

SCRUTINY COMMENTS ON DRAFT REVIEW OF MINING PLAN IN RESPECT OF SOHGARA GRAPHITE MINE (12.885 HA) IN VILLAGE- SOHGARA, DISTRICT PALAMAU, STATE JHARKHAND OF M/S VINIRA MINERALS SUBMITTED UNDER RULE- 17(2) OF MCR, 2016.

TEXT

01. The information on cover page should be written clearly.
- 02. Introduction:** Letter no. of mining plan approved on 20/02/2009 has not been mentioned.
- 03. Item 3.1:** Copy of the approval letter of mining plan approved on 20/02/2009 has not been enclosed.
- 04. Item 3.3.1:** Reason for not achieving the exploratory boreholes proposed for the period from 2011-12 to 2016-17 has not been given.
- 05. Item 3.3.2:** The heading of the table 3.2 should be net mineable reserve and in column no.2 it should be net mineable reserve.
- 06. Item 3.3.4, Table 3.4:** Date of discontinuance of mining operation should be mentioned in remarks column.
- 07. Item 3.3.5:** i) Instead of production of Graphite, Limestone have been mentioned.
ii) Table 3.5: Production target of scheme of mining plan mentioned instead of mining plan.
- 08. Item 3.3.6: Table 3.7:** Location of plantation, type of species planted along with area covered under plantation has not been mentioned.
- 09. Item 3.4:** Status of compliance of violence should be given in the following tabular format.

Sl.no.	Reference no. and date of issue of Violation letter / Show cause notice	Violation of rules pointed out	Reply status
--------	---	--------------------------------	--------------

- 10. Item 1.0 (d) & (e):** Name of the prospecting agency of the lease area should be furnished. The period of drilling 10 (ten) boreholes and its type whether coring type or non-coring type has not been mentioned.
- 11. Item 1.0.e) (iii):** i) The validity of certificate of accreditation of NABL laboratory (Mitra S.K.Laboratory, Kolkata) is upto 10/08/2016. Valid certificate of the laboratory should be attached.
ii) It is mentioned that the analysis report of graphite samples of BH-2 & 4 and quarry-2 are enclosed as annexure XV whereas in the enclosed analysis report it is mentioned as Sohgara pit-1 & 2. Also the analysis result given in table 1.4 is not matching with the analysis result.
- 12. Chapter 2.0. Mining:**
- (a): Existing as well as proposed method of excavation: The proposed quarry to be developed mentioned as Quarry-3A whereas in the plan the proposed quarry to be developed is mentioned as Quarry-6. Need to be corrected.
- (b) Bench development in 1st year: It is mentioned that the proposed quarry will be developed south of old quarry no. 3 and north of old quarry no. 2. But it was observed that the proposed quarry is north of old quarry no. 1. May be corrected.
- (c) Year wise tentative excavation: Year should be mentioned instead of 1st year, 2nd year etc.
- (d) Insitu tentative excavation, Table 2.1:
- i) The ROM to waste ratio appears to be wrong. Should be checked.
- ii) Table 2.3: Under column 6 it is mentioned 'Recovery @ 10% of ROM ore after beneficiation'. It should be ROM / total production in tonnes. The figures furnished in column 7 is Recovery @ 10% of ROM ore after beneficiation. May be corrected.
- (f) Conceptual mine planning:
- i) Item (iii) Anticipated excavation: Stripping ratio mentioned for the first year to be checked.

ii) Item (vii) Year wise afforestation schedule: Location of plantation, type of species to be planted along with area to be covered under plantation has to be mentioned in the year wise afforestation schedule. Specific year should be mentioned instead of 1st year, 2nd year etc.

(iii) Item (viii) Existing land use pattern:

The figures in the table are showing existing land use pattern of the area and not the land to be used. The same should be corrected.

(iv) Item (ix) Land use pattern:

Year to be corrected as 2021-22.

13. Chapter 4.0. Stacking of mineral rejects / sub-grade material & disposal of waste:

a) The proposed dumping ground: The size of the disposal of soil for the working quarry does not match with the size of the soil dump shown in the plans.

14. Chapter 7.0, Others:

a) Site services: The date from which the mining operation has been discontinued should be given.

15. Financial Assurance: The financial assurance has not been calculated as per rule 27 of MCDR, 2017. The Financial Assurance calculation rate has been kept at the old rate which should be revised @ Rs. 2 Lacs/hectare as per rule 27 of MCDR, 2017. In this case a minimum amount of Rs. 5 Lacs Bank Guarantee is to be submitted being category 'B' Mine.

A copy of the Bank guarantee as per calculation under financial assurance has to be submitted for five years period of the review of mining. The financial assurance submitted earlier if any should also be mentioned in the text.

Chapter 8.0, Progressive Mine Closure Plan:

16. Existing land use pattern, Table 8.2 and 8.12: The figures furnished for existing land use pattern are not matching with the figures furnished under chapter 2.0 (f)(viii). Same should be corrected, as some areas under mine road & green belt have been added.

17. Progressive reclamation plan: In the year wise afforestation schedule specific year should be mentioned instead of 1st year, 2nd year etc. Location /site of plantation are not matching with the site shown in the Environment Management Plan (XI), which should be corrected. Also the type of species to be planted along with area to be covered under plantation has not been mentioned in the year wise afforestation schedule.

PLATES

01. The lease map authenticated by the competent authority of State Government has not been enclosed along with the document which should be submitted.

02. i) Surface plan, Geological plan, development plan and Conceptual plan should bear date of survey.

ii) Surface quarry outline of quarry no. 1 & its location w.r.t. pillar 2 & 3 to be corrected as shown by Qualified Person during inspection. Same needs to be corrected by re-survey. Accordingly quarry dimension length and width are to be corrected as mentioned in page no. 20.

iii) Ground Control Points 1, 2 & 3 should be smaller in size as shown the index of the plan. The ground control points should be shown in all the plans.

iv) Approach road to the quarries/dumps should be shown.

03. Geological plan (VII): i) The graphite vein should be shown properly as per vein observed along the quarry no. 1, 2, 3 & 4 and the graphite vein should be drawn in accordance with the foliation trend shown in the geological plan / development plan.

ii) Index of the geological plan is incomplete as the blue dotted lines in quarry no. 1 and 2 indicate water. Same should be shown in the index.

iii) Symbol of proposed boreholes to be corrected as per index in all the plans.

04. Geological section (VIIA): i) In section A-A' the graphite bearing mica schist shown beyond bore hole no. 4. How this has been interpreted when there is no borehole beyond borehole no.4. The section is also not matching with the plan.

- ii) Safety barrier of 7.5m along the lease boundary has not shown in all the sections.
 - iii) The quarry section C-D, I-J, G-H and E-F along quarry no. 2, quarry no. 3, quarry no. 4 and quarry no. 5 to be shown across the lease boundary.
 - iv) Section 3-3' not matching with the plan, as no Bore Hole on this section have been shown. The section to be drawn correctly as some areas are falling outside the lease.
 - v) Benches shown in the section 5-5' whereas benches not shown in the plan.
 - vi) Section C-D should be drawn from the lease boundary to lease boundary.
05. Year wise development plan: i) One circular red dot near BP 53 shown on the plates VIIA to VIIE. Same has to be removed as it does not indicate anything as per index.
- ii) Index in development plan and sections for the period from 2017-18 to 2021-22 to be changed with respect to year wise development. In all the plans **first year** symbol shown in the index.
 - iii) 7.5m safety barrier and road are not shown in the year wise development section C-D in all the sections from 2017-18 to 2021-22.
06. Conceptual section (plate no. IX): i) Lease boundary and Safety barrier in the both end and in between BP-9 and 11 are not shown in the section A-A'.
- ii) In the north of borehole 4 graphite bearing schist has not been shown whereas in the cross section line A-A' graphite bearing schist has been shown all along the cross section line.
 - iii) An area of 0.41 ha has been mentioned for dumping of top soil / OB in the Land use pattern at conceptual stage whereas in the conceptual plan no such area has been marked for dumping of top soil/OB.
