

Purpose of Meeting:	Tutuka Continuous Ashing EIA – Public Meeting
Venue:	Ulwazi Primary School, Thuthukani
Date:	2 September 2014

Attendance Register			
Project Team Members Present:			
Name	Company	Name	Company
Tobile Bokwe (TB)	Eskom – EIA Centre of Excellence	Ryno Lacock (RL)	Eskom SOC Ltd – Tutuka Power Station
Shane Roux (SR)	Eskom SOC Ltd	Egard van Rensburg (EvR)	Eskom SOC Ltd – Tutuka Power Station
Ilse Coop (IC)	Eskom SOC Ltd – Tutuka Power Station	Vusi Mahlabe (VM)	Eskom SOC Ltd – Tutuka Power Station
Meshack Hlogwane (MH)	Eskom SOC Ltd	Danie Brummer (DB)	Lidwala SA
Nicolene Venter (NV)	Zitholele Consulting	Bongi Mhlanga (BM)	Lidwala SA
65 Thuthukani community members attended the Public meeting. Please see attached Appendix A for the attendance record of the attendees.			

Acronyms	
ADF	Ash Disposal Facility
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
FFP	Fabric Filter Plant
DEIR	Draft Environmental Impact Report
TT02	Emergency ashing area

Item	Actions	Action by whom	Action by when
1.	Pre-meeting discussion (Members of the public had queries about the public meeting's attendance before the meeting commenced)		
1.1	Mninwa Mthimunye commented by saying: if this is a public meeting, then it should have been arranged properly and held at a venue that will be big enough to accommodate the entire public. An announcement		

	<p>should have been made to inform the entire public to ensure that the public can have an input on the issues presented. Mr Mthimunye also stated that he has a problem that the few people who have attended the public meeting are regarded as the public.</p>		
<p>1.2</p>	<p>Thomas Xaba noted that Mr Mtimunye’s comments have partially covered his concerns. Mr Xaba stated that as a resident of Thuthukani, he has observed the impacts of Tutuka Power Station on the entire Thuthukani community. It was also commented that, the Cllr’s introduction mentioned that he reports to various structures in the community which consist of various groups, and this is a problem to him. Mr Xaba posed the question: where do those structures report to because there are public meetings held or conducted in Thuthukani. They only conduct or hold organisational meetings yet the impact of the Tutuka ash plant doesn’t only have an impact on organisations but also has an impact on the entire Thuthukani community.</p> <p>Cllr Mosia responded by clarifying the following: There is no number or general membership that constitutes a public. Even if there are three people it’s also regarded as the public. This is not the first time that Lidwala presented this proposed project to the community and it’s also not the last time, whatever they are presenting and the members of the public will attest to that. Note that different structures work in different ways. Lidwala requested that should loud hailing be used, then one of their team members should be present and be part of the loud hailing process, so as to facilitate what is being said. As this proposed project is not a municipal project, loud hailing is not a requirement. Lidwala is present to present the proposed project and the various environmental impacts to Thuthukani’s residents that the community are afforded an opportunity to provide their inputs. If a follow up meeting is required it will be conducted as the community is at liberty to request a follow up meeting.</p> <p>Cllr Mosia further commented that any member of the community can go to the municipality and request access to the municipality’s records of all the different wards files. They can check if there were any public meetings conducted in that specific ward, the purpose of those public meetings and what the attendance of those meetings were. Cllr Mosia also mentioned that</p>		

	<p>in April there was a community meeting conducted whereby the Executive Mayor, Cllr Caroline Matsidiso Morajane was invited to discuss the budget for the whole municipality and of the ward. The Cllr Mosia said that if they speak of ward 12, they are not only speaking about Thuthukani but also the surrounded 32 farms and they have to rotate amongst those farms to tell them anything about what is going to happen within the ward.</p> <p>Cllr Mosia further explained that this meeting is conducted by Lidwala SA and Eskom (Tutuka Power Station) and the purpose of the meeting is to report back to the community regarding the proposed new Ash Disposal Facility (ADF) and the associated environmental impacts. Questions for clarification, where needed will be asked. The Cllr further stressed to the public to note that this is not his meeting, however it is still a public meeting. Hence he is handing over to the public to ask whatever it is that they would like to ask.</p> <p>Cllr Mosia commented on the issue of different structures by saying that they had arranged from the side of the ward committee, which was elected constitutionally by the majority of the people, that the meeting will be attended by members representing different disciplines in the community. He added that the meeting conducted today is to clarify things that were requested in the previous meeting that was held at this venue, and stated that Lidwala and Eskom is there to answer and respond to questions that were previously asked by the community members.</p> <p>Cllr Mosia mentioned that if anyone has anything to say or has a query regarding the operations of the ward, the community is at liberty to attend the ward meetings. He asked the community to wait for their own ward meeting to take place where they can bring up and deal with all of the ward's issues.</p> <p>Cllr asked the community to let Lidwala SA and Eskom to continue with their meeting.</p> <p><u>Post-meeting note:</u> It should also be noted the following activities have taken place through that the public participation process to ensure that the public at large are informed of the public meeting:</p>		
--	--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 Advertisements were placed in the XXXX <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First advertisement: announcing the availability of the DEIR and the Public Meeting date and venue; • Second advertisement: announcing the postponement of the Public Meeting; and • Third advertisement: announcing the continuation of the Public Meeting. • Liaison with key community members; and • Liaison with the Councillor to ensure that the word regarding the public meeting reach the community. <p>The School Hall was booked and made available for the meeting, but due t the lack of power at the hall, the team was forced to make alternative arrangements and therefore the classroom was utilised.</p>		
1.3	BM clarified the issue with regards to the two projects that Lidwala SA is doing on behalf of Eskom (Tutuka Power Station) the first one is the EIA for the proposed new ADF (reason for this meeting) and the FFP project (environmental authorisation already received, and project completed, and not part of the current proceedings).		
2.	INTRODUCTION / WELCOME		
2.1	Cllr Mosia, officially opened the meeting. Mr Mthimunye opened the meeting with prayer.		
2.2	BM presented the purpose of the meeting, conduct of the meeting and the role players and their responsibilities associated with the proposed project.		
2.3	The project team (Lidwala SA and Eskom) members introduced themselves, their roles and responsibilities associated with this proposed project.		
3.	ESKOM PRESENTATION (<i>Presentation attached as Appendix B</i>). <i>The presentation was conducted in English by RL with VM translating in Zulu.</i>		
3.1	RL provided a brief summary of the history of Tutuka Power Station and then presented the need for the proposed project.		
4.	QUESTIONS / DISCUSSION		
4.1	<p>Thomas Xaba asked the following questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eskom talked about the initial design of the Tutuka Power Station was for 35 years and an additional 5 years for contingency. In Mr Lock's presentation it was also mentioned that Eskom extracts 99.8% of ash at Tutuka Power Station. What he would like to know is seeing 		

	<p>that the power station is old, has Eskom done an assessment or an analysis just to verify whether the power station still meets the design efficiency in terms of the extraction of ash because he knows for a fact that the ash gets deposited behind the power station (entering the Power Station from the East. However it has an impact on the people of Thuthukani. Mr Xaba said that a person who has a car that is not parked in a garage or a covered area but is parked outside, the amount of ash deposits on the car is a good indication of the amount of ash and smoke in the area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What means has Eskom taken to see what is the extent the ash impacted on the community of Thuthukani or to what extent does the ash migrate from the ash disposal plant to Thuthukani. <p>RL responded by saying that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The dust that goes out of the chimneys is dispersed all over the area, depending on the wind direction. If the wind blows predominantly from the north or predominantly from the North West it blows the ash to the other side far away from Thuthukani and when the wind turns around and blows in the direction of Thuthukani, the dust will settle in the Thuthukani area. There is dust monitoring points all around the power station where Eskom is collecting dust in dust buckets. Eskom does standardised sampling from these buckets and it is monitored and compared with the overall minimal standards as per the environmental legislation. The Power Station has to adhere to the minimum requirements as stipulated by law. • RL further explained that part of the study that was done also looked at wind strength and wind direction through the course of the year to see which areas are mostly affected. Eskom knows that the areas to the south west of the power station are mostly affected (privately owned farm lands). It needs to be noted that 		
--	--	--	--

	<p>when the wind blows on the Highveld, dust is from everywhere, i.e. from Sasol, Secunda, mining operations in the area, etc. What Eskom is trying to do with these two projects is that: from the FFP project, by changing the filters plant is that what comes out of the chimneys the community will not be able to see it anymore and that it will almost have no effect to the community. With the expansion of the ash disposal facility, the improved dust suppression system will enable Eskom to suppress dust better so that it can no longer affect the people of these surroundings. The attendees were reminded that should they be interested, they can download the DEIR from Lidwala's website (http://www.lidwala.com/eiar-tutuka/The air quality study that was conducted is available and the wind direction and strength is indicated. Page 24 and 25 will be attached to the draft minutes.</p> <p>BM also noted to the community that a hard copy of the report is also available at the public library in Standerton.</p> <p><u>Post-meeting note:</u></p> <p>The power station life has been extended from 40 years to 65 years including the 5 years contingency. The replacement of the existing precipitators with fabric filter plant would reduce the amount of ash particles from the smoke stacks.</p> <p><i>Tutuka Power Station</i></p>		
4.2	<p>Mr Mthokozisi Fadukey asked Eskom what would be the impacts of dumping ash for a further 20 years on the same land that was initially projected to be used for 40 years. Mr Fakude stated that Eskom should remember that the dumping site area is also part of ward 12 meaning that the people of Thuthukani are also affected. Mr Fakude further commented by saying that maybe Eskom wants to save money and avoid the difficulty, logistics or the legalities of purchasing private land for Eskom to use as the dumping site. Mr Fakude noted to Eskom that a bigger area is needed so as to accommodate the new life span of the power station.</p>		

	<p>RL responded by saying he is not sure if he is the most appropriate person to answer that question because this whole environmental assessment was exactly about that, to determine whether what Eskom wants to do will detrimentally affect the environment or not.</p> <p><i>(RL explained the process of stacking the ash)</i></p> <p>The stacker puts the ash down on the front stacker and when it's filled up, turns around and puts the ash at the back. Once the area has been filled, then it is rehabilitated by putting top soil on top. RL further explained that in this process where Eskom now needs to put in more ash in the same footprint and in the same space, they have to make it higher and the way to make it higher is that there is a second machine that comes behind the first machine and this machine puts more ash down on a higher level, first on the front side and then on back side and then they cover it with top soil, so ultimately, the only difference that people will see afterwards is that the whole place will be much higher than what it normally would be.</p> <p>RL further stated that the challenge now will be that they will have a larger exposed surface area, while they are busy depositing the ash therefore the extended dust suppression system that Eskom wants to implement is now very important, so that they can spray that whole area effectively to make sure that dust does not blow off all around. RL also stated that in order to increase their dust spraying with more water while preventing more water seeping down into the ground water that is why Eskom has to have the liner placed underneath the ash facility. RL stated that this whole study is about making it environmentally acceptable to do what Eskom has to do with regards to the project. RL mentioned that there are only two alternatives: The one is to shut the power station down prematurely and take 10% of South Africans electricity away, and then the country will have to deal with things like load shedding. Or alternatively Eskom can have the current operation plus another operation like the current one at Tutuka Power Station at another location, but then there will be two areas that will be contaminated. RL commented that, those were the alternatives and of all those alternatives, site Alternative this A seems to have the lowest impacts.</p>		
--	---	--	--

	<p><u>Post meeting note:</u></p> <p>Having a separate facility in another vicinity will not affect any changes to the challenges experienced with the current facility. The new facility will have a different, and improved, design and management philosophy.</p>		
4.3	<p>Nelson Dlamini asked if there is alternative use for the ash, like use it to produce another product instead of getting more land space just to dump the ash.</p> <p>RL responded by saying ash can be used to make bricks and be added to cement as an additive and these products are currently being done at Matla, Kendal and Lethabo Power Stations. The attendees were informed that the power station puts out 13 000 tons of ash per day, which, as an example can fill up a classroom of the host venue size 20 to 50 times. So, currently, any ash utilisation would not make any difference. South African does not have enough use for cement/bricks in the country to make the ash deposits less or go away and that the most economical way is to put the ash in one place and contain it. There is other technical solution available at the moment. RL shared that there are thoughts of putting the ash into mined out areas, however that will create other problems as it would mean that while they are mining the ash will have to be disposed of somewhere else and once mining ceased then the ash can be disposed of in the hole. This, however can cause groundwater impacts. RL commented that there is no easy solution with regards to ash disposal.</p>		
4.4	<p>Cllr Mosia enquired if, in an event whereby the members of the community decide to start a co-op and want to make use of the ash for a certain project, would Eskom grant the community access to the ash?</p> <p>RL responded by saying Eskom is open to be approached about that, however it is not so simple because firstly the kind of ash that you need for possible uses is not exactly the mixture it gets deposited in. RL explained that the way that Tutuka power station is designed is that they mix the fine ash with the coarse ash. The coarse ash comes out of the boiler. The fine ash comes out of the precipitator filters</p>		

	<p>and that is being conditioned and mixed together on the same conveyer belt stream to go out. At the power stations where they are actually utilising the ash, either as a cement additive or as a compound for brick they need to separate that ash and to separate it is a difficult process. So to separate the ash, Eskom could need to build a plant on the power station to extract the ash from the process earlier than from the disposal facility itself, so it is not so easy because the composition of the ash might not be suitable for those uses, such as making bricks. RL stated that in principle, yes Eskom is open to be approached but technically it's not so easy.</p> <p>DB added that the additional problem that you will have is that ash is classified as waste so you will need a certain authorisation to use the ash.</p>		
4.5	<p>Thomas Xaba made the following comments: Eskom has acknowledged the environmental impacts of the ash disposal facility and as well as the gas emissions from the chimneys. When the power station was constructed Eskom had a social responsibility to the community of Thuthukani. Thuthukani used to have ambulances and clinics but those things have been taken away. Mr Xaba added that some of the kids are asthmatic and some of the parents have taken their children out of Thuthukani because of their asthmatics conditions which in Mr Xaba's opinion are because of the pollution resulting from the ash dump. Mr Xaba commented that Eskom wants to expand, which means its more exposure. The children as well as the adults will get sick.</p> <p>Mr Xaba asked what social commitment Eskom has, towards the people of Thuthukani because the hospital is 30km away.</p> <p>RL responded that he is not in a position to answer that. Mr Xaba's comment will be noted, taken forward and then responded to in the minutes.</p> <p>RL added that Eskom is confident that what it intends and plan to do with this ash disposal facility expansion project will not leave people worse off than they are now. RL stated that whether we say yes or no to the expansion it will not make a difference in the current</p>		

	<p>conditions. The only difference it will make, will be that it will improve the current situation.</p>		
<p>4.6</p>	<p>Thokozani Ngubeni commented that following up on such meetings has proven to be a complicated exercise. Except if you are exposed to Tutuka Power Station, you are working there, you are part of an organisation that has dealings with the power station or unless if you are health conscious and you do research. Mr Ngubeni stated that the majority of the community here in Thuthukani are saying that this is a health issue and they do not have information about it but they are convinced that Eskom is doing something about it. Mr Ngubeni further stated the community wants to know if this process will create jobs.</p> <p>NV responded by saying that she is glad Mr Ngubeni asked that question because the team sometimes tends to focus on the environmental impacts on biophysical impacts, like the plants and animals and etc. NV stated that aspects such as jobs, health, visual impacts are part of the social impacts that are also part of this assessment. Unfortunately the team have not had an opportunity yet to present those aspects that have been assessed in the process.</p> <p>NV referred the question of jobs to Danie. NV asked if the social impact assessment talks about job opportunities and what the figure is.</p> <p>DB responded by saying that question will be addressed in the minutes as he is not certain of the contents of the social impact assessment.</p> <p>RL added that the further planning of redesigning and disposing of more ash will not in itself create more jobs. However the community have to remember that the fact that Eskom will be running the power station for 60 years instead of 25 years means that the station will provide jobs to the people of this community for another 25 years. RL stated that if the power station was not here, people would not be here tonight because, the school would not be here. RL added that he can already counted 6 people whom he recognises at the meeting that work at the power station, whose families are being fed from the power station. So as long as Eskom continues with the disposal of ash and</p>		

	<p>the power station keeps running for 60 years then that means people will still have jobs. RL commented that this process will not create jobs in itself because it is a continuation of the current process just slightly in a different manner.</p> <p><u>Post meeting note:</u> The EAP feels that the question regarding job opportunities for this proposed project was adequately responded to by Mr Ryno Lacock to at the Public Meeting. <i>Danie Brummer, EAP, Lidwala Environmental</i></p>		
4.7	<p>Mninwa Mthimunye commented by saying that he hears Eskom talking about the extension of the TT02. He then asked what mechanism is going to be implemented to control the dust at TT02 because at the present moment there is nothing in place to control the dust.</p> <p>Egard responded by saying that the dust suppression system will be implemented.</p>		
4.8	<p>Thomas Xaba made the following statements: Mr Xaba commented by saying that he does not want Eskom to fool the community of Thuthukani just because they are not exposed and/or do not have access to the Power Station, but he is working there and he knows what is happening at the power station on a daily basis. Seeing that this is a public meeting Mr Xaba stressed that Eskom and the project team need to give the community of Thuthukani a true reflection of what is currently happening at the power station. Mr Xaba added that Mr Mthimunye is right to bring up the issue of the TT02 because it disposes to the settling ponds. Mr Xaba explained that because the coal plant is also disposing to those two points. The design philosophy behind those two settling points was that there will only be one working at a time until it packs up, with ash coal slimes and then they divert to the next one until it also packs up, while the other one is drying out, so that the ponds can be dredged and the dredged material disposed, but that has not happened at Tutuka for a long time. Mr Xaba further explained that when he left Tutuka and went to the union in 2009, was the last time Eskom dredged the ponds. Mr Xaba said that he came back last year and found those ponds fully packed with reeds fully grown, and birds had built up their nests there. Mr Xaba explained that</p>		

	<p>when it rains the water goes through the ash and ends up in the river streams on the neighbouring farms. Mr Xaba urged that whenever Eskom comes to Thuthukani, it should present a true reflection of what is happening at the power station and not mislead the community members.</p> <p>Ryno responded by saying that he is going to accept Mr Xaba comment and will not be able to respond to it and that it will be noted.</p> <p>Post meeting note: In the meetings held with farmers, there has not been a single submission about ash being washed into their properties. Instead all ash related issues are waterborne, so the source of Mr Xaba's assertion is not known. It should be noted that Eskom operates through a Zero Liquid Effluent Discharge (ZLED) philosophy, by which Eskom operations are managed such that no polluted water leaves the station premises.</p>		
5.	LIDWALA PRESENTATION (<i>Presentation attached as Appendix B</i>). <i>The presentation was conducted by DB in English with BM translating in Zulu.</i>		
6.	QUESTIONS / DISCUSSION		
6.1	<p>Thomas Xaba asked if the presentation is also part of the DEIR report.</p> <p>BM responded by saying that the presentation is a summary of what is in the DEIR report.</p> <p>NV added that the presentation will be appended in the minutes.</p>		
7.	Closure		
7.1	BM closed the meeting and thanked everyone for making the time to come to the public meeting.		

Minuted by: Bongsi Mhlanga