

ANNEXURE-I

SCRUTINY COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT MODIFICATION TO THE APPROVED MINING PLAN OF RAMGAD IRON ORE MINE OF M/S ZEENATH TRANSPORT COMPANY, OVER AN AREA OF 50 HA AS PER THE LEASE DEED & 49.73 HA AS PER THE CEC SKETCH, M.L. NO. 2547 ,IN VILLAGE RAMGAD, SANDUR TALUK, RAMGAD RANGE RESERVE FOREST, IN BELLARY DISTRICT, KARNATAKA STATE. SUBMITTED UNDER RULE 17(3) OF MCR,2016. CATEGORY OF THE MINE IS A(FM-FULLY MECHANISED MINE, FOR THE CURRENT MODIFICATION PERIOD IS 2016-17, ( 5 YEARS PERIOD IS 2012-13 TO 2016-17).

GENERAL

1. On cover page, it is indicated that the ML area falls in forest land, but in the text paras it is given reserve forest, if it is so, better to indicate as reserve forest, wherever applicable.
2. In annexures enclosed in the text given in the table, without indicating number of pages comes under each annexure may be given for easy reference.
3. In annexure-No. XX, reveals the R & R proposals and completion, but the balance proposals and completion is not indicated which ought to have been.
4. In annexure-No. XVII, wherein the photographs should be given with name of the mine and the Owner.
5. In annexure. No.XVI, the chemical analysis report has been enclosed for the year 2012, instead of furnishing the latest one.
6. In annexure.No. XIV, the details of violation enclosed are found to be incomplete.
7. The annexure.No. XI, where the boundary pillars are enclosed without mentioning the name of the mine and the lessee/ owners.
8. In annexure.VIC, passport ID of Shri. Syed Ahmed name must be written for reference.
9. In para 3.1, the details furnished in table-6, where the period must be given from which year to which year, instead of just of giving 5 years.
10. In para 3.3, annexure-XII referred, may be added with, some bore holes through photographs, in addition what is shown.
11. Table-11, may be reconciled with annexure-XX for appropriate datas.
12. The para 3.4 and the related annexure may be reconciled.

PART-A

13. In para 1(g),on the geological plan, separate indexing marked for G-1 & G-2 scale of exploration, as 7.47 ha & 6.29 ha extent, for both the G-1 & G-2, it is mentioned as G1 itself, instead of G1 & G2 respectively.
14. In para 1(i),under table-14, the details of the bore holes proposed are given and the location indicated are not appropriate, though some bore holes were undertaken in that area and proposing 30m depth is also not appropriate, when already the depth of the pit has gone to 59m,

some core drill holes were drilled more than 50m. In this juncture, as per the observation in the field, from the above proposals, some holes can be placed on the western side of the UPL, to find out the depth continuity and lateral extension of the ore body to fix the UPL and will help in future mining.

15. In para 1(j), under reserves/ resources as per UNFC, furnished in table, without number, and the approved scheme of mining indicated without the date of approval, and the reserve/ resources position stands as on what date is not clear, which ought to have been.

16. In 1(k), the analysis report pertains to 2012 as per annexure-XVI is taken for calculation of reserve/ resources for the present submission is found to be not appropriate, which should be changed and latest analysis report may be considered.

17. In para 1(l), in table-15, the reserves indicated under G1 & G2, were not indicated with UNFC codes for the mineable & blocked reserves. In the light of the above remarks, the related text paras and the plates may be attended.( table-16& 17, the last column, unit is not indicated).

18. In para2A(a), it is given height of the bench is 7.5m & the width is minimum 8m, but what is the maximum width proposed is not indicated. The mine is going to be worked under A(FM), category, keeping 8m width to the height of 7.5m is not appropriate, it should be at least 10m. Besides, it is given that the slope stability study carried out by NIT, Suratkal, if it is so, the copy of the report may be enclosed in the annexure for reference.

19. In table-18 & 18A, the excavation details furnished for the year 2016-17, reveals that the working will be concentrated between the sections K-K' to L-L', where it is given OB waste of 96,200t & 22,636t of intercalated waste is proposed to excavate, but as per the plate No.7, from the proposed sections, it is observed that, there exist lateritic ore & insitu ore & interacted waste only and there is no OB waste. In the light of the above remarks, both the tables must be reconciled.

20. In para 1(f), under tables 23 & 24, the calculation made to present need to be reconciled and corrected, similarly, table-no. 27 & 28 also need to attend for correction.

21. In table-28, the proposals made should be mentioned with financial year, instead of just giving number of years.

22. In table-32, the time frame for implementation of R & R plan given may be indicated with financial year for easy reference.

#### PART-B

##### PLATES:

23. Surface Plan (Plate no.3): The active dump area need to be demarcated with the extent of the area going to be utilized for future dumping may be indicated with the boundary for reference. The modification period is indicated, along with five years period may also be furnished in all the plates, wherever applicable, including the text part.

24. Geological Plan (Plate no.4): The modification to the approved mining plan period is 2016-17( i.e. previous approval is for five years is 2012-13 to 2016-17). Same may be indicated in all the plates.

The notation used for BHQ is not with clarity on the plan. The proposed bore holes location may be attended as per the remarks given in part-A.

25. Geological section (Plate no.5): in some sections, where the reserves are getting blocked due to 7.5m common boundary, wherein the UNFC code is given as 221 & 222 for some sections, which is not correct. It should be corrected appropriately. Besides, in the longitudinal sections X-X', the proposed bore holes for 30m depth, is found to be not suitable, at least for 50m depth may be proposed to know more information at depth, than the previous holes. The UPL marked and notation given in the index part must be changed as Ultimate pit slopes.

26. Pit Lay Out plan( Plate No.6): The proposals drawn to develop and produce iron ore for the current modification period may be modified to orient the excavations along the ore body/ strike line, instead of bending the development within L-L'. On the day of inspection, it was observed that the mineralized area is continuing, beyond L-L' & M1-M1'. Further, the development may be widened towards UPL line, from the G1 boundary line to understand and expose the ore body at the bottom of pits.

27. Environment Plan (Plate No.8): The other ML area of other lessees demarcated in the buffer zone, without indicating the name of the mine or the village for reference.

28. Conceptual Plan & Section (Plate No.9): The conceptual plan & section submitted does not reveal, how the mined out area will be dealt during that period. Whether any area is going be reclaimed & rehabilitated or going to be converted in to water storage pond, etc., should be shown in the index.

29. Graphical Litho Logs: From the litho logs, it is observed that the some of the bore holes topped at very shallow depth and some were not. It is advisable to continue for some minimum depth of 50m or so, to understand the strata/ geology at depth, how it varies.