

Issues trail from I&AP's (prior and after circulation of the Basic Assessment Report)

	Issue/ Comment	Response
<p>1. Lionel Frank and Son Attorneys (for Mr L Louw)</p>	<p>Object the proposed preferred Route A and Route B on the basis that it is not following a current degraded area along the road.</p>	<p>The project is currently in the environmental impact assessment (EIA) phase during which interested and affected parties are invited to register as such. This will enable these parties to make inputs and comment on the proposed alternative powerline routes and substation sites.</p>
	<p>Wants assurance that Mr L Louw will be granted an opportunity to make further suggestions and inputs for the alternative routes that will have less environmental and economic impact on his farming activities and will only affect the owner of Vyevelei Farm, who seems to be the sole beneficiary of the requested Vyevelei powerline and</p>	<p>The project is currently in the environmental impact assessment phase during which interested and affected parties are invited to register as such. This will enable these parties to make inputs and comment on the proposed alternative powerline routes and substation sites.</p> <p>The two proposed alternative powerline routes over Farm 586 and 586 portion6 was discussed with Mr L</p>

	substation.	<p>Louw. It was also brought to his attention that the proposed powerline and substation are not for the sole benefit of Vyevelei Farm. The existing electrical supply to the farms in the area is fed from Eskom's Malmesbury Substation. With the current growth in the area the electricity supply will reach its full capacity in the near future. To cater for this Eskom is proposing to build a new 66kV substation in the area which link to the Moorreesburg Substation via a new 66kV powerline.</p>
<p>2. Tweekuylen Bewarea Conservancy (for Mr Lammie Louw)</p>	<p>Mr Nelius Louw has not received notice concerning the construction of the proposed 66/11kV Moorreesberg-Vyevelei powerline and substation even though the proposed site B for the</p>	<p>Eskom apologises for not contacting you re: the matter. This is due to the fact that Site B is an alternative and not the preferred site. However, assurance is given that you will be contacted during the entire EIA process.</p>

	substation is planned on his farm.	
	Request examples of similar substation and powerline that have been constructed.	Acknowledged
	How much arable land is going to be lost to the farmers due to the proposed project? Existing powerlines over farmland make it already very difficult cultivating the land.	Eskom appoints an independent land evaluator whereby a full price of the land used for the servitude is paid. However, even though Eskom pays for the use of the servitude, the land owner can still farm on the servitude.
	Is it possible for the landowners to suggest alternative routes for the proposed powerlines?	The project is currently in the environmental impact assessment phase during which interested and affected parties are invited to register as such. This will enable these parties to make inputs and comment on the proposed alternative powerline routes and substation sites.
	From the Conservancy point of view it is worrying that Eskom is exempted from appointing an	The EIA for this project is being undertaken by an Eskom in-house EAP, Ms. Nokhuthala D Hlongwana who is registered as an

	<p>independent Environmental Assessment Practitioner as required by the NEMA where such powerlines are planned to go over farms that have joined a conservancy.</p>	<p>Associate member with the Southern African Institute for Ecologists and Environmental Scientists (SAIEES). Ms. Hlongwana has completed both her honours as well as her under graduate degrees in Environmental and Geographical Science at the <i>University of Cape Town</i> in 2000 and 1999 respectively. She has five years experience in the impact assessment field.</p> <p>Eskom Holdings Limited has been exempted from using an independent Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) by the Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA) based on the condition that the Basic Assessment Report for the proposed project will be peer reviewed by an independent (EAP) certified by the Interim Certification Board for EAPs.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>Argues that the powerlines are planned at a huge financial cost to Eskom for the pure reason that the dairy farm at Vyevelei (the biggest dairy in the Western Cape) requires more electricity when the technology exist for Eskom to use the dairy</p>	<p>The proposed powerline and substation are not for the sole benefit of Vyevelei Farm. The existing electrical supply to the farms in the area is fed from Eskom's Malmesbury Substation. With the current growth in the area the electricity supply will reach its full capacity in the near future. To cater for this Eskom is proposing to build a new 66kV substation in the area which link to the Moorreesburg Substation via a new 66kV powerline.</p>
	<p>Argues that he was given four days to contact Ms. Nokhuthala Hlongwana at Eskom Holdings Limited about the proposed project of which on 08 July '10 she was out of the office till further notice.</p>	<p>Interested and Affected Parties (I&APs) letters were sent to the Eskom's mail department on 03 June 2010 and the closing date for an appeal was on 09 July. The public participation (PPP) period for an appeal is 30 days, however, Eskom extended it by five days to cater for delays in the post.</p>

<p>3. Cape Nature</p>	<p>The preferred route alternative lies across land that was historically covered by Swartland Shale Renosterveld and Swartland Granite Renosterveld. Both of these vegetation types are now considered to be Critically Endangered.</p>	<p>Acknowledged</p>
	<p>However, it appears that the preferred route and preferred site for the new substation have been almost entirely transformed by agricultural activities.</p>	
	<p>Both route alternatives cross and pass near several rivers and streams and therefore construction activities must be strictly controlled in these areas so that no part of the rivers, riparian areas or wetlands are impacted by the powerlines.</p>	

	<p>Bird diverters must be placed on the lines (no matter which route alternative is selected) but the preferred route alternative is likely to have less impact on avifauna.</p>	
	<p>The landowners of properties which will be affected must be asked to point out any ecologically sensitive areas or areas of natural vegetation remaining on their land which must be clearly demarcated as no-go areas during construction.</p>	
<p>4. Mr Carstens</p>	<p>States that the servitude registered for the powerline is 21 meters. Wants to know if the existing servitude is in the middle of the servitude or on the edge of the servitude. Suggests a better option is to construct along the tarred road.</p>	<p>The existing powerline occupies one of two servitudes, 28.34 metres wide each and was registered in the seventies. The existing powerline is very near to the centre line of the one servitude. Eskom intends occupying the vacant servitude with the proposed Moorreesburg Vyevelei overhead powerline. If the tar</p>

		road you are referring to is the N7 then we can not build the powerline right next to the fence because of building restrictions.
5. DEADP (Western Cape)	All mitigation measures as described in the EMP must be implemented and that the Dept of Agriculture has no objections	Acknowledged
	Water must not be used to suppress dust nuisance.	
	The removal of sensitive indigenous vegetation must be limited and powerlines must be located where possible, on already disturbed land.	
	Any cement or concrete mixing must be done on an impervious surface to prevent soil contamination	
6. The South African National Roads Agency Limited (SANRAL)	Require a way-leave application to be submitted prior to commencement of	Acknowledged

	any work	
7. Department of Agriculture	<p>Assumes that masts and anchors would be placed:</p> <p>Outside the calculated flood lines of rivers and streams.</p> <p>Outside roads, access roads and offset far enough from gates in order to allow access and movement of farming implements and not only vehicles.</p> <p>Outside contour banks in order not to obstruct storm water runoff within protection works (contour banks) and cause erosion.</p>	<p>The powerline will be placed outside the calculated flood lines and streams as this will ensure access to our infrastructure.</p> <p>Roads and other restrictions will be taken into account as we are limited by building restrictions.</p> <p>The farmers are also consulted during the route selection process which will give them ample opportunity to give their input regarding implements and the placing of poles on contours. The site will only be surveyed and contours drawn up when we have more certainty around which site to occupy.</p>
	<p>Advises that construction should be communicated with the land users and owners and that construction must rather be conducted in the off-season.</p>	<p>The landowners will be informed before and during construction as this is standard practice in Eskom. The time of construction will also be taken into account to ensure minimal impact on farming activities.</p>

	<p>Product and personal security must be guaranteed.</p>	<p>Access will strictly be for Eskom staff and contractors. Landowners will also be notified when Eskom or its contractors want to access the property.</p>
	<p>The two alternative routes have negative impacts on agricultural land use: Aerial spraying of herbicides and pesticides will be impacted on in both cases. Long straight lines that follow the existing fields rather than the cadastral boundaries may prove to be the best situation. It is therefore advised that the local farmers must comment on the alternatives and that proposals be amended according to land use rather than cadastral lines.</p>	<p>Contamination of the perennial crops due to dust pollution will be avoided as the construction will take place in the off season when there are no crops.</p> <p>On the point of long straight lines as opposed to following cadastral boundaries, the farmers prefer the powerline route to follow the cadastral boundaries.</p>
	<p>It is noted that letters objecting to the proposed routes were</p>	<p>The farmers' objection have been addressed and taken into consideration before the</p>

	<p>received from the respective landowners. The size and direct impacts of the infrastructure is not known to the land owners and there is a concern that the public participation process is not followed correctly.</p>	<p>Basic Assessment Report (BAR) was sent out for public review. The size and impact of the infrastructure were further addressed in the BAR and Environmental Management Program. To date no further comments have been received from the landowners.</p>
	<p>Contamination of the perennial crops due to dust pollution must be avoided at all times.</p>	<p>Contamination of the perennial crops due to dust pollution will be avoided as the construction will take place in the off season when there are no crops.</p>
	<p>The route along the existing power line might however sterilize a larger area due to the cumulative effect of parallel lines placed in buffer distances and according to regulations from each other.</p>	<p>The route is not final yet. The crossing of cultivated fields is inevitable as the powerline starts in Moorreesburg further north. Where the powerline runs parallel with the existing powerline we are merely occupying one of our two powerline servitudes.</p>
<p>8. Department of Water Affairs (DWA)</p>	<p>Request a letter from the Local Municipality confirming the</p>	<p>Acknowledged</p>

	<p>availability of the capacity to accommodate the solid waste to be obtained prior to construction of the proposed development.</p>	
	<p>All procedures to minimise potential impacts as stipulated in the EMP to be adhered to at all times.</p>	
	<p>A qualified ECO or EAP to be appointed to oversee the development during the construction and operation phases of the development as indicated in the BAR.</p>	
	<p>Any water use activity that is not Schedule 1 water use must be registered and authorised by DWA.</p>	
	<p>If earth cables cross rivers or streams, authorisation must be obtained from DWA before such activity may commence.</p>	<p>Even though the powerline will cross the two rivers mentioned in the Basic Assessment Report, river banks will not be disturbed as these are overhead</p>

		powerlines. Building restrictions on river banks will be adhered to.
	Authorisation for any development within 500m from any wetland must be obtained from DWA before it takes place.	Acknowledged
	Storm water management plan must be put in place.	
	Chemical toilets utilised during construction to be properly located such that they do not pose risk of water resource pollution and its contents must be disposed of at an authorised facility.	
	Fuel and oil storage area to be hardened and bunded in order to minimise pollution of the environment.	
	No surface, ground or storm water may be polluted as a result of any activities.	
	Solid waste must be managed in	

	accordance with the requirements of the relevant legislation.	
	All requirements of the NWA, 1998 (Act No. 36 of 1998) must be adhered to at all times.	