



भारत सरकार/Government of India
खान मंत्रालय/Ministry of Mines
भारतीय खान ब्यूरो/Indian Bureau of Mines
हैदराबाद क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय/Hyderabad Regional Office



No. AP/VZNR/MP/Mn-101/HYD

6th Floor, CGO Towers,
Kavadiiguda,
Secunderabad- 500 080, AP.
Date: 13.04.2018.

To
Shri S.Venkata Narayan Reddy,
S/O Shri Ramulu Reddy,
Balasubbaiah Nagar,
Pamuru Village & Mandal
Prakasam district,A.P.-523 108.

Sub: Submission of Review of Mining Plan in respect of Putkavalasa manganese mine of S.Venkata Narayan Reddy over an extent of 21.77 ha. located in Putkavalasa Village, Saluru Mandal, Vizianagaram Dist. of Andhra Pradesh State submitted under Rule 17(2) of MCR, 2016.

Ref: Your letter no. Nil dated. Nil received in this office on 22.03.2018.
Sir,

01. With reference to your letter cited above on the subject, the site inspection was carried out on 07.04.2018 by Shri.S.K.Muduli, JMG accompanied by Sri. Sudhakar, Mine Representative and Shri P.R. Mishra, Qualified Person. The draft Review of Mining Plan has since been examined and found certain deficiencies in the form of Scrutiny Comments as given in Annexure. The scrutiny comments have already been forwarded on your mail id: svmines0803@gmail.com and : earth.environmenter2008@yahoo.com Qualified person as submitted in the document.

02. You are advised to attend the deficiencies as per the annexure and resubmit the document, complete in all respects, in three bound copies along with soft copy in the form of CD (2Nos.). In this regard you are directed 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 and @ Rs.Two Lakhs/hectare for category 'B' mines provided that the minimum amount shall be Rs.Five lakhs as per the provision of Rule 27(1) of MCDR, 2017 at the time of submission of final copies of the document within 15 (fifteen) days from the date of issue of this letter, failing which the document will be disposed without giving any further opportunity.

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

Yours faithfully,

(Pankaj Mishra)
Controller of Mines

Copy to : Shri P R Mishra, QP,

(Pankaj Mishra)
Controller of Mines.

मूल प्रति पर नहीं
खान नियंत्रक (द), भारतीय खान ब्यूरो, बंगलुरु।

(पंकज कुलश्रेष्ठ)
खान नियंत्रक

Inspection report cum Scrutiny comments on the review of mining plan in respect of Pedanandipalli Manganese Ore Mine of Shri S.Venkata Narayana Reddy over an extent of 21.77 hectares in Putikavalasa H/o Diguvaendalagi (Mokasa) village, Saluru mandal, Vizianagaram dist. Andhra Pradesh

The ML area was inspected by the undersigned on 07.04.2018 and Shri Sudhakar, Geologist and Shri P.R.Mishra, QP accompanied during the inspection.

The plans and sections are not matching with the field condition. The existing mining pit near BP-A has not been shown in the plans and sections. During inspection it was observed that only one exploratory pit is having float ore upto a depth of 1m BGL and the balance 6 exploratory pits are have no float ore and insitu manganese ore mineralization. All the 7 exploratory pits are dug upto 1m depth BGL. For reserves/resource estimation purpose the ore is considered in all the pits upto 5 m depth BGL and in one case 10m depth BGL. The reserves /resources estimated based on the is not as per MEMC rules-2015 and can not be accepted at this stage. Further the production and development plan prepared based on the above reserves/resources estimation is not acceptable and needs complete recasting of the entire document.

1. General

- a) Consent letter and undertaking of the lessee be signed by the Lessee in real. The name of the person signing be displayed at signature panel. Lessee's originally signature is not appended in the letter but submitted by printing the letter with scanned image of the signature.
- b) The shape of the precise area shown in the plan is not matching with that of the precise area marked in lease sketch. Further the north direction as submitted in all the plans is different from that of the lease transfer sketch.
- c) The lease sketch along with all lease boundary pillar co-ordinates (in WGS-84 format) duly authenticated by the competent authority of the state government be submitted and all the plans and sections be prepared on the basis of the authenticated lease sketch.
- d) The issue pertaining to transfer of the ML to M/s SVN Mines Private Limited be discussed.
- e) Bench mark needs to be established within the mining lease area such that it will not be disturbed, by linking to some FRP/Survey of India triangulation point/Railway station and the contours levels be mentioned in the plan accordingly. Co-ordinates and RL of the bench mark be mentioned in the text and in the place where it is to be established.
- f) Date of survey be mentioned in the plans and the plans should be signed by DGMS certified surveyor for its correctness and its accuracy.
- g) The individual Survey nos. with its area extent, with nature of land shall be furnished in a table form.
- h) The location of the seasonal nala flowing through the lease is not shown correctly in the plan.
- i) Annexure-II (Lease deed) be furnished completely instead of the front page. Mining plan approval letter be annexed.

2. Review

Review has not been furnished correctly. Review of production in respect of ROM, Saleable ore and sub grade, waste generation, top soil generation, exploration, plantation, environmental monitoring and reclamation and rehabilitation, status of compliance be furnished from 2013-14 to 2017-18 with mentioning reason for deviation.

3. Geology, Exploration & Reserve: -

- a) Data source of temperature and rain fall, regional geology be submitted.
- b) During field inspection the manganese insitu ore body found to occur only at one place near to BP-A (30m away) but in the Geological plan the occurrence of manganese insitu ore body has been shown in very higher that to actual and no insitu manganese ore body found near towards the south western part of the lease. There is occurrence of float ore in the exploratory pit and also on surface which has not been marked on the geological plan correctly. During inspection it has been observed that the Pit nos as per field is not matching with Pit no mentioned in the Geological plan. Pit-8, Pit-6, Pit-5, Pit-4, Pit-3 & Pit-2 are non-mineralised and only Pit-7 contains manganese float ore. Further no sampling has been done from the pit for the purpose of chemical analysis. The pit should be proposed in area where it can intersect the mineralized zone. The level of exploration has not been furnished in the geological plan. The geological plan be corrected as per the existing filed condition. Further the trend and dipping direction of the manganese ore body be shown on plan.
- c) The exploratory pit lithologs has not been maintained as per statute and chemical analysis has not been carried out as per statute.

- d) The exploratory pit number, collar RL, co-ordinates, dimension have not been submitted. Further the details of working pits like co-ordinates, no of benches, dimension of pits has not been furnished. The mining pit dimension furnished in page -9 is not correct. Further in the surface plan and geological plan no mining pit has been shown.
- e) Pit wise mineralized zone details with grade be submitted.
- f) The maximum explored depth by means of exploratory pitting is 1m depth BGL in 7 nos exploratory pit. Out of 7 nos exploratory pit only 1 no exploratory pit is float ore bearing and balance 6 exploratory pits have no evidence of float ore and insitu ore. In all the geological sections the depth of mineralization is shown 5m depth BGL and in one section 10m depth BGL. Thus the geological section drawn are not correct. The UNFC category has not been furnished in the geological sections. The ultimate pit limit depth has not been accessed correctly. The Geological sections be drawn across strike of the ore body. The length and thickness of manganese ore body has not been accessed. The geological section be made as per the lithology encountered in the exploratory pit and also taking into consideration of the geological facts. The blocked reserves/resources be shown on geological section and estimated and furnished section wise. The reserves/resources has been estimated in excess on the basis wrong cross section. Thus the reserves/resources be estimated considering the present pit dimension, earlier approved mining plan.
- g) The manganese ore body has not been delineated yet. The manganese ore (Min % > 20%) recovery study from the ROM has not been submitted. Thus the recovery test be carried out and submitted to know the recovery factor of the ROM along with size wise grade.
- h) The category of the deposit as per MEMC Rules-2015 has not been justified and mentioned accordingly. Further parameters considered for reserves/resources estimation has not been furnished correctly.
- i) Ultimate pit limit depth proposed is 180.50 mRL at page no-15 which be justified properly. The Ultimate Pit slope should be as per statute.
- j) The level of exploration wise reserves/resources and UNFC wise reserves/resources has not been furnished with weighted average grade also.
- k) The reserves of sub grade mineral and mineral rejects should be accessed with grade, as per the threshold values and its generation be discussed in the mining chapter.
- l) Geological axis wise justification submitted is not correct. In the feasibility axis justification the costing details be submitted as per the format of Annual return and in addition to that the economic viability data and status of environmental clearance and legal issues has not been submitted.
- m) Exploration proposed is not correct. Potential area be marked on the geological plan and its extent be mentioned in the text. Exploration by means of trenching and exploratory core drilling be proposed to explore the entire potential mineralized area in G1 level of exploration as per statute. Further 10% check sample of each core bore be analyzed from NABL accredited laboratory. Further the details of Samples analysed by NABL laboratory be submitted.
- n) The insitu manganese ore body has not been delineated yet in complete. As only one pit contains float manganese ore it is not possible to estimate the reserves/resources of manganese ore. Further the geological sections drawn are not correct. The mining proposal has been given in such areas where the mineral existence is in doubt as the depth of pit is only 1m and out of 7 shown pits, 6 nos of pits have no sign of float ore mineralization and insitu manganese ore mineralization.

3. Mining

- a) Furnish the coordinates of the existing mining pit and other details like no of benches, height of benches, dimension of the mining pit.
- b) As the cut off grade Min% is 20%, which is on higher side in comparison to the threshold value of manganese ore notified by IBM, generation of sub grade and mineral rejects should be estimated and its stacking, blending should be proposed year wise for easy reference.
- c) The drilling and blasting requirement calculation has not been furnished. In the blasting parameters calculation of powder factor has not been given. Further the details of decking, bottom charge and column charge be submitted.
- d) The year wise production and development plan is not correct as the proposed mining depth is 5 times more than the actual explored depth. In the year wise production and development plans year wise in ward and out ward road and ramp provision with gradient, level of mining to be attained should be shown in YPD plan.
- e) In the lay out of mine working amount of advance to be made length wise, width wise, height, co-ordinates, from -to level (in mRL), Volume has not been furnished.

- f) Production and development section be submitted year wise for easy reference.
- g) The section wise bench wise weighted average grade of proposed mining block for each year needs to be furnished and the mechanism for the grade control for optimum utilization of mineral along with blending techniques needs to be furnished.
- h) The conceptual plan and section is not correct as it contains only the ensuing proposal. Proposal be submitted till the end of life of the mine. Conceptual status of mine at the end of lease period be discussed for exploration, waste and sub grade generation, pit development, land use pattern, afforestation, reclamation and rehabilitation correctly taking in to account of the safety zone area, bench height and width, bench slope and ultimate pit slope as per statute. Conceptual plan and section be prepared and submitted and the conceptual status of mine should be same in the text and with submission in plates.
- i) Max & min depth of water table has not been mentioned in the text with annexing supporting document and level of proposed workings has not been furnished in the plan and that is mentioned in the text is not correct and be furnished with due justification. Year wise sump planning with co-ordinates, dimension and capacity has not been furnished in text and shown in plan. Two nos seasonal nala flowing within the lease towards south, thus the environmental protection measures should be proposed.
- j) Waste dumping should be proposed in non-mineralised area. Quantity of waste to be generated vis-a-vis its disposal scheme alongwith the rehabilitation scheme, of the proposed and existing dumps should be discussed. A summary of all dump areas, its height, existing volume, degraded area for different types of wastes, mineral rejects, sub grade material etc.future plan for rehabilitation be discussed. This discussed plan should be supported with appropriate plan and enough number of sections.
- k) Year wise proposal for generation, utilization, blending of mineral reject & sub grade be furnished with quantity and grade. of existing mineral reject / sub grade stock like location co-ordinates, dimensions, quantity and grade should be furnished. The site of temporary dumping of mineral reject & sub grade be identified and submitted.
- l) Processing of ROM and Mineral reject be submitted if any apart from manual sorting.
- m) OMS output has not been submitted.

4. Progressive mine closure

- a. The net area put to use for mining and allied activities is on lower side as the existing and proposed waste dumping area, ROM dumping area, Sub-grade dumping area, top soil dump area processing area and existing mining pit area, exploratory pit area have not been taken into consideration. Thus head wise area put to use be corrected and be submitted and accordingly the calculation of financial assurance be corrected and the balance Financial assurance be submitted at the time of final submission.
- b. Summary of baseline environmental information should be furnished.
- c. Environmental protection measures for waste dump and mineral reject dump be discussed and proposed. Proposal be submitted for management of rainfall water run off within the mine. The year wise proposal for development of gartland drain, retention walls, gully checks, retaining bund for top-soil, siltation pit, check dam, plantation be discussed in text and shown in the reclamation –rehabilitation plan. Details like location, co-ordinates, and dimensions should be submitted. The year wise plantation be proposed along the 7.5m safety zone giving details like location, co-ordinates, length.
- d. The environmental monitoring should be proposed year wise for Air, Noise, Water, Soil within the core and buffer zone and should be furnished in tabular format with details like location name, co-ordinates, frequency of sampling in text and locations in key plan, reclamation-rehabilitation plan.

5. Plans and Sections

- a) The geological plan has not been signed by the QP and geologist, whereas the geological section has not been signed by the geologist.
- b) In the earlier approved mining plan the plans were prepared in assumed co-ordinates. All the plans be prepared in UTM co-ordinates and the earlier approved local co-ordinates be mentioned for each grid.
- c) The surface plan is not up to date. The existing mining pits has not been shown in the surface plan. Thus survey should be done afresh and all the plans and section should be prepared based on this plan.
- d) 50m Safety zone along both the sides of the seasonal nala flowing through the lease be marked on all plan.

- e) The table pertaining to area considered for calculation of financial assurance in the progressive mine closure plan is not correct.
- f) In the environmental plan the villages, stream be shown.
- g) Ultimate pit limit be shown in the Plans and sections.
- h) As per rule 34 of MCDR-1988, -
 - (1) All digitally prepared plans, sections and print copies thereof kept at the mine shall be suitably indexed.
 - (2) Every plan, section or part thereof prepared under these rules shall carry thereon a certificate for its correctness and shall be signed by the mining engineer with date. Provided that the geological plans and sections shall be certified and signed by the geologist employed under rule 55.
 - (3) Every copy of a plan and section or part thereof submitted or maintained under these rules 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.

.....*****