

**SCRUNITY COMMENTS ON MODIFICATION TO THE APPROVED REVIEW AND UP-DATION OF MINING PLAN OF S.V.CHETTY IRON ORE MINE (M.L. NO. 2604) OF SHRI S.V. SRINIVASALU., OVER AN AREA OF 60.00 HA AS PER F.C. & AS PER CEC 60.23 HA. IN JAISINGPUR VILLAGE, SANDUR TALUK, BALLARI DISTRICT OF KARNATAKA STATE. THE PRESENT MODIFICATION PERIOD IS FOR 2017-18 TO 2019-20, AGAINST THE PREVIOUS APPROVED DOCUMENT PERIOD 2016-17 TO 2019-20. CATEGORY OF THE MINE - A(MECHANISED), COMPLETE FOREST LAND, NON-CAPTIVE MINE.**

**COVER PAGE**

1. Date of first grant of the ML to be furnished in the cover page. The Modification to the approved Review and up-dation of Mining Plan including PMCP, under rule 17(3) of MCR, 2016 should be indicated, instead of rule 10(1) of MCDR, 1988.
2. The type of forest land may be given specifically, whether any reserve forest is present or not, without any ambiguity in the text & the plates.
3. IBM registration number & the mine code need to be indicated. The category of the mine is given as A (OTFM), which need to be corrected as A (M-Mechanized), instead of OTFM.
4. RQP certificate number indicated for Shri. S.B. Naganur, may be deleted and mentioned as qualified persons. In the light of the above remarks, the text and the plates may be attended, wherever applicable.

**INTRODUCTION**

5. Modification to the approved Mining plan/ scheme of mining should be written clearly, without any ambiguity. In the light of the above remarks, the whole text and the plates may be attended, wherever applicable.
6. The enhanced production from 99,960t/ annum to 1.95 lakhs tpa approval obtained from the CEC or monitoring committee is not enclosed. Without which it is difficult to consider the document for the approvals. Annexure-III, referred here is not appropriate without specific approval letter as mentioned above. Just with the recommendation letter it is not possible to consider for the enhancement of the production in the mine. Hence, the proposed production will be considered only after submitting a specific approval letter from CEC/ Monitoring committee.

**GENERAL**

7. Para 1(f), recognized person should be replaced with Qualified person and the rule 15(1) of MCR, 2016 should be added in place of rule 22 C of MCR 1960.
8. Para 2(b), under the details of forest, it is given sandur reserve forest of 60.23 ha, as per FC, but in cover page and other pages it is given 60.00 ha, which is not correct, it should be spelt with clarity, for the extent of the area, the mining proposals have been given or undertaken.

**PART-A**

9. Table-18, given with lessee is the name of the prospecting exploration agency, is not correct, which should be attended replacing the exploration agency, who really undertaken exploration.
10. Para 1(e), under this para already exploration under taken reveals only trial pits and only 08 nos., of bore holes of DTH drilling, in the common boundary area with M/s Balaji, but remaining areas, what is the reasons for not undertaking through few drill holes for understanding the deposits at depths and also in lateral extensions for better planning.
11. Para 1.0 (J): under table-19, (i). the reserves and the resources indicated both in the name of the & reserves & resources, this should be checked and corrected, why the G2 scale is not given at that time. In the light of the above remarks, the remaining tables may be attended and corrected. (ii). Table-26, under mineral resources, it is observed that, float iron ores reflected without the unit, without which it is incomplete, whether tonnes or in hectares. (iii). Under feasibility report, under cost of production, the DMF & the NMET factor has not considered. (iv). Table-27, G2 in probable mineral reserves it is reported as 0.473 million tonnes, whereas

- in table-26, it is reported as 1.388 float ores, not clear for the unit, to be attended appropriately. (v). The table-27, should be indicated with date as on the reported reserves/ resources to be considered.
12. Para 2.0 A (a): (i). The text paras should be strictly followed as per the guidelines format. (ii). The proposed method is A(OTFM), it should be changed to A(M-mechanized). The existing and the proposed method of working should be briefed giving the details of pits; approach roads to the working benches are not brought out and not explained accordingly in this para.(ii). The existing number of pits, their sizes, top & bottom RLs and average depth etc., may be given in tabular form.(iii). Further, it is expected to brief on the slope of faces, direction of advancement, approach road to the working faces & specification of roads, etc., to be marked. (iv).Also, the existing dumps spread parameters, height, slope protective works etc., to be marked. (v). The bench wise, mRL wise, opening reserves, exploitation and the closing balance (reserves) should be furnished for the proposed periods. (vi). In the light of the above remarks, the remaining part of the text and the plates may be attended.
13. Para 2.0 (b),under insitu tentative excavation, table-no. 28, only details pertaining to the march is given, which must be corrected and given for complete year, including March 2018 may be given.
14. Para 2(b), under dump re-handling, the details of the dumps and the stacks may be given with clarity, that in which are the dumps and stacks will be considered for future re-handling, to recover the saleable materials. Table-no.29 need to be attended by giving the dumps/ stacks identifications. Table no.30 need to be attended for complete year, instead of part.
15. Para 2.0 (d): it is given no drilling and blasting will be practiced, which is not correct. There is proposals to work in insitu deposit area, which need to be re-considered, while selecting insitu areas for mining proposals.
16. Para 2(e), in table no.33, wherein float ore working are given for the year 2018-19 & 2019-20, excluding the year 2017-18, what is the reasons for not including 2017-18 may be explained. (ii). Table-no.35, it is given for working reef ore, should be corrected as insitu reef. (iii). Table no.36, given back filling in worked out area, both in reef ore mined area and float ore mined out area, better the pit numbers may be added for clarity in each case.
17. Para 2(f), wherein it is given back filling in worked out areas, without indicating the details of the pits for reference in future workings. (ii). Table no. 38, land use pattern is given, in which in sl.no. 1, mining and back filling is given together, which is not correct, should be separated for reference.
18. Para 4(a), under dumping, it is given waste generated will be back filled in the float ore worked out area, it is good to indicate the pit numbers for easy reference, without which it is difficult to identify. In line with the above remarks, the other para4(c), need to be attended if applicable.
- 19.Para 6(a), it is expected to indicate what is the ratio of lump and fines and also recovery of saleable ore form the mine for reference may be indicated.
20. Para 8.1, table no.44 need to be attended and corrected in line with the remarks already given for land use pattern.
21. Para 8.3.1, need to be attended appropriately in line with the remarks, already given in above paras for correct information of the text.
22. Para 8.6, table no.47, under financial assurance, OB dump should be brought out in the net area considered column, bio diversity area may be deleted from the net net area calculation.
23. Shri. S.B. Naganur may be indicated with Qualified person, instead of giving the RQP certificate number, which may be deleted from the document both in the text and the plates.
24. Certificate/ consent letter from the applicant should be replaced with lessee. (ii). The document is indicated as modified mining scheme, and also it is written as approved mining plan and so on, which must be corrected appriately. (iii). Recognised person need to be replaced with qualified person. (iv). The certificate from the qualified person also need to be corrected MCDR, 2017, instead of MCDR, 1988. Applicant should be removed and the RQP certificate number to be deleted.

## **PART-B**

### **Plates:**

25. Key Plan (Plate 1/b):The approach road to the ML area is not marked, which should be from the known place with approximate distance to be given.

**26. Surface Plan (Plate No. II/a):** The existing working and the non-working pits must be demarked with the extent of area covered in each pits with number/ names, waste dumps, stacks, crusher and the screening plant, etc., should be indicated with clarity. On the plate it is written as modification to the approved modified mining plan, but in some other plate and in the text part, it is written modification to the approved scheme of mining, which should be corrected. In the light of the above remarks, the text and the other plates may be attended, if applicable.

**27. Geological Plan (Plate No. II/b):** The ultimate pit limit in the plan and the ultimate pit slopes in the sections should be drawn to know the extent of the workings proposed to be operated/ worked in the lateral extent and also at depths. Besides, there should not be any waste dumps/ stacks within the ultimate pit limit. (ii). The reserves/ resources added in three codes of UNFC classification may be indicated in specific in the text and also in the plate, in respect of present submission. (iii). The codification given for 211 as feasibility resources to be changed to probable reserves. (iv). The index used to show iron ore should be corrected in-situ iron ore, instead of just iron ore.

**28. Geological section (Plate No. II/C):** From the sections, it is very clear that the majority of the area has been interpreted without undertaking actual exploration in the form of bore holes, either RC drill holes or core drill holes, to know the actual mineralization at depth and the lateral extent.(ii). Whatever trial pits made reveals within the float areas of lesser depth, nothing undertaken at deeper levels. (iii). Random bore holes could be undertaken in the ML area from N-S and E-W for better understanding of the area. (iv). Sections along J2-J2', K-K', L-L' & J1-J1', wherein adequate bore holes towards slope side not undertaken to know the actual mineralization, but assumed the area as non-mineralized.

**29. Year wise Development Plan (2017-18, PlateNo. III/a, ):** On the plate it is written as Modification to the approved Modified mining plan, but in other plate and the text, it is written as something else, which should be attended appropriately. The workings shown for the year 2017-18 is in the limited area, which need to be re-attended to show the complete area, where the development and production undertaken during the whole year of 2017-18 may be shown for clarity. Similarly the other activities undertaken like waste dumping, stacking & reclamation if any may be brought out accordingly. In the light of the above remarks, the remaining plates for the year 2018-19 & for the year 2019-20 may be attended and brought out the workings with clarity for understanding.

**30. Year wise Development & Production section (Plate No. III/d, ):** The development sections depicted at the common boundary with M/s Balaji Mines & Minerals Pvt. Ltd., is not appropriate and correct, which should be developed more on the slope side, by slicing, otherwise, the proposed method is not possible to achieve in practical. In the light of the above remarks, the proposals drawn in the plan also may be attended appropriately during the year 2018-19 & 2019-20 respectively.

**31. Environment Plan (Plate No. V):** The other ML areas present away from the present ML need to be indicated with ML. Number and the name of the other lessees.

**32. Conceptual Plan &Section (Plate No.VI):** The development & production undertaken as per the proposals in the development & production plates and as per the document is found to be not appropriate.Working pits and the exhausted pits/ areas need to be highlighted with bold color index for easy reference. Though, the ML is going to be expired by 31/03/2020 and the reserves/ resources will continue to exist, hence the mineralized areas need to be kept as it is, instead of bringing under green cover or rehabilitation through plantations. Only the mineral exhausted area need to be reclaimed/ rehabilitated. Besides, the sections line considered as J-J1' & J-J2' reveals incomplete sections, this should be considered for ML boundary to ML boundary.

**33. Reclamation Plan (Plate no. IV):**This plate should be written as Reclamation and rehabilitation plan, instead of just reclamation plan as per the R & R approved by ICFRE, indicating the work completed and the work under progress.

**Annexure:** Following items are required to be annexed with the document:

34. In the consent letter, it is expected to mention as Modification to the approved Mining Plan or Scheme of Mining Plan, under rule 17(3) of MCR, 2016, instead of giving incorrectly, modification to the approved Mining Plan/ Scheme of Mining etc. Further below para need to be attended accordingly. In the light of the above remarks, the text and the plates may be attended.

35. Certificate from the QP, wherein MCDR, 1988 should be corrected as MCDR, 2017, with the latest amendments.

36. All the Boundary pillars may be enclosed in the documents in color photographs, instead of black & white.
37. Copy of the application given by the lessee to the State Govt. of Karnataka, seeking extension of ML period. Similarly in the annexures, whatever the annexures enclosed must be clearly indicated in all the annexures.
38. All the Annexures should be given with date of the letter and the valid period, whatever applicable. Number of pages in each annexure also needs to be given.
39. Progress of the R & R works, with details not given with photographs.
40. Annexure 05, should be replaced with qualification certificate & the experience certificate minimum of five years need to be enclosed.
41. Annexure-8 & 9 not indicated in the annexures. Feasibility report is not given with complete information, under cost of production, the DMF & the NMET factor has not considered.
42. Copy of valid Bank Guarantee, in accordance with Rule 27(1) of MCDR, 2017, valid till 31.03.2020 may be enclosed.
43. Bore holes in the form of DTH drill holes and the trial pits with color photographs is not enclosed completely, which ought to have been.
44. EC limit for the mine production obtained from the appropriate authority is not enclosed, which ought to have been.