

4.0 DATA

4.1 Report Review

4.1.1 Objective

The objective of the report review is to extract details from existing reports, pertaining to public participation and methods which would enable a detailed study. The following details were extracted from reports.

1. Name of the Project developer
2. Project Approving Agency
3. Project cost
4. Project extent
5. Number of affected people
6. Methodologies used in different stages

EIA reports of development projects which underwent the formal clearance procedure are not easy to find in one place. To obtain such reports various agencies and personnel were contacted. The following are the agencies visited to collect data (Table 1)

1. Central Environmental Authority(CEA)
2. Sri Lanka Environmental Assessment Association (SLEAA)
3. International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN)
4. University of Moratuwa

Table 1: Locations visited, Dates, Reports and Personnel contacted

Name of the Institution	Contact Personnel	Contact Dates (The Year 2000)	Project Report No.
1) Central Environmental Authority	Mrs. Kanthi De Silva	25/2,3/3,10/3,7/4, 28/4, 4/5, 5/5,12/5, 19/5, 2/6, 9/6, 13/6, 4/7, 18/7, 23/8, 31/8, 7/9, 20/9	IEE – 1 to 13 EIA – 1 to 15
2) Sri Lanka Environmental Assessment Association	Ms.U.Deraniyagala	2/3,8/3,9/3,16/3, 3/4,17/4	IEE-2,4,6,8 EIA-5.7,13, 14, 15

Name of the Institution	Contact Personnel	Contact Dates (The Year 2000)	Project Report No.
3) International Union for Conservation of Nature	Mrs. S. Yasarathne	20/7,24/7,26/7,3/8,8/8,11/8,	IEE-4, 10 EIA-6,9,12,17
4) University of Moratuwa	Dr. N.T.S.Wijesekera	25/2,2/3,25/4,10/5,15/6,21/7,2/8,	IEE-2,5,10 EIA-1, 4, 6,7, 9, 11, 13

4.1.2 Data Extraction

Reports were scanned to collect informations on public participation during EIA stages, and to identify the methods. Reports in general did not contain explicit information about public participation. However, the data collection from reports was done to obtain important informations (Table 2)

4.1.3 Data Extraction Issues

1. Some of the reports do not contain the project alternatives, though it is a prime objective of an EIA to identify "alternatives" to the proposed project.
2. Most of the reports do not contain a scientific comparison of project alternatives other than a justification on the selected option.
3. Methodologies used in different activities such as identification of impacts, comparison of alternatives, quantification of impacts, mitigatory measures are very limited. Most of them are limited to simple and descriptive check lists.
4. Very few EIA reports had the Extended Benefit Cost Analysis and a monitoring plan.

4.2 Documents of Central Environmental Authority

EIA reports do not contain all the details related to public participation, i.e. stages of public participation, different sectors involved, public comments and public hearing details etc. This is because action takes place after submission of the EIA report. These details are available with the agency which is administering the EIA process. Natural Resources Management Division of the CEA had information of most of these reports. Details obtained were separated and kept in different files under each project.

These data were sorted out under following headings.

1. Different Affiliated Groups in the IEE/EIA Process (Table 3)

As affiliated groups Non-Governmental Organizations, Youth organizations, Residents of the locality, Non-residents, Gramodaya mandala and Religious organizations have taken part in this process.

2. Different Issues in Public Comments (Table 4)

The comments given by public could be categorized into six issue groups.

1. Socio – Economic Issues (Table 4.1)

I. Loss of house / land

This is a very basic need about which the public is always concerned. People have made different comments like, inundation of house and property, demolishing of their house and property due to various widening and extension road projects, demolishing of their ancestral houses, departing from their beloved ones, resettlement areas where there are no basic facilities like water, electricity etc.

II. Loss of jobs / income

Under this category people have commented on losing their only income source like groceries, boutique or shops, fishing activities in danger, difficulties on sales, difficulty on sales promotion due to resettlement or relocation, loss of their daily customers due to changing the location, loss of their routine jobs due to new project development activities such as closing of roads and pathways etc.

III. Loss of cultivation / Cultivable land.

Under this sub-issue people have made comments on loss of paddy lands, rubber plantation and chena cultivation, water becomes a scarcity due to the project activities, new road ways and path ways are going on cultivable land plots, soil erosion, inundation of cultivation and cultivated lands, lands taken over by the Government for development project activities etc.

2. Environment and Health Issues (Table 4.2)

I. Air/Water/Noise Pollution

In this sub issue public have commented mainly about the pollution of water bodies, atmosphere and the pollution due to sounds and various noises.

- II Spreading of Diseases
This category mainly covers the issues in spreading of diseases due to various project development activities. It seems to be very high in sanitary land fill sites.
- III Impact on vulnerable groups
Infants, school children and pregnant women have categorized under this group.

3. Inadequacy in IEE/EIA Reports (Table 4.3)

- I. Alternative Strategies
Under this sub issue public have raised comments on other alternative options for the development projects, which they feel inadequately addressed.
- II. Data queries
In this sub issue the comments are mainly on the accuracy of data. Specially the number of affected people, number of houses to be demolished etc. are the main concerns.
- III. Maintenance and Operation and Mitigatory Measures
Under this sub issue public have commented on operation and maintenance problem, mitigatory measures adopted to reduce various impacts etc.
- IV. Simplicity of IEE/EIA reports
Under this category, public have mentioned that the report writing language is difficult to understand and the terminology used is not simple.

4. Requests for Public Hearing

This issue only considers the requests made by the public to hold public hearings for development projects.

5. Cultural and Aesthetic Issues

This category covers the comments on loss of cultural and aesthetic values, loss of important religious places, loss of scenic beauty and loss of historical values.

6. Other Issues (Table 4.4)

- I. Legal issues
- II. Financial issues
- III. Just protest only

3. Public Involvement Stages in IEE/EIA Process (Table 5)

According to the National Environmental Act (NEA 1980,1988) public can participate in five stages. i.e.

1. Scoping
2. Meeting with public
3. Public commenting period
4. Public hearing
5. EIA appeals

Such information were extracted from the official files maintained for IEE/EIA administration.

4. Different Methodologies Adopted in IEE/EIA Pocess (Table 6)

Five different process activities were selected where methodologies can be adopted, i.e.

1. Scoping
2. Comparison of alternatives
3. Impact identification
4. Impact quantification
5. Mitigatory measures



University of Moratuwa, Sri Lanka.
Electronic Theses & Dissertations
www.lib.mrt.ac.lk

4.3 Data Verification

4.3.1 Direct Contact for Verification

Interviews/discussions were held with some selected organizations to obtain a picture of public participation from their view point. The organizations actively engaged in the EIA process, such as Project developers, Project Approving Agencies, NGOO, Donor agencies were selected.

Selected agencies are summarized below.

1. Project Developers

Under this category two organizations were selected, i.e. Road Development Authority and Ceylon Electricity Board. Basis behind the selection of these two is that development projects such as Colombo – Katunayake Expressway and Upper Kotmale Hydropower Project have raised much public concern under these agencies.

2. Project Approving Agency

Two Institutions were selected. Mainly the Central Environmental Authority(CEA) and Department of Coast Conservation(CCD). These were selected since, CEA is the lead agency for environmental concerns in Sri Lanka and CCD is the first organization to implement the EIA process.

3. NGO


Environmental Foundation Ltd. (EFL) was selected under this category because it is a leading and a very active institution in environmental concerns. It is also Sri Lanka's oldest environmental NGO which made the selection criteria. EFL has been active in Sri Lanka's EIA process since its infancy. It had been dealing with EIAs from 1993 and possess wealth of experience.

4. Donor Agency

World Bank was selected under this category. This is one of the leading donor agencies which gives public participation a high priority. Following table shows a summary of the interviews and discussions.

Table 7 – Contacted Personnel from Different Institutions

Institution	Contacted Personal	Views on Public Participation
Central Environmental Authority	Mrs.R.Ellepola Deputy Director General	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Public participation is a good option, if the public comments come in a more matured manner.▪ Unlike in Developed countries, Sri Lankans are not educated enough to comment on a project.▪ Public comments are very emotional.

Institution	Contacted Personal	Views on Public Participation
Coast Conservation Department	Mr. I.Ranasinghe Deputy Director (Planning)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Public commenting period makes the EIA process unnecessarily delayed. ▪ Most of the public comments do not have any factual basis. Good example is Kalpitiya Coal power plant.
North Western Provincial Council	Mr.S.Senanayake Director	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Public participation should be encouraged since it makes the process more effective. ▪ Since the public is influenced by external groups, it is difficult to obtain genuine comments.
Road Development Authority	Mr.Weerasinghe Project Director(CKE)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Public comments are very helpful to make a good EIA report. ▪ To get more genuine comments public should be aware of the project. Should conduct more awareness programs. ▪ Unnecessary comments can be controlled by conducting these programs.
 World Bank	<p>University of Moratuwa, Sri Lanka Electronic Theses & Dissertations www.lib.mrt.ac.lk</p> <p>Dr.S.Pilapitiya Snr.Env.Engineer</p> <p>Dr.S.Pilapitiya's personnel view</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ According to World Bank conditions public participation is a compulsory event. ▪ As a donor agency, always encourage and enhance public participation. ▪ Public involvement does not create any sense for the EIA process, since the public is not educated enough to comment on it. ▪ Since the comments are more emotional they have become barriers for the development process. ▪ EIA process today has become only an administrative tool than a decision making tool.

Institution	Contacted Personal	Views on Public Participation
Environmental Law Foundation Ltd.,	Mr.Lalanath De Silva Director	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Public involvement should be encouraged and it is compulsorily included in the EIA process. ▪ Lot of problems arise due to public participation, because the public is not getting the clear picture about the project during planning stages. ▪ If the Developer carries out awareness programs properly, more valuable and informative comments could be obtained.
Environmental Foundation Ltd.,	Mr.H.Vithanage Director	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Still public commenting is not in a very satisfactory stage in Sri Lanka. In the scoping sessions it is not welcomed by most of the Project Approving Agencies. ▪ Translated EIA documents are incorrect. It does not contain adequate data. These things lead to misleading the public. Therefore, public do not have any confidence over the Developer. ▪ EIA is a good mechanism if, used sincerely.

4.3.2 Indirect Contact for Verification

Collected data from reports and files were verified by contacting some of the responded personnel. Intention was to obtain direct information about their interests, the way and impression on the process. In this process projects were randomly selected and a few personnel, who had responded were contacted.

The projects and contacted personnel are listed in the table.



Table 8 - Indirectly Contacted Personnel

Name of the project	Name of the Contacted Person
Buddhist / Hindu Cultural Centre Complex at Muthurajawela (IEE)	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. AntonyRaja,Awarakotuwa ,Elakanda.2. S.A.Fernando, Maradana Rd. Hendala3. M.I Perera, Galkanda, Kerawalapitiya4. A. U.De Silva, Hekitta, Hendala5. F.R. Dias, Bund Rd. Hendala.
Colombo-Katunayake Expressway	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. R.A.Sunil,16a,Station Rd, Hunupitiya2. W.A.Anurasiri, Ekala Rd,Ja- ela.3. A.S.Samarasinghe,CrossRd, Hunupitiya.4. K.C.Perera,No.33,Swastika gardens,Peliyagoda.5. K.T.T.Perera, Tudella, Ja- ela.
Southern Expressway	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. K. Dayawansa, Kumaragama pl, Talawakele.2. Rev.Fr. Nandana, Kande Vidiya, Kandy3. K.Sitharan, Station Rd, Kotagoda.4. W.Kandasamy,Main St.,Talawakele5. C.Habraduwa,Kumaragama, Talawakele.

Name of the project	Name of the Contacted Person
Coal Fired Thermal Power Plant, Kalpitiya.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. J.B.Devaraja, Kinsey Rd, Colombo 8 2. D.S.Armstrong, Dalugama, Kelaniya 3. G.Lord, Korea Mw., Chillaw 4. Fr.A.Vincent, RC Church, Bolawatha. 5. Dulip Chamal, Main Rd., Puttlam.
Solid Waste Disposal Site at Koratota	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. S.A.Somawathie, Galketiya, Kaduwela. 2. V.Nanyakkara, Keels Housing scheme, Kaduwela. 3. Alice Perera, Kandewatta, Malabe. 4. A.T.De Silva, Colmbo Rd, Hingurala. 5. Saraswathie, Uyan watta, Malabe.

