



NMA
EFFECTIVE SOCIAL
STRATEGISTS

Development Through Participation



ARCUS

GIBB

ENGINEERING & SCIENCE

MINUTES OF MEETING

CLIENT : Eskom Holdings Limited – Transmission Division
PROJECT : EIA for Bantamsklip Transmission Lines and Associated Infrastructure
PROJECT No : J28087
PURPOSE : Multi-Stakeholder Workshop – Overberg Alternative Corridor Alignments
PLACE : Overberg Agri Training Centre, Bredasdorp
DATE & TIME : 27 November 2009, 08h30 – 15h30

Name	Representing
PRESENT	
Liana Stroebel	Agri Mega
Hanno Maritz	Agri Mega
Tertius Carinus	Agulhas Biodiversity Initiative
Helena Swart	Baardskeedersbos Homeowners' Ass
Johan Wolfaardt	Bonnievale AA
Herkie van der Merwe	Bonnievale Tourism
Stander Terblanche	Buffeljagsrivier AA
Cornie Swart	Buffeljagsrivier AA
Sepie Morkel	Bredasdorp AA
Bertus Hayward	Cape Agulhas Municipality
Vicki Hudson	Cape Nature Conservation
Ferde Hugo	DAFF: Dept of Agriculture
Otto Pienaar	DAFF: Dept of Forestry
Hendrik Schoeman	EGVV – Villiersdorp
Fredie van Breda	Elim AA
Lesley Richardson	Flower Valley Conservation Trust
Roderic Duminy	Genadendal AA
Geoff Hobbs	Haasvlakte AA
R Gimberg	Kleinswartberg Conservancy
CJ September	Klipdale Community
JP du Plessis	Napier AA
Deon de Kock	Napier AA
CA Januarie	ODLV
Rory Allardice	OICG
Johan Lusse	Overberg Agri
Francois Kotze	Overberg District Municipality
Rob Fryer	Overstrand Conservation Foundation
Stephen Muller	Overstrand Municipality
Eugene Hendry	Pearly Beach Ratepayers' Association
Jose de Kock	Riviersonderend AA
LG van As	Ruggens AA
Lizell Stroh	SA Civil Aviation Authority
Gideon van Zyl Joubert	South African Honeybush Tea Association
EC Fourie	SANParks
Geoff Whitelaw	Stanford AA
Danie de Villiers	STCA
Nic Bednall	STCA

EIA for Proposed Eskom Bantamsklip Transmission Lines and Associated Infrastructure

SM Thomson	Stormsvlei Community
Mike Gafney	Strandveld AA
Willie Hatting	Swellendam Municipality
Johnvin Hendricks	Tesselaarsdal Action Group
Katrin Pobantz	Tesselaarsdal Action Group
Kobus Visser	Tesselaarsdal Action Group
Johan Viljoen	Theewaterskloof Municipality
Deon Evert	Wolvengat Action Group
Kayleen Fester	DEA & DP (observer)
Eldon van Boom	DEA & DP (observer)
Mervin Theron	Eskom Nuclear Division
Mmamoloko Seabe	Eskom Transmission
Kevin Leask	Eskom Transmission
Joyce Mashiteng	Eskom Transmission
Tyrone Singleton	Eskom Generation
Pieter Steenkamp	Eskom Transmission
Yvonne Steenkamp	Eskom Transmission
Lerato Mokgwathheng	Eskom Transmission
Justice Mavhungu	Eskom Corporate
Jaana-Maria Ball	Arcus GIBB
Natalie Ritsch	Arcus GIBB
Stephen Stead	VRMA
Julian Drew	NMA
Nomi Muthialu	NMA

ADDITIONAL DISTRIBUTION

None

Attendees at the meeting were required to take their own notes and act on these rather than await the arrival of the minutes. The minutes serve as a record of events at the meeting.

Please note that following the distribution of the minutes for comment by attendees, a number of points of clarification were made that were not actually made at the meeting. These have been included as footnotes to the relevant points in the minutes.

	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
1.	<u>INTRODUCTION AND OBJECTIVES OF THE WORKSHOP</u>	
1.1	<p>Ms Muthialu (NMA) welcomed everybody and asked members of the project team to introduce themselves.</p> <p>Ms Muthialu then presented the agenda which was adopted as a suitable guide for the proceedings of the meeting with the addition of a discussion surrounding future engagement with stakeholders and the completion of the Multi-Stakeholder Workshop (MSW) process as the new item 3 on the agenda.</p> <p>Ms Muthialu went through the ground rules and these were accepted as a suitable guide for conducting the meeting.</p>	
1.2	<p>Mr Hobbs (Haasvlakte AA) wanted to know when the minutes of the MSW would be finalized.</p> <p>Mr Drew (NMA) replied that they will be done by the end of the week following the MSW.</p> <p>Ms Ball (Arcus GIBB) indicated that the project team will do their best to finish the minutes within a week. She added that the meeting is being recorded in order to assist the project</p>	

EIA for Proposed Eskom Bantamsklip Transmission Lines and Associated Infrastructure

	team in compiling the minutes.	
1.3	<p>Mr De Villiers (Strandveld Tourism and Conservation Association) stated that the participation of the Strandveld Tourism and Conservation Association (STCA) at the workshop does not in any way prejudice their standpoints regarding the suitability of Bantamsklip as a potential nuclear power station and, secondly, the need for a specialist study by international experts to investigate the construction of underground lines for part of the route through the Strandveld area, which still remains, despite Eskom's comments on this subject contained in the Information Pack.</p> <p>Ms Muthialu thanked the STCA for the spirit in which they are engaging with the project team. The concerns of the STCA will be kept in mind throughout the MSW. She added that the topic of underground lines will be discussed under item 4 of the agenda. Attendees will be given the chance at this point in the meeting to engage with Eskom's technical team.</p>	
1.4	<p>Mr Allardice (Overberg Integrated Conservation Group) thanked the project team for giving key stakeholders the opportunity to provide constructive input. He indicated, however, that a request was made a number of months ago to have a workshop with the environmental specialists. None of the environmental specialists are present at this meeting so it will not be possible to question their methodology in determining sensitive areas. This is considered to be something that is lacking from this MSW.</p> <p>Ms Ball indicated that the environmental specialists had only given preliminary comment on the stakeholder input. After the MSW the specialists will be going out into the field to undertake the detailed fieldwork as part of the Scoping phase. The findings of the specialists will be published in what will be called the Revised Draft Scoping Report. As with the previous Draft Scoping Report, this report will be put out for public comment. After the comment has been processed the Final Scoping Report will be published. Included in the Final Scoping Report is the Plan of Study for EIA which includes the Terms of Reference for the detailed specialist studies. Once the Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA) has approved the Final Scoping Report the detailed assessment will commence. During the detailed assessment the specialists are encouraged to interact with the community and local specialists. She concluded by encouraging attendees to forward the contact details of other specialists they believe should be consulted.</p>	
1.5	<p>Mr Whitelaw (Stanford AA) noted that it is a common view amongst the various agricultural associations in the area that too little time was given to prepare proper input. They therefore reserve the right to amend any written input submitted prior to the MSW. He also pointed out that minutes of previous meetings had been sent out 3 to 6 months after the meeting, rendering them almost useless. He requested that a specific date be set for the minutes to be distributed.</p> <p>Ms Muthialu thanked Mr Whitelaw for pointing out the constraints stakeholders had to deal with in preparing for the MSW. She added that they have been noted but hoped that stakeholders will still be able to provide meaningful input now that they are here at the MSW.</p> <p>Regarding distribution of the minutes, Mr Drew indicated that he could have them finished within a week's time. He could, however, not speak on behalf of Eskom and Arcus GIBB regarding the time they need to review them, prior to public distribution.</p> <p>Ms Ball said that the minutes will be distributed within two weeks of the meeting.</p> <p>Mr De Villiers asked if they would be given the opportunity to comment on the accuracy of the minutes.</p> <p>Ms Ball indicated that a 14-day comment period will be given for attendees to comment on the minutes. After they are finalised they will be distributed to all attendees.</p>	<p>NMA / Arcus GIBB / Eskom</p>
1.6	Mr Hobbs indicated that he and Mr Lusse (Overberg Agri) had letters of proxy from organisations that could not be present at the meeting. He wanted to know if they were	

EIA for Proposed Eskom Bantamsklip Transmission Lines and Associated Infrastructure

	<p>allowed to represent these organisations (<i>Nuwejaars Wetland Landowners' Association and Caledon AA</i>).</p> <p>Ms Muthialu agreed that Mr Hobbs and Mr Lusse could represent these organisations in their absence.</p>	
1.7	<p>Mr Whitelaw commented that participants should be given the opportunity to comment on whether they believe that they have been given sufficient chance to provide meaningful input in this MSW process.</p> <p>Ms Muthialu said the meeting will be an extension of the opportunity participants have had to provide meaningful input into the EIA process. Item 6 of the agenda focuses on building on the input already provided. Participants will also have future opportunities to provide further input.</p> <p>Ms Ball added that input is accepted throughout the EIA process and stakeholders are welcome to submit input at any point during the EIA.</p> <p>Ms Pobantz (Tesselaarsdal Action Group) noted that the information submitted by stakeholders thus far is not comprehensive, especially regarding input from the agricultural associations. The timing of the MSW is not optimum in terms of agriculture, as agricultural associations had to develop their input during the harvest time. Therefore, input from agricultural associations cannot be seen as sufficient; thus the MSW process is flawed.</p>	
1.8	<p>Mr Fryer (Overstrand Conservation Foundation) indicated that the Overstrand Conservation Foundation's (OCF's) input was not included in the Report Back document.</p> <p>Ms Muthialu noted Mr Fryer's concern and said it will be addressed during the relevant item on the agenda.</p>	
1.9	<p>Mr Allardice asked whether any of the participating stakeholders have submitted proposed alternative routes.</p> <p>Mr Evert (Wolvengat Action Group) indicated that they have submitted an alternative alignment but added that Bantamsklip was an impossible location for the proposed nuclear power station. No matter where the transmission lines go from the proposed power station they will go over extremely sensitive land and they will have a severe effect on the village of Wolvengat.</p> <p>Mr Singleton (Eskom Generation) explained why Bantamsklip is being considered as a site for the power station. It was proposed as one of five possible sites during a detailed nuclear power station siting study done in the mid 1980s. Bantamsklip is currently going through an EIA process and it is being considered as one of three possible sites. He informed attendees that the concerns raised regarding the site will be put forward to the Nuclear-1 EIA team and they will be considered.</p>	
1.10	<p>Mr Hobbs wanted to know whether they were bound by the decisions made at this meeting.</p> <p>Ms Ball explained that the aim of the workshop is to gain consensus amongst those present at the workshop. Should an alternative route be identified the specialists and technical planning teams will go out and investigate it together with the potential fatal flaws or sensitive areas also identified by the stakeholders. After this the Revised Draft Scoping Report and the minutes of this workshop will be made available for public comment in order to finalise the Scoping Report. Stakeholder representatives will have enough time to report back to their various organisations and to submit further input while the specialists are in the field.</p> <p>An attendee asked whether a decision will be made at this workshop.</p> <p>Ms Ball replied that they will only make recommendations that will be captured in the Revised Draft Scoping Report. The DEA has to make the final decision relating to this EIA.</p>	

EIA for Proposed Eskom Bantamsklip Transmission Lines and Associated Infrastructure

1.11	Ms Muthialu indicated that the objectives of the workshop are to: give an overview of the EIA process leading up to the MSW; inform stakeholders of the technical considerations and challenges faced by the project team; and to review the input provided by the stakeholders. This will be done in preparation for the main objective of the workshop, which is to determine and gain consensus on new alternative corridors.	
2.	<u>OVERVIEW OF EIA PROCESS LEADING UP TO THE WORKSHOP</u>	
2.1	Ms Ritsch (Arcus GIBB) gave a presentation summarising the EIA process for the proposed Eskom Bantamsklip Transmission Lines and Associated Infrastructure while Mr Drew (NMA) covered the public participation and Multi-Stakeholder Workshop (MSW) processes.	
2.2	<p>Mr Allardice wanted information on the application for the proposed nuclear power station sites. Apparently there were originally three separate applications; one for each of the three sites; now all three sites have been thrown together in one application. If this was the case he asked for clarification on why Eskom proceeded in such a manner.</p> <p>Mr Singleton explained that Eskom initially submitted a single application for one 4 000 MW nuclear power station. There were five site alternatives which have since been reduced to three. Eskom have since motioned to amend the application to seek approval for all three sites for nuclear power stations, meaning Eskom aims to construct three nuclear power stations. Since the start of the process Eskom was mandated to roll out 20 000 MW of nuclear energy and not just 4 000 MW. This means that if all three sites are approved by the DEA, each of them will receive a nuclear power station. To date Eskom has not yet amended the application. If Eskom decides to amend the application the public will be informed of their decision. Currently, the original application still stands.</p> <p>Mr Allardice argued that if Eskom should consider applying for all three sites it would nullify the reasoning behind eliminating the two sites on the West Coast that were part of the initial five sites.</p> <p>Mr Singleton thought it unnecessary to debate the removal of those two sites; the reasons for their removal are clear. The fact remains that there is a single application for only one 4 000 MW nuclear power station and the three sites are the three alternatives.</p> <p>Mr Fourie (SANParks) asked whether the transmission line implications were considered during the first detailed study that was done to determine the initial five sites. He was not convinced that transmission line implications were taken into account as there seems to be a lack of integration between Eskom Generation and Eskom Transmission.</p> <p>Mr Singleton assured attendees that the full range of environmental criteria were considered during the first detailed study. Currently, two separate EIAs are being run; this created some timing issues that have resulted in stakeholders asking why the two processes were running separately. He added that although there are two EIAs, a great amount of effort is being put in to align the two processes in order for them to feed each other with information.</p>	
2.3	<p>Ms Richardson (Flower Valley Conservation Trust) referred to the summary of issues shown in the presentation saying that the summary makes no mention of the impact of the transmission lines on the tourism industry.</p> <p>Mr Drew replied that the summary shown in the presentation is just a brief summary of the Issues and Responses Report which is 500 pages long. Tourism has been identified as one of the main concerns and the specialists will treat it likewise.</p>	
3.	<u>WAY FORWARD FOR COMPLETION OF MULTI-STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP (MSW) PROCESS</u>	
3.1	Mr Allardice firstly stated that he could gather, from the comments already made, that there is already some sort of consensus in the room that power lines through the Overberg area should be avoided. Secondly, he warned attendees that if they put alternative routes on the	

EIA for Proposed Eskom Bantamsklip Transmission Lines and Associated Infrastructure

	<p>table they would have to take ownership of those routes, which means they will not be able to criticize them in the future. ABI had learned this the hard way as they had to defend their route even though it ended up being just as sensitive as the other corridors.</p> <p>Ms Muthialu assured attendees that the aim behind allowing stakeholders to submit their own alternative routes is a sincere attempt to pro-actively involve stakeholders in determining the best possible alternative transmission line corridors.</p>	
3.2	<p>Mr De Villiers commented that it is imperative for the process forward to be conducted in a professional manner to allow maximum input from all Interested and Affected Parties (I&APs). According to the STCA, the process to date has not been satisfactory and shows a lack of commitment to consultation and thoroughness. In confirmation of this point of view he mentioned that they had requested Eskom's criteria for determining a transmission line route in September 2008. This information was only received in September of 2009 as part of the Information Package that was sent out prior to the MSW. He said this is completely unprofessional and he hoped that the process forward will be handled differently.</p> <p>Ms Mashiteng (Eskom) explained that there had been a change of management personnel at Eskom and Arcus GIBB during the period the request was made. The delay had been caused by this change and she apologised on behalf of Eskom. However, she also added that since this misunderstanding Eskom have been doing their best to get back to stakeholders as soon as possible and that they will continue to do their best to do so.</p>	
3.3	<p>Mr De Villiers also stated that the Report Back Document should have been sent out prior to the meeting so that stakeholders could at least read through it before the meeting; now they have no idea what kind of input has been submitted.</p> <p>Mr Drew said the specialists needed time to review the input and therefore there was too little time to send out the Report Back Document before the workshop. He added that item 5 on the agenda will cover the document extensively, allowing stakeholders to see what input had been made by others and what the specialists thought of the input provided. He undertook to ensure that the Report Back Document in future will be circulated to all attendees of the MSW at least 14 days before the date of such workshop.</p>	
3.4	<p>Mr Duminy (Genadendal AA) commented that stakeholders should keep in mind that they are at the workshop to provide meaningful input that will make a difference. He welcomed the development and said it is important that it takes place. Genadendal AA therefore has no objections to the proposed power lines even though they encroach on two of their farms.</p>	
3.5	<p>Mr Whitelaw stated that people commonly believe the process to be flawed and people are participating under duress. These and all other fundamental mistakes that have been made up to now have to be identified and the project team needs to make certain they do not occur again in the future.</p> <p>He also added that the farmers, who, according to Mr Drew's presentation, are a key stakeholder in the process, are not happy with the process undertaken thus far. He warned stakeholders not to be tricked into being co-opted by recommending 'pie-in-the-sky' alternatives. The process should allow for meaningful and informed input from all stakeholders. To date this has not been the case.</p>	
3.6	<p>Ms Pobantz (Tesselaarsdal Action Group) noted that a vital issue that needs to be considered when discussing the process going forward is timing. Representatives need sufficient time to interact with their various members to ensure that they properly represent their organisations. They also need enough time to provide feedback to their members in order to capture their reactions on the progress made.</p> <p>Ms Seabe (Eskom) asked stakeholders to guide them in terms of timing by giving estimates of timeframes that will be acceptable to them. She also asked for guidance regarding a suitable time of the year to hold the workshop. Things like having a workshop in the harvest season should be avoided.</p>	

EIA for Proposed Eskom Bantamsklip Transmission Lines and Associated Infrastructure

	<p>Ms Pobantz suggested that a minimum of 60 days be given in the future to allow ordinary people such as themselves time to carefully investigate the documentation, inform their members of what is required of them and, finally, to capture all their input.</p> <p>Ms Muthialu said it is best to first come up with a proper process before attaching any timeframes to it.</p> <p>Ms Ball noted Ms Pobantz's request to be given the opportunity to provide feedback of this meeting to their organisations in order for them to get further inputs from their members.</p>	
3.7	An attendee encouraged everyone at the meeting to be open and listen to the concerns that are stated in order for the process to move forward.	
3.8	Mr Hendry (Pearly Beach Rate Payers' Association) indicated that another critical aspect of moving forward is for stakeholders to be supplied with proper answers to their concerns and sufficient feedback to their inputs. Without proper information it will be impossible to have a meaningful process.	
3.9	<p>Mr Whitelaw said they believe a constructive process going forward can be established by forming specialist committees to investigate the possible impacts of both the proposed nuclear power station and the power lines. Each specialist committee should consist of key representatives of all the various stakeholders; meaning representatives from Eskom, Arcus GIBB, NMA, and people from the area. Each specialist committee will then investigate their field of specialisation together with I&APs. These committees will report to a process run by Arcus GIBB to pull together all their findings. In that way consensus will be reached from the start. He added that they see multi-representation as the way forward.</p> <p>Ms Ball replied that this is an interesting concept and added that it had never been done before in an EIA. She explained that specialists engage with local experts on a more informal basis than suggested by Mr Whitelaw. She said the proposal will need to be taken up with Eskom, the client, as it would have massive time and cost implications for the EIA. She reminded attendees of the electricity crisis currently facing South Africa.</p> <p>Mr Theron (Eskom Nuclear Division) added that everyone is aware of the reality of the electricity crisis currently being experienced in the country. To address this crisis Eskom has envisaged developing 20 000 MW of nuclear power to ensure that the electricity supply meets the growth demands of the country.</p> <p>Mr De Villiers commented that he did not understand the logic behind Eskom's actions. On the one hand they press the fact that they are in a hurry to build this nuclear power station and on the other hand they take forever to provide responses. He mentioned another case where he and Mr Allardice were taken on a helicopter ride by Eskom and they came up with a possible route. To date Eskom have not responded to the proposal.</p> <p>Ms Ball indicated that she will talk with Eskom during the tea break about Mr Whitelaw's suggestion and added that she will report back to attendees before the end of the day.</p> <p>Mr Hendricks (Tesselaarsdal Action Group) stated that his organisation fully supports the proposal of Mr Whitelaw. He reminded attendees that they will have to live with the transmission lines for the rest of their lives and therefore it is critical that the right decision is made.</p> <p>After the tea break Ms Seabe indicated that due to time and cost constraints, the most feasible way forward would be for I&APs to submit specialist related concerns to NMA. They will forward these concerns to the specialists who will in turn interact with the I&APs who raised them.</p>	
3.10	Mr Swart (Buffeljagsrivier AA) proposed that Nuclear-1 be built at Koeberg. If further nuclear power plants are proposed the Bantamsklip site can be considered again but with the correct timeframes and process in place.	

EIA for Proposed Eskom Bantamsklip Transmission Lines and Associated Infrastructure

	Ms Muthialu noted Mr Swart's proposal but said that the project team do not have the mandate to discuss it.	
3.11	Mr Hobbs commented that members of the agricultural associations are spread out across a wide area. Some members have to drive up to 160 km to attend a meeting. That is why they need more time to capture input from their members.	
3.12	Mr Viljoen (Theewaterskloof Municipality) referred to what Mr Theron said earlier about the need for the project and asked whether the study area will benefit from the electricity generated from the project or whether the area is just being used to get electricity to other parts of the country. Mr Leask (Eskom Transmission) replied that such matters will be discussed in the technical presentation on transmission and base load electricity considerations.	
3.13	An attendee also referred to what Mr Theron said and noted that there are other methods of generating electricity that also need to be considered, for example South Africa has great potential for wave energy.	
3.14	Mr Bednall (STCA) wanted clarification on the process going forwards regarding the time stakeholders will have to review the Report Back Document to ensure that the input is comprehensive, as well as when the specialists will go out into the field. Ms Ball said they are considering giving stakeholders extra time to review and provide further input on the Report Back Document. It should be around 14 January 2010. This input will be given to the specialists before they go out into the field. Mr Van As (Ruggens AA) commented that 14 January 2010 is too soon. He explained that he only saw his members once a quarter; he just met with them the day before and he will only see them again in January. Therefore they will have insufficient time to review and provide input on the document before 14 January 2010. Mr Allardice noted that most of the municipalities are in recess until the end of January, making it difficult for them to arrange meetings. The same goes for organisations like ABI and OICG, it is impossible for them to have meetings in mid-January. He added that a date closer to April 2010 will be more realistic. Ms Muthialu replied that the proposal for April 2010 will also be discussed by Arcus GIBB and Eskom over the tea break and feedback will be given later in the meeting. Mr Whitelaw said that it is ridiculous to expect farmers to produce a complex and meaningful document over the end of the harvest period and Christmas. Most businesses were in the process of closing down for Christmas (and therefore extremely busy) and will only be opening in the middle of January 2010. The extension to provide input by the end of January 2010 was effectively a 2 week extension which was insufficient and again showed a lack of genuine commitment to proper process; it might as well be removed completely because no one will be able to deliver within such a timeframe. ¹ Ms Seabe clarified that I&APs did not need to produce a report. They only had to indicate high sensitivity areas and alternative corridor suggestions and now they had until the end of January 2010 to do so. She added that I&APs will have further opportunities to provide input and once the final input for the MSW has been collected, another meeting, similar to this one, will be held to provide I&APs with an overview of what has been collected so that they can decide on the final route alignments that should go forward to the next phase of the EIA.	

¹ I&APs want to be part of the process in determining the power line routes but only once meaningful information was available (comment on the minutes G Whitelaw – 24/12/09).

EIA for Proposed Eskom Bantamsklip Transmission Lines and Associated Infrastructure

	<p>Ms Mashiteng said the agricultural associations originally indicated that they would not be able to attend this workshop and they would participate in a similar workshop on 9 December 2009. However, they had subsequently agreed to participate today. She said the agricultural associations are not the only stakeholders in the area and although every attempt would be made to ensure they are properly consulted at a time convenient to them, this does not mean that other stakeholders cannot be consulted in the meantime.</p> <p>Mr Visser (Tesselaarsdal Action Group) commented that the meeting of 9 December 2009 was arranged between the project team and the Overberg Distrik Landbou Vereniging (ODLV). It is a sideline meeting and the other stakeholders were not involved in arranging it.</p> <p>Mr Drew explained that the project team wanted to give the agricultural associations the opportunity to provide input so they had been busy arranging to meet with them on 9 December 2009. A week before today's workshop, however, they indicated that they would prefer to provide their input at this meeting. He said the project team is willing to meet with the agricultural associations at any time that is convenient to them.</p> <p>Mr Viljoen indicated that the municipality's councillors have already gone on recess. A meeting in January will not be feasible. They can only get an answer from their councillors by the end of February.</p> <p>Ms Seabe said the end of January is not a final cut-off date for providing input; comment received after that will still be accepted and looked at. The date is just to give specialists a timeframe to work with regarding their fieldwork.</p> <p>Ms Muthialu indicated that both Eskom and I&APs have constraints regarding this matter and she reminded attendees that everyone will have to compromise to some extent.</p> <p>Mr Van As stated that it is not a negotiation if Eskom tells everyone to have their input in by the end of January 2010. They need time to ensure that the best route is selected.</p> <p>Mr Hendry added that it's a matter of give and take. The local municipalities have indicated that it is impossible for them to convene and the agricultural associations also have a problem.</p> <p>Mr Whitelaw said it would have been great if Eskom had listened to them a year ago when they told them that their process is lacking.</p> <p>Ms Muthialu asked whether they could move on from this topic and attendees agreed.</p> <p>After the tea break Ms Seabe indicated that the project team have agreed for the time to provide input to be extended to the end of January 2010. After the end of January 2010, the specialists will go out to do their preliminary fieldwork, and after that a Report Back document will be distributed at least 14 days prior to the follow-up MSW. After this MSW the Revised Draft Scoping Report will be published and sent out for another comment period before the Final Scoping Report is completed.</p>	
<p>3.15</p>	<p>Mr Allardice asked whether the technical considerations item on the agenda for today will be different from the technical considerations items at previous meetings.</p> <p>Ms Muthialu indicated that it will be different from previous meetings.</p>	
<p>4.</p> <p>4.1</p>	<p><u>TECHNICAL CONSIDERATIONS AND CHALLENGES</u></p> <p>Mr Leask (Eskom) gave a presentation on Eskom's technical criteria for routing transmission lines. He started off by giving attendees an overview of Eskom's planning process for supplying electricity in general. He then explained the transmission requirements for each of the three proposed nuclear power station sites; the transmission line route requirements; power station security requirements and the effect thereof on corridor requirements; and the use of overhead conductors versus underground cables.</p>	

EIA for Proposed Eskom Bantamsklip Transmission Lines and Associated Infrastructure

<p>4.2</p>	<p>Mr Fryer informed the project team that none of the routing considerations mentioned in the presentation incorporate the requirements of the provincial Spatial Development Framework (SDF). The provincial SDF is no longer a mere guideline but a statutory requirement and therefore it must be followed. Objective 5 of the SDF is to conserve and strengthen the sense of place of important natural, cultural and productive landscapes, artefacts and buildings; section 2.3.14 of this objective refers specifically to transmission lines, pipelines, telecommunications masts and wind farms. He asked whether the planning team are familiar with it.</p> <p>Mr Leask replied that he is not directly familiar with it as he is part of the technical planning team and not the legal planning team. They only determine the transmission requirements for the power station. The MSW is part of the process of identifying the actual route.</p> <p>Mr Fryer said the legal aspect should form part of the technical planning. Policy HR26 under section 2.3.14 states that pipelines, transmission lines and telecommunications masts should be aligned along existing and proposed transportation corridors rather than point to point, cross-country routes. This means that the project team should firstly aim to route the transmission lines along existing and proposed transportation corridors and, only if they prove that such an approach is not viable, should they attempt to route the transmission lines across country. There is also a section in the SDF that speaks to transmission alignments and scenic routes, scenic routes should also be avoided where possible. Since there are no existing or proposed transportation corridors anywhere near Bantamsklip, the planning team will struggle to comply with the Western Cape SDF.</p> <p>Mr Leask noted Mr Fryer's concern and explained that the planning team are assisted by the lands and rights division when they try to come up with possible routes. He agreed that all major developments such as roads, pipelines and transmission lines should happen in a co-ordinated manner. Routing a transmission line means finding the lesser evil. There will always be a negative impact.</p>	
<p>4.3</p>	<p>Mr Carinus (ABI) commented that the impacts of the transmission lines on this tourism hotspot will be severe. It is also a low flying zone and investments in the area in that regard will also be compromised. He also mentioned that there is a gravel road, running in a North-East direction, which they are planning to upgrade. The planning team should consider this and other route alternatives that have been mentioned by I&APs but which have not been investigated by the planning team.</p> <p>Mr Leask noted Mr Carinus' concerns and suggestions.</p>	
<p>4.4</p>	<p>Mr Hendry wanted to know if it is possible to get Mr Leask's presentation. If stakeholders had access to such information before the workshop, they could have provided more meaningful input.</p> <p>Ms Ball replied that it will be made available on the Eskom and Arcus GIBB websites; it will also be attached to the minutes.</p>	<p align="right">Arcus GIBB / Eskom / NMA</p>
<p>4.5</p>	<p>Mr Thomson (Stormsvlei community) wanted to know why the Overberg had to be raped of its beauty to provide the rest of the country with power. As the presentation indicated, there are no major load centres in the Overberg area.</p> <p>Mr Leask explained that Eskom decided that nuclear power has to be considered to diversify the national fuel mix. Bantamsklip has been identified as a possible site for a nuclear power station which is being investigated through the EIA process. The EIA process will guide Eskom in terms of the best possible implementation plan.</p> <p>Mr Thomson added that he couldn't understand how two of the proposed routes could be placed over the Stormsvlei area; the village dates back to the seventeenth century. To the north of Stormsvlei there are two registered game farms, also directly affected by the lines. He, as owner of Stormsvlei, has only recently been informed of the project, which is</p>	

EIA for Proposed Eskom Bantamsklip Transmission Lines and Associated Infrastructure

	<p>unacceptable.</p> <p>Ms Muthialu replied that such detailed concerns will be addressed later on in the meeting.</p>	
4.6	<p>Mr Fourie said Eskom should really consider using underground lines. They should look at the latest technology with regards to underground lines. Tunnelling can, for instance, be used instead of excavations for installing underground lines. Going underground will eliminate the visual implications. SANParks formally request that Eskom investigate the latest technology in considering underground lines.</p> <p>Mr Leask indicated that the proposal of underground lines will be considered with the other alternatives that are on the table. He said tunnelling will have problems of its own. Tunnels will, for example, need to be big enough for a person to go into, to construct and maintain the power cables.</p>	
4.7	<p>Mr De Villiers also requested access to Mr Leask's presentation, either via website or email. Referring to the presentation he asked whether Thyspunt and Koeberg are the more favourable alternatives from a transmission point of view since they are close to load centres. Judging from the size of Cape Town's load centre, he wondered whether 4 000 MW will be enough to accommodate Cape Town's growth. He wanted to know if Mr Leask's mention of additional units at the power station meant that a 4 000 MW station can be upgraded to a 6 000 MW or 8 000 MW nuclear power station. Finally, he referred to the export of electricity from the Western Cape to Gauteng; he wondered if it wouldn't be more feasible to have a nuclear power station in KwaZulu-Natal as it will be a much shorter distance from Gauteng. It will also be closer to Durban, another big load centre.</p> <p>Ms Muthialu said the presentation could be copied on a CD and given to Mr De Villiers and anyone else who would like a copy at lunchtime.</p> <p>Mr Leask noted that the presentation only describes the complexity of supplying electricity in South Africa and it is not the final plan for supplying electricity. He also agreed with Mr De Villiers that the Bantamsklip site is more complex than the other two sites in terms of its transmission requirements. He said more units are needed in the Western Cape from a transmission point of view. The two existing units at Koeberg are not enough. Eskom are in the process of identifying more possible sites in other parts of the country such as KwaZulu-Natal. These sites will be investigated in the further phases of establishing a fleet of nuclear power stations.</p>	
4.8	<p>Mr Gafney (Strandveld AA) mentioned that the cost of the Bantamsklip nuclear power station will be at least two times as much as for Koeberg or Thyspunt. If this was the case, he wanted to know why Bantamsklip is still being considered.</p> <p>Mr Leask did not know what the estimated costs for the power stations are, but from a transmission point of view, the Bantamsklip site will definitely be more expensive than the other two sites.</p>	
4.9	<p>Mr Evert stressed the fact that the transmission lines and the power station should not be considered in isolation of each other. He wanted to know whether the Bantamsklip site was feasible from a technical point of view.</p> <p>Mr Leask replied that it is technically feasible to build a power station at Bantamsklip. The decision on whether or not one will be built there will depend on the decision of the DEA.</p> <p>Mr Theron stated that there is a national nuclear energy policy that was approved in June 2008 by Government. That policy requires the development of nuclear power in South Africa. Depending on the EIAs and other regulatory processes, such as nuclear licensing, all three sites could receive nuclear power stations eventually. In other words all the sites that receive an environmental authorisation and nuclear licensing authorisation will get a nuclear power station.</p>	

EIA for Proposed Eskom Bantamsklip Transmission Lines and Associated Infrastructure

<p>4.10</p>	<p>Mr Thomson wanted clarity on why Eskom wants to build a nuclear power station so far away from the big cities where the power is needed.</p> <p>Mr Leask said he believed that he had already addressed this question adequately. In short, Bantamsklip is technically viable and from a transmission point of view there needs to be more power sources in the Western Cape.</p>	
<p>4.11</p>	<p>Mr Carinus noted that there is a wave energy hotspot near the Koeberg site. He commented that it would be sensible to develop the transmission network on that site because there are nuclear and wave power generation possibilities on that site.</p> <p>Mr Leask fully agreed with Mr Carinus that this could be taken into account.</p>	
<p>4.12</p>	<p>Mr Hendry wondered why there isn't a 'no-go' alternative in the EIA for the nuclear power plant.</p> <p>Ms Ball assured Mr Hendry that the specialists are investigating the 'no-go' option as is required by the EIA regulations.</p>	
<p>4.13</p>	<p>Mr Hendry also wanted to know if Eskom have considered importing power from other countries.</p> <p>Mr Leask replied that Eskom is looking into importing power. Eskom forms part of the Southern African Power Pool, which is currently more focussed on developing networks in neighbouring countries. As these networks become developed they can look at harnessing some of the generation sources to import power. This will not happen in the near future but it's a very real possibility.</p>	
<p>4.14</p>	<p>Mr De Villiers said Eskom cannot say that Bantamsklip will definitely receive a nuclear power station down the line. They have to receive environmental authorisation before this can be said.</p> <p>Mr Singleton agreed with Mr De Villiers and explained that each site has to obtain approval from various processes such as the EIA and National Nuclear Regulator (NNR) processes before a nuclear power plant can be constructed. Eskom aim to utilise all the sites that receive these various approvals.</p>	
<p>4.15</p>	<p>Mr Fryer referred back to a previous public participation meeting where someone from Eskom told them that, should all three sites be approved, the first three power stations will be built at the first three sites, but the fourth and fifth power stations will be built at the first two sites; meaning the first two sites will eventually have two power stations each. If this was the case he wanted to know what the transmission implications would be if two power stations are constructed at Bantamsklip.</p> <p>Mr Singleton said that Eskom has no idea where Nuclear-1 and Nuclear-2 will be; they do not even know if there will be a Nuclear-2. It all depends on whether the sites get approved or not. Eskom are taking it one step at a time; if one site gets approved, they will focus on constructing Nuclear-1 and then continue as the story unfolds.</p> <p>Mr Leask added that the transmission lines from Bantamsklip will only be able to evacuate a maximum of 6 000 MW. Therefore no more that 6 000 MW can be generated at Bantamsklip.</p> <p>Ms Seabe also added that the Transmission EIA will help to inform Eskom on where the site for Nuclear-1 should be.</p>	
<p>4.16</p>	<p>Mr Duminy urged attendees to stop complaining about the proposed development. It is in the country's best interests to have a power source in the south of the country, as explained during the presentation. Attendees should support what is best for the country instead of trying to think of excuses for why the project should be aborted. The view point of the Genadendal AA is that they have been properly consulted and they are in favour of the</p>	

EIA for Proposed Eskom Bantamsklip Transmission Lines and Associated Infrastructure

	project.	
5.	<u>INPUT OF STAKEHOLDERS AND REVIEW OF INFORMATION PROVIDED</u>	
5.1	Ms Ritsch briefly explained how the stakeholder input had been captured. The presentation is only a summary of the Report Back Document that attendees received. Mr Stead (GIS specialist) added that they created a GIS based decision making support system from all the information that was received. He also explained how the input had been mapped. Ms Ritsch then went through each of the individual maps and indicated what types of sensitive areas and points had been identified with regards to the four themes of tourism, agriculture, social and biodiversity. After that Mr Stead went through the alternative routes that were proposed by the stakeholders. Ms Ritsch also went through the preliminary feedback the specialists had given on the input of the stakeholders.	
5.2	An attendee commented that if this document had been sent out prior to the meeting it would not have been necessary to go through each of the individual maps. Ms Muthialu indicated that the aim of the workshop is to gain consensus on sensitive areas and possible route alignments amongst all stakeholders. To be able to do this each stakeholder must be made aware of the other stakeholders' input on the matter.	
5.3	At map 6, Mr Kotze (Overberg District Municipality) noted that they also submitted an extensive list of minimum requirements that need to be met when routing a transmission line. This list should also be taken into account.	
5.4	At map 14, Mr Bednall indicated that there were some discrepancies between the original input the STCA submitted and the captured/mapped input. He noted that the STCA will have to go back to rectify these discrepancies so that the input can be correctly presented.	
5.5	Ms Ritsch stated that some of the stakeholders were under the impression that all the land underneath the power lines will become sterile. This was not the case as only the tower footprint will become sterile, the rest of the land will still be arable. An attendee did not completely agree with Ms Ritsch. He said that some farming activities depend heavily on crop spraying and transmission lines could render entire farms useless if they make crop spraying impossible. Farming is not as easy as stated. Ms Ball urged farmers to inform them of the exact details of the farming methods they use for their various farming activities. The project team are not always aware of the constraints transmission lines place on farming methods. She added that Ms Ritsch did not say that there will be no impacts on farming, she only stated that the land underneath the lines is not completely sterile. Another attendee wanted to know what impact the lines would have on precision farming equipment such as GPS. Mr Steenkamp (Eskom) said Eskom did do research and produce a report on this topic. He did not know what the report stated. He agreed to make the report available. Ms Ball added that the report will be put on the Eskom website and those who don't have access to the internet should contact NMA so they can make arrangements regarding this matter. An attendee clarified that he had mentioned sterile land in terms of livestock farming. He read the report on Electro Magnetic Fields (EMF) on Eskom's website and it only mentions that there is no effect on animal breeding when artificial insemination is used. He commented that most livestock farmers in the Overberg area did not make use of artificial insemination so the report does not dismiss the possibility of EMF affecting livestock farming. Ms Ball mentioned that there are various reports on the subject and said the project team will	Arcus GIBB/ Eskom
		Arcus

EIA for Proposed Eskom Bantamsklip Transmission Lines and Associated Infrastructure

	see if they can find something that addresses this concern and put it on the website.	GIBB/ Eskom
5.6	<p>At map 17, Ms Pobantz noted that their map only indicated current sensitive elements. It is difficult to map the future potential of a place but there is great potential in the Tesselaarsdal area. Future potential needs to be considered as well. She also officially withdrew the alternative alignment submitted by TAG, saying that they did not have enough time to come up with a proper alternative.</p> <p>Mr Visser stated that the alternative submitted by TAG was captured incorrectly on the GIS maps in any case.</p> <p>Ms Ritsch thanked Mr Visser for pointing this out and added that all stakeholders should inform the project team if their input was not captured correctly so that the project team can rectify the mistakes.</p>	
5.7	Mr Stead explained that the SANParks alternative was not mapped because it is a proposal to go underground and not overhead. The proposal has been well documented in the Report Back document.	
5.8	<p>Mr Viljoen commented that it was very difficult for the Theewaterskloof Municipality to propose an alternative route. If they had submitted one they would have stepped on someone's toes and they could not be so arrogant as to place a power line over someone's farm.</p> <p>Ms Ritsch reminded attendees that they were not asked to put the exact alignment on a map but rather a corridor – an area they believe to be the least sensitive to go through. All the suggested alternatives will be thoroughly investigated by the specialists to determine the finer details.</p> <p>Ms Ball added that they do not expect stakeholders to go in to the finer details of their route suggestions. The specialists are being paid to do the detailed investigation part.</p>	
5.9	<p>Mr Carinus wanted to know whether the ABI information formed part of the general biodiversity map. He also wanted to know if the proposed Special Management Area (SMA) had been included on the conservation map; two of the current alternative routes run straight over the proposed SMA.</p> <p>Examining the map, attendees discovered that the proposed SMA (Nuwejaars Wetland SMA) had not been located on the conservation map and that the two Bantamsklip-Kappa alternatives run over it.</p> <p>Ms Ritsch asked ABI to forward the information on the SMA to them so they can capture it on the map.</p> <p>Mr Stead indicated that the information on the biodiversity map was provide by Mr Holness and included the Agulhas Park Interface Zones Visual Protection area. He said they did not capture all the information that was initially provided by ABI. That information will be included in the mapping.</p> <p>Mr Carinus informed Mr Stead that Mr Holness also did a bio-regional plan. He advised Mr Stead that he should also get this plan from Mr Holness.</p> <p>Mr Fourie referred to the table of contents of the Report back document. It states that there are themes and sub-themes for the various types of sensitive areas. He wanted to know where conservation areas were located because the table of contents does not indicate it. Conservation areas cannot just be placed under the biodiversity theme as it contains a number of the themes given. There are also various types of conservation areas. Mr Stead has to take cognisance of these points when he captures input on conservation areas.</p> <p>Mr Stead said he will follow up on the requests and acquire the additional information.</p>	VRMA

EIA for Proposed Eskom Bantamsklip Transmission Lines and Associated Infrastructure

	<p>Mr Fourie and Mr Carinus agreed and requested that conservation be a separate theme on the maps.</p> <p>Mr Carinus also added that there is an international project underway, in the proposed Nuwejaars Wetland SMA, to mitigate the fire threat of the area. Routing two power lines through this area is not going to compliment the mitigation measures.</p>	
5.10	<p>Mr Hobbs commented that the Nuwejaars Wetlands Landowners' Association got a Mr Euston-Brown to do a study on the ecology of their area. They are also working on a climate change project that is currently being implemented in the area and funded by the German Ministry of Environment in cooperation with the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the DEA. This all relates to the fire hazards caused by power lines. This study will only be finished in a couple of months but it should definitely be considered by the project team.</p> <p>Ms Ball replied that such research is welcome at any time. If it is submitted in the next couple of months it will still be assessed in the main Environmental Impact Report which will be due much later.</p> <p>Mr Carinus added that part of the project concerns alternative energy and tourism. He said the opportunities that will be created through this project cannot really be marked on a map. It seems that this project is in conflict with the Eskom project.</p>	
5.11	<p>Mr Van As spoke to individual maps 7 and 10 both of which refer to the vulture colony in Potberg. He did not agree with the preliminary feedback of the specialists that this is not really a concern. These birds are active in a big area and surely the two proposed routes will affect them. He added that many farmers run small guest farms on their farms to supplement their income. A power line running through such a farm will also affect the income margins regarding the guest houses.</p> <p>Ms Ritsch acknowledged Mr Van As' comment. His avifaunal concerns will be verified and discussed with the specialists. She added that the agricultural and economic specialists will take these types of impacts into account when they are out in the field.</p> <p>Ms Ball asked Mr Van As to separate the eco tourism activities from the traditional farming activities in future in order to assist the specialists.</p>	
5.12	<p>Regarding farming methods, an attendee noted that the loss of agricultural land will be far bigger than just the footprints of the towers. It will not be possible to manoeuvre irrigation systems, planters and even some of the larger tractors around these towers.² The overall value of a farm will also be lowered significantly when such a power line is routed over it. The income margins of a farmer can also drop significantly if he loses the ability to use precision farming equipment and GPS near the lines. He believed that the impact on farming has been underestimated by the specialists.³</p> <p>Ms Ritsch said that these finer impacts will have to be looked at by the specialists when they are out in the field.</p>	
5.13	<p>Ms Richardson mentioned that a concern was raised at one of the previous public meetings regarding having a specialist who will integrate all the various impacts of the proposed lines</p>	

² *The specialists' findings regarding land use potential and the various aspects of potential limitations on current and future production practices are incorrect. It is clear that the specialists' comments are based on outdated knowledge. Specialists will have to inform themselves of the newest production practices being used in the area as well as the development in food production in the area. Some of the specialists' assumptions, like categorising of ground potential and the influences of power lines on grain production practices, are incorrect (comment on minutes J Lusse 14/12/09).*

³ *The effect of power lines and their EMF on the production of livestock should be investigated since intensive livestock production (4 animals per hectare) takes place in the area (comment on minutes J Lusse 14/12/09).*

EIA for Proposed Eskom Bantamsklip Transmission Lines and Associated Infrastructure

	<p>in order to calculate the opportunity cost of having them. She said this was still lacking.</p> <p>Ms Ball indicated that they have been looking at appointing a resource economist as one of the specialists – this was decided after the public meeting in question. Hopefully he will come on board soon.</p>	
5.14	<p>Mr Fryer said a lot of the issues that are being raised today have already been dealt with in the provincial SDF. The SDF is a state of the art strategic document that is absolutely critical if one wants to ensure sustainable development within the province. If there is no one on the project team who is looking into this document then the process is flawed. He pointed to a brown line on the map which was a major transport route (N2). He said according to the provincial SDF that is where the lines should be going. At the Koeberg site, all the transmission lines could fit in nicely with the major transport routes. Somebody needs to take the strategic implications of the SDF and put them on one of these maps.</p> <p>Mr Stead replied that the provincial SDF also states that the N2 is a scenic corridor. Therefore any development in the vicinity of the N2 has to be treated with the utmost sensitivity with regards to scenic quality.</p>	
5.15	<p>Ms Pobantz agreed with what Mr Fryer said with regards to the SDF. She also commented that the appointment of the resource economist is a must and not a maybe. She also asked if one report, containing the impacts of both the power plant and the transmission lines, will be issued; although they are two separate EIAs, their impacts have to be combined at some stage as one cannot go without the other.</p> <p>Ms Ball indicated that Mr Singleton could have answered the question; unfortunately he was no longer at the meeting. She agreed to get feedback and come back to Ms Pobantz and added that this question has also been raised through the Nuclear-1 consultation process and it has been responded to in that Issues and Responses Report (IRR). Ms Pobantz is also welcome to look at that.</p>	Eskom
6.	<u>DEVELOPMENT OF ALTERNATIVE CORRIDORS</u>	
6.1	Mr Stead started off by explaining the various GIS layers he will be using to assist stakeholders in this exercise. It included: a vertical elevation layer; biodiversity and protected areas layer; and two layers of Google maps.	
6.2	Attendees mentioned that there is a dam that should be avoided (<i>Kraaibosdam</i>). It was identified on the map.	
6.3	<p>Mr Drew asked attendees which of the two current alternatives from Bantamsklip to Bacchus they preferred.</p> <p>They replied that no route out of Bantamsklip is preferable.</p> <p>One attendee indicated that the one running directly North is preferred if it runs underground from the High Voltage Yard up until the mountains.</p> <p>Mr Stead wanted to know what the motivation behind this proposal was.</p> <p>Attendees replied that the whole area around Bantamsklip is a no-go-area for transmission lines in terms of the severe impact it will have on the biodiversity of the area. Taking a direct route out underground should be the only consideration.</p> <p>Mr Drew reiterated that the impacts of an underground line will be far worse on biodiversity than with overhead lines. With underground lines they will only save on the visual impact.</p> <p>Mr Fourie said the impacts of underground lines will not be as severe if the latest technologies, such as tunnelling, are employed.</p>	

EIA for Proposed Eskom Bantamsklip Transmission Lines and Associated Infrastructure

	<p>Mr Leask reminded attendees that the biggest concerns with underground lines are maintenance and repair.</p> <p>Mr Fourie stressed the fact that they are simply requesting that the specialists investigate the underground proposal in detail as with the other input.</p> <p>Ms Ball and Mr Drew assured Mr Fourie that this item will be taken on board.</p>	
<p>6.4</p>	<p>Mr Viljoen once again warned attendees that putting an alternative route on the map will inevitably make someone angry. Stakeholders should be careful.</p> <p>Mr Drew explained that stakeholders will not be held to their proposals. All the proposed routes will be screened by the specialists and if they are found to be unfeasible they will not be considered. The project team is not trying to trap stakeholders, it is extending a hand to them to give them the opportunity to proactively provide input into the process. Stakeholders have local knowledge of the area that specialists do not have and that local knowledge can be vital to identify the route with the least impact. This is not a decision-making forum, it is a forum where the stakeholders can influence the outcome by informing the project team of their perceptions of the area.</p> <p>Mr Whitelaw commented that due to lack of information and unreasonable timeframes it was impossible to provide meaningful input. They want to be constructive but it still feels like they are being forced into processes that are full of shortcomings. As an example Mr Whitelaw said that the STCA had a meeting with Eskom and Arcus GIBB on 12 June 2009 where they were informed that Arcus GIBB had suggested to Eskom a MSW process as part of the transmission line EIA public participation process. A draft document containing this suggestion was briefly shown to attendees.⁴ Only on 17 September 2009 (3 months later) did they hear from the project team again regarding the workshop – they received a letter from NMA notifying I&APs to register by 24 September 2009 to participate in a workshop in early November 2009, failing which the invitation to participate in the process would be withdrawn. I&APs therefore had 7 days to accept an invitation to participate in a MSW or be disqualified. On 25 September 2009 a letter was received from NMA notifying participants that the two week period available for compiling input commenced on Monday 28 September 2009 and written reports had to be handed in by 11 October 2009.⁵ When a project is managed on this basis I&APs are quite justified in questioning whether there is a genuine attempt to obtain meaningful information or whether a process is being followed simply for compliance with statutory requirements. He added that it was apparent which party was responsible for the delay as Arcus GIBB appeared more than capable of managing a project of this nature. All are sensitive to the needs of providing power to the country as a whole but this is not the way to run a project where meaningful input is required.⁶</p>	

⁴ An undertaking was given that an opportunity would be given to the STCA to provide input to the MSW plan and process to be followed (refer point 3.3 Arcus GIBB minutes dated 12 June 2009). It should be noted that despite the minutes recording that I&APs shall have the opportunity to provide input to the MSW process, no opportunity was given in this regard (comment on minutes G Whitelaw 24/12/09).

⁵ In other words after sitting on the MSW proposal for 3 months Eskom, Arcus GIBB and NMA decided to give I&APs 7 days to accept an invitation to participate in a MSW or be disqualified, and then gave I&APs not even 1 business days notice to begin compiling a written report to be submitted within 14 days. It should be noted that for many I&APs this would have been the first time they would have heard of the MSW process. Given that many I&APs all have full time jobs, and in some instances being farmers busy harvesting, running a project of this basis is completely unsatisfactory and shows little regard for those I&APs from whom information is being requested (comment on minutes G Whitelaw 24/12/09).

⁶ By far the majority of I&APs agreed that the main objective of the workshop (i.e. to propose alternative power line corridors) was wholly inappropriate as insufficient time had been given to provide meaningful input. As a result the main objective of the workshop was not even embarked upon by consensus and no routes were recommended. I&APs did not want to make the same mistake as Eskom and its advisors and table proposed transmission routes without meaningful information at hand (comment on minutes G Whitelaw 24/12/09).

EIA for Proposed Eskom Bantamsklip Transmission Lines and Associated Infrastructure

	<p>Mr Duminy asked why attendees spent their whole day at the meeting if they do not agree with the process. They should stop talking in circles and start being constructive because they are wasting everyone's time.</p> <p>Ms Mashiteng reminded attendees that the EIA is currently only in the Scoping Phase; this phase usually consists of gathering information and identifying possible flaws. The detailed assessment only takes place in the following phase (<i>i.e.</i> Impact Assessment phase).</p>	
6.5	Mr Muller (Overstrand Municipality) said the Overstrand Municipality prefers alternative three with the deviation to alternative three as proposed by the STCA.	
6.6	<p>Ms Pobantz wanted to know if Eskom could give a bit more leeway in terms of the end of January date. She wondered whether they would consider the end of February in order to give municipalities a chance to get their members together.</p> <p>Ms Mashiteng replied that she would discuss the proposal with Ms Seabe, who has unfortunately left the meeting. She will get back to attendees on the proposal.</p>	Eskom
6.7	<p>An attendee said the project team should provide better motivation for wanting to develop a massive power station in an area as sensitive as the Overberg area.</p> <p>Ms Ball suggested that he should register as an I&AP for the Nuclear-1 EIA. The Draft Environmental Impact Report is about to be published and it provides ample motivation for the nuclear power station at Bantamsklip.</p>	
6.8	<p>Mr Visser wanted to know what exactly Eskom are making provisions for in the Bantamsklip-Bacchus transmission lines project. According to the information package the servitude for the 400 kV lines will be made big enough to accommodate 765 kV lines. Some of the documents also mention sizes of 6 000 MW of power as opposed to 4 000 MW which is apparently the size of the proposed nuclear power station. He wondered what exactly Eskom are planning to do at Bantamsklip and asked how stakeholders could provide meaningful input if Eskom gives them contradicting information.</p> <p>Mr Leask explained it is common practice for Eskom to make provision for upgrading their transmission lines. He assured Mr Visser, however, that upgrading of the transmission lines would require another EIA.</p> <p>Mr Visser referred back to the public meeting that was held in Caledon where an Eskom representative told someone from Villiersdorp that he cannot complain about an Eskom line because there is already an existing line. He was concerned that once one set of lines have been approved nothing would stand in Eskom's way to get further lines approved.</p> <p>Mr Leask assured Mr Visser no further 400 kV transmission lines will be needed out of Bantamsklip.</p> <p>Mr Visser said that Mr Leask could not guarantee what he was saying. There are already talks of possibly considering another power station for Bantamsklip.</p> <p>Ms Ball indicated that the Nuclear-1 EIA is only for one 4 000 MW nuclear power station. If Eskom want to construct anything in addition to that they will have to do another EIA.</p> <p>Mr Visser asked what chance the community had to stop the construction of a second power station once the first one had been approved.</p> <p>Ms Ball said that an EIA process will still need to be conducted according to EIA Regulations, for a second power station.</p>	
6.9	Mr Fryer could not believe that the Eskom representatives deemed it acceptable to leave the meeting while the rest of the attendees were still debating the issues. It is totally unacceptable and a complaint should be laid at the highest level at Eskom. If stakeholders are expected to sit and debate these issues it is only fair and decent that the authorities that	

EIA for Proposed Eskom Bantamsklip Transmission Lines and Associated Infrastructure

	brought the issues to the table in the first place are present until the end of the meeting. He could not express his disappointment more strongly without using abusive language.	
6.10	Mr Fryer reiterated that the idea of expecting stakeholders to come up with alternative routes, when there are so many gaps in the detail provided, is absurd. The complete detail needs to be included in the overlay maps and the least sensitive routes need to be plotted on a scientific basis and not on what the stakeholders feel is the less sensitive route. Once this is done stakeholders can sit down and comment on the least sensitive route.	
6.11	Mr Leask explained the planning process that Eskom follows when routing a transmission line. He said that the planning team is given the transmission requirements. Then they consult their maps to see where the lines could go from a geophysical point of view. After this they roughly identify potential sensitive areas. Using that information they identify a few possible routes and forward them to the specialists to investigate. Currently this is where the process is at and the nature of this meeting was to get further consultation on the current routes from the stakeholders. If they felt that there are less sensitive route possibilities they were being asked to put those ideas forward.	
6.12	Mr Van As commented that the DEA should be aware of how difficult it is to get the transmission lines out of Bantamsklip when they make a decision on whether to authorise the nuclear power station or not. He added that back in the 1980s, when the initial site identification was done, there was no such thing as tourism in South Africa. Today, tourism is just as important as any other industry in the country.	
6.13	Mr Viljoen stated that although stakeholders do not want to come up with their own alternatives, they do want to be involved in the process of deciding where the lines should go. In other words, the specialists have to use the input to determine where the least sensitive route is and then they have to present that route to stakeholders so they can comment on it. Mr Fryer added that the stakeholders at this forum should also assist specialists in adding weights to the various sensitivities. He agreed that specialists should determine the least sensitive route and then that route should be presented to stakeholders for additional comment and input.	
6.14	Mr Fourie wanted to know from Eskom what the chances would be for them to erect one or two pylons at Bantamsklip so that stakeholders could go down there and see what the implications of these power lines will be. Ms Ball said that an EIA would be required before such a pylon could be erected. Mr Leask replied that it would be far cheaper to arrange a visit to existing pylons than to build a new one. Such a visit could be arranged in the future.	
6.15	Ms Pobantz asked the project team to make a general undertaking to provide 60 days for comment every time there is a public comment period, including when the Revised Draft Scoping Report is released. Ms Ball said her request will be considered each time there is a comment period.	
7.	<u>SUMMARY OF OUTCOMES, WAY FORWARD AND CLOSURE</u>	
7.1	Ms Muthialu summarised the outcomes of the meeting by stating that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eskom have given an extended deadline of 31 January 2010 for stakeholders to provide additional input. • The counter proposal to extend that date to 28 February 2010 will be put forward to Ms Seabe and feedback on her response will be given as soon as possible. • Ms Seabe indicated that contact can be established between I&APs and specialists by simply sending a request to NMA. 	

EIA for Proposed Eskom Bantamsklip Transmission Lines and Associated Infrastructure

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eskom, the Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) and the specialists will be responsible for using the input that stakeholders submit to determine the least sensitive routes. They will then present these to stakeholders, at a workshop similar to this one, to comment on and to assist specialists in assigning weights to the various sensitivities. • The Report Back Document will be sent out to attendees of the workshop at least 14 days before the date of such workshop. • The specialists will need about a month after the deadline to review the input. • The project team will discuss the date for the workshop and report back to stakeholders. 	
<p>7.2</p>	<p>Ms Muthialu reminded attendees to sign the attendance register and to hand in their badges as they will be used again.</p> <p>She thanked attendees for their valuable time. She believed that they have reached some positive outcomes and that the process forward will be less constrictive in terms of time frames. She said she looked forward to seeing them again and the meeting was closed.</p>	