PROPOSED POWER STATION AND ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE IN THE WITBANK AREA

Public Meeting

Date	*Time*	*Venue*
28 November 2006	18:00 – 20:00	El Toro

An open house was held between 16h00 and 18h00 in the same venue. **An attendance register for the open house and meeting is shown on the last page of the minutes.**

1. Welcome and introduction

Ms Karen Shippey (KS) welcomed everybody and introduced the Eskom representatives and the Ninham Shand team members. The purpose of the meeting was explained as being to describe the EIA process undertaken this far, to present the draft Environmental Impact Report and to provide an opportunity to identify issues, questions and concerns raised by the public. Ms Puleng Buku (PB) enquired as to whether an agenda of the meeting was available and KS responded that no material in addition to the Executive Summaries was provided in hardcopy and that the discussions would be based on the presentations prepared by the project team.

2. Overview of electricity supply and demand

Mr Tony Stott (TS) presented an overview of electricity supply and demand in the country.

The presentation covered the following points:

- The demand and required growth into the future was discussed
- The renewable energy research and pilot projects as well as the available coal, gas and nuclear technologies being used were outlined
- Three areas were identified for new coal-fired power stations by Eskom's strategic planning namely: Lephalale (EIA completed), Witbank (EIA process in progress) and Vaal South (EIA process in progress)
- The meeting was advised that these three projects are not alternatives if electricity demands were to be met. The areas were selected based on a number of factors, particularly the availability of the coal resource and the time lines associated with accessing this resource.

Mr Jan Human (JH) referred to the wind farm in the Western Cape stating that to his knowledge that specific technology was 1/5th of the cost of a coal fired power station. He furthermore asked whether that was a feasible option for the Witbank geographical area, and why it was not considered as a first option. TS responded that the wind turbine demonstration plant in the Western Cape only accounts for 3 Megawatts (MW) of power whereas the coal fired station would generate 5 400 MW. The scale and magnitude of the coal fired power station is much larger that that of the "wind farm". He added that the "wind farm" only operates for 18-20 % of the time, due to the fact that the wind does not always blow sufficiently to ensure operation. Furthermore, Eskom is currently looking into commercial application of a wind farm, which will generate approximately 100 MW, but still is much smaller in scale and magnitude than the coal fired power station.

JH made reference to a wind farm in California (USA) which generates, to his knowledge, up to 25 000 000 MW of electricity. TS stated that he had knowledge of a wind farm of approximately 500 MW electricity generation located in a valley in California, but that there still was a significant difference in scale and magnitude if compared to 5 400 MW. Eskom would have to provide back-up electricity generation for times when the wind does not blow and cannot rely on this kind of power generation for base-load electricity supply.

Mr Andrè Roets (AR) mentioned that rumours were circulating regarding a dam that would be built and enquired whether Eskom could confirm these rumours. TS replied, to his knowledge no plans for the construction of a dam were imminent.

Mr Geoff Byrne (GB) asked whether the sites for the Vaal Project had been identified yet. TS replied that it was following an EIA process similar to the Witbank project and three sites had been identified. All three identified sites were being assessed in terms of specialist studies, and from there the environmentally preferred site would be recommended.

GB further stated that with the Coega Smelter a lot of electricity would be required. He wanted to know where that electricity would originate from, as there is no electricity generated in the Eastern Cape. TS replied that the transmission lines were being upgraded and that Eskom was looking at the construction of a combined cycle gas turbine plant, generating approximately 2 400 MW, in that area. He further added that an Independent Power Provider (IPP) was also investigating the option of an open cycle gas turbine plant generating 500 -600 MW.

GB noted that the proposed sites in the Witbank geographical area were densely populated, with high quality agricultural land, while there is a large amount of coal found across the country. He wanted to know why Eskom wasn't looking at other areas with coal, and why Witbank had been selected. He also enquired what the breakdown of transmission cost vs. generation costs were. TS answered that during the site selection process various options were investigated, whereby the availability of coal and water was investigated, as well as access to sorbent material. That suite of studies identified the three locations mentioned in the presentations as Lephalale, Vaal South and Witbank. He added that it is very important to have a stable network, and that the cost of transport of coal and water is very high when compared to transmission costs.

GB noted that there is a high concentration of power stations in the area, and that Eskom are in fact not doubling, but squaring the pollution. The worldwide issues of pollution and global warming need consideration. TS noted that it was in fact part of the EIA process to look at these issues.

GB wanted to know whether the EIA process measures up to International Standards.
KS asked that the question be held until after the EIA presentation had been given, when these issues would be addressed.

3. Recruitment Initiatives for proposed Coal-fired Power Station

Mr Suren Rajaruthnam (SR) provided an overview of the recruitment initiatives for the proposed power station which would be followed by Eskom during the construction phase, as well as the operational phase of the project.

The presentation highlighted the following aspects:

- An overview of labour during the Construction Phase
- Requirements for the Operational Phase
  - Skills Profile
  - Recruitment Methods
  - Training & Placement
  - Outsourcing
  - What must a job seeker do?

SR indicated that Eskom had recently run a Career Expo held in Witbank and asked whether the audience was aware of it. The response was that no-one had been aware of the Expo.

JH replied that there is a serious lack of information in the area in many areas of life. He said that one might come across a very small advertisement in the newspaper but other than that, information seemed to be kept secret. JH commented that the presentation held no interest for him or most parties present as he simply wanted to know where the power station would be located and not the job creation opportunities associated with it.

PB disagreed and wanted to know what level of education was required for prospective applicants. SR replied that various levels were applicable for different positions. The minimum requirement would be Grade 12 or some level of tertiary studies.

PB then further enquired about the opportunities that would be created for unskilled workers. She also wanted to know whether these people could be trained, and what opportunities would exist for them then. SR replied that there were opportunities for unskilled labour, as well as training.

Mr Jabulani Chiloane (JC) mentioned that various companies come into the area and promise residents job opportunities. He feels that if Eskom promises jobs, they must be obligated to live up to their promises. SR stated that the proof lies in the fact that Eskom already has a presence in the area, and that numerous jobs have been created. Eskom has been using local labour to date, and that they have already proven themselves.

JC asked whether there was a specific method that Eskom would use to apply the preference for local labour instead of outside companies. SR stated that major contractors would be required by their contracts with Eskom to source labour from the local area, rather than importing external labour. Furthermore, he also added that it made business sense as local labour did not require new accommodation.

Mr Krish Pillay (KP) added that it would cost much more to bring labour in from the outside and that Eskom stipulates the use of local labour in its contracts. Engagement with the local community takes place to formalise the process and to ensure that local labour is used. Local community leaders would be included in the process to ensure that people are in fact *bona fide* locals.

AR requested clarification on the areas where local labour would be sourced from, naming Delmas, Bronkhorstspruit and Witbank. SR then confirmed that these were the surrounding areas where labour would likely be sourced from.

Mr Eric Ndhlovu (EN) noted that there was confusion as there were people visiting resident's houses, having them complete forms and wanted to know whether Eskom knew about this. He further wanted to know whether their houses were affected by the proposed power station. SR noted that the people visiting residents were associated with the Anglo Coal Mining EIA process and that that process was separate from the Eskom process. Eskom would focus on affected landowners on identified sites and as soon as that phase was entered they would engage directly with landowners. KS noted that anyone affected by the mine would be dealt with by Anglo Coal. Eskom was only dealing with the power station issues. EN felt that Eskom employees were being affected by the mine and that Eskom should take cognisance of that.

Mr Hendrik Louwrens (HL) noted that his property falls into site X, but the mine (which is an open cast mine) will be approximately 500 metres from his fence. He felt that an exact indication should be provided of the mine location.

KS suggested that the next presentation be provided as some of the questions may be answered in the presentation.

4. The EIA process to date

Mr Brett Lawson (BL) explained the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process being followed and reminded the meeting of the findings of the Scoping phase which included the investigation of alternatives and the identification of impacts. The presentation highlighted:

- Purpose of the Scoping Report
- Alternatives
  - Activity alternatives~ outside this scope
  - Location alternatives ~ Sites X & Y
  - Layout alternatives ~ informed primarily by technical considerations and natural features
  - Process alternatives
    - Combustion technology
    - Cooling technologies
    - Ash disposal
    - Emissions- Sulphur oxides, Nitrogen oxides and particulates
- Utility corridors
    - Water supply pipeline from Kendal power station

- Coal conveyor alignment
- Road access alignments
- Sorbent supply options

BL referred back to the question raised earlier by GB regarding whether the EIA measures up to international standards by stating that the methodology being adopted complies to world standards. He said that Eskom requires compliance to these standards and that there was an independent review consultant responsible for monitoring that the required standards were upheld.

Mr Johan Roets (JR) wanted to know whether Eskom could indicate a radius around the power station that would have an impact on vegetation, and also where the new tar road will be located. BL responded that everything is dependent on the size of the farms, and the specific footprint of the power station. Eskom would then look at the most logical purchase of land, but it could also happen that land be bought and, after construction of the power station is completed, remains unoccupied. Farming could then possibly continue on remaining land. In terms of the pollution radius, BL noted that in the case of air pollution no specific radius per se exists as the pollutants had been assessed in terms of their impact on agriculture and human health.

JR re-iterated the question of impact on agriculture and grazing upon which BL replied that the air quality specialist study also investigated the impact of sulphur on crops and the impact was found to be of very low concern. BL noted that Eskom does not have insight into the final location of road R545 as it was dependent on the Anglo Coal mine.

JH stated that the landowners were told that the Ogies / Balmoral road would be unavailable and it was also made clear to the landowners that Eskom would decide where the road would be located. He felt that the landowners did not know where they stood with Eskom and that Eskom was not being completely honest with the landowners. Furthermore, he stated that Eskom's valuers had already been on the farms, but no-one knew where they stood with Eskom.

BL noted that the discussion regarding the site preference would follow soon but in terms of planning, Eskom had to look at access roads from the North and South leading to the sites. He also added that the Kendal / Balmoral road (R545) would be realigned, due to the mining operations but that Anglo Coal would have to be contacted regarding this issue.

JH expressed concern that Site X, mine and new road will border their fences. Furthermore, he noted that Anglo Coal had indicated to the landowners that Eskom was responsible for deciding where the road would be located.

KS clarified the confusion by stating that when the final location for the power station has been determined, the location of the road will follow from that and that this is probably what Anglo Coal was referring to as it being Eskom's decision. SR added that once Eskom knows where the exact location for the power station is the mine will be able to firm up its plans.

JH stated that Anglo Coal had identified various sites, and that he needed to know where the mining would occur. He re-iterated that he felt the landowners still do not know where they stand with regard to all these developments and enquired which site had been selected for the power station.

KS indicated that the presentation of the findings of the Draft Environmental Impact Report would answer the site issue in terms of the environmentally preferred site.

Mr John Byrne (JB) noted that it was problematic that the two EIA processes (power station and coal mine) weren't talking to one another. He felt that Eskom and Anglo Coal should be talking to each other, eliminating confusion and conflict between all parties.

BL responded that communication does take place, but ideally the processes should have run in conjunction. He stated that combined meetings, unfortunately, were not going to happen as the Eskom process was approximately 6 months ahead of the mine process. He added that the authorities will have to consider both projects in context though, even though they have run two separate processes.

GB wanted to know whether the two projects were related. BL re-iterated that the Anglo Coal project is a totally separate project. Furthermore, transmission lines from the power station, Vaal River Eastern Subsystem Augmentation Project (VRESAP) providing water to this project and ultimately the new power station can be seen as part of a continuum of projects. He then agreed that running the mining and power station EIA processes together would have introduced less confusion for interested parties.

GB posed a question regarding the pollution emitted from the smoke stacks and noted that eventually it all comes down to ground level. He stated that with a high density of power stations together in the area, it could be a serious problem. BL noted that the air pollution specialist study had considered the cumulative effect.

5. The Draft Environmental Impact Assessment Report

Mr Ashwin West (AW) then proceeded to present the findings of the Draft EIR. The presentation highlighted the following:

- No clear distinction between Sites X & Y
- Site X (marginally) preferable ~Groundwater, Wetlands, Noise, Heritage & Agriculture
  - Site Y would require refinement to avoid wetlands but is constrained by space
  - Site X would also require refinement to avoid wetlands but more space available
- Cooling Technology
  - Indirect dry cooling = towers & larger footprint
  - Direct dry cooling = no towers, smaller footprint but higher noise levels
  - Direct dry cooling preferable since noise abatement possible
- Air Emissions
  Sulphur Oxides ~ Eskom committed to FGD

- 90% removal efficiency
- Predicted magnitude, frequency & spatial extent of non-compliance of ambient air quality appears to be unchanged from estimated future baseline conditions

Nitrogen Oxides ~ Eskom committed to low NOx technology (low NOx burners)

- magnitude of power station contribution to NOx concentrations considered low
- Particulates ~ Eskom committed to controls (bag filters / electrostatic precipitators) magnitude of the impact of particulate release considered low

- Ash Disposal
  - Surface ashing larger footprint than other forms of ash disposal but lower potential for groundwater contamination
  - Sub-surface ash disposal – may be considered in the future but will require collaboration between Eskom and mining house
- Construction Impacts
  - No construction phase impacts of high impact significance
  - Many construction phase impacts of medium significance
  - require mitigation measures
  - framework Environmental Management Plan (fEMP) compiled
  - More detailed & contract-specific EMP to follow, to address both construction & operation
- Way forward and comment period for Draft Environmental Impact Report

6. Discussion

GB asked for the term “mitigation” to be explained in this context. AW responded that it referred to methods to reduce the impact by for example; slight adjustments in terms of power station location on the site in terms of ecology, implementing certain new technologies in terms of air quality to reduce the pollution and in terms of noise mitigation it could also refer to the purchase of more land to create a buffer zone.

JH stated that between all the vague promises the landowners still did not know which site had been selected. He added that all the technical data is lost on all present and he would like to know what exactly is happening. AW responded that in terms of impacts and the severity thereof, Site X was marginally preferable from an environmental perspective. Furthermore, he added that Eskom would still have an opportunity to choose the site and motivate it to the environmental authorities, and that the EIR would inform that decision. JH then left the meeting.

Mr Andrè Cherry (AC) referred to the visual mitigation measures suggested in the presentation and wanted to know what kind of trees would be planted to screen the power station. AW responded that no tree could hide a power station but that trees used as screening along roads and view sights could be used. BL commented that certain routes e.g. a tourist route could be screened, so that the power station is not directly visible.

AC questioned whether a strip of trees would then be planted next to the highway, which was confirmed by BL. Furthermore, he wanted to know why acronyms were being used in the presentations e.g. NO_x, SO_x, DEAT etc. He stated that JH left because of use of acronyms which confused people.

JB stated that Eskom should not try to baffle the farmers' minds. He enquired how the public responded to the documents and he also questioned how the information is sourced as the public needs to query the scientific information provided. He also stated that there are no references in the documents and that the public had no access to the documents. BL noted that the specialist reports and the Draft Environmental Impact report itself were in fact referenced, and are available at local libraries, municipal offices and on two websites (Eskom's and Ninham Shand's). He said that all the reports were produced to a high scientific standard which has to comply with international standards but acknowledged the complexity of the issues dealt with which will not be accessible to many.

JB added that the sourcing of information is important and referred in particular to the impact on poultry. BL responded that the EIA process relies on the integrity of specialist reports.

JR requested clarification, as his property is located on Site Y. He asked whether he could continue farming or whether there was still be a chance of the location moving to Site Y. BL noted that it was unlikely that the site selected by Eskom would not be X and all the investigations indicate that it is the most preferred. Furthermore, he stated that landowners should continue with their lives and farming irrespective of the site selected adding that if the authorities decide that Site X is not suitable, the whole process would need to "start from scratch".

Mr Marius Louwrens (ML) asked that in the case of Site X being selected, where exactly the power station and associated infrastructure would be situated. BL noted that the layout alternatives which were in the document had been referred to during the presentation. He said that there was a possibility that the power station would be located further north, but that the specialist studies indicate that the power station could be more or less in the middle of site X with the coal stockyard to the south of that and the ash dump to the south of the coal stockyard.

ML further indicated that the mine EIA mentioned a split in site X. BL noted that initially 8 sites were identified in the site selection process and that Site X comprises two sites which were merged into one due to the similarity of the terrain.

ML then requested confirmation that when Site X is bought out, the entire site will be bought and BL responded that this was not necessarily the case. He added that the possibility exists that large areas would perhaps not be affected. TS commented that land in-between the power station, coal stockyard and ash dump would be bought out.

GB stated that in terms of the site of the power station, all landowners are concerned and that none of them want a power station "in their back yard". He noted that Eskom shouldn't try and convince them that it's healthy to have another power station. He added that their farms have been here and in operation for over two decades and they farm poultry that have a high respiration rate and are therefore susceptible to additional pollution. He said that they felt like experiments. He stated that their businesses were important in terms of economy and that they

need to know how far one needs to be from the power station and the coal mine to remain healthy. TS replied that that was the whole point of the EIA. The results from the specialist studies would answer these questions. AW added that the outfall area is actually further away from the point source, thus indicating that parties closer to the power station are actually less affected.

GB felt that their specific problem had not been investigated at all, and added that poultry farming was very important for the economy. BL noted that the air quality specialists had been specifically asked to look at the impact on poultry and enquired whether the information in the report was sufficient. GB stated that the information was not comprehensive and that they required more detail.

KS suggested that BL provide additional detail from the report outside of the meeting to GB to ensure that all questions are answered by more specific information.

GB further enquired about the impact wind direction has on the smoke stacks and whether this had been considered in considering the impact on their farm. BL responded that the air quality study did take wind direction into account, and that the information would be made available to GB.

PB, a resident on Farm Vlakfontein belonging to Mr. Corrie van Eeden, requested it be minuted that electricity was absent at her residence. Electricity was available but a transformer had been removed and she requested that her electricity be reconnected. Furthermore she added that the issue of job creation was vital for herself and her community.

AC wanted to know how many tons of coal per day would be burnt and BL responded that approximately 55 000 tons would be burnt per day. AC commented that even though Eskom claim that 90% of emissions are filtered out, it still adds up to a significant number if 10% of 55 000 tons is not filtered. TS explained that the sulphur content of the coal was only some 1% i.e. some 550 tonnes. With FGD operating at 90% efficiency, less than 10% of the 550 tonnes of sulphur would be emitted to the atmosphere each year. This would be emitted at a high elevation, above the inversion layer and hence there would be a further dilution effect. AC also wanted to know what would happen to the ambient temperature if 5 400 MW is generated without cooling stacks. He commented that his property is located directly to the south of Site X and wanted to know what would be done in terms of the heat emissions. BL re-iterated that this was investigated by the air quality specialist study.

AC commented that dust monitors had been placed on his farm by the mining houses and according to him it is “merely a bucket” which doesn’t seem to be very scientific or practical. He said that he felt it was only a bluff and wanted to know if this is how the specialists had collected information for the study BL had referenced. AC asked how the ambient temperature would be measured. He said that he felt that a great amount of energy was being produced and the heat had to go somewhere. He requested ambient temperature studies and said that he was not convinced that the impact was low as had been stated by the air quality specialist report,

especially on the southern border of Site X. TS stated that Eskom only uses SANS approved equipment for monitoring.

AC noted that the public wants figures and that the scientific data is going over their heads. They need practical examples to visualise things such as converting amounts of air pollutants into "numbers of truck loads". KS noted that the methodology was clearly detailed in the report and suggested that the discussion be continued one-on-one so that AC could be provided with sufficient detail.

AC noted that there is no impact on the Cape Town team members, and that one needs to consider the cumulative impacts of all development in the area including the power station, the realignment of roads, the various pipelines and the mine.

AW noted that most of the impacts had already been considered by the specialists and the information was available. BL also noted that it was evident from comments and issues received that a focus group be put together to address the issues raised by GB, JB and AC.

Mr Kobus Louwrens (KL) noted that he didn't know about the issues others were referring to but had a question regarding the operation of power stations. He asked whether Kendal would be phased out once the new power station had been built or whether both would remain in operation, thus resulting in double electricity generation. He also wanted to know what the impact of this would be on poultry and human health. BL responded that the new power station would not replace Kendal but would add to the electricity already generated. The new power station will generate 5 400 MW while Kendal generates 4 200 MW. He added that the technology will not be the same; it will be newer with lower impacts.

AC stated that he had only been informed of the project at the end of August 2006 and had also discovered that a pipeline will also be traversing his property. He commented that he was extremely concerned about the impacts during construction and did not believe they had been given adequate consideration. He said he was very concerned about the influx of new people into the area and the resultant increase in crime associated. He noted that it is unacceptable that Eskom says that there will be low impacts with the construction of a new power station and to claim that it is not their responsibility. Furthermore, he felt that Eskom and Anglo Coal were going to change the entire area and that more consultation with the community should be taking place. He asked why he had not been personally visited by the environmental team so that impacts on his farm could be assessed. He commented that the Anglo Coal process was more successful as they had visited more of the landowners individually and had undertaken more community engagement. He said that, since the ash dump will be located directly north of his farm, the cumulative impacts will be of large significance. He commented that the direct impact was on the landowners and for a team sitting in Cape Town there naturally would not be an impact.

KS clarified that the EIA process did not require that Ninham Shand or Eskom visit adjacent landowners on an individual basis but that they be informed of the process and be given

appropriate opportunity to engage. She highlighted that public meetings were included in the definition of engagement. She said that the legislative requirements have been met for this project. KS further stated that the location of the project team outside of the area did not affect their status and behaviour as professional and certified environmental assessment practitioners.

AC stated that the power station was going to be his neighbour, which is worse than being bought out and that his farm on the southern boundary of site X. He said that he felt it was too late to talk now and that information received up to date had been fragmented and unclear. Furthermore, he stated that there has been no interaction between Ninham Shand, Eskom and himself.

KS stated for the record, that all public information had been sent to AC and that several telephone conversations had been undertaken between herself and AC and that his issues had been captured in the issues trail and responded to. She clarified that it was not accurate to say that there had been no consultation with AC.

AC then noted that no detailed information had been made available previously. KS responded that the information in the EIA reports was made available as it became available from the specialist study reports. She explained that that this was why this round of public engagement was taking place, to make the information available to the public. AC enquired about the noise level of the cooling fans and KP stated that average freeway noise is louder than the fans. AC further noted that he feels that everyone within a 10km radius around the sites should have been personally visited.

GB noted that mitigation measures are only possibilities and wanted to know how it would be ensured that mitigation is implemented and controlled. BL responded that once a Record of Decision (RoD) has been issued certain conditions are linked to that. The report also includes a framework Environmental Management Plan (fEMP) and monitoring would be enforced. TS added that the recommendations in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) become binding, and that an Environmental Control Officer (ECO) is required on site to monitor construction in addition to an independent audit which is also required to determine whether the RoD conditions are being met. BL added that Environmental Liaison Committees (ELC) or Environmental Monitoring Committees (EMC) are often established and that a detailed EMP becomes part of the contract that the contractor is required to sign.

GB requested that economic factors are considered and wanted to know who authorised the site and where the final decision lies. KP noted that sites which could sustain a power station were placed on a strategic list in order to satisfy technical needs. He further noted that the consultants (Ninham Shand) should not be compromised and that they are acting in the interest of the public in ensuring site screening and assessment occurred. Furthermore, he added that if Eskom had their way these sites may not have been selected at all, but the independent consultants had been appointed to ensure the environmental viability of the project.

GB reiterated that the whole site, including the mine needs to be considered as an economical

entity. He asked which sites Eskom would chose next if these sites were found unsuitable for development. He stated that they had been living there for years and with the decommissioning of the Wilge Power Station and the mine the area was now pristine with high quality agricultural land. He repeated his question regarding how Eskom could motivate another power station in this area. KS noted that this issue had been dealt in detail in the Scoping report. She reassured the meeting that their issues will be placed in the issues trail and submitted to the authorities. GB asked whether the minutes of the meeting would be available to the public and authorities. KS responded that the minutes would be circulated and also submitted to the authorities as part of the final EIR. AC had a further query regarding livelihood security mentioned in the report and how it can be ranked as having a low impact as crime would have a significant impact. BL replied that livelihood security did not refer to security per sè, but rather to the security of one's livelihood i.e. jobs, not property. KS encouraged members of the public to stay and engage with the project team on detailed queries should they choose to but after requests from the audience agreed to close the formal meeting due to the lateness of the hour.
7. Way forward
KS reminded the meeting of the opportunities for input and encouraged everyone to submit their comments to Ninham Shand by 8 January 2007. KS thanked everyone for their attendance and closed the meeting at 20:45.

ATTENDANCE REGISTER (OPEN HOUSE AND PUBLIC MEETING)

NAME	ORGANISATION
Puleng Buku (PB)	Private
Geoff Byrne (GB)	Fairacres
John Byrne (JB)	Fairacres
Graeme Campbell (GC)	Streeknuus
Andre Cherry (AC)	Landowner
Jabulane Chiloane (JC)	Pedro Suppliers CC
Nicolaas Cloete (JPN)	Klipfontein Landowner
CL de Kock (CL)	Klipfontein Landowner
Llewellyn Du Toit (LDT)	Private
Johan Human (JH)	Private
Hendrik Kok (HK)	Sterley Farms
AJ Louwrens (AJ)	Private
Johannes Louwrens (JL)	Private
Wellington Mabona (WM)	ANC
Sidwell Mahlangu (SM)	ANC

Zebulon Maroga (ZM)	Petronet
HJ Meyer (HJ)	Private
Lucas Mnisi (LM)	Pecuglenden Genala Trediga
Ziyanda Ngumane (ZN)	Private
Eric Ndhlovu (EN)	Wilge Community Leader
Deon Nel (DN)	Klipfontein Landowner
JH Nel (JH)	Private
A Nortjie (AN)	Private
Peter Riba (PR)	ANC
Andre Roets (AR)	Nooitgedacht Landowner
Ruan Roets (RR)	Nooitgedacht Landowner
ME Schroender (ME)	Klipfontein Landowner
Stephan Swanepoel (SS)	Klipfontein Landowner
MP Van Eeden (MP)	Klipfontein Landowner
PJ Van Eeden (PJ)	Klipfontein Landowner
Annis Mohr Van Rooyen (AM)	Haartebeesfontein Landowner
Engeke Van der Merwe (EVD)	34 Klipfontein
Pieter Venter (PV)	Bronlaw Properties
JH Visser (JH)	Haartebeesfontein Landowner
Frik S Vivier (FS)	Klipfontein Landowner
Eskom Team	
Tony Stott (TS)	ESKOM
Tobile Bokwe (TB)	ESKOM
Krish Pillay (KP)	ESKOM
Suren Rajaruthnam (SR)	ESKOM
Goodness Ntuli (GN)	ESKOM
Environmental Team	
Brett Lawson (BL)	Ninham Shand
Ashwin West (AW)	Ninham Shand
Karen Shippey (KS)	Ninham Shand
Natanya Bezuidenhout (NB)	Ninham Shand
Gift Maganganye (GM)	Bohlweki Environmental