

INSPECTION REPORT CUM SCRUTINY COMMENTS ON REVIEW OF MINING PLAN OF KOCHERUVU LIMESTONE & DOLOMITE MINE OF SHRI FAHAD ALI KHAN SPEARD OVER AN AREA OF 22.096 HA IN SURVEY NO-571/F2-1 OF KOCHERUVU VILLAGE, DHONE MANADAL, KURNOOL DISTRICT OF ANDHRA PRADESH, DATE OF FIELD INSPECTION-26.07.2017

During the inspection of mine, the inspecting officer asked for the inclusion of proposal for Dolomite as well as per MoM 16/106/2015-M.VI dated 12.07.2017. But the lessee has not undertaken any exploration in the Dolomite area. In this situation mining plan proposal for Dolomite can not be carried at this stage.

Further it has been noted that working has been extended outside the lease area clearly.

1. Location and accessibility-

Email Id & Fax no- of the lessee should be furnished.

2. Review

- a) The comparative statement of proposed exploration and achieved exploration with the dimension of existing working pit needs to be furnished.
- b) Status of violation should be correctly submitted.

Part-A

3. Geology & Exploration-

- a) The shape of the precise area shown in the Surface and Geological plan is not matching with that of the precise area marked in lease sketch. It has been observed that the mining proposal for Limestone has been given in that part of precise area whose shape is not matching which needs both clarification and correction.
- b) Assumed bench mark needs to be linked to some FRP and contours levels be corrected accordingly. Further the plans should be signed by DGMS certified surveyor for its correctness and its accuracy.
- c) During inspection Limestone out crop found in the adjoining southern part of Boundary Pillar No-18. So Geological plan needs to be corrected. Further there is no sharp contact found between Limestone and Dolomite, so the contact line should be marked by dotted line.
- d) In the table provided for details of exploration carried out, the dimension furnished wrt Mine pit is not correct and co-ordinates with top collar RL needs to be mentioned for each type of exploration inputs. Further during inspection LTP-3 and LTP-4 was not found to exist, which needs to be corrected accordingly.
- e) During inspection it has been observed that the depth of mineralization in one pit is about 9.5 m and in trial pit is just 3m. The minerals only upto the explored depth in the two pits should be considered for reserves/resource estimation.
- f) Lithologs of exploratory pits and working pits along with meter wise chemical analysis for Limestone needs to be furnished with depth wise meter wise analysis of the mineralized zone. The chemical analysis reports needs to be enclosed. At least for 10% of the total samples needs to be analysed in accordance to BIS as and reports from NABL accredited / other Govt Laboratory.
- g) Ultimate pit limit, Area explored under different level of exploration has not been marked on the Geological plan and UNFC code considered for different categories of reserves/ resources estimation needs to be marked on the Geological cross section.
- h) The justification for G1 Level of exploration is not proper. In the justification for feasibility axis, submit the status of EC, CFE, CFO with capacity. In the justification for Economic viability, information pertaining to drilling of 5 bore holes is wrong and needs to be removed and the information pertaining to status of mine is wrong.
- i) The Geological cross section drawn is not correct and the reserves/ resources should be justified correctly and re-estimated as per MEMC-Rules. Reserves / resources needs to be estimated with reference to thresh hold limit prescribed for Limestone in respect of Andhra Pradesh. Blocked reserves / resources has not been estimated.
- j) The future programme of exploration should be proposed for the entire lease area by core drilling at G2 level of exploration with infilling bore holes by RAB to explore the lease area in G1

level of exploration. Future programme of exploration table needs to be given year wise having co-ordinates, collar RL, proposed depth of drilling and dimension of pit/trench.

- k) The lessee is proposing to mine Dolomite during the Plan period. But during inspection it is found that in the Dolomite bearing area no exploration activity have been carried out and no working pit also found to exist there. In the absence of exploration data in the Dolomite area, the G2 exploration level, reserves/resource can not be estimated, due to which mining proposal in respect of Dolomite bearing area for a period of five years can not be prepared and proposed. However resources of Dolomite be assessed under (334) category.

4. Mining

- a) Details of existing mining pit such as dimension of working pit, co-ordinates, no of benches, height of benches, top level and bottom level of the pit have not been furnished in tabular form.
- b) Furnish year wise, section wise, bench wise production and development details in volume and quantity.
- c) Justification for requirement of drilling and blasting, material transportation within the mine has not been furnished.
- d) Top soil generated should be proposed for disposal for plantation purpose only within the mining lease.
- e) Anticipated life of mine should be calculated taking into consideration of both Limestone and Dolomite.

5. Mine Drainage

Min and Max level of working in the proposed plan period has not been furnished. The max and min depth of water table based on the observation from nearby wells and water bodies not furnished.

6. Stacking of mineral rejects/SG and disposal of waste

The interstitial burden will be utilized for backfilling the safety zone area between K-19 to K-20. Furnish temporary dump out side the UPL for storage of top soil generated.

7. Use of mineral and mineral rejects

- a) Furnish industry wise requirement chemical and physical specification.
- b) Mention the use of mineral rejects if any.

8. Others

Without furnishing the details of OMS, the manpower strength has been furnished.

9. Progressive Mine Closure Plan

Base line information on environment has been dealt casually without furnishing facts and figures.

Summary of year wise proposal for progressive reclamation plan not furnished. Proposal needs to be furnished for stabilization of the 7.5 m safety zone area lying between BP K-19 and K-20 by back filling and plantation.

10. Plates

- a) All the plans and sections should be prepared as per rule 31 and 32 of MCDR-2017.
- b) Location and Key Plan-The mining lease area demarcated is not upto the scale as mentioned.
- c) Geological Plan-Show all the proposed exploration points and existing exploration inputs.
- d) Environmental Plan-Mining Lease area existing in the SW part of the lease area has not been shown. Nala flowing through the lease and adjacent to the lease has not been shown properly. The forest area shown in the SW part and as shown in Location and Key plan is not matching, which should be corrected as per field condition/actual. Wind direction has not been shown.
- e) Financial Assurance Plan should be modified as per the authenticated lease sketch and accordingly the total area put to use for mining purpose should be calculated.

11. Certificates

The certificate should be in Mining Lessee's Letter head.