

Appendix 12: Comments and Responses Report (CRR)

PROPOSED MOOKODI-MAHIKENG 400kV POWERLINE, NORTH WEST PROVINCE

Comments and Responses Report

February 2018

Draft

Prepared for: Eskom Holdings (SOC) Ltd



Environmental, Social and OHS Consultants

P.O. Box 1673 147 Bram Fisher Drive Tel: 011 781 1730
Sunninghill Ferndale Fax: 011 781 1731
2157 2194 Email: info@nemai.co.za

1 PURPOSE OF THIS DOCUMENT

This Comments and Responses Report summarises the correspondence received by Interested and Affected Parties (IAPs) and Organs of State, completed via the Reply Forms, Comments Sheets, letters, faxes and emails. This report captures all the significant issues and queries raised, any statements that were made, and a record of all IAPs that registered. This report also attempts to address every comment through responses and input provided by the project team.

2 PUBLIC NOTIFICATION

Nemai Consulting commenced with public notification in October 2017 in which the direct and adjacent landowners, key regulatory authorities, stakeholders and the public were informed of the proposed Mookodi-Mahikeng 400kV line. An IAP database was developed by identifying any interested and/or affected person which includes the following:

- Direct Landowners/Occupiers;
- Adjacent Landowners/Occupiers within the 2km servitude;
- Key Regulatory Authorities ;
- Organs of State that may have an interest in the project;
- Stakeholders that may not be directly affected by the project but may be interested in the development;
- Conservancies and recreation organisations in close proximity;
- Farms, Estates and Rate Payer's Associations in the surrounding areas; and
- Businesses in the area.

Notification to the IAPs identified in the IAP Database were notified via a Background Information Document (BID). The BID contained a brief overview of the project, a locality map, an overview of how the Scoping and EIA Process works, and the details on how a person can register as an IAP. In order to ensure all other possible IAPs (that were potentially not identified on the database) were notified and informed about the project, site notices were placed around the site area on road intersections fences, library entrances, and newspaper adverts were placed in several local newspapers.

3 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION – SCOPING PHASE

Public Participation during the Scoping phase serves to identify and prioritise issues for further assessment during the EIA phase. This report will be made available for the public and authorities to review and provide further comments on during the 30-Day Draft Scoping Report review period which will take place from 12 February 2018 – 13 March 2018.

The comments received from IAPs during the Draft Scoping Report review period (as well as the minutes of the Focus Group Meetings) will be considered and will be investigated further to be included in the Final Scoping Report. The public and authorities will be provided with the Final Scoping Report (which will include the updated Comments and Responses Report) to review at the same time the Final Scoping Report is submitted to the Competent Authority: The Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA). The reason for this is that the 2014 EIA Regulations (as amended) of the National Environmental Management Act (Act No. 107 of 1998) (NEMA) have limited timeframes in which the Final Scoping Report is to be submitted. However, the Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) will forward all comments received by registered IAPs on the Final Scoping Report to the relevant DEA Official to take into consideration when making the decision to approve or reject the Final Scoping Report.

4 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION – EIA PHASE

The Comments and Response Report is continuously updated throughout the process and thus registered IAPs will have a chance to review this Comments and Responses Report during the 30-Day public and authority review period of the Draft EIA Report. Again, the public and authorities will be provided with the Final EIA Report in which further comments received by registered IAPs (as well as the minutes of the Public Meetings) will be forwarded to the relevant DEA Official to consider when making the decision whether to grant Environmental Authorisation (EA) or not.

5 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

The Comments and Responses Report has captured all comments received in writing and that have been recorded in minutes of any meetings. The project team have also provided a response to each comment which may provide clarity on a query or may provide a resolution to an issue/concern. IAPs must engage with the EAP if they feel their comments have not

been addressed accurately. The current Comments and Responses for the proposed Mookodi-Mahikeng 400kV has been separated into the following main categories:

1. Registration of IAPs
2. General Enquiries
3. Comments from Authorities

5.1 Registration of IAPs

A record of all IAPs that registered are included in **Table 1** below.

Table 1: Registration of IAPs

No.	Comment/Query	Raised by	Source and Date	Response
1.1.	Registered as an IAP. Refer to Table 2 for further comments.	Leads 2 Business Regional Content Researcher: Carmen Barends	Email 30/10/2017	Added to Database
1.2.	Registered as an IAP. Refer to Table 2 for further comments.	Resident Adrian Cloete	Email: 31/10/2017	Added to Database
1.3.	Registered as an IAP. Refer to Table 2 for further comments.	Resident Daniel Theodorus van Rensburg	Email and Reply Form: 01/11/2017	Added to Database
1.4.	Registered as an IAP. Refer to Table 2 for further comments.	Landowner Vesta and Wilhelmus Liberte Niewoudt	Email and Reply Form 02/11/2017	Added to Database
1.5.	Registered as an IAP. Refer to Table 2 for further comments.	JJ Vosser Boerdery Jannie Vosser	Email and Reply Form 08/11/2017	Added to Database
1.6.	Registered as an IAP.	Resident D.Z Jacobs and Marike Jacobs	Email and Reply Form 08/11/2017	Added to Database
1.7.	Registered as an IAP. Refer to Table 2 for further comments.	Anker Boerdery J.A Schollitz and Sarah Harris	Email and Reply Form 13/11/2016	Added to Database
1.8.	Registered as an IAP.	Ratlou Local Municipality	Email	Added to Database

No.	Comment/Query	Raised by	Source and Date	Response
	Refer to Table 3 for further comments.	Mooketsi Shomolekae	10/11/2017	
1.9.	Registered as an IAP. Refer to Table 2 for further comments.	Resident Elzaine Joubert and Coetzee Joubert	Email and Reply Form 22/11/2016	Added to Database
1.10.	Registered as an IAP. Refer to Table 2 for further comments.	Agri North West E.B Van Wyk	Email and Reply Form 06/11/2018	Added to Database
1.11.	Registered as an IAP. Refer to Table 2 for further comments.	Mphehlalerole Farming Projects CC: Dikeledi Mashiloane	Email and Reply Form 22/11/2017	Added to Database
1.12.	Registered as an IAP. Refer to Table 2 for further comments.	Rosendal Country Estate Carel Sterrenberg	Email 10/01/2018	Added to Database
1.13.	Registered as an IAP. Refer to Table 2 for further comments.	MacDonald's Transport Nic Erasmus Executive Manager : Operations (Planthire)	Email 28/11/2017	Added to Database

5.2 General Enquiries

Refer to **Table 2** below for the general enquires raised by registered IAPs.

Table 2: General Enquires

No.	Comment/Query	Raised by	Source and Date	Response
2.1	I have forward the message through to the rightful owner, however we are still leasing the land. Here is his email address: [REDACTED]	Resident Adrian Cloete	Email: 31/10/2017	Added contact details to Database.
2.2	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concerned that the proposed powerline will negatively affect the scenery and landscape of the farm. 2. Concerned that the fertility of my stud cattle will be affected by the proposed project. 3. Concerned about my farms property value decreasing due to the proposed powerlines. <p>I do not want the powerline on my farm as I don't use ESKOMs power on the farm. I only make use of windmills for pumping water.</p>	Resident Daniel Thedorus van Rensburg	Reply Form: 01/11/2017	<p>A Focus Group Meeting was held with the IAP on 23/11/2017 to discuss the concerns raised, refer to the minutes of the meeting in Appendix 10 of the Scoping Report. The following responses have been provided below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A map was provided to the IAP showing how the proposed powerline alternative routes affect the properties owned by the IAP. The IAP is affected by one of the alternative routes: Option 4 (WM9a). All four alternative routes will be equally assessed in the EIA Phase and the route which is found to have the overall least environmental impact will be recommended as the Best Practicable Environmental Option (BPEO). In addition, a Visual Impact Assessment will be undertaken during the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Phase and will assess the visual impact on the IAPs farms and make a recommendation as to which route is preferred. 2. The concern regarding Electromagnetic Field (EMF) is noted. The potential impact of EMF from the powerline on cattle will be assessed in the EIA Phase. However, the powerline is expected to have minimal effect on animals grazing underneath the powerline. A Socio-Economic Impact Assessment will be undertaken as

No.	Comment/Query	Raised by	Source and Date	Response
				<p>part of the EIA Phase, and mitigation measures will need to be identified to manage the impacts to the local social and economic environments.</p> <p>3. Eskom has a compensation procedure in place to address devaluing of the property by a powerline. In addition, a Socio-Economic Impact Assessment will be undertaken as part of the EIA Phase, and mitigation measures will need to be identified to manage the impacts to the local social and economic environments.</p> <p>The IAPs objection to Option 4 (WM9a) will be included in the assessment of the BPEO.</p>
2.3	Could you please advise who the Client/Proponent is on this Project?	Leads 2 Business Regional Content Researcher: Carmen Barends	Email: 01/11/2017	Eskom. Contact details of the Applicant are provided in the Application Form, refer to Appendix 4 of the Scoping Report.
2.4	Provided contact details of the Erasmus's (tenants and neighbours).	Landowner Vesta and Wilhelmus Liberte Niewoudt	Reply Form 02/11/2017	Notified and added to the Database.
2.5	Our farm Graspan (877.67 ha) is exclusively a cattle farm. The magnificent Camel Thorn trees over 100 years old are an outstanding feature of this farm. This tree is a protected tree. The peels of the Camel Thorn tree are a source of protein for the cattle and the trees provide shade. The farm is ideally suited for game ranching as the bushveld natural vegetation is unique.	Landowner Vesta and Wilhelmus Liberte Niewoudt	Reply Form 02/11/2017	<p>The comment regarding the Camel Thorn trees will be provided to the Terrestrial Ecological Specialist to include in the assessment.</p> <p>A Visual Impact Assessment will be undertaken during the EIA Phase and will assess the visual impact on the IAPs farm and make a recommendation as to which route is preferred.</p>

No.	Comment/Query	Raised by	Source and Date	Response
	<p>The security of the farm owners and workers will be jeopardised as foreigners will obtain access.</p> <p>Why can be powerline not be erected along the highway between Vryburg, Stella to Mahikeng? If you do a Cost/Benefit analysis then it may be a bit longer but other costs such as access will be less.</p> <p>Can you please provide us with a map of the proposed power line transecting our farm.</p>			<p>With regards to the security concern, the Socio-Economic Impact Assessment will be undertaken as part of the EIA Phase, and mitigation measures will need to be identified to manage the impacts to the local social and economic environments. There will also be measures included in the Environmental Management Programme (EMPr) to address the impacts of the project on safety and security of the affected residents.</p> <p>An alternative along the N8 was investigated but was far less feasible according to the Multi-criteria Decision-Making Model (MCDM) and route optimisation processes for the selected line routes conducted in the Transmission Line Corridor Route Selection Process Report (2017). Refer to Section 6.1 of the DSR.</p> <p>A map was provided to the IAP on 03/11/2017 showing how the proposed powerline alternative routes affect the properties owned by the IAP. The IAP is affected by two of the alternative routes: Option 2 (WM13) and Option 3 (WM4a).</p>
2.6	<p>Thank you for your diligence in sending the maps.</p> <p>The Farm shown as GRAS PAN 555 is actually divided in two equal rectangular parts. Our farm is the left and the farm indicated as Gras Pan 2 the right. The latter farm is actually Longziek Pan and belongs to Bert and Gerrit Erasmus (██████████).</p>	Private: Vesta and Wilhelmus Liberte Niewoudt	Email 06/11/2017	<p>Contact details provided were added to Database.</p> <p>The concern regarding the Camel Thorn trees along Option 3 (WM4a) will be provided to the Terrestrial Ecological Specialist to include in the assessment, and the Specialist will recommend the BPEO.</p>

No.	Comment/Query	Raised by	Source and Date	Response
	<p>Weltevrede belongs to Jenco Scholtz (██████████)</p> <p>Groenvlakte belongs to Pieter Devilliers (██████████).</p> <p>Our concern is with power line (Option 3) traversing Gras Pan 555 on the left. This line goes through 100 year old Camel Thorn Trees which we would like to be conserved. The rest of the vegetation can be cleared.</p>			
2.7	Impact on farming practices?	JJ Vosser Boerdery Jannie Vosser	Reply Form 08/11/2017	An enquiry was sent to the IAP regarding what farming practice takes place on the IAPs farm. No response has been received to date but the Agricultural Specialist will contact the IAP during the assessment to assess the impact the proposed powerline will have on the IAPs farming practice.
2.8	<p>There are clear bushman graves on the Naudespan Farm that must not be disturbed.</p> <p>There was little information about which farms will be affected by the proposed powerline.</p>	Anker Boerdery J.A Scholltz and Sarah Harris	Reply Form 13/11/2016	<p>The information provided by the IAP will be provided to the Heritage Impact Assessment to be included in the assessment. The Specialist will recommend the BPEO and provide mitigation measures/conditions if the graves are to be impacted on by the proposed project.</p> <p>The Scoping Report includes a full list of the properties affected by each powerline route alternative. Refer to Appendix 5.</p>
2.9	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Access control to the farms 2) The impact on grazing 3) Property values 	Resident Elzaine Joubert and Coetzee Joubert	Reply Form 22/11/2016	1) Measures for access control will be provided in the EMPr during the EIA Phase for the project. Eskom has a procedure to properly manage access into farms during construction.

No.	Comment/Query	Raised by	Source and Date	Response
				<p>2) Grazing of animals under the powerlines is allowed and only the tower footprints limit the area of grazing. The Agricultural Specialist will assess the impact the proposed powerline will have on cattle grazing.</p> <p>3) Eskom has a compensation procedure in place to address devaluing of the property by a powerline. In addition, a Socio-Economic Impact Assessment will be undertaken as part of the EIA Phase, and mitigation measures will need to be identified to manage the impacts to the local social and economic environments.</p>
2.10	<p>I am writing this letter with regards to our telephonic discussion this morning.</p> <p>My name is Eric van Wyk, Chairperson of Agri North West Electrical Forum. We represent our members on various forums of which Eskom is one. Agri North West is affiliated with Agri SA and therefore form part of organised Agriculture. We will highly appreciate it if you can inform me and our offices of your actions. (I refer to your document).</p> <p>Due to our circumstances on farms, it is our responsibility to our members to make sure that this type of development is co-ordinated with our office, members and your Company.</p> <p>Please let us know if you need to meet with the stakeholders. We can assist you in contacting them.</p>	Agri North West E.B Van Wyk	Letter 06/11/2017	A Focus Group Meeting was held with the IAP on 23/11/2017 to discuss the concerns raised, refer to the minutes of the meeting in Appendix 10 of the Scoping Report. The IAP has offered to assist with the notification of the farmers in the areas.

No.	Comment/Query	Raised by	Source and Date	Response
2.11	<p>Concerned with the extent of the area that will be used.</p> <p>There must be a clear indication of how the servitude will affect the property.</p> <p>Notify farmers in the vicinity.</p> <p>The detailed property description of the entity's property is:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Remaining extent of the farm Stroebels Rust 343. 2. Portion 50 of Farm Stroebels Rust 343. 	<p>Mpohlalerole Farming Projects CC: Dikeledi Mashiloane</p>	<p>Reply Form 22/11/2016</p>	<p>A map was provided to the IAP on 30/11/2017 showing how the proposed powerline alternative routes affect the properties owned by the IAP. The powerline route option that affects the IAPs farms is Option 1 (WM1). The RE of Farm Stroebels Rust 343 falls within the 2km radius that is currently being assessed as part of the EIA Process. It does not necessarily mean that the powerline servitude will include that entire section. It basically means that the powerline will be positioned somewhere within that 2 km radius. The powerline will only end up having a 55m wide servitude, but this 55m can be anywhere within the 2km radius. The final position will only be determined after the EIA Process.</p>
2.12	<p>Can you send me the route around Vryburg that you want to take to Mahikeng, so that I can see if you are planning to go over my property.</p>	<p>Rosendal Country Estate Carel Sterrenberg</p>	<p>Email 10/01/2018</p>	<p>A map was provided to the IAP on 12/01/2018 showing how the proposed powerline alternative routes affect the properties owned by the IAP. The IAPs property is affected by two of the four alternative options: Option 2 (WM13) and Option 4 (WM9a).</p> <p>A 2km servitude is being assessed for all 4 alternative routes (as can be seen on the map) however the actual Eskom Servitude will only be 55m wide when constructed.</p>
2.13	<p>Do you know that my property is a township development, extension 26/27 of Vryburg? It is going to be difficult to build over any Eskom servitude. What is going to happen with the 88kv line? The 88kv line runs over Extension 27 of the Rosendal development and I want to remove it. I have spoken to Eskom in the past and I have already organize a</p>	<p>Rosendal Country Estate Carel Sterrenberg</p>	<p>Email 15/01/2018</p>	<p>Eskom is not aware that his property is a township development. For the removal or relocation of the 88kV powerline, the Eskom EIA project will liaise with the Distribution colleagues for an update on this.</p>

No.	Comment/Query	Raised by	Source and Date	Response
	servitude with Mr van der Merwe for the 88kv line to be remove.			
2.14	<p>Provided letter of objection against the power line as it affects the IAPs farm Dublin. IAPs attached photos of the farm Dublin to show the bush chalet, game, topography, trees and environment.</p> <p>Further information on the objection to the power line:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I manage a game farm with accommodation for hunters and tourists. My regular annual customers have already indicated that they will no longer come hunting if there is a power line on the farm, as the power line will adversely affect the scenery and the experience of untouched nature will be ruined. 2. Since my game hunting and tourism industry is a profitable business I have decided to expand my Lodge further and increase my game numbers so as to increase my income. 3. Considering the above, I will suffer major financial damage if there is a powerline on my farm and my business cannot continue anymore. 4. Please send me the EIA report on the power line project. 5. The Dublin and Zoete-Inval farms are definitely not the same as other farms in the area, as it looks very different. The topography is wavy and the vegetation also looks different because of the presence of other types of trees, namely Sandgeelhout and Camel thorn trees. 	Resident Daniel Thedorus van Rensburg	Email and Letter 14/01/2018	<p>Letter of acknowledgement is acknowledged and will be included in the EIA and CRR.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Socio-Economic Impact Assessment during the EIA Phase will consider the concerns raised by the IAP regarding the negative impact that the proposed powerline could have on the game farm business. 2. The Socio-Economic Impact Assessment during the EIA Phase will consider the concerns raised by the IAP regarding the negative impact that the proposed powerline could have on the game farm business. 3. The Socio-Economic Impact Assessment during the EIA Phase will consider the concerns raised by the IAP regarding the negative impact that the proposed powerline could have on the game farm business. 4. The IAP is a registered IAP on the Database and will be notified of the 30-day public review period for the reports as well as invited to the public meetings. 5. The Visual Impact Assessment and Terrestrial Ecological Study will assess the impacts on the IAPs farm during the EIA Phase.

No.	Comment/Query	Raised by	Source and Date	Response
2.15	<p>If I need more information on the proposed 400kv Mookodi Mahineng Powerline would you please be so kind and forward it to me to this e-mail address.</p> <p>I am from our Plant Hire division and are keen to assist with the necessary equipment.</p>	<p>MacDonald's Transport Nic Erasmus Executive Manager : Operations (Planthire)</p>	<p>Email 28/11/2017</p>	<p>A BID was sent to the IAP on 28/11/2017.</p>

5.3 Comments from Authorities

Refer to **Table 3** below for the comments raised by organs of state.

Table 3: Commenting Authorities

No.	Comment/Query	Raised by	Source and Date	Response
3.1.	<p>Option 2 of the proposed has potential to across an area proposed for development, which is also at Public Participation Process Stage. This is in Setlagole where the powerline crosses the N18.</p> <p>Provided some IAPs to be notified about the project.</p>	<p>Ratlou Local Municipality: Mooketsi Shomolekae Manager: Buildings Maintenance & Electrification</p>	<p>Reply Form 10/11/2017</p>	<p>A meeting will be organised during the Scoping Phase with the Ratlou Local Municipality to discuss how the two projects overlap and the impacts thereof. It is noted that the Ratlou Spatial Development Framework (SDF) (2016-2017) mentions the Setlagole Commercial Hub proposed in the N18 Western trans frontier corridor.</p>