

ANNEXURE

SCRUTINY COMMENTS ON DRAFT REVIEW & UPDATION OF MINING PLAN OF HONNEBAGI IRON ORE MINE, M. L. NO. 2570 OF M/s SHRI B.R. GANAPATHI, OVER AN AREA OF 10.53 HA AS PER LEASE DEED/ 10.43 HA AS PER CEC. IN VILLAGE HONNEBAGI, CHIKKANAYAKANAHALLI TALUK OF TUMKUR-DISTRICT, IN STATE KARNATAKA. SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL, UNDER RULE 17(1) OF MCR, 2016. NON-FOREST, CATEGORY OF THE MINE IS A-OTFM (OTHER THAN FULLY MECHANIZED).. FOR THE PERIOD 2020-23(1.4.2020 TO 31.12.2023.

Note:

The RMP submitted here with for approval reveals very bulky and it is therefore advised to re-submit the text document and the annexures as per the prevailing guide lines with relevant information. All the irrelevant information need to be removed, without which the document will not be acceptable for approval. .

COVER PAGE

1. The period of document indicated as April 2020 to December 2023, this may be corrected as 1.4.2020 to 31.12.2023 as per the validity of the ML deed. The name of the person who prepared the document is mentioned without mentioning qualified person. In the light of the above remarks, the text/ plates need to be wherever applicable.
2. The list of annexures furnished, which must be added with another column to give number of pages in each annexure for clarity. The annexures must be given with date and validity also in each annexures as applicable to each letter, including the approved mining plan/ scheme etc. Name of the mine with lessee need to be given in the photographs.
3. Introduction: In the introductory part is not attended which ought to have been, giving the brief description about the lessee and the ML area, past working & the present workings, reasons for non operations & likely when to start the mining operations/ other activities, other constrains if any may be dealt. etc.
4. Para 1(f), name of the recognized person, under rule 22(C) of MCR, 1960, & sub rule 42 of MCDR of 1988, need to be changed to qualified person rule 15 of MCR, of 2016 and rule 55 of MCDR, 2017.
5. The Para 3.6, under which the rule quoted for the modification as Rule 9 & 10 of MCDR, 1988, need to be changed to 17(3) of MCR, 2016, and even in the guidelines query. Though, the document is submitted for rule 17(1) of MCR, 2016.

Part-A

6. Para 1(J), the reserves/ resources presented as per UNFC in table without table number on the estimated up to threshold limit prescribed by IBM (i.e. 45%), in page no. 39, but as per the latest threshold limit prescribed by IBM is (i.e. 35%), but reflected as on 31/12/2014, for +45% Fe to +58% Fe. Similarly, in para 1(L), summary is given as on 1/4/2014, instead of latest date 1/4/2019 or 1/12/2019 may be updated. In the light of the above remarks, the related text/ tables may be attended if applicable.
7. Para 2A (a), The existing and the proposed method of working should be described in brief with relevant information. (ii). Besides, it is expected to brief on the slope of faces, direction of advancement, approach road to the faces & specification of roads, etc., to be marked. (iii). Also, the existing dumps spread parameters, height, slope protective works etc., to be marked. (iv). The bench wise, mRL wise, opening reserves, exploitation and the closing balance should be furnished for the proposed periods. (v). The details of existing pit dimensions and nos. of benches developed have not been discussed. (vi). The powder factor given as 4.5 is found to be not appropriate and correct. In iron ore mines, majority of the mines are reporting 7t/kg of explosives used. Hence, this powder

factor needs to be re-established. The calculations made for the explosives consumption also needs to be reconciled. What is the quantity of explosives required to undertake blasting in the mine need to be recalculated.

8. Para 8.6, under financial assurance, the BG amount should be submitted to this document as per the calculation of Rs. 3.00 lakhs/ ha area of degraded in the mining operations & other allied activities. The net area considered for calculation is 10.43 ha as per the table x Rs. 3.00 lakhs/ ha, need to be submitted before the approval of the document.

Part-B

9. **Plate No.1 (Key Plan):** The approach road to the ML area with approximate distance from the known place needs to be marked.

10. **Surface Plan: (Plate No. 3):** The color code used for the drilled hole through DTH also need to be shown in red color, except the proposed bore holes if any. (ii). The existing pits, dumps, stacks etc., need to be numbered for easy reference. (iii). The color code used for the dumps/ sub grade may be differentiated with different colors to avoid confusions. (iv). The garland drain is shown in the index, but not the retaining wall, which ought to be. (v). The pits, dumps, stacks etc., are must be depicted in the index/ plan as per the standard notation given in the MMR 1961. (vi). The notations used for the encroachment of dumps, pits etc., are shown in the index, which may be avoided, if it is not falling within the ML area of Shri. B.R. Ganapathy. (vii). The pit No.1 & 2 shown in the plan may be demarked with the boundary of those two pits for more clarity. (viii). The qualified person should be given below the name of Shri. Rajeshwar Lal Dass. In the light of the above remarks, the other plates may be attended, wherever applicable.

11. **Plate No -4 (Geological Plan):** (i) The plan may be as per rule 32 (1) (b) of MCDR 2017. (ii). The color code used for the drilled hole through DTH also need to be shown in red color, except the proposed bore holes if any. (iii). The UPL line marked all most within the 7.5m limit of the ML area, but there are some inactive dumps present within that, which is not appropriate, the UPL should be where the mining activities are planned/ but the dumps & inactive dumps goes out of UPL. Care should be taken while marking the same. (iv).

12. **Plate No.5 (Geological Cross sections):** (i)..The sections views presented in G-G', F-F', C-C' are not presented as it is in the field and the geological plan submitted, including L-L' sections. This needs to be attended and modified.

13. **Plate No –6A & B (Year-wise Production and developments Plan-2020-21, 2021-22):** (i). The working faces shown for the 1st year development & production plan without revealing the approach road & exit roads from the working faces and also to the waste dump faces. (ii). similarly the 2nd year working of 2021-22 need to be attended and modified. Why the 2nd waste dump has been shifted separately to the other location may be explained, instead of continuing in the 1st year locations.

14. **Plate No –6 & (Year-wise Production and developments Plan-2020-21, 2021-22):** This plan needs to be attended in line with the above scrutiny comments. Besides, the reasons for not proposed for working in the main pit no.1, may be justified.

15. **Plate Nos. 09 (Conceptual plan & sections):** (i). The plan and sections should be such that, what would be position of workings at the end of this plan period/ conceptual stage must be visualized and brought out accordingly. (ii). The present lease is for December, 2023, if it is so, how the ML area has been considered for complete reclamation & rehabilitation may be explained. Otherwise, the present ML area period only attended for more clarity, instead of showing complete area. (iii). The conceptual stage 9.432 ha area has been considered as back filling & plantations and also other avenue plantations, if it is so, what is the period that is considered for doing this complete area maybe explained.