
MINUTES OF MEETING

PROPOSED WATERBERG COAL-FIRED POWER STATIONS EIA AND EMP: DEAT CAPCO MEETING NOTES

<i>Date</i>	<i>Time</i>	<i>Venue</i>
28 November 2008	09:00 – 10:15	DEAT Offices, Fedsure Building, 4 th Floor, South Tower, 315 Pretorius St, Pretoria

Present:

Sthembiso Hinani	(SH)	Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism (DEAT)
Prince Mkhonto	(PM)	DEAT
Gregory Scott	(GS)	DEAT
Tobile Bokwe	(TB)	Eskom
Leonard van der Walt	(LvdW)	Eskom
Kristy Ross	(KR)	Eskom
Ashwin West	(AW)	Ninham Shand
Louise Corbett	(LC)	Ninham Shand
Brett Lawson	(BL)	Ninham Shand

Discussion notes:

No.	Discussion
1	AW provided an overview of the Air Quality Assessment terms of reference as proposed in the Draft Scoping Report, and also provided a brief overview of the site selection process.
2	<p>GS asked whether moving the point source between the proposed candidate sites in the air quality model would make any difference to the results, since the sites were close together.</p> <p>AW noted that this was a valid question but that site A and C are quite far apart. He also noted that the public would need to be convinced that there was no difference in the air emissions between the sites, and it would therefore make sense to run separate scenarios for each site.</p>
3	<p>GS queried how much technical information and specifications would be available from Sasol for their proposed Coal to Liquids facility (CTL), as this would influence the usefulness of the air quality modelling undertaken in the power station EIA process.</p> <p>AW noted that there was some early-stage information and that this would be sufficiently useful. He also noted that Airshed had recently undertaken modelling for a CTL facility, so would have some data to parameterise the model.</p>
4	<p>GS asked if any of the specialist studies would be looking at human health. AW noted that the air quality study would consider this.</p> <p>GS asked whether this would be detailed or only high-level information. AW responded that it would be</p>

No.	Discussion
	<p>high-level information.</p> <p>GS noted that this was probably fine for the area as it was not densely populated.</p>
5	<p>PM asked if the proposed power stations would be able to comply with the proposed new air quality limits. KR noted that this should be possible with the new technology which would be used. LvdW added that the proposed limits had been given to the design engineering team and therefore the technology was designed to be within these limits.</p> <p>KR added that Eskom wanted the proposed power stations to be comfortably within the proposed limits. She also noted that Flue Gas Desulphurisation (FGD) and the less buoyant plume that this would result in would mean that any impacts would be much more localised than without FGD.</p>
6	<p>GS requested that the Matimba and Medupi power stations be included in the air quality modelling, as well as the proposed Mamabula power station located in Botswana.</p> <p>AW noted that the Matimba power station would be included in the baseline and the Medupi power station would be included in the future scenario. AW asked what size Mamabula should be modelled at. It was agreed that the proposed full capacity of the station be included, which is 2 400 MW.</p> <p>GS noted that Ninham Shand's air quality consultants, Airshed Planning Professionals, had modelled Mamabula before and hence the information could be obtained from them.</p>
7	<p>GS explained that DEAT did not want the Waterberg area to become a priority airshed area. While there was not any potential for cross boundary pollution with other provinces within South Africa there was with Botswana. He added that DEAT would not allow this area to become a deteriorating airshed simply because the coal resources were there.</p>
8	<p>AW asked if DEAT was considering other developments in the area.</p> <p>GS noted that there were other developments proposed such as Exxaro's coking plant, amongst others.</p>
9	<p>GS noted that DEAT wanted the air quality model, inputs and report peer reviewed once it had been compiled.</p> <p>LvdW questioned who would review the report. GS stated that Eskom or Ninham Shand should put forward whomever they preferred and DEAT would indicate the acceptability of the potential peer review consultants.</p>
10	<p>AW noted that later developments in the Waterberg area would have to have greater emissions controls.</p> <p>GS agreed that this was the case.</p>
11	<p>GS noted that he wanted to see carbon capture seriously considered.</p> <p>KR asked whether this only included capture. GS noted that Eskom needs to consider what to do in this area and how CO₂ could be stored once it was captured. KR and LvdW noted that Eskom was currently engaged with DEAT regarding requirements for carbon capture readiness. They queried whether the study requested could be incorporated into this forum and whether other players coming into the area could also be brought into the forum.</p> <p>GS agreed that this could be done. He noted that the next meeting was scheduled to take place soon and that this (carbon capture) should be put onto the agenda. GS noted that by the time the proposed power stations were operational South Africa was likely to have emission restrictions from the Kyoto protocol.</p>

No.	Discussion
	<p>KR agreed that this was true but that carbon capture technology would only have been demonstrated on a large scale by around 2020, so it was not yet commercially implementable.</p> <p>AW noted that Ninham Shand would not be able to say where the carbon would be stored in the Environmental Impact Report but that they would note which options were being investigated by Eskom. KR reiterated that the carbon capture study would take longer than the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process, and would therefore not be able to provide definitive answers to these questions.</p> <p>GS noted that the study could form part of the conditions of authorisation for the project.</p>
12	<p>GS queried where the towns that would potentially be impacted were located, or whether only Lephalale would be impacted.</p> <p>LvdW explained that Lephalale was unlikely to be affected as the predominant wind direction was East North East. Therefore only Steenbokpan would potentially be affected.</p>
13	<p>GS questioned what lay to the south of the sites.</p> <p>LvdW noted that there were farms to the south. KR added that there was a mountain range further south and that this could affect the transport of the plumes. LvdW noted that Sasol was planning a town in the area to support their CTL but that they would probably consider the proposed two power stations when locating this town as they knew about the project.</p>
14	<p>GS queried whether the implementation of FGD was realistic as it increased water consumption.</p> <p>LvdW noted that it was realistic and that it would be implemented. AW noted that DWAF was currently considering ways in which to bring water to the area and that this was for a number of future developments in the area, not just the proposed power stations.</p> <p>KR noted that water resources and requirements needed to be looked at strategically as water would eventually become a limiting factor and it would effectively sterilise the coal resource. GS hypothesised that coal may need to be transported in the future, to where it could be used most beneficially.</p>
15	<p>GS noted that the coal beds were close to the surface. LvdW agreed that it was and that it would be mined by open cast methods.</p> <p>GS noted that this had implications for cumulative impacts. He asked whether the coal supplier was known at this point. LvdW explained that though Eskom was moving forward with the selection of the coal supplier, the preferred supplier was not known at this point.</p> <p>GS noted that the consideration of cumulative impacts was a shortfall of EIA's in general and that consultants should try to look at these in the future and now. He continued that open cast mining produced more low level particulate pollution than a 250 m stack did and that this would be more significant than the power stations. It was a catch 22 situation.</p>
16	<p>GS wondered whether Eskom would consider transporting the coal further, such as 50 km, although he noted that at present all existing power stations were within 10 – 15 km of the supplying mines.</p> <p>LvdW stated that 30 km had been allowed for in the site determination process. This was currently seen as maximum distance over which coal could be transported reliably and efficiently by conveyor.</p> <p>GS noted this.</p>
17	<p>AW asked if GS would send DEAT's concerns in a letter or if the notes of the meeting should be used as the record of DEAT: CAPCO's comments. GS suggested that the minutes would suffice as comments from DEAT: CAPCO.</p>

No.	Discussion
18	<p>PM queried when the project would go ahead should all go according to plan.</p> <p>LvdW noted that the optimistic programme showed commissioning in 2015. He noted that the schedule was dependent on supply and demand in electricity and, in the case of Coal 4, when nuclear power is commissioned.</p>
19	<p>GS requested that the air quality specialists be creative with mitigation measures and not just consider point source mitigation. He noted that DEAT wanted to manage the area such that additional developments can be authorised.</p> <p>BL agreed that a net gain should be strived for and not a net loss.</p>

Without further discussions to be had on the project, the meeting was closed at 10:15.