

N2 WILD COAST TOLL HIGHWAY PROJECT

MINUTES OF THE FIRST AUTHORITIES COORDINATION COMMITTEE MEETING	Date: 22 July 2016
	Time: 11h00
	Venue: Mzamba Conference Room, Wild Coast Sun

No.	Item	Action
1.	<u>OPENING AND WELCOME</u>	
1.1	<p>Opening Ms Makoa (South African National Roads Agency Ltd - SANRAL) opened the meeting and welcomed attendees. <i>Refer to the attached attendance register for a list of attendees</i></p> <p>Mr Drew (NMA Effective Social Strategists) said this is the first Authorities Coordination Committee (ACC) meeting and the purpose of the meeting is for everyone to understand their roles and responsibilities and also to allow SANRAL to give a presentation so that all the relevant authorities are updated on the project and know how it is going to be implemented.</p>	
1.2	<p>Apologies Apologies were given for Mr Malaza (Department of Environmental Affairs – DEA) and Mr Madula (Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries – DAFF). Mr Geldenhuys was standing in for Mr Lucas (Department of Water and Sanitation - DWS).</p>	
2.	<u>ADOPTION OF AGENDA</u>	
2.1	The agenda was adopted as a suitable guide for the proceedings of the meeting without any amendments or additions.	
3.	<u>PRESENTATION ON N2 WILD COAST TOLL HIGHWAY PROJECT - SANRAL</u>	
3.1	Presentations:	
3.1.1	Mr McLachlan (SANRAL) gave an overview of the project and an update on the process going forwards. <i>See attached presentation.</i>	
3.1.2	Mr Damhuis (SANRAL) gave a presentation on the geotechnical investigations that have been carried out to date. <i>See attached presentation.</i>	
3.1.3	Ms Makoa said that in terms of the Environmental Authorisation (EA) there are a number of requirements which include the Biodiversity Offset Agreement. She said that the offset agreement has already been signed but implementation of the offset agreement has not yet started. There have been other studies undertaken to give effect to the EA conditions, such as the Biodiversity Offset study leading up to the Offset Agreement and updating the heritage studies. The Environmental Management Plan (EMP) has been compiled and approved. As part of the EMP there is an aquatic specific EMP due to the large number of river crossings. The	

<p>3.2</p> <p>3.2.1</p> <p>3.2.2</p> <p>3.2.3</p>	<p>EMP also includes an Alien and Invasive Species Control Plan as well as a Search and Rescue Plan for Threatened and/or Protected Species (TOPS).</p> <p>Ms Makoa said an application was made for a Water Use Licence (WULA) for the bridges and road infrastructure, specifically under Sections 21(c) and (i) of the National Water Act. There still needs to be an application for consumptive uses (Section 21 (a)). As part of the drilling SANRAL are looking at the potential for groundwater. The applications will be made as soon as SANRAL knows where the potential sources are. She appealed to the representatives from DWS to assist SANRAL once they have the information.</p> <p>Ms Makoa said SANRAL has also applied for the removal of protected trees and passing through natural forests. Those applications still need to be approved.</p> <p>In terms of materials SANRAL will start with an application for one of the quarries. She discussed the matter with the representatives from the Department of Mineral Resources (DMR) before the meeting and will be in contact with them once the application is made to see how they can assist. SANRAL will also try to accelerate the application from their side.</p> <p>Ms Makoa said that in terms of the EA a number of appointments were required such as a Project Environmental Manager, and SLR Consulting has been appointed for that position. They are in the process of acquiring Environmental Control Officers (ECOs) for construction. SANRAL are also in the process of appointing a practitioner for Search and Rescue of TOPS and for the setting up of short term holding and long term nurseries for use in rehabilitation. SANRAL are exploring the potential of some Small Medium and Micro Enterprises (SMMEs) to establish the nurseries for commercial purposes. They still need to appoint an environmental auditor for the project.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>Mr Mthembu (DEA) asked Mr Geldenhuys if DWS could provide feedback regarding the status of the Water Use License Application (WULA) and what needs to be done to expedite the process.</p> <p>Mr Geldenhuys (DWS) said he was not briefed on the status of the application but said the question will be posed to the relevant people in his department and he would report back to the chairperson.</p> <p>Mr Fredericks (SLR Consulting) said the application was submitted to Mr Mbikwana at the East London offices of DWS.</p> <p>Mr Pantshwa (Ingquza Hill Local Municipality - IHLM) said he appreciated SANRAL creating a database of local SMMEs and their proposal for the formation of partnerships. IHLM will make a presentation to SANRAL once the information has been collected. IHLM's concern is around the capacity of the local SMMEs. There are certain programs currently being undertaken by SANRAL such as the geotechnical investigations and the SMMEs did not see these programs being advertised. Some of the local SMMEs were complaining about this. He asked that SANRAL share information with IHLM regarding any upcoming activities in order for them to inform their local SMMEs.</p> <p>Mr McLachlan said SANRAL are looking at establishing a local office somewhere along the route. At the moment they are looking at the area between Lusikisiki and Flagstaff. SMMEs will then be able to collect information and tenders from the local office instead of going all the way to Port Elizabeth. It will take a few months to establish the office. SANRAL will ensure that any opportunities for local SMMEs are advertised in the local press.</p> <p>Mr Pantshwa said they received complaints from the communities that there are people on site and the communities do not even know what they are there for. He asked that the traditional</p>	<p>DWS</p> <p>SANRAL</p>
---	--	--

3.2.4	<p>authority and ward councillor be notified if anyone visits the site. IHLM can assist if SANRAL does not have the details of the ward councillors or traditional authorities. It will also assist IHLM if they are informed in order for them to address any complaints from the community.</p> <p>Mr Pantshwa said he is aware that there are building restriction lines of around 90 metres from the road. He said that the traditional leaders are busy allocating land along the road to people who are interested in investing. He said he was not sure how SANRAL was planning to manage this risk. His office invited all the traditional leaders to sensitise them to the issue and to say that there are bigger investment opportunities than allocating land without the proper planning. He wanted SANRAL to advise IHLM on how to deal with this challenge.</p> <p>Mr Drew said ribbon development was raised as a big issue during the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA).</p> <p>Mr McLachlan said it is something that SANRAL is also very concerned about. SANRAL has seen what has happened on their existing roads. There is a densification that happens as people try to be close to the good access provided by SANRAL's roads. There is a natural tendency to build close to a good road and take illegal access in the form of a driveway that is often not located in a safe place. SANRAL have tried speaking with all the chiefs along the route and will continue engaging with them to say they should rather develop along the roads leading to and from the N2. SANRAL acknowledges that they cannot rely entirely on these engagements therefore the detailed design scope for the consultants will look at anticipating what will happen based on SANRAL's experience of what has happened on existing roads.</p> <p>Certain facilities will need to be provided upfront in the design. This will include putting facilities such as cattle underpasses appropriately along the route. SANRAL needs to formalise where the access points are going to be and put in the service roads that will lead to those access points so that settlement will happen along those service roads and not along the N2.</p> <p>SANRAL has historical aerial photos of the route and they have also taken new aerial photos within the last month. SANRAL will set up a series of meetings with all the chiefs within the next month and show them the historical and recent aerial photos. SANRAL want to get the chiefs to sign off on the aerial photos as confirmation of the houses that will have to be relocated and / or provided with access. SANRAL will then not accommodate any new dwellings other than those that have been confirmed through this process. SANRAL does not know to what extent the chiefs will stick to this agreement but at least SANRAL is trying to avoid ribbon development.</p> <p>SANRAL will also speak to the Eastern Cape Department of Roads and Public Works about their roads. For example, SANRAL will request that the road from Mkambati to Holy Cross is surfaced all the way to the N2. That would create a development corridor through Holy Cross and people would get access to Flagstaff via that road as opposed to driving around via the R61.</p> <p>SANRAL also need to bring in the local municipalities on town planning issues where this is under their control. SANRAL want to help the local municipalities to get their town planning and nodal developments firmly in place and also help them to control them. This is why SANRAL needs this Authorities Coordination Committee.</p> <p>Mr Fredericks said that normally the EMP translates all these key issues into management objectives but where issues were considered to be beyond the jurisdiction and direct control of SANRAL, they were excluded from the EMP. Issues like tourism management and ribbon development are the mandate of other authorities such as the district or local municipalities. Therefore there is a need for coordination between SANRAL and those authorities in terms of nodal developments, Spatial Development Frameworks (SDFs) and Integrated Development Plans (IDPs), for example.</p> <p>Mr Drew said this is an issue that can be coordinated through the Authorities Coordination</p>	<p>SANRAL</p> <p>SANRAL</p>
-------	---	---

	Committee because it is a big concern and all the relevant authorities are represented.	
3.2.5	<p>Mr Mokhanya (Eastern Cape Provincial Heritage Resources Authority – ECPHRA) asked if the developer of the first quarry has a letter stating that there is no objection from the responsible heritage authority.</p> <p>Ms Makoa said SANRAL still needs to obtain authorisation for the quarry.</p>	
3.2.6	<p>Mr Mokhanya asked that the updated heritage studies be sent to ECPHRA. He said that when the EIA started documents were submitted to the South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) but in 2012 the ECPHRA came into existence and it has now taken over heritage responsibilities in the province.</p> <p>Ms Makoa said she will forward the updated heritage studies to ECPHRA.</p>	SANRAL
3.2.7	<p>Mr McLachlan said SANRAL are in the process of doing the EIA and permitting for the first quarry. The Public Participation Process (PPP) still needs to be done. A scoping scan has been done to ensure there are no major issues. There are no settlements near the suggested area for the first quarry except for one house that falls just outside the area.</p> <p>Mr Damhuis said solid rock is located less than a metre below the surface so there is very little chance that there are any graves on the proposed site.</p>	
3.2.8	<p>Mr Fredericks said the EIA process for the first quarry will start with a site visit next week so the applications will be submitted soon. He asked DMR to expedite those applications.</p> <p>Mr McLachlan said there is a risk of one of the bidders for the bridges trying to get a permit for the site for the first quarry to gain an advantage over the other bidders in the tenders. SANRAL told the bidders at the site briefing that SANRAL is in the process of obtaining permits for the quarry. If one of the contractors gets a permit for the quarry it will give them a huge commercial advantage. He asked that DMR not accept the permit application from the bidder. As a key stakeholder he asked that DMR reserve the permit for SANRAL.</p> <p>Ms Thompson (DMR) said licences are issued on a first-come first-served basis. There is no legal way for DMR to withhold anyone's application. Once an application is made the applicant has 44 days to submit a scoping report. The DMR then has 44 days to evaluate the scoping report. Once the scoping report has been accepted the applicant has 107 days to submit the EIA report. The applicant has to do 30 days of public consultation during the 44 day period for preparing the scoping report. If an applicant does not do the public consultation during the 44 day scoping period their application will fail.</p>	SLR / DMR
3.2.9	<p>Mr Gabula (Eastern Cape Department of Economic Development and Environmental Affairs - DEDEA) said one of the biggest challenges he anticipates will be sand mining. There will be a big demand for sand on the project. He asked if the EMP can include a method statement on how sand should be obtained. He said it will get worse once the N2 opens up access to the rest of the coast.</p> <p>Mr Damhuis said from a construction point of view SANRAL will not allow any sand mining in any of the rivers. The local SMMEs are using the sand from the rivers primarily for their block manufacturing. SANRAL will not use river sand because the sand sources within the rivers are usually small pockets and the project will need a lot of sand. About two thirds of the material required on the project will be sand. For this reason SANRAL have been drilling all the cuttings to see if they can crush the material to meet the sand requirements for the concrete. At this stage it looks fairly positive.</p> <p>Mr Mthembu said SANRAL will need to ensure that their conditions of procurement prevent the</p>	

	<p>purchase of sand from businesses that obtain sand through unauthorised sand mining in the rivers.</p> <p>Mr Damhuis said SANRAL has to approve all sources from a quality and environmental / permitting perspective. It is part of SANRAL's supply chain management to ensure they acquire the material from reputable sources.</p> <p>Ms Thompson said the applicant is responsible for checking the supplier's licence from DMR. If the supplier does not have a licence from DMR then they are illegal miners. A letter from a chief authorising the provision of materials is invalid. DMR has an enforcement section at head office that deals with illegal mining. They only have compliance officials at their regional offices so if any illegal mining activities are discovered they need to be reported to the enforcement section at head office. That includes people mining sand from the sand dunes on the coast.</p>	<p>SANRAL</p> <p>SANRAL</p>
3.2.10	<p>Mr Gabula asked when SANRAL will deal with the Biodiversity Offset Agreement implementation. He asked if the parties involved have their processes planned. He asked if the trust fund between DEA, SANRAL and the provincial authorities is in place and if the key offset site for protected area expansion has been identified. The province has a Protected Area Expansion Plan that includes five sites that have been identified for expansion.</p>	
	<p>Ms Geach (Eastern Cape Parks and Tourism Agency - ECPTA) said the offset agreement is a key condition of the Environmental Authorisation. It has a 10 year implementation plan and it is a big project to implement which will require a lot of community consultation on the ground. She believes it is important that the ACC drives the offset agreement. It will require traditional authorities, local municipalities and local communities to recognise the offset agreement and start looking at potential receiving sites and assist in protecting them. The presence of plantations, sand mining and development will rule out potential sites for the offset which means the intent of the Agreement will not be met. She therefore thinks it is important that the offset agreement be built into the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the ACC.</p>	
3.2.11	<p>Ms Makoa said that the Authorities Reference Group which had been set up prior to the signing of the BOA had recognised that the implementation of the BOA would be a separate project – a big one, as indicated by Ms Geach, with its own timelines. The ToR for the ACC should therefore be for the current construction programme for the greenfields section of the N2 Wild Coast Toll Highway.</p> <p>Mr Gabula asked for feedback regarding the funding for the Greenfields section of the project. The funding for the project needs to be confirmed so that everybody knows it is going ahead.</p>	
3.2.12	<p>Mr McLachlan said the project is a Strategic Infrastructure Project (SIP) and therefore the government has committed to funding it. The exact model (proportion of toll to fiscus funding) was to still be determined.</p>	
	<p>Mr Gabula said DEDEA is concerned with the implementation of the EA and suggested that there must be some kind of working relationship between DEA and DEDEA. The EA was issued by DEA but there are elements that affect the province directly. He asked how the search and rescue application and the unfolding process of advertising for SMMEs to get involved in the nurseries would be handled. The project has a big footprint and if SANRAL is going to rescue plants they need to ensure the plants will be in safe hands. The province wants to get involved with such things. At some stage there was talk of a botanical garden and this will be viable considering the large amount of plants that will be collected. He is concerned that the search and rescue of plants is not part of the biodiversity offset agreement.</p>	
	<p>Mr Mthembu said Mr Gabula can initiate a meeting with DEA at any time to clarify any issues regarding the EA.</p>	<p>DEDEA</p>

3.2.13	<p>Mr Fredericks asked if there are certain requirements from the traditional authority before the actual mining licence is issued and if so what those requirements are.</p> <p>Ms Thompson said in order to issue a licence for a quarry there first needs to be a public participation process. When the application is on tribal land there needs to be community meetings with the traditional authority and the DMR must receive details of the public meetings and a signed resolution from the traditional authority stating that they have been consulted and they have no objections to the establishment of the quarry in the area. The meeting must be organised in conjunction with the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform. In terms of an application for mining rights, SANRAL will have to do an EIA because they will have secondary activities on site.</p> <p>Mr Pantshwa said the resolution needs to be drawn up in accordance with the Interim Protection of Informal Land Rights Act that has to be sent to the Minister of Land Affairs for his consent.</p>	
3.2.14	<p>Ms Thompson said SANRAL have indicated in the presentation that they have done prospecting for three quarries. She asked if they intended doing prospecting for any further quarries.</p> <p>Mr Damhuis said they will do further prospecting (materials / geotechnical investigations) for the roads but not the bridges.</p> <p>Ms Thompson said SANRAL is required to get authorisation to do prospecting. They have recently received a lot of complaints from communities in the area about people drilling on site. As soon a community sees this they immediately phone the DMR to say that the applicant is already on site commencing with mining activities. This is a very sensitive area. It is therefore very important to have authorisation for prospecting. The consultants on another project have been chased off site and their lives threatened by the local community.</p>	SANRAL
3.2.15	<p>Ms Thompson said if the SANRAL application coincides with the area of the Xolobeni mining application there will be a conflict between the two applications. If that is the case then SANRAL would need to make an application with the Xolobeni mining applicant to exclude the area from their application. SANRAL needs to submit the coordinates for the application to the DMR's Geographical Information Systems (GIS) department so they can confirm if there is a spatial conflict between applications. This needs to be done before SANRAL submit their application otherwise it will be delayed.</p> <p>Mr McLachlan confirmed that there is no overlap between the SANRAL application and the Xolobeni application.</p>	
3.2.16	<p>Mr Mapiya (ECPTA) said that if the DMR enforcement section is at head office it means there are no people on the ground. This is a big project in the area and he is concerned about the compliance monitoring and enforcement. DMR should also create awareness with local SMMEs about illegal mining.</p> <p>Ms Thompson said that unfortunately she has no say on where the officials are located. She said 25 enforcement officials are about to be appointed and hopefully they will be sent to the different regions. Currently no enforcement officials are allocated to specific regions.</p>	DMR
3.2.17	<p>Mr Fredericks asked if DMR could indicate the location of all the prospecting and mining applications submitted in the Pondoland area.</p> <p>Ms Thompson said SANRAL can consult with the GIS person at DMR who will be able to point out all the mining areas that have been approved.</p>	SANRAL
3.2.18	<p>Ms Olivier (DEA Biodiversity and Conservation) reminded the meeting of Section 48 of the Mineral Resources and Petroleum Development Act (MRPDA) that says if land is under the</p>	

3.2.19	<p>control of another minister the applicant needs approval from that minister before applying for a mining right. She said in this area it might be the Minister for Rural Development and Land Reform or Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs.</p> <p>Mr Smit (DEA) said all the conditions of the EA must be tied up and signed off. If there is commencement without adhering to any one of the conditions it is going to create havoc. If there is an issue with any of the conditions it needs to be fixed before commencement.</p>	SLR
<p>4.</p> <p>4.1</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>4.3</p>	<p><u>CONFIRMATION OF THE MEMBERS OF THE AUTHORITIES COORDINATION COMMITTEE</u></p> <p>Mr Drew said the list of organisations to form the ACC was stipulated in the Environmental Authorisation and all the organisations on the list were included except the two from KwaZulu-Natal (KZN) as the current implementation programme excludes KZN. He said each organisation needs to provide the details of a principal and alternate member for representation on the ACC. The minutes will be circulated to both members so that if the principal member is not available the alternate member is always up to speed with what has been discussed at the ACC.</p> <p>Mr Mthembu said the EA lists the KZN Department of Agriculture and KZN Wildlife. He asked for something in writing from SANRAL that requests the removal of the two organisations because the project is no longer in KZN.</p> <p>Ms Makoa said there was a letter submitted together with the EMP. She will re-send the letter.</p> <p>Mr Fredericks said there is a clause in the EA that states that the composition of the committee may change if circumstances justify it.</p> <p>Mr Smit said the change in composition should still be confirmed in a letter.</p> <p>Ms Makoa reiterated that this has been done.</p> <p>Ms Geach asked if members could get a copy of the EMP.</p> <p>Mr Drew said it can be arranged to have the EMP circulated.</p>	<p>AII</p> <p>NMA</p> <p>SANRAL</p> <p>NMA</p>
<p>5.</p> <p>5.1</p> <p>5.2</p> <p>5.3</p>	<p><u>CONFIRMATION OF TERMS OF REFERENCE</u></p> <p>Mr Drew said the EA stipulated that the Authorities Coordination Committee (ACC) must be formed to serve as a forum for the discussion and coordination of project related issues and for timeous dissemination of information about progress on the project to the key authorities. He said the role of the ACC is to assist in moving the project forward. If there are any problems SANRAL would like to be able to call on members of the ACC, as representatives of their departments or organisations, to facilitate in unblocking any blockages. The principal and alternate members for each organisation will be the conduits through whom SANRAL will work to get any issues or problems resolved. The members of the ACC will be expected to relay any information received in the meeting back to the relevant people in their departments or organisations.</p> <p>The members of the ACC agreed that Mr Drew should draft a ToR for the ACC and circulate them to the members for comment. The comments can then be incorporated through an iterative process until they are finalised.</p> <p>Ms Makoa said there was an Authorities' Reference Group (ARG) set up for the offset agreement and a lot of value can be derived from the experiences of that group. In those discussions the ARG could see that the project is massive and that the offset project is to all intents and purposes a stand-alone project. She said she does not believe the ACC should take ownership of the offset agreement and combine it with the main project. The ACC does need to</p>	NMA

5.4	<p>keep implementation of the offset agreement on their radar though.</p> <p>Mr Drew agreed and said if there is work that needs to be done on the BOA it should be done through that forum. He said the ACC can get feedback from that forum and provide assistance if required.</p> <p>Ms Geach said that the purpose of the ARG was to reach agreement on the BOA. There does not seem to be a role for it beyond that. The ARG hasn't met for more than two years.</p> <p>Ms Thompson said she could forward the terms of reference for a similar committee formed for the Coega monitoring as an example.</p>	DMR
6.	<p><u>ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING COMMITTEE</u></p> <p>6.1 Mr Drew said the Environmental Monitoring Committee (EMC) has not been formed yet but he anticipates that a lot of the members on the ACC will also be on the EMC as well. Initially the proposal was for the two committees to meet on separate days because once the project gets going there will be site visits that will take place together with the meetings. If it turns out that the membership for the two committees is the same then it could be possible to look at having both meetings on the same day and then having the site visit the following day. The EMC should start soon because construction is scheduled to commence on the haul roads in August.</p> <p>6.2 Mr Mthembu asked if the ECO and environmental auditor appointments will be sent to DEA before the EMC commences.</p> <p>Ms Makoa confirmed this would be the case.</p> <p>6.3 Ms Makoa said the EMC will include the contractors, ECOs, auditors, etc. Therefore the EMC will be quite a big meeting.</p> <p>6.4 Mr Drew said there will be people that are not common to both committees such as the traditional authorities. It is a big project and there will be a lot of different traditional authorities involved. He asked if they need to get a representative from the Regional Authority or go down to the level of each Traditional Authority. It will not be practical to have a representative from each administrative area.</p> <p>Mr Pantshwa said due to the nature of the traditional leadership dynamics he proposes that the EMC considers the chiefs at the Traditional Authority level.</p> <p>Mr McLachlan said there are seven chiefs that fall under a king or paramount chief. Up to now SANRAL has managed to coordinate and arrange meetings with all seven so it is theoretically possible to include them. They could also be offered the opportunity to elect representatives if all of them do not want to attend the EMC meetings.</p>	SANRAL SANRAL
7.	<p><u>FURTHER MEETINGS AND MOST SUITABLE VENUE</u></p> <p>7.1 Members agreed to have the next meeting at the current venue. If it is decided to move the venue to be closer to the construction activities when construction commences this can be discussed at the relevant time.</p> <p>7.2 Mr Drew said he will send out a tentative date for the next meeting in October 2016 together with the minutes. He will discuss the dates with SANRAL.</p>	NMA
8.	<p><u>OTHER ISSUES GENERAL</u></p> <p>8.1 Mr Pantshwa asked for a calendar of future meetings in order for members to diarise the dates.</p>	

	Mr Drew said, going forwards, the dates for the whole year would be set in advance so that members can diarise them.	NMA / SANRAL
8.2	Mr Mokhanya said there are activities that are no longer listed activities in the environmental legislation but they remain listed activities in other legislation such as the National Heritage Resources Act. He suggested that SANRAL ensures that each activity complies with the applicable legislation going forward. It will assist them in monitoring the project as a whole.	
8.3	Ms Makoa asked for a more streamlined process that meets the requirements of all the relevant legislation instead of multiple processes that speak to only one piece of legislation. She said this is the best forum to address such issues.	
8.4	Ms Makoa said the meeting serves as a formal notice of commencement of the N2 Wild Coast Toll Highway. SANRAL will still send letters of commencement to DEA and the provincial departments that will also confirm the appointments of the ECOs, etc.	SANRAL
8.5	Mr Tshangela (IHLM) asked when the draft ToR will be circulated and if the EMC will have separate ToR.	
	Mr Drew said the EMC will have separate ToR and he will circulate the draft ToR for the ACC early in September 2016.	NMA
8.6	Mr Van Der Merwe (DAFF) said their Deputy Director General (DDG) needs to approve the principal and alternate members that will attend future meetings. The DDG will shortly send a letter in that regard.	
	Mr Bester (DAFF) said that there first needs to be a letter from SANRAL to the DDG requesting nominations.	
	Mr Drew said there has already been correspondence with DAFF in that regard.	
8.7	Mr McLachlan responded to the earlier concerns raised by DMR and the municipalities regarding complaints from the communities in terms of activities and people on site. He said SANRAL have tried to facilitate with the local traditional leadership as far as possible before they or any of their service providers go on site. Sometimes there are misunderstandings and gaps in the communication. SANRAL have emphasised the importance of communicating with the traditional leadership to the prospective bidders. There will be gaps in communication but SANRAL plans to sensitise all their service providers regarding this issue.	
8.8	Mr Fredericks said the EMC will possibly meet on site at the contractor's offices once construction commences. This option will be considered when construction commences.	
8.9	Mr Mthembu said he is worried about community issues when some of the responsible people are based in Pretoria. He appealed to SANRAL to spend a lot of time and energy on community facilitation otherwise there will be stoppages on the project as there are many different interested parties.	
8.10	Mr Smit concurred with Mr Mthembu and said that the community facilitation was the most important factor in ensuring the success of the project. He said SANRAL needs to keep EIA issues separate from the other issues that will be raised by the communities. He said community issues always seem to be reported to DEA even though they are not EIA related. He said DEA cannot manage such issues.	
8.11	Ms Thompson said the communities have the capacity to stop projects like these. The project team needs to be very thorough and very careful with their public participation.	

8.12	Ms Thompson said SANRAL is required to provide financial provision for rehabilitation of the quarry before DMR approves their application but noted there is a Memorandum of Understanding between DMR and SANRAL, stipulating the manner in which SANRAL provides for rehabilitation within its projects.	SANRAL
8.13	Mr Mgudlwa (DAFF) said the sand mining is a serious issue that will escalate if left unattended during the implementation of the project.	
9.	<u>WAY FORWARD AND CLOSURE</u>	
9.1	Mr Drew thanked members for their attendance and said the minutes of the meeting would be sent out the following week together with the date for the next meeting. He then closed the meeting. NB: The date of the next ACC meeting has been set for Friday 21 October 2016 at the Wild Coast Sun.	NMA All