

## **Marmugoa Port Dredging Project**

### **What is the issue?**

\n\n

\n

- Dredging to deepen the estuarine natural harbour of Mormuga, Goa was started in early 2016.

\n

- The massiveness of the projects threatened the environment and fishing in the region, triggering public outrage.

\n

- Subsequently 'National Green Tribunal' gave its verdict that barred further work in September 2016, which was later upheld by the Supreme Court.

\n

\n\n

### **What was the need of a deep navigational channel?**

\n\n

\n

- Mormugao Port, a major port under the Ministry of Shipping has a 14 m draft canal depth.

\n

\n\n

\n

- It imports 12 million tonnes of coal annually and aims to raise this figure to 51 million tonnes by 2030.

\n

- So deepening the shipping channel to a depth of 19.5m is necessary to to facilitate the entry of 'capesize vessals'.

\n

- Currently, only private ports have depths of 18 m or more, and a deeper draft is the first step towards port expansion.

\n

- The overall EXIM (export-import) boost due to better transport economics is being touted as a net-positive.

\n

\n\n

## **What was the method proposed to deepen?**

\n\n

- \n
  - Capital dredging was being done.
- \n
  - It involves tearing up the seabed and extracting its sediments to create greater depth.
- \n
  - This is different from maintenance dredging in which there is no sediment extraction.
- \n
  - About 15 million cubic metres of Seabed was to be dredged, and an 18 km-long navigational channel was to be deepened.
- \n
  - Some 65% of the work had been completed by September 2016.

\n\n

## **Why was the project opposed?**

\n\n

- \n
  - There was no clarity on whether a geomorphological study of the shipping channel undertaken.
- \n
  - The study on the 'benthic activity' of the deep ocean ecology in the region wasn't brought out.
- \n
  - As there is a risk of sediment erosion from the estuaries into the trenches created by dredging, these aspects needs further study.

\n\n

- \n
  - The approval of the Expert Appraisal Committee (EAC) was not taken.
- \n
  - Concerns flagged by 'Goa Coastal zone Management Authorities' were ignored.
- \n
  - 'Ministry of Environment' bypassed the mandatory public hearing before project commencement.

\n

- It was feared that aquatic life, sea bed ecosystem and livelihoods of fishermen would be affected.  
\n
- Also, it was felt that subsequent infrastructure upgrades like roads, increased traffic and store houses needed scrutiny.  
\n

\n\n

### **What was the Tribunal's verdict?**

\n\n

- \n
- NGT passed its final order in September 2016, accusing the port authorities of several irregularities and banned further work.  
\n
- It noted that mandatory provisions were treated as mere formalities as work had commenced even before Environmental Clearance was sought.  
\n
- Authorities were held responsibly for irreversibly damaging the environment and geomorphology of the sea-bead.  
\n
- The MoEF's decision to bypass public consultation was labelled arbitrary and a violation of norms.  
\n
- The tribunal stressed that policy or administrative decisions cannot bypass or subvert statutory provisions of existing acts.  
\n
- The importance of transparency and accountability in public administration was highlighted.  
\n

\n\n

### **What is the situation now?**

\n\n

- \n
- A committee has been appointed by the tribunal to monitor maintenance dredging at the port.  
\n
- Following the NGT order, the public hearing finally took place in March 2017.  
\n
- The Tribunal is now hearing a matter related to the restoration of the seabed and new set of recommendations is expected.

\n

\n\n

\n\n

**Source: The Indian Express**

\n

