

**Scrutiny Comments of Review of Mining Plan with PMCP in respect of Palayam Limestone Mine over an area of 4.01.0 hectares in Palayam Village, Veda sandur Taluk, Dindigul District of M/s. D.V. Minerals submitted under Rule 17(1) of MCR, 2016 and 23(B) of MCDR, 1988**

**General:**

1. Previous approved scheme of mining period vide letter no. TN/DGL/CBT/MS-947/MDS dated 18/3/2014. The mining scheme period was written on cover page as 2011-2012 to 2015-2016. But, this review of mining plan period is written as 2016-17 to 2020-2021. Further inside the first page no.1 that the period was wrongly mentioned as 2015-16 to 2020-2021. The same may be corrected, wherever it may be applicable.
2. Para 3.3 – Afforestation and Reclamation : Which part of ML area is available for reclamation has not been indicated the direction.
3. Part A (1.0) Geology & Exploration:  
Details of exploration already carried out: It is mentioned in the part that Pit-II length is 59.0 m. instead of 69.0 m. It may be checked and corrected.
4. The chemical analysis report furnished is outdated. Hence, fresh chemical analysis report from the laboratory accredited by NABL should be given.
5. (J) Geological Reserves: Reserves and Resources: The lessee has not carried out any exploration as per the UNFC norms except opening the existing pit. However, some wagon drills at the bottom of the pit should be proposed at 50 m. grid interval mentioned as per the norms of the UNFC. The reserves should be re-assessed. Exploration in the entire ML area as per UNFC norms must be completed in the year 2016-2017 itself and proposal given accordingly.
6. The likely expenditure to be incurred for the proposed exploration to be mentioned clearly.
7. Mining: There is no exploration carried out below 12.0 m. (i.e.) (1.0 m. top soil 11.0 m. limestone), that production and development plan should be restricted to only 12.0 m. The reserves calculation should be modified accordingly.
8. The ROM figure given in Table No. 12, Page no. 13 found to be wrong. The man power calculation may also be wrong as it has not taken into consideration the quantity of reject to be handled that the same should be calculated for highest total handling in any proposal year and corrected, wherever it may be applicable.
9. Page no. 31, Dumping details : The first column is mentioned as overburden and second column repeatedly mentioned as overburden which may be checked and corrected.
10. Blasting: Page nos. 29 & 31: It is written as small mine seasonal working mine drilling will be done by contractor. However, blasting should be done by Qualified Mate or Blaster. Statutory certificate in this regard should be enclosed. Further, annual production is about 10688 tonnes of limestone with 250 working days and also 24 workers. Hence, given details is contradictory which may be checked and corrected.
11. IV – Production Schedule: Yearwise development and production schedule as per UNFC system: It is written in Plate no. 18 that this typing error may be corrected.
12. FMB sketches have been highlighted. Whereas enclosed sketches have not been highlighted.

: 2 :

13. Plates:

Plate IV Geological Plan: In this plate, ROM has been given, but recovery percentage 60% separately may be given. Grid pattern numbers are not shown in all plans.

14. CD may be corrected in all respect with text part and plans and sections also.

15. Copy of valid Environmental clearance certificate & certificate from Pollution control board may be submitted.