

ESKOM

Environmental Impact Assessment for two proposed coal-fired power stations in the Waterberg area, Limpopo

DEAT Ref No. 12/12/20/1255

DRAFT record of the Public Meeting to review the contents of the Draft Scoping Report

Thursday, 26 November 2008 at 18:00, Mogol Club Conference Centre, Lephalale

The meeting was preceded by an Open House session, from 16:00 to 18:00, where stakeholders could meet with Eskom and project team members on an individual basis to address their concerns, issues and questions. The issues raised during the Open House are also captured in this report.

1. INTRODUCTION

The facilitator, **Ms Anelle Odendaal of Zitholele Consulting**, welcomed all participants. The meeting was attended by 31 participants, representatives of the proposed directly affected landowners, provincial authorities, business, the technical team and Eskom. The list of attendees is attached (see Appendix 1).

2. OBJECTIVES OF THE MEETING

The facilitator described the main purpose of the meeting as the sharing of information, especially in terms of the content of the Draft Scoping Report (DSR), which was available for public comment. The main objectives of the meeting were to:

- present to stakeholders the contents of the DSR;
- obtain comments and inputs by stakeholders on the DSR; and
- obtain suggestions for the planning, impact assessment and public participation processes ahead.

The facilitator announced that the comment period for the DSR had been extended to 30 January 2009, to allow for a meeting with the landowners at their request.

3. OVERVIEW OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Ms Deidre Herbst, Environmental Manager of Eskom Generation gave a strategic overview of energy generation in the country and the role the proposed power stations would play in the demand and supply of electricity. The complete presentation is attached (see Appendix 2).

Ms Herbst noted that the demand for electricity continues to increase, resulting in South Africa approaching the end of its surplus generation capacity. She added that if the demand for electricity continues at the current average rate of 2.3 % then South Africa would require 56 710 Megawatt (MW) by 2025, 19 000 MW more than what is currently available. At a growth rate of 4 %, South Africa would need a total of 77 960 MW, in other words an extra 40 000 MW, by 2025 to fulfil all its commitments. This is in addition to the existing power stations, therefore additional stations would need to be constructed.

Ms Herbst noted that three sites had been identified close to the Waterberg coalfield for the two proposed power stations. She explained that these sites would be evaluated from an environmental perspective. The decision to build would be made by the Eskom Board, taking the environmental and other inputs into account. Ms Herbst noted that the approval by the Eskom Board and the timing of the construction of the proposed power stations would be dependent on various ever changing factors, which are, amongst others, the actual electricity demand growth and the feasibility of these projects in relation to other available generation options.

Ms Herbst went on to mention that challenges facing Eskom included avoiding a mismatch between demand and supply. Excess capacity would translate into stranded resources while a capacity shortage would hamper economic growth.

Mr Mfundi Songo of Eskom Grid Planning, discussed the possible routes for transmission lines that could be needed to link the proposed power stations with the national grid. Two corridors of three lines each, running from Lephalale down to Gauteng, were being investigated. No more transmission lines would be needed on the corridor from Lephalale towards Potchefstroom. The planned 6 x 765 kV line corridor will accommodate the planned generation capacity at this stage. Should there be a need for more power stations in the Waterberg area that exhaust the 6 x 765 kV line corridor, more lines may be required but will not be towards the Potchefstroom area.

Mr Leonard van der Walt of Eskom Enterprises explained how the proposed power stations would operate. Each power station would generate up to 5 400 MW by burning pulverised fuel. He noted that the power stations would be based on the latest super critical technology which is more efficient as it uses less coal and less water, and has reduced emissions as well. The power stations would be dry cooled; either direct or indirect dry cooling. Mr van der Walt noted that sulphur dioxide would be removed through Flue Gas Desulphurisation technology. Nitrogen oxides (NO_x) would also be reduced by installing low NO_x burners, and either bag filters or precipitators would be used to control fine particulate matter.

4. APPROACH TO ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT – TECHNICAL COMPONENT

Mr Ashwin West, Ninham Shand Consulting Services, the project manager of this Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), gave an overview of the EIA process and a detailed presentation of the contents of the DSR. The presentation is attached (see Appendix 3).

Mr West explained that the purpose of a scoping phase is to identify alternatives and potential impacts requiring more detailed investigation in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) phase. The DSR was based on a literature review, professional input (technical and environmental), site visits and public input. The DSR forms the basis for the plan of study for the EIA.

Mr West continued that the DSR also lists all the specialist studies to be undertaken during the EIR phase. Below is the list of specialist studies and the companies undertaking the respective studies:

- Air Quality Assessment - Airshed Planning Professionals (Lucian Burger);
- Noise assessment - Jongens Keet Associates (Derek Cosijn);
- Visual Impact Assessment – Strategic Environmental Focus (Eamonn O'Rourke);
- Groundwater assessment – Groundwater Consulting Services (Andrew Johnstone);
- Terrestrial fauna and flora - Makecha Development Associates (Johan du Preez);
- Aquatic fauna and flora - Golder Associates (Danie Otto);
- Heritage Impact Assessment - Private Consultant (Johnny van Schalkwyk);
- Land use and Planning - Winterbach, Potgieter & Associates (Wim Jacobsz);
- Toxicology - Infotox (Willie van Niekerk);
- Local economic survey - Urban Econ (Ben van der Merwe);
- Social Impact Assessment – Ptersa Environmental Consultants (Ilse Aucamp);
- Societal Risk - Riscom (Mike Oberholzer);
- Agricultural Potential -Ivuzi (Alta van Dyke);
- Traffic - Ndodana Consulting Engineers (Louis Roodt); and
- Public participation - Zitholele Consulting (Anelle Odendaal).

Mr West added that Eskom had appointed Partridge, Maud and Associates to undertake the geotechnical investigations.

5. APPROACH TO ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT – PUBLIC PARTICIPATION COMPONENT

Ms Odendaal explained that Zitholele Consulting was conducting the public participation process and her presentation is also included in Appendix 3. She explained that public participation was a process in the EIA that is regulated under the National Environmental Management Act. The process aims to obtain and share information and also to verify for the I&APs that comments have been considered. Ms Odendaal continued that public participation is a process leading to a

joint effort amongst stakeholders, technical specialists, the authorities and the applicant who work together to produce better decisions than if they had acted independently.

6. DISCUSSION

Comments and questions raised during the open house are listed in Table 1 and comments and questions made during the public meeting have been captured in Table 2.

Table 1: Comments and responses raised during the open house.

	COMMENTS, QUESTIONS AND ISSUES	COMMENTATOR(S)	SOURCE	RESPONSE
1.	Will there be a need for housing and what are the proposed plans towards that?	Maree Aucamp, Exxaro, Lephalale	Comments during the open house held on 26 November 2008 at the Mogol Club	Eskom responded that a study will commence in January 2009 to determine the housing needs of the proposed development. In principle Eskom develops housing in existing townships or in new developments.
2.	Capricorn Business Forum expressed their interest in the development of possible business opportunities for their members.	Solly Ngoepe and Tshepo Phukubye, Capricorn Business Forum, Polokwane	Comments during the open house held on 26 November 2008 at the Mogol Club	Eskom will take a similar approach as with Medupi - the development of a stakeholder forum followed by a supplier development workshop to enable businesses to become registered Eskom vendors. Eskom will forward the necessary information to the representatives of the Capricorn Business Forum.
3.	Is the EIA for the proposed project still going ahead?	Adam Gunn, Routledge – Modise, Johannesburg	Comments during the open house held on 26 November 2008 at the Mogol Club	There is a need for electricity in South Africa. The proposed project is in its feasibility stage, thus studies such as EIAs are being undertaken (the EIA is currently in its scoping phase). Once such authorisations are in place, chances are very good that the project will go ahead.
4.	Why does Eskom not use railway transport of coal to power stations close to the cities where power is needed the most?	Adam Gunn, Routledge – Modise, Johannesburg	Comments during the open house held on 26 November 2008 at the Mogol Club	Eskom does use rail and road to transport coal, however this puts an additional burden on infrastructure. Further the price of electricity would increase significantly if this model was employed as it is cheaper to transport electricity for long distances than coal.
5.	How is it possible that mines find it profitable to transport coal to countries as far away as China?	Adam Gunn, Routledge – Modise, Johannesburg	Comments during the open house held on 26 November 2008 at the Mogol Club	The mines export high quality coal, which is considerably more expensive than the poorer quality coal used at Eskom power stations. The price premium attached to high quality coal makes its transport over great distances profitable. One of the reasons that Eskom has the lowest cost electricity in the world is due to the cost of lower quality coal.
6.	Where will the electricity be used that is	Adam Gunn,	Comments during	Eskom advised that it will be fed into the national grid and

	COMMENTS, QUESTIONS AND ISSUES	COMMENTATOR(S)	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	generated by the new power stations?	Routledge – Modise, Johannesburg	the open house held on 26 November 2008 at the Mogol Club	delivered where it is needed – even as far as Cape Town.
7.	More power stations will have a negative impact on the environment.	Adam Gunn, Routledge – Modise, Johannesburg	Comments during the open house held on 26 November 2008 at the Mogol Club	Eskom responded that power stations will have an impact on the environment but, with appropriate mitigation, such impacts are minimised. Also all aspects related to the project must be taken into account, such as the need for electricity for future economic growth of the country.
8.	Where will the water for the two proposed power stations come from?	Pieter Lamprecht, Matjiesfontein	Comments during the open house held on 26 November 2008 at the Mogol Club	The Department of Water Affairs and Forestry (DWAF) is investigating options to augment the water in the Crocodile River System to ensure sufficient water supply for the proposed power stations and other proposed developments in the area, for the future.
9.	Will groundwater resources be used for the proposed developments? The mines are already using groundwater and this may deplete water for farming practises.	Pieter Lamprecht, Matjiesfontein	Comments during the open house held on 26 November 2008 at the Mogol Club	Eskom reported that it does not intend to use groundwater.
10.	Can the country afford to have another highly polluted area like the Witbank area?	Adam Gunn, Routledge – Modise, Johannesburg	Comments during the open house held on 26 November 2008 at the Mogol Club	Eskom said the trade-off between environmental impacts and development are challenging. Feasibility studies have shown the Waterberg to be the best area for additional power stations due to the presence of a large coal resource. Eskom investigated, for example, the options to construct power stations at the coast where sea water could have been used for cooling purposes but the cost of transporting coal that far was too high. The new generation power stations planned in the Waterberg emits far less emissions than the power stations found in the Witbank area. Eskom investigates many options to improve the efficiency and reduce the environmental impact of their power stations on the environment.
11.	What is the status with the nuclear power generation option?	Adam Gunn, Routledge – Modise, Johannesburg	Comments during the open house held on 26	Eskom and the Government are investigating Nuclear as an option. Eskom reported that EIAs are being done on three sites in the Western and Southern Cape and

	COMMENTS, QUESTIONS AND ISSUES	COMMENTATOR(S)	SOURCE	RESPONSE
			November 2008 at the Mogol Club	environmental authorisation is expected sometime during 2009. Funding and licensing as with coal fired power stations will still need to be in place prior to the construction starting.
12.	What is the difference between the old and new power stations?	Adam Gunn, Routledge – Modise, Johannesburg	Comments during the open house held on 26 November 2008 at the Mogol Club	The proposed new power stations at Waterberg will have new technology, e.g. Flue Gas Desulphurisation (FGD), which takes away about 90% of sulphur emissions – thus reducing emissions to the air. The new power stations also burn less coal for the same kW/hours. The only negative fact is that FGD needs more water, which will be mitigated by planning. When compared with older wet cooled power stations a dry cooled power station with FGD uses considerably less water.
13.	What is being done to promote renewable energy sources and the use thereof to decrease the dependency on coal-fired power stations?	Adam Gunn, Routledge – Modise, Johannesburg	Comments during the open house held on 26 November 2008 at the Mogol Club	Eskom has a strategy to investigate and implement renewable technologies. Plans are in place to build a 100 MW wind facility during 2009/10. Eskom also hope to demonstrate a 100MW Concentrated Solar Power plant in the Northern Cape. Various programmes are in place to work with other parties on smaller renewable options such as biomass.

Table 2: Comments and responses raised during the public meeting.

	COMMENTS, QUESTIONS AND ISSUES	COMMENTATOR(S)	SOURCE	RESPONSE
1.	FGD technology uses more water; does Eskom plan to investigate fluidised bed combustion (FBC), a technology that uses far less water?	Oockie van den Berg, DWAF	Comments during the public meeting held on 26 November 2008 at the Mogol Club	Leonard van der Walt (LvdW) said FBC technology has only been proven in facilities of around 300 MW or less per unit. It also uses sub-critical technology burning which means that more emissions are emitted. FBC was investigated, but the option was discarded for Coal 3. FGD will be used to reduce emissions even though it uses more water.
2.	What is the status of the EIAs for the	Hardus Steenkamp,	Comments during	Mfundu Songo (MS) and LvdW said Eskom has received

	COMMENTS, QUESTIONS AND ISSUES	COMMENTATOR(S)	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	transmission lines?	landowner	the public meeting held on 26 November 2008 at the Mogol Club	environmental authorisation for 3 x 400 kV lines (Rustenburg/Northam), but the decision is being appealed by stakeholders. The final report for the EIA for the 6 x 765 kV lines still has to be submitted to the Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism (DEAT) for a decision. An EIA for a 2 x 765 kV line corridor (Mokopane/ Marken) is currently being undertaken.
3.	Are the transmission lines to the east 132 kV?	Adam Gunn, Routledge – Modise, Johannesburg	Comments during the public meeting held on 26 November 2008 at the Mogol Club	MS responded that the EIA was assessing lines of 765 kV.
4.	Where do you plan to put the transmission lines for the new power stations?	Pieter Lamprecht, Matjiesfontein	Comments during the public meeting held on 26 November 2008 at the Mogol Club	MS said Eskom is in the process of investigating the matter and are looking at three existing corridors.
5.	Could Eskom provide a written guarantee that once it is decided where the lines are it will not change nor will additional lines be required in the future?	Pieter Lamprecht, Matjiesfontein	Comments during the public meeting held on 26 November 2008 at the Mogol Club	MS said once the route has been investigated and approved, it will not be changed. There will be more than enough transmission lines for the generation capacity currently planned once the proposed lines have been built. The planned 6 x 765 kV line corridor will accommodate the planned generation capacity at this stage. Should there be a need for more power stations in the Waterberg area that exhaust the 6 x 765 kV line corridor, more lines may be required but will not be towards the Potchefstroom area.
6.	The map of the typical power station layout showed a dam. What will the effect be of the dam on groundwater sources?	Sylvia Jordaan, landowner Dwars-in-de-Weg	Comments during the public meeting held on 26 November 2008 at the Mogol Club	Ashwin West (AW) said a groundwater specialist study will be undertaken to determine possible impacts and provide appropriate mitigation to avoid or minimise any potential impacts.
7.	The planning of super load transportation is not being investigated. Will road degradation during construction also be investigated? Will	Mike York-Hart, South African National Road	Comments during the public meeting held on 26	AW said a traffic specialist study is proposed that will include comment on the effect of traffic on the road surfaces. The Medupi transport study for the

	COMMENTS, QUESTIONS AND ISSUES	COMMENTATOR(S)	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	there be any road crossings?	Agency Limited (SANRAL)	November 2008 at the Mogol Club	transportation of large loads will be revisited and updated if necessary for the purpose of this project. Any proposed road crossings will be discussed with SANRAL and other involved authorities.
8.	What happens if the specialists say that the development will ruin the environment? Does this stop the development? Did any of the Medupi specialist studies come up with a negative answer and if so what did Eskom do in such a case?	Fred Jordaan, landowner Dwars-in-de-Weg	Comments during the public meeting held on 26 November 2008 at the Mogol Club	AW responded that if any of the specialist studies comes up with a red flag, the specialist looks at mitigatory measures or alternatives. Red flags are also evaluated through a holistic approach on their significance to the overall project. Mitigatory measures can include offsets, such as the re-establishment of a plant species or a wetland on another site, outside the area of the proposed development.
9.	Who is the authorising authority and can they turn an EIA down?	Fred Jordaan, landowner Dwars-in-de-Weg	Comments during the public meeting held on 26 November 2008 at the Mogol Club	AW commented that the authorising authority is DEAT. The DEAT takes the decision on whether the project receives environmental authorisation or not. Yes, they can give a negative decision, or a decision with specific conditions.
10.	Did Eskom do an EIA for the Matimba power station that was built in the late 1970s/early 1980s?	Adam Gunn, Routledge – Modise, Johannesburg	Comments during the public meeting held on 26 November 2008 at the Mogol Club	<p>AW and Brett Lawson (Ninham Shand) said a specific EIA was not conducted, since EIAs only became a legal requirement in 1997. Eskom has been conducting environmental specialist studies much earlier than 1997 to assess the impact of proposed developments on the environment.</p> <p>It was noted that the studies were done for Medupi power station.</p> <p>The facilitator explained that the DEAT does not just look at the final Report (FEIR), but also at the Scoping Report to approve the rest of the Plan of Study for the next phase to make sure that the necessary specialist studies are being conducted. Stakeholders have the opportunity to comment on the DSR to also evaluate if they are satisfied with the proposed specialist studies to be undertaken. It should be noted that the final decision to be taken by</p>

	COMMENTS, QUESTIONS AND ISSUES	COMMENTATOR(S)	SOURCE	RESPONSE
				DEAT in terms of environmental authorisation can be appealed by stakeholders, Eskom and the technical team should they so wish. LvdW added that appeals were dealt with by the Minister of Environmental Affairs and Tourism.
11.	Why was this meeting not held at Steenbokpan?	Sylvia Jordaan, landowner Dwars-in-de-Weg	Comments during the public meeting held on 26 November 2008 at the Mogol Club	The facilitator responded that a special focus group meeting was held in Steenbokpan on 4 October. This meeting was to give an opportunity to all stakeholders in Lephalale who would like to contribute to this process. Another meeting with the landowners in the Steenbokpan area is proposed in January 2009, where the contents of the DSR would also be presented. It was noted that stakeholders have many opportunities to respond to the DSR – not just by attending a meeting, as meetings are just one of the methods employed to receive comments from stakeholders. Stakeholders can respond via written or telephonic communication.
12.	What about the neighbours of the proposed power stations that will be indirectly affected by this proposed development? Will they be compensated for proposed impacts, such as groundwater contamination 30km away or visual impacts on lodges a kilometre away from the power station?	Pieter Lamprecht, Matjiesfontein	Comments during the public meeting held on 26 November 2008 at the Mogol Club	AW stated that some of the specialist studies, such as fauna, would only look at the proposed sites but others, such as groundwater and air quality, would look further afield. For instance the groundwater study would look at where any pollution would spread to if there was a pollution event, which would be effected etc. More than half of the specialist studies will look at the proposed impacts on the broader area and not just at the alternative sites.
13.	Depending on what developments materialise, the water usage of the Lephalale area could increase from the 25 million cubic metres per annum to 260 cubic metres per annum. It was agreed with DEAT that the Lephalale area needs an Environmental Management Framework to guide proposed impacts on the broad area. Proposals towards such	Ockie van den Berg, DWAF	Comments during the public meeting held on 26 November 2008 at the Mogol Club	Eskom is aware of this proposal and they will provide their co-operation for such an assessment.

	COMMENTS, QUESTIONS AND ISSUES	COMMENTATOR(S)	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	framework are being investigated by the authorities.			
14.	I understand that DWAF is monitoring a number of deep boreholes (50 -100 m) in the area. Can we (landowners) have access to the information that the DWAF is currently gathering through their assessments (drilling exploration)?	Pieter Lamprecht, Matjiesfontein	Comments during the public meeting held on 26 November 2008 at the Mogol Club	Ockie van den Berg (OvdB) (DWAF) said his Department is currently monitoring groundwater levels during dry and wet seasons. He requested the contact information of Mr Lamprecht for further discussions between them. They agreed to speak to each other after the meeting.
15.	Mr Lamprecht expressed his concerns that groundwater levels can drop due to over exploitation by developments. He also expressed his concerns for groundwater pollution impacts and requested that it should be studied thoroughly. Mr Lamprecht asked about compensation should Eskom affect the groundwater.	Pieter Lamprecht, Matjiesfontein	Comments during the public meeting held on 26 November 2008 at the Mogol Club	The facilitator responded that a groundwater specialist study has been commissioned and will investigate the groundwater in detail. Kritesh Bedessie (KB)(Eskom) noted that compensation would be determined after an impact occurred, which will be dependent on the outcome of an investigation into the matter and that it can be proven that Eskom is responsible for affecting the groundwater. The facilitator also mentioned that almost half of the specialist studies to be conducted will also focus on the impacts of the proposed development on people. She mentioned for example the socio-economic, economic, risk assessment and social impact assessments. Stakeholders were requested to provide support by co-operating with the specialists by providing correct information about their circumstances, fears and opportunities.
16.	Mr Steenkamp voiced his concern that the EIA is not approached in a holistic fashion. He said that he is aware of five EIAs that are being conducted and each project only looked at its own specific area. Eskom should work	Hardus Steenkamp, landowner	Comments during the public meeting held on 26 November 2008 at the Mogol Club	AW advised that cumulative impacts of more than one development were investigated as part of a normal EIA process. For example, the air quality study for the proposed two power stations will include Sasol's proposed Coal-to-liquids (CTL) facility in its model to

	COMMENTS, QUESTIONS AND ISSUES	COMMENTATOR(S)	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	towards integrating the various EIAs and specialist studies being done. For example, one EIA investigating 7 000 new stands to be developed recommended groundwater as the water source and the question is whether this is viable against the background of all the other proposed developments.			determine pollution.
17.	Does the EIA also investigate the future of farm workers that may be impacted upon? He mentioned that some of them have been working on the farms for 60 years and all they are skilled in is game or cattle farming. How can they be accommodated in the process?	Hardus Steenkamp, landowner	Comments during the public meeting held on 26 November 2008 at the Mogol Club	AW responded that the social impact assessment will look at the future of the farm workers. The social specialist will engage with the farm workers once consent has been provided by the relevant landowners. KB said Eskom knows from experience that some landowners will take some of the workers with them to new farms, another portion would like to move to the nearest town and farm workers that would like to stay on a farm would be assisted in conjunction with the Department of Land Affairs to buy a property. By law, Eskom must assist farm workers as they are considered to be unregistered rights holders. A number of options are available and the final choice depends on the outcomes of negotiations with farm workers. At Kusile (Bravo) power station near Witbank, Eskom assisted farm workers to build houses and drill boreholes on their newly acquired land.
18.	This EIA should investigate the proposed impact of, for example, the development of new townships, its water use, etc, since a proposed development such as the power stations has many indirect impacts that should also be investigated.	Luke Perkins, WESSA	Comments during the public meeting held on 26 November 2008 at the Mogol Club	The facilitator said this will be done by the specialist studies during the Impact Assessment phase. OvdB added that when DWAF plans for a proposed development such as these power stations, it factors in water for a coal mine, township extension, schools, shopping centres, etc – thus the proposed water planning includes the broad impact. He said that it was his opinion that another town is likely to be developed since Lephalale is too far from the proposed power stations.
19.	Would the EIA take into account other developments?	Anelle Odendaal, facilitator	Comments during the public meeting	AW responded that the EIA would take into account Sasol's proposed CTL but could not take into account

	COMMENTS, QUESTIONS AND ISSUES	COMMENTATOR(S)	SOURCE	RESPONSE
			held on 26 November 2008 at the Mogol Club	three CTL's for instance as there was no certainty that three more would be developed.
20.	It was suggested that the Environmental Management Forum of Eskom look at these developments and its proposed impacts holistically.	Adam Gunn, Routledge – Modise, Johannesburg	Comments during the public meeting held on 26 November 2008 at the Mogol Club	Noted. Stakeholders will receive notice of the Environmental Management Forum meeting proposed in December 2008.
21.	Which road from Thabazimbi to Steenbokpan was referred to earlier in the meeting.	Pieter Lamprecht, Matjiesfontein	Comments during the public meeting held on 26 November 2008 at the Mogol Club	AW clarified that he had been referring to the existing roads in the area.
22.	Why is a representative of the DEAT never at these meetings?	Hardus Steenkamp, landowner	Comments during the public meeting held on 26 November 2008 at the Mogol Club	The facilitator explained that the specific case officer of this EIA was present at the authority focus group meeting held on 3 October 2008. The EIA team plans to meet again with the DEAT on 28 November on matters pertaining to this study. Eskom has regular meetings with the DEAT and DEAT is well aware of this EIA, its process and proposed next steps.
23.	When will DEAT take a final decision on the environmental authorisation of this EIA?	Hardus Steenkamp, landowner	Comments during the public meeting held on 26 November 2008 at the Mogol Club	AW said a decision is expected before the end of 2009. Stakeholders were reminded that the first phase, scoping is still underway and that the specialist studies are still to be conducted.
24.	Adam Gunn read a statement on behalf of his clients, Lephale Environmental Action Forum (see Appendix 4).		Comments during the public meeting held on 26 November 2008 at the Mogol Club	Noted.

7. NEXT STEPS AND CLOSURE

The facilitator closed the meeting by summarising the next proposed steps, which are:

- The closing of comments on the DSR on 30 January 2009;
- Finalisation of the Scoping Report and submission thereof to the DEAT (February 2009);
- Completion of specialist studies (April 2009); and
- Compilation of the Draft Environmental Impact Report as soon as the specialist studies are completed. The draft report will again be available for public review. Meetings to present the content of the report will be proposed.

The facilitator thanked all for their attendance and contributions to the project. The meeting was closed at 8:45.

Please verify that your contribution at the meeting was correctly captured. Should you wish to notify us of any discrepancies, please feel free to contact us: Anelle Odendaal or Andre Joubert, Zitholele Consulting: Tel (011) 254-4855 or 254-4987, Email: aodendaal@zitholele.co.za or Andrej@zitholele.co.za