

MINUTES

DE BEERS MEETING FOR THE ESKOM-KUDU INTEGRATION PROJECT AT GARIES ON 8 FEBRUARY 2007

Page 1 of 5

1.	ATTENDANCE	
	<i>NAME</i>	<i>ORGANISATION</i>
	Gert Kloppers (GK)	De Beers Consolidated Mines, Namaqualand
	Paul Kruger (PK)	De Beers Consolidated Mines - Kleinzee Environmental Co-ordinator
	Reuben Heydenrych (RH)	SEF
	Jaqueta Keet (JK)	SEF
2.	WELCOME The meeting was opened at 14h10. Reuben Heydenrych (RN) welcomed everyone to the meeting.	RESPONSE
3.	INTRODUCTION TO THE MEETING Gert Kloppers (GK) informed SEF that he was upset and uncomfortable with regards to the public participation process. He has no problem with the project but that consultation with de Beers was lacking. He indicated that Eskom contacted Paul Combrink's boss wanting access to the mine to survey a power line. Paul's boss said no to the request. Police clearance is required to enter the property. With regards to the public participation process De Beers was referred to as the adjacent landowners when in actual fact they are the landowners. The stakeholders list indicates that they are the adjacent stakeholders without any contact details. GK indicated that the meeting was crucial as he had no information. He also said a site notice advertising the EIA process was inaccessible.	RH made an apology for the incorrect details and the fact that the letters regarding the public participation process had not reached to appropriate person. RH indicated that landowners should be contacted directly. The De Beers experience in this regard is not how SEF likes to conduct its public participation processes.
4.	PUBLIC RESPONSE	RESPONSE
4.1.	GK indicated that De Beers issues should be noted as the information provided is very skimpy.	
4.2.	GK stated that in terms of current mining the existing servitude is not affecting the mining North of Kleinzee or Koingnaas mining to the south.	

MINUTES

DE BEERS MEETING FOR THE ESKOM-KUDU INTEGRATION PROJECT AT GARIES ON 8 FEBRUARY 2007

Page 2 of 5

4.3.	<p>GK stated that with regards to map provided all the areas in green are mined while those in pink are prospecting (The map could not be provided to SEF). In 2008/9 the dragline will have to move eastwards and the power line might be in the way, which means that Eskom will have to move their line. GK stated that Alternative E does not make sense to him.</p>	<p>RH stated that Alternative E was the alternative generated by CapeNature and Sanparks. With respect to the dragline issue, RH indicated that Eskom would have to indicate an appropriate solution.</p>
4.4.	<p>GK indicated that Route E runs through the De Beers area, which is private land covering Koingnaas, Schulpfontein, Samsonsbak and Elandsklip, making up a game camp / conservation area.</p>	
4.5.	<p>GK stated that the line will pass through their prospecting area, where everything gets removed till the bedrock is reached.</p>	<p>RH queried the line being moved to the East of the sensitive area.</p>
4.6.	<p>GK stated that more discussions need to take place with de Beers and Eskom before any proposed alternatives can be considered.</p>	<p>Comment noted and the request for a meeting with Eskom will be forwarded to them.</p>
4.7.	<p>PK indicated that de Beers is the owners of most of the land but farmers are farming on their land and need to be added to the I&AP list as these farmers are extremely sensitive.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
4.8.	<p>GK stated that Paul and himself are not the right people to discuss the project with. A meeting is required with the right people at De Beers.</p>	
4.9.	<p>GK stated that the Buffels River area is a potential problem as it is subject to flash floods.</p>	<p>RH indicated that this would be communicated to Eskom, but that it would probably be possible to span across the river.</p>
4.10.	<p>PK stated that stealing diamond is an issue therefore strict access is required. Access cannot be provided to just anybody with regards to construction of the power line.</p>	
4.11.	<p>GK stated that Grootmis is on their property therefore it is planned for mining and thus not an option for a power line. The N7 is the only way to avoid De Beers land.</p>	<p>In response to a question from RH, GK indicated that the mining area continues almost as far south as Lutzville.</p>

MINUTES

DE BEERS MEETING FOR THE ESKOM-KUDU INTEGRATION PROJECT AT GARIES ON 8 FEBRUARY 2007

Page 3 of 5

4.12.	GK stated that the properties have the potential for mining development thus the proposed Eskom line is not advisable.	
4.13.	PK indicated that the Namaqua National Park extends to the coast until Strandfontein. It is important that the right people are contacted.	RH stated that Sanparks have been informed and have participated and indicated their concerns.
4.14.	PK stated that the areas that have been mined are disturbed and thus suited for a transmission line.	
4.15.	RH asked if there are roads on the disturbed area.	PK indicated that there are sand roads on all the existing sites.
4.16.	GK stated that combined planning with Eskom should take place. Mining should not be planned in isolation but with Eskom. Sustainable development in future is proposed on rehabilitated land, such as Mariculture. Electricity must be made available to other properties.	
4.17.	GK stated that there is an opportunity for synergy but serious discussions have to take place with Eskom.	
4.18.	RH stated that Eskom would prefer the transmission line approximately 10km from the sea due to the corrosion problem.	GK stated that Gromis is approximately 5 to 6 km from the sea.
4.19.	PK indicated that the SIA report with the effects of mining should be included in the EIA report.	RH indicated that an SIA study was included in the EIA report. A heritage study was done by Tim Hart and various other specialist studies had been conducted, which was incorporated into the draft EIA report.
4.20.	GK indicated that this is an opportunity for sharing information and that it is also an opportunity for synergy.	Noted.
4.21.	PK indicated that he could not find the botanical study.	The botanical study will be e-mailed to PK.
4.22.	GK indicated that there is an extensive social labour plan, which is applicable could provide important background information for any EIA process in the area, since the information obtainable from local authorities is not complete.	

MINUTES

DE BEERS MEETING FOR THE ESKOM-KUDU INTEGRATION PROJECT AT GARIES ON 8 FEBRUARY 2007

Page 4 of 5

4.23.	PK queried what the way forward will be.	RH indicated that the Scoping Report was approved as well as the Plan of Study for EIA. The draft EIA was made available for public comment and I&APs can request meetings, of which this meeting was one. All comments will be incorporated into the final EIA.
4.24.	GK expressed his frustration, which is not with regards to the fundamentals but with regards to practical issues that should be sorted out.	Noted
4.25.	PK suggested that SEF visits the mine with an Eskom representative as well.	RH indicated that he would invite Douw Willemse to attend a site visit.
4.26.	GK indicated that he would be the contact person to arrange for the relevant representatives from De Beers to attend the meeting/s	RH indicated that long term planning with Eskom is important for other future developments in the area.
4.27.	RH asked De Beers what their preferred alternative is.	GK advises that the line in Hondeklip is not appropriate and that the most logical alternative would be as far east as possible.
4.28.	RH indicated that the furthest alternative has lots of changes in direction and it is botanically unacceptable. Along the N7 is not ideal.	GK indicated that if the alternative runs past their area then the straight line is the preferred alternative
4.29.	PK queried what the appropriate distance for the power line would be away from the communities, as the power line is far from communities.	RH indicated that the route of the power line is dependant on botanical sensitivity, roads, visual impacts, etc.
4.30.	GK asked if all the communities were aware that they would not be receiving electricity, while the electricity received by De Beers is only 2%. Eskom need to ensure that De Beers is part of social commitment with regards to providing electricity to the communities.	RH indicated that he is aware that is a major concern for affected communities that they would not receive electricity from the transmission line.
4.31.	PK queried what time frame we are looking at before issuing of the Record of Decision.	RH indicated a period of approximately 2 month after submission of the final EIA, which has to go to both provinces (Western Cape and Northern Cape) as well for comment.

MINUTES

DE BEERS MEETING FOR THE ESKOM-KUDU INTEGRATION PROJECT AT GARIES ON 8 FEBRUARY 2007

Page 5 of 5

4.32.	PK queried that if an alternative is decided on if there will be mitigation measure.	RH indicated that an EMP will be submitted with the EIA report. Specialist will determine the final route within the recommended 2km corridor after the Record of Decision has been issued.
4.33.	GK indicated that there are two main industries in the Northern Cape namely mariculture and tourism. With regards to the Buffels river community if the line is over the mountain the line will have a major impact on the 4x4 route. Victor Cloete must be contacted with regards to the labour plan. GK also indicated that each mine is either surveyed or will be surveyed.	Noted.
4.34.	PK queried where the Kleinzee and mining information was obtained.	RH indicated that the social assessment specialist obtained the information from local sources. GK indicated that the information was obtained from the District municipalities' website and that the information was incomplete.
4.35.	RH queried if the map from De Beers is a public document and if SEF could utilise the map. GK indicated that 10% of the area is mined and that the pylons and the proposed lines would be an obstacle as the dragline is 50m high.	GK indicated the map was not authorised and that he would provide an authorised map.
4.36.	PK asked who was consulted at De Beers. PK also indicated that he was only made aware of the proposed Eskom development when an archaeological study was conducted at the end of 2006. PK and GK also indicated that the public notice was not accessible to everyone.	RH indicated the letter sent to De Beers early in 2006 was not addressed to anyone specific.
4.37.	RH indicated that a CD with all the project information was forwarded to Promise at De Beers.	GK indicated at they had not yet received the information.
5.	CLOSURE RH thanked GK and PK for meeting with them and that the minutes will be forwarded to them for comment. The meeting was adjourned at 16h00.	