



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

प
८
1

फाइल संख्या File No: : 614(2)/MS-B-198/2011-DDN

देहरादून, दिनांक 28.01.2019

सेवा में/ To : श्री पंकज पाण्डे, कन्सल्टेंट (परामर्शदाता), सहज सहयोग कन्सल्टेंट्स प्रा0 लि0,
 बी-1/21, सेक्टर-बी, अलीगंज,
 लखनऊ-226 024 (30 प्र0)।
 sahasahyig990@gmail.com

विषय/ Sub : Submission of Review & Updation of Mining Plan with Progressive Mine Closure Plan in respect Verinag Limestone Mine over an mine of 4.0875 Hectares at Village- Verinag,, Tehsil – Dooru District - Anantnag, State-Jammu & Kashmir of M/s Verinag Stones, submitted under Rule 17 (1) of Minerals (Other than Atomic And Hydro Carbons Energy Minerals) Concession Rule, 2016 & 23 of Mineral Conservation and Development Rules-2017

संदर्भ/Ref. Your letter No. Nil dated -Nil received on dated 10.12.2019

महोदय/ Sir,

This office is in receipt of two copies of the above-mentioned draft Review & Updation of Mining Plan including Progressive Mine Closure Plan on 10.12.2018. On examination of the same the discrepancies / deficiencies observed have been listed in annexure.

You are advised to correct the submitted Review & Updation of 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 Review & Updation of 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 Review & Updation of 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 AMG
 कृते प्रभारी अधिकारी For Officer In Charge
 भारतीय खान ब्यूरो Indian Bureau of Mines

प्रतिलिपि सूचनार्थ प्रेषित :-

1. खान नियंत्रक (उत्तर), भारतीय खान ब्यूरो, उदयपुर।
2. मेसर्स वेरीनाग स्टोन्सग्राम - वेरीनाग तहसील द्वारु, जिला - अनंतनाग (J & K) 192230
M/s Verinag Stones, Village – Verinag Tehsil – Dooru, District - Anantnag (J&K) 192230
2. उप खान नियंत्रक एवं प्रभारी अधिकारी, भारतीय खान ब्यूरो, क्षेत्रीय कैम्प कार्यालय, नई दिल्ली।

LS - 29/1/18

उप खान नियंत्रक एवं प्रभारी अधिकारी
Deputy Controller of Mines & OIC
भारतीय खान ब्यूरो / Indian Bureau of Mines

Scrutiny comments indicating deficiencies in respect of Review and updation of Mining Plan with PMCP of Verinag limestone mine of M/s Verinag Stones(4.087 hect.) in Anantnag district of J&K State submitted under Rule 17(1) 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. More representative photographs are not enclosed. Actual operation photo to be given.
3. Lease deed copy is not legible.
4. The validity of previous scheme of mining expired in the year 2016-17 and present submission is submitted in the month of December 2018. Justification for lapse period and late submission has not been justified.
5. Cover page- Not evident as category B mine.
6. Excess production has been observed during the year 2013-14 and 2014-5 but the reason for deviation has not been justified.
7. Quantity of excavated material without a valid mining plan should be indicated.
8. Production proposals for the year 2018-19 should be reduced proportionately considering that nearly three months are left.
9. Under chapter 3.0 in the review part, previous excavation proposals indicating mRL are different than indicated in the ensuing development proposals. Such drastic changes in the mRL need to be clarified.
10. On page 9 under item 3.4 it is mentioned that no violations were pointed out by IBM is not a true fact.
11. On page 13 under expenditure, 01 pit is indicated. It is not understood what this pit is. Whether trial pits have been dug. In case the trial pits have been dug in the past, the location of the same should have been marked on the relevant plates.
12. The exploration shall be carried out as per rule 12 of MCDR 2017.
13. Insitu and recoverable reserves are required to be rechecked thoroughly.
14. Excavation is proposed which is not in line with excavation profile. Category of mine is not correct. It is not B category mine as motrable haul roads are evident in satellite image and plan.
15. On page 18 total exploitation during the last five years is indicated as 132697 tonnes whereas on page 19 exploitation figures are indicated as 1396690 tonnes. Similarly figures mentioned for exploitation under 122 and 333 are arbitrary. Nil figure for exploitation should have been indicated under 122 and 333 category. Thus Reserves under 111 category need to be updated afresh.
16. Page 20- Take care of threshold value also under cut off grade.
17. Page 24- More pits are evident.
18. Page 33- Employment potential should be given as per MCDR 1988.
19. Page 34- Area under pit is not correct.
20. Page 41- Recalculate the FA.

21. On page 21 under table (1) reserves figures should have been in tonnes whereas the same are indicated in million tonnes. Similarly on the same page reserves and resources figures are not converted in million tonnes. Similar mistake is done on the figures mentioned in feasibility report. This is a gross error.
22. The design of the parameter of pit in the text is not in conjunction with that given in different relevant plates. For example the pit slope in text is 70 degree whereas the same is not matching in the relevant plans and sections and thus effect of slope of benches is not considered while designing the pit. By virtue of which the conceptual plan is to be redrawn.
23. On page 37, total area at the end of plan period is indicated as 2.464 hectares whereas on page 43 the same is indicated as 2.466 hectares. The same may be corrected.
24. Certificate from QP is without signature.
25. Yearwise proposals for rehabilitation and reclamation should be given in tabular form.
26. Proposed plantation for ensuing for third year to fifth year are not adequate. At least 50 saplings per year should be proposed.
27. Green belt should be developed towards prominent wind direction.
28. 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. Proposals for ground vibration and AOP be given.
29. PMCP proposals are given within conceptual plan which will not be sustained beyond closure and thus are not closure activities proportionately.
30. Annexures are not as per IBM guide lines.
31. Bank guarantee for FA should be co terminus with mining plan.
32. No approval for lapse period will be given and the proposals in text are upto 2021-22 only which is not correct.
33. FA to be given for category A mine as evident from satellite image.
34. Proposals should be given for five years. Include year 2022-23 on page 41 (table 8.3)
35. There are several typographical mistakes which require to be corrected.
36. All the annexures should be attested by qualified persons for their authenticity.
37. A CD / pen drive 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.
38. Copy of Bank Guarantee is incomplete.
39. Additional comments shall also be communicated to you in case of receipt of comments from State government if any.



Plates

40. 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 should be enclosed in which original lease area, area surrendered and retained area are to be marked precisely. 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.
41. Surface features shown are not correct
42. Precise superimposition of authentic lease plan is to be carried out before preparation of all the plans and all the plans should be revised accordingly.
43. From surface plan it appears that mining during last scheme period is not carried out as per mining plan.
44. Geological sections are not correct.
45. Conceptual pit profile is with out haulage route.
46. Atleast three ground control points are not given.
47. Surface features are not matching with actual ground profile as excavation is evident near lease corner, pillar C-D(line).
48. Existing mining pits are indicated on surface and geological plan but the same are not indicated in the index.
49. UPL should be marked on reclamation plan.
50. Conceptual plan-Adequate sections are not drawn. It has impact on calculation of R&R and thus it is to be drawn carefully and should be implementable.
51. More sections on geological plan showing UPL shall be given.
52. Proposed trial pits are not plotted on the relevant plates nor indicated in the index.
53. Features to be shown as per rule 32(a) of MCDR 2017 are not depicted in surface plan.
54. Features to be shown as per rule 32(a) of MCDR 2017 are not depicted in geological plan.
55. Slopes of 70 degree are not depicted in any of the section
56. Environment plan is not as per rule 32(5)(b).

Note- All the points mentioned in the text and plates should also be attended.

पथर्तु C:\Users\Acer\Desktop\Saklan\Scrutiny letter Verinaa.doc

LL -
29/7/19