ESKOM LANDFILL

SCOPING REPORT: SOCIAL IMPACTS

Ptersa Environmental Management Consultants

Prepared by:
Ilse Aucamp
San-Marié Aucamp

Ptersa Environmental Management Consultants
PO Box 915 751
Faerie Glen
0043

Contact person: Ilse Aucamp
082 828 0668
ilsea@lantic.net

Prepared for:
Envirolution Consulting (Pty) Ltd

February 2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this report is to identify possible social impacts resulting from the proposed construction of the Medupi Landfill. This report does not aim to identify all possible social impacts, only to highlight the most likely and severe impacts. No public consultation has been done to inform this scoping report. Further investigation will be done utilising social science methodologies, which will include participatory processes, during the impact assessment phase of the project. Paragraph 5 will refer to the categories of social impacts that will be investigated in the Social Impact Assessment (SIA) report.

2. METHODOLOGY

It is believed that a participatory approach is the best way to approach social impact assessment in the South African context. The World Bank Social Standards, Equator Principles and International Principles for Social Impact Assessment will be applied in the study. It must be noted that international standards and principles will be adapted to ensure that it can be applied in the local social context. Apart from obtaining environmental permits as required by law, any proposed project would also require "social license to operate" from the community where it will be situated. This is seen to be a crucial element to ensure the successful implementation of any EMP. Without the buy-in of the affected public, the chance of successful implementing the plan will be slim. The methodology proposed will therefore focus on involving the affected public in the research and planning where it is realistically possible and executable. Different methodologies will be utilised to ensure the affected communities are consulted in the way that is most appropriate to the community.

It is proposed that the following methodologies are followed:

- The SIA will commence with a baseline study which will include an in-depth literature review of the available literature. This will include relevant legislation and existing provincial and municipal documents and studies, as well as any additional literature that

is deemed to be applicable to the study. This study will focus on the local and regional level.

- Necessary demographic data will be obtained from Statistics South Africa and Municipal Integrated Development Plans.
- A scoping exercise consisting of an initial site visit and information search have been conducted to identify key stakeholders. Key stakeholders will be interviewed and asked to compile a questionnaire. Stakeholders will include town councils, community representatives, political leaders, tribal councils, representatives of industry, tourism groups, farmer's unions and agricultural groups amongst others.
- The initial site visit will be followed up with a longer period of field work to obtain additional information and communicate with key stakeholders. A preliminary report listing issues identified during this process will be submitted after the fieldwork is completed.
- All public meetings arranged by the stakeholder engagement team will be attended by the social scientists.
- Information will be obtained via focus groups, formal and informal interviews, participatory rural appraisal, observation, the internet and literature reviews. Minutes and notes will be kept of all interviews and focus groups.
- An interview schedule might utilised instead of formal questionnaires. An interview schedule consists of a list of topics to be covered, but it is not as structured as an interview. It provides respondents with more freedom to elaborate on their views.
- The final SIA report will focus on current conditions, providing baseline data. Each category will discuss the current state of affairs, but also investigate the possible impacts that might occur in future. Recommendations for mitigation will be made at the end of the report.
- The SIA will have a participatory focus. This implies that the SIA will focus strongly on including the local community and key stakeholders.
- The public consultation process needs to feed into the SIA.

Information obtained through the public processes will inform the writing of the SIA and associated documents.

3. POSSIBLE SOCIAL RISKS

The community in the Lephalale area are being bombarded with environmental authorisation processes, and symptoms of stakeholder fatigue have been reported by environmental consultants operating in the area. Taking this social context into consideration, it is important to be aware of possible social risks associated with the project. An important consideration when looking at possible impacts, whatever their source, is to appreciate that all impacts are social impacts and that people experience the physical environment in human terms (Vanclay, 2003). Another consideration is the way in which public perception are addressed. Perceptions, attitudes, and beliefs must be treated as real with real consequences. While the public's assessment of risk is perceptual in nature, their fears should not be dismissed as irrational and therefore unimportant. Living with the fear and uncertainty is an impact in itself (Burdge, 1998).

Eskom was responsible for a lot of activities which changed the sense of place in the Lephalale area – the construction of a new power station, power lines, the need to expand mining activities etc. Although these activities are in the interest of the South African population in general, the social price was, and is still, paid by the Lephalale community. It is therefore to be expected that there will be a certain resistance to additional change, and perceptions of how additional activities may influence the area in a negative manner. It needs to be considered that although people's judgements about the riskiness of activities can be updated through experience, such experience is typically selective and incomplete. Attitudes and behaviour (risk perceptions and decisions) can also be influenced by other people. Because our friends tend to share our attitudes, and we are more likely to accept advice from our friends, such influence can reinforce existing attitudes (Eiser, 2004). Thus, different interest groups which may be affected by the project can influence each other regarding the functioning of Eskom.

Another important aspect to consider in the entire process, especially when dealing with the public, is trust. The public rely on Eskom to control risks associated with the project and to inform them about the extent of the risks. Therefore, the trust the public have in Eskom will depend on implicit estimates of Eskom's competence, values or partiality and honesty and will be interpreted as consistent with the public's prior beliefs, which may be that Eskom is not 100% trust-worthy. In order to try and re-build trust, some of the following matters should be considered. If 'experts' are

seen as having a vested interest (for example if they are paid by Eskom, or committed to defending the standpoint of a pressure group), this may undermine trust. Communicators (Experts, Eskom, EIA team) found to have withheld information lose trust. Important evidence could be what, if anything, the communicator stands to gain or lose by dressing up the information in a particular way. Expertise by itself is not enough to engender trust. Independence and impartiality are also essential. Any communicator who is perceived, rightly or wrongly, to have a stake in persuading the public either that something is safe or that it is dangerous is less likely to be trusted than someone who is seen to provide the facts as they themselves interpret them. Risk inevitably involves a concern with good and bad outcomes (Eiser, 2004). Such values will be implicit in any exchange. What any audience will be listening for is an indication of what they need to do – not simply for a prediction of what consequences may or may not happen, but also for an indication of how good or bad these consequences will be, and what they, or anyone else, is expected to do about it. The best way to communicate is to adopt a less didactic model of communication. It is already widely recognised that, to be effective, the communication of risks cannot be merely one-way. It must involve exchange and interaction between all parties. But there are obstacles to putting such good intentions into practice. The 'experts' need to be prepared to give up not only time, but some of their power (Eiser, 2004). The 'public' need to be willing to be engaged in the decision process and take some responsibility for the outcomes, if these have been shaped to take account of their views. All this can be costly, in terms of time, patience and the risk of disappointment if not everything one wants can be achieved. The real advantage over the traditional, less consultative, approach is that the debate or discussion can focus on what people want to know and issues of value, rather than merely probability can be considered (Eiser, 2004).

Another important social factor to consider is the "social licence to operate". In 2003 Pierre Lassonde drew attention to the observation that "Without local community support, your project is going nowhere." He described social license as "…the acceptance and belief by society, and specifically local communities, in the value creation of activities". Social licence cannot be obtained by going to a government ministry and making an application or simply paying a fee. It requires far more than money to truly become part of the communities in which a company operates (Lassonde 2003). A primary objective of gaining a social license is to minimize project risk. "Successful operations require the support of the communities in which they operate now, and in the future, to ensure continued access to land and resources" (Render 2005). The social

license to operate can be further described as the degree of match between stakeholders' individual expectations of corporate behaviour and companies' actual behaviour.

Earning a social licence to operate starts in the planning phase of any given project. First impressions are long lasting and the company must recognize that community opinion will be conditioned by previous experience, knowledge gained from elsewhere and the approach taken by the company. Conflict can arise very quickly if there is a failure to respect local customs of land use and religious sites, give notice of actions, pay fair market compensation and so on. Knowledge of the community and on-going communications are prerequisites for good relations.

4. BASELINE DESCRIPTION OF THE SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT

Eskom is currently constructing a 6 x 800MW coal-fired power station about 15 km from the town of Lephalale. This station is known as the Medupi Power Station and is in close proximity of the existing Matimba Power Station and the proposed Coal 3 Power Station in Waterberg.

In order to comply with a number of legal requirements all waste materials from Medupi's construction must be disposed of in an appropriately licensed waste dump site. There is currently a waste site at the town of Lephalale, but this site is not licensed and can thus not be used for Medupi's waste. As a result Medupi's waste has to be transported to the Johannesburg area to be disposed of at a licensed site. Due to the volume of waste produced, this is not the most cost-effective or sustainable solution.

The power stations are situated in the Lephalale Local Municipality that falls under jurisdiction of the Waterberg District Municipality in the Limpopo Province. The Limpopo Province is situated at the North Eastern corner of South Africa. Limpopo shares international borders with Botswana, Zimbabwe and Mozambique and locally it borders the North West province, Gauteng and Mpumalanga. The province spans an area of 125 755 square kilometres, taking up 10.3% of South Africa's land area. Six district municipalities fall within the jurisdiction of the Limpopo Province, namely Waterberg, Capricorn, Vhembe, Mopani and Sekhukhune. The capital is Polokwane, lying in the middle of the province.

The province is a typical developing area, exporting primary products and importing manufactured goods and services. It has a high potential for development, with resources such as tourism, rain-fed agriculture, minerals and abundant labour offering investment opportunities. Despite all its assets, Limpopo is a very poor province, mainly due to apartheid planning.

The Waterberg District Municipality is the largest district municipality in the province and consists of six local municipalities, namely Mogalakwena, Lephalale, Bela- Bela, Modimolle, Thabazimbi and Mookgopong. The district is located in the western side of the Limpopo province and borders the neighbouring country of Botswana, as well as the North West province and Gauteng. Waterberg district is rural in nature with urban areas that can mostly be described as dispersed and fragmented.

The key pillars of economic development in the Waterberg area are mining, agriculture and tourism. The area has significant mineral zones with the most important mining activities including granite, tin, platinum, iron and coal. About 45% of the total in situ coal reserves of South Africa are in the Waterberg area, although only a fraction of this coal could be considered recoverable because the bulk is too deep to mine economically. In terms of agriculture most of the district is suited for livestock production, but some major cropping is also taking place in cotton, sunflower, tobacco, and soya bean production. Waterberg has a competitive edge in terms of tourism because of its close proximity to the Gauteng province, its rich biosphere, malaria-free areas and its hunting capital status. The area is home to the Macadam's Valley World Heritage Site as well as the provincial Nature Reserve Nylsvley which is internationally known for the wetlands research undertaken there as well as the Marakele National Park near Thabazimbi.

Lephalale is the largest municipality in the Waterberg district and accounts for 39% of the district. It came into being in December 2000 as a result of the amalgamation of the Ellisras/Marapong Transitional Local Council and the Ellisras/Tswelopele Transitional Local Council. The municipality is about 19 605 square kilometres in size and shares an international border with Botswana. The main town in the area is Lephalale (previously known as Ellisras). The area is a prime hunting mecca and prime eco-tourism area that draws thousands of tourists every year. Lephalale forms part of the world-renowned Waterberg Savannah Biosphere and is also well-known for its coal-mining industry which is, besides tourism, the mainstay of the area. Also in the

area is the Kumba Grootegeluk mine which is the largest mine of its kind in South Africa and the Matimba power station that is currently the largest dry-cooled power station in the world.

Although the Limpopo province showed a positive growth rate (based on the results of the Census 2001 and Community Survey 2007 data), it was still below the national average. The Waterberg district as well as the Lephalale municipal area both showed a decline in population which was more pronounced in the Lephalale area. As the town of Lephalale has expanded a lot over the past couple of years, it is possible that this phenomenon may relate more to the rural areas of the municipality as most of the people in the municipality live there. It must be mentioned that there is a discrepancy between the population Community Survey 2007 shows for Lephalale (80 141) and the population that Lephalale's website indicates (105 000 – www.lephalale.com, accessed 21/01/09). It is anticipated that the urban population will increase over the next years and that the town of Lephalale will expand even more due to the construction and operation of the Medupi power station, as well as the two new planned coal fired power stations and other associated industrial activities. It is important to note that Sasol is also busy with investigating industrial development in the area, therefore the potential cumulative impacts of all these developments may change the socio-economic characteristics of the area significantly in the near future.

More than 90% of the people in the Lephalale area belong to the Black population (Community Survey 2007). The population in the area is very young, with more than 50% being younger than 24 years of age. About 20% of the population aged 20 years or older has completed Grade 12 or higher. Almost half of the people between the ages of 15 and 65 years have no income at all.

A quarter of the households in the Lephalale area has indicated that their refuse is removed at least once a week by a local authority or a private company, while the bulk of the remaining households have indicated that they have their own refuse dumps. About a third of households have piped water inside the dwelling, and just over 50% have piped water inside the yard or from an access point outside the yard. In terms of sanitation, about 50% of the households have pit toilets without ventilation and about 30% have flush toilets that are connected to a sewerage system.

The Community Survey 2007 did not release information on home language, but according to Census 2001, just over half the population in the Lephalale area has Sepedi as home language,

followed by almost a third with Setswana as home language. The third most common home language was Afrikaans (9%). Not even a percentage of the population in the Lephalale area had English as home language. This suggests that in addition to English as language of communication, Afrikaans, Sepedi and Setswana should also be included in communication to ensure as wide an audience as possible is reached.

5. SOCIAL CHANGES VERSUS SOCIAL IMPACTS

It is important to understand the difference between a social change process and a social impact. For the purpose of the SIA report both these categories will be investigated. For the purpose of this report, only possible social impacts will be mentioned.

Social change processes are set in motion by project activities or policies. Social change processes can be measured objectively, independent of the local context. Examples of a social change process are increase in the population, relocation or presence of temporary workers. Under certain circumstances these processes may result in social impacts, but if managed properly these changes may not create impacts. Whether impacts are caused will depend on the characteristics and history of the host community, and the extent of mitigation measures that are put in place. (Vanclay, 2003:192).

The following categories of social change processes will be investigated:

- Demographic processes
- Economic processes
- Geographic processes
- Institutional and legal processes
- Emancipatory and empowerment processes
- Sociocultural processes

A social impact is something that is experienced or felt by humans. It can be positive or negative. Social impacts can be experienced in a physical or perceptual sense. Therefore, two types of social impacts can be distinguished:

- **Objective** social impacts – i.e. impacts that can be quantified and verified by independent observers in the local context, such as changes in employment patterns, in standard of living or in health and safety.
- **Subjective** social impacts – i.e. impacts that occur "in the heads" or emotions of people, such as negative public attitudes, psychological stress or reduced quality of life.

It is important to include subjective social impacts, as these can have far-reaching consequences in the form of opposition to, and social mobilisation against the project (Du Preez & Perold, 2005: v). The following categories of social impacts will be investigated:

- Health and social well-being
- Quality of the living environment
- Economic impacts and material well-being
- Cultural impacts
- Family and community impacts
- Institutional, legal, political and equity impacts
- Gender impacts

In conclusion, it is very likely that a number of social changes processes will be set in motion by the project. Whether these processes cause social impacts will depend on the successful implementation of suggested mitigation measures. Having said that, it must be considered that the social environment is dynamic and constantly changing, making it difficult to predict exact impacts. External processes not related to the project, like political changes or global economic changes can alter the social environment in a short period of time, and therefore alter the predicted impacts.

6. PRELIMINARY IMPACTS

Sources of social impacts are often not as clear cut as those in the biophysical environment. Social impacts are not site specific, but occur in the communities surrounding the proposed site – where the people are. The following is a list of some of the possible impacts identified during the scoping phase of the project. The list is not exhaustive and will be expanded on in the EIA phase. These impacts will be investigated further in the Environmental Impact Assessment phase of the project. The impacts will then be assessed and mitigation suggested.

Pre-construction:

- Public perception
- Feelings in relation to the projects
- Expectations regarding creation of opportunities (Jobs etc.)

Construction:

- Impacts of traffic on people – dust, noise, safety – from a social and nuisance perspective.
- Impacts of construction camp – HIV/AIDS, movement of people etc.
- Influx of people
- Creation of jobs and other economic opportunities
- Sense of place
- Property values
- Visual

Operation:

- Traffic
- Possible health impacts
- Creation of jobs and other economic opportunities
- Additional social infrastructure
- Sense of place
- Property values
- Visual

Decommission:

- Loss of jobs

- New opportunities

7. SITE SELECTION

Five possible sites have been identified during the scoping process. Sites 1 to 4 falls within the farm Grootvallei, and site 5 falls within the farm Grootestryd, the site of the Matimba Power station. All the sites are located some distance from existing communities. From a community access point of view, and considering existing disturbances, site 5 seems to be ideally suited. The only hassle would be the additional traffic, since the site is close to other industrial activities like the Grootegeluk mine, the Matimba power station. It is presumed that the specialist responsible for the traffic impact assessment will consider this potential impact. The criteria used from a social perspective would be accessibility and impact on sense of place, which would consider surrounding land uses. The preference of the site from most desirable to least desirable from a social perspective are:

- Site 5
- Site 3
- Site 2
- Site 4
- Site 1

It must be emphasized that from a social perspective none of the sites seem to have a fatal flaw, and therefore no site should be excluded on social grounds.

8. CONCLUSIONS

The aim of this report is to identify preliminary impacts to be used in the scoping phase of the EIA. An in-depth study and impact assessment will be conducted in the EIA phase of the project.

9. REFERENCES

Burdge, R.J. 1998. **A Conceptual approach to Social Impact Assessment.** Revised Edition. Social Ecology Press: Middleton. 284p

Du Preez, M. & Perold, J. 2005. **Scoping/feasibility study for the development of a new landfill site for the Northern Areas of the Metropolitan Municipality of Johannesburg. Socio-Economic Assessment.** Mawatsan.

Eiser, R. 2004. **Public Perception of Risk** Centre for Research in Social Attitudes. Department of Psychology. University of Sheffield

Lassonde, Pierre., 2003. **How to earn your Social Licence** Mining Review, Summer, pp. 7-13.

Render, Jo. M., 2005. Mining and Indigenous Peoples Issues Review, pp. 1-82, (London: International Council on Mining & Metals).

Salzmann, O; Ionescu-Somers, A and Steger, U. Undated **Corporate license to operate (BCS) - review of the literature and research options**

Vanclay, F. 2003. **Conceptual and methodological advances in Social Impact Assessment.** In Vanclay, F. & Becker, H.A. 2003. *The International Handbook for Social Impact Assessment*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited