



GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF MINES
INDIAN BUREAU OF MINES
Office of the Regional Controller of Mines

No. AP/KNL/MP/Lst-52/Hyd

Room No.603, 6th Floor,
CGO Towers,Kavadiguda,
Secunderabad.-500080.
Date: 17.05.2018

To
Sri P.R.Venkatrama Raja,
Chairman & Managing Director,
M/s Ramco Cements Ltd ,
Auras Corporate Cemtre,
98-A, Dr. Radha Krishnan Salai,
Mylapore, Chennai – 600 004
Tamil Nadu State.

Sub: Submission of Modified Mining Plan in respect of Kolimigundla Limestone mine of M/s Ramco Cements Ltd over an extent of 255.0 ha. in Kolimigundla, Itikyala and Kalavatala villages of Kolimigundla Mandal, Kurnool District of AP State submitted under Rule 17(3) of MCR, 2016.

Ref: Your letter no. nil received in this Office on 20.4.2018.

Sir,

With reference to your letter cited above on the subject, the site inspection was carried out on 07.05.2018 by Shri. Manish.K.Maindiratta, DCOM accompanied by S/Sri.P. Jani Reddy, Murthy & Ajmal Mine Representatives. The draft Modified Mining Plan has since been examined and found certain deficiencies as given in Annexure. The same scrutiny comments have already been forwarded on your e mail id mcljpm@ramcocements.co.in and your Qualified Person id evnkumar@yahoo.com 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 also advised s 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 Kulshrestha)
Controller of Mines

Copy to Shri E. V. Naresh Kumar, Qualified person, C/o BS Envitech Tech Pvt Ltd, H.no. 12-13-1270/71/73, Amity Ville, 4th floor, St Ann's Road, Tarnaka, Secunderabad-500017, TS. for information & necessary action.

Encl:a/a

(Pankaj Kulshrestha)
Controller of Mines

मूल पति पर नही
खान नियंत्रक (द), भारतीय खान ब्यूरो, बेंगलुरु।

(पंकज कुलश्रेष्ठ)
खान नियंत्रक

Inspection report cum scrutiny comment on the Modification of Mining Plan submitted by M/s Ramco Cements Limited for Kolimigundla Limestone Mine (255 hectare), village Kolimigundla, Kalavatala and Itkyala, Mandal-Kolimigundla, Kurnool, A.P after field inspection dated

1. The Annexures submitted in the document are not found matching. The copy of letter of intent (GO) issued for the mine by the State government, document regarding transfer of lease in favour of Ramco cement is not enclosed. The lease has been granted with a condition to put up the cement plant within three years but the document in support of extension period granted for putting up the plant is not enclosed. However, as per the copy of the same letter submitted in other mining plan of Chintalayapalli state government has already granted extensions for commencement of mining operation and last extension is valid upto 13.10.2018.
2. The lessee in it's clarification regarding submission of document for approval beyond 13.10.2018 has submitted that since the approval of mining plan is subject to compliance of condition of lease deed (valid upto 2030) which includes installation of the plant; the document is submitted beyond 13.10.2018. However as per the letter/orders issued by state government itself, the validity of lease is subject to the condition of putting up a cement plant by 31.03.2018. The validity of the lease is not established from the documents made available (GOMs No 138 dated 15.02.2000 and other documents) for the period upto 08.08.2030. Hence the approval of this document is subject to validity of the lease beyond 13.10.2018. The same may be recorded.
3. The document needs to be submitted by the nominated owner and not the authorised signatory, as per manual for appraisal of Mining Plan. Hence the same should be corrected.
4. It has been noted that as per annexed Board of Director's Resolution dated 19.04.2018, the clinkerisation capacity has been assessed as 3.15 MTPA for which the limestone requirement is assessed as 4.41 MTPA but the NCBM report for assessing the same has not been submitted. Though the plant requirement is just 4.5 million tonnes but the rated capacity of the feeding mines for these four mines has been submitted as 5.2 million tonnes which is very much in excess of the plant requirement. As the plant requirement is just 4.5 million tonnes, it is not clear as why the mining plan is being prepared much in excess of the requirement. These capacities are required to be assessed on scientific basis and submitted.
5. The reason for not putting up a cement plant is not the subject matter of Introduction, it may be put up in the review of mining in appropriate head subject to the relevance.
6. The list of leases held by the lessee in the state be provided.

Location and accessibility

1. It has been noted that the lease sketch submitted along with the lease deed and the sketch submitted now are different specifically w.r.to the shape and orientation. Clarify.

Details of approved Mining Plan

2. In item 3.6, the reason for modification in Mining Plan has been submitted as 'Not Applicable', which needs to be corrected.
3. Review of exploration need to be submitted correctly.

Geology and Exploration:

4. Local geology of the area has not been explained properly.
5. In para 1.0(e), page 15, the exploration work is reported to be undertaken by GSI, MECL and lessee itself. No GSI borehole is shown in the lease please clarify. The number of boreholes already carried out in the lease area be discussed. Whether it falls under G1 or G2 category be discussed along with area under different levels of exploration. Area under G3 and G4 level of exploration be marked as well.
6. In para 1.0(f), submit the location of permanent bench mark as per last approved document, whether the surveying has been linked with the same bench mark.

7. Geological sections be drawn at the scale of 1:2000 as it not clear as in which bore holes conglomerate/ Quartz/shale has been encountered.
8. The bulk density has been considered as 2.5 considering the voids but in the exploration data , no such thing has been recorded. Clarify with scientific data or some field tests.
9. The remaining resource (331/332/333/334) should be assessed as per sectional area method.
10. The future exploration should not be proposed in areas of habitation.
11. Clarify the cut off grade of plant viz a viz the weighted average grade of this mine.
12. The resource under unexplored area should be established on the basis of geological extrapolation. Submit the area under G3 and area covered under the habitation or it's influence where mining cannot be taken.

Mining

13. Since the area proposed for mining is within a distance of 300m from the habitation and state highway, the controlled blasting be adopted after getting the vibration study done through Government recognised agencies like University, NIRM, CIMFR etc for the purpose with an objective is to ensure that there would be no harm to the structures nearby.
14. In para 2.0(a) discuss as how the 4.5 million tonne requirement of plant is proposed to be fed from the four feeding mines. What is the rated capacity of these mines established on the scientific basis. A sum total of proposed production from all the feeder mines should commensurate with the limestone requirement of plant.
15. Also submit the following information

Name of Mine	Date of execution	Date of opening of Mine	Capacities as per approved Mining Plan	Rated capacity as per the present submission
Kankadripalli				
Narayanpalli				
Chintalayapalli				
Kolimigundla				

16. It has been observed that to meet the plant requirement of 4.4 million tonnes , 4 million tonnes have been proposed from this mine and remaining just 0.5 million tonnes is proposed from the remaining mines. Also noted that in Kolimigundla Limestone Mine, production is proposed for a rated capacity of 1.0 million tonnes of limestone, which is incongruent to the submissions in the chintalayapalli modified mining plan document.
17. Noted that there is no increase in reserve base and lessee has not undertaken the exploration proposal as per approved mining plan. The proposal for increase in Production capacity of 1 million tonnes is not enough for the total reserves of about 3.198 million tonnes. Hence the production proposal be proposed as per the established reserves to cater the need of atleast 5-10 years. You are therefore advised to clearly submit the rated capacities of all the mines correctly and any change need to be justified scientifically and with proper documentation.
18. In the yearwise production proposal bulk density has not been taken as per the field data. Clarify and correct.
19. Discuss the explosive requirement, magazine capacity and the status of permission w.r.to the magazine from PESO.

Conceptual Mining Plan

20. Conceptual generation of top soil at the end of lease period and its utilisation be discussed properly. Ultimate pit depth, rated capacity and life of mine be corrected in line of above comment.
21. In the conceptual plan, it has been submitted that there is no public building in the lease area, whereas the same need to be corrected.
22. The chapter be revised in light of the comment on Mining chapter.

Use of mineral

23. Para 5.0(a) has not been discussed properly. The industry requirement viz-a-viz the specification of the feeding mines have not been discussed. It should be clarified as how the quality requirement will be met from the proposed production from various mines.
24. The top soil spreading proposal should only be given for plantation purposes. Stacking proposal within 7.5m zone should be avoided. The sufficiency of land for spreading of top soil for plantation purpose be submitted.

Progressive Mine Closure Plan

25. Impact of mining on human settlements in the area be assessed.
26. Submit the baseline data regarding the number of settlements within the lease area, flora observed in the lease area.
27. In the environment the features within 500m of the lease may also be plotted as per rule.
28. The bank guarantee should be submitted as per the land put to use.
29. If due to aforesaid changes, the data in other chapter or plates changes, they may please be done accordingly and ensure the consistency of the data submitted in various chapters of the document.
