

Scrutiny Comments on examination of the Review of Mining Plan with Progressive Mine Closure Plan for Thob-I Selenite mine (ML no. 10/1992) over an area 126.77hactare located near village – Thob, Tehsil – Pachpadra District – Barmer submitted on behalf of M/s Rajasthan State Mines & Minerals Ltd. under rule17(2) and rule 23 of MCDR 2017. Date of inspection- 11/7/2017

1. The present submission may be under rule 17(2) of MCR 2016 & rule 23 of MCDR 2017. The correction may be made in all the relevant places. Lease period may also be given on cover page.
2. Copy of experience certificate as required under rule 15 of MCR 2016 of authorised persons is not found enclosed as stated it is enclosed as annexure -8.
3. The coordinate given for all the pillars are not verified by the State DMG official. Hence on demarcation report or any other the coordinate for the all pillars should be verified by State DMG Officials.
4. Para 3.3(Review of earlier approval proposal)
 - (i) The review of exploration should be given year wise.
 - (ii) The total of Year wise proposed production table is not correct.
 - (iii) The PMCP proposal is not reviewed. The year wise land degradation, mine development, Backfilling, phased reclamation proposal, plantation proposal etc. should be reviewed year wise.
 - (iv) Para 3.4 Status of compliance of violation may be given in tabular form in chronological order for the reviewed plan period. The status of violation letter issued by this office on 1/9/2016 is missing. The violation letter issued on 16/1/2017 is not pointed out by Senior Geologist. It is issued by RCOM.
 - (v) Para 3.6 The rule mentioned is not correct in title may be corrected. As rule 9 and 10 of MCDR 1988 has no relevance at present

5. Part –A Chapter 1.0 (Geology and Exploration)

- I The chemical analysis and physical properties and bulk density etc. should be discussed under the chapter.
- II The basis of reserves and resources estimation in current plan period has not been given. Why the reserves and resources increased without additional exploration during last plan period.
- III Table regarding Mineral Resources: (Mineral resources may be estimated purely based on level of exploration) has not given.

Level of Exploration	Area in hectare	Resources in million tons	Grade	Remarks
G1 - Detailed exploration				
G2 - General Exploration				
G3 – Prospecting				
G4- Reconnaissance				

- IV For UNFC table the justification of parameter considers for the estimation of category wise reserve and resources under UNFC has to be explained in detailed like strike length, width and depth of ore body is considered for different category. The resources blocked under statutory boundary and under benches beyond UPL should also be given separately. The various UNFC codifications may also be given in geological sections and on surface geological plan. The reserves and resources may reconcile.
- V The future exploration programme has not been discussed. The exploration programme is to given in order to convert resources into reserves and confirmation of mineral in virgin area , hence a remark column in table showing the purpose of exploration is to be given. All resources may be explored for G-1 level within 2 years

6. Part-A Chapter-2- Mining-

- i The recovery of saleable mineral given in insitu excavation table and detailed calculation sheet is not correlated. Total excavation data and other data are confusing, it may be clarified and consolidated table for giving year wise subtotal, total and grand total may be given.
- ii The details regarding size of existing pit with number of benches and depth may be given
- iii The year wise layout of mine workings should also be described in brief indicating year wise working, excavation, development direction, indicating pit no. and supported with grid pattern
- iv All mining proposal should be supported with Grid references.
- v List of machinery deployed may be given with their specification and capacity.

vi Para 2.4 Conceptual Mining Plan- The pit size, UPL, exploration proposal, dump size, Quantity of waste/reject, land degradation reclamation etc for first five year and after next five year or for life of mine is not given. This information may be given in tabular form also. Concrete backfilling and reclamation with afforestation program should be clearly given. Simultaneous year wise backfilling proposal for mined out area may be submitted.

7. Chapter 4.0 The chapter title and information has not given as per guidelines. The Year wise table for generation of top soil, OB and rejects has not been given. The dumping ground location and size also not described.
8. To secure the fines of screening a temporary retaining wall around may be proposed.
9. Chapter 7.0 other information is also not as per guidelines. Site services, employment potential and OMS etc is not described. The details of Mines manager, mining engineer, geologist as per provision of MCDR 2017 should be given.

10. **Chapter 8.0 PMCP**

I The area shown in status of land as on April 2017 table and status of land march 2017 & March 2022 under backfilled and covered under green belt on reclaimed/backfilled area is not true. The 100% mined out area cannot be considered as backfilled as the open pit is observed in the area. Like this until the vegetation grown on backfilled area like original ground condition before start of mining cannot be claimed as reclaimed area. The area coved under green belt in virgin area as per proposal given in last approved plan may be given separately.

II The demographic pattern of the area nearby villages is not given.

III Para 8.6 of PMCP. The table is not found correct. The area of 6.43 hact area shown under area put on use at start of mining and column for proposed area/ additional requirement is blank. The 6.45hact as given in land use table in PMCP chapter may be given in put to use at the start of this plan period column area 6.43 may be under additional requirement column. In the table the financial assurance for the area put for mining and its allied activities is not properly calculated. The area which is fully reclaimed and rehabilitated (by plantation or another use like original ground condition) is only considered as fully reclaimed and rehabilitated for exempt for financial assurance calculation. In this case the area (6.45hact) claimed is not fully reclaimed and rehabilitated and cannot be considered for exemption. Hence the financial assurance should be given for total area i.e 13.94

hectare. As per provision of Rule 27(1) of MCDR 2017 financial assurance co-terminus with mining plan period in favour of Regional Controller of Mines, IBM, Ajmer should be submitted in Original with a copy annexed in the documents.

11 Plans & sections;-

- i In key plan coordinates of lease area is not given.
- ii Surface Geological plan & sections-. The UNFC code, UPL, surface features, Category of reserves, Dip and strike, Different zone of proved , probable reserve and other resources have not been marked on plan and section based on exploration so far carried out as per UNFC norm.
- iii In conceptual plan year wise area in hectare to be reclaimed may also be mentioned in table shown on plan.
- iv As per guidelines the **Financial Area Assurance plan** is not found enclosed. A financial assurance plan incorporating all the features as per financial assurance table under par 8.6 should be submitted and the table given for calculation of Financial assurance should also be given on plan and correlate them with actual ground condition.

12 All the above maps/plate will be properly colour index & duly attested and authorised persons with date of survey.

13 Each and every page of text and annexure should be signed by the authorised persons who prepared the mining plan.

Dated 20-07-2017

Place Ajmer

(Chetan Parkash)
Asstt. Mining Geologist
