SCRUTINY COMMENTS ON THE MODIFICATION & REVIEW OF MINING PLAN OF BBH IRON ORE MINE OF M/S MINERAL ENTERPRISES LIMITED, OVER AN AREA OF 102.53 HA, AS PER CEC. M.L.NO. 2346, IN VILLAGE, BEDARABOMMENAHALLI, HIREKANDAVADI & OTHERS, CHITRADURGA TALUK & DISTRICTS.STATE KARNATAKA.SUBMITTED UNDER RULE 17(3) OF MCR, 2016. CATEGORY OF THE MINE IS A(FM-FULLY MECHANIZED MINE), OPEN CAST, NON CAPTIVE FOREST LAND IS 99.23 HA & NON-FOREST IS 3.30 HA.PERIOD OF THE DOCUMENT IS FROM 2018-19 TO 2019-20(I.E. 31.03.2020).

TEXT

- 1. The category of the mine is A (FM-fully mechanized mine), the photograph of the mine pit may be replace with the clarity one.
- 2. Under the list of annexures, the hand written letters may be changed. In the light of the above remarks, the other part of the text may be attended if any.
- 3. Para 3.2, under last modification if any, it is reported nil, this must be attended considering the last modification.
- 4. Para 3.3A.7, table no. 3(5), wherein the R & R works completion period is given as 2020 & followed by to be done after built up of dumps is not correct, this must be given appropriately.
- 5. Para 3.6, the blank space left for filling the date and number of the letter from the CEC need to be given.
- 6. Para 1(L), under recovery factor, average lump & fines ratio is not dealt appropriately, which ought to have been. Besides, the reserves/ resources on siliceous ore for +35%Fe grade as per the latest notification need to be discussed and brought out for updation of reserves.
- 7. Table no. Geo-1.17, the reserves brought out in the table is not indicated with date, as on 1.4.2018 need to be brought out.
- 8. Para 2A(a), it is expected to brief on the existing & the proposed method of workings, giving number of pits workings with the bench height, width, approach road, angle of benches, over all slope of the pits etc.
- 9. Table no. 2.1, under dimension of the pits, indicated for pit no.1 & 2, whereas in some other paras, it is mentioned for pit No.1 & 3. Care should be taken to give correct proposals. Besides, the extent of the area for the pits 1 & 2 is 40.82 ha, which is not correct, this needs to be rechecked and attend appropriately.
- 10.Para 2.1, under design parameters, it is given 6m is the height of the bench and 7m is the width is not appropriate, which must be revised. (ii). The dump is spread to an area of 10.74 ha, is not correct, this must be reconciled, since the waste dump area also covers pit no.2, wherein the pit already exploited and abandoned.

- 11. Para 2(b), under year wise tentative excavation, table number not given, besides, in the column 6 & 7, there it is indicated 80% & 20% of ROM & rejects, what is the grade of the ROM & reject for the same is not given.
- 12. Para 2(II), under dump re-handling, it is given nil, instead of that, it is expected that, whether any chance for recovery of mineral from the existence dumps need to be indicated, instead of mentioning nil.
- 13. Para 2©, under development & production (2018-2020), the location indicated for the pit 1 & 3, in page 62, reveals for north, west & east, but not indicated on the SW, which is not appropriate, but for the pit no.3 is agreeable.
- 14. Para 2(d), the mode of working indicated as mechanized, whereas in the cover page & other place it is given as fully mechanized, hence this may be corrected. (ii). It is given minimum 7m width will be maintained is not appropriate for the 6m bench height, this needs to be reconciled to increase the width for the safety of the machineries movement. (iii). It is given rejects will be dumped at predetermined dumped yard, but no dump yard is ear marked for the same.
- 15.Para 2(f), under mine development, pit no.2 is indicated for the dumping waste materials is not appropriate, this should be considered separately as back filling as reclamation and followed by rehabilitation and brought under relevant places/column in the financial assurance.
- 16. Table no. 2.3, under land use pattern for the present, end of the plan period & conceptual plan period is not appropriate and correct, this needs to be rectified/corrected suitably. (ii). Reclamation/ rehabilitated area need to be brought out accordingly in the appropriate column/ table.
- 17. Para 4(a), table no.4.1, the quantity of rejects indicated for the two years, as 177,777 m3, but the location for the same is not indicated or ear marked on the plan for reference. Old subgrade dump area was found to be fenced and the materials are moved from the place, but not the rejects as it is mentioned.
- 18. Table no.4.3, under the below para, the quantity of material indicated as 0.806 without unit.
- 19. Para 4©, underutilization of subgrade, it is given that, subgrade residual stock of approx. 2-3 lakhs MT is available at the mine head, but during the site inspection, the fenced area referred to subgrade materials, but the quantity indicated is not appropriate at the ear marked location, which need to be corrected.
- 20. Table no.8.1, under existing land use pattern, the table information need to be rechecked and corrected, based on the explanation and discussed on the issues.
- 21.Para 8.27, under financial assurance, in column no.4, additional area required for plan period as 5.00 ha, for mining purpose, this may be reconciled and justified suitably in all respect. Besides, the net area considered for calculation of financial

assurance must be rechecked and corrected appropriately, including the rows as below, in no.2, 4, 5,&6comes to 64.51 ha and the total amount comes to 19,353,000/- (one crore, ninety three lakhs & fifty three thousand only).

22. The consent letter from the lessee should be indicated, instead of what is given. Besides, the qualified person may be retained and the recognised qualified person may be changed.

Part-B

- 23. Surface Plan (Plate No. 2): The surface plan is not updated as observed during the site inspection on 21/6/2018. There are ore stacks present on the southern side of the main pit No.1 is kept without updating the same in the plan. Similarly, some of the calibrated ore also placed in many places on the northern & western sides also, which are not updated. (ii). The excavation undertaken in the previous years and during the current year 2018-19 are not updated, what is present in the ML area. (iii). The mineral rejects indicated comprises of BHJ/SG of low grades needs to be stacked separately, instead of dumping along with the waste dumps. (iv). The ore stacks placed on the northern part of main pit no.1 & other places of the ML area should be designated with identified numbers, instead of in scattered manner. (v). The quantity of subgrade stack indicated on the surface plan need to be given with quantity of materials actual present in the site may be indicated along with text.
- 24. Geological Plan (Plate No.3): The scale of exploration as per UNFC undertaken in the ML area may be given on the plan. Pit no.2, reveals already exhausted of iron ore and declared non-mineralized. This area needs to be brought out accordingly and extent of such area needs to be shown in appropriate places also in the land use pattern and other relevant places of the text and the plates, applicable.
- 25. Development & Production Plan (Plate No.6& 6A): The proposals drawn for the year 2018-19 need to be restricted, that is given on the SSW, except N & W sides. The proposals drawn to develop through benches on the N & western side may be planned to work through slicing method. In the light of the above remarks, the proposals for the year 2019-20, may be attended suitably to work within the already broken up area, instead of fresh virgin area. The new proposal to add 5.0 ha more areas for fresh development & production may be avoided/ what is the actual area undergoes only may be considered, otherwise, some extent of the areas may be deleted.
- 26. Conceptual Plan (Plate no.8): The conceptual plan should be prepared in such a way to bring out the position of workings, at the time of conceptual period/ end of lease period.
- 27. Conceptual section (Plate no.8A): the sections presented need to be attended appropriately, by deleting the present position of workings, at the conceptual stage/end of the lease period will not appear.