

**Proceedings of Environmental Public Hearing of M/s. Mangalore Refinery and Petrochemicals Ltd. (MRPL) on proposed up-gradation/augmentation of its existing facilities to produce products that comply with BS-VI Auto Fuel Quality Compliance and Associated Projects Facilities (Stage 1) within the existing Refinery Premises at Katipalla Village, Mangaluru Taluk, Dakshina Kannada District, Karnataka State held on 27.02.2017 at 11.00 AM at Siddivinayaka Sabha Graha, Beside Ganeshpura Mahaganapathi Temple, Ganeshpura, Katipalla - 575 030, Mangaluru Taluk, Dakshina Kannada District, Karnataka.**

Sri. Rajshekhar Puranik, Environmental Officer, Karnataka State Pollution Control Board, Mangaluru welcomed Dr. K. G. Jagadeesha, Deputy Commissioner and Chairman of District Environmental Public Hearing Committee, Dakshina Kannada District and requested to chair the Hearing. He welcomed all the officers from various Departments of the District, Media persons and the general Public. The list of Officials, representatives of project proponent and public present is enclosed as **Annexure-1**.

Further he addressed the gathering and briefed about the need of public hearing as follows;

- M/s. Mangalore Refinery and Petrochemicals Ltd.(MRPL) has proposed up-gradation/augmentation of its existing facilities to produce products that comply with BS-VI Auto Fuel Quality Compliance and Associated Projects Facilities (Stage 1) within the existing Refinery Premises at Katipalla Village, Mangaluru Taluk, Dakshina Kannada District, Karnataka State
- The project proponent has to obtain prior Environmental Clearance from Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, New Delhi as per the EIA Notification dated 14.09.2006 and subsequent amendment of 01.02.2009 and also requires going through Environmental Public Hearing process.
- The project proponent had requested the Member Secretary, Karnataka State Pollution Control Board to conduct the Environmental Public Hearing.
- KSPCB issued paper notification on 27.01.2017 in State level leading English and Kannada News Paper "Deccan Herald" and "Udayavani" respectively and Regional Office; KSPCB, Mangaluru had issued notification on 28.01.2017 in local newspaper "Karavali Ale".
- Draft Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) report, Executive Summary (Kannada & English), CD of Draft EIA report prepared by the project proponents are placed at the following places for the reference of public and to file any suggestions, views, comments and objections of interested bonafide residents, environmental groups and others located at project site and likely to be affected by the proposed project.

1. Office of the Deputy Commissioner, Dakshina Kannada District, Mangaluru
2. Chief Executive Officer, Zilla Panchayat, Dakshina Kannada District, Mangaluru
3. Joint Director, District Industries Centre, Dakshina Kannada District, Mangaluru.
4. Grama Panchayath Office of Bala, Permude, Jokatte, Bajpe and Yekkaru Grama.
5. Regional Office, Karnataka State Pollution Control Board, "Parisara Bhavan", Baikampady Industrial Area, Mangluru
6. Ministry of Environment & Forest, South Zone Office, E-3/240, Kendriya Sadan, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor, E&F Wings, 17<sup>th</sup> Main Road, 2<sup>nd</sup> Block, Koramangala, Bengaluru – 560 034.
7. Help Desk, Karnataka State Pollution Control Board, Ground Floor, No.49, Parisara Bhavan, Church Street, Bengaluru – 560 001
8. Mangalore City Corporation, Lalbagh, Mangaluru.

Board had also uploaded the draft EIA report, executive summary in Kannada and English on the official website: [www.kspcb.gov.in](http://www.kspcb.gov.in).

Further, Dr. K. G. Jagadeesha, Deputy Commissioner and Chairman of District Environmental Public Hearing Committee, Dakshina Kannada District informed the project proponent to give the technical presentation of proposed project to the gathering. The project proponent, M/s Mangalore Refinery and Petrochemicals Ltd. made presentation to the assembled public regarding the proposed project, the impact on the environment due to the implementation of proposed project (BS-VI stage 1) and mitigation measures proposed to be taken to reduce the impact. (The copy of technical presentation presented by the project proponent in Kannada & English are enclosed as **Annexure-2**)

After the presentation Dr. K. G. Jagadeesha, Deputy Commissioner and Chairman of District Environmental Public Hearing Committee, Dakshina Kannada District informed the gathering to place their views / comments / objections if any on the proposed project and accordingly following local residents/participants expressed their views / comments / objections as follows;

**1. Sri. Bhaskar, Member of Bala Grama Panachayath, expressed that**

- a. The approach road to the company and the public roads are in bad condition and hence the problem due to dust is increasing every day. The public are affected to the dust pollution in the locality. He demanded the MRPL authority

to rectify the road problem immediately. Further he expressed that there are couple of incidents wherein the public have lost their life due to road accidents caused due to heavy truck movements in these roads. It is also expressed that there is a problem of smell nuisance observed very frequently around Mr. Prabhakar Rao house, Bala and he demanded compensation to be given to the affected family. He demanded that the MRPL hospital facilities shall be made accessible to even general public.

- b. Since 20 years people those who are lost their land have got Khata but not been given any RTC to the affected people.
- c. People those who are lost their property for 3<sup>rd</sup> phase activity were not given compensatory job till today. He demanded the details of CSR funds spent by MRPL till date.
- d. He categorically said that he has no objection in going for up-gradation of the existing facilities to meet BS-VI Auto Fuel Quality Compliance.

**2. Sri. Gangadhara, Chelairu, informed that**

- a. MRPL had an agreement with the District Administration to deliver 3 lakh liters of water per day to the R&R colony and accordingly the pipeline has been laid by concerned Public department. However the Chelairu village is being supplied only 30,000 liters per day.
- b. People those who are residing in R&R colony are yet to receive RTC.
- c. Roads and drainage including underground drainage system requires immediate attention for repairing works.
- d. He also demanded immediate attention for providing solar lighting system in the area.
- e. The district authority shall take care the requirements of primary school, playground and also there is an immediate need for approach to the burial ground for the locality.
- f. The project affected community was not given suitable jobs.

**3. Smt. Rekha Shetty, Ontekkaru Grama said that**

- a. They are facing smell problem due to several companies in the locality like MRPL, BASF, HPCL, etc. She further expressed that they are also facing noise problem due to industries operation in the locality. It was not sure which Company is causing the smell.
- b. She had no specific comments about the project expansion whereas she pleaded for the action from the project authority to reduce the noise pollution in the area and also expressed that they would be ready to go for rehabilitation area in case if they are accommodated.

**4. Sri Subhash Shetty, Kundapur, Nagarika Horata Samithi**

- a. He had the deep concern about not providing the complete information to the public in presentation made regarding the project expansion activity. It is not even informed about the volume of water required, the volume of waste water generated from the proposed activity. The company authority neither given the information nor clarified about sound pollution and other issues due to proposed MRPL expansion activity.
- b. He demanded the project proponent to arrange for a visit to similar projects in India to have the first hand information about the activity. He demanded immediate measures to be taken for road repair in the area.
- c. Construction of ring roads starting from outside Krishnapura area bypassing Mangalore city and joining BC road may also be explored for possibility to reduce vehicle traffic in the area. He said that the project affected people were not given employment since 2011 to 2017.

**5. Sri. P. V. Rao, Pejavar,**

- a. He said that notice for the Public hearing has not been served.
- b. He expressed that people of Jokatte Village are facing pollution problems since 5-6 years but till date no concrete steps have been taken by the industry in alleviating pollution problems of the locality. It is informed that there no underground drainage system provided for the locality and there is also Hi-tension wire flowing in the area posing possible threat to the human life.
- c. There is court order and Sarojini Mahishi report with respect to providing local employment which is not being honored by MRPL.
- d. He has submitted the written copy of objection against this project activity and he opposed for issue of Environmental Clearance for said expansion project.

**6. Sri. Gangadhar Poojary, Bala resident:**

- a. He appealed the project proponent to provide roofing to the Government school, Bala and in particular he was stressing on the need for development of playground, Library, Providing benches, development of Children Park and also providing drinking water dispensers to the public in the area.
- b. All the said facilities are very much required for 5<sup>th</sup> block, Krishnapura residence. He demanded to operate KSRTC bus facilities to the area during night hours.

**7. Sri. Samshudin, Jokatte,**

- a. He expressed that water quality analysis for surface water and well water in the area to be conducted because he has apprehension about possible pollution due to coke dust pollution by MRPL 3<sup>rd</sup> phase project.
- b. He has sought the clarification with respect to possible pollution due to the plant activities of MRPL 3<sup>rd</sup> phase even after acquiring 27 acres of buffer land in Jokatte area.

**8. Sri Francis, Kalavar Resident,**

- a. He demanded the MRPL factory authority to show the green belt provided inside the industry premises as per government Norms.
- b. He expressed displeasure about the noise pollution caused by the industry from flare gas chimney and problems due to frequent tripping of plant operation.
- c. He expressed that the Government has issued siting guidelines for stone crusher units stating that, no residences in 500m distance from crusher, but no such siting guidelines for petroleum refinery, wherein Kalavar church, school, residences are located 100m from MRPL.

**9. Sri. Muneer Katipalla, Katipalla**

- a. He was stressing on the EIA report and said that the report is wonderful but expressed displeasure about not covering the issues of smell problem and the report also lack in providing the information about forth coming emissions and waste water treatment plant after expansion.
- b. He further pointed out that there are houses within 500 meter from the industry whereas in the report the same is not recorded. He stressed on the need for forming a monitoring committee to monitor the day to day pollution problems caused by the industry incorporating local public and government departments. He also pointed out that only people from outside the state like Bihari's are given job but local persons are not given permanent or temporary jobs.
- c. Air pollutants emitted carryover up to 3km distance according to the experts, those contaminants are mixed with the air, water etc. these polluted water will enter the underground well water and gets polluted and causes health problems to the children, adults and women's and results in the skin problem. He referred to following para's of EIA report, i.e., para 4.2.4.2 regarding the presence of heavy metals in the sea water, para 4.2.1 on effect of flue gas within radius of 3 km, para 4.2.4.4 on effect of earthquake on surrounding areas.

- d. If we complain that the water is polluted by the release of industrial waste, MRPL claims it is because of the sewage and drainage system in the area.
- e. He complained that to control the sound pollution MRPL company has installed the silencer and acoustics, but the sound pollution is still exceeding limits stipulated for residential locality.
- f. People are pleading with the company to distribute the CSR fund for the sake of welfare of the children's education and social welfare of villages.
- g. He further pointed out that EIA report says that only treated sewage will be used for expansion activity and no discharge of waste water into the sea, but in other slide they say that, they are planning to install sea water de-salination plant for fresh water and waste water generated is treated in existing ETP which are contradictory in nature.
- h. Further he requested the Deputy Commissioner to take the required action as soon as possible.

**10. Sri Praveen, Krishnapura Resident informed that:**

- a. Road is always blocked due to the movement of MRPL, HPCL trucks and creates traffic problem to the localities. SMS alert can be given to the truck to reduce the rush problem.
- b. He has expressed that the local people should be given priority in employment and all the facilities which are legally viable shall be offered to the local affected community only. The first priority should be given to the local people only.

**11. Sri. Ramakrishna, BSNL Retired Employee,**

- a. He said that he is the resident of the locality and demanded for providing proper roads to 10 villages with proper names and also insisted on providing foot paths to the concrete roads in the area. He pointed out the need for having facilities like library and reading room for the area/locality.

**12. Sri Gragory Patrao, Permude, Kuthettor**

- a. He has expressed displeasure about the company attitude towards addressing pollution problems in this area and in particular oil pollution of well water at his residence due to discharge of oily water from MRPL.
- b. He said that MRPL has not yet taken any action nor measures on Assistant Commissioner, Mangalore order dated 18.07.2011 on restoration of Atturkodi Nala due to oil discharged from MRPL.

- c. He said that the location of residences from such industries should be minimum 1.5km away, but existing residences are located nearby to MRPL.
- d. He said that his well water is contaminated due to oil discharge by MRPL and daily he is drinking same oil contaminated water.
- e. He pointed out that the company has not given compensation to Sri. Aliyappa Moolya and Smt. Radha Bai.
- f. He has submitted hard copy of application opposing the expansion of said project.
- g. He on his second time of representation pointed out that the need for issuing certificate to project displaced person for the convenience of the property transition or to receive the government benefits.
- h. He opposed to issue Environmental Clearance to the said expansion project.

### **13. Sri Surendra Bhat, Katipalla**

- a. He appreciated the skill India project being taken up MRPL and insisted on the need for providing free training and education to meritorious students which would help in obtaining jobs.

### **14. Sri. B. S Hussain, Jokatte , Nagarika Horata Samithi,**

- a. At the outset he expressed that the problem due to third phase activity has not been resolved or addressed and issues like 33% of green cover is still pending. The problem is appeared to be due to lack of coordination among various government departments which has led to failures in maintaining minimum distance between the compound wall and nearby residences.
- b. He demanded to come up with the facts about the release of sulfur and other air pollutants due to increased pollution load due to expansion activity of the industry.
- c. He stressed on the need for adopting latest possible technology in petroleum refining plants.
- d. He pointed out that there will be an increase in emission and according to the project authority shall provide green cover around the industry premises.
- e. The problems like solid waste management and the problems due to leachate are yet to be resolved.
- f. He expressed full support for the proposed project.

### **15. Sri. Sandeep Bala expressed that**

- a. Problem due to parking of tankers on road side is severe and people are forced to face inconvenience in daily travel. He demanded providing health cards to the public in the locality.

**16. Smt. Hemalatha Bhat, Vice President, Krishibhoomi Samrakshana Samithi, Tenkayekkaru**

- a. She expressed displeasure about disparity in providing the information to the public, viz; about presence of Pilikula, NMPT and other considerable habitation/activity within 10 km radius of the project area but the report suppressed presence of part of Mangalore city area and presence of 30 wards of Mangalore city corporation and thickly populated areas within 10 km radius of project referred EIA figure number 1.2.
- b. Further she expressed about air pollution caused, water pollution and cumulative affect faced by the public. She demanded solar power shall be provided for the public lighting system. Plant and Human life have already been visibly impacted by MRPL activity especially in Atturkodi and Jokatte. Further, She also mentioned the following points:
  - Severe dust and noise has been major factor responsible for deteriorating health and quality of life.
  - Shri A.B Ibrahim and D.C and the Minister Shri Ramanath Rai have admitted the ground realities of human life at Jokkatte, after visiting the area. As reported in 19 January 2016 in Prajavani paper.
  - There are enough evidence to show ground water is unfit for drinking.
  - The mitigation measures mentioned in EIA reports seems to be ritual not executed at any stage.
  - The added traffic due to expansion is going to have adverse impact.
  - The MRPL company had bad track record and does not give confidence that it is going to set right the things in future.

**17. Sri Ramachandra Bhat (Retd. Professor), College of Fisheries**

- a. He pointed out that the EIA report page No. 4.18 Sec 4.2.6.1 fails to record presence of mangroves near MRPL industrial area specially Kuttethur and Jokatte area.
- b. The EIA report is prepared considering only one season data.
- c. NEERI is misleading in preparation of report as no baseline data is considered and matrix method is used in para 4.2.7 for preparation of socio economic studies for next 30 years is wrong.
- d. He expressed that the report submitted by the project proponent provided lot of misleading information and pointed out that in many instances the report speaks about the expert judgment which is quite contradictory in nature. And further point out there is no mention of the notified area as per CRZ Regulation.
- e. He said that the EIA does not carry information on water, air and soil pollution.



18. Smt. Anuradha Shetty, Permude Village informed that she gave land for establishment of MRPL and OMPL industries, but no job given to their family members.

19. Sri. Shashidhar Shetty stressed on the need for MRPL obliging the High Court orders, direction on giving job for displaced public for establishment of MRPL. He was pointing out need for local employment and expressed displeasure about the apathy of the MRPL towards development of surrounding villages.

At this juncture Deputy Commissioner, Dakshina Kannada District directed KIADB/KSPCB/Project proponent to take suitable action to alleviate the problems of affected community and also expressed his opinion that the MRPL should allocate maximum amount of its CSR funding to the neighboring villages.

Dr. K. G. Jagadeesha, Deputy Commissioner and Chairman of District Environmental Public Hearing Committee, Dakshina Kannada District informed that he will call the meeting of concerned PDO's and all concerned officers to verify the problem of rehabilitation related issues and same will be addressed with priority and transparency. He directed the KSPCB to visit the area to verify oil contamination of open wells and take necessary action.

The Deputy Commissioner, Dakshina Kannada district concluded the meeting stating that views / comments expressed by the public will be included in the proceedings and will be sent to the Government and thanked the public.



(Dr. K. G. Jagadeesha, IAS)  
Deputy Commissioner & District Magistrate,  
Chairman, EPH committee,  
Dakshina Kannada District.

Encl:

1. Video & Audio CD of the public hearing and photographs
2. List with signature of officers & publics attended the hearing.
3. Hardcopy of technical presentation PPT's by project proponent.
4. Copies of 11 application submitted by the public at the public hearing venue.  
(The translation is given in the following pages)



Hard copies of application submitted by the public at the public hearing spot are as follows:

1. **Antony Pinto, Pintos House, Damaskatte.**
  - a. No sufficient report from NEERI
  - b. MOEF rules for sound, dust, air, soil, water pollution, people suffering from chonical disease, cancer etc.
  - c. All reports from KSPCB, Baikampady are false
  - d. Sensitive land has given Barren land
  - e. 33% Green belt not done.
  - f. Out of 1800 Acres of land acquired for MSEZ more than 800 Acres land vacant.
  - g. Central Pollution Board has given report.
  - h. Water scarcity for public for drinking.
  - i. Report of Fisheries collage and from Goa not given.
  - j. Dust pollution damages crop, trees, economies and Ecology.
  
2. **Kuttethur and Permude villagers**
  - a. People in the locality are suffering from the skin, lung disease and other problems
  - b. Open well and other water sources are contaminated with oil not fit for drinking of human beings and animals.
  - c. Because of MRPL surroundings of water air is polluted and fire and smoke coming out from the stacks are disturbing the regular livelihood of people.
  - d. People in the area are suffering from sound pollution and because of industrial pollution cropping is also coming down in the locality.
  - e. There is a guideline for establishing industry at the distance of 1.5km from the residential area but the same is not being followed.
  - f. The area is polluted because of coke and sulphur contamination. Hence we oppose MRPL BS-VI expansion facilities.
  
3. **MRPL and HPCL Nirvasithara Samithi, Rehabilitation colony, chalairu, Mangalore:**
  - a. People are facing severe drinking water problem. Though MRPL has made some facilities but rehabilitation colony is not receiving the benefits.
  - b. Colony is not receiving electricity supply because of low grade of electrical cables used in establishing power grid.
  - c. Land conversion documentation to the rehabilitation area is not completed and hence issue of property documents to the beneficiary is not completed.

- d. People have not received the RTC even after completion of 25 year of site sanction.
- e. The drainage and the road network is totally damaged and the same is not being attended.
- f. Colony people are not given the facility of playground to their children.
- g. The land belonging to the burial ground has been used for road construction.

**4. Kambatthi Bandasale Nagareekara Samithi Jokatte:**

- a. People are suffering from lungs diseases because of coke, Sulphur and other pollutants from the industry.
- b. People are suffering from sound pollution and also problems due to fly ash/coke dust in the area.
- c. Local people are not given employment. Though the same was assured by land acquisition officer and executive officer of SEZ area.
- d. People are facing accidents regularly in the area due to narrow roads and some of them were killed due to road accidents.

**5. Sri. Vijayananda Rao, Ganeshpura, Katipalla, Mangalore:**

- a. Public hearing information was not discriminated properly. The public of the locality were distributed with pamphlets just one day before the event.
- b. I strongly oppose the expansion activity of the industry for the following reason.
- c. Pollution is continuously happening in the MRPL and coke and sulphur division are contributing lungs diseases to the people.
- d. Mangalore city corporation is collection UGD cess since 35 years but not developed any UGD infrastructure.
- e. MRPL company has proved by itself that it is not having any social/ moral binding to protect the health of the people in the area. This is proved by the court orders that they are receiving.
- f. Company is not giving employment to the local community. And based on the above points we have strong objection to the expansion of industry.

**6. Krishi Bhoomi Samrakshana Samithi, Permude, Mangalore:**

- a. Plant and Human life have already been visibly impacted by MRPL activity especially in Atturkodi and Jokatte.
- b. Severe dust and noise has been major factor responsible for deteriorating health and quality of life.
- c. Sri. A.B Ibrahim Deputy Commissioner and the Minister Sri Ramanath Rai have admitted the ground realities of human life at Jokatte, after visiting the area. As reported in 19 January 2016 in Prajavani paper.
- d. There are enough evidence to show ground water is unfit for drinking.

- e. The mitigation measures mentioned in EIA reports seems to be ritual not executed at any stage.
- f. The added traffic due to expansion is going to have adverse impact.
- g. The company bad track record does not give confidence that it is going to set right the things in future.

**7. Sri. Ramachandra Bhat, Karavali Karnataka Jana abhivridhhi vedike,:**

We welcome the proposed upgrade of refining facilities of MRPL so as to achieve BS-VI Auto Fuel Quality Compliance as per Supreme Court and Ministry of Road Transport Directives. However based on our perusal of the draft EIA and Risk Analysis report we would like to make the following submission.

- a. Combine upgrade of phases I and II with augmentation of capacity to 18 MMTPA without further diversion of agricultural land for industrial use.
- b. Judicious allocation and use of common water resources.
- c. Permissible emission must be based on cumulative emissions of all industries in area.
- d. Independent safety inspection of the aging plant.
- e. Baseline health survey of the neighborhood
- f. A detailed independent risk assessment study is required.
- g. Insurance cover for public against for loss due to accidents.
- h. Study on contamination of ground water.
- i. Consider storage capacity in ISPRL, MSEZ area while planning storage tanks.
- j. Industry must be held responsible for maintaining quality of roads used by refinery traffics.

**8. Smt. Carmine Sequeira, Pinto Sadan, Irmudi, Thenkayekkaru, Mangalore:**

- a. People, birds and animals are suffering from Sound Pollution.
- b. Because of Air pollution people are suffering from trout infection, vomiting and other problems.
- c. Black dust is deposited on leaves of many plants.
- d. SEZ project people are not following MOEF guidelines and pollution control board failed to protect the environment.
- e. Because of industrial activity surrounding area temperature is increasing.

**9. Sri. Ramachandra Bhatta, ICAR, College of Fisheries, Mangalore:**

- a. Proposed project adds to the air pollution.
- b. What are the storage arrangements for hazardous chemicals.
- c. What are the ground water quality parameters and actual results in the neighboring villages.

- d. Whether any consultation meetings are held with the actual water users of ground water.
- e. Whether all four seasonal data on soil, water, temperature and other parameters done for preparation of EIA report.
- f. How many local people received jobs.
- g. In page number 4.18 Sec 4.2.6.1 of the EIA report it is mentioned that there are no notified areas are there with Mangroves in Mangalore division which is false.

**10. Sri Gragory Patrao, Permude, Kuthettor**

Contamination of well water due to discharge of oily water from MRPL, violating Assistant Commissioner, Mangalore order dated 18.07.2011 and expressed his opposition for the establishment of said project.

**11. Smt. Yashodhara, Atturkodi, Kuthettur**

Contamination of well water due to discharge of oily water from MRPL, violating Assistant Commissioner, Mangalore order dated 18.07.2011 and expressed her opposition for the establishment of said project.

\*\*\*\*\*