



भारत सरकार / Government of India

खान मंत्रालय / Ministry of Mines

भारतीय खान ब्यूरो / Indian Bureau of Mines

क्षेत्रीय खान नियंत्रक का कार्यालय / OFFICE OF THE REGIONAL CONTROLLER OF MINES

100, ओल्ड नेहरू कालोनी, देहरादून (उत्तराखण्ड) 248001 / 100 Old Nehru Colony, Dehradun (U.K.) 248001

TEL- 0135-2676350 / 2671896, FAX-0135-2674962; E-mail - ro.dehradun@ibm.gov.in

फाईल संख्या File No: 614(2)/MS-A-138/2003-DDN

दिनांक 22.01.2018

29

सेवा में/ To : श्री पंकज नयन, प्रबन्धक खनन, pankaj.nayan@acclimited.com  
गागल चूनापत्थर खान  
में. ए.सी.सी. लि०,  
गागल सीमेन्ट वर्क्स, पोस्ट -बरवाना,  
बिलासपुर -174 013 (हि० प्र०)

विषय/ Sub : Submission of Modified Mining Plan along-with Progressive Mine Closure Plan in respect of Gagal Limestone mine of M/s ACC Ltd over an area of 231.25 hectare in Village-Nalag, Bhateh, Uprali, Barmana, Jamthal. Dhwan Kothi, Baloh & Panjgain, District -Bilaspur of HP State, submitted under Rule 17(3) of Minerals (Other than Atomic & Hydro Carbons Energy Minerals) Concession Rules, 2016 & 23 of MCDR 2017.

संदर्भ/Ref. Your letter No-GL/QRY/IBM/254 dated 25.12.2017 received on dated 27.12.2017

महोदय/ Sir,

This office is in receipt of two copies of the above-mentioned draft Modified Mining Plan including Progressive Mine Closure Plan on 27.12.2017. On examination of the same the discrepancies / deficiencies observed have been listed in annexure.

You are advised to correct the submitted Mining Plan including Progressive Mine Closure Plan as per deficiencies /discrepancies pointed in the enclosed annexure as scrutiny comments and submit 3 fair copies of the Modified Mining Plan including Progressive Mine Closure Plan within 15 days from the date of issue of this letter after corrections in hard bound copies (no spiral binding). If the fair copies of Modified Mining Plan including Progressive Mine Closure Plan will not be submitted within stipulated time, final action will be taken as per rule. Two CDs of the fair Modified Mining Plan including Progressive Mine Closure Plan may also be submitted including text, plates and annexures. On receipt of additional comments from State government, it shall be communicated to you subsequently. In case if it is necessary to incorporate the additional information, the details of the same should be given along with page numbers.

You are further advised to prepare the fair copies carefully and ensure that it is correct in all respect. Preferably use of paper on both the side should be made. If again deficiencies are observed then final action will be taken by this office without returning the copies for correction. This issues with the approval of competent authority.

Encl: as above.

भवदीय Yours faithfully,

(एस.सकलानी S Saklani)

सहायक खनन भूवैज्ञानिक Assistant Mining Geologist

कृते उप खान नियंत्रक एवं प्रभारी अधिकारी For DCOM & Officer In Charge

भारतीय खान ब्यूरो Indian Bureau of Mines

पत्र प्रेषित किया

दि० 29/1/18.....



**प्रतिलिपि सूचनार्थ प्रेषित :-**

- 1- खान नियंत्रक (उत्तर), भारतीय खान ब्यूरो, उदयपुर।
- 2- में. ए.सी.सी. लि0, गागल सीमेन्ट वर्क्स, पोस्ट -बरवाना, बिलासपुर -174 013 (हि0 प्र0)
- 3- उप खान नियंत्रक एवं प्रभारी अधिकारी, भारतीय खान ब्यूरो, क्षेत्रीय कैम्प कार्यालय, एनसीआर, सीजीओ कॉम्प्लेक्स नई दिल्ली।

सहायक खनन भूवैज्ञानिक Assistant Mining Geologist  
कृते उप खान नियंत्रक एवं प्रभारी अधिकारी For DCOM & Officer In Charge  
भारतीय खान ब्यूरो Indian Bureau of Mines

तियारी cl.7 C:\Users\lbm\Desktop\For.Scr. Gagal ACC LTD SS.doc

प्राप्त की तारीख 05/11/2017



**Scrutiny comments indicating deficiencies in respect of submitted modified Mining Plan with PMCP of Gagai limestone mine of M/s ACC Ltd (231.25) hect.) in Bilaspur district of HP State submitted under Rule 17(3) of MCR 2016 & 23 of MCDR 2017.**

1. Authentic lease plan with all the Khasra details of the villages duly verified by Geology & Mining department of State Govt showing the location of the lease area with DGPS coordinates of boundary pillars has not been enclosed. Authentic lease plan shall be the basis for the preparation of all the plans and sections. There should not be any deviations in all the plans and sections with respect to configuration given in the lease plan.
2. On cover page lease period is wrongly indicated. As per letter of State government the lease period has been extended upto 31.03.30. Name of lessee is not as per lease deed. Lease deed agreement is incomplete.
3. PMCP is submitted under rule 23 of MCDR 2017. The same should be mentioned on cover page.
4. The actual work done in the PMCP proposals against proposal shall be explicit and it is to be reflected in reclamation plan, environment plan and surface plan.
5. On cover page RQP is indicated. Provision of RQP as on date is no more as per statutory provision. Further seal of RQP is marked at various places of this document which is wrong.
6. Experience certificates from QP are not enclosed.
7. Copy of approval letter of previous approved scheme of mining is not enclosed.
8. 43.12 hectares of area is brought under G-3. In case it is a mineralised zone, proposals should be incorporated to bring it into G-1 axis. In case it is in non-mineralised zone, the same should be marked on geological plan.
9. On page 3 reserves are indicated but as on which date is not clear.
10. Following methodology for calculation of reserves and resources be given :
  - a. R&R in previous approved scheme of mining/MP (2013-18).
  - b. Depletion during this period (01-03-2013 to 31-12-2017).
  - c. Updation of R&R by virtue of exploration (refer page 16).
  - d. Net R&R as on date (31-12-2017).
11. On page 25 method of mining opencast class A is indicated. No class term is there.
12. On page 32 mineral production is indicated in cubic metre. Furnish tonnage table also.



13. On page 42 under conceptual mining plan only summary of UNFC of R&R is to be given.
14. On page 44 it is indicated that there was no proposal for carrying out further exploration, inspite of G2 and G3 area within ML area. Such area shall be brought to G1 level as per rule 12 of MCDR 2017.
15. On page 17 it is indicated that entire area is proved under G1 category whereas on page 23, area has also been brought under G-2 category. Contradictory statement is given which is incorrect.
16. On page 46 under ultimate pit limit, level(s) are not indicated.
17. On page 66 under top soil management year wise table is not given.
18. Resources under 211 category for cement grade is assessed but the same has not been assessed for high magnesia limestone. Similarly resources for cement grade for 211 is to be checked.
19. On page 32 quantity of mineral rejects are indicated whereas unit is not given. Further it is given for only 1<sup>st</sup> year i.e. 2018-19 but not for next years. The reason attributable needs to be explained.
20. Chapter 4 need thorough review and need to be rewritten and avoid duplication. There is clear cut difference between subgrade and other minerals. Thus details given are incorrect.
21. Chapter of mining –please explicitly indicate whether excavation/mining of grey shale, quartzite (minor mineral) are proposed exclusively or not. If exclusive then these minerals being minor mineral shall be dealt as per stipulated statutory provisions. However, in case their excavation is essential for mining of limestone then such minor minerals shall be stacked separately.
22. On page 33, Production of high magnesia is indicated to the tune of 290870 cum whereas in tonnes it is indicated as 344250 tonnes. It is not correct. Other production figures (year wise) are therefore required to be thoroughly checked in final submission.
23. On page 34, quantity of disposal of mineral reject (high magnesia) is indicated as 482925 tonnes for the year 2018-19. How these figures have been arrived at is not clear. Similarly year wise production of high magnesia and disposal quantity of the same needs to be clarified.
24. On page 43 resources under G-1 category are indicated. How these figures has been arrived. It is not clear and no supporting calculation are given.
25. Conceptual mining plan is not dealt adequately as per guidelines.



26. On page 67 under item 8.3.5, plantation is proposed. Neither it has been quantified nor year wise proposals indicated. This has been dealt very casually. It may kindly be noted that green belt development and afforestation are two different aspects and shall be dealt specified explicitly separately.
27. On page 66 it is indicated that only 1.01 hectares of fresh area will be added as put to use. This is not appearing justified considering the production schedule for the ensuing five years.
28. All the proposals should be restricted within the mining lease.
29. Proposal for daily monitoring of ground vibration / AOP due to blasting shall be incorporated in mining plan being the area eco sensitive zone.
30. The mine is located on hill slope. Hence adequate proposals should be incorporated like controlled blasting techniques, erecting retaining walls, check dams, parapet walls to ensure safe and systematic mining for ensuing five years.  
Being the hilly terrain suitable fencing proposals are not given in PMCP at para 8.3.
31. There are several typographical mistakes which requires to be corrected.
32. All the annexures should be attested by qualified persons for their authenticity. **No RQP seal be stamped.**
33. Two CDs covering the entire document and plans should be enclosed at the time of final submission. Undertaking in this regard by the qualified person should be given that the CD contains the same text & plates as submitted in hard copy.
34. Forest clearance is not enclosed in annexure.

#### **Plates**

35. 3 ground control points on surface plan are not shown.
36. Reclamation plan is not enclosed. It must depict details / proposals of para 8.5 of the text.
37. Latest survey to be carried out as earlier survey is more than 6 month old as date of survey on plan is 24.06.2017.
38. Surface plan – is not as per rule 32 of MCDR 2017 as forest boundary is not marked on it.
39. Extents of area under G-axis of UNFC is not given on surface geological plan – plate 3.
40. UPL showing without ramp is unscientific and is of no use, therefore it should not be shown. Refer – geological section.
41. Geological sections – boreholes are not marked as per standard symbol.



42. Mineral reject shown dumped within UPL is not correct as such proposal in various year wise working plans.
43. Except Environmental Plan, all other plans & sections should be restricted to mine lease area only. No proposal should be made outside the ML area.
44. Sections depicting year wise excavation proposals shall be superimposed on geological sections only. No new arbitrary section to be given.
45. More sections on geological plan showing UPL shall be given.
46. Environment plan is not as per rule 32 (5)(b) of MCDR 2017.
47. Conceptual plan of northern pit is not scientific for hilly terrain. No haulage route given.
48. Financial area assurance plan is not as per guidelines. Only such area having area put to use be shown.
49. Conceptual plan shall be upto lease period only.

C:\Users\Acer\Desktop\S Saklani\SL Gagal ACC.doc