

AGENDA: PUBLIC MEETING	Date: 23 November 2021
Project: Midvaal Brick Manufacturing SA Block (Pty) Ltd	Venue: .Conference Centre, GlenDouglas Dolomite Mine, Meyerton, Guateng Province

1. Welcome and introduction

Mr. Da Serra welcomed everybody to the meeting and introduced himself and handed over to Mr Swanepoel.

2. Background Information

Mr Swanepoel, from SA Block, gave some background information, about what has been done thus far. Mr Swanepoel referred to the previous meeting held on the 21 June 2021 which was facilitated by Ms Nsako Ndlovu. Mr Swanepoel introduced Ms. White to the group, who is now taking over the Environmental Impact Assessment for the proposed project, as Ms. Ntanko Ndlovu resigned from Afrimat.

Ms. White introduced herself to the group. She went through the agenda of the meeting. Ms. White referred to the previous meeting held where the community requested additional specialist studies to be undertaken. A request for the extension of the application was submitted to the department to prevent the project from lapsing. The department approved the extension on 22 October 2021 and noted that the final report must be submitted by 6 December 2021.

Ms. White explained that SA Block (Pty) Ltd is proposing to erect a brick manufacturing facility adjacent to Glen Douglas mine, on the corner of Adelaar Drive and Bokmakierie Street. She noted that the brick manufacturing plant will be under a roof of 1500m² in size and it will also have a storage yard of approximately 5000m². There will also be temporary buildings and offices. She added that there is a possibility that the project could be expanded in the future with a ready-mix plant. She noted that there was a previous discussion about also having an asphalt plant added to this facility, but it must be placed on record that this is no longer considered.

Mr. Swanepoel then explained the process flow for the making of bricks. The way SA Block is proposing to manufacture bricks are different than baking clay bricks in an oven. A mixture of cement, water and aggregate (which is a -10 stone dust) is used as a dry mix to manufacture the bricks. SA Block is proposing to use Glen Douglas mine's -10 materials. The mixture used for the brick manufacturing consist of a chemical that expedites a reaction with the cement, currently this method is not being used, but most brick manufacturers are using this method. The wet concrete mixture is thrown into a mould and under pressure and vibration it is compacted into stone bricks. The mould lifts and the stone bricks are released onto a conveyer belt where it is cured for 24 - 48 hours. Once it is cured it is at 70% strength where it is placed in the yard for at least one week, thereafter the stone bricks can be collected by client. A forklift will be used to transport the stone bricks. A loader will also be used to get the dry mixture into the large mixer.

Ms. White explained that an EIA process is a legislative tool which must be undertaken in order for the department to make a decision regarding the proposed project. She explained that it is called an Environmental Impact Assessment process and during this process it is required to do public participation, therefore a meeting was arranged to gather everybody's inputs and see where everyone can be accommodated, what the impacts are and how the impacts are going to be mitigated. For this reason, the additional three specialist studies were undertaken. According to the National Environmental Management Act (Act 107 of 1998), there are three listing notices, namely, Listing notice 1, 2, and 3 (GNR 983 GNR 984 and GNR 985, 2014) as amended in 2017. The two listed activities applicable to this proposed project falls within Listing Notice 1, which states that a Basic Assessment process must to be conducted:

GNR 983, 2014 (as amended), Activity 26:

Residential, retail, recreational, tourism, commercial or institutional developments of 1000 square meters or more, on land previously used for mining or heavy industrial purposes

GNR 983, 2014 (as amended), Activity 27:

The clearance of an area of 1 hectare or more, but less than 20 hectares of indigenous vegetation, except where such clearance of indigenous vegetation is required for – (i) the undertaking of a linear activity.

Ms. White then explained that a Heritage Impact Assessment and an Ecological Impact Assessment was requested by the department and the findings were as follow:

Heritage Impact Assessment

A site investigation was conducted and nothing that was found to be of heritage significance by Mr. Francois Coetzee.

Ecological Impact Assessment

The Ecological Impact Assessment was undertaken by scientific terrestrial services. The site is located within the Vulnerable Soweto Highveld Grassland. It was found that the study area has been exposed to historic disturbances, therefore the impact on fauna and flora is low, however there was one species found to be of conservation concern. A permit will have to be obtained in order for that species to be removed.

Ms. White stated that upon request from the attendees of the previous stakeholder and public consultations, a Dust Impact Assessment, Noise Impact Assessment and Traffic Assessment was conducted and that the findings are noted below:

Noise Impact Assessment

Acusolv was appointed to investigate the noise impact of the proposed operation on the surrounding environment. It was found that there is a lot of noise surrounding the proposed operation. The noise is generated from the R59 main road and local roads, noise from the railway line to the west, and noise from Glen Douglas Dolomite Mine to the South. In Daleside, surveys indicate that the daytime and night-time levels were in the order of 50dBA and 45 dBA, respectively. The Noise study found that the noise impact of the proposed operation on the nearest houses, will be negligible (the nearest house is outside the 3dBA impact footprint).

This negligible impact is due to the following reasons:

- Restriction of operation to daytime hours;
- Placement of brick manufacturing machines inside brick plant buildings;

- Reverse alarm noises could however be audible but can effectively be mitigated by construction of a noise barrier along the northern and along part of the eastern site boundaries.

Dust Impact Assessment

OH & AP Consulting was appointed to conduct the dust assessment for the proposed operation. It was concluded that the main sources of dust will be from the movement of haul trucks over the terrain for the delivery of process material, off-loading of process material, open storage of process material, dust generated through material entering silos and dust emitted through material handling inside the plant.

The processing plant will be housed inside an enclosed structure. Any dust emissions inside the plant will be controlled as required by the relevant Occupational Health Legislation. The impact rating of the proposed project is projected to be **low** provided the mitigating measures are implemented against backdrop of the prevailing dust fall conditions at the boundaries of the existing site.

The proposed mitigation measures are as follow:

- The paving of access roads and material storage areas
- Building of product storage bunkers to limit windblown dust
- The implementation of dust suppression at storage bunkers
- The use of dust suppression at material transfer points
- The implementation of dust extraction with a filtering system on top of silos
- Dust extraction and filtering of emissions from sources inside building

Traffic Assessment

Mariteng Consulting Engineers were appointed to conduct the Traffic Impact Assessment. Based on the results the proposed development will generate approximately 8 and 11 trips, during the weekday morning and weekday afternoon peak hours respectively. The following minimum access arrangements are proposed for the site:

- Access from Bokmakierie Road, on the most southern boundary of the site;
- Two inbound lanes (1 x 3.7m & 1 x 4.5m);
- One outbound lane, minimum width 4.5m;

From a traffic engineering point of view, it is confirmed that the impact of the new brick manufacturing facility will be negligible on the traffic flow along Bokmakierie Road. To compensate for the turning vehicles an exclusive right-turn lane (storage length = 25) should be provided on the southern leg of Bokmakierie Road. To improve road safety, taxi stops to be provided on Bokmakierie Road, downstream of the new access and to improve road safety, a 1.5m paved walkway to be provided around the taxi stops.

Ms. White indicated that no fatal flaws in terms of environmental and socio-economic impacts were identified as all of the impacts can be mitigated and managed to be of low significance and where possible it can also be prevented.

Ms. White indicated that the findings of the additional specialist studies will be included within the Final Basic Assessment Report and Environmental Management Programme, which will include mitigation measures proposed by the project specialists. All the additional information will be included for approval by the department.

Ms. White briefly explained the public participation process to date. The summary of the PPP was as follows:

- Project announcement
- On-site notices (8) – 27 May 2021
- Newspaper (English) adverts – Sedibeng Ster, 26 May 2021 and the Henley- Herald Newspaper, 10 June 2021
- Distribution of notification letters by email to I&AP's - 27 May 2021
- Distribution of Draft Scoping Report – 01 June 2021

Previous public consultations undertaken:

- Henley Liaison Forum – 21 June 2021;
- Daleside community – 24 June 2021 (which was organized by Mr. Peter Teixeira)

I&APs comments were received and included within the Comments and Response Report submitted to GDARD which was followed by a request for extension to undertake the additional specialist assessments.

3. Questions and Comments:

Interested and Affected Party	Comment	Response
Process flow for brick making		
Mr. L. Kirchner	Mr. Kirchner requested information about the number of lines that will be made.	<u>Response from Mr. Swanepoel:</u> We will be making one line. We are hoping to produce 120 000 bricks per day.
Mr. A. Dougherty	Mr. Dougherty required a better understanding of how the concrete will be cured within 2 days, as the concreted used at other operations take 28 days to cure.	<u>Response from Mr. Swanepoel:</u> Concrete is not going to be used. The mixture used for the brick manufacturing will be a dry mix which use less water.
Ecological Impact Assessment		
Mr S. Wallace	Mr Wallace wanted to know what species was found to be of conservation concern.	<u>Response from Ms. White:</u> The species name will be included within the Final Basic Assessment, as it was omitted from the presentation
Noise Impact		
Mr S. Wallace	Mr Wallace requested clarification whether a noise barrier could or would be placed along the northern	<u>Response from Ms. White:</u> If it is found that the impact is so severe a noise barrier can

	and along part of the eastern site boundaries.	be placed, however, Mr. Swanepoel confirmed that a noise barrier will be placed to reduce the noise impact.
Mr. A. Dougherty	Mr. Dougherty objected to the daytime and night-time noise levels. He expressed that the noise levels are too low. Mr Dougherty used the mine plant to explain that households that are located 3 kilometres from the mine can still hear the reverse alarms during night-time.	<u>Response from Ms. White:</u> Ms. White reminded Mr Dougherty that the assessment was undertaken by a noise specialist and that the comment will be noted.
Mr. A. Dougherty	Mr. Dougherty requested clarification about the operating hours for the proposed development as daytime could mean anytime from when the sun rises until the sun sets. He also expressed that the mine's operating hours are from 6am to 10pm and he requested information whether the plant will also be operated during these hours.	<u>Response from Mr. Swanepoel:</u> Mr. Swanepoel confirmed that the noise specialist indicated according to international standards, day-time operating hours are indicated as 6:00 – 22:00. Confirmation will however be given upon review of the previous minutes.
Mr D. Grobbelaar	Mr. Grobbelaar also requested clarification about the operating hour and expressed that it was said that the operating hours will be from 6am to 6pm during the previous meeting held.	
Mr S. Wallace	Mr. Wallace expressed his concern about the reverse alarm noises that will be generated and requested clarification on how this will be mitigated.	<u>Response from Mr. Da Serra:</u> Mr. Da Serra reassured Mr. Wallace that the brick manufacturing facility will have to comply with the Occupational Health and Safety regulations and not the regulations issued by the Department of Minerals and Energy and therefore the rules and regulations are not as stringent as required or the mining operation. The alarm noises will therefore be effectively mitigated, but still be audible to be heard for safety purposes.

Mr S. Wallace	Mr. Wallace requested clarification whether the Noise Study done by the Mine was separate from this project.	<u>Response from Mr. Swanepoel:</u> Mr Swanepoel confirmed that it was a separate study.
Mr D. Grobbelaar	Mr. Grobbelaar disagrees with the base line noise levels and argues that it is over exaggerated.	<u>Response from Ms. White:</u> No comment can be made as Ms. White is not the Noise Specialist. The comment is therefore noted.
Mr S. Wallace	Mr. Wallace wanted to know to which regulations the operation of the conveyor belt will have to comply with when materials are transported. Mr Wallace's concern with the conveyer belt is the sirens which make a lot of noise.	<u>Response from Mr. Ackerman:</u> The operation of the conveyor belt will have to conform with the mine's regulations.
Dust Impact		
Mr D. Grobbelaar	Mr Grobbelaar requested information on how a dust impact assessment was done without the plant being operational currently	<u>Response from Ms. White:</u> All specialist reports will be sent to all interested and affected parties. The PowerPoint presentation only contains the summary of all the specialist studies and does not go into detail about what methodology was used for the assessment.
Mr. A. Dougherty	Mr. Dougherty stated that the impact of dust cannot be assessed if no design for the brick manufacturing plant exists.	<u>Response from Mr. Swanepoel:</u> The designs will be undertaken upon a decision from the Environmental Authority. Undertaking the designs for the development is an enormous cost if it is not yet known whether the development will be approved. Your comment is however noted.
Traffic Assessment		
Mr S. Wallace	Mr. Wallace requested confirmation whether the outbound lane is within	<u>Response from Ms. White:</u> Ms. White confirmed that it was lanes on Bokmakierie road to

	the parameter of the project footprint.	ensure access from Bokmakierie road to the site.
Mr. A. Dougherty	Mr. Dougherty requested confirmation whether new lanes are going to be built on Bokmakierie road.	<u>Response from Ms. White:</u> New lanes are going to be build as per the mitigation measures in order to ease traffic
Mr. A. Dougherty	Mr. Dougherty requested information on how the material will be transported from the mine to the brick plant.	<u>Response from Mr. Swanepoel:</u> Trucks will be used to transport the materials from the mine to the brick plant and there will be approximately 4 trucks per week delivering cement. <u>Response from Mr. Da Serra:</u> In the future, conveyer belts will be used to transport materials used from the mine to the brick plant.
Mr D. Grobbelaar	Mr. Grobbelaar expressed his concern about the traffic assessment that has been done. According to Mr. Grobbelaar, Bokmakierie road is in a bad condition and adding traffic to that road will only worsen the state of the road. He would like to note that the road is beyond repair.	<u>Response from Ms. White:</u> Ms White explained that the Traffic assessment was done by looking at how many vehicles will be travelling to and from the facility and according to these numbers (8 and 11 respectively), a conclusion was made that the additional traffic will not be significant. The specialist stated that there will be an additional 8 to 11 trips on that road which is not significant.
Vibration Assessment		
Mr S. Wallace	Mr. Wallace requested information about a Vibration Impact Assessment	<u>Response from Mr. Swanepoel:</u> The Vibration Assessment was included within the scope of work for the noise impact assessment conducted. The specialist report will be

		reviewed to include this aspect.
<u>General comments</u>		
Mr S. Wallace	Mr Wallace expressed his concern about why they have not received all specialist studies prior to the public participation meeting	<u>Response from Ms. White:</u> Ms. White explained that extension of the project was granted by the department on the 22 nd of October. The specialists should have completed all additional assessments by the 15 th of November, however, these assessments were only concluded two days prior to the consultation. Ms. White apologised and indicated that the specialist assessments will be shared after the meeting has been concluded.
Mr D. Grobbelaar	Mr Grobbelaar expressed his concern that all formal questions and concerns raised by the public were not being addressed and that there is no assurance that the comment would be included within the Final Basic Assessment Report.	<u>Response from Ms. White:</u> Ms White reassured all attendees that all comments will be addressed, and everybody will receive a copy of the minutes of the stakeholder engagement as well as a copy of the comments and response report.
Mr S. Wallace	Mr Wallace expressed his concern about the lack of time for commenting on the specialist reports	<u>Response from Ms. White:</u> Ms White explained that the Final Report needs to be submitted to the Competent Authority (GDARD) by the 6 th of December to prevent the project from lapsing and that all interested and affected parties may still send all comments and concerns even though the Final has been submitted. Any comments received will be forwarded to the competent authority for consideration. It is also noted that all I&AP's still have another opportunity to appeal the project once a decision has been made by the GDARD.

4. Conclusions

Ms. White indicated that the meeting was noted, and communication will be forwarded to all attendees. Ms. White requested that any additional questions be submitted via email in order for the comments and questions to be included within the Final Basic Assessment Report.

Ms. White added that all attendees will receive a copy of the additional specialist studies. Ms White encouraged all the attendees to write down all concerns and questions and send it to her via email.

Ms. White thanked everybody for attending the meeting and the meeting was adjourned.