

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT – SCOPING PHASE**

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE PROPOSED WESTGATE TARLTON KROMDRAAI 132 KILOVOLT POWER LINE, KROMDRAAI SUBSTATION AND ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE**

**ABBREVIATED SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES/CONCERNS AND COMMENTS/SUGGESTIONS RAISED BY INTERESTED AND/OR AFFECTED PARTIES**

**FEBRUARY 2009**

Stakeholders who contributed issues range across all sectors of society. A full record of every issue raised is available from the Arcus GIBB office in Sunninghill. Many stakeholders raised the same issue. This list of issues does not focus solely on a specific route corridor or alternative. Instead, it lists all the issues raised by I&APs throughout the study area. In many instances, an issue raised about a particular alternative, is also applicable to other alternatives.

The issues have been arranged into groups of similar issues, and are listed in each group more or less in the order in which they were received. The issues raised by technical specialists and the project proponents are not included in the list below. Comments made during public meetings are included.

**INDEX TO ISSUES IN THIS TABLE**

1.	GENERAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS .....	1
2.	VISUAL IMPACTS .....	4
3.	SERVITUDE ACQUISITION .....	5
4.	SECURITY & SAFETY .....	6
5.	IMPACTS ON EXISTING INFRASTRUCTURES .....	7
6.	IMPACTS ON PROPOSED INFRASTRUCTURES .....	8
7.	TECHNICAL ASPECTS .....	8
8.	ALTERNATIVES .....	10
9.	ACCESS ROUTES.....	11
10.	FINANCIAL AND ECONOMIC IMPACTS .....	11
11.	HERITAGE IMPACTS.....	12
12.	PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESS .....	13
13.	GENERAL COMMENTS & ISSUES RAISED .....	16

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
<b>1. GENERAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS</b>		
<b>SCOPING PHASE - GENERAL CORRESPONDENCE</b>		
<p>Attention should be given to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proximity of air fields in the area and the impact thereof on the proposed development;</li> <li>• Geotechnical stability in the area in question; and</li> <li>• A Botanist should also be commissioned to participate in the site clearing and identification of plant species that should be removed and translocated to a suitable environment.</li> </ul>	<p><b>West Rand District Municipality (19 May 2008) - Letter</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing infrastructure in the area has been taken into consideration by the planning and land departments of Eskom, the impacts of such infrastructure like airfields have been considered</li> <li>• A geotechnical study will be conducted for all route and site alternatives, thus the geotechnical stability of all areas was assessed and will be considered when the preferred routes are chosen.</li> <li>• An ecological study of all route alternatives will also be undertaken in which important plant species will be identified, these sensitive environments will be considered when choosing a preferred alternative.</li> </ul>

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed <b><u>power lines do cross shallow stoping</u></b>, where caving of ground is possible. Such caving of abandoned underground workings may result in sudden and uneven surface subsidence and tilting of blocks on surface.</li> <li>• Abandoned shallow stopes might have been up to 2m wide, and the resulting surface adjustments may be of the similar dimension.</li> <li>• These <b><u>re-adjustments of ground may affect any construction</u></b> that has taken or will take place over such undermined grounds.</li> <li>• <b><u>Placement of support pylons for power lines onto shallowly undermined blocks of ground must not be permitted</u></b>, unless a detailed rock mechanic simulation can prove that the planned construction will not be adversely affected by the highest theoretically-predicted surface subsidence. Such an investigation may prove inconclusive and costly, so <b><u>moving of the pylons onto solid ground</u></b> must be seen as the preferred option.</li> <li>• We thus strongly advise that pylons for all new power lines are <b><u>placed to the West of shallow stopes</u></b>, -onto the Wits footwall rocks, of the reefs mined.</li> <li>• All existing pylons, which had already been placed on top of shallow stoping, should be checked for any tilting or subsidence, and safety of their positions should be evaluated, discussed and reported.</li> <li>• <b><u>In no circumstances should existing pylons, which sit on top of shallow stoping, be burdened with weight of any additional new power lines</u></b>.</li> <li>• Other concerns, related to placement of power lines and their support pylons include proximity of Harmony's slimes dams, which will require space for their maintenance, but they may also require space for additional deposition and for possible re-mining and reprocessing. Plans for all the anticipated works on and around slimes dams have to be discussed, before their space is allowed to be restricted by permanent structures, like power lines.</li> <li>• Proposed new <b><u>power lines and their pylons cross two dolomitic outliers</u></b>, which require appropriate geotechnical clearance, and likely each pylon should be anchored into solid rock, wherever strata is dolomitic. By anchoring into solid rock we can avoid accidental placement of pylons into unstable sinkhole-fills. As a note from recent field work in the area: the <b><u>formation of soil pipes is widespread</u></b> in this area –even over terrain, not underlain by dolomites. The necessary geotechnical investigations will have ensure that pylons are not placed</li> </ul>	<p data-bbox="961 272 1297 345"><b>Mr Sarel Keller -Harmony Gold Mining Company Ltd (18 August 2008) - Email</b></p> <p data-bbox="1039 1409 1060 1433" style="text-align: center;">2</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comments noted on the geotechnical condition along the new proposed alternatives.</li> </ul>

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• over any existing soil pipes. We will gladly share our knowledge of these phenomena and our maps with the engineering geologists and civil engineers, who will geo-technically evaluate the sites, designated for supporting pylons.</li> <li>• In future, all new infrastructure plans PDF files are not precise and not suitable for enlargements, required for geo-technical work (1:1000 or 1:2000).</li> <li>• We may also suggest and hope that in the future even initial planning for any construction in Randfontein area, will show areas, underlain by dolomites, and at least broad zones, where shallow stoping is present.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Mr Sarel Keller-Harmony Gold Mining Company Ltd (18 August 2008) – Email</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comments noted on the geotechnical condition along the new proposed alternatives.</li> </ul>
<b>SCOPING PHASE – MEETINGS</b>		
Loss of available land.	<p><b>Mr Algie Rogers (10 March 2008) – Email</b></p>	Comment noted.
Mr Klopčic raised a concern over the fact that all the proposed alternatives are traversing areas of dolomite rock.	<p><b>Mr Igor Klopčic (15 January 2009) – Recorded during meeting</b></p>	The geology of the area shall be assessed by geologists.
<b>SCOPING PHASE – COMMENT ON DRAFT REPORT</b>		

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
<p>From a geological point of view, the area is underlain by severely leached dolomite; a factor that has increased building costs within our estate significantly. The area is literally riddled with caves and sinkholes. Depending on the structure planned on a piece of land, prior to drafting the building plans, a gravity survey has to be completed, several boreholes are to be drilled where the structure is planned to be erected and an geotechnical report presented, signed by an engineering geologist. The findings of this report are then incorporated in the design specifications of the structure to be built on the land. In short, all buildings are constructed in such a way that a sinkhole with a diameter of at least 3 m can fall in at any place under a building or under a corner of the building without the building being damaged. We believe that this aspect will also apply to the proposed Eskom power line, increasing the costs thereof significantly.</p> <p>From a botanical biodiversity point of view, several Red Data species such as <i>Melolobium subspicatum</i>, <i>Lotononsis adpressa</i> subsp. <i>leptantha</i> and <i>Harveya pumila</i> have been recorded in the area where Options 4 and 8 are planned. This is another reason for avoiding this area</p>	<p><b>Management Committee – Sterkfontein Country Estate (02 February 2009) - Email</b></p>	<p>Comments noted. Please note that a geotechnical assessment shall be undertaken in the detailed Impact Assessment Phase. Further to this should authorisation be granted, Eskom will undertake detailed assessments of the ground that the pylons will be placed on.</p> <p>An ecological assessment shall also be undertaken in the Impact Assessment Phase of the project. The information provided shall be passed along to the relevant persons.</p>
<b>2. VISUAL IMPACTS</b>		
<b>SCOPING PHASE - GENERAL CORRESPONDENCE</b>		
Aesthetics	<p><b>Mr Pierre Rautenbach (28 November 2007) - Facsimile</b></p>	<p>The visual aspects will be addressed as part of the Visual Impact Assessment, which will be undertaken during the detailed Impact Assessment phase of the EIA process. The Visual Impact Assessment will include mitigation measures in order to reduce the impact of the proposed development.</p>
<b>SCOPING PHASE – MEETINGS</b>		
<p>The aesthetics &amp; view will be very spoilt – going against the reason why I purchased the land (to build myself a home to possibly retire in)</p>	<p><b>Mr Algie Rogers (10 March 2008) - Email</b></p>	<p>The visual aspects will be addressed as part of the Visual Impact Assessment, which will be undertaken during the detailed Impact Assessment phase of the EIA process. The Visual Impact Assessment will include mitigation measures in order to reduce the impact of the proposed development.</p>

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
<b>SCOPING PHASE – COMMENT ON DRAFT REPORT</b>		
<p>We further object to Options 4 and 8 as the proposed power lines follow our northern boundary and are considered a visual degradation. The proposed power lines will not only interfere with the estate's northern, currently uninterrupted, vision over the Zwartkrans valley, but will also interfere with the vision along the "Valley of the Ancestors", i.e. the Blaauwbankspruit valley past Sterkfontein Caves towards Zwartkop. Apart from being located in the Cradle of Humankind World Heritage Site, the excellent vision from our estate is another contributing factor that adds value to our properties. We therefore believe that the construction of a power line immediately in front of our estate will downgrade the visual characteristics of our estate and therefore degrade the value of our properties.</p>	<p><b>Management Committee – Sterkfontein Country Estate (02 February 2009) - Email</b></p>	<p>The visual aspects will be addressed as part of the Visual Impact Assessment, which will be undertaken during the detailed Impact Assessment phase of the EIA process. The Visual Impact Assessment will include mitigation measures in order to reduce the impact of the proposed development.</p>
<b>3. SERVITUDE ACQUISITION</b>		
<b>SCOPING PHASE – MEETINGS</b>		
<p>The distance between the point where Eskom wishes to put the proposed power line and the point where the existing power line infrastructure is, is 500 meters. Further to Mr Rogers he had asked two other questions regarding servitude acquisition, firstly he queried if all the landowners had to object to the proposed development, would Eskom still be able to construct the power line and secondly if the properties are required, will the landowners be compensated accordingly.</p>	<p><b>Mr Algie Rogers (04 March 2008) – Recorded during meeting</b></p>	<p>Eskom do have the right to expropriate properties, however, Eskom do not like to go this route and it is only utilised as a last resort if there is absolutely no alternative. Compensation for the servitude would take into account the value of the property before and after construction of the proposed power line.</p>
<p>Mr Rogers made reference to the previous public meeting, held on 04 March 2008 regarding expropriation. He said that it was stated that a landowners property can get expropriated if the landowner is not willing to co-operate. He stated that landowners, as individuals have rights as well</p>	<p><b>Mr Algie Rogers (15 January 2009) – Recorded during meeting</b></p>	<p>It is true that Eskom has the right to expropriate but chooses not to. Electricity is infrastructure, thus it is a necessity. Eskom can therefore, by law, expropriate. Eskom will try to come to an agreement with the landowner but if this fails then they will expropriate.</p> <p>Section 25 of the Constitution which states that the interests of the majority are higher than the interests of the individual. Expropriation rarely occurs and only happens if there is no other alternative.</p>

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
Who does the servitude belong to once it is bought by Eskom?	<b>Mr Igor Klopcic(15 January 2009)- Recorded during meeting</b>	Eskom has rights over the land bought, thus certain restrictions will be placed on the landowner, even though the land will still belong to the landowner. Some responsibilities such as erosion lie with both the landowner and Eskom.
<b>4. SECURITY &amp; SAFETY</b>		
<b>SCOPING PHASE - GENERAL CORRESPONDENCE</b>		
Security of station.	<b>Mr Pierre Rautenbach (28 November 2007) - Facsimile</b>	The mitigation measures outlined in the EMP must be implemented in order to ensure the safety of both the substation as well as the landowners during both the construction and operational phases of the proposed development.
<b>SCOPING PHASE – MEETINGS</b>		
Eskom would rather put the safety of animals ahead of the safety of human beings.	<b>Mr Herman Brand (04 March 2008) – Recorded during meeting</b>	Comment noted.
Mr Klopcic raised his concern over abandoned mine land. His issue was regarding safety during construction and operation of the proposed project. He is also concerned over the fact that the materials at the abandoned mines are radioactive and hazardous. He indicated that the pylons of the proposed powerline would be a few meters away from the mine. He suggests that we all work together as safety on a mine is very important.	<b>Mr Igor Klopcic (15 January 2009) – Recorded during meeting</b>	The issue of safety will be included in the EMP, which then becomes a legal document once a Record of Decision (RoD) is granted. Thank you for raising those issues, your assistance would be appreciated.
Mr Goldsmith queried the impact on health of high voltage powerlines.	<b>Mr Alan Goldsmith (15 January 2009) – Recorded during meeting</b>	There is a great concern over this issue as there is a lot of coverage in the media about it. There has been no conclusive report that Electromagnetic Fields (EMF) causes cancer. The effect of EMF is indirectly proportional to the distance from the pylon. The height at which the power line is situated ensures that the effect of EMF on the health of humans and animals is negligible. The EMF in a household is greater than that under a power line.

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
<b>5. IMPACTS ON EXISTING INFRASTRUCTURES</b>		
<b>SCOPING PHASE - GENERAL CORRESPONDENCE</b>		
<p>Mr Schutte requested Arcus GIBB to contact him urgently as he owns an airfield on his farm (Portion 8 of the Farm Sterkfontein 173-IQ) and therefore questioned the potential impacts of the power line on aircraft.</p>	<p><b>Mr Piet Schutte (26 November 2007) - Facsimile</b></p>	<p>The initial alternative power line corridors as determined by Eskom, would have traversed Mr Schutte's property. However, based on the elimination of the one location for the proposed substation, as well as the power line corridor leading to the substation, Mr Schutte's property will no longer be directly impacted by the proposed power line corridors.</p> <p>Copies of the updated maps were posted to Mr Schutte (24 January 2008).</p>
<p>Mr Leonard indicated that the power line located between points A and B of the updated map could impact on Harmony Gold Mine's Dump Reclamation Project.</p>	<p><b>Mr Trevor Leonard (28 January 2008) – Facsimile</b></p>	<p>This issue has been identified as an issue for further investigation in the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA.</p>
<b>SCOPING PHASE – MEETINGS</b>		
<p>Mr Vermeulen queried the distance that a power line can be placed from a house and if it can run over a house</p>	<p><b>Mr Vermeulen (04 March 2008) – Recorded during the meeting</b></p>	<p>No power lines are allowed directly over a house as it is seen as a health and safety hazard. According to the Eskom Guidelines, the building restriction on each side of the centreline for a 132kV powerline is 18 meters.</p>
<b>SCOPING PHASE – COMMENT ON DRAFT REPORT</b>		



Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
<p>Although the area we represent has been subdivided several years prior to the declaration of the Cradle of Humankind World Heritage Site, the map you attached to your draft Scoping Report shows the old portions before consolidation and subdivision and incorrect portion numbers. The data you are using is over a decade old! Since then, the portions shown on your map were consolidated into a single portion, Portion 113, and then again subdivided into Portions 114 to 178, as they are today. It is therefore understandable (albeit inexcusable) that you did not include these portions in your list of I&amp;AP's. This data is, and has always been, freely available from the Mogale City Local Municipality and from Eskom.</p> <p>An airfield exists on Portion 8 of the farm Sterkfontein 173 IQ. Two of the proposed alternative routes (no 4 and 8) indicated on your map lie directly in the flight path of the two runways of this airfield. This portion is an immediate neighbour of our estate.</p> <p>There are already several thatch-roofed residences in close proximity to the proposed power line (Option 4 and 8) worth several million rands. Thatch-roofed buildings have tall lightning conductors and the proximity of a high voltage power line to these lightning conductors pose an unacceptably high risk to the occupants of these residences. Furthermore, the central part of our estate represents the highest point in the general area and is frequently hit by lightning, hence the many lightning protectors in this area (as well as several telephone poles damaged by lightning!). We are already experiencing high losses of electrical and computer equipment due to electrical strikes. We believe that the close proximity of an Eskom power line to this section of the estate will increase the frequency and danger of lightning strikes in this area. There are additional residences planned along this route. This should automatically exclude this route as a feasible option. Exactly the same applies to the other alternative, Option 8.</p>	<p><b>Management Committee – Sterkfontein Country Estate (02 February 2009) - Email</b></p>	<p>Thank you for pointing this out. The relevant persons will be notified of this error which shall be rectified.</p> <p>With regards to the airfield, please see comment and response above from Mr Schutte (Owner of portion 8 of the farm Sterkfontein 173 IQ).</p> <p>There have been no recorded incidents of a high voltage powerline having a negative effect on lightning conductors, according to Eskom Project Engineers.</p> <p>Furthermore, Eskom maintains specific clearances in terms of the Occupational Health and Safety Act to protect the general public, sensitive environments and to ensure safety of electricity infrastructure. Eskom also operates all infrastructure according to NRS 02 80 standards. In addition all powerlines are installed with a surge arrester, to ensure that they are protected if and when lightning strikes. In the event of such an incident, this current is taken straight to the ground. Thus there are measures of protection to ensure the safety of all.</p>
<b>6. IMPACTS ON PROPOSED INFRASTRUCTURES</b>		
<b>SCOPING PHASE – MEETINGS</b>		
Power line will go over where I plan to build my residence	<b>Mr Algie Rogers(10 March 2008) – Email</b>	Comment Noted
<b>7. TECHNICAL ASPECTS</b>		
<b>SCOPING PHASE - GENERAL CORRESPONDENCE</b>		

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Position of pylons; and</li> <li>Route of overhead cables.</li> </ul>	<b>Mr Pierre Rautenbach(28 November 2007) - Facsimile</b>	<p>In the event that DEAT authorise a specific corridor, a detailed Environmental Management Plan (EMP), which entails an Ecological, Avifaunal and Heritage 'Walk through' will occur. These studies will delineate no-go areas within the servitude and will inform the location of the pylons and the overhead cables.</p> <p>Specific landowner requirements can also affect the exact location of the pylons</p>
<p>Mr Cappaert questioned the exact site that Eskom intends to construct the substation, with particular reference to Pole TO TO 131/6. He also questioned how the substation would be serviced.</p> <p>Mr Cappaert also requested copies of documentation relating to the planned substation.</p>	<b>Mr D R Cappaert (23 November 2007) - Facsimile</b>	<p>The Farm name and number of the alternate locations for the substation were emailed (4 December 2007) to Mr Cappaert. It should be noted that Arcus GIBB's response, included the alternative substation location, which was subsequently eliminated as an alternative i.e. Portion 149 of the Farm Sterkfontein 173-IQ.</p> <p>Mr Cappaert was informed that details pertaining to the servicing of the substation were unavailable at the time. However, the Environmental Impact Report will address this issue.</p> <p>Arcus GIBB ensured that he will be kept informed regarding the proposed development and the availability of documentation for review.</p>
<b>SCOPING PHASE – MEETINGS</b>		
Why the existing powerline can't be upgraded?	<b>Mr Algie Rogers (04 March 2008) – Recorded during the meeting</b>	Not possible as the existing infrastructure would not be able to withstand the weight of the proposed 132kV power line.
Why the existing pylons and servitudes cannot be utilised to run the 132kV power line on?	<b>Mr Algie Rogers (04 March 2008) – Recorded during the meeting</b>	Not possible as the existing infrastructure would not be able to withstand the weight of the proposed 132kV power line.
Is it possible to build another power line on top of the infrastructure of an existing power line?	<b>Mrs Adri Garnett Bennett (04 March 2008) – Recorded during the meeting</b>	Not possible as the existing infrastructure would not be able to withstand the weight of the proposed 132kV power line.
Mr Vermeulen asked if Eskom have decided on two (2) lines or one (1) line. Many landowners would be affected if two (2) lines are chosen	<b>Mr Vermeulen (15 January 2009) – Recorded during the meeting</b>	Eskom have decided on two (2) lines. The line does not necessarily have to be the same throughout the route; it can change between single and double lines.

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
<b>8. ALTERNATIVES</b>		
<b>SCOPING PHASE - GENERAL CORRESPONDENCE</b>		
<p>After the meeting 3 alternative routes (I am told – I know of personally of 2) were put forward to the Eskom representatives.</p> <p>A further 2 alternatives would be to a) design a tower for the lines that can be erected between the existing lines with enough clearance and height that might be necessary for technical reasons – this also alleviates the servitude problem (it might be an ideal opportunity to be used countrywide. b) To run the new line next to the existing line like it has been done in the Derby area.</p>	<p><b>Mr Algie Rogers (10 March 2008) - Email</b></p>	<p>The alternative route alignments suggested at the meeting have been incorporated into the Draft Scoping Report. Please refer to Appendix A1 for the revised route alignments.</p> <p>Your suggested alternatives have been noted and shall be considered further in the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA Process.</p>
<p>I further propose to build the powerline along the western border (but in side) of the Krugersdorp Game Reserve. There is no excuse why "public land" should not be used. Your preferred route A-B-C-D-E, especially between C and D will impact heavily on the relatively small size of plots in that area.</p>	<p><b>Mrs Wiltrud Werkle (13 March 2008) - Facsimile</b></p>	<p>Comment noted. An alternative running along the western border of the Krugersdorp Game Reserve has been included and will be investigated further in the Impact Assessment Phase.</p>
<b>SCOPING PHASE – MEETINGS</b>		
<p>Mr Vermeulen enquired about the Red Corridor on the screen, stating that there were open spaces to the side of the corridor and asked why the proposed power line was not going through these open spaces.</p>	<p><b>Mr Vermeulen (04 March 2008) Recorded during the meeting</b></p>	<p>It was pointed out that the open space in question was the Krugersdorp Game Reserve.</p> <p>The power line cannot go through the Reserve, as legislation exists to protect these natural resources.</p> <p>Alternatives are identified not only from a biophysical and social point of view but also from an economic point of view. The straight line route between two substations is the most economical route as there are no turns in the alignment, however, if a straight line cannot be achieved, alternatives are investigated in and around this ideal. A route around the Krugersdorp Game Reserve may have been found to be unfeasible due to the economic impacts on the property.</p>
<p>Mr Herman Brand raised the issue of the Krugersdorp Game Reserve and asked why the proposed power line cannot run through the Reserve.</p>	<p><b>Mr Herman Brand (04 March 2008) Recorded during the meeting</b></p>	<p>Government authorities will not allow such an alternative; furthermore the power line might be a hazard to the animals in the Reserve. However, an alternative running along the western border of the Krugersdorp Game Reserve has been included and will be investigated further in the Impact Assessment Phase.</p>

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
Ms Adri-Garnett Bennett queried the area left of the Red Corridor (Refer to map).	<b>Ms Adri- Garnett Bennett(04 March 2008) Recorded during the meeting</b>	Capacity in the area is dwindling thus new electricity infrastructure is required specifically where Eskom proposes the construction of the power line and substation. The existing electricity infrastructure needs to be strengthened by constructing a larger network.
Mr Vermeulen asked why the open space around the other corridor alternatives cannot be used.	<b>Mr Vermeulen(04 March 2008) Recorded during the meeting</b>	The eastern and western side of the proposed power line corridors were considered.
Mr Vermeulen queried the proposed substation site that was eliminated and thus no longer considered an alternative.	<b>Mr Vermeulen(15 January 2009) Recorded during the meeting</b>	It is no longer considered as the relevant landowner strongly objected.
Mr Goldsmith questioned whether there has been any consensus on the final route.	<b>Mr Alan Goldsmith (15 January 2009) – Recorded during meeting</b>	No consensus had been reached. There was consensus amongst meeting attendees about which route they had preferred.
<b>9. ACCESS ROUTES</b>		
<b>SCOPING PHASE - GENERAL CORRESPONDENCE</b>		
Access routes to power station	<b>Mr Pierre Rautenbach(28 November 2007) - Facsimile</b>	Access to the substation will be negotiated with the landowner.
<b>10. FINANCIAL AND ECONOMIC IMPACTS</b>		
<b>SCOPING PHASE - GENERAL CORRESPONDENCE</b>		
<u>Conditions</u> of property sale/purchase in the event a property is required by Eskom for the project development/construction must be addressed as part of the EIA.	<b>Mr Alan Goldsmith (30 April 2008) - Facsimile</b>	Comment noted and shall be addressed in the Environmental Reports.
A decrease in value of my property.	<b>Mr Algie Rogers (10 March 2008) - Email</b>	Comment noted. In general terms it is common knowledge that residential property situated alongside a powerline is less desirable than property without such infrastructure. The extent to which the value would be less than a similar property without a powerline is dependent on various factors including: the affluence of an area, visual appearance of such infrastructure and the mis-perception of powerlines.

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
<b>SCOPING PHASE – MEETINGS</b>		
Mr Brand expressed his concern over the devaluation of his property.	<b>Mr Herman Brand (04 March 2008) – Recorded during the meeting</b>	Comment noted. In general terms it is common knowledge that residential property situated alongside a powerline is less desirable than property without such infrastructure. The extent to which the value would be less than a similar property without a powerline is dependent on various factors including: the affluence of an area, visual appearance of such infrastructure and the misperception of powerlines.
Mr Kruger said that corridor 6 marked in blue is one kilometre onto his property. His concern was that the value of the servitude is lower than the price paid for it. The resale value of the land decreases due to the presence of the power line.	<b>Mr Hennie Kruger (15 January 2009) – Recorded during meeting</b>	Eskom pays landowners for the loss that they incur, the Expropriation Act is used as a basis for negotiation.
<b>11. HERITAGE IMPACTS</b>		
<b>SCOPING PHASE – MEETINGS</b>		
Mr Goldsmith informed those present at the meeting that Wits University (Dr. Ron Clarke) have excavated on his property and have found bones on his farm. The property is now for sale and the government would benefit from buying it as the area could be preserved. He also stated that there were excavations done adjacent to his property as well.	<b>Mr Alan Goldsmith (15 January 2009) – Recorded during meeting</b>	Thank you for informing Arcus GIBB of this information, we shall ensure that this gets forwarded to the relevant persons for further assessment.
<b>SCOPING PHASE – COMMENT ON DRAFT REPORT</b>		
It also appears as if you may not be aware that the proposed Options 4 and 8 pass through, or in close proximity to, part of the proclaimed Kromdraai Palaeontological Reserve (the Bolts Farm section of "Gauteng: National Heritage Site, National Monument, Kromdraai Palaeontological Reserve Kromdraai 71 Krugersdorp District, Item 31158") as declared by the South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA). Details of this palaeontological reserve can be found at the SAHRA website, <a href="http://196.35.231.29/sahra/HeritageSitesDetail.aspx?id=31158">http://196.35.231.29/sahra/HeritageSitesDetail.aspx?id=31158</a> . The Bolts Farm section of this site covers a total area of 37.4642 Ha. This should be considered a fatal flaw, which should automatically exclude Options 4 and 8 as realistic alternatives for a power line, especially in the light of the recent constraints placed by GDACE on some of the development on portions within our estate, although they are not even located close to the palaeontological reserve.	<b>Management Committee – Sterkfontein Country Estate (02 February 2009) - Email</b>	Thank you for informing Arcus GIBB of this information, we shall ensure that this gets forwarded to the relevant persons for further assessment.

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
<b>12. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESS</b>		
<b>SCOPING PHASE - GENERAL CORRESPONDENCE</b>		
<p>I am the owner of plot 51 Beckedan and I believe that you have entered into discussions with myself regarding the proposed powerline. I would like to put things straight that no one has spoken to me regarding the above and I will not be interested in entering into any discussions regarding the above for it will be dealt with by my lawyer, should need be. I am and will never be pro this powerline. Please do not use my name on any further correspondence to other parties for you are trying to fool them by pretending that you have spoken to me, should this happen again I reserve my rights.</p>	<p><b>Mr Herman Brand (12 February 2008) -Email</b></p>	<p>We appreciate your response. Kindly be advised that Arcus GIBB is the independent consultant undertaking the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) for the proposed project. The purpose of the investigation is to identify and assess potential impacts of the proposed development on the receiving environment.</p> <p>With regards to your name being used on correspondence sent to other parties, please note that we are not sure when this has occurred. We can confirm that none of your contact details are on our Interested and Affected Party database and that the e-mail received was the first form of communication that we have received from you. The only contact that we may have had with you is the delivery of a Background Information Document to your property.</p>
<p>Could you please send me the report for this proposed line - I have not seen it and we're also involved in it.</p> <p>With all the electricity supply problems and load shedding for the next couple of years, will this still continue?</p> <p>Is there going to be a public meeting regarding this or will the affected parties be kept in the dark? It just seems that there is not enough correspondence regarding this project.</p>	<p><b>Adri Garnett-Bennett (12 February 2008) - Email</b></p>	<p>We appreciate you coming forward and getting involved in our process. Please find the draft scoping report attached hereto (appendices are not included due to the size). I have also attached the email that has been sent to all interested and affected parties (I&amp;APs) informing them of the availability of the report.</p> <p>Kindly be advised at this stage in the process, impacts of the proposed development on the receiving environment are being identified. ARCUS GIBB is the independent environmental consultant who is undertaking the investigation. The National Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism (DEAT) make the decision which may be appealed.</p> <p>Please note, we are currently trying to find the most suitable and accessible venue for all I&amp;APs. You will be notified of the meeting well in advance.</p> <p>Your comment regarding project correspondence has been noted.</p>
<p>We would like to be informed via email or mail or phoning regarding the above also we would like to attend meetings regarding the above. Please email the map we can't see anything on the attached map.</p>	<p><b>Mr Martunus &amp; Mrs Susanna Kruger (24 April 2008) - Facsimile</b></p>	<p>Mrs Kruger was thanked for coming forward to participate in our process. A larger version of the map was sent to her via email.</p>
<p>Inform all affected Tarlton residents of proposals and developments via a monthly Eskom Account/Statement in the mailing list</p>	<p><b>Mrs Wiltrud Werkle(13 March 2008) – Facsimile</b></p>	<p>Suggestion noted.</p>

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
<b>SCOPING PHASE – MEETINGS</b>		
Mr Vermeulen queried the prior discussions held between landowners and Eskom. He stated that only certain landowners were aware of the proposed development. Mr Vermeulen then asked if Eskom could clarify which properties will be traversed by the proposed power line.	<b>Mr Vermeulen (04 March 2008) – Recorded during the meeting</b>	The properties that are affected can be seen clearly from the maps in Appendix A1.
All landowners then raised the issue of inadequate notification of the proposed development	<b>All attendees at meeting (04 March 2008) – Recorded during the meeting</b>	It was requested that I&APs assist the EIA project team in this regard by informing others about the project and passing along all project documentation to other relevant people.
Mr Rogers then said that he was provided with 5-6 names of landowners that were contacted by Eskom; he contacted those landowners only to find out that they have not been liaised with regarding the proposed project.	<b>Mr Algie Rogers (04 March 2008) – Recorded during the meeting</b>	Comment Noted.
A landowner from Tarlton requested there be better methods of communication with I&APs	<b>Landowner (04 March 2008) – Recorded during the meeting</b>	Arcus GIBB was informed at this meeting that they have been using the incorrect newspapers to inform the public of project developments, this will be rectified in the EIA phase.
It was suggested by the landowner that Eskom accounts be used or the delivery of flyers in everyone's post boxes. He also suggested that we inform people about the project before moving any further with the EIA process. In addition it was suggested that project documentation be placed at the Nelson Mandela Centre.	<b>Landowner (04 March 2008) – Recorded during the meeting</b>	Every effort has been made to find affected landowners and inform the general public of the proposed development, please refer to the public participation chapter, chapter 7 in the Draft Scoping Report. Please note the identification of I&APs is continuous in the EIA Process. Unfortunately the Nelson Mandela Centre is open only when there are occasions. Thus we have chosen to place the report in the Tarlton Post Office and at the Randfontein Public Library.
Mr Rogers suggested that contact details be retrieved from the Title Deeds of all affected landowners.	<b>Mr Algie Rogers (04 March 2008) – Recorded during the meeting</b>	Comment noted. Please note that this has been done through a winded search. This search has provided postal addresses of the various affected parties.
Mr Vermeulen asked if other I&APs from different areas within the study area were aware of the public meeting. He further stated that the landowners who complain the most are not present at the meeting.	<b>Mr Vermeulen (15 January 2009) – Recorded during the meeting</b>	All registered I&APs were informed, it is very difficult to keep people interested as they often experience fatigue with the process especially when it continues for long periods of time.
Mr Rogers queried when the final decision regarding the final route will be made and when the public will be notified.	<b>Mr Algie Rogers(15 January 2009)- Recorded during meeting</b>	The public will be notified once the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) is submitted to the Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism (DEAT) and a RoD is issued. The public will have thirty days to review the report and make any comments; this should be near the end of March or April.

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
<p>An estate has been built near where the blue route is running. He went on to say that the line affects the whole area and the landowners have not been notified. There is a need to consult more landowners that are affected.</p> <p>He further stated that not everybody reads the fine print in newspapers and that if the public input is really valuable, the consultants would try harder.</p>	<p><b>Mr Hennie Kruger (15 January 2009) – Recorded during meeting</b></p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Arcus GIBB have gone to extremes to ensure that more people are involved and have always tried to do more than what the law requires of us to do. There is also a responsibility on the affected parties to come forward and participate. As the EIA Process is often over long periods of time, thus new developments or new information comes up and is not brought to the consultant's attention which results in major issues.</p>
<p>There is no need for advertisements in the newspaper, if there are twenty (20) people affected by the proposed routes.</p>	<p><b>Mr Igor Klopčič (15 January 2009) – Recorded during meeting</b></p>	<p>Twenty (20) people may be affected in each of the eight alternatives. Therefore close to two hundred people are affected in total.</p>
<p>Mr Goldsmith said that he knows it is very frustrating to send emails and post letters and not get a response. He went on to say that Eskom should consider those landowners that attended the meeting. People that participate should reap the benefits.</p>	<p><b>Mr Alan Goldsmith (15 January 2009) – Recorded during meeting</b></p>	<p>The project has been ongoing for years and people do get tired of coming to the meetings. It is very difficult to convince people that their issues are considered.</p>
<p><b>SCOPING PHASE – COMMENT ON DRAFT REPORT</b></p>		



Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
<p>We happened to become aware of the proposed power line purely by chance. Although our estate borders on one of the proposed alternative routes for the power line, while another alternative passes <u>through</u> our estate, and although you have access to the Eskom database while all the occupied portions purchase electricity from Eskom, we have not been notified of the proposed planned power line. In our opinion, this is a huge and inexcusable omission. We believe that you have been holding meetings with I&amp;AP's without having representation by one of the important portions of land that will be impacted upon directly by the proposed development, Sterkfontein Country Estates.</p> <p>You claim to have advertised in local newspapers distributed in Randfontein and Roodepoort, neither of which covers the area we represent. Our estate falls within the Mogale City Local Municipal area. Another omission on your part. Although these local newspapers are distributed (usually free of charge or at a nominal cost) in the urban areas, they are <u>not</u> distributed in rural areas and as the entire proposed power line passes through rural areas and not urban areas, we consider this another huge omission on your part.</p>	<p><b>Management Committee – Sterkfontein Country Estate (02 February 2009) - Email</b></p>	<p>Please note that every requirement was fulfilled by Arcus GIBB in terms of the Public Participation Process (PPP). At the start of the project, “knock and drop” visits were made twice, where a Background Information Document (BID) was distributed to landowners within the study area. Further to this, posters notifying landowners of the project were erected around the study area. The Eskom database is not made available to consultants or any other members of the public as these details are confidential. However, Eskom have conducted a windeed search for all properties potentially affected by the proposed route alternatives. This search was then taken to the municipality to request for postal addresses so that all landowners could be notified of the project. The Municipality did provide postal addresses but did not match these with the name of the landowner, thus general letters were posted to these postal addresses. Only 2 (two) responses were received.</p> <p>Arcus GIBB sincerely apologises for this omission however please note that a number of the registered I&amp;APs on the database are from portions of the Farm Sterkfontein 173 IQ, we feel that landowners also have a duty to inform other I&amp;APs of the development. It is a dual role that we have encouraged from the very beginning of this process.</p> <p>With regards to the newspapers used to advertise the EIA Process, please be advised that initially the Randfontein Herald and the Roodepoort Rekord were used. At the first public meeting held on 04 March 2008, it was indicated that the Krugersdorp News should be used instead, thus this was immediately rectified. The release of the revised Scoping Report and the notice of the second public meeting were both advertised in the Randfontein Herald and in the Krugersdorp News. The advertisements can be found in <b>Appendix C1</b> in the Final Scoping Report.</p>
<p><b>13. GENERAL COMMENTS &amp; ISSUES RAISED</b></p>		

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
<b>SCOPING PHASE - GENERAL CORRESPONDENCE</b>		
<p>Mr Rogers highlighted that there is a strong objection to the power line within the community. He promised to forward a document containing the various signatories confirming the objection.<sup>1</sup></p> <p>Mr Rogers suggested that a meeting should take place and he requested a map, which clearly indicates the proposed power line corridors and the substation locations. Mr Rogers requested the names and contact details of the landowners who were consulted with by Eskom.</p> <p>Mr Rogers also requested the name and contact details of the Eskom representative who undertook the initial consultation with the landowners.</p>	<b>Mr Algie Rogers</b>	<p>Arcus GIBB emailed (8 November 2007) a PDF version of the map, which would allow for the viewer to zoom in and out of specific areas of interest. Hardcopies of the updated maps are provided in <b>Appendix A</b> of the Draft Scoping Report.</p> <p>Arcus GIBB also requested that Mr Rogers submits his and other landowners' objections, in writing, in order for ARCUS GIBB to adequately address their issues.</p> <p>Arcus GIBB provided clarity with regards to the consultation undertaken by Eskom and apologised for the confusion created. Eskom initiated the process of consultation with landowners. However, given that the project was in a preliminary / design phase it was deemed more appropriate for landowners to be informed of the proposed project through the EIA process. Once a preferred alignment is selected, based on the outcome of the EIA process (including the Public Participation Process), Eskom will proceed to liaise directly with the affected landowners.</p> <p>The names of the landowners that Eskom consulted were provided to Mr Rogers via email.</p>
<p>Mr Paul informed Arcus GIBB that he strongly objects to the project occurring in such close proximity to his property.</p> <p>Mr Paul requested the names and contact details of the landowners who were consulted by Eskom.</p> <p>Mr Paul also questioned whether the landowners will be compensated.</p>	<b>Mr Paul</b>	<p>Objection noted.</p> <p>The names of the landowners that Eskom consulted were provided to Mr Paul via email (14 November 2007).</p> <p>After completion of the EIA process, the Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism (DEAT) will determine the most suitable corridor for the proposed power line. Once this decision is made, Eskom will proceed to negotiate any compensation with relevant landowners.</p>
<p>Ms Stoffberg stated that the development falls within the area of jurisdiction of the West Rand District Municipality.</p>	<b>Ms Susan Stoffberg (24 January 2008) - Email</b>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>We plan to develop the land and therefore oppose against any development on our property.</p>	<b>Abraham Van Der Berg (03 December 2007) - Facsimile</b>	<p>Objection noted</p>
<p>We plan to develop the land and therefore oppose against any development on our property.</p>	<b>Rynier Van Der Berg (03 December 2007) - Facsimile</b>	<p>Objection Noted</p>

<sup>1</sup> Document promised by Mr Rogers has not been received by Arcus GIBB to date.

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
<p>I am very concerned and grieved that I was told by an Eskom representative that if I do not agree to a servitude on my property it will be expropriated. With this, including all points above and with potential future/new issues (which I will take up under advisement) in mind, I reserve all my rights as well as any legal issues etc <b>without</b> reserve.</p>	<p><b>Mr Algie Rogers (10 March 2008) - Email</b></p>	<p>Eskoms powerline servitudes over privately owned land is a very sensitive issue and has both legal and emotional connotations attached to it.</p>
<p>The information on the above matter was not brought to our attention from any entity involved in the proposed power line construction.</p> <p>The proposed lines H, F to G, FG I to J, will be erected on the border of SCE which also forms part of The Cradle of Human Kind, World Heritage Site. (COHWHS)</p> <p>The impact of this project will have an adverse effect on ecological &amp; property value of members</p> <p>My neighbour, Mr. H Kruger has provided me with information of the proposed power lines to be constructed, but would appreciate your direct input on this matter.</p> <p>As a director of SCE body corporate, I request that all relevant public information to be distributed to all affected members of the estate.</p> <p>I will be able to assist you in providing contact details of the SCE members for this purpose.</p>	<p><b>Christo Pretorius (19 January 2009) - Email</b></p>	<p>Thank you for coming forward with your concerns. Please note that it is not too late for you or other parties to become involved in the EIA (Environmental Impact Assessment) Process.</p> <p>Please note that an ecology study has been conducted as part of the EIA.</p> <p>The Revised Draft Scoping Report for the project shall assist you with understanding the project and the EIA Process.</p> <p>Your comments are welcome, the commenting period on the report ends on <b>02 February 2009</b>. Further to this, I have added you as an Interested and Affected Party on the database for the project. You will thus be kept informed of project developments and the availability of project documentation.</p> <p>Your assistance with the contact details of the relevant stakeholders would be greatly appreciated.</p>

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
<p>We as Sterkfontein Country Estate have received the proposal for the new power line only this morning 19/01/2009 where we as management of the estate was not informed of the proposed new power line development even though it will have an direct impact on Sterkfontein Country estate .</p> <p>Sterkfontein Country Estates represent approx 64 homeowners we have contacted all the relevant parties on the estate and we have received a mandate to fight the new development with tooth and nail where it will affect the estates , we as a home owners association will not give our blessing for any development that will have an impact on our Estate we therefore will not give any permission for a power line running through the estate or on any of our borders.</p> <p>We do understand that we can not stop progress but the fact that Management was not known in the decision making process or consulted up to date is appalling to say the least.</p> <p>Please note a petition stopping the proposed power line through the ESTATE and along our borders will follow shortly .</p>	<p><b>Mr Paul Hoogendyk (19 January 2009) - Email</b></p>	<p>Arcus GIBB (Pty) Ltd have been appointed as the independent environmental consultants for this proposed development. As consultants we are responsible for compiling the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and undertaking a Public Participation Process (PPP). The findings of our reports and process are submitted to the relevant authority, in this case it is the Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism (DEAT), who consider the project and issue a Record of Decision (RoD). The project is currently still in the beginning stages of the process with a revised draft scoping report presently out for public review.</p> <p>The first draft of the scoping report was released at the beginning of 2008, where a Public Meeting was held on 04 March 2008. This meeting highlighted a significant objection by the various interested and affected parties (I&amp;APs) to the proposed project alternatives and the project itself. This meeting has thus resulted in the need for Eskom to re-evaluate the proposed project alternatives. Two additional route alternatives for the proposed powerline were identified during these meetings.</p> <p>The following power line corridor alternatives were initially assessed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Three (3) alternative power line corridors from the existing Westgate Substation to Tarlton Substation (Corridors 1-3)</li> <li>Three (3) alternative power line corridors from the existing Tarlton Substation to the proposed Kromdraai Substation (Corridors 4-6)</li> <li>Two (2) additional route alignment alternatives identified:</li> </ul> <p><b>Corridor 7:</b> Starting from the existing Westgate Substation to Tarlton Substation ending at the proposed Kromdraai Substation. Combination of other proposed alignments with a section running along the Krugersdorp Game Reserve.</p>

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
		<p><b>Corridor 8:</b> Disjointed and utilises sections of other proposed alignments linking the substations.</p> <p>Due to the fact that new route alternatives were identified, a revision of the Draft Scoping Report (DSR) was required. The new route alternatives were presented at a public meeting held on 15 January 2009 (held during the review of the revised draft scoping report)</p> <p>The Revised Draft Scoping Report shall assist you with understanding the project and the EIA Process.</p> <p>Currently, we are at the stage of finalising the Environmental Scoping Report (ESR) for submission to DEAT (attached document). The commenting period on the report ends on 02 February 2009. Please note that the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Phase has yet to be undertaken, thus it is not too late for you or other parties to become involved in the EIA (Environmental Impact Assessment) Process. It should also be noted that a final preferred alignment has not been recommended at this stage as this will only occur once the EIA phase has been completed.</p> <p>Your objection has been noted and shall be included in an Issues and Response Report which shall be submitted with the Final Environmental Scoping Report (FESR) for commenting by the authorities.</p> <p>Please note that every effort has been made to inform all affected residents during this scoping phase, please refer to the chapter on the public participation process for further details.</p> <p>You have been registered as an Interested &amp; Affected Party (I&amp;AP) on the database for the project. You will thus be kept informed of the status of the project and of the availability of any project documentation.</p>
<b>SCOPING PHASE – MEETINGS</b>		
Mr Esterhuizen queried the timeframe for the proposed project.	<b>Mr Esterhuizen (04 March 2008) Recorded during the meeting</b>	Construction can be expected to take place at the beginning of 2009.
Mr Brand wanted to know what was considered in terms of interests when designing the route and the corridor alternatives	<b>Mr Herman Brand (04 March 2008) Recorded during the meeting</b>	These factors shall be discussed in the Impact assessment phase of the EIA Process.

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
Mr Brand wanted to know if one person decides where the power line goes through.	<b>Mr Herman Brand (04 March 2008) Recorded during the meeting</b>	There is a team of people working on the project as a whole that investigate and assess the feasibility of each alternative. Some of the people who assist in choosing an appropriate route; are the specialists, the environmental team and Eskom engineers.
<p>For the record, if it was not for a recipient unknown letter that was posted to my home address I would not have known about the proposed power line routes. I have checked with the other land owners in the area and no one seems to know about the proposals. This tells me that the communication network has failed to inform possible affected land owners.</p> <p>I have looked at the maps and the routes that affect me personally are:</p> <p><b>ORIGINAL PROPOSAL</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Point F to point F.G. (Light pink line) This means that I will have a double power line running through the corner of my property.</li> <li>2) Point D to point H. This is running through portion 78 and portion 93 of my properties.</li> </ol> <p>I find this totally unacceptable as I will not be able to sell my ground commercially as the value will decrease substantially and it will look like an Eskom power station.</p> <p><b>2ND PROPOSAL</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Point H to point J ( Green line)</li> <li>2) Point I to point IK ( Blue line)</li> </ol> <p>Once again this will affect the value of my ground and it will end up looking like a railway junction.</p> <p>If you look at point F1K to point 1K, these lines are going through Sterkfontein Estates and all these proposals are affecting the area from a resale point and the aesthetics of the area.</p> <p>I appose all these routes that affect myself and the estate.</p>	<b>Mr Hennie Kruger (14 August 2008) - Email</b>	<p>Please note that every effort was made in informing all affected landowners, a windeed search was conducted and the Krugersdorp Municipality assisted with the Postal Addresses of all landowners. A letter informing all I&amp;APs of the proposed development and encouraging them to register on the database was sent in November 2007. However it is difficult to determine if it were received or not as the postal address was the only communication link.</p> <p>Your objection to the route alternatives has been noted. In general terms it is common knowledge that residential property situated alongside a powerline is less desirable than property without such infrastructure. The extent to which the value would be less than a similar property without a powerline is dependent on various factors including: the affluence of an area, visual appearance of such infrastructure and the mis-perception of powerlines. Please note that a Visual Impact Assessment will be undertaken as part of this EIA Process to determine the potential impacts of the proposed development on the aesthetics of an area.</p>
Mr Vermeulen said that he is one of two people from his area that attended the public meeting. He went on to say that they will be left with the problem when they are unable to sell their houses due to the presence of the power line. The loss is then incurred by the surrounding landowners as well.	<b>Mr Vermeulen (15 January 2009) – Recorded during meeting</b>	It is also the responsibility of the landowners to share the information.
Mr Klopovic questioned whether there was not any public land that could be used.	<b>Mr Igor Klopovic (15 January 2009) – Recorded during meeting</b>	Roadside farms boundaries are followed as far as possible, in order to prevent having alternatives that cut through properties.
Prefer corridor eight (8), then corridor seven (7).	<b>Mr H. Kruger and Mr E. Vermeulen (15 January 2009) – Recorded during meeting</b>	Comment Noted.
Mr Rogers asked if the routes where aligned along property boundaries.	<b>Mr Algie Rogers (15 January 2009) – Recorded during meeting</b>	They are aligned as much as possible, however it is not always possible to align the routes to property boundaries.

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
<b>SCOPING PHASE – COMMENT ON DRAFT REPORT</b>		
<p>The West Rand District Municipality (Environmental Management Section) is in agreement with the proposed specialist studies in the report, the latter which are to form part of the Environmental Impact Report.</p>	<p><b>West Rand District Municipality (09 January 2009) - Post</b></p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>According to page 2-4 and page 8-1 of the report the placement of towers on the banks of drainage lines may occur. It must be noted that the placements require a Water Use Authorisation (WUA) from this Department in terms of Section 21 (c) and (i) of the National Water Act, 1998. The other water use identified in the report is on page 8-1 that water may be sourced from rivers during construction, this is a section 21 (a) water use. For this Department to approve the above-mentioned activities, licence application forms (part 1 and part 2 c, i and a) available in the Departments website <a href="http://www.dwaf.gov.za">www.dwaf.gov.za</a> should be fully completed by the proponent and submitted to this department. Furthermore a prescribed fee of R 114-00 is required for administration purposes. An external Guideline that will assist the WUA application process is also available on the department's website. The proposed activity is not recommended until a WUA has been issued by this department.</p>	<p><b>Department of Water Affairs and Forestry (02 January 2009) - Post</b></p>	<p>Comments noted. Please note that a Water Use Licence Application (WULA) will be submitted to your department should an environmental authorisation be granted by Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism (DEAT).</p>

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
<p>We, as the Management Committee of the Sterkfontein Country Estates Home Owners Association (SCE HOA) represent 65 individual portions of the farm Sterkfontein 173 IQ, i.e. Portions 114 to 178. The landowners of these portions have given us a mandate to represent all the landowners in our estate with matters relating to the proposed Eskom power line.</p> <p>On behalf of all our members, we would like to request you to record us as Interested and Affected Parties (I&amp;AP's) in this EIA and also record our objections to part of the project as described.</p> <p>In the light of the objections and facts made, we recommend that you consider routing the proposed power line along an entirely different route in such a way that it does not cross over or near our estate or the many caves and fossil sites associated with our estate and the palaeontological site.</p> <p>Due to the fact that our estate was omitted from your I&amp;AP process and given the limited time and incompleteness of the documentation we have at our disposal, we reserve the option to amend and/or add to our list of objections to the proposed power line at any time in the future.</p> <p>We also request you to forward all previous correspondence and documentation relating to the proposed power line to us and, as we have not had the opportunity to discuss the matter in a public forum, also to provide us with dates and a venue close by to discuss the matter in an official public forum as part of the I&amp;AP process. The EIA process should be placed on hold until this meeting has taken place.</p>	<p><b>Management Committee – Sterkfontein Country Estate (02 February 2009) – Email</b></p>	<p>Please note that all directors listed on your correspondence have been added onto the I&amp;AP database for the proposed development.</p> <p>All objections have been noted and have been incorporated into this Issues and Response Report.</p> <p>Kindly be advised that the EIA Process is still in the early stages, the public meetings for the Scoping Phase are over, however there will be public meetings held during the Impact Assessment Phase, where additional issues may be raised. The issues raised by the committee shall be submitted to the relevant authority in the form of this report.</p>



Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
<p>The Department of Integrated Environmental Management (DIEM) of Mogale City Local Municipality (MCLM) had the following comments to make:</p> <p>One of the principle "non-use values" of the natural environment is scenic beauty, which attracts visitors and makes conservation profitable. This value has been measured through environmental valuation techniques commonly employed in Environmental resources Economics. With this perspective in mind, it is of paramount importance that man-made infrastructure, which can spoil scenic beauty, be avoided or managed carefully. It is doubtful whether the negative visual impact of the proposed route through the Krugersdorp Game Reserve can be mitigated in an economically feasible manner Any negative visual impact will devalue the scenic beauty of the Game Reserve and has a direct bearing on the asset value. The Game reserve is a public asset and a protected area and it would not be in the best interest of the public or the Municipality to place the powerline in the Game Reserve.</p> <p>It is well known that the Krugersdorp Game Reserve is frequented by various birds of prey. The negative effects of powerlines placed within the flight paths of large birds of prey are well documented. "Bird Flippers" are often placed on powerlines to mitigate the risk of bird injury. While this may be an option, it should be noted that this would further aggravate the visual impact of the powerlines on the Game Reserve.</p> <p>Helicopters are used for game counting in the Game reserve and the placement of the powerlines within the area would be of high risk to aircrafts.</p> <p>Please note that the proposed route traverses the lion camp, which might be unsafe for Eskom contractors and employees for the regular maintenance of the servitude.</p> <p>Based on the above, the placement of an overhead powerline through the Krugersdorp Game Reserve is not supported.</p>	<p><b>Mogale City Local Municipality (15 June 2009) - Facsimile</b></p>	<p>Comments have been noted and considered in the compilation of the Draft Environmental Impact Report.</p>