

SCRUTINY COMMENTS ON THE VIBHUTI GUDDA IRON ORE MINE OF M/S. VIBHUTI GUDDA MINES PVT., LTD., FOR FINAL MINE CLOSURE PLAN, OVER AN AREA OF 55 HA, AS PER CEC & ALSO AS PER THE LEASE DEED, IN BELEGAL VILLAGE, BALLARI TALUK, BALLARY DISTRICT, KARNATAKA STATE. SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL UNDER RULE 24/25 OF MCDR, 2017. CATEGORY OF THE MINE IS A (FM- FULLY MECHANIZED), OPEN CAST MINE. BALLARI RESERVE FOREST. DATE OF EXPIRY OF THE MINING LEASE IS 31/03/2020. ML. NO. 2469.

TEXT:

1. On the cover page, the rule quoted both 24/25, it should be 24 of MCDR, 2017. The mine code may be given along with registration number. The qualified person indicated without mentioning whether he is a geologist or mining engineer for reference. The date of grant of ML may be given on the cover page. It is given as A (FM-Fully Mechanized mine), but in the text para, it is given A(M-mechanized mine, better to give appropriately, what is the actual category of the mine. In the light of the above remarks, the text and the plates may be attended, wherever applicable.
2. The list of the annexures enclosed in the document, need to be given with date of the letter/ numbers etc., for reference, instead of without anything. Besides, in each annexure, what is the number of pages enclosed may be indicated in the format by adding another column.
3. All the text part need to be attended as prescribed in the guidelines format only.
4. In the introduction part, it is mentioned that the CFO was applied to state pollution control board, Bellary, what is the present status of the same from the SPCB, Bellary. Though there is a scope to work the mine, if the needed approvals/ clearance as required from the competent authority of the state Govt., before the expiry of the mining lease period. But, the present submission is based on your letter for approval.
5. In part-v, under the review chapter, instead of indicating blank in the table format, it is expected to mention, if no proposals during the period, or if there is in approved it is required to be mentioned accordingly. Based on the above remarks, the remaining text part need to be attended appropriately.
6. Para 5.6, the production of ROM in tonnes, table, blank table format is given without any proposals or actual. In the light of the above remarks, the other tables/ paras of the text need to be attended with comments if applicable.
7. Para 5.24, 5.25, etc., need to be attended appropriately with available information instead of giving empty format.
8. Para 6.5.5, reserves/ resources given for the ML area under +45%Fe to 66.63%Fe, if it is so, how about the +35%Fe available in the ML area may be explained. In the light of the above remarks, the tables no. 12 & para 6.8 table without need to be attended, wherever applicable.
9. Para 7.1(a), the mine proposed for the A (FM-fully Mechanized mine), in the cover page, but in this para it is found to be A (M-mechanized), this need to attend appropriately and correctly. (ii). The existing method working & the proposed method of working may be attended as it is exist & the future planning.
10. Para 7.2, under dump re-handling, it is expected to give the available information from the ML area, which are dumps/ stacks present, from which what is the anticipated quantity can be recovered may be given tentatively.
11. Para 7.4, the bench height proposals and the width proposals need to be attended appropriately, instead of giving the same size of both.
12. Para 9.2, the proposed dump within the Ultimate pit limit is not appropriate, which need to be outside the UPL on the mineral conservation point of view and also as per the future planning.
13. Para 11.2.1, under mined out land, in page no. nil, the area considered for mineral storage as 0.5 ha, and method of rehabilitation proposed for plantation is not correct, after the removal of mineral

stacks, the area becomes free and it is a virgin land and undisturbed, this may be placed appropriately in the relevant table.

14. Para 11.2.15, time scheduling for abandonment table is given blank, without any information, need to be attended with relevant information.
15. The table 11.4 need to be attended appropriately as given in the Modified document and the financial assurance part and the details furnished in this is not correct.
16. Key Plan (Plate No.1): The approach road to the ML area needs to be indicated with approximate distance from the known place.
17. Surface Plan (Plate No. 3): The signature of the surveyor is not appended. The approach road to the bottom of the workings and the return from the bottom and other part of the benches are not depicted.
18. Geological Plan (Plate No. 4): The Ultimate Pit Limit need to be marked on the plan & the ultimate pit slopes in the sections, which must be corrected. In the index, it is mentioned garland, instead of garland drain. In the light of the above remarks, the other plates may be attended and corrected.
19. Production & Development Plan (Plate No. 5A & 5B, 2018-19 & 2019-20.): The proposals drawn for the years need to be re-drawn, developing both the sides, instead of one side proposals. In the light of the above remarks, the other year development & production may be attended.
20. Conceptual Plan (Plate No. 9): Any reclamation & rehabilitation work undertaken in the form of back filling other than the R & R document approval as per ICFRE may be brought out appropriately. Otherwise, what will be position of mine workings at the end of conceptual period may be brought out accordingly.