

SCRUTNY CUM INSPECTION REPORT OF REVIEW OF MINING PLAN OF DUGAR VERMICULITE MINE-III OF M/s DUGAR VERMICULITE PRIVATE LIMITED SPEARD OVER AN AREA OF 2.707 HECTRES IN PALICHARLA VILLAGE GUDUR MNADAL NELLORE DISTRICT IN ANDHARAPRADESH

TEXT:

1. In cover, page rule under which the document submitted, lease area details like Lease area, (in Ha & Acres), Land schedule(Forest, Non-Forest and if non forest whether Government land, Private land), Lease period Validity as per executed lease deed only and present status, Name of Lessee, Name of Qualified person etc. should also be furnished.
2. The rule under which the document submitted should have been furnished as under Rule 17(2) of MC(OH&EM)R, 2016.
3. Consent letter/ Undertaking/ Certificates from the applicant should be submitted on company's original letter head duly dated and signed.
4. Only the person authorized from the Resolution of board of directors of the company should sign the document and submitted.
5. Certificate from qualified person, MCDR, 2017 has already been notified, instead of quoting the same MCDR, 1988 is furnished, should be corrected.
6. Introduction chapter, it is stated that lessee name has changed as DUGAR INSULATIONS INDIA PRIVATE LIMITED and the mine is for captive consumption, but above changes have not been accepted by competent authority of State government and as per the lease deed the lessee is "DUGAR VERMICULITE PRIVATE LIMITED" and the mine is '**non captive mine**'. In this regard only the details as per the lease deed should be furnished and corrected.
7. Validity of lease period has already been expired on 11.11.2007, status of the lease should be furnished with supporting document, if any.
8. Lease consist of non-contagious two blocks, block no. should be designated for easy reference.
9. Boundary pillars should be posted in the lease area as per the provision of rule 12(v) of M(OTAHM)CR,2016 and photographs of the same should be submitted.
10. All the tables should be serially numbered and index of the same should be furnished for easy reference.
11. Method of mining should be changed from manual category-B to category-A mine.

Review

12. Review should have been carried out for the five years period only i.e. 2012-13 to 2016-17 instead from 2007-08 onwards.
13. Substantiate deviation in production has been observed but reason for such deviation has not been furnished.
14. Excess production has been carried out for the years 2014-15 & 2016-17 i.e.

Year	Proposal	Achieved
2014-15	704	2590
2016-17	310	1305

15. Incorrect information has been furnished in the document in respect of production, i.e. for the year 2013-14 & 2014-15, 2590 MT & 2000 MT of ore was produced respectively; but in the document the same is stated as 1770 MT for the year 2013-14 & NIL for the year 2014-15. Relevant para/tables in the document should be modified in view of the above.
16. Annual return for the years 2013-14, 2014-15, 2015-16 should be submitted through online and enclosed.
17. Status of reclamation should be furnished in detail in tabular form incorporating Area under mining, area matured for reclamation (mineral exhausted), area matured for rehabilitation in reclaimed area, area rehabilitated so far.

GEOLOGY & EXPLORATION

18. Trial pits from 10 to trial pit no.20 is stated to be completed but chemical analysis report from Govt. lab / NABL lab has not been submitted. Further photographs of the same should have been submitted for easy reference.
19. Page 36, expenditure incurred for 11 no. of trial pits is furnished as Rs. 10 Lakhs, which on higher side needs justification.
20. Copy of Form K should be submitted in respect of exploration carried out so far.
21. Trial pits have not been observed in Eastern Block of the lease area, reserves assessed in this area cannot be acceptable.
22. During field observation it was observed that occurrence of ore is below 8 meters, in this context few bore holes should be proposed for future exploration for depth continuity of ore in the lease area.
23. Details of exploration carried out should be furnished in the tabular form as below and the same should be depicted in geological plan.

SL no.	Area explored under	Total	lease
--------	---------------------	-------	-------

	G1 level (ha)	G2 level (ha)	G3 level (ha)	Unexplored area (ha)	area

24. Reserves have been estimated in North-Eastern side of Eastern block of lease area without any exploration by pitting and trenching, which cannot be acceptable. Reserves should be assessed only in the area explored under G1 & G2 category. Reserves should be recalculated and submitted.
25. Reserves should be estimated as per the provision of ME&MC Rules 2015 also, accordingly categorization of the deposit, Grid interval etc. should be corrected.
26. Detailed calculation in respect of Reserves/ resources estimated has not been furnished, the detail should be furnished in tabular form incorporating Section considered, sectional area, length of influence, Total volume, ROM, % Recovery of ore in ROM, Bulk Density, Tonnage, Stripping ratio etc. for easy reference.
27. Table in page no.53 should be corrected in view of comment at sl. no.12.
28. Tables in respect of reserves and resources in page no. 49,59,61 & 62 are contradictory. There cannot be any reserves without exploration under G1/G2 category.

MINING

29. Present status of working should be submitted in tabular form incorporating dimension of quarry, grid lines, top RL, bottom RL, No. of benches in ore & waste, bench height & width etc.
30. Table at page no.64, tentative excavation should be furnished in cubic meter instead of in Tonnes as per the prescribed format. Year should have been stated to be from 2017-18 to 2021-22 instead of I,II...V. Further while estimation of reserves/ resources recovery % is considered as 80% of ROM whereas in tentative excavation the same is considered as 50%, which is contradictory.
31. Total tonnage of Ore proposed for production is stated to be 9715 MT but no such quantum of reserves are available in the lease, which cannot be acceptable. Quantum of reserves estimated production proposal of ore should be furnished.
32. Page no.65. details furnished in table (waste dump re-handling) are irrelevant.
33. During field inspection it was observed that drilling & blasting is required for development of benches in western block of lease area, accordingly method of mining, machinery details etc. should be modified and submitted incorporating all the details.

34. Year wise development proposal should be submitted only in the area in which ore occurrence had been geologically proved, year wise proposal should be suitably modified and submitted.
35. Backfilling will be allowed only in the area where the ore is exhausted, ore is found to exist in Western block but proposal of backfilling is submitted which cannot be acceptable.
36. Conceptual plan should be modified in view of comments at sl. no. 22, 32.
37. It is proposed to produce 1943 MT of ore per year in page no.64, whereas in page no.70 for calculation of life of the mine production of ore per year is furnished as 980 MT which is contradictory.
38. Details furnished in Page no. 81 to 85 in respect of Underground mining is not applicable to this mine, hence should not be submitted.

STACKING OF MINERAL REJECT AND DISPOSAL OF WASTE

39. Entire should be modified in view of comment at sl no.33.

USE OF MINERAL

40. Factory is situated outside of this lease area, the mine is not captive mine as per lease deed and ore is used for the consumption in the lessee factory accordingly relevant para should be suitably corrected.

PROGRESSIVE MINE CLOSURE PLAN

41. Refer page no. 49, total Reserves estimated are 5425 MT but in page 102 the reserves were stated to be 10,000 MT, which are contradictory.
42. Refer page no. 113, Summary of year wise proposal should be furnished instead of submitting blank.

PLATES:

1. Key plan submitted is not incorporating the details as required under the provision of rule 32(5)(a) of MCDR, 2017, all the details should be incorporated as per statue and submitted.
2. The surface plan should be duly dated and signed by Agent/ Mines manager and Surveyor. Further access road to the both the block should be depicted.
3. UNFC code should have been depicted in Geological plans and sections, Development Plans and sections, Conceptual plans and section, for easy reference.
4. Reclamation plan should be submitted instead of Environment management plan.

5. Financial assurance plan submitted is not depicted clearly the area degraded due mining and allied activities as per the table. Specific colors should have been used for depicting specific details as per the table for easy reference.

There are irrelevant, in-consist and contradictory data/ statement are furnished, which should be avoided corrected/ modified.

In view of the comments above, relevant para, plans and sections should be suitably modified