

ANNEXURE-I

SCRUTINY COMMENTS ON THE REVIEW & UPDATION OF MINING PLAN OF MEGALAHALLI/(JOHN)IRON ORE MINE OF M/S R. PRAVEEN CHANDRA., OVER AN AREA OF 42.13 HA AS PER CEC&ALSO AS PER LEASE DEED, IN MEGALAHALLI & OTHER VILLAGES, IN CHITRADURGA & HOLALKERE TALUKS, CHITRADURGA DISTRICT, KARNATAKA STATE.UNDER RULE 17(1) OF MCR, 2016. M.L. NO. 2294.CATEGORY OF THE MINE IS A (FM-FULLY MECHANISED MINE, LEASE AREA UNDER RESERVE FOREST. PROPOSED PERIOD ISFROM 2017-18 TO 2021-22.

COVER PAGE

1. The name of the mine should be written as John (Meghalahalli) Iron Ore Mine, instead of just John Mine. Besides, the lease area comprises of other villages, if it is so, instead of indicating other villages, better to mention all the villages, for clarity. In the light of the above remarks, all the text part and the plates must indicated with John (Meghalahalli) Iron Ore Mine, wherever applicable as per the ML deed.
2. The extended ML period to 50 years period from the ML grant may be indicated as per amended Act,2015, instead of just indicating without any authenticity.
3. The ML area falls under Nirudhadi Reserve forest, it should be indicated so.
4. The online registration number should be written as IBM/167/2011, instead of the way it is written.In the light of the above remarks, the text part may be attended, wherever applicable.
5. The month September indicated need to be changed to November, 2016.

GENERAL

6. In the contents it is given certificate from the applicant, instead of lessee.
7. Annexure-17, enclosed in Kannada, needs to be submitted with along with English translated copy for easy reference.
8. In the introduction chapter, furnishing mining lease details held by the lessee is not appropriate. The chapter need to be described with the previous approval and the present submission made and the purposes for which it is done. Besides, any changes in the exploration, reserves/ resources and the production may be dealt for more clarity. The five years period must be indicated as 2017-18 to 2021-22.
9. Table-1 should be enclosed in the text at appropriate location of the text, indicating the working status of the individual leases.
10. Table-3a, wherein tree is considered as GCP-3 is not appropriate and correct, must be replaced with some other permanent structures. Accordingly, the latitude & longitude and distance should be changed.
11. Para 3.1, the approval details given, without indicating the period for which the document got approved for reference.
12. Para 3.3, under review of earlier approved proposals, it should be presented in table format, instead of explaining in para itself, on excavation, afforestation, etc.
13. Certificate from QP, it is mentioned MCR, 2016, instead of MCDR, 1988.
14. Annexures-17 contains three pages in kannada, dated 6/2/2013, 7/3/2014 & 12/3/2016 which may be translated in English and placed in the text for reference.

PART –A

15. Para 1(j), under reserves/ resources, the updated on 1/4/2016, may be changed and updated for 1/11/2016. In the light of the above remarks, the information furnished in the following para need to be updated, including the tables-10 to 13.
16. The bulk density calculated for ore reserve, iron ore & for siliceous ore, may be explained.
17. Para 2A(a), Existing dimension of the pits, geometry of the benches, faces, slopes, direction of advancement, specification of haul roads, waste dumps spreads, and its heights & slope etc., may be added, in addition to the information furnished.
18. Para 2(b), may be explained with bench geometry with approachability to the main workings and the waste dumps etc., Similarly, the dump re-handling also may be explained with the concerned development and production plans and sections. Besides, year wise/ bench wise, mRL wise, opening reserve, exploitation & the closing balance may be tabulated for the five years. In the light of the above remarks, the remaining workings may be explained and attended suitably.
19. Para 2©, the development and production plan and sections for the year 2017-18 to 2021-22 must be accompanied with sections in each year working plan/ plates respectively, instead of producing the sections separately.
20. Table-17 must be shown through plates in relation with the waste handling.
21. Table-18, the layout of dumping indicated with method of dump, as dump is not found to be inappropriate which must be attended suitably, whether lessee intends to operate the dumping method though retreating method or forward method may be explained.
22. Table-19 reveals about the list of machineries intent to use in the mine,, which should be give importance to use it for the optimum extent, in addition to the above, if any other machineries required may be given for clarity.
23. Para 2(f), it is given existing engineering structures built at toe of dumps, and other reclamation drain will be carried out during conceptual stage is not appropriate, it should be undertaken before the conceptual stage for strengthening the different facilities.
24. Para 4(C), under stacking, it is given one dump is present in the ML area, but there is another waste dump on the northern side, wherein it is not indexed properly, though it is joined with the main waste dump on the NE and eastern part of the ML area is located. This should be checked and reconciled. The surface plan should be updated accordingly and also in the relevant plans/ sections for clarity. Table-29 should be attended, by including the other dump. Besides, the in 3rd column, under method it is given dump, what it means is not clear for understanding. It should be attended appropriately.
25. In the same para as above in mineral rejects, it is given in page-36, that 236m of retaining wall & garland drain will be constructed during 2019-20 for dump management as per plate no. III/c, better to specify the location of these protective measures. Further, the engineering structures indexed are not matching with the plans. It is also noted that, after removing of 1, 40,000 metric tonnes of low grade from the existing dump location, fresh dumping will be undertaken, if it is so, how the old waste dumps is present as per the plate III/c may be examined & reconciled.
26. Para 8.3, not commented on progressive reclamation plan.

PART-B

27. Key Plan (Plate No.1/b): the name of the mine may be invariably written on all the plates as John (Meghalahalli) Iron Ore Mine. The approach road to the ML area with

approximate distance from a known place may be indicated for reference. In the light of the above remarks, all the plates may be attended.

28. Surface Plan(Plate No.II/a): The main waste dump present on the eastern side should be shown with extent of the dump has been completed and inactive. Active portion should be shown with different colours. Other small waste dump present on the northern end is not denoted properly, whether it is falls under waste or something else with clarity for reference. Besides, other stacks of fines, C-ore and other infrastructure may be marked appropriately for easy reference. Mineral rejects should be kept away from the mineral stacks. Besides, this plan should be prepared as per rule 28(1)(a) of MCDR, 88.

29. Geological Plan (Plate No.II/b): The ultimate pit limit marked for the present must be re-assessed based on the future mining by extending the present working faces on either side, i.e. towards eastern & western side, to understand the ore geometry in depth and lateral extension through appropriate planning. Besides, this plan should be prepared as per rule 28(1)(b) of MCDR, 88.

30. Geological Cross section (Plate No.II/C): Similarly, the ultimate pit slope needs to be established for the geological sections, by carrying out remarks given for the geological plan to be appropriate. The one marked is not permanent, which may be changed in the course of future development and mining.

31. Production & Development Plan (Plate No.III/a): The development and production proposals submitted are accepted, but it is essential to work on the NW side, where the common boundary is being worked by the M/s SesaSterlite company, so that the deposit / benches can be developed systematically on that side and extended towards the southern end, where the present main workings are proposed. Besides, it is already advised during the last inspection that the main workings and the benches should be extended along the strike, i.e. at the middle of the benches should be straightened, instead of working across for systematic and scientific mining. The five years workings should be followed accordingly, by breaking the barriers at the middle and faces to be extended south to north or opposite in other developments. The working benches shown for the year 2017-18 must be brought out at the end of 31st March 2018. In the light of the above remarks, all the years' development & production workings must be brought out at the end of 31st march 2022 respectively. Similarly, year wise build of dumps status should match to the end of each year as 31st March and in the 5th year it should be up to 31st march 2022. In the light of the above remarks, protective works should be attended. Approach road to the each bench should be marked. CCOM circular No.4/91 & 5/91 may be taken full care while preparing these plates. Modified/ updated surface geological plan to be used as base plate for preparing these plates.

32. Production sections (Plate No. III/f): The sections along H-H' & I-I' etc., the proposed workings shown is not appropriate, which needs to be extended all along like top slicing at the top to bottom for some extent, so that the future workings will be easy, otherwise, the future workings will be restricted in the present time itself.

33. Reclamation Plan (Plate No.IV): Reclamation plan is not prepared in a way it should be showing the activities undertaken in the mine has not brought out in the plan. Especially the Conceptual plan/ sections prepared showing the water reservoir in the mined out area are all comes under the above heading. Besides, the remarks given in the conceptual plan need to be followed for preparing this plan.

34. Environment Plan (Plate No.V): Should be prepared as per rule 28(5) (b) of MCDR, 88.

35. Conceptual Plan (Plate No.VI): The conceptual plan and section is not matching with each other. Besides, at the bottom of the workings, water reservoir has been planned to be called back filled through water & planted over the worked out benches for the whole ML area. While doing so, at least some portion of the worked out area/ land could have been considered for back filling through waste muck and brought under reclamation & rehabilitation, to be more appropriate method for systematic and scientific mining. Instead of lifted the waste dump(i.e. conceptual dumping), could be avoided and reclaimed/ rehabilitated on the northern side of the ML and such area may be used for more useful purposes in the future.