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1 Introduction

This report describes the Public Participation Process (PPP) undertaken as part of Eskom’s Section 24 G application for the rectification of the unlawful commencement of listed activities in terms of Section 24 of the National Environmental Management Act (Act 107 of 1998). The application is for the erroneous construction of 80 Km of the Ruigtevallei – Dreunberg 132kV overhead powerline on an unauthorised route.

PPP is a requirement in terms of Regulation 41, 3 (a) of the National Environmental Management Act, 1998 (Act no. 107 of 1998). The PPP aims to ensure that Interested and Affected Parties (I&APs) are informed of the application process and submit any comments or queries on the process. Responses to submissions from I&APs are presented in the Comments and Response Report (CRR) (Appendix E).

1.1 Methodology Overview

The following activities were undertaken as part of the PPP:

- The application was advertised in Reporter (Eastern Cape) newspaper on 22 November 2013 and Uit ons Kontrei on 29 November 2013. The public were given until 11 December 2013, 21 days from the date of advertisement to submit comments and register as I&APs.
- All comments received during the 21 day comment period were recorded in the comment and response report.
- Three site notices were placed along the poweline route.
- All landowners and key stakeholders were notified of the Section 24G application.
- The draft Section 24G report was placed for public review at the following locations:
  - Burgersdorp public library
  - Venterstad public library
  - GIBB website [http://project.gibb.co.za](http://project.gibb.co.za)
- Notifications letters were sent to all I&APs notifying them of the availability of the reports.
- A key stakeholders (landowners) meeting was held to discuss concerns over the routing of the powerline.

1.2 Newspaper Advertisement

Newspaper advertisements were placed in two local newspapers, The Reporter, on 20 November 2013 and Uit ons Kontrei on 29 November 2013 notifying the public about the 24 G application undertaken by Eskom and inviting them to register as I&APs. The advertisement included contact details of the GIBB public participation office.

Proof of newspaper advertisement is attached in Appendix A.
1.3 Site Notices

Site notices were placed at the substation at Ruigtevallei and the substation at Dreunberg as well as at the site camp located halfway along the powerline route.

Photographs of the site notices are attached in Appendix B.

1.4 Notification of I&APs

The following I&APs were notified:

- Municipal Manager; Gariep Municipality
- Eastern Cape Parks and Tourism
- South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA)
- Department of Economic Development, Environmental Affairs and Tourism (DEDEAT)
- Affected landowners

Proof of notification of I&APs is attached in Appendix C.

I&AP database is included in Appendix D.

1.5 I&AP Comment Period

1.5.1 I&AP Registration Period

The I&AP comment period commenced on 20 November 2013 and closed on 11 December 2013.

1.5.2 Review Period for Draft Section 24G Report

The I&AP review period for the draft Section 24G report commenced on 20 August 2014 and closed on 29 September 2014. The report was made available at the following locations:

- Burgersdorp public library
- Venterstad public library
- GIBB website http://project.gibb.co.za

Comments with key stakeholders continued to be exchanged post the review period and these, together with all other comments received, have been included in the Comments and Response Report attached in Appendix E. A number of landowners commented on the draft BAR, and in light of the comments raised it was decided to hold a key stakeholder’s meeting. This is described in section 1.5.3 below.
1.5.3 Key Stakeholder (Landowner) Meeting

A meeting was held between landowners, Eskom representatives and GIBB representatives on 31 November 2014. The meeting served to discuss landowner concerns. The full detail of what was discussed is presented in the email dated 17 November (see Appendix E below). In summary, five of the local I&APs, four of which are affected landowners, prefer Route 3 over the proposed Route 4. This preference for Route 3 stems mainly around their concerns about the security of their future electricity supply. Route 3 runs closest to the existing two sub-stations which feed electricity to their area, and the landowners are concerned that due to future financial constraints, Eskom may not be able to maintain future supply to their substations. They are concerned that their supply quality will deteriorate, or even be terminated. They would like to see the new line run as close as possible to these existing sub-stations because it represents to them a guarantee that future supply could be secured. Eskom has however confirmed to them that their supply will not be cut off, irrespective of where this new 132kv will be built. Eskom has also undertaken to involve these landowners in the planning process for upgrading their lines.

Finally Mr M. van der Walt (landowner) has also indicated that he would prefer Route 3 over Route 4 because large birds are already aware of the presence of the 66kv line along much of Route 3, and therefore he believes Route 3 will have a fewer bird collisions than Route 4. The avifauna specialist has however already considered this and concluded:

“It is normally an advantage to place new power lines adjacent to existing lines. Typically then this route (Route 3) would have been preferred on that basis. However in this case, it is our opinion that the existing 66kV line was built on a particularly sensitive route for avifauna, for reasons including those below. It is therefore not ideal to compound this historic error by adding a new power line to the same route.”

The specialist confirms that overall Route 4 is a better route.

At the time of concluding this report the landowners had “agreed to disagree” regarding the avifauna issue described above, but still had serious concerns regarding securing power supply to their area. They indicated that they would not allow construction of Route 4 on their property until they had been satisfied that their future supply would be secure. It is therefore recommended that Eskom continue to liaise closely with these landowners, and workshop their strengthening plans with these landowners as they are developed.

1.6 Way Forward

The final Section 24G report will be submitted to Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA) and released for public and authority review. It will be placed in the same locations as noted under section 1.5.2.
All comments on the final Section 24G report must be submitted directly to DEA using the contact details listed below and copied to GIBB:

The DEA reference number (14/12/16/3/2/61) must be quoted on all correspondence to DEA.

Department of Environmental Affairs
Ms Pumeza Skepe-Mngcita (Deputy Director CIPS and Section 24G)
Postal address: Private Bag X447, Pretoria, 0001
Email address: pskepe@environment.gov.za
Telephone: 012 399 9000

GIBB Public Participation
Ms Kate Parkinson
Postal Address: PO 63704, Greenacres, Port Elizabeth, 6057
Email Address: kparkinson@gibb.co.za
Telephone: 041 392 7500
Fax Number: 086 608 2522

The following steps are remaining in the Section 24G process:
• Notification of all I&APs of DEA’s decision on the project.
Appendix A
Newspaper Advertisement
The following newspaper advertisement was placed in two newspapers. Proof is included below.

Notice of Section 24G Application for the Ruigtevallei - Dreunberg 132kV powerline

Notice is hereby given of an application for the rectification of the unlawful commencement of listed activities in terms of Section 24 of the National Environmental Management Act (Act 107 of 1998) as amended.

Eskom conducted a Basic Assessment process for the proposed Ruigtevallei – Dreunberg powerline which was granted authorisation on 29 November 2012. The Department of Environmental Affairs authorised powerline route alternative 3 (R3) however Eskom erroneously proceeded with construction of route (R1). Construction has been halted. A Section 24G application will be submitted to DEA for the continued construction of R1.

Interested & Affected Parties are hereby invited to register and forward comments or queries to GIBB before 11/12/13.

GIBB
Kate Parkinson
P.O. Box 63703,
Greenacres, 6057
Tel: 041 392 7500
Fax: 041 363 9300
E-mail: kparkinson@gibb.co.za
Dear Sir/Madam,

Please find attached the detailed report on the public participation for the Section 24G Ruigtevallei – Dreunberg Powerline project.

The report includes:
- Description of the project
- Community consultations
- Environmental impact analysis
- Mitigation measures
- Public feedback

Please review the report for any feedback or comments you may have.

Thank you for your attention.

[Signature]

[Name]
[Position]
[Organization]
Newspaper advertisement in the Reporter local newspaper.

Newspaper advertisement in the Uit ons Kontrei local newspaper.
Appendix B
Site Notices
Photograph 1 and 2: Site notice at Ruigtesvallei Substation

Photograph 3 and 4: Site notice on gate of site camp halfway along the line.

Photograph 4: Site notice at the gate to the Dreunburg powerstation.
Figure 1: Location of site notices
Appendix C
Notification of Interested and Affected Parties
NOTIFICATION OF SECTION 24G PROCESS

From: Mail Delivery System [mailto:MAILER-DAEMON@gibb.co.za]
Sent: 22 November 2013 16:29
To: kparkinson@gibb.co.za
Subject: Successful Mail Delivery Report

This is the mail system at host portelizabeth-5.gibb.local.

Your message was successfully delivered to the destination(s) listed below. If the message was delivered to mailbox you will receive no further notifications. Otherwise you may still receive notifications of mail delivery errors from other systems.

The mail system

<wandile.mzazi@ecpta.co.za>: delivery via kolabfilter: delivered via kolabfilter service
<acollett@gibb.co.za>: delivery via kolabfilter: delivered via kolabfilter service
<geoffsouthey@bokaroo.co.za>: delivery via kolabfilter: delivered via kolabfilter service
<flentges@gmail.com>: delivery via kolabfilter: delivered via kolabfilter service
<kparkinson@gibb.co.za>: delivery via kolabfilter: delivered via kolabfilter service
<gelykfontein@zipplink.co.za>: delivery via kolabfilter: delivered via kolabfilter service
<trixxx@mweb.co.za>: delivery via kolabfilter: delivered via kolabfilter service
<sbotha25@polka.co.za>: delivery via kolabfilter: delivered via kolabfilter service
<JCV888@telkomsa.net>: delivery via kolabfilter: delivered via kolabfilter service
<peet@bershaba.co.za>: delivery via kolabfilter: delivered via kolabfilter service
<ajstyger@nokwi.co.za>: delivery via kolabfilter: delivered via kolabfilter service
<as@nokwi.co.za>: delivery via kolabfilter: delivered via kolabfilter service
J33156: Letters detailing the Section 24 (G) NEMA application process were sent to the below Landowners of the below on 22/11/2013

- Mr DGM Southey
  P O Box 201
  Gariep Dam
  99222

- Mr Petrus De Villiers
  P O Box 31
  Gariep Dam
  9922

- Mr David Southey
  P O Box 202
  Gariep Dam
  9922

- Mr FM Van der Walt
  PO Box 110
  Gariep Dam
  9922

- The Municipal Manager
  Gariep Municipality
  Att: Mr T Mawonga, Private Bag X13
  Burgersdorpe
  9744

- Mr Frans Marx
  PO Box 229
  Burgersdorpe
  9744

- Mr Izak Temengo
  PO Box 14
  Venterstad
  9798

- Mr JH Van Wyk
  PO Box 57
  Venterstad
  9798

- Mr Stephanus Van Wyk
  PO Box 120
  Burgersdorp
  9744

- Ms Hester Venter
  PO Box 393
  Burgersdorp
  9744

- Mr Van den Berg
  PO Box 245
  Burgersdorp
  9744

- FAO: Director General
  Department of Environmental Affairs
  Fedsure Building
  2nd Floor North Tower
  315 Pretorius Street
  Pretoria
  0002

Proof of postage of notification to I&APs
NOTIFICATION OF REVIEW PERIOD FOR DRAFT SECTION 24G REPORT

Kate Parkinson

From: Mail Delivery System <MAILER-DAEMON@gibb.co.za>
Sent: 20 August 2014 16:43
To: kparkinson@gibb.co.za
Subject: Successful Mail Delivery Report
Attachments: Message Delivery Status; att19912

This is the mail system at host portelizabeth-5.gibb.local.

Your message was successfully delivered to the destination(s) listed below. If the message was delivered to mailbox you will receive no further notifications. Otherwise you may still receive notifications of mail delivery errors from other systems.

The mail system

<peet@bershaba.co.za>: delivery via kolabfilter: delivered via kolabfilter service
<geoffsouthey@bokarop.co.za>: delivery via kolabfilter: delivered via kolabfilter service
<mailimberi@sahra.org.za>: delivery via kolabfilter: delivered via kolabfilter service
<wandile.mzazi@ecpta.co.za>: delivery via kolabfilter: delivered via kolabfilter service
<ajstygere@nokwi.co.za>: delivery via kolabfilter: delivered via kolabfilter service
<trixx@mweb.co.za>: delivery via kolabfilter: delivered via kolabfilter service
<kparkinson@gibb.co.za>: delivery via kolabfilter: delivered via kolabfilter service
<sandiso.mabongo@deaet.cape.gov.za>: delivery via kolabfilter: delivered via kolabfilter service
<flentges@gmail.com>: delivery via kolabfilter: delivered via kolabfilter service
<elyxfontein@ziplink.co.za>: delivery via kolabfilter: delivered via kolabfilter service
<sonpxnn@eskom.co.za>: delivery via kolabfilter: delivered via kolabfilter service
<sbotha25@polka.co.za>: delivery via kolabfilter: delivered via kolabfilter service
<jCV888@telkomsa.net>: delivery via kolabfilter: delivered via kolabfilter service
Letters notifying I&APs and authorities of the availability of the Draft Section 24G Report for the Ruigtevallei to Dreunberg 132 kV powerline (DEA Ref: 14/12/16/3/2/61) were sent to the below on 18 August 2014.

David George Montagu Southey
PO Box 202, Gariep Dam, 9022
Erasmus Jacobus Myburgh Van Den Berg
C/O Mr Daniel Van den Berg
PO Box 245, Burgersdorp, 9744

The Municipal Manager
Gariep Municipality
Att: Mr T Mawonga
Private Bag X13
Burgersdorp, 9744

Hester Hendrina Maria Ventor
PO Box 353, Burgersdorp, 9744
Jan Harm Van Wyk
PO Box 57, Venterstad, 9798

Johannes Christiaan Viljoen
PO Box 88, Burgersdorp, 9744

Petrus Hendrik De Villiers
PO Box 31, Gariep Dam, 9022
Sowefontein Boordery Trust
C/O Mr Frans Marx
PO Box 229, Burgersdorp, 9744

Southeby Family Trust
C/O Mr DGM Southey
PO Box 201, Gariep Dam, 9022

Stephanus Johannes Van Wyk
PO Box 120, Burgersdorp, 9744
Tenengo Brothers CC
C/O Mr Izak Temengo
PO Box 14, Venterstad, 9798

Department of Water Affairs
Mr Carlo Schrader
2nd Floor, Sanlam Plaza, Cnr Charlotte
Maxwell and East Burger Street

Eastern Cape Parks & Tourism
Att Regional Manager
6 St Marks Road, Southernwood
5201

Eastern Cape Provincial Heritage
Resources Agency
Mr Sello Mokhanya
74 Alexander Road
King Williams Town
5600

Department of Economic Development and
Environmental Affairs
Mr Sandile Mabongo
10 Smith Street
Aiwal North
9750
Appendix D
I&AP Database
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>EMAIL ADDRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abraham Stephanus Steyn</td>
<td>PO Box 25, Venterstad, 9798</td>
<td><a href="mailto:as@nokwi.co.za">as@nokwi.co.za</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna Margaretha Beatrix Kruger (Botha)</td>
<td>PO Box 32539, Fichardt Park, 9317</td>
<td><a href="mailto:trixx@myweb.co.za">trixx@myweb.co.za</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonie Johannes Styger</td>
<td>PO Box 221, Burgersdorp, 9744</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ajstyger@nokwi.co.za">ajstyger@nokwi.co.za</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David George Montagu Southey</td>
<td>PO Box 202 Gariep Dam, 9922</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erasmus Jacobus Myburgh Van Den Berg</td>
<td>C/o Mr Daniel Van den Berg, PO Box 245, Burgersdorp, 9744</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gariep Municipality</td>
<td>The Municipal Manager, Gariep Municipality, Att: Mr T Mawonga, Private Bag X13, Burgersdorp, 9744</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geoffrey Montagu Southey</td>
<td>PO Box 201, Gariep Dam, 9922</td>
<td><a href="mailto:geoffsouthey@bokaroo.co.za">geoffsouthey@bokaroo.co.za</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>PO Box 114, Burgersdorp, 9744</td>
<td><a href="mailto:peet@bersheba.co.za">peet@bersheba.co.za</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hester Hendrina Maria Venter</td>
<td>PO Box 393, Burgersdorp, 9744</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Harm Van Wyk</td>
<td>PO Box 57, Venterstad, 9798</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jvanwyk@nokwi.co.za">jvanwyk@nokwi.co.za</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johannes Christiaan Viljoen</td>
<td>PO Box 88, Burgersdorp, 9744</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kareeberg Trust</td>
<td>C/o Mr FM Van der Walt, PO Box 110, Gariep Dam, 9922</td>
<td><a href="mailto:fransmeyer@nokwi.co.za">fransmeyer@nokwi.co.za</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis Jaco Botha</td>
<td>PO Box 26, Burgersdorp, 9744</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sbotha25@polka.co.za">sbotha25@polka.co.za</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountolive Prop Enterprises C C</td>
<td>Mrs A Flentge, PO Box 991, Aukland Park, 2006</td>
<td><a href="mailto:flentges@gmail.com">flentges@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petrus Hendrik De Villiers</td>
<td>PO Box 31, Gariep Dam, 9922</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Cape Parks &amp; Tourism, Oviston Nature Reserve</td>
<td>Eastern Cape Parks &amp; Tourism, Att: Regional Manager - Mr Wandile Mzazi, 6 St Marks Road, Southernwood, 5201</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wandile.mzazi@ecpta.co.za">wandile.mzazi@ecpta.co.za</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schalk Willem Van der Walt</td>
<td>PO Box 38, Venterstad, 9798</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gelykfontein@zipplink.co.za">gelykfontein@zipplink.co.za</a>; <a href="mailto:gelykfontein@telkomsa.net">gelykfontein@telkomsa.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewefontein Boerdery Trust</td>
<td>C/o Mr Frans Marx, PO Box 229, Burgersdorp, 9744</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southey Family Trust</td>
<td>C/o Mr DGM Southey, P O Box 201, Gariep Dam, 9922</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanus Johannes Van Wyk</td>
<td>PO Box 120, Burgersdorp, 9744</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temengo Brothers CC</td>
<td>C/o Mr Izak Temengo, PO Box 14, Venterstad, 9798</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildebeeste Valley Farming CC</td>
<td>C/o Mr JC Van der Walt, PO Box 165, Venterstad, 9798</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jCV888@telkomsa.net">jCV888@telkomsa.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr Mariagrazia Galimberti SAHRA</td>
<td>PO Box 4637, Cape Town, 8000</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mgalimberti@sahra.org.za">mgalimberti@sahra.org.za</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Sello Mokhanya ECPHRA</td>
<td>PO Box 4637, Cape Town, 8000</td>
<td><a href="mailto:smokhanya@ecphra.org.za">smokhanya@ecphra.org.za</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Sandiso Mabongo DEDEA</td>
<td>10 Smith Street, Aliwal North, 9750/ Private Bag X1016, Aliwal</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sandiso.mabongo@deae.tcape.gov.za">sandiso.mabongo@deae.tcape.gov.za</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Carlo Schroder - Department of Water Affairs</td>
<td>Department of Water Affairs, 2nd Floor, Sanlam Plazza, Cnr Charlotte Maxele and East Burger Street</td>
<td><a href="mailto:schraderc@dwa.gov.za">schraderc@dwa.gov.za</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E
Comments and Responses Report
INTRODUCTION:

This Comments and Response Report (CRR) has been compiled as part of the Section 24G report for the Ruigtevallei – Dreunberg 132 kV powerline.

This report presents all comments raised during this Section 24G process. The different Sections (A, B, and C) of the report present comments which have been made by Interested and Affected Parties (I&APs) during the different phases of the process.

SUMMARY OF COMMENTING I&APs

Comments have been received from the I&APs listed in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Mr Meyer van der Walt</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mr Meyer van der Walt</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ms Mmatlala Rabothata</td>
<td>Environmental Officer: Integrated Environmental Authorisations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ms Milicent Solomans</td>
<td>Director: Environmental Impact Evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mr Herman Alberts</td>
<td>Environmental Officer: Integrated Environmental Authorisations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ms Milicent Solomans</td>
<td>Director: Environmental Impact Evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mr Ishaam Abader</td>
<td>Deputy Director General: Legal, Authorisations and Compliance Enforcement Grade 1 Environmental Management Inspector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Mr Jan Van Wky</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Mr Jan Van Wky</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mr JC Oosthuizen</td>
<td>Chairman: Venterstad Agricultural Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Mr Meyer van der Walt</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Mr A Steyn</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Mr Meyer van der Walt</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Mr Meyer van der Walt</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Mr Meyer van der Walt</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments received during the registration period.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Mr Meyer van der Walt</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Mr A Steyn</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Mr JC Oosthuizen</td>
<td>Chairman: Venterstad Agricultural Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Mr Jan Van Wky</td>
<td>Landowner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Comments and Response Report (CRR) below consolidates all input received throughout the Public Participation Process (PPP) to date.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>NAME &amp; ORGANISATION</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04/12/13</td>
<td>Mr Meyer van der Walt Schalkwykskraal Venterstad</td>
<td>I would like to confirm that nobody ever contact me or accessed my property in the process of compiling an EIA for the building of this power line. I was never contacted nor acknowledged in the process. My one concern was that the power line would have passed very near too an Black Eagles nesting site (within 80m) but that was rectified by a deviation from the original route. A further concern is that in the area where the power line pass over Suurbergspruit through the Oviston Nature Reserve there is a lot of large trees that are frequently visit by Fish Eagles. This power line (even with bird diverters) will be a huge threat to them. Where the power line cross the R390 it pass through centre pivots on the farm Merino. These irrigated fields attract huge flocks of Blue Crane in winter (I counted more than 600 at one stage this past winter). As these birds fly in very low from the Gariep dam in the early mornings before sunrise it is almost certain that there will be collusions with the power line.</td>
<td>As part of the Section 24G process letter or emails were sent to landowners on 22 November 2013. We note that you have signed an option for servitude with Eskom for the erection of this proposed line (see Appendix C of the S24G report). Route alternative 4 (Eskom’s preferred route) runs approximately 2.4 km away from the Verreaux’s eagle (black eagle) nesting site. Due to the direction of the powerline, there is unfortunately no route alternative available that will avoid crossing the Suubergspruit river. The section of powerline that crosses the Suubergspruit will be equipped with Bird Flight Diverters as mitigation. This has been deemed acceptable by the avifauna specialist. Route alternative 4 (Eskom’s preferred route) is located approximately 812 m away from the closest pivot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>NAME &amp; ORGANISATION</td>
<td>COMMENT</td>
<td>RESPONSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/12/2013</td>
<td>Mr Meyer van der Walt Schalkwykskraal Venterstad</td>
<td>Just a few photo’s taken by Joggie Ackerman (Nature Conservation) to confirm the presence of the Blue Crane in the area that I am concerned about.</td>
<td>Thank you for your photos, we are aware of the presence of Blue Cranes in the area and have observed a few birds during our site visit. The route that was authorised was shown as having a slightly lower environmental impact than the other two options. GIBB appointed an avifauna specialist to undertake an avifauna impact assessment of all route alternatives. The avifauna and biodiversity specialist report is available in appendix F of the Section 24G report. The avifauna and biodiversity specialist report recommended route alternative 4 as the route with the lowest impact on avifauna.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/01/2014</td>
<td>Ms Mmatlala Rabothata Environmental Officer: Integrated Environmental Authorisations. Department of Environmental Affairs</td>
<td>Acknowledgement receipt and acceptance f Section 24G application form for the Ruigtevallei – Dreunberg 132 kV powerline, Gariep Local Municipality in the Eastern Cape Province</td>
<td>The Department confirms having received the Sec 24G application form submitted by you on 6 January 2014 for environmental authorisation for the above mentioned project. The application is accepted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/03/2014</td>
<td>Ms Milicent Solomans Director: Environmental Impact Evaluation. Department of Environmental Affairs</td>
<td>Application for rectification in terms of Section 24G of the National Environmental Management Act of 1998 for the unlawful commencement of listed activities for the construction of Ruigtevallei to Dreunberg 132 kV powerline within Gariep Local Municipality in the Eastern Cape Province.</td>
<td>The letter from DEA dated 11/03/2014 is included</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
in Appendix F. The letter details the requirements for the Section 24G report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>NAME &amp; ORGANISATION</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30/05/2014</td>
<td>Mr Herman Alberts Environmental Officer:</td>
<td>Acknowledgment of receipt of request for an extension to submit the Section 24G report for the proposed Ruigtevallei – Dreunberg 132 kV Powerline.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integrated Environmental Authorisations.</td>
<td>The Department confirms having received the request for extension dated 24 April 2014 for the above mentioned project on 14 May 2014. The Department will response in due course.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/07/2014</td>
<td>Ms Milicent Solomans Director: Integrated</td>
<td>Request for extension Ruigtevallei – Dreunberg 132 kV Powerline, Section 24G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental Authorisations.</td>
<td>Your request for extension dated 24 April 2014 and received by the Department on 14 May 2014, has reference.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department of Environmental Affairs</td>
<td>The Department accepts your request for extension for the abovementioned application and hereby advises you that the abovementioned application will remain open on the Departmental system.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In light of the above, this Department requests that all outstanding information be submitted in accordance with your letter dated 24 April 2014. All outstanding information must be submitted to the Department on or before 11 October 2014.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Should you have any queries or wish to discuss the points raised above, please do not hesitate to contact our offices.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>NAME &amp; ORGANISATION</td>
<td>COMMENT</td>
<td>RESPONSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/07/2014</td>
<td>Mr Ishaam Abader</td>
<td>Notice of intention to issue a compliance notice in terms of Section 31L of the National Environmental Management Act, 1998 (Act No. 107 of 1998) (&quot;NEMA&quot;): Non Compliance with the failure to comply with the law and environmental authorisations in respect to the construction of the Ruigtevallei – Dreunberg 132 kV powerline Gariep Local Municipality, Eastern Cape. The letter from DEA dated 23/07/2014 is included in Appendix F. The letter details the requirements for the Section 24G report.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 25/08/2014| Mr J Van Wyk                        | Thanks a lot for the mail we received regarding the proposed Eskom Power line that will supposable pass through my land  
I received the letters and drafts from MRN MEYER VD WALT and no one from GIBB or Eskom sent me a mail regarding the matter and I only found out at Church yesterday 25-8-2014 about the letter  
There is just 2 points I want to address please and will appreciate it if you can get back to me regarding this  
1 – in point 3.3.4 you talk about a deviation around my dam and that a agreement was reached after negotiations between myself and Escom,this is not true as I did not agree to anything as they only come by and told me that | GIBB Response  
Good afternoon Mr van Wyk,  
Letters were sent to all landowners for whom we didn't have an email address listed in our database. The postal address listed for you is PO Box 57, Venterstad, 9798. Can you please confirm if this address is correct? I have added your email address to our database and will be sending all future communication via email.  
I have forwarded your comments regarding negotiations and maintenance of access roads onto Eskom. I will respond to your comments once I receive feedback from Eskom.  
Please find attached the Section 24G report, figure 11 shows the location of the powerline in relation to known graves on your property. The graves were identified by a heritage specialist during a site visit. The map shows the most southerly and northerly identified graves. Also attached is a google earth map showing the location of graves in relation to the powerline. |

Section 24G Ruigtevallei – Dreunberg Powerline  
Appendix E: Public Participation Report  
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>NAME &amp; ORGANISATION</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 25/08/2014 | Mr J Van Wyk Landowner | Thanks a lot for your response I appreciate it                                                                                                                                                         | **Eskom response:**  
Good afternoon Jan,  
We appreciate your response to Kate and we would like to comment likewise for our involvement with you comes a long way in this regard.  
It must be noted that the servitudes on your farms for the powerline were registered in 2012 and 2013 based on the Option Agreement between the parties concerned. However, according to our knowledge |
<p>|            |                     | Thanks a lot for your response I appreciate it                                                                                                                                                         |                                                                         |
|            |                     | Regarding the graves I pointed these out to the heritage specialist during his visit to my farm as at that stage there were markers around the grave indicated and I was concerned about those, but because we thought that this was where the line was going to be I did not point out the graves that |                                                                         |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>NAME &amp; ORGANISATION</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>is even more south than the southern graves that’s why I am saying that NO POWERLINE will pass through this area. I suggest the line being built alongside the R58 and not on this route pass the graves. The postal address is correct as indicated in your email</td>
<td>you have declare a dispute regarding the position of the proposed overhead powerline after the line was pegged; and for the value of the paid compensation after one of the farmers disclosed his compensation. Recently, a visit was made to your farm by me and showed you that the pegs you saw near the graves were for the survey station (temporary); and there is a fair clearance between the line and the graves. Indeed you did not give consent to the position of the line and whoever said that is misleading us; maybe their base is the registered servitude of the same. Nevertheless, we appreciate your participation and willingness to allow this powerline built although not at the same position on your farm. This is what the business and the environmental specialist is to further debate with you. Secondly, the issue of the compensation (ex-gratia) is still on our table but is waiting the conclusion the position of the powerlines. Concerning the alternative position of the line on your farm will need our land surveyor, John Wood and the environmental specialist to relook at this matter so that it be part of part of G54 application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/09/2014</td>
<td>Mr JC Oosthuizen Chairman: Venterstad Agricultural Union</td>
<td>It came to our attention through our members that the current 66kV power line supplying electricity to the Rooiwal and Badsfontein substations will be decommissioned in the near future. This was told to our members by Cecil Hoffman at the Stakeholder’s Meeting of the Ruigtevallei-Dreunberg Project on 10 December 2013 in Venterstad. This information has been confirmed by a letter dated 14 October 2013 in Appendix K of the Section 24G Application to Mr Sabelo Malaza by Tom Smith (Land Development &amp; Environmental Manager of Eskom). In this letter it is stated that “this existing power line will be decommissioned in the near future.” This means that if this happens there will be no power supply in future.</td>
<td>The issues have been discussed with Eskom and they have responded as follows: Concern: Will the line in discussion be broken down or not? Response: Eskom (Northern Cape) apparently have plans to rebuild the existing 66kV lines to Rooiwal and Badsfontein Sub Stations in the future as these lines are old, and once the new line is built the old one will be broken down. Concern: If so, when? Response: We are not sure at this stage. How this is going to be done is still in their early planning stages. Concern: Will this have any electricity supply implications for the places (Rooival/Badsfontein) that the I&amp;AP has mentioned? Response: As mentioned, exactly how this is going to be done is still in the early planning stages. That is, if they are to build next to the existing line or look for an alternative route. Either way, this intervention will not affect supply to customers. Irrespective of whether the new line is built to Rooiwal or Badsfontein, or whether it will be a 66kV or 132kV line, the supply will be improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>NAME &amp; ORGANISATION</td>
<td>COMMENT</td>
<td>RESPONSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|      |                     | to the Rooiwal and Badsfontein substations if the new above mentioned power line isn’t built adjacent to the existing 66kV power line (route alternative 3). | Concern: The original BAR said the line would not be broken down. The latest letter from ESKOM (14 Oct 2013) then indicated that it WOULD be broken down. Explain how the confusion arose.  
Response: The original Basic Assessment report (which indicated that the existing 66kV line would not be broken down) was incorrect. We apologise for this error. |  |
|      |                     | I would like to bring it to your attention that electricity from the Rooiwal substation supplies the whole western rural and agricultural area of the Venterstad district as well as portions of Colesberg-, Noupoort- and Steynburg districts. | Concern: How does this line relate to the current proposal to construct the new 132kV line? Are they related at all?  
Response: There is no connection between the two proposals. |  |
|      |                     | The Badsfontein substation supplies electricity to the towns of Nozizwe, Lyceumville, Venterstad and Oviston and to the eastern rural area of Venterstad, and portions of the Burgersdorp district. |  |
|      |                     | It is therefore of great importance that reliable power will be supplied to the existing substations. Any economical growth and future development and job creation depends on good power supply to this area. Furthermore this also supplies power to a keypoint like the Orange/Fishriver Tunnel inlet at Oviston that is crucial for the water supply to the Orange-Fish River irrigation scheme. An unreliable power supply will also have devastating effects on planned development of the Lake Gariep Initiative and the Gariep Dam Resource Management plan currently being investigated. |  |
|      |                     | By building this new 132kV power line adjacent to the old 66kV line (route option 3) the future |  |
power supply to the this substations will thus be secured. This will also minimize any future costs and planning to rectify the problem if the old line is decommissioned.

We feel that this problem should be addressed as a matter of urgency before any further planning or work is done on this new 132V power line.

17/09/2014

Mr Meyer van der Walt
Schalkwykskraal
Venterstad

Hi Kate

Working through the application I was amused by the first response on pg 17 of the Public PR. I didn’t realize that the person acquiring the option for the servitudes for Eskom was also compiling the EIA report for the project.

Comments will follow soon.

The response you are referring to is “It must be noted that the servitudes on your farms for the powerline were registered in 2012 and 2013 based on the Option Agreement between the parties concerned. However, according to our knowledge you have declare a dispute regarding the position of the proposed overhead powerline after the line was pegged; and for the value of the paid compensation after one of the farmers disclosed his compensation”.

This response was prepared by Eskom in response to your comments received on 25/08/2014. Comments related to route realignment are submitted to Eskom as the EAP was not involved in any negotiations with landowners.

Unless otherwise stated in the comments and response report responses are from the EAP. Eskom’s input may be sought for issues relating to land negotiations or of technical nature.

17/09/2014

Mr Meyer van der Walt
Schalkwykskraal
Venterstad

We are well aware of the importance which the construction of the above mentioned power line can have. As mentioned time and again in the Basic Assessment, Basic Assessment Report and Section 24G Application the importance for providing stable electricity supply to the Gariep Municipality especially in the rural areas is true.

As mentioned, and we quote from page 16, paragraph 3.6:

“The 132kV power line is required to meet the increasing electricity demand in the surrounding areas.”

GIBB Response submitted to Mr van der Walt on 26/09/2014.

Good morning Mr van der Walt,

A letter voicing similar concerns was previously received from another interested and affected party.

The issues have been discussed with Eskom and they have responded as follows:

Concern: Will the line in discussion be broken down or not?
Response: Eskom (Northern Cape) apparently have plans to rebuild the existing 66kV lines to Rooiwal and Badsfontein Sub Stations in the future as these lines are old, and once the new line is built the old one will be broken down.

Concern: If so, when?
The potential benefit of the proposed development of the broader Gariep Community lies in the stimulation of the local economy through the provision of a reliable and improved electricity supply, which will assist in the generation and provision of services. The provision of electricity may ultimately promote local economic development and investment in the Venterstad and Burgersdorp area. Electricity provision is critical for economic development, related employment and sustainable development in South Africa."

It was brought to our attention by Cecil Hoffman at the Stakeholder’s Meeting of the Ruigtevallei-Dreunberg Project on 10 December 2013 in Venterstad that the current 66kV power line supplying electricity to the Rooiwal and Badsfontein sub-stations will be decommissioned in the near future.

This is confirmed by a letter dated 14 October 2013 (in Appendix K of the Section 24G Application) to Mr Sabelo Malaza by Tom Smith (Land Development & Environmental Manager of Eskom). In this letter it is stated that “this existing power line will be decommissioned in the near future.”

Being stakeholders affected by the proposed route alternatives 1, 2 and 4, we have looked into this matter and realised that if this power line is not built adjacent to the existing 66kV power line (route alternative 3), our whole area’s electricity supply could be affected in future as the mentioned routes would not be able to supply...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>NAME &amp; ORGANISATION</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>power to the existing sub-stations of Rooiwal and Badsfontein which is the only supply of electricity to this area. Route alternative 4 which is Eskom’s preferred route is at the nearest points approximately 9km from Rooiwal sub-station, and 7km from the Badsfontein sub-station. Rooiwal sub-station supplies the whole western rural and agricultural area of the Venterstad district as well as portions of Colesberg-, Noupoort- and Steynburg districts. The Badsfontein sub-station supplies electricity to the towns of Nozizwe, Lyceumville, Venterstad and Oviston and to the eastern rural area of Venterstad, and portions of the Burgersdorp district. It is therefore of no significance to compare these proposed route alternatives if the lines connecting route alternatives 1, 2 and 4 to the existing sub-stations are not taken into account and included in the Section 24G Application and environmental impact studies on these connecting lines are not done, and costs of these lines are not included. By constructing this new 132kV power line adjacent to the old 66kV line (route alternative 3) the power supply to the sub-stations will not be affected as the sub-stations can easily be integrated. This will also minimize any future costs and planning to rectify the problem if the old line is decommissioned. If permission is acquired to construct this 132kV line on Eskom preferred route alternative 4 this</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
will mean that in future spurs will have to be build to supply power to these sub-stations if reliable power is to be supplied to this area. This will be a high cost option duplicating planning and studies already done. This will also have an extensive environmental impact on this area again.

We as stakeholder and landowners will strongly oppose the construction of this 132kV power line on the route alternatives 1, 2 & 4 and we won’t allow any construction to continue on our properties unless the construction of lines connecting this 132kV power line to the existing sub-stations is done simultaneously. This will guarantee that electricity supply to this area will not be affected negatively in future.

As this matter is affecting the whole community of this area and could have serious consequences for everyone, we as stakeholders hope that this matter could be resolved to the benefit of all.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>NAME &amp; ORGANISATION</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 22/09/2014 | Mr A Steyn Wildebeeste Valley  | Ruigtevally-Dreunberg kraglyn

Ek wil dit net onder julle aandag bring dat daar nog niemand op my grond was oor die verskuwing van die lyn. Geen mense van Eskom of die van die impak studie.

My plaas is Wildebeeste Valley waar die spilpunte is.

Ek beplan verdere uitbreidings met my besproeiing. Ek sal dus voorstel dat iemand my
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>NAME &amp; ORGANISATION</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>eers kom besoek voordat daar aangegaan kan word met nuwe kraglyn.</td>
<td>Eskom have indicated that the moving of the line to accommodate the deviations recommended for Route 4 was discussed briefly at a meeting between Eskom and farmers on the 05 March 2014. Eskom will be engaging with land owners to discuss these further.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TRANSLATION</strong></td>
<td>As the independent Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP), we understand that you may want to expand your pivots in future, and if your pivots are extended south, that the value of this deviation will be reduced. However we feel that the proposed deviation on Route 4, which takes the line well south of the existing pivot fields, is nonetheless a good recommendation based on current activities. It has been especially supported by the bird specialist and it also moves the line away from the southern section of the Oviston Nature Reserve. As the EAP, we are not empowered by Eskom to enter into negotiations with you regarding this route, but Eskom have indicated that they will be doing this shortly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I want to bring it to your attention that no one has been here regarding the moving of the line.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No one from Escom or the Impact study.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>My farm is called Wildebeeste Valley, where the mobile irrigation system is.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I plan future expansion with my irrigation. I suggest someone come and see me before proceeding with the new electricity line.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/09/2014</td>
<td>Mr Meyer van der Walt</td>
<td>This response (the response given to the I&amp;AP is included below for ease of reference) is not adequate at all (I’ve underlined a few phrases in their response that I’ve received, to highlight this). We want sufficient answers and proof that our power supply will not be affected in future. As a concerned member of this community who can’t see the possibility that Eskom is going to spend millions on a separate project just to supply this area of electricity, I must air my concerns and ask for guarantees. It is just logic that these two projects must be planned simultaneously and the substations involved must be integrated into this planning. This will be the only cost-effective and viable option. The fact that it is said that there is no connection</td>
<td>As the EAP, we note your concerns regarding ensuring on-going supply of electricity to your areas. Eskom have confirmed to us that the ongoing supply will be ensured and that they will meet with you to discuss this issue further.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schalkwykskraal Venterstad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We note that the original BAR and the S24G report erroneously indicated that this proposed 132kw line would improve supply to the Venterstad area. The incorrect sections (underlined) were as follows: The BAR stated on pg 10: &quot;Benefits: The provision of electricity may promote local economic development and investment in the Venterstad and Burgersdorp area.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
between the two proposals is directly in contrast with the BAR and the Section 24 Application being drawn up by GIBB. It is specifically mentioned in these documents that this project is to the benefit of the local municipalities and rural areas.

The response from Eskom is a clear indication of their misconception and unwillingness to address the actual problems. All our concerns were raised in meetings with Eskom but it seems they want to push through with this project ignoring our inputs.

Just a remark about bird strikes – it’s a fact that birds get to know obstacles in an area they frequently visit. It will therefore always be the best to build a line like this next to a known obstacle like the 66kV line to avoid bird strikes. This will also limit further damage to the environment.

My previous concerns still apply.

GIBB Response.

Good morning Mr van der Walt,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>NAME &amp; ORGANISATION</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The draft S24G report stated on pg 16: 3.4: The increase in demand for electricity to the district, with no backup or alternative supply, and reliance on the existing 66kv increased the risk of frequent outages due to overload of existing infrastructure. The No-Go alternative will affect the whole district as well as development will be constrained as the existing networks are at capacity” 3.6: “The provision of electricity may ultimately promote local economic development and investment in the Venterstad and Burgersdorp area.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eskom have however now confirmed that there is definitely no connection between the two proposals. The currently proposed 132kv line will only strengthen the supply to Burgersdorp, and will not be linking into the existing 66kv line which supplies the farmers in the Venterdorp area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eskom have indicated that they will be meeting with you to discuss this issue further.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We have discussed this issue with the avifauna specialist, who has confirmed that birds may become habituated to the presence of structures such as powerlines, but that there is no documented evidence of this. The specialist has considered this issue, but still recommends in his report that Route 4 be constructed. He notes that Route 3 is the least favourable because it is in a remote location, and near a black eagle nest.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A letter voicing similar concerns was previously received from another interested and affected party.

The issues have been discussed with Eskom and they have responded as follows:

**Concern:** Will the line in discussion be broken down or not?

**Response:** Eskom (Northern Cape) *apparently* have plans to rebuild the existing 66kV lines to Rooiwal and Badsfontein Sub Stations *in the future* as these lines are old, and once the new line is built the old one will be broken down.

**Concern:** If so, when?

**Response:** We are *not sure* at this stage. How this is going to be done is still in their *early planning* stages.

**Concern:** Will this have any electricity supply implications for the places (Rooival/Badsfontein) that the I&AP has mentioned?

**Response:** As mentioned, *exactly how this is going to be done is still in the early planning stages.* That is, if they are to build next to the existing line or look for an alternative route. Either way, this intervention will not affect supply to customers. Irrespective of whether the new line is built to Rooiwal or Badsfontein, or whether it will be a 66kV or 132kV line, the supply will be improved.

As mentioned, Eskom have indicated that they will be meeting with you to explain the future plans for the 66kV line.

As mentioned, the plans for the 66kV line are still in the early planning stage, but Eskom have indicated that they will be meeting with you to explain these future plans.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>NAME &amp; ORGANISATION</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Concern: The original BAR said the line would not be broken down. The latest letter from ESKOM (14 Oct 2013) then indicated that it WOULD be broken down. Explain how the confusion arose. Response: The original Basic Assessment report (which indicated that the existing 66kV line would not be broken down) was incorrect. We apologise for this error. Concern: How does this line relate to the current proposal to construct the new 132kV line? Are they related at all? <strong>Response: There is no connection between the two proposals.</strong> Please advise if this response adequately addresses your concerns.</td>
<td>Your concerns are noted. As an independent EAP, we have been advised by Eskom that they will be meeting with you to discuss these concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/09/2014</td>
<td>Mr Meyer van der Walt Schalkwykskraal Venterstad</td>
<td>I would like to state to whom it may concern that we as stakeholders are not opposed to the building of the line in question. We feel though that with the right planning Eskom can address all the current concerns with much less impact on our area now and in future. At this stage it is clear that in planning this line Eskom did not take into account the supply of electricity to our area and the enormous cost it will take to rectify this in future. It is even possible that building a line to supply only our substations in future will not be economically viable. Although our concerns was voiced to Eskom on various meetings they choose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As stakeholders we gave our full co-operation from the onset of this project. As the project progressed it was getting clear that certain vital information was being withheld by Eskom representatives and even lies were told. Information on sensitive areas on the route was totally disregarded in the initial planning. It became clear that Eskom did not take all the factors into account while planning this project.

We hope that Eskom will take our input into consideration and find a solution that will be of benefit to all.

**COMMENTS RECEIVED AFTER THE REVIEW PERIOD FOR DRAFT SECTION 24G REPORT**

Note that in light of the comments received from landowners (see section above) Eskom and GIBB held a key stakeholder (landowner) meeting on 31 November 2014 at the home of Mr Meyer v.d. Walt. The outcome of the meeting was summarised by W. Fyvie of GIBB in an email (see below) to the key stakeholders. Their responses are provided in the rows below.

**From:** Walter Fyvie [mailto:wfyvie@gibb.co.za]
**Sent:** Monday, November 17, 2014 11:38 AM
**To:** 'jcv888@telkomsa.net'; 'jvanwyk@nokwi.co.za'; 'fransmeyer@nokwi.co.za'; 'jcoo@nokwi.co.za'; 'as@nokwi.co.za'; John Wood (WoodJ@eskom.co.za); Zandi Siyongwana (SiyongZA@eskom.co.za); 'Sterk Hibana'; Nene Songxaba (SongxaNN@eskom.co.za); Mxolisi Mabindisa (MabindM@eskom.co.za); Cicil Hoffman (HoffmaC@eskom.co.za); 'maraisch@eskom.co.za'; 'hougha@eskom.co.za'; 'Kate Parkinson'

**Subject:** Ruigtevallei - Dreunberg 132kv line S24G process: Key stakeholder meeting follow-up

Good day gentlemen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>NAME &amp; ORGANISATION &amp;</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to disregard it and push on with their agenda.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As stakeholders we gave our full co-operation from the onset of this project. As the project progressed it was getting clear that certain vital information was being withheld by Eskom representatives and even lies were told. Information on sensitive areas on the route was totally disregarded in the initial planning. It became clear that Eskom did not take all the factors into account while planning this project.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We hope that Eskom will take our input into consideration and find a solution that will be of benefit to all.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Firstly, many thanks to Mr van Der Walt for hosting us so well on Friday 14 Nov at the key stakeholders meeting for this project, and secondly, many thanks to all those who made themselves available for the meeting. It is much appreciated and I think we can agree it was a good meeting.

As mentioned at the meeting, the intention of this email is to briefly summarize the outcome of the meeting, specifically to:
1. Confirm the landowners position regarding future power supply to the area, and
2. Confirm what was agreed in terms of environmental issues and the S24G process.

1. **FUTURE POWER SUPPLY:**
The following was concluded regarding this issue:
- **Landowners concern:** The landowners (and Mr Oosthuizen) confirmed that their key concern with this project was ensuring that they would have a secure power supply in the future. They feel uncomfortable with the fact that their existing 66kv line which feeds their two local substations is old, and are concerned that Eskom may in the future not have sufficient funds to maintain this line, and may be forced to cancel supply to their area. Route 3 of the proposed 132kv line runs in close proximity to this existing 66kv line, and for this reason the landowners prefer Route 3 for the new 132kv line, because it would make it easy and cheap for Eskom to tie into their existing substations in future. The landowners feel that Route 3 would provide them with the best guarantee of a future power supply. For this reason they prefer Route 3 over Route 4.

- **Eskom’s response:** Eskom assured the landowners that they will not abandon customers. Furthermore, Eskom explained that the existing 66kv line does not only supply the landowners in this area, but also supplies power to areas south of the Badsfontein sub-station. The existing 66kv line is therefore an important line and supply to these sub-stations cannot be abandoned. Mr Mxolisi Mabindisa (Eskom Northern Cape) indicated that the strengthening plans for this area where in the early stages, but undertook to table and discuss these plans with the landowners as they are developed. The landowners accepted this provided they remained involved in the process.

2. **S24G AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS:**
The following was concluded regarding this issue:
- **Landowner concern:** Mr M. van der Walt indicated that it would be better to locate the proposed 132kv line along Route 3 because it would be adjacent to the existing 66kv line and the birds in the area are already used to this line and know how to avoid it.

- **EAP’s response:** Mr Fyvie indicated that the avifauna specialist considered this. However in section 4.5.3 of the specialist’s report he noted that “It is normally an advantage to place new power lines adjacent to existing lines. Typically then this route would have been preferred on that basis. However in this case, it is our opinion that the existing 66kV line was built on a particularly sensitive route for avifauna, for reasons including those below. It is therefore not ideal to compound this historic error by adding a new power line to the same route.” The specialist confirms that overall, Route 4 is a better route.

- **Landowner concern:** The landowners indicated that they had concerns with the manner in which the incorrect monopoles would be removed, as well as general access to their property.

- **EAP’s response:** Mr Fyvie indicated that he would make a recommendation in the S24G report that any approval conditions should include the following requirements:
  - Prior to any further work being undertaken on the landowner’s property, a method statement addressing property access must be compiled by the contractor, and review by Eskom and the these affected landowners before signoff.
  - Prior to any structures being removed, a method statement addressing this work must be compiled by the contractor, and review by Eskom and these affected landowners before signoff.
**SUMMARY REGARDING ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:**
The landowners confirmed that, notwithstanding their issues raised above, the main objection they have had to the proposed Route 4 was about guaranteeing future power supply to their area, and not on environmental grounds. The landowners accepted that the S24G process can continue with the recommendation for Route 4, provided that the commitments made under point 1 above are respected.

I trust that the notes above accurately reflect what was discussed. If so, please can you respond confirming this.

For the record, I’ve attached the attendance register. The following attended:

- Meyer van der Walt (Landowner)
- J.C. van der Walt (Landowner)
- Abraham Steyn (Landowner)
- Jan Harm van Wyk (Landowner)
- J.C. Oosthuizen (Venterstad Agric Assoc.)
- John Wood (Eskom)
- Zandi Siyongwana (Eskom)
- Sterk Hibana (Eskom)
- Nene Songxaba (Eskom)
- Mxolisi Mabindisa (Eskom)
- C.W. Hoffman (Eskom)
- Chris Marais (Eskom)
- Amanda Hough (Eskom)
- Walter Fyvie (GIBB)

Many thanks again

**Walter Fyvie**
**Associate**
**Environmental Scientist**
Cell: +27 72 8439 630
Tel: +27 41 392 7500
Email: wfyvie@gibb.co.za
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>NAME &amp; ORGANISATION</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 21/11/2014 | Mr Meyer van der Walt       | From: Meyer van der Walt [mailto:fransmeyer@nokwi.co.za]  
Sent: 21 November 2014 09:58 AM  
To: 'Walter Fyvie'  
Subject: RE: Ruigtevallei - Dreunberg 132kv line S24G process: Key stakeholder meeting follow-up  
Hallo Walter  
I can confirm that the notes accurately reflect what was discussed although we agreed to disagree on certain aspects in the specialist reports. We still feel that route 3 will be the best option environmentally, economically and ecstatically.  
Guaranteeing future power supply to this area is still a huge concern. It is therefore necessary to mention that we as landowners will not allow any construction to continue on route 4 before this matter is resolved to our satisfaction.  
Thanks.  
Meyer van der Walt  
Schalkwykskraal  
Venterstad  
9798 | From: Walter Fyvie [mailto:wfyvie@gibb.co.za]  
Sent: 25 November 2014 01:02 PM  
To: 'Meyer van der Walt'; jcv888@telkomsa.net; jvanwyk@nokwi.co.za; jcoo@nokwi.co.za; as@nokwi.co.za  
Cc: 'Kate Parkinson'; Zandi Siyongwana (SiyongZA@eskom.co.za)  
Subject: RE: Ruigtevallei - Dreunberg 132kv line S24G process: Key stakeholder meeting follow-up  
Hello Mr van der Walt  
Thanks for you clarification email below. I have forwarded this onto Eskom as well.  
Could I please ask Mr Jan Harm van Wyk, Mr J.C. van der Walt, Mr J.C. Oosthuizen, and Mr Abraham Steyn to please respond individually to my email as well. This is needed so that I can prove to the Department of Environmental Affairs, that all those who have commented as part of this S24G process, have been engaged. If you have nothing to add to what Mr Meyer van der Walt has indicated below, please just state that you support his statement below.  
I would appreciate it if you could respond as soon as possible.  
Regards  
Walter |  
| 25/11/2014 | Mr A Steyn                  | From: Abraham Steyn [mailto:as@nokwi.co.za]  
Sent: 25 November 2014 01:43 PM  
To: Walter Fyvie  
Subject: Re: Ruigtevallei - Dreunberg 132kv line S24G process: Key stakeholder meeting follow-up | From: Walter Fyvie [mailto:wfyvie@gibb.co.za]  
Sent: 25 November 2014 04:10 PM  
To: 'Abraham Steyn'  
Subject: RE: Ruigtevallei - Dreunberg 132kv line S24G process: Key stakeholder meeting follow-up |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>NAME &amp; ORGANISATION</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 25/11/2014 | Mr JC Oosthuizen                          | **From:** JC Oosthuizen [mailto:jcoo@nokwi.co.za]  
**Sent:** 25 November 2014 03:17 PM  
**To:** 'Walter Fyvie'  
**Cc:** as@nokwi.co.za; Jan Harm; Meyer van der Walt;  
SiyongZA@eskom.co.za; J.C. van der Walt  
**Subject:** RE: Ruigtevallei - Dreunberg 132kv line S24G process: Key stakeholder meeting follow-up  

Hallo Walter,  
Yes, Meyer v/d Walt has captured the essence of the matter. I would also just want to emphasize that if Escom wants to go for route 4 instead of route 3, Escom has to include in there current proposals either a substation for feeding the Rooiwal en Badsfontein substations or building spurs from the new 132kV line to the mentioned substations.  
Regards  
JC Oosthuizen  
Chairman: Venterstad Agricultural Association | From: Walter Fyvie [mailto:wfyvie@gibb.co.za]  
**Sent:** 25 November 2014 03:20 PM  
**To:** 'jcoo@nokwi.co.za'  
**Cc:** 'as@nokwi.co.za'; 'Jan Harm'; 'Meyer van der Walt'; 'SiyongZA@eskom.co.za'; 'J.C. van der Walt'  
**Subject:** RE: Ruigtevallei - Dreunberg 132kv line S24G process: Key stakeholder meeting follow-up  

Thanks for your response Mr Oosthuizen. I will pass your comments on to Eskom.  
Regards  
Walter Fyvie  
Associate  
Environmental Scientist  
Cell: +27 72 8439 630  
Tel: +27 41 392 7500  
Email: wfyvie@gibb.co.za |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>NAME &amp; ORGANISATION</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 26/11/2014 | Mr J Van Wyk Landowner | **From:** J van Wyk [mailto:jvanwyk@nokwi.co.za]  
**Sent:** 26 November 2014 01:43 PM  
**To:** 'Walter Fyvie'  
**Subject:** RE: Ruigtevallei - Dreunberg 132kv line S24G process: Key stakeholder meeting follow-up  
Hi Walter  
I also support the matter as described by Meyer vd Walt  
Regards  
Jan Harm van Wyk | **From:** Walter Fyvie [mailto:wfyvie@gibb.co.za]  
**Sent:** 27 November 2014 10:01 AM  
**To:** 'jvanwyk@nokwi.co.za'  
**Subject:** RE: Ruigtevallei - Dreunberg 132kv line S24G process: Key stakeholder meeting follow-up  
Many thanks Mr van Wyk.  
Regards  
**Walter Fyvie**  
**Associate**  
**Environmental Scientist**  
Cell: +27 72 8439 630  
Tel: +27 41 392 7500  
Email: wfyvie@gibb.co.za |
Appendix F

Original Comments from I&APs
Kate Parkinson

From: Meyer van der Walt <fransmeyer@nokwi.co.za>
Sent: 04 December 2013 23:25
To: 'Kate Parkinson'
Subject: RE: Ruitgevallei- Dreunberg 132kV powerline

Kate

I would like to confirm that nobody ever contact me or accessed my property in the process of compiling an EIA for the building of this power line. I was never contacted nor acknowledged in the process.

My one concern was that the power line would have passed very near too an Black Eagles nesting site (within 80m) but that was rectified by a deviation from the original route.

A further concern is that in the area where the power line pass over Suurbergspruit through the Oviston Nature Reserve there is a lot of large trees that are frequently visit by Fish Eagles. This power line (even with bird diverters) will be a huge threat towards them.

Where the power line cross the R390 it pass through centre pivots on the farm Merino. These irrigated fields attract huge flocks of Blue Crane in winter (I counted more than 600 at one stage this past winter). As these birds fly in very low from the Gariep dam in the early mornings before sunrise it is almost certain that there will be collusions with the power line.

I sincerely hope that commonsense will prevail an that alternative 3 will be accept an the preferred route.

Thanks

Meyer van der Walt
Schalkwykskraal
Venterstad
9798
0725295803

From: Kate Parkinson [mailto:kparkinson@gibb.co.za]
Sent: Tuesday, December 03, 2013 10:35 AM
To: 'Meyer van der Walt'
Subject: RE: Ruitgevallei- Dreunberg 132kV powerline

Good morning Mr van der Walt,

As previously discussed can you please put any concerns you have regarding the Ruitgevallei – Dreunberg powerline into writing and send to me. Your comments will be communicated to Eskom and will also be included in the report submitted to the Department of Environmental Affairs. It is possible that notifications for the basic assessment were sent via post and got misplaced or weren’t delivered.
I have added your email address to our I&AP database and all future correspondence will be sent via email. I will send a copy of the basic assessment and specialist reports (archaeology, palaeontology and avifauna) to you tomorrow.
Kind regards

Kate Parkinson
Environmental Scientist
Tel: +27 41 392 7500
Email: kparkinson@gibb.co.za

2nd Floor, Greyville House,
Cnr Greyville & Cape Rd,
Greenacres, Port Elizabeth 6001
PO Box 63703, Greenacres 6057
Fax: +27 41 363 9300
Web: www.gibb.co.za

This email is subjected to the legal disclaimer of GIBB which is available on the GIBB website: www.gibb.co.za

From: Meyer van der Walt [mailto:fransmeyer@nokwi.co.za]
Sent: 03 December 2013 08:38
To: kparkinson@gibb.co.za
Subject: Ruigtevallei- Dreunberg 132kV powerline

Kate Parkinson

I appreciate your letter (dating 22/11/13) stating that I am considered as an I&AP in the matter of the Ruigtevallei – Dreunberg power line. I would though like to know how the first EIA was compiled as I was never contacted or acknowledged in the process.

Meyer van der Walt
Schalkwykskraal
Venterstad
9798

0725295803
Kate Parkinson

From: Meyer van der Walt <fransmeyer@nokwi.co.za>
Sent: 06 December 2013 21:39
To: 'Kate Parkinson'
Subject: Blue Cranes
Attachments: P1060132.jpg; P1060133.jpg; P1060134.jpg; P1060136.jpg; P1060137.jpg; P1060138.jpg; P1060139.jpg; P1060141.jpg; P1060142.jpg; P1060144.jpg; _Certification_.txt

Kate

Just a few photo's taken by Joggie Ackerman (Nature Conservation) to confirm the presence of the Blue Crane in the area that I am concerned about.

I received the reports you send me and it is interesting that they all recommend the route following the old 66kV line. I still feel that these studies doesn't stress the negative impact of the other routes enough and the basic EIA is actually much too positive towards these two high impact options.

Thank you.

Meyer van der Walt
Schalkwykskraal
Venterstad
9798

0725295803

-----Original Message-----
From: Joggie Ackerman [mailto:Joggie.Ackerman@deaet.ecape.gov.za]
Sent: Friday, December 06, 2013 1:54 PM
To: fransmeyer@nokwi.co.za

Your message is ready to be sent with the following file or link attachments:

P1060132.jpg
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P1060144.jpg
Walter Fyvie  
GIBB Pty Ltd  
P O Box 63703  
PORT ELIZABETH  
6057  

Fax: 041 363 9300/086 608 2522  
Tel: 041 392 7500  

PER FACSIMILE / MAIL  

Dear Sir/Madam  

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RECEIPT AND ACCEPTANCE OF SECTION 24G APPLICATION FORM FOR THE RUISTEVALLEI – DREUNBERG 132 KV POWER LINE, GARIEP LOCAL MUNICIPALITY IN THE EASTERN CAPE PROVINCE  

The Department confirms having received the Sec 24G application form submitted by you on 6 January 2014 for environmental authorisation for the abovementioned project. The application is accepted.  

Yours sincerely  

[Signature]  
Mr Ishaam Abade  
Deputy Director-General: Legal, Authorisations, Compliance and Enforcement  
Department of Environmental Affairs:  
Latter signed by: Ms Mmatlala Rabothata  
Designation: Environmental Officer: Integrated Environmental Authorisations  
Date: 31/01/2014
APPLICATION FOR RECTIFICATION IN TERMS OF SECTIONS 24G OF THE NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT ACT OF 1998 FOR THE UNLAWFUL COMMENCEMENT OF LISTED ACTIVITIES FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF RUIGTEVELLEI TO DREUNBERG 132 KV POWERLINE WITHIN GARIOEP LOCAL MUNICIPALITY IN THE EASTERN CAPE PROVINCE

Dear Mr Fyvie

The following application for rectification in terms of Section 24G of the National Environmental Management Act, 1998 (Act No 107 of 1998), has reference:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Listed activities in terms of GN R.544</th>
<th>Activity details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity 10 (i)</td>
<td>The construction of facilities or infrastructure for the transmission and distribution of electricity -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i. outside urban areas or industrial complexes with a capacity of more than 33 but less than 275 kilovolts; or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 12</td>
<td>The clearance of an area of 300 square metres or more of vegetation where 75% or more of the vegetative cover constitutes indigenous vegetation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 18</td>
<td>The construction of infrastructure covering 10 square metres or more construction occurs within a watercourse or within 32 metres of a watercourse, measured from the edge of a watercourse, excluding where such construction will occur behind the development setback.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On review of the application for rectification form and the information provided in your application; Eskom, illegally commenced with activities which were listed in terms of section 24 (2) of the NEMA without an Environmental Authorisation which was required in terms of section 24 of the NEMA read with section 24F of NEMA and the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations which were set out in Government Notice R.543 of 18 June 2010 read with the listed activities identified in GN R.544 and GN R.546 (dated 18 June 2010).
In order for this Department to make an informed decision regarding the above application, you are required in terms of section 24G (1) of NEMA, as amended, to follow the process set out below and submit the following information to the Department:

A. Additional information containing the following:

- An assessment of the nature, extent, duration and significance of the consequences for or impacts on the environment of each of the activities unlawfully commenced with,
- An assessment of the nature, extent, duration and significance of the consequences for or impacts on the environment of the cumulative effects that the activities unlawfully commenced with have had and will have on the environment,
- A description of mitigation measures undertaken or to be undertaken in respect of the consequences for or impacts on the environment of the activities unlawfully commenced with;
- A detailed description of the scope of the development, including the extent thereof, must be indicated on a map and according to scale;
- A description of the environment that has been and may further be affected by the activity and the manner in which the physical, biological, social, economic and cultural aspects have been and may further be affected by the activity;
- A description and comparative assessment of the potential alternatives to the proposed activity, including advantages and disadvantages that the activity or alternatives may have on the environment. The effects of this development on the affected community must be described;
- An indication of the methodology used in determining the significance of potential environmental impacts;
- A summary of the findings and recommendations of any specialist report or report on a specialised process;
- Copies of any specialist reports and reports on specialised processes including:
  - details of—
    - the person who prepared the report; and
    - the expertise of that person to carry out the specialist study
  - or specialised process;
  - a declaration that the person is independent in a form as may be specified by the competent authority;
  - an indication of the scope of and the purpose for which the report was prepared;
  - a description of the methodology adopted in preparing the report or carrying out the specialised process;
  - a description of any assumptions made and any uncertainties or gaps in knowledge;
  - a description of the findings and potential implications of such findings on the impact of the proposed activity, including identified alternatives, on the environment;
  - recommendations in respect of any mitigation measures that should be considered by the applicant and the competent authority;
  - a description of any consultation process that was undertaken during the course of carrying out the study;
  - a summary and copies of any comments that were received during any consultation process, and
- An environmental management programme including:
  - details of —
    - the person who prepared the environmental management programme; and
    - the expertise of the person who prepared the environmental management programme;
  - information on any proposed management or mitigation measures that will be taken to address the environmental impacts that have been identified in the EIR, including environmental impacts or objectives in respect of—
    - planning and design;
    - pre-construction and construction activities;
    - operation or undertaking of the activity;
    - rehabilitation of the environment; and
Closure.

- an identification of the persons who will be responsible for the implementation of the mitigation measures as above;
- a detailed description of the aspects of the activity that are covered by the draft environmental management programme;
- proposed mechanisms for monitoring compliance with and performance assessment against the environmental management programme and reporting thereon;
- as far as reasonably practicable, measures to rehabilitate the environment affected by the undertaking of any listed activity or specified activity to its natural or predetermined state or to a land use which conforms to the generally accepted principle of sustainable development, including, where appropriate, concurrent or progressive rehabilitation measures;
- a description of the manner in which it intends to—
  - modify, remedy, control or stop any action, activity or process which causes pollution or environmental degradation;
  - remedy the cause of pollution or degradation and migration of pollutants;
  - comply with any prescribed environmental management, standards or practices;
- time periods within which the measures contemplated in the environmental management programme must be implemented;
- the process for managing any environmental damage, pollution, pumping and treatment of extraneous water or ecological degradation as a result of undertaking a listed activity;
- an environmental awareness plan describing the manner in which—
  - the applicant intends to inform his or her employees of any environmental risk which may result from their work; and
  - risks must be dealt with in order to avoid pollution or the degradation of the environment;

- Closure plans, including closure objectives.
- A description of all environmental issues that were identified during the environmental impact assessment process, an assessment of the significance of each issue and an indication of the extent to which the issue could be addressed by the adoption of mitigation measures;
- An assessment of each identified potentially significant impact, including—
  - cumulative impacts;
  - the nature of the impact;
  - the extent and duration of the impact;
  - the probability of the impact occurring;
  - the degree to which the impact can be reversed;
  - the degree to which the impact may cause irreplaceable loss of resources; and
  - the degree to which the impact can be mitigated;
- A description of any assumptions, uncertainties and gaps in knowledge;
- A reasoned opinion as to whether the activity should or should not be authorised, and if the opinion is that it should be authorised, outline conditions that should be made in respect of the authorisation;
- An environmental impact statement which contains—
  - a summary of the key findings of the environmental impact assessment; and
  - a comparative assessment of the positive and negative implications of the proposed activity and identified alternatives;

The EAP must ensure that the comments of interested and affected parties are recorded in reports and that such written comment, including records of meetings, are attached to the report referred to above.

Lastly, a motivation of why your application in terms of Section 24G of the National Environmental Management Amendment Act should be considered favourably, with specific reference to the site's environmental sensitivity, environmental management plans, proposed mitigation measures, offset considerations and time frames associated with rehabilitation and mitigation.
The information requested above must be contained in an **individual report**. Please ensure that the report is complete and reflects the correct DEA reference number 14/12/16/3/2/61.

The above application for rectification will be subject to an administration fine that may not exceed 5 Million Rand (R5,000,000). You will accordingly be informed of the amount of the fine once the above requested requirements and information has been compiled with and submitted to this Department. Please note that all information required above, including proof of public participation and copies of objections/comments, must reach this Department within four months of signature of this letter. Should the Department not receive this information within the four month period or at least receive a request for an extension of time within the four month period, your section 24G file will be closed and there will be no further opportunity to rectify this unlawful activity.

Please note that activities which result in detrimental impacts to the environment are considered in a serious light by the Department and accordingly applicants must understand that lodging an application for rectification does not necessarily imply that the activity will be authorised. In terms of the NEMA, as amended, the Minister may either conditionally authorise the activity or issue a directive for the activity to cease and for the environment to be rehabinulated.

The information requested above must be submitted and addressed to:

The Department of Environmental Affairs

**DIRECTOR: INTEGRATED ENVIRONMENTAL AUTHORISATION**

4th Floor South Tower


Please note that the Department is more than willing to provide guidance in relation to this process. Please do not hesitate to call the official mentioned for enquiries should you have any questions in relation to the content of this letter.

Yours faithfully

Mr. Ishaam Abader

Deputy Director-General: Legal, Authorisations, Compliance & Enforcement
Department of Environmental Affairs

Letter signed by: Ms Milcent Solomons

Designation: Director: Environmental Impact Evaluation

Date: 11/02/2014.
Mr Waller Fyvie  
GIBB (Pty) Ltd  
PO Box 63703  
GREENACRES  
6057  

Fax: 041 363 9300  
Tel: 041 392 7500  

PER FACSIMILE / MAIL  

Dear Mr Fyvie  

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RECEIPT OF REQUEST FOR AN EXTENSION TO SUBMIT THE SECTION 24G REPORT FOR THE PROPOSED RUIGTEVALLEI – DREUNBERG 132KV POWERLINE  

The Department confirms having received the request for extension dated 24 April 2014 for the above-mentioned project on 14 May 2014. The Department will respond in due course.  

Yours sincerely  

[Signature]  

Mr Ishaam Abader  
Deputy Director-General: Legal, Authorizations Compliance and Enforcement  
Department of Environmental Affairs  
Letter signed by: Mr Herman Alberts  
Designation: Environmental Officer: Integrated Environmental Authorisations  
Date: 30/05/2014
Mr Walter Fyvie  
GIBB (Pty) Ltd  
PO Box 63703  
GREENACRES  
6057

Fax: 041 363 9300  
Tel: 041 392 7500

PE FACSIMILE / MAIL

Dear Mr Fyvie

REQUEST FOR EXTENSION: RUIGTEVALLE - DREUNBERG 132kV POWERLINE, SECTION 24G

Your request for extension dated 24 April 2014 and received by the Department on 14 May 2014, has reference.

The Department accepts your request for extension for the abovementioned application and hereby advises you that the abovementioned application will remain open on the Departmental system.

In light of the above, this Department requests that all outstanding information be submitted in accordance with your letter dated 24 April 2014. All outstanding information must be submitted to the Department on or before 11 October 2014.

Should you have any queries or wish to discuss the points raised above, please do not hesitate to contact our offices.

Yours faithfully

Mr Ishaam Abader  
Deputy Director-General: Legal, Authorisations, Compliance & Enforcement  
Department of Environmental Affairs  
Letter signed by: Ms Milicent Solomons  
Designation: Director: Integrated Environmental Authorisations  
Date: 07/07/2014.
Dear Sir


1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 I refer to the above matter and to the site inspection conducted on 17 October 2013 by the Environmental Management Inspectors (EMIs) duly authorised in terms of section 31B of NEMA from the Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA);

1.2 This inspection followed a complaint regarding the non-compliance with the Environmental Authorisation with reference number 12/12/20/2315 (EA) dated 29 November 2012, issued for the construction of a new 132KV overhead powerline from the Ruigtevallei substation to Dreunberg in the Eastern Cape Province; and,

1.3 Section 24G referenced 14/12/16/3/2/61, submitted on 10 January 2014.
2. FINDINGS:

2.1 The Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA) granted Eskom an Environmental Authorisation ("EA") reference 12/12/20/2315 for the construction of the Ruigtevallei-Dreunberg 132KV powerline, approving option three (3) ("route 3") as the best option. In contrast, Eskom opted to deviate from the approved option and illegally implemented the non-approved option one (1) ("route 1").

2.2 In total, the 132 KV power line measures approximately 85 km in distance of which 40.5 km forms part of the illegal constructed powerline on route 1.

2.3 The EMIs enquired about the Basic Assessment Report (BAR), submitted for comment to Eastern Cape Park and Tourism Agency (ECP&TA), to cross the Oviston nature reserve and Eskom reported that:

2.3.1 The draft BAR was submitted to ECP&TA for comments and inputs on matters relating to the crossing of the nature reserve. ECP&TA sent a letter to the Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) dated 25 September 2012 indicating their satisfaction with regard to the proposed project;

2.3.2 In the final BAR dated June 2012 submitted to DEA, it was never mentioned that consent was obtained from ECP&TA. The BAR dated June 2012 indicated that there were three (3) routes that were assessed and all impacts were identified and captured;

2.3.3 In the BAR the EAP recommended route 3 considering the high negative impacts associated with routes 1 and 2; and

2.3.4 Based on the high negative impacts associated with routes 1 and 2, DEA approved the construction of the power line to follow route 3.

2.4 Despite the approved EA with route 3, Eskom nonetheless opted to proceed illegally with route one (1), irrespective of the high negative impacts associated with this route.

2.5 The illegal construction of the pylons on route 1 commenced on 23 May 2013 from Dreunberg to Ruigtevallei substation. Eskom detected the non-compliance with the approved EA on 19 September 2013 and ceased with parts of the project. On the 11 October 2013, after having had a meeting with DEA, Eskom finally ceased with the entire project work.
3. The following further findings are relevant:

3.1 Eskom has commenced with the construction of an illegal power line along the R58 road on the non-approved option one (1) route;

3.2 Excavations commenced in certain sections of the power line, with minimal clearing below and around the foundation for the towers (pylons and/or support structures) to be constructed. In total 77 foundations were completed and 77 towers were completed in the unauthorised route;

3.3 Construction has commenced near to the Verreaux’s eagle nesting area;

3.4 Map 1 shows route diversion 1 near Rooi Kop, 80m away from the Eagle nesting;

3.5 The existing tracks used for construction purposes will be further used for maintenance purposes during the power line operation; and

3.6 An existing farm has been used as a camp site.

4. Route deviation 2 at the farm dam - Based on the information provided in the S24G application, a site visit undertaken by the EAP in November 2013 established that the powerline deviated and traversed around the farm dam and/or a wetland and it was reported that, although there was no water in the dam, the existence of the dam was confirmed through a satellite imagery during this site visit. (Please refer to Annexure A and B showing the powerline route diversion and transgression through the farm dam and/or wetland).

5. Route deviation 3 at the Oviston Nature Reserve - Although on 17 October 2013 it was reported the powerline that was constructed never crossed the nature reserve, the information provided in S24G application further provided that original route 1 included a 1km section of line, approximately 5km west of Venterstad which passed through the Oviston Nature Reserve.

6. Two (2) vegetation namely, Besemkaree Koppies Shrubland and Eastern Upper Karoo are found onsite. Although this vegetation is listed as least threatened, this veld type has been used for grazing and a large section has been disturbed.

7. INTENDED ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION:

7.1 I, Ishaam Abader, in my capacity as a Grade 1 Environmental Management Inspector (EMI), having considered the illegal activities undertaken on this site, hereby issue Eskom, with this notice of my intention to issue a Compliance Notice in terms of Section 31L of NEMA read with Regulation 8 of the Regulations relating to Environmental Management Inspectors (GNR 494 dated 2 June 2008) issued in terms of NEMA.

7.2 The Compliance Notice that I intend to issue relates to your non-compliance with the provisions of GNR 544 issued under NEMA dated 18 June 2010 and/or the EA referenced 12/12/20/2315.
NON-COMPLIANCE WITH THE NEMA:

8. Section 24F (1) states that:
   (1) Notwithstanding any other Act, no person may-

   (a) commence an activity listed or specified in terms of section 24(2)(a) or (b) unless the competent authority or the Minister responsible for mineral resources, as the case may be, has granted an environmental authorisation for the activity; or
   (b) commence and continue an activity listed in terms of section 24(2)(d) unless it is done in terms of an applicable norm or standard.

8.1 The specific activities relevant to this matter are listed in GNR 544 of 18 June 2010

   Listed Activity 10(I): The construction of facilities or infrastructure for the transmission of distribution of electricity outside urban areas or industrial complexes with the capacity of more than 33 but less than 275 kilovolts.

   Listed Activity 18: The construction of infrastructure covering 10 square metres or more construction occurs within a watercourse or within 32 metres of a watercourse, measured from the edge of a watercourse, excluding where such construction will occur behind the development setback.

8.2 The specific activities relevant to this matter are listed in GNR 546 of 18 June 2010

   Listed Activity 12: The clearance of an area of 300 square metres or more of vegetation where 75% or more of the vegetation cover constitutes indigenous vegetation.

   Listed Activity 16 (iv)(a)(ii)(aa)(ff): The construction of infrastructure covering 10 square metres or more within a watercourse or within 32 metres of a watercourse within protected areas identified in terms of NEMPA or within a Critical Biodiversity Area.

Based on the observations given in paragraphs 2 - 6 above, the DEA has reasonable grounds to believe that the construction activities associated with this transmission line are unlawful.
9. In the event that it is disputed that an EA is not required for the sections of the transmission line which deviated from the authorised route, I have reason to be believe that the following conditions of the EA referenced 12/12/20/2315 have nonetheless been breached. I point this out on the basis that Section 49A (c) of the National Environmental Management Laws Second Amendment Act, (30 of 2013) (NEMLA2) dated 18 December 2013 provides that a person is guilty of an offence if that person "fails to comply with or contravenes a condition of an environmental authorisation granted for a listed activity or specified activity or an approved environmental management programme".

9.1 Non - compliance with the conditions of the EA 12/12/20/2315 are as follows:

a) **Condition 2:** Stipulates that the holder of the authorisation is responsible for ensuring compliance with the conditions contained in this EA. This includes any person acting on the holder’s behalf, including but not limited to, an agent, servant, contractor, sub-contractor, employee, consultant or person rendering a service to the holder of the authorisation. 

*It was reported that the contractor was authorised to undertake the construction work on the site on behalf of Eskom without being given the map to be used in following the approved route 3.*

b) **Condition 5:** Stipulates that any changes to, or deviations from, the project description set in this authorisation must be approved, in writing, by the Department before such changes or deviations may be effected. In assessing whether to grant such approval or not, the Department may request such information as it deems necessary for the holder of the authorisation to apply for further authorisation in terms of the regulations.

*The DEA did not approve the deviation from the approved route.*

10. Based on the above I have reasonable grounds to believe that Eskom has failed to comply with the conditions of the EA that were issued for this project.

11. **INTENDED ADMINISTRATIVE INSTRUCTIONS:**

In light of the reasons set out above, I am of the view that Eskom has deviated from the authorised route, and/or commenced construction in non-compliance with the applicable law and/or conditions of the EA referenced 12/12/20/2315 dated 29 November 2012. Eskom is hereby afforded a period of seven (7) working days from the date of receipt of this notice to make representations stating reasons why I, Ishaam Abader, in my capacity as a Grade 1 EMI, should not issue Eskom with a Compliance Notice in terms of section 31L of National Environmental Management Act, which would require you to do the following:

11.1 Immediately (within 24 hours) after receipt of the final Compliance Notice, cease with all the activities onsite until such time that all applicable environmental authorisations have been obtained;
11.2 Within 20 (twenty) working days of receipt of the final Compliance Notice, appoint the services of an accredited independent environmental consultant to submit a report for Departmental approval which includes, but is not only limited to, the following:

a. Assessment of the environmental impacts of the unlawful activities,
b. Assessment of the impacts of the constructed pylons on the environment,
c. A layout/diagrammatic representation of the extent of the disturbance of the affected areas,
d. A rehabilitation plan for all areas affected by the unlawful activities, including but not only limited to the feasibility of removing the structures that were unlawfully constructed,
e. Recommend timeframes within which the measures recommended in above must be completed.

11.3 Commence with the rehabilitation of the affected areas within the timeframes as approved by the Department;

11.4 Work on the property is only deemed to be completed once full compliance with the recommendations of the approved report has been achieved in line with the approval of the Department frames set out therein, to the satisfaction of this Department.

OFFENCES AND PENALTIES:

12. Please note that the following offences and penalties may ultimately be applicable to the illegal activities being conducted on the site:

12.1 Section 49A(1)(a) and (c) of the NEMA provides that the commencement of a listed activity without an environmental authorisation / fails to comply with a condition of an environmental authorisation constitutes an offence. Upon conviction for such an offence, a person is liable to a fine not exceeding five million rand (R 10 000 000) or to imprisonment for a period not exceeding ten (10) years or to both such fine and such imprisonment

13. Depending on the outcome of the representations made in this regard, the Department will decide upon a way forward regarding this matter.
14. If you should be unclear about any aspect of this notice, kindly contact the person indicated for enquiries as soon as possible. You are kindly requested to sign the acknowledgement of receipt below and fax it back to the Department at (012) 320 4431 / 086 6312244.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

MR ISHAAM ABADER
DEPUTY DIRECTOR GENERAL: LEGAL, AUTHORIZATION AND COMPLIANCE ENFORCEMENT
GRADE 1 ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT INSPECTOR
DATE: 28/07/2014

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RECEIPT:

Received by Mr/Ms ...........................................................................................................

On behalf of the Company ................................................................................................

On this ........................day of ......................................................2014, at .......................................

........................................................

Signature:
ANNEXURE A – ROUTE DEVIATION:

GREEN LINE – APPROVED ROUTE
BLUE LINE – EXACT AREA WHERE LINE WAS CONSTRUCTED
ANNEXURE B – AREAS WHERE CONSTRUCTION Entered INTO A WETLAND:
Good afternoon Jan,

We appreciate your response to Kate and we would like to comment likewise for our involvement with you comes a long way in this regard.

It must be noted that the servitudes on your farms for the powerline were registered in 2012 and 2013 based on the Option Agreement between the parties concerned. However, according to our knowledge you have declare a dispute regarding the position of the proposed overhead powerline after the line was pegged; and for the value of the paid compensation after one of the farmers disclosed his compensation.

Recently, a visit was made to your farm by me and showed you that the pegs you saw near the graves were for the survey station (temporary); and there is a fair clearance between the line and the graves. Indeed you did not give consent to the position of the line and whoever said that is misleading us; maybe their base is the registered servitude of the same.

Nevertheless, we appreciate your participation and willingness to allow this powerline built although not at the same position on your farm. This is what the business and the environmental specialist is to further debate with you. Secondly, the issue of the compensation (ex-gratia) is still on our table but is waiting the conclusion the position of the powerlines.

Concerning the alternative position of the line on your farm will need our land surveyor, John Wood and the environmental specialist to relook at this matter so that it be part of part of G54 application.

Kind regards,

Sterk Terry Hibana
Assistant Land & Rights Officer
Asset Creation Department
Land Development

Eskom Holdings SOC Limited
Distribution Division - Eastern Cape Operating Unit
Sunilaws Office Park | Cnr Bonza Bay Rd & Quenery Drive
Private Bag X1 | BEACON BAY, 5241 (RSA)

Tel: +27 43 703 2735 (Fx: 8710-2735)
Fax: +27 86 613 6352
Cell: +27 78 749 7749
Email: hibanas@eskom.co.za
From: J van Wyk [mailto:jvanwyk@nokwi.co.za]
Sent: 25 August 2014 04:15 PM
To: 'Kate Parkinson'
Cc: Sterk Hibana
Subject: RE: ESKOM POWER LINE

Kate

Thanks a lot for your response I appreciate it

Regarding the graves I pointed these out to the heritage specialist during his visit to my farm as at that stage there were markers around the grave indicated and I was concerned about those, but because we thought that this was where the line was going to be I did not point out the graves that is even more south than the southern graves that’s why I am saying that NO POWERLINE will pass through this area. I suggest the line being built alongside the R58 and not on this route pass the graves

Regards
Jan Harm van Wyk
082 825 1367
051 654 0530

From: Kate Parkinson [mailto:kparkinson@gibb.co.za]
Sent: 25 August 2014 02:29 PM
To: 'Jvanwyk@nokwi.co.za'
Cc: ‘Sterk Hibana’
Subject: RE: ESKOM POWER LINE

Good afternoon Mr van Wyk,

Letters were sent to all landowners for whom we didn’t have an email address listed in our database. The postal address listed for you is PO Box 57, Venterstad, 9798. Can you please confirm if this address is correct? I have added your email address to our database and will be sending all future communication via email.

I have forwarded your comments regarding negotiations and maintenance of access roads onto Eskom. I will respond to your comments once I receive feedback from Eskom.

Please find attached the Section 24G report, figure 11 shows the location of the powerline in relation to known graves on your property. The graves were identified by a heritage specialist during a site visit. The map shows the most southerly and northerly identified graves. Also attached is a google earth map showing the location of graves in relation to the powerline.

Kind regards

Kate Parkinson
Environmental Scientist
Tel: +27 41 392 7500
Email: kparkinson@gibb.co.za

Port Elizabeth
2nd Floor, Greyville House,
Cnr Greyville & Cape Rd,
Greenacres, Port Elizabeth 6001
Kate

Thanks a lot for the mail we received regarding the proposed Eskom Power line that will supposable pass through my land

I received the letters and drafts from MRN MEYER VD WALT and no one from GIBB or Eskom sent me a mail regarding the matter and I only found out at Church yesterday 25-8-2014 about the letter

There is just 2 points I want to address please and will appreciate it if you can get back to me regarding this

1 – in point 3.3.4 you talk about a deviation around my dam and that a agreement was reached after negotiations between myself and Escom, this is not true as I did not agree to anything as they only come by and told me that they want to make the deviation and I said that I will consider it but have not given any approval on this!!!

2-in point 8.2.3 where my fathers and labarours graves are mentioned I would like to know the precise points where the line will be constructed as I only pointed out the graves we thought was close to a pole but in that area there are lots of other graves and that proposed route I will not allow to go where it is proposed so this have to be looked and another route must be negotiated

3-Do your company also do the survey on the current roads that Eskom wants to use and what about the yearly maintenance on these roads as we constructed it on my own cost and these have to be maintained if it’s being used by ESKOM

You or someone from your office is more than welcome to make a appointment to come and see me on my farm to sow me exactly where the planed route is and then only can I say where I want the route on my land as the current one will not be build on the proposed route as currently the case

I'm part of the 49Million initiative.
http://www.49Million.co.za

NB: This Email and its contents are subject to the Eskom Holdings SOC Limited EMAIL LEGAL NOTICE which can be viewed at http://www.eskom.co.za/Pages/Email_Legal_Spam_Disclaimer.aspx
Section 24G Application Ruigtevallei-Dreunberg 132kV Powerline

It came to our attention through our members that the current 66kV power line supplying electricity to the Rooiwal and Badsfontein substations will be decommissioned in the near future. This was told to our members by Cecil Hoffman at the Stakeholder’s Meeting of the Ruigtevallei-Dreunberg Project on 10 December 2013 in Venterstad.

This information has been confirmed by a letter dated 14 October 2013 in Appendix K of the Section 24G Application to Mr Sabelo Malaza by Tom Smith (Land Development & Environmental Manager of Eskom). In this letter it is stated that “this existing power line will be decommissioned in the near future.” This means that if this happens there will be no power supply in future to the Rooiwal and Badsfontein substations if the new above mentioned power line isn’t built adjacent to the existing 66kV power line (route alternative 3).

I would like to bring it to your attention that electricity from the Rooiwal substation supplies the whole western rural and agricultural area of the Venterstad district as well as portions of Colesberg-, Noupoort- and Steynburg districts.

The Badsfontein substation supplies electricity to the towns of Nozizwe, Lyceumville, Venterstad and Oviston and to the eastern rural area of Venterstad, and portions of the Burgersdorp district.
It is therefore of great importance that reliable power will be supplied to the existing substations. Any economical growth and future development and job creation depends on good power supply to this area. Furthermore this also supplies power to a keypoint like the Orange/Fishriver Tunnel inlet at Oviston that is crucial for the water supply to the Orange-Fish River irrigation scheme. An unreliable power supply will also have devastating effects on planned development of the !Lake Gariep Initiative and the Gariep Dam Resource Management plan currently being investigated.

By building this new 132kV power line adjacent to the old 66kV line (route option 3) the future power supply to the this substations will thus be secured. This will also minimize any future costs and planning to rectify the problem if the old line is decommissioned.

We feel that this problem should be addressed as a matter of urgency before any further planning or work is done on this new 132V power line.

Regards

JC Oosthuizen

Chairman: Venterstad Agricultural Union
Gibb Public Participation Office
Ms Kate Parkinson
PO Box 63703
Greenacres
Port Elizabeth
6057

Section 24G Application Ruigtevallei-Dreunberg 132kV Powerline

We are well aware of the importance which the construction of the above mentioned power line can have. As mentioned time and again in the Basic Assessment, Basic Assessment Report and Section 24G Application the importance for providing stable electricity supply to the Gariep Municipality especially in the rural areas is true. As mentioned, and we quote from page 16, paragraph 3.6:

“The 132kV power line is required to meet the increasing electricity demand in the surrounding areas. The potential benefit of the proposed development of the broader Gariep Community lies in the stimulation of the local economy through the provision of a reliable and improved electricity supply, which will assist in the generation and provision of services. The provision of electricity may ultimately promote local economic development and investment in the Venterstad and Burgersdorp area. Electricity provision is critical for economic development, related employment and sustainable development in South Africa.”

It was brought to our attention by Cicil Hoffman at the Stakeholder’s Meeting of the Ruigtevallei-Dreunberg Project on 10 December 2013 in Venterstad that the current 66kV power line supplying electricity to the Rooiwal and Badsfontein sub-stations will be decommissioned in the near future.

This is confirmed by a letter dated 14 October 2013 (in Appendix K of the Section 24G Application) to Mr Sabelo Malaza by Tom Smith (Land Development & Environmental Manager of Eskom). In this letter it is stated that “this existing power line will be decommissioned in the near future.”

Being stakeholders affected by the proposed route alternatives 1, 2 and 4, we have looked into this matter and realised that if this power line is not built adjacent to the existing 66kV power line (route alternative 3), our whole area’s electricity supply could be affected in future as the mentioned routes would not be able to supply power to the existing sub-stations of Rooiwal and Badsfontein which is the only supply of electricity to this area. Route alternative 4 which is Eskom’s preferred route is at the nearest points approximately 9km from Rooiwal sub-station, and 7km from the Badsfontein sub-station.

Rooiwal sub-station supplies the whole western rural and agricultural area of the Venterstad district as well as portions of Colesberg-, Noupoor- and Steynburg districts. The Badsfontein sub-station supplies electricity to the towns of Nozizwe, Lyceumville, Venterstad and Oviston and to the eastern rural area of Venterstad, and portions of the Burgersdorp district.
It is therefore of no significance to compare these proposed route alternatives if the lines connecting route alternatives 1, 2 and 4 to the existing sub-stations are not taken into account and included in the Section 24G Application and environmental impact studies on these connecting lines are not done, and costs of these lines are not included.

By constructing this new 132kV power line adjacent to the old 66kV line (route alternative 3) the power supply to the sub-stations will not be affected as the sub-stations can easily be integrated. This will also minimize any future costs and planning to rectify the problem if the old line is decommissioned.

If permission is acquired to construct this 132kV line on Eskom preferred route alternative 4 this will mean that in future spurs will have to be build to supply power to these sub-stations if reliable power is to be supplied to this area. This will be a high cost option duplicating planning and studies already done. This will also have an extensive environmental impact on this area again.

We as stakeholder and landowners will strongly oppose the construction of this 132kV power line on the route alternatives 1, 2 & 4 and we won’t allow any construction to continue on our properties unless the construction of lines connecting this 132kV power line to the existing sub-stations is done simultaneously. This will guarantee that electricity supply to this area will not be affected negatively in future.

As this matter is affecting the whole community of this area and could have serious consequences for everyone, we as stakeholders hope that this matter could be resolved to the benefit of all.

Regards.

Meyer van der Walt
Schalkwykskraal
Venterstad
9798
fransmeyer@nokwi.co.za
0725295803

Also on behalf of:

S.W. van der Walt (082 927 1806), Gelykfontein, Venterstad.
A.S. Steyn (082 478 2470), Wildebeesvlei, Venterstad.
J.C. van der Walt (082 926 0577), Wildebeesvlei, Venterstad.
J.H. van Wyk (082 825 1367), Murrayskop, Venterstad.
Dear Authority or Interested and Affected Party,

Please find attached a letter detailing the review period for the Section 24G report for the Ruigtevallei - Dreunberg 132 kV Powerline. The Section 24G report has been attached to this email for your convenience. The appendices are available as detailed in the notification letter.

All comments on the report can be submitted in writing to the sender.

Kind regards,

Meyer van der Walt
Schalkwykskraal
Venterstad
9798
0725295803

---

Hi Kate

Working through the application I was amused by the first response on pg 17 of the Public PR. I didn’t realize that the person acquiring the option for the servitudes for Eskom was also compiling the EIA report for the project.

Comments will follow soon.

Meyer van der Walt
Schalkwykskraal
Venterstad
9798
0725295803
Ruigtevalley-Dreunberg kraglyn

Ek wil dit net onder julle aandag bring dat daar nog niemand op my grond was oor die verskuiwing van die lyn. Geen mense van Eskom of die van die impak studie.

My plaas is Wildebeste Valley waar die spilpunte is.

Ek beplan verdere uitbreidings met my besproeiing. Ek sal dus voorstel dat iemand my eers kom besoek voordat daar aangegaan kan word met nuwe kraglyn.

Die uwe

AS Steyn
Kate Parkinson

From: Meyer van der Walt <fransmeyer@nokwi.co.za>
Sent: 29 September 2014 10:54
To: 'Kate Parkinson'
Subject: dreunberg

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Kate

I would like to state to whom it may concern that we as stakeholders are not opposed to the building of the line in question. We feel though that with the right planning Eskom can address all the current concerns with much less impact on our area now and in future. At this stage it is clear that in planning this line Eskom did not take into account the supply of electricity to our area and the enormous cost it will take to rectify this in future. It is even possible that building a line to supply only our substations in future will not be economically viable. Although our concerns was voiced to Eskom on various meetings they choose to disregard it and push on with their agenda.

As stakeholders we gave our full co-operation from the onset of this project. As the project progressed it was getting clear that certain vital information was being withheld by Eskom representatives and even lies were told. Information on sensitive areas on the route was totally disregarded in the initial planning. It became clear that Eskom did not take all the factors into account while planning this project.

We hope that Eskom will take our input into consideration and find a solution that will be of benefit to all.

Thanks

Meyer van der Walt
Schalkwykskraal
Venterstad
9798

0725295803
Hallo Walter

I can confirm that the notes accurately reflect what was discussed although we agreed to disagree on certain aspects in the specialist reports. We still feel that route 3 will be the best option environmentally, economically and ecstatically.

Guaranteeing future power supply to this area is still a huge concern. It is therefore necessary to mention that we as landowners will not allow any construction to continue on route 4 before this matter is resolved to our satisfaction.

Thanks.

Meyer van der Walt
Schalkwykskraal
Venterstad
9798
0725295803
with the fact that their existing 66kv line which feeds their two local substations is old, and are concerned that Eskom may in the future not have sufficient funds to maintain this line, and may be forced to cancel supply to their area. Route 3 of the proposed 132kv line runs in close proximity to this existing 66kv line, and for this reason the landowners prefer Route 3 for the new 132kv line, because it would make it easy and cheap for Eskom to tie into their existing substations in future. The landowners feel that Route 3 would provide them with the best guarantee of a future power supply. For this reason they prefer Route 3 over Route 4.

- Eskom’s response: Eskom assured the landowners that they will not abandon customers. Furthermore, Eskom explained that the existing 66kv line does not only supply the landowners in this area, but also supplies power to areas south of the Badsfontein sub-station. The existing 66kv line is therefore an important line and supply to these sub-stations cannot be abandoned. Mr Mxolisi Mabindisa (Eskom Northern Cape) indicated that the strengthening plans for this area where in the early stages, but undertook to table and discuss these plans with the landowners as they are developed. The landowners accepted this provided they remained involved in the process.

2. S24G AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS:
The following was concluded regarding this issue:

- Landowner concern: Mr M. van der Walt indicated that it would be better to locate the proposed 132kv line along Route 3 because it would be adjacent to the existing 66kv line and the birds in the area are already used to this line and know how to avoid it.

- EAP’s response: Mr Fyvie indicated that the avifauna specialist considered this. However in section 4.5.3 of the specialist’s report he noted that

> It is normally an advantage to place new power lines adjacent to existing lines. Typically then this route would have been preferred on that basis. However in this case, it is our opinion that the existing 66kV line was built on a particularly sensitive route for avifauna, for reasons including those below. It is therefore not ideal to compound this historic error by adding a new power line to the same route.”

The specialist confirms that overall, Route 4 is a better route.

- Landowner concern: The landowners indicated that they had concerns with the manner in which the incorrect monopoles would be removed, as well as general access to their property.

- EAP’s response: Mr Fyvie indicated that he would make a recommendation in the S24G report that any approval conditions should include the following requirements:
  - Prior to any further work being undertaken on the landowner’s property, a method statement addressing property access must be compiled by the contractor, and review by Eskom and the these affected landowners before signoff.
  - Prior to any structures being removed, a method statement addressing this work must be compiled by the contractor, and review by Eskom and these affected landowners before signoff.

SUMMARY REGARDING ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:
The landowners confirmed that, notwithstanding their issues raised above, the main objection they have had to the proposed Route 4 was about guaranteeing future power supply to their area, and not on environmental grounds. The landowners accepted that the S24G process can continue with the recommendation for Route 4, provided that the commitments made under point 1 above are respected.

I trust that the notes above accurately reflect what was discussed. If so, please can you respond confirming this.

For the record, I’ve attached the attendance register. The following attended:

- Meyer van der Walt (Landowner)
- J.C. van der Walt (Landowner)
- Abraham Steyn (Landowner)
- Jan Harm van Wyk (Landowner)
- J.C. Oosthuizen (Venterstad Agric Assoc.)
- John Wood (Eskom)
- Zandi Siyongwana (Eskom)
- Sterk Hibana (Eskom)
Many thanks again

Walter Fyvie
Associate
Environmental Scientist
Cell: +27 72 8439 630
Tel: +27 41 392 7500
Email: wfyvie@gibb.co.za

Port Elizabeth
2nd Floor, Greyville House,
Cnr Greyville & Cape Rd,
Greenacres, Port Elizabeth 6001
PO Box 63703, Greenacres 6057
Fax: +27 41 363 9300
Web: www.gibb.co.za

This email is subjected to the legal disclaimer of GIBB which is available on the GIBB website: www.gibb.co.za

Please consider your environmental responsibility. Before printing this e-mail message, ask yourself whether you really need a hard copy.
Hi Walter

I support mr van der Walt's statement 100% and has nothing to add

Regards

Abraham Steyn

Sent from my iPhone

On 25 Nov 2014, at 13:01, Walter Fyvie <wfyvie@gibb.co.za> wrote:

Hello Mr van der Walt

Thanks for you clarification email below. I have forwarded this onto Eskom as well.

Could I please ask Mr Jan Harm van Wyk, Mr J.C. van der Walt, Mr J.C. Oosthuizen, and Mr Abraham Steyn to please respond individually to my email as well. This is needed so that I can prove to the Department of Environmental Affairs, that all those who have commented as part of this S24G process, have been engaged. If you have nothing to add to what Mr Meyer van der Walt has indicated below, please just state that you support his statement below.

I would appreciate it if you could respond as soon as possible.

Regards

Walter Fyvie
Associate Environmental Scientist

Cell: +27 72 8439 630
Tel: +27 41 392 7500
Email: wfyvie@gibb.co.za

Port Elizabeth
2nd Floor, Greyville House,
Cnr Greyville & Cape Rd,
Greenacres, Port Elizabeth 6001
PO Box 63703, Greenacres 6057
Fax: +27 41 363 9300
Web: www.gibb.co.za

This email is subjected to the legal disclaimer of GIBB which is available on the GIBB website: www.gibb.co.za
Hallo Walter

I can confirm that the notes accurately reflect what was discussed although we agreed to disagree on certain aspects in the specialist reports. We still feel that route 3 will be the best option environmentally, economically and ecstatically.

Guaranteeing future power supply to this area is still a huge concern. It is therefore necessary to mention that we as landowners will not allow any construction to continue on route 4 before this matter is resolved to our satisfaction.

Thanks.

Meyer van der Walt
Schalkwykskraal
Venterstad
9798
0725295803

Good day gentlemen

Firstly, many thanks to Mr van Der Walt for hosting us so well on Friday 14 Nov at the key stakeholders meeting for this project, and secondly, many thanks to all those who made themselves available for the meeting. It is much appreciated and I think we can agree it was a good meeting.

As mentioned at the meeting, the intention of this email is to briefly summarize the outcome of the meeting, specifically to:

1. Confirm the landowners position regarding future power supply to the area, and
2. Confirm what was agreed in terms of environmental issues and the S24G process.

1. **FUTURE POWER SUPPLY:**
The following was concluded regarding this issue:

- **Landowners concern:** The landowners (and Mr Oosthuizen) confirmed that their key concern with this project was ensuring that they would have a secure power supply in the future. They feel uncomfortable with the fact that their existing 66kv line which feeds their two local substations is old, and are concerned that Eskom may in the future not have...
sufficient funds to maintain this line, and may be forced to cancel supply to their area. Route 3 of the proposed 132kv line runs in close proximity to this existing 66kv line, and for this reason the landowners prefer Route 3 for the new 132kv line, because it would make it easy and cheap for Eskom to tie into their existing substations in future. The landowners feel that Route 3 would provide them with the best guarantee of a future power supply. For this reason they prefer Route 3 over Route 4.

- **Eskom’s response:** Eskom assured the landowners that they will not abandon customers. Furthermore, Eskom explained that the existing 66kv line does not only supply the landowners in this area, but also supplies power to areas south of the Badsfontein substation. The existing 66kv line is therefore an important line and supply to these substations cannot be abandoned. Mr Mxolisi Mabindisa (Eskom Northern Cape) indicated that the strengthening plans for this area where in the early stages, but undertook to table and discuss these plans with the landowners as they are developed. The landowners accepted this provided they remained involved in the process.

2. **S24G AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS:**
The following was concluded regarding this issue:

- **Landowner concern:** Mr M. van der Walt indicated that it would be better to locate the proposed 132kv line along Route 3 because it would be adjacent to the existing 66kv line and the birds in the area are already used to this line and know how to avoid it.

- **EAP’s response:** Mr Fyvie indicated that the avifauna specialist considered this. However in section 4.5.3 of the specialist’s report he noted that “It is normally an advantage to place new power lines adjacent to existing lines. Typically then this route would have been preferred on that basis. However in this case, it is our opinion that the existing 66kV line was built on a particularly sensitive route for avifauna, for reasons including those below. It is therefore not ideal to compound this historic error by adding a new power line to the same route.” The specialist confirms that overall, Route 4 is a better route.

- **Landowner concern:** The landowners indicated that they had concerns with the manner in which the incorrect monopoles would be removed, as well as general access to their property.

- **EAP’s response:** Mr Fyvie indicated that he would make a recommendation in the S24G report that any approval conditions should include the following requirements:
  - Prior to any further work being undertaken on the landowner’s property, a method statement addressing property access must be compiled by the contractor, and review by Eskom and the these affected landowners before signoff.
  - Prior to any structures being removed, a method statement addressing this work must be compiled by the contractor, and review by Eskom and these affected landowners before signoff.

**SUMMARY REGARDING ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:**
The landowners confirmed that, notwithstanding their issues raised above, the main objection they have had to the proposed Route 4 was about guaranteeing future power supply to their area, and not on environmental grounds. The landowners accepted that the S24G process can continue with the recommendation for Route 4, provided that the commitments made under point 1 above are respected.

I trust that the notes above accurately reflect what was discussed. If so, please can you respond confirming this.

For the record, I’ve attached the attendance register. The following attended:

- Meyer van der Walt (Landowner)
- J.C. van der Walt (Landowner)
- Abraham Steyn (Landowner)
- Jan Harm van Wyk (Landowner)
Many thanks again

Walter Fyvie  
Associate  
Environmental Scientist  
Cell: +27 72 8439 630  
Tel: +27 41 392 7500  
Email: wfyvie@gibb.co.za

Port Elizabeth  
2nd Floor, Greyville House,  
Cnr Greyville & Cape Rd,  
Greenacres, Port Elizabeth 6001  
PO Box 63703, Greenacres 6057  
Fax: +27 41 363 9300  
Web: www.gibb.co.za

This email is subjected to the legal disclaimer of GIBB which is available on the GIBB website: www.gibb.co.za

Please consider your environmental responsibility. Before printing this e-mail message, ask yourself whether you really need a hard copy.
Hi Walter

I also support the matter as described by Meyer vd Walt

Regards
Jan Harm van Wyk

Thanks for your response Mr Oosthuizen. I will pass your comments on to Eskom.

Regards

Walter Fyvie
Associate
Environmental Scientist
Cell: +27 72 8439 630
Tel: +27 41 392 7500
Email: wfyvie@gibb.co.za

Port Elizabeth
2nd Floor, Greyville House,
Cnr Greyville & Cape Rd,
Greenacres, Port Elizabeth 6001
PO Box 63703, Greenacres 6057
Fax: +27 41 363 9300
Web: www.gibb.co.za

This email is subjected to the legal disclaimer of GIBB which is available on the GIBB website: www.gibb.co.za

Please consider your environmental responsibility. Before printing this e-mail message, ask yourself whether you really need a hard copy.
Hallo Walter,

Yes, Meyer v/d Walt has captured the essence of the matter.

I would also just want to emphasize that if Escom wants to go for route 4 instead of route 3, Escom has to include in there current proposals either a substation for feeding the Rooiwal en Badsfontein substations or building spurs from the new 132kV line to the mentioned substations.

Regards

JC Oosthuizen
Chairman: Venterstad Agricultural Association

---

Hello Mr van der Walt

Thanks for you clarification email below. I have forwarded this onto Eskom as well.

Could I please ask Mr Jan Harm van Wyk, Mr J.C. van der Walt, Mr J.C. Oosthuizen, and Mr Abraham Steyn to please respond individually to my email as well. This is needed so that I can prove to the Department of Environmental Affairs, that all those who have commented as part of this S24G process, have been engaged. If you have nothing to add to what Mr Meyer van der Walt has indicated below, please just state that you support his statement below.

I would appreciate it if you could respond as soon as possible.

Regards

Walter Fyvie
Associate
Environmental Scientist
Cell: +27 72 8439 630
Tel: +27 41 392 7500
Email: wfvyie@gibb.co.za

---

Port Elizabeth
2nd Floor, Greyville House,
Cnr Greyville & Cape Rd,
Greenacres, Port Elizabeth 6001
PO Box 63703, Greenacres 6057
Fax: +27 41 363 9300
Web: www.gibb.co.za
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Hallo Walter

I can confirm that the notes accurately reflect what was discussed although we agreed to disagree on certain aspects in the specialist reports. We still feel that route 3 will be the best option environmentally, economically and ecstatically.

Guaranteeing future power supply to this area is still a huge concern. It is therefore necessary to mention that we as landowners will not allow any construction to continue on route 4 before this matter is resolved to our satisfaction.

Thanks.

Meyer van der Walt
Schalkwykskraal
Venterstad
9798
0725295803

Good day gentlemen

Firstly, many thanks to Mr van Der Walt for hosting us so well on Friday 14 Nov at the key stakeholders meeting for this project, and secondly, many thanks to all those who made themselves available for the meeting. It is much appreciated and I think we can agree it was a good meeting.

As mentioned at the meeting, the intention of this email is to briefly summarize the outcome of the meeting, specifically to:

1. Confirm the landowners position regarding future power supply to the area, and
2. Confirm what was agreed in terms of environmental issues and the S24G process.

1. FUTURE POWER SUPPLY:

The following was concluded regarding this issue:

- Landowners concern: The landowners (and Mr Oosthuizen) confirmed that their key concern with this project was ensuring that they would have a secure power supply in the future. They feel uncomfortable with the fact that their existing 66kv line which feeds their two local substations is old, and are concerned that Eskom may in the future not have sufficient funds to maintain this line, and may be forced to cancel supply to their area. Route 3 of the proposed 132kv line runs in close proximity to this existing 66kv line, and for this reason the landowners prefer Route 3 for the new 132kv line, because it would make it easy and cheap for Eskom to tie into their existing substations in future. The landowners feel that Route 3 would provide them with the best guarantee of a future power supply. For this reason they prefer Route 3 over Route 4.
• Eskom’s response: Eskom assured the landowners that they will not abandon customers. Furthermore, Eskom explained that the existing 66kv line does not only supply the landowners in this area, but also supplies power to areas south of the Badsfontein sub-station. The existing 66kv line is therefore an important line and supply to these sub-stations cannot be abandoned. Mr Mxolisi Mabindisa (Eskom Northern Cape) indicated that the strengthening plans for this area where in the early stages, but undertook to table and discuss these plans with the landowners as they are developed. The landowners accepted this provided they remained involved in the process.

2. **S24G AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS:**

The following was concluded regarding this issue:

- Landowner concern: Mr M. van der Walt indicated that it would be better to locate the proposed 132kv line along Route 3 because it would be adjacent to the existing 66kv line and the birds in the area are already used to this line and know how to avoid it.

- EAP’s response: Mr Fyvie indicated that the avifauna specialist considered this. However in section 4.5.3 of the specialist’s report he noted that “It is normally an advantage to place new power lines adjacent to existing lines. Typically then this route would have been preferred on that basis. However in this case, it is our opinion that the existing 66kV line was built on a particularly sensitive route for avifauna, for reasons including those below. It is therefore not ideal to compound this historic error by adding a new power line to the same route.” The specialist confirms that overall, Route 4 is a better route.

- Landowner concern: The landowners indicated that they had concerns with the manner in which the incorrect monopoles would be removed, as well as general access to their property.

- EAP’s response: Mr Fyvie indicated that he would make a recommendation in the S24G report that any approval conditions should include the following requirements:
  - Prior to any further work being undertaken on the landowner’s property, a method statement addressing property access must be compiled by the contractor, and review by Eskom and the these affected landowners before signoff.
  - Prior to any structures being removed, a method statement addressing this work must be compiled by the contractor, and review by Eskom and these affected landowners before signoff.

**SUMMARY REGARDING ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:**

The landowners confirmed that, notwithstanding their issues raised above, the main objection they have had to the proposed Route 4 was about guaranteeing future power supply to their area, and not on environmental grounds. The landowners accepted that the S24G process can continue with the recommendation for Route 4, provided that the commitments made under point 1 above are respected.

I trust that the notes above accurately reflect what was discussed. If so, please can you respond confirming this.

For the record, I’ve attached the attendance register. The following attended:

- Meyer van der Walt (Landowner)
- J.C. van der Walt (Landowner)
- Abraham Steyn (Landowner)
- Jan Harm van Wyk (Landowner)
- J.C. Oosthuizen (Venterstad Agric Assoc.)
- John Wood (Eskom)
- Zandi Siyongwana (Eskom)
- Sterk Hibana (Eskom)
- Nene Songxaba (Eskom)
- Mxolisi Mabindisa (Eskom)
- C.W. Hoffman (Eskom)
- Chris Marais (Eskom)
- Amanda Hough (Eskom)
- Walter Fyvie (GIBB)
Many thanks again

Walter Fyvie  
**Associate  
Environmental Scientist**  
Cell: +27 72 8439 630  
Tel: +27 41 392 7500  
Email: wfyvie@gibb.co.za

---

Port Elizabeth  
2nd Floor, Greyville House,  
Cnr Greyville & Cape Rd,  
Greenacres, Port Elizabeth 6001  
PO Box 63703, Greenacres 6057  
Fax: +27 41 363 9300  
Web: www.gibb.co.za

---
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Hallo Walter,

Yes, Meyer v/d Walt has captured the essence of the matter.

I would also just want to emphasize that if Escom wants to go for route 4 instead of route 3, Escom has to include in there current proposals either a substation for feeding the Rooiwal en Badsfontein substations or building spurs from the new 132kV line to the mentioned substations.

Regards

JC Oosthuizen
Chairman: Venterstad Agricultural Association

---

Hello Mr van der Walt

Thanks for you clarification email below. I have forwarded this onto Eskom as well.

Could I please ask Mr Jan Harm van Wyk, Mr J.C. van der Walt, Mr J.C. Oosthuizen, and Mr Abraham Steyn to please respond individually to my email as well. This is needed so that I can prove to the Department of Environmental Affairs, that all those who have commented as part of this S24G process, have been engaged. If you have nothing to add to what Mr Meyer van der Walt has indicated below, please just state that you support his statement below.

I would appreciate it if you could respond as soon as possible.

Regards

Walter Fyvie
Associate
Environmental Scientist
Cell: +27 72 8439 630
Tel: +27 41 392 7500
Email: wfyvie@gibb.co.za

Port Elizabeth
From: Meyer van der Walt [mailto:fransmeyer@nokwi.co.za]
Sent: 21 November 2014 09:58 AM
To: 'Walter Fyvie'
Subject: RE: Ruigetvallei - Dreunberg 132kv line S24G process: Key stakeholder meeting follow-up

Hallo Walter

I can confirm that the notes accurately reflect what was discussed although we agreed to disagree on certain aspects in the specialist reports. We still feel that route 3 will be the best option environmentally, economically and ecstatically.

Guaranteeing future power supply to this area is still a huge concern. It is therefore necessary to mention that we as landowners will not allow any construction to continue on route 4 before this matter is resolved to our satisfaction.

Thanks.

Meyer van der Walt
Schalkwykskraal
Venterstad
9798
0725295803

From: Walter Fyvie [mailto:wfyvie@gibb.co.za]
Sent: Monday, November 17, 2014 11:38 AM
To: 'jcv888@telkomsa.net'; 'jvanwyk@nokwi.co.za'; 'fransmeyer@nokwi.co.za'; 'jcoo@nokwi.co.za'; 'as@nokwi.co.za'
Cc: John Wood (WoodJ@eskom.co.za); Zandi Siyongwana (SiyongZA@eskom.co.za); 'Sterk Hibana'; Nene Songxaba (SongxaNN@eskom.co.za); Mxolisi Mabindisa (MabindM@eskom.co.za); Cicil Hoffman (HoffmaC@eskom.co.za); 'maraisch@eskom.co.za'; 'hougha@eskom.co.za'; 'Kate Parkinson'
Subject: Ruigetvallei - Dreunberg 132kv line S24G process: Key stakeholder meeting follow-up

Good day gentlemen

Firstly, many thanks to Mr van Der Walt for hosting us so well on Friday 14 Nov at the key stakeholders meeting for this project, and secondly, many thanks to all those who made themselves available for the meeting. It is much appreciated and I think we can agree it was a good meeting.

As mentioned at the meeting, the intention of this email is to briefly summarize the outcome of the meeting, specifically to:

1. Confirm the landowners position regarding future power supply to the area, and
2. Confirm what was agreed in terms of environmental issues and the S24G process.
1. FUTURE POWER SUPPLY:
The following was concluded regarding this issue:

- Landowners concern: The landowners (and Mr Oosthuizen) confirmed that their key concern with this project was ensuring that they would have a secure power supply in the future. They feel uncomfortable with the fact that their existing 66kv line which feeds their two local substations is old, and are concerned that Eskom may in the future not have sufficient funds to maintain this line, and may be forced to cancel supply to their area. Route 3 of the proposed 132kv line runs in close proximity to this existing 66kv line, and for this reason the landowners prefer Route 3 for the new 132kv line, because it would make it easy and cheap for Eskom to tie into their existing substations in future. The landowners feel that Route 3 would provide them with the best guarantee of a future power supply. For this reason they prefer Route 3 over Route 4.
- Eskom’s response: Eskom assured the landowners that they will not abandon customers. Furthermore, Eskom explained that the existing 66kv line does not only supply the landowners in this area, but also supplies power to areas south of the Badsfontein sub-station. The existing 66kv line is therefore an important line and supply to these sub-stations cannot be abandoned. Mr Mxolisi Mabindisa (Eskom Northern Cape) indicated that the strengthening plans for this area where in the early stages, but undertook to table and discuss these plans with the landowners as they are developed. The landowners accepted this provided they remained involved in the process.

2. S24G AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS:
The following was concluded regarding this issue:

- Landowner concern: Mr M. van der Walt indicated that it would be better to locate the proposed 132kv line along Route 3 because it would be adjacent to the existing 66kv line and the birds in the area are already used to this line and know how to avoid it.
- EAP’s response: Mr Fyvie indicated that the avifauna specialist considered this. However in section 4.5.3 of the specialist’s report he noted that “It is normally an advantage to place new power lines adjacent to existing lines. Typically then this route would have been preferred on that basis. However in this case, it is our opinion that the existing 66kV line was built on a particularly sensitive route for avifauna, for reasons including those below. It is therefore not ideal to compound this historic error by adding a new power line to the same route.” The specialist confirms that overall, Route 4 is a better route.
- Landowner concern: The landowners indicated that they had concerns with the manner in which the incorrect monopoles would be removed, as well as general access to their property.
- EAP’s response: Mr Fyvie indicated that he would make a recommendation in the S24G report that any approval conditions should include the following requirements:
  - Prior to any further work being undertaken on the landowner’s property, a method statement addressing property access must be compiled by the contractor, and review by Eskom and the these affected landowners before signoff.
  - Prior to any structures being removed, a method statement addressing this work must be compiled by the contractor, and review by Eskom and these affected landowners before signoff.

SUMMARY REGARDING ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES:
The landowners confirmed that, notwithstanding their issues raised above, the main objection they have had to the proposed Route 4 was about guaranteeing future power supply to their area, and not on environmental grounds. The landowners accepted that the S24G process can continue with the recommendation for Route 4, provided that the commitments made under point 1 above are respected.

I trust that the notes above accurately reflect what was discussed. If so, please can you respond confirming this.

For the record, I’ve attached the attendance register. The following attended:

- Meyer van der Walt (Landowner)
- J.C. van der Walt (Landowner)
- Abraham Steyn (Landowner)
- Jan Harm van Wyk (Landowner)
Many thanks again

Walter Fyvie  
Associate  
Environmental Scientist

Cell: +27 72 8439 630  
Tel: +27 41 392 7500  
Email: wfyvie@gibb.co.za

Port Elizabeth  
2nd Floor, Greyville House,  
Cnr Greyville & Cape Rd,  
Greenacres, Port Elizabeth 6001  
PO Box 63703, Greenacres 6057  
Fax: +27 41 363 9300  
Web: www.gibb.co.za

This email is subjected to the legal disclaimer of GIBB which is available on the GIBB website: www.gibb.co.za

Please consider your environmental responsibility. Before printing this e-mail message, ask yourself whether you really need a hard copy.
Appendix G

Attendance Register from Landowner Meeting on 31 November
### KEY STAKEHOLDER MEETING
#### ATTENDANCE REGISTER

**PROJECT:** Ruigtevallei - Drunenberg 132kV line  
**PURPOSE:** stakeholders re 5243  
**VENUE:** Venterstad  
**DATE & TIME:** 14 Nov 2014, 9:00

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REPRESENTATIVE</th>
<th>COMPANY / ORGANIZATION NAME</th>
<th>OFFICE NR.</th>
<th>CELL PHONE NR.</th>
<th>E-MAIL ADDRESS</th>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walter</td>
<td>GIBB</td>
<td>041 392 75 20</td>
<td>072 842 76 80</td>
<td>walter.gibb.co.za</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Escom EC</td>
<td>043 708 23 32</td>
<td>082 645 16 24</td>
<td><a href="mailto:johnwood@eskom.co.za">johnwood@eskom.co.za</a></td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zondi</td>
<td>Escom EC</td>
<td>043 703 54 43</td>
<td>082 348 51 19</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breuk</td>
<td>Escom EC</td>
<td>072 749 77 69</td>
<td>043 703 27 35</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.C</td>
<td>Van der Walt</td>
<td>082 926 05 77</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Haem</td>
<td>Van Wyk</td>
<td>082 925 18 67</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meyer</td>
<td>Van der Walt</td>
<td>072 595 58 03</td>
<td>072 585 80 3</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tsmeyer@nokwi.co.za">tsmeyer@nokwi.co.za</a></td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nene</td>
<td>Sengabesi</td>
<td>043 703 54 67</td>
<td>082 988 15 16</td>
<td><a href="mailto:songabesi@eskom.co.za">songabesi@eskom.co.za</a></td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mxolisi</td>
<td>Nkabindisa</td>
<td>033 833 54 72</td>
<td>083 684 30 56</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mbakindisa@eskom.co.za">mbakindisa@eskom.co.za</a></td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.C</td>
<td>Oosthuizen - Fortis Pule</td>
<td>082 952 10 16</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.W.</td>
<td>Hoffman</td>
<td>043 703 24 1</td>
<td>043 703 24 1</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cwhoffman@eskom.co.za">cwhoffman@eskom.co.za</a></td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>MAAR</td>
<td>051 753 68 13</td>
<td>092 964 15 54</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>Hough</td>
<td>072 923 55 27</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 24G Ruigtevallei - Drunenberg Powerline**  
Appendix E: Public Participation Report  
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This report, and information or advice, which it contains, is provided by GIBB (or any of its related entities) solely for internal use and reliance by its Client in performance of GIBB’s duties and liabilities under its contract with the Client. Any advice, opinions, or recommendations within this report should be read and relied upon only in the context of the report as a whole. The advice and opinions in this report are based upon the information made available to GIBB at the date of this report and on current South African standards, codes, technology and construction practices as at the date of this report. Following final delivery of this report to the Client, GIBB will have no further obligations or duty to advise the Client on any matters, including development affecting the information or advice provided in this report. This report has been prepared by GIBB in their professional capacity as Consulting Engineers. The contents of the report do not, in any way, purport to include any manner of legal advice or opinion. This report is prepared in accordance with the terms and conditions of the GIBB contract with the Client. Regard should be had to those terms and conditions when considering and/or placing any reliance on this report. Should the Client wish to release this report to a Third Party for that party’s reliance, GIBB may, at its discretion, agree to such release provided that:

(a) GIBB’s written agreement is obtained prior to such release, and
(b) By release of the report to the Third Party, that Third Party does not acquire any rights, contractual or otherwise, whatsoever against GIBB and GIBB, accordingly, assume no duties, liabilities or obligations to that Third Party, and
(c) GIBB accepts no responsibility for any loss or damage incurred by the Client or for any conflict of GIBB interests arising out of the Client’s release of this report to the Third Party.
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Contact Person : Walter Fyvie
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Website : www.gibb.co.za
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Email Address : Wfyvie@gibb.co.za
Fax No. :