

Purpose of Meeting:	Tutuka Continuous Ashing EIA Key Stakeholders Workshop
Venue:	Die Kliphuis 31 Caledon street, Standerton
Date:	Tuesday, 2 September 2014

Attendant 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	Senzo Sibiyi (SS)	Eskom SOC Ltd – Tutuka Power Station
Meshack Hlogwane (MH)	Eskom SOC Ltd	Netshidongololwe Thivhusiwi (NT)	Eskom SOC Ltd
Danie Brummer (DB)	Lidwala SA	Bongi Mhlanga (BM)	Lidwala SA
Nicolene Venter (NV)	Zitholele Consulting		

3 Key stakeholders attended the Key Stakeholders Workshop. Please see attached Appendix A for the full attendance record of the attendees.

Item	Actions	Action by whom	Action by when
1.	INTRODUCTION / WELCOME		
1.1	NV welcomed everyone present and thanked them for taking the time off their busy schedules to attend the Workshop.		
1.2	NV requested that the team members introduce themselves, and briefly describe their roles and responsibilities associated with this proposed project, and/or the organisations they represent.		
2.	PRESENTATIONS (Presentation attached as Appendix B)		
2.1	NV presented the Draft Agenda, the purpose of the meeting and the conduct of the meeting. The attendees present accepted the Draft Agenda.		

2.2	RL provided a brief summary of the history of Tutuka Power Station and then presented the need for the proposed project, and.		
3.	QUESTIONS / DISCUSSION		
3.1	<p>JV asked the following questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the process that Eskom uses to place top soil on top of the ash; • What is the thickness of the soil layers; • What type of soil is it; and • Where is Eskom getting the topsoil from; <p>RL responded by saying:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tutuka Power Station (PS) harvest topsoil from the front end of the Ash Disposal Facility (ADF) and this topsoil is then placed on top and on the sides of the ADF for rehabilitation. • The thickness of the topsoil is 300mm and is harvested from the front end of the ADF. Ash is not dumped on top of the topsoil, topsoil is placed on top of existing ash because it is 25m down and you cannot use it again if placed underneath the ash. • Tutuka picks up in-front of the depositing wall and transport it around and put it back on top. <p><u>Post-meeting note:</u> In response to the question regarding what type of soil is currently being used for top soil of the existing ADF the team refers the delegate to the Soils and Agricultural Report as appended to the DEIR. <i>Danie Brummer, EAP</i></p>		
3.2	<p>JV enquired about the thickness of the top soil that is taken from the front end of the ADF and placed at the back of the ADF.</p> <p>RL responded by saying it is the same thickness (300mm) that they put at the back because if you go in too deep then you start digging out clay.</p> <p>RL referred to a picture from his presentation and pointed out the areas that have been planted with grass and those blocks have been mowed, as clearly visible on the picture. RL stated that this process is working fairly well and that the grass that grows there is possibly a mixture of 4 seeds</p>		

	that are being used and it is well compatible with the environment and soil.		
3.3	<p>JV said he was concerned that when he looks at the soil map of the ADF area as presented (<i>please refer to the attached presentation</i>), it shows that there are different soil types between the pre-ashing and post-ashing. JV stated that the soil before the ash facility, on the same footprint, is the arcadia soil type which is high in clay and the soil after the ash facility, on the same footprint, is the Avalon synclare valley soils, which are yellow soils. JV also stated that when one looks at the horizons they are completely different from the ones inside.</p> <p>JV pointed out to the project team that the soil maps included in the DEIR differ from those that the DARDLEA has available. He pointed out to the project team (on his laptop) the two different type of soils namely arcadia soil and Avalon.</p> <p>DB will request the Agricultural Potential Specialist to liaise with the DARDLEA regarding the soil types identified and reported by him in comparison to that of the DARDLEA.</p> <p>Post Meeting Note: The information in the Agricultural Impact assessment is more detailed than the information available to DARDLEA which accounts for the difference.</p>		
3.4	<p>JV noted to Eskom that if soil is taken from the front of the ADF and moved to the back, then the different horizons of the soil do not meet. The soil at the top and the C horizon does not measure up with the original soil horizon that was there as soil is taken and mixed with a different type of soil that has got a completely different function.</p> <p>EvR responded by saying that Eskom is using the same type of soil which is clay like.</p> <p>RL clarified that the Power Station is moving the soil 50 metres back and 25 metres up. He does not know how detrimental that is but noted that they are not bringing the soil from somewhere far away, or from another borrow pit somewhere else.</p>		
3.5	JV commented that when looking at the picture that was done on the ADF area via remote and		

	<p>satellite remote sensing it shows different soil types. He asked if Garry Peterson did a soil map on this area, as part of his assessment and if he did he would like to see it, so that he can compare the two maps.</p> <p>RL commented that it would not be economically viable for the Power Station to transport soil from anywhere else and that the system that they are currently using is more feasible as they are just removing soil from the front end of the ADF and placing it on top of the ADF.</p> <p>Post-meeting note: A CD was provided to the delegate which contained the various maps indicate the soil types and conditions.</p>		
3.7	<p>JV further stated that (<i>Referring to the presentation</i>) taking soil from the front end of the ADF and placing it at the back, B and C will stay the same but with an ash layer in between them.</p> <p>TB asked JV whether the DARDLEA would expect the functionality of horizon A, B and C to remain the same after it is placed on top of the ashing facility.</p> <p>JV responded to TB by saying that the functionality of the horizon will be completely different. JV further commented that if a thicker layer was placed on top of the ADF it would be more feasible for the rehabilitation purposes.</p>		
3.8	<p>RL stated that the Power Station has been doing this process of rehabilitation for many years and the grass that grows on the ADF grows very well.</p> <p>JV commented that Eskom should also look at the economics because the problems the Department experienced with rehabilitation is that currently natural grazing is the cheapest food source for animals. The moment one goes into rehabilitation it is not natural grazing anymore, but becomes artificial grazing. When one has artificial grazing that is when fertiliser is required and this increased the cost compared to the low cost of the natural grazing. The team will have to look at those ratios in the economics part of the studies</p>		
3.0	JV asked what the extent of the ADF area was.		

	<p>EvR responded by saying that it is about 530ha, however they have already covered 400ha.</p> <p>JV commented that if it was about 50ha or 100ha, then it would not make such a difference.</p> <p>JV also raised the following questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is the source of the water for the dust suppression system, • Is the conveyer belt a closed system, because always on the conveyer belt you have got contamination that takes place, and is the area closed off? <p>RL responded that the conveyer belt is a closed system, there are small open sections but it is an enclosed system.</p> <p>And that the source of the dust suppression system is ash water and brine. RL stated that Eskom, and Tutuka Power Station, has a Zero Liquid Effluent Discharge (ZLED) policy. RL also noted that in the future raw water and surface water will be used and less of brine water will be used for dust suppression.</p>		
3.11	<p>JV asked whether Eskom has mitigation measures in place for the runoff water.</p> <p>RL responded by saying yes.</p>		
4.	PRESENTATIONS (Presentation attached as Appendix B)		
4.1	DB presented the project scope and a brief summary of the environmental findings as documented in the Draft Environmental Impact Report.		
4.2	NV presented the Public Participation Process.		
5.	QUESTIONS / DISCUSSION		
5.1	<p>NV asked the officials from the department of labour whether they will be the responsible officials who will be submitting written comments on the DEIR.</p> <p>SM responded that they will have a look at the report with their colleagues and if there are any inputs from their colleagues they will forward them to Lidwala SA.</p>		
5.2	JV indicated that he will send through formal comments, including the ones raised at the meeting, to Lidwala before the end of the review period.	JV	26/09/2014

	<p>He requested the following additional information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shapefiles of the current ash dam; • Shapefiles of the expansion; • The soil map that was done with the symbology that comes with the map (shapefile), the detailed raw data plus the GPS points of where the observation was done <p>JV added that looking at the picture that he has got and the soil map that was done there is a big difference between the two. Based on the fact that the image that he has is based on the satellite remote sensing the DARDLEA will take the ground truthing undertaken by the Agricultural Potential Specialist as a true reflection of the area.</p> <p><u>Post-meeting note:</u> Written comments received from DARDLEA on Friday 21 October 2014.</p> <p>The requested shape files were e-mailed to DARDLEA’s representative on 09 October 2014, sourcing the comments as promised.</p>	DB	05/09/2014
5.3	<p>It was agreed that a copy of the landowner’s meeting minutes held earlier that day will be send to the DARDLEA for information purposes.</p> <p><u>Post-meeting note:</u> A copy of the minutes was e-mail on 27 October 2014.</p>	NV	12/09/2014
5.4	<p>JV requested that the dust suppression and water quality/quantity results for both the existing and proposed ADF be forwarded to the DARDLEA.</p> <p>JV commented that in a case where these soils were surveyed by Garry Peterson, he would like to see the report or results. JV further commented that maybe Garry might give good advice in terms of what mitigation measures can be taken and also shed light on what would be the best practise to rehabilitate these soils.</p> <p><u>Post-meeting note:</u> The requested information was e-mailed to DARDLEA’s representative on 29 October 2014.</p>	IC	

6.	CLOSURE		
6.1	NV thanked everyone for their time and invited the attendees to a light lunch and then closed the meeting.		

Minuted by: Bongsi Mhlanga