

Table Scrutiny comments on the Mining Plan submitted by M/s vertex Cements Pvt Limited. in respect of Limestone deposit at Gangavaram (v), Gurajala Mandal,Guntur (A.P) over an extent of 623.039 ha.

1. The area under consideration for mining plan was held under prospecting license by M/s Vertex Cements(P) Limited, a company incorporated under companies Act. PL for the purpose was granted on 29.01.2014 and PL agreement signed over 623.8 hectare area. From the records available with this office (correspondence side), it is clear that the lessee submitted the scheme of prospecting on date 17.04.2014 and the modified scheme of prospecting on date 17.12.2014.

Comment on the status of compliance of letter issued by the IBM on prospecting report to the applicant was received by this office on 25.08.2015.

It has been noticed that the lessee is neither having ownership of the land proposed for mining nor he has the consent of the owner of the land for the proposed mining operations. For which the lessee has submitted that he will not undertake mining operation without the permission/ acquisition of the land from the owner.

The area is traversed by string of channels for irrigation, for which the lessee need to record that the irrigation system , being a public utility will not be affected unless and until the permission of the competent authority is taken.

2. The document needs to be signed by the nominated owner authorized by the board of Directors of the company, as per the guidelines for preparation of Mining Plan. The resolution of board of Director be enclosed. The CLEAR LEGIBLE identity and address proof of the nominated owner be enclosed.

3. It has been observed that the list of survey number mentioned in the Annexure to Lol are not tallying with the survey number shown in the submitted lease sketch; the part survey numbers are not shown in the lease sketch so the boundary pillar coordinates certified by the state Government are being considered for the disposal of this document.

In the revised sketch produced by the lessee, boundary pillar coordinates have been submitted. A lot of patches have been shown to be out of lease area/ not recommended and their coordinates have not been submitted. Hence, the original, signed copy of the revised lease sketch, certified by the state ADMG be submitted.

4. All surface and geological plan and sections be submitted in the scale of 1:2000 and in two parts.
5. Key Plan: The key plan be submitted as per rule 32(5) showing the contours and other details. WGS-84 toposheet may be obtained from Survey of India and key plan be drawn and copy thereof submitted .
6. The drainage defined on page 11 does not goes with the plates. Clarify and correct.

7. Surface Plan: The irrigation channel have not been marked on the surface plan, but they are shown on the lease plan. Clarify .
8. The Drainage pattern of the lease area be submitted w.r.t the canals/ gullies/ streams through lease area and the Krishna river to the north of lease area. Comment of the highest flood level in the area and that of the river..
9. Geology:
 1. In para 1.0(c), it has been submitted that there is no pay zone as such and the entire mineral will be transported. It is incorrect and cannot be substantiated as only 44 hectare area has been explored at G1 level. Thus the sentence be removed.
 2. However as per the table on page 16, average grade of Flaggy limestone is 69% TC and that of RBL shaly limestone is 76.8% TC, which is not useable. Thus the submission that will be no subgrade is too early to commit hence be removed . Further the present detailed exploration is in grey Limestone only and not much data is available on other bands , across the large lease area.
 3. The submission on page 27 that there is no need to assess the reserve or resources lithounitwise is not justifiable in light of the fact that Light Cement grade limestone is having a Tc of 78.9 % , Flaggy is 69.1 % Tc and reddish Brown Limestone low cement grade and reddish Brown Limestone shale portion is having a TC of 81% and 76.8, whereas in general the plant requirement is 84% TC.
In light of above lithounit wise reserves and resources be assessed and submitted with back up calculation. The grade of the reserves be assessed as well.
 4. The lithology submitted in PL report seems to have been redefined for preparation of mining plan, as seen in the form K revised submitted at Annexure-11. Clarify.
 5. The plans and sections need to be submitted on 1:2000 as per MCD R'88 and accordingly corrections be done in the text. UNFC codes be shown on the geological section. In the enclosed geological section, the lithologs and sections can not be checked/ corelated. Further the Geological Plan and sections are not matching, as the OML area and the mineral blocked in irrigation channel field have not been accounted for in section and accordingly mineable mineral reserves are also not correct.
 6. It has been observed that 15m buffer has been on irrigation channel and field roads instead of 50m , clarify.
 7. The cut off grade submitted in the text and the PL report are not in consonance. Clarify.

Geological Plan and section:

8. The future exploration proposal be incorporated in the document as per MEMC Rules and MCDR to bring the area under **G1 level of exploration**. The proposal be given in the following format upto the marker bed.

9. Justification for considering the area under G3 level of exploration be given.
10. Submit the correct feasibility report incorporating the capital Cost , Net present value of the project depending on the cash flow and the pay back period.
11. Comment on conversion factor from cement to clinker and clinker to limestone be submitted. Also propose the test for the purpose if the same has not been undertaken .

Mining

12. Describe the layout of mine working pit road layout, layout of waste and top soil disposal as per the guidelines for mining plan at the proper place.
13. Opening of a new pit in fifth year is not justified and be accommodated in the first pit only.
14. It should be submitted that the lessee will take all the clearances, from the respective authorities AS as required for undertaking the works i.e, EC, CoP, CoE, , permissions from PESO, CGWB, DGMS, etc.
15. As the ground water is submitted to be very high, no work should be undertaken without, the permission of CGWB, Further the Ground water study report is required to assess the make of water in the pit and corresponding pumping capacity for the mine need to be provided . Corresponding corrections are required in Mine drainage chapter.

Conceptual Plan:

16. It should be submitted at the beginning that the conceptual exploration may change depending on the exploration results and other parameters. Based on the established reserves the Conceptual plan has been submitted.
17. In the chapter on conceptual plan submit the ultimate pit limit as per the explored area (G1)/ established reserves only.
18. Exploration: Submit the area explored and and the area required to be explored under G1 category
19. Conceptual Plan & section: The pit , dump, afforestation status at the end of the reserves established be shown. Conceptual period working be shown in the five year blocks.
20. Discuss the land put to use for infrastructure purpose.

Progressive Mine Closure Plan:

21. The information on expenditure towards yearwise reclamation activities be submitted correctly.
22. The base line data pertains to which period, which agency has collected it and whether it has been collected as per MoEf norm or not need to be recorded.
23. If due to aforesaid changes, the data in other chapter or plates changes, they may please be done accordingly and ensure the consistency of the data submitted in various chapters of the document.

