

Discrepancies in the Modification in the approved Mining Plan &PMCP of M/s Shakeel Ahmed s/o Aqueel Ahmed, Tehsil Ramtek, District Nagpur, Maharashtra for an area of 3.97hect. submitted under rule 17(3)of MCR 2016 . (Based on site inspection done on 09/05/2017)

- 1) Boundary pillars need to be erected as per CCOM circular 2/2010 (addendum).
- 2) PMCP is an integral part of the mining Plan. Hence document should be submitted as 'Modification in the Approved mining Plan' only.
- 3) On page number 1, lessee is mentioned as a proprietary firm whereas status of the lessee is individual.
- 4) Further on page number 1, for reasons of modifications, 'exploitation of mineral reserves blocked in the pit slope' is mentioned as a reason which is incorrect.
- 5) On page number 1, last para is irrelevant as it has been mentioned that SOM is being submitted whereas the document is Modification in the Approved Mining Plan under Rule 17(3) of MCR'2016.
- 6) On page number 8 under 3.2, mine-code and registration numbers mentioned are incorrect.
- 7) Under chapter 5, in the review of earlier approved proposal, the details of boreholes furnished are not correct with reference to the same details furnished in the earlier approved scheme of mining for the period 2012-13 to 2016-17, ie number of boreholes drilled, Collar mRL, depth of boreholes drilled and ore zone intersection details. The details are to be corrected as per the earlier approved document.
- 8) On page number 12 under 5.2, proposed and actual area put to use has been given. It is to be justified:-
 - (i) Proposed area is the additional area requirements in the last scheme period. Actual figures given in the table show that work has been done during last scheme period whereas no production has been done as per review/annual returns and as per the statement mentioned under item (a) on page number 22.

- (ii) Therefore, without any mining, how the actual area has changed? It should remain as per the status of the area mentioned in last approved SOM.
- 9) On page number 11, in the reason for deviations from the proposals, 'no work for want of EC' is mentioned. The same should be written in 5.23 on page number 12 under statutory obligations.
- 10) Under chapter no 6, strike of the formation/ore horizon is not mentioned properly.
- 11) Under chapter Geology and Exploration, fresh calculation of reserves/resources has been made without drilling boreholes. The reporting reserves/resources are to be mentioned as established in the earlier approved document, after depletion of the production. Accordingly modifications /corrections are to be made at all the relevant places of the document.
- 12) Resources blocked under 50 m zone from the canal have not been estimated and shown on the Geological Plan and sections. Thus suitable corrections are required to be made.
- 13) Future exploration proposal is to be made as per in accordance with Rule 12 of MCDR'2017.
- 14) As per the reserves available, all the proposals for mining, conceptual plan, environment management plan and PMCP need to be modified alongwith suitable modifications in the plates. The proposals should limit to the available reserves and proved depth only till further exploration. No vertical influence should be considered while making proposals.
- 15) As per page 21, 10% of the ROM is sub-grade and 10% is mineral reject. Separate stacking for both has not been shown on the plans. Further, grade of both the constituents as well as management of generated sub-grade and mineral rejects need to be discussed.
- 16) In the financial assurance plan, and also in the text, NE part of the pit has been proposed for backfilling in the proposal period but details of the same has not been discussed in the text mentioning source of material etc. thus suitable correction is required. Also, the activity should be shown year-wise in the five years development and production plan and sections.

- 17) Environmental monitoring for all parameters need to be discussed in the text and sampling locations (core zone and buffer zone) should be shown on relevant plates (shown on Environment Plan but not clear).
- 18) Instead of enclosing RQP certificate, suitable documents in terms of Rule 15 of MCR'2016 should be enclosed.
- 19) Copy of Environment Clearance need to be enclosed with the document.
- 20) Copy of FA in terms of Rule 27 of MCDR'2017 need to be enclosed and details should be mentioned on page number 88.

Plates

- 1) All the sections have been plotted incorrectly. Surface profile/existing pits/dumps have not been shown on any of the sections.
- 2) Contours have been shown inside the excavation which is incorrect.
- 2) Plate no V-A, on all the cross sections drawn, the projections of ore body are shown up to the surface level but as noticed during the field visit that there are no outcrops of ore body. Needs corrections/ justification.
- 3) Plate no VA , all the cross section are to be drawn properly ie intersection of manganese ore are to be shown/plotted as mentioned in the text, similarly total depth of the boreholes drilled are to be mentioned.
- 4) Area under G-1/G-2/G-3/G-4/non-mineralized is to be marked on the Geological map.
- 5) In the development and production plan, ore body shown has been shifted from the location shown in the geological plan (actual location). Hence, the plate is irrelevant and it should be suitably corrected.
- 6) Environment Plan: A clear plan should be submitted showing the prominent surface features within 60 m & 500 m as per the provisions of Rule 32(5)(b) of MCDR'2017. Further, all around the lease area, forest land has been shown, but, as the land falls under PRL, forest boundary should be demarcated.