

SCRUTINY COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT REVIEW OF MINING PLAN OF JALIM - SANAI BAUXITE MINE (AREA 12.14 HECT) OF M/s HINDALCO INDUSTRIES LTD. VILLAGE – Jalim & Sanai, DISTRICT – Gumla (JHARKHAND) SUBMITTED UNDER RULE 17(2) OF MINERALS (OTHER THAN ATOMIC & HYDRO CARBONS ENERGY) CONCESSION RULES, 2016 & RULE 23 OF MCDR, 2017.

TEXT

1. Lease has been extended up to 31.03.2030 for lease area 38.45 ha where as document has been submitted for approval for area 12.14 ha.

Land Schedule and authenticated lease map as per extended lease dated 11/04/2017, surrender certificate received from State Govt. and DGPS surveyed map/plan in compliance to the CCOM's circular No. 2/2010 dated 6.4.2010 as per extended lease required to be enclosed.

2. Justification of submission of the document “review of mining plan under rule 17(2) of MCR, 2016” where as lease has been renewed and extended up to 31.03.2030.

3. Ten boreholes have been drilled during March - May, 2017 to enhance reserve position. GPS reading and photographs of those boreholes may be furnished.

4. Boundary pillars marking is anticlockwise as shown in Surface plan is against the Rule 12(i)(v) of MCR, 2016 need to be complied.

5. Copy of the valid explosive licence or agreement with Blasting Agency to be enclosed. During inspection, the mine was not operation. The period of discontinuation should be mentioned in proper form. The explosives used for blasting have been mentioned procured from agency as well as mention of centralised Magazine have been mentioned which are contradictory.

6. Bank Guarantee for the plan period 2018-19 to 2022-23 has not been enclosed with the document for approval. Photocopy of the difference of B. G. submitted as per rule 27(2) of MCDR, 2017 may be enclosed.

7. P-26, Reserve blocked under 7.5 m safety barrier has been considered under 211 is not valid.

8. P-11, Proposed land reclamation during 2014-15 to 2017-18 was 1.70 ha where as actual reclamation shown 2.61 hect. i.e., more than proposed but which do not match with field evidence.

9. Area considered as fully reclaimed as per Financial assurance plan (P-74) furnished as 2.11 hect is not correct may be justified with calculation sheet showing volume excavated and volume required for reclamation 2.11 ha. during the plan period with dimensions.

10. Afforestation Photographs enclosed in the document approved on 19/12/2014 and in present document is same justifies the plantation and reclamation history in the lease area during last five years.

11. P-28, Year wise ROM/OB ratio does not match with tabulated information.

12. P-38, Information furnished regarding centralised magazine but not shown on plans, in page -39, it has been mentioned that blasting will be done after agreement with blasting agency.

13. P-42, In the Table showing reclaimed area and rehabilitated area ,dimension of the reclaimed & rehabilitated area year wise may be furnished.
14. Land use pattern as proposed till 31.03.2018 in the last approved document and existing land use pattern as furnished in present document do not match when mining was carried as per approved document (P-42).
15. Area to be reclaimed during 2018-19 to 2022-23 furnished in P-42 and P-45 do not match.
16. Fresh and legible photocopy of Secretary of Mine letter dated 7.4.17 and adhaar cards to be enclosed.
17. Reserve calculation sheet Annex-11, do not show reserve as per UNFC codes.
18. Fresh photographs with actual colours of reclaimed, afforested area may be enclosed.

PLAN & SECTION

1. All plan & section should prepared as per rule 31(4) of MCDR 2017with shown a scale of the plan at least twenty five centimeters long and suitably sub-divided .
 - 2.i) Colour scheme of plan and section do not match.
 - ii) Index colour do not match with features on plan and section..
 - iii).Top and Bottom R. L. in quarry and benches are missing and R.L of Plan & section do not match.
2. Plate no.-1, (Key plan): Co-ordinate of the lease area may be mentioned.
3. Plate no.-2, (Area Plan): Authenticated lease map after extended lease deed may be enclosed.
4. Plate no.-3, (Surface Plan): Signature of the Surveyor is missing. Pillars are not marked as per MCR, 2016.
5. Plate no.-4&4A, (Geological Plan and Section) & Development Plan & Section: Colour scheme of plan and section do not match. At places RL is missing. RL of Plan and section varies. The reserves on this plate have not been shown with code. Also UPL have not been drawn.
6. Environment Management plan (plate-11): Different colour codes may be used to differentiate yearwise proposed working, Reclamation and Plantation.
Scale of Geological Plan wrongly written as 1:4000 instead of 1:5000 whereas Geological section is 1:2000,and Surface plan is 1:4000 may be clarified.
7. Conceptual Plan (plate-13): Proposed length of retaining wall along with dimension and coordinate of proposed reservoir may be furnished.
8. Financial Assurance Plan(plate-14): Area under column “C & F “ do not match with existing land use pattern of present document and land use pattern furnished in approved document dated19/12/2014.Area considered as fully reclaimed -2.11 hec. do not match with field evidence. Also, the area considered as fully reclaimed & mentioned is not supported with relevant documents.