

**Report cum scrutiny comments on examination of Review of Mining plan with Progressive mine closure plan of Rata Talab Bauxite mine of M/s Orient Abrasives Limited over an area of 110.07 hect. (S no. 275/p) situated in village Moti Balachor, Taluka Abdasa, District Kutch submitted under Rule 17(2) of MCR, 2016 and 23 of MCDR, 2017.**

**General**

1. The Cover Page do not have standard format.
2. Content of mining plan is not as per guide line.
3. Certificate/Undertakings from Owner and qualified person is not as per guide line. It should be updated.
4. Duly authenticated by State Govt. lease plan showing the coordinates & the lease area should be enclosed. Lease plan given in plate no.1 is not proper.
5. Copy Environmental Clearance obtained from MOEF should be enclosed. Adequate water harvesting measures should be proposed towards protection of environment.
6. Further consent to operate mine obtained from State Pollution control Board should be enclosed.
7. Every chapter should be start from new page.

**Chapter no.2- Location and Accessibility**

8. KML file is not enclosed. Lease plan is not bearing co-ordinate of the boundary pillar.
9. Compliance of CCOM circular 2/2010 with regard to Geo-referenced mining lease map has not been done.

**Chapter no. 3-Details of approved mining plan/scheme of mining**

10. Review given under item no. 3.3 is not in order. None of the proposal right from exploration, mining and reclamation have been implemented. It needed detailed justification.
11. No benches are seen in field. Deviation are in Development, exploitation and environment monitoring during previous passed period. Every year not achieved production. Give reason is non availability of desired grade & low market demand is not justified.
- 12.

**Part-A**

**Chapter no. 1.0 Geology & Exploration**

13. Para no. (c)- Information in Succession is not up-to-date such as thickness of lithomargic clay is not furnished.
14. Para (i)-Broadly indicate the future programme of exploration..... in next five years as in table below: Information given in table is not as per guide line. How much area is fully explored?
15. Entire reserve estimation is incorrect. Mineral reserve is to be re-estimate on the basis of Mineral (Evidence of mineral content) Rules 2015. Accordingly only exposed thickness of mineral shall be considered in whole reserve/ reserve estimation. Lateral extension for G1 & G2 is to be taken not more than 50% of the grid spacing of the probe point. So per rule reserve re-assessed.
16. In section line Q-Q' calculation of Proved & probable reserve is not correct.

17. No information is given about how much previously produced bauxite is depleted from present reserve. Calculation in all table given for reserve is not clear. In all table how much thickness of Bauxite is to be taken for reserve calculation is not given. Accordingly to change all the table.
18. In table no.31 calculation for G1 & G2 reserve is not clear/ not co relate with other table.

### **Chapter no. 2-Mining**

19. Mining chapter is not described correctly. On doing inspection no bench is seen in entire area. In some pit no & dimension of pit are not given such as dimension of pit no 6 is same at page no. 30 & 58. Check and update it.
20. Reject generation to the order of 10% is very high. It is not understood why there is such reject generate. It could not be accepted.
21. In table no. 34 year wise proposed area for taking mining is not matching with year wise development plan. In third year proposal mining proposed is not correct in section line. Unit for area is also not given. Proposal year for fifth is written 2023-24 instead of 2022-23. Therefore necessary correction is needed.
22. In tentative excavation (table no. 35), total waste included top soil & OB is not correct. It is recommended to stack top soil separately with overburden.
23. Extent of mined out area is 20%. But area proposal from reclamation is very low.
24. Year wise Grid Coordinate for five year Mining area is not given in table. In first year mining started from west part which is not correct. As per plan it is south eastern area lease area. In the same way mining for second started North West & southeast part of lease area but it is written west & east part. So need to check & update it. As per given table average thickness of Bauxite written in text for third to fifth year are not correct.
25. In conceptual panning: in given table no.55 &55A unit for area is not correct of wrong. In table no. 55B stripping ratio is not correct. In this table unit for total waste & production is written cum & tonne respectively.
26. **In table no. 59 unit is not furnished. Ultimate pit limit is marked but in index it is missing.**
27. Proposal scale of production cannot be accepted as there mineral reserve is yet to be assured correctly.

### **Chapter no.8-PMC**

28. While calculating financial assurance, 4.0217ha has been considered as fully reclaimed. But such area has not been shown in land use pattern hence could not be accepted.
29. In, para no.8.2 (I) page no.111, additional area taken for plantation: 1.2400ha is not clear or how to calculate it. Justify it.
30. In PMCP, para no. 8.6- F A table is also not correct. FA is not correct as per area 25.0119ha. But two figure is given which is mismatch. In financial table given proposal has not matched with FMCP plan.
31. Financial assurance has not been computed in terms of rule 27(1) of MCDR 2017.
32. As per correction in mining plan accordingly Feasibility report should be updated.
33. Flow chart of plant using high grade bauxite is to be furnished.

### **Plates**

34. Cadastral plan duly authenticated by concerned Govt. agency is not furnished.
35. **Location plan:** Plan is not prepared as per guide line.

36. **Key Plan** is not submitted as required under rule 32(5)(a) of MCDR 2017 because some of important aspects are not incorporated like existing tree density, directions of road not shown, predominant wind directions is not marked, villages populations, various monitoring stations have not been marked, etc.
37. **Surface Plan:** Surface plan is not submitted with all the information/prominent features as required under Rule 32(5) (a) of MCDR, 2017. Mining Lease boundary not marked as per the standard conventions. All the pits is not numbered. Other permanent features like temple, buildings, hutments, etc. exist in the ML area may also be marked.
38. **Surface Geological Plan:** is not submitted as per the relevant details as required under rule 32(1) (b) of MCDR 2017 because depth persistence & horizontal for different category of reserves not marked, strike & dip of the formation not shown, lithological contacts not marked distinctly, other adjoining ML area marked on sections but not shown on plan.
39. **Year wise Plan:** Plan is not prepared as per guide line. All the plan are same. Only year wise section is correct. Area marked under the year wise excavation appears to be incorrect & need to be reviewed, Ultimate pit limit not marked, advancement of excavation, approach to the faces are not marked, proposed protective works have not been marked correctly.
40. **Plate no.6: Composite year wise plan should be show of all the five plan as well as five year section.**
41. **Environment Plan:** The plan has not been prepared incorporating all details as per rule 32(5)(b) of MCDR'2017 because rejection dumps not marked monitoring stations of Air, Water & noise quality Survey not marked, surface features including human settlement may also be shown.
42. **Conceptual Plan:** Pit configuration at the ultimate stage not marked, benching pattern not indicated in section, ultimate depth of working not marked, approach to faces at conceptual stage not marked. Section line is not matched with the plan.
43. **Reclamation plan:** Para 8.3: the details of progressive mine closure plan is not depicted distinctly on plan. The year wise completion status of proposed protective works should be incorporated in this plate. Index is not correct.
44. **Financial Area Assurance Plan:** Area reclaimed and considered as fully reclaimed and rehabilitated if any may be shown clearly. Area marked under FA table must should be matched with the broken up areas as marked on plan.
45. Copy Environmental Clearance obtained from MOEF should be enclosed. Adequate water harvesting measures should be proposed towards protection of environment. Further consent to operate mine obtained from State Pollution control Board should be enclosed.
46. Numbering of annexure & plate is not in chronological order in text & index. Many annexures are not clear & nor readable.
47. Some of the mine photo such as pillar, working and old pit etc. should be enclosed.
48. There are certain omissions, deficiencies in the text and plates. Some of them are marked in the text & plates. QPs should ensure thorough editing before preparing the final copies.

Place:

Date:

(Dr. N K Mathur)  
Assistant .Mining Geologist  
Regional office, Gandhinagar