

Public Participation in Environmental Impact Assessment: A Review

Pooja Rohidas Chandgude¹, Prof Sachin Mane²

¹Dept of Construction and management, Civil Engineering

²Guide, Principal

^{1, 2} D Y Patil College of Engineering, Akurdi, Pune, India

Abstract- *In recent years the need to enhance public participation in Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and the efficacy of alternative mechanisms in achieving this goal. There has been limited analysis of the implications of different forms and degrees of public participation for public decision making based on EIA, and little discussion of how experience with public participation in EIA. This paper distinguishes foundation and different countries analyze the public participation used in EIA case studies. How they influence the decision making process and provides ways to improve its effectiveness. The conclude with practical steps to improve public participation programmes in environmental planning and decision making.*

Keywords- EIA, Public Participation

I. INTRODUCTION : THE GLOBAL FOUNDATIONS OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Public Participation in Environmental Assessment covers the public participation in environmental decision-making procedures as well as the access to environmental information, and to justice. The call for Public Participation in Environmental Assessment was prominently expressed for the first time at the global level in Principle 10 of the Rio Declaration on Environment and Development (short 'Rio Declaration') in 1992 and further reiterated in Chapter 23 of the Earth Summit Agenda 21.

Also, the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) drew a similar conclusion two years later and emphasized the need for Public Participation in degradation assessment and rehabilitation of land. Since then, Public Participation in Environmental Assessment has been increasingly discussed and implemented worldwide. It culminated since then with the conclusion of the Convention on Access to Information, public participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Assessment (the "Aarhus Convention") in 1998 under the auspices of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe-UNECE, the so-called Bali Guidelines from 20115 as well as in

paragraphs 43–44 of the 2012 concluded Rio + 20 outcome document titled "The Future We Want".

A global and comparative overview of public participation in environmental matters in the sense of the Aarhus convention is provided. It is based upon an in-depth literature review, in particular of research papers, legal documents, policy papers, and implemented by means of electronic databases (Web of Science, Scopus) as well as by Internet research using terms such as public participation, access to information, access to participation in decision-making and access to justice in combination with continent names. This great chance of achieving a better result.

II. LITRATURE REVIEW

A John Sinclair and Alan P Diduck (*et al.*, 2000) Discuss the adoption policy changes intended to expedite development approvals for power projects by Governments of India and the Indian state of Himachal Pradesh (HP). Mainly focuses on the 1997 changes to the Environmental Protection Act that establish procedures for public hearings as a component of EIA. Three hydro project public hearings in the Kullu District (HP) in 1998 show that public involvement and public hearing processes are in their nascent stages despite the rapid pace of development.

The study focused on the Kullu District in the Upper Beas River Watershed, Pir Panjal Range of the Western Himalaya, Himachal Pradesh (literally "land of the snowy mountains"), India. Their are three involved hydroelectric projects: Parbati Stages II and III and the Malana project. They conclude that the fact that reports of proceedings from both the Manali and Parbati III hearings ended with a general statement like "all people were in favour of early clearance so socio-economic benefits could reach people early and prevent cost over-runs", strongly supports this claim. The issues explored in this paper confirm the need for policy makers to consider fully a diverse array of constraints to the effective implementation of legislative initiatives. In developing countries, an effective public participation strategy should not assume that people have the time, willingness, organization

and Public involvement in EIA in India resources to participate (World Bank Environment Department, 1993). This may be possible in some parts of India where the institutional capacity exists, but is not the case in the high mountain rural areas of the country. In these situations, extra steps must be taken to facilitate public participation and make the EIA process effective, efficient and fair.

Obaidullah Nadeem And Thomas B. Fischer (*et al.*, 2011) present to contribute to the professional debate by establishing a country specific evaluation framework for Pakistan, which, it is suggested, could also potentially be used in other developing countries. The framework is used to evaluate performance of public participation in EIA in terms of 40 attributes for four selected projects include two road developments and two industry establishments in the Punjab Province. The evaluation is based on interviews with stakeholders, review of EIA reports as well as public hearing proceedings and environmental approval conditions. The evaluation of the selected projects revealed an overall weak influence of public participation on substantive quality of EIA and on the final decision. Overall, EIA public participation has succeeded in providing a more egalitarian environment. Conclusion is projects have demonstrated a weak influence of public participation on the substantive quality of the EIA and the final decision. The main reason is a failure to involve stakeholders early in the EIA process and adequately addressing concerns before irreversible decisions regarding the project site and its procurement are made. There was lack of communication as well as access to information between the EPA and stakeholders. This was identified by interviewees as a cause for a lack of transparency in the decision making process and also trust in the EPA and the proponents. The research underlying this paper identified a direct relationship between the presence of qualified environmentalists and positive outcomes of the project in terms of an improved EIA report and better final decision, at least from a public's point of view. Whilst the literature suggests that there is often a general apathy and lack of willingness to participate in EIA, both, in developing and developed countries, the public in Punjab province appear to be highly willing to contribute. There is therefore a great potential for an active public involvement in EIA of projects. It can thus be concluded that public participation in EIA is gaining grounds in Pakistan.

Daniele Brombal (*et al.*, 2016) This paper aims at appraising the institutional rationale informing the implementation of public participation in China's EIA, benchmarking it against three conceptualizations: (1) Normative, based on objectives of empowerment and democratization; (2) Substantive, where participation is pursued mainly to improve quality of decisions; (3) Instrumental, seeking participation as an

instrument to legitimize decision-making processes. The appraisal is carried out by means of a new integrated index (Public Participation Index, PPI), which is applied to a case study representative of latest advancements in EIA public participation practices in China, namely the “New Beijing Airport Project”. Located 46 km south of downtown Beijing, the project was approved in 2014 and it is currently under construction. Results of the PPI application to this case study indicate that, despite progress made in recent years, the implementation of public participation in Chinese EIA still largely responds to an instrumental rationale, with limited capacity for the public to affect decisions.

Conclusion during the EIA process for the “New Beijing Airport Project”, limited possibilities were given to the public to influence decision-making. Multiple channels are given to the public to express their views, however no significant comments or suggestions can be raised, since no viable options to adjust project execution to public needs are given; a great deal of work is done to consult affected communities, but the consultation activities seem incapable to tackle issues of equity, and results fail to be convincingly representative. The paper also adds new insights on how different procedural attributes concur to participation effectiveness: extensive provision of information and wide consultations cannot ensure meaningful participation if they are not coupled with a careful selection of participants and if consultation results are not given appropriate consideration. Finally, Chinese authorities should be aware that the mismatch between theory and practice can trigger a general mistrust towards institutionalized forms of public participation in environmental planning. In order to avoid this scenario, political attention is required and the role of the public in decision-making should be made clearer. Against this background, the integrated Public Participation Index developed and applied in this paper can be an useful tool to monitor the development of EIA participation processes in China over time. The Index could also support the identification of variables influencing participation processes, by comparing cases in different sectors and geographical areas.

Luca Del Furia (*et al.*, 2000) examines is: how can the effectiveness of provisions for and practices concerning public participation in the EIA procedure be improved, with specific reference to those in Italy? To address this question, the paper starts by establishing what the “goals” of involving the public in the EIA procedure are, and which “factors” contribute towards achieving effective public participation. Indicators for both the “goals” and the “factors” are then identified and used to analyze the legislative provisions and procedure in Italy in relation to their implications for effective public participation.

Two case studies are also analyzed in relation to the same set of indicators. As a final step, a “profile” of public participation in EIA is created, and broad recommendations based on the opportunities for improving the effectiveness of public participation formulated.

The fact that Italy does not have a framework law has contributed to the low effectiveness of both involving the public and EIA as a whole, yet its institution would be an important opportunity for improvement by providing for simplified procedures with increased transparency, credibility, and efficiency. The framework law should include provisions that address the restricted nature of the comments which, as previously noted, can in turn restrict the public involved; the inaccessibility of documents; the late involvement of the public; and the inadequate length of time for formulating comments of this nature. In addition, it should ensure public involvement in the scoping stage. Last, but not least, responsibility for effective participation falls on the public. This includes the fundamental recognition by the public that, through EIA, they have the opportunity to define how they want their environment and not only oppose, the public’s use of existing rights to participate, and moreover, the application of pressure for other channels and mechanisms for public involvement if dissatisfied with those existing. Indeed, in Robert’s opinion, “the greatest guarantee of continuing growth of public involvement is the public itself”.

III. DISCUSSION

In INDIA, PAKISTAN, CHINA and ITALY country are improve their impact assessment process by using involving public in process of Environmental Impact assessment. Some percentage they are successes but improvement is also required. All countries are gave the opportunity to public to involved and put their point in front of the government to protect their area from anthropogenic activities.

IV. CONCLUSION

- 1) When scope of project is ready then at that stage public participation is required for further improvement and what public think about the scope of project is also helpful for project proponent, practitioner and SPCB.
- 2) If public is not ready for accept the project activity with prominent point then at that stage project is rejected so further steps is not required.
- 3) In Public Participation process SPCB/CPCB officers are only listen and point write. Not gave their point of view on their point put in public participation process and decision also.

- 4) Public is also attend and put their point of view in public participation process, this is what they protect their area and put their requirement in the process.
- 5) The Number of public present in public participation process is not effective when they not put their views and thoughts in process.

REFERENCES

- [1] John. Sinclair PhD & Alan P. Diduck LLB, MNRM, “Public involvement in environmental impact assessment: a case study of hydro development in Kullu District, Himachal Pradesh, India” Published online: 20 Feb 2012. ISSN: 1461-5517 (Print) 1471-5465 (Online) Journal homepage: <http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/tipo20>
- [2] Obaidullah Nadeem , Thomas B. Fischer, “An evaluation framework for effective public participation in EIA in Pakistan” Environmental Impact Assessment Review 31 (2011) 36–47.
- [3] Daniele Brombal, Angela Moriggi, Antonio Marcomini, “Evaluating public participation in Chinese EIA. An integrated Public Participation Index and its application to the case of the New Beijing Airport” Environmental Impact Assessment Review 62 (2017) 49–60
- [4] Luca Del Furiaa, Jane Wallace-Jonesb, “The effectiveness of provisions and quality of practices concerning public participation in EIA in Italy” Environmental Impact Assessment Review 20 (2000)457–479