



Ck No. 2007/196934/23      VAT No: 4030265740

**Physical Address:** 49 3rd Avenue, Highlands North, 2192

**Postal Address:** P O Box 2363, Highlands North, 2037

**Tel:** 011 4401817 **Fax:** 086 607 9841

**Contact Person :** Judith Fasheun, **Cell:** 076 876 2672, **Email:** judy@mokgope.co.za

---

Dear all,

Thank you for attending the public meeting on the 26<sup>th</sup> October 2016.

We would like to draw your attention that these minutes were drawn from notes taken from the Public Meeting; please provide corrections / additions if applicable.

We would like to advise that while utmost care was taken to record your comments accurately and faithfully, there may be some discrepancies between what has been written in the minutes that follow and what was actually said. We apologise for this and request that you correct the minutes and e-mail back to us for final amendments.

Many thanks for your participation at the meeting, as well as for your understanding regarding the minutes.

Regards

Judith Fasheun

*Mokgope Consulting cc*  
*Cell: 076 876 2672*



Ck No. 2007/196934/23 VAT No: 4030265740

Physical Address: 49 3rd Avenue, Highlands North, 2192

Postal Address: P O Box 2363, Highlands North, 2037

Tel: 011 4401817 Fax: 086 607 9841

Contact Person : Judith Fasheun, Cell: 076 876 2672, Email: judy@mokgope.co.za

## Proposed “Aggeneis-Paulputs” 400kV Transmission Powerline & Substations Upgrade, Northern Cape Province

### Meeting with I&APs held at 10h00 on 26<sup>th</sup> October 2016 at Pofadder Hotel

#### Attendees:

Judith	Fasheun	JF	Mokgope Consulting
Victoria	Somo	VS	Mokgope Consulting
Mpilo	Masondo	MM	Eskom
Jamila	Kombe	JK	Eskom
Faith	Mokhonoana	FM	Eskom
Estelle	Cloete	EC	Khai-Ma Councillor Ward 2
Annas	JHB van der Merwe	AJ	Landowner
Gerhard	Visser	GV	Landowner
G	Van der Heever	GH	Landowner
Deon	Pietersen	DP	Landowner
Pieter	van der Heever	PH	Landowner
Luise	Coertzen	LC	Landowner

Item No	Item Description	Response / Comment
1.	JF: Welcome and Introduction	
2.	JK: Presentation 1	
3.	JF: Presentation 2	
4.	<b>DISCUSSION</b>	
	<b>GV:</b> One of my biggest concerns is to know which route is preferred.	<b>JF:</b> At this stage we are not certain which would be the preferred route. However, from an environmental perspective it is always better to follow the existing line since there are already other associated infrastructure in place such as access and the area is already disturbed.
	My feeling is that they should follow the	<b>MM:</b> Your thoughts are very valid. That will be

Item No	Item Description	Response / Comment
	<p>existing line. This existing line runs through my property so I want the lines to be close together. If the line is going to follow the other routes, you will be cutting my property in different sections. So this is my comment: I want the new line to be along the existing line.</p>	<p>dealt with at a later stage when the acquisition or the negotiator comes and negotiates where the land will be crossing on your property.</p>
	<p><b>Landowner??:</b> What is the distance between the existing line and the new line? How far are they going to be apart? Can one servitude run next to the other?</p>	<p><b>FM:</b> From the centre line of the existing line to the centre line of the other one, that would be 17.5m plus the other 17.5m. That would be from centre to centre. So they don't have to build a new road, they can use the same road.</p>
	<p><b>GH:</b> I think the point that we are trying to make is also on route 3. What I am saying is that you won't go over my farm.</p> <p>Nobody visited any farm before hand, because you did not come to my farm or his farm. So my suggestion is for you to look at possible routes for the various alternative routes. So what should have happened is to have done your homework before hand. This will help you know landowners concerns by the time you do negotiations. Anyway, my concern is that Corridor 3 is not possible, he said the same thing and he is saying the same thing.</p> <p>Corridor 3 is avoiding the mine. This powerline is not taking power to Paulputs, am I right? No it is taking power for Paulputs. There is a 40MW load in Paulputs right now. What is the study showing...the increase in electricity demands but this is not a Pofadder line it is a Paulputs line to Aggeneys. Now who is demanding more power now? It is the mine. Plus they need more for the smelter.</p> <p>The mine does not know what they want to do, they chance every six months. What I am saying is, why don't you go over their property, by deviating the green line to cross over the mine's property since they are the ones who need more power than us. So if you choose the green line, our suggestion is to go over the mine's property.</p>	<p><b>JK:</b> So if there were no renewable, It takes power to Paulputs.</p> <p><b>JK:</b> Just to answer in terms of Black Mountain; they have put in an application through to us for the additional supply of activities. Currently they are being supplied from Aggeneis. Apparently they are most likely not to build the smelter, Instead they will take the raw material and transport it to Saldana.</p>
	<p><b>GH:</b> I know for a fact that on the other side of</p>	<p><b>JK:</b> Just to give you an idea in terms of black</p>

Item No	Item Description	Response / Comment
	<p>Gamsberg you can see an existing line then it crosses the road. The reason why it crosses the road to the northern side is because the mine wants to build the so called smelter. So if they are saying they are not going to build the smelter you can stick on the southern side of the tar road and you can stick on their property. But the mine will say no, because they are thinking of building the smelter, so you must go over the road. When you go further you get to Abrie van Nieker's property where they are busy constructing a solar plant and that is already approved.</p>	<p>mountain: we have engaged with them and we have been engaging with them for many years. When the mine was still owned by Anglo they had an idea of putting a smelter there. So they put in an application to Eskom to request 300MW. Then they sold the operations to Vendata.</p> <p>I was here about two years ago and had a meeting with the mine. I said "what about your plans for your need for power because right now you only asked for 40MW to do this just for this operations?". So we Eskom suggested that they needed to give us an idea of their 20 year plan and their 30 year plan of how much power they would need if their operations are going to expand. So when we spoke to the mine, they said they took away the idea of the smelter, because during 2008/9, Eskom did not have enough power to supply the whole country. Hence the mine had to re-think and pull back that idea of the smelter.</p> <p>I spoke to the mine yesterday and asked if they were going to need more power supply? They mentioned that the smelter is not likely to be placed here (<i>pointing at the map</i>) but they will take the raw material to Saldana. I would need to have this in writing.</p> <p>Even if the mine wants the smelter, it is not going to happen tomorrow. So they will put in an application, we will look at the network and ask what is the least cost solution to actually supply them with the amount they want. The fact that we have a 400kV just coming from Aggeneis, we have that as an option because its aligned with higher capacity. We can look at other options and think of the least costs to the country because it is not about the least cost for Black Mountain on how to get their power.</p> <p>So if the mine requests for more power, we would have already taken it into account when we were proposing this project and at that point we also thought of what was going around in the area. Pofadder and other surrounding towns are gradually growing but at a slow pace.</p>
	<p><b>GV:</b> <i>He was showing us on the map; suggesting where to deviate route three.</i></p>	

Item No	Item Description	Response / Comment
	<p><b>GH:</b> None of the landowners would agree to Route 3 as the affected landowners would tell you to stick to the road. So what I am trying to say is; before you start negotiating it would better to take our concerns first. I won't even allow the specialists to come and look for something that is sensitive on my farm because I don't see why.</p>	
	<p><b>GV:</b> What is the length of the green line? So there is a cost implication there if this Route 3 is chosen and the environmental impact as well would be higher.</p>	<p><b>JF:</b> We don't know the exact length but it may be longer than the other lines.</p>
	<p><b>GH:</b> Can somebody explain to me what the ratio of that green line is? Why is it even there? I understand you have to have alternatives; however you should have chosen to go to the north. If you chose route three, an alternative is to go right next to the mountain.</p>	<p><b>MM:</b> We are required to have different alternatives</p>
	<p><b>PH:</b> How is the new solar plant going to connect to Aggeneis substation? Will the new solar plant connect to the new powerline?</p> <p>In that case it would be also better for the new line to go on the other side of the road to miss that new proposed solar farm.</p>	<p><b>JK:</b> The solar farm will connect to the substation. They will have smaller lines that will connect to the substation.</p> <p><b>JK:</b> The solar has already been proposed and the land has already been sterilized for them. Hence for Eskom to cross through their land will clash with them. So we will need to avoid them.</p>
	<p><b>GV:</b> Have you considered upgrading the existing line to a 400kV line?</p> <p><b>GV:</b> So you are going to keep the old one and build the new line?</p>	<p><b>JK:</b> This is one of the key issues from a planning perspective. We discussed that when we get the servitude for the new line, we would have to make sure that if we plan to energize this line to 400kV, then we are not in violation. We need to make sure that there is also space for the existing line to go from 33 to 55m servitude. In terms of implementation, we would have to build the new line first, then we would be unreliable again because now we need to energize...FM would have to tell us how she would get the existing line to 400kV and energise it, so she would have to advise us accordingly.</p> <p><b>JK:</b> Yes.</p>

Item No	Item Description	Response / Comment
	<p><b>GH:</b> So inclusion, you understand what we are saying? We are saying that Route 3 is not a possibility because many of the affected landowners are opposing Route 3.</p>	<p><b>JK:</b> We understand. You are really being helpful by giving us this information because we don't want to get to the level of negotiating and then the farmer now start opposing at that later stage.</p>
	<p><b>GH:</b> For the affected landowner, do they get compensated?</p>	<p><b>MM:</b> Eskom Hires the services of a valuer who will come down and see the area which is going to be affected by the line. Eskom would compensate you for the loss that you will incur for not being able to use that part of your land.</p>
	<p><b>LC:</b> I have seen quite a few Heritage impact studies that have been presented to us and I have also seen Dr Morris name in a few of those projects. I have seen artifacts that they have found in our study area. When I ask where those artifacts are, the answer is that all of them are at the McGregor Museum. I have a problem with that. Everything they find in our area goes to the McGregor Museum. I suggest that when you do further Heritage impact studies and you find things about heritage, I think we should be informed and that the artifacts be kept here. I don't think they should leave our area.</p>	<p><b>JF:</b> Yes it makes sense that your artifacts should be kept in their appropriate area. We will forward your comments to Dr Morris to hear what he has to say about this issue and why the artifacts are being kept in Kimberley area. Thank you.</p>
	<p><b>Landowner??:</b> Everyone is talking about Route 1 and 3. Nobody is talking about route 2, so is that route taken out?</p> <p>Route 2 is not good for me because it is running right next to my house.</p>	<p><b>JF:</b> No, all the three routes are being considered for the studies. So in Phase 2 of the EIA, we will have a final route which is to be considered for Environmental Authorisation.</p> <p>Thank you for your input, hence we will document all these concerns which will help us weigh the options of why one route is more feasible than the other routes or why a certain route has to be deviated to avoid certain obstacles as a mitigation measure.</p>
5.	Meeting was declared closed.	