

**Environmental
Resources
Management**

Building 23, The Woodlands,
Woodlands Drive,
Woodmead, Sandton
Tel: +27 (0) 11 802 8263
Fax: +27 (0) 11 802 8299

www.erm.com

Postal Address:
Postnet Suite 624
Private Bag X29
Gallo Manor, 2052
South Africa



20 April 2007

**For Attention: Brett Lawson & Genie DeWaal
Ninham Shands**

Dear Brett and Genie

**Review comments on Specialist Reports for the Eskom OCGT Power
Plant EIA – Additional Units**

The purpose of ERM's review was to evaluate the Specialist Reports of the EIA process as per the new NEMA requirements and to identify any conflicting findings and ensure a more integrated product.

Overall five Specialist Reports were reviewed; Impact Assessment for Biodiversity, Visual Impact Assessment, Social Impact Assessment, Air Quality Assessment and an Environmental Noise Impact Study. Findings from the review and any comments have been captured in Table 1 below.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any queries or points of clarification which you would like to discuss.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "JSoboil".

Jeremy Soboil
Partner

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Thato Manare".

Thato Manare
Consultant

Registered Company address
Environmental Resources
Management Southern Africa (Pty) Ltd
The Terraces, Block E
Steenberg Office Park
Silverwood Close
Steenberg, 7945

Company registration number
2003/001404/07

Directors
Jeremy Soboil (Managing)
Jan Rasmussen
Johanita Kotze
Sue Posnik
John Alexander (UK)
Claudio Bertora (Italy)

Offices Worldwide

A member of the
Environment Resources
Management Group

No: 7-378	File:	
Date: 20 APR 2007		
To:	Seen	Action:
BL		
GDW.		



Table 1 ERM Review comments on the Specialist Reports

<p>Visual Impact Assessment</p>	<p>The following conclusions are reached in the visual impact assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The overall visual impact is defined as Moderate due to the fact that the additional units are located within the visual entity of PetroSA which is located in an area the Mossel Bay Municipality has marked for future industrial expansion.
	<p>No specific comments or conflicting findings.</p>
<p>Air Quality Assessment</p>	<p>The following conclusions are reached in the air quality assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is predicted that the concentrations from the power stations would double with the additional three units to the current existing three. Even for worst case scenarios however, the plant would only contribute 9% to cumulative annual average concentrations and not exceed any of the guidelines or standards.
	<p>No specific comments or conflicting findings.</p>
<p>Environmental Noise Impact Assessment</p>	<p>The following conclusions are reached in the environmental noise impact assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the six OCGT units operating under normal conditions, the intensity of noise impact at all residential dwellings within the study area range between Low and Medium, increasing to Medium and Very High for continuous operation. • However, factors affecting the intensity of noise impact include the proximity of sources with high noise emission levels.
	<p>No specific comments or conflicting findings.</p>
<p>Social Impact Assessment</p>	<p>The following conclusions are reached in the social impact assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to providing for the broader South African Population, the OCGR development has a potential positive impact on local communities in terms of jobs, business creation and skills development. • However, these impacts can only be realised through concerted efforts on local involvement by Eskom. Failure to do this could result in the increase of opposing negative impacts on the local community.
	<p>No specific comments or conflicting findings.</p>

Biodiversity Assessment	<p>The following conclusions are reached in the biodiversity assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• An impact assessment evaluation concluded that overall impact will be very low or neutral. Diligent application of mitigation measures will ensure the overall impact remains very low and therefore negligible.• It was concluded therefore, that the proposed OCGT additions will have little or no negative impact on the environment.
	No specific comments or conflicting findings.

→ Brett



CONSERVATION MANAGEMENT SERVICES – Ken Coetzee
 4 Chestnut Street, Heather Park
 GEORGE, 6529
 Tel / Fax: 044 – 8708472
 e-mail: ConsKen@cybertrade.co.za

17 April 2007

FOR ATT: Ms G de Waal
By e-mail

Mr Brett Lawson
Ninham Shand
GEORGE

No: 7.338	File:	
Date: 17 APR 2007		
To:	Seen:	Action:
BL.		

Dear Brett

**ESKOM'S PROPOSED OCGT POWER PLANT DEVELOPMENT IN MOSSEL BAY:
REPORT REVIEWS**

I have read through the reports and found nothing worth commenting on.

REPORT 1:

OCGT FIXED FACILITY: REVISED RISK ASSESSMENT, MOSSEL BAY

March 2007
Prepared by: Thato Manare - Environmental Resources Management

COMMENT: The above specialist report has been reviewed and was not found to be in any way, contradictory to the findings of the biodiversity impact assessment.

REPORT 2:

**AIR QUALITY ASSESSMENT FOR THE OCGT POWER PLANT'S ADDITIONAL UNITS
IN MOSSEL BAY**

January 2007
Prepared by: G Petzer / L Burger - Airshed Planning Professionals (Pty) Ltd

COMMENT: The above specialist report has been reviewed and was not found to be in any way, contradictory to the findings of the biodiversity impact assessment.

REPORT 3:

SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR ESKOM'S PROPOSED OCGT POWER PLANT DEVELOPMENT IN MOSSEL BAY

March 2007

Prepared by: L Coetzee

COMMENT: The above specialist report has been reviewed and was not found to be in any way, contradictory to the findings of the biodiversity impact assessment.

REPORT 4:

ENVIRONMENTAL NOISE IMPACT STUDY FOR THE PROPOSED CAPACITY EXPANSION OF THE OCGT POWER PLANT AT MOSSEL BAY

January 2007

Prepared by: A W D Jongens - Jongens Keet Associates, Acoustical Engineering Consultants

COMMENT: The above specialist report has been reviewed and was not found to be in any way, contradictory to the findings of the biodiversity impact assessment.

REPORT 5:

VISUAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT: OCGT POWER PLANT ADDITIONAL UNITS

February 2007

Prepared by: S Stead, VRM Africa

COMMENT: The above specialist report has been reviewed and was not found to be in any way, contradictory to the findings of the biodiversity impact assessment.

Best wishes



**KENNETH COETZEE
CONSERVATION MANAGEMENT SERVICES**

→ BL

From: "Heather Stead" <heather@vrma.co.za>
To: <Genie.DeWaal@shands.co.za>
Date: Thu, Apr 19, 2007 3:07 PM
Subject: Cross specialist review

Hi Genie,

Please find attached cross specialist review. Please contact us if you have any queries.

Regards,

Heather

VRM Africa Office

Tel/Fax: 044 764 3267

heather@vrma.co.za

No: 7.374	File:	
Date: 19 APR 2007		
To:	Seen:	Action:
BL		

Ninham Shand Consulting Services
York Street, George
PO Box 509
George
6530

19 April 2007

To whom it may concern.

Re: Cross Specialist Review for Proposed OCGT Power Station, Mossel Bay

According to the new NEMA requirements, specialists must review the others' reports on a specific project, to identify any conflicting findings and ensure a more holistic product.

The following reports were reviewed:

- Impact Assessment for Biodiversity
Ken Coetzee of Conservation Management Services
- Social Impact Assessment
Liezl Coetzee
- Air Quality Assessment
G Petzer and L Burger of Airshed Planning Professionals (Pty) Ltd
- Revised Risk Assessment
Thato Manare of Environmental Resources Management
- Environmental Noise Impact Study
A.W.D. Jongens of Jongens Keet Associates

In reviewing the above specialist studies we find that from a visual perspective their report findings are acceptable and there are no inconsistencies in comparison to our own report.

Regards,
Steve Stead

From: "A. Jongens" <jongens@yebo.co.za>
To: "Genie DeWaal" <Genie.DeWaal@shands.co.za>
Date: Wed, Apr 18, 2007 10:24 PM
Subject: Re: OCGT PLANT - Mossel Bay : CROSS-REVIEW OF SPECIALISTS'FINDINGS (BATCH 1 ...)

Genie de Waal,

I have read each of the specialist reports that you have emailed to me. The contents of these reports do not contain any material that pertains to our field of specialisation and therefore do not add to or conflict with the findings contained in our report. I am not able to comment on the acceptability of the contents of these reports that are outside my field of expertise.

Kind regards,

Adrian Jongens
 Jongens Keet Associates

----- Original Message -----

From: "Genie DeWaal" <Genie.DeWaal@shands.co.za>
 To: <lucian@airshed.co.za>; <consken@cybertrade.co.za>; <jeremy.soboil@erm.com>; <liezlc@gmail.com>; <info@vrma.co.za>; <jongens@yebo.co.za>
 Sent: Thursday, April 12, 2007 11:29 AM
 Subject: OCGT PLANT - Mossel Bay : CROSS-REVIEW OF SPECIALISTS'FINDINGS (BATCH 1 ...)

>
 > Our ref : 401629/7.426
 >
 > TO :
 > Jeremy Soboil - ERM Consulting Services
 > Ken Coetzee - Conservation Management Services
 > Lucian Burger - Airshed Planning Professionals
 > AWD Jongens - Jongens Keet Associates
 > Stephen Stead - VRM Africa
 > Liezl Coetzee
 >
 > Good morning all,
 >
 > According to the new NEMA requirements, all specialists must review the
 > others' reports on a specific project, to identify any conflicting
 > findings and ensure a more holistic product. Due to various factors,
 > this exercise was not done at an earlier time and it is now necessary
 > for each specialist to review the others' basic findings and provide
 > comment to Ninham Shand as a matter of urgency, at least before 19 April
 > 2007. A quick review of the summary/conclusion of each of the other
 > specialist reports and a brief indication of their acceptability is all
 > that is required. An amount of R5 000 each has been allocated to the
 > task.
 >
 > Attached hereto please find the reports for your perusal.
 > Please also reply to this mail to acknowledge receipt thereof and
 > confirm your undertaking to provide the required input by said date.
 >
 > kind regards
 > Genie de Waal

No: 7-359	File:
Date: 18 APR 2007	
To:	Action:
BC	
GDN	

From: "Lucian Burger" <lucian@airshed.co.za>
To: "Genie DeWaal" <Genie.DeWaal@shands.co.za>
Date: Wed, Apr 18, 2007 5:16 PM
Subject: FW: OCGT PLANT - Mossel Bay : CROSS-REVIEW OF SPECIALISTS' FINDINGS (BATCH 2 ...)

Dear Genie,

Apologies, I responded to Brett only - see e-mail below.

I went through the documents and there are no references made to our studies or report.

Secondly, none of the reports contain information that could have been in conflict with our findings.

Kind regards,

Lucian

Dr L W Burger
Airshed Planning Professionals (Pty) Ltd
P O Box 5260
Halfway House
1685
Tel +27(0)11 805 1940
Fax +27(0)11 805 7010
Cel +27(0)82 491 0385
e-mail: Lucian@airshed.co.za
web: www.airshed.co.za

No: 7 360.	File:	
Date: 18 APR 2007		
To:	Seen:	Action:
BL		


From: Brett Lawson
To: DeWaal, Genie
Date: Wed, Apr 25, 2007 2:40 PM
Subject: Fwd: Peer Review for Eskom OCGT Specialist Studies

Ninham Shand Consulting Engineers
George, South Africa
Tel : +27 (0)44 874 2165
Fax : +27 (0)44 873 5843
e-Mail : Genie.DeWaal@shands.co.za

>>> "Liezl Coetzee" <liezlc@gmail.com> 19/04/07 13:36:11 >>>

I hereby wish to confirm that none of the specialist studies, namely the Risk Assessment, Noise Impact Assessment, Visual Impact Assessment, Biodiversity Impact Assessment, and Air Quality Impact Assessment, conflict with or impact on the Social Impact Assessment which I conducted for the proposed Eskom Open Cycle Gas Turbine (OCGT) development at Mossel Bay.

Liezl Coetzee
073 153 9969

No: 7.367	File:	
Date: 19 APR 2007		
To:	Seen:	Action:
DS.		
BL		