



भारत सरकार GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
खान मंत्रालय MINISTRY OF MINES
भारतीय खान ब्यूरो INDIAN BUREAU OF MINES
क्षेत्रीय खान नियंत्रक के कार्यालय
OFFICE OF THE REGIONAL CONTROLLER OF MINES



By Speed Post/E-Mail
Phone: 0674-2352463;
Tele Fax: 0674-2352490;
eMail:
ro.bhubaneshwar@ibm.gov.in
Plot No.149, Pokhariput
BHUBANESWAR-751020

No. MS/OTFM/52-ORI/BHU/2018-19

दिनांक / Date: 04.03.2019

To

Shri Sayed Abdul Halim, Mine Owner,
C/o-Jagannath Mazumdar, Ward No-2,
At-Hudisahi, Post-Joda, Dist-Keonjhar.

Sub: Review of Mining Plan of Oraghat Iron & Manganese Mine over an area of 25.847 ha in Sundargarh district of Odisha of Shri Sayed Abdul Halim submitted under Rule-17 (1) of MCR, 2016.

Ref: - i) Your letter no. nil dated 11.02.2019.
ii) This office letter of even no. dated 12.02.2019.
iii) This office letter of even no. dated 12.02.2019 addressed to the Director of Mines, Govt. of Odisha, copy endorsed to you.

Sir,

This has reference to the letters cited above on the subject. The draft Review of Mining Plan along with Progressive Mine Closure Plan has been examined in this office based on earlier site inspection carried out on 26.02.2019 by Shri Sudip Ranjan Mazumdar, Senior Mining Geologist. The deficiencies observed are enclosed herewith as Annexure-I.

You are advised to carry out the necessary modifications in the draft Review of Mining Plan in the light of the contents vide Annexure-I and submit **three (3) firm bound and two (2) soft copies of the document text in CD in a single MS Word file (the drawing/plates should be submitted in Auto CAD compatible format and JPG format in resolution of 100x100 pixels on same CD)** with financial assurance under Rule 27 of MCDR' 2017 within 15 (fifteen) days from the date of issue of this letter for further necessary action. If the total page of annexures exceeds 50 (Fifty) then it should be submitted as separate volume. But reference of these annexures must appear in the Review of Mining Plan document. The plates are also to be submitted in separate volume.

The para-wise clarifications and the manner in which the deficiencies are attended should invariably be given while forwarding the modified copies of the Review of Mining Plan. It may be noted that no extension of time in this regard will be entertained and the Review of Mining Plan will be considered for rejection if not submitted within above due date. It may also be noted that if the deficiencies are not attended completely, the submission would be liable for rejection without further correspondence.

भवदीय / yours faithfully,

०५

११/३/१९
५१०३११

(HARKESH MEENA)

क्षेत्रीय खान नियंत्रक / Regional Controller of Mines

Copy for kind information and necessary action to:

1. Shri Chandrabhanu Dash, Qualified Person, Geo Consultants Private Limited, Plot No-853, Gobind Prasad (Medical Lane), Mahavir Nagar (Infront of Radhika Complex/Reliance Fresh), Laxmisagar, Bhubaneswar-751006, Odisha

HTU

(HARKESH MEENA)

क्षेत्रीय खान नियंत्रक / Regional Controller of Mines

N.O.O:

Copy for kind information to the Controller of Mines (EZ), Indian Bureau of Mines, CP-13, Sector V Salt Lake City, Kolkata- 700091.

HTU

(HARKESH MEENA)

क्षेत्रीय खान नियंत्रक / Regional Controller of Mines

Scrutiny comments on examination of Review of Mining Plan along with PMCP of Oraghat Iron & Manganese Mine over an area of 25.847 Ha in Sundergarh district of Odisha State of Shri Sayed Abdul Halim

GENERAL

1. All the text, tables, annexures and plates has not been properly indexed/ numbered/ paged and signed by qualified person. Plate No-IIA has not been marked on relevant plate.
2. As the year 2018-19 is almost complete, therefore the period of proposal should be from 2019-20 to 2022-23 and accordingly proposals under exploration, mining and PMCP should be proposed from 2019-20 to 2022-23. Need to do necessary correction.
3. The term “subgrade” part of ROM may be replaced with “Mineral reject” at all places in the text/tables/plates. Necessary corrections to be done.
4. In para 2 (iii), PIN code and state in which regd office is situated is not mentioned.
5. In para 3.5, the annexure reference number does not correlate. Need to correct the annexure reference no and also numbering of the annexures.
6. In Part A, para-1©, the local geology of the lease area has not been described in details.
7. In Part A, para-1(e), the information pertaining to pitting/trenching, if any, for exploration purpose that have been carried out should only be furnished. Details of quarries from mining operation should be omitted here.
8. In Part A, para-1(i), under depth proposal it should be mentioned that “the depth of boreholes would be 100m or till the end of mineralization”. The parameters for chemical analysis should include Fe%, SiO₂%, Al₂O₃%, P% and Mn%. Entire mineralized area may be analyzed meter wise with 10% of check samples. (At least for 10% of total samples may be analyzed in accordance to BIS and reports from NABL accredited/other government laboratory). The proposal to be modified accordingly.
9. In para j(i), the statement “no mining activities were taken up in Block III” is not justified with present quarry shown. In page 26, under categorization of reserve, the area considered under G2 & G3 has not been adequately justified as per provision of exploration norms as per UNFC specified in MEMC Rules, 2015. Further, the lateral influence and depth considered for resource/reserve assessment should be mentioned in line with the provision of point no.4 in Part II of MEMC Rules, 2015. Reserves and resources should be estimated as per the provision of MEMC Rules ‘205.
10. In page 27, in the table showing total lease area explored under UNFC, the grid spacing of the boreholes under “G2” should be corrected as per borehole location spacing shown in Geological plan.
11. The bulk density considered is not specified whether that is “saleable ore” or “mineral reject” part of ROM both for iron ore and manganese ore. Further, in bulk density and recovery factor considered the reference of approved scheme of mining with period of proposal should also be specified. Necessary corrections to be made.
12. In pg. 29-30, the term “Geological Reserve” should be replaced with “Resource” and “Mineable Reserve” to be replaced with “Reserve”. The similar changes should be made at relevant places.
13. In the Geological sections (ref. Plate IV (a)), it is evident reserves/resources have not been estimated as per the provision of MEMC Rules, 2015 as the UPL has been drawn beyond the proved depth by borehole. Need to revise the UPL and correct the reserve and resource figures. Necessary corrections to be done in relevant plans and sections.

14. Justification of UNFC codes have not been furnished as per UNFC guidelines and preferably be submitted in tabulated format.
15. Under para K, the supporting chemical analysis report justifying the grade of iron ore and manganese ore as furnished should be justified.
16. Under para 2(A) (a), the closure period of mine should be rechecked and corrected along with reason of closure should be mentioned. In the table the quarry position "as on date" should be mentioned.
17. In the table in page 40, the "unit of measurement" of stripping ratio has not been furnished in the tabular format. The insitu tentative excavation figures should be furnished in similar tabular format in metric tones. The table provided in page 41 should be modified accordingly.
18. In the tables from pg 42-47, the "unit of measurement" for the parameter "dimension of the pit at the end of the year" has not been furnished.
19. In page 49, the Handling of ROM should be described in detail till its end use. The ROM handling process from its excavation, loading and Transportation, sorting yard and crushing & screening operation etc. to its end use. Necessary corrections to be made.
20. Under Para II.A (e) and in 4(b), the location of the proposed waste dump site has to be outside the UPL. Necessary justification and correction to be made.
21. In page 53, in the table the blasting parameters for ore, waste etc. should be specified clearly.
22. In page 53, the monitoring of air, water, noise and vibration has not been proposed along with monitoring frequency and location of monitoring stations. Necessary corrections to be made.
23. In page 65, in the table "subgrade" should be replaced with "Mineral Reject". In the insitu excavation figs shown in table in page 40, the total OB generation shown for the year 2018-19 is 5753 m³ whereas in the table in page 65, the total OB handled for 2018-19 is 5253 m³. The same to be corrected in para 4© and at all relevant places. Additionally, the nomenclature "DUMP-A" has not marked in plans and sections. It should be clarified at all places whether the DUMP-A is proposed dump or existing dump. Need to do necessary correction at all places.
24. Reclamation and rehabilitation of the mined out portion in the northern part of quarry-5 where safety zone has been disturbed have not been proposed.
25. In page 68, the nomenclature of DUMP around which construction of retaining wall and garland drain have been proposed has not been specified.
26. Under para 6(a), it has been mentioned that "ore recovered during excavation constitutes about 70% iron ore" is not correct. Need to do necessary correction.
27. In para 6(b), it is mentioned that ROM from mine will be transported to dump hopper but in page 49, it has been mentioned that ROM will be transported to proposed sorting yard. Need to rectify and clarify the process of handling and processing of ROM. The material balance chart should be shown in flow sheet with each stage /facilities for processing indicating feed size and grade of ROM with product size and grade at each stage of processing. Need to modify the flowsheet.
28. In para 7(a), at present the site services mentioned does not exist at mine. Need to do necessary correction
29. In para 7(b), the semi-skilled category of persons may be rechecked and corrected.
30. Under para 8.2, specific proposal for monitoring air, water, noise through out the life of mine with parameters to be monitored, monitoring frequency and location of monitoring stations has to be furnished in tabulated format. Additionally, as mentioned that frequency of monitoring during study period should be modified. Proposal to undertake "blast induced

vibration study” to be carried out after reopening of the mine should be submitted and mentioned at relevant places of the text. Need to do necessary corrections.

31. In para 8.3.1, it should be mentioned that area under excavation is not matured for reclamation and rehabilitation. Further, it has been shown that area that would degrade under various mining activities at the end of plan period will be 5.514 whereas financial assurance has been submitted only for 4.698 Ha area. Also, in FA calculation and in plate X, rainwater water harvesting pits as proposed under para 6 (g) has not been shown in plate X and also not considered in FA calculation. Additionally, in plate X, the feature shown in violet color (settling tank and settling pond) under index 12 A has not been described and considered for FA calculation. Hence, net area to be considered for FA calculation has to be rechecked and corrected and if additional area is degraded then equivalent financial assurance in form of that additional bank guarantee need to be submitted.

ANNEXURES

- a) The copy of power of attorney holder in favor of Shri Kamala Kanta Samal has not been enclosed with the document. The same should be enclosed with the document.
- b) The address proof of the lessee as furnished in Annexure IX does not match with address mention under para 2(2). Further the address proof submitted is almost 6 years back. Need to submit the recent address proof of the lessee.
- c) Few photographs showing present land use, environmental status of the mining lease area.

PLATES

KEY PLAN:

- i) The blue color dotted line beyond limit of 5km radius has not been described in index.

LEASE PLAN/DGPS MAP:

- i) The Plan showing the granted Mining Lease area (ref. Plate No-II) in favor of lessee has not been signed by Collector. The same should be signed by the collector and submit a copy of the same.

GEOLOGICAL PLAN AND SECTIONS:

- i) The surface right area should be shown in Geological plan. The UPL shown in the Geological sections should be modified as mentioned in point no.12. Grid coordinates (in UTM) to be shown along the x-axis of Geological sections.

DEVELOPMENT PLAN & SECTION:

- i) Proposed waste dump nomenclature to be shown in the development plans and sections. Dump-A has not been mentioned. UPL to be modified in development sections as mentioned in point no.12.
- ii) The index of settling tank has not been properly shown in all location of settling tank in development plan and sections.

PMCP:

- i) Proposal for reclamation of mined out portion of safety zone disturbed in northern part of Quarry-5 has not been proposed. Same should be proposed.

Samasundar
01/03/19
(Sudip Ranjan Mazumdar)
Senior Mining Geologist