Annexure

Scrutiny comments on Modification in approved Modified Mining Plan alongwith Progressive Mine Closure Plan of Kiriburu-Meghahatuburu Iron ore mine (area 2897.499 ha) of M/s Steel Authority of India Ltd. Submitted under rule 17(3) of MCR, 2016.

A. TEXT:

1. On the cover page (a) Modification of approved modified mining plan and progressive mine closure plan may be written instead of only modified mining plan & PMCP.

b. Whether the forest area is Reserved or protected, may be given.

c. Instead of scheme period, plan period from 01/04/2018 to 31/03/2020 may be written as the plan period from 01/01/2018 to 31/03/2018 has already lapsed.

2. The word 'scheme' may be replaced by 'Mining plan' in all the places in the text, as per MCR, 2016.
3. Signature of Shri S.D. Pahari, Qualified person is missing in all the pages of the text.
4. Page 3, para 2.0 (a): Name of nominated owner and his address may be given.
5. Page 2, para 1.0 (a): (a) Name of applicant is not correct. Name of existing nominated owner and his present and permanent address, phone/fax no./e-mail id may be given.
6. Page 3, para 2.0(a): A copy of the supporting document from the Jharkhand Govt. w.r. to expiry of lease on 13.3.2029 may be given.
7. Page 4, para 2.0 (b): a. Distance of Ranchi from the mine may be given.
   b. Ranchi Airport, Sonari Airport Jamshedpur may be included in the list of Airports and its distance from the mine.
8. Page 54, para 1.0(I): Mineral Reserve/Resources as on which date has not been given. Reserve may be given as on 1.4.2018.
9. Page 56, 57, Insitu Tentative Excavation: i. Column no. 8 of the format is not as per the universal format.
   ii. The figure given in column 8 should be given in column 7.
   iii. Column 9 should be 6+7/4+5+8 and the ROM/waste ratio may be calculated accordingly.
   iv. The production of ROM+ subgrade is exceeding the E.C. limit for Kiriburu block for 2019-20 and for Meghatuburu for 2018-19 and 2019-20. It may be reconciled.
10. Page 57, Dump re-handling: (a) The table given is not as per universal format. Column no. 4 for reject is missing.
11. Page 67, para 4.0 (c) (i) Plantation proposal for Kiriburu block and Meghatuburu block may be proposed separately.
    ii. Few more fruit bearing trees may be proposed. Accordingly, the Drawing no. K10M-M10M/MSOM/17-18/11 may be modified. So that details of plantation for Kiriburu & Meghahatuburu could be shown clearly.
12. Page 90 to 93 para 8.3.5: (i) The summary of yearwise proposal for item no. 8.35 may be given for the year 2018-19 to 2019-20 only as 2017-18 (Jan-Mar'18) has already lapsed.
    ii. In page 90 for the item Management of worked out benches in Kiriburu block (a) How the area available for rehabilitation has been reduced from 5.4 ha to 1.4 ha during 2018-19 and 15.56 to 1.10 ha during 2019-20 as per earlier approved modified mining plan dated 13.10.2015 is not clear. The details may be furnished in a clear manner.
    b. The cumulative number of plants for the 2018-19 have been reduced from 4000 to 2000 and 5000 no. to 3000 no. during 2019-20 as per the earlier approved mining plan dated 13.10.2015 is not clear. It should be the same.
    iii. (a) On page 91 in the summary of yearwise proposal for item no. 8.3.5 for Kiriburu block for item Management of worked out benches in the details column for "Any other means(specify)" and also in the item "Reclamation and rehabilitation by backfilling, in the details column for "Any other means(specify)" the word ' in conceptual stage' has been added, which is not correct. In the approved document dated 13.10.2015, the status of proposals and its cumulative status have not been reflected in a clear manner and quantified manner w.r.t. proposals
    b) The cost including watch and care during the year have not been given.

Contd. ----2/-

13. Page 92, 93, para 8.3.5: i. The summary of yearwise proposal for meghatuburu Block may be given for the year 2018-19 to 2019-20 only as plan period 2017-18 (Jan.' 2018 to Mar.' 2018) has already lapsed & irrelevant.

    ii. (a) In page 92, for the item "Management of warked out benches in Meghatuburu Block for details i.e., area available for rehabilitation has been reduced from 6.11 ha to 5.00 ha during 2018-19 and from 10.22 ha to 7.00 ha during 2019-20 as compared to earlier approved mining plan dated 13.10.2025 is not clear. Likewise, the area for afforestation to be done has been given as 3.00 ha instead of 4.70 ha and 5.00 ha in place of 6.11 ha as compared to earlier approved document dated 13.10.2015 is not clear. It should be reflect clearly the actual work carried out under discussion.

    b. The cumulative nos. of plants for the year 2018-19 have been reduced from 4000 to 2000 and 5000 to 3000 during 2018-19, 2019-20 respectively as compared to earlier approved document dated 13.10.2015 is not clear.

    iii) (a) On page 93, in the summary of yearwise proposal for item no. 8.35 for Meghatuburu for item "Management of worked out benches in the details column of "Any other means (specify)" the word in "conceptual stage" has been added which is not correct. The proposal should be the same as given in the approved mining plan dated 13.10.2015.

    b. The cost of water and care has been reduced from Rs. 9.9 crore to Rs. 3 lac and Rs. 15.03 crore to Rs. 3 lac during 2018-19 to 2019-20 respectively as compared to earlier approved mining plan dated 13.10.2015 is not clear.

    c) Item "Reclamation and Rehabilitation by backfilling and Rehabilitation of waste land within lease" have not been discussed. The proposal should be same as given in earlier approved mining plan dated 13.10.2015 i.e. Development of a modern athletic track for harnessing local talent with necessary infrastructure. The work done and present proposal should be reflected.

B. PART:

14. List of certificate/ undertaking/consent should be given on para 9.0 of part B as per the universal format.
15. In the consent letter/undertaking/certificate from the applicant the statement at para 02 is incorrect as item no. 1, 3, 4, 5 of CCOM circular 02/10 have not been complied.
16. An undertaking that in case there is any change in the address/name of the ownership it will be promptly intimated has not been given.
17. Certificate from the qualified person has not been submitted.
18. List of plan and section submitted should be enclosed on para 10 of part B as per the universal format.
19. List of document to be annexed should be given on para 11 of part B as per the universal format.

C. Annexures:

20. Photo ID of the present nominated owner has not been given.
21. DGPS report has not been submitted as annexure.

D. GEOLOGY:

22. Point 1.0, (f) –Heading is to be changed to – Name of person as prescribed under Rule 15 (1) & 15 (2) of MCR 2016, preparing the mining Plan.
23. Point 2.0 (a) – As per Rule 56 of MCR 2016, the period of amalgamated lease shall be co-terminus with the lease whose period will expire first, in such a case period / expiry date is to be mentioned accordingly.
24. As per office records, in reference to CCOM's Circular No. 2/2010 a copy of Geo referenced Cadastral Map with DGPS Surveyed Mining Lease Boundary done by ISM, Dhanbad has already been submitted to the office, but as mentioned in Pg. 4 & 5 the Geographical Co-ordinates (WGS-84) of the

Contd. ----3/-

lease boundary pillars are mentioned. UTM Co-ordinates should also be incorporated in text and respective plates also.

25. Point 3.1 – Date & reference of earlier approved MP / SOM – attach the letter as annexure.
26. Point 3.3 (v) Afforestation – during 2015-16, 2016-17, 2017-18 (till Dec. 2017) as mentioned afforestation has been done. Location of Afforestation done is to be mentioned accordingly.
27. Point 3.5 – As mentioned in review of earlier approved proposals actual planned work could not be done due to non-availability of Stage II Forest Clearance which is to be mentioned under this point.
28. According to Rule 12(4) of MCDR 2017 ***"In the case of existing mining leases detailed exploration (G1 level) over the entire potentially mineralized area under the mining lease shall be carried out within a period of five years from the date of commencement of these rules."***; in such a case the exploration proposals of the entire area in G1 level should be proposed accordingly.
29. Mention the mineral resources as per following format –

Level of Exploration	Resources in Million Tons	Grade
G1- Detailed Exploration		
G2 – General Exploration		
G3 – Prospecting		
G4 - Reconnaissance		

30. Determination of Bulk density and Recovery factor should be based on field test and its methodology adopted is to be mentioned accordingly.
31. Cut off grade of ROM with reference to threshold value should be mentioned.
32. Utilization of mineral in between threshold value to cut off grade is also to be mentioned. Plates
33. In all the Plans & Sections period of proposal / Scheme period / Plan period is to be mentioned.
34. Signature of all the Qualified persons preparing the proposals is necessary.

C. Plates:

35. CCOM circular 02/2010 has not been complied. Instead of mining lease area of 2897.449 ha, DGPS survey map of 2927.908 ha. area has been given, which is more and not matching with the lease area. The boundary pillar has not been fixed precisely on a result the area has increased up to 52 ha. in lease-I and decreased upto 22 ha. in lease no.-II.
36. a) Name of present nominated owner may be given in all the plates & text.
    b) Signature of Shri S.D. Pahari, Q.P is missing in all the plates.
37. Key Plan: DRG no. KIOM-MIOM/MSOM/17-18/01
    a. The key plan does not show the 5 km. area adjoining the lease area on the south side.
    b. Topo sheet numbers not given.
    c. The state boundary of Jharkhand has not been shown prominently using colours.
    d. Wind rose diagram has not been shown.
    e. The surface right area of Ranging Tailing pond (97.76 ha) and Kumdih water pumping station 68.90 ha have not been shown.
38. Lease plan (DRG No. KIOM-MIOM/MSOM/17-18/2):
    a. The lease plan shows for the lease no. III i.e., 82 ha and not the total lease area (i.e., 2897.499 ha.).
    b. The lease map of 2897.499 ha. Area certified by the Jharkhand Govt. has not been enclosed.
39. Waste dump plan & section has not been submitted.
40. Environment plan as per Rule 32(5)(b) of MCDR 2017 has not been submitted.
41. Conceptual plan and section has not been submitted.
42. Reclamation plan has not been submitted.
43. Environment management plan has not been enclosed.

=====***=====