

MINUTES

PROPOSED FORSKOR-MERNSKY 275KV±130KM POWERLINE AND ASSOCIATED SUBSTATION WORKS

Meeting Details

Date: 27 th November 2012	Time: 01:00- 12H00
Venue: Kruger 2 Canyon Offices	Re: Focus Group Meeting
Consultant: Nsovo Environmental Consultants	Munyadziwa Rikhotso
Proponent: Eskom Transmission:	Henry Nawa Phuti Makweya Thamsanqa Ngcobo

Attendance Register

The register is attached as Annexure A.

Purpose of the Meeting:

- Discuss the Final EIR
- Outline and discuss the way forward

Presentation by:

- Mrs Munyadziwa Rikhotso presented the findings of the EIA report with focus on a comparative analysis of the different routes including route 5 and made recommendations.

General Comment

The focus group meeting was requested during the EIA meeting held in September by the landowners in and around Hoedspruit. The meeting was arranged accordingly and the minutes as recorded hereunder are the reflection of the presentation and discussion of the meeting held with attending stakeholders.

The minutes are not written as verbatim pronouncement but merely as summary of what was said. Hence questions, comments and issues raised at the meeting are not linked to particular persons.

ITEM	PRESENTATION
Welcome and Introductions	MR officially welcomed all in attendance and requested that each attendee completes the register.

Presentation	Ms Rikhotso presented the findings of the EIA and discussed in detail the alternatives with emphasis on the comparative analysis of the 5 alternatives that were under consideration. She also highlighted the finding of the specialist as well as their recommendations.
--------------	--

ISSUES AND RESPONSE	
QUESTIONS/ISSUES/COMMENTS RAISED <i>(Not linked to specific individuals)</i>	RESPONSE
On opening of the meeting a member of the panel sort to understand Nsovo's Role and why the interested and affected parties need to go through Nsovo and not communicate with the applicant (Eskom) directly.	Nsovo responded that Nsovo is an independent consultant whose role is to liaise with the authorities as well as the I&As. Mr Craig Ferguson added by explaining the EIA process and the roles of different parties.
Commented on the minutes of the previous meeting highlighting that the venue on the minutes was incorrect.	Nsovo apologized for not writing the correct venue details on the minutes and requested that they comment more on the contents as the venue was a typo. Following which the I&As raised no further comments on the contents.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I&As requested that the time to review the report and the minutes be extended to enable them to comment meaningful as well as to contact their legal representatives and other affected parties. - They further highlighted the report was only received a few days before the meeting, therefore they would not be able to participate meaningfully as they could not go through the report. 	<p>Nsovo responded that the purpose of the meeting was to guide the I&As through the report given that the report is revised version of what they have already gone through in detail. To summarise the report and key findings. The attendees concurred.</p> <p>Nsovo in agreement with HN from Eskom further agreed to the extension of the review period by agreeing to allow for a 40 days + review period, i.e. until 27th January 2013.</p>
<p>Comments raised on the comparative analysis presented included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concerned about the extent of the impact of resettlement of the community in Finale and Diphuthi, noting that it has adverse effects. - Raised that a double circuit be use instead of the proposed single circuit to reduce the impact. 	<p>Nsovo agreed that the impact is fairly severe and further agreed that they will advise the specialist to relook at impact. Nsovo further added that it could be for that same reason that the specialist opted for alternative 5.</p> <p>TN raised that as discussed at the last meeting, the existing line is not designed to carry double circuits</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - -Raised that power generation be implemented in Phalaborwa as a solution to avoid impacting on farms. - -Raised a concern that the proposed development can compromise the hunting industry. - Concern on the electromagnetic fields. <p>Attendees agreed that route 5 avoid cutting across the game farms but runs along the edges.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Asked how Eskom would compensate the landowners. - Concerned about the comparative table ratings. - Queried the required distance between the line and the residence. 	<p>TN responded that power generation at such scale is highly unlikely. The 2nd Foskop-Merensky line remains the best solution to reinforce the Phalaborwa area. One of the attendees added that the suggestion would be an unlikely solution as its not feasible nor practical.</p> <p>Nsovo responded that that the reason input from specialist was sought. The idea was to ensure that proper mitigation is put in place.</p> <p>Nsovo responded that a specialist report has been attached that addresses that issue, She further highlighted that the long term impact remains unknown.</p> <p>MR concurred.</p> <p>PM responded that Eskom would purchase the servitude on a market price which would be assessed by the land surveyors and negotiated with the landowner.</p> <p>MR agreed to review the table.</p> <p>The servitude is 47m wide and the construction of dwellings is not allowed within the servitude. Normally it is recommended that other structures are erected 10m away from the servitude.</p>
<p>Recommendations included:</p> <p>That the table be updated That the buffer be 3m and not 6m That a map depicting the recommended route be included in the report</p>	<p>The report was updated and the issue of buffers clarified.</p>
<p>MR requested that the attendees revisit the issues and response report to confirm if the issues are accurately addressed.</p>	<p>The attendees responded that they would check and confirm in writing if anything.</p>

MR further asked the attendees what method of submitting the report would suite them. She further suggested that she would send them individual emails with the link and would post the report on the Nsovo website.	The link was forwarded to the attendees as requested.
--	---

Way Forward

- The attendees where advised that the closing date to comment on the project is the 27th January 2012
- The attendees where further advised that after the comment period the Final Environmental Impact Report will be compiled and submitted to DEA for a decision and that all registered stakeholders will be informed of the decision of the authority and information on how to appeal will be circulated.