

Scrutiny comments on draft Review of Mining Plan &PMCP for Palayam limestone mine over 3.21 hect in Palayam village Vedasandur taluk of Dindigul district Owned by Sri J.Sheik Abdulla submitted under rule 17(1) of MCR, 2016 & rule 23 of MCDR-2017 for the period from 2018-19 to 2022-23 .Mine code 38TMN33033.

1. The reason for delay in submission of document may be justified.
2. Para 2.0 (a&b):Application submitted to state govt.,for extension of ML, communication received in this regard from state government as per MMDR Amendment Act-2015 should be enclosed. Facilities mentioned under sub para 20(b)are not seen at mine site, hence statement should be corrected.
- 3.Para 3.3 Exploration: Existing pit geometry indicated is in-correct. A single pit end to end of ML along the strike is observed for a depth ranging 3m-7m with 1.0m to1.5m topsoil. Existing pit dimensions in other para's should be corrected.
- 4.Para 3.3 Exploitation: Quantity of waste generated indicated as 1172tonnes,whereas the existing two dumps shows comparatively small quantity only also be discussed under dump re-handling page no.23.Composition of waste and its usage should be discussed.
- 5.Para 3.4:Violation of rules communicated vide this office letter dated 16.9.2017 to you and the efforts taken for compliance should be discussed.

Part-A

- 6.Para 1.0(j): As per the existing status of the pit, reserve should be recalculated as the configuration of the mine pit differ to geological plan. The sectional area on western side ie (A-B,C-D) has reached 2m-3m deep. Hence, reserve should be recalculated and concerned tables should be corrected.
- 7.Para 2.0 :In view of scrutiny on reserve i.e. para 1.0(j),development and production for the year 2018-19 should be corrected. How the objective of obtaining of ML for optimum exploitation/ conservation of mineral is justified by carrying out backfilling on western side of ML, leaving the available mineral more than 10m depth. Therefore, production and development scheme should be redrafted considering the aspects of conservation and re-handling of dump (proposed backfilling).
8. The proposal for the year 2018-19 should be indicated in Tables 27 & 28 as 2018-19 (01.08.2018 to 31.3.2019) and accordingly the production schedule may be planned on pro rata basis.
- 9.Para 2(b)II: It is mentioned under table no.29A in page no.23 that, the proposed to be backfilling on the western side in the year 2019-20, whereas,pit will be reaching a depth of12m not the ultimate level. The ultimate pit's depth range should be furnished instead of its maximum depth in table no.35.Hence,the statement should be corrected.
10. Para 8.3.5:Inview of consideration on optimum exploitation of mineral and postponing the backfilling proposals under para 2.0,concerned event in table no.50,52,54,56 should be altered.
11. All chapters of PMCP,feasibility report, UNFC report should be reconciled as per scrutiny for the paras of ROMP.

Annexures :

- 12.Annexure-IB: Annexure furnished without title i.e. mine name and its details.

Plates

- 13.Plate no.III: Pit status marked as two pits is incorrect should be marked as it exists as single one. The only, ground control point(house) available about 0.75m away on northern side to ML.
- 14.Plate no.IV: In view of change in pit configuration as indicated in para 1.0(j), plan should be corrected and reserve should be recalculated.
- 15.Plate no V: Inview of sugession on optimum exploitation of mineral and postponing the backfilling proposals under para 2.0,backfilling proposal should be altered in pate. V-A,V-B,V-C,V-D