

**MOSSEL BAY OCGT: EIA FOR ADDITIONAL UNITS, FINAL EIR
ANNEXURE Q: ISSUES TRAIL FROM DRAFT EIR, APRIL 2007**

No.	Individual	Organisation	Question, Issue or Concern	Reference	Action/ Response
1	Mr. Jacob Graaff	Boggomsbaai Belastingbetalersvereniging	Request to be registered as an I&AP	Email dated 20 March 2007	Registered as an I&AP.
2	Mr. Chris Swanepoel	Gemeenskapspolisieforum Mosselbaai	Request to be registered as an I&AP	Letter dated 20 March 2007	Registered as an I&AP.
3	Mr Johan du Preez	Dana Bay Residents Association (DBRA)	EIA process is seriously flawed as the State's constitutional duty to protect the environment is compromised by simultaneously filling the roles of developer, legislator, judge, jury and policeman.	Letter dated 23 April 2007	As a constitutional matter, this is beyond the scope of this EIA. Eskom would in any event comply with all relevant legislation. Eskom Holdings limited is a registered company , Government is the only shareholder. Eskom is required to comply with legislation and EIA reports are reviewed by DEAT with the same level of diligence as any other report..
4			The EIA of the initial facility should be declared invalid as the public has been misled regarding the envisaged capacity. The fact that the original installed transmission lines have enough capacity for the upgrade as well bears testament to this.		There was no purposeful misleading of the public. The need for additional generating capacity was dictated by a greater increase in demand than initially envisaged. Transmission lines are normally built to cater for redundancy, which is requirement of the National Energy Regulator.
5			The DBRA is concerned that Eskom, with assistance from the state will continue major incremental expansion on sites, which should not have been approved in the first place.		Eskom did not intentionally apply for the OCGT capacity separately as explained above. The increase in demand in 2006 was an unprecedented 4.6%. Continued growth was predicted which led to a decision that additional capacity was required. This prediction has been realised with 2007 year-to-date growth in demand of electricity at 5.4%.

No.	Individual	Organisation	Question, Issue or Concern	Reference	Action/ Response
6	Mr Johan du Preez	Dana Bay Residents Association (DBRA)	The DBRA requires assurance from Eskom that the current site and the Mosselbay Municipal area will not be used for any additional energy/electricity generating projects. This commitment should be included in DEA&DP's RoD.	Letter dated 23 April 2007	Although it is unlikely that Eskom would add additional capacity to this site in the future, Eskom is unable to predict with certainty the challenges that SA will be faced with in the longer term. However Eskom, like all other entities, is subject to the provisions of NEMA and all other associated legislation, and as such, would have to obtain authorisation for any activity embarked upon. The public and relevant authorities would then have an opportunity to assess the impacts and to make a decision on such an application.
7			The DBRA is concerned that PetroSA's 2004 emissions values used in the study to estimated cumulative impacts are inaccurate/ incorrect and are not acceptable for use in the Air Quality Assessment Model		The emissions obtained for this EIA was from an EIA carried out for PetroSA. The EIA was undertaken for a particular process. The emissions inventory is linked to this process. The process has not changed, since the activities applied for in the PetroSA EIA were only implemented in 2006. Since the process has not changed, the emission values would similarly remain unchanged.
8			PetroSA upset conditions were not considered in the air quality prediction model of the DEIR.		The PetroSA data that were considered for this study were accumulated over a period of a year. The worst case scenario for dispersion potential would have been captured. Hence the "worst case" scenario for the air quality study with respect to PetroSA would have been considered.

No.	Individual	Organisation	Question, Issue or Concern	Reference	Action/ Response
9	Mr Johan du Preez	Dana Bay Residents Association (DBRA)	The visual impacts arising from the poor location of the OCGT alongside the N2 should be mitigated through the planting of one or two rows of trees alongside the N2.	Letter dated 23 April 2007	This is indeed one of the recommended mitigatory measures in the draft EIR.
10			Due to PetroSA's inability to manage highly polluted discharges into the Blinde River it is considered important that Eskom develops a separate storm water management system.		The issue of proper co-operative environmental management has been identified as an imperative. Eskom has a process in place which will ensure that only water that is not contaminated by pollutants is released into the common dirty water system. The contaminated water from the different parts of the plant, mainly from the turbine area, collects in the dirty storm water dam. The major risk of contamination of water that Eskom faces is from oil spills (diesel, kerosene, hydraulic oil, lube oil and transformer oil). From the dirty storm water line, the water passes through a Drizit plant (separator plant) where oil and water will be separated. The separated oil is stored in tanks and then taken for recycling, and the water passes through to the clean storm water catchment. When the clean storm water dam reaches a certain level it is tested before being pumped through to the common dirty water system.

No.	Individual	Organisation	Question, Issue or Concern	Reference	Action/ Response
11	Mr Johan du Preez	Dana Bay Residents Association (DBRA)	If unbridled, heavy industrial development such as the OCGT plant, will result in the migration of tourists and residents from the area, potentially resulting in significant, negative socio-economic impacts.	Letter dated 23 April 2007	A comprehensive specialist study was completed on social aspects of the project and this negative impact was identified as a potential risk. There is no indication that this was the case with the first units built. In many cases such projects bring additional business which supports the tourism industry.
12			The DBRA believes that, contrary to the findings of the Draft IER findings, the overall negative Socio-economic impacts associated with the OCGT plant cannot be mitigated.		Opinion noted.
13			The additional impacts and risks associated with the supply of millions of liters of fuel for the extended OCGT plant should be assessed in the EIA. Without this information the EIA is incomplete.		A risk assessment was undertaken as part of the present EIA. Insofar supply is concerned, PetroSA will not increase production for the additional OCGT units but re-allocate from existing production. This has been confirmed with PetroSA.
14			The risk assessment is limited to the OCGT installation alone and has not considered the combined risk associated with the OCGT and PetroSA installations together.		As a project-level EIA, the brief did not include the PetroSA installation. PetroSA nevertheless have their own risk and environmental management systems in place and information from these should be made available.