

Scrutiny comments on Review of Mining Plan for Unjanai&Pudupuliampatti limestone mine over an area 2.56ha in Unjanai& Pudupuliampatti village in Tiruchengode taluk of Namakkal district Owned by Sivasakthi Enterprises under rule 17(1) of MCR, 2016 & rule 23 of MCDR-1988 for the period from 2017-18 to 2021-22

1. Para 3.3: Reason for justification for not carrying out exploration during the previous years is not proper and the maximum depth reached in pit-1 as per table no.4 as 35m and statement regarding depth of workings in the para indicated as 41m is contrary should be corrected. The same details in exploitation sub para and in Part-A of relevant para's need to be corrected.  
Part-A
2. 1.0(b): The occurrence of calcitic variety of limestone in the central part of mining lease at a depth of 20-30m depth on the western side of the lease should be discussed under the geology of the area as the occurrence of this variety is rare in Namakkal district.
3. 1.0(e)(iii): The variety of limestone occurring and its chemical analysis results need to be discussed under the para. The statement regarding other details indicated "area is very small and deposit is shallow exploration carried out entire ML area" should be corrected.
4. 1.0(g): The scale of surface/Geological plan indicated under the para as 1:2000 is incorrect should be corrected.
5. 1.0(i): Exploration proposals made for pit-1 may be redrafted as it reached maximum depth, as depth persistence of limestone is required to be proved in ML.
6. Para 1.0(k) : The limestone band parameters shown for the cross section X4Y4-A5B5 in table no.13 for estimation of reserve is not tallying with geological plan (plate no.IV) needs verification and correction. In view of this proved reserve as per UNFC code (111) may be corrected in all the relevant tables.
7. Para 2.0: As certain bench correction work is observed, the bench parameters need to be discussed and details should be indicated under the para. The statement regarding backfilling is vague, the proposals if any during the current document need to be discussed clearly. Pit nos indicated in table no.18 should be corrected as excavation is restricted to pit-1 only.
8. Para 2.0(f): Details furnished under the para i.e. depth of mining, no. of benches are contrary to details furnished earlier sub para's of same para, needs verification for correctness. Also indicated the ultimate pit limit as 205mX110mX41m, which is less than the size of existing pit-1 should be verified and corrected.
9. Para 4.0(b): Composition of mineral waste may be discussed under the para and the proposed yearwise waste generation is about 2000 tonnes per year besides side burden, but the place for waste has not discussed under the para, as stated plate nos.V and VI are showing dumps. Yearwise proposals for back filling is not discussed under the para, but para 8.3.5 under PMCP mentioned that 014 hect., area proposed for backfilling for each year. The scheme of yearwise back filling details may be discussed and drawn clearly.

10. The financial assurance submitting along with final copies of Review of Mining Plan should contain e-mail ID of the bank/concerned person for verification of the same.
11. All the chapters of PMCP, feasibility report, UNFC report should be reconciled as per scrutiny for the paras of review of mining plan.

Annexures:

12. Annexure VI: Copy of acknowledgement to renewal application issued by government of Tamilnadu need to be enclosed.

Plates:

13. Plate no.II : Grid values need to marked on the plan and all other plates.
14. Plate noIV-A: Limestone band parameters shown for the cross section X4Y4-A5B5 are not matching to table no.13,should be verified and corrected.
15. Plate no. V-A: Cross section A-B named wrongly as A2-B2, should be corrected. The cross sections (Plate IVA & VA) may be redrawn on the scale of 1:1000 for horizontal and vertical. Since the extent of lease area is small and there are no constraints in drawing the same scale. 2 more cross sections may be drawn 1 each on either side of the section A-B at equal intervals in Plate No. VA for ascertaining the exact volume of excavation.
16. Plate IV : It has been indicated PBH-11 at 2 places. The PBH-11 indicated at south east corner may be indicated as PBH-12 instead of PBH-11.

.....