

1.	<p><b>ATTENDANCE</b></p> <p>Nick Helme                      Botanical Specialist  Tim Hart                         Archeological Specialist (University of Cape Town)  Jan Lambrechts                Agricultural/ soils Specialist (University of Stellenbosch)</p> <p>Mark Richter                    Geotechnologist Specialist (MSJ Consulting)  Jon Smallie                      Avifauna Specialist (Endangered Wildlife Trust)  Mosili Ntene                    Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism (DEAT)  Leptieshaam Bekko          Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning (DEA&amp;DP)  Fabio Venturi                  Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning (DEA&amp;DP)  Guillaume Nel                 SEF (Project Manager – Cape Town)  Reuben Heydenrych         SEF (Project Manager – Head Office)  Vici Napier                      SEF (Public Participation)</p>	
2.	<p><b>WELCOMING</b></p> <p>R. Heydenrych (RH) welcomed all the specialists and authorities to the meeting and asked all to introduce themselves.</p> <p>He also asked if there were any apologies.</p>	<p><b>FEEDBACK</b></p> <p>RH apologised on behalf of the Northern Cape authorities who could not attend the meeting.</p>
3.	<p><b>INTRODUCTION TO THE MEETING</b></p> <p>RH provided background to the Eskom-Kudu project to ensure all specialists were on the same page, as new people have come aboard the project team.</p>	
4.	<p><b>SPECIALISTS COMMENTS</b></p>	<p><b>REACTION</b></p>
4.1	<p>M. Richter (MR) commented on the gas resources in Namibia, mentioning that the presence of adequate reserves has not been proven only assumed.</p>	
4.2	<p>Nick Helme (NH) enquired as to the life span of the project, mentioning that building powerlines usually takes between 10-15 years.</p>	<p>MR and RH replied that the project was only proposed (by Eskom) to span 4-5 years.</p>
4.3	<p>MR asked for clarification on the number of</p>	<p>RH explained the route</p>

	lines crossing the Orange River and whether South Africa would be responsible for the EIA of this section.	layout. Eskom (South Africa) is responsible for erecting or upgrading the lines from the point just before crossing over the Orange River, on Namibia's side.
4.4	LB requested copies of the presentation	Seconded by everyone else.
4.5	RH confirmed that existing substations were being upgraded, but not expanded beyond their existing boundaries.	
4.6	NH queried the width of the servitude on the existing line between Oranjemond and Gromis? He stated that a botanical assessment would be required if the servitude width (in which upgrading would take place) was large.	RH did not know the exact width and would get the information to NH as soon as possible. RH mentioned that the servitude was not fenced.
4.7	RH detailed and explained each alternative	F. Venturi (FV) mentioned that all routes have to be compared in a strategic study, whether or not they seem feasible at the moment.
4.8	G. Nel (GN) provided background on the Public Participation process and described how the alternative routes were selected and what criteria/ issues supported each alternative.	NH mentioned that the entire area from Juno to Bitterfontein and west of the Green alternative are sensitive botanical areas.
4.9	FV highlighted the importance of the tourist/ heritage impact as well as the visual impact of the powerlines, and asked that strategic comments on the visual impact be included in the reports.	GN stated that the visual impact is taken into account in the Scoping Report and that through assessing the alternatives, Cape Nature, SANParks and the I&APs took this into

		consideration.
4.10	M. Ntene (MN) also expressed the concern for the visual impact. She enquired as to combining alternative B and A as another alternative.	GN and NH mentioned that the quartz patches of the Knersvlakte exist within this proposed new route and that the alternative A cuts through vast open plains (north of the Namaqua National Park) creating a significant visual impact.
	T. Hart (TH) mentioned that if the routes run along existing roads, then the infrastructure for construction is already provided for and that this should be taken into account.	NH commented that more than 70% of each alternative will require new roads and servitudes.
	FV suggested combining alternative C and B at Garies.	NH commented that the visual impact would be greater, and that tourists would be impacted. Consensus was obtained that the powerlines should not go through the mountains.
	J. Smallie (JS) enquired who “at the end of the day” has the authority to approve or discard alternatives. Commented that SANParks are not specialists and that their views are subjective and not objective with regards to the preferred alternative.	RH asked all specialists to consider all the routes and to comment on which would be the preferred route. The specialists can reject alternatives if they provide good motivation for their decisions. RH explained that the scoping report only identifies alternatives, whereas the EIA process

		with specialists involvement identifies the preferred route.
	J. Lambrechts (JL) enquired as to the impact of the pylons and whether they would be fenced off or not.	RH explained the structure of the pylons and that the only impact would be the footprint area. Pylons will not be fenced off.
	NH clarified that the most sensitive area of the Knersvlakte was the northern portion and not the hardeveld section further south.	
4.11	JL commented that the effect of the powerline on agriculture would be insignificant. JS commented that Eskom prefers not to place pylons within lands and will span across lands as far as possible.	
	RH then continued with the way forward for the project.	LB stated that the final scoping report must be revised and include a strategic comparison between all suggested alternatives. It need not be detailed consisting of specialists comments on each route. LB also stated that the new alternative suggested (combination of alternative B and A) must be subjected to Public Participation.
	FV enquired as to the specifics of the gas source in Namibia – where it is situated, at what stage it was and when it will be operational. MN enquired as to whether there were any	

	international requirements that need to be incorporated into the Scoping report. Whether any permits were required.	
	JL again raised the issue of who would be responsible for the crossing over the Orange River.	RH stated that Eskom would be responsible for this section. He also said that he would provide the authorities with the Namibian EIA.
	LB mentioned that time frames could not be established now and that Eskom must allow the process to dictate the timeframes. Another Public Participation process would have to be followed for the new alternative proposed within the meeting.	LB and MN commented that DEADP and DEAT have made Eskom's application a priority.
	NH commented that the botanical impact of the new proposed alternative would not be any more significant than the previously preferred alternative (alternative B).	MN proposed that the visual impact would be less significant as compared to alternative B. MN stated that a corridor of at least 1km wide should be applied to the new alternative in which the specialists must carry out their investigations.
	MR asked for clarification as to which three alternatives were to be assessed in the EIA process.	Everyone agreed that alternatives A, B and the new combined route E would be investigated. A new map showing the new alternative will be circulated to all specialists including the associated shape files.
	JS enquired on the time schedule for specialist's reports.	It was agreed that the initial description of each



		alternative for the Scoping report be due on the 15 May and the detailed analysis for the EIA by the end of May.
	RH thanked the authorities for attending the meeting.	LB encouraged the participants to submit a detailed and complete Scoping and EIA Report thus avoiding appeal. It would be in Eskom's favour to allow the process to determine the timeframes, rather than rush through the process and risk appeal.
5.	<b>CONCLUSION</b>	
5.1	RH thanked all the specialists for attending the meeting.	