



**ANDERSON-DINALEDI:
400kV POWERLINE AND SUBSTATION**

EIA PHASE - DEA MEETING

DATE: 8 July 2010
TIME: 09:30-10:30
VENUE: DEA Offices
Pretoria

1. Attendance

Name	Organisation	Contact No	E-mail
Project Team			
Nicky Naidoo (NN)	Nemai Consulting	011 781 1730	nickyn@nemai.co.za
Sonja van Eden (SvE)	Nemai Consulting	011 781 1730	sonjav@nemai.co.za
DEA Representative			
Lené Grobelaar (LG)	DEA Environmental Impact Management	012 310 3087	LGrobbelaar@deat.gov.za

2. Apologies

None

3. Agenda Items and Discussions

No.	Item	Action
1	WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION	
1.1	NN thanked LG for availing herself to attend the meeting.	
2	PROJECT BACKGROUND	
2.1	NN provided LG with background to the project. Mentioned that the Anderson-Dinaledi project consist of a proposed 400kV powerline between the existng Dinaledi substation located near Brits and the proposed new Anderson Substation. Mentioned that Eskom originally wanted to re-commission the current Anderson substation which is located within the NECSA property, but that NECSA did not want to allow this activity due to security reasons, as well as due to proposed expansion of NECSA.	

No.	Item	Action
3	PURPOSE OF THE MEETING	
3.1	<p>NN mentioned that a meeting with the DEA was requested to discuss the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment raised by Mr Oosthuizen; • Allowable width of study corridor for the proposed 400kV powerline; • Allowable width of study area for the substation; • Separate or combined application; and • Public Participation Process 	
4	DISCUSSIONS	
4.1	<p>NN mentioned that Mr Oosthuizen is a stakeholder in the area, and that he was informed on the Anderson-Dinaledi project by NECSA. Mr Oosthuizen owns a property in the study area. Mr Oosthuizen enquired on the status of the project and on the proposed route alignment. NN explained to Mr Oosthuizen that there is currently not a fixed route alignment, and a study corridor will be investigated, instead of a fixed alignment. NN also mentioned that normally the study corridor investigated are 1km wide, but due to various technical issues experienced in the past, Eskom are looking at a 2km wide study corridor for this project. Mr Oosthuizen indicated that he is opposed to a 2km wide study area, but that a 1km study area would be suitable. Mr Oosthuizen also indicated that a fixed route alignment should be included within the 1km study corridor, as legislation only accommodates for directly affected people, and that directly affected landowners cannot be identified within a 1km wide study area. Also mentioned that specialist studies could not be accurate when studying a full 1km study corridor, and therefore it is important to include a centre line.</p> <p>Mr Oosthuizen requested to review the Scoping Report, and also requested that a meeting with DEA be held to establish the allowable servitude width and that this meeting should be minuted. Requested that the minutes be included in the Scoping Report as proof that this meeting took place. Mr Oosthuizen indicated that he does not have internet access, and that he is unable to forward written comment to Nema.</p> <p>NN further mentioned to DEA that the Eskom Planning Department indicated that a 5km wide study corridor would be more feasible, and enquired from LG, whether such a wide study corridor would be allowed. NN also mentioned that Eskom does not want to include a centre line in the corridor as it creates issues during the Public Participation Phase.</p>	
4.2	<p>LG indicated that DEA will not allow a 5km wide study area, and that a 2km wide study area will also not be allowed. Indicated that a 1km study corridor would be suitable, and that a centre line has to be included within the study corridor.</p> <p>LG further indicated that DEA authorises a study corridor and that the exact route are only</p>	

No.	Item	Action
	<p>determine after the project has been authorised.</p> <p>LG enquired whether Eskom have previously submitted powerline application for which only a corridor and no centre line was assessed.</p>	
4.3	<p>SvE indicated that Eskom indicated that they would like to study a 2x2km are for the proposed substation as the exact location of the loop-in lines will only become known after authorisation and after the detailed substation design has been finalised. Mentioned that Eskom have experienced difficulty in the past as in some cases the loop-in lines has to cross over properties which did not form part of the study area.</p>	
4.4	<p>LG mentioned that a 2x2km study area will not be allowed for the proposed substation. Mentioned that a substation is a fixed, and that a fixed site should be investigated for the proposed substation.</p>	
4.5	<p>During the meeting NN contacted Lucia Chauke from Eskom to establish whether Eskom have in the past submitted application which only included a study corridor and not a centre line.</p>	
4.6	<p>Lucia Chauke indicated that Eskom have never submitted application for just a study corridor, but that this is the route which Eskom wants to follow in future.</p>	
4.7	<p>LG mentioned that Eskom should attend the monthly Forum meetings with the DEA to discuss the issue of only assessing a study corridor and not a centre line. Indicated that for now a centre line should definitely be included in the study corridor, as no centre line will cause a lot of issues during the Public Participation Phase, as landowners will not know whether they could potentially be affected by the proposed powerline.</p>	
4.8	<p>NN indicated that two separate EIA application forms was submitted for this project, one for the proposed substation, and one for the proposed 400kV powerline. Enquired whether these applications should rather be withdrawn to submit a combined application.</p>	
4.9	<p>LG indicated that DEA finds separate applications suitable and that the submission of a combined application will not be required. Mentioned that Nemai should refer to these projects as c combined project during the Public Participation Phase as the Public should be made aware of the both of the projects.</p>	
4.10	<p>NN outline the proposed Public Participation process as follows, and enquired whether the DEA will approve of this process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only identify directly affected landowners, and not everyone located within the 1km study area; • Identify key stakeholders in the study area, such as mines, etc; and • Place site notices to notify broader public of the project and on the public meeting. <p>NN also confirmed with LG that no landowner consent forms will be required as this project is a linear project.</p>	
4.11	<p>LG approved the public participation process as outlined by NN and agreed that no</p>	



No.	Item	Action
	landowner consent forms would be required.	
5	CLOSING	
5.1	NN thanked LG for availing herself to attend the meeting.	