

**SCRUTINY COMMENTS ON THE MINING PLAN SUBMITTED UNDER RULE 17(3)
OF MCR,2016 FOR JAYANTHIPURAM LIMESTONE MINE(NORTH BAND) OVER
AN EXTENT OF 256.54 HA OF M/S RAMCO CEMENTS LIMITED IN
JAGGAYYAPETA MANDAL,KRISHNA DISTRICT,ANDHRA PRADESH STATE**

1. In The introduction chapter, details of the mining leases held by m/s RAMCO cements in the state of Andhra Pradesh need to be incorporated along with the status of of the lease i.e. working/Non working.
2. In chapter-General at para(f),the rule should be mentioned as Rule 15 of MCR,2016 instead of MCR,1960.
3. Also MCR,1960 to be replaced with MCR,2016 wherever applicable in the document.
4. Under para 3.3, review of the earlier proposals made for the plan period for exploration, excavation, production, afforestation etc was made. In the review, mention to be made of the reserve/resource as on 23.09.2016 as per the earlier approved mining plan and the reserve utilized during 2016-17 to 31.08.2018 need to be incorporated. Accordingly the present reserve/resource for the remaining plan period to be mentioned.
5. In chapter Geology & Exploration, mention about type of drainage pattern to be included.
6. In the same chapter under sub-heading cut off grade, discuss about the threshold value of the Limestone as notified by Indian Bureau of Mines dated 25.04.2018, wherein the threshold value of Limestone has been notified as Cao 3459min) and Mgo 5%(Max).Taking cognizance of this notification, reserves/resources need to be re-casted. The cut off grade need to be mentioned taking into account the Cao% as per notification as Sio₂ has been excluded in the said notification.
7. Table No.18 to Table No.120 need to excluded from text part of the document.
8. Under chapter Mining, indicate the dimensions of the pit no.2 as well though no proposals are made for production from it in the current plan period. The page no.142 has been repeated.
9. The Mineral reject to discussed in the light of the recently notified threshold value notification. The quantity of mineral reject generated below the cut off grade to be stacked separately and quantified.
10. On page 145 it was mentioned that the advancement of the workings will be towards South and East. However, on page no.148, it was mentioned as South and West. This contradiction need to be corrected.

11. Under Mineral reject chapter, yearly generation of mineral reject to be mentioned.
12. In the text it was mentioned that there are three waste dumps in the lease. These dumps need to be marked by way of numbering in the relevant plans for better clarity. The dump No.4 need to be renamed as Mineral Reject dump.
13. It was noticed during the inspection that dump no.3 on Northern side of the lease is barren and the proposed afforestation proposals need to be modified and the plantation to be taken up on the dump no.3. The modification to be made accordingly.
14. In tables 137 & 138, the proposed reclamation by way of backfilling is not shown, though proposals were made for same. This needs to be corrected.
15. In para 8.4 under disaster management plan, name & designation and other contact details of the person to be mentioned.
16. The Financial Assurance as calculated at para no.8.6, including extent as advised in the comments to be submitted along with final copies. along with any other
17. The details of the execution of the G.O. Ms No.71 dated 12.05.2017 pertaining to extension of lease period up to 50 years to be annexed.
18. A copy of the permission letter from DGMS for using Heavy earth Moving Machinery (HEMM) to be enclosed.
19. In the feasibility study annexure, under criteria for reserve calculation, it was mentioned that for SiO₂ 18% was taken as per threshold limit. However, as per the recent notification SiO₂ parameter has been excluded. Accordingly, the same to be modified.
20. In the location plan, distance from the nearest rail head and road head to be mentioned.
21. In plate No.III i.e. Surface Plan:
 - (a) Lease boundary pillars to be marked.
 - (b) It was observed that, two non contiguous blocks of the lease exist on the Eastern side. These two blocks need to be marked with relevant survey no.s and their extent marked in the plan. The same to be discussed in the text part at relevant place.
22. The 7.5 meter barrier zone to be marked on all plans and sections.
23. The gridlines in the plans are missing. All the plans to be connected to National grid and UTM co-ordinates to be given.
24. In plate No.IV i.e. Surface Geological Plan:

- (a) Some extent of lease between dump no.3 on Northern side and mineral reject dump needs to be proved for non mineralization. Four to six boreholes are advised to proposed for the purpose. Accordingly exploration proposals need to be incorporated. This to be mentioned in the text part of the document.
 - (b) G1,G2,G3,G4 extent to be marked on the Geological plan.
25. In plate no. V A i.e. Geological sections:
- (a) Buffer/ safety zone to be marked for nala & roads.
 - (b) All the section lines need to be extended up to lease boundary. Accordingly sections to be modified.
26. In plate V B i.e. Geological sections:
- (a) Section line ML 20.5 missing.
 - (b) All the section lines need to be extended up to lease boundary. Accordingly sections to be modified.
 - (c) In section ML 19.5,G-4 area is wrongly marked.
27. In plate no. X i.e. Environment Plan: few more environmental monitoring stations for Air, Noise, water quality monitoring at various strategic locations/points such as loading/unloading, haul roads, sump, nala in core zone need to be proposed for better environmental monitoring.
28. In plate no. XII i.e Financial Assurance plan, area under recharge pit need to be included for area under put to use and accordingly financial assurance to be calculated and submitted.