EIA PROCESS FOR FIRGROVE-MITCHELL'S PLAIN 2×400KV ON A DOUBLE CIRCUIT TRANSMISSION POWER LINE AND MITCHELL'S PLAIN SUBSTATION; AND MITCHELL'S PLAIN-PHILLIPI 400KV SINGLE CIRCUIT TRANSMISSION POWER LINE AND PHILLIPI SUBSTATION UPGRADE

POST-APPLICATION MEETING WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS (DEA)

19 APRIL 2010, 10:00, DEA OFFICE

NO.	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
1.	**WELCOME** Peter Teurlings welcomed representatives of Eskom and the Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA) to the meeting and handed over to Bharat Gordhan.	
2.	**ATTENDANCE** An attendance register was circulated for everyone present to sign and is attached as Appendix 1 to these minutes. **Present:** Takalani Maswime (TK) DEA Gabisile Hlongwane (GH) DEA Tebogo Mapinga (TM) DEA Kentridge Makhanya (KM) Eskom Peter Teurlings (PT) BKS Bharat Gordhan (BG) BKS **Apologies:** David de Waal (DdW) BKS	
3.	**PROJECT DESCRIPTION** BG and PT provided a brief description of the proposed Eskom Transmission project in Cape Town. As such, the project entailed the undertaking of environmental authorisation processes for the construction of the following infrastructure: • 2×400kV on a double-circuit Transmission power line from the existing Firgrove Substation to the proposed Mitchell's Plain Substation; and • 1×400kV single-circuit Transmission power line from the same proposed Mitchell's Plain Substation to the proposed upgrade of the existing Phillipi Substation.	
4.	**WASTE MANAGEMENT LICENCE APPLICATION** TK indicated that the environmental-related information and impacts must be assessed separately from the waste-related information and impacts as there are different departments within the DEA that deal with these issues separately. PT requested that a consolidated report outlining waste and environmental issues be submitted to the DEA, which substantiates an integrated environmental management approach to the EIA process. It was agreed that Mr. Mpho Tshitangore and/or Mr. Lukas Mahlangu of the Waste Management Department at the DEA be contacted for further details of the submission of the waste-related information and impacts in the EIA Report.	BG
5.	**PUBLIC PARTICIPATION** GH and TM requested that documentation produced during the public participation process (PPP) be clearly defined and clearly spelled out so as not to cause confusion (especially the advertisement and Background Information Document) with I&APs.	BG

NO.	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
	PT informed that the upgrade of the Firgrove Substation and associated infrastructure forms part of another EIA process undertaken by Enkanyini Projects. GH indicated that the EIA process for the project of Enkanyini Projects will be evaluated independently of the BKS projects, and that this matter will be handled within the DEA internally.	GH
	In addition, PT stated that BKS and Enkanyini Projects are planning to align the public open day in the Firgrove area as this area is common to both consultants' projects and to avoid any confusion with the public around the Firgrove area. GH indicated that this strategy would not be a problem for the DEA.	BKS and Enkanyini Projects
	TK and GH confirmed that the DEA has not yet taken an official stance on the matter of submission of environmental reports for review to the public during the Soccer World Cup (i.e. 11 June 2010 to 11 July 2010), but TM indicated that not all I&APs would be fairly reached and thus should be treated like any other extended school holiday as indicated in the guidelines.	TK, BG
	TM requested that BKS strive to obtain comment from all commenting authorities, including, *inter alia*, the Western Cape Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning (DEA&DP), the City of Cape Town, and Heritage Western Cape.	BG
	GH stated that it is the mandate of the DEA to remind the commenting authorities to provide comment on the Draft Scoping and EIA Reports from 40 days of the receipt of said documents. Therefore, BKS shall submit to the DEA a list of commenting authorities that received the draft documents and proof of such, for aforesaid action.	BG
6.	**COMBINED SCOPING AND EIA REPORTS**	
	GH confirmed that following the submission of the EIA application forms, reference numbers were allocated for each project respectively.	
	PT proposed the combination of both projects mentioned above for the submission of the Scoping Report and EIA Report, even though the EIA application forms have been submitted separately. This strategy would save on cost and time for the proposed project.	
	KM explained that the abovementioned projects form part of a greater Cape Peninsular Strengthening Project undertaken by Eskom, and that each project could potentially operate independently of each other. This is the reason that the EIA application forms were submitted separately of each other and not combined. In addition, following the obtaining of the environmental authorisation for each project, an appeal on a certain section of the project could delay the start of construction for the entire project.	
	After some discussion, it was agreed that the Scoping Report and the EIA Report for the respective projects must be submitted separately. GH indicated that this strategy would clear out any confusion in a combined report that could transpire from the DEA's and the public's perspective.	BG
	Following a request from GH, PT stated that a combined study area map could be included in the extended summary in order to indicate the larger strategy of Eskom's Cape Peninsular Strengthening Project.	BG
	PT requested that the specialist studies be allowed to submit a combined report, which indicates the distinction between the projects clearly. GH agreed on condition that the specialists separate the findings of their studies accurately and appropriately.	BG
	GH indicated that the alternative routes to be considered as part of the EIA process for each project respectively must be clearly described and depicted so as not to confuse the public and stakeholders.	BG

NO.	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
7.	**DEA SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS**	
	• The DEA indicated that a site visit for GH would need to be organised once the Scoping Report had been submitted to the DEA.	BG
	• BG to submit a .pdf version of the Gantt Chart of the EIA process to GH for her reference. GH indicated that she would align her schedule according to the Gantt Chart so as not cause unnecessary delays.	BG
	• Three (3) colour copies of each report compiled must be submitted to the DEA for consideration by the Environmental Assessment Department, the Waste Department and the Conservation Department of the DEA.	BG
	• The C-Plan of the Western Cape must be aligned with the Ecological Assessment Study.	BG
	• The following organisations must be contacted for involvement in the EIA process o Heritage Western Cape; o Cape Nature; o Earthlife Africa; and o Provincial and Local Government.	BG
	• GH enquired if any jobs for the local communities that are affected could be made available. KM indicated that the contractor appoints his own employees, but the hiring of the contractor is undertaken by the Tender Committee at Eskom. However, this matter will be looked at by Eskom and explained in the EIA Report.	KM, BG
8.	**CLOSURE** The meeting was closed at 11:30.	