

SCRUTINY COMMENTS ON DRAFT REVIEW AND UPDATION OF MINING PLAN OF DEOGIRI IRON AND MANGANESE MINE OF M/S THE SANDUR MANGANESE & IRON ORES LIMITED., OVER AN EXTENT OF 1860.10 HA, AS PER LEASE DEED (1612.72 HA UNDER FOREST, 247.38 HA, REVENUE LAND), AS PER CEC 1864.70 HA, OUT OF WHICH 1617.32 HA (FOREST LAND) & 247.38HA (REVENUE LAND). M.L. NO. 2678. IN VILLAGE, DEOGIRI, TALUKA-SANDUR, DISTRICT BELLARY, STATE KARNATAKA. SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL, UNDER RULE 17(1) OF MCR, 2016. CATEGORY A-(FM-FULLY MECHANIZED), FOR THE PERIOD 2018-19 TO 2022-23.

COVER PAGE

1. Name of the mine need to be specified, along with the mine code.
2. The document should be written as Review & Updation of Mining Plan. In the light of the above remarks, the text and the plates may be attended, wherever applicable.
3. Whether Captive/ non –captive should be indicated.
4. Type of forest land need to be specified.

INTRODUCTION

5. The present document is prepared and submitted for next five years, under rule 17(1) of MCR, 2016 for approval, without indicating any other changes in the proposals, like exploration, development and production etc., for reference.
6. The name of the lessee should be given, instead of applicant, since already lease is in existence.

LOCATION & ACCESSIBILITY

7. Para 2 (b), the details of the other leases held by the lessee if any may be furnished.

DETAILS OF APPROVED MINING PLAN

8. The details of the approved mining plan and scheme of mining, including RMP may be given in table format for clarity.
9. Table no.0.1, under review of exploration may be given up to October, 2017, instead of September, 2017.
10. Table no.0.2, the reasons given for shortfall of development is not justified, when there is adequate dumping provision created within the ML area. (ii). When the production was reduced from the DMG/ monitoring committee side, though the production could not be achieved due to the limitation constrains, at that time, development could have been made, utilizing the availability of machineries.
11. Table no. 0.3, reveals the non-achieving the desired quantity of reclamation quantity and the extent of the area, due to continued mineralized area/ existence of ore in the S. Bencha pit. If it is so, the proposals in table no.0.2, should have been accommodated.
12. Para 3.6, the headings should be corrected, by replacing, MCDR, 1988 to 2017. Rule 22(6) of MCR, 1960 to Rule 17(3) of MCR, 2016 respectively.

PART-A

13. Para 1(d), the address given for the existing company can be indicated instead of not applicable.
14. Para 1(e), the already exploration carried out in the ML area considered up to 2011-2014; instead it can be taken up to October, 2017.
15. Table no. 1.03 on details of DTH drilling may be given with year wise completion and the pit details if applicable, as per the table number may be given for reference.
16. Para 1(e)(iii), under future exploration proposals, the proposals giving for few DTH holes if need arises, which may be avoided, as per the exploration undertaken covered in the ML areas proved to be adequate with the reserve assessment as on date, but the resources indicated in the text around

- 5.38MT, which need to be reassessed and bring to the reserve category as per the UNFC classification. Accordingly, it should be re-planned for proposals if it is warrants.
17. Para 1(j) & 1(K), and related tables and the text part need to be attended wherever applicable. Table nos. 1.04 & 1.05 need to be rechecked action should be initiated to convert conditional resources in to reserves category.
18. Table-no.1.08 & 1.09 reveals the updated reserves/ resources of iron & manganese ore as on 1.10.2017 and the depletion shown in table no.0.2, reveals not matching to the updated figures to the figure what is given during the last approved document dated 17/8/2016. Hence, the updated figures and the depletion taken while submitting this document, need to be indicated separately in part-A of the current submission.
19. Para 2A(a), as per the heading, it is expected to brief initially on the existing workings/ methods of workings for both Iron & Manganese pits may be given, followed by the proposed workings also may be given. (ii). Individual pits may be appraised in brief giving the working and the non-working status, and more on the working pits, instead of describing all together. (iii). The Existing mining practice viz. dimensions of working pits, bench parameters, overall and individual pit slopes, dump configuration and existing slope etc. should be discussed in this para. Proposed excavations are also to be discussed in similar manner. Further, the slope of faces, direction of advancement, approach to the faces & specification of roads, etc to be indicated. Also, the existing dumps spread parameters, height, slope protective works etc., to be indicated for the existing and the proposed workings.
20. Para 2A(I), under dump re-handling, the information furnished for Manganese & Iron ore stacks/ dumps referred, that these dumps are not part of CEC/ EC production limit as per Supreme Court order dated 18/4/2013, a copy of the same may be enclosed in the annexure for reference.
21. Para 2©, under individual year wise development plan & sections showing pit layouts, dumps etc., are given in plates mentioned need to be attended for respective financial year wise 2018-19, 2019-20, etc., up to 2022-23 respectively, in brief about the direction of advancement, number of benches etc. In the light of the above remarks, the waste disposal also should be given year wise. Text may and the plates may be attended,
22. Table no.2.27, wherein it is given BHQ stacking, need to be corrected appropriately.
23. Para 2(f), under conceptual mine planning need to be attended and modified, if required wherever applicable, especially on the conceptual exploration, development and the reclamation & rehabilitation proposals, appropriately.
24. Table.no. 2.30, wherein the ore to waste ratio indicated need to be reconciled. Besides, the bulk density considered in the calculation of reserves/ resources and also the production of Iron & Manganese is not dealt in the text.
25. Para 4(a), the details of overburden/ waste materials & mineral rejects to be mined during the current this plan period is given below in table. No. 4.01, but in this table BHQ, other than BHQ & mineral rejects are given. It should be specified clearly, that instead of mentioning waste materials, it should be given BHQ/ BHJ, which materials is taken as other than BHQ may be clarified.
26. Para 4(b), simultaneous back filling, is proposed in KTIO-A, SK & KMK-E, Chance, & NK pits, which must be justified with evidence of the bore-hole datas to this for approval. In the light of the above remarks, the back filling in the worked out pit in JLK should be adhered.
27. Para 7(a) & (b), should be presented in the standard universal format.
28. Para 8.6, table-no.8.03, the figures indicated for 1121.52 ha, as 33.6453 in Crores, need to be expanded in words.) for clarity.

PART-B

29. Under certificate, for the consent letter should be from the lessee and not from the applicant.
30. Certificate from the QP, wherein MCDR, 1988 is needed to be replaced with MCDR, 2017.

31. The list of annexures enclosed in the document need to be given with number of pages in each annexures for reference by adding another column in the format. Each annexures should be given clearly the date and the reference numbers.
32. Table no. 1.10, wherein the reserves of Kammathuru iron ore mine block-A is given, wherein bulk density is considered as 2.6 for iron ore is low, but the recovery percentage of ore is taken as 95% is on higher side. This should be rechecked. In the light of the above remarks, the remaining tables and other datas need to be rechecked.
33. Table no. 1.16, wherein the reserves of Ramakolla(RMK) iron ore mine is given, wherein bulk density is considered as 2.62 for iron ore is low, but the recovery percentage of ore is taken as 95% is on higher side. How the BD changes case to case may be explained with evidence. In the light of the above remarks, the remaining tables and other datas need to be rechecked.
34. Annexure-6, enclosed without any authenticity from the company, need to be furnished appropriately.
35. Annexure-15, feasibility report is not enclosed which ought to have been furnished with all details as per the prevailing guidelines.

PLATES

36. Plate No.SM.02 (Key Plan): There is no difference between forest land / revenue, non-forest from the plan, or from the indexing. The extent of the area as per ML deed is given, but not as per the CEC. The approach road to the ML area from a known place may be indicated with approximate distance.
37. Plate No.SM-04(Combined surface Plan): the working and the non-working pits may be given with clarity for easy reference. Similarly, active and the non-active waste dumps, stacks of iron ore & Manganese may be given with notations. Also for manganese & iron ore pits may be differentiated. Sorting & stacking yard may be given. Back filling area or reclamation and rehabilitation pits may be indicated. The extent of the area is given for ML deed, but not for CEC authenticated one, which ought to have been. In the light of the above remarks, in all the plates, it should be attended and modified.
38. Plate No. SM, 09, 10, 11 & 12(Geological Plan of Kammathuru-KTIO): from the plan it is clear that the exploration undertaken area are mainly concentrated in the main pit and around the pit area and not covered complete area, pertaining to the extent of the area under KTIO. (ii). It is therefore, the area which are required to explore need to be undertaken appropriately away from the pit locations, to understand the extent of the ore body on the lateral side and at depth. (iii). The ultimate pit limit line is not marked, without which it is difficult to understand the extent of the mining area. (iv). In the light of the above remarks, the other geological plan of other area needs to be proposed with future exploration or exploratory mining to study ore body.
39. Plate No.MP02a1,(Geological section of Kammathuru-KTIO): from the section, the ultimate pit slope is not drawn, without which how the reserve/ resources calculation computed may be explained. (ii). From the sections along A-A', G-G' & H-H', the lithology of the respective sections are drawn approximately and not based on the actual drilling exploration datas, whatever the interpretation drawn is not appropriate and correct. Hence, the ML area needs to be re-assessed to for better planning of the area for future mining. Whatever the exploration meterage shown in the document is no meaning. Until, unless proved the depth and the lateral extensions.

40. Plate No.MP02C, (Tentative Excavation of Kammathuru-KTIO-A): the notation used to refer the bench top & bottom through the index is not appropriate and not clear for understanding. How it is possible to refer bench top and the dump in a single line is not clear. The current year workings should be brought out appropriately. Pit workings and the waste dumps should be shown separately for easy reference. (ii). In the light of the above remarks, the other excavation plan/ productions should be attended and updated appropriately in line with the scrutiny remarks, given in the text also.

41. Plate No. SM17 (Dump design & Back filling): The plan drawn along X-X' is not correct. The final slope and extent of the dump extended through the terracing is also not appropriate. The terracing could be continued for another level also, instead of single. The afforestations undertaken are not brought out in the plan. The pit benches will not be appearing in the plan.

42. Plate No. SM14 (Conceptual Plan): The plan and the sections should be drawn considering the position of workings, waste dumps, reclamation and rehabilitation position at that time of closing the mine, either lease period or conceptual period, may be brought out. Besides, considering the above remarks in the scrutiny of the text and the plates may be attended appropriately in all respect.