

SCRUTINY COMMENTS ON THE MODIFICATION OF MINING PLAN OF JAISINGHPUR IRON ORE MINE OF M/S ASHWATHANARAYANA SINGH & CO., M.L. NO. 2531, OVER AN AREA OF 56.00 HA AS PER CEC/ 56.50.00 HA AS PER LEASE DEED, IN JAISINGHPUR VILLAGE, SANDUR TALUK, BALLARY DISTRICT, KARNATAKA STATE. SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL UNDER RULE 12(4A)(a) /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. 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, instead of 17(3) OF 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. Boundary pillars also need to be attached in color photographs.
3. Introduction: It is expected to emphasize the previous approved document was for the period from 2015-16 to 2019-20, and the present submission period for the years 2018-19 to 2019-20. Whatever the changes that is going to be incorporated in the present submission for modification need to be specified with clarity for understanding. The reserves/ resources changes, exploration if any based on the notification from the ministry of mines, change of location for the development & production if any may be given with more clarity.
4. Para 3.3, the reason given for less development & production for the year 2017-18 is not valid reasons and justified.
5. 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.
6. In para 1(e), of Part-A, the surface plan should be prepared under rule 32(1)(a) of MCDR, 2017 and not what is referred as MCDR, 1988. 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.
7. Para 1(L), under mineral reserves/ resources, given table nos. 22/23, as per the freshly updated reserves as on 31/8/2018, given with +45%Fe threshold value limit, but the latest threshold value of +35% Fe siliceous ore have not been discussed. Therefore, this needs to be re-assessed for the whole ML area. Relevant text paras and the tables need to be reconciled and submitted.
8. Table nos. 24, 25 & 26, updated as on 31/8/2018, further needs to be reassessed based on the new threshold value of +35% Fe silicious iron ore may be attended accordingly based on the above remarks.

9. Para 2A(a), in the existing method of working, the pits details furnished needs to be indicated with working pit and the non-working pits also for more clarity, similarly in the proposed workings. Besides, 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.

10. 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.

11. Para 2(f)(a), under conceptual mine planning, it is mentioned that the ML area has been fully explored, and hence no exploration proposals drawn, but in para 2(f)(e), final pit limit so defined may remain tentative as the exploration is yet to be proved. This reveals the contrary statement and need to be reconciled and furnished appropriately. In the light of the above remarks, the text and the plates needs to be rechecked and attended wherever, applicable.

12. Table no.39, under land use pattern, for the present and for the ensuing period is not appropriate, especially, the mineral storage land will not be same even during the end of the plan period, there is a possibility of consumed by the consumer or removed during the e-auction from the respective location, which is temporary, hence this may be removed or deleted. In the light of the above remarks, the text paras/ plates may be attended, wherever applicable.

13. Para 4(a)(ii), if any areas within the ML area undertaken such back filling in the float areas, need to be brought out in the surface plan and also in the land use pattern and in the financial assurance table and considered under Reclamation & rehabilitation of such extent area and claim for exemption.

14. Para 5(d), the threshold limit of +45%Fe is referred, which must be checked for the latest threshold value of +35%Fe published recently.

15. Para 8.6, under financial assurance, 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. 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.

PART-B

16. In the undertaking, the RQP should be replaced with QP.

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

18. Surface Plan (Plate No.3): 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. Whatever the surface features shown should be legibly marked and notation should be with clarity. The sorting & screening areas should be updated.

19. Geological Plan (plate No.4): The existing benches and the ore body in the workings are not presented as exist in the mine. The ultimate pit limit marked is not legible, which needs to be bold and with clarity.(ii). The sectional vies are not prepared as per the scale it is prepared for the plan. In the sections, the ultimate pit limit is not correct; it is ultimate pit slopes, which need to be attended.

20. Production & the Development Plan (Plate No.6A & 6B): The proposals drawn for the year 2018-18 needs to be demarked appropriately to reveals the extent of the areas. Adeuate area may be considered and taken the production without any improper planning. 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.

21. Conceptual Plan & section (Plate No. 8 & 9): 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. The ultimate pit slope in the sections should be attended.