

Discrepancies observed in the Review of Mining Plan of Chikla Mine (Area-150.65 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. EC granted is for 15000TPM i.e., 180000TPA (Annexure-IX) and it is valid for underground mining only. As per the proposals in the last approved SOM, it was mentioned in the 'Introduction' chapter that upon approval of the SOM, MoEF clearance shall be obtained but it has not been submitted till date nor enclosed with the document whereas production from opencast has been carried out without having necessary clearances from MoEF. Clarifications on the same should be furnished and in the present document, no proposals should be made for any opencast working without MoEF clearance. Document-Text and plates should be modified accordingly for reserves (opencast reserves shall be furnished as resources due to non-availability of necessary clearances), production, land use and FA.
2. Proposed working should be limited to underground method of mining and production should be limited to 180000 TPA or 15000TPM (as per the EC granted by MoEF).
3. Category of the mine should be mentioned as 'A' as per rule 55(2) of MCDR'2017. There is no category as 'A-OTFM' is defined.
4. Complete review should be given as per the annual / monthly returns submitted. In the chapter, review for afforestation, environment monitoring etc. is not mentioned in the text.
5. Review given on page no. 11-12 is not clear. For underground, development has been given under proposed and actual in RMT but quantum of development done in cuM from underground should also be given. For dump working, dump development has been given, but the figures mentioned in the dump development table stand for what-it is ambiguous. Thus dump development tables should be given as material handled and recovered ore.
6. Review for year-wise clean ore production should be furnished as per the proposals made in the approved SOM-for opencast/underground/dump and total and it should be in line with the annual returns submitted for the year.
7. Non-mineralized area mentioned on page no. 24 is 123.96 ha which needs to be checked and corrected considering surface as well as underground mineralization. Further, this non-mineralized area needs to be shown on geological plan.
8. Opencast/Dump and Underground resources need to be given separately prior to the reporting of complete resources.
9. In the mining chapter, proposed development from underground has been given only in RMT. It should also be given in cuM.

(Ashish Mishra)
ACOM-NR