

Discrepancies observed in the Mining Plan of Pali Manganese Ore Deposit (Applied Area-4.80 Hect.) of Shri Anil M. Gupta & Others, located in Tehsil Parseoni, Distt. Nagpur (Maharashtra), submitted under Rule 16(1) of MCR' 2016 inspected by the undersigned on 29.09.2016

Field Observations:

1. Size of the trial pits shown on the plates should be corrected as per the details given in the prospecting report and as seen during the site inspection.
2. Rock exposures seen in the applied area during the site inspection should be shown on the plates.
3. There is an HT line passing through the lease area in the N-W side where dumping has been proposed. Suitable corrections in the proposals should be made in compliance to the provisions of rule 12(d) of MCR'2016.

Text and Plates:

1. PMCP is an integrated part of Mining Plan. Thus cover page should be revised accordingly as 'Mining Plan' submitted under rule 16(1) of MCR'2016 to the competent authority as per rule 13(1)(a).
2. LOI has been granted in the name of Shri Anil M. Gupta & others. "Others" stand for Shri Sanjay M. Gupta, Shri Rajesh M. Gupta and Shri Ritesh M. Gupta as mentioned in Annexure V whereas the consents and certificates have been submitted by signature of Shri Anil M. Gupta only without declaration of his name as nominated owner and authorized signatory. Thus legal document in support of Shri Anil M. Gupta for signing the document by all the persons as mentioned needs to be enclosed.
3. At places, in the prospecting report, Limestone is mentioned instead of Manganese. Thus suitable correction is required.
4. In the introduction chapter, compliance of MCDR'1988 should be furnished for Rules 4, 7 & 8.
5. Instead of considering reserves/resources as given in the prospecting report, it should be re-assessed in accordance with the Mineral (Evidence of Mineral Content) Rules'2015 based on the exploration done in the area. Accordingly production and conceptual planning should be revised and plates should be modified.
6. Revised feasibility study report should be submitted as per the Mineral (Evidence of Mineral Content) Rules'2015. Production proposals should be modified considering depth persistency of the mineral proved in the applied area such that the mine-able reserves under UNFC categories 111, 121 & 122 should remain sufficient for 5 years production. Further, exploration proposals should be such that the area shall be explored in detail in a time bound manner for occurrence and depth persistency of manganese ore.
7. As per the details given in the prospecting report/exploration done in the area, basis of considering occurrence of fold in the area should be discussed and plotted on the geological plan. Further, reserves should be limited to the exposure of manganese ore and as the trial pits are closely spaced, it may be considered for the influence within the limits as prescribed under the provisions of the Mineral (Evidence of Mineral Content) Rules'2015.
8. Extent of mechanization should be furnished alongwith backup calculations for requirement of man power/ machineries.

9. Ultimate depth of the pit as given on page no. 28 should be corrected as per the present proved depth of the deposit in the area.
10. Conceptual planning has been discussed more on theoretical and less on data. Thus it should be discussed with facts and figures with available exploration data for the mine life. Plates should be corrected accordingly and size and shape of ultimate pit should be given.
11. Production planning for first five years only to be given considering the year of lease execution as the 1st year of production planning.
12. Under item 9.2, it is mentioned that dumping is proposed on non-mineralized land in the northern part of the applied area, but the specific area is still unexplored. Thus the statement should be justified/corrected suitably.
13. Under item 10 on page no. 31-32, use of mineral rejects has not been discussed. Further, grade of this mineral rejects should be indicated and an analysis report should be submitted at the time when the mine starts working. It should be co-related with the threshold value of mineral also.
14. Under the land use details given on page no. 35, present area under pits should be mentioned for combined area under the trial pits. The correction should be carried forward at places where the same has been mentioned.
15. Under item (ix) on page no. 39, local people that may get benefits from the opening of the mine should be discussed alongwith employment potential for them under community development programme.
16. Abandonment cost calculations and proposals under PMCP should be given in tabular form for the five year proposal period. Further, year-wise reclamation should be furnished.
17. **Lease Plan/ Khasra map** should be submitted which should be authenticated by state govt. in original.
18. Compliance of CCOM circular 2/2010 should be furnished within 6 months of execution of lease.
19. All the plates are having mentioned 'Pali Manganese Ore Mine'. It should be replaced with 'Pali Manganese Ore Deposit' and 'applied area' should be mentioned.
20. **Key Plan:** A clear Key Plan should be submitted showing latitude and longitudes and Toposheet number should be mentioned on it. A wind rose diagram should be shown depicting predominant wind directions..
21. **Geological Plan and Sections:** UPL needs to be shown on the plan and sections. UNFC category of the reserves/resources needs to be marked on the plan and sections instead of proved/probable terminology.
Further:-
 - i) In C2C2' section, proved category reserves as shown should be corrected.
 - ii) Levels/thickness of the ore body, Lithology of the area, dip & strike etc. should be clearly marked.
 - iii) More no. Of boreholes should be proposed and shown on the plates as required for detailed exploration of the area.
22. **Year-wise Development and Production Plan and Sections:** The plates should be modified with re-assessment of reserves in the area. Depth of the workings proposed/ultimate pit depth should be in commensurate with the proved depth of the deposit. Levels (RL's) should be marked and shown in the sections.

23. **Environment Plan:** Should be submitted as per the provisions of Rule 28 of MCDR'1988.
24. **Financial Assurance Area Plan:** Area as shown is not matching with the calculation of FA as given in the text. It should be revised accordingly.

(Ashish Mishra)
ACOM