

SCRUTINY COMMENTS ON THE MINING PLAN OF VIBHUTI GUDDA IRON ORE MINE OF M/S VIBHUTI GUDDA MINES PVT. LTD., OVER AN AREA OF 5.67 HA AS PER THE LEASE DEED & AS PER THE CEC SKETCH, M.L. NO.80, IN VILLAGE BELAGAL, BALLARI TALUK, IN BALLARY DISTRICT, KARNATAKA STATE.SUBMITTED UNDER RULE 16(1) OF MCR,2016. CATEGORY OF THE MINE IS A (FM-FULLY MECHANISED MINE, THEPROPOSED DOCUMENT PERIOD IS FROM 2013-14 TO2017-18, (BUT EFFECTIVE FROM I.E. AUGUST'16 TO 2017-2018).

COVER PAGE

1. The document should be submitted under rule 16(1) of MCR, 2016 and not under rule 12(2) of MCDR, 1988, with the latest amendments. In the light of the above remarks, the whole text and the plates need to be modified, wherever applicable.
2. The extent of the area is given as 5.67 ha, which need to be indicated as per lease deed what is the extent & as per CEC sketch. The ML number is not written. The name of the qualified person prepared the document must be indicated.
3. The Online registration number of the company may be indicated. The one indicated in page -2, is not correct.
4. The validity of ML period as per the MMDR, amendment Act, 2015 must be indicated.
5. The ML area falls under Bellary reserve forest, instead of furnishing reserve forest, it is mentioned as just forest land.

GENERAL

6. In the consent letter, the letter need to be signed by the lessee/ owner, instead it is mentioned as director. The document submitted under Rule 24A of MCR, 1960/12 of MCDR 1988, but in cover page, it is given as rule 12 of MCDR, 1988, are not appropriate. The qualified person prepared the document must be careful in preparing the document, by indicating appropriately the rule position, instead of reflecting wrongly.The RQP certificate number indicated must be deleted. In the light of the above remarks, the text para must be attended, including the plates, wherever applicable. In the future, the word Recognized qualified person must be replaced with qualified person. The contact number/ mobile email & fax number of the qualified person has not indicated. Para 2 need to be corrected suitably. Wherever, scheme of mining is written, need to be replaced with mining plan. Extension of time under section 8(5) of MMDR Act, letter issued by state Govt., or not may be indicated. The submitted document under rule 16(1) will be approved under rule 17(1) of MCR,2016.
7. The list of annexures, given in table format, must be added with number of pages, in each annexure may be indicated for easy reference.
8. All the annexures letter must be appropriately given with topic/ content of the respective letter may be given in short.
9. Annexure-7, pertains to the RQP, must be replaced with qualification and the experience certificate of the qualified person for the proof of his competency as per rule 15(1) of MCR, 2016.
10. Irrespective of photographs of the mine, infrastructure, etc., may be written with names of the mine & lessee for clarity and easy reference.
11. The annexure-10, mentioned for violation letter, but along with suspension letter & the discontinuance notice were there, which need to be indicated separately.
12. In annexure 12, 13, 14, etc. are furnished without indicating the name of the mine/ lessee for clarity.
13. The annexure-16 must be submitted in the main text document para itself, instead of furnishing in annexures side.
14. The annexure-17 must be replaced with the latest report.
15. In para 1, the introductory part, though the reason for submission of document is indicated, is not appropriate. Besides, the ML period expired on 6.4.2008, forthwith, lessee did have approved mining

plantill 2015-16, and till date. In addition to that, the reserve part is not dealt, if the reserve remains the same as per the previous approved documents, it should be emphasized, that there is no change in the reserve part and the previous document was approved letter No. 279/219/1990/BNG/2015 dated on 25/8/2014. Now the document is submitted separately for the ML. No.80. All the above information must be dealt, with clarity without any anomaly.

16. In para 1(f), it should be written as qualified person under rule 15(1) of MCR, 2016. In the light of the above remarks, RQP & recognized must be removed, the text and the plates need to be attended, wherever applicable.

17. In para 2(b), under the details of leases area held by the lessee, must be given in tabular form as per the guidelines, the one submitted for the present lease No.80 is not correct. The present status of the lease must be furnished and the extension of leases obtained under which rule must be specified.

18. In para 3.1, the details of approved mining plan/ scheme of mining, approved upto 2011 period only indicated, but the last document approved dated 25/8/2014 is not indicated, which ought to have been and later withdrawal other details may be given.

PART-A

19. In para 1(a), the need to be described about the lease area appropriately.

19. In para 1(l), in table-10, the updated reserve/ resources as on 15.05.2014 is indicated, instead of the latest date 1.4.2016. In the light of the above remarks, the text and the plates may be attended, wherever applicable.

20. In para 2A (a), it is given in table 11, the height of the bench is 9m & the width is 10m, the top & bottom RL referred here is not appropriate. Besides, wherever scheme of mining is indicated need to be changed suitably to the present submission in the text paras. Further, in the same para, the production limit is indicated 0.037million tonne per annum, instead of the 0.027mtpa as per the CEC limit, which should be rectified.

21. In para 2(b), in table-12, the financial year 2016-17 need to be corrected as August, 2016 to March, 2017 and the proposals for the year 2018-19 & 2019-20 may be deleted, which will be submitted 180 days before the expiry of this document, based on the modification in the five years proposals from 2013-14 to 2017-18 respectively. Besides, the production proposals from April to July, 16 should be reduced accordingly from the annual production proportionately prorate basis. In the light of the above remarks, the text tables need to be corrected accordingly, wherever applicable.

22. In para 2(d), under drilling, it is given, average bulk density for both waste & ore is taken as 2.7t/m³ is not appropriate and correct. In the light of the above remarks, the related paras and the tables must be attended, wherever applicable.

23. In para 2(e), in page-30, under layout of mine workings, it is given, that the during the plan period, the mine is worked with 9m bench height and the width is more than the height, in other para it is given height of 9m and the width is 10m is not appropriate, better to propose without any difference.

24. In para 2(f), the life of the mine is calculated taking 0.038MTPA, against the permitted quantity of 0.027MTPA, which should be reconciled. Besides, the recovery factor taken as 95% is also found to be on higher side, which should be reconciled.

25. In table-17, the R & R proposals drawn is indicated, but in column-6, in 1st row, out of 248m dry rubble wall, 124m completed, remaining rubble wall completion period is not indicated, which must be pertaining to this ML area and not to club with other area .e. ML. No. 2469.

26. In para 7(b), table-23, the employment of mining engineer, must be indicated.

27. In para 8.3.1, under mined out land, it is expected to furnish, if there is any mined out land present in the ML area or not, which should be specified. Further, other details may be indicated.

28. In para 8.3.5, in table-30, the year wise proposals, should be specified with financial year, instead of mentioning 1st year, 2nd year etc.

29. In para 8.6, table-34, under financial assurance, the copy of the valid bank guarantee need to be enclosed. The amount indicated is not appropriate, which should be corrected as minimum of Rs. 200,000(Rupees Two lakhs only).

PART-B

PLATES:

30. Key Plan (Plate No.1): The approach road to the mine needs to be marked on the plan, with approximate distance from the known place.

31. Surface Plan (Plate no.3): The position of three GCP's are not brought out in the surface plan, instead of showing separately as part plan. The extent of the area as per ML deed & as per CEC must be written. The date of survey is written as 26.04.2014, which should be corrected and give the latest date. In the light of the above remarks, the all the plates must be attended suitable, wherever applicable as rule 28(1) (a)(b) & 28(5)(a)(b) of MCDR,1988.

32. Geological Plan (Plate no.4): The exploration undertaken in the past reveals only one in the ML area is found to be not appropriate. Few more bore holes should have undertaken in the idle of the ML area to understand the behavior of the ore body at depth.

33. Geological section (Plate no.5): The UPL marked and notation given in the index part must be changed as Ultimate pit slopes, instead of ultimate pit limit.

34. Pit Lay Out plan (Plate No.6A-2016-17): The proposals drawn to develop and produce iron ore for the year and for the year 2017-18 must be restricted and modified as per the scrutiny remarks given in the text part and suitably changed.

35. Environment Plan (Plate No.8): The other ML areas of other lessees if any present within the buffer zone, the name of the mine or the village for reference must be depicted.

36. Conceptual Plan & Section (Plate No.9): The conceptual plan should be attended and modified based on the scrutiny remarks, whatever the reclamation and rehabilitation work proposed to undertake in the form of water reservoir, back filling if any, need to be brought out in the plan as well in the sections.