

Name	Comment	Response	Date of Comments	Means of Comments
Mr Christo Gagiano (Enviro-solution Systems)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The presence of both species of bullfrogs occurs in the area. Habitat preservation is of importance since Padspersus is listed as a Red Data species.</li> <li>Impacts in general on the flora and fauna of the area are to be fully investigated.</li> </ul>	<p>Enviroolution Consulting has during the Screening and Scoping phases involved a Surface Water Resources and Wetland Specialist as well as Ecological Specialist. Preliminary impact assessment reports from these specialist studies are attached in <b>Appendix C</b> of this Scoping Report. The terms of reference for the Ecological Assessment specialist are outlined in <b>Section 9</b> of this Scoping Report.</p>	29/01/2009	Fax
Ms Clarissa Jacobs (Eskom)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requested co-ordinates of the proposed site to establish whether a vacant Eskom servitude will be affected or not.</li> </ul>	<p>Comment noted and relevant documents were sent.</p>	27/01/2009	Email
Mr Mickey Majadibodu (I&AP)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stated that the project is a good idea.</li> </ul>	<p>Comment noted.</p>	29/01/2009	Email
Ms Jessica Oberholster	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requested to be registered as an I&amp;AP and wanted additional project information.</li> </ul>	<p>Registered as an I&amp;AP and a Background Information Document was sent</p>	02/02/2009	Email
Mr/Ms T.I. Malatji (Land Affairs)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requested the properties to be affected to determine whether it's State or Tribe land.</li> </ul>	<p>The properties that have been identified for the proposed location of the landfill are all owned by Eskom</p>	02/02/2009	Fax
Mr John Miller (Waterberg Nature Conservancy)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Waterberg Mountains benefit from many features, including the name itself. To those of us who live here, the very words conjure up all that we appreciate about the region – the bio-diversity, the environment, the vistas, the game, the watercourses, even the remoteness from urban centres. Those who operate tourist establishments benefit from the natural branding; the rest of us are simply delighted with our good fortune.</li> </ul>	<p>Kindly note that the use of 'Waterberg' has only been used to state that waste will come from two proposed power stations in the Waterberg area; and was not used in the project title. The municipality alone cannot describe the above as it covers a vast area.</p>	03/02/2009	Email

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When Eskom (and Sasol, Resource Generation, and so many others) uses the name Waterberg to identify its projects, you are detracting from the Waterberg's positive image. I realize that Envirolution and Eskom are simply looking for a convenient way to identify the project and location, but you are inadvertently joining others in destroying a valued name. I am well aware that the Waterberg Coalfields is a known and accepted geological place, so let that remain as a name.</li> <li>• Some tourist destinations abuse the name to reap good will by association, but mining and energy project locations should be identified accurately and clearly. The Waterberg name doesn't even give a good idea of where your project is located.</li> <li>• Eskom's Matimba and Medupi power stations are not in the Waterberg Mountains, nor are they in the Waterberg Biosphere Reserve. Yes, they are in the Waterberg District Municipality, but the Municipality is a very large area, extending well northeast of Lephalale, well south of Bela-Bela and well east of Modimolle.</li> <li>• Calling it in the Waterberg area is too casually done. I suggest you consider calling the area the Limpopo Western Bushveld, or Western Limpopo Bushveld or Western Limpopo.</li> </ul>			
--	---	--	--	--

	Requested project info. and to be registered as an I&AP.	Registered as an I&AP and a Background Information Document was sent.	05/02/09	Email
Ms Dhelia Raman (Eskom)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requested project info. and to be registered as an I&amp;AP.</li> </ul>	Registered as an I&AP and a Background Information Document was sent.	05/02/09	Email
Mr Malwa Ganiso (National Department of Public Works)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Department reserves its comments as the proposal has no detrimental effect to state properties.</li> </ul>	Comment noted.	29/01/09	Post
Mr/Ms Makuwa MS (Provincial Department of Economic Development, Environment and Tourism)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stated that the BID does not contain alternatives and that this should be considered as part of the EIA process.</li> </ul>	<p>The alternatives that were identified during the Scoping and Site Selection processes are clearly indicated on the map that was circulated with the Background Information Document. Envirovolution Consulting with the guidance from the specialists will investigate these alternatives during the EIA phase of the project. This is detailed in Chapter 6 of this Scoping Report. It should be noted that Site 5 (Grootestryd) has been identified by all the specialists that were involved in the project as most suitable. This site will be evaluated based on 3 alternative localities or potential footprints within the site. These alternatives will be evaluated during the EIR phase to determine the most environmental and technical feasible alternative. Detailed findings of the specialist investigations will be included in the EIR.</p>	29/01/09	Post
Mr Leonard Sole (Lephalale Municipality)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requested that the following I&amp;APs be registered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Department of Land Use and Building control;</li> <li>Department of Waste Management; IDP Officer; and</li> <li>PMU Manager.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>The I&amp;APs were registered on the stakeholder database and they will be informed of the availability of the Draft Scoping Report for public review.</p>	06/02/09	Fax
Mrs Johanna Matlou (Department of Agriculture)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stated that no development is allowed on high potential soil which has to be preserved for agricultural purposes, as well as near a wetland area.</li> </ul>	<p>An agricultural potential specialist will be involved in the project to advise on any potential impacts on agricultural land. Envirovolution Consulting has also appointed a Surface Water Resources and Wetland</p>	02/02/09	Fax

## ISSUES AND RESPONSE REPORT (PROJECT ANNOUNCEMENT)

Mr Jan van Dyk	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stated that existing and envisaged housing developments in the area should be addressed in the EIR.</li> </ul>	Specialists to provide input on any potential impact on wetland areas. Please refer to Appendix C for the Specialists reports.		
Ms Jay Dax (Protech Khuthele Holding Limited)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requested to be registered as an I&amp;AP and kept informed of project progress.</li> </ul>	Issues related to housing development are considered to be outside of the scope of this EIA. The comment is noted	07/02/09	Email
Ms Shoni Tshivhase (Roads Agency, Limpopo)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Chemical composition of hazardous waste and its relative impacts to the environment (direct and indirect) as well as cumulative and long-term impacts should be assessed.</li> </ul>	Registered as an I&AP.	12/02/09	Email
		The management and control of waste that will be generated as a result of the proposed project will be covered in the Environmental Management Plan that will be submitted with the EIR during the Impact Assessment Phase.	16/02/09	Fax

# ISSUES AND RESPONSE REPORT (COMMENTS ON DRAFT SCOPING REPORT)

20 February – 20 March 09

Name	Comment	Response	Date of Comments	Means of Comments
Mr Christo Gagiano (Enviro-solution systems)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enquired whether the landfill site can accommodate waste from resources other than Eskom.</li> </ul>	<p>Eskom has indicated that the landfill site will be for use only by Eskom for disposal of waste from their construction and operational activities. No waste from other sources will be accepted to be disposed at the site. The landfill will be designed to accommodate Eskom waste for the operational life of the power stations.</p>	07/03/2009	Email
Mr T.I Malatji (Department of Land Affairs)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requested property details to determine ownership of land.</li> </ul>	<p>Eskom currently owns the land where the proposed landfill is to be located. The property is known as Farm Grootestryd.</p>	27/01/2009	Email
Mr Justice Maluleke (Department of Water Affairs and Forestry)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Referred the project to Mr Donald Mabada at the Limpopo Office.</li> </ul>	<p>Enviroolution Consulting has been in contact with Ms Mercy Mamali (the designated officer for projects in Lephatale area) of DWAF Limpopo. Ms Mamali attended the focus group meeting on 10 March 09 and was also sent a hard copy of the Scoping Report for DWAF Limpopo comments.</p>	23/02/2009	Email
Mr M.S Makuwa (LEDIT)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What criteria was used to rate the sites as well as to eliminate other candidate sites?</li> </ul>	<p>The initial criteria used was Eskom owned land which was in close proximity to Matimba and Medupi Power Stations as well as the two new proposed coal fired power stations. The other primary criteria were groundwater resources and geotechnical studies. The elimination of sites was based on groundwater vulnerability, surface water, and ecological sensitivity. Detailed findings of the specialist investigations will be included in the EIR. <b>Chapter 3</b> of the Draft Scoping Report details the methodology that was used during the Screening process.</p>	02/03/2009	Email

# ISSUES AND RESPONSE REPORT (COMMENTS ON DRAFT SCOPING REPORT)

20 February – 20 March 09

<p>Mr Zakhele Chagi (Department of Health)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The following should be taken cognisance of:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Air quality impact assessment;</li> <li>➤ Ground water contamination;</li> <li>➤ Rehabilitation plan;</li> <li>➤ Sampling schedule;</li> <li>➤ Emergency preparedness plan;</li> <li>➤ Disaster preparedness plan; and</li> <li>➤ Town planning scheme in terms of future developments.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>The mentioned specialist studies have been considered during the Screening and Scoping phases. Further detailed assessment will be undertaken by these specialists during the EIA phase that will also include the compilation of the Draft Environmental Management Plan aimed at addressing the anticipated impacts of the proposed construction of the landfill.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">20/03/2009</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Email</p>

**ISSUES AND RESPONSE REPORT (PUBLIC AND FOCUS GROUP MEETINGS: 10 MAR 09)**

Name	Comment	Response	Date of Comments	Means of Comments
<b>Focus group meeting</b>				
Mr Richard Tredway (Department of Health)	Questioned whether the district municipality was informed; whether the development will be on one site; and what type of hazardous waste will be stored.	Yes, the district municipality was informed; the development will occur on one site; and the primary hazardous waste anticipated at this stage is hydrocarbons. However the EIA process will provide definite answers as to what can be place in the facility.	10/03/2009	Meeting
Mr Ramayai T.P (Department of Health)	Enquired about night soil for people working on site.	There will be abluent facilities on site. The Lephatale Municipality confirmed that the waste from these abluent facilities is disposed of at the Lephatale municipality sewage treatment works. The Environmental Management Plan will also include information in this regard; and the EIR will deal with sewage during construction in more detail.	10/03/2009	Meeting
Mr Waldo Last (Department of Health)	Questioned Eskom's commitment to rehabilitating the proposed site as the old existing site was not rehabilitated.  Questioned whether Exxaro has a licensed waste disposal site; and raised a concern that if all industries in Lephatale continue to develop individual landfill sites there would be an excess of them in the Waterberg area and they wouldn't be managed properly.  Eskom should also consider giving back to the community by for example tarring and maintaining roads in the area as the road from Modimolle is deteriorating from the activities associated with the construction of	Eskom is committed to rehabilitating. Eskom has been communicating with DWAF on the issue, and is in the process of closing the old waste site which would include rehabilitation of this site.  The Lephatale Municipality confirmed that Exxaro is in a partnership with them to license a new landfill site for the municipality. They will need to obtain licenses and permits accordingly.	10/03/2009	Meeting

	<p>Medupi Power Station.</p>	<p>can. Currently, Eskom is in partnership with the Lephhalale on improving infrastructure such as the sewerage treatment works.</p>	
<p>Ms M Manthata (Lephhalale Municipality)</p>	<p>Questioned how long the temporary hazardous waste would be stored on site; and stated that the exposure of waste on site should be investigated in the EIR.</p> <p>Lephhalale LEDET offices are not aware of this project.</p> <p>Four sites were proposed for a new landfill development by the municipality. Based on some of the challenges with respect to planning Eskom should make sure that their proposed site is available for use, that is it does not encounter problems with the planning department at a later stage. Contact must be made with the relevant planning people in the municipality. Ideally landfill sites should be consolidated, however due to the lack of a current landfill site; facilities owned and operated will be considered by DEAT and not rejected outright.</p> <p>Stated that EIAs are integrated and includes issues on the distribution of land.</p>	<p>The temporary hazardous waste would be stored on site for a period of 90 days and that exposure of the waste will be considered in the study.</p> <p>The provincial LEDET based in Polokwane were informed of the project and correspondences including the draft scoping report have been sent to for their comments.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>	<p>10/03/2009</p> <p>Meeting</p>
<p>Ms Wilna Moolman (DWAF)</p>	<p>Stated that information on the size of the proposed site and volumes of waste respectively should be included in the EIR. She also enquired on details of the type of waste that what was disposed on the old existing site.</p> <p>Questioned whether other general waste will be allowed to be disposed on site.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Eskom is unsure of what was disposed of on the decommissioned existing site. However DWAF has communicated with the power station on the steps that needed to be undertaken for remediation before a closure certificate can be issued.</p> <p>The proposed landfill site is for Eskom use only</p>	<p>10/03/2009</p> <p>Meeting</p>
<p>Ms A Malima (DWAF)</p>			<p>10/03/2009</p> <p>Meeting</p>



Ms PP Mosoane (DWAF)	Questioned where the proposed development will get water supply from.	Water supply will be gained from the Matimba Power Station and the EIA will explain the extent of water needed for the proposed development.	10/03/2009	Meeting
<b>Public meeting</b>				
Mr Victor Mbodi (Department of Agriculture)	Supports Site 5 as the proposed site as it is owned by Eskom and is recommended by specialists (as per the presentation) as the most suitable site for a landfill development. Stated that the EIR should investigate the following:	Comment noted.	10/03/2009	Meeting
Ms Mulalo Munjai (Department of Agriculture)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Impacts of leachate into groundwater;</li> <li>➤ Distance of the water table from ground level;</li> <li>➤ Land suitability for the dumping of waste;</li> <li>➤ Health and safety issues; and</li> <li>➤ Rehabilitation.</li> </ul> <p>She added that she supports Site 5 as the proposed site as it is already disturbed.</p>	A detailed geohydrological assessment report addressing all potential issues pertaining to ground water contamination will be provided during the EIR phase. The EIR report will also address health and safety issues during the construction and operational phases of the project. Issues on decommissioning of the landfill and closure will also be addressed in the EIR report	10/03/2009	Meeting
Ms Johanna Matlou (Department of Agriculture)	Stated that she does not object to the project as Site 5 has low agricultural potential.	Comment noted.	10/03/2009	Meeting