

Matimba B Transmission Integration Project

Submission of Letters to Consultants and Responses thereto

(Please note that these are shortened versions of the letters, however all letters have been attached as appendixes.)

September 2007

Letter received from:

**GVD Inc on behalf of MW de Jager Kinder Trust, MW de Jager and Landelani Lodge
8 March 2007**

*Nooitgedacht 514
Vlakvlei 516*

We are requested to note our clients' formal objections to the proposed power lines and any substation of the proposed Mmamabula-Delta and Matimba B Transmission Integration Project.

The specialist reports are generalized aspects to a greater region and not site specific.

Response:

The consultant had to consider numerous aspects with regards to the study area and due to the extent of the study area. It is not possible to conduct such studies in any other way. However after scoping studies were aimed at determining further issues more related to the specific landowners as affected along the proposed corridor options. In addition an attempt was made to meet with individual landowners potentially affected to determine their individual issues and site specific problems in an attempt to finalise route selections and to determine possible applicable mitigation for each individual.

None of the comments by any of the specialists and relevant authorities contributing to the report, took into consideration the direct consequences the proposed power lines and the result it will have on specific properties, specifically those of our clients.

Response:

This statement is not factually correct as the studies from the onset considered such consequences wherever relevant information and public feedback was available. In the social specialist's reports this is especially evident. The direct consequences for most of the landowners who participated in this process are well known and specific mitigation measures are proposed in most of these cases. Unfortunately the proposed mitigation is not always acceptable to all landowners and it is the relevant authority's responsibility to make an informed decision in this regard, it is not the consultant's decision.

Our clients business will be directly affected as it is exclusively aimed at the international ecotourism and trophy hunting market, as well as breeding of rare species animals. The visual impact of the proposed power lines and substation or stations will directly influence the business of our clients.

Response:

The consultant is aware of this and acknowledges the fact that this business could be affected. The eventual extent of this impact will determine the required mitigation which could end up being a payment of actual damages by Eskom if this is found to be applicable during the negotiation phase and the affected party can provide proof accordingly. It is important to note that the consultant cannot in its assessment determine individual landowners' costs of impacts and that is why the negotiator is responsible to determine this during the negotiation phase. The issue of the value of visual impacts is also one that the consultant cannot determine and the relevant decision-making authority will have to either make a further ruling in this regard or the matter will have to be resolved in a court of law.

Please note that on the farm Nooitgedacht there are already power lines bordering the northern section of the farm and the proposed additional lines is proposed for placement to the north of these existing lines. As there are already lines there, the net impact is expected to be less than it would over new terrain as some adaptation to the existing lines could reasonably be expected.

The proposed transmission systems will negatively impact the land value.

Response:

This consultant has not been able to find any conclusive evidence supporting this statement. It has been noted that properties with power lines (or other infrastructure) appear to have reduced interest from prospective buyers. It is claimed by estate agents there is a resulting reduction in land value, but it appears there are no guideline figures for this. However, the effect is much reduced on properties where there are existing power lines.

Fauna and flora will be adversely affected. The aesthetic and pristine environment of undisturbed and virgin rural bush environment will be demolished.

Response:

There is no argument against the fact that negative impacts will occur in this regard and this is precisely why mitigation measures are proposed in the EIR for approval by the relevant authority. Some of these proposed measures are specifically proposed to ensure that bush clearing will be minimized.

The cumulative impact of large numbers of temporary workers and construction of transmission lines will severely impact the fauna and flora on the properties.

Response:

The consultant is not convinced of this statement when considering actual worker team sizes and the timeframes for which they should be in any specific area and would therefore challenge this statement. Measures in the EMP are specifically aimed at minimizing such impacts. Construction teams are confined to the servitude widths and use of heavy machinery, waste and litter control, fire management, etc. is much more controlled than in the past. Rehabilitation begins before the last construction team is finished and the landowner must be satisfied before the construction team is allowed to leave.

The mitigation factors in the report do not contain the policing or monitoring or implementation of these measures and how this will be guaranteed.
these measures and how this will be guaranteed.

Response:

An ECO will be employed by Eskom to conduct policing and monitoring. The EMP is the relevant tool utilized by the ECO to ensure that these measures are implemented. Eskom applies an ISO14001 environmental management system, and all non-conformances are reported and addressed. The ECO must keep a register of all complaints by landowners and these are to be reported to DEAT, typically on a monthly basis. DEAT may also inspect the site from time to time. DEAT may stop construction if it is apparent that unnecessary environmental damage is occurring, if landowners concerns are not being addressed, or if it appears there is inadequate environmental control of the construction process. Landowners may also report matters directly to DEAT.

Concerned about the effect the power lines will have on safety and security, as well as the maintenance and patrolling of these lines.

Response:

This concern is noted in the EIR and has been raised by various other landowners. These issues are addressed in the EIR. The consultant would strongly propose that the option of conducting servitude maintenance and management as an effective contractor to Eskom is taken up by the affected landowner to help mitigate impacts in this regard.

Alternative methods of transmission, i.e. underground has not been properly addressed as well as alternative routes, such as following the railway lines.

Response:

This statement is uninformed as the consideration of alternatives has been extensive. Clear reasons for not considering the underground option are indicated in the EIR under the applicable annexed report. The final report will also clearly indicate why following roads and railway lines would be problematic. It is also important to note that route options are based on the outcome of numerous individual considerations and that although a proposed route might not seem well planned on a large map that only displays some cadastral information, this would be misleading as to the actual effort that had been taken and the multitude of issues considered in order to determine such a route.

It is our clients view that they have to date been severely prejudiced by the time limitations and lack of independent researchers to advise them properly on the impacts of the activities proposed. Having regard to the devastating impact that the proposed activity will have on our clients property and their livelihood, our clients reserve the right to note an appeal to the MEC and to take all further steps as it may be advised to protect their interests in the matter.

Response:

The consultant has full regard for the rights of any affected party to follow due procedure and take any action as deemed necessary. With regards to time limitations, the consultant is of the opinion that reasonable timeframes have been allowed for public feedback and consideration of reports. If

however the affected party only became aware of the project or only participated at a very late stage, the consequence of an unfortunate lack of time is a reality and the affected party has the full right to launch an appeal to the relevant authority to extend the required participation period beyond that allowed for by the consultant in order to accommodate an individual person or party to the effect of being able to further participate in the process. The consultant would like to indicate that affected parties should familiarize themselves with the publicized documentation indicating the applicable process and authorities relevant to this specific EIA.

Mr De Jager was first involved in this project in August 2006. A letter was received from Mr van Dyk, as well as Pauw and Associates in this regard. It is the consultant's opinion that he has had sufficient time to comment on the documents.

**Kopana Joint Venture
15 March 2007**

This letter serves to confirm the specific discussions that were held relating to the proposed Matimba B Marang power line that crosses the site of Anglo Platinum's proposed Rustenburg Deep Shaft Project.

Anglo intend developing their Deep Shaft project on the farm Klipgat 281 JQ, of which the surface rights belong to the Royal Bafokeng Nation. A workable layout for the shaft complex can be achieved without having to consider deviation of the existing power lines.

The issue that concerns Anglo Plat's is the corridor which is finally chosen for the proposed 400kV line. If it were for example to occupy a corridor on the eastern side of the existing lines the development of the shaft complex would not be feasible without considering power line deviations.

Response:

The consultant acknowledges that the above meeting took place that discussions occurred as indicated and would like to again like to extend its appreciation for the opportunity to have such discussions. The affected party will have to consider the final route proposals as indicated in the EIR submitted for approval to confirm which of the above scenarios would be applicable.

Subsequently the EIR has been made available for public review and no further feedback in this regard was received. Therefore the consultant accepts that the issues in this regard have been addressed.

**Heritage Park – c/o Contour Project Managers CC
27 March 2007**

It has come to our attention that Eskom is planning the construction of eleven major power transmission lines through the middle of the Heritage Park corridor, namely the Matimba B and Delta-Epsilon Projects.

As you know the Heritage Park is one of the priority projects in the Growth and Development Strategy of the North West province, aiming to establish tourism as an alternative economy to mining and agriculture in the Bojanala region. The Heritage Park corridor plans to ultimately link Pilanesberg National Park with the Madikwe Game Reserve.

The planned Eskom transmission lines go exactly through the least disturbed areas of the rural landscape. These areas were selected in 2002 as the most suitable alignment for the Heritage Park, based on the limited infrastructure and minimal disturbance of the natural landscape. Lebatlane Game Reserve, a community-based ecotourism project initiated by the Bakgatla community whereby 31,000 ha of land have already been set aside for development as a Big Five Game Reserve within the Heritage Park corridor with the consent of the community and the endorsement of the Department of Land Affairs will be the first project to be negatively affected. It will mean loss of more than 1000 jobs, R1 billion in private sector investment and annual income potential of R300 million.

It is our belief that the Heritage Park (already spent R6.5 million to date) and the Lebatlane Game Reserve cannot survive if the proposed alignment of the Eskom transmission lines is allowed to continue. A suitable alternative route could surely be found around the east (rather than the west) of Lebatlane Game Reserve and Pilanesberg National Park.

Response:

It is our understanding that the latest meeting held with Mr Willie Boonzaaier essentially resolved issues surrounding the route placements for the 3 X 400kV transmission lines linking the Medupi power station and the Spitskop, Marang and Dinaledi substations. Our final proposal in the EIR to the relevant decision-making authority reflects the outcome of these discussions and we are hopeful that this project will not have a significantly negative effect on the heritage park.

As far as the 765kV power lines are concerned, we do not have any comments at this stage and the relating issues will have to be addressed as part of that process.

Makoppa Environmental Action Group on behalf of Various Landowners

5 June 2007

Recommendation: to place all power lines, as closely spaced as possible, along existing roads. Where suitably located roads do not exist lines should, wherever possible, be located along farm boundaries.

Response:

Please observe the relevant maps and sections in the applicable EIRs for the Marang and Dinaledi power lines now submitted to the DEAT. Please note that power lines are still proposed to follow existing routes in a corridor wherever possible and farm boundaries wherever such a corridor placement is not possible.

We have carefully considered the option of following roads and have found such an option not to be either sensible from an environmental point of view or practical from a design and cost point of view.

Marius Barnard
24 Julie 2007

Carolina 76 KQ / 2

Wil graag 'n dringende versoek aan Eskom rig om een van die volgende opsies te oorweeg:

- Die 3 lyne padlangs te plaas soos voorgestel op die kaarte aan ons verskaf op die vergadering;
- Die lyne oor ons eiendom aan die oostekant te plaas van die bestaande 2 lyne in plaas van die westekant soos beplan;

Response:

- Die konsultant is onder die indruk dat hierdie opsie deur die onderhandelaar as haalbaar beskou word en dus so met u onderhandel sal kan word. Neem asseblief egter kennis dat die detail kraglynplasinge nie in die OIV aangedui kan word as finale beplanning nie en dat dit slegs deur die finale ooreenkoms tydens onderhandelinge met Eskom bepaal kan word. Die OIV maak egter nou voorsiening vir 'n breër buffer van 500m wat u in staat sal stel om sodanige lynplasinge met Eskom te kan onderhandel sou die betrokke owerheid dan die OIV so aanvaar en 'n Rekord van Besluitneming daarvolgens uitreik.
- Die beplanning en oprigting van die 3 lyne te staak totdat daar meer duidelikheid is tov die ander 6 lyne wat ook beoog word;
- 'n Alternatiewe oplossing moet vind.

Ook deeglik navorsing gedoen oor die waarde van plase en grond voordat ons die plaas gekoop het. Met die verbeterings wat aangebring is is die eienaars baie sensitief oor die bedrag wat aangebied sal word vir die serwituut area. Ons dring daarop aan dat Eskom nie sal huiwer om die beste moontlike aanbod te maak vir die grond wat Eskom beoog vir die plasing van die lyne nie. Bewyse van uitgawes en die geadverteerde waardes van die eiendomme in ons omgewing vir die laaste 8 maande sowel as plase verkoop en geadverteer huidiglik sal as 'n basis van onderhandeling moet geskied tov die bedrag per hektaar wat deur ons aanvaar sal word.

Response:

Hierdie kwessies lê buite die bestek van die konsultant se omgewingimpakstudie. U vereistes sal egter gereflekteer word in die OIV en vir oorweging aan die betrokke besluitnemende owerheid voorgelê word.

Verder is ons ook baie bekommerd oor die oprigting van die torings en lyne en die impak wat dit het op nie net die waarde van die grond nie, maar ook op faktore soos: brand, skade aan

wildheining, diefstal, toiletgeriewe, water, konflik met plaaswerkers, diefstal van wild en verlies aan inkomste tydens die oprigtingsperiode. Ons wil graag bevestig dat ons skriftelike waarborge van Eskom wil he dat Eskom aanspreeklik gehou sal word vir enige verliese in hierdie verband.

Response:

Die vereiste OBP vir hierdie projek wat ook by die huidige OIV ingesluit is, is bedoel om hierdie aspekte aan te spreek. Baie van hierdie kwessies word ook in die OIV aangespreek. Weereens sal hierdie aangeleenthede gereflekteer word in die finale verslae en stel ons voor dat u dit finaal opneem met die betrokke onderhandelaar van Eskom wanneer u die relevante ooreenkomste aangaan vir die servitude oor u grond. Sien ook antwoorde aan **GVD Inc on behalf of MW de Jager Kinder Trust**.

Die ontbosting sal veroorsaak dat bestaande diere nie genoegsame weiding het nie – dit sal sterftes onder veral diere soos koedoes, wat blaarvreter is, aansienlik verhoog en ook ons uitgawes om die diere van kos te voorsien in die wintermaande.

Response:

Eskom het aangedui dat daar buigbaarheid sal wees in terme van die bogenoemde asook dat individuele grondeienaars sal kan onderhandel om servitude oor hul grond self te kan bestuur. Hierdie aangeleenthede moet ook met Eskom direk onderhandel word tydens die ondehandelingsproses.

Ons besef die noodsaaklikheid van die kraglyne, maar dat dit nie regverdig sal wees teenoor ons indien ons nie behoorlik vergoed sal word vir die nadelige gevolge wat hierdie kraglyne oor ons eiendom sal he nie.

Response:

Ons neem kennis hiervan en sal ook sorg dat u kommernisse in die verband aan die betrokke owerhede voorgelê word.

Eskom Response:

Finale belyning van die kraglyn sal deur die onderhandelaar met u onderhandel word. Die finale roete moet aan all omgewing, eienaar en tegniese voorwaardes nakom. Die OIV maak egter nou voorsiening vir 'n breër buffer van 500m wat u in staat sal stel om sodanige lynplasings met Eskom te kan onderhandel sou die betrokke owerheid dan die OIV so aanvaar en 'n Rekord van Besluitneming daarvolgens uitreik.

Eskom sal die eienaar die beste vergoeding betaal wat gestaaf kan word, die vergoeding sal deur 'n onafhanklike waardeerder bepaal word.

Die vereiste OBP vir hierdie projek wat ook by die huidige OIV ingesluit is, is bedoel om eienaars se spesiale versoeke soos diefstal ens. aan te spreek so dat konstruksie en onderhoud op die eiendom die eienaar se versoeke respekteer.

Enige finansiële verliese soos voeding vir diere as gevolg van ontbosting sal wetenskaplik bereken word en reggestel of vergoed word.

Buffelspan 329 KQ / R

Kameelpoort 332 KQ

Welgewaagd 358 KQ / R

Redes hoekom Eskom lyne nie oor Kameelpoort kan loop nie:

- **Ligging van Jagkamp:** die plase is al drie wildsplase en ons genereer slegs 'n inkomste uit die benutting van wild. Die kamp is gelee op die plaas Welgewaagd en is so uitgele dat die toeriste en jagters oor de ou lande uitkyk (teen Northam pad) waar verskillende wildsoorte in die middag kom wei. Die kamp is onlangs gerestoureer teen aansienlike finansiële koste. Die bou van kraglyne voor die kamp sal verrykende gevolge he op ons toeriste en jage bedryf wat 'n omset van R300 000 tot R400 000 per jaar het. Die bou van kraglyne het reeds beperking op ontwikkeling – wil graag die plaas inrig vir boogjag en daarvoor moer ons akkommodasie oprig. Die plaas is relatief small (3.5km op sy breedste en 1.5km op sy smalste) sal die kraglyne 'n groot gedeelte van die plaas in beslag neem en nie veel plek los om 'n kamp op te rig nie.
- **Watervoorsiening:** indien die kraglyne soos voorgestel al langs die Northam, Makoppa pad sou loop en binne ons grense van die plase sal al die boorgate wat die drie plase van water moet voorsien in gedrang wees. Almal is naby die groot pad. In die geval van Kameelpoort en Buffelspan is die hoof reservoirs ook in gedrang omdat hulle naby aan die pad gelee is. Kameelpoort se reservoirs is ook onlangs nuut oorgebou teen 'n koste van R140 000. Die dam is op 'n koppie gebou sodat die water daarvandaan met gravitasie na die suipings en huise kan loop. Indien die boorgate weer geboor of skoon gemaak moet word sal 'n boormasjien onder die kraglyne moet werk. Daar is dan ook die kwessie van statiese elektrisiteit in die water.
- **Benutting van Wild:** drie plase is afsonderlik omhein wat ons in staat stel om apart te bestuur. Gebruik wildvang dienste om die wild getalle te beheer. Verskillende soorte wild wat dit moeilik maak om daardie diere met 'n helikopter te vang. Om daardie wild uit te dun is baie minder ekonomies as om dit te vang en te verkoop. Wanneer van die spesies gejag word sal dit dan onder die kraglyne moet gebeur wat gaan beteken dat my kliente daardie spesies op 'n ander plek sal gaan jag weg van kraglyne af.
- **Plantegroei tipes:** reeds veldopnames gemaak deur ekoloe (Dubel Integrated Environmental Services van Polokwane) en 15 verskillende plantegroei tipes is geïdentifiseer. Die tipes wat geraak gaan word deur die beoogde roetes is: oop hardekool, verdigte sekelbos stande, turf doringveld, ou lande, larentelkoorsbessie – rooiboskwartsietrif, sering – vaalboom sandveld, tambotie – kwarriebrakveld, verdigte tambotie – bosvy dreinerings, raasblaar – harpuijsboom terrasveld. Die plantegroei is dalk nie skaars nie, maar is van kardinale belang vir diversiteit van ons plaas.

- **Brandprogram:** met die bestuur van hierdie veldtipes is dit noodsaaklik om die plantegroei tipes te brand om bosverdigting te beheer en goeie graslaag te verseker. Die uitsluiting van brande kan veroorsaak dat gras "moribund" raak en die smaaklikheid en produktiwiteit van die gras gaan verlore. Ongeluksvure onder die lyne op verkeerde tye kan baie negatiewe gevolge vir die ekologiese bestuur van die plaas in geheel he. Die brandprogram word vooruit beplan en ten einde effektief te brand om nie oorbeweiding te bewerkstellig nie moet groot gedeeltes van die plaas op 'n slag gebrand word. As daar reeds gedeelte gebrand is en daar sou nog 'n brand onder die kraglyn ontstaan gaan ons 'n tekort aan weiding he. Maak ook jaarliks voorbrande langs die groot pad om ons te beskerm van buite vure. Om te verseker dat ons bos nie weer verdig nada tons ontbos het nie moet ons vure soms 'n hoe intensiteit he, soda tons die bogrondse dele van houtagtiges dood kan brand. Dit sal dan beteken dat ons onder die kraglyne sal moet brand soms met warm vure.
- **Estetika:** die enigste rigting waarvan die plase betree kan word is van die weste kant. Al drie plase se ingange is op die Northam-Makoppa pad. Ons kliente sal nou onderdeur kraglyne moet ry om die plaas te betree wat 'n geweldige negatiewe indruk gaan skep. Ons beskik ook oor koppies op die plaas wat ons as uitkykpunte gebruik. Die moontlikheid van 'n lodge op een van die koppies word ook ondersoek en die kraglyne gaan ons pragtige uitsig van die bosveld ongelooflik bederf.

Ons vertrou dat u die fakore in alle erns in ag sal neem met u besluite van waar die kraglyne geplaas gaan word.

Response:

Geagte Menere

Ons wil u graag bedank vir die moeite wat u gedoen het om ons van die inligting in u brief te voorsien. Hoewel ons nie die goedkeuring van die huidige OIV kan vooruitloop nie, is dit wel vir ons moontlik om u te kan verwittig dat die voorheen voorgestelde roete wat oor of op die grense van die genoemde plase sou loop, nou nie meer as ons hoofvoorstel aangedui word nie. Verskeie redes hiervoor is van toepassing en indien u meer inligting hieroor sou wou bekom is u welkom om die finale OIV wat nou by die betrokke owerhede ingedien sal word te bestudeer. Die implikasies hiervan is dat indien die OIV, soos dit nou daaruitsien, goedgekeur sou word, die plase onder u bestuur, nie meer geraak sal word deur die beplande 400kV kraglyne nie.

Response:

**Duard Barnard on behalf of Messrs J Bodenstein and P Lamprecht
9 August 2007**

I was asked by my clients Messrs J Bodenstein and P Lamprecht, that act in their own capacity and as representatives of other farmers in the area, to write this letter to you.

The process for the permitting of 400 KVA power lines from Eskom Matimba B to Marang and Dinaledi refers. My clients got to know about the proposed power lines at a very late stage. For example, some heard of the proposed power lines as long ago as June (which leaves them little time for preparation) while others heard of the proposed power lines by chance during the beginning of August 2007. They feel that the period given to them to react by the 24th August 2007 to the EIA for the proposed power lines is completely inadequate.

Response:

The process for the 400kV transmission power line started in July 2006. Mr Lamprecht (his father) attended a meeting in Sentrum on 31 October 2006. He was then registered on the database for I&APs. He received notification of the availability of the EIR in June and was also invited to the Focus Group Meeting held in July for this project. The time period given with regards to comments on the 400kV is sufficient from the consultant's viewpoint.

Mr Bodenstein contacted the consultants in June this year – the consultants had not previously contacted with him. He attended the meeting in July regarding this project and was afforded the same time period to comment on the EIR as other I&APs, until 24 August 2007 which was extended to 10 September 2007. He had two months to submit his comments from the date of the meeting held in July.

There is a further circumstance that makes this period far too short. Your attention is directed to the fact that a 765 KV a line must also be positioned from North to South in this area. There is still an unresolved debate as to whether or not several power lines could be positioned in one corridor fairly close to each other or whether a 2 km or other minimum distance at least should be maintained between power lines.

This matter, by arrangement with you, Eskom and Mr Sergei Steyn on behalf of Makkoppa Environmental Action Group, will be debated by several electrical specialists towards the end of August 2007. This debate will result in the formulation of a clear policy that allows for the correct minimum distances between power lines to be established. This exercise would not only have to be executed for the purposes of the North South power lines, it would also be essential for the planning of the East West power lines from Matimba to Mmamabula in Botswana and, in fact, in the rest of the country.

In view of the uncertainty as to the distances between power lines, neither the EIA with regard to the 400 KV (the EIA dealt with in this letter) and the EIA for the 765 KV a can be completed. (The EIA with regard to the 765 KV a power lines had hardly commenced and a Scoping Report for it must still be prepared. It will be realised that the question regarding distances between power lines must be resolved before scoping can be undertaken.)

The question as to the minimum distances between power lines affect the positioning of both the 400 KV a hand the 765 KV a. All the power lines may be positioned close to each and other and, for environmental reasons, they should be positioned close to the other. The width of all the power lines so established makes the positioning of the one set of lines for example the 400 kVa line, if it had all really been decided, to be unacceptable.

My clients therefore have no choice but to await the finalisation of the preliminary question as to what the distances between power lines should be. Once that question had been resolved, my clients will prepare suggested alternative position for the power lines. They have already started preparing different positions in which power lines could be established. They would also work together with the farmers represented by Mr Sergei Steyn in order to ensure that their suggestions are the result of integrated planning. Their contribution in this regard will be very important in view thereof that my clients have extensive and intelligent indigenous knowledge as to the circumstances pertaining to the possible positioning of power lines.

It is essential to realise that the EIA cannot be submitted to the Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism until the alternatives suggested by my clients had been debated with my client and considered carefully by you. After all, public participation does not only amount to passive audiences being informed of the decisions of consultant as to the position of the power lines. It has the further requirement that people should be involved. This would mean that they actively share in the developing of alternative positions for the power line. This is precisely what my clients want to do.

Response:

Please be advised that Eskom has recently issued a general letter to all interested and affected parties of the 3 X 400kV Marang and Dinaledi power line EIA. In this letter Eskom undertakes to keep all future Transmission power lines away from the properties currently identified for the new 3 x 400kV lines to the Marang and Dinaledi Substations. Should this not be possible in certain circumstances Eskom would be willing to buy such land. Additionally the EIR for the 400kV power lines has concluded that the proposed 400kV power lines can be placed in servitudes directly adjacent the existing power line servitudes along the proposed route as indicated in this report. Considering these facts, it is believed that interested and affected parties have now received sufficient time to consider this project proposal and it was decided that the EIR for the Marang and Dinaledi 400kV power lines could continue and consequently the report has been finalized for submission to the relevant decision-making authority.

The issues surrounding consideration of the 765kV power lines as part of a cumulative approach are still of concern but it is held that the Dinaledi and Marang 400kV power lines proposed has followed a comprehensive EIA process with justifiable methodology and outcomes which would rather affect the latter 765kV project and cannot be redesigned based on the findings of that study which in essence is still only in its beginning stages. Furthermore it is held that several issues surrounding the 765kV power lines still need to be resolved and that these issues could still affect decision-making for the 765kV lines. Should the 400kV power line project be delayed until the issues surrounding the 765kV lines are concluded, this could delay the project by another year which would have serious consequences for the implementation of the proposed 400kV lines in time for the completion of the Medupi Power Station. In turn, this would have serious consequences for power supply in the country as a whole.

The consultant is of the opinion that the final reports for the Marang and Dinaledi 400kV power lines are ready for and should now be submitted to the relevant authority as sufficient public participation has occurred, no new route proposals have been submitted that require additional assessment and that if there are any concerns from interested and affected parties regarding the process followed or the timeframes allowed, that this is now a matter for further consideration by the relevant decision-making authority namely the DEAT. Any further correspondence in this regard to the effect of extension requests or appeals should therefore be directed to the DEAT.

Duard Barnard on behalf of Sergei Steyn and the Makoppa Environmental Action Group
9 August 2007

I was asked by my client Mr Sergei Steyn on behalf of the Makoppa Environmental Action Group that represents many other farmers, to write this letter to you.

The process for the permitting of the 400 KVA power lines from Eskom Matimba B to Marang and Dinaledi refers. My client, and through him, many other farmers got to know about the proposed power lines at a late stage. He feels that the period given to him to react by the 24th August 2007 to the EIA for the proposed power lines is inadequate. He has however commenced with his preparation. He should be able to respond fairly soon, even if it is not by the 24th August 2007.

Response:

The process for the 400kV transmission power line started in July 2006. Mr Steyn has attended meetings since March 2007. The Makoppa Environmental Action Group was started in March or April 2007. The consultants had a meeting with the MEAG in May, even before the EIR was released for public review. They, as well as Mr Steyn, were on the database and received notification of the EIR available for public review and also received invitations to the meetings held in July, which was attended by Mr Steyn. The comment period was further extended to the 10th of September 2007. It is the consultants opinion that Mr Steyn and the MEAG have been afforded reasonable opportunity to comment on this project.

There is a further circumstance that makes this period too short. Your attention is directed to the fact that a 765 KVA line must also be positioned from North to South in this area. There is still an unresolved debate as to whether or not several power lines could be positioned in one corridor fairly close to each other or whether a 2 km or other minimum distance at least should be maintained between power lines.

This matter by arrangement with you, Eskom and Mr Sergei Steyn on behalf of Makkoppa Environmental Action Group, will be debated by several electrical specialists towards the end of August 2007. This debate should result in the formulation of a clear policy that allows for the correct minimum distances between power lines to be established. This exercise would not only have to be executed for the purposes of the North South power lines, it would also be essential for the planning of the East West power lines from Matimba to Mmamabula in Botswana and, in fact, in the rest of the country.

In view of the uncertainty as to the distances between power lines, neither the EIA with regard to the 400 KV (the EIA dealt with in this letter) and the EIA for the 765 KV a can be completed. (The EIA with regard to the 765 KVA power lines had hardly commenced and a Scoping Report for it must still be prepared. It will be realised that the question regarding distances between power lines must be resolved before scoping can be undertaken.)

The question as to the minimum distances between power lines affect the positioning of both the 400 KVA lines and the 765 KVA 765 lines. It is for example possible that all the power lines may be positioned close to each other and, for environmental reasons, they should be positioned close to the other. The width of all the power lines so established makes the positioning of the one set of lines for example the 400 KVA line, if it had all really been decided upon, to be unacceptable.

My client therefore has no choice but to await the finalisation of the of the preliminary question as to what the distances between power lines should be before he finalises his suggestions as to the position s of the power lines. He asked me to mention that although you have already been provided some time ago with his provisional alternatives, the alternatives had not yet been debated.

Once the question as to the distance between power lines had been the resolved, my client will finalise his suggested alternative position for the power lines. He would also work together with the farmers represented by Messrs Johan Bodenstein and Pieter Lamprecht and Mr Marvin Hennessey in order to ensure that his suggestion is the result of integrated planning. His contribution in this regard will be important in view thereof that he has extensive and intelligent indigenous knowledge as to the circumstances pertaining to the possible positioning of power lines.

It is essential to realise that the EIA cannot be submitted to the Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism until the alternatives suggested by my clients had been debated with my client and considered carefully by you. After all, public participation does not only amount to passive audiences being informed of the decisions of consultant as to the position of the power lines. It has the further requirement that people should be involved. This would mean that they actively share in the developing of alternative positions for the power line. This is precisely what my client wants to do.

Response:

| See notes on first letter, from Duard Barnard above.

**Duard Barnard on behalf of Marvin Hennessey
9 August 2007**

I was asked by my client Mr Marvin Hennessey to write this letter to you.

The process for the permitting of 400 KVA power lines from Eskom Matimba B to Marang and Dinaledi refers. My client got to know about the proposed power lines at a late stage. He feels that the period given to him to react by the 24th August 2007 to the EIA for the proposed power lines is inadequate.

Response:

Mr Hennessy was contacted in September 2006 and his contact details were obtained. Information was sent to him regarding the project. He received notification of the availability of the EIR for public review and also received notification of the meetings held in March, April and July 2007. He attended the meeting in July. It is the consultants opinion that Mr Hennessy has been afforded reasonable opportunity to comment on this project.

There is a further circumstance that makes this period far too short. Your attention is directed to the fact that a 765 KVA line must also be positioned from North to South in this area. There is still an unresolved debate as to whether or not several power lines could be positioned in one corridor fairly close to each other or whether a 2 km or other minimum distance at least should be maintained between power lines.

This matter by arrangement with you, Eskom and Mr Sergei Steyn on behalf of Makkoppa Environmental Action Group, will be debated by several electrical specialists towards the end of August 2007. This debate should result in the formulation of a clear policy that allows for the correct minimum distances between power lines to be established. This exercise would not only have to be executed for the purposes of the North South power lines, it would also be essential for the planning of the East West power lines from Matimba to Mmamabula in Botswana and, in fact, in the rest of the country.

In view of the uncertainty as to the distances between power lines, neither the EIA with regard to the 400 KV (the EIA dealt with in this letter) and the EIA for the 765 KV a can be completed. (The EIA with regard to the 765 KVA power lines had hardly commenced and a Scoping Report for it must still be prepared. It will be realised that the question regarding distances between power lines must be resolved before scoping can be undertaken.)

The question as to the minimum distances between power lines affect the positioning of both the 400 KVA lines and the 765 KVA 765 lines. It is for example possible that all the power lines may be positioned close to each other and, for environmental reasons, they should be positioned close to the other. The width of all the power lines so established makes the positioning of the one set of lines for example the 400 KVA line, if it had all really been decided upon, to be unacceptable.

My client therefore has no choice but to await the finalisation of the preliminary question as to what the distances between power lines should be. Once that question had been the resolved, my clients will prepare suggested alternative position for the power lines. He has already started preparing the delineation of a position in which power lines could be established. He would also

work together with the farmers represented by M Sergei Steyn in order to ensure that his suggestion is the result of integrated planning. His contribution in this regard will be important in view thereof that my clients have extensive and intelligent indigenous knowledge as to the circumstances pertaining to the possible positioning of power lines.

It is essential to realise that the EIA cannot be submitted to the Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism until the alternatives suggested by my clients had been debated with my client and considered carefully by you. After all, public participation does not only amount to passive audiences being informed of the decisions of consultant as to the position of the power lines. It has the further requirement that people should be involved. This would mean that they actively share in the developing of alternative positions for the power line. This is precisely what my client wants to do.

Response:

See notes on first letter, from Duard Barnard as listed above.

Willie Boonzaaier on behalf of Heritage Park

14 August 2007

In response to the meeting with yourselves and Escom today regarding the impact of the proposed transmission lines currently proposed to cut through the Heritage Park and more specifically the Lebatlane Game Reserve, I wish to report as follows:

1. The Heritage Park Concept Plan was presented to the North West Executive Committee on Economic Development and Infrastructure (Exco EDI) on 13 February 2002, upon which the North West Province requested the North West Parks and Tourism Board to proceed with detailed planning and implementation in early 2003 (I will attempt to get formal documentation where possible).

2. Please see the following attached as promised:

- Site layout plans (one with descriptions of main resorts included)
- Executive summary of Lebatlane Game Reserve development plan

3. Please note the following expected positive impacts of the Lebatlane project which could be minimised or nullified by the currently proposed alignments:

The expected intangible highlights of the Lebatlane project are the following:

- Contribution towards expansion of the conservation estate
- Improved utilisation of land
- Socio-economic development of the region
- Empowerment of communities
- Creation of business opportunities
- Development of an alternative economy and contributing towards diversification in line with the Provincial Growth and Development Strategy
- Providing the corner-stone for the expansion of the Heritage Park.

The expected tangible highlights of the Lebatlane project are the following:

- Expansion of the conservation estate with 31,047 ha
- Diversification and growth of the tourism product with more than 1,000 beds
- Increased employment with 1,000 temporary and 1,600 permanent jobs

- Investment of R179 million in infrastructure and game restocking programme
- Investment of R500 million plus in tourism products
- Income generation of R200 million pa

Response:

Dear Mr. Boonzaaier

Thank you for the additional information received. We also wish to confirm that a seemingly more sensible route through the area that we discussed at the mentioned meeting is now proposed in the final EIR to the DEAT. This route was carefully considered after deliberation with our social specialist as well as her presentation of specific findings in a further social report for this area and it is believed that this would be the most beneficial route in terms of all social, economic and environmental factors at play in this specific area.

I am hopeful that the DEAT would accept this route option and approve it as part of the total route proposal made in the final EIR. I also hope that you will find this proposed route more acceptable with regard to the Heritage Park.

THF van Rooyen
15 Augustus 2007

Potchefstroom 186 KP / 1

Schotskar 187 KP / 2

Graag lewer ek die volgende kommentaar aangaande bogenoemde transmissie kraglyne.

1. Ek, T F H van Rooyen, eienaar asook direkteur van Lentegur Boerdery (Edms) Bpk het volle magtiging om namens Lentegur Game Lodge op u skrywe kommentaar te lewer. Lentegur Game Lodge is geleë op ged. 1 van plaas Potchefstroom KP 186 asook ged. 2 van plaas Schotskar KP 187 wat moontlik deur die voorgestelde transmissie kraglyne geraak mag word.
2. Die totale oppervlakte van hierdie twee gedeeltes is 1800 Ha en waarop daar 'n internasionale jag onderneming bedryf word. Die afgelope vyf jaar het ongeveer vyf en dertig jaggroepe van onder andere, Oostenryk, Italië, Duitsland, Holland, Spanje en Engeland hierdie jagplaas besoek en gejag.
 Van hulle het reeds aangedui dat hulle ongelukkig is om op 'n jagplaas in Afrika te jag waar daar massiewe kraglyne is.
 Indien die bestaande twee kraglyne na vyf kraglyne vermeder word, het die buitelandse jagters reeds aangedui dat hulle nie gewillig is om op Lentegur Game Lodge te jag nie.
 Dit sal 'n geweldige finansiële verlies vir Lentegur Game Lodge beteken.

3. Volgens u plan A3:9 word daar aangetoon dat die voorgestelde lyne (in swart aangedui) nie bogenoemde eiendomme sal raak nie, en word hiermee ook ten sterkste ondersteun.

Verder word daar ook op plan A3:9 alternatiewe roetes aangetoon. Die een roete is parrallel met die teerpad wat in hierdie stadium glad nie ondersteun kan word nie. Verder is daar ook 'n roete waar die voorgestelde lyne parrallel aan die bestaande lyne oor bogenoemde eiendomme sal gaan. Hierdie roete sal aanvaar word onder die volgende voorwaardes:

- 3.1 Indien hierdie roete parrallel aan die bestaande lyne is, sal die voorgestelde 3 x 400KV kraglyne oor bogenoemde eiendomme gaan. Daar sal dus 5 x 400KV kraglyne oor bogenoemde eiendomme wees wat 'n enorme impak op die natuurskoon van hierdie internasionale jagplaas sal hê.
- 3.2 Indien die voorgestelde drie kraglyne oor bogenoemde eiendomme gaan moet Eskom skriftelik onderneem dat daar geen verdere kraglyne in die toekoms oor genoemde eiendomme sal gaan nie.
- 3.3 Lenteguur Boerdery (Edms) Bpk is begerig om self die servituut te ontbos en moet as kontrakteur daarvoor vergoed word deur Eskom.
- 3.4 Die ontbosting moet so gedoen word sodat die impak op die omgewing tot die minimum beperk word.
- 3.5 Die voorgestelde kraglyne moet direk langs die bestaande kraglyne geplaas word met 'n minimum afstand tussen torings.
- 3.6 Geen werkers van Eskom of enige Kontrakteur wat namens Eskom werk verrig sal verblyf te Lenteguur Game Lodge verkry nie.
- 3.7 Eskom sal verantwoordelik gehou word vir enige skade aan infrastruktuur asook verlies van wild as gevolg van stres, of wild wat deur wildsheining spring as gevolg van geraas.
- 3.8 Geen opmetings of konstruksie werk mag gedurende die jagseisoen wat vanaf 15 April tot 15 Oktober is, gedoen word nie. Indien enige werk in die jagseisoen uitgevoer moet word, moet Eskom Lenteguur Game Lodge daarvoor vergoed.
- 3.9 Alle paaie op Lenteguur Game Lodge, wat deur Eskom en/of sy gemagtigde kontrakteur gebruik word, sal na voltooiing van konstruksie geskraap word deur Eskom.

- 3.10 Toegang tot Lenteguur Game Lodge deur Eskom of sy gemagtigde kontrakteur sal slegs verkry word nadat daar telefonies met Mnr T F H van Rooyen gereël is, deur Eskom.
- 3.11 Alle onderhandelings en telefoniese gesprekke sal geskied tussen Eskom en Mnr T F H van Rooyen van Lenteguur Boerdery (Edms) Bpk. Geen direkte skakeling tussen Eskom se gemagtigde kontrakteur sal aanvaar word nie.
- 3.12 'n Voor- en na waardasie van Lenteguur Game Lodge moet gedoen word deur Eskom om te bepaal wat die impak op die markwaarde is voor en na konstruksie van die voorgestelde kraglyne. Eskom sal verantwoordelik wees vir die betaling van die twee waardasies.
- 3.13 Eskom sal 'n deposito teen moontlike skade aan Lenteguur Boerdery (Edms) Bpk betaal, voordat daar met enige opmeetwerk of konstruksiewerk begin word. Daar sal ooreengekom word tussen Eskom en Mnr T F H van Rooyen oor bedrag van deposito.

ALGEMEEN:

Soos reeds genoem is Lenteguur Game Lodge 'n geregistreerde internasionale jagplaas wat gemagtig is om buitelandse jagters hierheen uit te nooi en op jagtogte te vergesel. Van hierdie jagters was reeds ongelukkig om op 'n jagplaas in Afrika te jag waar massiewe kraglyne teenwoordig is.

Indien 3 x 400KV bykomende lyne op Lenteguur Game Lodge aangebring word sal dit 'n enorme invloed op die besoekers getalle op buitelandse jagters hê.

Graag verneem ek van Eskom hoe Lenteguur Game Lodge vergoed gaan word aan verlies van inkomste vir die volgende vyftig jaar as gevolg van buitelandse jagters wat nie belang stel om op 'n jagplaas in Afrika te jag waar daar 5 x 400KV kraglyne is nie.

Response:

U bekommernisse, aanmerkings en vereistes word so genotuleer en sal in die finale OIV weergegee word vir kennisname deur die betrokke besluitnemende owerheid. Neem wel kennis dat hierdie voorwaardes met die Eskom onderhandelaar tydens onderhandelinge ooreengekom sal moet word en nie spesifiek deel uitmaak van die OIS proses nie. U brief sal ook aan Eskom oorhandig word op hierdie stadium vir oorweging.

Ons dank u vir u deelname. Neem gerus kennis dat die finale OIV ook beskikbaar sal wees aan die publiek.

Crocodile River Properties (Pty) Ltd – SJ van Biljon

21 Augustus 2007

Crauseberg 328 KP

Soos in ons vorige skrywe van 1 April 2007 staan ons steeds die oprigting van enige addisionele kraglyne op Crauseberg tee vir die redes soos voorheen uitgele. Aangeheg die nuutste voorstel ontvang en ons teenvoorstel. In plaas van om op Beaufort te draai, oor Kleinbegin se plaashuis te gaan en tot op ons grens te kom en weer te draai, kan die lyne eerder reguit gespan word soos met die blou lyn op die figuur. Sodoende sal die lyne die grondpad op 'n korter afstand bereik. Soos reeds gese wil ons nie die lyne op Crauseberg he nie en die voorgestelde blou roete sal vir ons aanvaarbaar wees.

Response:

Kennis word geneem van u besware en voorstelle en dit is in ag geneem met die opstel van die finale OIV aan die besluitnemende owerheid. Neem asseblief kennis dat hierdie verslag beskikbaar gemaak word aan die publiek.

**Duard Barnard on behalf of Sergei Steyn and the Makoppa Environmental Action Group,
Messrs J Bodenstein and P Lamprecht and Marvin Hennessy**

27 August 2007

I would like to raise two aspects:

We would like to know whether you have been able to arrange a meeting with the electrical experts of Eskom in order to finalise the technical question as to whether or not several power lines could be positioned in one corridor fairly close to each other or whether a 2 km or other minimum distance at least should be maintained between some power lines. As this is an important issue it can definitively influence the positioning of the power lines. A decision can also not be reached before this aspect had not been finalised. We accept that it must be handled with urgency and we are willing to cooperate in this regard. Unfortunately due to previous postponements our specialist that was then available, Prof J Reynders, could not assist in finalising the matter. As mentioned to you previously he will be overseas from 22nd August till 17th September 2007 and a date subsequent to 17 September 2007 would have to be arranged.

Response:

This meeting relates to the 6 x 765kV lines from Lephalale to Potchefstroom. This meeting has been postponed until such time that Eskom has determined what the applicable separation distance should be. A meeting will then be held with the MEAG and others regarding the separation distance.

My clients considered the possible delimitation of a power line and would like to suggest another alternative route. The route is set out below in Annexure A.

Annexure A

A suggested specific alignment for the proposed power line from Matimba in a southerly direction past Northam

Except for a short distance over the Crocodile River, this proposed route follows existing roads, some railway lines and some power lines.

- Starting at the northern end from about the farms Grootestryd, 465 and Nelsonskop 464 nwar Matimba, follow the railway line along the boundary between Naauw Ontkomen 509 and Hanglip 518 to the southern boundary between Naauw Ontkomen 509 and Kuipersbult 511 to the north of or between the railway line and the power line over Vergulde Helm 316. At Vergulde Helm move into space between power line and road (if not already positioned in this space) over Buffelsjagt 317, over the eastern corner of Kringgatspruit 318, over Enkeldraai 319, through Geelhoutskloof 359, through Zandnek 358, through Rhenosterpan 361, through SW corner of Naauwpoort 363, through what may be Rooipan 357 to the east (my map is not clear), through what could be the eastern section of Zoutpan 367, through Zandfontein 382, through Diepspruit 386, to Groenland 397.
- In Groenland 397 veer to the west in order to stay next to the Ellisras – ThabaZimbi road. Cross Inkerman 10, over river and across the T-junction at the Buffelsdrift – Matlabas roads to boundary between Wegdraai 18 and Colchester 17. At the corner between Warwick 46, Wegdraai 18 and Colchester 17 veer south through Warwick 46, through New Castle 45, through Coventry 56, along the boundary between Witgatpan 57 and Springbokvlei 55, over NW corner of Ysterpan 69, over Groenvley 87, bypassing Sentrum to the west and continue over Groenvley 87 in a westerly direction along the Buffelsdrift – ThabaZimbi road up to about the T-junction of the road to Makoppa, a little distance into Rainpan 60.
- Continue following the road to Dwaalboom by going along the boundary between Blinkpan 84 and Rainpan 60, through Klippan 82, cross Honeymoon 80, the SE corner of Kameeldraai 77, over the post on the boundary between Kameeldraai 77, Kameelpa 79 and Leeuwdrift 78 and continue over Leeuwdrift 78 to the fork in the road about halfway into Leeuwdrift 78.
- Follow the eastern fork over Gana hoek 111 on the road to ThabaZimbi, choose a convenient position to veer south in order to cross the Crocodile River and to link up to the road between Rooibokkraal and Northam on Van Wykskraal 116.
- Follow the road as it turns south, continue over the furthestmost NE corner of Wildebeestvlei 115, cross Dwaalpan 297, cross Dwaalpan 297, cross the eastern corner of Vlakplaats 113, then Bloemhof 296, then western corner of Drinkpan 301, then

Beaufort 326, then over Kleinbegin 327 and veer west on the boundary between Kleibegin 327 in the north and Hoogebomen 333 and Buffelspan to the south.

- Veer south over Buffelspan 329, over NE corner of Zwartkop 331 and then follow the boundary between Zwartkop 331 and Kameelpoort 332 and the boundary between Buffelsfontein 360 and Welgewaagd 385.
- Shortly after entering the boundary between Bulskop 363 and Middelkop 362, veer west over Middelkop 362 in order to avoid hilly country. About on the boundary of the farm Witfontein 396 with Middelkop 363, veer south and join up with the railway line at the Middelwit station and the road between Dwaalboom and Northam.
- Follow the railway line and road over Pony 395, over Klapperrandje 394 and over Nooitgedacht 406 to shortly before the T-junction with the Saulspoort road just into Kameelhoek 408.
- At about the T-junction, veer south over Nooitgedacht 406, pass the Rustenburg Platinum Mines, cross Swartklip 405 and proceed to Spitskop. Some power lines could end at Spitskop and lines needed to the south can continue from Spitskop in a southerly direction.

Response:

Our reply to the previous three letters received from you on behalf of members of the Makoppa Environmental Action Group has reference and is applicable here. We have considered the proposed route and included this route on the maps and in our final EIR.

Please note however that we have previously indicated that following existing roads and railways have a number of significant implications from a visual and resource utilization point of view. The alternative route as proposed entails a number of further problems already considered during the scoping phase of the EIA for the 3 X 400kV Marang and Dinaledi power lines. Due to the above considerations, the consultant is not in a position to support the proposed alternative route and has accordingly made such a finding in the final EIR for submission to the DEAT which is available for public viewing.

**Chris Combrinck on behalf of Kornkoppie Game Ranch
29 Augustus 2007**

Zuid Braband 292 KQ

Objekteer teen die voorgestelde roete vir die volgende redes:

- Ons het reeds 2 x 400kV lyne wat vanaf noord ooste hoek tot die suid weste hoek van ons plaas strek oor 'n afstand van omtrent 8.4km. Alle bome binne hierdie serwituut is

deur Eskom verwyder, slegs grasbedekking is oor, wat alreeds 'n definitiewe ekonomiese effek het op die drakrag vermoë van die plaas ten opsigte van blaarvretende wild.

- Indien u 'n verdere 3 x 400kV lyne hier plaas sal dit 'n verdere 138ha impak he op die weidingspotensiaal van blaarvretende wild met die aanname dat Eskom dieselfde strategie volg en alle bome verwyder.
- Soos u weet is die wildsbedryf marginal en is dit moeilik om 'n lewensvatbare inkomste te genereer asook kapitaal delging te handhaaf. Verwydering van die drakrag vermoë het dus 'n wesenlike impak op die langtermyn vermoë van hierdie wildsplaas.
- Esteties het die huidige 400kV lyne reeds 'n definitiewe impak op ons bedryf en jagters en toeriste sien dit onmiddellik raak met negatiewe effekte op so wildsplaas. Addisionele lyne sal dit nog vererger veral aan die noordekant van die huidige lyne tov die impak op plaashuis, werkershuise en vliegvelden die res van die akkommodasie word blootgestel aan hierdie ongewenste natuur verskynsel.
- Huidige omheinde kamp vir teling van skaarswild van 50ha sal hiermee in die slag bly – nyalas word geteel. Die kraglyn gaan regoor hierdie kamp en ons gaan al die boom plantegroei verloor. Nyalas is blaarvretende diere en het die bome nodig. Die kamp sal dus geskuif moet word na 'n ander area waar die kraglyne nie voorkom nie.
- Ons vliegveld van 1000m met vliegloods is geplaas oos n awes en le huidiglik aan die westekant van die bestaande lyne. Die huidige lyne is 1000m vanaf die oostelike kant van die landingstrook. Dit is alreeds riskant van opstyg en landingsoogpunt en indien die 3 nuwe lyne aan die noord westekant van die huidige kraglyne gaan u die risiko van opstyg en landing verder versleg. Indien die kraglyne noordwes plaas van die huidige kraglyne sal die vliegveld geskuif moet word tesame met die vliegloods wat gevolg het: koste van nuwe landingstrook en vliegloods; verlore oppervlakte wat nuut ontbos moet word; huidige landstrook en area rondom vliegveld is reeds ontbos vir veiligheidsredes wat nou verlore is en jare gaan neem vir rehabilitasie.
- Ons besef die nasionale belang van energie voorsiening; het problem dat ons stukkie grond verder versnipper gaan word en onekonomies gaan maak; reeds ons kant gebring met huidige twee lyne; plaas die lyne op ander plase en verminder die impak by ons; indien die 765kV lyne ook hiergaan sal ons plaas total onekonomies wees; besef u wil ons verged, maar wil nie die kraglyne he nie, ook nie die geld nie, plaas met huidige kraglyne behou en probeer bestuur op die beste manier.
- Nuwe kraglyn gaan negatiewe invloed he op ons grond; kraglyn moet verkieslik geplaas word aan die suid ooste kant van huidige lyne, indien dit gebeur sal ons: teelkamp gered word van verskuiwing, vliegveld nie geskuif hoef te word nie, plaashuis en werkershuise

red van kraglyn op hul voorstoep; estetiese situasie ten opsigte van die ander akkommodasie darem dieselfd hou deurdat die nuwe lyne verder weg geplaas word.

- Het ook Ekofokus Wildsplasdiensle aangestel om die impak van hierdie kraglyne te ondersoek.

Response:

Kennis word geneem van u besware en voorstelle en dit is in ag geneem met die opstel van die finale OIV aan die besluitnemende owerheid. Neem asseblief kennis dat hierdie verslag beskikbaar gemaak word aan die publiek.

**Keystate (Pty) Ltd t/a Kameelpoort
5 September 2007**

This submission is made in respect of

- the 400kV Matimba-Dinaledi lines,
- the 400kV Matimba-Marang line, and
- the 765kV Matimba-Potchefstroom lines.

The submission is made on behalf of Keystate (Pty) Ltd, the owner of

- remaining extent of Farm Buffelspan 329 KQ,
- Farm Kameelpoort 332 KQ and
- Remaining extent of Farm Welgewaagd 358 KQ.

Keystate argues that both projects, the 400kV and the 765KV, should be investigated and decided upon together in order to

- minimise impacts on affected parties, and
- optimise the cost and efficiency of the total project.

It is understood that Eskom has given an undertaking (with certain conditions) not to construct additional high voltage power lines over properties that already have such lines or are earmarked to have the 400kV lines across them. Although it is understandable that property owners expect such an undertaking, the way the principle is applied can have an unwanted negative effect. At this stage the 400kV lines are considered and the time to take decisions regarding them is due any time now. A very real possibility exists that decisions on the 400kV lines will be taken without considering the effect of the 765kV lines on the affected parties, i.e. the property owners and on the environment.

Submissions and comments have been requested on the 400kV lines, before the position of the 765kV line have been finalised. This should result in placement of the 400kV lines in an area that has minimum negative effects on the ecology and other affected parties.

When the 765kV lines than have to be decided upon afterwards,

- they have to be sufficiently far away removed from the 400kV lines to isolate them from each other, and
- they may not run across the same properties as the 400kV lines because of the Eskom undertaking.

The 765kV lines (which are larger and have a bigger impact) then have to be routed through areas not utilised for the 400kV lines, and the 765kV lines will then in all likelihood have to go through areas that were bypassed by the 400kV route due to the sensitivity of these regions. The areas isolated from the 400kV lines will then carry the higher negative impact caused by the 765kV lines. Such a process (first the 400kV and then the 765kV lines) is the wrong way round and is counterproductive.

It is also possible that the 400kV lines will be placed where it is easiest to erect them and where it offers the cheapest alternative. When the 765kV lines are routed at a later stage, they will have to go through land unutilised by other high voltage power lines. They will then probably go through land which is more unsuitable for construction and where it will be more costly to erect the bigger lines. The total project (power from Matimba to Dinaledi, Marang and Potchefstroom) will then be considerably more expensive.

A submission is therefore made that either

- no decision is taken on the 400kV lines before the 765kV lines have been finalised, or preferably
- that the 400kV and 765kV lines are investigated together and decided upon together.

Response:

We cannot comment further on this issue and it is directed to the relevant authority for consideration. Note that the final EIRs for the 3 X 400kV Marang and Dineldi power lines are being submitted to the relevant decision-making authority for consideration and will include your concerns raised in this letter. The decision on whether the 765kV power lines and the 400kV power lines should be considered in any other way or whether the EIA processes should be adapted in any way now lies with the DEAT.

Eskom response:

The growth of electricity demand and the continual supply by building new generation is not done at the same time, for this reason projects will have different start and end dates.

It is in this case not possible to delay one project to wait for the next project, the present project needs to take the much needed generation out to South Africa in 2009, the future line will be doing the same but at other times with new generation coming onto line.

We will however consult with all affected parties when the new project comes to the stage where a final route has to be decided on.

The EIA will take all issues raised into consideration when deciding on the final route and Eskom will negotiate with land owners to compensate fairly for the eventual impacts on property.