

SCRUTINY COMMENTS ON EXAMINATION OF MODIFIED MINING PLAN AND PROGRESSIVE MINE CLOSURE PLAN OF BARAIBURU TATIBA IRON & MANGANESE MINE OF M/S THE RAMESHWARA JUTE MILLS LTD., OVER AN EXTENT OF 258.98968 HECTARES IN BARAIBURU TATIBA AREA OF SINGHBHUM WEST DISTRICT OF JHARKHAND STATE, SUBMITTED UNDER RULE 17(3) OF MCR, 2016.

(1) In the front cover, it is found that, the document has been submitted under Rule 17(3) of MCR, 2016 for modification in the approved mining plan, which is not required as the mining plan approved in the last occasion has already lapsed, thereby instead of submitting modification in the approved mining plan, the **Review of Mining Plan**, under Rule 17(2) of MCR, 2016 should be submitted. Accordingly, corresponding changes may also be made in other places of the document. Besides, the period of modification has been indicated to be for the period from 2016-17 to 2019-20 but the year 2016-17 has already lapsed, thereby the proposed period should be from 2017-18 to 2019-20 even if the block period is for 2016-17 to 2019-20.

(2) (i) In the consent letter / undertakings /certificate from the applicant, the consent is stated to be given for modification in mining plan, instead the samet should be given for preparation of Review of Mining Plan, under Rule 17(2) of MCR, 2016.

(3) The document has been submitted in 4 volumes, one for the text and the rest three for Drawings; instead the entire document should be maximum of two volumes for ease in handling.

(4) The contents for annexure & drawings has been attached at the end of the text, which is not proper, instead the contents for the all relevant attachment should be furnished at the beginning of the text for ease in monitoring.

(5) (i) In the consent letter from the applicant, Shri H.C. Daga, M/s The Rameshwara Jute Mills Ltd., has been consented to Dr. Gurupinder Singh Jaiswal, Qualified person for preparation of modification in approved mining plan but the ID proof in support of Dr. G.S. Jaiswal has not been submitted. (ii) Shri H.C. Daga has been signed the consent letter/certificate /declaration /undertaking in his capacity as nominated Owner of M/s The Rameshwara Jute Mills Ltd., but a board resolution nominating Shri Daga as the owner of the company has not been enclosed, which should be submitted.

(6) The I.D proof of the nominated owner enclosed as annexure-III is not legible; thereby a fresh copy of the same should be submitted replacing the enclosed one for clarity. Besides, the address proof of the applicant is missing in the referred annexure and the same should be submitted for more informative.

(7) In the contents for list of annexures, it is mentioned that, the copy of the approval letter of mining plan has been enclosed as annexure-V but on examination of the enclosure side, the copy of the scheme of mining approval letter has been enclosed, thereby necessary corrections may be made accordingly.

(8) The copy of the CTO enclosed as annexure-XI has already lapse on 31.03.2015; thereby a valid consent to operate from Jharkhand State Pollution Control Board should be submitted.

(9) The ambient air quality analysis, noise level study & water analysis report enclosed as annexure-XII are found to be very old, analysed during 20.11.2014 & 25.02.2015, which is not acceptable, instead, the same should be replaced by a fresh reports either from a NABL accredited laboratory or from a Govt. Laboratory. Besides, a valid NABL accreditation certificate issued in favour of the analytical laboratory may also be submitted.

Contd—2/-

(10) The chemical analysis report of iron ore samples from R.V.BRIGGS & CO. (P) LTD. has been enclosed as annexure-XIII but the report is very old analysed between 21.10.2009 to 11.01.2010, which is not proper, thereby a fresh report to that effect should be submitted. Besides, a valid NABL accreditation certificate issued in favour of R.V.BRIGGS & CO. (P) LTD. may also be enclosed.

(11) The photographs submitted along with the flow sheet of the processing unit, enclosed as annexure-XX is not clearly legible, thereby a fresh legible coloured photographs in support of the processing unit should be submitted for more informative.

(12) The copy of the Bank guarantee enclosed as annexure-XXII has already lapsed on 31.03.2016, thereby a fresh Bank Guarantee matching to the plan period should be submitted as per the requirement of Rule 27(1) of MCDR, 2017 replacing the enclosed one for clarity. Accordingly, the calculations of financial assurance @ 25000/-per hectare furnished in para 8.6 in the text should be deleted.

(13) Few photographs showing the status of existing quarries, afforestation and boundary pillars has been enclosed as annexure-XXV but no photographs in support of existing status dump(s) and reclamation & rehabilitation has been enclosed and the same may be submitted.

(14) The copy of the explosive procurement license issued to M/s The Rameshwara Jute Mills Ltd., has not been enclosed, which should be submitted. Besides, a copy of the blasters license issued by the competent authority for carrying out blasting operations may also be enclosed.

(15) The DGPS surveyed map/report has not been submitted along with the document in compliance to CCOMs circular No.2/2010, which should be submitted.

(16) A copy of the certificate of incorporation as per the company Act in favour of M/s The Rameshwara Jute Mills Ltd., has not been enclosed, which should be submitted.

(17) In the para under reference, the name of Shri Krishna Kant Dubey, Vice President & Head-RJM (Mines) has been mentioned against the Power of Attorney Holder, which is not necessary as Shri H.C. Daga has been declared as the nominated owner of the Company, who has signed the present document. [Para 1.0(a)]

(18) Under the heading **Bench Parameters**, it is mentioned that, the proposed height of the benches will be restricted to 6m and the width is not less than 10m, instead the average width of the benches should be specified. Specific information for bench formation both in overburden & in ore zone should be furnished. (Page No. 2-i)

(19) In table -2.1, it is mentioned that, a good number of quarries are proposed under excavation planning during the ensuing plan period. Instead of several quarries, proposal for a consolidated pit should be made to facilitate systematic mining and ease of mechanisation. Accordingly, corresponding changes may be made in the text as well as in the relevant plates submitted along with the document. (Table-2.1)

(20) On examination of the tables furnished in the pages under reference, it is found that, the entire excavated materials are considered as ROM, it seems, there is no lateral extension of the quarries in the overburden zone and no barren patches in the benches proposed under excavation planning, which cannot be a regular phenomena. Therefore, the bench formation status both in overburden and in ore zone/manganese zone should be clearly indicated. If there is any proposal for overburden handling, the status for the same may also be furnished in the calculation tables. Accordingly, corresponding incorporations/ modifications may also be made in other relevant paras in the text of the document. (Page No.2-iii)

(21) Under the heading **existing land use**, it is found that, the status/dimension of all the existing quarries & size/capacity of all the existing dumps available in the mine has not been given, which should be furnished for more informative. (Page No. 2-xxi)

(22) Under the heading **existing dump**, a mention has been made about the **scattered waste dump**, instead the status of all the existing dumps available in the lease area should be furnished indicating their size/capacity/active/deadness status for more informative. Besides, the location co-ordinates of such dumps may also be given with proper plate reference. (Page No. 2-xxii)

(23) Zone wise/Quarry wise extent of area proposed to be degraded in each year of the ensuing plan period has not been given, which should be furnished. All should be furnished in tabular form and rest of the things should be erased. (Para 8.3.1)

(24) The names & contact number of the person responsible during the emergency should be furnished. Besides, nearest fire stations, hospitals and police station is required to be mentioned for more informative. (Para 8.4)

(25) All the plan & sections submitted along with the modification document/review of mining plan should be certified by the qualified person mentioning that, the plans and sections are prepared based on the lease map authenticated by the State Govt. of Jharkhand and found to be correct.

(26) Plate.2 (Key Plan): The details of the deficiencies found on the plate are as follows: (i) Direction of flow of River/nala is missing on the plan portion of the plate as well as index reference for the same is also missing. (ii) The monitoring stations for air, noise & water within the lease area has not been marked, which should be depicted for erased for clarity.

(27) Plate-4 (Surface Plan): (i) The contours drawn on this plate is not matching with that of the surface plan enclosed along with scheme of mining approved vide letter No. 314(3)/2011-MCCM(CZ)/MS3, dated 05.07.2011, thereby suitable justification for the same should be furnished. Besides, a copy of the surface plan approved along with the aforesaid scheme of mining may also be submitted. (ii) At least three permanent ground control points outside the lease area has not been selected and latitude & longitude of those points may also not furnished. Besides, these ground control points need to be linked with the boundary pillars and the plate may be revised accordingly.

(28) Plate- 15 (Environment Plan): All the existing features available within 500m radius of the lease area has not been marked, which should be depicted and the plate may be revised accordingly.

Geology and Exploration

(29) According to Rule 12(4) of MCDR, 2017 “ ***In the case of existing mining leases detailed exploration (G1 level) over the entire potentially mineralized area under mining lease shall be carried out within a period of five years from the date of commencement of these rules***”; in such a case, the exploration proposals of the entire area in G1 level should be proposed accordingly.

(30) As per discussion the resources estimated is for broken area and out of broken area only for iron, but the lessee has been granted the lease for Iron as well as Manganese also. In such a case, the total reserves and resources for Iron and Manganese within the lease area is to be calculated separately in accordance with the UNFC coding and to be marked in relevant plans and sections.

(31) Table on presentation of Mineral Resources and Reserve should be proposed on a particular date.

(32) Resources estimation has not been done in the entire area for Iron and Manganese, which should also be done.

(33) Lithologs of the drilled BH should be attached as annexure for reference.
