



न्यूक्लियर पावर कॉर्पोरेशन  
ऑफ इंडिया लिमिटेड  
(भारत सरकार का उद्यम)

**NUCLEAR POWER CORPORATION  
OF INDIA LIMITED**  
( A Govt. of India Enterprise)

विक्रम साराभाई भवन, विक्रम Sarabhai Bhavan,  
मध्य मार्ग, अणुशक्तिनगर, Central Avenue Road, Anushaktinagar,  
मुंबई - 400 094. Mumbai - 400 094.

दूरभाष / Phone : (0) 022-2550 7773, 2599 1205  
फैक्स / Fax : 022-2599 1208  
ई-मेल / E-mail : nnagaich@npcil.co.in

नलिनीश नगाइच

अधिशासी निदेशक (सी पी एवं सी सी)

**Nalinish Nagaich**

Executive Director (CP & CC)

D.O.No. NPCIL/ED (CP&CC)/2012/M/ 60

March 27, 2012.

Dear Shri Sarma,

This has reference to your letter dated 07.01.2012 addressed to the Hon. Prime Minister regarding the nuclear power project at Kovadda (Andhra Pradesh) being implemented by NPCIL. The said letter is forwarded to us with an advice to respond. In your letter, you have raised some concerns in respect of the implementation of Kovvada project.

1.0 As for the land acquisition with respect to the proposed Kovvada project, we would like to clarify that there is a common 'Land Acquisition Act' of the government, which is applicable to all industries in the state/country, and nuclear power plants are no exception in this regard. The land acquisition process is fully consultative and democratic in nature. Indeed, NPCIL is following the laid-down procedures as per the land acquisition law in the country.

2.0. The site selection, pre-project activities and start of the project is fully consultative and democratic.

Unlike in case of other projects, sites for nuclear power projects are accorded 'in principle' approval by the Government after an exhaustive and long-drawn process of evaluation of sites offered by states. The evaluation

.....2/-

पंजीकृत कार्यालय : सेन्टर-1, 16 वाँ तल, विश्व व्यापार केन्द्र, कफ परेड, कुलाबा, मुंबई - 400 005

Regd. Office : Centre-1, 16<sup>th</sup> Floor, World Trade Centre, Cuffe Parade, Colaba, Mumbai - 400 005

of the candidate site(s) is carried out by Site Selection Committee (SSC) appointed by the government in accordance to the criteria laid down in the Code on Siting by Atomic Energy Regulatory Board (AERB). The sites which meet the criteria are recommended by the SSC to the Government. This is then followed by a consultation process involving various Ministries, before according in-principle approval.

A series of exhaustive technical studies in respect of siting, like seismo-tectonic, safe grade level, geo-technical, meteorological, and several other scientific studies are carried out by various specialized national-level institutions independent to NPCIL.

Pre-project activities are a prelude to the start of a nuclear power project and are a long-drawn process. These comprise land acquisition process, EIA clearance, AERB siting consent, and approval of detailed project proposals by the government. In respect of nuclear power project in accordance to the current approved procedure, these four modules are initiated concurrently essentially to optimize the gestation time of these pre-project activities. However, the approval of project by the government is accorded only after the ensuring environmental clearance by MoEF and siting clearance by AERB.

### 3.0 NPCIL is following the due process of Environmental clearance.

The application for approval of Terms of Reference (ToR) for the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) studies was submitted to the Ministry of Environment and Forests (MoEF) in April 2010, vide our letter no. NPCIL/ Dir(P)/2010/M/2214011/6/2010-IA.II(N) and the ToR were approved by the MoEF after review in July 2011, i.e. 'before' the State Government issued the GO No. 270 dt. 27-12-2011, and not 'after' as you have mentioned in your letter.

At present, EIA studies for the project are at an advanced stage and would be conducted in accordance with the ToR approved by the MoEF. After submission of the report, a public hearing will be organized as per the prescribed process. The project construction will only be started after the accord of environmental clearance from MoEF as per the MoEF stipulations.

#### 4.0 Nuclear power does not pollute the environment.

A nuclear power plant (NPP) is vastly different from other industries like chemical processing units / pharmaceutical industries, which release chemical pollutants into the environment in some or other form. In contrast, NPPs do not emit such environmental pollutants whatsoever. In comparison, if anything that is at all released from an NPP, it is plain water – the condenser cooling water, which is drawn from a nearby water body (the Bay of Bengal in this case), and is discharged back only slightly warmer (by about 5 degree C and well within stipulated limits) and without any pollution, as there is no change in the water chemistry. This discharged cooling water is also non-radioactive, as it is circulated in a completely isolated loop.

Another point that must be mentioned here is that other power-producing technologies like thermal power plants also discharge this slightly warmer condenser cooling water, so this feature is not unique to a nuclear power plant.

As regards the industries located in the area that you mention, they are located about 10 km away or more from the plant and indeed fall in a different watershed. These industries fall in a different environmental setting from that of the proposed nuclear power plant and there would be no incremental pollution load on account of their presence there. Thus, you can see that the presence of Kovvada NPP will not burden the

environment even in the presence of other industries that you have mentioned.

#### 5.0 Safety of the people in various zones around nuclear power plant

The various zones around the plant – the sterilized zone up to 5 km beyond the plant boundary, the emergency planning zone up to 16 km and the radiation impact assessment zone up to 30 km are defined in accordance with the codes and guides of the Atomic Energy Regulatory Board (AERB). While these zones are earmarked for emergency preparedness plans to be implemented in the highly unlikely event of an emergency having off-site implications, it is important to note that the increase in radiation level after setting up of the nuclear power plants would be extremely small and indeed negligible and the current designs of the reactors, Generation (III+), employ many state-of-the-art safety systems evolved based on about 15000 reactor-years of operational feedback globally. The systems employed in these reactors are capable of handling the most stressful situation without any human intervention, and thus the safety of environment and people is fully ensured. Indeed, the latest current-generation plants have exceptional “overlapping” safety provisions that ensure no serious or widespread consequences even in case of an emergency situation. Nevertheless, NPCIL has well laid down procedures and well-established arrangements for handling radiation emergencies as per the guidelines issued by Atomic Energy Regulatory Board. The efficacy of the procedures and arrangements are tested by conducting periodic ‘mock’ emergency drills in collaboration with local administration at regular intervals.

#### 5.1 As mentioned earlier, the impact assessment zone extends up to 30 km. However, even in the accident of the severity of Fukushima, the

evacuation radius was 20-km. In fact, some leading experts have even gone on to say that this 20-km cutoff was on a higher conservative side and overly cautious, suggesting further that a pragmatic approach of reducing this 20 km to a lower figure could have avoided some unnecessary displacement of people. And remember, these were 40-year-old “first-generation” reactors. The modern reactors afford a much higher safety and are indeed among the safest in the world.

5.2 In this context, an event “Radiation and Reason: Fukushima and After” was organized in Japan in October 2011. The event focused on radiation, its effects and general fear of radiation, to provide a more rational perspective. It was clearly noted at the meet that the fears related to radiation were far too exaggerated in comparison to the actual reality. Panelists at the meet pointed out that the current prescriptive levels were too conservative and that in reality the actually measured radioactivity levels around Fukushima were indeed very low and not a cause for the kind of panic that was seen in respect of evacuation of the surrounding population, except at a few hotspots where the radiation measured was relatively higher. In fact, Dr. Akira Tokuhiro, professor of nuclear engineering at the University of Idaho, a chief speaker at the event, said that much of the post-Fukushima evacuation was essentially a matter of abundant precaution and further asserted that a larger-than-necessary 20-km cutoff had in fact resulted in some unnecessary evacuation. Dr. Wade Allison, another noted expert in the field, points out that there are no valid scientific reasons for maligning low level radiation and points out that life on earth has evolved in a low radiation environment naturally and that there exist in our bodies repair mechanisms to counter-balance microscopic effects of radiation.

And as far as the sterilized zone is concerned, the setting up of the nuclear power will not affect the development of the villages as natural growth is

permitted in the zone. Thus, the development that goes with the natural growth, like, say, more hospitals, more schools etc. will take place. Only those activities which are likely to lead to mass migration into the area are regulated by administrative measures. As far as the fisher folk are concerned, they will not lose any fishing rights. Indeed, they can continue to fish in the sea off Kovvada just as fisher folk continue to fish in the sea off the existing coastal nuclear power stations.

#### 6.0 Dissemination of Information among the public

The people's apprehensions are being addressed both directly and through the state government through the Mandal Revenue Officer / Village Revenue Officer. NPCIL has enhanced its public outreach efforts manifold to inform people and allay their apprehensions about nuclear power and related aspects.

The zoning concept is explained through the public awareness campaigns among the people living in the vicinity of the Kovvada site. The zoning philosophy was also discussed and explained to all the visitors at these nuclear power plants. There have also been other public awareness events such as a journalist workshop that was organized at Visakhapatnam in February 2011, where the radiological aspects of nuclear power plants were explained. There have also been field visits of villagers and state officials to Madras Atomic Power Station (MAPS) as well as members comprising journalists, local politicians and leaders to MAPS and Kudankulam Nuclear Power Project (KKNPP).

An article "Anuvu Kadulutondi" explaining the zones was published in the Eenadu Srikakulam edition of 20.07.2011.

## 7.0 Resettlement & Rehabilitation (R&R)


Regarding the Resettlement & Rehabilitation (R&R) package, the persons to be affected by the project have had a series of meetings with the Joint Collector of Srikakulam, along with local leaders of political parties across party lines, where they have submitted a list of their needs.

8.0 Regarding your contention that public awareness programs of NPCIL are counter-productive expenditures is contrary to the truth. In fact, lack of authentic information is counter-productive. The real need of the hour is to empower the masses with reliable information and facts on nuclear power, so that people can have a rational view of the situation, rather than harboring unfounded apprehensions and misconceptions.

We would like to further assure you that NPCIL believes in and is committed to integration and inclusive growth of the surrounding communities, and that the nuclear power programme has always been and will be pursued with full regard to safety, security and livelihood of the people.

With warm regards,

Yours sincerely,

  
N. Nagach 27-03-2012

Shri E.A.S. Sarma  
14-40-4/1 Gokhale Road, Maharaniipeta  
Visakhapatnam-530002.  
Andhra Pradesh

AT - K - 11 Feb 12 - 14  
359626

**Subject** Kovvada Nuclear Power Project in Srikakulam district in AP- Appeal to direct DAE to comply with the law of the land

**From** EAS Sarma <eassarma@gmail.com>

**Date** Saturday, January 7, 2012 11:38 am

**To** pmh7rcr@pmo.nic.in, pmosb@pmo.nic.in, manmohan@sansad.nic.in, jayanthi.n@sansad.nic.in, Tishya Chatterjee <titchatterjee@gmail.com>, Mauskar <jm.mauskar@nic.in>, cs@ap.gov.in, secytoem@gmail.com, secy-atomic@nic.in, cabinetsty@nic.in  
Aruna Rodrigues <arunarod@gmail.com>, Shivaji Rao Tipimani <shivajirao1932@hotmail.com>, "Buddhi Kotasubbarao. Ph.D." <bksubbarao@gmail.com>, arjun@ieer.org, vinodmubayi@gmail.com, Adwait Pednekar <adwait.pednekar@gmail.com>, Ashok Rao <karao.geo@yahoo.com>, balakrishnan <ts.balakrishnan@yahoo.com>, "Dr. A. Gopalakrishnan" <agk37@hotmail.com>, Dunu Roy <quadeeroy@gmail.com>, fbv <fbvisakha@yahoogroups.com>, Medha Patkar <medha.narmada@gmail.com>, Medha Patkar <nba.medha@gmail.com>, napm <napmap@googlegroups.com>, Praful Bidwai <prafulbidwai@gmail.com>, Sanjeev <cpsr.wise@gmail.com>, surya sethi <sethisurya@yahoo.com>, vivek monteiro <vivekmonteiro@yahoo.com>, Vivek Pinto <vivpin689@gmail.com>, Babu Rao K <srikj pala@yahoo.co.uk>, Capt J Rama Rao <captjrrao@gmail.com>, CSE Equity <cse@equitywatch.org>, CSE News <csewhatsnew@lists.csenews.org>, Himanshu Thakkar <ht.sandrp@gmail.com>, K S MURTHY KONDA <ksmurthylaw@gmail.com>, konda srinivasa murthy <molekonda@yahoo.co.in>, krishna vs <vskvizag@gmail.com>, Mrutyumjaya rao <mrutyumjaya@hotmail.com>, Narasinga Rao <narasingaraomandapaka@gmail.com>, Patanjali Tallavajhala <ec\_india@yahoo.com>, pradhana sivaji9 <drshivaji9@yahoo.com>, R Ravi <rrpragada@gmail.com>, Ramana Kumar Kandula <ramana\_kandula@yahoo.com>, shekhar <shekharsingh@gmail.com>, singamsetty bhujangarao <space.disabled@yahoo.co.in>, singamsetty bhujangarao <spacedisabled@gmail.com>, srinivasa murthy konda <kondalaw@hotmail.com>, sunita <sunita@cseindia.org>, Urmila Pingle <upingle@gmail.com>, yaradi krishnamurthy <dry2k7@gmail.com>, raghava\_aj@rediffmail.com, sweeyaspurthi@gmail.com, Business Standard <prashanth.chintala@bsmail.in>, "C.R. Sukumar" <crsukumarmint@gmail.com>, deccan <editor@deccanmail.com>, deepthi bathini <depthibathini@gmail.com>, DNA <ramanadna1@gmail.com>, Eenadu <dyosyam@gmail.com>, Eenadu <editor@eenadu.net>, Eenadu <mspatnaik12@gmail.com>, ETV <nageshetv@gmail.com>, ETV <rajendra.n@etv.co.in>, ETV 1 <djayat@rediffmail.com>, ETV 2 <djayat@gmail.com>, ETV 3 <Eenaduvisakha@hotmail.com>, Hindu Ramesh Susarla <susarla13@gmail.com>, hindu sarma <biprasarma@thehindu.co.in>, HMTV <srbyaya@yahoo.co.in>, HMTV <vsmurthy.19@gmail.com>, HMTV Sarma <vspsharma@hmtv.in>, HT <snehal.rebello@hindustantimes.com>, IE <mkskumar1@gmail.com>, Indian Express <naiduie@gmail.com>, inews <jravichandrain@yahoo.com>, jayaram ps <psjayaram@hotmail.com>, ka-badarinath <badarinath61@yahoo.co.in>, Leader <andhrleader@gmail.com>, Mohammed Shafeeq <shafeeq.mohammed@gmail.com>, Moneylife <shuktl@moneylife.in>, mridula chunduri <cmrids@gmail.com>, MTV <eswarmahaatv@gmail.com>, nagaraju jinka <njinka@gmail.com>, nagesh <nageshjpt@gmail.com>, pavan <journalstriker\_pavan@yahoo.com>, pavan kumar <pavanew@gmail.com>, PTI <swathidiwakar@gmail.com>, Rajesh <rajesh.ramachandran@mailtoday.in>, rams nalla <nallaram99@gmail.com>, ratnam janapareddy <ratnamvsp@gmail.com>, Snehal Rebello <snehal.rebello@gmail.com>, Srinivasa Rao <asrao20@gmail.com>, Studio N <koti.gamidi@yahoo.com>, Sucheta Dalal <suchetadalal@yahoo.com>, sudhir t s <tss99822@gmail.com>, suryaprakash rao <prao@intoday.com>, Tehelka <kumarvijaynd@gmail.com>, Uma NDTV <umasudhir40@gmail.com>, Uma Sudhir <uma@ndtv.com>, yugandhar reddy <myreddy@rediffmail.com>, "yugandharr@yahoo.com" <yugandharr@yahoo.com>, B L Narayana <beeyellen@gmail.com>, mlcsarma@yahoo.co.in, MYSURA REDDY <office.mysurareddy@gmail.com>, bjpap@rediffmail.com, cpi@vsnl.com, cpim@vsnl.com, cpimvizag@gmail.com, rani sarma <ranisarma2010@gmail.com>, Pranav Sachdeva <pranavsachdeva@gmail.com>, Prashant Bhushan <prashantbhush@gmail.com>, Raman Subramanian <rsrsubramanian@gmail.com>, Venugopal Kasba <vkasba@hotmail.com>, Siddharth Varadarajan <svaradarajan@gmail.com>, Nandini Sundar <nandinisundar@yahoo.com>, Prabhu Chawla <prabhuchawla@newindianexpress.com>

**Cc**

E.A.S.Sarma  
14-40-4/1 Gokhale Road  
Maharanipeta  
Visakhapatnam 530002  
Tel. Nos. 0891-6619858/ 9866021646

1845833  
10/1

1/10



Dr. Manmohan Singh  
Prime Minister

Dear Dr. Manmohan Singh,

**Subject:- Kovvada Nuclear Power Project in Srikakulam district in AP- Appeal to direct DAE to comply with the law of the land**

DAE/ NPCIL have proposed to set up a 6,000 MWe nuclear power project near Kovvada in Srikakulam district in AP. As I had written to you vide my letter of May 2, 2011 (enclosed), the procedures followed by DAE/ NPCIL defy all democratic norms enshrined in the Constitution and make a mockery of the law of the land. I list below the concerns in this respect.

1. At the instance of DAE/ NPCIL, the State Government issued an order on 27-12-2011 (GO No. 270) setting the stage for forcibly acquiring the lands of the villagers to the extent of 2,252 acres even before the Ministry of Environment & Forests (MOEF) could set the Terms of Reference for environment impact appraisal (EIA), obtain an EIA report, hold public consultation and get the project duly approved in accordance with the provisions of Environment (Protection) Act, 1986. This implies a "decide-announce-defend" approach which is highly regressive as it preempts all the statutory regulatory requirements and bypasses the law of the land. In my view, land acquisition should await the nod of MOEF, not precede it. If the State, pressurized by DAE/ NPCIL, goes ahead with land acquisition like this, DAE will be a willing party to abridging MOEF's Constitutional obligation to protect the environment under Article 48A.
2. There are at least seven highly polluting industrial units already operating in the area where the nuclear power project is proposed to be set up. How much can the local environment bear any incremental pollution burden, whether chemical or radioactive? Should not MOEF first have a chance to evaluate the pollution bearing capacity of the area before DAE can preempt the role of MOEF in carrying out a cumulative impact assessment?
3. We are a part of a democratic nation. Article 19 and the Right to Information Act, 2005 require the public authorities like DAE/ NPCIL to function in a transparent manner. I am afraid that both your Ministry i.e. DAE and its PSU, NPCIL, have given a go by to the spirit of this Article. Even till date, those living dangerously within the "exclusion zone" within 1.5km from the project site, "sterilized zone" within 5km, "emergency planning zone" within 16km and "impact assessment zone" within 30km, have not been formally informed about their respective locations within each zone and the implications for them of living in those zones.
4. Under Section 4 of the RTI Act, NPCIL is under an obligation to disclose all such information on its own. By not complying with the requirement, NPCIL has evidently not cared to respect this provision. The residents unfortunately are struggling to get this information by filing individual RTI applications. NPCIL's failure has thus burdened the citizens!
5. NPCIL should have advertised the details of the villages and the towns covered in each zone in the local news papers and held meetings with the residents in a meaningful and comprehensive manner. My interaction with the people yesterday has shown that NPCIL has kept the residents within 30km from the project site in the dark about this. One cannot but come to the conclusion that NPCIL is either casual about the idea of taking the people into confidence or it is apprehensive of the people opposing the project in the event of any public disclosure of such information. In a democracy like ours, this is highly objectionable.
6. According to the information obtained by the people under RTI Act, there are five villages, 3,504 people and 560 acres of agricultural land within the "exclusion zone" where they cannot continue to live once the project comes up. Most of them are fisherfolk who will permanently lose their traditional rights to fish in the sea. How can any government ever compensate them for the deprivation of their customary, basic rights?
7. Within the "sterilized zone", there are 42 villages, 29,354 people (mostly agricultural workers) and 11,606 acres of agricultural land. In this zone, no development activity will be taken up and NPCIL does not expect any significant increase in population! Should these people live in constant fear of radioactive exposure? Is it going to be their future?
8. In the "emergency planning zone", there are 66 villages, 41,379 people, mostly agricultural families and 14,607 acres of agricultural land. Should they be forever under the Damocles' Sword of evacuation in the event of an accident? The nuclear evangelists, including some respected celebrities, are advertising for your Ministry saying that nuclear power is "100% safe", though any honest statistician worth his profession would have summarily brushed aside such a near impossible assertion!
9. NPCIL has not disclosed the number of human beings who will be similarly in a state of uncertainty within the "impact assessment zone". The emergency planning zones prescribed by Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) in USA extend up to 80km. Should not NPCIL consider this and enlarge the limits of its zoning in the light of Fukushima so that this country may not deliberately close its eyes to a potential danger that exists?
10. Instead of addressing these substantive issues of public importance, both the Ministry you head and NPCIL under your administrative control are incurring crores of rupees of public expenditure on a highly counter-productive public relations campaign to obfuscate the real concerns. Should your Ministry encourage this and be a willing partner?

I appeal to you, Mr. Prime Minister, to look at the way the legal procedures are being bypassed and the democratic norms being ignored by your Ministry in its anxiety to push through Kovvada at any cost. As a citizen of this country, I feel disconcerted about this. As a resident of Visakhapatnam which perhaps falls within the potentially dangerous ambit of Kovvada, I feel distressed. I feel particularly concerned as Kovvada is hardly 20km from the place where I grew up! I sometimes feel that the fundamental right to life assured to me in Article 21 has come under a serious threat, merely because the rulers are anxious to further the commercial interests of a western multinational corporation.

I enclose a copy of my letter to Ministry of Environment & Forests (MOEF) on some of these concerns but I

<https://mail.nic.in/uwc/webmail/print.html>

1/9/2012

3/10

apprehend that MOEF may go the same way as it did some time ago when it hastily cleared Jaitapur nuclear project to time it prior to the visit of the French President to Delhi! Strange are the ways of your government!

As a result of a compromised civil nuclear liability law that your government has got enacted and the way a further dilution in it has been allowed to take place through the enactment of the rules framed under it, one is now not sure at all about the safety of the design of the imported reactors.

I appeal to you to intervene in the case of Kovvada, direct NPCIL to allow the statutory processes to flow sequentially as they should and ensure that MOEF, DAE and NPCIL respect the democratic norms that form the core of our Constitution.

Regards,

Yours sincerely,

E.A.S.Sarma  
Former Secretary to GOI

Visakhapatnam  
7-1-2012

--  
E.A.S.Sarma  
14-40-4/1 Gokhale Road  
Maharanipeta  
Visakhapatnam 530002  
Mobile: 91-9866021646

Website: <http://eassarma.in>

5/10

E. A. S. Sarma  
14-40-4/1 Gokhale Road  
Maharanipeta  
Visakhapatnam 530002  
Tel. No.: 0891-6619858  
Mobile No.: 9866021646  
Email: eassarma@gmail.com

Visakhapatnam  
May 2, 2010

To

Dr. Mamohan Singh  
Prime Minister  
N.Delhi

Dear Dr. Manmohan Singh,

Subject:- Nuclear Power Plants- Radioactive hazards

Following closely on the heels of signing the Indo-US Nuclear deal, which many senior nuclear scientists and engineers and several civil society bodies in our country had strongly opposed for good reasons, your government seems to be proceeding in undue haste to clear the way for the US, French and other European MNCs to revive their own moribund nuclear engineering industry and further their respective commercial interests in India. While the government, the PMO and the DEA are preparing the ground for this in a highly non-transparent way, they do not seem to be equally conscious of the need to subject all these measures to public accountability, Parliamentary oversight and independent regulation. This is not in the public interest.

What makes a citizen like me highly apprehensive is the total failure of regulation by DAE and AERB in preventing the kind of the ghastly incident that came to light recently in Delhi which caused loss of life and grievous injury to poor, unsuspecting scrap dealers. What is scarier than this is the statement of denial made by the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC). He said that "whatever happened in Delhi had nothing to do with the activities of (his) department". He added that the scrap materials come from other countries and it was not possible for the Department of Atomic Energy (DAE) to check at the entry points if there were any radioactive materials in them. Checking all the containers laden with scrap was not possible. Instead, scanning could be done. While a decision to install scanners had been taken, implementation was taking time. Such a statement by the head of the DEA/ AEC does not inspire confidence among the public. It betrays total lack of sensitivity and responsibility on the part of DAE, whose administrative Ministry is headed by none other than yourself!

The Atomic Energy Regulatory Board (AERB) which is required to exercise independent technical oversight over the DAE has been so designed as to remain subservient to that Department. There is clearly a conflict of interest in this. AERB should have been structured in such a manner that it remains unambiguously at an arms length distance from the DAE and remains accountable directly to the Parliament and none else. From a government that is not tired of harping on the word "reform" day-in and day-out, the least that one would expect is a basic reform of this kind. This is the kind of reform that would have enabled AERB to adopt an independent active role in overseeing the activities of DAE/AEC and prevent such an obnoxious episode as the irresponsible dumping of radioactive material in the streets of Delhi and exposing unwary people to serious radioactive damage. I am not sure whether many more such cases of hidden dangers of radioactive scrap are waiting to reveal themselves, only after the damage is done.

5/10

In the absence of the existence of an independent AERB, the responsibility for the loss of life and injury that has already been suffered by the scrap dealers in Delhi and the possible recurrence of such events in the coming months and years should be owned by AERB, AEC, DAE and the Ministry headed by you.

In this connection, I enclose an excellent, thought provoking article authored by Dr. A Gopalakrishnan, former Chairman of AERB that highlights this issue in an incisive manner. His sane advice in such matters had fallen on deaf ears in the past!

This brings me to the point I had earlier raised about the rapid expansion of the nuclear power industry in India, based on reactors and fuel imported from the American and European MNCs, in an environment in which the government is prepared to bend backwards to accommodate the MNCs in transferring their contingent accident liability to the Indian tax payer, and allowing both the State-owned and the foreign nuclear companies to expand their operations in the face of ineffective regulation. If the Delhi incident left the families of a few voiceless scrap dealers uncared for and orphaned, an accident in any of these large nuclear power plants could spell disaster of incomparable magnitude that will not only be extensive territorially but also calamitous for several generations.

In this connection, I enclose an earlier letter (dated 15-12-2009) of mine addressed to you, for which I am yet to receive even a simple acknowledgement, leave alone a satisfactory response!

From what I read from the media, your government had initially indicated two nuclear power projects of 1400MWe capacity, one to be set up near Kovvada in Srikakulam district in AP and another in Gujarat. The latest reports talk of many more such projects, one similar project near Nizampatnam in AP and another 12 similar plants in the country! I am afraid that all this is happening fast behind the back of the Parliament and the people at large. The States, in close nexus with the Centre, are already starting to acquire lands and evict helpless farmers. No public consultation or discussion at the level of the Panchayat and Gram Sabha has taken place. The local communities are unaware of the potential hazards of a likely nuclear accident. I am not sure whether the Constitution that has given the Indian citizen the right to live permits such a dictatorial approach on the part of your Ministry. I do not think that capping nuclear liability is in itself Constitutionally valid. No government can impose its will on the people whose lives will get affected by such projects.

The grandiose plans of DAE/ AEC need to be unfolded to the Parliament and the people before any action can be initiated to go ahead with them. The government should stop using fashionable euphemisms such as "nuclear park" to hoodwink the people and benefit a few MNCs. The government should represent the interests of the public rather than the interests of the business community alone.

The Delhi radioactive incident should serve as a wake up call to DAE/ AEC, the Parliament and the people at large. A department that is blissfully unaware of what is happening under its nose cannot be trusted with the oversight of a large nuclear programme that is fast unfolding. You should scrap the Bill to cap nuclear liability, revoke the decision to set up the fifteen nuclear power projects and restructure AERB to become independent and accountable only to the Parliament. Otherwise, your Ministry owes an explanation to the Parliament and the people of India.

Mr. Prime Minister, even if you chose not to respond to this letter, you need to respond to the public and allay their fears!

Regards,

6/10

Yours sincerely,

E.A.S.Sarma  
Former Union Power Secretary

7/10

E.A.S.Sarma  
14-40-4/1 Gokhale Road  
Maharanipeta  
Visakhapatnam 530002  
Tel. Nos. 0891-6619858/ 9866021646

To

Shri T. Chatterjee  
Secretary  
Ministry of Environment & Forests (MOEF)  
Govt. of India

Dear Shri Chatterjee,

**Subject:- Kovvada nuclear power project in Srikakulam District in AP**

The AP State Govt. has recently issued a GO clearing forcible acquisition of land of 1938 acres for Kovvada nuclear power project and another 312 acres of land more than 5 kilometers away from the project site for the township. I enclose a copy of the GO for your ready reference. The local authorities, I am afraid, will soon initiate proceedings to acquire the land under the Land Acquisition Act.

In my view, there are a few basic issues that MOEF should address before the State Govt. can proceed with the land acquisition proceedings. These are as follows.

1. In the case of Jaitapur nuclear power project in Maharashtra, MOEF conveniently washed its hands off the legitimate concerns relevant to the safety of nuclear technology per se and the risk of a likely nuclear accident, with special reference to EPR reactors to be imported from France, and issued environment clearance for the project in November, 2010 in a tearing hurry. The Ministry was apparently under pressure to clear the project before the visiting French President arrived in Delhi. The then MOS (MOEF) brushed aside these concerns by saying that all such questions would be addressed by AERB, which is a regulatory authority that functioned under the administrative control of DAE itself. The Minister had apparently ignored the following requirement to be addressed in environment impact appraisal (EIA) as per Clause 4.9 of the Manual issued by his own Ministry in January, 2001.

*"If the nature of the project is such that accidents are possible that might cause severe damage to the surrounding environment, has an assessment of the probability and likely consequences of such events been carried out and the main findings reported? "*

8/10

MOEF cannot violate its own guidelines and its charter in appraising nuclear power projects. In the case of Kovvada, MOEF should ensure that its Manual is strictly followed.

2. In the same Manual, in Section 2, there are clear guidelines on the need to consider different alternatives w.r.t. the technologies, the processes and the sites. The following are the extracts of the relevant guidelines.

2. Project and Process Alternatives

2.1	<i>Does the information include reference to the consideration of alternative sites by the developer?</i>
2.2	<i>Whether adequate justification provided for final site selected?</i>
2.3	<i>Does the proposal include alternative technologies and implementation phases considered?</i> ✕

In the case of Kovvada, no such alternatives have apparently been considered. NPCIL's website does not disclose any analysis carried out on this. By allowing the State Govt. to issue a formal GO to initiate land acquisition for the project, MOEF has preempted the requirements of its own Manual and vitiated the appraisal proceedings.

3. MOEF and its officers have a regulatory role to discharge as far as nuclear power projects are concerned. I find that MOEF is represented through one of its officers on the Board of Directors of NPCIL. It is clearly a case of conflict of interest that renders the appraisal process questionable.
4. According to the zoning system adopted by NPCIL, the potential danger of radioactive exposure of the people residing in the vicinity of the project extends upto 16 km. According to US Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), the Emergency Planning Zone extends up to 80 km. In the light of Fukushima disaster and the projections made by several experts, the radioactive contamination in the event of an accident could go far beyond this, depending on the direction of the wind. In other words, in the case of Kovvada, places such as Srikakulam and Visakhapatnam and even areas farther that that could get exposed to radioactive contamination, if an accident takes place. MOEF cannot close its eyes to this to please the powers that be! The density of population along the north coastal AP is significant and, if MOEF fails to address this concern, it will be committing a great disservice to the people of this region.

9/10

I request you to get these issues examined quickly as all the three issues could come up for judicial scrutiny as MOEF takes up appraisal of Kovvada project in due course. Meanwhile, MOEF should take corrective action on the following lines.

- (a) Withdraw its officials from the Board of NPCIL to remove the conflict-of-interest element
- (b) Constitute an independent committee to consider several alternative sites for the project, ensure that the committee's proceedings are conducted in the presence of the public and, meanwhile, ask the State Govt. not to go ahead with any land acquisition
- (c) MOEF should appoint an independent, competent consultant to prepare an EIA report that complies with MOEF's own Manual and deals specifically with, among others, the issue of safety.

I hope you will consider this request as otherwise some of us will be constrained to seek judicial intervention, as Kovvada project per se violates the citizens' right to life provided in Article 21 of the Constitution.

I hope MOEF will do more during 2012 to realize its own Constitutional obligation under Article 48A and discharge that obligation without bowing down to pressures.

Regards,

Yours sincerely,

E.A.S.Sarma  
Former Secretary to GOI

Visakhapatnam  
1-1-2012

10/10