

PROCEEDINGS OF THE PUBLIC HEARING CONDUCTED AT THE MULTI-PURPOSE HALL, POLAGAM, T.R.PATTINAM, KARAIKAL, ON 26.10.2016, AT 11.00 AM, FOR THE PROPOSED PROJECT OF HANDLING OF LNG, AT M/S. KARAIKAL PORT PVT. LTD., KARAIKAL.

I. Queries and Comments of the Participants:

Post the presentation of the Consultant of the Project, the participants were given opportunity for expression of their Queries and Comments, regarding the project. The queries and comments raised during the Public Hearing are as follows:

S. No.	Name & Address of the participants and Queries / Comments raised in the Public Hearing.
1	<p>Dr. Anand Kumar, President, Indian Anti-Corruption Group, Puducherry:</p> <p>(a) At the outset, the above said representative welcomed the project to Karaikal District.</p> <p>(b) But alleged that, the consultant of the project have masked the truth stating that, Methane Gas is non-toxic, but actually it is toxic.</p> <p>(c) He informed that, Methane Gas will take oxygen from the atmosphere and it will cause health and fire hazard. The EIA report is silent about the compensation to be awarded to the victims, if any.</p>
2	<p>Thiru. R. Murugesan, Treasurer, Keezhavanjore Grama Nirvaga Panchayat, T.R.Pattinam, Karaikal:</p> <p>(a) Since inception of M/s. Karaikal Port Pvt. Ltd., in 2006, the people of the Keezhavanjore Village have been suffering from the Coal Dust, due to Handling of Coal at the Port and stated that, No CSR activities has been carried out by the Port, but claiming that they have spent nearly 7 Crores for the same.</p> <p>(b) No plantation has been done around the port area.</p> <p>(c) LNG is dangerous for Human life, at minus 162°C has a chance of explosion, as LNG is highly inflammable and that, the subject village is located only at a distance of 50 m from the Port.</p> <p>(d) Employment for the local people was not provided in the Port.</p> <p>(e) Air Quality Monitoring was not conducted in the village since 2012, by PPCC and that, third party monitoring is not advisable.</p> <p>(f) Groundwater has been polluted due to the present port activities.</p> <p>(g) Fishing is already been prohibited in the Port Area and will be prohibited in the proposed area of the Port also, since Handling of Bulk LNG, poses security</p>

Queries / Comments of the Public – Handling of LNG – M/s. Karaikal Port Pvt. Ltd.

	<p>threat and can manifest itself to a national security threat.</p> <p>(h) Due to coal dust deposition in sea, the fish catch in the nearby area has reduced and thereby a dire impact in the livelihood of the local people.</p>
3	<p>Thiru. Subramaniyan, Consumer Forum, Karaikal:</p> <p>(a) He was really happy for the project of Karaikal Port, before implementing, because of the expectation of developments like local employment offers and livelihood of the local public.</p> <p>(b) But, later on, due to unexpected handling of Coal and its consequent dust pollution in the village, he was frustrated.</p> <p>(c) Automatic Coal Handling system was not installed and practiced right now, which in turn is causing for the Air Pollution in the surrounding villages.</p> <p>(d) The port was alleged to offer only timely temporary compensations to the local public, as and when agitations were raised.</p> <p>(e) No single tree is planted in the surrounding villages by the Port and the local public has lost confidence on the management of the Port.</p> <p>(f) Land and Air are already polluted due to the poor handling of coal.</p>
4	<p>Thiru. S. Jayakrishnan, Wood Merchant, Karaikal:</p> <p>(a) The main activity in Karaikal was Agriculture which is majorly affected due to port activities.</p> <p>(b) No job opportunity was given to the local people.</p> <p>(c) No development in the local areas due to the Port activity.</p>
5	<p>Thiru. Ramadurai, Pattinacherry, T.R.Pattinam, Karaikal:</p> <p>(a) Fishing activity has been prohibited in the port area and hence, Livelihood of Fishermen is affected due to the advent of Port.</p> <p>(b) Local people have been denied their rights on fishing in the very port area.</p> <p>(c) Fish stock has decreased due to dredging and port activity.</p> <p>(d) Local people may revolt against the Port, if the LNG project is permitted.</p> <p>(e) It will be another Bhopal Gas Tragedy.</p>
6	<p>Thiru. James Baly, President, Press Club and Reporter, Dinakaran, Karaikal:</p> <p>(a) Due to handling of Coal at the Port, the local villages surrounding the same, such as, Keezhavanjore Village and Nagore, has been affected and also questioned PPCC & the District Collector, Karaikal that, how many inspections</p>

Queries / Comments of the Public – Handling of LNG – M/s. Karaikal Port Pvt. Ltd.

	/ monitoring has been carried out at the Port and the surrounding villages and what actions has been taken so far, regarding the same.
7	<p>Thiru. M. Rajendiran, President, Consumer Forum, T.R.Pattinam:</p> <p>(a) Facts about the possible hazards of the LNG to the lives and Environment have been hidden in the Draft EIA Report.</p> <p>(b) Deficiency in the pollution control measures by the port for coal handling has made local public to suffer.</p>
8	<p>Thiru. Shakthivel, Nagore Pattinacherry:</p> <p>(a) Due to the construction of the breakwaters of the Port, the shore on either side of the port got eroded and around 60 houses got inundated in the sea.</p> <p>(b) The breakwaters have forced the local fishermen to sail long way for fishing.</p> <p>(c) The Oil pipelines of the CPCL, near the Vettar River, has been a major hindrance for the landing of Fishing Boats.</p> <p>(d) Most of the fishermen's boats were damaged due to the same.</p> <p>(e) The dredged sand has been poured into the River Vettar and hence the river mouth has been closed.</p> <p>(f) If LNG also has been permitted the effects would be so devastating.</p>
9	<p>Thiru. Sowrirajan, Meenavar Panchayat, Nagore:</p> <p>(a) No public hearing was conducted before establishing port.</p> <p>(b) The River Vettar has been damaged by the advent of Port and has been major hindrance for the fishing activities.</p> <p>(c) Coal transportation through wagons spill coal in the river Vettar and the same has been polluted.</p> <p>(d) The north easterly wind carried coal dust and has deposited the same on the residences and Nagore Dargha, a sacred tourist place and also on the fishing net, which on using leads to lesser fish catch.</p> <p>(e) This affects the livelihood of around 5000 fishermen</p> <p>(f) Since the population density around the Port area is high, any accident due to LNG handling may cause serious damage, hence opposed the proposal.</p>
10	<p>Thiru. Shakthivel, Pattinacherry, T.R.Pattinam, Karaikal:</p> <p>(a) When the port has been proposed in 2006, the public were not aware of the proposed handling of Coal, since no public hearing was conducted.</p>

Queries / Comments of the Public – Handling of LNG – M/s. Karaikal Port Pvt. Ltd.

	<p>(b) Coal is being carried out by the rainwater and the sea water is being polluted.</p> <p>(c) Port has placed bouys in the sea water, which is hindering the pathway of boats for fishing and the same is being damaged.</p> <p>(d) Fishermen are denied of their right for fishing due to the advent of Port and hence, most of the fishermen have migrated to nearby coastal areas, like Poombuhar, Kodiyakarai, etc., for livelihood.</p> <p>(e) Awareness about the mobility for the fishermen, around the port was not provided by the port.</p> <p>(f) Around 1 km stretch of casuarina plantation has been uprooted for the construction of the port in the coastal area.</p> <p>(g) Hence, the local public need no port and don't support for the expansion.</p>
11	<p>Thiru. A. Abdul Rahman, Keezhavanjore, T.R.Pattinam, Karaikal:</p> <p>(a) Due to the advent of port, the local livelihood have been affected like, palm trees were dead, groundnut cultivation could not be carried out and there had been flood in the village due to heavy rains.</p> <p>(b) Port did not provide job offers to the local public, as propagated before establishment of port, instead destroyed the oneness of the people of the village, for their benefit.</p> <p>(c) Due to loss of groundnut cultivation, no compensation was provided also.</p> <p>(d) Pisciculture in ponds also could not be carried out by the local public.</p> <p>(e) The above said representative of the public expressed that, he may file a case against port in the NGT and hence did not support Port or LNG Project.</p>
12	<p>Thiru. Rajaraman, Melavanjore, T.R.Pattinam, Karaikal:</p> <p>(a) There is hazard in LPG also and hence, requested the Government to assess the project and then decide on granting permission for the project, if no risk is envisaged.</p>
13	<p>Thiru. Rajendiran, Pattinacherry, T.R.Pattinam, Karaikal:</p> <p>(a) Already CPCL has laid their pipeline beneath the Vettar River. Due to these the fishing crafts gets damage. The revolt for relief for the same is being carried out for the past three years, which was not addressed till now. Now Port's LNG pipeline will also have same effect on fishing crafts.</p>
14	<p>Thiru. Ramesh, T.R.Pattinam, Karaikal:</p> <p>(a) Advent of Port has affected the livelihood of all the adjacent villages and there</p>

Queries / Comments of the Public – Handling of LNG – M/s. Karaikal Port Pvt. Ltd.

	<p>were no development for them.</p> <p>(b) Why to support to such organization which has offered no development to the surrounding public.</p> <p>(c) Hence, he neither supported the Port nor the proposed LNG project.</p>
15	<p>Thiru. Senthil Kumaran, Pattinacherry, T.R.Pattinam, Karaikal:</p> <p>(a) The existing port operation is not done properly.</p> <p>(b) Though Port claims huge amount of money spent on CSR activities, no CSR benefit has reached the village.</p> <p>(c) Port should first conduct a hearing for the present port operations and then go for the LNG expansion.</p>
16	<p>Thiru. K.R.Rajendiran, Ex-Chairman, T.R.Pattinam Commune Panchayat, Keezhavanjore, T.R.Pattinam, Karaikal:</p> <p>(a) Being a farmer and Agriculture being a major activity in the region said that port activities should not affect farming or prawn culture.</p> <p>(b) Pollution issues to be tackled by the port.</p> <p>(c) Requested for compensation by the port in case of those lands those are not usable by the villagers.</p>
17	<p>Thiru. Kadar Mohideen, T.R.Pattinam, Karaikal:</p> <p>(a) Environment has been polluted due to the poor handling of coal.</p> <p>(b) Prove that there is no pollution from the port activities and then go for expansion.</p>
18	<p>Thiru. R.K.Baskaran, President, Keezhavanjore Grama Nirvaga Panchayat, T.R.Pattinam, Karaikal:</p> <p>(a) Mentioned that complaints were submitted by the Grama Nirvaga Panchayat with regards to the pollution due to coal handling.</p> <p>(b) Groundwater already polluted due to the port activities.</p> <p>(c) Solid waste/ garbage from the port is being disposed into the village.</p> <p>(d) Waste from LNG handling might pollute the sea water.</p> <p>(e) Awareness about the LNG was not well created and the project has not been clearly explained.</p>
19	<p>Thiru. Anbukadhiravan, Keezhavanjore, T.R.Pattinam, Karaikal:</p>

Queries / Comments of the Public – Handling of LNG – M/s. Karaikal Port Pvt. Ltd.

	<p>(a) What is the impact on neighbouring areas if LNG explodes and how much distance will it spread?</p> <p>(b) What are the impacts on fisheries due to drawing of seawater for cooling and outfall discharge?</p> <p>(c) Will LNG proposal be a hindrance for fishing?</p> <p>(d) Safe LNG handling by the port is an uncertainty.</p> <p>(e) Safe zones such as the 500 mtrs from the LNG terminal to be ensured.</p> <p>(f) Dust deposition on the houses due to Poor coal handling by the port. This dust washed by the rain water pollutes the land.</p> <p>(g) Dredging will affect the ground water.</p> <p>(h) The oneness of the people of the surrounding villages, has been effected due to the Port's Public relations.</p> <p>(i) LNG may be permitted only if it is 100% safe.</p>
--	--

II. Clarifications provided to the participants:

In pursuance of the Queries and Comments raised by the participants of the Public Hearing, the following clarifications were provided to the participants:

S. No.	Clarifications provided to the Participants
1	<p>Dr. P. Chandramohan, Project Co-ordinator of the Proposed LNG Project, Indomer Coastal Hydraulics Ltd., Chennai:</p> <p>(a) LNG is not dangerous to the Environment and does not explode at minus 162°C.</p> <p>(b) LNG is compressed to Liquid and maintained at minus 162°C, to be safe.</p> <p>(c) Methane Gas is lighter than air and hence, if leaks occur, will not disperse transversely, but move up in the atmosphere.</p> <p>(d) This project does not cause any pollution to the Environment, Land or water.</p> <p>(e) All safety measures and mitigations measures required and raised by the participants will be incorporated in the Draft EIA Report.</p>
2	<p>Dr. N. Ramesh, Environmental Engineer, Department of Science, Technology and Environment, Puducherry Pollution Control Committee, Puducherry :</p> <p>(a) No-Objection Certificate for the establishment of the Port was issued prior to</p>

Queries / Comments of the Public – Handling of LNG – M/s. Karaikal Port Pvt. Ltd.

	<p>the EIA Notification, 2006, wherein, Public Hearing was not mandated.</p> <p>(b) Now that, the proposed LNG Project falls under the EIA Notification, 2006 and hence, Public Hearing was conducted for the same.</p>
3	<p>Thiru. K. Dharmalingam, Indomer Coastal Hydraulics Ltd., Chennai :</p> <p>(a) LNG is not hazardous and dangerous to the Environment and does not explode at minus 162°C.</p> <p>(b) LNG is proposed to be handled at liquid phase at minus 162°C, which is very safe.</p> <p>(c) Many successful similar projects have been handled previously and no accidents have been reported till date.</p>

III. Written Representations of the Participants received :

Few numbers of the Representations were received from the Participants, for and against the proposed LNG Project, as follows :

S. No.	Written Representations of the Participants received
1	<p>Representations received in support of the proposal:</p> <p>(a) Thiru. K.R.Rajendiran, Ex-Chairman, T.R.Pattinam Commune Panchayat.</p> <p>(b) Melavanjore Gram Panchayat and local residents, Melavanjore Village, T.R.Pattinam, Karaikal.</p> <p>(c) Local Residents, Pillayar Koil Street, Keezhavanjore Village, Karaikal.</p> <p>(d) Gram Panchayat and local residents, Nagore Village, Nagapattinam District.</p> <p>(e) Tamilnadu Dhargas Co-ordinate Peravai, Darga Market Lane, Nagore.</p>
2	<p>Representations received against the proposal:</p> <p>(a) Keezhavanjore Grama Nirvaga Panchayat, Keezhavanjore Village, T.R.Pattinam, Karaikal.</p> <p>(b) Thirumalairayanpattinam Consumer Forum, T.R.Pattinam, Karaikal.</p>