

SCRUTINY COMMENTS ON DRAFT MODIFICATION TO THE APPROVED MINING PLAN OF SV CHETTY IRON ORE MINE OF SRI SV. SRINIVASULU, OVER AN AREA OF 60 HA AS PER CEC & AS PER LEASE DEED, IN JAISINGPUR VILLAGE, SANDUR TALUK, BELLARY DISTRICT, KARNATAKA STATE. SUBMITTED, UNDER RULE 17(3) OF MCR, 2016. M. L. NO. 2604, FOREST LAND, PRESENT MODIFICATION PERIOD IS FROM 2016-17 TO 2019-20.

COVER PAGE

1. The type of forest may be specified. The Online registration number obtained under rule 45 may be indicated for future reference. The extent of the ML area as per CEC & as per ML deed need to be indicated. The present submission under rule 17(3) of MCR 2015 is wrongly given.
2. The name of the mine owner is written as Sri SV. Srinivasulu, whereas in ID proof, it is given as Siddam Setty Virupaksha Setty Srinivasulu. In the light of the above remarks the text and the plates may be attended wherever applicable.

ANNEXURE

3. The annexures enclosed in the text need to be indicated with number of pages in each annexure may be given for easy reference.
4. Photographs of the mine enclosed without indicating the name of the mine in the respective photos and the other photographs of the waste dumping, stackings and sorting and screening plant and infrastructures are not brought out for reference.
5. Trial pits photos enclosed without giving the location and the particular number of the TP.
6. Photographs of boundary corner pillars and three GCP's are enclosed in the text, which are not indicated in the annexure list.
7. The consent letter/ undertaking given by the lessee, wherein the extent of the ML area is given as 60.23 ha as per CEC & 60.00 ha as per F.C., and as per the lease deed it is given as 149.73 acres(60.59 ha). The different figures given at various places will lead to incorrect and wrong datas, hence, care should be taken to given correct and described in introductory chapters with all clarity.

INTRODUCTION

8. In the introduction chapter, though the ML area given by CEC is 60.23 ha, but as the FC clearance is obtained for 60.00 ha area, to avoid further approval from MOEF for 0.23 ha extent clearance, the document is submitted for 60.00 ha area only and not for 60.23 ha. Besides, the present submission is sought for lease period upto 31.03.2020, enhanced production and also for enhancing the reserve part, which is not dealt in the introductory part, which ought to have been.

GENERAL

9. In para 2(b), the lease area is indicated as sandur reserve forest, whereas in the cover page, it is given as just forest, which is not appropriate and correct. It is expected that, whatever the document obtained from the concerned authority should be mentioned as it is wherever applicable in the text and in the plates.
10. In para 3.1, the scheme of mining approved for the period 2015-2020, is not given with reason for approval, but just given scheme.
11. In para 3.3, under review on exploration, instead of 10 DTH holes, 35 nos. of trial pits were made to establish the depth of occurrence of float iron ore & its recovery, but nothing briefed about the outcome of the exploration in this para, which ought to have been to know the depositions.
12. In the same para 3.3, under production, only for 2015-16 is given and not dealt about the previous years, atleast for 5 years period of the past for reference.
13. In para 3.3, under reclamation, it is given 1.91 ha of mined out area only was back filled and afforested. From surface plan, it is observed that, more area on the NW, NE, and also in middle of the ML area, below the BHJ/ BHQ area were worked out and planted in the past,

were not dealt clearly in this text. In the light of the above remarks, the text and the plates must be attended and incorporated appropriately, including the para 8.6(financial assurance).

PART-A

14. In para 1(e)(i), it is given lessee carried 35 nos. of trial during the year 2013, in 2014, 14 nos., of trial pits and in 2016-23 nos., of trial pits, how the trial pits in 2013 were carried out when the mine was discontinued during that period may be explained. Besides, in the approved document, there was a proposal for DTH holes, why the DTH holes proposals not implemented, at least few holes at prominent location should have been drilled to know the detailed lithology and will helped for appropriate future planning and to assess the reserve calculations.

15. In para 1(h), under geological sections, the ferruginous shale indicated with question mark, wherein the same is not established with authentic evidence through atleast few DTH holes 10 to 20m, without which giving no proposals under para 1(i) is not appropriate and correct, even though the lease period is expiring by 2020. The para may be reconciled.

16. In para 1(j), under mineral reserves/ resources, in table-18, as on 1/4/2015 is given, instead of mentioning the reserves/ resources as per the previous approved document and there is no depletion of reserves/ resources after the approval of the document, due to non-operational condition in the mine.

17. In para 1(k), in table-19, the tonnage factor taken for float fines and caliberated float ore as 2.8 is not appropriate, which should be calculated separately and changed suitably. The quantity of tons shown in the 7th column need to be corrected. In the light of the above remarks, the calculation made in the table 20 to 23 also need to be attended and corrected.

18. In para 1(l), mineral resources, based on the latest exploration, the resources/ reserves estimated are furnished below in table-No.24 as on 1/3/2016, is found to be not appropriate. The depleted reserves/ resources were not dealt in this para, the details of exploration undertaken in the form of trial pits totalling to 75 nos., but not dealt what is the depth wise considered and the lateral extension considered from the previous approval document to the present submission should have been dealt, without which it is not appropriate and correct. The average grade indicated as 60.52%Fe at +45%Fe cutoff is also not appropriate.

19. In the same para , in table-24 & 25, the level of exploration undertaken & the quantity of reserves/ resources reported without indicating the extent of the area in the respective level of exploration covered, also in the geological plan & sections, which ought to have been.

20. In para 2(a), under existing mining, that the waste materials of size -2mm materials will be sent to back filling in the worked out areas, but, in plate no.II/C, in sections N-N' & O-O', that on the NNE side, i.e on higher elevation, reveals the presence of iron ore & the working pits with the mineralization, in plate No.III/a, the section O-O' reveals with only dumping and nothing else, as if barren area, which is not correct.

21. In para 2(b), insitu tentative excavation, in table-26, that the production figure given in column -6, and in table-27, considering recovery of saleable materials considering the tonnage factor of 2.8 is not appropriate and correct. Please refer the above paras. Therefore, the text paras must be attended wherever applicable and the production fixed by the CEC should be maintained.

22. In para 2(d), under extent of mechanization, it is given proposed maximum handling ore & waste will be around 1.24 lakhs t/a, is not expected under the above heading. Besides, the ore and the waste proposed for the year should be restricted as per the CEC norms and the limit. In the light of the above remarks, the text and the plates must be attended accordingly as applicable.

23. In para 2(e), in table-30, the details of working pits are given from A1 to A3, A5 & A6, but though A4 is marked in the plan, but not brought out in the table, the reason for the same may be explained. The extent of the area for the respective blocks are not demarcated on the plan for easy reference.

24. In table-32, the details of the backfilling is indicated with sections P-P', is not correct and also not matching, should be corrected.
25. In para 2(f), under the disposal of waste dumps, it is given, 0.9lakh tones of waste will be generated during this plan period, if it is so, how 7.79lakhs tones will be generated during the life of the mine may be explained, when the lease period is as given in the cover page upto 31.03.2020.
26. In table-34, under land use pattern, it is given 34.52 ha area is for mining & back filling and scheme period it will be 34.65 ha, but in para 8.6, in table-45, under mining it is given as 34.52 ha, neither back filling, reclamation and rehabilitations details are not dealt in the para 8.6, if it is so. In the light of the above remarks, the text para and the plates if any may be attended.
27. The PMCP chapter should be attended in line with the above remarks. The para 8.3.1, need to be attended appropriately. The way it is attended is not correct.
28. From the surface plan and based on site inspection, it was felt that, the area already mined out were found with good dense forest growth, which are not classified appropriately and placed in the land use pattern.

PART-B

29. Key Plan: Instead of key plan, precise area map is submitted on toposheet.
30. Surface Plan (Plate No.II/a): Name of the mine must be invariably written on the plan. The extent of the area is given as 60.00 ha, as per lease deed & as per CEC not indicated. In the light of the above remarks, all the plates need to be attended.
31. Geological Plan & sections (Plate No.II/b & II/C): The level of exploration undertaken in the lease area is not demarcated on the plan & sections.
32. Conceptual Plan (Plate No.VI): The conceptual plan & sections should be attended in such a manner to understand the position of workings at the end of the life of the mine.