


# Eskom Holdings SOC Limited



## Environmental Impact Assessment for the Proposed 1x400kV Tabor-Bokmakirie (Nzhelele) and 4 X 250MVA 400kV/132kV Nzhelele Main Transmission Station, Limpopo Province

### FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

### VOLUME 1 - REPORT



**DEA EIA Reference Number:**  
14/12/16/3/3/2/317

**NEAS Ref Number:**  
DEA/EIA/0001132/2012

**LDEDET Ref Number:**  
12/1/9/E-V178

**Date:**  
May 2013

**Report Version:**  
Final

#### Lidwala Consulting Engineers (SA) (Pty) Ltd

**Randburg Office:**  
11th Church Avenue, Ruiterhof, Randburg, 2194,  
PO Box 4221, Northcliff, 2115.  
Tel: 0861 543 9252

**Pretoria Office:**  
1121 Hertzog Street, Office F005, Waverley, Pretoria, 0186,  
PO Box 32497, Waverley, Pretoria, 0135,  
Tel/fax: 0861 543 9252

**Polokwane Office:**  
128 Marshall Street, Amy Park no. 5, Polokwane  
PO Box 3558, Polokwane, 0700  
Tel: 0861 543 9252

**Nelspruit Office:**  
39 Emkhe Street, Nelpruit, 1200  
PO Box 2930, Nelspruit, 1200  
Tel: 0861 543 9252

## DOCUMENT DESCRIPTION

Client: Eskom Holdings SOC Limited

Project name: Environmental Impact Assessment for the Proposed 1x400kV Tabor-Bokmakirie (Nzhelele) and 4 X 250MVA 400kV/132kV Nzhelele Main Transmission Station, Limpopo Province

Report type: Final Environmental Impact Report

Lidwala Project number: 11040KNK

Document number: Document 2

Authority Reference: DEA - 14/12/16/3/3/2/317  
NEAS - DEA/EIA/0001132/2012  
LDEDET - 12/1/9/E-V178

Version: Final

Compiled by: Ashlea Strong (CEAPSA)

Specialists:

Frank van der Kooy (PrSciNat) (Social and Flora)  
Moseketsi Mochesane (Flora)  
Bongi Mhlanga (PPP and Social)  
Ntsebo Mofoka (PPP)  
Lionel Skeffers (PPP)  
Johnny van Schalkwyk (Heritage)  
Andrew Pearson (Avifauna)  
Clayton Cook (PrSciNat) (Fauna)  
Dawie Jansen van Vuuren (Visual)  
Jennifer Howarth (Legal)

GIS:

Glenn Mullett  
Katie Sassenberg

**Please note that the maps included in the text are also included as A3 maps in Appendix Q**

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### 1 INTRODUCTION

#### 1.1 Project Background

The Eskom Conversion Act, 2001 (Act No. 13 of 2001) establishes Eskom Holdings (SOC) Limited (Eskom) as a State Owned Enterprise (SOE), with the Government of South Africa as the only shareholder, represented by the Minister of Public Enterprises. The main objective of Eskom is to “provide energy and related services including the generation, transmission, distribution and supply of electricity, and to hold interests in other entities”.

Electricity cannot easily be stored in large quantities and in general must be used as it is generated. Therefore, electricity is generated in accordance with supply-demand requirements. Eskom Holdings (SOC) Limited (Eskom) is responsible for the provision of reliable and affordable power to South Africa. Eskom’s core business is the generation, transmission (transport), trading and retail of electricity. Eskom currently generates approximately 95% of the electricity used in South Africa. In terms of the Energy Policy of South Africa “energy is the life-blood of development”. The reliable provision of electricity is critical for industrial development and related employment and sustainable development in South Africa.

Eskom Transmission Division plan to strengthen the Northern Grid in the areas north of the Soutpansburg with a new 400kV powerline between the Tabor Main Transmission Substation and the newly approved Bokmakirie (Nzhelele) Substation.

The Polokwane Customer Load Network (CLN), including the Tabor and Spencer power corridor, remains susceptible to voltage instability and is the weakest part of the Northern Grid network due to being operated beyond its reliability power transfer limit. In addition to this, the Polokwane CLN, i.e., Tabor and Spencer 275 kV and 132 kV network is susceptible to low voltages regardless the approved and commissioned network strengthening in year 2010 below:

- Tabor-Spencer 275 kV line, and
- 2nd 250MVA 275/132 kV transformer

Listed below is the approved 400 kV network re-enforcement in the Polokwane CLN which is expected for commissioning by the end of year 2012:

- Witkop-Tabor 400 kV line, and
- Tabor 500MVA 400/132 kV transformer.

The combined transformation capacity at Tabor and Spencer MTS end state of 846MW exceeds the installed and the approved transformation capacity of 712 MW. In addition to

this, the low voltages and thermal constraints in the 132 kV Distribution network for both existing and planned network remains.

The Tabor and Spencer 275/132 kV transformation recorded peak in year 2010 was 280 MW and 210 MW, respectively. The exceeded Tabor 275/132 kV transformation firm will be restored once the Witkop-Tabor 400kV line and the 1st 500 MVA 400/132 kV transformer have been commissioned.

The Spencer 275/132 kV transformation firm capacity of 234 MW will be exceeded by 40 MW in year 2015. Therefore, compromising the network reliability by violating the set Grid Code N-1 transformation criteria.

The lengthy Tabor and Spencer 132 kV Distribution networks stretching 200 km from Polokwane to 50 km away from the Musina border-post result in low voltages and thermal constraints during N-1 transformation and line contingencies in year 2011 and beyond.

The expected Tabor and Spencer 132 kV load growth is located 100km north of Tabor and 70 km from Spencer, therefore, the Transmission outreach constraint will cap the load growth.

Following the findings after an assessment of the Tabor and Spencer 400 kV, 275 kV and 132kV network constraints for the 20 year horizon, Grid Planning proposes the following:

- Establish 4 x 250 MVA 400/132 kV Nzhelele Main Transmission Station (MTS) (**this project**)
- Construct Tabor–Nzhelele 130 km 400 kV line (**this project**),
- Construct Borutho–Nzhelele 250 km 400 kV line (**being undertaken concurrently by Nzumbululo Heritage Solutions**), and
- Commission all the associated infrastructure by year 2017.


The proposed servitudes for the Tabor-Nzhelele and Borutho 400 kV lines are likely to be more challenging to acquire due to the Mapungubwe mountain range which the lines will have to be built through to feed into the Nzhelele MTS. However, the planned commissioning date, i.e., 2017 take into account the EIA approval processes and challenges.

The above proposed network solution meets the 10 year Distribution load requirements in the Tabor and Spencer network area and it is also informed by the 20 year Transmission and Distribution load forecast in meeting the Transmission 20 year plan.

## 1.2 Description of the Study Area

The study area falls within the Limpopo Province between the Tabor Substation located just south of the Capricorn Toll Plaza approximately 67km north of Polokwane to the proposed new Bokmakirie (Nzhelele) substation approximately 45km south of Musina.

The regional location of the proposed project is indicated in **Figure 1**.



**Figure 1:** The location of the study area within the Makhado Local Municipality

Due to the fact that the EIA is a linear development, the Tabor- Nzhelele 400 kV power line EIA study area is shown as a sphere starting and ending at the two specified substation (**Figure 1**). The study area is approximately 83 kilometres in length and includes a total of 94 different farms divided into 204 farm portions along the length of the various alternative alignments.





## **2 PROCESS TO DATE**

The Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process for the proposed project is comprised of two main phases, namely the Scoping phase and Impact Assessment phase. This report documents the tasks which have been undertaken as part of the Impact Assessment phase of the EIA. These tasks include the public participation process and the documentation of the issues which have been identified as a result of these activities.

To date, tasks that have commenced include the:

- Identification of stakeholders or I&APs;
- Notification and advertisements;
- Background Information Documents; and
- Ongoing consultation and engagement

Lidwala undertook the Scoping Phase of the project between **March and August 2012**. The public review of the Draft Scoping Report ran for a period of **40 calendar days** from **31 May to 9 July 2012**. The responses and comments from I&APs on the draft Scoping Report were captured in the Final Environmental Scoping Report. The final Environmental Scoping Report was submitted to DEA for review and acceptance on **24 August 2011** together with the Final Plan of Study for Environmental Impact Assessment (POS for EIA). The Final Scoping Report and POS for EIA were accepted by the DEA on **2 November 2012**.

The relevant authorities required to review the proposed project and provide an Environmental Authorisation were consulted from the outset of this study, and have been engaged throughout the project process. The National Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA) is the competent authority for this Project. The Department of Water Affairs (DWA), and the Limpopo Department of Economic Development, Environment and Tourism (LDEDET) are noted as key commenting authorities.

The Impact Assessment Phase of an EIA serves to assess the potential impacts of a proposed project. The Environmental Impact Assessment Phase has been undertaken in accordance with the requirements of sections 24 and 24D of the National Environmental Management Act (NEMA) (Act 108 of 1998), as read with Government Notices R 543 of the 2010 EIA Regulations. The objectives of the EIA Phase are to:

- Ensure that the process is open and transparent and involves the Authorities, proponent and stakeholders;
- Address issues that have been raised during the preceding Scoping Phase;
- Assess alternatives to the proposed activity in a comparative manner;
- Assess all identified impacts and determine the significance of each impact; and
- Formulate mitigation measures.

The draft Environmental Impact Report was made available for review for a period of **40 days** from **7 March 2013** to **18 April 2013** at public locations within the study area, which are readily accessible to I&APs.

### **3 SUMMARY OF THE LEGISLATION CONTEXT**

The legislative framework applicable to this project is diverse and consists of a number of Acts, Regulations and Treaties which must be complied with. A summary of the key legislation is provided hereunder.

<b>Legislation</b>	<b>Sections</b>
The Constitution (Act No 108 of 1996)	Chapter 2
	Section 24
	Section 32
	Section 41
The Promotion of Administrative Justice Act (Act 3 of 2000)	-
Promotion of Access to Information Act (Act 2 of 2000)	-
National Environmental Management Act (No 107 of 1998)	Section 2
	Section 24A & 24D & 24(5)
	Section 28
National Environmental Management: Biodiversity Act No 10 of 2004	-
National Environmental Management: Protected Areas Act No 57 of 2003	-
National Environmental Management: Waste Act (No 59 of 2008)	Section 16
	Section 26
	Section 27
The Conservation of Agricultural Resources Act (No 43 of 1983)	Section 6 & R1048 of 25 May 1984
National Heritage Resources Act (No 25 of 1999)	-
National Forest Act No 84 of 1998	Section 15
National Water Act No 36 of 1998	Section 19
	Section 20
	Section 21
National Environmental Management: Air Quality Act (No 39 of 2004)	Section 32
	R1651 of 20 September 1974
Occupational Health and Safety Act (No 85 of 1993)	Section 8
	Section 9
Fertilisers, Farm Feeds, Agricultural Remedies and Stock Remedies Act (No 36 of 1947)	Sections 3 to 10



Legislation	Sections
Limpopo Environmental Management Act (No 7 of 2003)	Chapter 13 (sections 89-93)
Makhado Local Municipality: Environment: Inflammable liquids and substances By-law	Chapter 7
Drainage By-laws LA. 78 dated 5 January 1994	The whole

A full legal review was undertaken during the EIA phase of the project.

#### **4 DESCRIPTION OF THE BASELINE ENVIRONMENT**

The terrain morphology of the study area is broadly described as slightly undulating to strong undulating plains with high mountains. The study area (86 x 26 km) is divided into three zones, each of which presents different topographical characteristics, i.e. a northern section, the Soutpansberg, and a southern section.

The study area could be considered a subtropical climate. The winters are characterised by mild afternoons and cool evenings. Winters usually last from June to August. Summers experience warm and often humid temperatures with the occasional afternoon thunderstorm. Most of Louis Trichardt's rainfall occurs in the summer months, from November to March. The last few years have seen some water restrictions put in place by the municipality mainly due to drought in the area and lack of maintenance of the town's water supply system by the municipality.

The dominant vegetation type in the south of study area is "Makhado Sweet Bushveld". A large element of "Tzaneen Sour Bushveld" lies to the east of the route alternatives. As one moves north of Makhado (Louis Trichardt), and in to the mountains, the dominant vegetation type is "Soutpansberg Mountain Bushveld". Elements of "Soutpansberg Summit Sourveld" and "Northern Mistbelt Forest" are also present in the mountains. The patches of Afromontane forest, up to 30-40 m tall, are found in valleys and moist basins, especially where south-facing. On the lower and middle slopes, sourish mixed bushveld dominates. The mountain peaks are covered with scattered clumps of Protea bushes. The eastern portion of the Soutpansberg has been extensively afforested with commercial timber plantations. Parts of the range are also used for subtropical fruit farming, mainly avocados, mangos, nuts and citrus. The eastern portion holds various forest reserves, including Timbadola Forest Reserve, Entabeni State Forest, Klein Australië Forest Reserve, Goedehoop Forest Reserve, Roodewal Forest Reserve and Hanglip State Forest, and the private Buzzard Mountain Retreat, 20 km west of Louis Trichardt. Most of these protected areas are partly afforested and partly covered by indigenous vegetation.

North of the Soutpansberg, as one descends towards the Limpopo River, the area is dominated by "Musina Mopane Bushveld" while patches of "Limpopo Ridge Bushveld" are also present.

The archaeology of the Soutpansberg covers the time period from about 1 000 000 years ago to the beginning of the historical/colonial period in the area at about 1840.

The total population of Makhado is estimated at 495 261 and is growing at about 1.4% per annum. It is composed of 54.25% female and about 45.75% male persons. The local population has a youthful age structure and the immediate significance of this young age structure is that the population will grow rapidly in future and this implies a future high growth rate in the labour force. At present the local economy is unable to provide sufficient employment opportunities to meet the needs of the economically active population

## **5 ALTERNATIVES**

### *a) No-Go Alternative*

In the context of this project, the no-go alternative implies that the powerlines linking the Tabor substation to the new Bokmakirie (Nzhelele) Substation in order to strengthen the northern grid or that the expansion of the Bokmakirie substation to accommodate the new 400kV infrastructure will not be constructed.

The no-go alternative can be regarded as the baseline scenario against which the impacts of the powerlines are evaluated. This implies that the current biophysical and socio-economic conditions associated with the proposed routes will be used as the benchmark against which to assess the possible changes (impacts) to these conditions as a result of the powerlines.

In most cases, the no-go alternative will imply that the identified negative impacts of proceeding with the project will not be incurred. Conversely, selection of the no-go alternative will also result in the benefits (including the potential economic development and related job creation, and increased security of electricity supply for the northern areas of the Limpopo Province) of the project not being realised.

The 'no go' alternative has, however, been investigated in the EIA phase as an alternative as required by the EIA Regulations.

### *b) Tower Design Alternatives*

There are several tower design options available for use in the transmission line development, as described below. A variety or combination of tower designs are likely to be utilised for construction of the lines, depending on the characteristics and needs of the land and communities concerned. These can include:

- compact cross rope suspension tower
- cross rope suspension tower

- guyed suspension tower
- self supporting strain tower
- self supporting tower


The final tower design alternatives will be decided based on a walk down of the proposed corridors, and upon discussion with the relevant parties involved. The various tower designs can all be utilised for 400 kV powerlines.

In some cases particular towers are more appropriate for use, such as:

- Self supporting strain towers are always utilised on a turn or before and after particularly long spans, especially where mountainous terrain is concerned.
- The compact cross rope suspension and guyed suspension towers are preferred when grazing land or game farming occurs due to the small footprint area of the base of the tower.
- The self supporting tower is preferred on areas where crop farming occurs, due the fact that there are no guy ropes, which can make ploughing difficult


c) *Access Roads*

A formal section of access road is proposed to be constructed through the farms Clydesdale and Vlakfontein. Two sections of the road have been identified to be paved with a suitable surfacing material, such as bitumen or concrete, in order to reduce erosion due to the steepness of the slopes. This road is proposed not only as an access road for the proposed 400kV line alternative but also required for the existing 132kV line. Due to the fact that this road was proposed as a result of a direct request from the landowners, for use during the maintenance of the existing 132kV powerline, there are no alternatives and will require establishment even in the event that the proposed parallel 400kV alignment is not considered preferred. **Figure 3** gives an indication of the proposed route that has been investigated during the detailed studies.



**Figure 3:** Proposed formal access road

In addition to the above access road a further 5 km of access road is proposed to be constructed between the N1 and the proposed new Nzhelele substation. **Figure 4** gives an indication of the proposed route that has been investigated during the detailed studies.



**Figure 4:** Proposed formal access road to the proposed new Nzhelele substation



d) *Substation*


The full scope of work for the substation includes:

- Expansion of Bokmakirie (Nzhelele) Substation with 4 X 250MVA 400KV/132KV transformers and associated infrastructure, including:
  - Terrace the Nzhelele 400kV yard for and end-state of 4x 400kV feeder bays,
  - Terrace the Nzhelele 132kV yard for and end-state of 8x 132kV feeder bays,
  - Establish the control building, telecommunication infrastructure, oil dam,

Although the Bokmakirie Substation is not yet built, it has received an Environmental Authorisation for the building of a Distribution size (2 ha) substation for the new 132 kV powerline that was recently established. The Bokmakirie Substation will be built on the Farm Scott 567MS Portion 2.

This project requires the expansion of the Bokmakirie Substation to allow for both the Tabor – Nzhelele powerline and well as the Barutho – Nzhelele powerline. The Bokmakirie Substation will need to be increased to a size of 25 ha to accommodate the above-mentioned infrastructure (**Figure 5**).

Due to the fact that the activities involved are expansion activities, there is no alternative site for the substation.



**Figure 5:** Proposed Nzhelele Transmission Substation expansion footprint versus the approved Bokmakirie Distribution Substation expansion footprint




e) *Corridor Alternatives*

The proposed powerline includes:

- One 400 kV powerline from the Tabor substation to the Bokmakirie (Nzhelele) substation.

Once the most suitable corridor(s) have been recommended and authorised, the exact alignment of the powerlines within the corridor(s) will be finalised.

**Table 1** provides the summary of various sections of the five alternatives as illustrated in **Figure 6**.



**Figure 6:** A map indicating the various sections of each alternative as described in Table 1

**Table 1:** Alternative Summary

Issue	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Alternative 4	Alternative 5
<b>Length</b>	93km	95km	95km	119.3km	126.1km
<b>Number of Bend points</b>	50	54	42	±32	±40
<b>Number of Transmission Line Crossings</b>	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Number of Distribution Line Crossings</b>	5	8	5	unknown	unknown
<b>Number of National Road Crossings</b>	2	4	2	2	2
<b>Number of Railway Crossings</b>	1	1	1	4-5	4-5
<b>Land Use</b>	Game farms, Agricultural, residential, veld	Game farms, Agricultural, residential, veld	Game farms, Agricultural, residential, veld	Game farms, Agricultural, residential, veld	Game farms, Agricultural, residential, veld
<b>Topography</b>	Flat and Undulating (including mountainous section north of Louis Trichardt)	Flat and Undulating (including mountainous section north of Louis Trichardt)	Flat and Undulating (including mountainous section north of Louis Trichardt)	Flat and Undulating (including mountainous section northwest of Louis Trichardt)	Flat and Undulating (including mountainous section northwest of Louis Trichardt)
<b>Access</b>	Good	Good	Fair	Fair	Fair

## 6 IMPACT ASSESSMENT

### 6.1 Alternative 1

During the **construction phase**, the majority of impacts identified were considered to be of low to medium significance in the event that the appropriate mitigation measures are implemented.

The following **negative** impacts were assessed to be of High significance in the event that mitigation measures are not implemented as required:

- Heritage
  - Destruction of Heritage sites and features

After the implementation of mitigation measures the intensity levels of all impacts reduced.

The majority of the impacts identified, associated with the **operational phase** were considered to be of low to medium significance in the event that the appropriate mitigation measures are implemented.

The following **negative** impacts were assessed to be of high significance in the event that mitigation measures are not implemented as required:

- Visual
  - Visual exposure to the Powerline Servitude, Conductor Cables and Towers, as well as the Nzhelele Substation

After the implementation of mitigation measures the intensity levels of all impacts reduced.

The following **positive** impacts were assessed to be of high significance:

- Social
  - Increase in the voltage stability
  - Increase of electricity supply making it available for agriculture, tourism and other industries. The increase in electricity can also allow for the undertaking of other activities that may have been that may not have been possible prior to the improved electricity supply
  - No more backlogs in electricity Connections
  - The inadequate provision of electricity to services such as health facilities will cease
  - Electricity will be available to numerous rural settlements that do not have this service

The majority of impacts identified associated with the **de-commissioning phase** were considered to be of low to medium significance in the event that the appropriate mitigation measures are implemented. No impacts were assessed as having a high significance before the implementation of mitigation measures.

## 6.2 Alternative 1a

During the **construction phase**, the majority of impacts identified were considered to be of low to medium significance in the event that the appropriate mitigation measures are implemented. The following **negative** impacts were assessed to be of High significance in the event that mitigation measures are not implemented as required:

- Heritage

- Destruction of Heritage sites and features

After the implementation of mitigation measures the intensity levels of all impacts reduced.

The majority of the impacts identified, associated with the **operational phase** were considered to be of low to medium significance in the event that the appropriate mitigation measures are implemented. The following **negative** impacts were assessed to be of high significance in the event that mitigation measures are not implemented as required:

- Visual
  - Visual exposure to the Powerline Servitude, Conductor Cables and Towers, as well as the Nzhelele Substation

After the implementation of mitigation measures the intensity levels of all impacts reduced.

The following **positive** impacts were assessed to be of high significance:

- Social
  - Increase in the voltage stability
  - Increase of electricity supply making it available for agriculture, tourism and other industries. The increase in electricity can also allow for the undertaking of other activities that may have been that may not have been possible prior to the improved electricity supply
  - No more backlogs in electricity Connections
  - The inadequate provision of electricity to services such as health facilities will cease
  - Electricity will be available to numerous rural settlements that do not have this service

The majority of impacts identified associated with the **de-commissioning phase** were considered to be of low to medium significance in the event that the appropriate mitigation measures are implemented. No impacts were assessed as having a high significance before the implementation of mitigation measures.

### **6.3 Alternative 1b**

During the **construction phase**, the majority of impacts identified were considered to be of low to medium significance in the event that the appropriate mitigation measures are implemented. The following **negative** impacts were assessed to be of High significance in the event that mitigation measures are not implemented as required:



- Heritage
  - Destruction of Heritage sites and features

After the implementation of mitigation measures the intensity levels of all impacts reduced.

The majority of the impacts identified, associated with the **operational phase** were considered to be of low to medium significance in the event that the appropriate mitigation measures are implemented. The following **negative** impacts were assessed to be of high significance in the event that mitigation measures are not implemented as required:

- Visual
  - Visual exposure to the Powerline Servitude, Conductor Cables and Towers, as well as the Nzhelele Substation

After the implementation of mitigation measures the intensity levels of all impacts reduced.

The following **positive** impacts were assessed to be of high significance:

- Social
  - Increase in the voltage stability
  - Increase of electricity supply making it available for agriculture, tourism and other industries. The increase in electricity can also allow for the undertaking of other activities that may have been that may not have been possible prior to the improved electricity supply
  - No more backlogs in electricity Connections
  - The inadequate provision of electricity to services such as health facilities will cease
  - Electricity will be available to numerous rural settlements that do not have this service

The majority of impacts identified associated with the **de-commissioning phase** were considered to be of low to medium significance in the event that the appropriate mitigation measures are implemented. No impacts were assessed as having a high significance before the implementation of mitigation measures.

## 6.4 Alternative 2

During the **construction phase**, the majority of impacts identified were considered to be of low to medium significance in the event that the appropriate mitigation measures are implemented. The following **negative** impacts were assessed to be of High significance in the event that mitigation measures are not implemented as required:

- Heritage
  - Destruction of Heritage sites and features

After the implementation of mitigation measures the intensity levels of all impacts reduced.

The majority of the impacts identified, associated with the **operational phase** were considered to be of low to medium significance in the event that the appropriate mitigation measures are implemented. The following **negative** impacts were assessed to be of high significance in the event that mitigation measures are not implemented as required:

- Visual
  - Visual exposure to the Powerline Servitude, Conductor Cables and Towers, as well as the Nzhelele Substation

After the implementation of mitigation measures the intensity levels of all impacts reduced.

The following **positive** impacts were assessed to be of high significance:

- Social
  - Increase in the voltage stability
  - Increase of electricity supply making it available for agriculture, tourism and other industries. The increase in electricity can also allow for the undertaking of other activities that may have been that may not have been possible prior to the improved electricity supply
  - No more backlogs in electricity Connections
  - The inadequate provision of electricity to services such as health facilities will cease
  - Electricity will be available to numerous rural settlements that do not have this service

The majority of impacts identified associated with the **de-commissioning phase** were considered to be of low to medium significance in the event that the appropriate mitigation measures are implemented. No impacts were assessed as having a high significance before the implementation of mitigation measures.

## 6.5 Alternative 3

During the **construction phase**, the majority of impacts identified were considered to be of low to medium significance in the event that the appropriate mitigation measures are

implemented. The following **negative** impacts were assessed to be of High significance in the event that mitigation measures are not implemented as required:

- Flora
  - Destruction of pristine habitat
- Heritage
  - Destruction of Heritage sites and features

After the implementation of mitigation measures the intensity levels of all impacts reduced.

The majority of the impacts identified, associated with the **operational phase** were considered to be of low to medium significance in the event that the appropriate mitigation measures are implemented. The following **negative** impacts were assessed to be of high significance in the event that mitigation measures are not implemented as required:

- Flora
  - Destruction of protected flora
  - Destruction of pristine habitat
  - Vegetation clearance
- Visual
  - Visual exposure to the Powerline Servitude, Conductor Cables and Towers, as well as the Nzhelele Substation

After the implementation of mitigation measures the intensity levels of all impacts reduced.

The following **positive** impacts were assessed to be of high significance:

- Social
  - Increase in the voltage stability
  - Increase of electricity supply making it available for agriculture, tourism and other industries. The increase in electricity can also allow for the undertaking of other activities that may have been that may not have been possible prior to the improved electricity supply
  - No more backlogs in electricity Connections
  - The inadequate provision of electricity to services such as health facilities will cease
  - Electricity will be available to numerous rural settlements that do not have this service

The majority of impacts identified associated with the **de-commissioning phase** were considered to be of low to medium significance in the event that the appropriate

mitigation measures are implemented. The following **negative** impacts were assessed to be of high significance in the event that mitigation measures are not implemented as required:

- Flora
  - Destruction of pristine habitat

## 6.6 Alternative 4

During the **construction phase**, the majority of impacts identified were considered to be of low to medium significance in the event that the appropriate mitigation measures are implemented. The following **negative** impacts were assessed to be of High significance in the event that mitigation measures are not implemented as required:

- Flora
  - Destruction of protected flora
  - Destruction of pristine habitat
  - Vegetation clearance
  - Threat to biodiversity
- Heritage
  - Destruction of Heritage sites and features

After the implementation of mitigation measures the intensity levels of all impacts reduced.

The majority of the impacts identified, associated with the **operational phase** were considered to be of low to medium significance in the event that the appropriate mitigation measures are implemented. The following **negative** impacts were assessed to be of high significance in the event that mitigation measures are not implemented as required:

- Flora
  - Destruction of protected flora
  - Destruction of pristine habitat
  - Vegetation clearance
  - Threat to biodiversity
  - Soil erosion
- Visual
  - Visual exposure to the Powerline Servitude, Conductor Cables and Towers, as well as the Nzhelele Substation

After the implementation of mitigation measures the intensity levels of all impacts reduced.

The following **positive** impacts were assessed to be of high significance:

- Social
  - Increase in the voltage stability
  - Increase of electricity supply making it available for agriculture, tourism and other industries. The increase in electricity can also allow for the undertaking of other activities that may have been that may not have been possible prior to the improved electricity supply
  - No more backlogs in electricity Connections
  - The inadequate provision of electricity to services such as health facilities will cease
  - Electricity will be available to numerous rural settlements that do not have this service

The majority of impacts identified associated with the **de-commissioning phase** were considered to be of low to medium significance in the event that the appropriate mitigation measures are implemented. The following **negative** impacts were assessed to be of high significance in the event that mitigation measures are not implemented as required:

- Flora
  - Destruction of protected flora
  - Destruction of pristine habitat
  - Vegetation clearance
  - Threat to biodiversity

## 6.7 Alternative 5

During the **construction phase**, the majority of impacts identified were considered to be of low to medium significance in the event that the appropriate mitigation measures are implemented. The following **negative** impacts were assessed to be of High significance in the event that mitigation measures are not implemented as required:

- Flora
  - Destruction of protected flora
  - Destruction of pristine habitat
  - Vegetation clearance
  - Treat to biodiversity
- Heritage
  - Destruction of Heritage sites and features

After the implementation of mitigation measures the intensity levels of all impacts reduced.



The majority of the impacts identified, associated with the **operational phase** were considered to be of low to medium significance in the event that the appropriate mitigation measures are implemented. The following **negative** impacts were assessed to be of high significance in the event that mitigation measures are not implemented as required:

- Flora
  - Destruction of protected flora
  - Plant encroachment
  - Threat to biodiversity
- Visual
  - Visual exposure to the Powerline Servitude, Conductor Cables and Towers, as well as the Nzhelele Substation

After the implementation of mitigation measures the intensity levels of all impacts reduced.

The following **positive** impacts were assessed to be of high significance:

- Social
  - Increase in the voltage stability
  - Increase of electricity supply making it available for agriculture, tourism and other industries. The increase in electricity can also allow for the undertaking of other activities that may have been that may not have been possible prior to the improved electricity supply
  - No more backlogs in electricity Connections
  - The inadequate provision of electricity to services such as health facilities will cease
  - Electricity will be available to numerous rural settlements that do not have this service

The majority of impacts identified associated with the **de-commissioning phase** were considered to be of low to medium significance in the event that the appropriate mitigation measures are implemented. The following **negative** impacts were assessed to be of high significance in the event that mitigation measures are not implemented as required:

- Flora
  - Destruction of protected flora
  - Destruction of pristine habitat
  - Vegetation clearance
  - Threat to biodiversity

## 6.8 No-Go Alternative

In general, no impacts were identified to be associated with the No-Go Alternative, due to the fact that in the event that the transmission line is not constructed, no impacts will occur as the status quo will remain.

However, a number of **negative** impacts were identified to be of High significance from a social point of view in the event that the powerline is not constructed:

- Social
  - No increase and assurance of electricity supply making it unavailable for agriculture, tourism and other industries as well as allowing for the undertaking of other activities that may not have been possible before. The absence of an increase in electricity may also hinder the undertaking of other activities that may only be possible with electricity supply
  - Continuation of the inadequate provision of electricity to critical services such as health facilities
  - Continuation of the unavailability of electricity in numerous rural settlements
  - Continuation of backlogs in electricity connections
  - No increase in the voltage stability

## 6.9 Cumulative Impacts

The majority of **cumulative impacts** identified and associated with the project were considered to be of low to medium significance in the event that the appropriate mitigation measures are implemented.

The following **negative** impacts were assessed to be of High significance in the event that mitigation measures are not implemented as required:

- Flora
  - Plant encroachment
  - Soil erosion
- Fauna
  - Loss of faunal habitat
- Visual
  - Increased visual exposure to Power Line Infrastructure
- Social
  - Poaching of game impacting on the loss of game and in turn affecting the tourism industry of the Municipality and that of the country at large

With regards to the proposed new powerline a total of two (2) cumulative impacts were assessed as having a high significance before the implementation of mitigation measures.

After the implementation of mitigation measures the intensity levels of all impacts were reduced.

## 7 ROUTE PREFERENCE RANKING

In order to identify which of the alternative routes is deemed preferred, the specialists were requested to rank the alternatives routes according to a route ranking methodology. The route preference rating system is applied to each discipline, and the rating of each site was conducted according to the following system:

- 1 = Not suitable for development / No-Go (impact of very high significance - negative)
- 2 = not preferred (impact of high significance - negative)
- 3 = acceptable (impact of moderate significance - negative)
- 4 = Preferred (impact of low or negligible significance - negative)

While each specialist study was required to have the Route Preference as an outcome, how they evaluated each route varied from discipline to discipline and the description of their specific approaches are outlined in each specialist report (refer **Appendix J to P**).

The route preference results for each route from each specialist study were entered into a matrix and added together. The route with the highest value is then considered the most preferable. **Table 2** shows the final route preference matrix.

**Table 2:** Final Route Ranking Matrix

Study	Alt 1	Alt 1a	Alt 1b	Alt 2	Alt3	Alt 4	Alt 5
<b>Fauna</b>	3	3	4	4	3	2	3
<b>Avifauna</b>	3	3	3	4	2	1	1
<b>Flora</b>	4	4	4	4	1	2	1
<b>Soils and Agricultural Potential</b>	4	3	4	3	3	2	3
<b>Social</b>	4	3	1	3	3	2	3
<b>Visual</b>	3	3	3	3	2	2	2
<b>Heritage</b>	3	3	3	3	3	2	2
<b>Total</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>15</b>

From the above route raking assessment, it is clear that the preferred corridor would involve a combination of Alternatives 1, 1a, 1b and 2. Alternatives 3, 4 and 5 are not deemed to be acceptable. It can be noted that Alternative 1 and 2 have the same final value, however, Alternative 2 was identified as the more preferred route in the south due to the fact that the individual scores for biodiversity issues (i.e. flora, fauna and avifauna) were higher for Alternative 2 than for Alternative 1. Alternative 2 also does not cut through the Ben Lavin Nature Reserve.

Alternative 2 is approximately 10km from the eastern boundary of the Makhado Air Force Base with the line running more or less perpendicular to the extended centre line of the Makhado Air Force Base runway. According to Part 139 of the Civil Aviation Regulations, 2011 the following 2 items are of specific relevance:

- All objects, whether temporary or permanent, which project above the horizontal surface within a specified radius of 8 kilometres as measured from the aerodrome reference point should be marked as specified in Document SA-CATS 139
- No buildings or objects higher than 45 metres above the mean level of the landing area, or, in the case of a water aerodrome or heliport, the normal level of the water, must without the approval of the Director be erected within a distance of 8 kilometre measured from the nearest point on the boundary of an aerodrome or heliport

Due to the fact that the preferred corridor is situated more than 10 km from the end of the runway and that the towers will be less than 45 m metres in height there should be no reason why the powerline can not be built within the preferred corridor.

However, due to the fact that powerlines do constitute a hazard to aircraft and the associated pilots and passengers it is recommended that the following is undertaken by Eskom in terms of mitigation:

- Eskom must inform the Commissioner about the plans for the proposed powerline as per the Civil Aviation Regulations
- It is recommended that the section of the powerline that runs perpendicular to the air force runway (as agreed with the Air Force) is constructed utilising the shortest tower available i.e. self supporting towers (30m in height)
- It is also recommended that the section of the powerline that runs perpendicular to the air force runway (as agreed with the Air Force) is marked as required by the commissioner which could include the relevant aviation marker spheres as well as the marker lights (either red or strobes as required).
- Due to the fact that the Makhado Air force base specialises in low level flight manoeuvres and that the powerline corridor falls within the Makhado Air force Control Zone (CTR<sup>1</sup>), it is recommended that Eskom also consult the Air force with regards to suitable and appropriate marking requirements and tower heights.

In addition to the above aviation requirements, the corridor was requested to be widened in along two sections, namely:

- Just north of the mountains to accommodate the proposed mining infrastructure of Coal of Africa. The preferred corridor currently follows a route that traverses over one of the planned open cast pits as well as a railway line. Therefore, the corridor has

---

<sup>1</sup> CTR – Control Tower Region – an area of controlled air space extending upwards from ground level to specified upper limit (in this case 8000 feet)

been widened in this area to accommodate these future developments, in order to avoid having to move the powerline at a later stage (red circled area on **Figure 7**).

- Just south of Louis Trichart along a section of Alternative 1b, a landowner is a private aviator and has requested that the final alignment of the new powerline be investigated to north of the existing powerline. Therefore, the corridor has been widened slightly to accommodate this northern area (Yellow circled area on **Figure 7**).


Lastly, in terms of design alternative, landowners on the farms Clydesdale and Vlakfontein made the following suggestions:

- Use the existing servitude, or
- Build the new 400kV powerline next to the existing servitude and then later when the network is stable remove one of the two 132kV powerlines and rehabilitate the servitude

It is recommended that the merits of these suggestions are considered during the design phase of the project.

The final corridor is shown in **Figure 7** below.





**Figure 7:** Final Preferred Corridor

## **8 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

In the view of the environmental assessment practitioner, that once final, the information contained in this report and the documentation attached thereto will be sufficient for the National DEA to make a decision in respect of the activities applied for with respect to the proposed new 400 kV powerline between the Tabor and Nzhelele Substations.

This EIA provides an assessment of both the benefits and potential negative impacts anticipated as a result of the proposed new powerline. The findings of the assessment conclude that identified significant impacts can be addressed with relevant mitigation measures, therefore, in the view of the EAP, no environmental fatal flaws should prevent the proposed project from proceeding.

In order to achieve appropriate environmental management standards and ensure that the findings of the environmental studies are implemented through practical measures, the recommendations from this EIA have been included within a Preliminary Construction and Operational Environmental Management Programme (EMPR) which has been included in **Appendix E**. It is recommended that this EMPR is updated once the final alignment of the powerline has been identified and surveyed. A final walk-down of all proposed tower positions, by all relevant specialists, must be undertaken and tower specific recommendations and mitigation measures included into the update EMPR. This EMPR will then form part of the contract with the contractors appointed to construct and maintain the proposed infrastructure. The EMPR would be used to ensure compliance with environmental specifications and management measures. The implementation of this EMPR for key life cycle phases (i.e. construction and operation) of the proposed project is considered to be fundamental in achieving the appropriate environmental management standards as detailed for this project.

It is also recommended that the process of communication and consultation with the community representatives and landowners is maintained after the closure of this EIA process, during the construction and operational phases associated with the proposed project.

**Eskom Holdings SOC Limited**

**Environmental Impact Assessment for the Proposed 1x400kV Tabor-Bokmakirie  
(Nzhelele) and 4 X 250MVA 400kV/132kV Nzhelele Main Transmission Station,  
Limpopo Province**

**Final Environmental Impact Report**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b><u>Item</u></b>	<b><u>Description</u></b>	<b><u>Page No.</u></b>
	<b>Document Description</b>	
	<b>Executive Summary</b>	
	<b>Table of Contents</b>	
<b>1.</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	1-1
<b>1.1</b>	<b>Need and Justification for the Project</b>	1-1
<b>1.2</b>	<b>Summary of the EIA Process</b>	1-3
<b>1.2.1</b>	<b><i>Application Process</i></b>	1-4
<b>1.2.2</b>	<b><i>Scoping Phase</i></b>	1-5
<b>1.2.3</b>	<b><i>EIA or Assessment Phase</i></b>	1-5
<b>1.3</b>	<b>Way Forward</b>	1-6
<b>2.</b>	<b>DETAILS OF ROLE PLAYERS</b>	2-1
<b>2.1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	2-1
<b>2.2</b>	<b>Details of Applicant</b>	2-1
<b>2.3</b>	<b>Details of Independent Environmental Assessment Practitioner</b>	2-1
<b>2.4</b>	<b>Details of Competent / Relevant Authority</b>	2-4
<b>2.5</b>	<b>Details of Commenting Authority</b>	2-4
<b>2.5.1</b>	<b><i>Limpopo Department of Economic Development, Environment and Tourism (LDEDET)</i></b>	2-4
<b>3.</b>	<b>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</b>	3-1
<b>3.1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	3-1
<b>3.2</b>	<b>Need and Justification for the project</b>	3-1
<b>3.3</b>	<b>Electricity Transmission</b>	3-3
<b>3.3.1</b>	<b><i>Electrical power transmission and distribution</i></b>	3-3
<b>3.3.2</b>	<b><i>Components of a typical transmission line system</i></b>	3-5
<b>3.4</b>	<b>Location of the Proposed Development</b>	3-7
<b>3.5</b>	<b>Detailed Description of the Project</b>	3-8
<b>3.5.1</b>	<b><i>Components of the transmission power lines</i></b>	3-9
<b>3.5.2</b>	<b><i>Clearance requirements for transmission power lines</i></b>	3-9
<b>3.5.3</b>	<b><i>Proposed associated infrastructure to be constructed/erected</i></b>	3-10
<b>3.5.4</b>	<b><i>Use of services and resources during construction</i></b>	3-10
<b>3.6</b>	<b>The steps in constructing and operating a transmission powerline</b>	3-12



<b>3.6.1</b>	<b><i>Planning (Step1)</i></b>	3-13
<b>3.6.2</b>	<b><i>Environmental impact assessment and authority authorisation of corridor (Step 2 and 3)</i></b>	3-13
<b>3.6.3</b>	<b><i>Negotiation and registration of a servitude (Step 4)</i></b>	3-14
<b>3.6.4</b>	<b><i>Survey and line design (Steps 5 – 7)</i></b>	3-14
<b>3.6.5</b>	<b><i>Construction (Steps 8 – 13)</i></b>	3-14
<b>3.6.6</b>	<b><i>Rehabilitation (Step 14)</i></b>	3-17
<b>3.6.7</b>	<b><i>Commissioning of the line and on-going maintenance (Steps 15 – 16)</i></b>	3-17
<b>3.7</b>	<b>Construction schedule</b>	3-18
<b>3.8</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>	3-18
<b>4.</b>	<b>PROJECT ALTERNATIVES</b>	4-1
<b>4.1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	4-1
<b>4.2</b>	<b>The 'No-go' Alternative</b>	4-1
<b>4.3</b>	<b>Tower Design Alternatives</b>	4-2
<b>4.4</b>	<b>Access Road</b>	4-5
<b>4.5</b>	<b>Substation</b>	4-6
<b>4.6</b>	<b>Corridor Alternatives</b>	4-7
<b>4.6.1</b>	<b><i>Initial Corridor alternatives</i></b>	4-8
<b>4.6.2</b>	<b><i>Additional Corridors</i></b>	4-13
<b>5.</b>	<b>LEGISLATIVE CONTEXT</b>	5-1
<b>5.1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	5-1
<b>5.2</b>	<b>National Environmental Management Act</b>	5-1
<b>5.3</b>	<b>General Legislative Overview</b>	5-4
<b>5.4</b>	<b>Policy and Planning Context</b>	5-18
<b>5.4.1</b>	<b><i>White Paper on the Energy Policy of the Republic of South Africa</i></b>	5-18
<b>5.4.2</b>	<b><i>Energy Security Master Plan – Electricity (2007-2025)</i></b>	5-18
<b>5.4.3</b>	<b><i>National Spatial Biodiversity Assessment ("NSBA")</i></b>	5-19
<b>5.4.4</b>	<b><i>Draft National Strategy for Sustainable Development</i></b>	5-19
<b>5.4.5</b>	<b><i>National Protected Area Expansion Strategy</i></b>	5-20
<b>6.</b>	<b>EIA PROCESS AND METHODOLOGY</b>	6-1
<b>6.1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	6-1
<b>6.2</b>	<b>Scoping Phase</b>	6-1
<b>6.2.1</b>	<b><i>Introduction</i></b>	6-1
<b>6.3</b>	<b>Public Participation</b>	6-1
<b>6.4</b>	<b>Potential Environmental Impacts identified during Scoping</b>	6-4
<b>6.5</b>	<b>Impact Assessment Phase</b>	6-5
<b>6.5.1</b>	<b><i>Introduction</i></b>	6-5
<b>6.5.2</b>	<b><i>Impact Assessment Methodology</i></b>	6-6
<b>6.5.3</b>	<b><i>Specialist Studies</i></b>	6-8
<b>6.5.4</b>	<b><i>Public Participation Process</i></b>	6-8
<b>6.6</b>	<b>Authority Consultation</b>	6-11
<b>6.7</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>	6-11
<b>7</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION OF BASELINE ENVIRONMENT</b>	7-1
<b>7.1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	7-1

<b>7.2</b>	<b>Study Area in Regional Context</b>	7-1
<b>7.2.1</b>	<b>Locality</b>	7-1
<b>7.2.2</b>	<b>Study Area</b>	7-1
<b>7.3</b>	<b>Description of the Baseline Environment</b>	7-7
<b>7.3.1</b>	<b>Topography</b>	7-7
<b>7.3.2</b>	<b>Climate</b>	7-11
<b>7.3.3</b>	<b>Geology</b>	7-16
<b>7.3.4</b>	<b>Soils and Agricultural Potential</b>	7-18
<b>7.3.5</b>	<b>Natural Vegetation</b>	7-24
<b>7.3.6</b>	<b>Animal Life</b>	7-27
<b>7.3.7</b>	<b>Sensitive Environmental / Habitats on and Surrounding the Alignment</b>	7-37
<b>7.3.8</b>	<b>Avifauna</b>	7-40
<b>7.3.9</b>	<b>Site of Archaeological, Historical and Cultural Interest</b>	7-57
<b>7.3.10</b>	<b>Visual Aspects</b>	7-64
<b>7.3.11</b>	<b>Social Environment</b>	7-74
<b>8.</b>	<b>IMPACT IDENTIFICATION</b>	8-1
<b>8.1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	8-1
<b>8.2</b>	<b>Topography</b>	8-1
<b>8.2.1</b>	<b>Potential Impacts</b>	8-1
<b>8.2.2</b>	<b>Recommended Mitigation and Management Measures</b>	8-1
<b>8.3</b>	<b>Soil and Agricultural Potential</b>	8-2
<b>8.3.1</b>	<b>Potential Impacts</b>	8-2
<b>8.3.2</b>	<b>Recommended Mitigation and Management Measures</b>	8-2
<b>8.4</b>	<b>Geology</b>	8-3
<b>8.4.1</b>	<b>Potential Impacts</b>	8-3
<b>8.4.2</b>	<b>Recommended Mitigation and Management Measures</b>	8-4
<b>8.5</b>	<b>Flora</b>	8-4
<b>8.5.1</b>	<b>Potential Impacts</b>	8-4
<b>8.5.2</b>	<b>Recommended Mitigation and Management Measures</b>	8-6
<b>8.6</b>	<b>Fauna</b>	8-7
<b>8.6.1</b>	<b>Potential Impacts</b>	8-7
<b>8.6.2</b>	<b>Recommended Mitigation and Management Measures</b>	8-11
<b>8.7</b>	<b>Avifauna</b>	8-20
<b>8.7.1</b>	<b>Potential Impacts</b>	8-20
<b>8.7.2</b>	<b>Recommended Mitigation and Management Measures</b>	8-28
<b>8.8</b>	<b>Sites of Archaeological, Historical and Cultural Interest</b>	8-29
<b>8.8.1</b>	<b>Potential Impacts</b>	8-29
<b>8.8.2</b>	<b>Recommended Mitigation and Management Measures</b>	8-30
<b>8.9</b>	<b>Visual Aspects</b>	8-31
<b>8.9.1</b>	<b>Potential Impacts</b>	8-31
<b>8.9.2</b>	<b>Recommended Mitigation and Management Measures</b>	8-48
<b>8.10</b>	<b>Social Environment</b>	8-52
<b>8.10.1</b>	<b>Potential Impacts</b>	8-52
<b>8.10.2</b>	<b>Recommended Mitigation and Management Measures</b>	8-55
<b>9.</b>	<b>IMPACT ASSESSMENT</b>	9-1
<b>9.1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	9-1

<b>9.2</b>	<b>EIA Process and Methodology</b>	9-1
<b>9.3</b>	<b>Impact Assessment Conclusions</b>	9-229
<b>9.3.1</b>	<b><i>Alterantive 1</i></b>	9-229
<b>9.3.2</b>	<b><i>Alterantive 1a</i></b>	9-230
<b>9.3.3</b>	<b><i>Alterantive 1b</i></b>	9-231
<b>9.3.4</b>	<b><i>Alterantive 2</i></b>	9-232
<b>9.3.5</b>	<b><i>Alterantive 3</i></b>	9-233
<b>9.3.6</b>	<b><i>Alterantive 4</i></b>	9-234
<b>9.3.7</b>	<b><i>Alterantive 5</i></b>	9-235
<b>9.3.8</b>	<b><i>No-Go Alternative</i></b>	9-236
<b>9.3.9</b>	<b><i>Cumulative Impacts</i></b>	9-237
<b>9.4</b>	<b>Route Preference Rating</b>	9-237
<b>10.</b>	<b>CONCLUSION</b>	10-1
<b>10.1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	10-1
<b>10.1.1</b>	<b><i>Project Background</i></b>	10-1
<b>10.1.2</b>	<b><i>Description of the Study Area</i></b>	10-3
<b>10.2</b>	<b>Process to Date</b>	10-5
<b>10.3</b>	<b>Alternatives</b>	10-7
<b>10.3.1</b>	<b><i>No-Go Alternative</i></b>	10-7
<b>10.3.2</b>	<b><i>Tower Design Alternatives</i></b>	10-7
<b>10.3.3</b>	<b><i>Access Roads</i></b>	10-8
<b>10.3.4</b>	<b><i>Substation</i></b>	10-9
<b>10.3.5</b>	<b><i>Corridor Alternatives</i></b>	10-10
<b>10.4</b>	<b>Impact Assessment</b>	10-12
<b>10.4.1</b>	<b><i>Alterantive 1</i></b>	10-12
<b>10.4.2</b>	<b><i>Alterantive 1a</i></b>	10-13
<b>10.4.3</b>	<b><i>Alterantive 1b</i></b>	10-14
<b>10.4.4</b>	<b><i>Alterantive 2</i></b>	10-15
<b>10.4.5</b>	<b><i>Alterantive 3</i></b>	10-16
<b>10.4.6</b>	<b><i>Alterantive 4</i></b>	10-18
<b>10.4.7</b>	<b><i>Alterantive 5</i></b>	10-19
<b>10.4.8</b>	<b><i>No-Go Alternative</i></b>	10-21
<b>10.4.9</b>	<b><i>Cumulative Impacts</i></b>	10-21
<b>10.5</b>	<b>Route Preference Ranking</b>	10-22
<b>10.6</b>	<b>Environmental Impact Statement</b>	10-24
<b>10.7</b>	<b>Conclusions and Recommendations</b>	10-25

**LIST OF TABLES**

- Table 2.1:** Details of Applicant
- Table 2.2:** Details of the independent EIA Consultant (Environmental Assessment Practitioner)
- Table 2.3:** Details of relevant competent authority – DEA
- Table 2.4:** Details of the commenting authorities – LDEDET
- 
- Table 3.1:** Summary of points of origin and destination of the proposed power lines
- Table 3.2:** Typical steps in construction and operation of a transmission powerline
- 
- Table 4.1:** Eskom’s initial descriptions of the various sections of the three alternatives from the route selection report
- Table 4.2:** Alternative Summary
- Table 4.3:** Eskom’s initial descriptions of the various sections of the additional alternatives
- Table 4.4:** Updated Alternative Summary
- 
- Table 5.1:** Summary of applicable environmental legislation
- 
- Table 6.1:** List of environmental and socio-economic issues identified during Scoping
- Table 6.2:** List of Specialist Studies
- Table 6.3:** Date on which the adverts were published for the review of the Draft EIR
- Table 6.4:** Public Meeting / Open days
- 
- Table 7.1:** Farm Portions situated within the Tabor – Nzhelele 400 kV powerline Study Area
- Table 7.2:** Soil properties per land type: Tabor-Nzhelele study area
- Table 7.3:** Dominant dryland agricultural potential class per land type
- Table 7.4:** Number of mammal species per order as recorded for the Soutpansberg in relation to South Africa (Gaigher & Stuart 2003).
- Table 7.5:** Mammal species of conservation importance possibly occurring on the proposed 400kV Tabor-Nzhelele powerline alignments (using habitat availability and distribution as an indicator of presence)
- Table 7.6:** Reptile species of conservation significance that have been recorded from the Soutpansberg Conservancy area (Gaigher 2003). Species in bold could possibly occur on the site due to the presence of suitable habitat.
- Table 7.7:** Reptile species of conservation importance likely to occur on or around the proposed Tabor-Nzhelele alignments.
- Table 7.8:** Red Listed species recorded in the quarter degree squares covering the study area (Harrison et al 1997)
- Table 7.9:** Relevant species recorded by SABAP2 in selected pentads.
- Table 7.10:** Site visit observation list

**Table 7.11:** Unemployment Rate (%)

**Table 7.12:** Distribution of the Municipality's Employment Sector

**Table 7.13:** Opportunities of Agriculture (According to the LED Strategy)

**Table 9.1:** Detailed assessment of identified impacts for Alternative 1

**Table 9.2:** Detailed assessment of identified impacts for alternative 1a

**Table 9.3:** Detailed assessment of identified impacts for Alternative 1b

**Table 9.4:** Detailed assessment of identified impacts for Alternative 2

**Table 9.5:** Detailed assessment of identified impacts for Alternative 3

**Table 9.6:** Detailed assessment of identified impacts for Alternative 4

**Table 9.7:** Detailed assessment of identified impacts for Alternative 5

**Table 9.8:** Specialist Criteria for Route Preference Ratings

**Table 9.9:** Final Route Ranking Matrix

**Table 10.1:** Alternative Summary

**Table 10.2:** Final Route Ranking Matrix

## LIST OF FIGURES

**Figure 1.1:** Environmental Impact Assessment Process

**Figure 3.1:** Simplified electrical transmission and distribution system

**Figure 3.2:** Photograph of Self-supporting Strain Tower (in foreground) and Cross Rope Suspension tower (in centre) designs

**Figure 3.3:** Photograph of conductors strung between transmission towers

**Figure 3.4:** Photograph of a substation, which transforms electricity from high to low voltage for consumer use

**Figure 3.5:** Transformers at a substation

**Figure 3.6:** Locality of the study area within the Makhado Local Municipal area of Limpopo

**Figure 3.7:** Access road proposed through the Farms Clydesdale and Vlakfontein

**Figure 3.8:** Access road proposed between the N1 and the Nzhelele substation

**Figure 3.9:** Vegetation Clearance (Step 8)

**Figure 3.10:** Gate erection (access for maintenance phase) (Step 8)

**Figure 3.11:** Access roads (Step 10)

**Figure 3.12:** Construction Camp (Step 10)

**Figure 3.13:** Construction of tower foundations (Step 11)

**Figure 3.14:** Assembly and erection of towers (Step 12)

**Figure 3.15:** Stringing of conductors (power lines) (Step 13)

**Figure 3.16:** Maintenance – erosion control

**Figure 3.17:** Maintenance – fire breaks

**Figure 4.1:** Illustration of a compact cross rope suspension tower

**Figure 4.2:** Illustration of a cross rope suspension tower

**Figure 4.3:** Illustration of a guyed suspension tower

- Figure 4.4:** Illustration of a self-supporting strain tower
- Figure 4.5:** Illustration of a self supporting tower
- Figure 4.6:** Proposed formal access road
- Figure 4.7:** Proposed formal access road to the proposed new Nzhelele substation
- Figure 4.8:** Proposed Nzhelele Transmission Substation expansion footprint versus the approved Bokmakirie Distribution Substation expansion footprint
- Figure 4.9:** A map indicating the various sections of each alternative as described in Eskom's initial route selection report
- Figure 4.10:** A map indicating additional route corridors in relation to the original corridors
- 
- Figure 5.1:** Map showing protected areas and private tourist facilities
- 
- Figure 6.1:** Placement of site and general project notices in the study area
- Figure 6.2:** Placement of project notices in the study area during the Draft EIR Review
- 
- Figure 7.1:** The location of the study area within the Makhado Local Municipality
- Figure 7.2:** Proposed Alternative Alignments within the Study Area
- Figure 7.3:** Topography depicted by means of a shaded relief map.
- Figure 7.4:** Cliffs and valleys of the Soutpansberg, with the Hendrik Verwoerd tunnel.
- Figure 7.5:** Cross section from north to south - western part of the study area
- Figure 7.6:** Cross section from north to south - eastern part of the study area.
- Figure 7.7:** Average and Extreme Temperatures for Louis Trichardt **(a)** and Musina **(b)**
- Figure 7.8:** Average precipitation for Louis Trichardt **(a)** and Musina **(b)**
- Figure 7.9:** Long-term average rainfall patterns for the study area
- Figure 7.10:** Average number of rain days per month for Louis Trichardt **(a)** and Musina **(b)**
- Figure 7.11:** Average daily wind speed for Louis Trichardt **(a)** and Musina **(b)**
- Figure 7.12:** Land Type Map
- Figure 7.13:** Agriculture Potential Map
- Figure 7.14:** A conglomerate of photographs of frog species likely to occur within the Tabor-Nzhelele alignments
- Figure 7.15:** A conglomerate of photographs displaying the reptile species observed within the Tabor-Nzhelele alignments
- Figure 7.16:** Map indicating the various line alternatives, as Towns, IBA's, Rivers and the vegetation classification for the south of the study area (Mucina & Rutherford 2006).
- Figure 7.17:** Map indicating the various line alternatives, as Towns, IBA's, Rivers and the vegetation classification for the north of the study area (Mucina & Rutherford 2006).
- Figure 7.18:** A large Baobab tree seen in relatively undisturbed bushveld within the broader study area.
- Figure 7.19:** Disturbed bushveld / Thornveld that has been grazed by livestock.
- Figure 7.20:** A rocky ridge and cliffs in the Soutpansberg, within the study area.



- Figure 7.21:** View of the Soutpansberg Vulture Colony situated on a large cliff face. Note vultures soaring above.
- Figure 7.22:** A small stream running through evergreen montane forest.
- Figure 7.23:** Extensive forestry plantations are evident on the slopes of the Soutpansberg in the vicinity of Makhado.
- Figure 7.24:** Evidence of small scale farming in the more rural settlements within the broader study area.
- Figure 7.25:** A centre pivot irrigation system being used on cultivated lands in the study area.
- Figure 7.26:** Avocado trees on a farm in the Soutpansberg.
- Figure 7.27:** Relatively open and undisturbed grassland patch within the Ben Lavin Nature Reserve.
- Figure 7.28:** The Mutamba River which was dry at the time of the site visit.
- Figure 7.29:** Marabou Storks observed near to a small dam, close to the town of Louis Trichardt.
- Figure 7.30:** A group of crested Guinaefowl was observed in the Ben Lavin Nature Reserve.
- Figure 7.31:** The state of cadastral and geographical information of the study region in 1899. (Map: Jeppe 1899)
- Figure 7.32:** Distribution of Venda-, Tsonga- and Sotho speakers in the region c. 1935. (One dot represents 10 tax payers) (Map: Van Warmelo 1935)
- Figure 7.33:** Stone tool typology and rock paintings in the Soutpansberg. The stone tools (on the left) are not from the region and are only used to illustrate the difference between Early (left), Middle (middle) and Later Stone Age (right) technology
- Figure 7.34:** A multi-component Iron Age sites, showing excavated features (Sekgosese district).
- Figure 7.35:** A typical hilltop site and a much later open terrain site.
- Figure 7.36:** Buildings found in the urban environment.
- Figure 7.37:** Examples of farmsteads and farming related features identified in the region
- Figure 7.38:** Local cemeteries
- Figure 7.39:** Monuments in town and the rural area
- Figure 7.40:** Infrastructural elements in the environment (train stations and telephone lines).
- Figure 7.41:** View of landscape north of the Soutpansberg.
- Figure 7.42:** Land cover of the region north of the Soutpansberg.
- Figure 7.43:** Land cover of the Soutpansberg complex.
- Figure 7.44:** An aerial perspective view of the Sand River Gorge, showing the location of Medike Mountain Lodge (Source: Google Earth, 2013).
- Figure 7.45:** Typical view in the Soutpansberg, as seen from the N1 National road.
- Figure 7.46:** Land cover of the region south of the Soutpansberg
- Figure 7.47:** Map showing protected areas and private tourist facilities.
- Figure 7.48:** Location of possible sensitive receptors in the study area, denoted by buildings.

**Figure 7.49:** Tourist meanders in the Makhado area

**Figure 7.50:** Change in stock farming to game farming between 1964 and 2007 (Du Toit, 2007; Carruthers, 2008)

**Figure 7.51:** Area of game farms with valid permits in South African provinces in 2000 (Van der Merwe & Saayman, 2004:104 in Carruthers, 2008)

**Figure 8.1:** Sensitivity Map 1, showing areas of medium to high avifaunal sensitivity. The Mutamba River crossing is the main area of concern here.

**Figure 8.2:** Sensitivity Map 2, showing areas of medium to high avifaunal sensitivity. The Luvuvhu River is the main area of concern here.

**Figure 8.3:** Sensitivity Map 3, showing areas of medium to high avifaunal sensitivity.

**Figure 8.4:** Sensitivity Map 4, showing areas of medium to high avifaunal sensitivity.

**Figure 8.5:** Sensitivity map for the Soutpansberg region, showing the Vulture Colony, buffered wetlands and rivers, as well as areas of general concern (red polygons)..

**Figure 8.6:** Photo showing the highly visible nature of a powerline

**Figure 8.7:** Viewshed analysis for Alternative 1

**Figure 8.8:** Viewshed analysis for Alternative 1a

**Figure 8.9:** Viewshed analysis for Alternative 1b

**Figure 8.10:** Viewshed analysis for Alternative 2

**Figure 8.11:** Viewshed analysis for Alternative 3

**Figure 8.12:** Viewshed analysis for Alternative 4

**Figure 8.13:** Viewshed analysis for Alternative 5

**Figure 8.14:** Reduced visibility intensity over increased distance from the powerline (powerline complex).

**Figure 8.15:** Map of possible sensitive receptor locations, with symbols differentiated by virtue of proximity to the powerline

**Figure 8.16:** View of the Soutpansberg and a farmstead, illustrating a scene with a visually coherent and harmonious pattern.

**Figure 8.17:** View of a powerline in the distance, illustrating the VAC of the Soutpansberg landscape in terms of visual screening and background assimilation.

**Figure 8.18:** View of powerline cables in the foreground, partially screened by vegetation close to the observer.

**Figure 8.19:** Design of a typical 400kV tower: cross rope suspension tower (top) and supporting strain tower (bottom).

**Figure 8.20:** Focal points in the landscape should be avoided because the human eye is attracted to these points first. (Source: US-BLM, 2009)

**Figure 8.21:** New disturbance should be avoided and the natural lines in the landscape should be followed. (Source: US-BLM, 2009)

**Figure 9.1:** Position of Alternative 2 in relation to the extended centreline of the Air Force Base Runway

**Figure 9.2:** Final Preferred Corridor

**Figure 10.1:** The location of the study area within the Makhado Local Municipality

**Figure 10.2:** Proposed Alternative Alignments within the Study Area

**Figure 10.3:** Proposed formal access road

**Figure 10.4:** Proposed formal access road to the proposed new Nzhelele substation

**Figure 10.5:** Proposed Nzhelele Transmission Substation expansion footprint versus the approved Bokmakirie Distribution Substation expansion footprint

**Figure 10.6:** A map indicating the various sections of each alternative as described in Table 10.1

**Figure 10.7:** Final Preferred Route

## LIST OF APPENDICES

<b>Appendix A:</b>	DEA Acceptance of Environmental Scoping Report and Plan of Study for EIA
<b>Appendix B:</b>	Curricula Vitae of Project Team
<b>Appendix C:</b>	Eskom's Gate Guideline
<b>Appendix D:</b>	Eskom Erosion Control and Vegetation Management Guidelines
<b>Appendix E:</b>	Environmental Management Programme
<b>Appendix F:</b>	I&AP Database
<b>Appendix G:</b>	Comment and Response Report
<b>Appendix H:</b>	DEIR Advert
<b>Appendix I:</b>	DEIR Notification Letter
<b>Appendix J:</b>	Fauna Specialist Study
<b>Appendix K:</b>	Soil and Agricultural Potential Specialist Study
<b>Appendix L:</b>	Flora Specialist Study
<b>Appendix M:</b>	Avifauna Specialist Study
<b>Appendix N:</b>	Heritage Specialist Study
<b>Appendix O:</b>	Visual Specialist Study
<b>Appendix P:</b>	Social Specialist Study
<b>Appendix Q:</b>	A3 Maps
<b>Appendix R:</b>	<u>Focus Group and One-on-One Meeting Minutes and documentation</u>
<b>Appendix S:</b>	<u>Public meeting and Public Open days Documentation</u>
<b>Appendix T:</b>	<u>Landowner Consultation Map</u>