at 9 and 10 berths and is to be given to Fishing community but no written orders is given. MPT should take steps to protect our boats.	No remarks.
8.4	The Boat owners never objected to jetty never they were shifted to Chicalim, Vaddem, Baina Bay but again and again made to leave at every place for 40 years. They were fighting but till date they are not given fishing jetties. Even after continuous reminders. MPT states that they would clarify on the issues raised by the Boat Owners and consider the submissions made by them	Location of Fishing jetty was not finalized on account of various factors such as no consensus between GFBOA office bearers, state government, local objections, etc. This has delayed the process of finalization of fishing jetty.
8.5	All fisherman are carrying out fishing activity from Portuguese time and their residence are existing since long.	No remarks.
8.6	The Boat Owners states that they are not against development but MPT should'nt cheat them and should give them the jetty facility at the earliest and should not harass the fisherman community	No remarks.
8.7	Our boats gets damaged due to natural storm. We want immediate jetty and issues to be resolved on	No remarks.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	urgent basis. We do not have any facility like toilet, sanitation, etc.	
8.8	Even neighbouring State in Karwar has grounding facility, jetty even for few boats and we have around 300 boats but no proper facility even though the land belongs to State govt. We are ignored and harassed. We do not have proper place and facility even though we earn our livelihood by our hard work and sweat.	No remarks.
8.9	There was strike due to establishment of Metastrip unit/ Konkan Railway/Casinos, etc. But even after strong objection all these projects were established and fully operated. However, we have demanded and again and again requested we do not want hazardous and dirty cargo and MPT had agreed that hazardous and dirty cargo will not be brought. MPT has been silent and not abided by their undertaking regarding dirty and hazardous cargo.	No remarks. Allegations made are baseless and false. MPT is honouring its obligations as per the MOU signed with GFBOA and Govt. of Goa.
8.10	We are made to dream that we are going to get a world class jetty but today they have shown technical mistakes in EIA report. Whether rectification will done by MPT or not should be clarified by MPT.	MPT will review the EIA Report and necessary corrections, additions if required will be incorporated in the Final EIA Report.
8.11	At Berth No. 9 and 10 coal handling pollution is being caused but GSPCB says pollution parameter are within the prescribed limits. 2-3 places Ambient Air Quality monitored by GSPCB. However pollution continued unabated.	No coal handling carried out at Berth No.9. Coal handling totally stopped at Berth No.10 from August 2012.
9.0	Shri. Elvino Araujo, Vasco	
9.1	He stated that MPT does not stick to their decisions hence, they do not trust them.	Allegations made are not true.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

9.2	He stated that MPT has not disclosed anything about the road for the project.	The general layout drawings indicate the location of roads
9.3	He referred to one of the speakers who spoke about the crack in the road near Chowgule. He stated that dredging does not effect today but its impact will be felt over a period of time after 5 years. He stated that soil erosion will take place lateron due to dredging activity. Ground level reality is not there with MPT. (He further stated that he will not go into details as most points are covered by the earlier speakers which he has reiterated.)	There was no crack in the road near Chowgule's Harbour office and the road still exist without any damage. There is no soil erosion as alleged due to dredging activity. This is further confirmed through NIO studies.
9.4	He further says that MPT does not have proper infrastructure and facility but only knows to go ahead with so called development.	This is not true.
9.5	He questioned for whom is the security. Is it for the local people or for the MPT.	MPT is providing security of its operational area as the same is Custom notified area.
9.6	He further asked what is the record of trucks entering and going out. Whether loaded or not. They want State agencies ensure control.	MPT maintains the record of trucks entering and leaving the port area.
9.7	He further alleged that the disaster management aspect is not taken seriously by MPT.	Disaster management aspect is covered in the EIA report. Due importance is given to disaster management
9.8	He stated that State does not earn any revenue from Sagarmala.	No remarks.
9.9	He further stated that due to dredging in the villages of Loutolim, Raia, cultivable land/houses will disappear.	Allegations are baseless.
9.10	He further sought to know whether MPT can assure that the islands which are there will not be affected due to dredging.	All the technical studies carry out confirm that there will not be any adverse effects on the islands
9.11	He sought to know if Bat island and Grande Island in Arabian Sea and whether the marine bio-diversity will not get affected.	Studies carried out through NIO confirms that there will be no adverse effects on the bio diversity.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

9.12	Mr. Araujo further stated that the NIO study also indicates that there is adverse effects on corals	The NIO study also does not anticipate any impact on the corals. The same will be incorporated with Final EIA Report.
9.13	He sought to know what will be the mode of transport of POL. Whether it will be by boat/barge etc.	POL will be brought to the Port by ocean going tankers and the same will be pumped through dedicated and secure pipelines to the tanks of respective oil companies.
9.14	He further stated that Rumdavaddo is now termed as landslide prone area.	The statement made is baseless
9.15	He states that MPT does not know or clarify the long term impact of dredging.	The statement made is not true. MPT is carried out all relevant studies and the impact has been assessed.
9.16	With respect to security aspect, he stated that people were there from 1961. MPT was not even present at that time. Major Bandar a small port for importing rice, cereals, etc for people of Goa was present.	No remarks.
9.17	He further stated that MPT does not have any land documents to prove their ownership.	MPT's jurisdiction is clear according to the Major Port Trust Act 1963.
9.18	He stated that the compound wall is to be constructed around the jetty. He sought to know the area that is demarcated to say that it is no zone area to deny access to people. He further stated that over the passage of time, for security reasons, the people will be thrown out and asked to move away. Citing an example i.e. the navy took possession of 2 Beaches Suravell Beach and Bimbvell Beach allowing the fisher folk to carryout their fishing activity. But over a period of time the Navy introduced Identity Card for the fishing community at both the Beaches and later managed to drive away around four families citing defence and high security reasons. The same will take place to the fishing community of Khariwada once MPT constructs the POL and fishing Jetty Berth. He sought to know why a compound wall is being	Statement is not true. Please refer the reply at 7.19 of this document.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	built around the project. He stated that it is only for grabbing their land.	
9.19	He sought to know what is the provisions made for construction workers. He also asked what provisions are made for cold storage and other facilities for fisherman. MPT does not know what is mentioned in report. He further stated that MPT is not to be trusted.	Temporary accommodation with sanitation facilities will be provided for construction workers. Provision has been made for ice plant. Please see 2.3.1 of the EIA report.
9.20	He further stated that MPT has no infrastructure to control oil spillage. .	A management Plan and equipments necessary for an oil spill emergency are already in place.
9.21	Mr. Araujo sought to know whether there are any means to contain oil spills. He stated that M.V. Qing is still lying in Port area and MPT is stating that its removal is not their responsibility. He stated that Coast Guard Officers says that they have arranged for booms. MPT has no oil spill control plans.	Statement is not true. Please refer the reply at 9.20 of this document.
9.22	He asked that if there is any disaster who is responsible. The Ammonia/ Phosphorus Acid are potential disaster sources.	MPT has an approved Disaster Management Plan where the responsibilities of stakeholders are stated.
9.23	He sought to know if the hazardous material will be pumped through the existing pipeline.	The existing pipelines will be used. Additional new lines will also be laid.
9.24	He asked if there is any disaster taking place will MPT be responsible. He stated that they do not have the plan.	This is not true. Please refer the reply at 9.20 of this document.
9.25	He stated that no permissions should be granted for other project except for fishing jetty and nothing else should come in Vasco Bay as they are not the owner of the land.	The ownership of land and water area remains with Port.
10.0	Capt. Viriato Fernandes, Chicalim, Mormugao.	
10.1	He stated that he is a retired Naval Officer living at Chicalim in the vicinity of the subject project and he is directly affected by the air pollution and other impacts of the coal expansion.	No remarks. Air pollution levels are monitored by MPT and GSPCB and are within permissible limits.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

10.2	He stated that Form I , TOR and EIA Report for the subject proposal of MPT is full of contradictions, concealments and misrepresentations aimed at helping private corporations for their profits and without any consideration for the interests of the people, State and Nation.	The allegations made are not correct.
10.3	He stated that the very efficiency and competency of the Project consultancy firm is highly doubtful, whether they had followed guidelines laid down as per PMP certification (Project Management Planning certification), which was as per guidelines of the NiTiAayog, and stressed upon by its CEO, Shri Amitabh Kant. To which the consultancy firm stated that they didn't have PMP certified professionals.	Allegations made are not correct. EIA consultant is NABET accredited.
10.4	He stated that if the consultancy firm had any PMP certified professionals, they would have looked at the project Sagarmala holistically as mandated by the PMP guidelines and not at the proposed project in isolation as cleverly and falsely shown by the MPT to conceal the larger goal of Sagarmala project. However the MPT official, Capt. Fernandes said that it was a white lie and will be proved in his succeeding arguments.	Please refer the reply at 10.3.
10.5	He stated that the first and foremost requirement of the consultancy firm is to take the considerations of all the stakeholders prior proceeding with further studies. In the case of this proposed project, the main stakeholders are the fishing community, thereafter the people of Vasco, the tourism industry based in and around Vasco, the schools in Vasco, the Doctors and hospitals based in Vasco, etc. When the	The site of the fishing jetty is selected taking into confidence the fishing community and GFBOA. The MoU is also signed with GFBOA and GoG. The selection of site was not within the scope of EIA consultant.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	<p>Consultancy representative Mr. Kulkarni was asked if he had interacted or engaged with these stakeholders, he said that he hadn't taken their views and would do so in the future.</p>	
10.6	<p>He asked the MPT officials present whether the project falls under Mormugao ODP and if the project has the approval of the PDA. Capt. Fernandes stated that the project is illegal and should be scrapped immediately for bulldozing without approval and same amounts to a criminal offence.</p>	<p>The MPT is in the process of taking approvals from all the concerned relevant authorities. As per EIA Notification of 2006, EPH is one of the most important steps and a pre-requisite for obtaining the EC and all other relevant approvals.</p>
10.7	<p>He stated that the Sagarmala project is stated in the EIA Report as a single project contradicting the impression created by the title of the proposed project and the contents of the EIA Report that this is a standalone project.</p>	<p>The Ministry of Shipping, Government of India, launched the Sagarmala Scheme. The present project is financed under this scheme as an independent Project and not linked to any other project.</p>
10.8	<p>He stated that the then chairman of MPT, Shri Mari Pandyan was the chairman of the working group for Port Sector for the twelfth five year plan (2012-2017) and he brought out that MPT falls in the category of highly hazardous category and because of the densely populated city of Vasco, he recommended that the handling of hazardous cargo be stopped and priority be given for tourism related business at MPT. Based on the report, Mumbai, Kolkota and Chennai have moved their hazardous cargo to far off places but MPT, instead of stopping hazardous cargo have on the contrary increased the coal and dirty cargo and are further going to increase the coal handling.</p>	<p>No remarks.</p>
10.9	<p>He said that the proposed project when seen in tandem with the double tracking of the South Western railways, massive cutting of hills for</p>	<p>The subject project is an independent project and the allegations made are not relevant.</p>

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	road expansion, handing over the six rivers of Goa for nationalisation, construction of jetties all along the river sides clearly brings out the hidden agenda in achieving the bigger and dangerous goal of Sagarmala.	
10.10	He stated that all the projects related to expansion / modernization of berthing and storage facilities, dredging, road and rail connectivities must be evaluated as a single project in order to properly evaluate the impact.	Please refer the reply at 10.09.
10.11	He stated that the project actually displaces the fisher folk, but is falsely claiming that they are helping them. The 351 meters along berthing area to the east of berth 11, which is currently occupied and used by fishing trawlers, will be usurped through this project by MPT.	Allegations made are not correct. There is no displacement of fishing activities
10.12	He stated that the fishing community will not only lose this area, but will also lose the entire area where the proposal jetties and the related channels for cargo ships are to be located, which area is presently fully occupied and used by the traditional fisher folk of Vasco Bay. The proposed fishing jetty within the proposed new construction is no justification for the loss of such large areas and the fisher folk, who actually need more berthing and other spaces, are only losing more space instead of gaining space.	Please refer the reply at 10.11.
10.13	He stated that it was ironic that just a couple of days back, the PM, Shri Narendra Modi has been conferred an award titled "Champions of the Earth". Ironically, he added, that the PM himself pushes for these destructive projects and is the main destroyer of our city of Vasco and Goa.	No remarks.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

10.14	He stated that the EIA study and the project are both unlawful in view of the International Convention, to which India is a signatory, requiring Free, Prior and Informed Consent of the indigenous communities before approving the project. The EIA study has not made any attempt to verify if the indigenous fishing communities within the study area, and the Vasco Bay in particular, were informed and their free consent obtained prior to approving the proposal, and therefore the EIA study is premature, inadequate and fit to be rejected.	The EIA study was done as per the guidelines mandated by the MOEF&CC. Socio economic study is included in Chapter 3 and specifies community wise population residing within the 10km radius study area and their occupations are also presented in the EIA report.
10.15	He stated that the fulfilment of the mandatory requirement for Free, Prior and Informed Consent is essential for the EIA study to be successful since most of the social, economic and environmental data, which is available only with the indigenous community, can be procured only through this process. The EIA study must be carried out only after the mandatory requirement for Free, Prior and Informed Consent is fulfilled.	Social, economic and environmental data is covered by referring secondary sources as well as actual ground surveys. Please refer the reply at item 1.20 of this document.
10.16	He stated that constitutional mandate also requires the participation of people in the determination of their development plans, which has not taken place in the present case, wherein the displacement of the local communities is planned and proposed while keeping the citizens in the dark.	Allegations made are not correct. Participation of all stakeholders have been considered.
10.17	He stated that the EIA data collection was done without TOR as TOR was issued in May 2017 whereas the EIA agency started data collection from March 2017 till May 2017 so we cannot be sure all the conditions stipulated in the TOR are sufficiently addressed or if the data collected has been manipulated to suit the TOR.	Please see the Reply at 3.3 (O).

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

10.18	He stated that the mudflats that provide large quantities of mussels, shell fish, crabs, fish, and the famed and extremely rare window pane oysters and support the livelihoods of thousand will be lost forever, if the subject project is allowed.	Project does not involve any development in the mudflat region.
10.19	He stated that there are three important defence units/installations including a major naval hospital within in 200 metres of aerial distance from the proposed project site. The same has been cleverly omitted. One needs to include the impact on these defence installations including the hospital, the patients admitted therein and also the sophisticated medical equipment installed inside. The Project consultant M/s. Ultratech admitted that he was not aware of these important defence installations.	Significant Defence related installations which might have been overlooked will be listed in the Final EIA Report
10.20	He stated that in Goa Shipyard Limited is located just about 200-250 meters of aerial distance from the proposed site and INS Hansa is located just about 300 metres of aerial distance from the proposed site but the consultant has falsely shown that these defence units are far away.	Goa shipyard is located at about 1.5km East & INS Hansa is located at 2.2km South from the project location. The same will be included in the Final EIA report.
10.21	He stated that there is a major defence ammunition depot located within 300 metres of aerial distance from the proposed project site at village Chicalim. He said that any impact on this depot can reduce the city of Vasco and nearby villages of Vaddem, New Vaddem, Mangoor, Baina, Destero, Chicalim, Bogmallo, Sancoale, Cortalim and even as far as Panjim, Dona Paula, Taleigao, etc to ashes and rubble within minutes. To this again the Project consultant admitted that he was not aware of the ammunition depot and its location. He requested	Please refer the reply at 10.19.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	the Chairman, as disaster management chief to visit the ammunition depot for a first hand assessment.	
10.22	He also stated that there were six schools within a radius of about 300-400 metres of aerial distance. The safety and health of the children is of paramount importance and needs to be considered prior to considering any such disastrous proposals.	Necessary safety precautions will be taken as per the relevant provisions. Standing Operating Procedures will be adopted as per the good practices followed in the developed countries.
10.23	He stated that the South Western Railways is proceeding with the double tracking of the Vasco-Londa route without any EIA study, without which the coal expansion cannot take place. This went on to prove the link between the leases with which MPT is trying hard to push through this project in the guise of helping the fishing community but is actually trying to meet the larger goal of project Sagarmala.	This issue is not relevant to the present project.
10.24	He stated that the present proposal is being considered without finalisation of the CZMP for Goa under CRZ Notification, 2011. Considering the orders of the NGT given in Original Application No. 11 of 2014 and 424 of 2016 and 22 nd November, 2017, the present proposal and this Public Hearing being held today on 5 th October, 2018 are in gross contempt of the orders.	Proposal will be scrutinised by GCZMA. No NGT pending litigations with present project.
10.25	He stated that despite the Constitution of India and our International Commitments, by which it was mandatory to obtain prior consent of indigenous communities as well as engage public participation in development planning, MPT and the Government have taken great pains to hide the coal expansion plans from the indigenous people (in this case the	The allegation is baseless

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	fishing community) and also the people of Goa, and are dangerously threatening the environment and economies of Goa for the private profits of a few.	
10.26	He stated that the project should be rejected because it is unenviable, vitiates EIA notification and nullifies powers and duties of EAC.	No remarks.
10.27	He stated that the project conceals private interests, coal-driven objectives, and violation of policy just to help future development of MPT related to dirty and hazardous cargoes and cruise ships.	Allegations made are not correct.
10.28	He stated that the new location proposed for the POL facility is closer to larger populations, including thousands of fishermen on the narrow finger jetty right next to it.	For POL jetty, permission from PESO will be obtained prior to commissioning of facilities. Necessary fire and safety provisions will be made as per OISD-156 standards.
10.29	He stated that the new location proposed for the POL facility has limited width of access for a long length, restricting evacuations and firefighting and rescue operations, as compared with the present location.	Please refer the reply at 10.28.
10.30	He stated that the EIA report was not made available to the affected people of CCP, Panjim and VP St Cruz, VP Siridao-Pale, VP St Lawrence, VP St Andre, VP Curca-Bambolim-Talaulim, VP Batim and VP Mercedes in Tiswadi, Vasco Municipal Council, VP Chicalim, VP Sancoale, VP Issorcim, VP Chicolna, VP Pale-Velsao, VP Cansaulim-Arossim-Cuelim, VP Cortalim and VP Quelossim in Mormugao and VP Candolim, VP Nerul and VP Reis Magos in Bardez.	GSPCB vide letter No. 11/25/17-PCB-Tech/10913 dated 03.09.2018 issued copies of EIA report to all the local governing bodies, Public Libraries and Public offices as mentioned in EIA Notification of 2006. Hence the allegations made are false.
10.31	He stated that the Project proponent has not carried out any study on marine life, environment and fisheries.	This is not true.
10.32	He stated that if the EIA report and the Sagarmala report are seen together,	Please refer the reply at 10.09.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	then the complete conspiracy unfolds and real objectives of this project becomes evident that the subject relocation of POL handling facilities and fishing trawlers is to only increase coal handling at MPT to enable Vedanta to handle coal/other dirty or hazardous cargoes at Berths 8 and 9.	
10.33	He stated that the project will lead to displacement of the large fleet of fishing boats and trawlers and the massive fishing community at Vasco Bay.	No displacement of fishing activities
10.34	He stated that the project is only to increase coal handling at MPT from present 12.74 MTPA to 51.07 MTPA.	No coal handling is proposed at these berths
10.35	He also stated that since many of his learned predecessors viz. Mr. Abhijit Prabhudesai, Mr. Savio Correia, Mr. Dinesh Dias, Mr. Avinash Tavares, etc have already covered the technical details during their speech which he too wanted to project, however to avoid repetition, he stated that he wished to submit the same in writing so as not to waste the time of the chair as well as of other speakers, but wish to mention it is passing. He requested the Chair that his statement be recorded for official purpose.	No remarks.
10.36	He stated that he had given a large number of reasons as to why the proposed project should be rejected, and since he didn't want to take more time of the chairman, he therefore objects to the subject project and ask for the Terms of Reference for the subject project to be quashed and the EIA Report also to be rejected with directions to consider the project in its entirety of MPT wishes to continue with these coal plans.	This is not true.
11.0	Shri Jose Philip D'Souza, Vasco	

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	Not present when the name called out	
12.0	Shri Salusinho R. Vas, Vasco	
12.1	He stated that 40 years have passed that they were assured that fishing jetty will be provided.	No remarks.
12.2	He sought clarification from MPT with regards to the distance of fishing jetty. However, MPT stated that the same will be given later on.	All the distances are mentioned in the plan of fishing jetty. The distance between the proposed POL jetty and existing Berths 10 & 11 is also mentioned in the same drawing.
12.3	He further stated that at page 22 and 31 of EIA report speaks about development of fishing harbour.	No remarks.
12.4	He stated that MOU is null and void hence new MOU should be signed as per Court orders.	The MoU was signed between MPT, GoG, and GFBOA in December 2016.
12.5	He stated that the people wanted clean and green cargo and full fledged jetty with infrastructure such as freezer, cold storage, etc. But MPT seems to be fooling the people and hence cannot be trusted	All necessary facilities have been considered while planning the fishing jetty.
13.0	Shri. Sudeep Dalvi, Old Goa.	
	Not present when the name called out	
14.0	Shri. Custodio D'Souza, Vasco.	
14.1	He questioned MPT as to whether they are aware that traditional fisherman are there or not.	MPT is aware of traditional fishermen.
14.2	He stated that they have done agitation on 16/04/2011 and stopped MPT's operation for 4 days. Then Central Govt. called for a meeting and asked them to put forth their demands. He stated that demands are: 1) Villages of Khariwada be notified as fisherman Village as per the notification 2011 2) MPT should reconstruct the 66 houses at Khariwada that were demolished. 3) A 360 houses at Khariwada should be	No remarks

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	regularised. 4) Court case pending in the High Court on houses should be withdrawn State govt. had accepted. Today he ask what MPT has decided on these demands.	
14.3	He stated that his association has 100 canoe and uses the Khariwado bay as landing site besides 4 other union which use the Khariwado bay.	No remarks.
14.4	He stated that dredging for the past several years have eroded 40% of the beaches and now remaining area is used as landing site for canoe.	This is not true.
14.5	Stated if the new proposed comes then fishermen of Vasco will be displaced.	No displacement of fishing activities
14.6	He stated that he along with 4 associations has not signed the MOU. therefore, it is null and void and the project needs to be scarped.	The MoU was signed between MPT, GoG, and GFBOA in December 2016.
14.7	Has suggested that the existing jetty needs to be expanded	The subject proposal is to construct a new state of the art fishing jetty for the fishermen of Vasco.
14.8	That the traditional fishermen are fighting for their own cause and livelihood and if MPT does not want to resolve their issues, how can the Public Hearing be continued traditional fishermen.	No remarks.
14.9	That the dredging has already commenced.	Only maintenance dredging was in progress during EPH.
14.10	MPT has been doing illegal dredging but has stopped it.	No comments.
14.11	To sign MoU traditional fishermen were called. Initially MPT was not aware or do not want to know that traditional fishermen are there. Without fishermen there will not be boats.	No remarks.
14.12	He stated that when MoU regarding construction of fishing jetty was to be signed, it had to come prior to 8 days so as to go through the MoU. He had come to sign MoU but to falsity not signed.	No remarks.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

14.13	He further stated that 160 canoes operate from Berth No. 11 and to berth canoes they require the beach. MPT wants to make the beach half and want to allow only half the place on the beach even though no ownership documents are with MPT.	No remarks
14.14	Since no Public Hearing was conducted for Berth No. 10 & 11, they have gone ahead to grab our land and our existence.	The construction of Berth No. 10 started prior to 1985 and the same was commissioned in 1985. Similarly, Berth No. 11 was commissioned in 1993. Berth No. 11 is having EC, whereas Berth No. 10 was commissioned prior to the enactment of Environment Protection Act, 1986.
14.15	We demand that no further illegality and harassment will be allowed. MPT is not helping any fishermen on contrary wants to destroy our boats.	This is not true.
15.0 Shri Olencio Simoes, General Secretary, GRE		
15.1	He sought to know from the Collector South as to why no action had been taken on his objections for violation of TOR submitted in his office.	No remarks
15.2	He stated that he is not satisfied with the answer hence he is proceeding under protest.	No remarks.
15.3	He stated that this project is a clear violation of Environment Protection Act 1986, EIA Notification 2006, CRZ 2011, Wildlife Protection Act 1972, Indian Forest Act, Indian Fishing Act, Act 21,14, 47. He stated that the TOR compliance given is in violation.	This is not true.
15.4	He sought to know as to within the 10 Km radius of the project, how many beach areas are affected. He also asked when the study was conducted to verify this.	The names of beaches are listed in the draft EIA report at pages 11 & 12. No beaches are affected
15.5	He questioned that MPT cannot answer basic question and whether the consultant has visited the beaches or not. He stated that on page 11	Based on actual ground survey information is listed on page No.11.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	many historical places and tourist places. Consultant replied that he has visited beaches and it is recorded in EIA report.	
15.6	He stated that the statement that only one bay is affected is misleading. He sought to know the names of the beaches affected and he also asked the consultant when was he present to conduct the study.	The Ultra-tech team was present from March 2017 to May 2017 for conducting the baseline study. Any missing information will be incorporated in Final EIA report if required.
15.7	He stated that the report states that only Vasco Bay is affected which is in violation of the EIA. He stated that 15 beaches i.e. from Caranzalem, Dona Paula, Miramar, Siridao, Bambolim, Nauxim, Cacra, Khariwado, Issorcim, Desterro, Baina, Bogmalo, Hollant, Santarem, Velsao are affected by the project. Further besides beaches, Bays are also affected. He stated that main impact is hidden.	None of the beaches mentioned by the speaker will be affected in any way by the proposed project.
15.8	With respect to point no 1 of TOR compliance, he sought to know which site was selected for the project and further why Khariwadda was selected. MPT did not answer stating that the question was already answered. He state that Beside that the impact of the site will have the following impact: Impacts on water quality is that the Breakwaters and landfills will change current patterns and cause stagnation of water behind the structures. If municipal or industrial effluent flows into a port, stagnant port water may deteriorate through a dramatic increase of phytoplankton and a decrease of dissolved oxygen, resulting from eutrophication of water, caused by effluents containing nutrient salts (chemical compounds including N and P). Anaerobic water leads to the generation of hydrogen sulphide (H ₂ S)	Impacts and mitigation study has been elaborated in Chapter 4 and site specific EMP has been proposed in Chapter 8. The impacts enlisted by the speaker are exaggerated and considering the quality of sea water with respect to the tested samples, these impacts are practically not possible.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

<p>and can be identified by its odour. It has serious effects on marine organisms. Impacts on coastal hydrology is on the location of this site will cause changes in current patterns and littoral drifts due to alteration of wave refraction, diffraction and reflection. The change of littoral drift may lead to erosion or accretion in shore zones. Altered currents or reflected waves may endanger small ships maneuvering near structures. The creation of this project may cause changes in river flow and waterfront drainage. Impacts on bottom contamination is the location of the site will accelerate sediment deposition in stagnant water behind structures and cause contamination of the sea bottom. Sediment deposition covers bottom biota and physical habitat. Pile structures shade the bottom and affect habitat. Eutrophication of water induces sedimentation of dead plankton and changes chemical characteristics of bottom sediments, resulting in an increase of organic matter, hydrogen sulphide, and mobilization of harmful substances. Impacts on marine/coastal ecology is the location of the site will affect aquatic fauna and flora through changes of water quality, coastal hydrology and bottom contamination. Land reclamation from the sea destroys bottom habitat and displaces fishery resources. Terrestrial fauna and flora will also be altered by the location of a port. Diminution of bottom biota is usually linked to a reduction of fishery resources, and occasionally to an increase of undesirable species. Deterioration of water quality usually gives rise to</p>	
--	--

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	changes in aquatic biota: a decrease in the number of species; and an increase in the quantity of one or two specific species. Further deterioration will lead to the destruction of all kinds of aquatic biota. Diminution of plants in a shore zone within enclosed water will degrade its aeration capability and worsen water pollution. Mangroves in wetlands play an important role in providing habitat for terrestrial and aquatic biota and indirectly recovering water quality.	
15.9	He stated that the Chicalim Bay has to be surveyed and mapped under CRZ 2011 and due to non compliance by State Government has to have CZMP Plan in place. Goa Coastal Zone Management Plan (CZMP) has not been finalized till date as per NGT order of Nov 22nd 2017. So this site is in violation of CRZ notification 2011. Under the CRZ 2011 The Government of Goa shall notify the fishing villages and khariwado is a fishing village and you have acknowledged in assurance made by MPT and GOG to Traditional fisherfolk of Kharewado dated 16-04-2011 that the khariwado bay will be declared as fishing village.	CRZ map within 10km radius has been mapped by IRS, Anna university and the same is incorporated in EIA report. Finalization of CZMP and Notification of fishing villages are in State Government's purview and the present project is not having any relation with the same.
15.10	He stated that Sancoale bay, Mangroves near Chicalim Bay Corals at Grande Island just 3 Kms from site but MPT says it is 7 kms. He stated that the Aerial is less than 3 kms.	Grande island is 7km away from the project site through the water. Aerial distance has no relevance for the type of the project in question.
15.11	Mr. Simoes stated that the statements in the EIA report is misleading. He stated that the site is completely misfit and needs to be rejected due to various impact on environment.	This is not true.
15.12	He stated that POL compliance point 3 regarding Land use. He stated that MPT cannot claim ownership on	MPT requires no permission in its operational area for Port related activities.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	account of Portuguese handing over the land to them. He seeks clarification on the above from MPT and also obtain permissions has been taken for construction of office on land ward side.	The ownership of land and water area belong to Port.
15.13	He stated that all TOR replies are misleading and false and hence he had sought for postponement of the Public Hearing.	No remarks.
15.14	TOR compliance regarding number of water bodies. He seeks clarification regarding number of waterbodies from MPT.	The number of water bodies is specified in EIA and any left out water body will be listed in the Final EIA report.
15.15	He stated that the project site is 10 Kms and all water bodies are not included.	Missing water bodies will be studied and will be incorporated in the Final EIA report.
15.16	He demands that as false information is given, in the EIA report as per declaration on draft EIA report, action must be initiated on CE, MPT.	This is not true.
15.17	With respected to the 2 springs in Bogda, sancoale lake, kesarval spring, 2 Bogmallo springs, velsao lake, Bondava Lake, sanjiv lake, sulabhat lake, Batim lake, Mala lake, Goa Velha lake and what about seasonal lake and non seasonal lake not in EIA and hence it is in violation of TOR.	None of the listed water bodies will be influenced by the present project.
15.18	TOR compliance point 10; regarding position of HTL/LTL in the map. MPT replied that the map is attached in Appendix II. He stated that this compliance is in violation as; The EIA draft report includes Appendix II HTL/LTL Map Prepared by IRS, Anna University Chennai. This map is meant to demarcate the high tide line, low tide line and various CRZ areas as per the CRZ notification of 2011. But it is evident from the legend of the map that the consultant has used the recently proposed, yet to be notified, new proposal for zonation in CRZ areas	CRZ map is prepared by IRS Anna University as per CRZ Notification of 2011. GSPCB officials stated that PCB is only recording the minutes as per EIA Notification of 2011.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	<p>for eg CRZ – 1B, CRZ IV A, CRZ IVB. To propose a project based on a draft notification 2018 is beyond absurd and is definitely legally untenable (1) CZMP for Goa is not finalised, (2) Fishing villages not finalised. He further stated that the Map at Appendix II is illegal as the map shows CRZ demarcation that are not as per CRZ 2011. He stated that the details regarding the exact clause of CRZ notification will be furnished. He seeks an answer from the GSPCB regarding the demarcation of CRZ Zones.</p>	
15.19	<p>He states that the map at Appendix II is a per draft CRZ Notification 2018, which is a serious violation.</p>	<p>Map at Appendix II is as per CRZ 2011 Notification</p>
15.20	<p>TOR compliance no 11 regarding shoreline changes at site regarding map attached at Appendix VII. Mormugao coast and coastline of Goa is highly vulnerable as per report of NIO and NCSCM (regarding carrying of capacity of beaches report) The above statement is false and fabricated as Historical shoreline change analysis for the coast of Goa has been analysed for the period from 1972 to 2010 (38 years). Multiple shorelines extracted from satellite images were used to calculate shoreline change rates using Digital Shoreline Analysis System (DSAS) model developed by United States Geological Survey (USGS) in an ArcGIS environment. Overall for a coastal stretch of about 105 km, 35% of the coast is rocky terrain, 20% of the coast is stable, 27% is under erosion (i.e. 24% of erosion and 3% of artificial coast) and 17% of the coasts experiences accretion. River mouths and port areas experience significant erosion characteristics under the report of Prof Ramesh Ramachandran</p>	<p>Please refer the reply at 3.3(u) of this document.</p>

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	<p>of NCSCM Carrying Capacity of Beaches of Goa for Providing Shacks & Other Temporary Seasonal Structures in Private Areas. The 7,516.6 k.m. coastline in the country, 42% of the coast has already been washed away and the main cause is the unplanned ports / harbours which are also documented by National Institute of Port Management. An example of such a situation is the Pondicherry harbour which build a new deep-water port and due to this the town's beautiful sand beach disappeared and the fishing villages got destroyed. All this was due to unplanned expansion of port and dredging. Union Minister of State (Independent Charge) for Science and Technology and Earth Sciences Jitendra Singh "The study conducted by the Pune-based Central Water and Power Research Station found out that over the years the problem of coastal erosion has accelerated, and presently about 25 km is affected,</p>	
15.21	<p>Yet same agency NCZMA is the map at Appendix I now says coastline is not vulnerable. Hence, statement of TOR compliance is false and fabricated.</p>	<p>This is not true.</p>
15.22	<p>He stated that the report of NCSCM states that coastline and port area experiences significant erosion. This is supported by statement of local fishermen.</p>	<p>This is not true.</p>
15.23	<p>He stated with reference to 2nd point of TOR, detailed land pattern is not mentioned. He stated that MPT is the encroacher as no ownership documents are with MPT as already pointed out by Mr. Savio Correia.</p>	<p>This is not true. Land use plan is included in Chapter 3.</p>
15.24	<p>He stated that 25 Km coastline is affected and in assessment report it is stated that more than 20 % of the coastline is affected. He sought to</p>	<p>There is no adverse impact on shore lines due to this project</p>

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	know how much coastline can be affected.	
15.25	He stated that the statement of the MPT and the consultant are contradictory.	This is not true.
15.26	He spoke that about shoreline erosion misleading statement are being made. He stated that MPT has shamelessly manipulated and mislead in the EIA report.	This is not true.
15.27	He stated that no study is done as they first of all do not known as to how many beaches are there. Shoreline changes NCSEF.	No remarks.
15.28	He points out point 12 of TOR. Detail plan at 203 =- no sufficient data provided and misleading figure. Data shown no clarity what will be maintained dredging is shown. He sought to know the length and breadth of the area of fishing harbour.	The drawing showing detailed dimensions of the proposed fishing jetty will be incorporated in the Final EIA report.
15.29	He stated that 15 lakh cubic meter of silt in dredging were misleading information and violation of TOR and what about maintenance of dredging	The quantity of 15 lakh m ³ is on account of capital dredging involved in the proposed project and the same is mentioned in EIA report. As per the studies, maintenance dredging will be about 0.34 cum same will be incorporated in EIA report.
15.30	He stated that the report says that for the breakwater dredging of 9 to 20 meters. Even details of maintenance dredging will be provided in compliance.	Details will be provided. The proposed capital dredging at Breakwater berths is of 2m depth only. Additional maintenance dredging quantity is negligible.
15.31	He stated that every statement is in violation of EP Act and EIA notification. False and misleading is made and no proper data is provided in EIA. Strict legal action has to be initiated against. MPT for making mockery of Law.	This is not true. EIA report is prepared based on primary data gathered on the site and environs. Information provided by MPT and secondary data was gathered from available published sources.
15.32	Handling of each cargo detail measures – Chapter 2.1 explanation given. Chapter 2.24 – Storage facility given. No details of area	Details of storage facilities are available and the same will be included in Final EIA report.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	demarcation/location given fabricated document, misleading information.	
15.33	He stated that details of fishing activity the likely impact on it due to construction in the bay etc., misleading information.	Impacts on fishing activity are discussed in Chapter 4 and appropriate mitigation measures are also and piling on marine environment proposed.
15.34	He stated that chapter 2.3 doesn't mentioned a single word of and likely impacts on the fishing activity due to the project. Specific study on impacts of construction and piling on marine life at khariwado bay.	With reference to Chapter 2.3 - the impact of construction will be reviewed and additions if any, will be incorporated in the Final EIA Report.
15.35	He stated that the fishing jetty is exclusively built for fishing trawlers and motorized fishing vessels that is only for The Goa Boat Owner's Association only.	No remarks.
15.36	But chapter 2.3 doesn't speak threat to 2000 traditional fishermen families i.e canoe owners, as five canoe owners association that is Old Cross Canoe Association Owners Co-operative, Society Ltd, Baina Ramponkar, Fishing Canoe Owners Society, Desterro Fisherman's Association, St Andrew fisherman association uses the bay of landing site and fish in the Khariwado bay.	The figure of 2000 traditional fishermen seems to be high. The details of traditional fishermen will be reviewed and incorporated in Final EIA report.
15.37	The impacts of construction and piling on marine life is that Depletion of nutrients and organic matter along with reduced mud and silt deposition affects benthic life on the continental shelf. Impacts of Construction and piling on marine life are as follows, the Impacts on water quality, the Pile driving, deposition of rubble, dredging, sand compaction and other construction work in water cause resuspension of sediments and turbid water. Resuspension of sediments in water leads to an increase in the level of suspended solids (88) and in the concentration of organic matter,	Appropriate mitigation measures during construction and operation phases of the project are elaborated in Chapter 4 and Chapter 8. Necessary Impact and mitigation study will be elaborated with respect to fishing activity and socio-economic aspects in the Final EIA report.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

<p>possibly to toxic or harmful levels. It also reduces sunlight penetration. Work vessels are a cause of oil spills, garbage discharge, and leakage of other substances into water. Diffusion from concrete work in water and overflows from landfills will be sources of water pollution. The Impacts on coastal hydrology and the potential impacts of construction on coastal hydrology are nearly the same as the potential impacts of the location of a port .Dredging causes changes in current patterns and flows as well as salt wedge intrusion into a river mouth or littoral drifts in the shore zone. Changes in littoral drifts lead to beach erosion or accretion. Disposal of dredged material may possibly cause leakage of harmful substances into ground water or changes in waterfront drainage. Impacts on bottom contamination of Construction work and dredging disturb bottom sediments and induce resuspension, dispersal and settlement of such sediments. Dumping of dredged material directly alters bottom configuration and biota and disperse toxic or harmful chemicals around the disposal site. Dredging removes bottom habitat and lead to a loss of fishery resources. Impacts on marine/coastal ecology of the Disturbance from construction activities cause displacement of fishery resources and other mobile bottom biota. Dredging removes bottom biota and dumping of dredged material covers bottom habitat, both of which may reduce fishery resources. Settlement of resuspended sediments on fragile marine fauna and flora damages the ecosystem particularly</p>	
---	--

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	<p>coral reefs, which are formed by the extracellular product of symbiotic plants. The great number of coral polyps attached need dissolved oxygen for respiration and the plants need sunlight for photosynthesis. Piles, concrete surfaces, rubble mounds and other similar structures in water could form new habitats, which will introduce undesirable species. If toxic substances and other contaminants are resuspended through dredging or dumping, will led to contamination of fishery and shellfishery resources.</p>	
15.38	<p>He wanted to know how in the meeting how many boat owner association were there. MPT stated that 2 canoe owners and one boat owner. MOU is signed and it is mentioned on that MOU.</p>	No remarks.
15.39	<p>He stated that this is not as per knowledge of so many fisherman community. Hence, they are bound to know.</p>	No remarks.
15.40	<p>He stated that as per the TOR they are needed to submit compliance on fishing activity and association etc., No consent taken from fishing community or association. He stated that this is a misleading distorted and destroyed their right. Which is violation or United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, which was adopted by the General Assembly on September 13, 2007. Of particular importance is the right to Free, Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) as indicated in Articles 10, 11, 19, and 28.</p>	This is not true.
15.41	<p>Piling deposits of rubble, sand compaction etc., causes turbid water, increasing SS, in case of oil spill in water, water pollution, coastal hydrology is affected.</p>	Pages 142 &143 of the draft EIA have addressed impacts due to construction activity.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

15.42	He stated that all facts are misleading. He stated that what is the time taken by the coral reefs regrowth.	This is not true.
15.43	He sought details of oil spill contingency plan at Appendix V. The effect of oil spillage Impacts on water quality, the Discharges from ships that could be sources of water pollution are bilge water, ballast water, oily wastes, sewage, garbage and other residues in a ship. Spills of oils, lubricants, fuels and other oily liquids may be other sources of water pollution. Once an oil or oily compound is discharged into water, it is spread on the surface by winds and currents, forming a thin layer. On the surface of seas in tropical or temperate zones, oils can be polymerized gradually by biodegradation and eventually form dense particles which sink. Concentration of oily compounds in water is an important indicator of water quality, particularly in recreational water areas. Repair docks may be a possible source of toxic or harmful materials such as anti foulants, paints, or heavy metals. The impacts on marine and coastal ecology the Leakage of oils, oily wastes and mixtures may directly cause damage to fishery resources, aquatic biota and coastal habitat. Biodegradation of oil also generates polymerizedoil particles and toxic aromatic fractions using dissolved oxygen in the water, which indirectly cause damages to bottom biota and habitat. Both effects may seriously damage marine and coastal ecology. Fishery resources, including shellfish, may be spoiled by oil and toxic substances generated by biodegradation. Some oils contain carcinogens and their contamination is	Oil Spill Contingency Plan is given at page 331of the draft EIA. Chapter 4 and Chapter 8 depict the impacts and mitigation measures and project specific EMP. Impacts and mitigation measures are elaborated both for construction and operation phases of the project. Ships also segregate their waste in-house in to components such as bio-degradable, non bio-degradable, bilge water, ballast water, sewage water, etc. Licenced contractors from GSPCB collect bilge water and oily waste and treat it in their facilities as approved by GSPCB. For untreated solid waste is collected by contractors who are registered with MMC and the same is disposed at MMC's solid waste treatment plant. For sewage collected through night soil tankers and

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	<p>reported in fishery resources. The impact on air quality and Ships are a possible source of airborne emissions such as gasses, smoke, soot and fumes. NO₂ and SO₂ are typical pollutants generated by ships while both manoeuvring and berthing and may affect air pollution in the hinterland. The management of waste which Ships generate: (a) oily wastes such as bilge water, ballast water, washing water, lubricant oil and other residues in machinery space; (b) sewage and garbage; and (c) cargo residues such as wood bark. Discharges and spills of these wastes cause problems of oil pollution, floating garbage, unsanitary conditions, odour and other degradation of water quality. The Socio-cultural Impacts of Oil and oily wastes which discharged from ships may reach nearby beaches and spoil recreational activities which cause serious damage to tourism. Ship traffic may disturb pleasure boat cruising and fishery boat operations. The possibility of accidents in the ship traffic becomes a worry to local people. Ship calls create many related jobs including pilotage, tug services, stevedoring, bunker and crew services, however, they may bring considerable changes in the life style of local people.</p>	
15.44	<p>He stated that the EIA report does not speak about any litigations. He stated that there are two litigations which are already pending.. This statement is false as two litigation pending on BEFORE THE NATIONAL GREEN TRIBUNAL, WESTERN ZONE BENCH, PUNE M.A. No.210/2017 (WZ),M.A. No.211/2017(WZ) and In Appeal No.10/2016 (WZ) In the matter of Old</p>	<p>There is no litigation pending with respect to the present project.</p>

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	Cross Fishing Canoe Owners Co-operative Society V/s Mormugao Port Trust regarding dredging matter and IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY, AT GOA	
15.45	He stated that the shoreline impact study (Chapter 4.4 & 4.5) is false and impact due to dredging is for 15 kms area. This is anti-people project and hence trying to suppress facts. Grande island is a coral rich area which is 3 Kms away from the project site and whether permission is taken.	As far as distances are concerned please refer reply at 15.10. It may be noted that Grande Island is not a notified entity and hence, no permission is taken.
15.46	Grande Island archipelago has Coral Reefs, the world wide fund (WWF) for nature and National Institute of Oceanography (NIO) are studying coral reefs.	No remarks
15.47	Grande Island archipelago is approximately 3km from Vasco coast, the WWF Study funded by the international Union for Conservation of Nature –Mangroves for the future the coral reef growth at depth of 4-5mts and are home to 18 species of fish life, including parrotfish, butterfly fish, damselfish and fauna such as sea urchins and sea cucumbers. Various groups of fishes identified from the island include snapper, grouper, fusilier, dragon fish, bat fish, pufferfish, butterfly fish, wrasse, damsel fish, carangid, moray eels, pennant coral fish, surgeon fish, filefish, angel fish, frogfish, cardinal fish, stone fish, blennies, porcupine fish, box fish, ray, sea horse, finger fish, sweetlip, rubberlip, monacle bream, rabbit fish, moorish idol, barracuda and red mullet among others.	Primary marine biodiversity data was collected through site visits. Additional data was collected through available secondary sources.
15.48	Sea horse is protected under the sub-section (1) of section 61 of the Wildlife (Protection) Act, 1972 (53 of 1972)	No remarks

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	and Coastal Regulation Zone Notification of 2011.	
15.49	Coral Reefs serve as a protective barrier around coasts, they create and support living biomass and serve as an important food source for marine species.	No comments.
15.50	The most common coral reef are tabletop corals said Baban Ingole fisheries scientist at NIO.	No remarks.
15.51	Coral Reefs are protected under the as the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 and the Coastal Regulation Zone Notification of 2011 , Wildlife (Protection) Act, (WPA) 1972 and Indian Forest Act, 1927, the Forest Conservation Act, 1980 and the Indian Fisheries Act.	No comments.
15.52	Sancoale constitutes a back water complex with a network of creeks and lagoons influenced by the tide, twice daily. Dense fringing mangroves adorn the river bank and the lagoon system, as can be observed from the Zuari bridge.	No comments
15.53	The Survey of India (SoI) Toposheets of 1964 and Naval Hydrographic Office (NHO) charts drawn subsequently can be used to study the morphology and the areal extent of these mud flats.	No comments
15.54	Presently, the river bank of Sancoale is marked by a prominent mud flat that gets fully exposed during the low tide. This geological feature in fact extends from Zuari bridge up to Chicalim bay, a distance of about 6 kilometres. Visual megascopic observations indicate that the sediment is composed of sand near the bank where as silty clay dominates the deeper strip. This marine deposit forms the second largest tidal flat within the estuarine systems of Goa.	No comments
15.55	Similarly, along the opposite bank, the stretch from Agassaim to Siridao is	No comments

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	again characterized by another tidal flat which gets sub-aerially exposed at low tide. This feature also extends up to around 1.6 kilometres into the Zuari River. The Sancoale and the Siridao mud flats make this part of the river extremely shallow. Mud flats are protected under CRZ 2011.	
15.56	A comparison of SoI and NHO maps indicate that both the tidal flats formed over the last 60 years at least. The Siridao flat has extended considerably in space and time, the Sancoale – Chicalim linear deposit has remained unchanged. Generally, tidal flats are located in estuaries and low energy marine environments and at places where fine-grain sediments accumulate. The Sancoale mud flat could be termed as inter-tidal, as a maximum of around 1 kilometre (from the bank into the river) gets exposed during low tides owing to the shallow nature of such habitats.	No comments
15.57	The functions of riverine tidal flats are documented globally. These accreted sediments perform the functions of a buffer zone between the land and the deeper sea thereby protecting inter-tidal habitats by dissipating wave energy. More importantly, such habitats reduce and even eliminate erosion.	No remarks.
15.58	Under the CRZ 2011 notification, mud flats are classified under CRZ I since they are biologically active and hence ecologically sensitive; no interference is permitted in such environments. Being a tidally influenced water body and a mangrove marsh setting adjacent to a saline river, the entire area also falls within the No Development Zone (NDZ) according to the CRZ 2011 notification. Therefore,	No comments

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	the Sancoale mud flat is one such sensitive ecosystem that cannot be tampered with.	
15.59	Therefore, any unwarranted interference in the mud flat system can have a drastic long term ramification – sediment deficit, consequent deepening, rapid erosion of an erstwhile stable river bank, and invasion of river water into the hinterland. It is precisely due to the fragile nature and ecological sensitivity of mud flats that these habitats are protected by law.	No comments
15.60	Based on the data of Goa State Biodiversity Board, the Sancoale - Chicalim strip is a confirmed site for Window Pane Oyster and a habitat for diverse marine organisms such as shrimps, clams and crabs. Independent research by NIO scientists had also confirmed the richness of benthic population as this bay is not only the habitat but also a breeding site for the Window Pane Oyster species, listed as endangered under the Wildlife Protection Act 1972. Therefore, the impact of dredging on the habitat, bathymetry and evolution of the fragile mud flats of Sancoale bay is manifold. Remobilization of sediment will endanger the stability of the bank and the population dynamics of diverse bivalves in the bay as well as the permanently established clam bed in the vicinity. Scouring of an established and productive mud flat can be frightening and can be the worst environmental impact that one can expect.(Dr Antonio Mascarenhas is a former Scientist, NIO, Goa.)	No remarks.
15.61	Dredged quantity of 16 lakhs Cubic meter of silty clay and clayey silt which will inturn destroy the entire	This is not true.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

<p>khariwado beach and also Caranzalem, Dona Paula, Miramar, Siridao, Bambolim, Nauxim, Cakra, Khariwado, Issorcim, <i>Desterro</i>, Baina, Bogmalo, Hollant, Santarem, Velsao. The proposed project will dredge around 16 lakhs Cubic meter of silty clay and clayey silt. This will result in degradation of the ecosystem and will destroy the ecology of the region, the soil deposit in any water body have a certain pre disposed composition thus through dredging this composition will be altered and because of the said alteration the existing habitat of creatures and organisms that depend on the original composition of the soil will die out due to non-favourableness of the changes caused. The said alteration in the turbidity of the soil under the water also changes this causes problems by way of creation of newer and harmful organisms, transferring of unwanted organisms to other parts in the water-body leading to wider spread of contamination and organic processes by way of release of extra and unwanted nutrients. The removing gravel (founded stones) from river /sea beds by dredging leads to the loss of spawning (eggs depositing spaces) grounds for fish, and can cause loss of some species, the removal of river / sea bank soils disturbs the habitat of river / sea bank fauna such as otters (mammals) and water voles and this will lead to change in chemical composition of water. This will affect the fish and other aquatic organisms and lead to a depletion in the fish / shell fish catch and in turn deprive the fishermen from Caranzalem, Dona Paula, Miramar, Siridao, Bambolim, Nauxim, Cakra,</p>	
--	--

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	Khariwado, Issorcim, Desterro, Baina, Bogmalo, Hollant, Santarem, Velsao of their livelihood.	
15.62	The Capital dredging will lead to erosion of the seabed and beach at the Caranzalem, Dona Paula, Miramar, Siridao, Bambolim, Nauxim, Cakra, Khariwado, Issorcim, Desterro, Baina, Bogmalo, Hollant, Santarem, Velsao beach and will lead to collapsing of river beds in the nearby villages of Sancoale, Cortalim, Quelossim and Chicalim as the River Zuari flows past these villages at a stretch of around 10 kms and meets the Arabian Sea at Dabolim. About 20% of the 105 km of Goa's coastline has already been affected by erosion, the Colvale area in North Goa and River Talpona in South Goa is already affected by erosion in the last monsoon. If such large scale of Capital dredging is done then this will cause floods in the neighbouring villages and it will also cause destruction of Corals and coral reefs, Turtle nesting grounds, Horse shoe crabs habitats, Sea grass beds, Mudflats and also Nesting grounds of birds etc. the dredging will lead to collapse of the river beds thereby leading to water logging of all low lying areas surrounding the rivers and will further aggravate the already fast eroding coast of Caranzalem, Dona Paula, Miramar, Siridao, Bambolim, Nauxim, Cakra, Khariwado, Issorcim, Desterro, Baina, Bogmalo, Hollant, Santarem, Velsao.	Capital dredging quantity is only 1.50 million cum and apprehensions are not correct.
15.63	The Capital dredging of such large volume will affect the rocky shoreline. As a result, the stability of the sea cliff / Headland Sada may be at stake, due to the fact that the sea-facing laterite	This is not true.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	sea cliffs are highly vulnerable to collapse	
15.64	He stated that this projects were CRZ plan is not complete and this area are to be notified in protected area and the project will be reduced to garbage hence by suppressing the facts. Dredging impact is not been reflected in the report.	None of the environmental entities within the study area (10 km radius) are notified as protected as per MoEF & CC. Dredging impacts are included, however the same will be reviewed and additions will be incorporated in the Final EIA Report.
15.65	ISPS code whether fishing trawler and canoes are in violation of ISPS code. Khariwada Fishing Jetty, fishing boats, trawlers, canoes, etc. are considered by captain of ships expressing grave concern about the security regime of MPT and hence the ISPS compliance of MPT has been questioned and it may loose ISPS compliance This has been published and clarified in a public Notice dated 3 rd Notice 2009 by MPT Notice.MPT clarifies that such fishing jetty has to moved out from Vasco Bay. So, the question is raised as to how the security of the ships and the ISPS code is compromised. The example of Mumbai terrorist attack 26/11, 2008 which came by fishing trawlers should not be forgotten and such incidents can again happen considering our unprotected coastline. A security wall separating the POL/Cargo berth and Fishing harbour will not solve the security concerns as the approach of fishing boats/trawlers are in same vicinity. Considering the security of the foreign tourist and the local population of Vasco, I strongly oppose such hazardous POL berth, passenger ship berth, Cargo berths next to the fishing jetty. I propose a dedicated Fish Jetty for the fishermen.	Suggestions not agreed to.
15.66	He stated that Form I details of school/church/ temples etc. are not	Details of school/church/ temples etc. were gathered through socio economic survey on actual ground basis and

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	provided correctly. He state that the information in Form I is misleading.	available secondary resources, same will be reviewed and necessary relevant information will be added in Final EIA report.
15.67	Municipal School, Municipal building-0.400 kms Government High school, Swantra-path – 0.500kms, St. Joseph Institute, Vasco – 0.500kms	Please refer the reply at 15.66.
15.68	St. Andrew school and college – 0.600kmsChicalim cottage Hospital - 2.2 kms,St. Andrew church build in 1594,0.600kms,Desterro Church – 1.00kms,Damodar Temple-0.50kms, Sanjeevani Hospital-1.2kms	Please refer the reply at 15.66.
15.69	Airport -3.0kms,The St.Cosme and St.Damian Church is in Bogmalo. The <i>Bogmalo church</i> was originally a chapel built in March 1784.	Please refer the reply at 15.66.
15.70	Our Lady of Exile Church, <u>Desterro</u> was built in 1672.Our Lady of Candelaria Church, Baina, Goabuilt before 1796.	Please refer the reply at 15.66.
15.71	St. Francis Xavier Church, Chicalim, built in 1747,St. Jacinto Church, 1789,Our Lady of Health Church at Sancoale 1566	Please refer the reply at 15.66.
15.72	Saint Joseph Vaz Sanctuary,St Philip and James Church1566.	Please refer the reply at 15.66.
15.73	Ayyappa Temple, 1978. MANGOR HILL,VASCO DA GAMA.	Please refer the reply at 15.66.
15.74	Shree Mahadev Temple, Alto Chicalim, all this information is missing Action plan for disposal of dredged soil and rocks.Dredged material will be disposed off in the existing marine spoil grounds identified and demarcated by CWPRS, Pune.	Please refer the reply at 15.66.
15.75	The above documentation is false and fabricated as it is a cut copy paste of "Proposed deepening of Approach Channel and Inner Basin for Capsize Vessels at Mormugao Port" by M/s. Mormugao Port Trust, Headland Sada-Goa" and not ofProposed	This is not true.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	Modernization and Expansion of Port Infrastructure for Fishing, Coastal, Multipurpose Cargo Berth and Liquid /General Cargo at Mormugao Port, Goa.	
15.76	There is no whatsoever details of how Dredged material will be disposed. No details of location and impact on marine life. Dredged material should be use for beach nourishment and not dumped any other place.	Disposal details of the dredged material are mentioned in the EIA Report. The dredged material is basically clay and as such it cannot be used for reclamation.
15.77	Hoping that you consider the above objections and scrape the project in totality and do the needful at the earliest as the above proposed project is in violation of law and therefore will be threat to our livelihoods.	This is not true.
15.78	Finally he summarised that he wants to know as to fishing jetty will be under whose jurisdiction. What guarantee is there it will be with the fishing association. What measures for preventing beach erosion .	The fishing jetty will be constructed by MPT and handed over to the State Govt. for operation and maintenance. There is no beach erosion as per NIO and NCSCM report.
15.79	The site of traditional fisherman not mentioned and if the site is destroyed.	The detailed plan shows the area reserved for canoe owners.
15.80	How many will be affected and what provisions made for compensating this loss.	Nobody will be affected and there will be no loss
15.81	Requested for strict action as this project is in clear violation of all environmental laws.	This is not true.
15.82	He asked the Collector to file an FIR against MPT Management. FIR Under Section 15 in The Environment (Protection) Act, 1986 and Section 167 of IPC against Chief Engineer L.A.Mathew and Shekhar M. Tamhane, Managing Director of ULTRA-TECH for giving misleading information	This is not true.
15.83	Therefore the above project is in violation of Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) notification2006, Coastal Regulation Zone (CRZ)2011 notification,Protection of Wildlife Act,	This is false.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	1972, Wildlife (Protection) Act, (WPA) 1972 and Indian Forest Act, 1927, the Forest Conservation Act, 1980 and the Indian Fisheries Act. Therefore the above plans need to be scraped in toto.	
15.84	He objected to the entire project. He stated that the existing jetty to be modernised and world class fishing jetty to be developed.	No remarks.
15.85	He completely opposed this project.	No remarks.
16.0 Shri Nelson Mascarenhas, St. Jose de Areal, Margao-Goa.		
16.1	Have come to seek answer whether Double tracking of railway track at Sao Jose de Areal for transportation of coal/iron ore.	This is not relevant to the proposed project.
16.2	Seeks clarification from MPT as to whether double tracking of railway at Sao Jose de Areal is for coal?	Please refer the reply at 16.1.
16.3	He stated that the double tracking in our village are built purposely because to transport the coal only.	Please refer the reply at 16.1.
16.4	He stated 90% of people staying in the village are ST's staying in Sao Jose De Areal belong to the ST community and their livelihood depends mainly on agriculture.	The village of San-Jose-de-Areal is not within the study area of the present project.
16.5	For last few years Sao Jose de Areal Village has been polluted due to coal handling activity of Goa Carbon Factory and the transportation of the coal. People of the said village have already filed a complaint in the Human Rights and it is known that the case is waiting for the final hearing and the judgement will be in favour of the villagers.	Please refer the reply at 16.1.
16.6	States that he has worked for Royal Cruise Lines and has experience in this field. He seeks clarification from MPT regarding the Royal Caribbean Cruise Lines Oasis class Capacity of cruise vessel.	No remarks

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

16.7	He states that MPT is seeking cruise liner at MPT but is unprepared for casualty. The Oasis class passenger ships capacity is total 8000 passengers including the crew because he had already worked on that ship. He asked for the MPT if the Disaster takes place while these ships are docked in a port how the MPT is going to handle the casualty of 8000 lives from that passenger ship.	Please refer the reply at 16.1.
16.8	He seeks to know no. Of ships visiting MPT yearly during iron ore Boom in 2010 across the world hazardous cargo docks from passengers berth at other ports.	Please refer the reply at 16.1.
16.9	He states that at one time while he was working on a cruise line, passenger vessel docked at MPT during the same time.	No remarks.
16.10	When he was on that Passenger ship Iron ore was being loaded next to the same passenger ship and passengers had to suffer from this dust pollution. After the passenger ship left, they had to hold the ship in the anchorage and they washed the ship completely because the dust was accumulated on the entire open decks on the ship and the guest commented on the comment card of that cruise that they never ever want to come back to Goa again.He state that Goa is a beautiful State and we should not destroy it for benefit of few.	Please refer the reply at 16.1.
16.11	He demand that a passenger jetty should not be built near a coal handling terminal Iron ore and hazardous cargos.	No remarks
16.12	He said that in the year 1990's the western ports used to have the same handling terminal, close to the Passenger ships with the other dangerous cargos and due to this	No remarks.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	many accidents had taken place and then because of this, due to the several complaints done by the passenger ships they already built the completely new ports for the passenger only and they shifted all the dangerous and pollution creating cargos far far away from the passenger berth.	
16.13	He state that Goa is a beautiful State and we should not destroy it for benefit of few.	No remarks.
17.0	Smt. Taniya Devaiah, Sancoale	
17.1	She refers to Chapter I of the EIA report.	No remarks.
17.2	She states that The EIA potrays that there has been increase in cargo handling over the last few yrs. It speaks of coal handling increase. It fails to disclose that handling of coal as shown in the said report for the year from 2012-17 reflects illegal excess handling of coal that was done without the Consent of GSPCB. She ask how illegal excess handling can be used to justify cargo handling growth at the port.	This is not relevant to the proposed project.
17.3	She states Para 1.4 states "Further, deepening of the channel to -19.80 m for Capesize vessels is in process."There is no disclosure that this capital dredging has in fact been stayed by an order of the NGT as it was done illegally. No new EC has been given for the Capital Dredging proposal till date.	Please refer the reply at 17.2.
17.4	The EIA report is misleading and gives a false picture and defeats the purpose of PH process.	This is not true. EIA report is prepared based on primary data collection during baseline survey, information from MPT & available secondary sources of references.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

17.5	With regard to Chapter II of the report, it indicates that only coking coal handling will be increased 3.8 times over the next few years and no other commodity. However POL is not the commodity that will see a rise. So why does MPT need a new POL berth?	Please reply at 17.2. POL Berth is required considering the future growth of the liquid traffic.
17.6	MPTs present proposal is in violation of MOEF&CC OM No. J-11013/41/2006-IA.II(I) dt. 24/12/2010 of MoEF as it presents all its expansion projects individually rather than as integrated and interlinked projects which they are.	Please refer the reply at 17.2.
17.7	Project Proponent should provide cumulative data regarding the impact of its activities on the Vasco bay area. This data should be provided under law.	EIA report is prepared based on primary data collection during baseline survey, information from MPT & available secondary sources of references.
17.8	As per the report, dredging to be done as per the current proposal in question only i.e. for fisheries harbour – from 2.5 to 4 mts -1,00,000 m ³ (pg 31) ; for passenger jetty – 2.5 to 5.10 mts - 20,000 m ³ (page 34) ; for POL berth – from 2.5 mts to 13.10 mts – 4,00,000 m ³ (page 38); for General and Cargo berth – from 2.5 to (initially) 13.10mt and eventually 15mts- 3,40,000 m ³ and 1,40,000m ³ respectively (page 41) that is a total of 10,00,000 m ³ of dredging for this proposal which in effect is made up of 6 proposals (As per Chapter 2).	No remarks.
17.9	But in (Para 2.3, page 25)the total amount of dredging stated is 15,05,660m ³ . therefore, there is a major discrepancy in the actual amount of dredging being stated by the project proponent in this EIA.	The total quantity of dredged spoils is estimated at 15,05,660M ³ .
17.10	MPT proposes to dredge a further 15,05,660m ³ which is not explained in this EIA. She asks the project	Necessary points will be reviewed and if required corrections will be made in the Final EIA Report.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	proponent which of these 2 figures is the correct one?	
17.11	She also referred to table 2.7 of the report i.e. Land requirement. She stated that MPT claims in Table 7, page 44 of EIA that 87,000 sq.mts is required however at para 2.3 it is stated that required land is 70885 sq.mts required which is again a serious discrepancy which needs to be addresses and explained.	Necessary points will be reviewed and if required corrections will be made in the Final EIA Report.
17.12	EIA report states that no land will be required. However page 30 of the EIA report mentions a "rehabilitation area". She questioned MPT as to for whom the rehabilitated area is meant and why, since MPT claims there is no R&R requirement and as no land is being acquired.	Necessary points will be reviewed and if required corrections will be made in the Final EIA Report.
17.13	She refers to page 37 of the report, a 3 mt security wall is proposed to be built so as to protect the fisheries harbour from damage. She questioned how only a 3 mt wall will protect the boat owners, their labourers, traditional fishermen, their canoes, nets, houses, Vasco businesses and residents. She would specifically like to know if the project proponent is going to insure the civilians and their property and their lives and if so, for how much.	3 m security wall is proposed to segregate the fishing harbour from the port operational area which is custom bound.
17.14	She questioned MPT as to future expansion plans for Berth 10 and 11 which are stated as a possibility in the future in the report (Para 2.3.3. Page 37). She asked the project proponent to clarify in writing what the future expansions could be in this scenarios? Do any of these scenarios include future dredging and if so to what degree and what is it estimated impact?	The present proposal is for deepening berths 10 and 11 by 2 m more.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

17.15	She highlighted that Sec 2.3.4 describing the development plans of General and Coastal Berths states on Page 40 "An effective back up area of 0.79ha (7,930 m ²) is proposed due to space constraint, for handling and movement of the coastal cargo as discussed with MPT officials, without customs formalities. However, the Indian Standard 4651 prescribes a backup areas of 2.5 to 3hectarefor a general cargo berth"	The reduction in area proposed is due to space constraints
17.16	She stated that this in effect means that MPT has proposed construction of these two cargo berths with a combined backup area which is less than 1/3rd of the area prescribed by India's own standards for one, single general cargo berth. What is the rational based on which this plan, in contravention of applicable standards resulting in this drastic lack of backup area for these 2 berths will impact the handling activities at these berths?	To make up for the reduction in area, MPT will put in efforts to increase the plot turnover or look for secondary storage areas adjacent to Berth No. 10 & 11.
17.17	She asked what will be done in the future to ease most likely scenario of requirement of more space for backup area? Will this requirement have any impact on communities who live of the landward side of the proposed development?	Please refer to reply at 17.15. There will be no impact on the communities who live on the landward side of the proposed development.
17.18	She refers to page 41 and questions as to whether cargo can be handled at the "Return wharf" and whether a returning wharf can be used as a berths without an EC.	'Return wharf' is also proposed in the proposed project.
17.19	With regard to mitigation measures as stated in the EIA report measures stated are insufficient. They are vague and do not commit to any concrete plans of what will be done to mitigate any foreseeable impacts. They only go on about what "shall" or "should" be done.	EIA covers the anticipated impacts and its mitigation measures are also enlisted in the EIA Report.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

17.20	Impact of dredging, pollution and vessel movement on fisheries resources and hence on livelihood of fisherman not mentioned. She says there needs to be detailed study on these aspects and asks the proponent to produce this data.	Please refer to reply at 17.18.
17.21	With regard to impacts on marine life due to dredging etc the report admits to existence of some marine mammals like dolphins and risks to them. However mitigation measures are not mentioned in the EIA report.	There is no risk whatsoever to such mammals. Anticipated impact mitigation study is discussed in chapter 4.5 of EIA report.
17.22	There are a large number of marine mammals e.g. dolphin, turtles, whale Sharks, Orca or Killer whales etc. either living close vicinity of MPT or as seasonal visitors.	No remarks.
17.23	She submits that she will furnish a detailed submission in writing and seeks a written clarification from MPT.	No remarks.
17.24	She states that an expert opinion has been submitted to State Govt. GSPCB and MPT regarding impact of expansion plans on marine life and demands to stop all expansions. They have not acted upon it.	No remarks.
17.25	She objects to the methodology adopted by MPT that they have used to State that schedule I marine life is not visible in the study area. States that anyone who knows anything about marine watching knows that if you dont see a particular species on the day you decide to go out on a boat, it does not mean they do not live in that area.	No remarks.
17.26	She states a long term study must be done to determine the marine species in the study area and methods to protect them and it must be included in the EIA. No plans should progress before this.	Please refer to reply at 17.20.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

17.27	She seeks clarity from MPT on the steps to prevent discharge of sewage and other hazardous waste from Ships. The EIA only says "discharge into sea should be prohibited" but it doesn't go on to explain exactly how this will be implemented.	Most of the ships are having Sewage Treatment Plant on board as per MARPOL Regulations. Facilities are provided by the port to off load the raw sewage from vessels that do not have STP. Similarly a hazardous waste like bilge water and waste oil is collected from the vessel through agencies approved by the GSPCB.
17.28	She objects to MPT's consultant report that benthic organisms are "not expected" to rehabilitate the area after dredging activity. She asks the EIA consultant if they can cite any study to prove this to be a fact. She then states that no such study has been done in this project area. This needs to be done and incorporated into the EIA.	As per available research reports, all marine areas which are temporarily disturbed due to dredging activities are regenerated with respect to benthic organisms in due course of time. However, in certain areas such as the dredged navigational channels the organisms which tend to regenerate are constantly disturbed during periodical maintenance dredging which is essential in all port areas.
17.29	A study on impact of dredging in Vasco Bay is under scrutiny of NGT.	This is not true.
17.30	She questions MPT submissions that sediment plume "not likely" to flow to Grande island after dredging. She says such presumptions cannot be allowed. It needs to be backed up by data. Grande island is a fragile location. She says she has quoted scientific studies on sediment plume in her written submission. Consultant needs to do better secondary research.	MPT has conducted modelling studies on sediment plume through CWPRS and based on the conclusion of this study it is determined that the sediment plume is not likely to flow to Grande island after dredging. Moreover Grande Island is 7km from the proposed project site and hence no impacts are envisaged. The identified disposal grounds are selected in such a way that due to sea currents the sediments are moving towards the North.
17.31	She questions MPT's consultant as the EIA states vehicular traffic will increase but vehicular pollution will not increase. Has the consultant done any traffic projection and impact studies? She requests that these studies be done and incorporated into the EIA.	This aspect will be reviewed if required necessary information will be furnished in EIA report.
17.32	She questions the impact of light pollution on the marine life.	Light pollution to marine life is not relevant for this project

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

17.33	Explosion risks of POL storage is not mentioned in the report.	QRA has been studied for the POL berth and explosion risks are also discussed in the same report.
17.34	With regard to social impact of the project she states that this section needs to be redone more rigorously. The section is very incomplete and only says the project is good for the locals but no explanation about how it will impact them. A social scientist needs to do this study.	Socio economic study will be reviewed and revised for this project and necessary information will be furnished in Final EIA Report.
17.35	She objects to the statement that water based transportation does not cause pollution. She asks the Consultant to produce studies/ data to back these vague statements and ensure it is incorporated in the final EIA.	Water based transportation is the least polluting mode of transport. Reference will be provided in final EIA.
17.36	She states that MPT does not own the Vasco bay on the land, they only have regulatory jurisdiction and should behave accordingly.	No comments. The project area is within MPT's jurisdiction as per Major Port Trust Act 1963. The ownership of land and water area belong to Port.
17.37	With regard to impact on fisheries by the project she states that impact of polluting activity of the proposed project will impact fishes.	Impact on fishery resources are evaluated in Chapter 4 and mitigation measures are suggested.
17.38	She states that the CRZ HTL/LTL mapping done in the EIA report is not as per the CRZ Notification 2011, but is in fact done as per the Draft CRZ notification 2018 as is evident from the CRZ zonations mention in the Map in Appendix II. She states that this is a very serious legal breach.	CRZ map is prepared as per CRZ 2011 Notification by IRS, Anna University, which is recognized and selected for this purpose by the MoEF & CC.
17.39	She states that the report does not mention any evacuation plan but only saysthere should be an evacuation plan. There are only 2 exits out of Vasco – one from varnapuri and the other from Chicalim. Both are currently plagued with traffic problems. Evacuation plan must necessarily be done.	In addition to what is stated, a 4 lane port connectivity will be completed before the completion of this project. Additionally, water mode of transport will also be available.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

17.40	A comprehensive EIA is required to be done of all expansion and other activities done so far by MPT immediately.	EIA Report is prepared based on the TOR issued by the EAC of MoEF & CC.
17.41	Present project is only a Trojan House that is causing a rift between the boat/trawler owners and the traditional fishermen just so that MPT can move the POL berth into Vasco bay. In fact the fishing jetty only constituted 18% of the total cost of the project.	No remarks.
17.42	Report does not mention risks to Naval ammunition depot, Vasco market etc that is located within 10 km from the proposal project.	QRA has been studied for the POL berth and accordingly necessary safety and preventive measures will be taken into account before commissioning the facilities.
17.43	She categorically stated that this EIA has too many major mistakes, misrepresentations and lack of detail to be acceptable. It must be set aside and declared null and void. Fresh EIA for Study of Cumulative impact needs to be done immediately for any of these projects to be considered. She stated that the fishing jetty should be built only as per the wishes of all of Vasco's fishing community	EIA report is prepared based on guidelines issued as per MoEF & CC in accordance to EIA Notification of 2006 and CRZ Notification of 2011. Suggestions regarding impact mitigation study are noted and the same will be revised in Final EIA Report.
18.0 Shri Sydney Furtado, General Secretary, GFBOA		
18.1	He stated that Fishermen badly want fishing a Jetty since long.	No remarks.
18.2	In Vasco Bay, fishing was never an issue.	No remarks.
18.3	Fishermen of Vasco were left out of development.	No remarks.
18.4	He stated that they cannot do anything in Vasco without objections from MPT. He said MPT are not owners of land, but only have jurisdiction over it.	No remarks.
18.5	Fishermen need development.	No remarks.
18.6	With regard to POL – he stated that they have objected to bring in Hazardous and dirty cargo to MPT. It	For POL jetty, permission from PESO will be obtained prior to commissioning of facilities. Necessary fire and safety

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	was accepted by MPT but again it is come back with Hazardous & dirty cargo.	provisions will be made as per OISD-156 standards.
18.7	Berth Development at Vasco Bay is a continuous process. He submitted a copy of the proceedings of Board of Trustees held on 30//201 and quoted page 1 Item 1.4	Please refer to reply at 18.6.
19.0	Shri Xencor P. Polgi, Resident of Vasco	
	Not present when the name called out	
20.0	Shri Peter Andrade, Resident of Mangor, Vasco	
20.1	Most points were taken up by other speakers. Hence for avoiding repetition only few points will be taken up.	No remarks.
20.2	Last years hearing at TilakMaidan, MPT chairman termed Goans as outsiders, Tilakmaidan is Vasco but now we are in chicalim and MPT Chairman will say we are not from Chicalim.	No remarks.
20.3	On the first page, the photograph shown is an old photograph about 10 to 15 years old and not showing the developments like Adani's coal berths and the berth No.9 which is now devoid of Mechanical ore handling plant. With this they want to show to EAC that no development is done in the port.	The photograph is of no consequence. The EAC will scrutinize only the contents of the Final EIA
20.4	Earlier the relations between the people and MPT were good and common people depended on MPT for various reasons. Later with appointment of various Chairmen, relations have been completely destroyed. When an ammonia tanker from MPT overturned on airport road, no MPT officials or their emergency services came to control the leakage. It was our Vasco police who without	No remarks.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	gas masks put themselves at risk and successfully managed the situation.	
20.5	Same thing with the fishing community. MPT wanted to throw out the fishing community from Vasco bay.	This is not true.
20.6	He asked the EIA consultant whether it is written in the report that Vasco Bay is a bay of rocks or is it a beach.	It is a sandy beach with a small rocky stretch
20.7	He stated that the Berth No.8 is a dedicated POL handling berth with best of firefighting technology and designed for POL. Instead of carrying on operations there, the MPT is bringing the POL berth into the city. He requested the collector to kindly visit the Berth No.8 and see for himself since collector is Head of Disaster Management for the district.	No remarks.
20.8	The nearest residential area from the berth no.8 is around 500 meters but the new POL berth will be hardly 300 meters from dense residential areas.	No comments
20.9	There is a pipeline from berth no.8 to IOC tanks, more than 2 kms within MPT walls and this line is under MPT's watchful eyes and still people made hole in the pipeline and pilfered petrol and a leakage occurred which resulted in a dangerous fire which was somehow brought under control. No one was prosecuted and perpetrators of this act are moving around as honourable persons. Nothing is mentioned about this in the EIA report and there are no citations of fire incidents within MPT.	The proposed project is an independent activity. However, the EIA has taken into account all possible impacts and its mitigation measures. As regards the pilferage incident, it has no relevance to the present project.
20.10	MPT chairman is on record to say that whatever happens outside their compound is not their concern. So such ammonia incidents don't matter because our lives don't matter.	This is not true.
20.11	The ammonia tank inside MPT premises has never been inspected for structural stability as per their RTI	This is not true.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	response. He requested Collector to inspect it himself.	
20.12	The Vasco fire services do not have their own building because their 30 year old RCC building was demolished last year and over 1 lakh persons depend on Vasco fire services in case of emergency.	No remarks.
20.13	Speaker said live ammunition firing was carried out from there and it is not a secret because public and marine industry is made aware before such firing takes place.	No remarks.
20.14	He pointed out the various locations that surround Vasco city, viz. fire hazards like ATF storage in Chicalim, Naval armament depot, GSL, INS Gomantak, Phosphoric tanks, IOC/HPCL POL tanks, POL/wood chips cargo at berth 10/11, coal handling berths, ammonia tanks, Private tanks on Sada hillock, naval coast battery, and the INS Hansa naval base and these are like time bombs waiting to explode. And now MPT through this present hearing wants to bring POL berth hence this new time bomb is being opposed.	Naval Coastal Battery was not mentioned in the list of defence installations and this along with other missing installations will be incorporated in the Final EIA Report.
20.15	Just like Duryodhan in Mahabharata who wanted the whole kingdom for himself and would not even give 5 villages to avert a war, MPT wants the whole of Vasco for itself. So Duryodhan built a house for the pandavas made of inflammable articles called Lakshagrah which eventually caught fire but the with the help of a tunnel dug by experts sent by Pitamaha and Vidhur, the pandavas escaped death.	No remarks.
20.16	MPT has built a Lakshagarh for citizens of Vasco with these time bombs and we want the District collector and GSPCB to act as Pitamaha and Vidhur,	No remarks.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	and help us escape from these time bombs through proper drills and not like the drill made recently which was like a mockery of a drill.	
20.17	He questioned whether MPT wants to create another Bhopal tragedy .	No comments
20.18	Any government may come in Delhi, they behave like Dhithrastra, a blind king oblivious to our plight but giving out orders to build new time bombs.	No comments
20.19	On 03/08/2009 an advertisement was put by MPT in all major newspapers clarifying about an MOU with fishermen, stakeholders and Goa government, wherein it was stated that MPT is committed to building a world class fishing jetty for the fishermen but the jetty will have to be built out of Vasco bay due to ISPS convention as MPT will lose its compliance of ISPS and ships will stop coming to MPT port. Speaker asked whether the advertisement is true or false and whether the present proposal will not violate the ISPS. The advertisement was placed on record	This advertisement has no relevance to the proposed project and EIA studies.
21.0	Shri. Custodio Camilo Souza, Vasco	
	Not present when the name called out	
22.0	Shri. Gracias A. Countiho, Resident of Vasco	
22.1	That traditional fisherman operate from Baina and Dasteiro.	No remarks.
22.2	300 plus canoes of traditional fishermen operate in Vasco	As the official information collected there are 72 canoes from Vasco.
22.3	Place on the beach is not enough.	This is not true.
22.4	200 plus canoes need place to be parked.	No remarks.
22.5	Traditional fisherman do not want POL berth due to fire hazard.	No remarks.
22.6	He states by continuous dredging the Khariwada beach is destroyed.	This is not true.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

22.7	MPT is doing business by outsourcing the berths and destroying poor peoples stomach and livelihood.	This is not true.
22.8	He does not oppose modernization of the fishing jetty.	No remarks.
23.0	ShriBernado Marques, resident of Vasco.	
	Not present when the name called out	
24.0	Piedade Desouza, resident of Vasco	
	Not present when the name called out	
25.0	Shri. Suresh Barve resident of Vaddem, Vasco	
25.1	He questioned GSPCB officials as to why the public has been called for public hearing if they are not being allowed to question GSPCB	As per the mandate of the EIA Notification of 2006, the role of GSPCB is only to conduct the public hearing as prescribed and prepare the minutes.
25.2	He seeks clarification from MPT on the exact location (PT sheet no. And survey nos) of each project.	Location has been explained through drawings
25.3	He seeks clarification from MPT on exact location of the project in Vasco Bay.	Please refer reply at 25.2.
25.4	He seeks clarification on the length of proposed project.	All details were presented in the Plan displayed at the venue.
25.5	He seeks clarification from MPT as to whether Public Hearing is violating and is in contempt of the Court order.	Public Hearing is held as per the EIA Notification, 2006 and there is no contempt of court order.
25.6	He states that Courts have directed MPT to remove the oil and ammonia storage tanks.	This is not true.
25.7	He states that MPT will destroy Goan Tourism if they bring tourists by cruise MPT to its proposed cruise berth in MPT in presence of all coal handling activity.	Allegations made are not correct.
25.8	He submits that his total objection to cruise berth and POL projects of MPT.	No remarks.
25.9	He objects to not being provided drinking water.	Drinking water was provided at the EPH venue
25.10	He seeks to know if the beach is a part of the project.	Yes

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

25.11	He states that MPT has no title ownership documents.	Please refer the reply at 5.3 of this document..
25.12	He states that POL berth is violation of court direction.	This is not true.
25.13	He alleges that the MPT is indulging in illegalities and that he will request the court to ban and close MPT as it disoing illegalities and that a detailed inquiry has to be done in this episode	The allegations made are not correct.
26.0	Shri Sanjay Redkar- Resident of Vasco.	
	Not present when the name called out	
27.0	Shri Maxie Correia – Resident of Vasco	
	Not present when the name called out	
28.0	Shri Sidharth Karapurkar – Resident of Vasco.	
	Not present when the name called out	
29.0	Shri Swapnesh Sherleker, resident of Mulgao, Vasco	
29.1	He stated that he was shocked to see the notice published on 03/09/2018 by GSPCB of how all of a sudden fishing jetty was proposed for development by MPT. Being curious to find the reason for the love of MPT for fishing community he downloaded the EIA report to study the reasons.	No comments.
29.2	He cited at page 10, para 1.3 of the EIA Report – Temporary fish landing platform occupies prominent waterfront area close to Berth No. 11 making development of Port Infrastructure difficult.	No remarks.
29.3	He also cited at page 27 para 2.3.1 – Fishing activities within Vasco Bay is one of the major limitations for expansion of the Mormugao Port.	No remarks.
29.4	He stated that the proposal for development of fishing jetty by MPT is not out of love for fishing community of Goa but they had an eye on the area	No remarks.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	utilised by the fishing community for their activities.	
29.5	He questioned why state government is not developing fishing jetty for fishing community.	State Government is contributing and therefore a partner in the development of the fishing jetty
29.6	He said Government of Goa is in collusion with MPT in conning fishing community, allowing MPT to trade the area utilized by fishing community in exchange for the new fishing jetty at other location.	No remarks.
29.7	He stated that the reason for taking away the area used by fishing community is for creation of new berths by MPT.	No remarks.
29.8	Referring to page 36 para 2.3.3, he stated that the reason for creation of new berths is due to over utilisation of berth 10 & 11. The reason for over utilisation of new berths is due to shifting of operations of berths 8 and 9 to berth 10 and 11. The reason for shifting of operation of berth 8, only liquid handling cargo berth, to berth 10 and 11 is due to Berth 8 and 9 are being handed over to a PPP operator for redevelopment and cargo handling.	No comments
29.9	Scope for Redevelopment of Berth 8 & 9 is not included in this EIA report as this project is the cause for the projects due to which this hearing is undertaken.	These are "separate/independent" projects. The EPH for the project on "Redevelopment of Berths 8, 9 & Barge Berths" was conducted in April, 2017.
29.10	He questioned before getting clearance why conduct public hearing for other projects which are of consequential nature due to Redevelopment of Berth 8 & 9 project?	The present project is an independent project and hence EC of other projects has no bearing on the same.
29.11	He stated that as environmental impact of Redevelopment of Berth 8 & 9 project is not included in this EIA Report's scope the Report is incomplete and MPT has suppressed the information.	The EIA Report is prepared based on the specific TOR issued by MoEF & CC to the proposed project. EIA Report has covered all the points issued in the TOR and the MPT has not suppressed any information.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

29.12	He sought to know the capacity of Berth 8, only Liquid Berth handling capacity as per table 2.5 of the EIA Report. MPT said capacity is 1.5. He stated that but in EIA report at page 36 different figure of 2.2 MTPA with about 70% capacity is mentioned.	The figures in Table 2.5 refers to the capacity of existing berth No.8 whereas the figure indicated at page 36 has been erroneously indicated as 2.2 MTPA.
29.13	He stated that in EIA report in table 2.4 at page 21 – the forecasted requirement of all Liquid Cargo handling, including POL, till year 2030 is 1.55 MTPA and hence to show shortage of liquid handling berth capacity Berth 8 is falsely mentioned as 1.5 MTPA in EIA Report wherein, in actual, its rated capacity is 2.2 MTPA.	No comments
29.14	He stated that capacity of new POL berth is 2 MPTA and giving away a higher capacity berth 8, of 2.2 MTPA, for other use and creation of lower capacity berth suggests that there is no demand for new berth for handling liquid cargo and beyond logic.	MPT is exploring its business prospects to handle other liquid cargo in addition to petroleum, and not limiting to the existing handling. As such possible alternative is also being explored.
29.15	He stated that at page 8 (para 1.2) of EIA Report – MPT has 11 berths and out of which 6 berths (Berth No 1,2,3,5,6,7) are leased out to other organisations.	No remarks.
29.16	He stated that further at page 36, para 2.3.3 of EIA Report - Berth 8 & 9 are being handed over to PPP operator for redevelopment and cargo handling.	No remarks.
29.17	He questioned why 8 berths out of 11 berths are rented leaving MPT with only 3 Berths for themselves? This shows that MPT is mismanaged and there is no planed study. He stated that MPT is only interested in development of new berths and renting it out to corporate and then cry shortage of capacity for self. He stated that we are not giving our Goa's land and property to MPT for eventually renting it to corporates.	Leasing out of berths to private operators is as per the policy and guidelines of the Ministry of Shipping, Govt. Of India, spelled out from time to time. Port is expanding its business and creating infrastructure to facilitate "exim" trade as a part of logistics.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

29.18	He stated that as previously admitted in Public Hearing by MPT that the new berths developed will not be used for coke and coal handling then how they are planning to achieve the forecast mentioned in table 2.4 page 21 of handling coking coal of 36.7 MTPA by year 2030. He sought explanation on this from MPT.	Coal & Coke cargo will not be handled at the proposed berths. The figures mentioned in table 2.4 are traffic forecasts for the entire Port, which include Berths 6 & 7 dedicated for Coke and Coal.
29.19	He stated that MPT is giving false statements by stating it is only forecast and not to be relied upon. He questioned if it is only forecast and not to be relied upon then why is it mentioned in the EIA Report? MPT stated that it is recoded and will be clarified.	Traffic forecast studies will only indicate the traffic potential. However, this traffic will not materialise unless infrastructure for the same is created and rail and road systems are upgraded. The proposed project is not for coal and coke.
29.20	He stated that MPT is lying by stating that this project is not for coal handling as the basic reason for these projects if due to handing over of Berth 8 & 9 to PPP operator, which are to be used for coal handling.	The statement is not correct.
29.21	As regard to table 4.4 regarding 2 new berths will not be used for coke and coal handling till 2030. He sought explanation on this from MPT.	This is only a projection for the Port as a whole. Coal & Coke is not part of this EIA report.
30.0	Rupesh Shinkre, Resident of Curtorim.	
	Not present when the name called out	
	Zarina D' Cunha, Resident of Nuvem.	
31.1	She stated that the written submissions have been forwarded.	No remarks.
31.2	She stated that in Goa we are having another project which is going to come as another Hazard in the name of development.	The proposed project will incorporate all necessary safety measures prescribed by the competent authority.
31.3	She stated that what the people who spoke on this projects EIA report be taken into consideration. MPT has given all false and misleading information in the EIA report.	This is not true.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

31.4	She submitted that MPT should have taken people into confidence as they are going to be affected, like, the fisherman, indigenous people, local residents, etc.	The project of fishing jetty is finalised with inputs from GFBOA, whereas other berths are proposed by taking in to account views of relevant stake holders including GoG. Moreover all the concerns raised in the present public hearing will be taken into account and addressed.
31.5	There is no disaster management plan in place.	Disaster Management Plan will be incorporated in the Final EIA Report.
31.6	No proper data on the irreversible change that would take place in view of this project.	Irreversible changes are covered in the EIA report.
31.7	She submitted that our environmental harmony will be destroyed.	This is not True
31.8	The petroleum lubricant oil which is brought by MPT will cause disaster to people in the vicinity.	For POL jetty, permission from PESO will be obtained prior to commissioning of facilities. Necessary fire and safety provisions will be made as per OISD-156 standards. Berth No.8, which is a POL jetty is under operation for the past 40 years without any incident of accidents. Therefore MPT has an impeccable safety record.
31.9	It appears that the intention of MPT is to displace all the local people from their own land.	This is not true.
31.10	He submitted that no women folk was represented in any decision making process.	This is an irrelevant allegation
31.11	No explanation is given by MPT what they mean by the development and benefit of local fisherman community.	This is not true.
31.12	MPT has proposed for 250 trawler but how they are going to sustain for this 250 trawlers is not mentioned.	Please refer the reply at 31.4. Moreover, the expert opinion of CICEF, Bangalore, was also sought for the purpose.
31.13	She submitted that the project is envisaged on the whims and fancies and self-profit of few vested interests.	This is not true.
31.14	She submitted that MPT intends to bring chemical hazardous arsenic prone products petroleum are brought and transported on our roads with no safety precautionary measures in place.	This is not true.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

31.15	She stated that they will assert their right to live on their land is a sustainable way of life	No remarks.
31.16	She questioned as to how the data collected only for 2 months can be considered.	Baseline data was gathered between March 2017 to May 2017.
31.17	She stated that our aquifers are punctured and nobody is taking cognizance of the same.	This is not true.
31.18	She stated that marginalised people should be left alone and should not be made a scapeboard and made to suffer at the cost of high end industrial conglomerates.	This is not true.
31.19	She submitted that the 700 pages EIA is full of flaws and MPT is only giving assurance as that the same will be corrected or amended.	No remarks.
31.20	She stated that no proper data is coming forth from MPT and in absence of such material data it is difficult for the public like us to assess the project and its impact on our livelihood and on our environment.	This is not true.
31.21	She submitted that there is no sufficient proof as regards to the type of cargo that will be brought to MPT.	Traffic forecast is made by consulting the stake holders and their business prospects.
31.22	She stated that out of 11 berths, 8 berths are given to private entities'/industries and all these industries are running for self profit.	Please refer the reply at 29.17.
31.23	She submitted that she is speaking also on behalf of voiceless species such as turtles, sea shells, marine species, etc which are also a part of our Environment and will be affected by such harmful projects.	No remarks.
31.24	She further submitted that the poor people have to suffer from coal pollution due to coal handling activity of MPT.	No remarks.
31.25	She stated that MPT is bringing coaking coal and that also not for Goa but for industries located outside Goa	In its role as a major national Port, MPT is catering to the exim needs of a hinterland including State of Goa.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	but at the cost of Goa's environment and people's health.	
31.26	She stated that recently there was the Naphtha accident and no safety measures are in place. Hence in the absence of any safety measures, she doesn't want any hazardous products to come to Goa.	No remarks.
31.27	She wanted to know from MPT what it means by necessary services will be given to hinterland	Please refer the reply at 31.25
31.28	She stated that Hubli is not a part of Goa. It is part of Karnataka which is so huge and having many ports and why such hazardous cargo should be brought to Goa and transported to Karnataka.	No remarks.
31.29	She stated that 500 mtrs is not enough for Ramponkars canoes. These ramponkars bring us formalin free fish which we need for our daily meals.	No remarks.
31.30	She stated that the beach is our property and be maintained at all cost. She placed the photographs of the beach behind IOC that is illegally claimed by MPT on record.	No remarks.
31.31	She further states that all the issues are already taken up by earlier speakers hence not repeated.	No remarks.
31.32	MPT has not mentioned information on requirement of cement.	This will be incorporated in the Final EIA Report.
31.33	She wanted to know the potential source of noise pollution as mentioned by MPT at page 154.	The potential source of noise pollution envisaged are construction activities/equipments, which are in temporary in nature.
31.34	If this project goes through these Vasco city will turn into a dark black place not fit to live in and the people will have to suffer.	This is not true.
31.35	She further stated that it is a manmade disaster in the name of development.	This is not true.
31.36	She stated that before the project is developed there will be irreversible damage.	No remarks.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

32.0	Anil Noronha, Resident of Verna	
	Not present when the name called out	
33.0	Shri Seby Dsouza, Member of Fishing Jetty	
33.1	Because of inefficient fishing jetty we are facing lot of hardship and were requested MPT several times to help us. When they showed us a plan of proposed jetty, MPT gave us an assurance that houses in Khariwada will not be taken and beach will be maintained MPT is falsely assuring us.	This is not true. MPT is maintaining the existing temporary fish landing platform as per the requirement of GFBOA.
33.2	We want development too but not at the cost of our houses and we should not be thrown out.	The proposed project is on reclaimed land. Only few dwellings will be affected and the same will be rehabilitated as per the understanding with GFBOA and GoG.
34.0	Shri. Edwin D'Souza, Resident of Boat Owners Association	
34.1	Shri. Sydney and Ronny has cleared all the points and I reiterate whatever they have placed on record.	No remarks.
34.2	We were playing cricket on the beach which was very big but now it is not there. NGT has ordered stopping of capital dredging in view of pollution case filed by Old Cross Canoe Association. The number of trawlers has increased. Govt has to develop the fishing jetty and hand it over to us. He requested MPT build handover the fishing jetty to them.	No remarks.
35.0	Adv. Albertina Alemida, Resident of Taleigao,	
	Not present when the name called out	
36.0	Smt. Madeline Pereira, resident of Vasco 73 yrs.	
36.1	MPT is not clear about how it will dispose of non-biodegradable waste this waste cannot be disposed at the existing facility of MMC i.e. Waste treatment plant as it cannot handle existing waste of Vasco. MPT should	No remarks.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	arrange for their own non-biodegradable waste plant.	
36.2	However, in the EIA report it is stated that waste from the proposed vicinity will be treated at the plant whose operation itself has been opposed by MPT before NGT this indicates that no application of mind has been done by MPT.	No remarks.
36.3	She objects to the statement in the EIA report at page 126 (4.3.2) that MPT will obtain water for this project from PWD as PWD cannot supply adequate water to existing public.	No remarks.
36.4	She opposes MPT's submission that the fishing jetty will help fishing community as it will not be of any use to traditional fisherman and may only help trawler owners. Provision also has to be made to accommodate traditional fishing boats.	No remarks.
36.5	MPT has not made any arrangement to help the Ramponkars.	No remarks.
36.6	MPTs proposed project will destroy the Khariwada beach which is required by the Ramponkars for their fishing activity.	At the present only 50% of the Khariwada beach is freely accessible to the general public and this portion will not be affected by the proposed project.
36.7	MPT cannot claim ownership of the beach as it belongs to the Ramponkars and to the people of Vasco da Gama.	No remarks.
36.8	She objects to statement at Pg. 27 in EIA report that states that fishing activity in Vasco bay is a limitations for expansion of MPT and says that MPT only targeting the Ramponkars.	The twin problems of lack of the space for Port development and inadequate facilities for the fishing community at the present jetty, are going to be solved by the present project which makes available adequate space for the fisherman as well as the Port.
36.9	She states that dredging work by MPT will destroy the river basin and marine ecology.	This is not true.
36.10	She states that MPT should have taken that POL berth to west of break water and should not have disturb river basin with regard to TOR compliance item	No remarks.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	no. 7 she states that construction materials stated to be transported by MPT through existing roads for proposed project will cause inconvenience to public and noise and dust pollution.	
36.11	With regard to dredging activity MPT is unclear on which areas they specifically intend to reclaim.	The dredged material to the extent possible will be used for the reclamation.
36.12	She stated that MPT's description of baseline environment data at page 49, para 3.1 is unreliable.	Chapter 3 is prepared as per EIA Notification, 2006.
36.13	She states that the crises management details as stated by MPT at pg. 32 of the report are inadequate and the proposed POL berth will result in serious fire hazard.	For POL jetty, permission from PESO will be obtained prior to commissioning of facilities. Necessary fire and safety provisions will be made as per OISD-156 standards.
36.14	She concludes by saying that fishing harbour should be modernised at its existing location and Rampokars should not be interfered with. She objects to the 8 mtr height winds screen mentioned at pg 148 of the report as it has been ineffective to control coal pollution.	No comments.
36.15	She objected to the proposed security that would shut out the people of Vasco and the fishing village from Vasco and restrict their access to the public beach.	Construction of compound wall is to separate the Port Operational Area which is custom bound.
36.16	The draft EIA is silent on the storm water drainage system in Vasco City that was constructed by the Portuguese. In fact the main outlet into the Vasco Bay near T.B. Cunha Chowk passes through the project site. At present it is blocked up due to erosion of the beach due to earlier degradation of reclamation. If this drainage is not taken into account it will be a recipe for massive flooding in Vasco in the event of a full scale or excess monsoon.	Existing drainage system will not be disturbed.

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

36.17	The Mormugao Port Trusts intends to turn our safe natural harbour into an unsafe man-made disaster	This is not true.
37.0	Shri Terence George, Resident of Panaji	
	Not present when the name was called out	
38.0	Shri Sidharth Karapurkar, Resident of Margao	
	Not present when the name was called out	
39.0	Shri Roshan Mathias, Resident of Candolim	
	Not present when the name was called out	
40.0	Fr. Gabriel Coutinho, Parish Priest of St. Andrew Church, Vasco.	
	Not present when the name was called out	
41.0	Shri Avertino Miranda, Resident of Panaji Goa.	
	Not present when the name was called out	
42.0	Shri Parag Rangnekar, Resident of Vasco.	
	Not present when the name was called out	
43.0	Shri Agnelo Godinho, Resident of Vasco, Old cross Fisherman association.	
43.1	He stated that Sagarmala project is coming up and it is effecting the local fisherman. He stated that there is no proper facility for their canoes.	This is not true.
43.2	He stated that the Beach space has become very less due to dredging by MPT.	This is not true.
43.3	He stated that he is against the project but the jetty should be built world class and all provisions should be given to them	No remarks.
44.0	Shri John Fernandes, Resident of Benaulim.	

PROJECT PROPONENT: MORMUGAO PORT TRUST
REPLY TO EPH QUERIES RAISED DURING THE HEARING

	Not present when the name called out	
--	--------------------------------------	--