

Scrutiny comments on Review of Mining Plan for Keeripatty Magnesite mine over an area 6.29ha in Keeripatty village, Attur taluk of Salem district Owned by M/s Prabha Enterprise under rule 17(1) of MCR, 2016 & rule 23 of MCDR-1988 for the period from 2017-18 to 2021-22.

General:

1. Mining lease granted was non-contiguous distributed as two blocks need to be mentioned under the para. Filing of W.P.No.3088/87 with High Court of Chennai & issue of proceeding of Roc.No.517/1996/Mines-A dated 07.04.2014 by district Collector should be indicated before the para of application for first renewal of ML. A copy of GO.87 dated 16.2.1987 need to be furnished in the report. The average annual production figure indicated in page no.2 as per the approved SOM is incorrect should be verified and corrected.
2. In the document the rule may be mentioned as per MCR,2016 and MCDR,2017 wherever applicable.
3. Certified copies of Educational qualification and experience certificate of qualified person may be enclosed.
4. Para 1.0(d): Details of minerals as per lease deed need to be furnished. Furnishing irrelevant details/information should be avoided.
5. Para 1.0(e): The sentence should be proper by including the word "granted".
6. Para 2.0 : The document is submitted under small B category, but for loading and transport tippers and trucks are proposed. Hence, may be submitted under Category A-OTFM.
7. Para 2.0: Expiry date indicated is incorrect, should be calculated as per MMDR Act-2015. Meaningful sentence should be written against sub para (b) as per the format. The range of co-ordinates should be furnished as observed in the field under the sub para (c) and in location plan.
8. Para 3.1: Reasons for delay in submission of SOM, though district Collector issued Roc.No.517 on 07.04.2014 need to be discussed under the para.
9. Para 3.3 Exploration: Reason mentioned is not proper & justifiable should be corrected. The actual yearwise quantities for the years 2014-15 & 2015-16 against exploitation and waste management are one and same should be verified and corrected.

Part-A

10. Para 1.0: Co-ordinates range should be furnished and the statement furnished about the terrain is incorrect, as the altitude difference of ground level and office shed located on the Block-II is about 20m, should be corrected in other para's also.
11. Para 1.0(d): The statement about magnesite occurrence may be corrected as "network of magnesite veins exposed on the working faces" instead of exposed on surface mentioned in page.11. The colour of magnesite mentioned as grey to brown is incorrect, need to be corrected as observed in the field. The irrelevant information on grade of magnesite and surface plan may be omitted.
12. Para 1.0(i)&(j) : The proposed bore holes on dump of Block-II may be avoided as the dumps are more than 20m, accordingly it may be redrafted. Reserve estimation table no.12 is not showing the UNFC code, should be indicated. Resource estimation table no.13 shows, 7.5m boundary barrier band -1&2 should be corrected to block 1&2 and the dimensions may be verified for correctness.

13. Para 1.0(l): The statement of maximum depth of working 44m from general ground level is incorrect, as magnesite deposit is being mined from a hillock. Hence the statement should be corrected and its depth from general ground also need to be mentioned under the para. The quantity unit indicated for table.14 should be corrected.

14. Para 2.0: Construction of bund to prevent inrush of rainwater is discussed but, no yearwise bund proposal is seen in tables for protective measures under para 8.3.5.

15. Table 17 : Since 5 months already over in the year 2017-18, it may be indicated in the column No.1 (year) as 2017-18 (01.09.2017 to 31.03.2018). Production proposal for the year 2017-18 may also be proposed on prorata basis for the remaining months.

16. Para 2.0(f)(03): No of benches mentioned under the para is incorrect, should be corrected. General occurrence of magnesite need to be discussed under nature of ore body sub para in page 32 instead of mentioning no of bands.

17. Para 2.0(f) Page.33: Under para type waste generation and area for proposed back filling has been stated, but the exact location/block should be discussed and marked on the plate. Sufficient area for stacking waste should be proposed.

18. Para 8.3.5: Back filling is proposed over 0.14 hect to 0.21 hect with quantity for all the 5 years but, in para 8.3.1 stated clearly no proposal of backfilling, which is contrary should be clarified, also mentioned as new ML which should be corrected.

19. Para 8.6: Financial assurance should be calculated as applicable to rule 27 of MCDR-2017 instead of Rs.95,000/- indicated.

20. All the chapters of PMCP, feasibility report, UNFC report should be reconciled as per scrutiny for the paras of review of mining plan.

21. The boundary pillars erected are not as per the CCOM circular. All pillars needs to be erected as per CCOM Circular and photographs in this regard may be submitted.

22. The copies of valid environmental clearance and pollution clearance may be submitted.

Annexures:

23. Few more photographs showing the land use of mine need to be annexed. Title of photograph should indicate working pit of which block. All annexures should be signed by the Qualified Person.

Plates:

24. General: Date & details of surveyor have not indicated on any plan.

25. Plate no.II : SF nos of ML need to be marked on the plan.

26. Plate no.III: A temporary shed on southern side on block-II should be marked and house located on the western side of ML need to be taken as one of the ground control point and linked to the nearest boundary pillar.

27. Plate no.V: Proposed backfilling area should be shown with prominent colour and indexed.

28. Plate no.VII: A house located on the western side of ML need to be marked on the plan.