

Scrutiny comments on draft Review of Mining Plan &PMCP for Karikali limestone mine over 1.75.9hect in Karikali village Vedasandur taluk of Dindigul district Owned by D.R.Sakthivel Durai submitted under rule 17(1) of MCR, 2016 & rule 23 of MCDR-2017 for the period from 2017-18 to 2021-22.

1. Introduction:

The Scheme of Mining/Review of Mining Plan was due for submission on 1.12.2016, document submitted after 10 months of the due date. The reasons for the same may be furnished in introduction chapter.

2. Para 2(b): The year wise development and production in cu.m./ton be spelled out in the text from referring co-ordinates, bench RLs, etc with respective plans and sections. The manner by which the year wise disposal of waste/backfilling shall be done be spelled out.
3. Para 3.3(i) Exploration: Submission of “Form-I” required under rule 47 of MCDR-2017 need to be discussed under the para.
4. Para 3.3(ii)Indicate details of suspension/closure : As per the field observations depth of the pit-1 is about 12m should be corrected in all concerned.
5. Para 3.5: The status of suspension order imposed by Director of Mines Safety vide letter dated 24.10.2013 , need to be discussed and vacation of such order if any need submitted.

Part-A

6. Para 1.0 (e-ii): Intimation regarding sinking of bore holes in the required form i.e. in “Form-I” under rule 47 of MCDR-2017 need to be submitted.
7. Para 1.0 k: In view of depth of pit-1 observed about-12m,the area considered for reserve computation for sections XY-EF dimensions indicated should be corrected and table nos19,23 also be corrected.
8. Para 2.0 Mining: No of benches that are exist in OB and ore ,need to be discussed under the para. The quantity of limestone to be mined out yearwise as per the table no.26 is not tallying for the first three years ie 2017-18 to 2019-20 with table no 27(Lst quantity in tonnes) and table no.28 (Lst in Cu m).Hence, the table nos.27,28 need to be checked and corrected.
9. The statement regarding backfilling is contrary as per the statement “the reject& side burden during the present plan period will be proposed to be back filled after complete extraction” ,whereas the exhaust/complete extraction of limestone is yet to be confirmed as per the geological section, yaerwise development& production section,needs clarification. Also indicated the contrary statement under sub paras.(b)of II in page no.27,(f) of (iii) in page no.21,and 22 should be corrected.
- 10.It has been observed that the maximum production reached during the past year 2013-14 was 6877 tonnes. During the last 5 years block, the production proposed was 38322 tonnes, the mine has not worked at full capacity. Therefore, proper justification should be given for production proposal of 39000 tonnes per year (195538 tonnes/5 years) during the next five year period.
- 11.Table 35: The year 2017-18 is already 6 months passed and a production of 39847 tonnes is planned which is not tenable and it may be proposed in pro rata basis for the remaining period of the year. Further, it may be mentioned the year as 2017-18(01.11.2017 to 31.3.2018). Accordingly, the relevant changes may be incorporated at all appropriate places.

12. Extent of Mechanisation: Document is submitted under Category “B”. Tippers of 10 HP (2) are planned for transportation means of loading into tippers also not discussed. Hence, document may be prepared under A “OTFM” category and accordingly, financial assurance for Category “A” mines may be furnished. Further, the requirement of drill machine is not calculated properly. Hours of waste is not considered for calculation of drilling machine.
13. Since the mine is not in operation for more than 2 years, status of the ML may be obtained/submitted from the Department of Geology & Mining, Government of Tamilnadu.
14. Para 4.0.V Disposal of waste: The contrary statement regarding backfilling should be clarified, table no.39 shows the entire waste generated is going to be used for backfilling in the ensuing document period.
15. Para 8.3.1 Mined out land: It is stated under the para that no reclamation will be carried out in the present document should be clarified and corrected. In the same subpara table no.46 shows nil area reclaimed/backfilled for the document period.
16. Para 8.3.5: The table no. 47,49,51,53,55 shows uniform area proposed to be backfilled ,with 19m height for each of 5 years, needs correction and the contrary statement regarding backfilling is confusing. It reveals that RQP’s is not taking interest in concluding the PMCP, which is a part of document.
17. All chapters of PMCP, feasibility report, UNFC report should be reconciled as per scrutiny for the paras of ROMP.

Part-B:-

18. Annexure V: Copy of Accreditation issued to the lab need to be submitted as this new lab from Salem city.
19. Copies of environmental clearance and pollution clearance may be submitted.
20. All annexures and documents should be certified by Qualified Person.

Plates:

21. General: Dimensions marked on cross sections should be more visible.
22. Plate no.II Lease plan : EB poll/ small house opposite to NE corner to ML need to be marked as GCP point and EB poll of SW corner to ML need to be marked as GCP as observed at mine site.
23. Plate no.III Surface plan: Waste dump marked on the southern side is in correct as most of the part is falling outside ML. Pit-I in the central part of ML drawn almost closed to boundary is incorrect should be correct as per the field observations and its depth range may be marked to know the depth at different places.
24. Plate no.IV Geological Plan: As per the field observations depth of pit-I need to be shown accordingly and section E-F to be corrected.
25. Plate no.VII: The dimensions of yearwise reclamation/backfilling and its quantity of waste used for back filling are need to be shown on the plan if reclamation is proposed.
26. Plate no.IX: Conceptual plan and sections should be re-drawn and the dimensions of yearwise reclamation/backfilling need to be marked.

.....