ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE PROPOSED MATIMBA – WITKOP TRANSMISSION LINE PROJECT: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESS

STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP

5 MARCH 2002

10:00

PIETERSBURG CLUB, PROTEA ROOM, PIETERSBURG

DRAFT MINUTES

NOTE

We request you to verify whether your comments were captured correctly.

Kindly notify Ms. Ingrid Snyman within fourteen (14) days of receipt of this document if any of your comments are not portrayed correctly or if you would like to provide the consultants with additional inputs regarding the proposed project. You are welcome to make changes directly on the document and fax it to Bohlweki Environmental at (011) 805 0226.

For more information on the project and progress you are welcome to contact the public participation consultants.

NOTA

Ons versoek u om die notule na te gaan om te verseker dat u kommentaar korrek genotuleer is.

Verwittig Me. Ingrid Snyman asb. binne veertien (14) dae na ontvangs van die dokument indien daar foute in die voorlopige notule is, of indien u verdere insette aan die konsultante rakende die voorgestelde projek wil verskaf. U is welkom om veranderinge op die dokument aan te bring en aan Bohlweki Environmental te faks by (011) 805 0226.

U is welkom om die openbare deelname konsultante te kontak vir enige verdere navrae aangaande die projek

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE PROPOSED MATIMBA – WITKOP TRANSMISSION LINE PROJECT: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESS

STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP

5 MARCH 2002

10:00

PIETERSBURG CLUB, PROTEA ROOM, PIETERSBURG

DRAFT MINUTES

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

Ms. J. Thomas of Bohlweki Environmental opened the meeting at 10:30 and welcomed the attendants. She introduced Ms. I. Snyman and Mr. G. Magangane of Bohlweki Environmental, as well as Mr. J. Geeringh, Ms. C. Streaton and Mr. C. Vuso of Eskom. She explained that the purpose of the meeting was to:

- Provide a brief overview of the EIA process followed for this project;
- Present the findings of the draft report;
- Receive feedback from key stakeholders; and
- Provide details regarding the way forward.

2. APOLOGIES

The following apologies were received:

- Mr. J. Thorp (Marken Farmers Union & Twiga Wildlife Santuary);
- Mr. B. Crots (Marken Farmers Union: Chairperson);
- Mr. T. Theron (Transvaal Agricultural Union (TAU): Regional Manager);
- Mr. P. Mockford (TAU & Mockford Farms);
- Mr. J. Eckard (TAU: District Chairperson);
- Mr. H. Pretorius (Ellisras Farmers Union);
- Mr. D. de Ridder (Lephalale Municipality: Town Planner);
- Ms. S. Letsoalo (Department of Land Affairs: Provincial Director);
- Mr. M. Malisela (Department of Land Affairs: Deputy Director: Planning);
- Mr. G. Engelbrecht (Department of Agriculture);
- Mr. W. Booysen;
- Mr. P. van Zyl (Agri-North: President); and
- Mr. C. Mkwalo (DWAF: Social and Ecological Services).

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The draft agenda was approved.

4. BACKGROUND TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Ms. J. Thomas explained that the peak electricity load required in the greater Pietersburg area is expected to increase significantly within the next year due to the emergence of new mines in the area. The temporary loss of power transmission through one of the existing 400 kV Transmission lines supplying Witkop Substation due to failure, or the line being temporarily being taken out of service for maintenance, will result in power-outages as one 400 kV Transmission line cannot supply the required load alone. In order to improve and maintain the electricity supply to the greater Pietersburg area, a new Matimba-Witkop 400 kV Transmission line is required.

The distance between the Matimba and Witkop Substations is approximately 250 km and a 55 m wide servitude is required between these two substations to accommodate the proposed 400 kV Transmission line. Feasible alternate route corridors for the new 400 kV Transmission line have been identified with Eskom and the consultants, as well as from inputs from I&APs, within a broader study area between the Matimba and Witkop Substations. Both the existing Matimba and Witkop Substations will require an additional 400 kV line feeder bay for the new Transmission line, but these extensions to the substations can be accommodated within the existing Eskom property boundaries.

Ms. J. Thomas discussed the study area by means of a map. She noted that one alternative was to follow the existing Matimba-Witkop Transmission line. She indicated the Waterberg Biosphere area in that corridor was identified as a sensitive area. Another alternative that was identified skirts the Masebe Nature Reserve along the Marken Road to join the existing line again. A sub-alternative of that was that the line could break off at any point within the study area to again join the existing line. An additional alternative, approximately 1 km to the south of the existing line was also looked at. The environmental studies considered the entire study area.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT PROCESS

The environmental studies for the project are being undertaken in two phases, namely the Environmental Scoping Phase and the detailed Environmental Impact Assessment Phase. The Environmental Scoping Study has now been completed, and an Environmental Scoping Report has been compiled and is available for public review in a number of public places. The public review period is currently under way and finishes on 15 March 2002. Public meetings were held during this review period. After the public review period, a final Scoping Report will be submitted to the National Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism (DEAT) before continuing with phase two.

Within the EIA phase, detailed specialist studies will be undertaken within the identified corridors. The public participation process will continue throughout the EIA process. Final recommendations regarding the proposed project will be made within the EIA Report that will again be submitted to the DEAT for their review and approval.

Ms. J. Thomas said that the aim of the Environmental Scoping Study was to:

- Identify potential impacts;
- Describe alternatives identified;
- Scope & evaluate preferred corridors; and
- Make recommendations regarding studies required within the EIA.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESS

Ms. I. Snyman explained that, in terms of the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations, a public participation process was required. The objectives of such a process were to:

- Promote transparency and trust between the consultants, project proponent and I&APs;
- Promote understanding of the project and/or its consequences to ensure informed decision making;
- Serve as a structure for liaison and consultation with the I&APs;
- Serve as a vehicle for data gathering (SIA); and
- Assist in the identification of potential alternatives.

The public participation activities undertaken during the Scoping Phase were the following:

- The development of a database of Interested and Affected Parties (I&APs) within the identified corridors by means of a deeds search;
- Placing of advertisements in the local newspapers to invite I&APs to become involved in the process and to invite them to attend the public participation sessions;
- The distribution of a briefing paper which contained information regarding the project, process to be followed and a map of the study area;
- Focus group meetings with organised groupings;
- Compilation of an Issues Trail containing the issues, comments and concerns received during the process and which formed part of the Environmental Scoping Report;
- The stakeholder workshop; and
- Public feedback meetings in Ellisras, Marken, Pietersburg and the Bakenberg area.

7. FEEDBACK ON THE FINDINGS OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL SCOPING REPORT

Ms. J. Thomas highlighted the following issues identified within the Scoping Study:

- Climate and atmospheric conditions potentially has an impact on the Transmission line. The local climate is dry and it is anticipated to have little impact on the line, but wind speeds and possible pollution that could cause stress and operational problems also have to be taken into account. Eskom requested detailed studies on these aspects and recommendations based on the assessment of local climate and atmospheric conditions will feed into the design of the line.
- Topography: The potential impacts are anticipated to be restricted to the foundation areas associated with the tower positions, as well as to the access roads, mainly as a result of erosion. These are expected to have a low significance, but the impacts will be addressed by site-specific investigations. Appropriate mitigation measures will be included in the Environmental Management Plan (EMP).
- The potential impacts regarding soils and the agricultural potential of the study area are anticipated to be restricted to the tower positions and access roads, especially during the construction, stabilisation and re-enforcement activities as a result of erosion. The loss of agricultural potential as a result of the tower placement is localized, except in areas where pivot irrigation is used. Dryland agriculture is limited in the study area due to the low rainfall, and it is therefore expected that the proposed Transmission line will have a limited impact on the agricultural potential. Detailed studies regarding soils and the agricultural potential are to be

undertaken within the EIA and recommendations about site-specific detail will be included in the EMP.

- Flora and fauna: The Waterberg Biosphere area, traversed by Corridor 1, was identified as a potentially sensitive area due to the high floral and habitat diversity that occur in this area. The vegetation along Corridor 2 was identified as being less sensitive. However, it was recommended that detailed surveys be undertaken within the corridors for the EIA. Once the final alignment has been determined, a detailed survey of the route will be undertaken for input into the EMP.
- In terms of avifauna (birds), impacts occur as a result of bird collisions with the earth wire. Other impacts include disturbance to large birds (such as eagles) breeding on the existing line and habitat disturbance during construction and maintenance. Detailed surveys should be undertaken during the EIA phase and the sensitive areas must be identified and mapped so that mitigation measures can be implemented. Once the final alignment has been determined, the specialist will again provide input to specific areas where mitigation is required.
- The potential impacts regarding surface water are anticipated to mainly occur during the construction phase as a result of surface water pollution and sedimentation. These impacts are expected to be neglible, due to the implementation of appropriate management plans. It is recommended that the EMP address site-specific mitigation.

The social issues identified during the Scoping Phase include:

- Land Use: Sensitive areas were identified along the northern corridor (Corridor 1) due to the proximity of communities and settlements to the proposed Transmission line. The line may require relocation in these areas. In the Waterberg Biosphere and other reserves there might also be an impact on the conservation land use. Detailed studies and planning will therefore be undertaken within the EIA (including liaison with the communities and the local authorities).
- Sites of archaeological, cultural and historical significance: A number of potentially sensitive sites have been identified from the desk-top study undertaken. A detailed survey of the identified corridors will be undertaken within the EIA in order to determine the occurrence and sensitivity of these sites. A survey of the final route will be undertaken to ensure that the final placement of the towers avoid these sensitive areas and recommendations will be made which will be included in the EMP.
- Visual and aesthetic aspects are the issues mostly raised with regards to power lines. The Scoping Study found that if the proposed line follows the existing line or other linear developments (e.g. roads), the impact will be of low significance. In areas where there is no existing line or linear developments, the impact is considered to be moderate to high. Therefore it is recommended that a detailed visual assessment be undertaken within the EIA to make recommendations. Site-specific detail will be included in the EMP.
- I&APs in the study area raised the issue of impacts on tourism potential. The Scoping Study found that there will be no impact on the reserves or facilities which are removed from the line. Potential short-term impacts during the construction phase are anticipated on tourism operations located in close proximity to the area of construction along the final alignment. Potential long-term impacts are expected on the visual quality within a proclaimed or established conservation landscape. Corridor 2 is the preferred corridor alignment in terms of tourism potential, as it bypasses core portions of the Waterberg Biosphere Reserve, and only marginally impacts on the Masebe Nature Reserve as it skirts its boundaries rather than traverses it, resulting in reduced impacts on the visual quality of the conservation landscapes. Development along Corridor 1

should be in parallel only in order to reduce the visual impacts, particularly where the Waterberg Biosphere Reserve is traversed, and therefore retain the tourism potential of that area. It is, therefore, recommended that a detailed investigation be done on the potentially sensitive areas to recommend appropriate mitigation.

The Environmental Scoping Study identified a number of potentially significant issues and made the following key recommendations:

- The potentially significant issues require further investigation during the EIA;
- The significance of these issues should be assessed and recommendations must be made to address these;
- The studies are to be undertaken within the identified corridors; and
- The placement of a new Transmission line along Corridor 2 is favoured for the western section of the route up to the eastern side of Masebe Nature Reserve, at the Mogalakwena River. This corridor is considered to have a reduced impact on the biophysical and aesthetic environment, primarily as it eliminates the need to traverse the Waterberg Biosphere Reserve area through the narrow mountainous neck south of Masebe Nature Reserve. Corridor 2 does, however, exhibit impacts on the social environment, which are required to be investigated in further detail in the EIA.

The specialists involved in the studies are:

- Climate and Atmospheric Conditions: Peter Illgner of Rhodes University;
- Topography: Karen Kück of Bohlweki Environmental;
- Soils and agricultural potential: Garry Paterson of the Agricultural Research Council;
- Fauna and flora: Joggie van Staden of Bohlweki Environmental;
- Avifauna: Chris van Rooyen of the Endangered Wildlife Trust;
- Surface and Groundwater: Karen Kück of Bohlweki Environmental;
- Land-Use: Plan Practice;
- Visual and Aesthetics: Henry Holland;
- Archaeological: Stephen Gaiger of Archaeo-Info Northern Province; and
- Tourism: Grahame Thompson of Seaton Thomson and Associates;

Bohlweki Environmental will manage the specialist studies, and will be responsible for the compilation of the EIA Report.

In terms of the way forward the following were noted:

- The public participation process will continue throughout the study;
- Final recommendations will be made and included in the draft EIR;
- The draft EIR will be made available for public review for a period of thirty days;
- After the public review period a final report will be submitted to the authorities for their review and decision-making.

TECHNICAL DETAILS OF TRANSMISSION LINES AND ESKOM'S CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITIES

Ms. C. Streaton of Eskom thanked the attendants for being at the meeting. She explained that it was important for Eskom to get the inputs of the role-players and to listen to the problems that they were currently experiencing with power lines on their properties. She said that she would like the farmers to highlight any of these issues so that she could take it up with the line servitude managers at Eskom to ensure that these problems would immediately be addressed.

Ms. C. Streaton indicated that she would explain and discuss Eskom's new management and environmental policy by sharing the latest Transmission line construction process undertaken by Eskom between Arnot and Maputo. Eskom have had a lot of historical problems with their power lines, but their new policy is to mitigate any adverse impacts, and to ensure that the environmental impacts are kept to the minimum. The building of a power line is a listed activity in terms of the Environment Conservation Act, and Eskom have to undertake an Environmental Impact Assessment prior to the construction of such a line. An environmental control officer will be appointed to oversee the construction process and to ensure that the contractor is adhering to the Environmental Management Plan (EMP).

Ms. C. Streaton discussed the following with the attendants by means of a slide show:

- Access roads and construction camps;
- Tower types and foundations;
- The erection of a power line;
- Bush clearings and stringing;
- Environmental impacts on the power line and the impact of a power line on the environment;
- Agriculture and plantations; and
- Archaeology and landscaping.

Ms. C. Streaton explained that Eskom like to keep the construction of access roads to a minimum and rather use the existing infrastructure, as the construction and maintenance of these roads is very costly and creates another potential for erosion.

An independent contractor will be appointed to undertake the construction of the power line. The construction camps for a Transmission line will comprise of a big area, as a large workforce will be involved. The location of the camp/s will be negotiated with the landowner. Eskom require the assistance of the individual landowners in order to ensure that the construction process is successful. Eskom, however, have certain rules that the contractors have to abide by which include the handling of waste, water usage, etc. These guidelines will be stipulated in the Environmental Management Plan and will also be included in the tender documentation, so that the contractors can include the cost of these activities in their budgets.

Ms. C. Streaton showed and explained the new cross rope suspension towers. These are visually less intrusive than the freestanding towers that were usually erected. The freestanding towers are nowadays only used on the bend points. A compact cross rope will be used where there is less space available to erect the tower, as the mast footings are closer together than the other type of towers. These towers, however, are difficult for live-line maintenance and Eskom only use these when necessary.

Ms. C. Streaton showed the attendants the type of machinery used to dig the foundations, but mentioned that, in areas where access to the tower locations was difficult, the foundations would be

dug by hand. Eskom then transports the rest of the material by helicopter. The excavations at the tower locations are protected to avoid people and animals falling into these. Sometimes special measures are taken on game farms to keep animals away from the footings of the towers. The construction of the various towers will take place in the field, as these are not taken to the site already erected. In a dense area, a space will have to be cleared to actually put the tower together. Huge cranes and helicopters are used to construct these. The clearance needed to string a line is between 8-12 meters in the centre of the servitude. A pilot cable will be put over each structure and the conductors will then be pulled up. The conductors are sensitive and should not touch the ground.

Sometimes servitudes are cleared completely so that the farmers can use this area as fire breaks, but Eskom usually so not clear the entire servitude area. Indigenous grasses will be kept and a veld specialist will assist Eskom in managing the various servitudes by indicating which problem plants, that could cause a fire risk, should be removed or which should be cut down. To ensure the success of the programme, Eskom aims to integrate their management plan with the management plan of the landowners. Ms. C. Streaton showed the attendants photographs of the clearing methods used on the Arnot – Maputo line and where indigenous bush and specific trees were left underneath the lines. It was emphasised that Eskom will support the rehabilitation of the areas to its ideal habitat and will specifically try to prevent the growth of sickle bush in the Bushveld area.

Ms. C. Streaton explained the stringing methods used and indicated the type of machinery that would be used during the construction process.

The power lines have a potential environmental impact on the wildlife, as there are birds that occassionaly collide with the earthwire, but fortunately not a lot of electrocutions of birds occurrs. Eskom is currently undertaking research to improve the markers on the line so that these were more visible to the birds. Lights could put up in areas where a lot of birds would be flying around at night. Eskom also recently launched a project to prevent vultures and large bird species (e.g. herons and hadedas) from sitting on top of the critical areas near the insulator strings of the power line, as the birds could produce streamers that resulted in shorts. The birds are not affected, but Eskom experiences a dip on the system that creates numerous problems for dip sensitive customers. These dips cost the country approximately R26 million per year. Another example of where the environment impacts on Eskom is in areas where the birds chew on the wires, creating a lot of damage.

In areas where light aircraft pass close to the line, or crop spraying takes place, spheres are also put on the line to make it more visible.

Where the line will cut though plantations, some trees (an area of 27,5 meters on either side of the centre line) will be trimmed to approximately 5 meters in height to allow the line to pass. Negotiations regarding these aspects will be undertaken with each landowner and the conditions will be stipulated. These servitudes in the plantations are also used as firebreaks by e.g. Sappi and Mondi.

A desktop study will be undertaken at the beginning of the EIA process in order to identify any historical and archaeological sites. A registered archaeologist will undertake an in-depth study once the tower locations have been finalised. Eskom will obtain a permit from SAHRA before construction starts and will put mitigation measures in place to prevent any possible damage to these sites.

Ms. C. Streaton outlined the methods in which roads, which were required only for construction, were rehabilitated to limit any potential erosion.

9. FEEDBACK REGARDING THE KEY ISSUES RAISED AT THE PUBLIC MEETINGS

Ms. I. Snyman provided the attendants with the key issues and concerns that were raised during the public meetings held in Ellisras, Marken and Pietersburg in February 2002, namely:

- Pietersburg area:
  - There are a number of existing lines in the area surrounding the Witkop Substation, and the study area therefore has to be broadened.
  - The impact of the power lines on the fertility of the animals;
  - Farmers requested that their properties be visited to fully understand the problems currently experienced with the existing line;
  - Some farmers are not in favour of the line traversing their properties as they already have power lines crossing their properties.
- Marken area:
  - The impact of the power lines on the fertility of the animals;
  - The visual impact of the line;
  - The compensation method;
  - The devaluation of the property values due to the power line; and
  - The possible impact on wildlife and eco-tourism activities.
- Ellisras area:
  - The Ellisras Farmers Union suggested that the new power line be constructed next to the existing 400 kV line (in their area of jurisdiction);
  - The possible impact on wildlife and eco-tourism activities;
  - The impact of the power lines on the fertility of the animals;
  - The compensation method;
  - The devaluation of the property values due to the power line;
  - Stress placed on wildlife during the construction phase; and
  - Poor maintenance of the servitudes and clearing methods.

Mr. G. Magangane indicated that the main issues raised at the public meeting held in the Bakenberg area were:

- The new power line should run in parallel with the existing line;
- The Tribal Authority and Kgosi welcomed the line;
- Problems were experienced with the distribution lines, which need to be addressed.

10. DISCUSSION SESSION

9.1 What would be done with other existing infrastructure along the route alignment? Mr. J. Geeringh replied that the other major government departments are informed of the proposed development through the South African Right of Way Association (SARWA) to obtain their inputs. Once the preferred corridor or final alignment has been finalised, planning in terms of e.g. crossing or roads, pipelines etc. will be undertaken in conjunction with these departments to get their permission to

cross their infrastructure. It was a standard procedure followed by Eskom.

9.2 How are the mines involved? Mr. J. Geeringh said that information is distributed to the Department of Minerals and Energy as the holder of the mineral rights, so that they can indicate any future mining activities. The owners of existing infrastructure are also contacted e.g. private mines. More detailed consultation with these I&APs are undertaken once the final alignment has been approved. During the studies the specialists obtain a great deal of local information from the various communities and, therefore, most of the issues are addressed in the EIA.

9.3 Mr. V. Matabane: DEAT wanted to know whether there were issues raised regarding possible alternative alignments during the public participation meetings that were held. Ms. I. Snyman replied that the consultants did get comments from members of the Waterberg Biosphere and Waterberg Nature Conservancy during focus group meetings held with them. They suggested an alignment that bypasses the Biosphere area which was incorporated into the studies.

9.4 Ms. A. de Klerk: DFEAT (Manager: Eco-Tourism) noted that the Waterberg Biosphere was a joint initiative between the National, Provincial, Local Government and private landowners. They did not want to exclude development, but the way in which development was undertaken was important to them. Even if the Biosphere was not a proclaimed area it would have some value that had to be conserved. The main hot spot is the mountainous area where water management was critical. The area was also earmarked and prioritised for tourism activities focusing on eco-tourism and the involvement of the local communities. These communities would, therefore, benefit from this initiative.

9.5 Ms. A. de Klerk: DFEAT (Manager: Eco-Tourism) stated that the main concerns of the Waterberg Biosphere was in terms of the visual impact on the core area, as well as the impact on the fauna, flora and archaeological sites. One can assume that one would find more archaeological sites when an in-depth study is undertaken, as there were already a lot of these sites identified in the area.

9.6 Mr. M. Kotze: Rhinoland said that they have a 14 000 ha area with numerous animal species (e.g. elephant, black rhino etc.) and they have not been contacted to give their inputs in terms of the anticipated impacts on their properties. Ms. I. Snyman replied that documentation was sent to them, but the consultation process will continue and there was still ample opportunity to give inputs to the process. The landowners located in the study corridors will be consulted during the detailed EIA phase. If there were specific aspects that the consultants should look at on the specific property they were welcome to indicate the need to Bohlweki Environmental and the necessary visitation arrangements can then be made. There was also the opportunity to raise comments and concerns during the meeting.

9.7 Ms. A. de Klerk: DFEAT (Manager: Eco-Tourism) requested that the final report should include information regarding the impact on the Mogalakwena River and surrounding communal area.

9.8 Ms. A. de Klerk: DFEAT (Manager: Eco-Tourism) said that there are a lot of developments taking place in the Mogalakwena area and the Scoping Report mentioned that communities might have to be relocated. The future mine developments and other future plans for the area should be taken into account to avoid unnecessary or several relocations of communities. If there will be mine development in that area additional power lines will have to be constructed for their needs. Care should be taken not to overdevelop that area. Ms. A. de Klerk proposed that a task team be constituted to address this issue and to investigate the spatial impact of additional power lines. Mr. J. Geeringh replied that a map can be included in the report which will indicate the existing power line network and the proposed future developments and plans in the area that are available. Government holds the mineral rights and if a new mine was to be developed it was an opportunity for economic growth for the region. Eskom works on a demand and supply basis, but they have a

mandate from Government to supply electricity to those that need it. It is difficult for Eskom to determine the details of future developments at this stage and they do not want to make predictions that might not realise in future. However, the existing and future land-use and overall planning in the areas are taken into account. Eskom anticipated that the most suitable option would be determined through the EIA and public participation process.

9.9 Ms. C. Streaton of Eskom said that it became evident during the public participation process that the study area around the Witkop Substation will have to be widened.

9.10 Mr. Dikgale: Traditional leader asked how the rural communities were involved in the process. Mr. G. Magangane replied that the consultants had a meeting with the traditional leaders (kgosis) and the structures serving under them (indunas, electrical committees etc.) in the Bakenberg and Pietersburg areas. Chief Dikgale was consulted regarding the public meetings scheduled in the areas. He indicated that the traditional leaders or representatives in the Pietersburg area would attend the public meeting in Pietersburg but unfortunately they failed to attend. A public meeting was also held in the Bakenberg area.

9.11 Mr. Dikgale: Traditional leader wanted to know how the communities will benefit from the proposed project. Mr. J. Geeringh said that power lines brought economic development to a region and the local communities are, therefore, indirectly benefiting from this development. The local communities will not be able to directly get power from these Transmission lines. The job opportunities resulting from the construction of power lines are very limited, as it required highly skilled people. There will be limited opportunities for manual labour where the local contractor can make use of locals to assist with bush clearing, installation of gates, etc. If houses had to be relocated in an area under the jurisdiction of the Tribal Authority, they will be compensated.

9.12 Mr. C. van den Berg: Department of Environmental Affairs (Northern Province) asked how Eskom determined the demand and whether the additional 400 kV would be sufficient as there were a number of new smelters and mines planned in the area. Mr. J. Geeringh indicated that the existing 400 kV line was not at capacity, but in four years time the line will definitely be at full capacity. There are additional lines to the Witkop Substations, but the Matimba-Witkop No 1 400 kV line is the main direct supply point to the greater Pietersburg area. If problems were experienced with this line, due to strain, it would have serious problems for the whole Northern Province, as the Matimba Substation will shut itself down to protect the system. There is, therefore, no back up from the Matimba Substation. Eskom definitely cannot put additional strain on this line and the systems constraints have to be overcome. Due to the additional capacity needed, there was a critical need for another 400 kV line. In terms of their mandate from government, Eskom Transmission has to provide a secure electricity supply if there is a demand for electricity. Eskom has, therefore, started the process as the EIA takes approximately one year to complete and, if approved, it will take another year for the negotiations with the landowners. The construction will be at least one year. The line will, therefore, be in place when Eskom requires the additional capacity. Eskom will also not build lines that are not needed, as they have to borrow the funds for the construction and have to repay it.

9.13 Mr. C. van den Berg: Department of Environmental Affairs (Northern Province) indicated that there is a new smelter planned in the Potgietersrus area and he wanted to know how Eskom will deal with this. Mr. J. Geeringh explained that the electricity to the smelter will partially be supplied from the existing 400 kV line and the 132 kV lines from Witkop. There is a possibility of a 400 kV line to supply the smelter with electricity, but Eskom will not start such a process unless the customer signs a guarantee that they will use the line.

9.14 Mr. J. Geeringh asked if the participants were satisfied that the process followed was transparent

and if they agreed to the specialist studies to be undertaken. The floor agreed that the process was satisfactory.

9.15 Mr. J. Geeringh said the participants should forward any comments regarding the process to Bohlweki Environmental. He indicated that the public participation process will continue even after a Record of Decision has been taken as there will be an appeal period. He indicated that information regarding the project can also be obtained from Eskom's website.

9.16 Mr. V. Matabane: DEAT wanted to know if there was any area of controversy that they should be aware of e.g. landowners that did not want the line on their properties and whether they provided specific reasons. Ms. I. Snyman replied that initially almost all the property owners indicated that they did not want the power line on their property. Most of these indicated throughout the process that they understand the need for the line, but that they should be consulted to find the best route alignment. In the Ellisras area, the Ellisras Farmers Union provided some suggestions on the alignment. The consultants and Eskom explained to them that if one property owner refused the line to cross his/her property and the surrounding landowners agreed, Eskom would then re-negotiate the final route alignment with all those property owners. It was also explained that if they did not get an agreement, Eskom could expropriate the property, but it was the last option to be followed.

9.17 Ms. C. Streaton said that there were a lot of owners who asked about expropriation and whether Eskom had the right to expropriate them. She indicated that they explained to them how the expropriation process worked and how the National Energy Regulator would be involved.

9.18 Mr. M. Kotze: Rhinoland asked if the consultants contacted each property owner along the existing line in his/her personal capacity. He indicated that he only received a fax when he came back from an overseas visit. If he did not receive that he would not have known about the process. Ms. C. Streaton said that they will contact each individual property owner. Mr. J. Geeringh added that they tried to identify all the property owners along the line through a deed search. It was, however, difficult to get hold of all the landowners as they change, properties are sold and divided. The records at the deeds office are sometimes quite old and they do not have all the recent information. The consultants also contacted the Farmers Associations in the area, namely the TAU and Agri-North.

9.19 Mr. M. Kotze: Rhinoland said that a lot of farmers did not belong to the Agricultural Unions. Mr. J. Geeringh said that was a problem, but they contacted all the landowners that could be identified. Eskom knew that ideally DEAT wanted them to consult with each property owner along a route but it is a difficult process, especially if the landowners are not permanently staying on their properties. Once the final route has been identified, all the property owners will be contacted.

9.20 Mr. M. Kotze: Rhinoland said that once the final route has been identified it was too late for landowners to make comments and give inputs to the process. Their inputs at that stage would then have no merit.

9.21 Ms. I. Snyman explained that a deeds search was undertaken in the study area and along the existing route. The deeds search provides a farm name and a surname. This was followed up by searching for these landowners through the telephone directory and asking landowners who their neighbours are. Sometimes the property owners are not listed or they do not stay on the farm which makes it difficult to contact them. In the documentation distributed, it was also requested that I&APs should provide the consultants with details of additional role players or property owners to be contacted. Some problems were also experienced with the areas that belonged to the South African Development Trust, as information obtained indicated these were now either handed over to the Tribal Authority or rented out by the Department of Public Works to the Department of

Agriculture.

9.22 Ms. I. Snyman asked the attendants to provide any details of additional I&APs to the consultants so that they can ensure that these role players become involved in the process.

9.23 Ms. J. Thomas indicated that the identified farmers will be consulted with to obtain their issues during the detailed EIA phase.

9.24 Mr. V. Matabane: DEAT said that the public participation process had to be defensible and should be conducted as per the requirements stipulated in the EIA regulations. It might be that I&APs were not personally contacted, but therefore the process is advertised in the media. It is also the responsibility of the public to be aware of developments in their area and to become involved in the process. If they know of anyone that would be affected by the proposed development they should inform those people about it. The I&APs should also respond adequately so that their issues, comments and concerns can be addressed in the final report.

11. CLOSURE

Ms. J. Thomas thanked the attendants for their inputs and closed the meeting at 12:15.

12. ATTENDANCE REGISTER

NAME	REPRESENTATION	TEL	FAX / E-MAIL	POSTAL ADDRESS
Mr. M. Kotzé	Rhinoland Safaris: Manager	014-763 2497	014-763 5813 rhinoland@mweb.co.za	PO Box 1014 Ellisras, 0555
Ms. H Kotzé	Rhinoland Safaris: Manager	014-763 2497	014-763 5813 rhinoland@mweb.co.za	PO Box 1014 Ellisras, 0555
Mr. A. von Well	Northern Province Department of Environmental Affairs: EIA	015-295 9300 082 872 5258	015-295 5819 vanwella@finptb.norprov.gov.za	PO Box 217 Pietersburg, 0700
Mr. L. Malherbe	Northern Province Department of Environmental Affairs: Waterberg District	015-491 8010/1 082 436 4132	015-491 8140	PO Box 3567 Potgietersrus, 0600
Mr. Rian Beukes	Polokwane Municipality: Town Planner	015-290 2078 082 821 7500	015-290 2255 rian.beukes@pietersburg.org.za	PO Box 111 Pietersburg, 0700
Mr. Joe Grosel	Polokwane Municipality: Ecologist	015-290 2336 082 415 5250	015-290 2335 joe.grosel@polokwane.org.za	PO Box 111 Polokwane, 0700
Mr. Daan Truter	Potgietersrust Platinums Ltd.: Consulting Engineer	015-491 4756 083 771 4303	015-491 2086	PO Box 671 Potgietersrus, 0600
Ms. A. de Klerk	DFEAT: Manager Eco-Tourism	015-298 7000	015-295 7010 deKlerkA@finptb.norpro	Private Bag X 9486 Pietersburg, 0700

NAME	REPRESENTATION	TEL	FAX / E-MAIL	POSTAL ADDRESS
			v.gov.za	
Mr. M.S. Dikgale	Dikgale Tribal Authority: Kgosi	015-267 3050 072 192 3951	015-267 3050	PO Box 57 Dikgale, 0721
Ms. Mothapo	Bakgaga da Mothapo: Kgoshigadi	015-618 0526 072 203 8177	015-297 6406 manmag@mweb.co.za	PO Box 122 Tholongwe, 0734
Mr. Martin Maatli	Department of Public Works: Roads Superintendent (Chief)	015-297 3120 082 766 4196	015-297 1992	Private Bag X 9378 Pietersburg, 0700
Mr. Cornelius van den Berg	Northern Province Department of Environmental Affairs	015-276 4763 082 739 1111	015-276 4763 vandenberge@freemail.absa.co.za	PO Box 280 Haenertsburg, 0730
Ms. E. Ramatsetse	DEAT	012-310 3815 082 702 8028	eramatsetse@ozone.pwv.gov.za	Private Bag X 447 Pretoria, 0001
Mr. V. Matabane	DEAT	012-310 3624 082 871 2771	v.matabane@ozone.pwv.gov.za	Private Bag X 447 Pretoria, 0001
Mr. John Geeringh	Eskom: Environmental Management and Analysis	011-800 2465 083 632 7663	011-800 3917	PO Box 1091 Johannesburg, 2000
Mr. Chris Vuso	Eskom	011-800 2201 083 633 1550	011-800 3917 chris.vuso@eskom.co.za	PO Box 161 Strubenvallei, 1735
Ms. Carol Streaton	Eskom	011-800 5411	011-800 3917 carol.streaton@eskom.co.za	-
Ms. Jo-Anne Thomas	Bohlweki Environmental	011-805 0250	011-805 0226 bohlweki@pixie.co.za	PO Box 11784 Vorna Valley Midrand, 1686
Mr. Gift Magangane	Bohlweki Environmental	011-805 0250	011-805 0226 bohlweki@pixie.co.za	PO Box 11784 Vorna Valley Midrand, 1686
Ms. Ingrid Snyman	Bohlweki Environmental	011-805 0250 012-991 7947	011-805 0226 ingrids@mweb.co.za	PO Box 11784 Vorna Valley Midrand, 1686