

SCRUTINY COMMENTS ON THE MODIFICATION & REVIEW OF MINING PLAN OF BELEGAL IRON ORE MINE OF M/S VIBHUTI GUDDA MINES PVT., LTD., M.L. NO. 80, OVER AN AREA OF 5.66 HA AS PER THE CEC & 5.67 HA AS PER THE LEASE DEED, IN BELEGAL VILLAGE, BALLARI TALUK, BALLARY DISTRICT, KARNATAKA STATE. SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL UNDER RULE 12(4A) /17(3) OF MCR, 2016. MODIFICATION PERIOD FROM 2018-19 TO 2019-2020. CATEGORY OF THE MINE IS A(FM-FULLY MECHANIZED), OPEN CAST MINE. BALLARI RESERVE FOREST LAND. DATE OF EXPIRY OF THE MINING LEASE IS 31/03/2020.

TEXT:

1. On cover page, the mine code may be indicated for reference. Date of grant of the ML area and the expiry period may be given. Qualified person is whether, MSc-Geology or the mining engineer may be indicated. On the cover page the rule may be changed to 12(4A)(a) of MCDR, 2017, and not MCR, 2016.
2. The list of annexures enclosed in the text need to be indicated with number of pages in each annexures by adding another column in the table. Besides, the annexures should be indicated with dates of each letter and the lease number etc., for clarity. Latest photographs of the mine workings, dumps, stacks, etc., may be furnished.
3. Introduction: It is expected to emphasize the previous approved document was for the period from 2015-16 to 2019-20, but even after the lapse of three years the mining operations in the ML area is not started for want of clearance from the monitoring committee of DMG Karnataka state, which is still awaited. The repeated information may be avoided.
4. The para 1(f), the rule 42 of MCDR, 1988 may be replaced with rule 55 of MCDR, 2017.
5. Para 3.3, under exploration review, it is mentioned 64m depth of core drill holes undertaken at the common boundary, if it is so, why not this hole may be continued till the ore body is continued.
6. Para 3.3(ii), under excavation, the proposed production limit is given, but the achieved production is given ---, without specifying nil or what is achieved. In the light of the above remarks, the text paras may be attended appropriately.
7. Para 3.6, approval of modification need to be mentioned under rule 11(1) of MCDR,2017 or under rule 17(3) of MCR, 2016 respectively for approval of modification, specify the reason / justification for modification.
8. Para 1(f), of Part-A, the surface plan should be prepared under rule 32(1)(a) of MCDR, 2017 and not what is referred. Similarly the surface geological plan also required to be as per the rule 32 (1)(b) of MCDR, 2017 and not what the rule quoted by you. In the light of the above remarks, the text and the plates may be attended, wherever applicable.
9. In Part-A, para 1(i), under the future exploration, it is mentioned that, no proposals for future exploration due to various reasons indicated. However, the proposals may be considered, if the FC is obtained and the working permissions obtained in the future. (ii). The cut –off grade is considered as per the new threshold values i.e. 45% for iron ore, but the new threshold value is +35% Fe, so as per the latest one, this needs to be re-assessed for the whole ML area. Relevant text paras and the tables

need to be reconciled and submitted. Proposed bore holes not drilled in the ML area, reasons for the same with justification may be given.

10. Para 1(j), under the threshold value, it is given about +45%Fe only, but not for the new threshold value of +35%Fe, therefore, the text maybe attended in line with the present one and the whole text may be revised, wherever applicable.

11. Para 1(L), table no.10 & 11 needs to be attended and changed, wherever applicable, based on the above para remarks.

12. Para 2A(a), as per the para heading it is expected to give brief on existing mining operation with the details of the number of working benches height, width, slopes, waste dumps, stacks and infrastructures, etc., similarly, the proposed method of working for the next two years, provided work resumes in the mining lease area. Further, the slope of faces, direction of advancement, approach to the faces & specification of roads, etc to be marked. Also, the existing dumps spread parameters, height, slope protective works etc., to be marked. (ii). The method existing and the proposed is for A-FM, but the description for the mechanized one, which may be attended appropriately. (iii). The production proposals is from August instead of November, 2018, since October is near completion.

13. Table no.13, furnished with ore and the waste details without indicating the quantity in tonnes / or in lakhs etc.

14. Para 2(II), wherein the details of dump re-handling is indicated as nil, but during the field visit, it was advised to the geologist / manager present at the site, that the old waste dumps present in the ML area must be analyzed & assessed the quantity present, which must be proposed with some identification number, and the approximate quantity, grade with recovery percentage for future consideration in the mining operations and to be utilized.

15. The production & development calculation furnished in page no.24, without the table number, for the year 2018-19, reveals that, the proposals drawn from the month of August 2018, which need to be attended from the month of November or should be given for the whole year 2018-19 & 2019-20 respectively, as there is no pro-rata basis production. Full production capacity can be proposed. Similarly other tables para etc., may be attended in the text. (ii). Table no. 14 may be attended accordingly.

16. Para 2(e), under the layout of working, it is proposed to work the iron ore deposit in depth at the existing workings by open cast mechanized method is accepted, but while studying the development plan and sections are found to be not appropriate, since the production benches reveals in single bench only, to achieve the desired quantity is found to be not appropriate and correct. Development needs to be done in both the foot wall and the hanging wall. Table no.17 need to be attended appropriately.

17. Table no.18, needs to be attended appropriately, indicating the R & R works that are completed and which are yet to be completed as per the proposals in the approved document.

18. Para 4(a), the mineral reject, wherein it is described about +45%Fe, but no mention about the latest threshold value of +35%Fe, which need to be indicated in the text and also in the relevant tables.

19. Para 8.6, under financial assurance, the mineral storage may not be the same at the time of mine closure, which may be avoided. Safety zone / green belt area also may be deleted from the calculation,

which is virgin land for the plantation, which are already covered under plantations, roads also if plantations are undertaken this may be deleted from the column of area calculation; hence the table needs to be attended appropriately. The amount should be calculated at the rate of Rs. 3, 00,000 (Rupees three lakhs per hectares), x the net area considered for the calculations. This amount needs to be submitted if not submitted earlier. Minimum amount of 10 lakhs should be submitted for the A(FM) mines if the amount is coming less than 10 lakhs.

PART-B

20. The consent letter from the applicant should be replaced with the lessee. The rule should be 12(4A)(a)MCDR, 2017. Certificate from the QP should be corrected as MCDR, 2017, instead of 1988.

21. Key Plan (Plate No. 01): The approach road to the ML area may be given with approximate distance from the known place.

22. Surface Plan (Plate No.3): The surveyor not signed in the plan, which ought to have been. The proposed working area should be clearly indicated with appropriate notations. The extent of the active dump area and the inactive dump area may be marked with color notations. Similarly the existing pit extent also.

23. Geological Plan (plate No. 4 & 5): Except one bore holes, no other bore holes seen in the sections. What happened to the proposed bore holes? Few more bore holes may be taken up if the mine is started to understand.

24. Production & the Development Plan (Plate No.6A & 6B): The proposals submitted for the year from August, 2014, instead of from November, 2018. The proposals should be for the whole year and not month wise production. There is no pro-rata basis. In the general index side, it is mentioned **graland**, instead of garland drain. The proposals drawn for the year 2018-18 reveals that the development proposals drawn on eastern side, instead of both the sides. Working the development by widening the ore body and the faces on either side is more advantage, instead of working at the narrow development. Similarly in the year 2019-20, the development will be continued and the work of development and production will be achieved without any difficulty. Appropriate modification may be attended, wherever applicable.

25. Conceptual Plan & section (Plate No. 9 & 9A): The position of the workings and other related activities at the end of the lease period may be brought out accordingly, to know the difference of the existing and the conceptual stage. The existing workings will not be present at the time of conceptual stage. Whatever the protective measures and the reclamation & rehabilitation work that are proposed may be attended and present the same. The present submission need to be modified.