

# Tja Naledi Beafese Investment Holding



## BARRAGE BULK SAND MINE

### MEETING WITH VAAL-OEWER RATE PAYERS ASSOCIATION (PROTECT THE VAAL COMMITTEE)

Section 102 Mining Right Amendment over portion 4 of the farm Woodlands 407 (437.8330ha), which falls in the Ngwathe Local Municipality in the Fezile Dabi Magisterial district, Free State Province

<b>DATE:</b>	21 April 2018	
<b>TIME:</b>	9:00AM – 12:15PM	
<b>VENUE:</b>	Stonewall Café, Vaaloewer Cafe	
<b>ATTENDANCE:</b> Yolandie Coetzee Quintin van den Merwe Winzo Hein Stephen Jacobs Joy Rabotabi Henk Barnard Ivan van Rensburg Rudi Labuschagne Kobus Martins	YC QM WH SJ JR HB IVR RL KB	Greenmined Environmental SPH Kundalila SPH Kundalila Tja Naledi Tja Naledi SPH Kundalila Farm Manager Woodlands
<b>ATTENDANCE:</b> (Please refer to attached register)		
Gavin Aboud	GA	Vaaloewer Ratepayers Association / Protect the Vaal
Abrie Hanekom	AH	Vaaloewer Ratepayers Association / Protect the Vaal
Renee de Jong Hartsliet	RH	Vredefort Dome Tourism Association
Tertius Wehmeyer	TW	Protect the Vaal
Warrin Flores	WF	Dome Meteorite Park Conservancy. Vredefort Dome Tourism Association. Vaal Eden Land Care
Mariette Lieferink	ML	PEA and Federation of Sustainable Development
M.A. Oberholzer	MO	Private
Dina Henstock	DH	Lindequesdrift
Leon van Schalkwyk	LVS	Lindequesdrift & Oorbreetesfontein
Craig Richardson	CR	Tahiti Estates

Allister Cousins	AC	Pont du Vaal Estates.
1.	<p><b>WELCOME / INTRODUCTION:</b></p> <p>This Meeting was conducted where the Vaaloewer Ratepayers Association (Protect the Vaal Association) were invited to attend the meeting at 9:00am.</p> <p>A presentation was displayed and presented (please see attached presentation).</p> <p>The Final Basic Assessment Report (FBAR) and Section 102 documents, as well as the previous Mining Right of 2016, were displayed at the venue for explaining the project. The association were given the opportunity to discuss this information on a one-on-one basis with the representatives from SPH Kundalila, Tja Naledi Beafase Investment Holdings and Greenmined Environmental.</p> <p>Furthermore, a comment sheet was handed out to each member of the association to put their comments and complaints in writing.</p>	
2.	<p><b>COMMENT:</b></p> <p>Gavin Aboud (GA) GA indicated that everyone look out the window to see that Sweet Sensations is mining on a Saturday, this is not per their approved EMP. Hence the reason they distrust the mines. They are based right across Vaal-Eden. On the Woodlands farm, down the river on the left there is a boat club. Tja Naledi is obstructing their view from the boat club. The boat club was dismissed and not included into the PPP that was conducted. Please include Takalani Murathi (outa) in all correspondence to the association and DMR.</p> <p>Kobus Martins (KM) Skeiron Environmental, contracted to do the Dust fallout monitoring for SPH Kundalila.</p> <p>Winzor Heinz (WH) Safety Officer for SPH.</p> <p>Dr. Stephen Jacobs (SJ) Got two legs to stand on here, Owner of the Farm Woodlands 407 (the farm), and also co shareholder of Tja Naledi Beafase Investment Holdings (Mining Right Holder). Appointed SPH as the mining company to mine, and SPH appointed Greenmined Environmental. This will come out in the purpose of the meeting.</p> <p>GA So do I understand it correctly? You are owner of the mine?</p> <p>SJ Correct. I am the owner of the land, I have been involved with the land for the last 20 years, and from 2008 I have been the owner of the farm, which is Woodlands 407.</p> <p>GA And you have appointed SPH to mine on your behalf?</p> <p>SJ Mining right was issued, we can get to the discussions later. That's why we are here today, SJ is not running away to hide behind anybody, I want to discuss everything that is on the table today and I want to communicate in that way. We are all adults and all want answers. We don't want to fight to do anything. We are here to present what we want today. We need to sit around this table and work it out.</p>	

GA	Just like to make one point on what you said, it's a pity that you did not do that before you applied for your mining right.
SJ	Give a brief overview so that everyone understands. The idea was never to not meet anyone, asked YC if he can answer.
Yolandie Coetzee (YC)	Please proceed.
SJ	<p>I was going to tell you all of this later. I'm not a miner, I'll tell you about my position later. From 1976 there was mining activities on my farm, for the last 17 years for any given minute of the day; there was either a Mining Permit (MP), a Prospecting Right or lately Mining Right registered on the farm. The legislation has changed, many of you will know this, I did not know this. Prior to 1994, the farmer owned the MR to the farm, after 1994 the proses of national occurred and the minerals were taken away and belongs to the state. At that stage, if you have Minerals on your farm, anyone can apply to mine that mineral. That's just for the record. So the first process was that there was an old MR registered on Woodlands 407, old order mining right. Was not converted. SJ got involved with the farm, Mr. Steve Prowler, that many of you will know or heard off. Bought the farm from him. Sand is classified as a mineral, and is alluvial, everyone can see it. SJ decided to register a MP just so that you understand it, there are differences between MP and MR. MP at that stage was an area of 1.5ha x1.5ha. The MP was registered. My Farm manager, Ian van Rensburg (many of you know), he and his father have been on the farm (IVR was born on the farm). So people came to visit and were trespassing to say that they were going to mine here. So SJ was farming, not mining, and registered the MP, which get renewed every 3 years. SJ had 3 permits. So then it was decided that DMR once a permit is registered you must mine. So on small scale mining has been taken place just to keep the permits active. SJ didn't go overboard to get all of the sand out. Could have done that years ago, with the process and government process, got to a stage where it cost so much in high courts in Bloemfontein, because of people trespassing wanting to register to mine on the farm for anything. SJ decided to buy time by registering a PR. PR was registered for 4 years on the total farm, to keep everyone off the whole property. Went through the 4 years PR, where 100-200 holes where prospected/ drilled and excavated. The PR was issued. The day the PR expired, application for MR was issued at the DMR. To answer your question Gavin, the legislation has changed subsequently. We only followed the legislation. When we applied for all this processes, there was then this process of public participation. I appointed the then mining consultants that applied for the mining right. Subsequently after the MR was registered the legislation has changed again. Referred to YC about legislation changes. The whole process has changed. If you apply for a MR, there are other processes for SLP and EIA. That is the answer to your question. Do you understand how long back this is ago, talking 12 years ago. There was another law applicable. We followed the law to the T.</p>
GA	In your opinion. Not necessarily in our opinion. So in your opinion your followed the law to the T. we will dispute that and discuss that later.
SJ	Ok. That is just to give you the background. Ok so that is the long explanation of why we are here today.
GA	Thanks appreciated the explanation.

Mariette Liefferink (ML)	May I just ask, my understanding is that NEMA EIA regulation are applicable since 1998, which includes PPP, so I would just like to know if your applications were then prior to 1998?
SJ	I don't know, I can't answer that. I appointed the company that applied for all the permits since we started. I'm not sure the NEMA act, I'm not a lawyer or legal background person. Thus there reason I appoint everybody, and all environmental studies done. So I get what I'm given and I get told I must appoint some people and that is the process followed.
GA	But then maybe your consultant should answer that question.
YC	ML as mentioned previously. Greenmined Environmental was appointed only on the Section 102 amendment to this current MR. Dorean Environmental did the previous MR application, of 2014. All we know is what is stated in the EMP, which we had access to. We cannot answer for what they have done. They did follow all the NEMA EIA Regulations as per 2014. So everything did go according to the PPP process as published in NEMA.
Tertius Wehmeyer (TW)	That can again be disputed, as it was done after PPP regulations have changed.
GA	Let's get our introductions clear and follow your Presentation, when Craig introduces himself I will explain why he has been invited.
Joy Rabotapi (JR)	Introduced himself. Co-director with Dr. Stephen Jacobs of the Mining Right. Have been together with since the PR. I'm a mining engineer for 35 years, and read all the reports that was done by the previous consultants.
Craig Richardson (CR)	Neighbour to the property.
GA	So Craig is a neighbour to your mine across the river that has never been consulted.
CR	I have 2 subdivisions that border your property. We have been on the property since 2003. Never been consulted.
Allister Cousins (AC)	Represent Pont de Vaal and on the Vaal estates.
GA	Also, not consulted.
Leon van Schalkwyk (LVS)	Reside across the river near the Vaal. Is affected by the blasting and dust. Wife thinks we must sell the property. At this time, we can't sell. I want to appeal let's stay human. If we go for MR we are going for mining for profit. We are the subjects that are affected mostly because we are neighbours. If the laws have changed, you have every responsibility to change and let everyone know what you are doing. You have the experience of 35 years. I don't want you to tarnish and affect my lifestyle. Apart from that, we are going for mining, look at all the cases in the world where water rights are

	<p>impeded, movie made about that. Humanity won at the end. Don't let yourself fall into a situation like that.</p>
Dina Henstock (DH)	<p>Stay in Lindequesdrift.</p>
Renee Hartsliel (RH)	<p>I own Free state declared nature reserve down the river. Registered with Dorean in 2014. Was never consulted from the time registered.</p>
GA	<p>Flawed process.          Chairperson of Vaaloewer Ratepayers Association and chairman of Protect Vaal Eden committee.          Three (3) Apologies – Bob Hartsliel          Adv. Hendrik Smith – shadow minister of Metals and Minerals of DA in parliament.          Takalani Murathi – investigate from Outa appointed from Outa.          In future if we meet again to get 30 days' notice, norm in terms of these meetings to get full committee here, and not in a hurried basis to get people here. I invited Craig as living proof of the default that has taken place up to date as it not here says. I thank you for this opportunity.</p>
Mike Oberholzer (MO)	<p>I'm a consultant assisting the Protect Vaal committee.</p>
GA	<p>I would just like to say he is an ex chief director of the DMR RM.</p>
Abrie Hanekom (AH)	<p>Never been consulted about your mining activity or any of your mining activity, been to court. I'm going to court, various court cases. I'm a Mechanical engineer in the Vaal, and have various companies in the Vaal triangle.</p>
GA	<p>Tell them that you needed to move.</p>
AH	<p>I did move to town dust and roads can't get to his house. Sometimes you can't get to your house because of the roads. I had to get a place in town.</p>
ML	<p>ML is the CEO of the federation of non-governmental organisations. We are invested with the news media, and hope it's not within impeachment or forfeit by the news media, one of the most prominent NGO's in the mining sector in Africa. I sit on dozen or more steering committees and task teams of the DWS, also on the advisory committees of the South African Human Rights Commission. My interest is not self-narrowed interest; it's not a limping principle in my place. I feel that sand mining is not best practicable environmental option for this area; I would like to perhaps argue the need and desirability of this project, the Cumulative impacts, because it is not the only sand mine. ML would also like to offer apologies for Lucien Limacher, dedicated Environmental lawyer appointed by Legal Resource Centre for the use of ML's organisation Federation of Sustainable Development.</p>
Warren Flores	<p>Tourism association, Vredefort conservancy. World heritage site concerns, on all I&amp;APS indicated as a scenic route. This has been looked at for many years as a Geopark in the area. What is concerning is that all I&amp;APs have indicated as a high tourism area and scenic route especially for ecotourism in the Vaal area.</p>
Tertius Wehmeyer	<p>Member of Protect the Vaal committee. Recently purchase property March 2017, Tlokwe side. Our concerns are Property values, Expansion of mining activities, Roads,</p>

	<p>Accumulative effect, Persons interest to environment and have done research in the legal aspects. Can understand SJ's plight in protecting himself in anyone protecting himself to apply for MR. Would like to Invite to become part of the Geopark, in that way to protect yourself, to boost tourism and no need to mine the area. Geopark is the way to go and to protect themselves. Landowner need to feel that they need to protect themselves, therefore applying for mining right. That is the compromise in the end. AH wants to start a tourism business there.</p>
Henk Barnard	From SPH Kundalila
Ian van Rensburg	Stay on Dr. Stephen's farm on Woodlands
Rudi Labuschagne	SPH Kundalila
YC	Thank you everyone for introducing yourselves. Purpose of meeting is that DMR contacted Greenmined Environmental and Tja Naledi to consult with the Vaal Oewer Ratepayers Association. Gavin you said that you are not the Vaal Oewer Ratepayers Association but as in the DMR letter that we received, they stated that we need to consult with the Vaal Oewer Ratepayers Association.
GA	Do you know why they have asked you to consult with us.
YC	After the letter that was send by Tertius to the RM. So after the correspondence they requested us to consult with the association.
GA	I would just like to point out that in the Goosebay application, they registered 800 I&APs to their application, and those 800 I&PS registered 2000 concerns. We threw that PPP out and the process is on hold. Now if I look at your document, and the I&APS you registered. There is a major disparity between 800 and the number you have registered. You have missed a massive audience within the I&APS. In your documents you dismiss the Vaal Oewer as a "low density housing situation to the north", we are not that, we are a high density area that is a suburb of the Emfuleni Municipality that is directly affected by your application. So that is why the DMR asked you to consult with us because you have missed us, you have missed 800 I&APs that should have been consulted.
TW	I just want to point out that I wrote on behalf of Protect the Vaal Committee so that reason state from the DMR.
AH	I never know about it.
GA	What AH is saying is that the people you have register as I&APS, we do not have evidence from those people that they were consulted with. And even if you take it to neighbouring areas, here are 2 neighbours that are directly adjacent to the mine. So the proposal that we are putting forward is that your PPP was flawed, is flawed and until you amend with a Section 102 to amend with the DMR to reinstate the process to consult with us your process will remained flawed.
YC	Noted
RH	

YC	<p>There are 2 other farmers from the Free state who you did put as being consulted but no comments that was not correct. It was Sampi van Rooyen and Johan van Aswegen, they both responded</p> <p>YC noted that Sampie's comments were received, however they were late. Sampi was informed that his comments were late and that his comments cannot be included as the relative documents had already been submitted to DMR. DMR was aware that Sampie's comments were received late. YC noted that his comments will now be included in this FBAR amendment.</p>
JR	<p>JR requested that the meeting and proceedings follow the agenda.</p>
GA	<p>GA mentioned that the reason for diverting from the agenda was to seek clarity and understand what the purpose of the meeting is. PPP will be addressed later.</p>
YC	<p>YC mentioned that DMR must consult with Vaaloewer Ratepayers Association regarding the environmental impacts and not the PPP process. All comments addressed will be incorporated into the final BAR and sent to all the participants of this meeting.</p>
GA	<p>GA did not understand what YC was saying regarding the reason why DMR requested this meeting, GA mentions that the point of the meeting is to meet with the participants and discuss the way forward.</p>
YC	<p>YC quotes a letter from the DMR and mentions that DMR asks that we consult with you and after consultation we must include your comments in the FBAR in order for the DMR to process the application.</p>
GA	<p>GA notes that I&amp;APs must be given 30 days to comment</p>
YC	<p>YC confirms this. YC continues to read out the letter and mentions that it was received on the 11<sup>th</sup> of April, YC continues to mention that this letter was received after YC spoke to TW and GA to arrange this meeting. YC noted that a very strict timeline was given to hold this PPP meeting.</p>
GA	<p>GA asks if the 30day period started on the day of this meeting.</p>
YC	<p>YC responded and said that the 30day period started on the day the letter was received from DMR (11<sup>th</sup> of April)</p>
GA	<p>GA noted this and said that they will dispute that strongly as the I&amp;APS were unaware of the timelines and the initiation of the comments period. GA also mentions that the letter should have been send to him and the I&amp;APs. GA mentions that they will demand that the PPP process be restarted due to the flaws in the PPP process. GA carries on to say that he can refer to the legislation and point out the flaws.</p>
SJ	<p>GA was asked to stay calm.</p> <p>Asks when GA was first notified that the DMR said that the Vaaloewer Ratepayers Association must be consulted. SJ asks how GA was notified.</p>
GA	<p>GA answers and state that he was sent a request by YC to meet regarding this matter.</p>

SJ	QM/SJ replies and state that at this point, this is when the message was conveyed regarding the notification of the letter from the DMR.
GA	GA state that the message was not conveyed then. GA confirms that he was not informed that the DMR had instructed this consultation and that the 30-day comment period had been initiated. GA asks if that would like to be disputed.
CR	A comment was made that the 30day period is merely a minimum.
GA	GA thanked Unknown for that information
ML	ML asked for clarification; ML became aware of the operations when she met the contractor (SPH Kundalila). ML walked into the property, she was in the car with GA and the news media, and AH. They walked in and saw the operations taking place. ML assumed that the environmental permits/rights had already been granted as she was of the opinion that the mine can't operate without these permits or authorisations. ML asked if the environmental permits/ rights had already been granted, then this PPP hence forward would be unnecessary as the authorisation has already been granted. Therefore, the only "remedy" I&APs would have. It must be remembered that the rights that flow from a mining right are very far reaching, and one of the principle mechanisms is the PPP. Now that did not take place and it was the cart before the horse in other words. And therefore ML would suggest that the I&APS write to the appeal authority if the authorisation was legal, the appeal authority being the Department of Environmental Affairs and ask for condonation due to the time constraints of the comments period. Time condonation would be asked from the time that the I&APs become aware, the day that the I&APs entered the property and submit that to the DEA.
GA	GA states that he confused as he understands that there should be three separate PPP's. GA confirms that they were notified about this meeting, however there should be another PPP regarding the water use licence that was "activated" in October 2017, GA asked again where the PPP for that water use licence was. GA asked what the status on that was.
YC	YC answered and said that Greenmined is currently working on the application and the notice of intent has been submitted to water affairs and Greenmined is waiting on feedback in order to go ahead.
GA	GA asked if once water affairs gives Greenmined the "go-ahead", will the public participation process start.
YC	YC confirms this.
GA	GA mentions that the EMP for the mine states that water will be used to supress dust, however the water use licence has not been granted yet. GA carries on the explain that his third problem with the PPP is that the mine currently sits on land that is zoned for agriculture and mentions that there must be a PPP for the rezoning application. GA carries on to question which PPP is this a part of as there should be 3 concurrently running at this point. GA points out that it is illegal to mine on land that is incorrectly zoned and use water without a water use licence. GA motivates that this meeting



SJ	<p>shouldn't take place due to the illegal nature of the operations which has now included GA and the Vaalower Ratepayers Association.</p>
SJ	<p>GA is asked to calm down.          SJ argues that he has not done anything illegal as no sand has been sold. SJ carries on to mention that he is waiting on documents. SJ suggests that all the questions be asked and the floor be opened to discussion.</p>
GA	<p>GA asks if SJ grants him the facility to note in the minutes that SJ is indeed mining land which is incorrectly zoned.</p>
SJ	<p>SJ answers and state that he has consulted the senior counsel and the chambers in Pretoria and done his homework. SJ further mentions that he has consulted with the local authorities and received feedback which state that SJ won't have to rezone.</p> <p>Multiple appeals.</p>
GA	<p>GA asks if anyone is aware of the "Max sands" case. GA refers to the case and mentions that the case went to the constitutional court and the constitutional court stated that anyone who mines on property which is rezoned for another purpose is illegal and a criminal offence. GA continues to mention that last week there were DMR officials on site and when the roads officials asked the DMR officials why this land was not rezoned, they shrugged their shoulders. GA states that the reason why they didn't know was because if rezoning was applied for, the roads department would have been consulted. GA states that the legal carrying capacity of the access road is 10 tonnes and state that trucks will not be allowed to drive on it. GA mentions that road will have to be retarred in order for the road to be legally used by trucks with a capacity of over 10 tonnes. GA asks if SJ understands the implications and why it is necessary to follow steps and mentions that SJ has not followed this process.</p>
SJ	<p>SJ argues that his consultants told him otherwise.</p>
GA	<p>GA lists what is supposedly permitted on SJ's land, he mentions that shops, businesses, dwelling houses, place of worship, residential buildings</p>
SJ	<p>SJ asks if the meeting agenda can be followed and states that all the listed concerns will be documented, he carries on to mention that he is merely following what has been outlined to him by the DMR. SJ states that he is only doing what DMR has told him what to do and has been following what they have said up until this moment in time. SJ states that he received a request from the DMR (this meeting), and he reacts on it and follows their request. SJ mentions that he is not here to fight, he states that he has been neighbours with the current neighbours for over 20 years. SJ state that his biggest concern is the environmental impact.</p>
GA	<p>GA states that in the Goose Bay PPP, valuations of properties surrounding the project were put forward. The value of the properties around the mine in discussion is around 1 billion rand and states that the mine will destroy the value and state that SJ is the only person who will benefit from this.</p>
SJ	<p>SJ explains that the amount of minerals (sand) that is in the area is not in large volumes and describes the deposit as "very small" and not massive. SJ state that he will take</p>

	<p>any person onto the farm, he offers anyone the opportunity to drive through the farm if they first identify themselves to view areas on the farm where he has rehabilitated from the previous mine works and it looks exactly like the other areas of the farm. SJ motivates that he is governed to rehabilitate, he explains that when you mine sand, you are losing some areas of 500m and some of 300m and once it's done, normal vegetation.</p>
GA	<p>GA asked if blasting will occur.</p>
SJ	<p>No blasting to occur.</p>
GA	<p>GA state that blasting is referred to in SJ's "plan" for Diamonds</p>
SJ	<p>SJ denies this and state he has an amended application for his mine and wants to be legal.</p>
GA	<p>GA state that currently, SJ is acting illegally.</p>
SJ	<p>SJ states that in his opinion, he is acting legally and that in GA's opinion, he is acting illegally. SJ state that he wants to explain why he had the application amended, first is because he has many trespassers coming onto his property with SUVs and pointed shoes telling SJ to get off his farm as "they" want to mine here. SJ mentions that this is an area where the fact is that if SJ doesn't mine here, somebody else is. SJ carries on to explain that the process of mining sand is a very easy process. The sand must be lifted and maybe sieved the sand, through that process, SJ state that some diamonds may be found. He then questions what is expected of him if he finds a diamond and he doesn't have a mining right for diamonds.</p>
GA	<p>GA mentions that he has gone through a whole process with Goose bay.</p>
SJ	<p>SJ mentions that another bi product of sand mining is gravel and gravel is used to construct roads. SJ mentions that he has nothing to do with Goose bays application other than being an I&amp;AP. Nor does he have anything to do with 300 or 30 minerals. He only knows about his sand mine that he has been investing in for the past 17 years and wants to find a way that can make it easy for everybody so that he can mine the land and rehabilitate it so that it looks the same as the rest of the land.</p>
GA	<p>GA refers to the Goosebay Development application and state that there were 2000 concerns raised, SJ must get those 2000 concerns from SLR and add them to his application to the DMR, as well as register all the I&amp;APs on a database with SLR because the same applies to their application as yours. GA states that the environmental impact assessment (EIA) is a carbon copy of Goose bays and Sweet sensations EIA. GA state that it looks like someone took a Photostat and just used the same thing. GA state that it is mind boggling how the process works.</p>
SJ	<p>SJ argues that he was the first one to apply for a mining application and what happened after that, he couldn't answer for. SJ state that his documents were done first and that someone else had copied him. SJ states that according to him, everything was done which was supposed to be done. He has appointed and paid. His idea is that because he has been an owner of the property for many years and part of the community and</p>

	that he is not here to ruin the community. However, he is in a situation whereby if he doesn't mine, someone else will and illegally and ethically.
GA	GA state that he understands SJ but SJ does not have a water use licence and in order to mine, you need a water use licence, so SJ cannot continue. GA argues that by mining illegally, SJ is not suppressing the dust and has images to show SJ the effect of SJ's failure to suppress the dust and states that SJ is illegal.
QM	The EMP is legal.
GA	According to Tja Naledi, the EMP is legal, however according to us, it is illegal as "we" (Vaal rate payer's association) were not consulted in the PPP.
QM	QM state that "we" (Tja Naledi) were not part of that process.
GA	GA state that everyone here can take responsibility and apologise, but instead of taking responsibility, GA carries on to say that QM and SJ can't just sit here and say that they weren't part of the process. GA argued that "you" (Tja Naledi) was part of the process
SJ	SJ state that the only ground water that will be used is from an existing farm borehole for the use of domestic water supply and dust control.
GA	GA argues that SJ would still need a water use licence to operate.
ML	ML refers to the National Water Act Section 21, if there is any of those water uses identified in Section 21, you are required to apply for a water use licence which also includes any discharge of polluted water.
SJ	SJ agrees with ML and state that when one builds a road, that person doesn't have to apply for a water use licence, that person would use it as dust suppression. SJ carries on to explain that there is a big difference in his mine works program where he mentions that he is going to erect a wash plant, then SJ mentions that he would need a water use licence as he will create effluent and a substance that can pollute the ground. SJ carries on to say that he is merely suppressing dust.
ML	ML state that they can't make meaningful and intelligent comments without the information, ML requests a copy what water uses SJ employs currently or in the future.
CR	CR refers to when SJ said that he was part of the community and state that SJ doesn't even live on the property or deal with daily operations which cause noise and pollution. CR then questions why, as a neighbour, he was not consulted during the first application in 2014, therefore SJ has given CR no opportunity to protect the value of his property.
SJ	SJ further mentions that he is not someone who knows the process and has no legal background. SJ mentions that according to legislation at that time, it was followed and adverts were placed on the farm and in the newspapers. SJ state that whatever was deemed necessary by DMR was followed.
CR	CR states that as a direct neighbour, it is a legal requirement to notify him. CR carries on discussing that the October 2012 guidelines published clearly stipulates that surrounding neighbours must be notified in the form of a registered post, and then

	<p>providing proof that the party was notified. YC states that this was done by YC in the current process, but there was no address on the proof (receipt) proving where it was sent. CR carries on to mention that if the project is seen to affect neighbouring provinces or municipalities, the project needs to be advertised in a national newspaper, which CR state it was not as there is no proof in the documents. CR mentions that these are two simple aspects that were not followed by SJ's consultants (Darean consultants) who did the other three PPP's.</p>
GA	<p>GA mentions that by SJ putting his faith in the appointed consultant, SJ is then agreeing that the process has been followed, so if the process wasn't followed, GA state that he's sorry but that's the fact of the matter.</p>
SJ	<p>SJ argues that they can debate the matter further but wishes to stick to the presentation and that everything will be documented.</p>
LVS	<p>LVS state that although this is all being documented, he never knew about any of the other public participation meetings, nor were his neighbours; however LVS continues to say that DMR state that he (LVS) agrees with the decision to mine. LVS continues to say that he was never involved and question why his name is on a sheet saying that he agreed with the mine. AH then states that he is making a court case of it and state that that is fraud.</p>
SJ	<p>SJ mentions that YC will handle that she will contact him to hear his concerns.</p>
LVS	<p>LVS continues to say that he is making a court case out of it.</p>
GA	<p>GA asks for the front page of a document</p>
YC	<p>YC urges that she wants to tend to the presentation, YC carries on to explain that it is difficult to get through or even start the presentation and motivates that the point of this meeting is the amendment of the mining right application.</p>
CR	<p>CR states that it is unfair that their concerns are just being skipped and states that back in 2014 he wasn't notified; CR asks YC why he wasn't notified.</p>
YC	<p>YC states that she cannot answer that as that was handled by the previous consultants and that she wasn't involved in the project at that time. But she states that if CR wasn't notified, it was probably because CR wasn't listed in the application.</p>
CR	<p>CR states that he should have been notified and that he wasn't notified in the Goose bay application.</p>
YC	<p>YC asks CR if he might have driven past the property at the time the project was being advertised.</p>
CR	<p>CR state he didn't as he resides across the river and therefor doesn't drive past SJ's property, CR continues to say that it is a legal requirement to notify neighbours and if that hasn't been done and therefor the mine is operating illegally.</p>
YC	<p>YC states that statement is incorrect.</p>

ML	ML states that a rectification needs to be applied for, ML carries on to say that it is a G24 rectification.
LVS	LVS states that there are rules specifically laid out describing how this application should be done, LVS argues that the prime concern is to be “human” about the situation. He carries on that he wasn’t notified during the PPP and that this can’t carry on like this. LVS mentions that this begrudged feeling is not necessary. LVS states that the other mining group have changed their application from 1 mineral to 3 minerals and now the application is for 32 minerals. He questions why it was stated that 1 mineral (sand) was being applied for, and now we (I&APs) find out that because the PPP was done incorrectly, the mine can carry on operating. LVS states that that is the first thing, WF then states that your (SJ) legal team who you (SJ) pay a lot of money say that this is the route we should take, however LVS reiterates that in a court case, there are always two parties, so you (SJ) can’t go on the advice that it looks good, states that the court will determine which is the right party. LVS state that from a “human” side “we” are extremely affected, he carries on to say that you people (lawyers) are only doing their job, we (I&APs) have thousands of other activities and we (I&APs) must come and sit here and try spell out the law. LVS states that the laws and legislation is described meticulously for this sort of situation, so LVS urges everyone to listen to GA and TW, they are directly SJ’s neighbours, although LVS states that he is also severely affected as his estate value has been reduced from 20 million to 4 million. WF blames the mining activity but cannot prove it at this stage that the blasting has caused cracks. WF states that he can prove the dust and cracks in a building which is 10 years old and cost him (LVS) 2 million rand to fix because of the blasting. LVS state that he can’t blame SJ directly, but the cracks and dust is due to the blasting. LVS asks if we can start over, so that “we” will not oppose the application but say yes we have agreed, however WF states that he cannot agree at this stage as every time there is a change, there’s a jump. LVS states that the other licence was granted from the 1 <sup>st</sup> of December to the 15 <sup>th</sup> of January, LVS then state that no governmental department can approve that as the departments don’t work during that time and he doubts if the departments work at any other time too. He states that this is the problem they are facing; the affected party should be acknowledged.
ML	ML refers to point 4 of the presentation and states that it is important to note that commencement with a listed activity without environmental authorisation granted by the competent authority contravenes the provisions of section 24 F1 of NEMA and constitutes an offence (criminal offence) in terms of section 49 A1 and states that SJ has not been granted environmental authorisation and has already commenced.
YC	YC states that SJ has an approved mining right for the previous mining right of 2014.
JR	JR states that they have an approved EMP.
GA	GA states that the authorisation is for the section 102 amendment.
ML	ML questions that even if it is for an amendment, how can you (SJ) commence mining before the amendment has been approved.
QM	QM states that they have an approved mining right and EMP
GA	

SJ	GA states that the operations are over stepping the EMP and states that he has photos to prove it.
ML	SJ states that this is the whole point that has come across today, SJ attempts to put it into perspective by stating that he has a valid mining right EMP, SLP and a mining works program that was granted in 2016. SJ states that although he has all these documents, this is not what is being spoken about and why they are there. SJ wanted to clarify that.
SJ	ML states that she understands.
ML	SJ explains that he enjoys reading and that he reads 2 or 3 newspapers a day, he then gets bombarded by friends who have seen articles in the newspapers pertaining to his mine who email SJ and question if this is his illegal mine. SJ states that according to his mining right, that has been issued and legal mining right, EMP, SLP and mining works program, are all legal. Therefor SJ states that he is operating legally. SJ then refers to an amended 102 form because we are asking for something that's new. SJ states that it would be different if he hasn't gone according to his legal mining right, then SJ would understand that he is acting illegally, however he is operating according to his mining right.
YC	ML states to SJ if in 2014 he was granted the environmental authorisation, ML carries on to say that a mining right is valid for 3 years and now we're in 2018.
SJ	YC corrects ML and states that SJ had mining permits before, then that was converted to a prospecting right which was then converted to a mining right which brings us to 2016, so we have a current mining right which has been approved, YC then explains that a section 102 is being amended to a mining right in 2017. YC therefor states that they have an approved and legal mining right.
LVS	SJ states that a mining permit is for 3 years and a mining right is for 10 years.
AH	LVS states that he has a problem as it was stated in the mining right that he gave permission for the project to go ahead when he in fact didn't. LVS carries on to mention that all his details are there, but he never agreed with anything.
GA	AH states that there was no PPP done for that process.
TW	GA urges everyone to stop with questions and arguing as the presentation needs to go ahead.
	States that he would like to say something as this whole meeting came due to his email. TW carries on to explain that he sent that email because the I&APs were looking at Goose bay's mining activities and saw large heaps of sand with the names of Raubex and SPH on a board. Nothing about Tja Naledi, AH motivates that they had no idea who's mine this is, TW questions why Tja Naledi's name is not on the board along with the other names. TW continues to say that a DMR RM phoned him at night from Pretoria to ask who are these (Tja Naledi) people as they had no record of them. TW mentioned that he did read the documents and found that Tja Naledi has the mining right, so that is how this whole thing started, that's how they found out. TW continues to say that there is equipment on the property as if this 102 has been granted, and shouldn't be

JR	there. TW questions why the equipment is there, he motivates that the permit hadn't been granted and state that JS must wait until it is granted because your mining plan state caravan, a trailer. TW states that he can go through it and look it up as it states specific equipment and therefore cannot bring on other equipment before it's been granted.
TW	JR asks if TW is referring to the screener
GA	TW answers that he is referring to the screener and that it shouldn't be there and that it isn't part of his mining program.
SJ	GA asks if he can put things into perspective what TW is saying and mentions that he has had experience with Goose bay, GA mentions that the applicants didn't comply with all the permits, GA states that the applicant mined outside the approved areas and did a whole lot of things wrong. He questions if the guys across the road are mining now and states that they are not supposed to be mining now as they are not supposed to be mining on weekends, as per their mining plan. GA says that SJ's mining plan also states that there will be no work conducted on the weekends. Therefore, GA asks SJ to understand his distrust because of what has happened across the road and understand why they are not happy.
GA	SJ asks GA if he had ever had a meeting with the owners of the Goose bay mine.
SJ	GA says that the owners don't want to meet with him
TW	SJ states that this was the first time that the DMR had instructed to meet and this is why he is not running away. SJ expressed his desire to meet the attendees of this meeting face to face and have a chat.
SJ	TW expresses that SJ is the first mine owner to meet with them
TW	SJ states that he didn't do anything that was illegal, he states that "we" are all business men as well and that everyone at the meeting works. SJ states that if he makes this application, there is a sieve quite close the area and states that everyone knows how much it costs to upgrade roads. SJ carries on to say that they did request the sieve to be parked at his site, but he won't use it. SJ reassures everyone that he is trying to remain legal throughout every step and states that there hasn't been any sand put through that sieve. SJ state that if the right is not amended, they will not use the sieve. He carries on to say that he only got the sieve on his land as it was in the area.
GA	TW states that he has no way of monitoring whether SJ utilises the sieve or not.
TW	GA supports TW and state that they can't sit and watch the sieve.
SJ	TW further says that there are CAT trucks on the property which is used by SJ's customers to collect the sand TW reiterates that it is the customer's trucks. TW also states that this is what is mentioned in the mining works program.
AH	SJ states that the CAT trucks working on that piece of land are only.
SJ	AH states that it is not part of SJ's public participation.

AH	<p>SJ states that this meeting was held in order to pave a way forward and show faith.</p>
QM	<p>AH state that they are not against mining however he felt as though everyone was “stepping” on him.</p> <p>QM explained why the screen plant was there, QM states that as SJ mentioned, we are all business men and woman here. Therefore, the screen plant being there was a business decision. QM states that the screen plant came from a project called Aggenys, the screen plant was placed at this mine and will sit there until the amendment has been approved. QM states that as the safety officer, he stopped any use of the screening plant in order to remain compliant and prevent DMR from closing them down or receiving any fines. QM states that he followed the EMP and said that no screening may take place at that point. QM carries on to explain why the trucks are there, he quotes the EMP and state that in section 2.3 the main mining activities are listed such as, but not limited to. Therefor there is a clause for having the trucks on the property. QM states that he got DMRs opinion on the matter and they were in two minds. He then apologises if he stepped on any toes.</p>
AH	
SJ	<p>AH enquires about the excavators</p> <p>SJ states that he is the owner of the property and he has given a background regarding the process. He states that if he has to say exactly what he’s going to do in every detail, he will not comply when he has his first inspection and the listed equipment isn’t there. SJ carries on to say that any additional infrastructure that is required will be applied for through the DMR. SJ states again that he went through this whole process of looking for where the minerals are, so that the process can be as effective and safe as possible. SJ carries on to state that he wishes to rehabilitate the land to existing levels prior to mining. SJ states that with the current sand, he can do nothing. SJ states that he will make sure that he will get someone who is qualified to do the job so that he can sleep at night. SJ states that mining is done by specialists.</p>
AH	
LVS	<p>AH states that the specialists SJ appointed aren’t specialists. AH further states that SJ is meant to have 100m buffer zone from the road, AH states that he went with DMR and DMR said that the activities are too close to the road.</p> <p>LVS states that he understands however their rights are being impeded. LVS states that there was no public participation and he can’t allow these things to carry on. LVS states that this is why AH has spent money in court cases and that SJ’s application is destroying AH. LVS states that SJ did not honour them as humans and his property value has been disturbed. LVS then asks SJ how they should handle the costs and losses. LVS carries on to say that this is the first public participation he has been invited to and that now it is too late.</p>
GA	<p>GA states that Goosebay did start with their public participation and now their (Goosebays) application is on hold. He then states that if the process is followed it works and now they have Goosebay on hold. GA states that as things stand, he will oppose SJ’s application and put it on hold until a situation where everyone is happy is reached.</p>
SJ	<p>SJ states that the mineral is just lying there and is not underground, a mineral that South Africa needs. SJ state that we all need sand for infrastructure and other uses and is</p>



GA	<p>seen as a commodity in South Africa that is needed. He then carries on mentioning that AH stated that he isn't opposing mining. SJ states that he said that he would attend this meeting. SJ then state that if the mining had to go ahead, should he mine exactly as the governments law stipulates, his idea was to show all the consultants that he worked with and if anyone can tell SJ that they have a problem with dust, SJ's mandate would be to put up a dust monitoring program and see if there is any problem so that not ambiguities or uncertainties are found. SJ state that if anyone has a noise problem, he will set up a noise monitoring station and find any problems. SJ states that he is a medical practitioner and works in the mining industry performing medicals on mine workers, therefore he understands first-hand the medical problems associated with mining. SJ wants to have a mine that is the least destructive on the environment and this is what he has with the sand mine. He promises that there will be no blasting on his operation.</p>
YC GA	<p>GA states that in SJ's EMP, the mine is scheduled to conduct blasting twice a week. GA states that SJ is prepared to listen if your house has dust, he will do something about it. However, if SJ wants to help, he should have held a legal PPP. GA carries onto explain that Goose bay received 2000 concerns from "us" that the applicants need to address in their application. GA then states that SJ has not done that, GA uses an example and state that SJ hasn't come to the I&amp;APs and asked them what's wrong. GA then states that Goose bay and Sweet Sensations have a wonderful EMP but because they never asked the I&amp;APs, the trucks drive out of the mines on a not topped and therefore there is silica lying all over the road. GA state that SJ can do whatever he wants on the mine, the dust is flying all over the place from the road because the vehicles leave there not topped. GA states that SJ has shown no consideration and states that if he didn't bring this up, the trucks would never be topped.</p>
YC	<p>YC states that the purpose of today is to hear the I&amp;APs comments and concerns.</p>
	<p>GA states that this is not public participation meeting.</p>
GA	<p>YC states that this isn't a public participation meeting and actually a general meeting requested by the DMR in order to obtain the input from the I&amp;APs on the project regarding the roads and trucks and any other problems they might have.</p>
SJ	<p>GA states that YC is wrong. GA carries on to state that their input is to institute public participation process for his members.</p>
AH	<p>SJ states that when the first application was made, there was a different PPP process. He asks not to fight about things.</p>
GA	<p>AH states that he will fight about it as his constitutional right has been violated as it is stipulated that as the neighbour, he is legally meant to be informed. AH states that he has 3.5km of river and 500 hectares of land, he then asks SJ to put a value on that land.</p>
AH	<p>GA state that there are resorts along the river.</p>
SJ	<p>AH states that he is (SJ) making money off his property by destroying the value of his (AH) own property.</p>
GA	

SJ	SJ states that the purpose of this meeting is to gather all the concerns, and then there is a period allowed for raising concerns.
GA	GA interrupts states that they don't accept that and they want a proper PPP as this one is flawed.
JR	SJ states he isn't a lawyer. GA tells him to consult one
GA	JR states that there are regulations in terms of conducting a PPP. JR states that the project must be publicised in the public newspaper and that the I&AP's must be notified in writing where they must register, he then questions how one may know the addresses, he carries on to explain that this can be obtained at the deeds office. JR states that 95% of the written notifications are done. JR then states that many people change box numbers and don't change it at the deeds office. Therefore, a lot of letters bounce back. JR states that he is not saying that this is what happened, however, JR carries on that although members are saying that they weren't notified about the project, they still need to be consulted and he respects that. JR then states that in terms of the process and legalities, they were conducting themselves legally.
MO	
SJ	Can we give our ex-DMR official time to ask questions?
MO	Wants to receive clarity on a few issues. SJ has referred to the old order mining rights and if there was any conversion of the old order rights to new order rights. No conversion was made.
YC	MO carries on to state that the existing mining right cannot in MO's opinion the issues of historical Public Participation. All PPP was in term op the MPRDA. These are new PPP, new processes. With regards to the DMR letter, the instruction was referring to a minimum of 30 days. Not specifically 30 days. Minimum of 30 days.
MO	Asked if the association can please send a letter stating that they a limited time for their responses.
YC	MO's understanding is that TW wrote on behalf of Protect the Vaal Eden Committee and not on Behalf of the Vaal-Oewer Rate Payers Association. That is a big difference. We need clarity on that.
GA	This was also brought up with Gavin. When YC contacted the DMR, the email that TW send to DMR was forwarded to us. YC spoke to TW to ask who the chairperson was, who then referred YC to GA. GA confirmed that he represents both the Committee and Association. Therefore, we are dealing with both.
TW	
YC	Going forward, the committee must be referred to as the Protect the Vaal-Eden Committee.
ML	Requested the DMR letter. Yes, that will be send on the 23 <sup>rd</sup> of April 2018.

WF	<p>It is understood that the restoration is nearly impossible. She has visited with GA and AH all the surrounding mines (Sweet Sensations and Pure Source Minerals) and it is evident that restoration is irreversible and profound impacts on the land, therefore it is not possible to restore the land to its pre-mining condition. If the intention is to rehabilitate the area, ML would like to receive a copy of the financial provision. In terms of Department of Environmental Affairs, the 2015 regulations for the provision for mining exploration and prospecting there has to be provision for latent and residual impacts that are unforeseen, as well as the pumping and of extraneous water. Sand is plentiful. Needs and desirability needs to be established. Why mine in an area with a unique sense of place with tourism opportunities. ML refers to Save the Vaal case, where the case was won. Anglo wanted to open a coal mine in the Vaal. Court case was won due to the sense of place. Sense of place has an economic value. And has to be taken into consideration into your consideration. Visual or sense of place especially as it is sensitive tourist that will experience this.</p>
RH	<p>Just to fill in with ML's comment. Please, with SJ's concern was with the farms concerns and recognizing ML's concern on sense of place, we are on the border of the Vredefort dome heritage site. WF is busy writing a report for UNESCO and the feature of a potential Geofarm. Is SJ's interest in protecting the area, and would you rather not join to the area. The next door farm was recently listed as an eco-estate, to get the loop protected and form part of the tourism route. It would be preferable for the community, rather than mining in the area, that has short term benefits for present and future generations.</p>
GA	<p>In die IDP under review, the area listed as a scenic route. There is a paragraph in the IDP stating where sand mining should be taken place is, which is on the R59 not in this area. It is stated in the IDP that that is where sand and gravel mining should take place.</p>
TW	<p>SLP refers to the job creation you are creating. That is nothing in comparison with destroying jobs by destroying ecotourism. Numerous resorts are along the river, and the jobs that Tja Naledi is creating, is nothing in comparison with the jobs that will be lost to eco-tourism.</p>
YC	<p>Even with the 2014 application, the PPP was flawed, if you refer to the PPP guidelines and the NEMA act. Adjacent properties should be notified by letter and the guideline states that proof should be supplied. This proof should have been send by registered post and receipt should contain the addresses. YC's postnet slips do not supply the addresses. Act says you must follow all guidelines. Because this is a tripoint area where 3 municipalities meet, Tja Naledi will affect other provinces. PPP needs to go beyond other provinces. All municipalities need to be consulted. Only Free state has been consulted and local and district municipality. But not Emfuleni municipality. So even with the NEMA Act, the 2014 Mining Right has been flawed. Dorean Environmental EAP was at fault as well as DMR to not have done proper investigation to what should have taken place. DMR should have not granted the 2014 Mining Right.</p>
TW	<p>We did have a DMR pre-consultation meeting, where border issues were discussed.</p>
GA	<p>100% of the mining right area falls within 100% of the Free state province. And Tja Naledi is located 700m from the border of the river. DMR also felt the same as Tja Naledi falls 100% within the Free state province.</p>
SJ	

	<p>Where do the trucks go?</p> <p>That is a flaw in itself.</p>
CR	<p>The valid point needs to be taken up with the DMR. We follow exactly what the legislation say and that is why we don't have any further comment on that. Can't comment on anything that we should not do according to the legislation.</p>
TW	
SJ	<p>You said within 700m from a neighbouring province. There is no way that the distance that you are mining within the boundary of the province is less that 700m from the province.</p>
WF	<p>The DMR is wrong, because the property values are affected as the dust and noise travels, therefore the DMR is wrong.</p>
SJ	<p>That can be discussed with the DMR.</p> <p>Please respond to my comment to protect the area.</p>
AH	<p>There are a lot of issues at stake. There is a mineral that is laying there. If SJ is the owner of the farm and holds the mining rights, no one can mine the farm. This remains a threat for the area. That sand will be mined as long as it is mineable. We followed what the DMR said. The way forward is to mine the sand and to rehabilitate. The area on the right before entering the farm has been rehabilitated. Normal vegetation is established. You can see that it has been mined. But rehabilitation has been ongoing. And normal vegetation is establishing.</p>
SJ	
AH	<p>Does not agree. If you drive on the tar road. Pieter Koekoemoer mined in that area.</p>
GA	<p>Pieter Koekoemoer has never mined on my property.</p>
SJ	<p>I was under the impression that is your property. But that is not rehabilitated and it looks really bad.</p>
WF	<p>WF is saying that there is no economic value in joining the eco –estate. There is more economic value in mining the sand.</p>
SJ	<p>Disagrees. As SJ can't make a decision at the moment and needs to think about the project.</p>
CR	<p>Would you investigate to save the area, and be prepared to put your name down to save the area? To safeguard the area.</p>
SJ	<p>If you provide me with the information, as this is all new. Can't give an opinion as SJ does not have the goals, visions and missions of the project. This will be documented and investigated. All our details are here, and we will respond to all concerns.</p>
CR	<p>On the point, that nothing happens within 700m from the river. 836m from the middle of the river to the barrage road.</p>

GA	The closest to the river is 800m, which is an area that has already been historically mined.
SJ	There are trucks working there now. It starts at 7am. There is no way that that is within 700m from the provincial boundary.
QVM/YC	Can we please proceed with the meeting?
YC	All points are noted and documented. And some points have been brought up numerous times.
GA	We would like to show you on google earth the distances.  Continues with the presentation, and describes the project description and activities taking place.
YC	You said that relevant earth moving equipment will be used as deemed necessary. That can't be correct. You need to stipulate exactly. Your statement in the presentation says that we can use exactly what we want and when we want to. This is incorrect.
GA	The association received the FBAR, and you are aware what it says in the FBAR. This is a summary for the presentation.
SJ	This is not correct. You need to say there that relevant earth moving equipment as per the EMP will be used. Then I'll agree.
YC	
GA	Noted.  Continues with presentation.
YC	Your statement "Aggregate will be crushed and screened before loaded onto client's trucks to remove any debris contained in the aggregate, the aggregate will also be screened to identify any diamonds found in the product". States that you imply that an EIA needs to be done, because in original plan you said that the noise that will be generated will be nothing more than the normal agricultural equipment. Therefore, your statement is null and void, and you need to address that in an EIA.
GA	
SJ	Noted.
YC	And we want to see it.
GA	You will.
YC	Continues with presentation regarding NEMA Regulations triggered.
TW	We want to see those documents.
SJ	That is part of the FBAR, that was sent to you that forms part of the Section 102 amendment.
CR	So everything is contained in there. We don't have time to look through everything.

SJ/YC	Everything is in the document.
SJ	You were never screening sand beforehand on the property.
AH	No never.
YC	The neighbours did, but we never did.
GA	The neighbours screening plant has been stopped.
RH	Continues with the presentation describing the 2014 PPP conducted.
YC	That is established now that that is not correct.
AH	Can we note that I was registered?
SJ	Yes, RH has been acknowledged but not included in the previous EMP. There was no reference to RH's registration.
AH	How can the employees of the farm sign for rights?
SJ	Employees are registered as I&AP's.
TW	How can brother sign for sister if he is also in the mining right? Talking about the local mines.
AH	At the time of the PPP for the 2014 application, those mines where not active.
ML	They can because it is an accumulated affect.
	Where is the other I&APS? There is only 5?
SJ	The applicant can. If there is a flaw in the PPP or in any environmental impacts in terms of NEMA, the directors of a company or co-directors can be held personally liable and collectively liable is a criminal offence. There is no excuse to say I'm not a legal person.
JR	
ML	Proof was shown of correspondence with Dorean Environmental to Tja Naledi.
JR	I acknowledge that I had the impression that all I&APs where consulted. I acknowledge this.
ML	But then this process is flawed.
SJ	We will consult with Dorean to state that we met with the Vaal-Oewer Association to discuss this further.
LVR	Can we have a response to that. Can we make it within a certain time period?
CR	We all need said we need 30 days commenting period. The way forward will be discussed later.

SJ	Nobody in Lindequesdrift was consulted. So the DMR needs to hear that no one in Vaaloeuw or Lindequesdrift where consulted.
CR	An I&AP does not need to be an immediate neighbour.
YC	Confirms, and this has been noted. This is mentioned now that DMR said now in 2018 that neighbouring municipalities needs to be consulted.
CR	DMR said for a mining activity within 700m radius from the mining activities. No need to notify the boundary activity. YC said that you don't need to consult within if there is a mining activity within 700m.
YC	Disagreed. Neighbouring properties meaning adjacent to this site is the Vaal River, meaning DWS. This is Greenmined's interpretation.
CR	You said that you didn't have to consult if the activity is outside of the 700m boundary, your activity is within 700m from the border, therefore Emfuleni Municipality needs to be notified.
TW	No I did not say anything about 700m, and that you must not consult with anyone outside of the 700m.
CR	But what did you mean.
YC	You are an adjacent property, so you needed to be consulted.
TW	The DMR said that you don't have to consult with people that fall without the 700m radius.
YC	No, I did not say that.
CR	Corrects the point stating that he mentioned that the other provinces need to be consulted, then YC replied the provincial boundary is 700m away. But CR is a neighbouring property so for him this does not apply. He and his province is within 700m from the site.
YC	Acknowledged this that CR should have been consulted.
ML	Stated that the municipalities should also have been consulted.
JR	Noted.
CR	Then this is an acknowledgement. You said you will first investigate but now you acknowledge this.
YC	Stated that he is not concluding this. He will still investigate further with Dorean Environmental about this point. JR acknowledged that people was left out.
GA	

YC	700m radius from mining activity and not needing to notify cross border municipalities etc. where the mining activity is within the 700m, they should have been notified. That is what the DMR said.
GA	Noted.
YC	So the process is flawed.
JR	Noted.
YC	So ML's point is that if the process is flawed, it must be redone.
TW	Noted.
YC	Where is the regulation of 700m?
TW	It not a regulation, it's an opinion. Noted and will be investigated.
GA	Confirmed it's an opinion.
JR	Continues with the Presentation regarding the previous public participation process.
AH	Checking on SAHRA website.
GA	We have agreed the process is flawed.
	It was advertised in the Parys gazette.
SJ	We don't stay in Parys.
TW	Flowing from what we have established from the 700m, the fact that you published the project in the Parys Gazette is not only the requirement. Need to be in the national newspaper.
YC	We are going in circles. We do not need to advertise in other newspapers.
YC	That not the law. It's not in the document. There are no other newspapers where it was advertised.
TW	Continues with the presentation about the Section 102 application PPP.
GA	So they were hand delivered?
YC	Yes
GA	AH was not hand delivered.
YC	Let's go past this as this is irrelevant.
GA	Continues with presentation. Sampie's comments where late, therefore they have not been incorporated. RH was not included because she has not been registered.



TW	<p>Flawed process.</p> <p>Noted. Flawed previous process.</p>
YC	<p>So the process if flawed. And this PPP is also flawed due to the previous PPP being flawed.</p>
GA	<p>Just an admission on your slide show and in your FBAR PPP you do mention that AH name and that a letter was sent to him. It is in die documents but it does not reflect on your slide show that consultation was made.</p>
YC	<p>Not all comments that were made via email were included into the slide show. But all comments where addresses later in the slide show. YC explains the PPP process followed during the Section 102. And the purpose of the meeting.</p>
GA	<p>You have to agree that the process was flawed.</p>
QVM	<p>Noted.</p>
GA	<p>Continues with the slide show, although most of the comments have been addressed already during the meeting.</p>
QVM	<p>How are you dealing with dust suppression at the moment?</p>
SJ	<p>A 10 000l water cart is on site to be used for dust suppression and a water canon is suppressing the stockpiles.</p>
ML	<p>Where are you getting your water from?</p>
SJ	<p>From the boreholes that is within the Section 102 EMP.</p>
AH	<p>This has already been addressed previously.</p>
AH	<p>Refers to Silicosis case, and the effects of silicosis on mine workers. And to include that a health assessment be included into the amendment of the FBAR.</p>
SJ	<p>Personal dust and noise monitoring is being conducted, which forms part of the Mine Health and Safety Act</p>
ML	<p>2 laws need to be complied with: MHSA and dust regulation and OHS Act. Suggest that the whole community be send for health screening. Sky sands send people for medicals every 3 months.</p>
QVM	<p>According to the OHS Act, a medical need to be conducted once a year. Explains silicosis from a Medical Practitioners perspective.</p>
AH	<p>The dust monitoring is not sufficient. Every mine must have a dust monitoring and management plan and to meet the new dust regulations. And to include the health assessment.</p>
SJ	

AH	A dust fallout monitoring system is in place. SPH was not active on the site. 2 reports conducted when SPH was active on site falls within the legal limits. SPH have appointed an occupation hygienist as per the OHS to conduct the gravimetric noise testing done.
SJ	Will the mine carry the cost for these tests on health and safety?
QVM	Only direct neighbours affected by the dust will need to undergo a medical.
SJ	Dr. Gilliland goes to site from Sky Sands, and goes to affected parties. Sky Sands pay him to conduct the test.
YC	
AC	Only affected parties.
QVM	A survey will be done of the exposed parties.
	Wind roses are being conducted with the dust monitoring
	Mentions that AC had an issue with the truck noise.
GA	Major noise issue. Noise starts at 7am and ends at 5pm.
JR	These forms part of the safety processes. Could be addressed, sounds are muffled. Codes of practise needs to be followed hence the control measures and risk assessment of the people on the mine. Health and safety control measures to warn people. Will look at the noise impacts.
QVM	This should have been looked at from the beginning. In the EMP Greenmined states that the noise that we are making is nothing more than agricultural noises. This is not normal agricultural noises.
GA	Reverse hooters on trucks on mines is a legal requirement.
QVM	The EMP states that the noise will not be more than normal agricultural noise, which is not the case thus the rezoning issues. Farmers in the area would not need to live with that noise under normal agricultural use.
ML	Farmers are not regulated by the DMR.
CR	In your EMP you said that the only noise that will come from the mining activity is normal agricultural noise, which is incorrect.
	Noted.
SJ	In terms of the constitution, every person has the right to a clean environment and wellbeing. Wellbeing is affected here.
QVM	
CR	Sense of place is affected. You are doing mining activity on mining property. AC doesn't have issues with the noise decibels, have issues with the peace in own home and noise nuisance (sense of place).
TW	

GA	Will visit the AC farm.
JR	Reason for this meeting is to address these concerns.
SJ	You lie to the public and say its agricultural noise.
CR	Refers to Page 18 of the FBAR - noise levels.
SJ	It was said that the noise levels will not exceed normal agricultural levels. AC is saying this is not the case. We say noise levels will not access the normal legal requirement.
GA	The DMR does not have minimum or maximum legal requirement for decibels.
CR	Measure the noise and it will be below the decibels required. The noise is a nuisance.
CR	Have a constitutional right to peace in my own home, which I am being deprived off due to the impact of mining next to my property.
SJ	Will visit the property. And this is the purpose of the meeting.
CR	No, the purpose of this meeting is what happened in the past was not in the normal ambit of what was required and should have been given the right to raise concerns years ago.
ML	Should have been given the right to comment 4 years ago. Issues should have been raised by AC. These issues should have been addressed in 2014.
LVS	Acknowledged, and will discuss with DMR
GA	The process is already completed. There is trickery and the value of the property will decrease. Only recourse is to take this case to court.
YC	Since 2014 process was flawed, ask for consideration to appeal the process / ML will ask for a legal opinion, need to appeal the process. All authorisations will stop during the appeal process.
GA	Legal opinion will also give the right to be consulted.
CR	Please proceed
SJ	Road integrity has been discussed. There was no need for SPH to pay due diligence to the road used.
GA	
TW	Not correct
	The mine has been active since 2013. Trucks have been using the road.
SJ	Not correct.
AH, GA	Irrespective of that. The road cannot carry the load of the trucks.

YC	What does it imply that due diligence does not need to be paid if the mine is not active? The EMP is to forecast roads and trucks. And road capacities must be calculated. Department of roads has to have an input into this.
TW	
YC	Not client's responsibility to circulate the EMP to Department of Roads.  All roads have been upgraded around Exxaro mine.
TW	Please refer back the slide show. Going forward a strategy will be developed to assist in the road repairs.
YC	
TW	The EMP needs to include this issue.
LVS	Please refer back to the slides where it is stated that the roads department is busy conducting an analysis on the road.
AH	Yes, we are aware.
SJ	And this forms part of our process as well.  This has not been included in your previous process of 2014.
GA	DMR must be informed of the road problem and this is affected our lives on the road.  Your PPP is a copy of Sweet Sensations EMP. In that EMP it stated that the road will be upgraded.
AC	Please note that this was done by Dorean Environmental conducted the same time as Tja Naledi. SPH has also in the past been fixing the potholes in the area. This is illegal to repair the roads if you are not contracted by the department to fix the roads.
SJ	In terms of road, we want the hard facts, needs to get it from SANRAL.
AH	What they know about the road. Association has the documents from the Department stating the road capacity and bridge capacity, and there is limitation. Don't want a strategy; want to know what is the plan before authorisation.
IVR	Authorisation has been given. There is currently mining taking place on site, where sand is bought and leaves the property. So the road is being used.
AH	
TW	Sand is bought from the neighbours in the last 4 years  There is photo evidence that there are trucks loading sand.
JR	Trucks with sand bags is for sandy sand mine to load the sand to get dried, and the sand that they will not use is used to rehabilitate the property.
GA	Trucks on the road.
YC	All these impacts must be included in the EMP.
GA	

AH	GA said that regulations must be obtained from SANRAL. We will do that. Can this chapter be closed?
QVM	Agreed. Proceed.
YC	Continues with presentation discussing the road.  Disputing the fact about the capacities of the bridges.
TW	2 bridges, the Vaal-Eden bridge and barrage bridge. The Vaal-Eden bridge capacities does not correlate with your info.  We will investigate the Vaal-Eden Bridge.
GA	Way Forward. All minutes will be circulated. With comments and concerns. Commenting period closes on 14 <sup>th</sup> May which was agreed by the association to be disputed. Our dates were confirmed by the DMR. A letter needs to be written by the association to the DMR stating the timeframe.
SJ	30 days from new PPP that will have to be redone. Whole committee needs to be included. He will not send everyone the emails. Its Tja Naledi's responsibility to consult everyone.  All 800 people need to be present for new PPP. You will need to get them. Association have not noted all their concerns. All 2000 concerns from the goose bay development project needs to be incorporated into our PPP that will be applicable to you. You cannot say that all concerns have been addressed. As this is incorrect. 803 people have been registered for the goose bay development project. DMR is telling Tja Naledi to redo the PPP and to get all 800 people that was registered in the Goosebay Development to register. Want to know how Tja Naledi will be dealing with this?
AH	This is a legal issues and YC was appointed to do the Section 102, and this is discussion between the DMR and Greenmined. Cannot determine what will happen further. DMR will instruct on the way forward. We will address issues further as received from the DMR. We need to abide to the legal issues. We are fully legal. Feel free to contact Tja Naledi or SJ.
ML	Thank you SJ for being here today. We are not trying to aggravate anyone. Do you blame us for responding the way we do after you see mine's illegally mining? With the same hours as you are, with the same infrastructure that you do? This does not happen on your site yes, but this is happening in our community.
YC	Most of us work in the week, and we want to have a nice peaceful Saturday. I do understand your anger towards mines. Let's see what happens with the DMR. We know each other now, and don't want to read about it in the papers. There are 3 mines in the area, and they are all completely different. If there are problems, I want the neighbours and communities to contact me regarding their issues.
ML	Did not read through the FBAR and previous Mining right. Did Greenmined Environmental compile a biodiversity impact assessment?

	<p>Was not done for the previous EMP.</p>
GA/TW	<p>For the consideration of the Section 102 amendment, a biodiversity assessment needs to be considered. The site does not fall in the biodiversity guidelines, within any highest and high biodiversity area like ne national freshwater ecosystem priority area. Or within a critical biodiversity area. But is in very close proximity to the Vaal River, which supplies 60% water to the economy and 45% to the population. YC is a EAP and not a legal expert. In the next meeting the legal advisor with the consultancy firm needs to attend the meetings. The association is eager to prevent mines in the area of the Systematic non enforcement of DMR of non-compliances to EMP PAR's. To simply allow in good faith that the EMP's will comply is naïve.</p>
SJ	
GA	
ML	
TW	
SJ	
TW	
JR	
CR	
ML	
GA	<p>Give 30 days' notice of each meeting to be held with the association.</p>
TW	<p>We have reiterated most of these concerns various times through the meeting. GA has contact with all of these I&amp;APS. Stated that GA needs to represent the association and the people of the community when Tja Naledi meet's again with the association.</p>
SJ	<p>Can only represent the people in terms of processes and procedures. All I&amp;APS needs to be presented to, therefore all I&amp;APs needs to have the opportunity to raise their comments.</p>
TW	<p>DMR will read the comments and responses and they will only read these responses. Same with an appeal process. Everyone needs to appeal or object.</p>
JR	<p>SJ is trying to shift the onus on the association to consult with the 800 people. Cannot be done. We will assist where possible.</p>
CR	<p>Don't want to shift the responsibility. DMR needs to advice on what is the way forward.</p>
ML	<p>Requested that the minutes of this meeting to be circulated.</p>
GA	<p>ML referred to compliance and monitoring faith in DMR. SJ mentioned that the association knows Tja Naledi now. We have made commitments that we need to oblige to. You are free to take steps to DMR that is required. But please note that our doors are open and any concerns and comments will be addresses.</p>
SJ	<p>Should have been consulted during the 2014 Mining Right, is spirit of good neighbours. Property value is destroyed. Mitigation measures should have been discussed. 4 years down the line, Tja Naledi has not done what they were supposed to.</p>
LVS	<p>Needs and desirability of the project, and not best practise option as part NEMA principles. Least practicable option at a cost acceptable to society. ML requested the needs and desirability to see the alternatives, the cost.</p>
SJ	<p>Loss of employment, loss of value. Figures can be provided. All these needs to be addressed. Members of the committee have been threatened in the past.</p>
GA	<p>Glad to conduct the meeting.</p>
SJ/JR	

<p>ML</p> <p>LVS</p> <p>GA</p>	<p>We understand the request to stay out of the media. Cumulative effect is looked at. And the only way this is achieved is via the media.</p> <p>It's fine if you go to media, but please don't generalise.</p> <p>Mining is illegal because of zoning application not made.</p> <p>Not going to debate that further.</p> <p>Section 31 of NEMA states that a person has the right to disclose to media what a danger to the environment is. Listed all the Departments this can be disclosed to.</p> <p>Freedom of speech to protect our area. And applaud everyone for attending the meeting to discuss the way forward and to protect our area.</p> <p>Discusses the dust again.</p>
	<p><b>CLOSURE:</b>  YC and QVM thanked everyone for attending.</p> <p><b>Meeting closed at 12:15Pm</b></p>