

Scrutiny comments on examination of Review of Mining Plan in respect of Garbham Manganese mine of M/s Rastria Ispat Nigam Limited over an extent of 254.64 Ha. located in Garbham Village, Marakamudidam Mandal Vizianagaram District of Andhra Pradesh State submitted under Rule 17(3) of MCR, 2016.

Text

1. The document should have been submitted as 'Review of Mining plan' under rule 17(2) of MCR, 2016 instead of Revised Mining plan. And proposed plan period of the document should have been submitted up to 07.10.2022 with expiry of lease period instead of 2022-23.
2. In cover letter, Area of lease should have been furnished in 'Ha' in addition to Acres.
3. The document should be prepared by qualified person as per the provision of rule 15(1) of MCR, 2016, as RQP is no more exist as per the provisions of amendment rules.
4. Consent letter/ Certificates/ Undertaking etc. submitted by the authorized person and qualified persons should be submitted on company's letter head duly dated and signed. Further resolution of board of directors to nominate the person to sign the document should also be enclosed.
5. In Introductory chapter, clearly spell out the mining history, company details, its captive plants, future plans if any may be given. Also specifying various statutory clearances like, EC, CFO, Consent for Establishment, surface right area held by the lessee etc. may be given with documentary evidence.

Introduction

6. MCDR, 2017 had been notified in February 2017, but the qualified person is mentioning about MCDR, 1988, which is incorrect.
7. Survey no.'s furnished in page no.9 is different than that of the G.O order, which should be recheck, reconcile and resubmit.
8. It was proposed to increase the production level from 15000 MTPA to 60,000 MTPA, justification for above enhancement should be furnished in introduction chapter. Production proposal should commensurate with approved capacity of EC accorded by MOEF, if any increase in capacity the same may be detailed.
9. Details of the lease since inception should have been furnished.
10. Status of statutory clearance like FC, CFO, CFE, surface right area held by lessee should have been furnished in introduction chapter with supporting document.
11. Color photographs of core bore holes drilled, quarry working, core logs, lease boundary pillars, mining and allied activities etc. should be submitted.

Location and Accessibility

12. Address, phone no., mail id, Fax no. of the qualified persons should be submitted.
13. Geo-co-ordinates of all lease boundary pillars authenticated by state government should be submitted in para 2.d.
14. Details of approved documents should have been submitted in tabular form for easy reference.

Review of earlier approved document

15. Review of earlier approved proposals should be submitted in to-to. in tabular form indicating in columns of proposal, achievement, Deviation and remarks. Further review of PMCP should also submitted.
16. Para 3.4, compliance of violation has to be submitted as complied or not with supporting document for clarity.
17. As per the reply submitted for compliance, the bore to be drilled earlier has been committed to complete by end of 2017-18 i.e 31.03.2018, where as in future exploration proposal it is submitted to carried out by 2018-19 (refer page no.30), which is contradictory, the violation is still continuing, which needs to be complied as per the commitment.
18. Present Status of compliance of violation letter dated 14.02.2014 with supporting document.
19. Status of encroachment of safety zone area by dump at no. of places supporting with plan and section should be submitted.

Geology and exploration

20. Status of Open cast pit, waste dumps in East Garbham, Central Garbham and West Garbham with respect to no. of benches in ore & waste/ Terraces, their dimensions, exposure of ore/ ore content (in dumps) along with samples collected if any should have been submitted in para 1.0.(a). The above details should have been submitted in tabular form for easy reference. Further, it is to state in the above para whether the above pits/ dumps with mineral content have been considered for reserve estimation or not.
21. Regional geology succession of the area should be re-check and submitted. Regional geology has not been furnished with respect to manganese bearing rocks formation.
22. Details of occurrence of Manganese ore body it's mineralisation in the lease area should have been furnished for easy reference.
23. Details of samples collected with location should be submitted, the details furnished in page no.29 is not spelt about the location.
24. Bore holes drilled in the lease area so far should have been furnished in tabular form incorporating, Year, Bore hole no., Location, Collar RL, Depth, Remarks etc. should be submitted.
25. Location of bore holes, grid lines etc. should be furnished in 'WGS 84' co-ordinates for easy reference in text as well as in relevant plans and sections.
26. Details of bore holes which intersect the Manganese ore should be furnished in tabular form incorporating bore hole no. Meterage (From, To), lithology etc.
27. Expenditure incurred for exploration carried out during review period should be furnished with supporting document, Document submitted in Annexure12 recheck and submit pertaining to the instant lease.
28. Details of exploration carried out should be furnished in the tabular form as below

SL no.	Area explored under				Total lease area
	G1 level (ha)	G2 level (ha)	G3 level (ha)	Unexplored area (ha)	
29. Mineralised and non mineralized area in the lease based on exploration carried out so far by pitting, trenching, bore holes etc. exploitation by quarrying should have been defined and submitted for easy reference.
30. Justification of UNFC codes for reserve/ resource estimation as per MEMC Rules 2015 should be furnished.
31. Cut off grade considered is 28% Mn for the lease and threshold value for Manganese ore is 10% Mn, Status of the ore between >10% and <28% Mn should be furnished.

32. Details of computation for assessment of resources/ reserves (insitue and Dump) should be submitted in the text part of the document.
33. Detail of reserves estimated from dump with sufficient no, of cross sections should be submitted and the same sections should be used for re-handling of dumps, for easy reference.
34. Recovery percentage of ore from dump yard is considered as 100% which needs justification with supporting document.
35. In parameters for estimation of reserves cut off grade considered is 28% Mn whereas reserves were estimated with grade from 21% Mn ,refer page no.42, which is contradictory.
36. Exploration proposal should be submitted in such a way that the entire potential area has to be explored completely in G1 level as required under the provision of rule 12(4) of MCDR,2017, accordingly exploration proposal should be suitably modified.
37. Recovery of ore from earlier approved document has been increased up to 100% which needs justification. Further reserves should be re-estimated based on present recovery factor.

Mining

38. Present status of Mining (Quarry and dumps) with dimensions in block wise should be submitted in tabular form also for easy reference.
39. Detail computation of dump re-handling proposal on year wise basis should be submitted.
40. Insitue reserves under 111 category is estimated but exploitation of the same has not been furnished.
41. Computation for adequacy of machinery for proposed exploitation should be submitted in detail.
42. In page no.46 it is submitted that the lumps and fines are segregated by deploying manual screening but in the introduction chapter there is mention about mechanical screening, which needs to be reconcile and submit.

Conceptual plan

43. It is stated that there is no re-handling of dump in the plan period but production proposal is submitted in mining chapter is for recovery of ore from dump re-handling only, which needs to be corrected.
44. Details furnished in the conceptual plan is sketchy and has not been prepared as per the guidelines. UPL has to be determined based on exploration carried out so far and economic viability. Status of land use, reclamation and rehabilitation at the end of this plan period as well as at the end of life of the mine, has not been furnished. Which needs complete recasting.

Stacking of mineral reject/ sub grade mineral and disposal of waste

45. There exist old dumps from which substantial quantity of ore is being recovered, but details of the same in tabular form like Block, dump no., location, Top RL, bottom RL, no. of terraces, quantity (in cum) etc. should be submitted in para 4.0, page no.50.

Others

46. Employment as per the statute like Skilled, semi-skilled, unskilled, mining engineer, Geologist etc. should be submitted.

Progressive mine closure plan

47. Review of progressive mine closure plan of approved period should be furnished.
48. Para 8.3.5, in item of 'Dump management' though proposal is furnished but detail should be submitted in tabular form on year wise. Further the status of land is not detail in respect of waste land has not been established so far in the lease area for this type of deposit. The waste land should be identified and its proper upgradation/ utilization should have been submitted.
49. Status of dumps with respect to mineral content/ stability, protective measures to prevent wash off etc. should be detailed. In most of the dumps no protective measures taken to prevent wash off/ fencing, a proposal should be submitted in this regard.
50. Environmental monitoring is submitted in respect of Dolomite mine instead of Garbham Manganese mine. Please clarify this being Fully mechanized category mine, environmental monitoring is being carried out or not. In this regard original monitoring details should be submitted for verification.
51. Para 8.4., The lease area is vast, controlled and uncontrolled area as per the statute has to be defined, the detail of disaster within the controlled area should be furnished.
52. Para 8.5, in case of temporary discontinuance of mine, care and maintenance to be taken of the mining area so that it will not affect the larger interest of the public in respect of safety, environment degradation.
53. Para 8.6, the financial assurance computed for the area put to use is on lower side, which needs to be recalculated accordingly financial assurance should be suitably modified. Further bank guarantee valid up to the proposed plan period should be submitted.

Plans and sections

54. All the plans and sections should be submitted as per the provision of rules 31, 32,33 & 34 of MCDR, 2017.
55. Standard color code should be used in respect of litho units for easy reference.
56. Every copy of a plan and section or part thereof submitted or maintained under these rules (34) shall bear a reference to the original plan or section from which it was copied and shall be certified thereon by the holder of the mining lease to be a true copy of the original plan or section.
57. In index box, purpose of the plan submitted, plan period, date of survey etc. should have been incorporated in addition to the details furnished.
58. Copy of original lease map during execution of lease should be submitted.
59. Lease map with Geo-co ordinates of lease boundary pillars authenticated by state government authority should be submitted instead of submitting geo-co-ordinates in separate papers attached to it.
60. The qualified person should furnish certificate duly signed by them stating that "Certified that this plans and sections area prepared based on the lease map authenticated by state government".
61. Co-ordinates of grid lines should be submitted in 'WGS 84' in addition to local co-ordinates in all the plans and sections, for easy reference.
62. Key plan should be submitted as per the provision of rule 32(5)(a) of MCDR, 2017 and submitted on survey of India topo sheet only. Further shape of the lease furnished is not matching with lease plan submitted, which should be rectified.
63. In text part of the document it is stated that the lease area has been divided in to 'East Garbham', 'Central Garbham' and 'West Garbham', but the same has not depicted in plans and sections.
64. Surface plan, should be duly dated and signed by mines manager, surveyor with certificate no., mining Engineer, Geologist in relevant plans and sections as per the statute.

65. Geological plan and sections: G1, G2, G3 level of exploration should be depicted in different colors as per MEMC rules 2015.
66. Reclamation plan should be prepared and submitted in 1:2000 scale instead of Progressive Mine Closure Plan in 1: 1000.
67. Financial assurance plan should have been submitted in 1:2000 scale instead of 1: 1000 scale.

ENCLOSURES

68. Form K in respect of bore holes drilled in First phase is also required to be submitted for reference.

In view of the above comments relevant para, plans and section should be suitably modified and submitted.



GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF MINES
INDIAN BUREAU OF MINES
Office of the Regional Controller of Mines

No. AP/VZNR/MP/Mn-81/HYD

6th Floor, CGO Towers,
CGO Complex, Kavadiguda,
Secunderabad- 500 080, AP.
Date: 04.12.2017

To

Shri P.K.Rath, Director
Rashtriya Ispat Nigam Ltd.,
Room No.384, Mines Department,
Main Administrative Building,
Visakhapatnam Steel Plant,
Visakhapatnam-530031,
Andhra Pradesh.

Sub: Submission of Review of Mining Plan in respect of Garbham manganese mine of Rashtriya Ispat Nigam Ltd over an extent of 264.54 Ha. located in Garbham Village, Merakamudidam Mandal, Vizianagaram Dist. of Andhra Pradesh State submitted under Rule 17(2) of MCR, 2016.

Ref: Your letter no. Nil dated 11.12.2017.

Sir,

01. With reference to your letter cited above on the subject, the draft Review of Mining Plan has been examined based on the Office record and found certain deficiencies in the form of Scrutiny Comments as given in Annexure. The scrutiny comments have already been forwarded on your e mail id: and Qualified person's mail id: cnssastry@vizagsteel.com and pamidimukkala@vizagsteel.com

02. You are advised to attend the above deficiencies as per the annexure and resubmit the document complete in all respect in three bound copies along with soft copy in the form of CD (2 Nos.) within 15 days from the date of issue of this letter. In this regard you are advised to submit the Financial Assurance in the form of Bank Guarantee for the area put on use for Mining and allied activities @ Rs. Three lakhs/hectare for category 'A' mines provided that the minimum amount shall be Rs. Ten lakhs as per the provision of Rule 27 of MCDR, 2017 only at the time of submission of final copies of the document.

03. The para-wise clarification & the manner in which the deficiencies are attended should be given while forwarding modified document.

Yours faithfully,

(Pankaj Kulshrestha)
Controller of Mines

Copy : Shri C N S Sastry, DGM(Mines), QP, and P.Ramakrishna, Sr.Manager(Geo), QP.

(Pankaj Kulsreshtha)
Controller of Mines.

मूल पति पर नहीं
खान नियंत्रक (द), भारतीय खान ब्यूरो, बेंगलुरु।

(पंकज कुलश्रेष्ठ)
क्षेत्रीय खान नियंत्रक

