

## ANNEXURE-I

**SCRUTINY COMMENTS ON THE MODIFICATION OF REVIEW & UP DATION OF MINING OF VENKATAGIRI IRON ORE MINE OF M/S M/S LAKSHMI MINERALS., M.L. NO. 2551, OVER AN AREA OF 21.73 HA AS PER CEC, IN VENKATAGIRI VILLAGE, SANDUR TALUK, BELLARY DISTRICT, KARNATAKA STATE. SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL UNDER RULE 17(3) OF MCR, 2016. MODIFICATION PERIOD FROM 2018-19 TO 2021-2022. CATEGORY OF THE MINE IS A(M-MECHANIZED), OPEN CAST MINE. RAMGAD RESERVE FOREST LAND. DATE OF EXPIRY OF THE MINING LEASE IS 17/6/2057.**

### **TEXT:**

1. The list of annexures enclosed in the text need to be indicated with number of pages in each annexures by adding another column in the table. Besides, the annexures should be indicated with dates of each letter and the lease number etc., for clarity.
2. Introduction: A copy of the letter from state Government should be enclosed in support of extension of lease period as per the amended Act, 2015. The introduction part information must be given in chronological order for easy understanding. The approval of last document mentioned in the text need to be indicated with letter number with date. (ii). The present submission submitted only for production enhancement or anything else, if any may be touched upon for clarity.
3. The details of the mining leases held by the lessee is given in table no.1, as non-working, no reasons furnished for non-working.
4. Para 3.3, in table no.11, it is mentioned, that the incomplete work of R & R given in the table will be taken up during 2018-19, whether it will be completed within the year or prolong for some more periods.
5. Para 3.4, table no.12, the reply given in the table for the violation found to be incomplete, it is clarified with the latest study and the field condition, what is the next ratio arrived for the violation compliance and also reflected in the present draft modification document.

### **PART-A**

6. Para 1(d), it is mentioned that, there is no exploration was carried out during the year 2017-18. Besides, whether any exploration undertaken after the approval of the previous document approved vide letter no. 279/783/2004/BNG/1823 dated 9/11/2016. If it is so, any additional reserves/ resources added if any may be dealt accordingly.
7. Para 1( C), under future exploration programme, it is proposed for 6 nos. of bore holes in the form of RC/ Core bore holes, but in the table no.13, it is replaced with RC/ DTH, better DTH to be changed to Core bore holes. Besides, the exploration proposals should be considered based on conversion of G3 level of exploration to G2 level of exploration, what is available. Table 25/26 may be attended.
8. Para 1(k), the recovery of lump and fines ratio needs to be given, in addition to the recovery factor of different other ores of iron.
9. Para 1(L), table no.25 & 26, under reserves/ resources, as on 1/4/2018 it is given, reveals that the reserves brought out as on 1/10/2016 is 1.1.59 of Million tonnes of reserves & total is 2.32 MT altogether, but as on 1/4/2018, it is given 2.403 MT + 2.361 MT of siliceous ore is found to be not appropriate. (ii). What is the reserves depleted from the last approval, what is the quantity of reserves/ resources added, any conversion of resources in to reserves during the period from the previous approval are not dealt step by step, which ought to have been.

(iii). without undertaking any type of exploration & exploratory mining, how the reserves/ resources added may be explained.

10. Table no.27, under feasibility & economic analysis, under mining chapter, it is indicated, that the mine will be worked through Fully mechanized open cast method, but in the cover page and in some other para it is given as A( mechanized) method, hence this may be attended appropriately, wherever required.

11. Para 2A(a), as per the para heading it is expected to give brief on existing mining operation with the details of the number of working benches height, width, slopes, waste dumps, stacks and infrastructures, etc., similarly, the proposed method of working for the next two years, provided work resumes in the mining lease area. Further, the slope of faces, direction of advancement, approach to the faces & specification of roads, etc to be marked. Also, the existing dumps spread parameters, height, slope protective works etc., to be marked. The stacking location selected adjacent to the Main pit is not appropriate, which should be moved away from the advancement of the benches.

12. Para 2(b), the table no.30a & 30b, wherein the production figure reported in tonnes, for the whole year, out of which what is the quantity of fines and lumps are not touched upon, which ought to have been. In the light of the above remarks, the text paras may be attended, wherever applicable.

13. Para 2(b), table no. 31, under dump re-handling, the estimated available materials, given blank without indicating the quantity available for future consideration. Instead of giving blank, it is expected to report on the same, which is available in the ML area.

14. Para 2(d), the para need to be attended in line with the remarks given in the para 2A and related paras if applicable. (ii). The powder factor given is 7/kg., it is expected to give correctly as 7t/kg of explosives.

15. para 2(f), under the excavation, it is given, 8.53 ha area is mineralized out of total area, but in some other para it is given, complete ML area is of mineralized, this should be reconciled. (ii). It is stated in table 39, below table, that during the conceptual stage, most of the mining area will be back filled and afforested, what type of backfilling is suggested is not dealt.

16. Para 5( e), the dry process system plan to erect in the ML area is not dealt about the location and the quantity likely to be handled in a year is not given. This should be demarked in the surface plan for reference.

17. Para 8.6, under financial assurance, referring to MCDR, 1988 need to be changed to MCDR, 2017.

## **PART-B**

18. The certificate from the QP need to be mentioned with MCDR, 2017, instead of MCDR, 1988.

19.The photographs of the mine is enclosed without mentioning the name of the mine & owner. Similarly, the dumps photographs/ plantation etc., also need to be given identification of number/ name for reference.

20. Geological Plan (Plate No. IIB): The stackings of ore is placed within the UPL limit and also restricting the development towards the dip side of the ore body where the ore body continuing.

Hence, the stacking of ore body and the auctioning area should be away from the UPL, so that the systematic development & scientific mining can be established in the mine. In the light of the above remarks, the plan & the section and other related if any need to be attended accordingly.

21. Geological section (Plate No. II C): From the sections presented, it is very clear that the developments are not undertaken appropriately, owing to the mineral stocks. Hence, the proposals should be drawn by moving the mineral stacks away from the UPL.

22. Development & Production Plan (Plate No. III/a): It is very clear from the development and the production plan and the sections that the developments are proposed with restriction, due to the stacking of ROM, Stacks etc., which is must to be removed to the alternate place within the ML area, so that the development & the production workings should be along the strike line, instead of unsystematic way. In the light of the above remarks, the present and the remaining developments and the production for the remaining years may be attended accordingly by shifting the ROM/ stacks from the mineralized ground.

23. Conceptual Plan & section (Plate No. VI/a): The conceptual need to be attended in line with the scrutiny comments given in the development plates and also in the text. The conceptual plan is not appropriate. The present existing stacks, ROM location continued to be in the same place even in the conceptual stage, which is not practically possible. The stacking & ROM location area exhibits the presence of ore body beneath, hence it is obvious it should be removed for systematic operations.