

ENVIRONMENTAL SCOPING REPORT FOR THE PROPOSED ESTABLISHMENT OF A NEW COAL-FIRED POWER STATION IN THE LEPHALALE AREA, LIMPOPO PROVINCE

ISSUES TRAIL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ISSUE	PAGE NUMBER
Job Creation	2
Site selection	6
Land Use	9
Land Value	14
Development Planning	19
Additional Infrastructure, Services and Development associated with the Proposed Project	22
Local Economic Development	24
Safety and Security	26
Visual Impact	31
Tourism	34
Air Quality related Issues	36
Noise	49
Waste Management	52
Ground and Surface Water Related Issues	56
Fauna and Flora	92
Social Environment	75
Heritage	78
Roads and Stormwater Management	80
Power Generation	85
Fuel / Coal Requirements	91
EIA Process	93
Cumulative Impacts	103
General	104

ISSUE / COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
JOB CREATION		
I just need a job. To complain won't help. We just need your help to give us a job.	Ms M E Moloto (Local Community) (Comment Form)	At the peak of the construction phase of the project, between 2000 – 3000 people would be employed on the construction site. This will depend on the nature of construction and the type of skills required. Some contractors would be sourced from elsewhere due to the specialist tasks to be completed and due to their experience, but others will be sourced from local communities around Lephalale. Eskom will include a requirement in contracts with their contractors that a strategy is developed and implemented to employ people from the local community.
I need the work. I want to work to have something in the future. I want to have my own money to do what I want.	Miss S W Selota (Local Community) (Comment Form)	
My area is very poor with jobs because it has only one power station and one mine and it has got a lot of people. I believe that one day I will grow up and do better things in life.	Miss J M Chiloane (Local Community) (Comment Form)	
I need to work to improve my standard of living of my family. I want to work to support my family.	Mr Sello Setihare (Local Community) (Comment Form)	
I am a member of community of Marapong, so I need to work to improve my family because I am not working. I want to work with you and make my life successful. (I know housing bricking).	Mr Thapedi Moatshe (Local Community) (Comment Form)	
Work creation, fight poverty. Crime will also stop. Students from Technikons and universities will have opportunity to find jobs. Our area will have a good civilization.	Mr Z Namathe (Local Community) (Comment Form)	

ISSUE / COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>As a constructor, I feel very much interested about the proposed new Eskom coal-fired power station project (Matimba B) in the Lephalale area, Limpopo Province, because it is going to help us with many things like:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - High rate of unemployment - High rate of young people on the street with no job - House-owners without jobs - Having contracts and being underpaid or not working at all <p>This power will be to our benefit.</p>	<p>Mr. P.S. Malebana (Local Community) (Comment form for public open day)</p>	<p>At the peak of the construction phase of the project, between 2000 – 3000 people would be employed on the construction site. This will depend on the nature of construction and the type of skills required. Some contractors would be sourced from elsewhere due to the specialist tasks to be completed and due to their experience, but others will be sourced from local communities around Lephalale. Eskom will include a requirement in contracts with their contractors that a strategy is developed and implemented to employ people from the local community.</p>
<p>Giving our students and all residents opportunity to find themselves jobs and this will be fighting poverty and also our province will have civilization.</p>	<p>Mr JJ Matlou (Local Community) (Comment Form)</p>	
<p>It is anticipated that a significant number of the potential workforce would be sourced from the Mkorong area approximately 40 km from Lephalale near Marken. Movement of the workforce from the source area to Lephalale was raised as a concern.</p>	<p>Lephalale Municipality (one on one consultation - 9 June 2005)</p>	
<p>Whether the proposed project would create job opportunity for the local people and reduce our electricity bills.</p>	<p>Mr L Modimola (Dept of Education) (Comment Form)</p>	

ISSUE / COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
The interest in our area is that the proposed project will provide work and helps us find jobs.	Mr S J Molesiwa (Local Community) (Comment Form)	At the peak of the construction phase of the project, between 2000 – 3000 people would be employed on the construction site. This will depend on the nature of construction and the type of skills required. Some contractors would be sourced from elsewhere due to the specialist tasks to be completed and due to their experience, but others will be sourced from local communities around Lephalale. Eskom will include a requirement in contracts with their contractors that a strategy is developed and implemented to employ people from the local community.
My main area of interest is Building and construction, welding works, cleaning services and paved areas. Since the Lephalale has a high rate of unemployment, this project will create more jobs for Lephalale communities as well as neighbouring areas. This will reduce poverty.	Mr T.J. Matjeding (Local Community) (Comment Form)	
Building and construction, plumbing and cleaning services.	Mrs LR Majadibodu (Local Community) (Comment Form)	
I am of the opinion that the area is in desperate need of development and related job creation to lessen the ever increasing number of unemployment.	Mr. R. van Tonder (Landowner) (Individual meeting – 23 June 2005)	

ISSUE / COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
The project can help avoid unemployment.	Miss M.S Mokono (Local Community) (Comment Form)	At the peak of the construction phase of the project, between 2000 – 3000 people would be employed on the construction site. This will depend on the nature of construction and the type of skills required. Some contractors would be sourced from elsewhere due to the specialist tasks to be completed and due to their experience, but others will be sourced from local communities around Lephalale. Eskom will include a requirement in contracts with their contractors that a strategy is developed and implemented to employ people from the local community.
If the project comes to Lephalale most of us will be working at the time of the project.	Miss L.M Magoai (Local Community) (Comment Form)	
Most of us in Lephalale are unemployed. If you do the project maybe some of us will be working at that time. Please do the project in the Lephalale Area.	Miss A.M Magwai (Local Community) (Comment Form)	
Our lives in my area will be a little easier if we have electricity. Kids in my area will get jobs from the proposed project in the future.	Miss A.N Motswadira (Local Community) (Comment Form)	
Which contractors will be appointed and from where will they come from. Will Eskom consider employing and utilising local contractors and labourers as part of job creation.	Local Community Meeting – 27 June 2005	
I have the point of concern to limit the number of unemployed people and to motivate the youth to be highly skilled for the proposed project.	Miss L.R. Sekalo (Local Community) (Comment Form)	
What criteria will Eskom use to appoint workers. A concern about the percentage of unemployment affecting both learned and unlearned people in the community was raised.	Local Community Meeting Marapong – 27 June 2005	In such projects, skilled, semi-skilled and unskilled people would be employed during the construction and operation phases. This will depend on the nature of the activities and types of skills required.
How will the public know if jobs are available because not everybody has reliable contact numbers. Will the job opportunities would be advertised.	Local Community Meeting Marapong – 27 June 2005	An appropriate communication process will be developed by Eskom and the contractors to ensure that the public know where and how to apply for work or to supply their services.

ISSUE / COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>A mass meeting should be called in order to inform the community that they can start to apply for the jobs which would be made available at that time. The reason being that if the announcement can be given to certain leaders, these leaders might give employment to their favourites or might end up selling these opportunities to certain individuals. If forms are to be sent out, people should be informed of when and where to obtain these forms.</p>	<p>Local Community Meeting Marapong – 27 June 2005</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>Will training be provided to the community prior to construction. Capacity building is necessary for most of the local community.</p>	<p>Local Community Meeting Marapong – 27 June 2005</p>	<p>Skilled, semi-skilled and unskilled people would be utilised for this project. Eskom will work together with the department of labour to develop an appropriate plan to identify skills requirements and where possible build capacity. Eskom encourages in house training to all employees.</p>
<p>To take a part of the job like being a building contractor. We want to be one of the member of this project.</p>	<p>Mr MM Monama (Local Community) (Comment Form)</p>	<p>Some contractors would be sourced from elsewhere due to the specialist tasks to be completed and due to their experience, but others will be sourced from local communities around Lephalale.</p>
<p>To create job opportunities in our area, and to equip our area with numerous infrastructure. The project will market our town and Municipality. The project develops our youth with the necessary life skills and a better future.</p>	<p>Mr MS Mabula (Local Community) (Comment form)</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>The job creation opportunities created by such a project would have a positive impact, although the damage to the environment is irreplaceable.</p>	<p>Mr. T. Nel (Landowner) (Individual meeting – 22 June 05)</p>	<p>All positive and negative impacts are evaluated during the environmental impact assessment. Recommendations are made by independent consultants which will minimize the negative impacts and maximize the positive impacts. Eskom will be required to implement these recommendations during construction, operating and in the future during decommissioning.</p>

ISSUE / COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
SITE SELECTION		
In terms of management and logistics, it is perceived that this would be easier if the new and existing power stations were in close proximity to one another.	Mr A Bosman, Mr W O'Brien, Mr A Crous (one on one consultation - 21 June 2005)	Suggestions are noted. The criteria taken into consideration during Eskom's environmental screening processes included land issues, bio-diversity issues, water, air quality, and other important bio-diversity aspects. Through this screening process the four sites considered for the proposed new power station were put forward for investigation. The Environmental Scoping Process nominates a preferred site for development, and that site will be looked at in more detail through the EIA. . The Environmental Scoping Report also evaluates a number of aspects/issues including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water resources • Vegetation and Fauna • Agricultural potential, soils and geology • Air Quality • Land Use • Visual impacts • Tourism • Archaeology • Traffic • Noise • Social Issues
Would prefer if the power station and associated waste (ash) would be developed in close proximity to the existing power station.	Mr. S. Grobler (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 23 June 05)	
If Zongesien is the most preferred property for the ashing facility, it should be on the southern section of the property. The northern section cannot be used, as there are power lines on that section of the property. Another section is being used for the water care works.	Mr. M.F. Loots (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 21 June 05)	
If the power station would be placed on Eenzaamheid or Naauwontkomen it would again have a negative impact on the property owners to the south of these sites.	Mr. M.F. Loots (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 21 June 05)	
The construction of the proposed power station on the farm Appelvlakte would most probably not have a negative impact on the landowner's property.	Mr. M.F. Loots (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 21 June 05)	
Why were Hanglip, Peerboom and Eendracht not assessed as possible sites for the proposed power station? There are already numerous problems in that area with animal theft and trespassing on private properties. These properties are also situated next to the existing development.	Mr. C. Gouws (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 25 June 05)	

ISSUE / COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>What environmental selection criteria were used and taken into consideration when the screening process was undertaken.</p>	<p>Ms Carla Hudson (WESSA) (Key Stakeholders Workshop - 27 June 2005)</p>	<p>The criteria taken into consideration during Eskom's environmental screening processes included land issues, bio-diversity issues, water, air quality, and other important bio-diversity aspects Through this screening process the four sites considered for the proposed new power station were put forward for investigation. The Environmental Scoping Process nominates a preferred site for development, and that site will be looked at in more detail through the EIA. . The Environmental Scoping Report also evaluates a number of aspects/issues including:</p>
<p>Are the four sites indicated, the sites selected for the development.</p>	<p>Simon Thobani (Lephalale Municipality: Protection Services) (Local Municipality Meeting - 28 June 2005)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water resources • Vegetation and Fauna • Agricultural potential, soils and geology • Air Quality • Land Use • Visual impacts • Tourism • Archaeology • Traffic • Noise • Social Issues

ISSUE / COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>The site selection should take the impact on the mining activities into account. It should have the least impact on Kumba Resources planned activities. From a technical point of view both the southern and northern sites would be possible, although the southern sites would make ashing back into the pit more complicated due to the position of the mine's plant. The cost implications of the additional length of conveyor belt required should also be considered. At this stage, any site preference from Kumba's perspective would relate to the technology used that the power station - that is pulverised fuel (PF) technology versus fluidised bed combustion (FBC) technology.</p>	<p>Jan Oberholzer (Kumba Resources: Project Manager Matimba Expansion Study) (Focus Group meeting - Kumba Resources - 5 August 2005)</p>	<p>Comment noted. Issues pertaining to mining activities were evaluated in the chapter dealing within the Environmental Scoping Report dealing with Land Use issues. Kumba Resources is seen as the key source of coal for the power station and it is seen as preferable that coal is not transported over long distances.</p>

ISSUE / COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
LAND USE		
<p>Anglo Coal has interests in coal and coal bed methane deposits in the area and is actively evaluating their commercial value.</p>	<p>Mr Ian Hall (Anglo Coal) (email registration – 20 June 2005)</p>	<p>Comments noted. Issues pertaining to land use were evaluated within the Environmental Scoping Report and considered in the evaluation of sites in order to nominate a preferred site for detailed study in the EIA phase.</p> <p>Interested and affected parties will be engaged throughout the EIA process to ensure that all aspects are considered and included into the Environmental Impact Assessment Report.</p>
<p>We are the holders of a prospecting permit for gas on numerous farms in the area, including on the farms Droogeheuwel 447LQ, Zongezien 467LQ, Appelvlakte 448LQ & Nelsonkop 464LQ, which are amongst the proposed sites for the power station and ancillary infrastructure. These farms form part of our pending application for conversion to an exploration right in terms of the MPRD Act.</p>	<p>Mr Ian Hall (Anglo Coal) (Comment Form)</p>	
<p>We are currently engaged in the pilot operation of a Coal Bed Methane production trial as well as ongoing exploration and drilling activities for gas in the area. We also hold prospecting permits for coal on several farms in the area, which we intend to commercialize in the future. We therefore have a commercial, environmental and general interest in all developments with potential impact on our projects.</p>	<p>Mr Ian Hall (Anglo Coal) (Comment Form)</p>	
<p>The impact of the power station's proposed development on future exploitation of Coal Bed Methane on the same site needs to be clarified.</p>	<p>Mr Ian Hall (Anglo Coal) (Comment Form)</p>	
<p>We wish to ensure that our potential future projects are not negatively affected by the power station development. We therefore wish to remain well informed of all activities.</p>	<p>Mr Ian Hall (Anglo Coal) (Comment Form)</p>	

ISSUE / COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
Sasol has coal interests in the Waterberg Coalfield.	Mr W.E. Archer (Sasol Mining) (Comment Form)	Comment noted. Issues pertaining to land use were evaluated within the Environmental Scoping Report and considered in the evaluation of sites in order to nominate a preferred site for detailed study in the EIA phase.
The proposed power station on the farm Nelsonskop would be a suitable option for the Municipality, as the southern part of the farm Zongesien and the farm Peerboom (up to the boundary with the farm Eendracht) forms part of the planning for future township development.	Mr D de Ridder, Mr A Bower, Mr E Badenhorst, Ms C Cocquyt (Lephalale Municipality) (one on one consultation - 9 June 2005)	Issues pertaining to land use and social impacts have been evaluated in the chapters within the Environmental Scoping Report dealing with land-use and social issues. These issues were also considered in the evaluation of sites in order to nominate a preferred site for detailed study in the EIA phase.
Peerboom and Zongesien are leased out with two sub-leases for the different properties. The lease contracts end at the end of October 2005. An individual resides on the farm Zongesien and farms cattle. There is not a significant number of game on the farm due to poaching. An individual farms with cattle on the farm Peerboom, but does not reside on the property	Mr A Bosman, Mr W O'Brien, Mr A Crous (one on one consultation - 21 June 2005)	
Marapong is larger than indicated on the map provided as a result of the new RDP housing schemes which have been implemented.	Mr D de Ridder (Lephalale Municipality) (one on one consultation - 9 June 2005)	

ISSUE / COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
I am developing my property (chalets, a function hall and caravan park). Some of the construction work has been completed and municipal water and electricity have already been installed.	Mr. M.F. Loots (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 21 June 2005)	Issues pertaining to land use and social impacts have been evaluated in the chapters within the Environmental Scoping Report dealing with land-use and social issues. These issues were also considered in the evaluation of sites in order to nominate a preferred site for detailed study in the EIA phase. Comments noted your concerns will be considered during the EIA.
Was the property owner of the farms Zongesien and Peerboom. These developments and the associated social problems forced him to move to his existing farm. The development is again creeping nearer to him.	Mr. T. Nel (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 22 June 2005)	
Property would be in the middle of all the various developments and it would be beneficial to have the property bought out. If I am surrounded by all the developments I will not be able to continue with my hunting activities.	Mr. H. Pieterse (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 22 June 05)	
Concerned that the proposed development would force property owners out of the area, as there would no longer be a buffer between the private property owners and the developments.	Mr. J. van Rooyen (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 21 June 05)	
The landowner accepts the fact that development is necessary, but development could have negative impacts on the individual landowners in the area.	Mr. R. van Tonder (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 23 June 05)	

ISSUE / COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>There are discussions regarding the inclusion of the farm Peerboom into the town planning scheme, and the extension of Marapong township in this direction. Was this extension considered in terms of the dominant wind direction and the proposed new substation.</p>	<p>Gerhard Engelbrecht (Department of Agriculture) (Provincial Authorities Meeting: 28 June 2005)</p>	<p>The eastern side of the existing power station is not considered desirable due to the potential for heat to be generated by the new station, and the possible effects this could have on the existing station, should the new station be down-wind of Matimba A. The cumulative air quality assessments considered Peerboom, and these studies contributed to the initial selection of sites for Matimba B. The dominant wind direction blows approximately 60% of the time from the direction of Marapong.</p>
<p>There is an area available between the existing power station and the farm Turfvlakte that will be used for industrial development. This area could be enlarged. The location of a new power station should thus take that into account.</p>	<p>Mr. S. van Wyk (Lephalale Municipality: Divisional Head: Water) (Individual meeting - 10 June 2005)</p>	<p>The area required for the Power Station and terrace area is approximately 700 ha and approximately 500 - 1000 ha for ashing facilities. Eskom proposed sites considered feasible for investigation in the Environmental Scoping and Impact Assessments.</p>
<p>The landowners would like to know where the construction workers would be accommodated.</p>	<p>Mr. P. van Rooyen and Mr. P. Nel (Landowners) (Meeting - 22 June 2005)</p>	<p>Eskom will as far as possible accommodate employees and contractors in the existing urban areas where feasible. The Social Impact Assessment (SIA) will provide recommendations on an approach which will limit negative impacts on the local community.</p>
<p>No preference with regards to the sites proposed for the construction of the power station.</p>	<p>Mr. P. van Rooyen and Mr. P. Nel (Landowners) (Meeting - 22 June 2005)</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

ISSUE / COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
Would not want the power station and the ash dump near the border of his farm.	Mr. J. van Rooyen (Landowner: Kalkfontein) (Individual meeting - 21 June 05)	Comment noted.
Are the properties identified for possible development are state-owned or privately-owned properties.	Tsakani Khosa (Department of Land Affairs) (Provincial Authorities Meeting: 28 June 2005)	Three properties are owned by Kumba Resources, one by Eskom Holdings, and the remainder are privately-owned. None of the properties are state-owned.
Will Eskom purchase the entire farm, considering the proposed footprint of such a plant.	Gerhard Engelbrecht (Department of Agriculture) (Provincial Authorities Meeting: 28 June 2005)	Eskom would consider the purchase of an entire farm. The properties under consideration are approximately 1000 ha each, and that the area required for the power station is approximately 700 ha. The development would therefore fit comfortably on a farm.
If the farm/land is zoned for agricultural use, a change in land use would be required to be applied for in terms of legislation. This area would not wish to lose high potential agricultural land for non-agricultural use. Should any subdivision take place, the remaining extent would be required to remain viable. In this area, between 700 – 800 ha is considered a viable portion.	Gerhard Engelbrecht (Department of Agriculture) (Provincial Authorities Meeting: 28 June 2005)	A change of land use (item 2) has been applied for in terms of Regulations R1182 to R1184 of the Environment Conservation Act (No 73 of 1989). Eskom currently lease out portions of their land which are not utilised. ,
The properties in your fax dated 14 June 2005 are privately owned and we as the Department of Land Affairs are not involved. Kindly note that Kromdraai 513 LQ does not exist. 513 LQ is the farm Kaffirsdraai of which the Remainder is consolidated in Kromdraai 690 LQ and Portion 1 is consolidated in Eenzaamheid 687 LQ.	Sarie van der Poll (Department of Land Affairs) (Fax dated 20 June 2005)	Comment noted.

ISSUE / COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
LAND VALUE		
<p>I am a lawyer in Lephalale and I specialise in the game industry. 95% of my income is earned through the commission received during the sale of game farms. My clients are mostly absent Landowners who live on the Rand or overseas. Numerically these are not a lot but they are the economic heavyweights of the country and I therefore suggest that you strongly consider these people's viewpoints. I do not represent any organisation but my views are parallel to those of my clients.</p> <p>A power station such as Matimba is a seriously un-aesthetic structure and any affected estate's market value would be negatively influenced. It is not exaggerating to compare it to an atom bomb. The negative factors include, visual impact, noise, odour and population pressure.</p>	<p>Mr P Erasmus (Lawyer) (email letter – 29 June 05)</p>	<p>Comment noted. These issues will be considered during the EIA.</p> <p>A preferred site for the proposed power station has been recommended within the Scoping Report. This site will be assessed in more detail within the Environmental Impact Assessment.</p> <p>Depending on the outcome of the decision from the National Department of Environmental Affairs, a process will be initiated through which the preferred landowner is engaged and fairly compensated for the land.</p>
<p>The benefit of the farm is that it is situated in close proximity to the town, although you are in the Bushveld when on the farm. This factor makes the property more sought after than farms far away from town. The prices of farms nearer to the town are definitely higher than those further away.</p>	<p>Mr. C. Gouws (Landowner) (Individual meeting – 25 June 05)</p>	
<p>The property values would definitely decrease as a result of the power station.</p>	<p>Mr. G. Erasmus and Mr. H. Steenkamp (Landowners) (Meeting – 21 June 05)</p>	

ISSUE / COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
Developments next to or in the vicinity of game farms result in the decrease of the property value (as a game farm).	Mr. J. van Rooyen (Landowner) (Comment sheet - 14 July 05)	Comment noted. These issues will be considered during the EIA.
Property values will decrease.	Dr Andre Moolman (Landowner) (Comment Form)	A preferred site for the proposed power station has been recommended within the Scoping Report. This site will be assessed in more detail within the Environmental Impact Assessment.
Property values: I have had someone wanting to buy my farm for about 8 - 9 months now. He has been pestering me about it, however I kept saying no because I wanted to stay on my farm. Recently, however, I spoke with this person again but he withdrew his offer to purchase because of the power station	Mr Steyn (lanowner - Kromdraai) (telephonic conversation - 16 August 2005)	Depending on the outcome of the decision from the National Department of Environmental Affairs, a process will be initiated through which the preferred landowner is engaged and fairly compensated for the land.
The landowner's property has a variety of habitats, which makes the property more valuable. The natural dam has many positive impacts, as the development is concentrated around this. The stream supplies the dam, which has a weir that can be opened during heavy rains. The fact that there are no power lines on the property ensures that the area lends itself to many activities.	Mr. M.F. Loots (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 21 June 2005)	
The property value would definitely decrease if the power station is built on the farms Appelvlakte or Nelsonskop.	Mr. J. van Rooyen (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 21 June 05)	

ISSUE / COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>The landowner has owned the property for twenty years and it should therefore function as his pension. This will now be prejudiced should a power station be constructed near his property. The property value would decrease immediately, which would have severe negative impacts on the landowner.</p>	<p>Mr. R. van Tonder (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 23 June 05)</p>	<p>Comment noted. These issues will be considered during the EIA.</p>
<p>I am an attorney specialising in the game industry. The construction of a second power station in the area would have negative impacts on property prices in the area. It would be ideal to construct such a power station in already degraded areas e.g. Gauteng and transport the coal from the source, although I understand that this would not be viable. I plead with you that the impact should be kept to a minimum and that the second power station be erected as near as possible to the first Matimba Power Station. Any additional infrastructure such as transmission lines should also be erected next to existing infrastructure to limit any possible negative impacts associated with these.</p>	<p>Mr Tjaka Erasmus (Public Meeting - 28 June 2005)</p>	<p>A preferred site for the proposed power station has been recommended within the Scoping Report. This site will be assessed in more detail within the Environmental Impact Assessment.</p>
<p>Decrease of my farm's value bordering on the existing Power Station.</p>	<p>Mr Koot Thuynsma (Landowner) (Comment Form)</p>	<p>Depending on the outcome of the decision from the National Department of Environmental Affairs, a process will be initiated through which the preferred landowner is engaged and fairly compensated for the land.</p>

ISSUE / COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>The property value would be worthless if the power station is constructed on Appelvlakte or Nelsonskop. Eskom would then have to buy the property and the landowner is concerned about replacing the property. The family inherited the property eight years ago. The land was thus owned by the family prior to the construction of the existing Matimba power station. Eskom would have to buy the property to create a buffer between the privately owned land and the proposed power station. At the moment, the properties of Kumba Resources form a buffer between the privately owned land and the power station.</p>	<p>Mr. C. Gouws (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 25 June 2005)</p>	<p>Comment noted. These issues will be considered during the EIA.</p> <p>A preferred site for the proposed power station has been recommended within the Scoping Report. This site will be assessed in more detail within the Environmental Impact Assessment.</p> <p>Depending on the outcome of the decision from the National Department of Environmental Affairs, a process will be initiated through which the preferred landowner is engaged and fairly compensated for the land.</p>
<p>I accept the fact that development is necessary, but development could have negative impacts on the individual landowners in the area. It would have a definite negative impact on the property values.</p>	<p>Mr. S. Grobler (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 23 June 2005)</p>	
<p>The construction of a proposed power station on the farm Eenzaamheid or Naauwontkomen would negatively impact on my property values. I run a game farm and I will not be able to sell the farm if it is situated next to a power station, as the aesthetic value would be severely negatively impacted. Will the EIA consider this issue?</p>	<p>Mr Hendric Hills (Landowner - farms Vergulde Helm and Buffelsjagt) (Public Meeting - 28 June 2005)</p>	<p>The land use and social impact studies considered adjacent land uses and were also considered in the evaluation of sites in order to nominate a preferred site for detailed study in the EIA phase. From an economics perspective, Eskom would rely on the studies to determine the impact on market related prices and rely on recommendations from these studies to determine the severity of that type of impact.</p>

ISSUE / COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>I am opposed to the proposed development on my property, or on an adjacent farm, as I believe that it will be negative for my property and business. I would need to sell the farm to Eskom (as no one else would be interested in purchasing it) and move elsewhere, which would be highly inconvenient. It would take approximately five years to settle on another property and establish what I have on Droogeheuvel. I will not be able to continue to use the farm for my business should the proposed power station be erected on the farms Appelvlakte or Nelsonskop.</p>	<p>Mr A Malherbe (Landowner) (one-on-one consultation – 10 June 2005)</p>	<p>Issues pertaining to land use and social impacts have been evaluated in the chapters within the Environmental Scoping Report dealing with land-use and social issues. These issues were also considered in the evaluation of sites in order to nominate a preferred site for detailed study in the EIA phase.</p>
<p>I wish to express my concern about the effect and the adverse implications that the above-mentioned proposed development will have on my mother and father, Mr. & Mrs. L.F. Steyn of the Farm Kromdraai should this development be constructed on the farms Naauw Ontkomen and Eenzaamheid. The proposed development would certainly have a negative effect on the property value and intrinsic value of my parents' property.</p>	<p>Mr. L.I. Steyn (Family of landowner) (Comment received 24 October 2005)</p>	<p>Comment noted. Eskom will negotiate with the relevant property owners.</p>

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
DEVELOPMENT PLANNING		
<p>The Lephalale Municipality would prefer "compact" development in one area to avoid the need for additional roads and infrastructure to be developed into a "new" area, and to ease the management of such a compact area.</p>	<p>Mr D de Ridder, Mr A Bower, Mr E Badenhorst, Ms C Cocquyt (Lephalale Municipality) (one on one consultation - 9 June 2005)</p>	<p>Issues pertaining to the future use of land and the provision of services within the Lephalale Municipality have been evaluated in the Chapter within the Environmental Scoping Report dealing with Land use issues. These issues were also considered in the evaluation of sites in order to nominate a preferred site for detailed study in the EIA phase.</p>
<p>The IDP planning process would have to be adapted to accommodate the challenges that would be created for the municipality through the construction of a second power station.</p>	<p>Mr D de Ridder, Mr A Bower, Mr E Badenhorst, Ms C Cocquyt (Lephalale Municipality) (one on one consultation - 9 June 2005)</p>	<p>Further the social impacts referred to will be assessed in the EIA.</p>
<p>It is expected that the proposed development would have a severe impact on the provision of services e.g. housing, health care facilities, schools etc. It could also create numerous social problems.</p>	<p>Mr D de Ridder, Mr A Bower, Mr E Badenhorst, Ms C Cocquyt (Lephalale Municipality) (one on one consultation - 9 June 2005)</p>	

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>Representatives of the Lephalale Municipality foresee significant problems in terms of the requirement for increased provision of services. They would, for example have to provide additional housing in a short period of time without obtaining an income from that for several years. The Municipality would have to provide "bridging finance" which in turn could create a huge financial burden on the Municipality.</p>	<p>Mr D de Ridder, Mr A Bower, Mr E Badenhorst, Ms C Cocquyt (Lephalale Municipality) (one on one consultation - 9 June 2005)</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>What does Eskom's detailed planning entail. When do they plan to start the construction of the power station and when will the construction period be completed.</p>	<p>Mr. C. Gouws (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 25 June 05)</p>	<p>The overall project will be undertaken in two phases. If a positive ROD is obtained, it is expected that construction on phase one could begin in 2007 and be completed by 2010. The second phase is likely to overlap with this and finish after 2010.</p>
<p>The major role players in the area, namely Eskom and Kumba Resources are not transparent in terms of their future planning for the area.</p>	<p>Mr. G. Erasmus and Mr. H. Steenkamp (Landowners) (Meeting - 21 June 05)</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>Future mining activities will be to the west and towards the farm Turfvlakte (south of existing pit). Assessments will need to consider Kumba's mining activities on this property when determining the location of the new conveyor belt.</p>	<p>Jan Oberholzer (Kumba Resources: Project manager Matimba Expansion Study) (Focus Group Meeting - Kumba Resources - 5 August 2005)</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
Kumba Resources' EIA process for the extension of the operations at Grootegeluk is still in the planning phase.	Charl Nolte (Kumba Resources: Manager Strategy & Planning: Environmental Management) (Focus Group Meeting - Kumba Resources - 5 August 2005)	Comment noted.

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
ADDITIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE, SERVICES AND DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATED WITH PROPOSED PROJECT		
The farm Kuipersbult has 5 power lines traversing the property.	Mr. J.J. Thuynsma (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 09 June 05)	Transmission lines out of the Power Station would be required to be considered to integrate the new power station into the national electricity grid. The construction of new power lines would require a separate EIA process. The Corridor alignment would depend on the site selected as well as those alternatives identified through an EIA process for the lines themselves.
What about the new power lines, over whose land will they go?	Mr Hennie Hills (Farmer) (Open Day)	
Additional power lines are a source of concern.	Mr. R. van Tonder (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 23 June 05)	
There is a power line on a section of the farm Schrikvoorby. This section of the property can therefore not be used as game capturing helicopters cannot fly near the power line.	Dr. A. Moolman (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 21 July 05)	
An existing power line on property. If additional power needs to be transmitted to the north, another power line on the property would again result in negative impacts.	Mr. C. Gouws (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 25 June 05)	
Concerned about the future electricity network such as additional power lines, which could impact on his property.	Mr. H. Pieterse (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 22 June 05)	

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
The provision of adequate housing facilities during the construction and operational phase of the project would be problematic. The influx of people to the area also creates numerous social problems. Township development due to the influx of people to the area can have a negative impact on the farm Eendracht. This is a source of concern.	Mr. J.J. Lambrecht (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 21 June 05)	Comment noted. Issues pertaining to social impacts due to the influx of people as well as the provision of additional housing have been evaluated in the Social impact assessment during scoping and will be further evaluated in the EIA. Eskom will work together with local business and authorities to facilitate an appropriate process for the provision of housing.
The provision of adequate housing facilities during the construction and operational phase of the project is a source of concern. It must be formal housing facilities.	Mr. J. van Rooyen (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 21 June 05)	
Experiences problems with the mine activities, which would be worsened if the mine extends its activities due to the development of another power station.	Mr. H. Hills (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 22 June 05)	Comment noted. The extension of mining activities would require a separate EIA. This is required by the Minerals and Petroleum Resources Development Act, which regulates mining operations.
Concerned about the possible development of various smaller coal mines in the area to provide coal to the new power station.	Mr. R. van Tonder (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 23 June 05)	

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
LOCAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT		
<p>I had done some previous studies on the environment in the area and know some relatives who operate their business in the area. I am interested in development which enhances the economy. The development will enhance the social and economic status of Lephalale but it is crucial that the area is protected and well managed when the new power station is developed.</p>	<p>Mr Takalani Radali (Transwerk) (Comment Form)</p>	<p>Comment noted. A macro-economic study has been commissioned by Eskom to assess the socio-economic issues referred to. Further the EIA will provide recommendations which Eskom will be required to implement to ensure responsible environmental management.</p>
<p>We hope this project will heighten or benefit the economy of our province.</p>	<p>Benny Boshielo (Limpopo Tourism & Parks) (email letter - 27 June 05)</p>	
<p>To be a successful contractor and to supply competitive equipment which include supervisory service, environment equipment etc.</p>	<p>Mr Sotaro Okada (Hitachi) (Comment Form)</p>	<p>At the peak of the construction phase of the project, between 2000 – 3000 people would be employed on the construction site. This will depend on the nature of construction and the type of skills required. Some contractors would be sourced from elsewhere due to the specialist tasks to be completed and due to their experience, but others will be sourced from local communities around Lephalale. Eskom will include a requirement in contracts with their contractors that a strategy is developed and implemented to employ people from the local community.</p>
<p>In support of the proposed project due to the possibility of job creation and development of the area. The high unemployment figures in the area could be lessened by the proposed development. The development of the power station and the associated development would economically benefit the town.</p>	<p>Mr. M. Erasmus (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 22 June 05)</p>	
<p>The area needs the proposed development and employment creation.</p>	<p>Mr. E. Badenhorst (Lephalale Municipality) (Comment sheet - 29 July 05)</p>	

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>Aware of the negative impacts associated with a project of this nature, but is of the opinion that the positive impacts overshadow the negatives.</p>	<p>Mr. M. Erasmus (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 22 June 05)</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>During the construction period, the contractors could possibly make use of the landowner's accommodation facilities.</p>	<p>Mr. M.F. Loots (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 21 June 05)</p>	<p>Comment noted. Eskom usually try to not to establish a construction camp as they usually try to accommodate workers in existing accommodation facilities and aims to minimize any negative impacts associated with the construction phase on the community.</p>
<p>Environmental legislation is far more advanced today than it was before. Problems should be taken up with the local regulators, as the law was tighter than before and they will be required to take action in terms of the legislation. What is the local government doing to ensure that the necessary infrastructure associated with such a big investment was in place. There will be specific challenges as the local role players have learned from experience with the existing Matimba Power Station. The Lephalale Development Forum has been established and is mandated by provincial government. This forum consisted of the mining and industry section, organised business, farmers unions, tourism and representatives in the agricultural field. This body would co-ordinate between all these role players with regards to this development.</p>	<p>Mr Moses Moloantoa (Public Meeting - 28 June 2005)</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
SAFETY AND SECURITY		
Safety and Security, Disaster Management and Fire fighting services.	Mr Lesibana Thobane (Lephalale Municipality) (Comment Form)	The Environmental Management Plan (EMP) linked to the proposed project will cover aspects such as safety and security, disaster management and fire fighting at the proposed power station.
Safety and security is a source of concern. These impacts must be minimised.	Dr. W.H.S. Barnard (Landowner) (Comment sheet - 25 June 05)	Issues pertaining to safety and security have been evaluated in the chapter within the Environmental Scoping Report dealing with social issues and will be further evaluated during the EIA. Recommendations for minimizing the impact will be proposed by the independent consultants. I&APs will have an opportunity and are encouraged to put forward suggestions.
The existing negative impacts experienced in terms of safety and security would worsen during the construction period of the power station.	Mr. M.F. Loots (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 21 June 05)	
The increase in crime due to an increase in the population is a source of concern.	Dr. W.H.S. Barnard (Landowner) (Comment sheet - 25 June 05)	
Vagrants (rondloop mense) and theft.	Mr Hennie Hills (Farmer) (Comment Form)	
Theft and security.	Dr Andre Moolman (Landowner) (Comment Form)	
Poaching and theft are rampant with Marapong close by.	Mr Hannes Lamprecht (Farm Eendracht) (Comment Form)	
We have unending trouble with poaching and theft.	Mr Poem Lamprecht (landowner) (Comment Form)	

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
Game poaching could be attributed to the high unemployment rate in Marapong and squatters settling in the area.	Mr A Bosman, Mr W O'Brien, Mr A Crous (one on one consultation - 21 June 2005)	Issues pertaining to safety and security have been evaluated in the chapter within the Environmental Scoping Report dealing with social issues and will be further evaluated during the EIA. Recommendations for minimizing the impact will be proposed by the independent consultants. I&APs will have an opportunity and are encouraged to put forward suggestions.
Theft of wood from Zongesien and Peerboom farm also frequently takes place.	Mr A Bosman, Mr W O'Brien, Mr A Crous (one on one consultation - 21 June 2005)	
Theft, cutting of fences and poaching of game (snares) would increase if there is an influx of more people to the area.	Mr. C. Gouws (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 25 June 05)	
Many social problems such as theft, littering, cutting of trees, wood theft and so forth are associated with the development of a new township. This is a source of concern especially if this would be developed adjacent your property (e.g. if the power station would be built on the farm Eenzaamheid). He is of the opinion that such a development should be nearer to Onverwacht or Marapong.	Mr. H. Hills (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 22 June 05)	

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>Experiences numerous problems with animal theft and the setting of snares. He has lost various cattle due to this, which place a financial burden on his farming activities. He is of the opinion that these types of misconduct would increase if more people come to the area due to the development of the power station. The cruelty of these acts is appalling and unpleasant.</p>	<p>Mr. L. Steyn (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 10 June 05)</p>	<p>Issues pertaining to safety and security have been evaluated in the chapter within the Environmental Scoping Report dealing with social issues and will be further evaluated during the EIA. Recommendations for minimizing the impact will be proposed by the independent consultants. I&APs will have an opportunity and are encouraged to put forward suggestions.</p>
<p>The electrified fence erected around his property is of no value, as it does not keep people from entering the property. The landowner also does not farm with cattle anymore as he lost too many animals that ate plastic blown over from the adjacent municipal landfill site.</p>	<p>Mr. J.J. Lambrecht (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 21 June 05)</p>	
<p>The landowner already experiences problems with people illegally hunting with their dogs on his property. Various snares are also found. When the illegal hunters drive the game into a corner, they break the fences, which must be repaired at the cost of the landowner.</p>	<p>Mr. M.F. Loots (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 21 June 05)</p>	
<p>There are already problems with the setting of snares, poaching of game and wood theft. These problems would be worsened if there are more "disadvantaged" people in the area.</p>	<p>Dr. A. Moolman (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 21 July 05)</p>	
<p>Experiences problems with animal theft, trespassing of his property and setting of snares. There is an inability of Eskom to ensure that the trespassers do not access properties without the consent of the landowner. Most of these trespassers enter the property via Eskom's properties. This problem would just worsen.</p>	<p>Mr. H. Pieterse (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 22 June 05)</p>	

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
Experience problems with theft of game and livestock and it could be due to the fact that the property is near the residential areas.	Mr. P. van Rooyen and Mr. P. Nel (Landowners) (Meeting – 22 June 05)	Issues pertaining to safety and security have been evaluated in the chapter within the Environmental Scoping Report dealing with social issues and will be further evaluated during the EIA. Recommendations for minimizing the impact will be proposed by the independent consultants. I&APs will have an opportunity and are encouraged to put forward suggestions.
Experience problems with theft and suspect that it could be attributed to the illegal immigrants from neighbouring countries living in the area. The thieves operate during working hours, slaughter the animals and sell the meat to those coming from work after hours. The landowner does not farm with sheep due to this misconduct.	Mr. J. van Rooyen (Landowner) (Individual meeting – 21 June 05)	
In terms of agricultural practices there is no co-operation from construction or permanent workers employed by Eskom. Previously the landowner experienced trespassing onto his property, the setting of snares, animal and game theft, poaching, arson and wood theft. The flora was eradicated due to the chopping of trees. A viable farming practice is therefore not possible in such circumstances. The cruelty to the animals is totally unacceptable. There is no control of people entering private properties and the negative impacts associated with the influx of people to the area is a source of concern. The Municipality, Eskom and/or Kumba Resources cannot control the movement of these people. These problems would again be experienced by the property owners adjacent to the proposed power station.	Mr. T. Nel (Landowner) (Individual meeting – 22 June 05)	
The possible increase in crime is a source of concern, especially if the development is nearer to his property.	Mr. S. Grobler (Landowner) (Individual meeting – 23 June 05)	

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
Experiences various problems with unauthorized entry onto his property, as well as the setting of snares and hunting with dogs. He has reported these incidences to the police, and even wrote to the minister, but nothing is being done to address these problems. An influx of people to the area would worsen the situation.	Mr. J.J. Lamprecht (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 21 June 05)	Issues pertaining to safety and security have been evaluated in the chapter within the Environmental Scoping Report dealing with social issues and will be further evaluated during the EIA. Recommendations for minimizing the impact will be proposed by the independent consultants. I&APs will have an opportunity and are encouraged to put forward suggestions.
I would like confirmation and feedback regarding neighbouring Marapong, specifically with regards to poaching, hunting with dogs and the setting of snares. I submitted complaints to the police and the municipality two years ago, but I have not received any feedback. I have also met the station commander. Your assistance is greatly appreciated. (Translated from Afrikaans)	Mr. J.J. Lamprecht (Landowner) (Comment received on 20/10/2005)	
Hunting next to a power station could be problematic as stray bullets could be a risk for the workers.	Mr. M.F. Loots (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 21 June 05)	
The movement of construction workers create various problems. Electrified fences do not keep trespassers from entering the property. The landowner has also found children setting fire to the veld on his property.	Mr. M.F. Loots (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 21 June 05)	

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>I wish to express my concern about the effect and the adverse implications that the above-mentioned proposed development will have on my mother and father, Mr. & Mrs. L.F. Steyn of the Farm Kromdraai should this development be constructed on the farms NaauwOntkomen and Eenzaamheid. We are concerned about the safety of my parents and their increased exposure to falling victim to attacks and crime as a result of the construction and operation activities immediately next door to them. My father's game and cattle will also be extremely exposed to poachers and thieves.</p>	<p>Mr. L.I. Steyn (Family of landowner) (Comment received on 24/10/2005)</p>	<p>Comment noted. The Social Impact Assessment will address issues around safety and security, and make recommendations in this regard.</p>
<p>Developments create accommodation problems and result in illegal squatting, which in turn destabilises the area (theft, murder etc.). Farmers adjacent the existing power station already have escalating problems and these could result in farming activities being stopped all together.</p>	<p>Mr. J. van Rooyen (Landowner) (Comment sheet - 14 July 05)</p>	

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
VISUAL IMPACT		
<p>Unsightly: The power station itself and the power lines are ugly and unsightly. The market value of any farm from where the power station can be seen is negatively impacted. This can be up to 40 km and more from Matimba A. The closer the farm is to the power station the bigger the negative impact is. The market value is lowered due to the fact that you have to drive past such an ugly structure on the way to the farm e.g. farms on the gravel road past Matimba A.</p>	<p>Mr P Erasmus (Lawyer) (email letter – 29 June 05)</p>	<p>Comment noted. Issues pertaining to visual impacts and related social aspects were evaluated during the scoping phase and will be evaluated further during the EIA. These issues were also considered in the evaluation of sites in order to nominate a preferred site for detailed study in the EIA phase. Recommendations will be proposed in the EIA to minimise the negative visual impact.</p>
<p>The visual impact of the power station would have a negative impact on the landowner's property.</p>	<p>Mr. C. Gouws (Landowner) (Individual meeting – 25 June 05)</p>	
<p>The existing power station has a visual impact on the area. Foreign hunters visiting your property have negative comments regarding this aspect considering it impacts on their "Africa" / Hunting experience.</p>	<p>Dr. A. Moolman (Landowner) (Individual meeting – 21 July 05)</p>	
<p>The landowner would be able to see the ash dump if it would be developed on the farm Zongesien.</p>	<p>Mr. J. van Rooyen (Landowner) (Individual meeting – 21 June 05)</p>	

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>The negative visual impacts of a power station are widely felt. Each farm where the power station is visible experiences a decrease in the property value. The property value of farms between 30 – 40 km from the power station have also decreased based on the fact that guests have to travel past the power station to access these farms. The impacts must be seen on a broader scale.</p>	<p>Mr Tjaka Erasmus (Public Meeting – 28 June 2005)</p>	<p>Comment noted. Issues pertaining to visual impacts and related social aspects were evaluated during the scoping phase and will be evaluated further during the EIA. These issues were also considered in the evaluation of sites in order to nominate a preferred site for detailed study in the EIA phase. Recommendations will be proposed in the EIA to minimise the negative visual impact.</p>
<p>Another power station in the area would negatively affect the eco-tourism industry, as foreign hunters would not want to visit the area anymore.</p>	<p>Dr. A. Moolman (Landowner) (Individual meeting – 21 July 05)</p>	
<p>The existing power station, ash dumps and mining activities are visible from the landowner’s property.</p>	<p>Mr. T. Nel (Landowner) (Individual meeting – 22 June 05)</p>	
<p>Currently the property owner cannot see the power station from his property, but the lights are visible at night.</p>	<p>Mr. S. Grobler (Landowner) (Individual meeting – 23 June 05)</p>	<p>Comment noted. Issues pertaining to visual impacts and related social aspects were evaluated during the scoping phase and will be evaluated further during the EIA. These issues were also considered in the evaluation of sites in order to nominate a preferred site for detailed study in the EIA phase. Recommendations will be proposed in the EIA to minimise the negative visual impact. Mitigation measures to minimise the effect of lighting at night will be included in the Environmental Management Plan.</p>
<p>Lighting at night is already a problem. If the proposed power station is built next to the Landowner’s property, this problem would worsen.</p>	<p>Mr. C. Gouws (Landowner) (Individual meeting – 25 June 05)</p>	
<p>Lighting can create problems in the future if the power station is constructed nearer to his property.</p>	<p>Mr. H. Hills (Landowner) (Individual meeting – 22 June 05)</p>	

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
Lighting is already problematic and an additional power station would intensify this impact.	Mr. T. Nel (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 22 June 05)	Comment noted. Issues pertaining to visual impacts and related social aspects were evaluated during the scoping phase and will be evaluated further during the EIA. These issues were also considered in the evaluation of sites in order to nominate a preferred site for detailed study in the EIA phase. Recommendations will be proposed in the EIA to minimise the negative visual impact. Mitigation measures to minimise the effect of lighting at night will be included in the Environmental Management Plan.
Lighting is already problematic and the hunters comment in this regard.	Mr. G. Erasmus and Mr. H. Steenkamp (Landowners) (Meeting - 21 June 05)	
Lighting might be a concern raised by the Marapong community.	Lephalale Municipality (one on one consultation on 9 June 2005)	
The existing power station creates lighting pollution at night. Hunters visiting the area do not want to see the power station. The planned development would thus have a definite negative impact on the hunting activities in the area. The landowner has a camping facility for the hunters with a view across the dam. The power station would be clearly visible from that camping site.	Mr. J. van Rooyen (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 21 June 05)	

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
TOURISM		
Those of us in the tourism industry will absolutely benefit. It will also have a positive impact on Lephalale's economy.	Mr Gert Beegte (farmer) (Comment Form)	Comment noted.
The area is extremely valuable for the development of tourism and eco-tourism. Such a power station must therefore be constructed in an already degraded area.	Mr. G. Erasmus and Mr. H. Steenkamp (Landowners) (Meeting – 21 June 05)	Comment noted.
Developments to entice tourists to the area will need to be stopped – they will not be supported.	Mr. J. van Rooyen (Landowner) (Comment sheet – 14 July 05)	Issues pertaining to tourism impacts have been evaluated in the Scoping phase of the EIA and will be further evaluated during the EIA phase. These issues were also considered in the evaluation of sites in order to nominate a preferred site for detailed study in the EIA phase.
Numerous foreign hunters visit the property during hunting season. I have two accommodation facilities for the guests, as well as various other infrastructure for my hunting business. Foreign hunters would not want to hunt on a property adjacent to two power stations.	Mr A Malherbe (Landowner) (one-on-one consultation – 10 June 05)	
The existing power station has a negative visual impact on the area and foreign hunters visiting the property comment on this, as they perceive it to impact on their "Africa" or "hunting" experience. Such perceptions will thus influence the entire hunting industry.	Dr. A. Moolman (Landowner) (Individual meeting – 21 July 05)	
The foreign hunters do not want to hear or see the power station.	Mr. T. Nel (Landowner) (Individual meeting – 22 June 05)	

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>Hunters do not want to see the power lines or hear any noise from the mine or power station. A significant part of their income is derived from hunting activities. This could be negatively impacted upon if another power station be constructed in the area.</p>	<p>Mr. G. Erasmus and Mr. H. Steenkamp (Landowners) (Meeting – 21 June 05)</p>	<p>Issues pertaining to tourism impacts have been evaluated in the Scoping phase of the EIA and will be further evaluated during the EIA phase. These issues were also considered in the evaluation of sites in order to nominate a preferred site for detailed study in the EIA phase.</p>
<p>I am concerned about the impact of the proposed development on the eco-tourism industry. The hunters want to experience the scenic beauty of the area and do not want to hunt next to a power station.</p>	<p>Mr. S. Grobler (Landowner) (Individual meeting – 23 June 05)</p>	
<p>I am in tourism and game farming and a hunting lodge. The project will be no good for my business unless the project will make an offer on my farm to buy it.</p> <p>Another powerline and mine will be very bad for the natural environment for my eco-tourism business, unless Eskom can buy my farm and I can start a new eco-tourism business in another area not affected by industrial development.</p>	<p>Mr M W de Jager (Landowner) (Comment Form)</p>	
<p>Negative effect on tourists and overseas hunters.</p>	<p>Dr Andre Moolman (Landowner) (Comment Form)</p>	

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
AIR QUALITY RELATED ISSUES		
Smoke and noise.	Mr Hennie Hills (Farmer) (Comment Form)	Issues pertaining to air quality and noise have been evaluated in scoping phase of the EIA. These issues were also considered in the evaluation of sites in order to nominate a preferred site for detailed study in the EIA phase. Air Quality was considered one of the most important aspects influencing site selection.
Possible environmental pollution is a source of concern – possible dust and emissions.	Mr. E. Badenhorst (Lephalale Municipality) (Comment sheet – 29 July 2005)	
Air Pollution and Noise.	Ms Susan Pretorius (Landowner) (Comment Form)	
It is expected that the farms Droogeheuvel and Zongesien would be negatively affected by the “smoke” and noise pollution.	Mr D de Ridder, Mr A Bower, Mr E Badenhorst, Ms C Cocquyt (Lephalale Municipality) (one on one consultation – 9 June 2005)	
Large volume of coal burning would transpire into pollution	Mr T Sauer (Beestekraal Brits) (Comment Form)	
Air pollution must be taken into consideration.	Mr TJ Matjeding (Local community) (Comment Form)	
An additional power station would worsen the air quality.	Mr. L. Steyn (Landowner) (Individual meeting – 10 June 2005)	

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>The concerns from the Marapong community regarding the proposed project would primarily revolve around air and noise pollution, and the impact of these on the health of the communities. This is due to the fact that those living in close proximity to the existing Matimba Power Station frequently raise these issues as being of concern. Meetings with these communities would be required to address the health impact issues. Any possible air pollution should be explained in layman's terms.</p>	<p>Clr T Mmoya (Councilor) (one on one consultation - 8 June 2005)</p>	<p>Impact on the operation of the existing power station: 76% of the time the wind blows away from the existing Matimba Power Station and Marapong. Concern was raised that a new power station constructed upwind of the existing power station, could elevate the temperature of the air to a point where it impacts on the efficiency of the existing Matimba Power Station. Studies undertaken so far have, however, shown that a second power station is unlikely to have an impact on the existing Matimba Power Station based on the distances at which the new power station was proposed to be from the existing station.</p>
<p>The siting of this proposed power station is proposed for the area west and south of the existing Matimba Power Station and not to the east due to the critical wind directions. What factors made Eskom go west and not east? The existing power station is situated next to Marapong and what effects are felt by the individuals in Marapong?</p>	<p>Mr Ian Hall (Public Meeting - 28 June 2005)</p>	<p>Impact on human health: The potential impact of emissions from the power station on the Marapong community have been evaluated in scoping phase of the EIA. Air Quality was considered one of the most important aspects influencing site selection.</p>
<p>Affect of prevailing winds on the existing power station when the new one is built.</p>	<p>Mr A Bosman (Eskom) (Comment Form)</p>	<p>Air Quality aspects will be evaluated in more depth during the EIA and recommendations to effectively minimise the impact will be provided by the independent consultant.</p>
<p>Should the proposed power station be located on the farm Nelsonskop, and the ash dump on the farm Zongesien, it is expected that the Marapong community would complain about fly ash and dust pollution.</p>	<p>Mr A Bosman, Mr W O'Brien, Mr A Crous (one on one consultation - 21 June 2005)</p>	

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
The air quality is a source of concern.	Mr. J.J. Thuynsma (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 09 June 2005)	Impact on human health: The potential impact of emissions from the power station on the local communities was evaluated in scoping phase of the EIA. Air Quality was considered one of the most important aspects influencing site selection. Air Quality aspects will be evaluated in more depth during the EIA and recommendations to effectively minimise the impact will be provided by the independent consultant.
Impacts on air quality. Promotion of coal as a source of energy can have serious health impact to human life and can contribute to damaging the ozone layer.	Mr M Mhlalisi (Earthlife Africa) (Comment Form)	
Noise and pollution especially if built on Naauwontkome. Rusting of fences.	Mr Koot Thuynsma (Landowner) (Comment Form)	
Pollution, trees that die and fences that rust all because of the existing power station, how much more because of the planned expansions?	Mr Hannes Lamprecht (Farm Eendracht) (Comment Form)	
Air pollution is a source of concern. Already experience problems with rusting of fences and the maintenance is therefore more costly than under normal circumstances. The acid in the air cannot be good for human and animal health.	Mr. C. Gouws (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 25 June 2005)	
Our fences rust.	Mr P Lamprecht (landowner) (Comment Form)	
Our fences will rust more than they do now and the air will stink more than it does now.	Mr Hennie Hills (Farmer) (Open Day - comment form)	

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
Currently experience problems with the rusting of fences and is not sure whether this is caused by the emissions from the mine or Eskom. The impact would worsen if another power station would be built. Sometimes malodour pollution is also created by the emissions from the mine, especially on windy days.	Mr. H. Hills (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 22 June 2005)	Impact on human health: The potential impact of emissions from the power station on the local communities has been evaluated in scoping phase of the EIA. Air Quality was considered one of the most important aspects influencing site selection. Air Quality aspects will be evaluated in more depth during the EIA and recommendations to effectively minimise the impact will be provided by the independent consultant.
The fences on the southeastern section of the farm Kromdraai rust due to acid rain. The fences on the farm Grootvallei were erected at the same time, but do not need to be replaced. Any additional extensions to the mine (as an indirect result of the proposed power station) would therefore worsen the problem.	Mr. L. Steyn (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 10 June 2005)	
Fences will rust.	Mr Hennie Hills (Farmer) (Comment Form)	
Farm is close to the proposed project. Acid rain rusts the game fencing. The maintenance of the fencing is high as a result of this pollution. The general costs on the farm are also higher because everything rusts.	Mr Louis Rossel (landowner) (Comment Form)	
The acid rain currently experienced in the area result in the rusting of fences. An additional power station would worsen the problem.	Mr. M.F. Loots (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 21 June 2005)	

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>Pollution is already occurring through the release of e.g. acid and gasses (generated by combustion) by the existing power station. This is noticeable in the area as fences rust much quicker in comparison to the past, rust spots appears quicker on metal, and this is all due to the acid deposits. Larger and more frequent combustion goes hand-in-hand with pollution, which in the long term would definitely have a negative impact on the environment. The current environment is proof of this fact e.g. animals are born deformed, the environment and water are polluted, children illnesses occur more frequently in the area</p>	<p>Mr T Sauer (Beestekraal Brits) (Comment Form)</p>	<p>Issues pertaining to air quality have been evaluated in the chapter within the Environmental Scoping report dealing with air quality issues. These issues were also considered in the evaluation of sites in order to nominate a preferred site for detailed study in the EIA phase.</p>
<p>There are areas on his properties that receive less rain than other areas. Nearer to the power station, more rain occurs. The local weather pattern has thus been influenced by the existing power station. Has any research been done regarding the impact of the existing and proposed power stations on the local rainfall patterns?</p>	<p>Dr. A. Moolman (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 21 July 05)</p>	<p>Air Quality aspects will be evaluated in more depth during the EIA and recommendations to effectively minimise the impact will be provided by the independent consultant</p>
<p>The landowner experiences immense erosion of the steel infrastructure e.g. game fencing. This is as a result of the acid rain created by the operations of Eskom and/or the Kumba Resource's Grootegeluk mine. The private landowners in the area must thus bear the additional cost to maintain their fences. If another power station would be built, the problem would intensify. Who will be responsible for the financial "loss" of the private landowners and how will they be compensated for this negative impact?</p>	<p>Dr. A. Moolman (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 21 July 2005)</p>	<p>Air Quality aspects will be evaluated in more depth during the EIA and recommendations to effectively minimise the impact will be provided by the independent consultant.</p>

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
Acid rain is already a major problem and will just get worse.	Dr Andre Moolman (Landowner) (Comment Form)	Air Quality aspects will be evaluated in more depth during the EIA and recommendations to effectively minimise the impact will be provided by the independent consultant.
Air pollution and acid rain is a source of concern. Sometimes experience malodour pollution from the mining activities, especially during bad weather periods.	Mr. S. Grobler (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 23 June 2005)	
The acid raid has a definite impact on the soil and flora. Another power station would worsen the impact.	Mr. H. Pieterse (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 22 June 2005)	Issues pertaining to the potential impacts on soil and flora have been evaluated in the chapters within the Environmental Scoping report dealing with air quality, agricultural potential and soil as well as flora and fauna issues. Further evaluation of these aspects will take place during the EIA phase.
The definition of "acid" or "poisonous" rain should be given. Is this a risk if two power stations are operated in the area and what effect would it have on the plants, soil, water, animals and so forth?	Mr. J. van Rooyen (Landowner) (Comment sheet - 14 July 2005)	
Concerned about the existing emissions from the power station that leads to pollution and poisoning of the plants. The acid rain also has a very negative impact on the flora in the area.	Mr. J. van Rooyen (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 21 June 05)	

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
The impact on the landowner's property (air pollution) would be more negative the more to the east the proposed power station would be located, due to the prevailing wind direction.	Mr. J.J. Lambrecht (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 21 June 2005)	Comment noted. Impact on human health: The potential impact of emissions from the power station on the local communities has been evaluated in scoping phase of the EIA. Air Quality was considered one of the most important aspects influencing site selection. Air Quality aspects will be evaluated in more depth during the EIA and recommendations to effectively minimise the impact will be provided by the independent consultant.
Ash dumping on the farm Droogeheuvel is problematic due to the prevailing wind direction. The ash would be spread over the landowner's property.	Mr. M.F. Loots (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 21 June 05)	
If the proposed power station will be erected on Appelvlakte these landowners will receive additional air pollution and bad odours due to the prevailing wind direction.	Mr. G. Erasmus and Mr. H. Steenkamp (Landowners) (Meeting - 21 June 2005)	Comment noted.
The wind direction is in an easterly direction. The development will thus negatively impact on the area - dust, noise, emissions, ash and heat.	Mr. J. van Rooyen (Landowner) (Comment sheet - 14 July 2005)	
Malodour pollution spread by the north-easterly wind negatively affects the landowner. Monitoring stations have been erected on the property to measure the impacts.	Mr. L. Steyn (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 10 June 2005)	

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>During the Key Stakeholder meeting held on 27 June 2005 in Midrand, ESKOM indicated in the presentation done by Nigel Volk that one of the reasons why Lephalale was determined to be the preferred site was because of the "Potential to ash back into the mine pit". In the meeting Ms Carla Hudson of WESSA asked what DWAF's opinion was on ashing back into the pit and ESKOM responded that, "the viability of ashing back into the pit is still being investigated. The findings would be part of the Environmental impact process". There is however no mention of ashing back into the pit in the Scoping report. At this stage it seems that one of the reasons why Lephalale was determined to be the preferred site is not going to be investigated in the EIA. In the Scoping report in par. 2.2, p.7, it is stated clearly that "in terms of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) regulations, feasible alternatives are required to be considered within the environmental scoping study." Ashing into the pit can be considered an alternative with an incremental difference, since it is basically only the location that will change. Since it is already done at two other power stations, it is certainly feasible. There seems to be numerous benefits in ashing into the pit rather than to do above-ground ashing, both from an environmental and a financial point of view, for both ESKOM and Kumba Resources. Why is ashing into the pit not included in the scope???</p>	<p>H.N.L. Snyman (Comment on draft scoping report) 28/10/2005</p>	<p>Eskom is considering in-pit ashing, and have initiated initial discussions with Kumba Resources on the issue. However, a range of studies, such as environmental feasibility studies, leachability test, as well as technical and economic feasibility studies will have to be conducted first, before a final decision on in-pit ashing will be taken. Currently, the EIA focuses on on-surface (on-land) ashing and the environmental impacts associated with it.</p>

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
The landowner is of the opinion that a new power station should be constructed to the west or south-west of the existing power station due to the prevailing wind direction and the dust and air pollution. During the winter months the wind turns around and the oxidation odour of the coal can be smelt on his property.	Mr. T. Nel (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 22 July 2005)	Comment noted.
Odour: a stink-bomb type of smell is often smelt downwind. It also causes quicker rusting of fences.	Mr P Erasmus (Lawyer) (email letter dated 29 June 2005)	Comment noted. Impact on human health: The potential impact of emissions from the power station on the local communities has been evaluated in scoping phase of the EIA. Air Quality was considered one of the most important aspects influencing site selection. Air Quality aspects will be evaluated in more depth during the EIA and recommendations to effectively minimise the impact will be provided by the independent consultant.
The landowner experiences nuisance from the odours from the mine, but the mine was there before him, so he cannot complain about it.	Mr. R. van Tonder (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 23 June 2005)	
Concerned about the existing air pollution created by dust particles and gasses. The dust from the ash dumps is especially problematic during August.	Dr. A. Moolman (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 21 July 2005)	Comments noted.
Another power station could blow fly ash onto my property.	Mr A Malherbe (Landowner) (one-on-one consultation - 10 June 2005)	

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
The dust created by the existing ash dumps and conveyor belt is problematic.	Mr. H. Pieterse (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 22 June 2005)	Comments noted. Detailed studies to be conducted in the EIA phase will investigate issues around the ashing facility and the conveyor belts.
The impact of dust pollution should also be investigated	Mr T Sauer (Beestekraal Brits) (Comment Form)	
Dust.	Dr Andre Moolman (Landowner) (Comment Form)	
The dust from the ash dump would be spread across the landowner's property and this would have a severe negative impact on the property and the plants.	Mr. J. van Rooyen (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 21 June 2005)	
Taking the prevailing wind directions into account it is evident that my parents' farm is situated down-wind from the development and the effect of the noise, dust and smoke on their conditions of living and their health is of great concern. The smoke and the dust would also have a knock-on effect on the quality of the grazing on the farm.	Mr. L.I. Steyn (Family of landowner) (Comment received 24/10/2005)	Comment noted. Detailed studies to be conducted in the EIA phase will investigate issues around the ashing facility and the conveyor belts.
Gasses/smoke or particles that are blown into the air due to combustion. What is the existing concentration and composition of these gasses/smoke and what will it be with the new power station? Do independent institutions test this?	Mr. J. van Rooyen (Landowner) (Comment sheet - 14 July 2005)	Dust/fugitive emissions have been identified as an air quality issue which requires further investigation during the EIA.

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
Amount of CO ₂ , thermal pollution and effect on climate, especially rainfall patterns. Acid rain, such as in Highveld around Witbank.	Mrs Lesley Berry (Comment Form)	The consideration of alternative technologies which do not emit or which emit less CO ₂ are considered in the National Integrated Resource plan. Coal is the most abundant resource available in South Africa for the generation of affordable electricity. Eskom has initiated various research projects with a view to implementing the appropriate use of renewable technologies. This research includes a wind demonstration facility at Kliphuwel in Cape Town and potentially a solar thermal plant near Upington if the pre feasibility studies and EIA are positive. Climate Change will be evaluated during the EIA. Local weather will be discussed in the EIA.
Global warming has a negative effect on the ozone layer.	Dr Andre Moolman (Landowner) (Comment Form)	
Climate change and pollution must be key considerations in the choice of technology used.	Reginald Mabalane (DEAT: CAPCO) (Focus Group Meeting: CAPCO – 29 July 2005)	
Concerned about the release of CO and CO ₂ and the impact thereof. Are the emissions are in line with the relevant regulations.	Dr. A. Moolman (Landowner) (Individual meeting – 21 July 2005)	
Will Eskom considered trans-national pollution and the contribution of air pollution to global warming. Are the impacts on climate change being considered in the EIA studies?	Ms S Mandhlazi (Earthlife Africa) Key Stakeholders Workshop – 27 June 2005)	
Has any research been done regarding the impact of the heat generated on the local weather?	Dr. A. Moolman (Landowner) (Individual meeting – 21 July 2005)	

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
The plume of the new proposed power station would most probably not be detected at the existing monitoring stations. An additional ambient monitoring station would be necessary.	Mr. Eddie Viviers (Eskom) (one on one consultation - 9 June 2005)	Monitoring requirements will be determined based on the Air Quality studies completed during the EIA and the requirements of the Air Quality Registration certificate issued by the Air Quality Officer.
Air pollution (emissions) is a source of concern. Does monitoring take place?	Dr. W.H.S. Barnard (Landowner) (Comment sheet - 25 June 2005)	
Eskom indicated that the eastern side of the existing power station is unsuitable for the second station due to the dominant wind direction. What is the impact in terms of air pollution from emissions from the coal mine and Matimba A, and if these emissions are within the limits. In addition, what would be the effect with a second power station?	Tsenduka Hatlane (Limpopo DEDET) (Provincial Authorities Meeting - 28 June 2005)	Impact on the operation of the existing power station: 76% of the time the wind blows away from the existing Matimba Power Station and Marapong. Concern was raised that a new power station constructed upwind of the existing power station, could elevate the temperature of the air to a point where it impacts on the efficiency of the existing Matimba Power Station. Studies undertaken so far have, however, shown that a second power station is unlikely to have an impact on the existing Matimba Power Station based on the distances at which the new power station was proposed to be from the existing station.
Affect of prevailing winds on the existing power station when the new one is built.	Mr A Bosman (Eskom) (Comment Form)	
Will Eskom be applying for a Licence under the new Air Quality Act.	Ms Carla Hudson (WESSA) (Key Stakeholders Workshop - 27 June 2005)	The National Environmental Management Air Quality Act and the Atmospheric Pollution Prevention Act are currently both relevant. It is possible that by the time an emission licence is granted for Matimba B that APPA will be repealed and therefore the application would be made in terms of the National Environmental Management Air Quality Act.

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
Will the new power station be able to meet 50 mg/Nm ³ , should the standard change?	Reginald Mabalane (DEAT: CAPCO) (Focus Group Meeting: CAPCO – 29 July 2005)	Matimba B will be designed to comply with a limit of 50 mg/Sm ³ for particulate emissions.
I am aware that there are times when Matimba A cannot meet the standards, and I believe that the ash content of the coal plays a role. The ambient temperatures reached in the summer months play a role in load losses, as the station is less efficient at higher temperatures.	Jan Marais (DEAT: APCO) (Focus Group Meeting: CAPCO – 29 July 2005)	Comment noted. The performance of the electrostatic precipitators is influenced by high ambient temperatures resulting in occasional exceedances of limits. However, a strategy is in place to install Flue Gas Cleaning which will reduce particulate emissions.
What modelling has been completed with regards to meeting air quality standards?	Reginald Mabalane (DEAT: CAPCO) (Focus Group Meeting: CAPCO – 29 July 2005)	Modelling and monitoring has been undertaken for the existing Matimba A station. Modelling will again be conducted to determine the impacts of an additional coal-fired power station in the Lephalale area. The impacts of the new power station would be considered at a cumulative level within the EIA.
It would be interesting to see if the emissions comply with the relevant legislation.	Mr. M. Reinecke Ms. H. Bezuidenhout Mr. S. Grobler Mr. F.I. Roux Mr. F.J. du Plessis Mr. R. Rorich Mr. E. Viviers Lephalale Environmental Committee (one on one consultation - 9 June 2005)	Comment noted

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
Eskom should set up monitoring points where it makes sense to do the monitoring - that is to obtain maximum information regarding affected communities/populations.	Reginald Mabalane (DEAT: CAPCO) (Focus Group Meeting: CAPCO – 29 July 2005)	Comment noted. Eskom currently monitor at points of maximum impact.
What happens to the sulphur during combustion? What percentage sulphur is emitted into the air?	Mr. J. van Rooyen (Landowner) (Comment sheet – 14 July 2005)	Comment noted. Ambient air quality issues pertaining to Matimba B are covered in the scoping report. Refer to chapter 9. The cumulative impact of Matimba and Matimba B will be evaluated in the EIA.
I reviewed a paper a few years ago regarding the movement of SO ₂ released on the Highveld in the direction of Botswana. Has Eskom considered the effect of adding more SO ₂ to the area with a second power station.	Jan Marais (DEAT: APCO) (Focus Group Meeting: CAPCO – 29 July 2005)	
When will the findings of the specialist study for the new power station would be available.	Reginald Mabalane (DEAT: CAPCO) (Focus Group Meeting: CAPCO – 29 July 2005)	The specialists are still undertaking their scoping level studies. Once the scoping report is released and a preferred site is identified, the specialists will undertake their detailed studies. More detailed findings will be available towards to end of 2005, or early 2006.
Will the air quality assessment form part of the site selection criteria.	Charl Nolte (Kumba Resources: Manager Strategy & Planning: Environmental Management) (Focus Group Meeting – Kumba Resources – 5 August 2005)	Airshed Planning Professionals are undertaking the air quality impact assessment. The studies are currently at scoping level. Findings of these initial assessments will form part of the Scoping Report that would recommend a preferred site for the location of the power station. Air quality forms an integral part of the site selection criteria.

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>The proposed Matimba-B Power Station (2.1, page 5 of the draft scoping report): The power station will monitor emissions to air on a continuous basis.</p> <p>Comment from DEDET-BM: A risk assessment is necessary</p>	<p>Department of Economic Development, Environment & Tourism Limpopo – <i>Biodiversity Management</i> (DEDET-BM) (Comments on draft scoping report) Letter dated 28 Oct 2005</p>	<p>A Health Risk Assessment will be done as part of the air quality specialist study.</p>

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
NOISE		
Noise pollution is a source of concern.	Mr. C. Gouws (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 25 June 2005)	Issues pertaining to noise have been evaluated in scoping report. Noise was considered in the evaluation of sites. Noise will be evaluated in more detail during the EIA.
No noise pollution from the existing power station is currently experienced. The rumbling of the mine's machinery is however sometimes heard. Noise could in future be problematic should the power station be erected near the Landowner's farms.	Mr. H. Hills (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 22 June 2005)	
The noise of the existing power station already has a negative impact on the ill health of the landowners' wife. An additional power station would worsen the situation.	Mr. L. Steyn (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 10 June 2005)	
The landowner experiences noise pollution on his farm Eendracht.	Mr. J.J. Lambrecht (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 21 June 2005)	
The landowner experiences noise pollution which is clearly audible during the night (e.g. the noise of vehicles). If an additional power station would be erected the pollution would worsen.	Dr. A. Moolman (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 21 July 2005)	
The landowner experiences noise pollution created by the conveyor belt on his property. The rumbling of the power station is sometimes heard.	Mr. H. Pieterse (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 22 July 2005)	

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
The noise and rumbling of the power station is sometimes disturbing.	Mr. J.J. Thuynsma (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 09 June 05)	Issues pertaining to noise have been evaluated in scoping report. Noise was considered in the evaluation of sites. Noise will be evaluated in more detail during the EIA.
The existing power station creates noise pollution. Hunters visiting the area do not want to hear the power station. The planned development would thus have a definite negative impact on the hunting activities in the area.	Mr. J. van Rooyen (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 21 June 2005)	
The power station is sometimes heard.	Mr. R. van Tonder (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 23 June 05)	
Abnormal noise and lights spoil the Bushveld area. Hunters do not want to hunt in the "city". This would result in loss of income.	Mr. J. van Rooyen (Landowner) (Comment sheet - 14 July 2005)	
Noise at night.	Dr Andre Moolman (Landowner) (Comment Form)	
The noise impact of the existing power station is already high and an additional power station would definitely increase this negative impact.	Mr A Malherbe (Landowner) (one-on-one consultation - 10 June 2005)	
You sit on a bushveld farm and look at the stars at night and listen to a jackal. In the background is the ongoing drone of the power station - what a passion killer. This problem is found up to 30 km from Matimba A.	Mr P Erasmus (Lawyer) (email letter dated 29 June 2005)	

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>The existing mine and power station already contributes to noise pollution. The negative impact of noise pollution would be enhanced due to the fact that "Matimba B" would be constructed some distance away from the existing power station. The peace and tranquillity currently experienced in the area would be destroyed</p>	<p>Mr T Sauer (Beestekraal Brits) (Comment Form)</p>	<p>Issues pertaining to noise have been evaluated in the chapter within the Environmental Scoping report dealing with noise issues. These issues were also considered in the evaluation of sites in order to nominate a preferred site for detailed study in the EIA phase.</p>
<p>Noise might be a concern raised by the Marapong community.</p>	<p>Mr D de Ridder, Mr A Bower, Mr E Badenhorst, Ms C Cocquyt (Lephalale Municipality) (one on one consultation - 9 June 2005)</p>	
<p>An increase in noise and dust as a result of an increase in the traffic and heavy vehicle traffic on the roads crossing through my parents' farm.</p>	<p>Mr. L.I. Steyn (Family of landowner) (Comment received 24/10/2005)</p>	

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
WASTE MANAGEMENT		
Eskom indicated that between 250 and 500 people would be employed on the site. Will Eskom build a sewage works?	Carla Hudson (WESSA) (Key Stakeholders Workshop - 27 June 2005)	There are existing sewage treatment facilities in the area. Issues such as these would be included as part of the EIA specialist studies and Eskom would be guided by the findings and recommendations of these studies.
There is a sewage works on the farm Zongesien. The water is not chlorinated. The effluent from the sewage works on the farm Nelsonskop is treated with chlorine.	Mr A Bosman, Mr W O'Brien, Mr A Crous (one on one consultation - 21 June 2005)	Comment noted.
There is a water care works on the farm Zongesien which is based on an oxidation type of system. The future plan is to develop this water care works to take over the function of the existing water care works on the farm Nelsonskop.	S. van Wyk (Lephalale Municipality: Divisional Head: Water) (Individual meeting - 10 June 2005)	
<p>Ecological sensitivity (Figure 7.2, page 118): The farm Nelsonskop 464 LQ is classified as sensitive and is briefly discussed. It has a low suitability for the proposed development (Page 135, Figure 7.3).</p> <p>Comment from DEDET-BM: Why then develop the sewage works on the farm Nelsonskop – does it mean no EIA was carried out during 1987?</p>	Department of Economic Development, Environment & Tourism Limpopo – <i>Biodiversity Management</i> (DEDET-BM) (Comments on draft scoping report) Letter dated 28 Oct 2005	The EIA regulations only came into being 1998. No EIA had to be carried when the sewage works on Nelsonskop was constructed.

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
I agree with the recommendations in Chapter 7.9.	Department of Economic Development, Environment & Tourism Limpopo - <i>Biodiversity Management</i> (Comments on draft scoping report) Letter dated 28 Oct 2005	Comment noted
Interested party with regards to hazardous waste disposal.	Jan de Plessis (Lephalale Hazardous Waste Incinerators) (Comment Form)	The management of all types of waste from the proposed power station will be considered within the Environmental Impact Assessment and appropriate handling and disposal of waste will be described in the Environmental Management Plan.
Planning in terms of waste management is an issue.	E. Badenhorst (Lephalale Municipality) (Comment sheet - 29 July 2005)	

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
How will waste generated at the site during the construction and operation phases be dealt with.	Tsenduka Hatlane (Limpopo DEDET) (Provincial Authorities Meeting - 28 June 2005)	Waste management issues will be considered through the EIA and EMP. It is anticipated that the existing Lephalale municipal landfill site will be utilised for domestic waste disposal.
A letter of consent from the municipality may be required in terms of use of their landfill site.	Tsenduka Hatlane (Limpopo DEDET) (Provincial Authorities Meeting - 28 June 2005)	Comment noted.
Is there a memorandum of understanding between Eskom and Kumba Resources in order for in-pit ashing to be an option.	Tsenduka Hatlane (Limpopo DEDET) (Provincial Authorities Meeting - 28 June 2005)	The potential to ash back to the Kumba Resources pit is an alternative ash disposal mechanism being investigated at this time. However, activities within the Kumba pit will be viewed as a mining issue, and will require Kumba to assist in taking these investigations further. Licenses will be required from various departments in order to take the proposal further. These issues will also be covered in the EMPR (Environmental Management Programme Report)
Put the ash back into the pit - Should there not be rehabilitation?	J. van Rooyen (Landowner) (Comment sheet - 14 July 2005)	
The ash generated by the power station is a waste product belonging to Eskom. Kumba Resources will not accept ash disposal into the pit if there is any environmental risk associated with the process. Kumba Resources will not be in a position to accept Eskom's risk. The geochemical and geohydrological assessments will be required in order to assess this risk. The party responsible for the costs associated with the risk assessment needs to be determined as a matter of urgency.	Charl Nolte (Kumba Resources: Manager Strategy & Planning: Environmental Management) (Focus Group Meeting - Kumba Resources - 5 August 2005)	

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>The final process associated with ash disposal into the pit should be based on technical issues and environmental impacts.</p>	<p>Jan Oberholzer (Kumba Resources:Project Manager Matimba Expansion Study) (Focus Group Meeting – Kumba Resources – 5 August 2005)</p>	<p>The potential to ash back to the Kumba Resources pit is an alternative ash disposal mechanism being investigated at this time. However, activities within the Kumba pit will be viewed as a mining issue, and will require Kumba to assist in taking these investigations further. Licenses will be required from various departments in order to take the proposal further. These issues will also be covered in the EMPR (Environmental Management Programme Report)</p>
<p>Kumba Resources could experience more technical difficulties with Naauontkomen and Eenzaamheid than Appelvlakte due to the proximity of the farms to the Mine's plant. The ash would be required to be mixed with plant discard before back-filled.</p>	<p>Jan Oberholzer (Kumba Resources:Project Manager Matimba Expansion Study) (Focus Group Meeting – Kumba Resources – 5 August 2005)</p>	
<p>Kumba would prefer that an additional ash dumping facility is not established, but that rather the ash be backfilled into the pit (Grootegeluk Mine). Eenzaamheid and Naauwontkomen are closer to the pit for the establishment of a conveyor belt system, but these properties also have other disadvantages.</p>	<p>Mr E Geldenhuys (Kumba Resources) (one on one consultation on 10 June 2005)</p>	

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>Will the EIA determine what type of ash disposal method is the preferred option.</p>	<p>Jan Oberholzer (Kumba Resources:Project Manager Matimba Expansion Study) (Focus Group Meeting – Kumba Resources – 5 August 2005)</p>	<p>The EIA will assume disposal of ash to land. At this point there is no finality regarding the risks associated with in-pit ashing. The EIA would only consider feasible alternatives. The technical, commercial and environmental feasibility of in-pit ashing is yet to be determined.</p>
<p>What is DWAF's opinion with regards to ashing back into the mine's pit.</p>	<p>Ms Carla Hudson (WESSA) (Key Stakeholders Workshop – 27/06/05)</p>	<p>The viability of ashing back to the pit is still being investigated. This will be part of a separate study. Eskom has two power stations (Lethabo and Matla) that make use of in-pit ashing. These processes were authorised by both DME and DWAF. Should this be considered feasible for the proposed Matimba B Power Station and Grootegeluk Mine, Eskom would required to go through the same authorising process. The findings of the specialist studies undertaken with regards to groundwater would also be taken into consideration before making any decision in this regard.</p>
<p>Eskom is the lead agent for the ash disposal facility and that they should therefore initiate discussions between themselves and Kumba Resources at a higher level to determine a joint strategy for ash backfilling.</p>	<p>Charl Nolte (Kumba Resources: Manager Strategy & Planning: Environmental Management) (Focus Group Meeting – Kumba Resources – 5 August 2005)</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
I would just like clarity and feedback with regards to the municipal dumping site at Lephalale.	Mr. J.J. Lamprecht (Landowner) (Comment received on 20/10/2005)	Comment noted. The issue around the municipal dumping site will be discussed in a focus group meeting with the Lephalale Municipality, and appropriate feedback given.

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
GROUND AND SURFACE WATER RELATED ISSUES		
Surface and groundwater issues.	Mr Beyers Havenga (DWAF) (Comment Form)	Issues pertaining to surface and groundwater resources have been evaluated Scoping Report. These issues were also considered in the evaluation of sites in order to nominate a preferred site. Further detailed studies will be completed in the EIA phase.
Underground water.	Mr AP Henning (Farmer) (Comment Form)	
Groundwater resource will be affected.	Mr Hennie Hills (Farmer) (Comment Form)	
The groundwater resources will drop terribly because of the power station.	Mr Hennie Hills (Farmer) (Open Day – Comment Form)	
Groundwater pollution.	Ms Susan Pretorius (landowner) (Comment Form)	
Impacts on surface and groundwater	Mr M Mhlalisi (Earthlife Africa) (Comment Form)	
Concerned about the impact of the proposed development on the quality and quantity of the groundwater.	Mr. S. Grobler (Landowner) (Individual meeting – 23 June 2005)	
The power station should not have an impact on the underground water.	Mr. H. Hills (Landowner) (Individual meeting – 22 June 2005)	

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>Groundwater (Chapter 5.5.2 in draft scoping report): "The groundwater potential is limited. See also Chapter 6.4.3 (Groundwater use)."</p> <p>Comment from DEDET-BM: I presume water abstraction as a resource for Eskom's activities is thus not an option and the power station would thus be dependable for water from other resources.</p>	<p>Department of Economic Development, Environment & Tourism Limpopo - <i>Biodiversity Management</i> (Comments on draft scoping report) Letter dated 28 Oct 2005</p>	<p>Comment noted. The proposed new power station would not rely on groundwater abstraction as a source of water.</p>
<p>Power station monitoring (Chapter 6.6.3): Monitoring showing some degree of groundwater deterioration (paragraph 6, page 84). A contaminated plume has been identified which migrates to the northeast (paragraph 7, page 86).</p> <p>Comment from DEDET-BM: With the power station in operation it is believed that this type of pollution will probably increase. North-east is the drainage direction of the Limpopo River. What actions will be put in place in order to stop this type of groundwater pollution? The cumulative effect of groundwater pollution is a matter of concern and risk assessments are required.</p>	<p>Department of Economic Development, Environment & Tourism Limpopo - <i>Biodiversity Management</i> (Comments on draft scoping report) Letter dated 28 Oct 2005</p>	<p>An Environmental Management Programme will be compiled for the new proposed power station, recommending mitigation measures for residual environmental impacts. This would include <i>inter alia</i> the installation of a groundwater monitoring system, and regular reporting to regulatory authorities.</p>

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
The existing developments in the area and the proposed developments have a very negative impact on the water sources.	Mr. G. Erasmus and Mr. H. Steenkamp (Landowners) (Meeting - 21 June 2005)	Issues pertaining to surface and groundwater resources have been evaluated Scoping Report. These issues were also considered in the evaluation of sites in order to nominate a preferred site. Further detailed studies will be completed in the EIA phase.
Concerned about the impact of the power station on the water.	Mr. J. van Rooyen (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 21 June 2005)	
What will the impact on the groundwater sources be?	Dr. W.H.S. Barnard (Landowner) (Comment sheet - 25 July 2005)	
What about the Water? The system is already exhausted according to DWAF. That's nice, just pollute our unprotected Limpopo Valley.	Dr L.J Botha (Gwelo Safari) Comment Form	

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
The effect on the flow of the Limpopo River.	Mr Roy Young (Tuli Block Farmers Ass) (Comment Form)	The river system is a complete system that needs to be looked at in its entirety. The EIA will identify and consider the potential for downstream impacts. DWAF shares the same concerns in this regard. DWAF have identified a series of planning studies that would culminate in defining the water use and availability of water. The studies are as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verification and Validation study: This is to verify the water use of each water user and then verify the information. This study is expected to be completed in May 2006. • Hydrology Study: This is to update the hydrology of the area and confirm the yield of the system. This study will be completed by December 2006. • Water Conservation and Water Demand Management Study: This is a study to assess the potential to implement further water conservation and water demand management initiatives in the area. This study will be completed by January 2006. • Pre-feasibility and Feasibility Studies: Raising the Mokolo Dam Wall and/or Transfer of water from the Crocodile (West) catchments
The project would be the end of the Limpopo River.	Dr L.J Botha (Gwelo Safari) Comment Form	
Water – the proposed dam enlargement and specifically the effect this may have (will have) down stream in the Limpopo.	Mr Chris Lane (Comment Form)	
Ecological requirements for water. Impacts of decreasing riverine flows (Limpopo) as result of increased upstream utilisation.	Mrs Lesley Berry (Comment Form)	
My primary concern, and indeed that of owners of properties adjacent to the Limpopo river, is what is the impact of additional water impoundment and abstraction on Limpopo river flows?	Dr Mark Berry (Resource Ecologist) (Letter dated 30 June 2005)	

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>According to a recent report (Oct 2003) on the Limpopo River Basin, the natural MAR (mean annual runoff) of the two major (60% of total) tributaries, the Crocodile and Mokolo (Mogul) rivers, has already been reduced by 54% and 44% respectively. Not only has MAR been halved, but current over development of irrigation has resulted in irrigation demand in the Limpopo exceeding supply by 70 000 ha. River flows have been reduced to 40 days or less in a dry year with extended periods (36 months) of no-flow in the Limpopo in recent years. Up until the early 1980's (coinciding with the development of Matimba A) the Limpopo between the Lotsane and Mogalakwena rivers continued to flow right through out winter. Since the early 1980's the annual flow has declined to the extent that the river now only flows during periods of above normal rainfall and is dry for months on end. As a consequence, the Limpopo ecosystem has been seriously impaired and riparian and aquatic communities are in serious decline. <u>Any</u> additional extraction from, or increased impoundment of the Crocodile or Mokolo rivers will further exacerbate an already overstressed ecosystem. There needs to be less abstraction and impoundment if the flows in the Limpopo are to be restored and decline halted. The EIA must address the impact of current and proposed increased water extraction and impoundment on downstream flows in the Limpopo River relevant to the <u>original natural flow</u>. Has the ecosystem been identified as a user and what provision is made for ecological releases as required by the Water Act?</p>	<p>Dr Mark Berry (Resource Ecologist) (Letter dated 30 June 2005)</p>	<p>DWAF has initiated a Reserve Determination study which will identify the Reserve requirements for the catchment. The Reserve, according to the National Water Act (Act 36 of 1998), consists of the 'Basic Human Needs Reserve' and 'Ecological Reserve'. Compulsory licensing for water users in the catchment will be done once the Reserve is determined since water can only be allocated after the needs of the reserve have been met. Hence the process for the Mogol Catchment is in line with government policy and legislation. It needs to be noted that the Minister may use the rapid determination of the Reserve to issue water use licences.</p>

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>There are several SADC Protocols, Permanent Technical Committees and Water Commissions established by South Africa, Botswana, Zimbabwe and Mozambique for the management of shared water resources namely the Limpopo. Have these committees been notified and sanctioned the proposed water abstraction and impoundment?</p>	<p>Dr Mark Berry (Resource ecologist) (Letter dated 30 June 2005)</p>	<p>Comment noted. This will form part of the DWAF Reserve Determination exercise. This issue will be raised with the DWAF.</p>
<p>Section 6.5 Surface Water Hydrology (p77): It is acknowledged that there is insufficient water to meet the requirement of the Reserve (as required by the National Water Act) and that there is insufficient water to maintain the current balance of demand and supply. Furthermore, it is noted that "The supply of additional water from the already stressed (Mogol River) catchment <i>may</i> have an <i>indirect</i> impact on downstream surface water users." In my view, it is not a question of <i>may</i> – there definitely will be a negative impact and it will be <i>direct</i> (not indirect) on both downstream users and for the ecological reserve.</p>	<p>Dr Mark Berry (Resource Ecologist) (Comments on draft scoping report) 30 October 2005</p>	<p>Comment noted. DWAF is currently conducting a range of studies, including a hydrology study on the catchment, and this study will assess the impacts of all water use in the area.</p>

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>The issue of water supply is not viewed as part of the Matimba-B project – “Should an additional power station be built, then the demand on the dam will be increased and DWAF will be required to provide an assured supply” (p79). It would seem that the view of Eskom is that water supply is detached from the project and that DWAF must ensure that Matimba-B gets its required water supply, irrespective of the environmental impacts. If there was no power station there would be no increased demand. The supply of water is part and parcel of the Matimba-B project and should form part of the EIA (see points 5 & 6 below).</p>	<p>Dr Mark Berry (Resource Ecologist) (Comments on draft scoping report) 30 October 2005</p>	<p>Eskom recognises the hierarchy of water use, as stipulated in the National Water Act, 1998. The technology choice for the new proposed power station, i.e dry-cooled technology for cooling, has been made, and Eskom is mindful of the possible impacts the development may have on existing and future water use in the area.</p> <p>In anticipation of future development in the area and the possible increase in water demand from various users, DWAF has been engaging stakeholders in the area on their water requirements, as well as conducting various studies. The initial requirements for the Eskom development are being factored-in into these studies. Hence DWAF as the regulatory authority in this instance will need to ensure compliance by Eskom. Information from the DWAF studies is fed into the EIA process as it becomes available.</p>
<p>“Only the upper Lephalala River and Mokolo River have significant potential for surface water development” (p79). This contradicts several statements in the report (p77 see above & p79 para 3) that state the Mokolo system is already overstressed. Furthermore, any water development in the Lephalala river would negatively impact on the ecological water requirements of major conservation areas in the Waterberg (Lapalala, Touchstone, Kwalata).</p>	<p>Dr Mark Berry (Resource Ecologist) (Comments on draft scoping report) 30 October 2005</p>	<p>With the current level surface water development, a condition of water stress exist. However, if new surface water development (such as potentially raising the dam wall of the Mokolo Dam and other augmentation options) is exercised, the “water stress” will be alleviated.</p>

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>Section 6.5.4: The report concludes (p82) that water could be obtained from the Crocodile and Marico catchments yet these two catchments, like that of the Mogol, are already overstressed. Furthermore, while the current capacity of the Mogol dam ($146 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^3$) is less than the mean MAR ($240 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^3$), the proposal to raise the height of the dam wall will increase the capacity to $303 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^3$ which will be some 26% more than the mean MAR. Both the above augmentation schemes will have serious impacts on downstream users in those catchments as well as the Limpopo River and these should form part of the EIA of the proposed new power station.</p>	<p>Dr Mark Berry (Resource Ecologist) (Comments on draft scoping report) 30 October 2005</p>	<p>Comment noted. Eskom acknowledges the link between its new proposed power station, and the overall water supply issue. The future water infrastructure development options, if any, will require environmental approval. This approval should take cognisance of the environmental impacts associated with such surface water development options. DWAF is mandated by national government to carry out the function of water development in the national interest. Eskom, as key stakeholder, is actively participating in the DWAF stakeholder engagement processes and studies.</p>
<p>The water supply for the new power station should be an integral part of the EIA and not relegated to DWAF</p>	<p>Dr Mark Berry (Resource Ecologist) (Comments on draft scoping report) 30 October 2005</p>	<p>Comment noted. Eskom acknowledges the link between its new proposed power station, and the overall water supply issue. The future water infrastructure development options, if any, will require environmental approval. This approval should take cognisance of the environmental impacts associated with such surface water development options. DWAF is mandated by national government to carry out the function of water development in the national interest. Eskom, as key stakeholder, is actively participating in the DWAF stakeholder engagement processes and studies. Information on the DWAF processes will be fed into the EIA process, as it becomes available.</p>

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>Since the initial building of the Mokolo dam, the water flowing in the Limpopo past my farm has reduced considerably. I don't think I exaggerate if I say that this area has been adversely affected. It would be interesting to compare the original study, if one was made, and its predictions, to how things actually are today. Did the experts get it right?</p>	<p>Mr Chris Lane (Lungile Game Estates) (Email dated 2 July 2005)</p>	<p>Comment noted. One of the surface water development options currently investigated, is raising of the Mokolo dam wall. Eskom acknowledges the link between its new proposed power station, and the overall water supply issue. The future water infrastructure development options, if any, will require environmental approval. This approval should take cognisance of the environmental impacts associated with such surface water development options. DWAF is mandated by national government to carry out the function of water development in the national interest. Eskom, as key stakeholder, is actively participating in the DWAF stakeholder engagement processes and studies.</p>
<p>According to information received, the dam wall in the Mogol River will be increased. This would have severe cumulative impacts on the Limpopo River, which is already under pressure.</p>	<p>Dr. J.G. Williams (Agri Limpopo: President) (Comment sheet - 26 July 2005)</p>	

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>The Mogol, Crocodile and Limpopo River systems have been affected by the construction of the Mogolo dam. The proposed development could require the further raising of the dam wall, which would again have negative impacts on these river systems. The Department of Water Affairs and Forestry (DWAF) would have to look at an integrated water management plan for the Limpopo catchment as the development in the Lephalale area could have severe downstream impacts. The minimum flows of the rivers must be maintained. The upstream and downstream impacts should therefore be looked at by DWAF from an integrated perspective.</p>	<p>Mr Gerhard de Beer (Limpopo DEDET) (Public Meeting - 28 June 2005)</p>	<p>DWAF is undertaking Pre-feasibility and Feasibility Studies concerning the raising of the Mokolo Dam Wall and/or Transfer of water from the Crocodile (West) catchments. The future water infrastructure development options, if any, will require environmental approval. This approval should take cognisance of the environmental impacts associated with such surface water development options. DWAF is mandated by national government to carry out the function of water development in the national interest.</p>
<p>My concerns are related to the issue of water and the proposed raising of the dam wall. I am concerned about downstream impacts as his farm is over 100 km downstream on the Limpopo River. How much water would be required to be used by the proposed power station? Where will the water for the proposed power station be sourced from and what is the extent of the downstream impacts. When will the study being undertaken by DWAF be complete and will the findings made available.</p>	<p>Mr Chris Lane (Lungile Game Estates) (Public Meeting - 28 June 2005)</p>	<p>The quantity of water required by the power station amounts to approximately 4 - 6 million cubic meters per annum for each phase of the project (approximately 2100 MW per phase). It is anticipated that the proposed new power station will also receive its water from the Mokolo Dam. DWAF is undertaking Pre-feasibility and Feasibility Studies concerning the raising of the Mokolo Dam Wall and/or Transfer of water from the Crocodile (West) catchments. The EIA will be considering the studies being undertaken by DWAF and incorporate their findings, where possible. Whatever information is available at the time of the submission of the Final EIR, will be included. The anticipated completion date for the DWAF studies, is during the course of 2006. Through its public engagement/participation process, DWAF will make these findings available.</p>

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>Will the Mokolo Dam provide sufficient water for the proposed development, or will water be required to be imported to the area?</p>	<p>Johan Erasmus (Lephalale Municipality: Planning & Development) (Local Municipality Meeting - 28 June 2005)</p>	<p>DWAF are currently undertaking hydrological studies to define and quantify the need and the resource. At this stage, it is required to be determined if the existing surface water infrastructure will be able to support all the required users, and what other necessary surface water development will need to take place to meet the needs in the area.</p>
<p>Will Eskom source their required water supply from Mokolo Dam. Will it then be required to augment supply to Mokolo Dam. Two power stations relying on one source would not be considered ideal. The Department of Agriculture would prefer to see dual sources of water supply. What are the Irrigation Board's concerns are regarding the proposed project?</p>	<p>Gerhard Engelbrecht (Department of Agriculture) (Provincial Authorities Meeting - 28 June 2005)</p>	<p>Comment noted. DWAF are currently undertaking hydrological studies to define and quantify the need and the resource. In order to provide for the assurance of supply, it is most likely that a dual source would be required</p>
<p>Water is a case in point. The water requirements are known. Proposals are in place to raise the Mkolo dam by 12m (double the capacity), transfer water out of the Crocodile catchment, as well as augment supplies from underground sources. One also must question why the capacity of the dam needs to be doubled and additional water sources tapped for only 3 million m³?</p>	<p>Dr Mark Berry (Resource Ecologist) (Letter dated 30 June 2005)</p>	<p>DWAF are currently undertaking hydrological studies to define and quantify the need and the resource. At this stage, it is required to be determined if the existing surface water infrastructure will be able to support all the required users, and what other necessary surface water development will need to take place to meet the needs in the area. DWAF is also taking a holistic and strategic view of water demand in the area, and as such, has commissioned studies to address water supply from a holistic and strategic view.</p>

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>I find it ironic that a province which takes its name from this river, indeed recently changed its name in honour of the river, now, almost before the ink is dry, so to speak, would seek to gamble with its future. None of us want to stand in the way of progress but this is a major issue and one that effects more than just a handful of farmers downstream. We must get this one right! I have to believe that all right minded and responsible South Africans, indeed all right minded people, irrespective of who or where they are in this world, hold true to the principle that, the earth is something you protect every day of the year, and a river is something you defend every inch of its course. We must never neglect that principle. We are judged only by the future.</p>	<p>Mr Chris Lane (Lungile Game Estates) (Email dated 2 July 2005)</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>It would seem that the focus has been on the availability of supply rather than the impact of additional water use. Furthermore, the issue is been avoided by saying that it is DWAF's responsibility to provide the water and manage the impacts thereof. If there was no new power plant there would be no water requirement. In effect the environmental impacts of the power station are being externalised which is contrary to environmental best practice.</p>	<p>Dr Mark Berry (Resource ecologist) (Letter dated 30 June 2005)</p>	<p>The current water use at Matimba Power Station is 3.3 million m³/annum. At present the only source of water to the existing power station is the Mokolo Dam. Should an additional power station be built the demand on the dam will be increased and DWAF will be required to provide an assured water supply. . DWAF is currently undertaking Pre-feasibility and Feasibility Studies concerning the raising of the Mokolo Dam Wall and/or Transfer of water from the Crocodile (West) catchments. A reduction in the Mokolo River flow can occur if the Mokolo Dam capacity is increased. The impact will depend on the reduction of flow. The reduction in flow can impact on legal surface water use, riparian vegetation and emergent farmers. The augmentation of surface water from the Crocodile (West and Marico catchment will reduce the significance of the threat.</p>

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>What environmental study/studies are in fact being made and by whom? Presuming a full study is planned, taking into account all factors i.e. water loss due to evaporation since the proposed doubling of the capacity of the Mokolo dam will presumably greatly increase the surface area, to mining, to housing and domestic use as well as all the other factors associated with the proposed expansion? Most specifically however, will this also include a forecast or model predicting the effect on the flow of water into the Limpopo river downstream, as well as how the ground water-table in the immediate 200 kilometer long effected area below the dam may be reduced over the next 20 years or so. I stand to correction but I don't identify any major tributaries of the Limpopo downstream the Mokolo/Limpopo confluence, other than the Palala, which is very sporadic, until one reaches the Mogalakwena and the Shashi situated at about 200 km. It strikes me that our neighbors in Botswana should also have cause for alarm, what has been their response?</p>	<p>Mr Chris Lane (Lungile Game Estates) (Email dated 2 July 2005)</p>	<p>The river system is a complete system that needs to be looked at in its entirety. The EIA will identify and consider the potential for downstream impacts. DWAF shares the same concerns in this regard. DWAF have identified a series of planning studies that would culminate in defining the water use and availability of water. The studies are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verification and Validation study: This is to verify the water use of each water user and then verify the information. This study is expected to be completed in May 2006. • Hydrology Study: This is to update the hydrology of the area and confirm the yield of the system. This study will be completed by December 2006. • Water Conservation and Water Demand Management Study: This is a study to assess the potential to implement further water conservation and water demand management initiatives in the area. This study will be completed by January 2006. • Pre-feasibility and Feasibility Studies: Raising the Mokolo Dam Wall and/or Transfer of water from the Crocodile)West) catchments
<p>The assessments will be made with historical data (river flows, rainfall, MAR, etc). Recession curves show that periods of no-flow have an increase in gradient over the last decade. Consequently, what was normal in the past may not be normal in the future. Will modeling be done to take into account anticipated impacts of global warming and decline in rainfall over the next 50 years (life of plant)?</p>	<p>Dr Mark Berry (Resource Ecologist) (Letter dated 30 June 2005)</p>	<p>Comment noted. The water supply studies should address this issue.</p>

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>Eskom apparently know that its water requirement is 3 mil cubic meters. Kumba is however conducting its own separate study about which precious little is known. Even Eskom seem unaware that DWAF, which, we are told, is at present undertaking studies as part of the Kumba initiative, will not have completed their assessment before the end of 2006. Only then will Kumba know if it may proceed. A DWAF representative put the question at the meeting on the 28th, and I quote " ... are you prepared to wait?" I noticed that there was no direct response from Eskom to this question. Despite this however, we were told that the "Eskom decision to proceed will be taken in early 2006".</p>	<p>Mr Chris Lane (Lungile Game Estates) (Email dated 2 July 2005)</p>	<p>The river system is a complete system that needs to be looked at in its entirety. The EIA will identify and consider the potential for downstream impacts. DWAF shares the same concerns in this regard. DWAF have identified a series of planning studies that would culminate in defining the water use and availability of water. The studies are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verification and Validation study: This is to verify the water use of each water user and then verify the information. This study is expected to be completed in May 2006. • Hydrology Study: This is to update the hydrology of the area and confirm the yield of the system. This study will be completed by December 2006. • Water Conservation and Water Demand Management Study: This is a study to assess the potential to implement further water conservation and water demand management initiatives in the area. This study will be completed by January 2006. • Pre-feasibility and Feasibility Studies: Raising the Mokolo Dam Wall and/or Transfer of water from the Crocodile)West) catchments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation of all water uses, under Section 21 of the National Water Act. • How they are going to manage their water uses, and how they will minimize the negative impacts that will have on the water resource. 	<p>Miss RM Ledwaba (DWAF - Provincial) (Comment Form)</p>	<p>Water from the Mokolo Dam is currently allocated to households, irrigation, Matimba and Kumba. Eskom will be required to apply for a water use license.</p>
<p>Integrated Water Resources Management. Authorisation in terms of Section 40 (read with Section 21) of the National Water Act, 36 of 1998 with the intention of protecting water resources.</p>	<p>Mr TR Ngoasheng (DWAF) (Comment Form)</p>	

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
I am concerned about the volumes of water needed for another power station.	Mr A Malherbe (Landowner) (one-on-one consultation - 10 June 2005)	The proposed power station would be a dry-cooled station, which is less water intensive than station utilising conventional cooling systems. The proposed power station is proposed to utilise <0.2 litres of water per unit sent out.
How much water does such a power station use?	Mr. G. Erasmus and Mr. H. Steenkamp (Landowners) (Meeting - 21 June 2005)	
Water usage by the proposed power station is a source of concern.	Dr. J.G. Williams (Agri Limpopo: President) (Comment sheet - 26 July 2005)	
There is no water for current activities. The Development of this project would mean a long term tragedy.	Dr L.J Botha (Gwelo Safari) Comment Form	
The future provision of water is a source of concern. Additional pipelines and a dam would most probably have to be constructed.	Mr D de Ridder, Mr A Bower, Mr E Badenhorst, Ms C Cocquyt (Lephalale Municipality) (one on one consultation - 9 June 2005)	The proposed power station would be a dry-cooled station, which is less water intensive than station utilising conventional cooling systems. The proposed power station is proposed to utilise <0,2 litres of water per unit sent out. DWAF are currently undertaking studies on the Mokolo Dam and assessing the need for the supply to the dam to be augmented.

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
Projections of total water usage in the Matimba B Power Station and associated coal mining activities, including water requirements for pollution remediation activities that may be considered as a future option to meet air quality standards (e.g. scrubbers).	Nkosana Rakitla (Earthlife Africa) (Letter dated 21 September 2005)	The proposed power station would be a dry-cooled station, which is less water intensive than station utilising conventional cooling systems. The proposed power station is proposed to utilise <0,2 litres of water per unit sent out.
Water related issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there current water available in the catchment sufficient for such an extension? • Disposal facilities of ash need authorization in terms of the National Water Act, 1998 and other related legislation. 	Mr M Matlala (DWAF) (Comment Form)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The potential surface water resources within the area are nearly fully developed, however, various water supply schemes are being considered in order to augment the current volumes of water available in the catchment. • Comment noted. The required authorisations and permits will be applied for by Eskom.
What plans are there for the return water from mining i.e. waste water, what percentage of the draw-down will this be and will this be treated and returned to the dam or released down stream? Is the plan to release it beyond some other drainage divide?	Mr Chris Lane (Lungile Game Estates) (Email dated 2 July 2005)	Eskom are unable to comment on Kumba Resources plans with regards to water use and water discharge.
Previously experienced problems with Kumba Resource's waste water polluting the veld, but this has been addressed.	Mr. C. Gouws (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 25 June 2005)	Comment noted.

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>The two boreholes on Zongesien and Peerboom have a very low yield. The future water quality and quantity is a major source of concern.</p>	<p>Mr A Bosman, Mr W O'Brien, Mr A Crous (one on one consultation - 21 June 2005)</p>	<p>Comment noted. The existing Matimba Power Station follows a comprehensive monitoring programme which monitors water quality and quantity.</p>
<p>The borehole water cannot be used for drinking, but it has been tested and found suitable for animal consumption. It has been noted that some vegetables do not grow if they have been irrigated with borehole water.</p>	<p>Mr A Bosman, Mr W O'Brien, Mr A Crous (one on one consultation - 21 June 2005)</p>	
<p>Water supply for human and animals are very limited and boreholes are currently being used. Should this supply be cut-off or exhausted due to the mining activities, it is envisaged that farming would become unaffordable. Through the years living standards have declined, forcing people to live a pauper existence</p>	<p>Mr T Sauer (Beestekraal Brits) (Comment Form)</p>	

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>It is assumed that the existing coal mine(s) would be extended which means that it will contribute to further negative environmental impacts. Any possible blasting would expose groundwater watercourses. Should this happen farms would be cut off from their water supply, water pollution would occur or the water supply could dry up. This impact can occur immediately or over a period of time. To date, no mine has ever accepted any responsibility for any of the above-mentioned negative impacts. It would be a costly affair to embark on legal actions to address these problems. A strong viewpoint needs to be taken on this matter and a free-of-charge presses to be put in place immediately to assist farmers to replenish their resources, should it be affected by this project</p>	<p>Mr T Sauer (Beestekraal Brits) (Comment Form)</p>	<p>Comment noted. The existing Matimba Power Station follows a comprehensive monitoring programme which monitors water quality and quantity</p>
<p>From where will Eskom receive the water for the operation of the power station? The possible contamination (quality) and depletion (quantity) of the water sources are sources of concern.</p>	<p>Mr. C. Gouws (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 25 June 2005)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The existing Matimba power station receives water from the Mkolo Dam, it is anticipated that the proposed new Matimba power station would receive water from the same source. • The existing Matimba Power Station follows a comprehensive monitoring programme which monitors water quality and quantity.
<p>Propose that the water quality be tested prior to the development and after operations started to determine the negative impacts.</p>	<p>Mr. S. Grobler (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 23 June 2005)</p>	<p>The existing Matimba Power Station follows a comprehensive monitoring programme which monitors water quality and quantity. Issues pertaining to the monitoring of water quality monitoring will be considered during the Environmental Impact Assessment Phase and included within the Environmental Management Plan.</p>

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>Ambient hydrochemistry (Chapter 6.4.4 in draft scoping report): Limited data indicates elevated concentrations of dissolved solids of Sodium, Chloride, Sulphate and Calcium which exceed maximum levels on the farm Nooitgedacht.</p> <p>Comment from DEDET-BM: These farms (Table 6.3) do not form part of the study area. Furthermore, although a large number of monitoring boreholes occur on the present site of the Grootgeluk mine and Matimba power station, no monitoring results with regard to the ambient hydrochemistry are shown. The surface drainage is north-eastwards (Figure 6.11) and I would like to know what the risks are with persistent pollutants and what will Eskom do to prevent such pollution.</p>	<p>Department of Economic Development, Environment & Tourism Limpopo - <i>Biodiversity Management</i> (DEDET-BM) (Comments on draft scoping report) Letter dated 28 Oct 2005</p>	<p>Eskom has a duty of care to ensure that it minimises its impacts on the environment. Through its Environmental Management Programme, issues around potential groundwater pollution and the mitigation thereof will be dealt with.</p>

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
The Lephalale Municipality should not act as the Water Service Provider for the new power station, as the extent would be too vast.	Mr. S. van Wyk (Lephalale Municipality: Divisional Head: Water) (Individual meeting - 10 June 2005)	Comment noted. It is anticipated that DWAF would be the water service provider for the proposed new power station.
Planning should take the floodline of the Sandloop into account, as high flows have been noted in the past.	Mr A Bosman, Mr W O'Brien, Mr A Crous (one on one consultation - 21 June 2005)	Comment noted.
The Sandloop traverses many properties where the farmers have dams with earth walls. The ashing facility can therefore not be developed across the Sandloop.	Mr. J. van Rooyen (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 21 June 2005)	
The Sandloop through the farms should not be blocked or polluted as this is a natural water resource that has been feeding the dams on various farms for years.	Mr. J. van Rooyen (Landowner) (Comment sheet - 14 July 2005)	
Will Eskom consider Matimba A and Matimba B as a "complex", and therefore apply for a single license for both together. DWAF would prefer a single license application from Eskom for their water use.	Tehagala Ngoasheng (DWAF) (Provincial Authorities Meeting - 28 June 2005)	Comment noted.

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
Will the water licensing application for the power station form part of the EIA.	Charl Nolte (Kumba Resources: Manager Strategy & Planning: Environmental Management) (Focus Group Meeting – Kumba Resources – 5 August 2005)	The EIA will make recommendations in this regard. Eskom will make the necessary applications for a water use licence for the new proposed.
Will Eskom be renewing their water license.	Ms Carla Hudson (WESSA) (Key Stakeholders Workshop – 27 June 2005)	The current Matimba Power Station water use authorisation will be updated as part of water licensing process for all water users in the area.
Are studies being undertaken regarding water resources, and will Eskom be applying for a water use license for Matimba B.	Tehagala Ngoasheng (DWAF) (Provincial Authorities Meeting – 28 June 2005)	The environmental impact assessment will include potential impacts on quality and quantity of water resources. Eskom are a strategic water user. Eskom would be required to apply for a water use license, but that that would an action outside of the EIA process.
Will the groundwater assessments form part of the site selection criteria.	Charl Nolte (Kumba Resources: Manager Strategy & Planning: Environmental Management) (Focus Group Meeting – Kumba Resources – 5 August 2005)	Specialists studies concerning the impact on surface and groundwater are currently being undertaken. The studies are currently at scoping level. Findings of these initial assessments will form part of the Scoping Report that would recommend a preferred site for the location of the power station.

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>DWAF is currently undertaking three projects for the catchment and area. These include studies related to water conservation and water catchment management, clarification and sanitation of water uses, as well as the updating of the hydrology and system models. Will Eskom require these results for their project? The studies will only be finalised at the end of 2006.</p>	<p>Mr Moses Moloantoa (DWAF) (Public meeting – 28 June 2005)</p>	<p>Eskom are aware of these studies and will incorporate whatever information is available at the time, into the EIA process. Eskom understand the value of the DWAF studies and will utilise interim findings where final reports are not available. The DWAF studies are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verification and Validation study: This is to verify the water use of each water user and then verify the information. This study is expected to be completed in May 2006. • Hydrology Study: This is to update the hydrology of the area and confirm the yield of the system. This study will be completed by December 2006. • Water Conservation and Water Demand Management Study: This is a study to assess the potential to implement further water conservation and water demand management initiatives in the area. This study will be completed by January 2006. <p>Pre-feasibility and Feasibility Studies: Raising the Mokolo Dam Wall and/or Transfer of water from the Crocodile (West) catchments</p>
<p>What water related concerns were raised as part of the public participation process for the EIA for the power station. There is synergy between Eskom and Kumba regarding water issues, as they are currently utilising the same supply infrastructure.</p>	<p>Charl Nolte (Kumba Resources: Manager Strategy & Planning: Environmental Management) (Focus Group Meeting – Kumba Resources – 5 August 2005)</p>	<p>All the issues raised during the Scoping Phase are included in the Issues Trail.</p>

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>Overview of the proposed project (1.2, page 3 in the draft scoping report): The capacity is estimated at 4 800 MV. Dry-cooled technology reduces the amount of water consumed and approximately < 0.2 litres of water per unit sent out.</p> <p>Comment from DEDET-BM: The critical question about water need is vague. What amount of m³ of water is necessary for the operation per annum?</p>	<p>Department of Economic Development, Environment & Tourism Limpopo – <i>Biodiversity Management</i> (DEDET-BM) (Comments on draft scoping report) Letter dated 28 Oct 2005</p>	<p>The proposed power station will use approximately 4 - 6 million cubic meters of water per annum per phase (each phase - approximately 2100 MW).</p>
<p>Feasible Technology Alternatives (Chapter 2.5): Cooling technology such as dry-cooled is proposed as a result of limited water supply in the Lephalale area.</p> <p>Comment from DEDET-BM: Again the utilization of water is expressed as < 0.2 l/kWh... approximately 1.5 litres of water per unit sent out. In principle the technology will assist with water conservation but not necessarily meet the environmental requirements and subsequent water conservation needs. This can only be true if a sustainable amount of water is available. Again the total volume of water required to determine the extent is not indicated.</p>	<p>Department of Economic Development, Environment & Tourism Limpopo – <i>Biodiversity Management</i> (DEDET-BM) (Comments on draft scoping report) Letter dated 28 Oct 2005</p>	<p>Comment noted. The proposed power station will use approximately 4 - 6 million cubic meters of water per annum per phase (each phase - approximately 2100 MW). Eskom takes cognisance of the hierarchy of water uses, and Eskom is committed to "best practice" operational water management practices.</p>

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>Water users (5.5.3 in draft scoping report): Paragraph 2: "Currently the water availability and water use are in balance." Provisions in the Water Act as stipulated in the National Water Resource Strategy, there is a need to meet the water requirements of the Reserve (Basic human needs and Ecology). Water demands will increase with new developments. Comment from DEDET-BM: DWAF indicated that the current system was already stressed and that there are no additional volumes of water available from the Mokolo Dam.</p>	<p>Department of Economic Development, Environment & Tourism Limpopo - <i>Biodiversity Management</i> (DEDET-BM) (Comments on draft scoping report) Letter dated 28 Oct 2005</p>	<p>DWAF has embarked on a stakeholder consultation process in the Lephalale area in December 2003 to discuss future developments that were anticipated and the concomitant water requirements. DWAF also identified a series of planning studies that would culminate in defining the water use and the availability of water. These studies include <i>inter alia</i> a Verification and Validation Study (to verify the water use of each water user), a Hydrology Study (aimed at providing DWAF with an updated understanding of how much water/yield is presently available in the catchment), a Water Conservation & Water Demand Management Study (to assess the potential to implement further water conservation and water demand initiatives in the catchments area) and Pre-feasibility and Feasibility Studies (to evaluate the feasibility of raising the Mokolo Dam Wall and/or transfer of water from the Crocodile West catchments to augment the Mokolo system. The pre-feasibility for an augmentation option had been identified prior to Eskom's intent of developing the new power station for the reasons described above (DWAF, 2005).</p> <p>Collectively, the outcomes of these studies will enable the DWAF to be able to take decisions regarding water quantities and supply, water use and imbalances in the system.</p>
<p>Issues Trail</p>	<p>85</p>	<p>18/11/2005</p>

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>Services (Chapter 5.7.8): A very high percentage of communities in the Limpopo province are still below 50% of RDP standards in terms of water supply; Waterberg district about 48 000 households do not have access to water 98% of the time; In Lephalale Local Municipality, one third of households do not have access to water in the dwelling or yard.</p> <p>Comment from DEDET-BM: This statement is contradictory to above-mentioned statement, which indicates that the water usage and availability are in balance.</p>	<p>Department of Economic Development, Environment & Tourism Limpopo – <i>Biodiversity Management</i> (DEDET-BM) (Comments on draft scoping report) Letter dated 28 Oct 2005</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>Chapter 6.5 (Surface water hydrology – page 77, paragraph 6): Taking the requirements into account, there is insufficient water to maintain the current balance and “the supply of additional water from the already stressed catchments may have an indirect impact on the downstream surface water users.” See also paragraph 3, page 79; the potential surface water is nearly fully developed (the scheme is stressed) with major dams and a host of smaller dams in the area.</p> <p>Chapter 6.5.1: Current surface water supply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Matimba Power station (7.3 million m³/year) - Grootgeluk Coal Mine (9.9 m³/year) - Lephalale & adjacent urban users (1 million m³/year) - Irrigation (10.49 million m³/year) <p>Comment from DEDET-BM: If Matimba power station uses 3.3 million m³/year and the allocation is 7.3 m³/year, then there will be a surplus of 4 million m³/year that could potentially be used by the new mine – see Chapter 6.5.1.</p>	<p>Department of Economic Development, Environment & Tourism Limpopo – <i>Biodiversity Management</i> (DEDET-BM) (Comments on draft scoping report) Letter dated 28 Oct 2005</p>	<p>The following water allocations are current: Matimba Power Station: 6.5 million m³/year Grootegeluk Mine (Kumba Resources): 5.6 million m³/year Lephalale Municipality: 3.9 million m³/year</p> <p>DWAF is doing the verification and validation of existing lawful water use studies, to assess in conjunction with hydrology study, the potential 4 million cubic meters per annum, available from the current Eskom allocation (whether the water is there, or not). Similarly, this will apply to other users’ allocations.</p>

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>Chapter 6.5.2 (DWAF studies, page 80): DWAF undertook a series of planning studies that would culminate in defining the amount of water use and the availability of water namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Verification and validation of study which will be used to determine actual amount of water use <p>Comment from DEDET-BM: No information available yet</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hydrology study – to determine how much water (yield) is available in the catchments <p>Comment from DEDET-BM: No information available yet</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Water conservation and water demand Management study – water efficiency <p>Comment from DEDET-BM: No information available yet</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pre-feasibility and Feasibility studies for raising the dam wall, or transferring water from other catchments <p>Comment from DEDET-BM: No information available yet</p> <p>Comment from DEDET-BM: How can the ISEP process select this site on the criteria of availability and accessibility of primary resources such as water (Chapter 2.3, page 8) if the outcome of the studies (DWAF studies, page 80) is not finalized and also to be able to take decisions regarding water quantities and supply, water use and imbalances in the system.</p>	<p>Department of Economic Development, Environment & Tourism Limpopo – <i>Biodiversity Management</i> (DEDET-BM) (Comments on draft scoping report) Letter dated 28 Oct 2005</p>	<p>It is accepted in project planning, that at concept level, certain assumptions were made in terms of water availability such as the water available in the current allocation for Matimba Power Station, i.e approximately 4 million m³/year). As the project is better defined, more detailed studies are undertaken to gain a better understanding if issues such as what exiting water uses there are, what the hydrology studies indicate, whether the water is physically available, etc.</p>

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>Chapter 6.5.3 in draft scoping report (Possible water augmentation sources, page 82): The following water supply schemes are considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supply from the Crocodile and Marico catchments (45 million m³/annum) - Raising the dam wall - Bore fields from the Mogol River with capacity of 30.7 million m³/annum <p>Comment from DEDET-BM: The exact water demand for the proposed mine is not yet known as the power station size and type has not been finalized (paragraph 2, page 82). The power station is proposed to operate at an installed capacity of approximately 4800 MW (paragraph 1, page 3). According to design specifications, the dry cooled station would utilize approximately < 0.2 litres of water per unit sent out (paragraph 4, page 3). I cannot see why estimation cannot be given. The first power plant at Matimba has a capacity of approximately 3600-388 MW and needs 3.3 million m³/annum. Will the proposed power station, which is designed to conserve water, not use less than 4 million m³/annum? The fact that alternative resource areas have been investigated, suggests that a larger amount of water will be needed for the operation of the power station. Additional water supply from the Crocodile and Marico catchments, and water abstraction from the Mogol area is not that simple as the entire Limpopo System downwards is also dependant on water from these systems. In fact shortages already exist, especially during the dry period, and water for human use, mining and agriculture increased.</p>	<p>Department of Economic Development, Environment & Tourism Limpopo – <i>Biodiversity Management</i> (DEDET-BM) (Comments on draft scoping report) Letter dated 28 Oct 2005</p>	<p>The proposed power station will use approximately 4 - 6 million cubic meters of water per annum per phase (each phase - approximately 2100 MW). Eskom takes cognisance of the hierarchy of water uses, and Eskom is committed to "best practice" operational water management practices.</p>

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>Water is not that available and although it was noted that the present situation is in balance with the present need, further information from DWAF suggests that there is not sufficient water for the new development and that the water system is already under pressure. Studies undertaken by DWAF to address alternative ways of water management have not been finalized.</p>	<p>Department of Economic Development, Environment & Tourism Limpopo – <i>Biodiversity Management</i> (Comments on draft scoping report) Letter dated 28 Oct 2005</p>	<p>Comment noted. The DWAF studies will be finalised during the course of 2006. Whatever information from these studies is available at the time, will be included in the EIA process.</p>
<p>It is still not sure what the water demand will be. The water source from the Marico and Crocodile Rivers is potential yield that depends on climatic conditions as well as existing water use for human, industry and agriculture in the entire system. According to the permits, large amounts of water are abstracted from the Crocodile River or boreholes. This is a legal operation according to the approved permits from the Department of Water Affairs.</p>	<p>Department of Economic Development, Environment & Tourism Limpopo – <i>Biodiversity Management</i> (Comments on draft scoping report) Letter dated 28 Oct 2005</p>	<p>Comment noted. DWAF will have more information on this issue.</p>
<p>The total amount of water abstracted by all land users of the Crocodile River, however, is a matter of concern, as the minimum flow requirement is affected by this amount of water abstraction. This is applicable to all water users in the catchment.</p>	<p>Department of Economic Development, Environment & Tourism Limpopo – <i>Biodiversity Management</i> (Comments on draft scoping report) Letter dated 28 Oct 2005</p>	<p>The reasons for the DWAF studies, are <i>inter alia</i>, to determine the impacts of water abstraction.</p>

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>The same applies to water abstraction from the Mogol River. Allocations of water cannot be made without a system approach. L at present, indications are that the water reserve is not enough to fulfil the basic needs of the river ecology.</p>	<p>Department of Economic Development, Environment & Tourism Limpopo - <i>Biodiversity Management</i> (Comments on draft scoping report) Letter dated 28 Oct 2005</p>	<p>A Reserve determination is needed to determine the requirements of the reserve.</p>
<p>Pollution of groundwater is taking place and will increase with an increased capacity of industrial needs. Although monitoring is essential it is not clear what will be done to prevent or mitigate this pollution of ground water, which will have a cumulative effect on the water resources.</p>	<p>Department of Economic Development, Environment & Tourism Limpopo - <i>Biodiversity Management</i> (Comments on draft scoping report) Letter dated 28 Oct 2005</p>	<p>Eskom has a duty of care to ensure that it minimises its impacts on the environment. Through its Environmental Management Programme for the proposed new power station, issues around potential groundwater pollution and the mitigation thereof will be dealt with</p>

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>A sound decision cannot be made without all relevant information. Based on the present information the critical issue is water availability.</p> <p>It is recommended that Water Affairs first finalize their studies on the water management and conservation in the Limpopo River system. The minimum flow requirements to meet the needs of the river ecology should be firstly determined before allocations of water can be made</p> <p>A holistic approach is needed to comply with the National Environmental Management Act (Act No 107 of 1998) and the National Water Research Strategy to meet the requirements of the water reserve (Basic human needs and ecology).</p>	<p>Department of Economic Development, Environment & Tourism Limpopo - <i>Biodiversity Management</i> (Comments on draft scoping report) Letter dated 28 Oct 2005</p>	<p>Comment noted. The DWAF studies will inform this.</p>

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
FAUNA AND FLORA		
Impacts on ecology and flora.	Mr M Mhlalisi (Earthlife Africa) (Comment Form)	Issues pertaining to flora and fauna related impacts have been evaluated in the Scoping report. These issues were also considered in the evaluation of sites in order to nominate a preferred site. Detailed studies will be completed in the EIA phase.
I have various game species on the property, which include impala, blesbuck, kudu, waterbuck, zebra, giraffe, gemsbok, eland, steenbuck, duiker, blue wildebeest, duiker, tsessebe and ostriches. The habitat of the property is unique due to the variation in soil types and there is sufficient water available on the property. The game would have to be captured and moved to a new property, which would have a negative impact on the animals and their breeding patterns.	Mr A Malherbe (Landowner) (one-on-one consultation - 10 June 05)	
I wish to express my concern about the effect and the adverse implications that the above-mentioned proposed development will have on my mother and father, Mr. & Mrs. L.F. Steyn of the Farm Kromdraai should this development be constructed on the farms Naauw Ontkomen and Eenzaamheid. My parents' farm was declared a nature reserve in 1961 and the effect that the proposed development might have on the status of the farm as a nature reserve is of great concern to us.	Mr. L.I. Steyn (Family of landowner) (Comment received on 24 October 2005)	Comment noted.
In addition to the series of objections already submitted: The farms Grootvallei, Kaffirsdraai (now Kromdraai) and Nootgedacht 514-LQ were declared the Tierkop Private Nature Reserve by the Transvaal Provincial Administration through Proclamation nr. 72 of 1961.	Mr. L.F. Steyn (Comment form)	Comment noted.

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
The surface and biodiversity of the various farms under investigation are generally homogenous, except for the water availability. Kumba Resources have completed various assessments on their properties and information is available.	Mr E Geldenhuys (Kumba Resources) (one on one consultation on 10 June 2005)	Issues pertaining to flora and fauna related impacts have been evaluated in the Scoping report. These issues were also considered in the evaluation of sites in order to nominate a preferred site. Detailed studies will be completed in the EIA phase.
Of the opinion that the developments in the area do have a negative impact on nature, due to the fact that various trees in the area are dying.	Mr. S. Grobler (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 23 June 05)	
The environment is extremely sensitive and any developments would have a negative impact on the environment. The Landowners do not have any dung beetles on their properties and they are concerned that it is due to the negative impact on the environment created by the mine and/or Eskom.	Mr. G. Erasmus and Mr. H. Steenkamp (Landowners) (Individual meeting - 21 June 05)	
The electromagnetic fields of the power lines also have a negative impact on the reproduction patterns of animals. An additional power station would result in more power lines traversing the surrounding properties.	Dr. A. Moolman (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 21 July 05)	Comment noted. Transmission lines out of the power station would be required. The construction of these lines would require a separate EIA process, during which issues such as the impact of electromagnetic fields on fauna may be evaluated and assessed.

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>Will Eskom consider stopping the project should the environmental studies identify a Red data species on site.</p>	<p>Ms Carla Hudson (WESSA) (Key Stakeholders Workshop - 27 June 05)</p>	<p>Decisions in this regard would depend on the specialist studies undertaken during the EIA process and their recommendations in this regard. Eskom could then look at an alternative site, but they would not just assume that if there was a Red Data species on one section of a site that it would be found elsewhere and stop the project based on such an assumption. At the Majuba Power Station a Red Data species (Sun Gazer Lizard) was identified during the construction phase. This species was relocated and a dedicated conservation area formed to protect the species. It is considered possible for Eskom to deal with such situations.</p>

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT		
Population pressure: increasing population pressure also decreases the value of agricultural land with problems such as poaching and filthiness.	Mr P Erasmus (Lawyer) (email letter – 29 June 05)	Social impacts are covered by the Social Impact Assessment and will be evaluated in more depth in the EIA phase. These issues were also considered in the evaluation of sites.
Mining towns change the character of a town. Social decay is a possibility.	Mr. S. Grobler (Landowner) (Individual meeting – 23 June 05)	
Opposed to the proposed development as the landowner has already experienced the negative impacts of such developments when the existing Matimba power station was built.	Mr. T. Nel (Landowner) (Individual meeting – 22 June 05)	
The social aspects of the studies would form a critical part of the assessments as numerous negative social impacts could materialise.	Mr. S. van Wyk (Lephalale Municipality: Divisional Head: Water) (Individual meeting – 10 June 05)	
It is expected that South Africa must provide power to Africa, but the property owners near such a facility are the ones that are negatively affected. The quality of life of these property owners is severely negatively impacted on and an additional power station would worsen the situation.	Mr. G. Erasmus and Mr. H. Steenkamp (Landowners) (Meeting – 21 June 05)	
Impacts on the social environment.	Mr M Mhlalisi (Earthlife Africa) (Comment Form)	

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>The Lephalale Municipality (formerly known as the Ellisras Municipality) did not exist when the Matimba Power Station was constructed, but they have had to manage the social challenges created by the power station.</p>	<p>Mr D de Ridder, Mr A Bower, Mr E Badenhorst, Ms C Cocquyt (Lephalale Municipality) (one on one consultation - 9 June 2005)</p>	<p>Social impacts are covered by the Social Impact Assessment and will be evaluated in more depth in the EIA phase. These issues were also considered in the evaluation of sites.</p>
<p>Social Aspects and the location of the power station.</p>	<p>Mr D de Ridder (Lephalale Municipality) (comment form)</p>	
<p>Labour relation problems.</p>	<p>Dr Andre Moolman (Landowner) (Comment Form)</p>	
<p>It is anticipated that a significant number of the potential workforce would be sourced from the Mokorong area approximately 40 km from Lephalale near Marken. Concern regarding the movement of the workforce from the source area to Lephalale.</p>	<p>Lephalale Municipality (one on one consultation - 9 June 2005)</p>	
<p>The findings from a socio-economic impact assessment would be critical for the Lephalale Municipality for planning purposes.</p>	<p>Mr D de Ridder, Mr A Bower, Mr E Badenhorst, Ms C Cocquyt (Lephalale Municipality) (one on one consultation - 9 June 2005)</p>	<p>Both a Social Impact Assessment and a macro-Economic study have been commissioned by Eskom and results will be included in the Environmental Impact Report.</p>

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
Eskom and Kumba Resources do not assist the landowners in solving the social problems created by their activities.	Mr. J.J. Lambrecht (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 21 June 05)	Comment noted.
There are no workers residing on the farm Zongesien.	Mr A Bosman, Mr W O'Brien, Mr A Crous (one on one consultation - 21 June 2005)	Comment Noted.
Experience has shown that during the construction phase hostels were built in black townships. When the construction is complete, there is no management or upkeep of the hostels and there is no proper control. These problems were experienced in Marapong. This has severe negative impacts on the community.	Mr Moses Moloantoa (Public meeting - 28 June 2005)	Eskom usually encourages that hostels / camps are limited and aims to minimise any negative impacts associated with the construction phase on the community. The social impact assessment (SIA) would provide recommendations on how best Eskom could address this issue.
How Eskom will contribute in educating the community with regards to HIV Aids, as an influx of people to an area usually increases the prevalence of sexually transmitted diseases.	Mr Mosima Nyama (Public meeting - 28 June 2005)	Eskom does consider HIV and Aids a serious issue. Eskom have programmes implemented in areas around their other power stations, and Eskom also invests money into research for anti-viral medication. This issue would be considered in the social impact assessment (SIA).
How will the various role players in town such as the health services, education departments and local municipality are involved in the planning process. People's well-being is at stake, and how well integrated is this process?	Mr Pontes (Local Resident) (Public Meeting - 28 June 2005)	Eskom is communicating with the local and provincial authorities to ensure that these services and facilities can be made available, how Eskom can assist in providing the services, and to address impacts on infrastructure related services such as the schools and accommodation facilities.

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>I wish express my concern about the effect and the adverse implications that the above-mentioned proposed development will have on my mother and father, Mr. & Mrs. L.F. Steyn of the Farm Kromdraai should this development be constructed on the farms Naauw Ontkomen and Eenzaamheid. As you are aware the two properties on which the proposed development is to take place are immediate neighbouring properties to that of my parents. As you are aware my parents have been living on this farm since 1958. The proposed development would certainly impact on their lifestyle and quality of life and because of their age (father 84 years and mother 81 years) it would be very disruptive and traumatic for them to relocate.</p> <p>From the reports submitted it appears that no provision is made to create a buffer zone to mitigate the adverse effects of the proposed development on my parents' neighbouring farm.</p> <p>One aspect that hasn't been addressed is the way in which my parents will be compensated for all these direct negative effects should the development take place on the two neighbouring farms.</p> <p>I trust you will take these concerns into account in dealing with this matter.</p>	<p>Mr. L.I. Steyn (Family of landowner) (comment received on 24 October 2005)</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
HERITAGE		
There is a gravesite on the farm Peerboom which is frequently visited by pastors from the local community.	Mr A Bosman, Mr W O'Brien, Mr A Crous (one on one consultation - 21 June 2005)	It is not anticipated that the gravesite on this property would be affected by the proposed development. Issues pertaining to heritage impacts have been evaluated in the chapter within the Environmental Scoping report dealing with heritage issues.
SAHRA acknowledges receipt of your notice / application for the proposed construction of a new coal-fired power station in Lephalale. After going through your notice, the HIA Committee resolved that the Heritage Impact Assessment be conducted by a Heritage Expert. The report should indicate that the Impact Assessment has been supervised by a Principal Investigator.	T.V. Netshiavha (SAHRA - Limpopo Province) (letter of response - 25 July 2005)	Issues pertaining to heritage impacts have been evaluated in the chapter within the Environmental Scoping report dealing with heritage issues. Dr J van Schalkwyk is an accredited principal investigator in archaeology with SAHRA, as well as with ASAPA (Association of Southern African Professional Archaeologists - membership number 164).
Water bodies are often used for spiritual or religious actions, and they should be considered by the HIA consultant.	Donald Lithole (SAHRA) (Provincial Authorities meeting - 28 June 2005)	Issues pertaining to heritage impacts have been evaluated in the chapter within the Environmental Scoping report dealing with heritage issues.
The area is unique and is considered a world heritage area. Once the area has been polluted, it cannot be reinstated	Mr T Sauer (Beestekraal Brits) (Comment Form)	

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>SAHRA often experience problems that the description of the heritage of the area is often poorly addressed, and that this then delays their process of review. Heritage studies are often considered at a broad level, and the findings then reflect that there is nothing of significance. This results in SAHRA becoming suspicious, and they then complete their own investigations in order to verify the results. This can delay the process. SAHRA requested that the heritage assessment provide a clear description of sites. Heritage preservation is of national importance, and SAHRA rely on objective consultants to provide them with all the information they require in order to make an informed decision. The heritage consultant must provide as much detail as possible, as SAHRA would prefer to be able to send a team to rescue items of interest before they are lost through development.</p>	<p>Donald Lithole (SAHRA) (Provincial Authorities meeting - 28 June 2005)</p>	<p>Comment noted. Issues pertaining to heritage impacts have been evaluated in the chapter within the Environmental Scoping report dealing with heritage issues.</p>
<p><u>Kuipersbult 511LQ</u> A single grave with inscription MS Moloantao 25/5/1848 occur. The abovementioned conditions and stipulations apply here as well.</p>	<p>Dr S Wurz (SAHRA – Cape Town) (Comment on Heritage Study – Dated – 16 November 2005)</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>
<p><u>Kuipersbult 511 LQ</u> This is a small outcrop of non-diagnostic Iron Age pottery and is of low significance.</p>	<p>Dr S Wurz (SAHRA – Cape Town) (Comment on Heritage Study – Dated – 16 November 2005)</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p><u>Vergulde Helm 316 LQ:</u> An informal cemetery with four graves, two of which date to the 1930's, occur. The site is very close to the border of the farm Eenzaamheid. The report notes that if relocation of this site is necessary, a SAHRA permit and relevant local government permits will need to be obtained. SAHRA would further like to point out that standard procedures for relocation of burials include that the laws, provincial regulations and administrative procedures that regulate this activity should be adhered to. Relocation has to be done by a qualified archaeologist who will acquire all the necessary permits from SAHRA. If the burial ground is to be left intact a mini conservation plan must be drawn up and submitted to SAHRA by the specialist to indicate what conservation and maintenance measures will be needed and who will be responsible.</p>	<p>Dr S Wurz (SAHRA – Cape Town) (Comment on Heritage Study – Dated – 16 November 2005)</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>
<p><u>Nelsonskop 464 LQ</u> A small hill with interesting engravings of animal spoors, cupules and cut marks occur on the southern face of the outcrop. On top of the hill a number of small stone walled enclosures, probably a site of importance for the San and later Sotho-Tswana speaking people of the area. The report notes that the site is of high significance and development should not be allowed. It is recommended that it should be classified as a no-go area and development of the surrounding properties should be avoided due to their close proximity to Nelsonskop. SAHRA would further recommend that a rock art specialist survey and record the rock engraving hill site.</p>	<p>Dr S Wurz (SAHRA – Cape Town) (Comment on Heritage Study – Dated – 16 November 2005)</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>The site preference rating for the power station and ancillary infrastructure sites is discussed in the report. The farms Naauwontkomen 509 LQ and Eenzaamheid 678 LQ are considered 'ideal' for the construction of the proposed power station. The farms Naauwontkomen, Eenzaamheid and Kromdraai are considered the preferred sites for the establishment of ancillary infrastructure. Even if no sites with heritage value were identified on the farms Appelvlake 448 LQ, Droogeheuvel 447 LQ and Zongezien 467 LZ, a low preference rating is given for the construction of the power station and the establishment of ancillary infrastructure to reduce the impact on Nelsonskop.</p>	<p>Dr S Wurz (SAHRA – Cape Town) (Comment on Heritage Study – Dated – 16 November 2005)</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>
<p>The SAHRA Archaeology, Palaeontology and Meteorite unit supports the recommendations of the specialist that development may only take place on either Naauwontkomen 509 LQ or Eenzaamheid 678 LQ. Should sites or features be found during construction an archaeologist should be alerted immediately. If any further development is to occur on Appelvlake 448 LQ, Droogeheuvel 447 LQ and Zongezien 467 LZ, SAHRA must receive full details of exactly what this development will comprise and SAHRA must have the opportunity to comment on this. SAHRA would further like a report from the developer on the decision that has been taken with regards to the development.</p>	<p>Dr S Wurz (SAHRA – Cape Town) (Comment on Heritage Study – Dated – 16 November 2005)</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
ROADS AND STORMWATER MANAGEMENT		
Traffic Management.	Mr Lesibana Thobane (Lephalale Municipality) (Comment Form)	Issues pertaining to traffic and road infrastructure have been evaluated in the chapter within the Environmental Scoping Study dealing with traffic and transport issues. Detailed transport studies will be undertaken in the EIA phase of the project.
Roads infrastructure (Access facilities for site/s), Traffic Engineering, stormwater runoff from site/s.	Mrs Bonnie Bailey (Limpopo: Dept Roads & Transport) (Comment Form)	
Impact on National Road Infrastructure: What haulage routes/modes will be used to transport the coal to the proposed power generating plant.	Mr Ismail Essa (SANRAL) (Comment Form)	
Road R510 (Thabazimbi – Lephalale): Traffic impact on intersection with R510, capacity of R510 regarding traffic and goods traffic.	Mr Danie Venter (SANRAL) (Comment Form)	
Concerned about the impact on the roads during the construction phase of such a project.	Mr A Malherbe (Landowner) (one-on-one consultation – 10 June 05)	
There is only one route to the existing power station. With the construction of another power station, additional roads would be required.	Mr D de Ridder, Mr A Bower, Mr E Badenhorst, Ms C Cocquyt (Lephalale Municipality) (one on one consultation - 9 June 2005)	

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
The movement of heavy vehicles damage the local roads, and speeding through town is also a concern.	Mr D de Ridder, Mr A Bower, Mr E Badenhorst, Ms C Cocquyt (Lephalale Municipality) (one on one consultation - 9 June 2005)	Issues pertaining to traffic and road infrastructure have been evaluated in the chapter within the Environmental Scoping Study dealing with traffic and transport issues. The traffic impact assessment has considered the pavement conditions of the access roads to assess the capacity of these roads to accommodate additional traffic as well as the movement of vehicles to the greater Lephalale area, as well as local traffic movements. Detailed transport studies will be undertaken in the EIA phase of the project.
The southern bypass (P198-1) to the south of Lephalale should be constructed to limit the negative traffic impacts anticipated through town.	Mr D de Ridder, Mr A Bower, Mr E Badenhorst, Ms C Cocquyt (Lephalale Municipality) (one on one consultation - 9 June 2005)	
Provincial roads to Lephalale would have to be upgraded prior to the construction period.	Mr D de Ridder, Mr A Bower, Mr E Badenhorst, Ms C Cocquyt (Lephalale Municipality) (one on one consultation - 9 June 2005)	

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>Due to the proposed development and the movement of workers and vehicles, the construction of the northern bypass could also become more urgent.</p>	<p>Mr D de Ridder, Mr A Bower, Mr E Badenhorst, Ms C Cocquyt (Lephalale Municipality) (one on one consultation - 9 June 2005)</p>	<p>Issues pertaining to traffic and road infrastructure have been evaluated in the chapter within the Environmental Scoping Study dealing with traffic and transport issues. The traffic impact assessment has considered the pavement conditions of the access roads to assess the capacity of these roads to accommodate additional traffic as well as the movement of vehicles to the greater Lephalale area, as well as local traffic movements. Detailed transport studies will be undertaken in the EIA phase of the project.</p>
<p>The bridges across the Mogol and Tamboti Rivers would have to be reconstructed in order to accommodate the increase in traffic</p>	<p>Mr D de Ridder, Mr A Bower, Mr E Badenhorst, Ms C Cocquyt (Lephalale Municipality) (one on one consultation - 9 June 2005)</p>	
<p>Of the opinion that the construction of additional roads would create various problems.</p>	<p>Mr. J.J. Lambrecht (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 21 June 05)</p>	
<p>A road servitude on the border of the farm Droogeheuvel which could be affected if the farm Droogeheuvel would be used for the ashing facility. He would like to know what the impact would be, if this is the case.</p>	<p>Dr. A. Moolman (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 21 July 05)</p>	
<p>The routes to and from the power station should be easily accessible.</p>	<p>Mr. S. van Wyk (Lephalale Municipality: Divisional Head: Water) (Individual meeting - 10 June 05)</p>	

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>The roads will be damaged due to the increase in traffic, and due to the heavy vehicles that would be used during the construction phase.</p>	<p>Mr. G. Erasmus and Mr. H. Steenkamp (Landowners) (Meeting – 21 June 05)</p>	<p>Issues pertaining to traffic and road infrastructure have been evaluated in the chapter within the Environmental Scoping Study dealing with traffic and transport issues. The traffic impact assessment has considered the pavement conditions of the access roads to assess the capacity of these roads to accommodate additional traffic as well as the movement of vehicles to the greater Lephalale area, as well as local traffic movements. Detailed transport studies will be undertaken in the EIA phase of the project.</p>
<p>The road (Nelson Mandela Drive) is already traversing the landowners' property. Part of this section has been fenced off with a game fence, but if the traffic on the road increases, it could be necessary to also erect a game fence on the rest of the section. This would ensure the safety of the drivers, as numerous drivers have been involved in accidents on this road and many of these were due to kudus crossing the road. The landowner would like to know who would be responsible for funding such a fence.</p>	<p>Mr. P. van Rooyen and Mr. P. Nel (Landowners) (Meeting – 22 June 05)</p>	
<p>I wish to express my concern about the effect and the adverse implications that the above-mentioned proposed development will have on my mother and father, Mr. & Mrs. L.F. Steyn of the Farm Kromdraai should this development be constructed on the farms Naauw Ontkomen and Eenzaamheid. The increased activities would result in an increase in the traffic and heavy vehicle traffic on the roads crossing my parents' farm. Over and above the increase in noise and dust as a result of the traffic my father's game and cattle will be extremely exposed to poachers and thieves.</p>	<p>Mr. L.I. Steyn (Family of landowner) (comment received on 24 October 2005)</p>	
<p>Which roads would be used to access the proposed power station. If roads would be build on the farm Droogeheuvel, if would have a negative impact on his property.</p>	<p>Mr. J. van Rooyen (Landowner) (Individual meeting – 21 June 05)</p>	

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
Access roads across farms would decrease the property value and would create risks in terms of theft. This would also influence the hunting activities and would result in the loss of privacy and security for the landowner.	Mr. J. van Rooyen (Landowner) (Comment sheet - 14 July 05)	Issues pertaining to traffic and road infrastructure have been evaluated in the chapter within the Environmental Scoping Study dealing with traffic and transport issues. The traffic impact assessment has considered the pavement conditions of the access roads to assess the capacity of these roads to accommodate additional traffic as well as the movement of vehicles to the greater Lephalale area, as well as local traffic movements. Detailed transport studies will be undertaken in the EIA phase of the project.
No roads should be built on game farms and no additional traffic on these farms should be allowed, as this would negatively affect the game farming business and would lead to claims being lodged.	Mr. J. van Rooyen (Landowner) (Comment sheet - 14 July 05)	
The impact on the road network and infrastructure network is a source of concern.	Dr. W.H.S. Barnard (Landowner) (Comment sheet - 25 June 05)	
The detailed Traffic Impact Study will address our concerns regarding the impact of the power station.	Mr. Danie Venter SANRAL (Comment on draft scoping report) 20 October 2005	Comment noted.

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
Concerned about the provincial road between Vaalwater and Modimolle. This road is in a very deteriorated state and would not be able to handle additional heavy traffic.	Mr Koot Thuynsma (Public Meeting - 28 June 2005)	Issues pertaining to traffic and road infrastructure have been evaluated in the chapter within the Environmental Scoping Study dealing with traffic and transport issues. The traffic impact assessment has considered the pavement conditions of the access roads to assess the capacity of these roads to accommodate additional traffic as well as the movement of vehicles to the greater Lephalale area, as well as local traffic movements. Detailed transport studies will be undertaken in the EIA phase of the project.
Will a traffic impact assessment be included as part of the environmental studies, and will this study consider the impact on Provincial roads. The roads from Nylstroom were heavily impacted on during the construction phase of Matimba A. In addition, what is the current traffic generated from the movement of good and services in this area.	Simon Thobane (Lephalale Municipality: Protection Services) (Local Municipality Meeting - 28 June 2005)	

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
POWER GENERATION		
Power generation in SA.	Mr Hugo Grobler (BHP Billiton) (Comment Form)	<p>The South African Energy Policy (Dec 1998) published by the Department of Minerals and Energy (DME) identifies five key objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - increasing access to affordable energy services; - improving energy sector governance; - stimulating economic development; - managing energy related environmental impacts; and - securing supply through diversity. <p>In order to meet these objectives in South Africa, the country needs to optimally use the available energy resources.</p> <p>Additional capacity will be required in the near future, and various technologies are being considered to meet the demand.</p>
I have been lead to believe that the project was an extension to the existing power station, and not a new power station.	Reginald Mabalane (DEAT: CAPCO) (Focus Group Meeting – CAPCO – 29 July 2005)	The option of extending the existing power station was evaluated at pre-feasibility stage. Building a new power station was found to be a more viable option. Matimba B will be a separate station on a new site.
How many units does the existing Matimba A station currently operate.	Tsenduka Hatlane (Limpopo DEDET) (Provincial Authorities Meeting: 28 June 2005)	Six 660 MW units are installed and operated at the existing Matimba Power Station.

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>Why is the project is focussed on PF. What other technology alternatives were considered and were environmental studies included in considering the technology alternatives. Has Eskom considered an integrated gas combustion system?</p>	<p>Ms S Mandhlazi (Earthlife Africa) (Key Stakeholders Workshop - 27 June 2005)</p>	<p>The IEP, NIRP and ISEP are planning tools used by DME and Eskom to evaluate technologies based firstly on resource availability in South Africa. Further, criteria such as environmental, economic, socio-economic and security of supply are used to evaluate an appropriate mix of technologies for South Africa</p>
<p>The briefing paper on the project dated June 2005 indicated that a pulverized fuel (PF) combustion technology will be used for electricity generation. Our concern is that with a proposed lifespan of 50 years, a coal-fired power station of this magnitude and which does not use best available technologies, will have far greater negative impacts on the environment than a range of alternatives, including Integrated Gasification Combined Cycle (IGCC) which could be up to 30% more efficient than the technology currently proposed by Eskom, i.e. above 25% reduction of all emissions on efficiency alone. IGCC is also more compatible with further reductions of local air pollution and climate change mitigation than PF technology, due to the separation of various pollutants during the gasification process</p>	<p>Mr S Mandhlazi (Earthlife Africa) (Letter to DEAT: dated 26 August 2005)</p>	<p>Coal-based IGCC technology is emerging as a commercial option for power generation, with a promise of high efficiency and an inherent ability to separate the carbon dioxide (CO₂) into a relatively pure stream for subsequent sequestration. There are however, many issues (technical and economic) in terms of the utilisation of IGCC technology that remain unresolved, both from an international and a South African perspective. Coal based IGCC is not yet viable for full scale introduction into the South African electricity supply system and hence is still the subject of research focussing on overall technical and commercial feasibility.</p>

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>It is also worth noting that the use of IGCC, which has been commercially demonstrated, would be more compatible with regulations and other measures being contemplated in the Environmental Fiscal Reform process being undertaken by National Treasury, as well as standards promulgated in terms of the Air Quality Act. Since fuel costs constitute a smaller proportion of electricity generation costs than with PF technology, there will be less risk of the power station insisting on exemptions from future regulation on the grounds of rising fuel costs.</p>	<p>Mr S Mandhlazi (Earthlife Africa) (Letter to DEAT: dated 26 August 2005)</p>	<p>Alternatives for meeting the projected electricity demand are interrogated and pre-selected at a strategic level. Coal-fired technology options (together with, and not versus, other technology options such as gas turbines and pumped storage schemes) form an integral part of Eskom's integrated planning. A number of new coal-fired power stations will be required to be constructed within the planning period in order to be able to adequately provide for the growing electricity demand and contribute to the objectives of the South African Energy Policy.</p>
<p>Alternative technologies must be considered as part of the scoping process, as is required by the EIA regulations. ELA requested copies of the pre-feasibility studies and were informed that the project team would consider which sections of the report would be made publicly available. To date, we have not received any copy nor part of the pre-feasibility report nor response to our request.</p>	<p>Mr S Mandhlazi (Earthlife Africa) (Letter to DEAT: dated 26 August 2005)</p>	<p>The pre-feasibility studies contain commercially sensitive information and cannot be made available to the general public.</p>
<p>Is the use of pulverised fuel (PF) technology Eskom's preferred technology choice.</p>	<p>Reginald Mabalane (DEAT: CAPCO) (Focus Group Meeting – CAPCO – 29 July 2005)</p>	<p>The choice of pulverised fuel coal-fired power station technology is the result of strategic considerations of alternative energy sources, by DME, the NER and Eskom, in the light of the objectives of the South African Energy Policy and Government's growth and development objectives, and sustainability considerations of proven coal-fired technologies..</p>

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>Our immediate concern in regards to the proposed 4800 MW Matimba B Coal Fired Power Station is to ensure that electricity generation technology alternatives are considered before any decision is made on the choice of technology to be used at the power station. We are concerned that the proposed 4800 MW Matimba B Power Station, with pulverised Fuel Technology and a life span of 50 years, will have far greater negative impacts on the environment than if best available technology were deployed.</p> <p>The project needs to consider alternatives, including Integrated Gasification Combined Cycle (IGCC), which could be up to 30% more efficient than the technology currently proposed by Eskom. Integrated Gasification Combined Cycle could provide about 25% reduction of all air and atmospheric pollution on efficiency alone. IGCC is also compatible with further reductions of local pollution and climate change mitigation than Pulverised Fuel Technology, due to the separation of pollutants during the gasification process.</p>	<p>Nkosana Rakitla (Earthlife Africa) (Letter dated 21 September 2005)</p>	<p>The cost and type of fuel available are main contributing factors to technology selection, the availability and cost of the coal for PF are key considerations. Eskom have evaluated the alternative of utilising fluidised bed combustion (FBC). The first phase of Matimba B is proposed to be PF, the second phase could be FBC. The inclusion of FGD with PF would achieve the same emission levels as using FBC technology.</p>

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>ELA would like to see a range of alternatives considered within the EIA process, including independent assessment of the technology options. As a minimum, we request that DEAT insist that the pre-feasibility studies for this project (with motivation for any and all excisions of proprietary information) be included in the EIA Draft Scoping Report, due for release in September 2005.</p>	<p>Mr S Mandhlazi (Earthlife Africa) (Letter to DEAT: dated 26 August 2005)</p>	<p>The cost and type of fuel available are main contributing factors to technology selection, the availability and cost of the coal for PF are key considerations. Eskom have evaluated the alternative of utilising fluidised bed combustion (FBC). The first phase of Matimba B is proposed to be PF, and that the second phase could be FBC. The inclusion of FGD with PF would achieve the same emission levels as using FBC technology.</p> <p>The pre-feasibility studies contain commercially sensitive information and cannot be made available to the general public</p>
<p>Why coal is the preferred option and what clean coal technologies were considered.</p>	<p>Ms S Mandhlazi (Earthlife Africa) (Key Stakeholders Workshop - 27 June 2005)</p>	<p>The studies on the different technologies e.g. gas, renewable energy sources, coal, nuclear and so on, all formed part of the National Integrated Resources Plan (NIRP). For the pre-feasibility study for Matimba B, Eskom already identified coal as the selected fuel and investigated the different coal technologies. It was through this process that pulverised fuel (PF) and fluidised bed combustion (FBC) processes were proposed as the alternatives available for use at Matimba B, and has the most favourable results within the decision matrix.</p>
<p>Comprehensive analysis of the net energy balance of the proposed project - i.e. total energy input against output - and thus the overall energy efficiency of operation</p>	<p>Nkosana Rakitla (Earthlife Africa) (Letter dated 21 September 2005)</p>	<p>Plant will be designed to achieve 38% efficiency. There is a loss of 2% efficiency from 40% to 38% resulting from the use of dry cooled technology. The average efficiency of operational plant in Eskom is 34%.</p>
<p>What is the efficiency of the proposed underground coal gasification (UCG) process.</p>	<p>Ms Carla Hudson (WESSA) (Key Stakeholders Workshop - 27 June 2005)</p>	<p>The efficiency rates of the UCG process are still to be determined. The gas from the UCG will be co-fired in Majuba's boilers, and during this demonstration phase of the project, no change in the efficiencies is anticipated.</p>

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
Does the efficiency of 40% mentioned for the station accounted for the energy input in terms of coal washing and the water used.	Ms S Mandhlazi (Earthlife Africa) (Key Stakeholders Workshop - 27 June 2005)	An efficiency of 40% (less 2% due to dry-cooled technology) is for the power plant only.
I am aware of the use of solar technology pilot project in Johannesburg. Could the Lephalale area be considered for solar power technology?	Johan Erasmus (Lephalale Municipality: Planning & Development) (Local Municipality Meeting - 28 June 2005)	An EIA has been initiated for a 100 MW solar thermal demonstration plant in the Upington area. Once the technology has been demonstrated the potential for future use in other geographical areas will be considered.
The area under consideration is close to Botswana. I have heard that Botswana has large gas reserves. Is the use of gas as a fuel an option.	Reginald Mabalane (DEAT: CAPCO) (Focus Group Meeting - CAPCO - 29 July 2005)	Eskom is unaware of large gas reserves in Botswana. However, Eskom is aware that the Waterberg and Botswana coalfields are linked. As part the ISEP, Eskom is investigating gas-fired technology (open cycle and combined cycle) in order to meet future demand. The gas for Combined Cycle Gas Turbines will have to be shipped into South Africa from the international market.
Will Eskom, in terms of energy efficiency, be intending to generate more energy per unit water used in relation to what the existing Matimba A power station.	Mr Moses Moloantoa (DWAF) (Public meeting - 28 June 2005)	The water use will be similar for the two stations. However, if Flue Gas Desulphurisation (FGD) is installed, water use for Matimba "B" will be higher.
What renewable technologies are Eskom investigating.	Reginald Mabalane (DEAT: CAPCO) (Focus Group Meeting - CAPCO - 29 July 2005)	Eskom is currently doing research on various renewable energy options, including a wind demonstration facility and a potential concentrated solar thermal demonstration plant. Further desktop studies on less developed technologies such as tidal and ocean currents are underway.

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
FUEL / COAL REQUIREMENTS		
Kumba would have to extend their mining operations to accommodate the coal requirements of the proposed power station.	Mr E Geldenhuys (Kumba Resources) (one on one consultation on 10 June 2005)	Comment noted. These extensions would require a separate EIA. Kumba Resources have researched the availability of the resource, and have assured at least 35 years of coal for supply to Eskom
What is the sulphur content of the coal currently used at Matimba Power Station.	Ms Carla Hudson (WESSA) (Key Stakeholders Workshop - 27 June 2005)	The average sulphur content of the coal was 0,8% for all the Eskom power stations.
Are there sufficient coal reserves at Grootegeluk to support two power stations?	Tsenduka Hatlane (Limpopo DEDET) (Provincial Authorities Meeting: 28 June 2005)	Kumba Resources have researched the availability of the resource, and have assured at least 35 years of coal for supply to Eskom.
How many years of coal are available for the proposed station. DME has stated that the country has only 20 years of confirmed reserves.	Reginald Mabalane (DEAT: CAPCO) (Focus Group Meeting - CAPCO - 29 July 2005)	The mining houses have advised Eskom that the coalfields have 200 years confirmed reserves. It is also known that although the coal is there, the exploitation of this coal will become more difficult with time.
The stated reserves of the local coal mine compared to total consumption of coal over the project lifetime?	Nkosana Rakitla (Earthlife Africa) (Letter dated 21 September 2005)	The coal reserves have been proven by Kumba Resources. The Waterberg is one of the richest areas of coal.
Are there sufficient coal reserves for Matimba B?	Reginald Mabalane (DEAT: CAPCO) (Focus Group Meeting - CAPCO - 29 July 2005)	

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
Full analysis of any constrains on the qualities of coal that could be used as fuel, associated with different technology options	Nkosana Rakitla (Earthlife Africa) (Letter dated 21 September 2005)	Comment noted. Detailed feasibility studies are being undertaken by the mine, and the constraints on the qualities of the coal that will be used as fuel, will be derived from these studies.
An account of the assumptions that have been made about the future pricing of coal and electricity, e.g. in the financial feasibility study, indicating at least the range of prices assumed over the lifetime of the project.	Nkosana Rakitla (Earthlife Africa) (Letter dated 21 September 2005)	Comment noted. Electricity prices are regulated by the National Energy Regulator. The coal price is based on commercial negotiations between Eskom and the coal suppliers.
Has the lifespan of the proposed power station considered the availability of the coal supply in future. Has Eskom considered the price of coal in the future.	Ms S Mandhlazi (Earthlife Africa) (Key Stakeholders Workshop - 27 June 2005)	Eskom usually enters long-term coal contracts with the suppliers - that is for approximately 20 to 35 years. Eskom preferred to enter into as long as possible coal contracts with their suppliers this provides more certainty with regard to prices in the long term.
Has a coal supply study had been completed?	Francois Retief (Eskom: Primary Energy Consultant) (Focus Group Meeting - Kumba Resources - 5 August 2005)	A coal supply study formed part of the feasibility studies.
It is said that Matimba B will be dry cooled. Is it likely that cooling towers will be built, or will a direct dry cooling technology be preferred as it was already realised at Matimba A. Is the stack height already clear?	Dr S Schlohmer (Email dated 28 September 2005)	Both indirect and direct dry cooling technologies are under consideration for the proposed Matimba B Power Station. The stack heights will be guided through the findings of the air quality impact assessment.

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
EIA AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESS		
<p>The process in terms of recognized EIA practice has not been followed. Screening and feasibility studies have been undertaken and have identified the Waterberg coalfields as the most viable option based on a number of undisclosed criteria. These criteria included “the availability of resources such as water” and “environmental acceptability”. The basis of any EIA process is the assessment and evaluation of alternatives, including the “nil project” alternative. These screening and feasibility studies should have been submitted for independent assessment and public review. At the very least a matrix of the various criteria should be provided, how these scored for each site, and how it was concluded that resources were adequate and environmental impacts were acceptable. It was stated that there were no fatal flaws identified during environmental screening. The decision that the Waterberg Coalfield is the preferred site was unilateral and the process is now one of mitigation – not assessment.</p> <p>Transparency is a concern. A pre-feasibility has been completed and probably much of the feasibility study – the plant design must be known, the associated infrastructure and services such as pipelines, conveyors, transmission lines, roads etc. must at the very least be in the concept phase, if not already detailed – yet none of this has been revealed.</p>	<p>Dr Mark Berry (Resource ecologist) (Letter dated 30 June 2005)</p>	<p>The technology choice is determined in the National Integrated Resource Plan developed by the National Electricity Regulator. This plan was made available for public comment.</p> <p>Once a technology is chosen, in this case coal fired. Eskom is required to assess which geographic areas are suitable; this is primarily influenced by coal reserves. In the case of Matimba B the urgency for new plant is such, that a critical criterion was to identify a brown field coal mine which would provide access to coal when the power station is complete. Several sites have been identified; all of these sites will be subject to further investigation. These sites are not alternatives to each other, they will all be required to meet the growing energy demand.</p> <p>The criteria taken into consideration during Eskom’s environmental screening processes included land issues, bio-diversity issues, water, air quality, and other important bio-diversity aspects Through this screening process the four sites considered for the proposed new power station were put forward for investigation.</p> <p>The Environmental Scoping Process considers site alternatives within the Lephalale area and evaluates the identified environmental impacts against these site alternatives. The Environmental Scoping report nominates a preferred site for development, and that site will be looked at in more detail through the EIA. The results of the screening and pre-feasibility studies have been included within the Environmental Scoping Report.</p>

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>One of the difficulties in trying to identify potential impacts is that we do not yet have a detailed project description. The briefing document gives an extremely broad project view and is focused largely on power supply and the justification for a new power station, and potential sites. If we don't know what the project and associated infrastructure entails, how can the potential impacts be identified, let alone assessed? A detailed project description is a prerequisite for any EIA.</p>	<p>Dr Mark Berry (Resource Ecologist) (Letter dated 30 June 2005)</p>	<p>A detailed project description was provided at the public meeting (28 June 2005) and the opportunity provided for queries to be raised regarding potential impacts.</p> <p>In terms of the proposal with regards to the Mkolo Dam - the process being followed by DWAF is to ensure the long term water supply for the area. This query a case in point is the concern that occurred in December of 2003 when the ability of the system to deliver the requisite yield was questioned. Studies are necessary for the planning and development of this area in the future irrespective of Eskom's future expansion in the area. With the Eskom plans and other developmental initiatives by both the public and private sector, DWAF's initiatives were pre-emptive and timeous.</p>

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>I have a concern about objectivity and independency with Eskom and DWAF. Eskom (as stated at the meeting) are a government organization and they are asking another government organisation, DWAF, to provide them with water. It is akin to asking the fox to look after chicken run. Both organizations primarily represent the government's interests. How can we be sure that DWAF's assessment will be independent and objective and focused on what is best for the resource (water) as opposed as to what is best for another government department? Can DWAF be both player and referee? If process was to be correctly followed, then DWAF should subject their proposed plans for increased water supply to an EIA, expert peer review, and public participation and scrutiny.</p>	<p>Dr Mark Berry (Resource ecologist) (Letter dated 30 June 2005)</p>	<p>DWAF is currently undertaking a complete hydrological study which will not only investigate the option to increase the capacity of the dam, but will also investigate other impacts. It is anticipated that the DWAF study may be complete in 2006. The EIA will be considering the studies being undertaken by DWAF and will incorporate their findings where possible. It is anticipated that more detailed findings may be available to be included as part of the Environment Impact Assessment Report.</p> <p>The DWAF studies are going through the normal processes to ensure transparency and participation as required by legislation. A public participation meeting was held by DWAF on 19, 20 and 21 July 2005 in areas in and around Lephalale. The outcome of the studies will determine the need and scope of augmentation. The pre-feasibility and feasibility studies for the augmentation will include the relevant environmental scoping and assessment studies</p>
<p>A number of organizations have been engaged to conduct specialist studies and one assumes that these organizations have the necessary expertise and experience to meet the requirements for a detailed and comprehensive EIA. As already noted my particular concern is sustainable flow in the Limpopo River. Can we be assured that hydrologists, with ecological as opposed to geological expertise, have been included in the specialists?</p>	<p>Dr Mark Berry (Resource ecologist) (Letter dated 30 June 2005)</p>	<p>All the specialists involved in the specialist investigation have experience with regards to their particular fields of expertise. In addition, the various specialists are able to integrate their skill and expertise to assess impacts.</p>

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>I've always had a problem with the definition of the word "expert". It seems to imply that an individual or individuals so classified cannot make mistakes. The truth is they can and do, no disrespect to any such person or persons so classified in this instance. However, this inevitably causes me concern specifically should interested parties be excluded from the decision making and planning on this proposed project, particularly where critical decisions are to be made. Will this concern be addressed, if not, why not, if so, how?</p> <p>One can't help but get the impression that the decision to proceed with Matimba B is already made and that plans are already fairly advanced. If this is indeed the case, what happens if the experts do indeed "mess up"? Is it just, tough luck, deal with it, or will there be some sort of compensation agreement? Notwithstanding that no compensation could ever be considered truly adequate if things really went wrong.</p>	<p>Mr Chris Lane (Lungile Game Estates) (Email dated 2 July 2005)</p>	<p>The Public Participation Process for the proposed project provides all Interested and Affected parties with an opportunity to raise their varied concerns regarding the proposed project. All these concerns are included within the Issues Trail and have been taken into consideration during the compilation of the Environmental Scoping Report.</p> <p>The proposed project may not be undertaken unless a positive Record of Decision is received from the National Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism. The aim of the EIA process is to determine the potential issues / problems associated with a new power station in the area. All relevant authorities are required to look at the disadvantages and advantages of the project before they issue a final decision.</p>
<p>The following meetings should be held with the community and representatives from Marapong:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A community meeting held at a venue in Marapong; ▪ A meeting with the various stakeholders in Marapong; ▪ A meeting with the workers e.g. the National Union of Mineworkers (NUM); and ▪ Members of the project team should attend a scheduled ward committee meeting. 	<p>Clr T Mmoya (Councillor) (one on one consultation on 8 June 2005)</p>	<p>A meeting with the Local Community was held in Marapong on 27 June 2005, at the request of the councillor.</p>

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>Based on the information provided at the meeting, it would appear that the scoping exercise would be completed by end July (affected landowners will be advised in August of preferred site) and that the full EIA, including review and approval, will be completed by year end.</p> <p>If an integrated EIA process is to be followed, bio-physical and social baseline studies undertaken, objective assessment made and reviewed, and consultation with IA&P to take place, then this cannot be achieved inside 6 months. A real concern is that timelines are being dictated, this will compromise data collection on the one hand, and independent objective assessment on the other. Floral and faunal studies usually take several seasons, and at the very least, post the summer rainfall season. Until the sites have been identified, comprehensive studies cannot be undertaken. The DWAF studies will apparently not be concluded before the end of 2006. How can the EIA process be concluded by the end of 2005?</p>	<p>Dr Mark Berry (Resource ecologist) (Letter dated 30 June 2005)</p>	<p>Comment noted. Specialists have been involved on this project since early 2005 and will conclude their studies in early 2006. A letter was distributed to all I&APs regarding the delay in the timeframes and noting that the Environmental Scoping Report would be available for review at the end of September 2005. The briefing paper provided a broad overview of the project in order to introduce the public to the project.</p> <p>DWAF studies for validation and verification of water users and hydrology evaluations are anticipated to be complete in May 2006 and December 2006 respectively. These studies are necessary to determine the current water use and water availability. Thereafter water supply options will be evaluated to determine how to best support this area in the future. Discussions with DWAF concluded that there isn't a direct link between the EIA for Matimba B and these studies. Water augmentation for the area was identified prior to Eskom's build plan.</p>
<p>The Environmental Scoping Study focuses (understandably) on local impacts and insufficient attention or weighting is given to regional impact of the proposed development, specifically with regard to water supply and increased water demand.</p>	<p>Dr Mark Berry (Resource Ecologist) (Comments on draft scoping report) 30 October 2005</p>	<p>Comment noted. DWAF is currently conducting a range of studies, including a hydrology study on the catchment, and this study will assess the impacts of all water use in the area.</p> <p>In addition to this, Eskom is currently undertaking a macro-economics study to determine the economic impact of the proposed development, including the regional economic impacts.</p>

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
While the report acknowledges that the new power station will have significant impacts and that an EIA is required, it does not list the specific areas to be addressed in the EIA. The conclusions suggest the EIA will be largely site specific. The EIA should also address impact of increased water use with respect to regional availability and current demand.	Dr Mark Berry (Resource Ecologist) (Comments on draft scoping report) 30 October 2005	The Plan of Study for the EIA will outline all the issues to be addressed during the EIA phase. Information regarding the DWAF studies on water availability and supply will be incorporated into the EIA, as it becomes available.
The EIA should evaluate impacts at the regional level, not just at a site specific level.	Dr Mark Berry (Resource Ecologist) (Comments on draft scoping report) 30 October 2005	Comment noted.
Desired continued transparency regarding the project.	Mr D du Toit (Landowner) (comment form)	Comment noted. The public participation process provides all interested and affected parties the opportunity to raise concerns and issues regarding the proposed project, and in turn provides a vehicle for transparency.
The landowner would like more information on the timeframes and findings of the studies, as it would have an impact on his developments on his properties.	Mr. M.F. Loots (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 21 June 05)	The findings of the specialist studies at a scoping level are included within the Environmental Scoping Report. The Environmental Impacts Assessment Report is anticipated to be made available for review within the first quarter of 2006.

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>It is envisaged that Nature Conservation, Agri Limpopo, the Transvaal Agricultural Union (South Africa), the Limpopo Kwena W.B.K. and Veterinary Services discuss the threat that such a project could have on the ecology with Eskom and the consultants. It is envisaged that the above-mentioned organizations will compile a report that will indicate that the Limpopo River is already negatively affected by the over utilization of its feeding area.</p>	<p>Dr. J.G. Williams (Agri Limpopo: President) (Comment sheet - 26 July 05)</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>Will the construction of the associated transmission lines and substations form part of this EIA process or will it be undertaken as a separate EIA.</p>	<p>Ms Carla Hudson (WESSA) (Key Stakeholders Workshop - 27.06/05)</p>	<p>Separate processes would be required to be undertaken, and these would be initiated within the next few months.</p>
<p>Some of the questions raised by WESSA suggested that the DEAT already decided that the proposed project would go ahead. I would like to confirmed that a number of meetings between Eskom and the Department have taken place, and it was decided that DEAT would be the lead authority to assess the proposed project. The Limpopo Department (provincial department) would be commenting on the project and process. I would like to emphasise that DEAT is not pro or against the development. We are still in the early stages of the EIA process, and no decisions have been taken yet. DEAT have accepted the Plan of Study for Scoping and are awaiting the findings of the Environmental Scoping Study.</p>	<p>Mr V Mathabane (DEAT) (Key Stakeholders Workshop - 27/06/05)</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>Will the impact of the current and extended mining operations form part of the specialist studies of the EIA undertaken for the proposed power station.</p>	<p>Ms S Mandhlazi (Earthlife Africa) (Key Stakeholders Workshop - 27/06/05)</p>	<p>It is a requirement that the mine must conduct environmental studies for their operations. This is required by the Minerals and Petroleum Resources Development Act, which regulates mining operations.</p>

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>Will one preferred site only be selected and assessed during the detailed EIA. Will it not be necessary to assess two sites in the EIA for a comparative detailed study.</p>	<p>Mr V Mathabane (DEAT) (Key Stakeholders Workshop – 27/06/05)</p>	<p>At this stage, from an EIA perspective, it is planned that only one site would be assessed in the detailed EIA phase. Once the specialists have completed the ranking of the sites it would be clearer whether there were two sites that were extremely competitive/closely comparable. If that would be the case it would form part of the discussions with Eskom and DEAT whether more than one site would be required to be investigated in the detailed EIA phase. At this stage two sites (one for the power station and one for the ancillary services) will be considered in the EIA phase.</p>
<p>I am concerned that the process is already flawed due to the fact that a public participation process did not form part of Eskom's decision to construct a power station at the Waterberg coalfields. The public did not have the opportunity to evaluate the alternatives that Eskom were considering. The decision was already made that the power station would be constructed at Lephalale and the process therefore just involved how this development would be mitigated. I view this as a fatal flaw in the environmental screening, as the public had no input into the evaluation of the potential areas considered by Eskom.</p>	<p>Dr Mark Berry (Public Meeting – 28 June 2005)</p>	<p>Comment noted. The need for new power stations in South Africa is not only an Eskom process but that the National Electricity Regulator (NER) through their National Integrated Resource Plan identified that South Africa would have to rely on coal for their electricity generating processes. There was a Public Participation process associated with the development of the plan. The latest version of that plan was issued by the Department of Minerals and Energy during March 2005. This document is available upon request.</p>

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>The process advert that appeared in the local newspaper made no mention of the meeting held in Marapong and the key stakeholder workshop held in Gauteng on 27 June 2005. The advert was thus inadequate as it only covered the public meeting. I request that the future adverts should be more complete to inform I&APs of all vehicles that are being used to further the process.</p>	<p>Mr Ian Hall Anglo Coal (Public Meeting – 28 June 2005)</p>	<p>Bohlweki Environmental advertised the open day and public meeting, as is required by the environmental legislation. The key stakeholder workshop held in Gauteng was by invitation only and focused on government officials and NGOs. This was a 'focus group meeting'. In addition, the councillor of Marapong (Councillor Moyo) requested a special meeting with the Marapong community as he felt that the venue where the public meeting was being held not appropriate for the majority of people of Marapong. This meeting was requested after the adverts were placed, and the councillor personally invited the community to attend the meeting in Marapong.</p>
<p>It was mentioned that the end of July 2005 was the final date for affected parties to know what the final decisions are in terms of the proposed power station. Does this imply that everything will then be finalised in terms of the new power station?</p>	<p>Mr Alan Malherbe (Landowner – Farm Droogeheuvel) (Public Meeting – 28 June 2005)</p>	<p>The Environmental Scoping report includes an outline of the site selection process whereby the preferred site was chosen. There was, however, substantial work in addition to that that Eskom had to undertake to evaluate the various sites. The end of September would thus be a more suitable date for the conclusions in terms of the possible siting of the proposed power station. No final decisions regarding the construction of the power station have been taken, and the siting is only one element of various factors that play a role in the decision-making process. The decision whether the power station is to be built will only be made by Eskom's board in the first half of 2006. It was, nevertheless, in everybody's best interest to make the decision as soon as possible.</p>

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>The project is well thought through and the process has provided I&APs with an opportunity to raise their problems. It also seems as if the applicant was willing to address these problems. From an economic perspective, the project would be positive, particularly in terms of job creation. I would like to thank the consultants for the presentation.</p>	<p>Mr Giel Meyer (Public meeting - 28 June 2005)</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>What other meetings will be being held as part of the public participation, as this meeting is municipal members only.</p>	<p>Simon Thobani (Lephalale Municipality: Protection Services) (Local Municipality Meeting - 28 June 2005)</p>	<p>The Local Municipality Meeting was a focus group meeting - that is a meeting for a particular grouping who have a similar/common focus with regards to the project. Other meetings have been held with other groupings, and individuals, and a public meeting was held at the Mogol Club (i.e. 28 June 2005). All parties were invited to attend the public.</p>
<p>Is this project being considered under the current or the new EIA Regulations?</p>	<p>Eric Mohlodine (Lephalale Municipality: Safety Officer Protection Services) (Local Municipality Meeting - 28 June 2005)</p>	<p>The new EIA Regulations are currently in draft form and not yet promulgated. This project is being undertaken under the current Regulations in terms of the Environment Conservation Act.</p>
<p>Will the EIA include the assessment of impacts associated with the required expansion to the Kumba Resources mine.</p>	<p>Sarel van Wyk (Lephalale Municipality: Water) (Local Municipality Meeting - 28 June 2005)</p>	<p>This EIA will assess the potential impacts associated with the construction and operation of a new coal-fired power station. The impacts of the expansion of the existing mine would be undertaken as a separate assessment, and would be undertaken by Kumba Resources, and would be required to be considered under the MPRD Act. This would be a separate process.</p>

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>Will the EIA for the proposed new coal fired power station include an assessment of the entire project cycle (coal mining to ashing back into the pit)?</p>	<p>Charl Nolte (Kumba Resources: Manager Strategy & Planning: Environmental Management) (Focus Group Meeting – Kumba Resources – 5 August 2005)</p>	<p>The EIA assumed that the coal would be provided by Kumba Resources, and the EIA will therefore assess impacts associated with the movement of coal to the site, coal stockpiling, the generation of electricity, as well as the disposal of the ash. At this stage it is assumed that ashing will be to land, although it is known that the option to ash back to the Kumba pit is on the table.</p>
<p>Can the public participation processes for the new proposed coal-fired power station and the extension of Kumba Resources' Grootegeluk Mine be integrated as one process in order to avoid stakeholder fatigue?</p>	<p>Francois Retief (Eskom: Primary Energy Consultant) (Focus Group meeting – Kumba Resources – 5 August 2005)</p>	<p>It has been agreed that the public participation processes for the 2 projects be undertaken separately due to the different nature of the projects and different authorising government departments involved.</p>
<p>It is not acceptable for Eskom to put forward only one technology option on the basis of pre-feasibility studies that it is keeping out of the public domain.</p> <p>Earthlife Africa considers it a legal requirement of the EIA regulations that alternative technology must be considered, including independent assessment of the technology options as part of the Scoping process.</p>	<p>Nkosana Rakitla (Earthlife Africa) (Letter dated 21 September 2005)</p>	<p>Comment noted. Pulverised fuel (PF) and fluidised bed combustion (FBC) were evaluated during pre- feasibility.</p>

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p><u>The need and justification of the project</u> Pages 1 & 2, 1.1 in draft scoping report: Draft scoping: "Eskom undertook an ISEP process to identify the most feasible option for a power station. Matimba was identified as the most feasible option." DEDET-BM comment: No documents containing results of the study are available, and it is not sure if a holistic approach, including southern African states, was taken. No reference to the ISEP process is given / or alternative sites.</p>	<p>Department of Economic Development, Environment & Tourism Limpopo – <i>Biodiversity Management</i> (Comments on draft scoping report) Letter dated 28 Oct 2005</p>	<p>Comment noted. Reference is made to the ISEP in the Scoping documents.</p>

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>The need and justification of the project Chapter 2.2, 3rd paragraph: Draft scoping: The scoping report only deals with alternatives in the Lephalale area, and does not evaluate any other power generation options of other areas. DEDET-BM comment: To my mind this is not a holistic approach. Alternative areas should be evaluated as a group?</p>	<p>Department of Economic Development, Environment & Tourism Limpopo – <i>Biodiversity Management</i> (Comments on draft scoping report) Letter dated 28 Oct 2005</p>	<p>Through the National Integrated Resource Plan (NIRP), it was identified that South Africa will be dependent on coal for electricity generation for many years into the future. Specifically, the NER drew the following conclusion in their National Integrated Resource Plan (NIRP): “Options for diversification are insufficient to meet all of the forecast demand for electricity over the next 20-year planning horizon. Coal-fired options are still required for expansion during this period.” (reference NER NIRP2 available from the NER website www.ner.org.za)</p> <p>Hence alternatives for meeting the projected electricity demand are interrogated and pre-selected at a strategic level. Coal-fired technology options (together with, and not versus, other technology options such as gas turbines and pumped storage schemes) form an integral part of Eskom’s integrated planning. A number of new coal-fired power stations will be required to be constructed within the planning period in order to be able to adequately provide for the growing electricity demand and contribute to the objectives of the South African Energy Policy.</p>

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p><u>The need and justification of the project</u></p> <p>Chapter 2.3</p> <p>DEDET-BM comment: Decision making through the ISEP process should be transparent and information about alternative sites should have been included in order to evaluate the decision-making process</p> <p>See also statements in chapter 2.2.1 paragraph 3 “without the new proposed coal-fired power station in Lephalale...alternatives and paragraph 5. “Without the implementation of the project, the electricity network will not be able to function at full capacity”...potentially negative impacts on economic growth and social well-being.” One gets the impression that management already decided to establish the plant in Lephalale and abandon alternative areas.</p> <p>Important to note that the National Environmental Management Act (Act No 107 of 1998) mentioned sustainable development that “implies meeting the need of the present generation without compromising future generations.” The act also makes provision for protection of the environment.</p>	<p>Department of Economic Development, Environment & Tourism Limpopo – <i>Biodiversity Management</i></p> <p>(Comments on draft scoping report)</p> <p>Letter dated 28 Oct 2005</p>	<p>Comment noted. The NIRP has been subjected to a public participation process.</p>

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>The ISEP process of Eskom is not available for scrutinizing. One of the issues that make this proposed power station feasible was based on the availability of the water resources.</p>	<p>Department of Economic Development, Environment & Tourism Limpopo - <i>Biodiversity Management</i> (Comments on draft scoping report) Letter dated 28 Oct 2005</p>	<p>A range of criteria were used to determine pre-feasibility of the proposed project. These are now subjected to further detailed investigations.</p>

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
CUMULATIVE IMPACTS		
<p>The EIA should cover the cumulative impacts of Matimba A (which was pre ECA of 1989 and probably never subject to an EIA) and both Phases 1 and 2 of the Matimba B project to a maximum of 4800 MW. Secondly, the new power station will require expansion of the existing coal fields and/or development of additional coal fields. This was acknowledged at the meeting. However, this is not part of the Environmental consultants brief and we were told that Kumba Resources would conduct a separate EIA for this project. It is imperative that the cumulative impacts of knock-on projects arising out of the development of Matimba B be included in the EIA for the proposed power station and not be addressed in isolation. For example, the new coal mine will have a water requirement, as will associated domestic supply, secondary industries, etc. Are there any other major projects anticipated in the future that would further increase the demand for resources, e.g. housing?</p>	<p>Dr Mark Berry (Resource Ecologist) (Letter dated 30 June 2005)</p>	<p>The EIA would be required to assess cumulative impacts, particularly with regards to water, infrastructure, air quality etc. The Grootegeluk Mine of Kumba Resources would be required by law to undertake their own environmental assessment should expansion of the current activities be required. This is in terms of the Minerals and Petroleum Resources Act. There would therefore be a separate process for expanded mining activities. The EIA for the proposed power station would, however, make reference to other processes and licensing requirements.</p>
<p>How extensive will the EIA be in terms of assessing cumulative and associated impacts such as the need for additional coal, expanded mining activities, infrastructure, and other domestic requirements.</p>	<p>Dr Mark Berry (Public Meeting - 28 June 2005)</p>	

<p>No reference is made to the cumulative impact of the proposed new power station. Any comprehensive EIA should assess the current impacts of Matimba-A in conjunction with the anticipated impacts of Matimba-B (Phases 1 & 2).</p>	<p>Dr Mark Berry (Resource Ecologist) (Comments on draft scoping report) 30 October 2005</p>	<p>The EIA would be required to assess cumulative impacts, particularly with regards to water, infrastructure, air quality etc. The Grootegeluk Mine of Kumba Resources would be required by law to undertake their own environmental assessment should expansion of the current activities be required. This is in terms of the Minerals and Petroleum Resources Act. There would therefore be a separate process for expanded mining activities. The EIA for the proposed power station would, however, make reference to other processes and licensing requirements</p>
<p>It is imperative that the cumulative impacts of knock-on projects arising out of the development of Matimba-B be included in the EIA for the proposed power station and not be addressed in isolation. The new power station will require a new coal mine which in turn will have a water requirement, as will associated domestic supply, secondary industries, etc. Furthermore, the recently announced intention to exploit the Waterberg coal fields in Botswana will increase the demand for resources.</p>	<p>Dr Mark Berry (Resource Ecologist) (Comments on draft scoping report) 30 October 2005</p>	
<p>The EIA should assess the cumulative impact of the Matimba-B as well as the knock-impact of other projects that will be required to support the new power station viz. new coal mines.</p>	<p>Dr Mark Berry (Resource Ecologist) (Comments on draft scoping report) 30 October 2005</p>	

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
GENERAL		
Will the additional power would be generated for South Africa or for Zimbabwe. The power shortages in South Africa could be solved by not providing power to African countries that do not pay for this service.	Dr. A. Moolman (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 21 July 05)	South Africa supplies and receives electricity from neighboring countries. When there are shortages on the system the neighboring countries are affected.
I am totally against the establishment of the power station on Eenzaamheid. I will take legal action if the power station is built there. It does not make sense to build the power station and ash dumps there with the roads that transect the area.	Mr Hennie Hills (Farmer) (Open Day)	Comment noted.
I border on Eskom land. With the existing project there are already infinite problems – how many more from the planned expansions? As a landowner with all my complaints, there is no help / support from some stakeholders, namely, Eskom, Kumba and the municipality.	Mr Hannes Lamprecht (Farm Eendracht) (Comment Form)	Comment noted.
I am a Landowner that has experienced unending problems as a result of the existing power station, town and mine. How many more as a result of the expansion?	Mr Poem Lamprecht (landowner) (Comment Form)	Comment noted.

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>In your report I would like to see that the following points are investigated and I want to see good reasons why these arguments are not viable:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Build the power station in an area that is already polluted e.g. Gauteng and ship the coal by train alternatively. - Sink the power station so that only a portion of the chimney sticks out. <p>In the event that one of the above-mentioned options are not viable, I will request that you put your second atom bomb as close to the existing one as possible. Build the two power stations as close to each other as possible or build Matimba B as close to the town as possible, preferably between Lephalale and Marapong. I beg you to build Matimba B on Nelsonskop. Please keep away from the Naauwontkomen, Eenzaamheid, Kromdraai, Kuipersbuilt block – it will move the filth a further 10 km west.</p>	<p>Mr P Erasmus (Lawyer) (email letter – 29 June 05)</p>	<p>The siting of the new power station in the Lephalale area was chosen due to the coal availability. The Waterberg is one of the richest areas of coal in South Africa. The Environmental Scoping Report provides information regarding the selection of Lephalale as an area for the proposed new power station.</p> <p>Comment noted. Specific founding conditions are critical to the power station, and hence it will be difficult to sink the power station.</p> <p>The Environmental Scoping Report has identified the preferred site for the power station through the identification, evaluation and assessment of a number of issues, including impacts to fauna and flora, water resources, air quality, social impacts etc.</p>

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>Main area of interest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increasing access to affordable energy services • Improving energy sector governance • Stimulating Economic Development <p>Points of Concern:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The availability and accessibility of primary resources required for the operation of the power station, such as coal and water. • The ability of the new power station to connect to the existing Eskom Network / Grid 	<p>Mr NA Seodisa (ANC) (Comment Form)</p>	<p>Comment noted. Primary resources are available in the area, the Waterberg coal fields are known as the richest coal fields in the country. The proposed power station is proposed to be a dry cooled power station due to the fact that the area is water-stressed.</p> <p>The power station would be integrated into the national grid via transmission lines.</p>
<p>Eskom indicated that a 1800 MW power station was planned and that it was a political decision to construct the power station in the Lephalale area.</p>	<p>Mr. Roux (Lephalale Municipality) (one on one consultation on 9 June 2005)</p>	<p>The proposed new power station would have a maximum capacity of 4 800 MW. The first phase of the project will be approximately half the capacity (i.e. 2 100 MW). One of the contributing factors to the decision to construct the proposed power station in the Lephalale was due to the rich coal reserves. The decision to construct the new proposed power station in the Lephalale area is based on a number of criteria, one of which is the availability of coal .</p>
<p>The future ash dump will result in ash being blown into the high voltage yard. This will create maintenance problems.</p>	<p>Mr A Bosman, Mr W O'Brien, Mr A Crous (one on one consultation - 21 June 2005)</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
My main interests in the project are tourism, Local Economic Development, and because I am a landowner. I support the project 100%.	Mr J Erasmus (Lephalale Municipality) (Comment Form)	Comment noted.
Already in the process of constructing a new home on the farm Ganzepan. The building process was nearing completion, as only the finishes have to be completed. The house is situated on the southern section of the farm and is thus nearer to the proposed facility than the existing farmhouse.	Mr. C. Gouws (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 25 June 05)	The Environmental Scoping Report has nominated a preferred site for the construction of the proposed site. This site will be assessed in more detail during the Impact Assessment phase.
The property owner does not want to move as such relocation would negatively influence his wife's ill health.	Mr. L. Steyn (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 10 June 05)	
Development is necessary, but individuals should not be offended and should be treated fairly.	Mr. C. Gouws (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 25 June 05)	Comment noted. The Public Participation Process endeavors to provide all interested and affected parties the opportunity to raised concerns and issues regarding the proposed project.
Accepts the fact that the development is necessary and that additional power should be generated, but the individual property owners would be negatively affected in the process, as they are already experiencing problems with the existing power station.	Mr. L. Steyn (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 10 June 05)	
Would like to obtain the minutes of all meetings.	Mr. C. Gouws (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 25 June 05)	Minutes of all meetings will be sent to all registered I&AP's and will also be available on the Bohlweki Environmental website (www.bohlweki.co.za).

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
The power station has no benefits to the surrounding property owners.	Mr. L. Steyn (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 10 June 05)	Issues pertaining to impacts on the local community and surrounding property owners have been evaluated in the chapter within the Environmental Scoping Report dealing with social issues.
Already has a railway line traversing his property. The fences along this railway line are in pieces and the animals therefore wander across the railway line resulting in the death of some of his cattle.	Mr. L. Steyn (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 10 June 05)	Comment noted.
The landfill site has been in existence for approximately 18 years and this facility creates numerous problems for the landowner of Eendracht. The landfill site might have to be enlarged as a result of the population change and influx of people to the area. This is a source of concern, as the problems currently experienced with this facility would become worse. No impact assessment was undertaken for the landfill site and the Municipality has no license to operate the site.	Mr. J.J. Lambrecht (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 21 June 05)	Comment noted.
The comments made by the landowners have no value, as the development will continue. The power station will be built and the mining activities will be extended.	Mr. T. Nel (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 22 June 05)	The Public Participation Process endeavors to provide all interested and affected parties the opportunity to raised concerns and issues regarding the proposed project. All comments have been included within the Issues Trail and have been taken into account during the Scoping phase studies.
The landowners experience noise pollution as a result of the motor cross track built by Kumba Resources. It also creates dust and the landowners cannot use their meat processing facility as it is next to this track. Any developments next to the landowners' property have negative impacts and the same is expected with regards to the proposed power station.	Mr. P. van Rooyen and Mr. P. Nel (Landowners) (Meeting - 22 June 05)	Comment note. Issues pertaining to noise and dust have been evaluated during the scoping phase and reported in the chapter dealing with air quality and noise issues. These issues were also considered in the evaluation of sites. Detailed studies will be completed during the EIA phase.

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>The landowners understand that a new power station is necessary for the country's development but they do not want such a facility to be erected in this area. There will be no positive impacts for the property owners in the vicinity of such a development. The Lephalale environment is still somewhat pristine, but this would definitely not be the case anymore when another power station would be built.</p>	<p>Mr. G. Erasmus and Mr. H. Steenkamp (Landowners) (Meeting – 21 June 05)</p>	<p>Eskom identified the Lephalale area as a preferred area for the development of a new power station through feasibility studies. The Environmental Impact Assessment process is assessing the impacts of development on these chosen sites. The Environmental Scoping Report includes an assessment of various alternatives including both site and technology alternatives.</p>
<p>Since the Matimba power station has been built, the rainfall in the area has decreased with between 20% and 30%. A second power station would add to this negative impact.</p>	<p>Mr. G. Erasmus and Mr. H. Steenkamp (Landowners) (Meeting – 21 June 05)</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>Concerns raised by the property owners have no value as it is just noted that Eskom and Kumba Resources' emission are within the acceptable legal limits. This has no purpose as the property owners must still live with the negative impacts associated with the emissions. The power stations would blame each other and the concerns of the property owners would thus never be addressed.</p>	<p>Mr. G. Erasmus and Mr. H. Steenkamp (Landowners) (Meeting – 21 June 05)</p>	<p>The Public Participation Process endeavors to provide all interested and affected parties the opportunity to raised concerns and issues regarding the proposed project. All comments have been included within the Issues Trail and have been taken into account during the Scoping phase studies. The emissions from the power station will be monitored against the relevant legislated standards.</p>
<p>The landowner would rather sell his property to Eskom than stay next to a power station.</p>	<p>Mr. J.J. Thuynsma (Landowner) (Individual meeting – 09 June 05)</p>	<p>Comment noted. Issues pertaining to social impacts have been evaluated in the chapter of the Environmental Scoping Report dealing with social issues.</p>
<p>The private property owners and farmers will receive no benefits from the proposed power station. It will negatively influence the environment due to a number of reasons.</p>	<p>Mr. J. van Rooyen (Landowner) (Comment sheet – 14 July 05)</p>	

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
The landowner is of the opinion that the farm Eenzaamheid would be more suitable for a power station as the turbulence created by the power station would disperse the emissions from the mine.	Mr. J.J. Thuynsma (Landowner) (Individual meeting - 09 June 05)	Comment noted
Air and soil pollution is a source of concern (underground water, dust, ash and heat).	Mr. J. van Rooyen (Landowner) (Comment sheet - 14 July 05)	Refer to the chapters in the Environmental Scoping Report dealing with air quality, water and soil issues.
I would like to obtain a copy of Eskom's Environmental Policy.	Ms Carla Hudson (WESSA) (Key Stakeholders Workshop - 27 June 2005)	Eskom can make this document available.
I would like to request a copy of the Record of Decision (ROD) issued by the Department of Environmental Affairs and Forestry, as well as a copy of the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) for the existing Matimba Power Station.	Ms Carla Hudson (WESSA) (Key Stakeholders Workshop - 27 June 2005)	The existing Matimba power station was built pre-1997, and no ROD was issued. The operations of the existing Matimba Power Station are ISO 14000 compliant (an EMS is in place) and Eskom also have the required licenses to operate.
Does the existing Matimba Power Station have rehabilitation policies.	Ms Carla Hudson (WESSA) (Key Stakeholders Workshop - 27 June 2005)	Eskom rehabilitate what is required and all of these are identified within the ISO 14000 system. These include environmental operating procedures for a range of environmental issues, including erosion management, rehabilitation of the ash dam, responsible land management and water and waste management.
Can the information such as the rehabilitation policies (for Matimba A) be made available to the public?	Ms Carla Hudson (WESSA) (Key Stakeholders Workshop - 27 June 2005)	It may be more useful to make arrangements with the environmental manager at Matimba to visit the site.

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>Why was an authorities meeting not held before this key stakeholder meeting. When will the consultants have a meeting with the relevant authorities. I would also like to request a copy of the minutes of such a meeting.</p>	<p>Ms Carla Hudson (WESSA) (Key Stakeholders Workshop - 27 June 2005)</p>	<p>The meeting with the authorities scheduled for 28 June 2005 in Polokwane was with various relevant provincial departments such as the Department of Health, Department of Minerals and Energy, Department of Agriculture etc. The initial correspondence and authorities pre-application meeting was held with National DEAT, the lead authority for this project. A meeting was also held with the DEAT representatives when they attended the site visit.</p>
<p>The coal supplier, Grootegeluk mine, does not have a good environmental record. What demands will Eskom place on their suppliers to comply with the necessary environmental regulations.</p>	<p>Ms Carla Hudson (WESSA) (Key Stakeholders Workshop - 27 June 2005)</p>	<p>Eskom will audit their suppliers to monitor compliance.</p>
<p>Will Eskom take responsibility for the slimes dams on the farm Appelvlakte, and will it continued to be used.</p>	<p>Ms Carla Hudson (WESSA) (Key Stakeholders Workshop - 27 June 2005)</p>	<p>The utilisable area of each farm was indicated on the locality map. The utilisable area for Appelvlakte excludes the area utilised by the slimes dam. Kumba Resources are currently operating the slimes dams, and will continue to operate the facility.</p>
<p>I would like to request a copy of the Pre-feasibility report.</p>	<p>Ms S Mandhlazi (Earthlife Africa) (Key Stakeholders Workshop - 27 June 2005)</p>	<p>The Pre-feasibility report drafted by Eskom contains commercially sensitive information.</p>
<p>Will WESSA be able to receive the minutes of the public meeting to be held in Lephalale.</p>	<p>Ms Carla Hudson (WESSA) (Key Stakeholders Workshop - 27 June 2005)</p>	<p>All minutes will be on the Bohlweki Environmental web page where I&APs can access all the public documents. (www.bohlweki.co.za)</p>

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
When will the construction begin.	Local Community Meeting – Marapong – 27 June 2005	The overall project will be undertaken in two phases. Depending on the RoD, it is expected that construction on phase one could begin in 2007. Almost half of the total capacity will be constructed during the first phase of the project.
Will Eskom build the Power Station in phases.	Local Community Meeting – Marapong – 27 June 2005	Construction of the total capacity will take place in two phases. The first phase will possibly consist of half of the total capacity. It could be that three units are built at first. The units could be bigger in capacity than those of the existing Matimba Power Station.
The current problems need to be identified and ways to mitigate these problems should be sought. This is a role for all the role players and the community. I have a concern regarding the construction of an additional power station if the existing problems of the communities can not be solved at this stage.	Adv. Mboni Murathi (NER) (Public Meeting – 28 June 2005)	The aim of the EIA is to determine the potential issues/problems associated with a new Power Station in the area. The EIA includes specialist studies which will make recommendations on how this issue can be addressed and managed. All relevant authorities (including DEAT, NER etc) are required to look at the disadvantages and advantages before they issue a decision.
I am in the process of developing his property. When will Eskom be in a position to indicate to him whether my property will be required to be purchased, or not. Because I am in the process of building additional chalets and related infrastructure, I do not want a situation where I am told that I have overcapitalised on my property.	Mr Tienie Loots (Landowner – Farm Zongesien) (Public Meeting – 28 June 2005)	A preferred site for the proposed power station has been recommended within this Scoping Report. This report provides I&APs with more information on the preferred area for the construction of the power station and how their properties would potentially be affected. There would be a process through which the preferred landowner is engaged and subsequently compensated for the market value of the land as well as for inconveniences experienced.
The attendants were presented with the Waterberg coalfields as option one and were led to believe that Site B, C and D were poorer choices. The public would like more information on Sites B, C and D to determine how Eskom actually came to the conclusion that the Waterberg coalfields is the most suitable area.	Mr Ian Hall (Anglo Coal) (Public Meeting – 28 June 2005)	The four sites looked at were "brownfields" coal mines where Eskom could build power stations which would meet the growing demand of electricity. Matimba B proved to be the most viable of the areas considered. However, Eskom will be continuing the pre-feasibility studies and EIA's for the other potential sites for additional power stations.

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>Was there any consideration given to the Anglo Coal's gas rights regarding the recommendation of the positioning of the power station? The recommendation in the conclusion of the draft report is great for us, since it is not on the properties where Anglo Coal has gas exploration rights. Nowhere in the report was it mentioned that it was taken into account where Anglo Coal has gas rights on some of the properties when the recommendation was made or justified to this proposed position. Surely that must have played a role in the decision making of the proposed position? Or was it insignificant? Just a comment about something I have picked up in your report.</p>	<p>Johan Koekemoer Anglo American (Comment on draft scoping report) 17 October 2005</p>	<p>Comment noted. Anglo Coal's gas exploration rights were taken into account during the scoping study. Refer to pg 193 and 205 of the Environmental Scoping Report.</p>

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>The property owners are not opposed to development, but those proposing the development should acknowledge the individual property owners and co-operate with them to limit any negative impact on the individual properties. I am currently farming with game only as it became impossible to farm cattle due to theft and poaching on the farm Eendracht. It is costly to develop a game farm and the property owners are not receiving any assistance from the Lephalale Municipality, Nature Conservation, the police, Eskom and Kumba Resources. I feel that these role players should assist the property owners when the property owners forward complaints. In addition, the municipal landfill site adjacent to my property was not licensed until three months ago and no impact assessment was undertaken before the development of this landfill site. No compensation is received for animals dying from eating plastics and other rubbish from the landfill. A second power station in the area would double the population and therefore double the problems for the individual property owners. I would like to emphasise that the impacts on the farmers must be considered and their needs must be attended to.</p>	<p>Mr Lamprecht (Landowner - Farms Eendracht and Fancy) (Public Meeting - 28 June 2005)</p>	<p>Comment noted. All inputs from the Public Participation process have been included in the issues trail and considered in the evaluation of sites in order to nominate a preferred site for detailed study in the EIA phase.</p>

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>The property owners whose farms are not bought out are the ones that should be concerned about the proposed development, as they would have to deal with the negative impacts. The I&APs should not think that the power station would not be built, as the country needs the additional power to be generated. The EIA only assessed the positive and negative impacts and ensures that the negative impacts are properly mitigated. The property owners in the area already experienced air pollution from the existing Matimba Power Station and I believe that the problem of the fences rusting very quickly can be attributed to Matimba A. These property owners cannot prove that these negative impacts are a result of the power station and they therefore have not been compensated for their losses. Additional population numbers would also create problems for the surrounding property owners. There should therefore be a system or forum in place to evaluate the negative impacts experienced by the property owners in the long-term to ensure that they can be compensated.</p>	<p>Mr Willie Barnard (Landowner) (Public Meeting - 28 June 2005)</p>	<p>Eskom are ISO 14000 compliant and are therefore required to address the issues as per the environmental management plan/system on an on-going basis. In addition, it could be recommended through the EIA that an Environmental Monitoring Committee be established to monitor the environment on an on-going basis. There is already a Lephalale Environmental Committee in place that focuses on issues broader than the power station alone. Property owners and farmers are part of this established committee. A Monitoring Committee would have legal status and could consist of representatives of the relevant authorities such as environmental affairs, water affairs, health and so on, as well as property owners. This committee would usually focus on issues regarding a specific development and its members would monitor that the EMP is implemented correctly.</p>
<p>The major roleplayers in the area have ignored any complaints by the individual property owners in the past. The property owners experience numerous electricity outages and despite the problems being reported there has been nothing done to rectify the problem. There must therefore be a forum where these role players could effectively communicate with the property owners and address their problems.</p>	<p>Mr Gert Beetge (Lanowner) (Public meeting - 28 June 2005)</p>	<p>The farmers are important stakeholders for Eskom and that the power losses will be reported to the relevant people at Eskom to attend to this matter.</p>

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>I belong to the farmers union but for the past seven years none of our concerns have been addressed. These forums are therefore useless. The property owners still have to deal with trees dying, negative impacts on their water sources, poaching, blasting and rusting of fences. He added that when the property owners complained about the air pollution it was indicated that the emissions were below the international standard. These responses do not address the inconveniences and negative impacts experienced by the property owners at all.</p>	<p>Mr Gideon Erasmus (Public meeting – 28 June 2005)</p>	<p>Comment noted. The proposed new power station will be required to be in compliance with all relevant legislative and other requirements and standards.</p>
<p>The completely new coal fired power station should be constructed with a new name in Lephalale.</p>	<p>Miss L.R. Sekalo (Local Community) (Comment Form)</p>	<p>Comment noted. Currently the name for the proposed power station is Matimba B, but the name will be changed should the project be approved.</p>
<p>My main area of interest is that the completely new coal fired power station should be constructed with a new name in Lephalale.</p>	<p>Miss M.R. Monare (Local Community) (Comment Form)</p>	
<p>Why was Lephalale chosen as the most suitable area for the construction of a new coal fired power station.</p>	<p>Mr. M. Reinecke Ms. H. Bezuidenhout Mr. S. Grobler Mr. F.I. Roux Mr. F.J. du Plessis Mr. R. Rorich Mr. E. Viviers Lephalale Environmental Committee (one on one consultation - 9 June 2005)</p>	<p>Eskom Holdings Limited's screening and feasibility studies identified the coalfields in the Lephalale area as one of the most viable option for the construction of a new coal fired power station. The four sites looked at were "brownfield" coal mines where Eskom could build power stations to meet the growing demand for electricity. However, Eskom will be continuing the pre-feasibility and EIA studies for the other potential sites for additional power stations.</p>

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
It is not going to affect me. It is very interesting to me. I like your idea of opening the new power station.	Miss MM Modise (Local Community) (Comment Form)	Comment noted.
The landowners are of the opinion that previous studies focusing on an impact area of approximately 5km radius around the mine and power station, were not sufficient. Detail measurements and assessments must also be undertaken on their properties. Usually these are only undertaken after complaints have been received.	Mr. G. Erasmus and Mr. H. Steenkamp (Landowners) (Meeting – 21 June 05)	Comment noted.
What is the distance between the mine and the sites for the movement of coal.	Tsenduka Hatlane (Limpopo DEDET) (Provincial Authorities Meeting: 28 June 2005)	Eenzaamheid would be the greatest distance away from the mine, but that an average conveyor distance of approximately 4-6 km could be expected.
Have Eskom considered Best Available Technology (BAT). The Department would like to see a movement to bring back BAT.	Reginald Mabalane (DEAT: CAPCO) (Focus Group Meeting – CAPCO – 29 July 2005)	The technology under consideration is better technology than currently operating in South Africa. In terms of BAT, Eskom have investigated the best practicable environmental option for South Africa to implement.
Large volume of mining would result in the demolishing of the topsoil and environment.	Mr T Sauer (Beestekraal Brits) (Comment Form)	Comment noted. The environmental impacts of the mining operation will be the subject of a separate EIA.

COMMENT	NAME AND ORGANISATION	RESPONSE
<p>The construction of Matimba "B" is a definite NO. The power station can be constructed in an already polluted area where coal could be transported by rail. There is no reason to disrupt / pollute the splendid nature of South Africa or even Africa and then as "after the fact" try and rehabilitate the area. What would be next, Sasol and their henchmen, and one of these days the area becomes a second Vereeniging. Nature, humans, animals and any other living soul would be negatively impacted by this project. It is the general idea to uplift and enhance the environment and not to break it down</p>	<p>Mr T Sauer (Beestekraal Brits) (Comment Form)</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>The responsibility (management and assessment) point between Eskom and Kumba Resources should be determined. The take over points/points of transfer need to be finalised as Kumba need to issue instructions to their specialists. The current conveyor belt servitude has been excluded from the mining area, and remains the responsibility of Eskom.</p>	<p>Charl Nolte (Kumba Resources: Manager Strategy & Planning: Environmental Management) (Focus Group Meeting – Kumba Resources – 5 August 2005)</p>	<p>A transfer point must be agreed upon between Eskom and Kumba Resources.</p>
<p>Main area of interest with regards to the proposed project: Poultry.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In my area there is no Poultry - I think it would be a good project as we do not have one. 	<p>Miss W.S. Selota (Comment form)</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>