

Scrutiny comments on examination of modified mining plan including progressive mine closure plan of Rajshree Limestone Mine no. 1, Near village – Dhanappa, Tehsil – Merta, Distt. Nagaur (Rajasthan), M.L. No. 1/91, lease area 232.80 Ha. (Non-forest) submitted under Rule 17(3) of MCR, 2016 and 23(B) of MCDR, 1988 on behalf of M/s. Ultra-Tech Cement Ltd.

- 1 IBM Registration Number and mine code are not given correctly on cover page.
- 2 The submitted mining plan may contain proposal for one year as previous mining plan was approved up to 2016-17 and therefore modified mining plan may be limited to the year 2016-17. The review of mining plan for the period 2017-18 onwards cannot be considered at such an early stage.
- 3 The address proof of nominated owner is not given.
- 4 On line scrutiny sheet from DMG Rajasthan for coordinate of boundary pillar should also be enclosed.
- 5 Annexure 1A – As per letter of AME Gotan, DMG Govt. of Rajasthan the lease is in the name of M/s Grasim Industries Ltd., but mining plan is submitted by another party namely M/s UltraTech Cement Ltd. It needs to be clarified and reconciled. Copy of the letter from State Govt. indicating lease is in favour of M/s UltraTech Cement Ltd. should be enclosed.
- 6 At many places of text and plans the ML no 17/2010(R) is mentioned, since there is no renewal of lease, hence original ML no. should be mentioned at all the places, as lease is not renewed and lease period is automatically enhanced up to 31.3.2030
- 7 The statement regarding lease period given on page no. 4 is not correct. As per DMG letter annexed at 1A, it may be up to 31.3.2030.
- 8 Para 1.g the name of persons employed under rule 42 of MCDR is not mentioned.
- 9 Para 2.0 The name of mine is not Dhannapa limestone mine.
- 10 Copy of Financial assurance is not found enclosed.
- 11 Copy of approval letter of last approved mining plan is not found enclosed.
- 12 Para 3.3- Review of proposal given in earlier approved mining plan.
 - i Under para 3.3.n the total area backfilled is not given.
 - ii The review for exploration is incomplete as no details are given in achievement Column. Outcome of exploration may also be given in remark Column.
 - iii The review of pit development proposed in approved mining Plan and actual position is not given.
 - iv The item no. 3.4 is missing regarding status of compliance of violations pointed out by IBM. Give status of Violation letter issued by the department on 3/3/14, 1.7.2015 and 1.4.2016 with their compliance position. Please clarify

why this facts was misrepresented. Hence, copy of all the violation letter/show-cause notices issued by this department with their compliance report should be enclosed with the documents.

13 Geology & Exploration-

- i Chapter number should be given as per standard guideline.
- ii Para (d) in which year the study was carried out by ERCOM may be mentioned and resume of fresh calculation of reserves should also be given or enclosed the report. The status of reserves/resources may be given as on specific date
- iii The year may be mention in already exploration carried out. It is not clear that exploration is carried out after approval of last approved mining plan or earlier.
- iv The physical properties including specific gravity considered for reserves calculation is not given.

14 Mining Chapter- In the reserves calculation it is mentioned that in sub grade limestone band the recovery of white cement grade will be 75% and in white cement grade it is 90%, but in pit wise and bench wise calculation it is not clear that excavation is from sub grade limestone band or from white cement limestone band. It effect the final recovery of total production of White cement grade limestone.

15 The year wise development of the pits has not been discussed by supporting Grid location and year wise plans and sections. The year wise benches likely to be developed in overburden and in ore body at the end of each year's needs by supporting year wise plans and section.

16 Proper justification for enhance production proposal is not given. Justify by the proposal in view of last five year average production achievement.

17 A note on conceptual mining plan has not been discussed with relevant information. The ultimate pit limit at the end of fifth year, lease period and up to the life of mine needs to be furnished supported by conceptual plans and section. Further, proposal for reclamation and rehabilitation of worked out area also needs to be discussed by supporting plans and section.

18 All the Dump location of present & future proposal may be clearly specified with Long. And Latitude in plan & refer in Text also, No dump may be proposed outside the lease area. Quantity and size of waste dump, top soil stacks with location may also be furnished under the chapter.

- 19 All the mining proposal including pit development, waste dump, top soil stacks etc should be supported with grid pattern.
- 20 Use of minerals- It is stated that remaining limestone is sold out to other industries, , as it is a captive mine limestone cannot be sold out to other industries.
- 21 The noise survey, vibration study, air and water analysis reports not more than six month old is to be enclosed with the documents.
- 22 In PMCP Chapter-
 - I The year wise proposal for no. of plantation, construction of retaining wall around dumps and expenditure on them is missing.
 - II The year wise PMCP proposal table is also not given.
- 23 The financial assurance co-terminus with the plan period in favour of Regional Controller of mines should be submitted in original and a copy may be annexed with the documents.
- 24 In all the plate and section it is not clear that who surveyed the area, name of surveyor and certificate of correctness may also be given.
- 25 Plate no -2 Key Plan- The lease area is not marked with different colour as shown in the index. Coordinate of lease boundary pillar is also not given.
- 26 Surface plan-
 - I Permanent/temporary Air, Water monitoring survey station may be marked.
 - II Coordinate of boundary pillar and FRP may be given on surface plan.
- 27 Geological Plan and Section Plate –
 - I Different zone of proved, probable reserves and other reserves have not been marked on plan with different colour code.
 - II The symbol given in Index is not matching with the symbols given in plan. Hence, Index may be checked.
 - III The UNFC category and UPL may be given clearly with different color code and symbols.
 - IV The assay value of analyzed sample may also be marked on geological plan for proper planning.
- 28 Plate 5(B) Geological sections is missing- The section may be draw from lease boundary to lease boundary, ultimate pit limit is not properly draw and transferred on plan part correctly.
- 29 Year wise development plan- The benches with their RL is not clearly shown. Further, litho units already exposed in the pits and likely to be exposed at the end of

each year need to be shown on year wise plans and section. The topography of the mining blocks should be shown as per geological plan.

- 30 Plate 7 Environment plan- The plan is not clear, as the ML marked for M/s J K White is looking overlapping to this lease. The Air, Water monitoring station is not marked on the plate. The entire feature required under the rule including nearby granted/applied lease area may also be shown. Exist contours outside the area and within 500m from the lease boundary have not been marked.
- 31 Conceptual plan- What shown in the plan is not reflected in index. It is not clear that the conceptual mining plan is prepared for lease period or for entire life of mine. Needs to be revised.
- 32 Financial Area assurance Plan - Financial area Assurance plan showing only outlines of the existing working, dumps, stacks, etc. covering all the items under the financial assurance table and at the end of 5 year plan period in different colour for the purpose of computation of the areas required to be used in that period to verify the financial assurance including areas considered as reclaimed and rehabilitated. The FMCP table may also be given on this plan and correlate with features.
- 33 Necessary changes in text and plates as marked on documents should also be attended.
- 34 The minor typographical mistakes/correction/omissions marked on the plates as well as text should also be attended carefully.
- 35 Separate plastic bag may be used for individual plates.
- 36 All the above maps/plate will be properly colour index & duly attested and authenticated. Each and every page should be signed by RQP.

(Chetan Parkash)
Asstt. Mining Geologist
