

ANNEXURE U

Issues Trail 2

ISSUES TRAIL TWO

The first Issues Trail documented the comments received up to the compilation of the Draft Scoping Report. This Issues Trail documents all responses and comments received after the Draft Scoping Report was lodged in the public domain. It also includes issues raised at the public meetings that were held on 4 and 5 September 2006, when the Draft Scoping Report was presented to the public.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT: PROPOSED COAL FIRED POWER STATION IN THE WITBANK GEOGRAPHICAL AREA		
SUMMARY OF ISSUES AND CONCERNS RAISED VIA WRITTEN COMMENT		
No.	Individual Organisation	Issue or Concern
1.	Johan Britz Msukaligwa Municipality	<p>1. Concerned about the environmental impacts such as noise, dust and road damage caused by the trucks that are currently delivering coal to the existing Kendal power station. Will an impact study be undertaken on the trucks that will be delivering coal or other goods to the proposed power station?</p>
2.	Johan Raath Farm owner	<p>The dust, noise and traffic impacts of the proposed power station will be assessed in detail in the EIA Phase of the EIA process. The results of the air quality, noise and traffic specialist studies will be presented in the Draft EIR, which the public will have an opportunity to comment on.</p> <p>In terms of the delivery of coal, it is proposed to use conveyor belts to transport the coal from the coal mine pit head to the coal stockyard. It is not proposed to use trucks to transport coal to the power station.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
3.	Brian Toke SADTU	<p>1. Accept that this may be inevitable but not happy about the idea of selling the farm.</p> <p>2. Pollution from the ash tip could be minimised with effective planning.</p> <p>3. Opposed to the location of a power station on the second site (Site Y) as it is located on the banks of a significant water course, the Wilge River and it will not be possible to prevent contamination and pollution from the ash tips if this location is chosen.</p> <p>1. Concerned that the construction of another power station near to the existing Kendal power station will create more pollution around Phola and Ogies.</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT: PROPOSED COAL FIRED POWER STATION IN THE WITBANK GEOGRAPHICAL AREA

SUMMARY OF ISSUES AND CONCERNS RAISED VIA WRITTEN COMMENT			
No.	Individual Organisation	Issue or Concern	Response
		2. What percentage of the work force is likely to be recruited from Phola and Ogies?	Noted, Eskom will develop a plan which involves local labour and service providers as far as possible. However this EIA process is ahead of other decision-making processes that are related to the functioning of the station. The number and source of workers will depend on the amount and type of work created as a consequence of the proposed power station. Once relevant authorisations have been obtained to progress with identifying what skills are required and later when appointing contractors and a labour force, Eskom will engage relevant role players such as, the Department of Labour and local authorities in initiating a process of identifying and sourcing available skills among the local communities. During construction there would be between 2000 and 7000 jobs (between 400 and 1 400 unskilled) and during operation 600 – 800 (between 20 and 35 unskilled) permanent positions.
4.	Patricia Martinson	1. Strongly object to the siting of this power station. The proposed power station will have an adverse effect on the environment and ecology of the area.	The concern has been noted. The purpose of this EIA process is to understand, qualify and quantify the range of potential impacts that the proposed power station may have on the biophysical and social environment. The outcomes of the EIA process will help to inform DEAT's decision on whether to authorise the power station. The public will have the opportunity to comment on the Draft EIR, which will contain the impact assessments and results of the various specialist studies. In addition, specific mitigation measures will be developed to minimise identified impacts. An Environmental Management Plan would be implemented to enforce mitigation measures during construction and operation.
		2. The region is already inundated with power stations and is already polluted.	Noted. Power stations are located as close as possible to coal hence the number of power stations in the area. This aspect was taken into consideration during the site selection process and resulted in the optimal sites being selected taking into account air quality and extended conveyor belts. In terms of air pollution, an air quality study will examine the potential impacts of the proposed power station on the ambient air quality.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT: PROPOSED COAL FIRED POWER STATION IN THE WITBANK GEOGRAPHICAL AREA

SUMMARY OF ISSUES AND CONCERNS RAISED VIA WRITTEN COMMENT			
No.	Individual	Organisation	Issue or Concern
			3. The proposed power station will contribute to the already dangerous greenhouse gases occurring in the area.
5.	John D. Saunders	Emalahleni Councillor	1. Employment preference should be given to local people in all the phases of the construction and the subsequent operation of all classes of employees.
			Greenhouse gases and their implications for climate change have a regional and global significance. The potential local air quality impacts will be assessed as part of the air quality study. Climate change will also be discussed. Noted, Eskom will develop a plan which involves local labour and service providers as far as possible. However this EIA process is ahead of other decision-making processes that are related to the functioning of the station. The number and source of workers will depend on the amount and type of work created as a consequence of the proposed power station. Once relevant authorisations have been obtained to progress with identifying what skills are required and later when appointing contractors and a labour force, Eskom will engage relevant role players such as. the Department of Labour and local authorities in initiating a process of identifying and sourcing available skills among the local communities. During construction there would be between 2000 and 7000 jobs (between 400 and 1 400 unskilled) and during operation 600 – 800 (between 20 and 35 unskilled) permanent positions. Noted.
			2. There is a great wealth of human resources in this area and some inhabitants have been associated with Eskom.
			3. Training of prospective employees can greatly benefit employees, the community and Eskom. Where skills are lacking there is a willingness to learn.
			Comment noted.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT: PROPOSED COAL FIRED POWER STATION IN THE WITBANK GEOGRAPHICAL AREA

SUMMARY OF ISSUES AND CONCERNS RAISED VIA WRITTEN COMMENT			
No.	Individual Organisation	Issue or Concern	Response
		<p>4. The local service providers of all classes should be used for the needs of this project. This would require the dissemination of information standards and requirements to enable supplies to render a top quality service.</p>	<p>Noted, Eskom will develop a plan which involves local labour and service providers as far as possible. However this EIA process is ahead of other decision-making processes that are related to the functioning of the station. The number and source of workers will depend on the amount and type of work created as a consequence of the proposed power station. Once relevant authorisations have been obtained to progress with identifying what skills are required and later when appointing contractors and a labour force, Eskom will engage relevant role players such as: the Department of Labour and local authorities in initiating a process of identifying and sourcing available skills among the local communities. During construction there would be between 2000 and 7000 jobs (between 400 and 1 400 unskilled) and during operation 600 – 800 (between 20 and 35 unskilled) permanent positions.</p>
		<p>5. Careful monitoring of all the aspects of environmental impact must be done. Witbank suffers greatly from pollution in many spheres of the environment. We trust that Eskom will become a leader in the area and set an example of cleaning up the atmosphere for benefit of future generations</p> <p>6. Good luck with the project. As a retired Eskom human resources practitioner, would like to volunteer to assist where it would be beneficial.</p>	<p>In the event that the power station obtains the relevant authorisation, monitoring and auditing will be a part of the operation of the power station.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
6	M. T. Hadebe Petronet	<p>1. Site X is preferred, from our perspective, as the most suitable site for the construction of a power station because it will have minimal effect on our pipelines. Site Y would certainly affect the route of our proposed new pipeline as shown in the locality plan provided.</p>	<p>Noted. Meeting with the environmental practitioners responsible for the Petronet pipeline project was held on 7 September 2006. The matter is being pursued collaboratively.</p>
7.	Maria Sindane	<p>1. The aim of this proposed project is to open more job opportunities for those individuals with skills, knowledge and experience who were formerly denied a chance to prove themselves. An offer to supply services that may be required was made.</p>	<p>Noted. Eskom has equity policies which have been successfully implemented over many years. Therefore this issue will be addressed.</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT: PROPOSED COAL FIRED POWER STATION IN THE WITBANK GEOGRAPHICAL AREA

SUMMARY OF ISSUES AND CONCERNS RAISED VIA WRITTEN COMMENT			
No.	Individual	Organisation	Issue or Concern
8	Hurricane Silence Zembe	Community Committee Member	1. Our community is a well-organised society and we support this development and would like to be 100% involved in the development strategies of this proposed power station so as to enrich our community as a whole.
			Response Noted, Eskom will develop a plan which involves local labour and service providers as far as possible. However this EIA process is ahead of other decision-making processes that are related to the functioning of the station. The number and source of workers will depend on the amount and type of work created as a consequence of the proposed power station. Once relevant authorisations have been obtained to progress with identifying what skills are required and later when appointing contractors and a labour force, Eskom will engage relevant role players such as the Department of Labour and local authorities in initiating a process of identifying and sourcing available skills among the local communities. During construction there would be between 2000 and 7000 jobs (between 400 and 1 400 unskilled) and during operation 600 – 800 (between 20 and 35 unskilled) permanent positions.
9.	John Byrne	Fairacres	1. Attended a meeting at El Toro Conference Centre and would like to know how livestock production and egg production will be affected by the proposed power station. 2. Concerned about the effect of the proposed power station on noise, dust and water quality. Their organisation has invested a vast amount of money since the closure of the previous coal mines.
			The outcome of the EIA Phase of the EIA process will shed light on these concerns. The implications of the proposed power station on ambient noise levels, air quality and water resources in the area will be assessed as part of the range of specialist studies being undertaken for this project. The results of these studies will be presented in the Draft EIR, which will be made available for public comment.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT: PROPOSED COAL FIRED POWER STATION IN THE WITBANK GEOGRAPHICAL AREA

SUMMARY OF ISSUES AND CONCERNS RAISED VIA WRITTEN COMMENT			
No.	Individual	Organisation	Issue or Concern
10.	Malcolm Sutill	Wildlife and Environmental Society of South Africa	<p>1. We believe this project is being steamrolled into a position of no return on a project with major pollution potential. The September public meeting was arranged at short notice and the comment period is too short.</p>
			<p>2. Why are we not building clean nuclear power plants instead of the coal fired powered stations that are large polluters? Eskom appear to be taking an easy way out. Eskom's arguments on the coal-fired route are noted but they don't say why we are not going nuclear as a matter of extreme urgency. Costs and time frames etc. of alternatives should be made available. There should be more facts available regarding the basic level of coal-fired versus nuclear before we allow these units to be built.</p>

Response

The EIA process complies with Regulation 1183 of the Environment Conservation Act (No. 73 of 1989) and is not believed to prejudice anyone. A 30-day comment period is being implemented, which is keeping with best practice. Registered I&APs were given 2 weeks notice of the public meeting and the newspaper adverts gave anyone not registered as an I&AP 7 days notice of the public meeting. Those I&APs who have requested more time to formulate a response were allowed to provide comment up to 26 September 2006. Comment received after this date will be included as part of the Issues Trail for the EIA Phase.

The proposed power station does have the potential to impact negatively on the environment. The purpose of this EIA process is to understand, qualify and quantify the potential environmental impacts to inform the public as well as DEAT.

South Africa needs a range of supply options, including coal and nuclear, to be able to meet the increase in demand for electricity. Eskom is currently conducting pre-feasibility or feasibility studies for a range of technologies, including coal, gas, nuclear, pumped storage, solar and wind. However, due to the longer lead times associated with commissioning nuclear power stations, the coal, gas and pumped storage technology options will be the first to be implemented. Failure to commence with these options would result in the increasing demand for electricity in South Africa not being met after 2010. The coal technology that will be used is commercially proven modern technology that incorporates pollution mitigation plant.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT: PROPOSED COAL FIRED POWER STATION IN THE WITBANK GEOGRAPHICAL AREA

SUMMARY OF ISSUES AND CONCERNS RAISED VIA WRITTEN COMMENT		
No.	Individual Organisation	Issue or Concern
		<p>3. There should be an integrated EIA process for the whole project including the coal mine and the Power Station and water pipelines. The problem is that all these components cannot work without the other and therefore must be considered in an integrated manner. We are given to understand that separate EIAs are allowed for what is part and parcel of the same project. This is surely ridiculous if correct. How can you have a coal-fired power station without coal?</p>
		<p>4. Eskom seems to have determined that they will spread the three units to three different coalfield complexes. This means that all that has to be done in the Witbank area is to find two or three "best fit" sites in the area. Witbank is already overpolluted. Where are the figures? Does this power station have to be in the Witbank area at all? We need to see the detailed arguments here.</p>
		<p>The need for an integrated EIA process is recognised. The coal mine EIA authorisation will be sought from DME, while the power station EIA authorisation will be sought from DEAT. While they are indeed separate processes, the principle of co-operative governance would require that the two regulatory bodies would consult with each other during their respective decision-making processes. Integration of the processes is occurring as far as possible by means of information sharing, including shared I&AP databases, and reflecting outcomes of EIA reporting. It must also be noted that the lead time for the development of a power station is longer than that for a coal mine, especially considering the availability of preliminary coal information (such as quantity and quality of coal). Therefore, absolute synchronicity is difficult to achieve.</p> <p>The water pipeline from the existing Kendal power station to the proposed power station will be assessed in this EIA.</p> <p>The selection of the Witbank area, the Lephalale area and Vaal South area was based primarily on the availability of coal. While there are other areas in the country where coal is available, mining houses in these three geographical areas were closest to being authorised in terms of the Mineral and Petroleum Resources Development Act (No. 28 of 2002). Other coal resources were not sufficiently proven (quantity and quality) to consider power stations in those areas for the timeframes required for these power stations.</p> <p>In terms of pollution in the Witbank area, the air quality study will provide figures on the ambient air quality as well as assess the potential impact of the proposed power station.</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT: PROPOSED COAL FIRED POWER STATION IN THE WITBANK GEOGRAPHICAL AREA

SUMMARY OF ISSUES AND CONCERNS RAISED VIA WRITTEN COMMENT			
No.	Individual Organisation	Issue or Concern	Response
		<p>5. Eskom mentioned a major demand management effort by Government and themselves, and mentioned a high degree of success in the Cape. A big effect is peak power requirements, smoothing out the graphs, and there are different and lower requirements. We the ordinary citizens have not been subjected to any such major campaign. Maybe major industries have but if so that doesn't also seem to have got through to Municipalities. If government is going to run a campaign of smoothing peak periods, it should be done for the whole nation.</p>	<p>This concern is noted. Eskom currently runs national demand management campaigns including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Television and radio advertising; • The national efficient lighting roll-out initiative; and • Providing electricity saving facts and figures on the Eskom website.
		<p>6. There is also the projected life of existing power stations and projected power requirements. The question is how accurate are the projections for future requirements? Should these not be given more close scrutiny? We suggest an independent audit of Eskom's and government's projections.</p>	<p>The National Energy Regulator of South Africa (NERSA) is the independent energy regulatory body that reviews all Eskom's planning. In addition NIRP 2 was compiled by independent consultants, together with Eskom and government. NIRP documentation can be found on www.eskom.co.za. NERSA's website is www.ner.org.za. More information on strategic planning can be sought from these websites.</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT: PROPOSED COAL FIRED POWER STATION IN THE WITBANK GEOGRAPHICAL AREA

SUMMARY OF ISSUES AND CONCERNS RAISED VIA WRITTEN COMMENT			
No.	Individual Organisation	Issue or Concern	Response
		<p>7. Greenhouse gasses are hardly mentioned as it is considered that the only option is coal-fired power and therefore CO₂ is a given. Eskom think that ways of handling CO₂ e.g. sinks are faint future possibilities. Our children may not agree in future. This is glossed over but the world seems to think that carbon storage will be possible. What is the current position on carbon storage? If not available now, can this be added on to the power station later, if feasible, or once built will they go to atmosphere, with CO₂, for life?</p>	<p>CO₂ storage options in South Africa are being studied. These include geological and ocean storage. These options are in the process of being motivated for further research studies.</p> <p>Carbon capture technologies are relatively well known, albeit in the petrochemical industry. Their addition to a power station is possible however, no proven technology has been developed these technologies therefore require further investigation. Their adaptation to the power industry is not optimised, primarily due to the fact that conventional power stations use air for combustion. Air contains 3/4 inert nitrogen, which dilutes the flue gas CO₂. The diluted CO₂ is very costly to remove. An obvious solution would be to use oxygen instead of air, for combustion. This however carries a significant burden in extra energy to run the oxygen plant, which in turn reduces overall efficiency and results in more emissions. The international industry is working at reducing the energy impact of oxygen separation.</p> <p>Currently, more efficient power plants are being built, thereby producing more electricity for the same amount of coal. This effectively reduces emissions per unit of electricity. Eskom is presently pursuing the installation of super-critical pulverised fuel technology, which moves them closer to the commercially available limit in efficiency. The next generation of technologies with far higher efficiencies is approaching commercially proven capability, and Eskom is actively developing one of these that shows the greatest promise for the country's coal resources. This involves gasifying the coal underground, and then combusting the gas in a combined cycle gas turbine. This yields a world-leading efficiency, and also opens the possibility of having an in-built opportunity for capturing CO₂ if local storage opportunities are identified.</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT: PROPOSED COAL FIRED POWER STATION IN THE WITBANK GEOGRAPHICAL AREA

SUMMARY OF ISSUES AND CONCERNS RAISED VIA WRITTEN COMMENT		
No.	Individual Organisation	Issue or Concern
		Response
		<p>Eskom has extensive representation on international forums such as the International Energy Agency - Clean Coal Centre (UK) and the Carbon Sequestration Leadership Forum (USA), that are developing clean coal technologies and carbon sequestration and storage solutions.</p>
		<p>8. Ninham Shand has come up with some weighting factors for the sites they have selected. It was mentioned that air pollution was amongst the major factors but how this was brought in and what information was used is not clear. Such information is needed to examine the arguments for site selection. From the Draft Scoping Report (DSR) it seems that this air pollution data is still being collected. If that is the case, how was air pollution one of the chief criteria for site selection as stated at the September public meeting?</p>
		<p>The site selection process, including the methodology, the different site selection criteria and the weightings are presented in a Site Selection Report (Annexure A of the Draft Scoping Report). Air quality was indeed a heavily weighted criterion in evaluating eight potential sites in the Witbank geographical area. This, together with other site selection criteria, resulted in the selection of Sites X and Y. Please refer to the Site Selection Report for more information.</p> <p>The purpose of the specialist air quality study during the EIA Phase is to evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed power station at the two alternative sites in more detail.</p>
		<p>9. We are not convinced that Eskom is planning to take as much as possible of the SO_x out of the gases going to atmosphere. This could involve a higher water usage and cost. What are the plans to remove Sulphur? We believe Sulphur levels are already very high on the Highveld. Can we see Sulphur figures and projections with the new power stations added in?</p>
		<p>The various technologies available to reduce sulphur emissions will be addressed as possible alternatives in the EIA Phase of the EIA process. In addition the air quality study will model projected sulphur emissions as a consequence of the proposed power station, with and without mitigation measures. The public will have the opportunity to review the air quality specialist report.</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT: PROPOSED COAL FIRED POWER STATION IN THE WITBANK GEOGRAPHICAL AREA

SUMMARY OF ISSUES AND CONCERNS RAISED VIA WRITTEN COMMENT			
No.	Individual Organisation	Issue or Concern	Response
		<p>10. The question of mining, pollution of land, air and water is not being considered in depth at this moment, as this will be a future separate EIA process. But of course once the power station gets the go-ahead mining has to go with it, so there is no real discussion is there? We suggest the EIA for mining should go together with this EIA.</p>	<p>The coal mine EIA, which will assess all potential impacts, is currently under way. While they are indeed separate processes, the principle of co-operative governance would require that the two regulatory bodies, namely DEAT and DME, would consult with each other during their respective decision-making processes. Integration of the two processes is occurring as far as possible by means of information sharing, including shared I&AP databases, and reflecting outcomes of EIA reporting. It must be noted that the lead time for the development of a power station is longer than that for a coal mine, especially considering the availability of preliminary coal information (such as quantity and quality of coal). Therefore, absolute synchronicity is difficult to achieve.</p>
		<p>11. The proposed project will provide more employment in the area, however long term employment will probably be minimal and mainly highly skilled people, even in the ancillary and supply areas. In the construction phase, there should be some jobs, but there are probably less and less unskilled labour requirements in such projects. It would be better to support tourism to create employment and authorities should do much more in this field than they are doing. The numbers of likely jobs for unskilled people at construction and operating stages should be clearly stated.</p>	<p>Depending on the stage of construction, it is estimated that between 400 and 1 400 jobs would comprise unskilled labour. During the operation phase unskilled labour is estimated to comprise between 20 and 35 of the total number of jobs created.</p>
		<p>12. The DSR states that DWAF will supply water for the proposed power station. It is not clearly stated however exactly how much water will be needed for all the new power stations and whether we really are in a position to supply the needs of this whole Northern Region with sufficient water for at least, say, the next 25 years or more. We are constantly being told we are soon going to be running out of water. More details on water supply are needed with particular reference to this project.</p>	<p>9 to 10 million cubic meters of water per annum is estimated for a 5 400 MW power station. This includes water that would be required for Flue Gas Desulphurisation (FGD) processes.</p> <p>Without FGD, approximately 5.2 million cubic meters of water would be required annually.</p> <p>The water brought into the area via VRESAP will provide enough water for the lifespan of the proposed project.</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT: PROPOSED COAL FIRED POWER STATION IN THE WITBANK GEOGRAPHICAL AREA

SUMMARY OF ISSUES AND CONCERNS RAISED VIA WRITTEN COMMENT		
No.	Individual Organisation	Issue or Concern
		Response A heritage impact study is being conducted to provide specialist input into the EIA. This will provide specific information to address this question.
11.	Frik Vivier (Jnr) Klipfontein Farm	13. The question of people and graves on sites selected is going to be a source of worry to quite a lot of people. This problem needs to be fully identified with numbers and sites. 1. Our vital water source could be negatively impacted by the coal mining. If this is the case, we would rather sell the property and relocate the pivot irrigation system that was recently installed.
12	Deon Nel Klipfontein Farm	1. Economic viability of the remainder of the property is of concern. The remaining property will no longer be economically viable if the proposed power station is constructed.
13	John Latilla Eenzaamheid Farmer	1. The property lies 3km from the proposed sites. Concerned about the negative impacts of noise, aesthetics, dust, ground vibration, mining blasting, groundwater loss and security threats due to the increase in the number of people in the area. 2. Concerned that the value of property will steeply decline. Will Eskom buy the adjacent properties if their values are reduced or if the quality of life is negatively affected?
		The concern is noted. The impacts of the coal mine on water resources have yet to be established. Having shared I&AP databases with the mining EIA process, you will be kept informed as the coal mine EIA progresses. The concern is noted. The preferred site and power station layout has yet to be determined. A process of negotiating purchase options is being initiated with potentially affected landowners. With regard to the economic viability of remaining portions of land, Eskom will enter into negotiations with the affected landowners. Apart from blasting at the proposed mine, these issues will be examined in the EIA Phase of the EIA process. We will assess the significance of the range of potential impacts associated with the proposed power station. Eskom will undertake a land acquisition process to secure the land required for the power station. Eskom's land acquisitions department have noted that the value of land surrounding other power stations has not decreased over time and in some cases the value of the land has increased in the longer term. It is therefore unlikely to be the case should this proposed power station be established. Eskom's purchasing of land is informed by the land required for the establishment of the power station and associated infrastructure.
		Noted. The identification of a preferred site will follow in the Draft EIR.
		3. Where exactly will the power station be sited? Site X is 3km from property. Site Y is 12km from property and is therefore more acceptable.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT: PROPOSED COAL FIRED POWER STATION IN THE WITBANK GEOGRAPHICAL AREA

SUMMARY OF ISSUES AND CONCERNS RAISED VIA WRITTEN COMMENT			
No.	Individual Organisation	Issue or Concern	Response
14	Andre Cherry	<p>1. Dry cooled approach will have an influence on microclimate. What impact would the extra heat have during a drought or heat wave? How will it affect people, crops etc in the vicinity and then there is a greater knock on effect in the broader region.</p> <p>2. His land is on the south of one of the proposed sites and with prevailing winds believes that this will directly affect him.</p> <p>3. Crime is already a problem and police can't cope with it. The proposed power station will exacerbate the situation. There will be an influx of work seekers and that will be associated with an increase in crime. What will Eskom do to protect the surrounding landowners?</p> <p>4. Our farms are our "bread and butter". What will happen with our quality of life and livelihoods?</p> <p>5 Farmers of the area need to have a meeting to discuss this amongst themselves.</p> <p>6. Fires are a concern. There is likely to be an increase in fire frequency along paths between the infrastructure (power station and mine etc) and the fires will spread.</p> <p>7. The landowners of Sites X and Y were only informed about the project a month ago and are now expected to respond to the project by 15 September. This is too soon as time is needed to familiarise oneself with the project.</p>	<p>The air quality specialist will be asked to comment on this issue. More information will follow in the EIR.</p> <p>The air quality study will provide more information on the air quality implications of the proposed power station, including an indication of the prevalent wind direction and potential downwind impact.</p> <p>Eskom is not able to provide direct security services to surrounding landowners. However, Eskom will notify the local police services before construction commences and support initiatives to improve policing.</p> <p>The potential socio-economic impacts will be presented in the EIR.</p> <p>Noted. We will welcome any group submission arising from such a meeting.</p> <p>The prescribed fire detection and suppression systems will be installed and Eskom participates in local fire protection agencies.</p> <p>Letters to directly affected landowners were posted as soon as possible after the selection of Sites X and Y. There is a 30-day comment period on the Draft Scoping Report. This was anticipated to be sufficient time to review the report. Those I&APs who have requested more time to formulate a response were allowed to provide comment up to 26 September 2006. Comments received after the deadline will nevertheless be recorded and responded to in the EIA Phase of the process. Further opportunity for comment will be provided when the draft Environmental Impact is Released in the near future.</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT: PROPOSED COAL FIRED POWER STATION IN THE WITBANK GEOGRAPHICAL AREA

SUMMARY OF ISSUES AND CONCERNS RAISED VIA WRITTEN COMMENT

No.	Individual Organisation	Issue or Concern	Response
15	JH Nel Landowner	<p>8. The process is being forced down our throats. Eskom has had lots of time to approach them after the government told them to build a new power station in 2004. Eskom knew where the coal was. The talks with landowners should have started much earlier. Farmers need years to plan and the timing of the study and the extremely short notice is unacceptable.</p> <p>1. My farm is in Site X. The viability of the farm will be severely affected if a portion is purchased for this project.</p>	<p>Finalisation of site selection is the starting point of any discussion with landowners. Landowners were informed as soon as potential sites were identified this year. Prior to site selection, Eskom was involved in pre-feasibility studies and strategic planning to select geographical regions for a proposed power station. Landowners could not be contacted at this stage because the potential sites had not been identified.</p> <p>The concern is noted. The preferred site and power station layout has yet to be determined. A process of negotiating purchase options is being initiated with potentially affected landowners.</p> <p>With regard to the economic viability of remaining portions of land, Eskom will enter into negotiations with the affected landowners.</p>
16	C L de Kock	Please provide more information regarding the coal mining process.	Your contact details have been passed on to the coal mine EIA practitioners and you will be kept informed.
17	F.J Cronje Landowner	1. What will happen to Kendal?	The existing Kendal power station will remain in operation until the end of its life span.
		2. What will happen to our boreholes?	Potential impacts on groundwater will be assessed as part of the specialist groundwater study, which will be presented in the Draft EIR.
		3. What about our roads?	Potential impacts on roads and traffic will be assessed as part of the specialist traffic study, which will be presented in the Draft EIR.
		4. I suffer with asthma. What will be the effect of all the ash?	The potential health implications for humans will be assessed as part of the specialist air quality study, which will be presented in the Draft EIR.
		5. If the power station at Kendal goes ahead, will we be bought out or not?	Only the land which the proposed power station and associated infrastructure would occupy will be purchased by Eskom.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT: PROPOSED COAL FIRED POWER STATION IN THE WITBANK GEOGRAPHICAL AREA

SUMMARY OF ISSUES AND CONCERNS RAISED VIA WRITTEN COMMENT		
No.	Individual Organisation	Issue or Concern
		<p>6. My understanding is that my neighbour's property will be an open cast mine within 5 years. What will happen to my plot?</p> <p>7. What if our houses are damaged (crack) during blasting or construction</p>
18	Dr J.H Visser	<p>1. If my property is selected for the new power station will we be given sufficient time to sell up the farming business?</p>
		<p>Response</p> <p>Your contact details have been passed on to the coal mine EIA practitioners and you will be kept informed.</p> <p>Any damage to houses which are proven to be a direct consequence of the construction phase may be compensated by Eskom.</p> <p>Negotiations for the purchase of properties will be entered into between Eskom and the specific landowners, during which such issues can be resolved without prejudice to the landowner.</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT: PROPOSED COAL FIRED POWER STATION IN THE WITBANK GEOGRAPHICAL AREA

SUMMARY OF ISSUES AND CONCERNS RAISED AT THE PUBLIC MEETINGS ON 4 & 5 SEPTEMBER 2006			
No.	Individual Organisation	Issue or Concern	Response
19	Chris Cloete Kendal Forest Hotel	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Where would DWAF get water to supply the proposed power station? The locality maps did not illustrate the coal resource. 	<p>The Vaal River Eastern Sub-system Augmentation Project (VRESAP) would import water from the Vaal River into the region.</p> <p>The coal resource was pointed out on a locality map.</p>
20	Dan Campbell	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> What would be the main constituents of the power station emissions? Will acid rain occur as a consequence of the power station emissions? 	<p>The emissions comprised oxides of sulphur, oxides of nitrogen, carbon dioxide (CO₂) and particulates. In terms of acid rain, this is a possibility where there is significant rainfall in the vicinity of a power station. However, the last 30 years of research indicate that dry deposition of sulphur is more typical to the region than acid rain. In this regard, independent research has shown that the impact of dry deposition is minimal. The emission levels are regulated by government and Eskom would comply with these regulations.</p>
21	John Byrne Fairacres	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Would the proposed power station be directly or indirectly cooled? Where would excess water and wastewater be disposed off? Would the EIA take existing businesses in the area into consideration? Had the EIA practitioners compiled a list of industries that could be affected by the proposed power station? I am concerned specifically about impacts on poultry and livestock in the area. Where would be the exact footprint of the power station within the alternative sites? 	<p>Both direct and indirect dry cooling systems would be assessed in the EIA Phase. The power station would have a zero liquid effluent policy. Once in the power station, water of varying quality would be used for different purposes. The poor quality water would be used on the ash dump to suppress dust.</p> <p>A socio-economic study would incorporate those sorts of considerations into the EIA, but not at the level of detail of all individual businesses in the greater region. The air quality study would give some idea of the potential impacts of emissions but dust may have more of an impact on poultry and livestock than emissions. Please refer to item 9.1 above.</p> <p>An area within a preferred site would be identified in the Draft EIR.</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT: PROPOSED COAL FIRED POWER STATION IN THE WITBANK GEOGRAPHICAL AREA

SUMMARY OF ISSUES AND CONCERNS RAISED AT THE PUBLIC MEETINGS ON 4 & 5 SEPTEMBER 2006			
No.	Individual Organisation	Issue or Concern	Response
		4. I would like to have more information about the coal source and the mining house.	The coal source was indicated on a locality map. It was explained that the mine house would be applying for a mining right in terms of the Mineral and Petroleum Resources Development Act.
22	Geoff Byrne Fairacres	1. Where would be the site of the coal operations? Why were the coal mine impacts not considered as part of this EIA?	The coal mine EIA, which will assess all potential impacts, is currently under way as part of a separate process. The principle of co-operative governance would require that the two regulatory bodies, namely DEAT and DME, would consult with each other during their respective decision-making processes. Integration of the two processes is occurring as far as possible by means of information sharing, including shared I&AP databases, and reflecting outcomes of EIA reporting. It must be noted that the lead time for the development of a power station is longer than that for a coal mine, especially considering the availability of preliminary coal information (such as quantity and quality of coal). Therefore, absolute synchronicity is difficult to achieve.
		2. Why was the public only being informed at this late stage of the intention to construct a power station in the Witbank area, whereas Eskom planned 25 years in advance to construct this power station?	While the mining itself is subject to a separate EIA, the coal conveyor corridor from the coal mine to the proposed power station would be included. If people want to be involved in the coal mine EIA they should inform Ninham Shand and their details would be passed on to the coal mine environmental practitioners. The location of proposed power station was not determined years in advance. In 1994, government decided that Eskom would not be responsible for constructing any new power stations, but that independent power producers would be provided with this opportunity. However, in October 2004 Eskom was instructed to build new power stations. Future coal reserves and power stations would be better planned.
		3. Why did Eskom not plan properly and hence avoid the current electricity problems.	There was a dip in electricity demand in the 1990's and then a rapid escalation that government was unprepared for. In addition, Eskom was only mandated to construct new power stations in late 2004.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT: PROPOSED COAL FIRED POWER STATION IN THE WITBANK GEOGRAPHICAL AREA

SUMMARY OF ISSUES AND CONCERNS RAISED AT THE PUBLIC MEETINGS ON 4 & 5 SEPTEMBER 2006

No.	Individual Organisation	Issue or Concern	Response
		4. How much would the project cost?	It would cost approximately R40 billion.
		5. Would the new power station close to the existing Kendal power station compound the air quality problem in the area? Would the air quality study consider the Kendal power station as well?	The air quality study would determine exactly how the ambient air quality would be affected by the proposed power station and in assessing impacts on the ambient air quality; the cumulative impacts would also be addressed. The Terms of Reference for the air quality study is presented in the Draft Scoping Report and can be commented on.
		6. Depending on wind direction, Witbank experiences bad smells. The population in the Witbank area is growing. The power station could be placed elsewhere as there are other places in the country where coal could be found.	The strategic-level decision that identified the Witbank geographical area was taken before the EIA began. The EIA can only focus on project-level alternatives. The latest technology would be implemented to reduce emissions.
		7. The construction of a power station in the Witbank area is not a good idea due to the bad air quality and growing population. Population growth should be taken into consideration.	Noted. The air quality study would help to quantify potential impacts, providing more information on which to base decisions.
23	Participant	How far is the proposed Site X from the R545?	The boundary of Site X is approximately 2 km from the R545.
24	Eric Ndhlovu Wilge Community leader	1. Where would Eskom employees be housed? 2. Can the presentations be translated into other languages?	Eskom no longer constructs residential areas on site and employees would be integrated into existing local communities. The presentations are only available in English. However, the project documents were available in English, Afrikaans, Zulu and Pedi. Earlier that day in Phola, where English was not the dominant language, an Open House instead of a public meeting had been held to ensure that the community had access to the project information. There had been no presentations at the Open House, only one-on-one discussions with an interpreter present to assist.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT: PROPOSED COAL FIRED POWER STATION IN THE WITBANK GEOGRAPHICAL AREA

SUMMARY OF ISSUES AND CONCERNS RAISED AT THE PUBLIC MEETINGS ON 4 & 5 SEPTEMBER 2006

No.	Individual Organisation	Issue or Concern	Response
		3. Who is financing the project?	Eskom would finance the project.
		4. Is there a sufficient coal from various mines in the area to supply the proposed power station for its 40 – 50 year lifespan?	Coal would be sourced from one mine only and that mine would have sufficient coal for the next 40 – 50 years.
		5. Would the residents of Wilge and Phola be impacted by the mine?	Eric Ndhlovu's contact details will be forwarded to the mine environmental practitioner to be included in their database so that he could be provided with more information about the proposed mine.
		6. There are graves on the identified sites, where will they be moved?	Graves are categorised as heritage sites and can only be moved after undertaking a legislated process to contact the family to request their permission to relocate the graves and to ascertain their wishes in this regard. No construction is permitted on graves and the moving would be undertaken in accordance with the family's wishes including allowing for any necessary ceremonies.
25	Nicolene Venter	1. Would the coal conveyor belts be part of the power station EIA or coal mine EIA?	Conveyance of coal from the mine handling site to the proposed power station, as well as all conveyors within the power station site, will be a part of the power station EIA.
26	Hendrik Louwrens	1. How long will it take before the public is informed of the preferred site?	The Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) would be available in mid-November and would contain the results of the EIA Phase, which would include an indication of a preferred site.
27	Malcolm Suttill	1. Everything was calculated according to the electricity demand and peak capacity when the focus should be on lowering the demand for electricity. If Eskom is keen on efforts to lower electricity usage they should be focussing on it more strongly across the country. Do Eskom have the pollution under control at the other coal-fired station power stations that were mentioned?	The calculations are done based on energy demand, and not peak demand, which is the total amount of energy needed in each week. Peaks need to be reduced and in 2006, peaks could have been 1000 – 1500 MW higher if demand management interventions had not been implemented. Regarding pollution, Eskom compared the emissions of the 90's to the present day, and they are using modern technology to reduce the emissions.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT: PROPOSED COAL FIRED POWER STATION IN THE WITBANK GEOGRAPHICAL AREA

SUMMARY OF ISSUES AND CONCERNS RAISED AT THE PUBLIC MEETINGS ON 4 & 5 SEPTEMBER 2006

No.	Individual Organisation	Issue or Concern	Response
		<p>2. Cape Town was rather black at times, and that must have saved a lot of electricity.</p>	<p>Cape Town only had power cuts for 4 days in February, which constitutes one period of blackout. Furthermore, power cuts only took place on the 8th of April, 28th of April and 5 June. No blackouts were experienced in winter. Cape Town was very successful in terms of energy conservation and that was mainly due to the residents' response.</p>
		<p>3. What about the demand management initiatives? Eskom should run demand management programmes across the entire country.</p>	<p>Eskom had an active nationwide demand management initiative. The Department of Minerals and Energy (DME) had a monthly drive whereby people were encouraged to save electricity. The SABC monitor of the Western Cape demand for electricity had been very successful and, in the winter months, Eskom was aiming to implement it for the entire country.</p>
		<p>4. I find the chart depicting the life span of power stations frightening because it seems that everything tails off in 2025. Is a 25-year life span realistic for a power station?</p>	<p>The graph actually illustrates a 40 – 50 year life span for power stations. There were many power stations built in the 1970's – 1980's with a 50 year life span which means that several of them come to the end of their lifespan around the same time. Some power stations may have extended life spans of 60 years; however this will require further investigation.</p>
		<p>5. Will pollution as a topic be covered?</p>	<p>All forms of pollution will be addressed in the EIA Phase.</p>
		<p>6. What would 3 million litres of water be in tons?</p>	<p>This is equivalent to 3 000 tons.</p>
		<p>7. Is there a difference in water usage when reducing the sulphur content of the emissions? More information regarding water usage for desulphurisation should be provided in the documentation.</p>	<p>The water requirements described in the presentation did not include water required for desulphurisation. Estimated water requirements would be forthcoming in the EIR. Please also refer to 10.12 above.</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT: PROPOSED COAL FIRED POWER STATION IN THE WITBANK GEOGRAPHICAL AREA

SUMMARY OF ISSUES AND CONCERNS RAISED AT THE PUBLIC MEETINGS ON 4 & 5 SEPTEMBER 2006		
No. Individual Organisation	Issue or Concern	Response
	<p>8. An integrated plan and process need to be undertaken that includes all related infrastructure. Why has Witbank been selected for a proposed power station? Are there no other areas with coal resources? The high level area selection seems suspect as it seemed to only consider the coal resource. It has been mentioned that air pollution was an important factor. What data is Eskom utilising and is the data available for scrutiny?</p>	<p>The Witbank region had been selected by Eskom due to the coal resource which was fundamental to a coal fired power station. Due to time constraints in terms of construction and electricity supply, Eskom had to focus on where they knew the mines were in terms of getting a licence and permit. The next three power stations will be brought online where there is coal available.</p> <p>Regarding the site selection process within the region, an air quality specialist had been consulted and air quality and related issues are well understood. The specialist study would be based on the information that has been collected over many years and on previous studies done in the Witbank area.</p>
	<p>9. The air quality data should be provided so that it could be perused in detail.</p>	<p>Air quality data is generated by the municipalities as well as Eskom monitoring sites that have been in operation for the last 20 years. A model is used to extrapolate, if additional sources of pollution were added, potential impacts on air quality. The model is not 100% accurate and tended to be over-conservative and pollution is overestimated. Despite this the model is very reliable, and good enough to base decisions on. In terms of the current process Eskom have enough data to base decisions on, but it can be increased.</p> <p>The EIA would briefly touch on this and the specialist study would go into more detail regarding this issue. The Terms of Reference (ToR) for the air quality specialist must be considered to ensure that all appropriate aspects were included in the study. The complete findings of the specialist study would be presented in the Environmental Impact Report</p>
	<p>10. What is the difference between the EIA process under the new regulations of NEMA and the old ECA process?</p>	<p>Essentially in terms of information gathering and presentation it is still the same. NEMA differs in terms of the process itself (being made up of either a Basic Assessment or Scoping and EIA assessment). This differentiation between the processes does ultimately not have a significant impact for a project of this scale.</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT: PROPOSED COAL FIRED POWER STATION IN THE WITBANK GEOGRAPHICAL AREA

SUMMARY OF ISSUES AND CONCERNS RAISED AT THE PUBLIC MEETINGS ON 4 & 5 SEPTEMBER 2006

No.	Individual Organisation	Issue or Concern	Response
		<p>11. The following issues should be responded to in the EIA Report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why coal is proposed instead of nuclear technology. People seem to be rejecting nuclear technology, while coal releases CO₂ into the atmosphere. • Why Witbank has been chosen and why coal is the preferred technology. • Which alternative technologies had been considered? • Further information relating to air pollution and the air quality data. • Eskom needs to strive towards getting rid of the Oxides of Sulphur (SO_x) and the Oxides of Nitrogen (NO_x) in the emissions from coal fired power stations. • Socio-economic aspects are critical and must be dealt with adequately. • Job creation shouldn't be looked at only in terms of this power station, but jobs can be generated across the country due to the additional electricity capacity. 	<p>Noted. With respect to nuclear technology, please refer to 10.2 above.</p> <p>Remaining issues will be addressed in the EIR.</p>
28	Jan Visser	<p>1. 2500 ha is required for the power station, but site X appears to be almost double that size (approximately 5000 ha). Two sites were selected in the site selection process and I felt that this did not make sense.</p> <p>2. Is it possible that only 50% of site X would be used?</p> <p>3. Where would the coal be extracted if site X was selected?</p>	<p>Site X comprises two very similar sites, which were amalgamated to increase the flexibility regarding where the power station could be sited across that area.</p> <p>According to the team's understanding, the entire site will not necessarily be used</p> <p>The answer would emerge from the investigations that Anglo Coal is currently undertaking and the teams were trying to find commonality between the two processes. The position of the mine would be optimised by the mining house based on the resource and the final positioning of the power station. The first step is for Eskom to decide on a site location and then the mine plan will follow from there.</p>

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT: PROPOSED COAL FIRED POWER STATION IN THE WITBANK GEOGRAPHICAL AREA

SUMMARY OF ISSUES AND CONCERNS RAISED AT THE PUBLIC MEETINGS ON 4 & 5 SEPTEMBER 2006

No.	Individual	Organisation	Issue or Concern	Response
29	Eric Ndhlovu	Wilge Community Leader	1. Why did the presentation indicate that Majuba power station would be shutting down?	The presentation did not indicate this. During the 1980's it was recognised that the demand was not as high as was estimated so construction was stretched out over a longer period. Construction was finalised in 1995 and all 6 units were completed. Coal supply to the power station was then constricted, which required coal to be transported to the power station. Majuba then wasn't operated at the same capacity as the other power stations – only when it was absolutely essential. Currently all power stations were being operated at full capacity. Majuba had moved from operating at 25% to 60% and in the next 2 – 3 years is expected to operate at 90%.
			2. What would happen to the people currently living on Site X should it be selected by Eskom? As in the case of New Largo Coal mine, it also needs to be ensured that these people are looked after.	This would be covered during the land acquisition process and it would come down to an arrangement between Eskom, the landowners and the people living on the farms. Furthermore, this issue will be dealt with in the EIR. Relocations as a consequence of the coal mine would be addressed as part of the mine EIA.
			3. The presentation showed that initially there were eight identified sites that were reduced to two. Was the affected community engaged, as people might want to do improvements to their homes etc?	Interactions with landowners occurred immediately after selecting the two alternative sites. The current public participation process is intended to inform the local community of the proposed project and elicit comment.
			4. The water supply to Kendal Power Station and the residents in the surrounding area should not be affected by the needs of the new power station.	The Vaal River Eastern Sub-System Augmentation Project (VRESAP) would supply water to the power station and because of this it is highly unlikely that existing water users would be affected by the proposed power station.
			5. Was the municipality engaged during the compilation of the Scoping Report?	The municipality was contacted early in 2006 and kept apprised of the project ever since, with follow up meetings in August. Several officials and councillors were registered on the database and been sent information directly. The municipality has been encouraged to comment.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT: PROPOSED COAL FIRED POWER STATION IN THE WITBANK GEOGRAPHICAL AREA

SUMMARY OF ISSUES AND CONCERNS RAISED AT THE PUBLIC MEETINGS ON 4 & 5 SEPTEMBER 2006

No.	Individual	Organisation	Issue or Concern	Response
30	Sharon Clark	BHP Billiton	1. When is Eskom planning to see the various power stations in operation?	In terms of planning, Eskom is looking at the period between 2010 and 2020. Construction would be initiated as soon as environmental authorisations and Eskom Board approval were received. It would take approximately 4 years from approval before the power station could be expected to be in operation.
31	Wonderboy Mahlalele	Margea Industrial Services; Environmental Consultants	1. I am concerned about greenhouse gas emissions due to the burning of coal during the operational stage of the power station.	There are no truly effective mitigation measures available anywhere in the world for greenhouse gases. The only way to mitigate is to capture carbon dioxide (CO ₂) and to store it, but this was not possible commercially. Further diversification of the mix of technologies used would reduce the intensity of CO ₂ emissions. There is ongoing research into this and Eskom participates in the research. Please refer to 10.7 above.
			2. Briefly explain the concept of an ash management plan.	The plan has been set out to manage the 50-year life span of the power station. The plan describes the civil engineering process of how the dump should be developed and how ash is suppressed and compacted. The height and land available determines what the plan includes. The plan had not been written yet, as the project is still in its feasibility stage and the plans are very station specific.
			3. People who are being moved, would they be compensated accordingly?	Landowners would be compensated. The people living and working on the farms would need to be considered in the purchase negotiations and must be dealt with in a considerate manner.
			4. Was the visual impact of the power station considered during site selection?	The visual impact of the power station was considered during the site selection. The Site Selection Report (Annexure A of the Draft Scoping Report) contains details of the site selection process.
			5. Is this information contained in the DSR?	Yes, but the Scoping Report only determines the scope of work for the specialist investigations and no studies had yet been undertaken. Specialist input into site selection detailed in the Site Selection Report (Annexure A of the Draft Scoping Report)

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT: PROPOSED COAL FIRED POWER STATION IN THE WITBANK GEOGRAPHICAL AREA

SUMMARY OF ISSUES AND CONCERNS RAISED AT THE PUBLIC MEETINGS ON 4 & 5 SEPTEMBER 2006			
No.	Individual Organisation	Issue or Concern	Response
		6. Please briefly explain how and when ash dumps are rehabilitated and how the water is treated.	A dry ash handling system would be used whereby the ash is treated and conveyed to the dump where it is spread out. The dump is managed in terms of dust. As the dump footprint progresses the ash dump gets rehabilitated with topsoil and re-vegetated. In terms of water treatment, the raw water goes through a filtration process, to produce demineralised water for the boiler. Runoff is captured in dams and goes back for cleaning and is also used on the ash dump for dust suppression.
32	D Roberts	1. Does Eskom envisage the option of importing electricity? 2. Is a coal-powered electricity from Botswana an option?	A longer-term project (in approximately 15 years) is underway in partnership with other country governments to construct a transmission line from the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) to South Africa. Cahora Bassa in Mozambique is presently providing electricity to Eskom. Eskom negotiates power purchase agreements with neighbouring countries for the import of electricity if needed.
33	Nhlanhla Mkhonto	1. Will the land that is currently being used for agriculture be restored to its previous use, post power station?	It might be possible to lease the land back to the farmers or former owners (the means of decommissioning and rehabilitation will determine the end use).
34	Jennifer Louw	1. If people were to be relocated, the municipality should be engaged. The people in the informal settlements should be informed of the project.	Public engagement also took place in Phola. The assistance of local councillors in identifying the right leaders to ensure that the information was properly distributed would be appreciated.
35	Stan Makena	1. How many jobs would be provided by the power station? Families employed by existing landowners would need jobs when the farms are expropriated and Eskom should consider this thoroughly.	During construction there would be between 2000 and 7000 jobs and during operation 600 – 800 permanent positions. Contracted business positions could be available. The mine in close proximity would also provide jobs.