



## MEETING MINUTES

<b>Purpose of Meeting:</b>	Eskom – Hendrina Ash Dams EIA – Pre-Application Authorities Meeting
<b>Venue:</b>	DEA Offices, Pretoria, c/o van der Walt and Pretorius Streets, South Tower, 4 <sup>th</sup> Floor
<b>Date:</b>	7 December 2010

Attendance Register			
Name	Company	Cell:	Email
<b>Attendees:</b>			
Ashlea Strong (AS)	Lidwala SA	082 786 7819	astrong@lidwala.com
Tobile Bokwe (TB)	Eskom	082 828 1777	Tobile.Bokwe@eskom.co.za
Nozi Mabafokeng Nkoe (NMN)	Eskom	082 974 3839	nozimabafokeng.nkoe@eskom.co.za
Pumeza Skepe-Mngcita (PS)	DEA: EIA	-	pskepe@environment.gov.za
Zingisa Phohlo (ZP)	DEA:Permitting (Waste:Licensing Section)	-	zphohlo@environment.gov.za
<b>Apologies:</b>			
Nicolene Venter (NV)	SIVEST	083 377 9112	
Frank van der Kooy (FvdK)	Lidwala SA	082 890 1918	environmental@lidwala.com
Coenrad Agenbach	DEA:EIA	-	cagenbach@environment.gov.za
Lucas Mahlangu	DEA:Permitting Waste:Licensing Section)	-	lmahlangu@environment.gov.za
Mpho Tshitangoni	DEA:Permitting Waste:Licensing Section)	-	mtshitangoni@environment.gov.za

Item	Actions	Action by whom	Action by when
<b>1.</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION / WELCOME</b>		
	AS welcomed everyone and thanked them for putting time aside for this meeting. AS also stated that she would move through the proceedings fairly quickly so as not to waste time.		
	AS asked everyone to introduce themselves.		

<b>2</b>	<b>BACKGROUND TO THE PROJECT</b>		
<b>2.1.</b>	AS presented a summary background of the Hendrina Ash Dam Extension project, including information regarding the Hendrina Power Station, the need for the project as well as the identified listed activities to date (accepting that the exact detail of the project has not been finalised eg. If its will be wet ashing/dry ashing/hybrid ashing. Hence the potential for increasing the number of listed activities was presented of which if there any new listed activities identified while the EIA study carries on they will be covered in the final EIA).		
<b>2.2.</b>	ZP queried plans for the 2 dams (Dams 1 & 4) that have reached capacity. She asked what Eskom would normally do with the dams? She stated that she would advise Eskom to include the closure/decommissioning of those two dams into the EIA. The closure could be issued a separate license, however the information can be included in the ash dam EIA.	<b>Eskom</b>	<b>Jan 2011</b>
<b>2.3.</b>	TB stated that in terms of the closure / end use plans, ash dams are rehabilitated through revegetation and monitoring systems are continued to monitor the groundwater pollution.		
<b>2.4.</b>	In terms of the activities it was noted that the list presented was merely an initial indications of activities. It was noted that additional activities would indeed need to be added once a full project description is provided. It was also noted that additional activities may need to be added later in the process such as during the EIA phase in order to capture activities specific to relevant preferred activities.	<b>AS</b>	<b>Ongoing – before June 2011</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>INTEGRATED EIA / WASTE LICENSE PROCESS</b>		
<b>3.1.</b>	In terms of the authorities involved in the process, DWA will be moved up in the diagram to just under DEA:Permitting as a co-authorising authority as DEA: Permitting Licensing requires DWA's go-ahead before issuing an authorisation. DWA will have specific input into the designs and the geo-hydrological information of the application.	<b>AS</b>	<b>Jan 2011</b>
	DWA also require 60 days for the review of reports		
	TB and AS touched on the principal of DEA utilising the 30 day public review period as part of their 60 day review (utilising the draft report). DEA stated that this would need to be discussed later with the relevant case officers, and would ultimately depend on their work load at that stage. DEA:Permitting stated that it may not suit them	<b>AS and Eskom</b>	<b>Jan 2011</b>

	due to the fact that they are a very small team.		
	AS discussed the upfront ideas of the integrated process, looking at the different ways various departments require for submissions being made and asked DEA to clarify their integrated process.		
	PS stated that DEA have a new unit – Integrated Permit Systems – they utilise a new integrated application form and issue one Reference number and Licence for the project. The form is submitted through DEA: EIA offices.		
	AS requested DEA to send the new form. PS stated that she would ask admin to send it through to AS and its also available on website which changed to www.environment.gov.org.	<b>DEA</b>	<b>Dec 2010</b>
	In addition to the integrated application, an integrated authorisation is also issued		
	AS touched on the areas where interaction with DEA is foreseen during the process, i.e. this pre-application meeting, a presentation of the final scoping report and a presentation of the final EIA report and other documents. AS asked DEA if they would also like some input into the screening process – which would be undertaken before scoping and included in the scoping report. PS and ZP agreed that this would be helpful – especially for the case officers.		
<b>4</b>	<b>GENERAL DISCUSSION</b>		
<b>4.1.</b>	AS asked DEA if they would like a site visit and if so – when would be most appropriate for them. AS touched on the fact that different authorities prefer to visit the site at different stages. DEA stated that they would prefer to visit during the scoping phase, possible once the draft report is out for public review.	<b>AS</b>	<b>May 2011</b>
<b>4.2.</b>	PS stated that DEA would require 4 colour copies of the report and an electronic copy (1 for waste, 2 for DWA, 1 for EIA)	<b>AS</b>	<b>Ongoing</b>
<b>4.3.</b>	AS asked if one authorisation is granted what happens in future should there be any amendments required.  ZP stated that, in case of amendments within the integrated authorization that will have to be amended as per a particular section needing amendment		
<b>10</b>	<b>CLOSURE</b>		
	AS closed the meeting and wished everyone a wonderful Christmas and new year.		

Minuted by: Ashlea Strong