

Scrutiny Comments on Review of Mining Plan with PMCP for Seerapalli Magnesite Mine over an area of 1.45.0 hectares in Sreepalli Village Paramathi -Taluk and Namakal-District, Tamil Nadu State of M/s. Evergreen Enterprises. Mine code-39TMN23004(Date of MCDR Inspection-01/08/2018).

- 1) **The introduction notes is not correctly spelled as the MMDR amended Act 2015 section 8(9) which states that** “The provisions of this section, notwithstanding anything contained therein, shall not apply to a mining lease granted before the date of commencement of the Mines and Minerals (Development and Regulation) Amendment Act, 2015, for which renewal has been rejected, or which has been determined, or lapsed..”
- 2) As per the court order dated 14/02/2018 enclose mining lease grant order from state govt.
- 3) Page-7 – the maximum depth stated as 13 meter but during inspection it is found that it is more than 22 meter hence detailed survey work should be done and exact RL should be given in all the plan and section.
- 4) Page-8“Production for the during subsequent years from 2004-5 onwards cannot be incorporated now as the actual production is shown in these years which is violation of the rule” – the text should be corrected accordingly.
- 5) Photographs of Boundary pillars as per ccom circulars should be enclosed.
- 6) Depletion of reserve should be matching with respect to earlier approved M.S and neither % recovery should be changed. otherwise the annual return of last three years of approved Mining scheme period showing the % age recovery w.r.t ROM should be enclosed.
- 7) Page-9- details regarding the mining lease should be incorporated in point 3.5.
- 8) Page-14 – reassessed the mineral reserve as per scrutiny comment no-6 and correct the subsequent tables.
- 9) Page-20- if the last approved mining scheme/mining plan was upto year 2003-2004, the subsequent mining scheme validity will be 2004-2005 to 2008-2009 and so on, hence this plan will be from 2014-15 to 2018-19 period. It should be corrected wherever required in full text.
- 10) Mine development table(table-14) should be corrected scrutiny comment no-9 in page-9.
- 11) Para-3.4 – status of standing violation in incorrect-it should be corrected.
- 12) Para-1(h)page-13- it should be corrected as per scrutiny comments-9.
- 13) Reserves and resources- the reserve and resources should be recalculated as per scrutiny comments no-6.further it should be incorporated wherever it is required in the text.
- 14) Para-2-A(a&b)- the yearwise planning should be changed with respect to scrutiny comments no-9.
- 15) Page-23 para-2 f(ii)- the OMS calculated is seams to be very high as the % age of recovery is only 4-6%.it should be corrected.
- 16) Para-5-a-page26- the cost of production per ton indicates that labour cost is Rs1100 per ton which is not matching with the OMS.

Plates: - 1) plate-IV- the geological plan and section should be made in separate plates.

2) the dip direction should be given in geological plan.

3)separate year wise plan and cross-section should be enclosed.

4)Financial assurance plan is be submitted.

Annexure- 1) Copy of valid G.O / Lease document is to be enclosed.