



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 (उत्तराखंड) 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)/MP-B-247/2014-DDN

दिनांक 10.12.2018

सेवा में/ To : श्री पंकज पाण्डे, कन्सल्टेंट (परामर्शदाता), सहज सहयोग कन्सल्टेंट्स प्रा0 लि0,
बी-1/21, सेक्टर-बी, अलीगंज,
लखनऊ-226 024 (उ0 प्र0)।
sahajsahyog990@gmail.com

विषय/ Sub : Submission of Modified Mining Plan with Progressive Mine Closure Plan in respect of Barwas Limestone mine over an area of 4.157 hectare in Village-Barwas, Tehsil-Paonta Sahib, District - Sirmour 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-Nil dated Nil received on dated 09.11.2018

महोदय/ Sir,

This office is in receipt of two copies of the above-mentioned draft Modified Mining Plan with Progressive Mine Closure Plan on 09.11.2018. On examination of the same the discrepancies / deficiencies observed have been listed in annexure.

You are advised to correct the submitted Modified 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,

S. Saklani
10/12/18

(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

प्रतिलिपि सूचनार्थ प्रेषित :-

- 1- खान नियंत्रक (उत्तर), भारतीय खान ब्यूरो, उदयपुर।
- 2- मैसर्स बरवास माइन्स, गांव - बरवास, पोस्ट- कमरऊ तहसील-पांवटा साहिब जिला- सिरमौर(हि.प्र.)
- 2- उप खान नियंत्रक एवं प्रभारी अधिकारी, भारतीय खान ब्यूरो, क्षेत्रीय कैम्प कार्यालय, एनसीआर, सीजीओ कॉम्प्लेक्स नई दिल्ली

1

Dr. 10/12/18

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

Mukeshcl.7 C:\Users\ibm\Desktop\Scrutiny forwarding comments\For.Scr. Barwas LS Mine of Ms Barwas Mines SS.doc

10/12/18

(सहायक खनन भूवैज्ञानिक)

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

Scrutiny comments indicating deficiencies in respect of submitted Modified Mining Plan with PMCP of Barwas limestone mine of M/s Barwas Mines (4.157) hect.) in Sirmour district of HP State submitted under Rule 17(3) of MCR 2016 & 23 of MCDR 2017.

1. 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. Pg No.13 Expenditure incurred in various prospecting operations: figures given in table are not correct and these are not exploratory pits.
3. Pg No.13 Item i): Previous proposals also to be given.
4. Pg 17 Reserves: Feasibility axis-1 in terms of mining aspect is smaller. South block of lease is not appearing proper.
5. Compliance of PMCP and exploration proposals to be given.
6. Consent letter to be checked and corrected.
7. Pg No.24: Method of initiation should be such so as to keep air over pressure and Ground vibration minimal.
8. Pg 26: Ultimate pit limit: Proposals are not correctly designed and depicted in plates as in some of the area mining cannot be feasible.
9. R&R should be rechecked with reference to present excavation. The geological section need to be redrawn accordingly and correct R&R to be given
10. No proposals for waste dumps are incorporated. Based on the field observation, some quantity of waste is expected to be generated during the course of mining in the Block -I. Thus waste dump proposal is to be incorporated.
11. On page 31 under chapter use of mineral (item d), specification of limestone and consuming industries is to be given.
12. Further highway is passing. Slope of benches should be kept adequately and have to maintain it every point of time.
13. In mining chapter bench design parameters including bench height, face slope, over all pit slope, haul road width and gradient shall be given.
14. Surface features and spatial configuration of ML (especially southern block which is isolated) is not matching with Google satellite image. (when given coordinates KML is super imposed)
15. Further environmental plan is not prepared as per Rule 32(5)(b) of MCDR.
16. 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. The blasting proposals is not considered for approval, as the habitats/ dwellings are close to active mining area.
17. Being the hilly terrain suitable fencing proposals are to be given in PMCP at para 8.3.
18. All the proposals should be made within the ML only.
19. There are several topographical mistakes which requires to be corrected.
20. More representative photographs may be enclosed.
21. Green belt to be proposed in prominent wind direction.
22. All the annexures should be attested by qualified persons for their authenticity.
23. 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.
24. Maps should not be bounded with the text. Instead, separate plastic leaf should be inserted to keep all the maps in it.

Plates

25. 3 ground control points on surface plan are not shown.
26. Plate 5 – Basis of G-axis for depth extension not given.
27. There is substantial variation in surface features marked on surface plan as well as on the other plans. It need through review for making surface features the only systematic and scientific planning including PMCP proposals for fencing, green belt etc.

28. UPL is not shown on surface plan.
29. Please check feasibility of mining before assessing G, axis as 1. Pit bottom shall be of adequate width.
30. Separate section to be drawing for assessing R&R for block-2 (southern)
31. UPL section should superimpose on geological section and should match with conceptual plan and its section.
32. Actual location of nalah is not matching with satellite image.
33. Financial area assurance plan is wrong. Area put in use has not been indicated.
34. Except Environmental Plan, all other plans & sections should be restricted to mine lease area only. No proposal should be made outside the ML area.
35. On conceptual plan bench configuration is not given and the mine design parameters are also not found reflected through this plan and section. Adequate sections are not given. It has impact on calculation of R&R and thus it is to be drawn carefully & should be implementable.

36. Environment plan is not prepared as per rule 32 of MCDR 2017. Many features to be shown beyond ML area is not shown. All streams are not shown. Contours within 60m are not shown.
37. The basis of design of UPL is not evident in SGP/ SG sections.

38. Please re-check the contours. It has impact on calculation of proposed excavation.
39. More sections on geological plan showing UPL shall be given.

22-
10/12/18