

Discrepancies observed in the Review of Mining Plan of Dongri Buzurg Mine (Area-4.07 Hect.) of M/s MOIL Ltd., located in Tehsil Tumsar, Distt. Bhandara (Maharashtra), submitted under Rule 17(1) of MCR, 2016

Text and Plates:

1.0 General and Review of Mining plan:

1. PMCP is an integrated part of Mining Plan. Thus cover page should be revised accordingly and document should be mentioned submitted under Rule 17(1) of MCR'2016. Further, category of the mine should be clearly mentioned whether category A (FM) or OTFM.
2. On the cover page and at each place in the document, lapse period and proposal period should be correctly mentioned. As per the executed lease deed, Mining Plan proposal period was 2011-12 to 2015-16. Thus, proposal period for this document should be 2016-17 to 2020-21 of which 2016-17 should be lapse period and actual developments for the year should be mentioned for the year instead of giving proposals.
3. Information under item 3.4 should be correctly mentioned regarding violation issued by IBM.
4. Table of contents need to be reviewed for enclosures.

2.0 Geology and Reserves:

1. Borehole logs and other details in respect of bore holes done in the lease area (as also shown on the plan) should be submitted. Further, proposed boreholes as mentioned on page no. 21 should be shown on geological plan.
2. More number of cross sections to be prepared and submitted as per Annexure 1 A. In the Annexure, reserves for different sections have been estimated. Thus sections need to be submitted accordingly.
3. In the Geological plan and sections, lease area needs to be demarcated as per UNFC categories.
4. Position of lease area needs to be demarcated in the cross sections.
5. In the L-section, other bore holes are not clearly shown except MDB 9 & 21. Also, meterage for borehole MDB 9 needs to be corrected in the cross section/ L-section as per Annexure XXII.
6. UNFC Category-wise reserves assessment as per MEMC Rules'2015 need to be discussed in the text.
7. On page number 23, economic limit is mentioned as 215 mRL whereas on page no. 33, ultimate pit limit is mentioned as 184 mRL. Thus economically feasible limit needs to be ascertained through geological and feasibility study and uniform limit should be mentioned at each place in the document. Further, ore horizon in the lease area is at around 130 mRL which is lower than present economical limits through opencast. Going through the text, conceptual planning/ future planning has glimpse of mining the ore through underground mining methods and till time lease is supplementary to adjacent leases for development purposes. Therefore, these facts need to be addressed in the feasibility assessment of the area and a brief note of underground mining giving

tentative year for start of mining operations through underground means need to be discussed in the text.

8. Areas under G1/G2/G3/G4 should be mentioned in a table.
9. Reporting of reserves/resources should be done giving the position of reserves/resources in the approved Mining Plan, then deducting the depletion of reserves due to production during the proposal period of the approved Mining Plan, then addition due to exploration (if any) and finally re-classification as per Mineral (Evidence of Mineral Content) Rules'2015.

3.0 Mining:

1. Details of existing dump should be given (as shown on the plan).
2. Existing and proposed area for various mining activities should be shown on the Financial Assurance Area Plan distinctly.
3. Extent of development in the proposal period as well as upto conceptual period should be mentioned clearly showing year-wise levels in the text as well as relevant plates.
4. As mentioned in the table of contents (List of Plans and Sections), item no. 7 i.e., Year wise development sections- instead of year-wise sections plans for 3 years has been enclosed. Also in the Annexures, item no. 5 (Annexure-III) has not been enclosed.
5. Plates V and VI submitted for excavation/ development and dumping of waste are very unclear. Plates V-A, V-B and V-C show approximately entire area under mining except southern most part and Plate VI shown section of waste dumping. First of all, there is no reference that from where plate VI has been drawn and also location etc for dumping of waste is not clear. Therefore, year-wise development plan and sections need to be redrawn showing year-wise development with RLs, year-wise dumps, plantation etc.
6. While no production is proposed from the lease, how use of mineral, beneficiation etc have been discussed?
7. Conceptual plan submitted as plate IX suggests that whole area shall be planted as it is. The plan needs to revise as per the condition of lease area at the end of mine life. Conceptual sections also need to be submitted with the document.

4.0 Progressive Mine Closure Plan:

1. Existing land use for the lease area needs to be discussed on page no. 57.
2. While the area covers 1-2 feet (0.3-0.6 m) of top soil (refer page no. 63), why no top soil management has been discussed in mining/ stacking of overburden or in PMCP chapters whereas additional area requirements are 1.36 ha that will generate approximately 4080-7920 cuM of top soil (and as mentioned on page no. 63, this top soil shall be spread on dumps)? Further, as per item 3.3.2, total top soil generated for the Mining Plan period was 86550 cuM and was used for plantation in matured waste dump in adjoining leases and as per FA table, excavated area is 1.0 ha. This shows that 1.0 ha area generated 86550 cuM of top soil and hence top soil cover in the area should be at least 8.6 m. This contradicts the statement mentioned on page no. 63 that the area has 1-2 feet soil cover. Thus correct statement needs to be mentioned and top soil management needs to be discussed properly.

3. In the summary of proposal for item no. 8.3 given in the table on page no. 64, a column for cumulative till date should be added and information should be furnished accordingly.
4. Amount of FA should be revised as per Rule 27 of MCDR'2017 and details of existing FA should be mentioned on page no. 69.

5.0 Plates:

1. All the plates should bear the reference of the document under submission.
2. Location plan as per item 2.0 (c) of the text needs to be submitted.
3. In compliance to CCOM Circular 2/2010, Geo referenced cadastral map authenticated by state govt. in original needs to be enclosed.
4. Surface Plan: Demarcation of Forest and Non-forest land should be done on the plan.
5. Environment Plan: Incorrect plan has been submitted. Environment plan should be submitted as per the provisions of Rule 32(5)(b) of MCDR'2017.
6. Financial Assurance Plan: Area put to use at the start of SOM period and area required during the 5-years period should be shown distinctly on the plates and land use table should be shown on the plate for the calculation of FA.

(Ashish Mishra)
ACOM-NR