



भारत सरकार/Government of India
खान मंत्रालय/Ministry of Mines
भारतीय खान ब्यूरो/Indian Bureau of Mines
हैदराबाद क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय/Hyderabad Regional Office

By Email



Phone No. : (040)- 29553603/29554603
E-Mail : ro.hyderabad@ibm.gov.in

Room No.603, 6th Floor,
CGO Towers, Kavadiguda,
Secunderabad – 500 080
Date.

No. APR15028MP/NLR

To,
Smt.G.Aruna
H.No.8/442,Puripalem,
Ranganayakulapet,
SPSR Nellore Dist- 524001, A.P

Sub: Submission of Review of Mining Plan including Progressive Mine Closure Plan in respect of Quartz, Feldspar, and Vermiculite & Mica Mine over An extent Of 17.75 Ac. (7.183ha.) in Sy.No.39 & 40 of Jogipalli Village, Sydapuram Mandal,S.P.S.R Nellore District, Andhra Pradesh State submitted under Rule 17(2) of MCR,2016.

Ref: Your Email dated 11-05-2022.

Sir,

With reference to your letter cited above on the subject, the site inspection was carried out on 15-07-2022 by Smt CH Suseela,JMG accompanied by S.Sri. K Govind Rao, Qualified Person and G Srinivasa Rao, Lessee's Husband. The draft Review of Mining Plan including Progressive Mine Closure Plan has been examined and the scrutiny comments have already been forwarded to you and your Qualified Person on respective e-mail id's i.e., gvrakambampati@gmail.com & sdmcmmines@gmail.com

02. You are advised to attend these deficiencies as per the annexure and resubmit the document, complete in all respects, in three bound copies along with soft copy in the form of CD (4Nos.). In this regard, you are directed to submit the Financial Assurance in the form of Bank Guarantee for the area put on use for Mining and allied activities @ Rs.Five lakhs/hectare for category 'A' mines provided that the minimum amount shall be Rs.Ten lakhs as per the provision of Rule 27(1) of MCDR, 2017 at the time of submission of final copies of the document within 15 (fifteen) days from the date of issue of this letter, failing which the document will be disposed without giving any further opportunity.

03. The para-wise clarification & the manner in which the deficiencies are attended should be given while forwarding modified document.

Yours faithfully,

Sh Kumar
21/7/22

(Shailendra Kumar)

Regional Controller of Mines

Copy to:

Shri K Govind Rao, Qualified Person - for information & necessary action.

Sh Kumar
21/7/22

(Shailendra Kumar)

Regional Controller of Mines

प्रतिलिपि सूचनार्थ हेतु :

खान नियंत्रक (द), भारतीय खान ब्यूरो, बेंगलुरु।

शैलेन्द्र
21/7/22

(शैलेन्द्र कुमार)

क्षेत्रीय खान नियंत्रक

Scrutiny Of Review Of Mining Plan Of Jogipalli Mica, Quartz, Felspar and Vermiculite Mine of M/s Durga Mineral Corporation over an extent of 7.183 ha in Sy.No. 39 & 40 of Jogipalli Village, Sydapuram Mandal, S.P.S.R. Nellore dist., A.P.

- 1) On the cover page, Name of the lessee to be mentioned as per the name mentioned in the mining lease deed. Mining Lease period and Complete address of the qualified person with qualification needs to be mentioned.
- 2) In para 1.1, lease area is given as 7.186 ha whereas on the cover page, it is mentioned as 7.183 ha. Please furnish the correct figure.
- 3) In para 1.1.2, LOI number and date needs to be furnished.
- 4) In para 1.2, nature of land is mentioned as Pvt. Agriculture land instead of Govt. Revenue land. Needs to be corrected.
- 5) In para 1.3.1, the period of approved mining plan is incorrect. No Mining Plan was approved by IBM after 2001. Please justify the reasons for not submitting the subsequent document after 2001.
- 6) In para 1.3.4.1, 'No' is furnished against the applicability of EC, which is incorrect. Every lease should get EC irrespective of the lease area. It is reported that the lessee has obtained TOR in this regard. Please furnish the details of TOR.
- 7) In para 1.3.4.4, it is mentioned that 7.186 ha area has been acquired/purchased so far, which is incorrect as the total lease area is Govt. Revenue land.
- 8) In para 2.1.2, 'NIL' information is furnished though there is a public road passing through the North East side of mining lease area. The 50 m safety barrier on either side of the public road is to be maintained as per statute.
- 9) In para 2.2.1.7, it is mentioned that 5 DTH were drilled with a meterage of 65 m and enclosed as Annexure-7. However, during the inspection, no such bore holes and bore hole samples were shown to the Inspecting officer. The sample analysis data in respect of these bore holes is also not enclosed as Annexure-7 as mentioned.
- 10) In para 2.2.1.9, it is mentioned that 10 rock chip samples were collected and analysed. However, the details of these samples were not submitted.
- 11) In para 2.2.1.10 & 11, it is mentioned that chemical analysis of 4 vermiculite and associated minerals were analysed for all radicals and attached as Annexure 7A, but the same was not found to be attached.
- 12) In para 2.2.1.14, it is stated that total lease area has been explored under G1 scale, which is incorrect as no exploration has been carried out so far except two mining pits.
- 13) Submit the sample analysis report for supporting the data furnished in para 2.2.2.9 & 2.2.2.10
- 14) In para 2.2.2.14, data furnished is incorrect.
- 15) During the inspection, it was observed that no exploration has been carried out so far. In the absence of exploration data, the reserves and resources estimated under para 2.2.4 can not be accepted. As the existing pits are 120m apart, the scale of exploration can not be considered under G1. Hence, Lateral extension of 25m on either side of the pits may be considered for reserve estimation and the reserves may be re assessed under probable category (122) by considering the pit depth only.
- 16) As the total mineralized area has not been explored under G1 scale, a proposal may be made for additional exploration in accordance with the UNFC norms given in the MEMC Rule, 2015

during the ensuing plan period to convert the mineralized area under G1 scale and for compliance of Rule 12(4) of MCDR, 2017. In view of the above, all Reserves /Resources need to be reassessed based on the scale of exploration.

- 17) In Para 4.2.1.2.1, only 5 waste dumps were mentioned against 11 dumps. During the field visit, it was observed that the dumps are lying adjacent to the pits, which defeats the very purpose of systematic and scientific mining. Hence, all the scattered dumps are to be rehandled and accommodated in one dump in the non mineralized area. It was also observed that Dump 1&2 were extended beyond the lease boundary. Dump 4 & 11 were encroached 7.5m SZ, hence, back filling may be proposed to maintain the safety barrier zone.
- 18) In Para 4.2.1.2.2, 'NIL' is furnished under Stack details, though there are stacks existing in the lease area as verified in the field.
- 19) During the field visit, it was also observed that both the pits were extended beyond the lease boundary, which tantamounts illegal mining. Hence, appropriate steps to be taken for back filling and proposal be made accordingly. It was also observed that no systematic benches were developed in the pits. Proposal may be given for development of systematic benches as per the standard bench parameters.
- 20) The Development and Production is proposed in the unexplored area, which can not be accepted. The year wise production and development proposal be revised as per the comment given at S.No.16.
- 21) In the year wise production and development plans, year wise in ward and out ward road and ramp provision with gradient, level of mining to be attained should be shown . In the lay out of mine workings, amount of advance to be made length wise, width wise, height, co-ordinates, RLs, Volume to be furnished. Year wise Production and development be proposed within the ultimate pit limit. Accordingly year wise production and development plans and sections are to be re-drawn.
- 22) Adequacy of the machinery and Man power deployment are to be proposed in consonance with the proposed development & production and waste handling.
- 23) Para 5.1: All the essential information should be given based on the proposed production during five year plan period as well as proposed CSR activities. To improve the Ratings under the Sustainable Mining, all the parameters may be considered and likely to be covered, as prescribed in the template as well as in the manual.
- 24) Para 6.2 : Suitable proposal be made for protective measures around waste dumps. In para 6.2.7, Proposal may be given for stabilization of the dead dumps.
- 25) Para 6.2.11, the figures furnished are incorrect.
- 26) In view of the above comments, the Financial Assurance needs to be re-assessed and submitted for the area put to use for mining & allied activities in the form of Bank Guarantee as per Rule 27 of Mineral Conservation and Development (Amendment) Rules, 2021.
- 27) The Production and dispatch assessment report from the State Govt. be submitted supporting for the previous unreported production.
- 28) Every lessee shall carry out a drone survey of his leased area and up to hundred metres outside the lease boundary within six months before submission of any mining plan document or modification thereto to the Indian Bureau of Mines for approval and shall submit processed output [digital elevation model (DEM) and Orthomosaic] images obtained from such survey or any other format as may be specified by the Indian Bureau of Mines in this regard to the concerned Regional Controller of Mines and the Controller General along with the application for approval or modification of mining plan as per Rule 34 A(3) of MCDR,2017, amended on 3.11.2021.

29) The final document shall adhere to the conditions stipulated in CCOM circular 1/2021 & FAQ on format of Mining Plan issued vide CCOM circular no.1/2021 dated 08.09.2021.

Annexures :

30) Annexures submitted were not as per the list of Annexures mentioned in the text.

Plates :

31) .KML files are to be correlated with the drawing files.

32) Lease sketch not enclosed. Most of the boundary pillars are not numbered . Co –ordinates are also not marked on the Boundary Pillars.

33) In Surface plan, the date of survey and signature of the surveyor is missing. During the field visit, it was observed that the mining pits are water logged. However, the same has not been marked in the Surface plan.

34) In Surface Geological plan, lithological units have not been marked. Strike & Dip not marked. The features mentioned in the index are not matching with that of plan.

35) Geological sections are to be re –drawn in view of the comment given at S.No.16.

36) Year wise development plans and sections, be modified as per the comment given at S.No.16.

37) Conceptual Plan and Section be modified as per the comment given at S.No.16.

38) Financial Assurance Plan : Area utilization in different heads should be marked with the distinct patterns for better identification in the plan. Financial Assurance table need to be pasted on the Plan .

39) Environment Plan: Contours have not been extended up to 60m buffer zone. Land use pattern in the buffer zone has not been shown.

40) In view of the above comments, the entire document is to be redrafted and all the plans and sections needs to be re-drawn.

(Ch.Suseela)

Junior Mining Geologist