
SALDANHA BAY NETWORK STRENGTHENING PROJECT, WESTERN CAPE PROVINCE

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES REPORT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE REVISED DRAFT EIA REPORT	3
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT LETTERS RECEIVED FROM ORGANS OF STATE	3
ISSUES/CONCERNS RAISED BY IMPACTED AND ADJACENT LANDOWNERS	3
ECOLOGICAL IMPACTS.....	4
IMPACTS TO ROADS	7
CONSULTATION WITH THE SALDANHA BAY LOCAL MUNICIPALITY	12
CONSULTATION WITH THE WESTERN CAPE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS AND DEVELOPMENT PLANNING	13
COMMENTS RECEIVED: EIA PHASE.....	19
COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE DRAFT REPORT.....	19
LATE COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE SCOPING REPORT	33
PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESS & I&AP REGISTRATIONS.....	36
ISSUES RAISED BY LANDOWNERS	38
OTHER PLANNED DEVELOPMENTS POTENTIALLY IMPACTED BY THE POWER LINE CORRIDORS AND SUBSTATION SITES	46
IMPACTS TO ROADS	50
ECOLOGICAL IMPACTS.....	53
AVIFAUNAL IMPACTS	54
NETWORK INFRASTRUCTURE UPGRADE PLANS IN THE GREATER SALDANAH REGION AND PROJECT NEED AND DESIRABILITY	54
SOCIOECONOMIC IMPACTS	57

AGRICULTURE AND LAND USE	58
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT LETTERS RECEIVED FROM ORGANS OF STATE	58
COMMENTS RECEIVED: SCOPING PHASE	60
PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESS & I&AP REGISTRATIONS.....	60
HERITAGE IMPACTS	62
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS LETTERS AND COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM ORGANS OF STATE DEPARTMENTS	64
ISSUES RAISED BY LANDOWNERS	64
ECOLOGICAL IMPACTS.....	70
IMPACTS TO AVIFAUNA.....	77
PROJECT NEED AND DESIRABILITY	79
ALTERNATIVE POWER LINE AND SUBSTATION OPTIONS	80
CUMULATIVE IMPACTS.....	83
PROJECT TIMEFRAMES.....	84
PROJECT TECHNICAL DETAILS	84
GENERAL	84

COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE REVISED DRAFT EIA REPORT

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT LETTERS RECEIVED FROM ORGANS OF STATE			
1.	<p>The revised Environmental Impact Assessment Report ("EIAR") dated January 2017 and received by this Department on 31 January 2017, refers.</p> <p>1) This letter serves as acknowledgment of receipt of the revised EIAR by this Directorate.</p> <p>2) This Directorate will now review the revised EIAR and provide comments on the revised EIAR within the specified commenting period.</p> <p>This Department reserves the right to revise or withdraw comments or request further information based on any information received.</p> <p>Your interest in the future of our environment is greatly appreciated.</p>	<p>Ms K Adriaanse Case Officer</p> <p>Western Cape Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning</p> <p>Letter: 08-02-2017</p>	<p>Acknowledgment noted, no response required.</p>
ISSUES/CONCERNS RAISED BY IMPACTED AND ADJACENT LANDOWNERS			
2.	<p>We refer to our telephone conversation and confirm that Absa Trust Limited together with Ms HC Pieterse act as the trustees of the trust known as "The BJ Pieterse Testamentary Trust".</p> <p>As trustees we would like to highlight the fact that according to our records the BJ Pieterse Testamentary Trust only holds RE/187 and RE1/187 of farm Langeberg. [Please see the second attachment]</p> <p>The other portions RE4/187 and 11/187 according to your</p>	<p>Teunis Bennemeer Trust Manager</p> <p>Absa Trust Limited / BJ Pieterse Testamentary Trust</p> <p>Email: 9-02-2017</p>	<p>In correspondence dated 27 January 2017 and the Landowners Map sent to BJ Pieterse Testamentary Trust, the EAP requested the Trustees to confirm which portions of the Farm Langeberg 187 are registered in the name of the Trust. It is noted that the Remaining Extent and Portion 1 of the farm Langeberg 187 are no longer registered under the BJ Pieterse Testamentary Trust. The Trust is therefore no longer considered to be an impacted landowner for this project. Through further investigation, it is confirmed that the Remaining Extent and Portion 1 of the farm Langeberg 187 are owned by Mr G Stigling, who is a</p>

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>diagram were sold a year ago and does not form part of the trusts properties any more.</p> <p>Kindly amend your diagram and distribute to all relevant shareholders.</p>		<p>registered I&AP on the project. The I&AP database landowners map have been updated accordingly (refer to Appendix C1).</p>
ECOLOGICAL IMPACTS			
3.	<p>CapeNature would like to thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Revised Environmental Impact Report. Please read the following comments in conjunction with our previous comments dated 20 December 2016.</p> <p><u>Revised Ecology Study:</u></p> <p>Although Hopefield Sand Fynbos is described generally early in the report, the actual vegetation assessment (Section 4) is missing the description of Hopefield Sand Fynbos as will be impacted in the eastern most section of the power line route.</p> <p>Section 5.2.2 states that several Species of Conservation Concern were recorded on the site. There is a high likelihood that more could be present as the site visit was conducted at the least appropriate time of year (well into the hottest, driest period of the year). The specialist even concurs that further sampling is required in the correct season to determine more accurately if there are additional rare and threatened plant species on site.</p> <p>Furthermore, it is not clear from the information provided the exact location and number of individuals of each species that have been identified and that will be affected</p>	<p>Alana Duffell-Canham Scientific Services</p> <p>CapeNature</p> <p>Letter: 16-02-2017</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impacts on Hopefield Sand Fynbos are described and assessed under <i>Issue 1: Loss of Vegetation Communities</i> and <i>Impact 2: Loss of Hopefield Sand Fynbos</i> within the Ecological Impact Assessment Report contained within Appendix D of the Revised DEIR. • As is Eskom Standard Practice, a walk through survey of the negotiated power line route will be undertaken following final design and surveying of the site in order to determine Species of Conservation Concern impacted by the project infrastructure (tower positions, substation footprint and access roads (where new ones are required). This survey will inform the final placement of infrastructure as well as the permitting requirements for the project. This survey will be undertaken within the growing season as far as possible in order to ensure accurate identification of affected plants. • It is not possible to determine the exact location and

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>by the project and whether these can be avoided. It is important to note that many species do not survive search and rescue and those that may, still require intensive care for the initial phase of establishment.</p> <p>Section 8.2.1 contains a table with impact ratings relating to loss of "SSC" (again confusion exists between terminology). Even after mitigation, the impacts are still rated as high – it is not clear how this rating was reached but if this is the case, this is a red flag that requires avoidance of the affected sites and/or additional mitigation such as an offset. The sentence above the table is also confusing as surely if something is globally important it would be considered locally important as well. Note that impacts on loss of biodiversity (general) and well as fragmentation and edge effects have also been rated as high after mitigation.</p> <p>Species lists provided at a quarter degree scale are not particularly useful for an impact assessment of this nature.</p> <p>Section 8.1 lists several mitigation measures. The first one states that clearing of vegetation should only be done within the designated reserve (within 50m of the line) – this allows for a very large corridor. This statement should rather be removed as it is contradictory to statements later on which state that only the height of the vegetation under the powerlines should be restricted and that no whole-scale vegetation should be done.</p>		<p>number of individuals of each species affected by the project until the tower positions have been determined. This is undertaken in consultation with affected landowners (following servitude negotiation) and final surveying of this route. Areas of sensitivity where these species are likely to occur is indicated within the EIA Report and the preferred alternatives have been selected in order to minimise impacts on these areas as far as possible.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The assessment methodology used to quantify anticipated impacts is detailed in Section 2.4 - Impact rating scales – of the Ecological Assessment Report. • The sentence above the table in Section 8.2.1 has been correct to state - <i>As the vegetation types and associated SSC are restricted to a very small area, loss of these species are globally, not just locally important. The impacts reflect such.</i> • Where impacts on Species of Special Concern occur, these are expected to be high as a result of the restriction of these species to a small area. Impacts will be avoided as far as possible. • The mitigation measure within Section 8.1 has been amended as follows: <i>The clearing of vegetation must be restricted to the tower footprints within the designated reserve (within 50m of the line).</i>
4.	<u>Avifauna:</u>	Alana Duffell-	This requirement has been included within the EMPr.

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>We would like to reiterate that should this project receive authorisation, no construction should occur during the breeding season of the Southern Black Korhaan which is from August to November.</p>	<p>Canham Scientific Services CapeNature Letter: 16-02-2017</p>	
<p>5.</p>	<p><u>EMPr:</u></p> <p>We are pleased to note that the operational requirements for vegetation management have been greatly improved compared to the previous version of the report. We are also pleased to note that the EMPr includes the requirement for all new access roads to be ground-truthed and approved by a local botanist who is highly familiar with the vegetation types and Species of Conservation Concern found in the area.</p>	<p>Alana Duffell- Canham Scientific Services CapeNature Letter: 16-02-2017</p>	<p>Comment noted and it is part of the EMPr that will be complied with. No response required.</p>
<p>6.</p>	<p><u>Conclusion:</u></p> <p>Although there have been some improvements with regard to the information and recommendations provided in the report, it is still not clear what the exact extent of vegetation loss and impact on Species of Conservation Concern will be. CapeNature therefore strongly recommends that a follow-up spring botanical survey be conducted within the entire proposed power line footprint prior to authorisation and not only prior to construction. Only then will we be able to determine if the proposed mitigation will be sufficient.</p> <p>CapeNature reserves the right to revise initial comments</p>	<p>Alana Duffell- Canham Scientific Services CapeNature Letter: 16-02-2017</p>	<p>The ecological specialist used the precautionary approach in undertaking the assessment. The assessment of the impacts in the ecological assessment study is very conservative and it is therefore very unlikely that the ratings would change regardless of the timing of the survey.</p> <p>As is Eskom Standard Practice, a walk through survey of the negotiated power line route will be undertaken following final design and surveying of the site in order to determine Species of Conservation Concern impacted by the project infrastructure (tower positions, substation footprint and access roads (where new ones are required). This survey will inform the final placement of infrastructure</p>

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	and request further information based on any additional information that may be received.		<p>as well as the permitting requirements for the project. This survey will be undertaken within the growing season as far as possible in order to ensure accurate identification of affected plants. Impacts on Species of Conservation Concern will be avoided as far as possible. The report thereof will be submitted to CapeNature for review and comment.</p> <p>It is important to note that the EMPr is seen or regarded to be a "living document". The impacts or issues that may be identified and mitigation measures thereof that are not in this EMPr will then be incorporated or added in the EMPr and would be complied with during and post construction phases of the project.</p>
IMPACTS TO ROADS			
7.	<p>1) Your correspondence with DEA Ref No 14/12/16/3/3/2/926 dated 27 January 2017, refers.</p> <p>2) Comment is required on a revised EIA Report for the expansion of the Eskom electrical network in the Saldanha Bay Municipal area.</p> <p>3) This Branch, the Road Authority of Trunk Roads 21/2, 77/1 & 85/1 and Minor Roads 7643 & 7645 in the vicinity of the development, has the following initial comments:</p> <p style="margin-left: 20px;">a. Where Proclaimed Provincial Roads will be affected by the electrical services and facilities, the necessary wayleave approvals must be obtained from this Branch;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This includes services within the 5m building line, within the 95m building restriction line and within the 500m 	<p>Rod Boyes Land Transport, Transport and Public Works</p> <p>Western Cape Department of Transport and Public Works</p> <p>Email: 22-02-2017</p>	<p>The comments received have been forwarded to Eskom for consideration during the design of the infrastructure.</p> <p>Official signed comments dated 23 February 2017 were received and are included in Appendix C6 of the Revised EIAR and responded to in Appendix C8 - Comments and Responses Report.</p>

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>radius building restriction line</p> <p>b. In terms of Roads Ordinance 19 of 1976 no new accesses may be built or existing access layouts or access uses changed without the approval of this Branch;</p> <p>c. Trunk Road 85/1 is to be extended to Trunk Road 21/2 in the vicinity of Langebaan Airforce Base;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trunk Roads 85/1 is to be proclaimed as 60m in width for its whole length from Main Road 238 up to Trunk Road 21/2. <p>d. In terms of Section 9 of Act 21 of 1940 (Advertising & Ribbon Development Act) there is a 95m building restriction line along Trunk Road 77/1 as measured from the centre line of the road reserve;</p> <p>e. In terms of Section 9A of Act 21 of 1940 (Advertising & Ribbon Development Act), a 500m radius building restriction line is applicable to the intersection of Trunk Roads 77/1 & 85/1;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An interchange is to be constructed at the intersection of Trunk Roads 77/1 & 85/1 • This interchange and the 500m radius building restriction will have an effect as to the location of Transmission SS Site "F" <p>f. In terms of Section 17 of Roads Ordinance 19 of 1976, there is a statutory 5m building line</p>		

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>applicable along all Trunk, Main, Divisional & Minor Roads as measured from the statutory boundary of the roads;</p> <p>g. There is a potential conflict between the proposed upgrading of the Blouwater Substation and the approved Saldanha Bay Road Master Plan for the greater Saldanha Bay area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See attached locality sketch plan <p>4) Official signed comment will be sent to yourselves shortly.</p>		
8.	<p>1. The following refer:</p> <p>1.1. Your correspondence with DEA Ref No 14/12/16/3/3/2/926 dated 27 January 2017 and</p> <p>1.2. The e-mail of 22 February 2017 from Mr Rod Boyes of this Branch.</p> <p>2. Comment is required on a revised Environmental Impact Assessment Report for the expansion of the Eskom electrical network in the Saldanha Bay Municipal area.</p> <p>3. The proposed upgrades include the upgrading of the network between the Aurora Substation on Farm 176/3, Malmesburg and Farm 188, Malmesburg.</p> <p>3.1. Portions of Farms 174, 176, 179, 183, 187, 190 etc will be affected.</p>	<p>Grace Swanepoel Road Network Management</p> <p>Western Cape Department of Transport and Public Works</p> <p>Letter; 23-02-2017</p>	<p>The comments received have been forwarded to Eskom for consideration during the design of the infrastructure.</p>

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>4. This Branch, the Road Authority of Trunk Roads 21/2, 77/1 and 85/1 and Minor Roads 7643 and 7645 in the vicinity of the development, has the following initial comments:</p> <p>4.1. Where Proclaimed Provincial Roads will be affected by the electrical services and facilities, the necessary wayleave approvals must be obtained from this Branch;</p> <p>a) This includes services within the 5m building line, within the 95m building restriction line and within the 500m radius building restriction line</p> <p>4.2. In terms of Roads Ordinance 19 of 1976 no new accesses may be built or existing access layouts or access uses changed without the approval of this Branch;</p> <p>a) No direct access will be given from Trunk Roads 77/1 and 85/1 to any electrical facilities including proposed Transmission SS Sites "A", "D" and "F". Access shall be via approved shared access roads.</p> <p>b) Minor Road 7643 is to be rerouted and access to the existing Blouwater Substation will need to be relocated.</p> <p>4.3. Trunk Road 85/1 is to be extended to Trunk Road 21/2 in the vicinity of Langebaan Airforce Base;</p> <p>a) Trunk Roads 85/1 is to be proclaimed as</p>		

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>60m in width for its whole length from Main Road 238 up to Trunk Road 21/2</p> <p>b) To obtain the required 60m, the existing portion will be widened to the south by 20m</p> <p>4.4. In terms of Section 9 of Act 21 of 1940 (Advertising & Ribbon Development Act) there is a 95m building restriction line along Trunk Road 77/1 as measured from the centre line of the road reserve;</p> <p>4.5. In terms of Section 9A of Act 21 of 1940 (Advertising & Ribbon Development Act), a 500m radius building restriction line is applicable to the intersection of Trunk Roads 77/1 and 85/1. The 500m radius is measured from the centre line of the intersections of Trunk Roads 77/1 and 85/1:</p> <p>a) An interchange is to be constructed at the intersection of Trunk Roads 77/1 and 85/1;</p> <p>b) This interchange and the 500m radius building restriction will have an effect as to the location of Transmission SS Site "F";</p> <p>c) Transmission SS Site "F" is shown on the "Saldanha Strengthening Site and Lines Map revision 0 within the EIA documentation.</p> <p>4.6. In terms of Section 17 of Roads Ordinance 19 of 1976, there is a statutory 5m building line applicable along all Trunk, Main, Divisional and Minor Roads s measured from the statutory boundary of the roads;</p>		

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>4.7. Saldanha Bay Municipality and this Branch have approved the Road Master Plan for the greater Saldanha Bay area;</p> <p>a) The proposed extension to the Blouwater substation will have a detrimental effect on the approved Road Master Plan;</p> <p>b) To resolve conflicts between the electrical and roads network, the position of the proposed extension to the Blouwater substation must be discussed with this Branch.</p> <p>5. As this Branch is not opposed to the upgrading of electrical network in the Saldanha Bay area. It will comment in detail during the Land Use application stage.</p> <p>5.1. In the interim cognisance must be taken of the above comments and conditions.</p>		
CONSULTATION WITH THE SALDANHA BAY LOCAL MUNICIPALITY			
9.	<p>1) The Revised Environmental Impact Assessment for Saldanha Bay Network Strengthening Project, Western Cape Province dated 27 January 2017 refers.</p> <p>2) The Saldanha Bay Network Strengthening project is crucial for this area as it will cater for the expansion in demand and create sufficient capacity to evacuate all the potential renewable energy generation planned within the area. All these potential energy generators are located away from Aurora substation and the existing transmission lines. New servitude and</p>	<p>Eugene Mmbadi Environmental Officer</p> <p>Saldanha Bay Local Municipality</p> <p>Letter: 27-02-2017</p>	<p>The renewable energy facilities are being proposed and developed by Independent Power Producers and not by Eskom. As far as possible, EIA processes for these facilities include the grid connection requirements. This is however not within Eskom's control.</p>

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>access roads will be required, hence creating more impacts on biodiversity. The power lines coming from different direction will create visual impacts. Understanding the needs and uniqueness of each energy generator the Saldanha Bay Municipality ("SBM") recommend that in future Eskom should advise with the location of such facilities and to include transmission lines in their Environmental Impact Assessment applications.</p>		
CONSULTATION WITH THE WESTERN CAPE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS AND DEVELOPMENT PLANNING			
6.	<p>1. The Draft Environmental Impact Assessment ("EIA") Report dated November 2016, the Department's comments thereto dated 9 January 2017 and the Revised EIA Report dated January 2017 that was received by the Department on 31 January 2017, refer. The following consolidated comment by various directorates in Department is hereby offered.</p> <p>2. Directorate: Development Management (Region 1) – Keagan-leigh Adriaanse (Keaganleigh.Adriaanse@westerncape.gov.za; Tel: (021) 483 3763):</p> <p>a. It is noted that an extension of the timeframe to submit the Final EIA Report to the competent authority was granted by the Department of Environmental Affairs ("DEA") on 21 September 2016 in accordance with regulation 3(7) of the EIA Regulations, 2014. Paragraph 3 of the correspondence from DEA indicates that "Based on a review of the reason for requesting an</p>	<p>Adri La Meyer Development Facilitation</p> <p>Western Cape Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning</p> <p>Letter: 27-02-2017</p>	<p>a) The extension was issued based on the motivation submitted to the DEA. This motivation was based on the requirement for Eskom to resolve some landowner issues (particularly with the determination of where the new transmission substation and its power lines should best be located) which arose during the process. Reference is made to the minutes of the meetings held with the affected parties.</p>

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>extension of timeframes To submit the reports, in terms of Chapter 2 Regulation 3(7) of the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations 2014, this Department has decided to grant an additional 50 days, from the date of this letter to submit the final EIAr.”</p> <p>i. The deadline to submit the Final EIA Report, as per regulation 23(1)(a) of the EIA Regulations, 2014, is calculated 106 days from the date of acceptance of the Final Scoping Report by the competent authority (i.e. 106 days from 13 July 2016). The Final EIA Report should therefore have been submitted to the DEA on or before 30 October 2016. It is unclear why the DEA granted the time extension request of 5 September 2016 since the Draft EIA Report should have been made available before 30 October 2016 in order to prove that the request for time extension is an “exceptional circumstance” as per regulation 3(7) of the EIA Regulations, 2014. The Draft EIA Report was only made available during November 2016, when the Final EIA Report should have been submitted to DEA already. Clarity on this matter is requested.</p> <p>b. The Revised EIA Report does not contain any proof of correspondence to the competent authority notifying DEA that a Revised EIA Report has been released for an additional commenting period as per regulation 23(1)(b) of the EIA</p>		<p>b) The notification letter was submitted to the DEA on 10 January 2017. A copy of this notification has been included within Appendix B of the FEIR.</p>

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>Regulations, 2014. It is thus unclear whether the legislated timeframes for the submission of the Final EIA Report to the DEA have been met as the Revised EIA Report does not provide any proof of notification to the competent authority. Clarity in this regard must be provided.</p> <p>c. A detailed description of the proposed development with associated infrastructure (widening of roads and the storage of dangerous goods) has still not been provided. The following information must be provided in the Final EIA Report to be submitted to the competent authority:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The estimated width and length of the proposed roads to be developed and the estimated width of the road reserve; ii. An indication of which existing roads are proposed to be widened; iii. The estimated width and length of the proposed roads to be widened; iv. An indication of whether the proposed widening of the existing roads will occur within or beyond the existing road reserve; and v. The estimated volume of the dangerous goods that will be stored on site during the development phase (merely stating that more than 80m³ will be stored, is not sufficient). <p>d. The Comments and Responses Report ("CRR") included as Appendix C8 of the Revised EIA</p>		<p>c) The following is relevant regarding the project description:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Access roads will exceed 8m during construction (refer to Table 2.1 of the FEIR). The exact length of these roads will be confirmed based on the final location of project infrastructure, to be informed by the final servitude surveys (following negotiation with affected landowners) and the specialist walk-through surveys. ii. There are numerous existing farm roads and power line servitude roads within the study area. As far as possible, use will be made of these roads. The exact roads to be used will be confirmed based on the final location of project infrastructure, to be informed by the final servitude surveys (following negotiation with affected landowners) and the specialist walk-through surveys. iii. Existing roads will be widened by up to 6m. The exact length of these roads will be confirmed based on the final location of project infrastructure, to be informed by the final servitude surveys (following negotiation with affected landowners) and the specialist walk-through surveys. iv. Existing roads to be widened are local farm roads

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>Report states that the Ecological Impact Assessment dated November 2016 (compiled by Afzelia Environmental Consultants) has been updated and amended to address the gaps and recommendations identified by CapeNature. The CRR further states that the Ecological Impact Assessment has been reviewed by an external specialist. A clear indication of the changes to the original specialist report (preferably underlined to indicate the changes) must be provided in the updated Ecological Impact Assessment. Please further note that the updated Ecological Impact Assessment dated January 2017 is still on the letterhead of Afzelia Environmental Consultants with no indication of it being reviewed by an external specialist. Clarity in this regard must be provided.</p>		<p>and servitude roads which do not have a formal road reserve.</p> <p>v. The exact volume to be stored for this project is not confirmed at this stage. Based on experience on similar projects it is confirmed that the volumes would exceed 80m³.</p> <p>d) The changes made with regards to the ecological assessment were underlined within the Revised EIA Report (Section 5.1). The report was produced by Afzelia. The external specialist responsible for the review of the Ecological Assessment Report is Leigh-Ann de Wet, the details of who are included on Page i of the report.</p>
7.	<p>3. Directorate: Waste Management – Muneeb Baderoon (Muneeb.Baderoon@westerncape.gov.za; Tel: (021) 483 2965):</p> <p>7.1. This Directorate is satisfied that its comments on the Draft EIA Report have been considered and addressed in the Revised EIA Report. As such, this Directorate has no further comments on the Revised EIA Report.</p>	<p>Adri La Meyer Development Facilitation</p> <p>Western Cape Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning</p> <p>Letter: 27-02-2017</p>	<p>Comment noted. No response required.</p>
8.	<p>4. Directorate: Air Quality Management – Peter Harmse</p>	<p>Adri La Meyer</p>	<p>Comment noted. No response required.</p>

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>(Peter.Harmse@westerncape.gov.za; Tel: (021) 483 8343):</p> <p>8.1. This Directorate notes that its comments on the Draft EIA Report were considered and have been addressed in the Revised EIA Report. No further comment is offered.</p>	<p>Development Facilitation</p> <p>Western Cape Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning</p> <p>Letter: 27-02-2017</p>	
9.	<p>5. Directorate: Pollution and Chemicals Management – Zayed Brown (Zayed.Brown@westerncape.gov.za; Tel: (021) 483 8367):</p> <p>a. This Directorate notes that the existing Blouwater substation will only be decommissioned once the new distribution substation has been constructed and commissioned. The CRR states that a study will be undertaken by the applicant to determine whether the Blouwater substation site could potentially be significantly contaminated prior to decommissioning activities being undertaken. This proposal is supportive by this Directorate and should be included as a condition of approval, should the competent authority decide to authorise the proposed development.</p>	<p>Adri La Meyer Development Facilitation</p> <p>Western Cape Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning</p> <p>Letter: 27-02-2017</p>	<p>Comment noted. This recommendation has been included as part of the Final Recommendations for the project (refer to Section 6.4).</p>
10.	<p>6. Please direct all enquiries to the officials indicated in this correspondence should you require any clarity on</p>	<p>Adri La Meyer Development</p>	<p>Comment noted. No response required.</p>

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	any of the issues/comments provided. 7. The Department reserves the right to revise initial comments and request further information based on any or new information received.	Facilitation Western Cape Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning Letter: 27-02-2017	

COMMENTS RECEIVED: EIA PHASE

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE DRAFT REPORT			
8.	<p>CapeNature would like to thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for this application and wish to make the following comments:</p> <p>Impacts on terrestrial habitats:</p> <p>1) The powerline route alternatives pass through an area covered largely by Saldanha Flats Strandveld. According to a more recent analysis (than that used for the NSBA 2011 listings) conducted by CapeNature Saldanha Flats Strandveld should be considered as Endangered under criterion A1 (loss of habitat). All of the powerline alternatives will also pass through a substantial area containing Hopefield Sand Fynbos in good condition in the eastern portion of the proposed powerline route.</p>	<p>Alana Duffell-Canham Scientific Services CapeNature Letter: 20-12-2016</p>	<p>Saldanha Flats Strandveld is indicated as being endangered within the EIA Report.</p>
9.	<p>2) The Ecological Assessment Report mentions that four vegetation types are found in the study area but the report fails to describe Hopefield Sand Fynbos or the conservation significance thereof. This is a serious omission as the area of highest conservation concern is the area containing Hopefield Sand Fynbos around the Aurora substation. It should be noted that other botanical studies in the vicinity of Aurora substation have found up to 16 plant Species of Conservation Concern. CapeNature has low confidence in the findings of the specialist report</p>		<p>The report has been reviewed by an external specialist and shortcomings identified have been addressed. The specialist study has been updated and amended to address the identified gaps as well as the comments from Cape Nature.</p> <p>A description of Hopefield Sand Fynbos has been added to the Ecological Assessment Report (refer to Section 3.2.4). In addition, a comprehensive species list (Appendix B) and lists of possible species of Special Concern (Section 5.2.1. and Appendix C) and Confirmed Species of Special Concern (Section 5.2.2) have been added. An assessment of the</p>

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>for the eastern section of the powerline and is of the opinion that the impact ratings linked to habitat loss, fragmentation and loss of threatened species could possibly be much higher. The report should be revised accordingly. The ecological impact assessment report also makes use of the terms "Red listed plant species" and "Species of Conservation Concern" interchangeably. Please note that all plant species are now technically listed as Red listed species including those that are not threatened or rare. These terms are not interchangeable and specific reference must be made to Species of Conservation Concern (SCC). Species of Conservation Concern are species that have a high conservation importance in terms of preserving South Africa's high floristic diversity and include not only threatened species, but also those classified in the categories Extinct in the Wild (EW), Regionally Extinct (RE), Near Threatened (NT), Critically Rare, Rare, Declining and Data Deficient – Insufficient Information (DDD). It should also be noted that not all species listed as protected are threatened or vice versa.</p>		<p>impacts of the project on the various vegetation types affected by the project is included within Section 8.1 of the specialist report.</p>
10.	<p>3) The section of the route covered by Hopefield Sand Fynbos has been determined as a Critical Biodiversity Area (CBA) and is required to meet conservation targets for the region and is of high conservation value. Hopefield Sand Fynbos has also undergone an analysis by our conservation planner which showed that this vegetation type</p>		<p>A description of Hopefield Sand Fynbos has been added to the Ecological Assessment Report (refer to Section 3.2.4). An assessment of the impacts of the project on the various vegetation types affected by the project is included within Section 8.1 of the specialist report.</p>

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>still qualifies for listing as a Vulnerable habitat although it is very close to qualifying as Endangered under criterion A1 (remaining extent) and could possibly qualify as Endangered under criterion D1 (number of threatened species associated with this habitat). Other vegetation in the study area includes patches of Saldanha Granite Strandveld and Saldanha Limestone Strandveld. Both of these vegetation types are threatened and are known to contain unique habitats and species assemblages and should therefore be avoided. These areas have also been determined as Critical Biodiversity Areas.</p>		
11.	<p>4) Poor vegetation management under and in close proximity to power lines is one of the main causes of loss of biodiversity associated with power lines. Vegetation is often brush cut or mowed unnecessarily resulting in a loss of diversity over time. In our previous comments it was recommended that a Vegetation Management Plan be compiled to address the management of the vegetation under the power line. Although the Comments and Response Report states that "a site-specific vegetation management plan will form part of the EMPr for the project", the EMPr does not appear to contain any operational vegetation management requirements. This should be an essential part of the application in order to assess whether impacts on vegetation can be reduced to acceptable levels. The vegetation management</p>		<p>The EMPr has been updated to include more specific measures regarding the management of the servitude during operation.</p>

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>plan will need to be more specific than Eskom's Transmission Management Guideline which is rather generic.</p>		
12.	<p>5) The feasibility and appropriateness of certain of the mitigation measures proposed in the Ecological Impact Assessment Report are also questionable. For example, the recommendation that any protected plants that are destroyed must be replaced at a ratio 1:10. Where are these plants going to be obtained from? Relocation of plants from one area to another creates additional disturbance in both areas and one cannot simply take plants from a nursery due to the possibility of genetic contamination.</p>		<p>Mitigation measures proposed have been revisited and updated. These are reflected in Section 8.2 of the Specialist report.</p>
13.	<p>6) The EMPr also contains vague recommendations such as minimising footprints and using existing roads "as far as possible" and recommendations need to be more specific. Construction camps and laydown areas must only be located in previously transformed areas. All access roads must be approved by a botanical specialist prior to construction commencing. If new access roads are required these should be groundtruthed and approved by a local botanist who is highly familiar with the vegetation types and Species of Conservation Concern found in the area.</p>		<p>These recommendations have been included within the EMPr.</p>
14.	<p>Impacts on avifauna:</p> <p>1) Although there is a fair amount of consideration for reducing the potential for bird collisions with the proposed powerlines, the main mitigation</p>		<p>Impacts on avifauna associated with habitat destruction are assessed within the EIA Report (refer to Section 5.3).</p>

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>being use of anti-collision markers, additional consideration needs to be given to the impacts that may arise as a result of clearing of natural vegetation. For example, the Southern Black Korhaan is highly prone to impacts that may arise as a result of habitat loss and fragmentation. Thus species is currently listed as Vulnerable and populations are thought to be steadily declining. Construction should be avoided during the main breeding season (late August to November) especially in the eastern part of the powerline route. The way in which vegetation is managed and whether any additional roads will be constructed will also affect the extent to which this species is impacted.</p>		
15.	<p>Impacts on wetlands:</p> <p>1) From the information provided it appears that impacts on any wetlands should be able to be avoided for the substations and powerlines as it should be able to site these structures some distance from the wetlands in the area.</p>		<p>Comment noted. No response required.</p>
16.	<p>Conclusion:</p> <p>1) The preferred sites for the transmission and distribution substations appear to be previously disturbed and there are no significant constraints with regard to impacts on biodiversity on these sites.</p> <p>2) Information regarding the powerline route,</p>		<p>1) Comment noted. No response required. 2) A description of Hopefield Sand Fynbos has been added to the Ecological Assessment Report (refer to Section 3.2.4). The EMPr has been updated to include more specific measures regarding the management of the servitude during operation as well as additional measures recommended by CapeNature for the</p>

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>particularly in the eastern section of the study area is lacking in detail and site specific operational management measures are also not provided. The Environmental Management Programme (EMPr) must be updated to include detailed powerline servitude vegetation management measures/requirements.</p> <p>CapeNature cannot support this application in its current format. We will review our decision once the requested additional information as discussed above has been included.</p> <p>CapeNature reserves the right to revise initial comments and request further information based on any additional information that may be received.</p>		<p>planning and construction of the project.</p>
17.	<p>Heritage Western Cape is in receipt of your application for the above matter received on 24 October 2016. This matter was discussed at the Impact Assessment Committee (IACom) meeting held on 9 November 2016.</p> <p>FINAL COMMENT</p> <p>The integrated report is approved and the Committee supports transmission line alternative 3 substation alternative A and distribution substation alternative A, subject to the following conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If transmission line alternatives 4 or 6 are authorized, then archaeological mitigation of the historic ruins must take place under a workplan approved by HWC if they cannot be preserved <i>in</i> 	<p>Mr Mxolisi Dlamuka Chief Executive Officer Heritage Western Cape</p> <p>18-11-2016</p>	<p>These recommendations are already included within the EIA Report and Heritage Impact Assessment.</p>

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p><i>situ</i>;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Full-time palaeontological monitoring of both authorized substation foundations (any alternatives) during construction of camps, roads and any other infrastructure and <i>ad hoc</i> monitoring of power line foundations is required under a workplan approved by HWC. The workplan must include provision for the collection and recording of any fossils unearthed during construction; • Training in the identification of fossils must be provided to project staff (construction workers, excavator operators and the ECO) who should be instructed to watch for fossils and report any discoveries; • Any fossil material recovered during the course of the project should be properly recorded and then lodged with an appropriate approved repository; and • If any further archaeological and/or palaeontological material or human burials are uncovered during the course of development then work in the immediate area must be halted. The find would need to be reported to the heritage authorities and may require inspection by an archaeologist or palaeontologist. Such heritage is the property of the state and may require excavation and curation in an approved collection repository. <p>HWC reserves the right to request additional information</p>		

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>as required.</p> <p>Should you have any further queries, please contact the official above and quote the case number.</p>		
18.	<p>1) The Draft EIA Report: Savannah Environmental EIA Report – Saldanha Bay Strengthening Project dated November 2016 refers.</p> <p>2) Please ensure that the facilities used for accommodation are authorised for this purpose in terms of the zoning stipulated in the applicable Zoning Scheme.</p> <p>3) Relocated species must be translocated to an undisturbed area which will be suitable for its proliferation.</p> <p>4) How can the unauthorised use of service roads be prevented?</p> <p>5) The Saldanha Bay Municipality has a waste recycling facility and would appreciate sorting waste at the source. Please contact david.wright@sbm.gov.za 022 701 6988 for further information.</p>	<p>Ms N Duarte Environmental Officer</p> <p>Saldanha Bay Municipality</p> <p>Letter: 09-01-2017</p>	<p>2) Workers not living in the area, including those required for skilled positions will be transported to site on a daily basis and will not be housed on site.</p> <p>3) The EMPr includes the following specification: <i>“Should any Red Data faunal species be noted within the development footprint areas, these species must be relocated to similar habitat within the vacant land to the west of the development area with the assistance of a suitably qualified Ecologist.”</i></p> <p>4) Eskom install locked gates along the servitude to which only the maintenance teams have keys.</p> <p>5) Comment noted. No response required.</p>
19.	<p>1. The Draft Environmental Impact Assessment (“EIA”) Report dated November 2016 that was received by the Department on 21 November 2016, refers. The following consolidated comment by various directorates in Department is hereby offered.</p>	<p>Adri La Meyer Directorate: Development Planning Facilitation</p>	<p>Responses to comments raised are provided below.</p>
20.	<p>2. Directorate: Development Management (Region 1) – Keagan-leigh Adriaanse (Keaganleigh.</p>	<p>Western Cape Department of</p>	

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>Adriaanse@westerncape.gov.za; Tel: (021) 483 3763):</p> <p>2.1. The activity description must be amended to include a description of the following:</p> <p>2.1.1. The development and/or widening of roads; and</p> <p>2.1.2. The estimated volume of dangerous goods that will be stored on site during the development phase.</p>	<p>Environmental Affairs and Development Planning</p> <p>Letter: 09-01-2017</p>	<p>2.1.1. The development and/or widening of roads has been added to the project description.</p> <p>2.1.2. Dangerous goods to be sorted on site will include fuels and oils. The estimated volume of dangerous goods that will be stored on site will exceed 80 cubic meters.</p>
21.	<p>2.2. It is noted that the Draft EIA Report has been made available for public review from 18 November 2016 until 9 January 2017. However, page x of the Draft EIA Report indicates that said report is made available for review from 18 December 2016 to 9 January 2017. This typographical error must be corrected in the Final EIA Report to be submitted to the competent authority.</p>		<p>This error has been corrected in the revised EIA Report.</p>
22.	<p>2.3. The following amendments to the Environmental Management Programme ("EMPr") are required:</p> <p>2.3.1. The vegetation management plan (as recommended by CapeNature in their correspondence dated 13 May 2016) must be included in the EMPr.</p> <p>2.3.2. The recommendations of all the specialists contained in the various specialist studies must be included in the EMPr.</p> <p>2.3.3. The contact details of Heritage Western</p>		<p>2.3.1. The EMPr has been updated to include more specific measures regarding the management of the servitude during operation as required by CapeNature.</p> <p>2.3.2. The recommendations of the specialists have been included in the EMPr.</p> <p>2.3.3. Contact details for Heritage Western Cape have been added to the EMPr.</p> <p>2.3.4. A procedure for incidents or emergency situations in terms of Section 30 and Section 30A of NEMA has been included in the EMPr.</p>

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>Cape must be included in the EMPr to facilitate actions in the event that heritage resources are uncovered during the construction phase of the proposed development.</p> <p>2.3.4. The EMPr must outline the procedure for incidents or emergency situations in terms of Section 30 and Section 30A of the National Environmental Management Act, 1998 (Act No. 107 of 1998) ("NEMA"), respectively.</p> <p>2.3.5. The EMPr (Objective 9) indicates that a storm water management plan will be compiled during the pre-development phase. It is recommended that the storm water management plan be compiled and included in the EMPr.</p> <p>2.3.6. It is further noted that an emergency maintenance operational plan will be compiled during the construction phase of the proposed development (Objective 6 of the EMPr). It is recommended that the emergency maintenance operational plan be included as part of the EMPr.</p>		<p>2.3.5. A specific stormwater management plan can only be compiled once the final tower positions and access road layout is known. This will be available only after servitude negotiation and final design. The detailed stormwater management plan will be included within the site-specific management plan to be compiled following final design.</p> <p>2.3.6. An emergency maintenance operational plan will be developed by Eskom and included within the site-specific management plan to be compiled following final design.</p>
23.	<p>3. Directorate: Waste Management – Muneeb Baderoon (Muneeb.Baderoon@westerncape.gov.za; Tel: (021) 483 2965):</p> <p>3.1. Although the EMPr comprehensively addresses waste management, this Directorate wishes to emphasise that waste generated during the construction and operational phases of the</p>		<p>3.1. Comment noted. No response required.</p>

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>proposed development that cannot be reused or recycled, must be disposed of at a waste disposal facility suitably licensed to accept such waste. Additionally, waste disposal certificates must be made available to this Directorate upon request.</p>		
24.	<p>3.2. Your attention is drawn to Schedule 3 of the National Environmental Management: Waste Act, 2008 (Act No. 59 of 2008) ("NEM:WA"), which defines and identifies categories and waste types. Category A, Section 15 of Schedule 3 identifies certain types of construction waste as hazardous waste (e.g. wastes from other construction and demolition, discarded metals, etc.). Such wastes must be stored in hazardous waste containers and disposed of at a hazardous waste facility (i.e. it may not be disposed of with non-hazardous construction waste). Please also note that general waste and the non-hazardous portion of construction waste must be stored, reused (where possible) and disposed of separately, as the general construction waste will most likely be used for cover material at a waste disposal facility.</p>		<p>3.2. Comment noted. This information is included within the EMPr.</p>
25.	<p>4. Directorate: Air Quality Management – Peter Harmse (Peter.Harmse@westerncape.gov.za; Tel: (021) 483 8343):</p> <p>4.1. Dust and exhaust emissions will be generated during the construction phase of the proposed development, which could result in significant nuisance conditions. The applicant must comply</p>		<p>4.1. These requirements are included within the EMPr.</p>

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>with the National Dust Control Regulations (Government Notice (“GN”) No. R. 827) of 1 November 2013, promulgated in terms of the National Environmental Management: Air Quality Act, 2004 (Act No. 39 of 2004). These regulations prohibit a person from conducting any activity in such a way as to give rise to dust in such quantities and concentrations that the dust, or dust fall, may have a detrimental effect on the environment, including health</p>		
26.	<p>4.2. Table 3.4 of the Draft EIA Report and Appendix A of the EMPr must be amended to indicate that noise generated during the proposed development must comply with the Western Cape Noise Control Regulations (Provincial Notice 200/2013) of 20 June 2013 (and not the Noise Control Regulations of 1998). The applicable requirements of the 2013 Noise Control Regulations must be indicated in both documents.</p>		<p>4.2. The requirements of the Western Cape Noise Control Regulations are included within the table under the Provincial Legislation section.</p>
27.	<p>4.3. The mitigation measures related to dust and noise impact reduction as indicated in the Draft EIA Report and EMPr must be implemented.</p>		<p>4.3. Comment noted. No response required.</p>
28.	<p>4.4. The applicant is reminded of his requirement to comply with the “Duty of care” principle as defined in Section 28 of the NEMA by taking reasonable measures to ensure that the proposed development does not cause significant pollution or degradation of the environment.</p>		<p>4.4. Comment noted. This requirement is included within the EIA and EMPr.</p>
29.	<p>5. Directorate: Pollution and Chemicals Management – Najah Ben Jeddou</p>		<p>5.1. As detailed in Section 2.6 of the EIA report, decommissioning of the substation will include the</p>

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>(Najah.BenJeddou@westerncape.gov.za Zayed.Brown@westerncape.gov.za; Tel: (021) 483 8367):</p> <p>5.1. The Draft EIA Report and EMPr do not provide specific information with regards to the decommissioning of the Blouwater substation and deal with this matter in very general terms. This Directorate notes that the proposed new distribution substation will replace the existing Blouwater substation and that the Blouwater substation will only be decommissioned once the new distribution substation has been constructed and commissioned.</p>		<p>following:</p> <p><u>Site Preparation</u></p> <p>Site preparation activities will include confirming the integrity of the access to the site to accommodate the required equipment (e.g. lay down areas, construction platform) and the mobilisation of decommissioning equipment.</p> <p><u>Disassemble and Replace Existing Components</u></p> <p>When the project is ultimately decommissioned, the equipment to be removed will depend on the proposed land use for the site at that time. At this time, all above ground facilities that are not intended for future use at the site will be removed. Underground equipment (e.g. foundation, wiring) will be removed, and the surface restored to a stable slope. Much of the above ground wire and steel, of which the infrastructure is comprised are recyclable materials and would be recycled to the extent feasible. The components of the various infrastructure would be deconstructed and recycled or disposed of in accordance with regulatory requirements. The site will be rehabilitated and can be returned to agricultural or other beneficial land-use.</p>
30.	<p>5.1.1. This Directorate cannot support the inclusion of the decommissioning of the Blouwater substation as part of the EIA application in the absence of proof that the site is not significantly contaminated. To</p>		<p>5.1.1. A study to determine whether the site could potentially be significantly contaminated or not will be undertaken by Eskom prior to decommissioning activities being undertaken.</p>

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>this end, at least a preliminary assessment should be conducted to assess whether the site could potentially be significantly contaminated or not.</p>		
31.	<p>5.1.2. Should the preliminary assessment indicate that the Blouwater substation site could potentially be significantly contaminated, then the decommissioning of the Blouwater substation will have to be conducted in compliance with the requirements of Part 8 of Chapter 4 of the NEM:WA.</p>		<p>5.1.2. Should the study indicate that the Blouwater substation site could potentially be significantly contaminated, then the required licenses in this regard will be obtained.</p>
32.	<p>5.2. Table 3.1, page 20 of the Draft EIA Report incorrectly quotes Activity 12 of GN No. R. 985 of 4 December 2014, by referring to "75% of indigenous vegetation". Kindly note that the correct activity description is "" The Final EIA Report must be amended to reflect the correct activity description.</p>		<p>5.2. This has been corrected.</p>
33.	<p>5.3. The EMPr fails to address how transformer oil will be handled to avoid soil contamination and spills which could affect nearby valley bottom wetlands and depressions. This significant impact must be included and addressed in the EMPr.</p>		<p>5.3. The EMPr includes an objective for the handling and storage of hazardous substances (such as transformer oil) – refer to Objective 10 of the Construction EMPr (Chapter 5) and Objective 4 of the Operational EMPr (Chapter 7).</p>
34.	<p>6. Please direct all enquiries to the officials indicated in this correspondence should you require any clarity on any of the issues/comments provided.</p> <p>7. The department reserves the right to revise initial comments and request further clarity on any or new information.</p>		

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
LATE COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE SCOPING REPORT			
35.	<p>This Department has perused the abovementioned documents and has noted that the proposed activities trigger a water use in terms of section 21 (c) impeding or diversity the flow of water in a watercourse and section 21 (i) altering the bed, banks, course or characteristics of a watercourse of the National Water Act, 1998 (Act 36 of 1998). This is due to the proposed construction of substations to strengthen the power generation at Aurora and Blouwater substations will include construction work that will take place within a 500m boundary radius of the identified two unchanneled valley bottom wetlands and six depressions.</p> <p>Please advise your client to apply for a Water Use Authorisation from this Department prior to commencing with any of the activities. A checklist of the documents required by the Department to assess the file has been attached.</p> <p>Kindly contact the following official: Mr Warren Dreyer 021 941 6185 dreyerw@dws.gov.za for assistance.</p> <p>Please do not hesitate to contact the above official should there be any queries.</p>	<p>Ms N Ndobeni Case Officer and</p> <p>Melissa Lintnaar- Strauss Control Environmental Officer</p> <p>Department of Water and Sanitation</p> <p>Letter: 11-05-2016</p>	<p>It is noted that construction activities will take place within a 500m boundary radius of the two identified unchanneled valley bottom wetlands and six depressions. It is further acknowledged that the proposed activities will trigger a water use in terms of section 21 (c) and (i) of the National Water Act, 1998 (Act 36 of 1998). Eskom will apply for a water use license or General Authorisation as required by the Department of Water and Sanitation.</p>
36.	<p>The draft Scoping Report ("SR") dated April 2016 and received by this Department on 18 April 2016 and this Directorate's acknowledgment thereof dated 22 April 2016, refer.</p> <p>Comments on the draft SR are as follows:</p>	<p>Ms K. Adriaanse Case Officer</p> <p>Western Cape Department of Environmental</p>	

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>1. Activity description</p> <p>1.1. The activity description must be amended to include all infrastructure associated with the proposed development;</p> <p>1.2. The farm portions and numbers for the proposed transmission and distribution substations must be provided;</p> <p>1.3. Figure 2.1 of the draft SR indicates sites numbered A, B and C. However, a description of these sites has not been provided; and</p> <p>1.4. Note that a description of the proposed development in relation to the listed activities must be provided in order to confirm the listed activities that are triggered by the proposed development.</p> <p>2. Public Participation Process</p> <p>It is noted that the draft SR was available for review from 15 April 2016 to 18 May 2016. However, please note that the draft SR was received by this Department on 18 April 2016. Therefore, this Directorate has not been provided with an opportunity to comment on the draft SR within the prescribed 30-day commenting period. It is therefore advised that for all future applications, all documents must be submitted to this Directorate prior to the commencement of the public participation process.</p> <p>3. Specialist Input</p>	<p>Affairs and Development Planning</p> <p>Letter: 19-05-2016</p>	<p>1. Comments received have been addressed within the EIA Report as follows:</p> <p>1.1. A detailed description of the project infrastructure is included within Chapter 2 of the EIA Report.</p> <p>1.2. Farm portions and numbers for the nominated preferred alternatives are included within Chapter 6 of the EIA Report.</p> <p>1.3. A description of the alternative substation sites and power line corridors is included within Chapter 2 of the EIA Report</p> <p>1.4. A description of the proposed developments in relation to listed activities is included in Chapter 3 of the EIA Report.</p> <p>2. It must be noted that the Western Cape Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning were notified of the availability of the DSR via email on 15 April 2016, the first day of the review period. The email notifications which were sent to Ayub Mohamed and Piet van Zyl on 15 April 2016 contained the download link to the DSR on Savannah Environmental's website. Therefore, this Department was provided with 30-days to review and submit comments on the DSR as required in terms of Regulation 3(4) of the EIA Regulations 2014.</p> <p>3. Detailed specialist studies have been undertaken as part of the EIA Phase of the process. These studies are</p>

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>3.1. It is noted that the following specialist assessments were compiled as part of the Scoping phase in order to inform the specialists studies that will be undertaken as part of the Environmental Impact Reporting ("EIR") phase:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3.1.1. Desktop Vegetation Assessment (dated January 2016); 3.1.2. Fauna Impact Assessment (dated January 2016); 3.1.3. Avifauna Impact Assessment (dated January 2016); 3.1.4. Wetland Assessment (dated January 2016); 3.1.5. Heritage Scoping Study (dated 28 September 2015); 3.1.6. Visual Impact Assessment (dated September 2015); and 3.1.7. Social Impact Assessment (dated January 2016). <p>3.2. As such, the aforementioned specialist assessments have not been considered to collapse the Scoping phase and the EIR phase as the assessment of the identified potential impacts will be undertaken as part of the EIR phase.</p> <p>This Department reserves the right to revise or withdraw comments or request further information based on any information received.</p>		<p>included within Appendix D – K of the EIA Report.</p>

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	Your interest in the future of the environment is greatly appreciated.		
37.	<p>Your application of 14 April 2016 has reference.</p> <p>The Western Cape Department of Agriculture has no objection against the consideration of all six (6) powerline alternatives as well as sites DX and TX as the impact will be of limited significance as found in the Agricultural study.</p> <p>Please take note:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That this is only a recommendation to the relevant deciding Authorities in terms of the Subdivision of Agricultural Land Act 70 of 1970. • Kindly quote the above-mentioned reference number in any future correspondence in respect of the application. • The Department reserves the right to revise initial comments and request further information received. 	<p>AS Roux Director: Sustainable Resource Management</p> <p>Western Cape Department of Agriculture</p> <p>Letter: 26-07-2016</p>	<p>The Western Cape Department of Agriculture's comment regarding the project is noted.</p>
PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESS & I&AP REGISTRATIONS			
38.	Please could you register me as an I&AP for the Saldanha Bay Network Strengthening Project for Eskom.	<p>Zoë Palmer Environmental Scientist</p> <p>Aurecon</p> <p>Email: 01-06-2016</p>	<p>Zoë Palmer of Aurecon was registered as an I&AP on the project's database.</p>

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
39.	Please could you register AEP as an I&AP for the Saldanha Bay Network Strengthening Project?	Sonia Miszczak Project Developer Atlantic Energy Partners Email: 30-06-2016	Sonia Miszczak of Atlantic Energy Partners was registered as an I&AP on the project's database.
40.	Please register Mulilo Thermal Project Developments as an I&AP. We are developing a power station in Saldanha.	Bertus van Niekerk Technical Project Manager Mulilo Thermal Project Developments Reply Form: 24-08-2016	Bertus van Niekerk and Jannie Mueller of Mulilo Thermal Project Developments were registered as I&APs on the project's database.
41.	I would like to register on the Saldanha Bay Network Strengthening project database. We are actively working in the area and have a keen interest in the electrical aspects of the proposed network strengthening.	Barry Reid Specialist Electrical Engineer Royal HaskoningDHV Email: 27-10-2016	Barry Reid of Royal HaskoningDHV was registered as an I&AP on the project's database.
42.	I represent Elandsfontein Mine and we are one of the Eskom customers who are supplied our power out of the Aurora Substation and would like to find out more about the proposed project. Are you able to provide me with a copy of the Draft EIA Report mentioned in this invitation?	Mark Maynard Engineering & Operations Elandsfontein Mine	Mark Maynard of the Elandsfontein Mine was registered as an I&AP on the project's database. The draft EIA Report has been made available as requested. The link to the report on Savannah Environmental's website has been sent to Mark Maynard.

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
		Email: 27-10-2016	
43.	I am involved in an academic group that are studying road reserves and power line servitudes. The aim is to keep these reserves as natural as possible and to develop guidelines for the cutting and mowing of alien vegetation. They would be interested in being involved and provide feedback into the process.	Hedwig Slabig Representative Botanical Society West Coast Public Meeting: 03-11-2016	Hedwig Slabig was registered as an I&AP on the project's database. She was invited to send the details of the academic group to Savannah Environmental. No further correspondence was received in this regard.
44.	Have you spoken with Barend Pieterse Trust.	Darryl Hunt Dynamic Energy Consultants cc Public Meeting: 03-11-2016	Attempts to meet with the representatives of the Barend Pieterse Trust have been made. The Trustees have been invited them to attend this meeting; however, no responses to the requests made were received. A copy of the draft EIA Report has been sent to the Trust's representatives.
ISSUES RAISED BY LANDOWNERS			
45.	Thanks for meeting with the landowners and their representatives yesterday in Saldanha as part of the EIA for Eskom's Saldanha Strengthening Programme. To re-iterate, the landowners (represented by Gavin Stigling and Lizamarie Tolken) welcome Eskom's suggested Tx and Dx upgrades and welcome the opportunity to locate sub-stations on and/or route lines across their land, as most of this land falls within the Saldanha Municipality's spatial development corridor for industrial development.	Darryl Hunt Dynamic Energy Consultants cc Email: 17-08-2016	This comment was submitted following the interview undertaken for the Social Impact Assessment (SIA) undertaken by Savannah Environmental's social specialist held on 16 August 2016 (refer to the SIA Report for the minutes of this meeting). Gavin Stigling and Lizamarie Tolken's support for the development of the power lines as well as Tx and Dx substations is noted. The synopsis provided by the landowners has been considered within the EIA process and by Eskom.

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>As was discussed in the meeting, the landowners are requesting careful co-ordination and alignment between Eskom and other prospective infrastructure, industrial and power projects which are being proposed and developed by various project developers.</p> <p>Attached is an updated synopsis of the considerations which the landowners request that Eskom consider as part of their technical alternatives (best viewed in "slide show" due to small font size). This was originally sent to Eskom on 08 July and subsequently updated after the meeting with Savannah on 10 August.</p> <p>Please note that the synopsis still includes Tx E which is mainly located on Pieterse Family Trust land (and the "colours" don't correspond to those we discussed in our meeting yesterday).</p> <p>Finally, the landowners are awaiting confirmation of an urgent follow-up discussion with Eskom's technical team before progressing too far down the EIA process to ensure that site and route alternatives (especially Tx) are not in conflict with the other proposed projects and/or infrastructure. Lerato indicated on 02/08/2016 via email that she would consult with the Eskom team and advise.</p>		<p>A follow-up focus group meeting was held with the landowners, Eskom's technical team and Savannah Environmental on 27 September 2016 (refer to Appendix C7 of the draft EIA Report).</p>
46.	Has Transmission site option E now been removed?	Daryl Hunt Consultant	The transmission substation option E has been excluded from the project. The removal of this option was based on the fact that the site straddled two properties and various landowners were opposed to it.
47.	Could the transmission substation be smaller than 600m x 600m?	Dynamic Energy Consultants	The extent of the footprint of the site required for the transmission substation could be reduced depending on the

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
		Focus Group Meeting: 27-09-2016	site itself. However, 600m x 600m is the minimum footprint that Eskom usually requires.
48.	There are a number of commercial obligations and commitments on the properties owned by Gavin Stigling and Fredrik Tolken.		Eskom acknowledges that there are numerous commercial obligations and commitments on the properties owned by Gavin Stigling and Fredrik Tolken. It should be noted that the space provided by the transmission sites D and F options is required to accommodate ten 132kV power lines connecting the distribution and transmission sites. Eskom is willing to accommodate the needs of landowners in the layout and design of the grid infrastructure proposed in the area.
49.	Could we look at another site for the transmission substation site? We have come up with a Site G for the transmission substation.		This additional alternative was only suggested late in the EIA process despite previous consultations with the affected landowner. A brief consideration of this alternative from information provided by the stakeholder did not offer any benefits to the other options considered and already assessed by the specialists. It should be noted that the preferred alternative transmission site F is supported by the affected landowners.
50.	There is also a bulk water supply pipeline parallel to the R27 road. Is there an offset for that? Is there cathodic protection on that pipeline?		This will be investigated further by Eskom in the design stage of the project. There are mitigation measures that can be implemented if there are interferences between the pipeline and network infrastructure. It is not considered to be a fatal flaw for the project.
51.	There is a new road interchange at the Trunk Road 85 and the R27. The internal road plan also needs to be developed.		Eskom will implement the appropriate design solution in order to accommodate the road interchange. The heights of the power line towers can be increased as required. The Western Cape Department of Roads and Public Works are being consulted in this regard.
52.	The transmission substation site F would be our preferred option.	Gavin Stigling Landowner	It is noted that the transmission substation site F is Gavin Stigling's preferred option. Transmission substation site F

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
		Anyskop Focus Group Meeting: 27-09-2016	is recommended as the preferred alternative in the EIA Report.
53.	What timeframes are we looking at for this process?	Daryl Hunt Consultant Dynamic Energy Consulting Focus Group Meeting: 27-09-2017	Land negotiations will commence once the EIA process is concluded. Construction is likely to commence in 2019 and the power line is planned to be commissioned in 2022.
54.	Of the distribution sites site option A is slightly preferred from a technical perspective.	Gavin Stigling Landowner Anyskop Focus Group Meeting: 27-09-2016	It is noted that the distribution substation site A is Gavin Stigling's preferred option. Distribution substation site A is recommended as the preferred alternative in the EIA Report.
55.	What is the preferred substation site at this point?	Gessie Theron Project Planner: Energy & Land Development ArcelorMittal	Transmission substation site F and distribution substation site A have been recommended as the preferred alternative sites based on the EIA investigations and stakeholder consultation. These have been recommended as they are environmentally acceptable, technically feasible and accommodate landowner needs as identified through the public participation process.
56.	Transmission substation site options D and F would have	Focus Group	Option F is the preferred Transmission substation site

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	the least impact on us.	Meeting: 27-09-2016	recommended in the EIA Report.
57.	What would the width of the servitude for the distribution lines be?		The servitude for the distribution power lines will be 93m wide (3 servitudes of 31m each). The servitude for the transmission power line will be 110m wide (2 servitudes of 55m each).
58.	93m is a substantial impact. The Uyekraal property is earmarked for heavy industrial development. The other property affected is near the R27. That land has been allocated to IPP solar. That is on the west of the R27. To the east of the R27 we don't really have an issue.		It is noted that Uyekraal property is earmarked for heavy industrial development and that an IPP solar facility is planned for the property located adjacent to the R27. Eskom will continue engaging with the landowners regarding servitude negotiations and the positioning of the power lines prior to development.
59.	What is the timing of this?		The upgrade of the network infrastructure is required for the Saldanha Industrial Development Zone. Land negotiations will commence once the EIA process is concluded. Construction is likely to commence in 2019 and the power line is planned to be commissioned in 2022.
60.	Options D and F are better for us. It connects to the R27 and the area is not earmarked for development in the next few years.		Option F is the preferred alternative from a technical perspective.
61.	Yes we support the project but the best option must be selected for the substation site.		ArcelorMittal's support for the network strengthening project is noted. Option F is the preferred alternative from a technical perspective.
62.	Which site is preferred for the distribution substation?		Distribution substation Option A is the preferred alternative from an environmental and technical perspective.
63.	We are constantly having power cuts on our farm. There is theft of cables. Eskom needs to sort this out. Every month the electricity is off for two days. This is unacceptable. We are here to discuss electricity so let's discuss electricity. I want a name of someone who I can call to get a quick response on cut lines. Every time I call Eskom to get a response I am put on hold and can never	Francois Turner & Wilmaire Turner Landowners Farm Driehoekfontein RE/176 &	The strengthening project is required for future prospects in the area. There is a difference between Eskom distribution and Eskom transmission. Eskom transmission is proposing the development of the Saldanha Bay Network Strengthening project. Issues with electricity supply are related to Eskom

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	speak to anyone who can assist me.	Kerschbosch 1/175	Distribution which deals with 132kV and lower. Eskom Transmission undertook to provide Mr Turner with a contact person at Eskom Distribution who could assist with this matter.
64.	The Steyn brothers are also against the project.	Focus Group Meeting: 26-09-2016	This is incorrect. The Steyn brothers have not raised any major issues in the focus group meetings held with them.
65.	We cannot do anything about a lot of issues but we can do something about this. We are not in support of the project.		The objection against the project is noted.
66.	What about what happened in Durban and Paarl. People steal the nuts and there goes the line. And I heard a story about a power line that fell on someone's house. Why is our planning not world standard?		Eskom will secure a servitude that is safest for stakeholders involved and will undertake ongoing maintenance to ensure the safety of the power line and substation infrastructure.
67.	These transmission substations are proposed to be located here because the gas is there.		The primary reason for the development of this project is to support the development of the Saldanha Bay Industrial Development Zone.
68.	Mines worry me and they have damaged the environment. What seems practical to me is to build a power station, a line and distribute the power. What is the amount of electricity used by Arcelor Mittal?		ArcelorMittal uses approximately 200 – 300MW.
69.	What is the purpose of the IDZ?		The Saldanha Bay IDZ promotes the development of industry with a focus on Oil & Gas and Marine Engineering and Services in Saldanha Bay. It is responsible for the promotion, management and marketing of the IDZ to attract national and foreign investment.
70.	If I say "yes" to this project the whole area could turn into an industrial area. That is what I am worried about. If this is going to benefit the mines then I want nothing to do with it. If it is for the IDZ then I want Eskom to tell me the usage of the IDZ.		The purpose of this project is to ensure that future developments in the greater Saldanha region and the IDZ in particular, have access to sufficient electricity supply. Power to the Saldanha Bay area is currently supplied from Aurora Substation which is located 28km east of Saldanha

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
			<p>Bay. Aurora Substation supplies the Blouwater, Saldanha Steel and Smelter Substations. From the load forecast, it is evident that there will be a constraint at Aurora Substation in the future. The projected new load of approximately 200 MVA that will be realised in the area together with the natural load growth will increase Aurora Substation demand from 517 MVA to approximately 890 MVA in year 2030. The firm capacity in the area will be exceeded in 2018 if the additional loads are to be supplied from Aurora Substation.</p>
71.	<p>Where do we stop with all this development? Sooner or later we will destroy everything.</p>		<p>The purpose of the EIA is to determine ways in which to reduce the impact on the environment. The EMP, which forms part of the EIA, specifies how Eskom should undertake construction, operation and decommissioning in a way that is best for the environment.</p>
72.	<p>The way I see it Eskom just comes and builds what they want. Like the issues we have with the people working on the small lines in the area.</p>		<p>Transmission and distribution are two separate parts of Eskom. People working on wood poles are from distribution and it is a separate branch of the company.</p> <p>Eskom is committed to ensuring environmentally sustainable development. All permitting processes required in terms of relevant legislation are followed and completed prior to implementing any project.</p>
73.	<p>Don't wreck the Western Cape. This whole IDZ is a hoax. The project must be practical.</p>		<p>The Saldanha Bay Industrial Development Zone is a public entity established in 2013 with the purpose of developing and industrial development zone as a free trade zone within and around the Port of Saldanha Bay. The Saldanha Bay Network Strengthening Project is required to ensure that sufficient electricity is supplied to support the future developments within the IDZ. The need and desirability of the project is described in further detail in Chapter 2 in the draft EIA Report.</p>

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
74.	We are really concerned about what is happening on the West Coast. I am part of the Saldanha Bay Chamber of Commerce. I would like a hard copy of the EIA report.		A hard copy will be sent to Mr Turner at the commencement of the review period.
75.	<p>I would like to make a few comments on the proposed project, with specific reference to the attached map and the impact thereof on ArcelorMittal's properties.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ArcelorMittal is in support of the proposed upgrade of the electricity network as this will have a valuable impact on future development for the area, but the outcome of the preferred or selected route could have a severe impact on AMSA's property development and should be considered in a pragmatic manner. 2. The blue and yellow power line route and related transmission sites (on the eastern side of the R27) are supported as this route will have less of an impact on the existing and proposed farming activities (Evertshope Farm) and future use of the area. 3. The Uyekraal farm and surrounding properties have been earmarked for industrial development with reference to Saldanha Bay Spatial Development Framework (map included). The proposed transmission and distribution network and required servitude area (110m) will prohibit this kind of development and valuable industrial land and opportunities will be lost. We are therefore not in support of the purple and maroon route as indicated over the Uyekraal and Waschkliip Farms. The land on the eastern side of the R27 is not earmarked for 	<p>Gesie Theron Project Planner: Energy & Land Development</p> <p>ArcelorMittal South Africa</p> <p>Email: 19-10-2016</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ArcelorMittal's support for the project is noted. 2. Comment noted. Transmission Site F (yellow site) and alternative 6 (yellow route) have been nominated as the preferred substation site alternative and power line corridor respectively in the draft EIA Report. 3. Comment noted. Transmission Site F (yellow site) and alternative 6 (yellow route) have been nominated as the preferred substation site alternative and power line corridor respectively in the draft EIA report. Only the distribution power lines would impact the farm Uyekraal. It is noted that a solar PV facility is planned on farm Waschkop and it is assumed that the existing power line servitude would have been considered in the planning of the PV facility to avoid any conflict.

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>future development and existing activities could be maintained with the development of this network.</p> <p>4. Also take into consideration the Western Cape – Saldanha road network improvement plan with reference to the indicated distribution sites as the proposed re-alignment of OP 7644 could become an issue.</p>		<p>4. The Western Cape Department of Transport has been consulted and their consulting engineers have provided comment in this regard. The Distribution substation site A has been nominated as the preferred alternative in the EIA report and no issues with regards to the road network are expected as the site is adjacent to the existing Blouwater Substation.</p>
76.	The contractors must be cautious regarding the opening and closing of gates on my farm as it is a game farm.	Thys van Niekerk Impacted Landowner	Issues pertaining to access control are included in the EMPr.
77.	Can landowners be forced into agreeing to a servitude to accommodate the power lines? Landowners are unlikely to accept market related land related offers on a per hectare basis.	Thali Thali Game Lodge Public Meeting: 03-11-2016	Eskom's Land Development Department will negotiate with the affected landowners once the environmental authorisation is granted. Expropriation could take place if no agreements can be reached as a last resort. However, this is not an easy process and it can take numerous years to complete.
78.	Who do we negotiate with regarding costs in terms of upgrading our access?	Gavin Stigling Impacted Landowner Farm Anyskop Public Meeting: 03-11-2016	Commercial discussions of this nature should take place with the project developers.
OTHER PLANNED DEVELOPMENTS POTENTIALLY IMPACTED BY THE POWER LINE CORRIDORS AND SUBSTATION SITES			
79.	We are in the process of developing two power projects on the farm Uyekraal 189 portion 1, please see attached .kmz file indicating our development footprint (for both projects).	Bertus van Niekerk Technical Project Manager Mulilo Thermal	It is noted that Mulilo's CCGT site is proposed to be located on the same site proposed for the Transmission substation site A. This renders this site non-feasible from a technical perspective. Transmission substation site F has therefore been recommended as the preferred alternative in the EIA

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>As part of this power plant development, we are also intending to permit a transmission line from our project site to Aurora substation, with our preferred alternative also along the current transmission line (your Alternative 1).</p> <p>Perhaps we can meet up to discuss these projects when we are in Johannesburg again, or even via a telephone conference?</p>	<p>Project Developments</p> <p>Email: 24-08-2016</p>	<p>report.</p>
80.	<p>We have signed an Option to Lease with the land owner for the project site which I have provided. We have finalised our conceptual design of the power project and have appointed our Environmental Assessment Practitioner and all the relevant consultants. Our EAP has also commenced with the draft scoping report. We are just waiting for the Department of Energy to issue the Project Information Memorandum detailing the process of the Gas to Power Programme before we formally commence with the environmental impact assessment process.</p> <p>I have spoken to the land owner who has confirmed that they have had discussions with Eskom regarding the possible construction of a substation on the farm Uyekraal 189 Portion 1. According to the land owner, they had however indicated suitable locations for such a substation, but not at the current proposed location. The land owner pointed out to Eskom that he had agreements with developers and that this particular location was not available.</p>	<p>Bertus van Niekerk Technical Project Manager</p> <p>Mulilo Thermal Project Developments</p> <p>Email: 09-09-2016</p>	

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	Perhaps there has been some miscommunication, or misunderstanding around the sites which the land owner would be able to make available for such a substation? As the current proposed location (by Eskom) of the substation would infringe on our rights and accordingly our ability to further develop our project, we would appreciate an opportunity to meet with yourself and Eskom to discuss alternatives and we believe that the issue can easily be resolved.		
81.	The site is located on farm Uyekraal and is the same site as Transmission substation site A.	Jannie Mueller Project Developer Mulilo Thermal Project Developments (Pty) Ltd	It is noted that Mulilo's CCGT site is proposed to be located on the same site for the Transmission substation site A. This renders this site non-feasible from a technical perspective. Transmission substation site F has therefore been recommended as the preferred alternative in the EIA report.
82.	The CCTG project has not been authorized, we are currently in the Scoping Phase and have a BID document completed. CSIR is undertaking the EIA.	Focus Group Meeting: 26-09-2016	It is noted that the EIA process for Mulilo's CCGT project is underway and that the project has not received environmental authorisation. Due to the potential land use conflict, the site proposed for alternative A is not considered to be technically feasible for the substation.
83.	We are waiting for a project information memorandum from DoE before finalizing layout parameters. AH: Not yet, only a draft. However, there will eventually be about 10 x 132kV lines running from the transmission substation to the distribution substation. One IPP is fine but many more and we will start having space issues at the substation site.		
84.	Please add me to the project database.		Jannie Mueller of Mulilo Thermal Project Developments was added to the project database.
85.	The property traversed by the power lines, Langeberg 6/188 is 130ha in size. The CCGT plant we are proposing has been allocated 60ha. We may develop the other half	Izel van Roy Vortum Energy	Vortum Energy's proposed CCGT Plant is located 500m north of the proposed power line corridor and 1.2 km from Transmission substation site F which has been nominated

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	as well as we have purchased the full 130 ha.		as the preferred transmission substation site.
86.	An EA has been received for the CCGT plant as well as a power line. The current EA allows connection to either Aurora or Blouwater. It depends on what the situation is when construction commences as to which option we will choose.	Focus Group Meeting: 21-09-2016	Comment noted. Further consultation regarding potential infrastructure conflicts and connection options will be discussed with Eskom prior to project implementation.
87.	Transmission substation site F is slightly preferred from our side. Sites A and D are also acceptable. However, site D would entail the servitude for both 400kV lines traversing our property. I would need to work out the total loss of land that would result.		Transmission substation site F is nominated as the preferred alternative within the EIA Report.
88.	When would the detailed on-site planning begin? We would like to get involved with that process?		Detailed onsite planning would be initiated once the environmental authorisation is received and land negotiations have been concluded.
89.	When are you hoping to start construction?		Land negotiations will commence once the EIA process is concluded. Construction is likely to commence in 2019 and the power line is planned to be commissioned in 2022.
90.	We could possibly also connect to the new Blouwater substation.		This proposal would need to be discussed with Eskom outside of this EIA process.
91.	We would prefer Distribution substation site C.		Comment noted. Distribution substation site A has been recommended as the preferred alternative from a technical and environmental point of view, largely due to its location in proximity to the existing Blouwater substation.
92.	Are you aware that there is a solar energy facility planned to be developed on the property opposite the Engen One Stop on the R27.	Keith Harrison (KH) Northern Director Cape West Coast Biosphere Reserve Public Meeting: 03-11-2016	This project is planned on property owned by Arcelor Mittal.

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
IMPACTS TO ROADS			
93.	1. Your unreferenced letter dated 14 April 2016 to this Branch refers. 2. Register this Branch as an Interested and Affected Party and forward copies of all the relevant documentation. 3. This Branch, in conjunction with AECOM Consulting Engineers, brought its road network upgrade planning in that vicinity into place. In order to prevent a clash in possible planned alignments (roads versus cables) you are advised to arrange a meeting with this Branch) Attention: Mr E Burger Tel: 021 483 2180) as part of your consultation process.	ML Watter Chief Director: Road Network Management Western Cape Department of Transport and Public Works 01-09-2016	The branch Road Network Management of the Western Cape Department of Transport and Public Works has been registered as an I&AP on the project's database. The draft EIA report has been forwarded to the Department as requested. A meeting was held with Mr E Burger on 26 September 2016 to discuss the potential conflicts between the planned road and power line alignments. Refer to Appendix C7 for the minutes of the meeting and comments 54 – 56 below.
94.	There is a new interchange being constructed in the project area. You need to speak to Louw Venter at Aecom who are the consulting engineers on the project.	Evan Burger Road Network Management	Louw Venter of Aecom was consulted and comments dated 21 October 2016 have been included in the draft EIA Report (refer to Appendix C6) and comment 54 – 57 below.
95.	There is a possibility of flyovers. The clearance requirement is 5.2m with pylons at least 550m from edge of road. 7.1m is the legislated clearance requirement so there is no issue here.	Western Cape Department of Transport and Public Works	It is noted that Eskom's pylons would meet the legislated clearance requirement of 7.1m should flyovers be constructed as part of the interchange upgrade.
96.	The pylons will have to be over 95m from the centre of the road. That is a simple building restriction. Another factor to take into consideration is that there is a 500m radius control access at interchanges until the design is finalized. Once the design is finalized this can be reduced. Once the road network is finalized we can then relax the restrictions. Minor road 5545 and 233 could also be affected. There is	Focus Group Meeting: 26-09-2016	The Department's building restriction requirements of 95m from the centre of the road and the 500m radius control access are noted. The EIA assesses corridors wherein the power lines will be constructed. The exact power line routes will be planned at a later time within the corridor once authorisation is received.

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	usually a 25m building restriction on each side.		
97.	<p>Attached are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. your map with our proposed TR85 route shown. It is a new route that will be built in 2017. 2. our Road Network Master Plan for the Saldanha Municipal area. <p>Please take cognizance of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. (from the Road Network Master Plan) TR85/1 and its extension, TR21/2 (R45) and TR77/1 (R27) are freight routes and abnormal freight routes – special overhead clearance profiles shall apply. 4. Building lines and building restriction areas apply to all trunk roads, main roads, district roads, public transport roads and railway lines if so declared by the responsible authority. 5. Outside an urban area there is— <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) a building line on each side of a road or railway line at a distance of five metres measured at right angles to the centre line of the road or railway line; (b) a building restriction area on each side of a road or railway line within a distance of 100 metres measured at right angles to the centre line of the road or railway line; and (c) a building restriction area situated within a distance of 500 metres from any point of intersection of the centre line of a road or railway line with the centre line of another road or railway 	<p>Louw Venter Associate Infrastructure Design, Infrastructure</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Civil</p> <p>AECOM</p> <p>Email: 21-10-2016</p>	<p>The requirements stipulated by AECOM are noted. Eskom will take these into consideration in the design stage.</p>

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>line.</p> <p>6. The responsible authority may increase or reduce a building line or building restriction area.</p> <p>Structures and other works on, over or below reserves of transport infrastructure or within building lines or building restriction areas</p> <p>7. Despite any other law, no person may, except with the prior written permission of, and in accordance with standards and specifications approved by the responsible authority, undertake or cause or permit to be undertaken an activity mentioned in subsection 8 –</p> <p>(a) on or within the reserve or transport infrastructure;</p> <p>(b) within the building lines of transport infrastructure; or</p> <p>(c) within a building restriction area.</p> <p>8. The activities contemplated by subsection 7 are the following:</p> <p>(a) Erecting or installing a structure or other thing which is attached to the land on which it stands, including a structure or thing that does not form part of that land;</p> <p>(b) constructing or laying anything under or below the surface of land;</p> <p>(c) constructing anything which projects over the land concerned;</p>		

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>(d) carrying electric or other wires or pipelines across or laying underground cables or pipelines over, under or on the land concerned; or</p> <p>(e) making any structural addition or alteration to any structure or thing referred to in paragraph (a), (b), (c) or (d).</p> <p>9. A person may apply to the responsible authority in the prescribed manner and on payment of the prescribed fee for a departure from restrictions imposed by a building line or building restriction area referred to in subsection</p> <p>10. The responsible authority for the roads is the Road Network Management Branch, Department of Transport & Public Works, Western Cape Government.</p> <p>Contact us if any of the above is unclear or if you require additional information.</p>		
98.	I recommend that you consult with Aecom regarding the upgrade of the R27 road interchange as previously mentioned. We are now required to move our access point 1.2 km away from the new interchange on Trunk Road 85.	Gavin Stigling Impacted Landowner Farm Anyskop Public Meeting: 03-11-2016	Consultations between Savannah Environmental, Aecom and the Western Cape Department of Transport and Public Works were undertaken following the round of public consultation meetings held in September 2016. Aecom has subsequently submitted comments on the project. These comments have been included in the draft EIA Report (refer to Appendix B6).
ECOLOGICAL IMPACTS			
99.	On one of the slides of the presentation it was noted that there would be damage to habitat. What would the extent of this damage to habitat be?	Thys van Niekerk Impacted Landowner	Damage to habitat would result from the clearing of vegetation for the footprint of the power line structures. The extent of this damage would be minimal and

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
		Thali Thali Game Lodge Public Meeting: 03-11-2016	recommendations to reduce impacts as far as possible are included in the EMPr. No large-scale loss of habitat would occur. These areas will be rehabilitated once construction is complete. This recommendation has been included in the EMPr.
100.	The existing servitude roads should be used as far as possible to avoid damage to vegetation.		
101.	Did the specialist undertake fieldwork during the flowering season?	Hedwig Slabig Representative Botanical Society West Coast	The specialist undertook their field work during the flowering season. This was a requirement which was stipulated by the Western Cape Department of Environment and Development Planning. This information was submitted to the specialist who considered it in their final assessment report.
102.	It should be noted that CapeNature have updated the Critical Biodiversity Area maps for the region. Has this new information filtered through in your reporting?	Public Meeting: 03-11-2016	
AVIFAUNAL IMPACTS			
103.	Has the avifaunal specialist assessed the potential impacts to birds using the flyways in the area, particularly between the Berg River and the Lagoon?	Keith Harrison (KH) Northern Director Cape West Coast Biosphere Reserve Public Meeting: 03-11-2016	This information was submitted to the specialist who considered it in their final assessment report.
NETWORK INFRASTRUCTURE UPGRADE PLANS IN THE GREATER SALDANAH REGION AND PROJECT NEED AND DESIRABILITY			
104.	I understand that the existing Blouwater Substation will be decommissioned. Will the existing three overhead power lines that run into that substation from the Aurora Substation be decommissioned and removed?	Barry Ried Electrical Engineer Royal Haskoning DHV Public Meeting:	The Blouwater Substation will be decommissioned and a new substation will be built to replace it. The supply to the new substation will come from the new transmission substation. Additional distribution lines will supply Saldanha Steel and another distribution substation in the area. Essentially the substation will replace the supply to the distribution network in that area.

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
		03-11-2016	A portion of the existing power lines will be utilised to supply Saldanha Steel. It is possible that the old power lines could be decommissioned however this has not yet been confirmed by Eskom's Distribution department.
105.	Would there be an opportunity to upgrade the existing 132kV power lines to 400kV lines or decommission the 132kV power lines and build the new power lines in the existing servitude.		These opportunities have not been explored for this project because the existing 132kV power lines are required for the current supply. Eskom would consider rebuilding or recycling the existing power lines only once the new substation has been established.
106.	What key factors lead to the selection of the self-supporting power line structures being selected for the 400kV power lines?		<p>The self-supporting power line structures are preferred by the Western Cape Grid, the ultimate custodians of the grid infrastructure. In addition, the self-supporting structures are better suited for farms as livestock are unlikely to get trapped in these structures.</p> <p>Through the public participation process, farmers stated that they do not want the structures with the guides as these have an impact on farming activities like ploughing as this has an impact on the turning circles of their tractors.</p>
107.	What will happen to the existing Blouwater Substation since a new one will be built?	Keith Harrison (KH) Northern Director Cape West Coast Biosphere Reserve Public Meeting: 03-11-2016	The Blouwater Substation will be decommissioned because it is in a poor state primarily due to rust. All existing power lines from or to Blouwater Substation will then be diverted to the new Distribution's Substation.
108.	What would happen if this project does not proceed or if it takes a long time to execute? There are large scale industrial development projects planned for the greater	Hedwig Slabig Representative	The announcement of the Industrial Development Zone (IDZ) in Saldanha was made in 2015.

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>Saldanha region. If these projects are developed in the next five years then the construction of the network infrastructure should be implemented before these industrial projects come online. This project should have happened five years ago to accommodate industry needs.</p>	<p>Botanical Society West Coast Public Meeting: 03-11-2016</p>	<p>Prior to that Eskom had an indication that there is some potential for growth for the area. Eskom initially planned build at 400kV and operate the system at 132kV up until the need for 400kV capacity was triggered.</p> <p>If the IDZ growth accelerates as it was announced, then Eskom will operate a 400kV transmission substation and build a 400kV busbar with two transformers installed. The size of the land required for the substation will still be 600m x 600m. Eskom will decide whether to construct the full scope of the project from the onset in two years.</p>
<p>109.</p>	<p>Could a generation plant be such a trigger to bring forward the implementation of the full scope of the project?</p>	<p>Darryl Hunt Dynamic Energy Consultants Public Meeting: 03-11-2016</p>	<p>A generation project with a significant generating capacity of amount 1000MW and above would trigger the development of the full scope of the project.</p>
<p>110.</p>	<p>Am I correct in summarising that currently there is no commitment to decommission the existing three 132kV power lines.</p>	<p>Barry Ried Electrical Engineer Royal Haskoning DHV</p>	<p>That is correct. The existing three 132kV power lines must remain as the existing supply to the Saldanha area. These power lines will only be decommissioned or upgraded at a later stage once the new power lines and substation are constructed.</p>
<p>111.</p>	<p>Why are 2 new 132kV bays being installed at the Aurora Substation? What is their initial purpose?</p>	<p>Public Meeting: 03-11-2016</p>	<p>The initial plan for the area was to establish the substation but run the network at 132kV because the growth that was foreseen for the area was slightly slower and not as exaggerated as it is now. Eskom initially planned to build the lines at 400kV but operate them at 132kV. Therefore, two bays at the Aurora Substation are required to accommodate the new lines. The 2 new 132kV bays will remain as open spare bays once the system is operated at 400kV.</p>

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
112.	<p>What structures will be used for the 132kV power lines between the new transmission and the new distribution substations? Surely these details would have to be included in the EIA. The type of structures would impact the studies undertaking.</p> <p>We need to ensure that the specialists have had a good look at those subtle differences which could have a meaningful impact to a significant development.</p>		<p>The type of tower structure would not make a difference in terms of the environmental impact. A corridor has been evaluated in the EIA process. The power lines can be constructed anywhere within the corridor which was assessed. The DEA authorises the activity, namely, the development of the 132kV double circuit power line within the assessed corridor, not the power line structures. There would be subtle differences between the structures in terms of environmental impacts but the specialists assess these impacts on a worst-case scenario.</p> <p>The types of towers which would be used could be a combination from monopole structures and a lattice structure which are smaller than the 400kV structures.</p>
113.	<p>What is the programme for the implementation of this project?</p>		<p>It is assumed that the land negotiations with property owners would take approximately 1 year to complete. Construction is likely to commence in 2019 and the power lines are planned to be commissioned in 2022.</p> <p>This programme excludes the construction of the transmission substation which will be built at a later stage and as need arises.</p>
SOCIOECONOMIC IMPACTS			
114.	<p>We would request that you use 100% of local labour for this project. The West Coast Biosphere Reserve (WCBR) has trained approximately 91 people in alien vegetation clearance and rehabilitation. These people have the skills required for this project.</p>	<p>Keith Harrison (KH) Northern Director Cape West Coast Biosphere Reserve Public Meeting: 03-11-2016</p>	<p>This recommendation will be included in the project's Supplier Development & Localisation SD&L once the project goes into execution.</p>

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
AGRICULTURE AND LAND USE			
115.	<p>With reference to the above-mentioned matter, the department wishes to inform you that it has no objection against the proposed Saldanha Bay Network Strengthening Project on condition that no development takes place on cultivated areas and that rehabilitation is done afterwards.</p> <p>This comment does not exempt any person from any provision of any other law, with special reference to the Conservation of Agricultural Resources Act, 1983 (Act 43 of 1983) and does not purport to interfere with the rights of any person who may have an interest in the agricultural land.</p>	<p>DR M.E Tau Deputy Director-General: Forestry and Natural Resources Management</p> <p>Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries</p> <p>Letter: 19-10-2016</p>	<p>It is noted that the Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries has no objection against the proposed development on condition that no development takes place on cultivated areas and that rehabilitation is undertaken afterwards.</p>
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT LETTERS RECEIVED FROM ORGANS OF STATE			
116.	<p>I acknowledge with thanks receipt of your email dated 18 November 2016, regarding the above mentioned subject matter.</p> <p>Kindly note that the matter has been brought to the attention of the Deputy Director General: Spatial Planning & Land Use Management: Dr Nozizwe Makgalemele for attention and response.</p> <p>Should you wish to make a follow up on this, kindly contact Ms Baloi: Tel: 012 312 9851. Email: Malebo.Baloi@drdlr.gov.za or Ms Karen Van Schalkwyk Tel: 012 312 9665. Email: Karen.VanSchalkwyk@drdlr.gov.za.</p>	<p>Samuel Masemola Office of the Director General</p> <p>Department of Rural Development and Land Reform</p> <p>Letter: 21-11-2016</p>	<p>Acknowledgment noted, no response required. No further comment was received from the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform at the time of submitting the FEIAR.</p>
117.	<p>The draft Environmental Impact Assessment Report (EIAR) dated November 2016 and received by this</p>	<p>Ms K Adriaanse Directorate:</p>	<p>Acknowledgment noted, no response required.</p>

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>Department on 21 November 2016, refers.</p> <p>1) This letter serves as an acknowledgement of receipt of the draft EIAR by this Directorate.</p> <p>2) This Directorate will now review the draft EIAR and provided comments on the draft EIAR within the specified commenting period.</p> <p>This Department reserves the right to revise or withdraw comments or request further information based on any information received.</p> <p>You interest in the future of our environment is greatly appreciated.</p>	<p>Development Management Region 1</p> <p>Western Cape Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning</p> <p>Letter: 29-11-2016</p>	

COMMENTS RECEIVED: SCOPING PHASE

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESS & I&AP REGISTRATIONS			
1.	Kindly register me as an I&AP for the Saldanha Bay Network Strengthening Project.	Owen Peters Land Development Distribution, Eskom Email: 29-09-2015	Mr Peters' details have been included on the project's I&AP database.
2.	The Cape West Coast Biosphere Reserve (CWCBR), of the UNESCO: Man and Biosphere Program, aims to implement sustainable development principles along the West Coast, in addition to integrating rapid growth with biodiversity and heritage conservation. The CWCBR extends from the Diep River in the south to the Berg River in the north and inland to Malmesbury and therefore the proposed development is located within the CWCBR. In this regard, the CWCBR would like to register as an I&AP and receive further correspondence and documentation regarding this development.	Karin Otto Conservation Office Administrator, Cape West Coast Biosphere Reserve Email: 29-09-2015	Karin Otto of the West Coast Biosphere Reserve has been registered as an I&AP on the project's database.
3.	We have been informed by the registered landowner of the Remaining Extent of the farm Langeberg 188 Malmesbury RD Saldanha Bay, i.e. TRANS AFRICAN MURALS (PTY) LTD, that Savannah Environmental (Pty) Ltd has been appointed to conduct the EIA for the proposed strengthening of the Aurora Sub-Station in Saldanha Bay, including the building of a Distribution and Transmission Sub-Station and power lines to Aurora SS. Vortum Energy (Pty) Ltd has entered into an Option Agreement to purchase a part of the abovementioned property from TRANS AFRICAN MURALS (PTY) LTD and	Izel van Rooy Vortum Energy (Pty) Ltd Email: 07-04-2016	Izel van Rooy of Vortum Energy (Pty) has been registered as an I&AP on the project's database and has been provided with all available information as requested.

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>intends developing the land for industrial purposes and for the proposed Vortum Thermal Power Plant.</p> <p>We hereby wish to formally register as an Interested and Affected Party and kindly request a copy of the Background Information document (BID) on this project.</p> <p>Vortum Energy is in favour of the establishment of the proposed Sub-station(s) and power lines in the area, but kindly request all the available information to understand the size of the Sub- Station(s) and the potential impact of the sub-stations and power lines on the specific portion of land that we intend to purchase.</p>		
4.	Please register Bill Eloff of Trans African Murals as an I&AP.	Bill Eloff Project Manager, Trans African Murals Reply Form: 15-04-2016	Mr Bill Eloff was registered as an I&AP on the project's database.
5.	Please register Gavin Stigling of All Billboard Solutions as an I&AP.	Gavin Stigling Director, All Billboard Solutions Reply Form: 15-04-2016	Mr Gavin Stigling was registered as an I&AP on the project's database.
6.	Please register me as an Interested and Affected Party for Eskom's Saldanha Bay Network Strengthening EIA. I have interests in land and also assist landowners directly affected by the proposed project.	Darryl Hunt Dynamic Energy Consultants Email: 15-04-2016	Mr Darryl Hunt was registered as an I&AP on the project's database.
7.	Re-public sighting, the Vredenburg Library is no longer	Mr Keith Harrison	It is noted that the Vredeburg Library has moved to

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>in School Street. This could delay the process.</p> <p>Please register the West Coast Bird Club as an IAP to the Project.</p>	<p>West Coast Bird Club</p> <p>Email: 20-04-2016</p>	<p>Academy Street in Vredenburg. The EAP contacted the Vredenburg Library on 21 April 2016 and confirmed that the draft Scoping Report was delivered to the library timeously.</p> <p>Mr Keith Harrison was registered on the project's I&AP database.</p>
8.	<p>Can you please register Mr FGH Tolken as an Interested and Affected Party for Eskom's Saldanha Bay Network Strengthening EIA. He is a land owner directly affected by the proposed project.</p>	<p>Lizemarie Tolken on behalf of Frederik Tolken</p> <p>Portion 1 of Farm Uyekraal 189</p> <p>Email: 25-05-2016</p>	<p>Mr Frederik Tolken was registered as an I&AP on the project's database.</p>
9.	<p>When does the Scoping Report's review period end?</p>	<p>Dale Wright</p> <p>BirdLife South Africa</p> <p>Meeting: 10-05-2016</p>	<p>The review period will end on 18 May 2016.</p>
10.	<p>It is important to keep farmers involved in the process and let them know about the timeframes and the processes that are involved.</p>	<p>Cor van der Walt</p> <p>Land Use Management, Western Cape Department of Agriculture</p> <p>Meeting: 10-05-2016</p>	<p>Impacted and adjacent landowners have been informed of the EIA process. Ongoing consultation will occur with the public and I&APs throughout the EIA process.</p>
HERITAGE IMPACTS			
11.	<p>Heritage Western Cape is receipt of your application for the above matter received on 16 September 2015.</p>	<p>Guy Thomas</p> <p>Heritage Officer, Heritage Western</p>	<p>A Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) will be undertaken as required in the EIA phase of the project in line with the requirements from SAHRA.</p>

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>1) The application is for the development of a powerline across the land between the two substations/distribution points.</p> <p>2) The exact route is not yet finalised. Three options are proposed that cross numerous cadastral entities.</p> <p>3) The landscape is known for its Palaeontological sensitivity, as well as the numerous pockets of archaeological resources.</p> <p>Requirement: You are hereby notified that, since there is reason to believe that the proposed development will impact on heritage resources, HWC requires that a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) that satisfies the provisions of section 38(3) of the NHRA be submitted.</p> <p>All three routes described in the NID documentation cross a sensitive landscape.</p> <p>This HIA must have specific reference to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Impacts to archaeological heritage resources - Impacts to palaeontological heritage resources <p>The required HIA must have an integrated set of recommendations.</p> <p>The comments of relevant registered conservation bodies and relevant Municipality must be requested and included in the HIA where provided. Proof of these requests must be supplied.</p>	<p>Cape</p> <p>Letter: 30-09-2015</p>	

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS LETTERS AND COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM ORGANS OF STATE DEPARTMENTS			
12.	<p>The draft Scoping Report dated April 2016 and received by this Department on 18 April 2016, refers.</p> <p>1) This letter serves as an acknowledgment of receipt of the draft Scoping Report by this Directorate. 2) This Directorate will now review the draft Scoping Report and provide comments on the draft Scoping Report within the specified commenting period.</p> <p>This Department reserves the right to revise or withdraw comments or request further information based on any information received.</p>	<p>Ms K. Adriaanse Directorate: Development Management Region 1, Western cape Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning</p> <p>Letter: 22-04-2016</p>	<p>Acknowledgment noted, no response required. No further comments were received at the time of submitting the final Scoping Report to the DEA.</p>
13.	<p>This serves as a notice of receipt and confirms that your application has been captured in our electronic AgriLand tracking and management system. It is strongly recommended that you use the on-line AgriLand application facility in future.</p> <p>Detail of your application as captured: Type: EIA Your reference number: N/a Property Description: Various Farms (Saldanha Bay Network Strengthening Project) Dated: 14 April 2016 Please use the following reference number in all enquiries: AgriLand reference number: 2016_04_0235</p>	<p>K. Maluleke Land Use and Soil Management, Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries</p> <p>Letter: 14-04-2016</p>	<p>Acknowledgment noted, no response required.</p>
ISSUES RAISED BY LANDOWNERS			
14.	<p>Will the proposed power line traverse my property? The project will impact my farming practices.</p>	<p>Francois Turner Impacted Landowner</p>	<p>It is not possible to say at this stage if the power line will cross the affected property as no final alignment has been</p>

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
		Turnerland Manufacturing / Hopefields Hoop Trust Reply Form: 15-04-2016	selected. A final corridor within the proposed alignment of the power line will be negotiated will be selected as part of the recommendations of the EIA-phase report. The maps included in the Scoping report show the corridors being assessed as part of the EIA study as well as the broader study area considered in the scoping report. All affected landowners have been included on the project database and will be informed of the availability of the EIA report.
15.	<p>My brother and I farm on the following properties: Adjoining Springfontein 174, RE/175 of farm Kerschbosch, RE/1777 of farm Springfontein, 8/178 of farm Yzyerfontein, 2/184 of farm Kleineberg, 6/185 of farm 185, 3/178 of farm Yzerfontein.</p> <p>We will not permit power line route alternative 3 on our property under any circumstances. Concerns regarding the proposed 400kV power line alternative 3 are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The proposed route traverses through approximately 5km of good agricultural soil which will make cultivation impossible and thus a loss of agricultural soil will occur. b) The proposed route will be located 25 meters from our house. c) Visual impacts d) Noise pollution e) Health risks f) Impacts on scarce raptor species g) Construction will cause soil erosion 	De Wet Steyn and Pieter Steyn Impacted Landowner Farm Springfontein & Farm Wolfiesfontein Reply Form: 29-04-2016	Comments noted as part of the process and will be considered in the process going forward.

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	h) The proposed power lines will traverse sensitive fynbos areas which have not been disturbed. i) Interruptions to communications towers.		
16.	Eskom should have contacted the landowners to inform them of the proposed power lines. We saw the EIA process advert in the newspaper and also received documentation regarding the EIA process in the post. The correspondence received from Savannah Environmental is the only information that we have received on this project to date.	De Wet Steyn & Pieter Steyn Landowner Farm Springfontein & Farm Wolfiesfontein	Eskom will consult and negotiate a servitude with landowners once an Environmental Authorisation is granted by the Department of Environmental Affairs. The EIA process is currently underway and the preferred corridor will be recommended in the EIA report. The purpose of the meeting is to obtain comments on the proposed routes.
17.	<p>We object to power line alternatives 2 and 3 traversing our properties. The existing power line crosses 25m from the farm house. Power line alternative 1 would only transect a small piece of our land.</p> <p>We use large harvesters and crop sprayers. Power line alternatives 2 and 3 will have an impact on our farming practices as our machinery would not fit underneath the proposed power lines. This will lead to a decrease in income. We will not permit the power line alternatives 2 and 3 to be constructed over agricultural land.</p> <p>Power line alternative 1 traverses land that is not used for agricultural purposes. In addition, the infrastructure required to access the power line namely, access roads and gates are already in place for the existing power line.</p>	Meeting: 12-05-2016	The landowners' objection to power line alternatives 2 and 3 is noted as part of the process and will be considered in the process going forward.
18.	Does the Air Force have issues regarding these lines?		A meeting was held with Lt. Col. Tyrone King of the Langebaan Airforce Base and they are considering power line alternative corridor 1. The other power line alternatives are likely to be fatally flawed as they are too

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
			close to Langebaan Airforce Base. The air force will do their own assessments in this regard and confirm if the other alternatives are indeed fatally flawed.
19.	We are concerned of the visual impacts and health impacts that the power lines have due to the magnetic field around the power lines. The 400kV power lines will also have an influence on the communication systems as they are using Wi-Fi. We have a tower on our property that is being utilised by the Langebaan Air Force Base. The technicians working on the tower indicated that there will be a lot of interference in the communication systems if the 400kV lines are constructed. This tower is located next to the farm house.		Comments noted. The visual impact assessment will assess the impact of the project on scenic resources. The position of telecoms tower has been noted and the EIA-phase assessment will take this into consideration. The relevant stakeholder will also be consulted in this regard. Social impacts will also be assessed in a separate SIA.
20.	Will power line alternative 1 be located on the inside or outside of the existing power lines? Would it be possible to change the power line alternative 1 route so that it traverses in a straight line?		<p>The power line alternative 1 will be located on the inside (to the north) of the existing power lines. It will not be possible from a technical perspective to construct the power line on the outside (to the south) of the existing power lines as it would then need to cross over 5 existing power lines.</p> <p>It should be noted that the proposed power line routes are not fixed at this stage and can be changed.</p>
21.	Although there are no agricultural practices occurring in the area where power line alternative 1 is proposed, the construction of a power line will be an inconvenience to farmers. We burn the grass to keep it short, but we are not permitted to burn grass within the Eskom servitude. It is Eskom's responsibility to keep the grass short underneath the lines but they do not do so. Eskom's contractors often leave the gates open during maintenance.		<p>It will be more practical if the power line traverses along the farm boundaries so that it may not interfere with farming practices. Eskom is only required to cut vegetation within the servitude if it grows to higher than 4m.</p> <p>The maintenance of the servitude will form part of the EMPr.</p>
22.	There are historical sand dunes on our farm. When the		Comment noted, these issues will be considered in the EIA

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	sand dunes are disturbed, it will definitely blow everywhere. There are also trees that will need to be removed.		study.
23.	Have you consulted the owner of the Thali Thali Game Lodge? The farm is owned by the Barend Pieterse Trust and the contact person is Thys van Niekerk.		All affected and adjacent landowners were notified of the EIA process. Thys van Niekerk is registered on the database. He advised that a meeting was not required and that he would submit written comments – none have been received at this stage.
24.	Why are the substation positions on three pieces of land?. It makes it very difficult to deal with 3 title deeds. I am 100% shareholder on some of these properties and only 50% shareholder on others.	Gavin Stigling Impacted Landowner / Director Farm Anyskop / Trans African Murals Meeting: 12-05-2016	The sites selected for the substations are indicative sites only and the selection was based on preliminary ecological and topographical characteristics of the site. The sites for the substations are not finalised and can be amended within the study area considered.
25.	There are options on some of these farm portions already. I will point them out on the map. Eskom has indicated that they will make available a site for a gas fired power station for open tender in this area as well.	Bill Eloff Impacted Landowner / Director and Gavin Stigling Impacted Landowner / Director Trans African Murals Meeting: 12-05-2016	The information provided will be used to revise some of the locations of the substations.
26.	Why does the air force base have issues with some of the alternatives?	Gavin Stigling Impacted Landowner	The air force base is concerned about the height of the power lines along alternatives 2 and 3. The power line will

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
		/ Director Farm Anyskop / Trans African Murals Meeting: 12-05-2016	be on the approach and take-off for the airforce base runways and therefore some of the alternatives are not suitable, even though they are further than 2km away.
27.	There are a lot of issues to consider here. There may be pockets of indigenous protected vegetation as well.	Bill Eloff Impacted Landowner / Director Trans African Murals Meeting: 12-05-2016	Comment noted. A full flora impact assessment is being conducted as part of the EIA process.
28.	There is a technical feasibility study ongoing at the moment for an IPP project in this area. We are in discussions but it is only conceptual at the moment. Eskom could install a power precinct in here with a 400kV substation and then make a 30-hectare site available for the IPP program and another 30-hectare site for their own generation projects. You can put power stations and substation in one area.	Darryl Hunt Consultant, Dynamic Energy Consultants Meeting: 12-05-2016	It is recommended that Eskom Distribution consult the IPP developer and key stakeholders in this regard.
29.	Some of these substations are right in the middle of the CBA area. Is that a fatal flaw?		Although some of the substations are located within a CBA, this would not be considered to be a fatal flaw since sensitive vegetation types can be avoided. This will be confirmed in the impact assessment stage of the EIA process.
30.	Would the distribution substation be constructed if the transmission substation is not?		The distribution substation will definitely be constructed in order to replace the existing Blouwater substation. The transmission substation site is required in order to

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
			accommodate the new developments in the area but will be constructed at a later time.
31.	There are several new road junctions being considered by the department of transport that may also interfere with these routes and substation positions.	Bill Eloff Impacted Landowner / Director, Trans African Murals Meeting: 12-05-2016	The Western Cape Department of Transport have been informed of the EIA process and have been invited to submit comments on the proposed project. Further consultation will take place with the Department in the EIA phase of the project.
ECOLOGICAL IMPACTS			
32.	<p>CapeNature would like to thank you for the opportunity to comment on this application and wish to make the following comments:</p> <p>1) The preferred site for the CGCT power plant has been mapped by the South African Vegetation Map as well as the vegetation maps compiled as part of the CAPE finescale project as being covered by Saldanha Flats Strandveld. According to a more recent analysis (than that used for the NSBA 2011 listings) conducted by CapeNature Saldanha Flats Strandveld should be considered as Endangered under criterion A1 (loss of habitat). All of the powerline alternatives will pass through a substantial area containing Hopefield Sand Fynbos in good condition. This area has been determined as a Critical Biodiversity Area and is required to meet conservation targets for the region and is of high conservation value. Hopefield Sand Fynbos has also undergone an analysis by our conservation planner which showed that the vegetation should be listed</p>	<p>Alana Duffell-Canham Scientific Services, CapeNature Letter: 13-05-2016</p>	<p>1) Comment noted. A full flora impact assessment is being conducted as part of the EIA process.</p> <p>2) A detailed assessment of these impacts will form part of the EIA phase. Existing roads will be used as far as possible and this will be included as a requirement in the EMPr. Other mitigation measures in order to reduce impacts on sensitive vegetation will also be included in the EIAR and EMPr.</p> <p>3) A site-specific vegetation management plan will form part of the EMPr for the project.</p> <p>4) Comment noted. This information will be passed on to the botanist undertaking the flora study.</p> <p>5) Existing monitoring data will be obtained where possible and used to inform the EIA report.</p> <p>6) Noted. This information will be passed on to the avifauna specialist for consideration in the detailed</p>

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>as Vulnerable although it is very close to qualifying as Endangered under criterion A1 (remaining extent) and could possibly qualify as Endangered under criterion D1 (number of threatened species associated with this habitat). Other vegetation in the study area includes Saldanha Granite Strandveld and Saldanha Limestone Strandveld. Both of these vegetation types are threatened and are known to contain unique habitats and species assemblages and should therefore be avoided.</p> <p>2) Cumulative loss of habitat in the Saldanha region is of ever-increasing concern. This is due to the large number of developments underway including linear infrastructure such as roads and powerlines. Poor vegetation management under and in close proximity to power lines is one of the main causes of loss of biodiversity associated with power lines. Vegetation is often brush cut or mowed unnecessarily resulting in a loss of diversity over time. Even if an existing powerline route can be followed, this does not necessarily mean that the existing servitudes or access roads can be used as power lines have to be constructed a certain distance apart (as confirmed in the report). This means that a substantial amount of vegetation may be impacted on and result in further fragmentation of the landscape. This needs to be assessed in detail. It should be noted that Strandveld vegetation types are not prone to burning and once alien invasive species have been removed, the remaining</p>		<p>assessment.</p> <p>7) Comments noted as part of the process and will be considered in the process going forward.</p> <p>8) Comment noted. The relevant information will be used by the specialists in the EIA phase wherever possible.</p> <p>9) Comment noted. This requirement will be passed on to the avifauna specialist.</p> <p>10) Noted. A wetlands study is being conducted as part of the project. This information will be passed on to the wetlands specialist.</p> <p>11) Every effort will be made to avoid Critical Biodiversity Areas as far as possible. The flora impact assessment will contain mitigation measures and recommendations in this regard. Substation sites are selected based primarily on technical feasibility and avoidance of obvious environmental features.</p> <p>Regarding the substation site, the least sensitive site option will be selected through the EIA process. Also note that although the total size for the substation site will be 600x600m the actual development footprint will be less than this.</p> <p>Other powerline applications linked to Independent Power Producers (IPPs) in the area are not assessed as part of the strengthening project although cumulative</p>

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>natural vegetation should pose a low fire risk.</p> <p>3) It is recommended that a Vegetation Management Plan is compiled to address the management of the vegetation under the power line. CapeNature has initiated this process with Eskom Distribution and it needs to also be extended to Eskom Transmission. Adequate consideration needs to be given to the specific management requirements of the vegetation types through which the power line passes, and a generic vegetation management plan for entire country is not suitable, as appropriate vegetation management practices will differ greatly between biomes and even between different vegetation types.</p> <p>4) The powerline route options need to be thoroughly ground-truthed, preferably in early Spring when the more cryptic species are flowering (end July to early September) so that habitat condition can be assessed and the presence of Species of Conservation Concern (SCC) can be identified. Several SCC have been identified in the study area, especially in the Hopefield Sand Fynbos around Aurora substation. We note a few errors in the botanical scoping report including reference to the Gariiep Centre of Endemism and the Succulent Karoo region which is not relevant to this study.</p> <p>5) The proposed powerlines are located between two Important Bird Areas (IBAs), namely the Berg River</p>		<p>impacts will be investigated in the EIA phase. IPP projects will be required to have their own power lines and grid connection in order to be able to bid the project competitively and therefore the option of sharing lines is not possible for the IPP projects.</p>

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>Estuary and Langebaan Lagoon. Adequate monitoring of flight paths should be done as part of the study. Data should also be obtained from EWT with regard to any collision records from existing power lines in the area.</p> <p>6) Bird species which are relevant to the study area and must be considered for this project are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ludwig's Bustard (which is Endangered and shown to be under real threat from collision with powerlines) - Blue Crane (which is Near Threatened and shown to be under real threat from collision with powerlines) - Spotted Eagle Owl (which is Near Threatened and shown to be under real threat from collision and electrocution) - Lanner Falcon (which is Vulnerable and shown to be under real threat from collision and electrocution) - Greater and Lesser Flamingo (both Near Threatened and if passing through site are at real risk of collision with powerlines) - Black Harrier (which is Endangered and shown to be under real threat from collision with powerlines) - Southern Black Korhaan (which is Vulnerable and is threatened by habitat destruction as well as collision) - Secretarybird (which is Vulnerable and shown to 		

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>be under real threat from collision)</p> <p>7) With regard to potential impacts on avifauna, it is usually (but not always) better to locate new power lines close to existing power lines as this increases the visibility thus decreasing the risk of birds colliding with the power lines. However, this needs to be balanced against the loss of habitat. For example Alternative 1 mostly follows an existing powerline but it is also the longest route which passes through the most natural vegetation.</p> <p>8) There have been several other applications in the vicinity for renewable energy and power lines that will have information relevant to this project and will assist with determining likely impacts on avifauna. Please use this information.</p> <p>9) Mitigation measures proposed to reduce the risk of bird collision need to be feasible and applicable to the region.</p> <p>10) Wetland areas should also be ground-truthed towards the end of the rainy season (July-September) and these areas should generally be avoided. It should be noted that the FEPA mapping for this area has not been entirely accurate in the past with some artificial depressions of low conservation value being mapped as wetlands and other natural areas not being mapped at all.</p>		

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>11) In conclusion, at this stage, CapeNature is not able to indicate a preferred power line route or substation site as more detailed ground-truthing needs to be conducted. We do however request that every effort be made to avoid Critical Biodiversity Areas containing intact vegetation and that a highly detailed ecological study is conducted to determine the localities of Species of Conservation Concern so that these can be avoided. Substation footprints should be able to be located on previously disturbed land. It would also be beneficial if this application considers other powerline applications linked to Independent Power Producers (IPPs) in the area and investigate the possibility of sharing power lines instead of creating many different servitudes.</p> <p>CapeNature reserves the right to revise initial comments and request further information based on any additional information that may be received.</p>		
33.	<p>The Draft Scoping Report: Saldanha Bay Network Strengthening Project, Western Cape Province dated April 2016 refers.</p> <p>1) The Saldanha Bay Municipal area is a water scarce area and it would be preferable not to further modify its watercourses.</p> <p>2) The cumulative loss of habitat and further degradation within the Critical Biodiversity Areas in Saldanha Bay Municipality is a priority concern and it should be avoided, especially within vegetation</p>	<p>Nazeema Duarte Environmental Officer, Saldanha Bay Municipality</p> <p>Letter: 18-05-2016</p>	<p>1. Watercourses will only be modified if a road crossing is required. As far as possible the requirement for new access roads will be minimized.</p> <p>2. A full flora study is being conducted as part of the EIA process. The effects of the project on the CBA areas and how to manage these impacts will be of primary concern in this study.</p> <p>3. Noted.</p> <p>4. The Environment and Heritage Section of the Saldanha</p>

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>types which are considered to be endangered, critically endangered or vulnerable.</p> <p>3) Please include the Environment and Heritage Section of the Saldanha Bay Municipality on the database to be informed of any paleontological or archaeological discoveries.</p>		<p>Bay Municipality has been included in the project database as requested.</p>
34.	<p>If the existing line is expanded on then more Critical Biodiversity Areas (CBA) will be impacted on and destroyed.</p>	<p>Dale Wright BirdLife South Africa</p> <p>Meeting: 10-05-2016</p>	<p>Impacts could potentially be avoided if the new power line is constructed parallel to the exiting power line.</p>
35.	<p>The Hopefield sand fynbos located near the Aurora Substation is heavily impacted. It should be noted that this vegetation type is considered to be endangered although it is not listed.</p>	<p>Alana Duffell- Canham Scientific Services, CapeNature</p>	<p>It is noted that Hopefield sand fynbos is considered to be endangered. This information will be provided to the flora specialist. Sensitive vegetation types will be avoided as far as possible.</p>
36.	<p>Power line alternative 1 would have the most impacts from a botanical perspective as it traverses Critical Biodiversity Area (CBA). It would be preferred if the servitudes through the CBA were not widened as the CBA is already under pressure from development.</p>	<p>Meeting: 10-05-2016</p>	<p>Comment noted. As alternative corridors and broader study area have been considered in the scoping study, it will be possible to propose alternatives to avoid sensitive areas such as CBAs. CapeNature are welcome to propose alternative deviations which could be investigated further in the EIA phase.</p>
37.	<p>Species of conservation concern can be spanned and avoided by the power line. Botanical impacts can be reduced by 80% if the maintenance of servitudes and access roads is implemented correctly. Annual brush-cutting in the Western Cape is considered a no-go as the vegetation type is low.</p>		<p>Spanning of sensitive areas will be included as a recommendation in the EIA. Servitude maintenance measures will be provided in the EMP which will be included in the EIA Report.</p>
38.	<p>Who are the specialists which will be undertaking the flora, fauna and avifaunal studies? A significant amount of research has been undertaken and documented for</p>		<p>A team from Afzelia Environmental Consultants will conduct the flora, fauna and avifauna studies. The consultants are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Astika Bhugeloo – Vegetation Assessment

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	numerous projects proposed within the Saldanha Bay region. It is advisable that the specialists utilise these sources.		- Craig Widdows – Faunal Impact Assessment and Avifaunal Impact Assessment. The specialists are aware that a number of other projects are proposed for the area and that significant documentation exists which could inform their own studies.
39.	Are any of the proposed alternative power lines located within a Critical Biodiversity Area (CBA)?	Nazeema Duarte Environmental Officer, Saldanha Bay Local Municipality Meeting: 11-05-2016	All the power line routes do traverse some CBA areas. Power line development is not necessarily viewed as incompatible with CBAs as sensitive vegetation types can be avoided through careful planning. The EIA Report will demonstrate how impacts can be avoided and/or mitigated.
40.	Vegetation clearance is going to be an issue.	Ryno Pienaar Cape West Coast Biosphere Reserve Meeting: 12-05-2016	Vegetation clearance and management will be addressed in the EMPr which will be made available for review in the EIA phase of the project.
41.	Eskom has their own idea with vegetation management for the whole country and it doesn't work that way. They tend not to listen to anybody.	Martin Halvorsen Cape West Coast Biosphere Reserve Meeting: 12-05-2016	Vegetation clearance and management will be addressed in the EMPr which will be made available for review in the EIA phase of the project.
IMPACTS TO AVIFAUNA			
42.	Has Eskom undertaken any bird monitoring on the existing 400kV power line? It would be useful to look at the collision incidence reports.	Samantha Ralston & Dale Wright BirdLife South Africa	The Endangered Wildlife Trust (EWT) has been monitoring the existing power line on an adhoc basis. The EAP has recommended that the avifauna specialist use the existing monitoring information in the detailed

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
43.	Who is the avifauna specialist?	Meeting: 10-05-2016	assessment phase of the process.
			The consultancy undertaking the avifaunal impact assessment is Afzelia Environmental Consultants and the specialist's name is Craig Widdows.
44.	From a bird perspective we would prefer to have the power line running parallel to the existing power line.		It is noted that BirdLife prefer to have the power line routed parallel to the existing power lines.
45.	New infrastructure should not be constructed in a flight path.		It is noted that new power line infrastructure should not be constructed in existing bird flight paths.
46.	Are you planning to undertake field work as well?		The Scoping Report includes a desktop avifaunal assessment. Field work will be undertaken by the specialist in the EIA phase. This assessment will be included in the draft EIA Report which will be made available for public review.
47.	<p>It should be noted that Eskom and EWT are testing bird diverters that are visible at night. If there are significant concerns regarding the movement of water bird at night, then these diverters may be a suitable mitigation measure that could be considered for this project. EWT will be able to provide further information regarding this technology.</p> <p>BirdLife should be promoting the use of these diverters as best practice regardless of which power line will be preferred. I have heard of night time movements in this area.</p>		The avifaunal specialist has been informed of this research such that it can be considered in the assessment.
48.	Do the different types of pylons have varying impacts on birds?		<p>Most of the impacts to birds associated with 400kV power lines are connected to the power line earthwire itself and not the pylons.</p> <p>There are specific towers recommended for areas where impacts to birds are likely to occur. The types of pylons</p>

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
			will be by the local conditions and landowner requirements as well as specialist input. The line engineers will provide designs to mitigate the impacts to birds.
49.	From an avifaunal perspective, it would be preferable to construct the power line adjacent to the existing power line to reduce impacts to birds.	Alana Duffell-Canham Scientific Services, CapeNature Meeting: 10-05-2016	It is noted that CapeNature are of the opinion that impacts to birds would be reduced if the power line is constructed next to the existing power lines.
PROJECT NEED AND DESIRABILITY			
50.	Is the primary purpose to move the extra power coming into the grid from the renewable projects and other facilities from the Aurora Substation to one of the new substations to provide new industries with access to the grid?	Dale Wright BirdLife South Africa Meeting: 10-05-2016	There is currently not enough power in Saldanha Bay to supply the Saldanha Bay Industrial Development Zone (IDZ) and any other new developments with electricity. Therefore Eskom aim to increase supply of electricity to Saldanha through the upgrade of the network in the area.
51.	From an environmental perspective, we acknowledge that this is an IDZ area. We would rather have development focused and densified in specific areas then sprawling all over the landscape.		It is noted that BirdLife would rather have development focused and densified in specific areas.
52.	Ultimately what this project should do is to determine where the substation can be placed optimally so that other industries can link into it with a short power line.	Alana Duffell-Canham Scientific Services, Cape Nature Meeting: 10-05-2016	Other projects could potentially link into the substation or one of the 400kV transmission lines. The position of the substation is based on a number of technical and environmental feasibility constraints and aerial imagery analysis as well as ground trothing by the technical team.
53.	Why is the strengthening necessary? Someone from the IDZ came and told us there was still plenty of power in this area.	Hedwig Slabig Cape West Coast Biosphere Reserve	Eskom is planning for future need of the Saldanha area and the strengthening project must be implemented now in order to meet these.

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
		Meeting: 12-05-2016	
ALTERNATIVE POWER LINE AND SUBSTATION OPTIONS			
54.	Will a preferred alternative be recommended in the EIA Report?	Dale Wright BirdLife South Africa Meeting: 10-05-2016	The specialist recommendations will be considered and a preferred alternative will be recommended in the EIA Report. Two power lines will be constructed in one corridor. The preferred corridor will be recommended based on the outcome of the environmental assessments which will be undertaken in the EIA phase.
55.	Will the new substations tap into existing infrastructure or will new infrastructure be required to be constructed? Which one of the three substations will require the least additional infrastructure to be built? The preferred substation would depend on which one of the substations requires the least new build.		New servitudes will be required. The infrastructure required would also depend on which power line route is preferred. The preferred alternatives will be recommended based on environmental and technical considerations, including the requirement for additional infrastructure.
56.	Is it not possible to retrofit the existing power line to expand the capacity?		The existing line will remain and will still be used. One cannot add to the existing line to achieve the required capacity.
57.	On what criteria have you chosen the power line alternatives?	Cor van der Walt Land Use Management, Western Cape Department of Agriculture Meeting: 10-05-2016	The alternatives were selected by Eskom on the basis of technical considerations and high level environmental constraints. The logic behind power line alternative 1 is that it follows the existing power lines. Power line alternative 2 follows the R45 but does not follow cadastral boundaries. Power line alternative 3 follows the cadastral boundaries. Eskom has attempted to avoid major ecological or environmental sensitivities. The power lines are theoretical at this stage and deviations to the alternatives proposed within the broader study area considered can be considered in the detailed assessments.

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
58.	The visual impacts would be reduced if power line alternative 1 is constructed since there are existing power lines in the area.		Comment noted.
59.	Cultivated and irrigated lands and lands where intensive agricultural practices are implemented should be avoided as far as possible. It is noted that the area is primarily used for dry land cultivation therefore there would be no impact to the land by the proposed power lines and substations.		It is noted that the area is primarily used for dry land cultivation and that the proposed power line and substations would not have an impact to the agricultural potential of the land.
60.	I would recommend constructing the power lines along the cadastral boundaries to make it easier for farmers in terms of access and maintenance.		Comment noted. There are many variables to take into account so sometimes it is not possible to follow the cadastral boundaries for 100% of the route.
61.	Has a preferred alternative been selected as yet?		A preferred alternative has not been selected as yet. A preferred alternative will be selected based on the outcomes of the specialist studies undertaken.
62.	The electricity department of the Saldanha Bay Local Municipality (SBM) is interested in the placing of the substations and whether the Municipality would be able to connect to the substation in future.	Cassie du Preez Electricity Department, Saldanha Bay Municipality Meeting: 11-05-2016	The preferred location of the power lines and the substations will be presented in the EIA Report which will be sent to the Municipality for review and comment. Further consultation will take place in this regard during the EIA Phase. There should be capacity at the substation for connections for municipal projects into the future.
63.	Is it a case of electing one or more than one of these power lines?	Lt. Col. Tyrone King South African Airforce Base Langebaanweg	Only one preferred power line corridor would be recommended through the EIA process.
64.	Power line alternatives 2 and 3 are located in very close proximity to the air force base. The height of the pylon towers is also problematic.	Meeting: 11-05-2016	The pylon towers will be approximately 30 – 40 m high. Eskom can design the towers to be shorter if required. We will need an understanding of the take-off and landing directions. The power lines will be constructed in accordance with the South African Civil Aviation (CAA) requirements.

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
65.	Power line alternative 1 is most suitable from the air force's perspective.		Noted.
66.	I suggest a few route deviations.	Jaco Kotze Chairperson, Langebaan Ratepayers Association	The proposed power line alternatives are only proposals at this stage and there is still scope for changes within the broader study area. Mr Kotze's suggestion will be considered. It is also important to note that high voltage lines cannot be crossed. The suggestions will however be investigated as options for the EIA phase of the project.
67.	Alternative 1 is my preferred option. The viewshed is already spoilt. There is far less visual impact. I am also concerned about avian problems.	Meeting: 11-05-2016	Avifauna studies and visual assessments are being undertaken as part of the EIA. The specialists' recommendations will be considered when determining the preferred power line route alternative.
68.	I propose another variation on this Alternative 1.		The suggestion made will be considered in the EIA phase, as long as it is confirmed as a technically feasible option by Eskom.
69.	There is already infrastructure in this area along Alternative 1, especially access roads. So you will not need new roads. From an environmental perspective this is the best option.		The environmental cost of power line alternative 1 does seem to be preferred at this stage. However, this will be confirmed through the EIA studies to be undertaken.
70.	I want a motivation as to how these routes were chosen by Eskom. I want to see that in the scoping report.		The selection of the power line route alternatives was undertaken from a technical feasibility and cost perspective. Eskom have studied at the aerial imagery and selected the routes to avoid any obvious environmental sensitivities. This information is provided in section 2.2.1 of the Scoping Report.
71.	Regarding power line alternative 1, it must be noted that the corridor falls within the West Coast National Park buffer zone (Farms 183, 180 and 179 and 190). Although the buffer zone has been accepted by the Minister in terms of Section 57 of the National Environmental Management: Protected Areas Act (Act	Willem Louw Manager: Park Planning Development, SANParks	It is noted that power line alternative 1 falls within the West Coast National Park buffer zone and that the buffer zone does not have any legal standing as it has not been declared. It is noted that SANParks would not be impacted by the

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>No. 57 of 2003) (NEMPA) and it forms part of the West Coast National Management Plan, the buffer zone does not have any legal standing as it has not been declared.</p> <p>SANParks would not be impacted by this project at this stage as it does not have a direct impact on the West Coast National Park.</p>	<p>Meeting: 12-05-2016</p>	<p>project as it does not have a direct impact on the West Coast National Park.</p>
CUMULATIVE IMPACTS			
72.	<p>A key concern is the cumulative impact of the numerous projects and linear activities located within the Saldanha Bay Local Municipality. Will this project provide increased capacity to carry into the future? The construction of new smaller power lines should be avoided and strategic planning needs to be implemented to reduce cumulative impacts.</p>	<p>Alana Duffell-Canham Scientific Services, CapeNature</p> <p>Meeting: 10-05-2016</p>	<p>This project aims to strengthen Eskom's network to supply future developments in the broader Saldanha Bay area. A servitude for two 400kV power lines will be acquired within the identified preferred alternative corridor. The two power lines will initially operate at 132kV with the aim of operating at 400kV in 10 – 15 years' time. Both power lines are being constructed to accommodate future expansion requirements.</p> <p>Cumulative impacts associated with the proposed power line and substations will be evaluated in the EIA Report.</p> <p>The comments regarding strategic planning will be passed on Eskom.</p>
73.	<p>There are many developments proposed in the area that include the construction of power lines. The cumulative impacts resulting from these projects will need to be investigated. It would be preferable if linear infrastructure corridors were concentrated in one area.</p>	<p>Nazeema Duarte Environmental Officer, Saldanha Bay Local Municipality</p> <p>Meeting: 11-05-2016</p>	<p>Cumulative impacts associated with the proposed power line and substations will be evaluated in the EIA Report.</p>

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
PROJECT TIMEFRAMES			
74.	What are the project time lines?	Cassie du Preez Electricity Department, Saldanha Bay Municipality Meeting: 11-05- 2016	The EIA process will be completed in 2016. The project is a 10 – 15 year project. Eskom’s priority is to construct the distribution substation and the transmission power lines from the Auroura Substation to the new substation once the environmental authorisation has been received. The transmission substation will be constructed at a later stage.
PROJECT TECHNICAL DETAILS			
75.	HS: How wide is the total servitude going to be?	Hedwig Slabig Cape West Coast Biosphere Reserve	The servitude will be 110m, 55m for each 400kV power line.
GENERAL			
76.	The air force’s directorate for aviation safety would need to approve the power lines as well. Assessments are undertaken internally and in consultation with the CAA. The directorate for aviation safety has been informed of this proposal.	Lt. Col. Tyrone King South African Airforce Base Langebaanweg	Lt. Col. King is registered as an I&AP on the project’s database and will be kept informed of the EIA process.
77.	Please send through the minutes of the meeting so that I can forward them onto the SAAF in Pretoria. The EIA Report will also be sent to the Pretoria headquarters.	Meeting: 11-05- 2016	The minutes of the meeting were sent to Lt. Col. King on 31 May 2016.
78.	It should be noted that the air force base is also a divergent runway for commercial aircraft such as SA Airlink, SA Express and Mango.		It is noted that the air force base is a divergent runway for commercial aircraft.
79.	It is a pity that this map doesn’t have the topography on it.	Jaco Kotze Chairperson, Langebaan Residents and Rate Payers Association	The visual impact assessment will include a map depicting the topography of the study area.

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
		Meeting: 11-05-2016	
80.	When it comes to working in the servitude the contractors must use 90% local unskilled / semi-skilled labour. People have been trained on alien control. We don't want the contractors bringing in their crews. And we don't want vehicles with foreign registrations.	Keith Harrison West Coast Bird Club Meeting: 12-05-2016	The employment of local people to maintain the servitudes will be included as a requirement in the EMP.
81.	Who will be paying for this project? Are our taxes going to increase.	Sharon February Cape West Coast Biosphere Reserve Meeting: 12-05-2016	Eskom is funding the project.
82.	Environmental offsets. We always make similar points. Under the lines Eskom must adhere to certain principals but they don't always do that. They must appoint ECOs to monitor this.	Martin Halvorsen Cape West Coast Biosphere Reserve Meeting: 12-05-2016	ECOs can be appointed independently for the construction phase. This is a requirement of the EMP and will be a requirement of the Environmental Authorisation should the project be authorised. Environmental management during operation and maintenance will be ensured by Eskom's Environmental Manager for the area.