

ISSUES AND RESPONSE REPORT

Issues / comment raised by:	Date	Means of communication	Issue / comment	Response
GUIDELINES TO BE FOLLOWED				
B. Conradie	24 Jan 2006	Registration form	Emphasised that the requirements of the National Water Act 1998 (Act 36 of 1998) must be adhered to.	All legal requirements will be adhered to.
C. de Villiers (Botanical Society of South Africa, Conservation Unit) V. Bowie (Scientific Services – Cape Nature)	27 Jan, 22 Feb, 12 April 2006	E-mail & Faxed letter	Ensure that the specialist report regarding biodiversity follows the terms of reference of environmental assessment and decision-making they forwarded. Attention should also be paid to the Fynbos Forum ecosystem guidelines for environmental assessment in the Western Cape. Cape Nature supports all comments made by the Botanical Society of SA, Conservation Unit (27 January 2006)	The botanical specialist is well-informed of these guidelines and the Botanical Society's letter was forwarded to the ecological specialist to ensure that he considers their comments.
C. de Villiers (Botanical Society of South Africa, Conservation Unit)	27 Jan 2006	Faxed letter	Regarding the Succulent Karoo: Biodiversity Hotspot; A precautionary risk-averse approach must be followed with regard to the proposed Kudu Integration Project, as the proposed transmission lines as well as new access roads will be located in a global biodiversity hotspot, The Succulent Karoo Biome, which is the only arid "hotspot" in the world. He further stated that the National Spatial Biodiversity Assessment has identified the succulent Karoo Biome as one of nine broad priority areas for conservation action at a national scale.	The sensitivity of the study area as a biodiversity hotspot with a number of endemic species and threatened floral communities is recognised and is acknowledged in the Scoping Report. The ecological specialist study will take cognisance of these sensitive features and assess the level of impacts that the proposed power line may have on them.
C. de Villiers (Botanical Society of South Africa, Conservation Unit)	27 Jan 2006	Faxed letter	Regarding the Succulent Karoo Ecosystem Plan (SKEP); The SKEP framework for action has identified specific areas where vegetation is highly vulnerable and new options exist for achieving conservation	The terms of reference for the ecological specialist include the consideration of the information in the SKEP reports. The ecological specialist will consult with Dr Phil Desmet, who has been intimately involved with SKEP.

Issues / comment raised by:	Date	Means of communication	Issue / comment	Response
Unit)			<p>targets. Such areas with highly irreplaceable and vulnerable biodiversity occur among others between Port Nolloth and Lekkersing, Kleinsee and Springbok, and around Lutzville-Vredendal respectively. The Oranjemund – Gromis - Juno corridor negotiates a number of landscapes features that are important for the maintenance of ecological processes.</p> <p>The areas with the Quartz patches in particular are Habitats that is almost uniquely associated with the Succulent Karoo Biome. The Quartz patches are centres of plant endemism and species diversification. These quartz patches are delicate ecosystems that are sensitive to transformation. Once these quartz patches are disturbed, they are virtually impossible to restore. The SKEP maps are a very useful planning tool.</p>	<p>The ecological specialist has been informed to pay particular attention to the quartz patches and to other locations of endemic species.</p>
C. de Villiers (Botanical Society of South Africa, Conservation Unit)	27 Jan 2006	Faxed letter	<p>Spatial recommendations and specialists' workshop; Planning should seek to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Avoid any additional habitat loss in areas designated as highly irreplaceable for the achievement of biodiversity targets; 2. Promote functional connectivity; 3. Reduce the fragmentation of habitat by appropriate restorative actions. 4. It was strongly recommended that an inter-disciplinary, corridor workshop be held to draw on expert knowledge and experience of the area which can be used to identify major issues or "Show-stoppers" that can be dealt with through positive planning. 	<p>A corridor workshop was convened with a number of role players in the Succulent Karoo Biome, including SA National Parks, Cape Nature, farmers associations and municipalities. Minutes of this meeting are attached to the Environmental Impact Report. The outcome of the corridor workshop was a suggested corridor that kept to existing roads and areas or historical disturbance as much as possible.</p>
C. de Villiers (Botanical Society of	27 Jan 2006	Faxed letter	<p>National Environmental Management Principles; It was strongly recommended that all reports for the environmental process firmly demonstrate how the</p>	<p>The National Environmental Management Principles contained in the National Environmental Management Act, 1998 are</p>

Issues / comment raised by:	Date	Means of communication	Issue / comment	Response
South Africa, Conservation Unit)			<p>proponent intends complying with the following National Environmental Management Principles:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Avoid, minimise or remedy disturbance of ecosystems and loss of biodiversity; 2. Avoid degradation of the environment; 3. Avoid jeopardising ecosystem integrity; 4. Pursue the best practicable environmental option by means of integrated environmental management; 5. Protect the environment as the peoples common heritage; 6. Control and minimise environmental damage; 7. Pay specific attention to management and planning and planning procedures pertaining to sensitive, vulnerable, highly dynamic or stressed ecosystems. 	<p>overarching principles for all decisions relating to the management of the environment and we agree that they would, therefore, be applicable to this EIA process.</p> <p>Avoidance of impacts is very much the highest priority as far as management of environmental impacts is concerned, followed by mitigation and thereafter, substitution or replacement. The Environmental Impact Report will include a comprehensive Environmental Management Plan, which will specify detailed actions to be taken to avoid and mitigate impacts such that the NEMA principles are respected.</p>
C. de Villiers (Botanical Society of South Africa, Conservation Unit)	27 Jan 2006	Faxed letter	<p>Recommendation: Biodiversity ToR;</p> <p>The Fynbos Forum Ecosystem Guidelines for Environmental Assessment in the Western Cape (Helme, in De Villiers et al. 2005, pp 58-61) can be consulted to identify critical issues that should be addressed when undertaking biodiversity assessments in the Succulent Karoo. SEF was also referred to the DEADP guideline on the involvement of biodiversity specialists in EIA processes.</p>	<p>These guidelines and the rest of the contents of Botsoc's letters were forwarded to the botanical expert prior to his commencement of the botanical study to ensure that he does take these guidelines into account.</p>
V. Bowie (Scientific Services – Cape Nature)	22 Feb 2006	Faxed letter	<p>Support of the specialist assessments to take place – must ensure that the DEADP 2005 guideline series in EIA processes are used.</p>	<p>The botanical specialist has been provided with a copy of the DEA&DP guidelines.</p>
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS IN GENERAL				
V. Bowie P. Grobler E. Cloete	22 Feb, 2 March 2006	Faxed letter & Public Meeting - Vanrhynsdorp	<p>Emphasised the extremely sensitive nature of the Knersvlakte and that extreme caution should be exercised as it can never be rehabilitated to the original state. The white quartz patches may not be</p>	<p>This is a well known concern. This option will be regarded as the last alternative for construction</p>

Issues / comment raised by:	Date	Means of communication	Issue / comment	Response
			disturbed under any circumstances.	
A. Le Roux	2 March 2006	Public meeting – Kamieskroon	The erection of Eskom’s power lines will not be allowed through the Knersvlakte	This option will be regarded as the last alternative for construction. It was agreed at the interdisciplinary meeting that any route through the Knersvlakte is undesirable, since it would be almost impossible to rehabilitate.
A. Le Roux	2 March 2006	Public meeting - Kamieskroon	The Kamiesberg mountains have numerous endangered species, therefore Eskom will not be allowed through this area either.	The Kamiesberg Mountains have been identified as an area with a very high degree of endemism, and will therefore be regarded as an unfavourable alternative.
C. Paulsen	2 March	Public meeting – Vanrhynsdorp	It is suggested that the Hardeveld area of the Knersvlakte will not be an option for Eskom. The installation of water pipes in this area in the past proved extremely difficult.	This option will be regarded as the last alternative for construction
A. Le Roux	2 March	Public meeting- Kamieskroon	Highlighted the fact that the most environmental damage will be from the movements of construction vehicles and not necessarily the actual erection of the power line.	This is confirmed by the botanical specialist.
V. Bowie P. Grobler E. Cloete	22 February - 2 March 2006	Faxed letter & Public Meeting - Vanrhynsdorp	Eskom must fly in pylons & cables (or walk in) in sensitive areas, vehicles are NOT to be used.	This option will be addressed. This way of construction may be used in some areas.
H. Kohrg	2 March 2006	Public meeting – Kamieskroon	Concerned that maintenance of the power lines, will in future have a negative impact on the environment and that this needs to be considered.	Will be addressed in the Environmental Management Plan. The issue is noted and EIA team will consider it during the EIA
A. Le Roux P. Grobler	2 March 2006	Public meeting – Kamieskroon & Vanrhynsdorp	Sand will rehabilitate more easily than the Knersvlakte.	Issue noted.
G. Nel	2 March 2006	Public meeting –	Enquired of E. Cloete what the impact on the environment would be if, for example, the Juno	Impact would be minimal on the Knersvlakte.

Issues / comment raised by:	Date	Means of communication	Issue / comment	Response
		Vanrhynsdorp	substation expanded by one hectare.	
R. Smart	2 March 2006	Public meeting – Kamieskroon	The main reason for the corridor expansion of the Namaqua National Park is to ensure species survival through Global Warming	Issue noted
K. Kritzinger	2 March 2006	Public meeting – Vanrhynsdorp	A small patch of fynbos exists close to the coast inline with the proposed coastal alternative. This patch of fynbos needs to be bypassed and not disturbed in any way.	Comment noted
A. Le Roux	2 March 2006	Public meeting – Kamieskroon	It is suggested that an environmental control officer be present at all times during construction.	The need of an environmental control officer during construction will be included in the EIA report.
HERITAGE ISSUES				
A. Jerardino (Heritage Western Cape)	12 May 2006	E-mail	Highlighted that the Northern Cape landscape was not always the same throughout many millennia of prehistory. Through history there would have been wet spells and periods when vegetation and animals were more plentiful, thus human settlement of this area would have been more frequent during these wet periods, leading to the accumulation of archaeological sites. Mary Leslie should be contacted at SAHRA for comments on heritage issues in the Northern Cape.	Comment noted. Mary Leslie was added to the I&AP database.
IMPACTS ON BIRDS				
V. Bowie P. Grobler E. Cloete	22 Feb, 2 March 2006	Faxed letter & Public Meeting - Vanrhynsdorp	Mitigation measures must be implemented to prevent raptors from nesting above the conductors – option of nest platforms should be investigated.	Plastic spikes are attached to the pylons, just above the conductors. This ensures that no bird will sit or nest on or above the conductors.
S. Davids	9 May 2006	E-mail	Pylons may have a negative effect on the birds frequenting the region	Noted. This has been addressed in the avian impact assessment.
P. Grobler	2 March 2006	Public meeting – Vanrhynsdorp	Commented that power lines along the coast will have a lesser impact on bird life than those erected more inland.	The person tasked with the Avifauna studies will be in contact with him to ensure that all impacts and mitigation measures are addressed.

Issues / comment raised by:	Date	Means of communication	Issue / comment	Response
VISUAL IMPACTS				
S. Davids	9 May 2006	E-mail	The pylons will have a severe negative visual impact on the area and this in turn will have a negative socio-economic impact on the region. Tourism in general and eco-tourism in particular, forms a cornerstone of the area's socio-economic development (Kamiesberg IDP 2005: 34,44,46,47, 73, 77, 83, 90, 97, 98, 100, 102, 113, 121). He further stated that the unsightly pylons will go against the grain of this marketing campaign that aims to benefit this poverty stricken area. He believes that pylons will not be neutral static structures, but will function negatively for years to rob the community of potential economic income it can derive from its major natural resource, namely an undisturbed landscape. The cumulative cost to the community may run into millions over a few years while the human cost of not empowering the disadvantaged through tourism, will be substantial.	Comment noted. Issue will be addressed in social and tourism specialist report in the EIR.
C. Paulsen	2 March 2006	Public meeting – Vanrhynsdorp	It is suggested that the visual impact of the power lines will be less in the sand as compared to the Knersvlakte because plants are taller in the sand area.	K. Rau added that, if possible, Eskom should erect power lines during the rainy season to ensure minimal impact and faster rehabilitation. Note: This comment is contradicted by comments made by CapeNature during a meeting held in February 2007.
ALTERNATIVES & ISSUES ASSOCIATED WITH EACH				
J. Deventer G. de Kock K. Helmut R. Smart A. Le Roux	2 March 2006	Public meeting - Kamieskroon	It is suggested that the power line routes along the coast, cut through the Namaqua National Park alongside the Hondeklip road and then south again allowing for at least 2.5-3km distance from the eastern edge of the new park boundary.	This issue was noted
K. Rau	2 March 2006	Public meeting – Vanrhynsdorp	It is suggested that construction along the Lutzville-Nuwerus or Hondeklip roads are best alternatives.	This issue was noted.

Issues / comment raised by:	Date	Means of communication	Issue / comment	Response
J. Deventer G. de Kock H. Kohrg R. Smart A. Le Roux	2 March 2006	Public meeting - Kamieskroon	Preferred power line route to go through the Boesmanland area, second alternative is down the coast and through the Namaqua National Park along the Hondeklip road and the least preferred alternative along the N7.	It was explained that the route through the Boesmanland will be very costly and that the people residing in the Boesmanland will have issues with the line as well.
H. Kohrg	2 March 2006	Public meeting – Kamieskroon	Preferred the power lines to be erected through the Boesmanland area, past Vaalputs.	It was explained that the route through the Boesmanland will be very costly and that the people residing in the Boesmanland will have issues with the line as well.
J. Deventer	2 March 2006	Public meeting – Kamieskroon	Preferred the power lines to be erected alongside the N7	A. Le Roux again emphasized that the erection of power lines will not be allowed in the Knersvlakte (Quarts area).
P. Grobler C. vd Merwe E. Cloete T. Mehtoor K. Rau J. de V Kritzinger C. Paulsen A. Khan	2 March 2006	Public meeting – Vanrhynsdorp	It was decided that the first alternative suggested by SANParks (through the Boesmanland area) is not the best alternative, due to the negative impact on the Knersvlakte. The alternative that routs along the coast and cuts through the Namaqua National Park must be considered to be the most preferred alternative.	This issue was noted.
C. Paulsen	2 March 2006	Public meeting – Vanrhynsdorp	It is suggested that the Boesmanland alternative be viewed as the second best alternative as the environmental impacts are relatively high.	J. Kritzinger suggested that the Springbok Mountains must not be an option for Eskom.
J. Kritzinger C. Paulsen P. Grobler C. vd Merve E. Cloete T. Mehtoor K. Rau A. Kahn	2 March 2006	Public meeting – Vanrhynsdorp	Preferred the coastal route for the erection of power lines	SANParks initially agreed with this alternative.
K. Rau	2 March 2006	Public meeting – Vanrhynsdorp	It is noted that mining already exists along the coast, therefore the erection of the power lines close to the coast will impact the environment minimally.	It is agreed that a route through the mining areas will have minimal impact.

Issues / comment raised by:	Date	Means of communication	Issue / comment	Response
K. Rau	2 March 2006	Public meeting – Vanrynsdorp	Cautioned regarding the coastal mist.	Eskom would prefer not to erect their power lines within 10km from the coast to prevent corrosion of the pylons.
S. Davids	9 May 2006	E-mail	Unique plant material occurs in patches and the patches can easily be avoided by rerouting the power lines. An honest appraisal of the area by the specialists doing the vegetation assessment will reveal the well-known location of globally unique areas such as the Riethuis quartz patch. The power line must be routed around such sensitive areas. He referred the following biodiversity experts working in the area to assist in this regard. Dr. Phil Desmet. Cell: 082-352-2955 email: factoryrider@absamail.co.za Annalise Roux. Cell 082-484-6993. email: rouxa@cncjnk.wcape.gov.za	The botanical specialist appointed to the project team has a substantial amount of experience in the Succulent Karoo, and has been working closely with Dr Phil Desmet. He has identified and mapped the Riethuis Quartz Patch – refer to botanical specialist study. Annalise le Roux of Cape Nature and Charl de Villiers of the Botanical Society of South Africa have registered as I&APs with SEF.
K. Rau	2 March 2006	Public meeting – Vanrynsdorp	Mentioned that there are existing roads in the sand and that Eskom and SEF should consider these when finalising the power line route.	Comment noted. The power lines will be routes along existing infrastructure like as far as possible to minimise the impact.
T. Thiart (Namakwa District Municipality)	07 June 2006	Faxed and posted letter	Do not recommend that alternatives C and D be considered, as work within the mountains is very difficult to rehabilitate in comparison to the westerly routes through the Sandveld. Either of alternatives A, B, and E is acceptable with the existing servitude being the best option.	Noted.
CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES				
J. de Jager Maass Namakwa Boerdery BK	22 Feb 2006	Registration form	Construction workers do not stay within the construction site and that vehicles drive all over the veld and adjacent farms. Workers also trample bushes.	The impact of access by contractors to areas that are regarded as sensitive to farming operations is acknowledged as potentially significant. Appropriate mitigation will be proposed in the Environmental Management Plan (EMP). It is recommended that farmers agree on appropriate controls with contractors prior to the start of construction so that access is limited to suitable areas.
J. de Jager Maass Namakwa Boerdery BK	22 Feb 2006	Registration form	Eskom closes and opens gates without permission as well as cutting farm fences. Important that this gets addressed as livestock constantly move around.	

Issues / comment raised by:	Date	Means of communication	Issue / comment	Response
Namakwa Boerdery BK	22 Feb 2006	Registration form	Emphasises that Eskom must keep their construction sites clean from waste and fuel.	Issue was noted. Appropriate mitigation will be included in the EMP.
K. Kritzinger	2 March 2006	Public meeting – Vanrynsdorp	Emphasised that construction must remain alongside the roads and not in the dunes.	The dunes areas are regarded to be sensitive to erosion and as far as possible, the power line will be kept away from dunes.
BENEFITS OF THE POWERLINE				
H. Kohrg	2 March 2006	Public meeting - Kamieskroon	Enquired as to what benefits Namaqualand would receive from the project. If nothing, then why should the Namaqualand community comply?	There is no benefit to the people in Namaqualand, apart from the possibility of tap offs from the line by communities. There is a major shortage of electricity in the Cape Metropolitan area. Allowing the power line will only help to address this problem.
J. Deventer G. de Kock H. Kohrg R. Smart A. Le Roux	2 March 2006	Public meeting - Kamieskroon	It is suggested that Eskom should subsidise Namaqua National Park's electricity	Issue noted. Eskom has indicated that it is prepared to negotiate terms and conditions with Sanparks, including purchase of land or providing electricity to Sanparks.
B.J. Kennedy	15 Feb 2006	Letter	Interested in accessing electricity should the power line be erected alongside the Groenrivier road or through his farm.	Issue noted and confirmed by phone call to the I&AP. The appropriate contact persons to negotiate with regarding this possibility will be provided.
COMMUNITY UPLIFTMENT / WORK OPPORTUNITIES				
W. B. Hendriks G. Cloete	8-23 Feb 2006	Registration form/Telephonically	Enquired with regards to contract or subcontract work.	Most of the construction work is undertaken by highly specialised contractors. There is scope for local contractors for activities like fencing.
A. Kahn	2 March 2006	Public meeting – Vanrynsdorp	Enquired as to whether Eskom was looking at any possible opportunities for the local communities.	A database of all interested parties has been compiled and Eskom will consult this in order to meet employment stipulations with regards to local communities.
A. Kahn	2 March 2006	Public meeting – Vanrhynsdorp	Stated that he owns the largest herbicide company in South Africa and that he has done work for Eskom before.	Advised to send details of companies to be registered and included in the database.
GENERAL ISSUES				
R. Smit	1 Feb	Registration	Address the impact this project will have on existing	Eskom will ensure that no other services,

Issues / comment raised by:	Date	Means of communication	Issue / comment	Response
	2006	form faxed	electrical lines.	including existing power lines, are negatively affected.
H. K. J. Kohrs	22 Feb 2006	Registration form	Enquired as to whether the power line was a new one to be erected or upgrading an existing line.	It was responded that this will be a new power line.
M. Dreyer	9 Feb 2006	Registration form	Enquired as to whether the power line will be erected in a zig-zag manner or straight line. All households along the route need to be notified of activities. Specifics of where the power line will be erected between Garies & Bitterfontein.	Response by phone call: The plan is to have a line that is as straight as possible, depending on the location of sensitive areas.
C. Paulsen	2 March 2006	Public meeting – Vanrhynsdorp	Enquired as to why electricity had to go to the Juno substation when Eskom has a national grid.	The national grid cannot be sorted into incoming/outgoing electricity. Lines are erected for a specific reason and to serve specific areas.
C. Paulsen	2 March 2006	Public meeting – Vanrynsdorp	Enquired as to when Eskom would begin construction.	The EIA process is currently being conducted and only once that is complete and the Record of Decision (RoD) has been issued can construction commence. It is not possible to say at this stage when that will be. Another thirty days is allowed for appeals from all I&APs after the RoD has been issued.
J du Toit S.F. du Toit	22 Feb 2006	Registration form	Intends to build guest houses on his farm and does not want power lines to cross his farm.	Issue noted. The EIA includes a visual impact assessment and a socio-economic assessment that assesses the impacts of this nature.
C. Paulsen	2 March 2006	Public meeting – Vanrynsdorp	It is suggested that Eskom would save funds if they construct their power lines through sand rather than granite.	Comment noted. However, as indicated above, sandy soil is sensitive to erosion, and for this reason may need to be avoided.
H. Kohrg	2 March 2006	Public meeting – Kamieskroon	It is suggested that Eskom should consider incorporating the extra R600 million (for the longer route through the Boesmanland area) in user tariffs. This will amount to a minimal increase in tariffs that consumers should be willing to pay to protect the environment.	Decisions regarding the application of user tariffs is something about which Eskom would need to make a decision.
C. Du Toit Mostert	22 Feb 2006	Registration form	Would like to know whether the project will affect him in any way	The exact route of the power line is not known. The route will be presented to all registered

Issues / comment raised by:	Date	Means of communication	Issue / comment	Response
J.C.J Rossouw				and affected landowners I&AP's prior to construction.
A. W. Pienaar	13 April 2006	E-mail	Reports are only made available in communities that are not directly affected by the proposed power line. Poor communities such as Hondeklipbaai are excluded from the process due to the far distance to other areas.	SEF did place notices and pamphlets within 21 affected communities/ towns. The community of Hondeklipbaai was one of these towns. Due to the fact that so many towns are affected by the proposed power line, it was decided to place the report on the SEF website, all registered interested and affected parties were informed of this and if people did not register it is not SEFs responsibility to inform them.
A. W. Pienaar	13 April 2006	E-mail	It seems as if the report is drafted for big industries and organisations such as SANParks.	The project is definitely not drafted only for big industries and organisations. SANParks is part of the process as they are a major stakeholder as the power line may cross over their land. Eskom would therefore have to receive permission from them. The general public was invited on numerous occasions through numerous methods to register on the project to receive information and documentation. All comment received are captured within the report to be submitted to the deciding authority.
PEOPLE/ ORGANIZATIONS TO BE CONTACTED				
T.A. Anderson V. Bowie (Scientific Services – Cape Nature)	27 Jan 2006 22 Feb 2006	Registration form/Faxed letter	Local expert with knowledge and experience in the Succulent Karoo must be appointed. Dr P. Desmet has done botanical work on the Knersvlakte (as well as visual modelling) and should be consulted– if possible included in the project team.	Dr Desmet was extensively consulted by the EIA team's botanical specialist.
V. Bowie P. Grobler E. Cloete	22 Feb - 2 March 2006	Faxed letter & Public Meeting - Vanrhynsdorp	Dr P. Desmet must be consulted with respect to the exact positioning of pylons.	The exact positions of pylons will be determined by a walk-through inspection of the route prior to construction. This inspection will be undertaken by a botanist, a bird specialist and an archaeologist. The EIA process will recommend a 2km wide corridor, and then exact location of the pylons within the corridor

Issues / comment raised by:	Date	Means of communication	Issue / comment	Response
				will be determined through the walk-through inspection where specific sensitive areas will be recorded and the pylon positions will be optimised to avoid these features.
A. van der Westhuizen	9 Feb 2006	Registration form	Notify the Knersvlakte Biosphere Association – M. Langenhoven	The Knersvlakte Biosphere Association was added to the I&AP database.
G. de Kock C. Paulsen J. Kritzinger	2 March 2006	Public meeting – Kamieskroon & Vanrhynsdorp	Important tourist routes need to be considered before finalizing the route of the power lines. Herbert Howe of the Matzikamma Tourist Bureau should be contacted in this regard.	Tourism routes have been considered in the Social Impact Assessment.
J. J. Cloete (Garies Development Movement)	9 Feb 2006	Registration form	Notify the Kamiesberg Municipal area & Garies. Economies of all activities within their area.	Issue was noted.
M. Dreyer	9 Feb 2006	Registration form	All households along the route need to be notified of activities.	Notification of all affected landowners forms part of the EIA process.
M. J. Runkel (SANRA)	31 Jan 06	Letter	Application needs to be made to SANRAL (SA National Roads Agency) if there is a need for a road crossing and installation within the road reserve.	SANRAL is registered as an interested and affected party and have the opportunity to raise issues regarding their infrastructure.
REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION				
S. E. Cloete J. Maas A. van der Westhuizen	30 Jan 2006 17 Feb 2006	Letter/ Telephonically/ Registration form		These respondents saw the adverts / notices about the EIA or were informed about it by other means and requested additional information about the project. No questions or comments were raised.

COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE REVIEW PERIOD OF THE DRAFT EIA REPORT

Issues / comment raised by:	Date	Means of comm.	Issue / comment	Response
REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL MEETINGS				
A. Le Roux	20 Nov 2006	E-mailed request sheet	Requested meeting and highlighted the section through the Knersvlakte.	Meetings were scheduled for the 8 th and 9 th of February 2007 and Ms A. Le Roux and other SANParks and CapeNature representatives were informed of the meetings.
M. Gardiner C. Ovies S. Cloete J. Cloete	22 Nov 2006	Faxed request sheets	Requested meeting and all highlighted the section of the power line between Bitterfontein and the coast.	Meetings were scheduled for the 8 th and 9 th of February 2007 and all were informed of the meetings.
P. Herselman	27 Nov 2006	Faxed request sheet	Requested meeting.	Meetings were scheduled for the 8 th and 9 th of February 2007 and Mr Herselman was informed of them.
T. M. Mentoor P. Van Reenen	04 Dec 2006	Faxed request sheet	Requested meeting and Mr Mentoor highlighted the Knersvlakte near Ratelgat as an area of concern.	Meetings were scheduled for the 8 th and 9 th of February 2007 and Mr Mentoor was informed of them.
S. W. Cloete	08 Dec 2006	Faxed request sheet	Requested meeting.	Meetings were scheduled for the 8 th and 9 th of February 2007 and Mr Cloete was informed of them.
A. Van Der Westhuizen (Matzikama Municipality)	12 Dec 2006	Faxed letter	Requested to be informed should there be any meetings held regarding the project in the future.	SEF undertakes to notify the municipality of any meetings.
J. Du Toit S. Du Toit J. C. Rossouw G. Engelbrecht C. du Toit - Mostert C. Du Toit S. M. Kotze T. J. Mostert	01 Jan 2007	Posted request sheet	These respondents completed the sheet on which they were invited to indicate whether they would appreciate a meeting and would attend.	Meetings were scheduled for the 8 th and 9 th of February 2007 and all were notified of the meetings.

Environmental Impact Report

Kudu Integration Project

B. Van Lente	15 Jan 2007	Faxed request sheet	Requested meeting and highlighted the section of concern to be the Namaqua National Park and expansion.	Meetings were scheduled for the 8 th and 9 th of February 2007 and Mr Van Lente was informed of them.
H. Kombrink	25 Jan 2007	Telephonic request	Requested meeting with SANParks.	Meetings were scheduled for the 8 th of February 2007. Other SANParks representatives were also notified.
GRAPHICS				
J. Du Toit	01 Jan 2007	Letter	Requested a map indicating the subdivisions of the original farms that will be affected by Alternatives A and F so that he and the other land owners could discuss the route and comment thereon.	A map was posted via registered mail to Mr J. Du Toit indicating the routes of Alternatives A and F within a 1km buffer zone. As many of the farm subdivisions as possible were indicated.
J. Rheesel	8 Feb 2007	Meeting in Vanrhynsdorp	Requested that the Knersvlakte Conservation Area be indicated on the locality map.	The final EIA Report will include such a map.
R. Heydenrych (SEF)	8 Feb 2007	Meeting in Garies	SEF enquired as to whether the map indicating the De Beers mining areas is a public document and whether SEF could utilise it.	G. Kloppers said that he request De Beers to provide SEF with an authorised map.
ELECTROMAGNETIC IMPACTS AND INTERFERENCE				
J. Du Toit	01 Jan 2007	Letter	Enquired as to the possible negative effects of electromagnetic radiation on people, livestock and plants. Also, enquired as to the effect the power line may have on radios, TVs and telephone reception.	SEF obtained the necessary reports from ESKOM and forwarded them on to Mr J. Du Toit.
T. Schutte	09 Feb 2007	Meeting in Garies	What are the impacts of electromagnetic radiation?	Reports made available by Eskom will be sent through to those interested in the effects.
LACK OF BENEFITS				
J. Du Toit	01 Jan 2007	Letter	Those affected by the power line do not receive any benefits, in the form of electricity. Affected parties only receive the negative impacts of this development.	SEF acknowledges the comment regarding the lack of benefits. There are no benefits to the local population, apart from possible electricity tap-offs from the main line. It is recommended in the Draft EIA Report that Eskom must enter into negotiations with the affected local communities to provide them with power and provide proof of agreements reached with these communities.
T. Schutte	09 Feb 2007	Meeting in Garies	There are no benefits for the farmers.	
J. G. J. Rossouw	09 Feb 2007	Meeting in Garies	Frustrated that neither she nor the other farmers can get electricity from this proposed transmission line.	
G. Kloppers (De Beers Mines)	08 Feb 2007	Meeting in Garies	Enquired as to whether all the communities were aware of the fact that they will not be receiving electricity, while De Beers will receive 2%. Eskom	

Environmental Impact Report

Kudu Integration Project

			need to ensure that De Beers is part of a social commitment with regards to providing the community with electricity.	receive electricity from the transmission lines.
J. Du Toit	09 Feb 2007	Meeting in Garies	Should there be a power line on his farm, he would like to be compensated for it. The power line will only be allowed to cross over his land if he gets electricity from it, he is not willing to pay for connection to this power line.	SEF acknowledges that farmers are sensitive to having power lines run over their farms and that they do not get any benefits from it. All the benefits will be for the end users of the Cape. Eskom can make materials available for landowners to build their own power lines to feed off of the main transmission lines. However, farmers will still have to pay for their electricity and connection fees.
F. Van Heerden	15 Feb 2007	Telephonic Phone call & E-mail	Requested information regarding when the power line was going to be built. She is considering moving to Kotzesrust to retire and look after her mother, thus would like to know if the small towns will be provided with electricity – if not will Eskom provide the farmers with building materials to build their own lines to connect to the main transmission line?	The proposed powerline is a high-voltage transmission line of 400kV designed to transport electricity over long distances. Such high-voltage transmission lines normally do not include smaller distribution lines to supply towns or farms in the study area. However, it is recommended in the draft EIA report that Eskom must enter into negotiations with local authorities to investigate whether benefits in terms of power supply can be supplied to local communities. Eskom can provide materials for the construction of distribution lines to local communities. However, these communities will be responsible for the construction costs of such lines.
EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES				
P. Van Reenen	09 Feb 2007	Meeting in Garies	Will the power line alleviate some unemployment within the area?	People must not get the wrong impression, the power line is unlikely to allow for employment from the local communities as the construction work is highly specialised. There may be opportunities for employment with regards to fence contractors who may need to move or repair fences.
S. Cloete	09 Feb 2007	Meeting in Garies	The deciding authority must consider the needs for the power line. This must be a give and take situation. It will go well with reducing unemployment.	
VISUAL AND TOURISM IMPACTS				
J. Du Toit	01 Jan 2007	Letter	Concerned regarding the visual impact and impact on tourism of the power line with regards to the B&B he would like to establish on his farm in the	SEF acknowledges that there will be an impact on tourism and that tourism will be one of the few sustainable sources of income once mining is no

Environmental Impact Report

Kudu Integration Project

			future.	longer feasible. In the case of both the impact on tourism and lack of benefits, the benefits to the end users must be balanced against the impacts on the affected population along the route of the power line.
J. Rheesel	08 Feb 2007	Meeting in Vanrhysdorp	Visual impact in the mountainous areas is a major concern.	Noted.
G. Kloppers (De Beers Mines)	08 Feb 2007	Meeting in Garies	There are two main industries in the Northern Cape, namely Mariculture and tourism. With regards to the Buffels River community, if the line is to pass over the mountains it will have major impacts on the 4x4 routes established in the mountains.	Comment noted. The preferred corridor avoids the mountainous areas.
H. Combrink	8 Feb 2007	Meeting in Vanrhysdorp	Through a GIS presentation highlighted the fact that the Knersvlakte is an undeveloped area and thus the biggest tourism node for the area. The Knersvlakte covers the entire area from the Olifants River in the south to Garies in the north, and from the escarpment in the east to the coast in the west.	SEF noted the comments and requested copies of the shape files of the map presented in the GIS presentation. A map indicating the extent of the Knersvlakte Conservation Area is included in the final EIA report.
IMPACTS ON FARMERS AND LIVESTOCK				
J. Du Toit	01 Jan 2007	Letter	Concerned regarding crime and easy access to his property.	This issue has been highlighted in the EIA Report. There is the very real problem of gates being left open and livestock wondering out of their camps. Strict measures need to be put in place during the construction phase to prevent impacts on farms. These will be included in an Environmental Management Plan and these measures will be monitored by an independent ECO. The nature of the security measures must be agreed upon with the farmers to ensure effectiveness. The impact during operation will be minimal, since Eskom may need to travel along the route to do maintenance or respond to incidents such as bird strikes.
E. Cloete	09 Feb 2007	Meeting in Garies	What will be the impact on farmers and their livestock?	
H. Kohrs	09 Feb 2007	Meeting in Garies	What will happen should a house/ farmstead be in the way of the power line route?	Buildings are not allowed under power lines, thus the route of the line would have to move to bypass the buildings.

Environmental Impact Report

Kudu Integration Project

J. Du Toit	09 Feb 2007	Meeting in Garies	Against power lines on farms as it brings negative impacts. He sympathises with the Cape Town users requiring more electricity, he will not offer up his farm for the Cape.	Noted.
Attendees	09 Feb 2007	Meeting in Garies	In some cases, should the 2km corridor be implemented it will result in entire farms being fragmented into non-viable portions. Suggested that Eskom and SEF discuss the exact location of the line with the land owners.	The servitude for the transmission line will only be approximately 50m wide, thus should not completely destroy farms. Farming can continue in the servitudes. As soon as a Record of Decision has been issued regarding the preferred alternative, will Eskom discuss finer details with farmers? It is Eskom's preference to along the route along existing boundaries or roads. For instances where very small farms along the proposed route are affected, it will be recommended that an exception should be made to the 2km corridor and that the pylons can be aligned outside of this corridor.
REPORT DETAIL				
CapeNature S. Ralston, K. Shaw, A. Le Roux	25 Jan 2007	E-mailed Letter	Concerned regarding the level of detail of the assessment. Recognise, given the scale of the project, that detailed information is costly and difficult and suggest that in light of the potentially significant impacts on biodiversity it is imperative to understand and plan around these impacts in more detail. Not convinced that the proposed walkthrough, after authorisation, is the best process to follow as it would be difficult to enforce further conditions that may be necessary to protect the environment. Considering the level of detail applicants dealing with much smaller parcels of land are required to follow, it would be difficult for to condone such a broad brush approach.	The level of detail in the assessment is of necessity very broad because of the size of the study area, especially considering the number of alternatives that have to be investigated. It is almost impossible to do a detailed assessment of each alternative. The suggestion that a more detailed assessment be investigated is valid, and this is the purpose behind the walkthrough assessment prior to construction. There may be sensitive areas identified through the walk through that may have been missed in the broad assessment, if this is the case it may be necessary to amend the Record of Decision to allow the alignment to be changed. Such a recommendation will be made in the EIR so that the most appropriate alignment is not constrained by the alignment authorised in the Record of Decision.
CapeNature	25 Jan	E-mailed Letter	Recommend that this EIA be seen as a strategic	The value of a two stage assessment is

Environmental Impact Report

Kudu Integration Project

S. Ralston, K. Shaw, A. Le Roux	2007		level assessment to identify the most acceptable route. Recommend that a more detailed assessment is undertaken to assess the more site specific issues in areas identified as sensitive. Recommend that authorisation only be considered on the basis of the detailed assessment.	recognised and one of the purposes of the walk through assessment later on is to determine whether there have been any sensitive features missed during the initial broad assessment. However, withholding the Record of Decision until a further more detailed EIA is not supported, as this would amount to cumulative decision-making.
P. Kruger (De Beers Mines)	08 Feb 2007	Meeting in Garies	The Social Impact Assessment (SIA) with the effects of mining should be included in the report. The Botanical Study was not included on the CD.	An SIA was performed and included in the report as well as numerous other specialist studies such as Heritage. The Botanical Study will be sent through via e-mail.
G. Kloppers (De Beers Mines)	08 Feb 2007	Meeting in Garies	There is an extensive social labour plan, which is applicable and could provide important background information for any EIA process in the area, since the information from local authorities is not complete.	Noted.

IMPACTS ON BIRDS

CapeNature S. Ralston, K. Shaw, A. Le Roux	25 Jan 2007	E-mailed Letter	Irrespective on which alternative is chosen, there will be bird-power line interactions. Eskom has over the years developed mitigation measures which have reduced the impacts considerably, but do not eliminate the problem. CapeNature supports the recommendations made in the Bird Impact Assessment and would like to highlight the importance of a walkthrough by a qualified specialist once the line and towers have been pegged.	It is recognised that bird impacts can never be eliminated, and can at most be limited through appropriate mitigation. The walk through assessment, on completion of the route, is one of the key recommendations of the EIR. It is agreed that appropriate mitigation must be put in place at all locations identified in the walkthrough assessment.
CapeNature S. Ralston, K. Shaw, A. Le Roux	25 Jan 2007	E-mailed Letter	Alternative G is the overall preferred alternative according to the EIA, potentially has the second worst impact on birds. It is therefore imperative that mitigation measures are put in place to reduce the impacts to acceptable levels.	See response above
CapeNature S. Ralston, K. Shaw, A. Le Roux	25 Jan 2007	E-mailed Letter	Alternative C is preferred from the perspective of bird impacts. However, this is a “no-go” alternative in terms of botanical issues, thus not desirable from an overall biodiversity perspective.	It is recognised that Alternative C is the preferred option from a bird point of view, however taking into account the totality of the biodiversity impacts, it is agreed that this is not the best option.

Environmental Impact Report

Kudu Integration Project

J. Rheesel	8 Feb 2007	Meeting in Vanrhynsdorp	Bird collisions are an issue.	An Avian Impact Assessment has been conducted and the mitigation measures recommended will be adhered to.
D. Willemse (Eskom)	8 Feb 2007	Meeting in Vanrhynsdorp	What are the control measures for bird collisions?	Wentzel Hornimann described flappers on power lines as one measure. SEF assured all that bird impacts are manageable as long as flappers and installed along the route in strategic sections.
BOTANICAL IMPACTS				
C. De Villiers (Botanical Society of South Africa)	22 Jan 2007	Letter via Fax	Request a copy of the ToR for the vegetation study as well as a copy of the Vegetation Assessment.	The botanical Assessment and terms of reference for the study was sent to Mr de Villiers via e-mail.
CapeNature S. Ralston, K. Shaw, A. Le Roux	25 Jan 2007	E-mailed Letter	Given the limitations of the botanical study, believe that Mr Helme did a good job of identifying, at a broad level, the potential impacts of the various alternatives. From a botanical perspective CapeNature prefers alternative D, however, alternatives E and G are acceptable, provided all sensitive sites are avoided and all mitigation measures as outlined in the botanical report are followed.	SEF also believes that Mr Helme provided a thorough report. It is a key requirement that all sensitive areas identified by the botanical study must be avoided. Any impacts on these sensitive areas (e.g. quartz patches) would be considered as impacts of unacceptably high significance.
CapeNature S. Ralston, K. Shaw, A. Le Roux	25 Jan 2007	E-mailed Letter	Suggest that Eskom fly in pylon structures in sensitive areas. This includes the stringing of cables within sensitive areas, which must either be walked or flown in. Vehicles should not be used.	The option of flying in pylons in sensitive areas is supported and will be recommended in the final EIR.
C. De Villiers (Botanical Society of South Africa)	01 Feb 2007	Letter via Fax	<p>Three difficulties regarding the proposed power line with reference to the Botanical Assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Potential abandonment of the entire project due to the botanical sensitivities of the northernmost leg of the route and the lack of an alternative alignment for this stretch. ▪ Limitation of undertaking final selection of a route from at least 4, if not 6 alternatives adequately assessed at a strategic planning level but not a sufficient level of detail to allow 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The high sensitivity in the northern section is acknowledged. It will be a requirement in the final EIA that materials are flown in to this portion of the route to avoid trampling. It is also recommended that Eskom establish an offset conservation area to compensate for the impacts on this portion of the route. ▪ A walk-through assessment by a number of specialists must be conducted to assess the impacts of the recommended route on a detailed basis after authorisation. Pylons and

Environmental Impact Report

Kudu Integration Project

			<p>accurate conclusion regarding actual impacts at a pylon and road-specific scale.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Uncertain as to whether the report provides enough information for the authority to make an informed decision, and whether surveys and impact assessments can legitimately be referred to the development of route and site-specific EMPs after authorisation. 	<p>roads will be routes during this phase to ensure that impacts are avoided.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The EIA report's purpose was to identify the preferred alternative on a broad scale. It is acknowledged that it will not provide a reflection of all site-specific impacts. It will be recommended that the environmental authorities must study the findings of the walk-through assessment and must be satisfied that the impacts identified on a detailed scale are acceptable.
H. Combrink	8 Feb 2007	Meeting in Vanrhynsdorp	The area of the Knersvlakte is more sensitive than the Namaqua National Park.	SEF agrees with this statement. The Kamiesberg has been identified as an area with a high degree of endemism that should be avoided. Michael Knight of Sanparks indicated that the power line should not go through the Park, however, the botanical impacts of some alternatives that were explored to avoid the park (e.g. the alternative F through the Kamiesberg Mountains) were considered more significant than the impacts inside the Park.
J. Rheesel	8 Feb 2007	Meeting in Vanrhynsdorp	The route of the power line would be tolerated through the lower portion of the Knersvlakte west of the hilly area. The quartz areas must be avoided by erecting the pylons on either side. Enquired as to the spanning distance of the pylons.	SEF agreed with this statement and Eskom (D. Willemse) indicated that the distance between pylons is between 300-500m, depending on topography.
J. Rheesel	8 Feb 2007	Meeting in Vanrhynsdorp	The Knersvlakte will be expanded in the near future, thus the proposed power line may fall within the proposed expansion of the Knersvlakte conservation area.	Noted.
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS (EROSION, SENSITIVE AREAS, KNERSVLAKTE)				
D. Willemse	08 Feb 2007	Meeting in Vanrhynsdorp	Problems with the existing lines are erosion and birds. Access roads in the mountainous areas result in long term erosion. Thus, the route along the N7 is not preferred. Other attendees of the meeting agreed that erosion can also be problematic in the sandy areas along the coast.	Noted.
J. Reesel	08 Feb	Meeting in	Indicated that erosion is anticipated with Alternative	Noted.

Environmental Impact Report

Kudu Integration Project

	2007	Vanrhynsdorp	A, which cannot be rehabilitated, while Alternative E is in the Sandveld which can be rehabilitated.	
G. Kloppers (De Beers Mines)	08 Feb 2007	Meeting in Garies	The Buffels River area is a potential problem as the area is prone to flash floods.	This comment will be communicated to Eskom; however it is probably possible to span the lines across the river.
H. Kohrs	09 Feb 2007	Meeting in Garies	Enquired as to the inspection/access road for the power line. Will plants need to be removed for this road?	Eskom will not be building a road, they will use existing roads as far as possible and only need a two-wheel track to access the power line. Trees may be felled if they are in the way of the power line, however this is assessed on a case by case basis.
E. Cloete	09 Feb 2007	Meeting in Garies	Does not agree that rehabilitation within the Sandveld is easier than rehabilitation within the Knersvlakte. The Sandveld has big issues regarding erosion, whereas stones / ground can be used for controlling erosion, within the Knersvlakte.	It is to some degree possible to establish plant growth in the Sandveld, but it is really difficult and not possible in the Knersvlakte. Through general discussion it was commented that plant growth is possible in the Sandveld.
B. Niewoudt	09 Feb 2007	Meeting in Garies	What is being conserved in the conservation areas? Farmers also conserve areas on their farms and it does not go to say that only conservation areas have sensitive areas within them.	CapeNature wishes to expand the Knersvlakte conservation area towards the south of the study area in order to conserve rare plants. The proposed transmission line is not foreseen to traverse this area. The Namaqua National Park was created primarily to conserve Namaqualand flowers. It is very difficult to decide on the best alternative due to the sensitive nature of the entire area. The alternative which will be selected will be the alternative with the least impacts. There is no alternative that will not have any impacts. DEAT will make the decision as to the preferred and best alternative.
ACCESS TO THE ROUTE				
J. Rheesel H. Combrink	8 Feb 2007	Meeting in Vanrhynsdorp	Access to the site is not possible during winter months. Construction should take place in summer as it is difficult to work in the winter months.	SEF acknowledges that construction cannot take place in sandy areas during the winter months, however it can take place during winter in the non-sandy areas. A recommendation to this effect will be included in the EMP.
P. Kruger (De Beers Mines)	08 Feb 2007	Meeting in Garies	Diamond theft is a big issue and as a result access is very strict. Access cannot be granted to just anybody during the construction of the power line.	Noted. De Beers and Eskom will have to come to an agreement regarding access to the De Beers property in order to construct the power

			line.	
MINING RELATED ISSUES				
G. Kloppers (De Beers Mines)	8 Feb 2007	Meeting in Garies	In terms of current mining the existing servitude is not affecting the mining north of Klientee or Koingnaas to the south.	Noted.
G. Kloppers (De Beers Mines)	8 Feb 2007	Meeting in Garies	Areas currently being mined and those where prospecting is taking place were pointed out. Note: De Beers could not provide the map referred to during the meeting for inclusion in the EIA report. In 2008/9 the dragline would have to move eastwards and the power line may be in the way, thus Eskom would have to move it.	Eskom would have to indicate an appropriate solution to the dragline issue. <u>Clarification provided by Eskom after the meeting:</u> Eskom can construct the power line at a greater height to allow the dragline to move through underneath it.
G. Kloppers (De Beers Mines)	8 Feb 2007	Meeting in Garies	Mining should not be planned in isolation but with Eskom through combined planning. Sustainable development in the future is proposed for rehabilitated areas, such as Mariculture. Electricity must be made available to other properties. There is an opportunity for synergy but serious discussions with Eskom must take place.	Noted. These concerns were communicated to Eskom after the meeting and they were requested to enter into discussion with De Beers at a high level.
ALTERNATIVES				
T. M. Mentoor	06 Dec 2007	Faxed letter	Prefers Alternative F.	Noted.
A. Van Der Westhuizen (Matzikama Municipality)	12 Dec 2006	Faxed letter	The area south of Bitterfontein is within the jurisdiction of the Matzikama Municipality, thus more detailed information is requested. Although it appears to be a good choice from the point of view of the Western Cape, is the location of alternative F, south of Bitterfontein not clearly visible on the map.	Mrs Van der Westhuizen attended the meeting held with the Knersvlakte Conservation Committee on 8 February. The route was pointed out during this meeting. A map of the route and other alternatives was also attached to the minutes of this meeting.
A. Van Der Westhuizen (Matzikama Municipality)	12 Dec 2006	Faxed letter	Should the development take place outside of existing servitudes will an application for a change of land use in terms of the Land Use Planning Ordinance, 1985 (No. 15 of 1985) be submitted for authorisation?	No change of land use application needs to be submitted, because the pre-existing land use continues to exist. The registration of servitudes does not affect existing land use rights.
A. Van Der Westhuizen (Matzikama	12 Dec 2006	Faxed letter	Comment from CapeNature, Department of Agriculture, SAHRA, "Department van Erfenishulpbronne", Department of Environmental	These organisations are included in the I&AP database and were invited to comment. Comment has been received from CapeNature.

Environmental Impact Report

Kudu Integration Project

Municipality)			Affairs must be obtained as well as detailed indication of access roads, centres where workers will be housed and services provision (water, sanitation etc) for workers.	Detailed indications of access roads, areas where workers will be housed and services provision is not available at this stage. It will be recommended that these details be confirmed prior to construction and communicated to the local municipalities.
A. Van Der Westhuizen (Matzikama Municipality)	12 Dec 2006	Faxed letter	Before the authority can authorise the proposed change of land use, written consent from all the affected landowners must be obtained.	Eskom will enter into negotiations with all affected landowners if they receive a positive Record of Decision. Consent from the landowners will be provided to the Municipality.
CapeNature S. Ralston, K. Shaw, A. Le Roux	25 Jan 2007	E-mailed Letter	CapeNature would not support Alternatives A, B, C or F.	Noted.
CapeNature S. Ralston, K. Shaw, A. Le Roux	25 Jan 2007	E-mailed Letter	From a biodiversity perspective CapeNature prefers Alternative D, but the impacts of Alternatives E and G are acceptable, provided the recommended mitigation measures, as suggested by the botanical and bird specialists are implemented.	Noted and agreed.
T. Mentoor	08 Feb 2007	Meeting in Vanrhynsdorp	Queried the alternative next to the coast, mentioned that such an alternative should never be considered.	Comment noted. This alternative was, however, suggested during a workshop held with CapeNature and Sanparks during 2006.
A. Dysan	08 Feb 2007	Meeting in Vanrhynsdorp	Suggested an alternative route from Landplaas, Kotchies Rus, Groenrivier, almost past Wallekraal and over Soebatsfontein.	Noted.
J. Reesel	08 Feb 2007	Meeting in Vanrhynsdorp	Preferred option is the straight line option. Indicated that a route along the Moedverloor Koppe is an option as long as it does not go over the top of them.	SEF indicated that the straight line option is currently (at the stage of the draft EIA report) the preferred alternative. Noted the comment regarding the Moedverloor Koppe.
A. Van Der Westhuizen	08 Feb 2007	Meeting in Vanrhynsdorp	Indicated that the Kamiesberg Alternative is a no-go alternative while the straight line is the best alternative.	Comment noted. The Kamiesberg alternative (F) has been rejected because of the botanical sensitivity of the Kamiesberg Mountains.
J. Reesel	08 Feb 2007	Meeting in Vanrhynsdorp	Happy that none of the alternatives cross over through the Knersvlakte Conservation Area.	Noted.
D. Willemse H. Combrink	8 Feb 2007	Meeting in Vanrhynsdorp	The power line should be closest to existing roads rather than in the mountains.	SEF indicated that the best option is the southern portion of Alternative E, as it follows existing

Environmental Impact Report

Kudu Integration Project

Environmental Impact Report			Kudu Integration Project
			roads.
G. Kloppers (De Beers Mines)	8 Feb 2007	Meeting in Garies	Alternative E does not make sense. This alternative runs through the De Beers area, which is private land covering Koingnaas, Schulpfontein, Samsonsbak and Elandsklip, making up a game camp / conservation area. The prospecting area that the line runs through will be excavated to the bedrock level.
G. Kloppers (De Beers Mines)	08 Feb 2007	Meeting in Garies	Grootmis is on De Beers property and is planned for mining and thus not an option for the power line. De Beers properties have the potential for mining development and thus the proposed Eskom line is not advisable. The N7 is the only alternative that will not affect De Beers land.
P. Kruger (De Beers Mines)	08 Feb 2007	Meeting in Garies	The only areas suitable for transmission lines on the De Beers property would be those areas that are already disturbed by mining activities. All these disturbed sites have sand roads.
G. Kloppers (De Beers Mines)	8 Feb 2007	Meeting in Garies	The proposed line in Hondeklip is not appropriate and the most logical alternative would be as far east as possible. If the alternative route runs partly through the De Beers area, then the straight line alternative is the preferred alternative.
P. Kruger (De Beers Mines)	08 Feb 2007	Meeting in Garies	What is the appropriate distance the power lines would be away from the communities, as the power line is far from them?
H. Kohrs	09 Feb 2007	Meeting in Garies	Asked about the existing power line and whether power will flow from Grootmis to Spingbok.
			SEF acknowledged this and enquired as to whether the route could be moved to the east of the prospective and sensitive area. G. Kloppers (De Beers Mines) mentioned that further discussion with Eskom is required before any proposed alternatives can be considered. A request for a meeting with Eskom will be forwarded to them.
			Noted.
			SEF notes this comment and will inform Eskom of it.
			The furthestmost alternative has lots of changes in direction (expensive for Eskom) and it is botanically unacceptable. Along the N7 is not ideal.
			The route of the power line is dependent on botanical sensitivity, roads, visual impacts etc.
			SEF provided an explanation of the existing power line. Power will flow from Springbok, parallel to the existing servitude. SEF explained that the straight line alternative (Alternative E) has fewer changes in direction and is thus the cheaper option compared to an alternative with more direction changes. The N7 alternative is problematic due to the visual impact within the mountainous areas. The problem with alternatives through the Knersvlakte is that it is difficult to rehabilitate and botanically very

Environmental Impact Report

Kudu Integration Project

				sensitive. The selected alternative will have a corridor of 2km in which the final route will be decided with specialist input. The line will be marked out with input from land owners.
Du Toit B. Van Lente	09 Feb 2007	Meeting in Garies	Enquired as to which alternative has been selected. Is the 2km corridor already decided or can it still be changed? Mentioned that the National Park was indicated incorrectly on the map.	SEF is aware of the expansion of the National Park to the east and west towards the coast. At this stage a route through the National Park is suggested, however no final decisions have been made. It is recommended in the EIA report that Eskom has to compensate SANParks with additional land which is the same in extent as the land used for the power line servitude through the Park. A decision must be reached with the consent of both parties.
E. Coetzee	09 Feb 2007	Meeting in Garies	Cannot comment as she does not know what the alternative routes are.	SEF explained all the routes with the aid of a map. Alternative A and F (straight line route); CapeNature's alternatives B and C; the N7 route (alternative C) as well as the inland route through Bushmanland. Alternative G, through the Kamiesberge was also discussed.
B. Van Lente	09 Feb 2007	Meeting in Garies	Enquired regarding the Bushmanland Alternative as well as the route along the coast.	The route through the Bushmanland area is not indicated on the map as it was rejected at an earlier stage as impractical.
A. Le Roux (CapeNature)	09 Feb 2007	Meeting in Garies	Enquired about Alternative B through the National Park. Is SEF happy with this alternative and will it go through the quartz areas or past it.	SEF is aware of the quartz patches, since they have been identified in the botanical report. The specialist study did indicate that it was possible to miss the quartz patches.
H. Kohrs	09 Feb 2007	Meeting in Garies	Why can Eskom not expand the existing servitude that runs from Juno in a north-easterly direction?	The existing servitude does not align in the correct direction and it runs through the sensitive Knervlakte areas.
R. Heydenrych (SEF)	09 Feb 2007	Meeting in Garies	Enquired as to which route the Park Authorities would prefer.	B. Van Lente said that he would prefer a route that does not cross the Park, however he will consider it should there be no other alternative.
B. Van Lente	09 Feb 2007	Meeting in Garies	The first alternative is not shown on the map, the entire area is regarded as a conservation area and the whole area must be excluded.	Noted.
Du Toit	09 Feb 2007	Meeting in Garies	Concerned about her property which is only 2km wide.	SEF said that a recommendations will be made to allow exceptions from the 2km wide corridor

				proposed in the EIA report so that such small properties are not negatively affected.
PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESS				
C. De Villiers (Botanical Society of South Africa)	22 Nov 2006	Letter via Registered Post.	<p>Misgivings regarding public participation process to date, as the process has seemingly failed to take adequate cognisance of a number of biodiversity considerations that have been raised with SEF on a number of occasions. Would like written substantiation of SEF's claims that BotSoc's comments regarding biodiversity issues are being considered in this application or the reasons why SEF may have decided not to consider such comments. BotSoc does not feel that the Scoping Process gives credible and explicit effect to the following objectives: documenting main issues (and potential management and mitigation measures) which require attention; giving I&APs opportunity to confirm that their concerns and suggestion have been adequately documented for consideration in the EIA phase; inviting comments on the proposed guidelines for impact assessment (based on results of Scoping). There is no record in the minutes of the corridor workshop that BotSoc's inputs were tabled, let alone discussed. The Terms of Reference for the vegetation study make no reference of the contextual biodiversity informants identified by BotSoc in previous correspondence with SEF. The ToR simply states that "individuals" from the SKEP, SANParks, CapeNature and BotSoc must "be involved". The Final Scoping Report makes no reference to the SKEP conservation assessment, important ecological process areas, or areas identified as having high irreplaceability-high vulnerability status in terms of the SKEP framework for action. The National Spatial Biodiversity Assessment is not mentioned and neither are the ToR for biodiversity assessments recommended by BotSoc.</p>	<p>The EIA process has now progressed to the draft EIA Report stage, and it would have been appreciated if comments such as these, which relate mainly to the draft and final Scoping Reports, had been brought to our attention at the time when the draft Scoping Report was made available for comment. This would have enabled a quicker resolution of your concerns and would have ensured that the EIA process is not encumbered by delays. Clearly, the time frames during which the draft Scoping Report was provided for comment were accepted by the competent authority, since the Plan of Study for Scoping was approved by the Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism. Nevertheless, we believe that it is important to address the concerns you have raised in the interest of ensuring an open and participatory EIA process. The terms of reference for the vegetation study, as for all other specialist studies, are drafted as early as possible during the EIA process with the intention of securing the correct specialists for the project. This is done with the understanding that the terms of reference for the study may change as the EIA progresses, since new concerns may be identified at any stage of the process. It is with this in mind that BotSoc's comments on the ToR for the vegetation study were provided to the project ecologist with the instruction that they must be adhered to in the vegetation study. It is entirely correct that specific informants are not mentioned in the ToR, but it was not considered necessary to re-draft the terms of reference to include these informants,</p>

				<p>since BotSoc’s recommendations with regard to the ToR had been forwarded to the ecological specialist directly.</p> <p>It must be stated very clearly that the primary motivation behind the interdisciplinary workshop that was held was BOTSOC’s recommendation for such a workshop on page 3 of their letter dated 27 January 2006. The issues raised by BOTSOC were discussed during the background information session of the workshop. This discussion session revolved around the issues received from Cape Nature, SANParks and BOTSOC regarding the sensitivity of the areas around Lekkersing, Kleinzee and especially, the quartz patches of the Knersvlakte. As a result of this discussion, Nick Helme suggested new alternatives. It was also decided after taking BOTSOC’s comments into consideration, that the alternative passing through the Knersvlakte would be viewed unfavourably. All the attendees of this workshop were provided with a copy of BOTSOC’s comments. Nick Helme was informed verbally after this workshop to follow the BOTSOC comments as guidelines – this is why this is not minuted. If BOTSOC’s suggestions are not reflected in the minutes of this workshop it was unintentional. It is again emphasized that one of the prime motivations for the workshop was indeed BOTSOC’s suggestion to hold such a workshop.</p> <p>It is correctly stated that the biodiversity informants mentioned in BotSoc’s correspondence are not mentioned in the final Scoping Report. This is because BotSoc’s correspondence (as with all other interested and affected party correspondence) was attached as an appendix to the Scoping Report. It was therefore not considered necessary to mention</p>
--	--	--	--	---

Environmental Impact Report

Kudu Integration Project

				<p>the informants specifically in the text of the Scoping Report. BotSoc mentions several sources of information with respect to the biodiversity assessment and recommended that these sources be consulted. The biodiversity report, which has been included in the draft Environmental Impact Assessment, does in fact explicitly acknowledge these sources and others e.g. Dr Phil Desmet, who has been involved in the development of the SKEP and is acknowledged as an expert on Succulent Karoo flora. Other specialists on the area's flora such as Annelise le Roux of Cape Nature, ecologists from SA National Parks, etc. have been registered as interested and affected parties and have interacted with the EIA team.</p>
<p>C. De Villiers (Botanical Society of South Africa)</p>	<p>22 Nov 2006</p>	<p>Letter via Registered Post.</p>	<p>With regards to the Issues and Response Table: Every single response to the issues raised by Botsoc is the same, and entails the statement verbatim: "Informing specialists of these guidelines to be followed. Copies of the detailed guideline letters were issued to all specialists. Several phone calls to ensure that these guidelines are considered and to discuss the process followed for the Scoping Process".</p> <p>This stock "cut and paste" treatment of I&AP comments can scarcely be construed as proof that the project environmental assessment team has applied it mind to carefully-considered and substantiated I&AP comment on the biodiversity aspects of a project which traverses an area of extraordinary biological richness and vulnerability. The responses reflected in the document in question are rote, unthinking and careless, and fall badly short of the criterion of reasonableness that is prescribed in legislation and endorsed in best practice guidelines.</p> <p>A few examples suffice to illustrate this assertion:</p>	<p><u>Response letter via e-mail (dated 12 January 2007) sent to Botsoc on 18 January 2007:</u> After review of the comments and response report, SEF acknowledges that the comments and response report has not provided an adequate reply to all BOTSOC's concerns and we apologise for omissions in this regard. We would like to assure you that the omission of appropriate text in the report does not reflect a real disregard for your opinions, and that BOTSOC's opinions have been considered in practice. A revised comments and response report with amended responses to Botsoc's concerns was provided to Botsoc on 18 January (see Botsoc response below and revised responses captured in this Issues and Response report). Botsoc was provided with an extension to comment on the revised comments and response report until 31 January 2007.</p>

Environmental Impact Report

Kudu Integration Project

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Botsoc’s first recorded comment refers to biodiversity TOR and guidelines that should be followed. SEF acknowledges this. ▪ However, the 2nd Botsoc comment cites the National Environmental Management Principles when advising a precautionary and risk averse approach to the project, which would largely be implemented in a global biodiversity hotspot. The SEF response is that “these guidelines” will be followed. ▪ The third Botsoc comment refers to the Conservation Plan for the Succulent Karoo (SKEP) and points to factors such as highly irreplaceable vegetation, where this has been mapped through an explicit and systematic process of target-based prioritisation, and the occurrence of quartz patches as examples of vulnerable habitat types. SEF, in its response, maintains that “these guidelines” will be followed. And so it goes on, from one <i>non sequitor</i> to another. 	
C. De Villiers (Botanical Society of South Africa)	26 Jan 2007	Letter via Fax	<p>Thank you for your frank response to the public participation process and, specifically, treatment of the biodiversity aspect of this project. It is an unfortunate oversight that your reporting of the public participation process did not include a more comprehensive account of the corridor workshop that was held on 5 May 2006, as it would appear from your most recent correspondence that the workshop was, in fact, initiated on the basis of Botsoc’s recommendation.</p> <p>Your positive response in this regard is acknowledged, and it would seem that our proposal did in fact yield the type of benefits that we expected it would.</p>	Comment noted.
G. Kloppers (De Beers Mines)	8 Feb 2007	Meeting in Garies	Unhappy and uncomfortable with the public participation to date, as consultation with De Beers was lacking. De Beers supports the project but	SEF apologised for the lack of adequate communication with De Beers regarding the project and the fact that letters were not

Environmental Impact Report

Kudu Integration Project

			<p>was not properly informed of the project and is listed as an adjacent landowner, when in fact they are the landowner. Eskom contacted De Beers to survey a power line, however access was refused as one requires a police clearance to enter the site.</p> <p>Site notices erected at Kleinzee advertising the EIA Process were not easily accessible.</p>	<p>addressed to the appropriate person. The De Beers experience in this regard is not how SEF likes to conduct its public participation process and is not a reflection of the entire public participation process.</p>
P. Kruger (De Beers Mines)	08 Feb 2007	Meeting in Garies	<p>De Beers owns most of the land, however farmers are still able to farm on their land. These farmers need to be added to the I&AP database and involved in the process as they are extremely sensitive.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
P. Kruger and G. Kloppers (De Beers Mines)	08 Feb 2007	Meeting in Garies	<p>We are not the correct people to discuss this project with. A meeting is required with the correct persons from De Beers. G. Kloppers mentioned that he would be the contact person to arrange that the relevant persons from De Beers attend future meetings.</p>	<p>Noted. Long term planning with Eskom is important for other future developments in the area.</p>
P. Kruger (De Beers Mines)	08 Feb 2007	Meeting in Garies	<p>The Namaqua National Park extends to the coast until Strandfontein, it is important that the correct people within SANParks are contacted.</p>	<p>SEF have been discussing the route alternatives extensively with SANParks. SANParks have been actively involved in the process and have indicated their concerns.</p>
P. Kruger (De Beers Mines)	08 Feb 2007	Meeting in Garies	<p>What is the way forward?</p>	<p>The Scoping Report and Plan of Study for EIA have been approved. The Draft EIA was made available for public comment and I&APs were asked whether they would prefer meetings, of which this is one. All comments received and those from the meetings will be incorporated into the final EIA Report to be submitted for decision-making.</p>
G. Kloppers (De Beers Mines)	08 Feb 2007	Meeting in Garies	<p>Expressed frustration with regards to the practical issues that should have been sorted out, but not with regards to the fundamentals of the project.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
P. Kruger (De Beers Mines)	08 Feb 2007	Meeting in Garies	<p>Enquired as to where the Kleinzee and mining information was obtained. Information seems to have been gathered from the Districts Municipality's website, which is incomplete.</p>	<p>SEF indicated that the SIA specialist obtained the information primarily from local municipalities.</p>

Environmental Impact Report

Kudu Integration Project

P. Kruger (De Beers Mines)	08 Feb 2007	Meeting in Garies	Enquired as to who in De Beers was consulted regarding the project. He became aware of the project when an archaeological study was conducted at the end of 2006. He also would like to indicate that the public notice was not accessible to everyone.	Letters informing De Beers were sent to a De Beers address in Kleinzee, however they were not addressed to anyone specific.
E. Cloete	09 Feb 2007	Meeting in Garies	Do farmers have a say should the power line cross over their land? They are able to identify the sensitive areas on their land. Will farmers be involved once the project and route have been approved? Farmers feel that they have no say and that Eskom will do what they want to do once the decision has been made.	After the Record of Decision has been issued, specialists, Eskom and farmers will have to walk the 2km corridor route to decide on the exact location of the line within this corridor. The project cannot proceed until the exact route has been established, in consultation with all affected landowners etc. SEF will draw up an environmental management plan (EMP), compliance with which is fundamental to the project. An independent ECO will also be appointed to oversee the project construction and report on any con-conformances with the EMP.
E. Cloete	09 Feb 2007	Meeting in Garies	Can all farmers get a copy of the Record of Decision?	All registered Interested and Affected parties are entitled to a copy of the Record of Decision once it has been issued.
GENERAL				
M J. Runkel (SAN Roads Agency)	06 Dec 2007	Letter	It would appear as if the proposed alternatives for the 400kV line do not affect the N7 however, should the alignment be altered to affect the N7, the applicant needs to take cognisance of the following: SANRAL will not allow a parallel high voltage power line inside the road reserve; the N7 has been identified as a super route and a clearance of 7,5m must be maintained when a road crossing is anticipated; if a road crossing is anticipated SANRAL will impose conditions in terms of Act 7 of 1998. An application for wayleave approval needs to be submitted to SANRAL once the final route has been selected.	Noted.
J. Du Toit	01 Jan 2007	Letter	Does not want a high spanning power line over his property (Portion 5 of Restant, portion of Krommefontein).	Noted.

Environmental Impact Report

Kudu Integration Project

CapeNature S. Ralston, K. Shaw, A. Le Roux	25 Jan 2007	E-mailed Letter	Concerned regarding the delivery of documents/CD to CapeNature. CD did not contain the botanical report neither did the one sent thereafter. The information made available on the CD was confusing and the main route alignments were not clearly described or depicted in the Report.	SEF apologised for the lack of proper co-ordination of the distribution of information. SEF undertakes to ensure that all future correspondence with CapeNature is ordered and well defined. The botanical report was provided to CapeNature electronically.
CapeNature S. Ralston, K. Shaw, A. Le Roux	25 Jan 2007	E-mailed Letter	More than one ECO must be made available to ensure appropriate levels of expertise and presence across the landscape.	Should construction take place at two or more locations situated far from each other and at the same time, then the appointment of more than one ECO is recommended. Such a condition will be included in the recommendations and the EMP.
H. Combrink	8 Feb 2007	Meeting in Vanrhynsdorp	What are the biggest impacts of the development?	Minimal impacts during the operational phase, while the construction phase will have the biggest impact. Eskom require an access track along the route, however the construction area will be kept as small as possible. An agreement with the farm owners shall be reached in relation to farm gates.
H. Combrink	8 Feb 2007	Meeting in Vanrhynsdorp	Mentioned that De Beers had issues regarding the project.	SEF acknowledges that De Beers have concerns. A separate meeting with their representatives was scheduled and took place on the 8 th of February 2007 (refer to minutes of this meeting).
D. Willemse (Eskom)	8 Feb 2007	Meeting in Vanrhynsdorp	Highlighted the fact that Eskom does not necessarily require a maintenance road directly adjacent to the power line. If the line deviates from existing roads by a few hundred meters, Eskom would still be able to use the existing roads for inspections.	
P. Kruger (De Beers Mines)	08 Feb 2007	Meeting in Garies	Suggested that SEF visit the mines with an Eskom representative.	SEF mentioned that D. Willemse from Eskom would be invited to the site visit.
P. Kruger (De Beers Mines)	08 Feb 2007	Meeting in Garies	Enquired as to the timeframes before the Record of Decision is awarded.	Approximately two months after the submission of the final EIA Report. This report will go to both the Western and Northern Cape Provinces for comment before a decision is made by the national Department of Environmental Affairs and

Environmental Impact Report

Kudu Integration Project

				Tourism.
P. Kruger (De Beers Mines)	08 Feb 2007	Meeting in Garies	Will there be mitigation measures implemented once an alternative has been decided?	An Environmental Management Plan (EMP) will be submitted with the EIA Report. Specialists will determine the final route within the 2km corridor after the Record of Decision has been issued.
P. Van Reenen	09 Feb 2007	Meeting in Garies	Will the nuclear power station be replaced?	SEF is unaware of any plans with regards to the nuclear power station and can only comment with respect to the Kudu transmission line.
J. G. J. Rossow	09 Feb 2007	Meeting in Garies	The route of the transmission line should be named.	Noted.
ISSUES SURROUNDING AUTHORISATION				
C. De Villiers (Botanical Society of South Africa)	01 Feb 2007	Letter via Fax	Is an acceptable alternative to the Oranjemund-Gromis route? Without an alternative alignment, and further planning and assessment, any decision about this stretch of the route would be procedurally flawed as it would not be based on an objective assessment of the relative environmental merits and demerits of two or more alternatives in an area of extraordinary conservation importance and vulnerability.	It is a generally accepted principle, especially in the case of linear developments, that new infrastructure should preferably be placed parallel to existing infrastructure to concentrate the impacts rather than distributing them over a wide area. It is for this reason that the line was proposed to run along and existing Eskom servitude where there is an existing road. The botanical specialist was asked to comment on possible alternatives to this section of the route, and indicated that there is no alternative either to the east or west of the proposed corridor that would avoid the sensitive area. Very strict conditions will be stipulated for construction in this section of the route, including flying in of construction material to avoid trampling..
C. De Villiers (Botanical Society of South Africa)	01 Feb 2007	Letter via Fax	Were the competent authority to be approached now for a decision – bearing in mind the uncertainties unidentified by the botanist – would such authority be satisfied that an “informed” decision is possible, and could such as decision currently satisfy the relevant National Environmental Management Principles were it to be challenged?	It will be recommended that the Record of Decision should be reviewed if the walk-through assessment confirms an unacceptable level of impact in the northern section of the route.
C. De Villiers (Botanical Society of South Africa)	01 Feb 2007	Letter via Fax	If, speculatively, the competent authority believes it justifiable to “short-cut” the prescribed EIA process, and issue a positive RoD without further,	Comment noted.

Environmental Impact Report

Kudu Integration Project

South Africa)			site-specific impact assessment, this could expose such a decision to an appeal on the grounds that, firstly, the prescribed EIA process was being circumvented and, secondly that the public was being denied an opportunity to comment on information that properly should inform an administrative decision.	
C. De Villiers (Botanical Society of South Africa)	01 Feb 2007	Letter via Fax	<p>The following recommendations are suggested:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reconvene a sequel to the “corridor workshop” to further eliminate alternatives on the basis of environmental and technical parameters that have become apparent in the EIA phase. Consideration should be given to ensuring that a senior representative of the project proponent be present at such a meeting, as well as DEAT (Northern Cape and Western Cape), SANParks, Northern Cape Nature Conservation, and CapeNature. ▪ Finding and recommendations of the final EIA Report be submitted to independent review that reports <i>inter alia</i> on the issues raised through the botanical report and suggests a procedurally sound way for bringing this environmental process to an efficient and acceptable conclusion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A workshop will be convened with these stakeholders to present the findings of the EIA process and discuss these issues. ▪ SEF welcomes the suggestion for an independent review, should this be required by the environmental authorities.

COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE REVIEW PERIOD FOR THE MINUTES OF MEETINGS HELD DURING THE EIA PHASE				
Issues / comment raised by:	Date	Means of communication	Issue / comment	Response
ALTERNATIVES				
H. Kohrs	27 Feb 2007	E-mail	The presentation and explanation of the proposed alternatives for the transmission line to the public was very weak. No maps were presented and the alternative routes were not indicated clearly.	Maps indicating the alternatives were distributed with the minutes of the meetings that Mr Kohrs attended.
H. Kohrs	27 Feb 2007	E-mail	The proposed route suggested at the previous meeting between Namakwa National Park, Annelise le Roux and myself was not indicated on the map presented at the meeting. This is the route from Grootmis to Springbok, through the Bushmanland area then along the existing powerline through the Knersvlakte or around the sensitive areas within the Knersvlakte.	This alternative was not presented because it had been regarded as a non-feasible alternative early on during the Scoping process due to the long distance, the crossing of the escarpment (with its associated technical constraints and erosion impacts) and the fact that it would cross the botanically sensitive Knersvlakte, an area with outstanding levels of succulent endemism, in the south of the study area.
H. Kohrs	27 Feb 2007	E-mail	No where is there reference made to the importance of the Succulent Karoo, Namakwaland forms part of this area. This area, as a whole, deserves conservation status due to its sensitivity. Of course Eskom will want to spend as little as possible, but at what cost to the environment? It is not possible to restore the damage the impact of building and maintaining such a transmission power line will have. Thus, the necessary expenditure must be undertaken to ensure that the line is built along the "correct" route.	The Succulent Karoo and the importance of the area as a globally important centre of endemism is mentioned prominently in the botanical specialist study and the main Environmental Impact Report which was provided for public review. The very high ecological sensitivity of the area is acknowledged and it is realised that the routing of the line must be carefully chosen to avoid unacceptable impacts on the unique biodiversity of the area. This is the reason why a second stage assessment by specialists (including a botanist) is recommended to confirm the detailed routing and pylon positions.
H. Kohrs	27 Feb 2007	E-mail	The people who attended the meeting are predominantly land owners or farmers who believe there may be benefits to them from the erection of the transmission line. Why has it not been clearly indicated that there will not be any benefits to the	It was clearly indicated that farmers would not necessarily receive benefits at the open days and public meetings that were held during the Scoping phase during 2006, as well as during the stakeholder meetings held in February 2007.

Environmental Impact Report

Kudu Integration Project

Environmental Impact Report			Kudu Integration Project	
			local communities with regards to the provision of electricity?	
J. Du Toit	25 Feb 2007	Faxed Letter	Please provide maps of the two alternatives, as suggested, to Telkom, Vodocom/ MTN and SABC for their comment on the effects the proposed powerline may have on the telecommunications network and the radio and television reception in the surrounding area. Currently the area experiences broken cell phone reception. What will be the impact of the line on reception as well as in the future when the area receives better coverage? Comment should be forwarded to me for distribution among the farmers.	All the telecommunications service providers mentioned were included as interested and affected parties on the public participation database from the start of the project. No comments have been received from them to indicate that they are opposed to the transmission line, or that the transmission line will have any adverse impact on reception in the area.