



Minutes of meeting with Sanparks



Present:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reuben Heydenrych (RH): Strategic Environmental Focus (SEF) • John Geeringh (JG): Eskom Transmission • Bobby Richardson (BR): Eskom Transmission • Michael Knight (MK): Head of Park Planning & Development, Sanparks
Date:	12 September 2006
Time:	12h00
Venue:	Sanparks head office, Muckleneuk, Pretoria
Objective of meeting:	To determine Sanparks's opinion regarding the proposed alternative routes for the Eskom Kudu power line through Namaqualand, with particular emphasis on the impact on the Namaqua National Park (NNP)
Next meeting:	N.A.
Minutes	Responsible By when
<p>1. Purpose of meeting JG explained that the purpose of the meeting was to obtain Sanparks' opinion about an alternative route that was identified in consultation with the local stakeholders, and to identify any concerns or issues on Sanparks's side.</p>	
<p>2. Background JG provided a brief background to the need and justification for the Kudu Integration Project, namely:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2.1. Nampower is going to construct the Kudu gas-fired power station at Oranjemund 2.2. Namibia's power needs are less than will be generated by the power station, thus they will sell surplus power to Eskom 2.3. SEF had started the EIA process for the Kudu Project in 2005, and have recently received approval of the Plan of Study for EIA. They are currently busy with the specialist studies. 2.4. Several meetings had been held in the affected area with stakeholders, including Sanparks and Cape Nature. 2.5. At one of the meetings with Cape Nature and Sanparks, an alternative route along existing roads along the coastal plain had been identified by these stakeholders. They indicated at the time that this was a suitable route since it primarily followed existing roads and disturbed 	

<p>areas, although it would cut through the NNP.</p>	
<p>3. Impact on Namaqua National Park (NNP) expansion</p> <p>3.1. MK explained with reference to the maps displayed (see Appendix 1) that the yellow portion of the map had already been acquired by Sanparks.</p> <p>3.2. The eventual plan was to extend the NNP all the way to the N7 to the north of Kamieskroon.</p> <p>3.3. Due to this planned expansion, Sanparks prefers the Bushmanland and N7 alternatives. Sanparks considers the N7 alternative to be feasible, since it is already in an impacted area.</p> <p>3.4. MK indicated that the NNP is planned to be expanded as far as the N7 only to the north of Kamieskroon. South of Kamieskroon, it will still be possible to align a power line to the west of the N7. It is only north of Kamieskroon that a power line to the west of the N7 would affect the park expansion.</p> <p>3.5. JG explained, in response to a question from MK, that it was not possible to upgrade the Gromis-Springbok line at this stage, since it would not be economically justified.</p> <p>3.6. MK indicated that the mining operations along the coast would not continue for long, and that the justification for taking the power lines along here would not be valid.</p> <p>3.7. MK indicated that the long-term vision is for the NNP to become an economic generator in the area. This is not compatible with a power line through the park. The park itself would develop its own sustainable power supply, thus the NNP would get no benefit from the power line.</p> <p>3.8. JG and BR explained the additional costs of bringing a power line through the mountainous area northeast of Kamieskroon:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A tower on a bend costs in excess of R350,000 • A normal tower on a straight section costs around R70,000 • The difference in costs is related directly to the mass of steel to be used. A normal tower uses only about 7 tonnes of steel, while a bend tower uses approximately 30 tonnes of steel. • Thus, an alignment through the mountains that avoids the NNP would result in a significantly higher cost to the project. 	
<p>4. Other alternatives</p> <p>4.1. MK asked whether it would not be possible to use other options like undersea cables or underground cables.</p> <p>4.2. JG explained that undersea cables have very limited transfer capability, around 132kV. Below-ground cables would have to be insulated in a bed of oil in order to keep them cool and would cost approximately ten times more than a conventional line, which would make the line uneconomical.</p>	
<p>5. Conclusion</p> <p>5.1. MK would not accept an alignment through the proposed expansion area of the NNP.</p> <p>5.2. Eskom Transmission would investigate a new alternative alignment from Gromis Substation parallel to the existing transmission line to Springbok. The new line would veer off to the south at the point that the existing line goes through the mountains and would join up with</p>	

the N7 near Kamieskroon. 5.3. A copy of the draft Environmental Impact Report must be provided to Bernard van Lente, the NNP Park Manager.	
6. Closure The meeting was adjourned at 13h00.	