

Annexure

Scrutiny comments on the draft scheme of mining of Panniyamalai limestone mine Rc No.13368 over an area 2.54 ha SF nos.117 part and 138 part in Panniyamalai village Natham taluk of Dindigul district Owned by Sri M.Deepa Alankar submitted under rule 12 of MCDR 1988 for the period from 2014-15 to 2018-19.

1.Reason for delay in submission of Scheme of Mining should be explained.

2. General: Report submitted as scheme of mining and the certificates in the report indicates the report as “modified mining plan” should be verified and corrected.

First page of the report shows the category of land as poramboke land should be corrected .Land category of patta land need to be shown in table-2 against non-forest other. Numbers allocated to table should be checked no.18 occurring in page no.26 and 27.Para no and sub nos are not as per the format ex.,para 2.0 allocated for mining and mine drainage should be verified and entire document may be as per the format available in the ibm website.

03.Para 2.0(a):The latitude reading furnished is beyond the ML area as per the reading of plate no.III i.e. lease plan. Therefore, readings should be verified from lease plan or table -3.

04. Para 3.3: A notice of Form-J&K need to be submitted to IBM under rule 47 of MCDR-1988 for record for carrying out 2 no of wagon drill holes under exploration programme.

Part-A

05.Para 1.0(i): Under proposed exploration para it is stated that 3 no of drills 2 core drill and 1 wagon drill holes) which is contrary under the information as per the details in page no.7 should be verified and corrected.

06.Geological updated reserve and resource : Under sub para k and as per geological plan and sections the reserve has been calculated upto 40m under UNFC(111)category, whereas the limestone deposit has proved under exploration programme was up to 26m in previous scheme period. Therefore, reserve (111) category need to be considered upto 26m depth and accordingly reserves need to be re calculated and concerned tables should be corrected.

07. year-wise tentative Excavation- table no.18 : The section name as per table is not matching to plate no.VI-A. Dimensions indicated in table no.18 are not matching with plate no.VI-A i.e.cross section. There is no proposed development and working for the year2018-19 as per section should be verified and corrected.

08.Mine drainage: The depth of working indicated under the para is in-correct depth observed on the day of inspection is ranging 12-15m,the dimensions of existing pit need to be furnished.

09.Para 8.3:The programme of afforestation proposed is with in ML or outside ML should be indicated under the para.

10.Para 8.3.5: The year wise summary of protective measures for reclamation and rehabilitation table no.25 left blank without any information, no of plantation proposed under afforestation programme need to be furnished in table and yearwise separate table required to be furnished for each year.

Annexure:

11. Annexure VI: A copy of analysis report by the Regional Testing Lab., Madurai, for the sample of core drill under taken under exploration need to be annexed in place of report dt 9.2.2006.

Plates:

12. All the plan should have a proper gridline.

13. Plate no.V: In view, of scrutiny of para geological updated reserve and resource, the reserve computation required to be modified.

14. Plate no.VI: The section lines indicated on plan are different in sections.

15. Plate no.VIII: The adjacent mines that are within 500m need to be marked with its name on the plan. The environment plan should be prepared on a scale of 1:5000 showing all details as required under Rule 28(5)(b) of MCDR, 1988 instead of a Google map.

16. A legible copy of Kay plan should be submitted.

.....