



## EIA REVIEW CHECKLIST

Review is a mechanism employed in Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) to judge the adequacy of the process and quality of the EIA report. The review is conducted with reference to legal conformity and good practice.

Key objectives of EIA review are to:

- \* assess quality of information contained in the EIA report;
- \* determine how stakeholder concerns have been addressed;
- \* determine if the information is adequate for decision-making; and
- \* identify information gaps and deficiencies.

This review form provides a structure that helps the reviewer to assess the EIA's various components in a systematic way.

1. Methodology utilised in compiling the EIA report
2. Description of the project
3. Assessment of alternatives to the project
4. Description of the environment
5. Description of impacts
6. Consideration of measures to mitigate impacts
7. Legal Review
8. Non-technical summary
9. General approach

### Review methodology:

1. For each question, the reviewer considers whether the information is relevant to the project. If not, the question is ignored and the reviewer proceeds to the following question.
2. If the information is relevant, that section of the EIA report is read to establish whether the information provided is:

\* **Complete (C):** all information required for decision-making is available. No additional information is required even though more information might exist.

\* **Inadequate (I):** the information presented contains major omissions. Additional information is necessary before the decision-making process can proceed.

Name of the project	<b>MOORREESBURG-VYVLEI 66 kV POWERLINE AND SUBSTATION</b>
Location of the project	Moorreesburg, Western Cape Province
Name of Environmental Consultancy which compiled the EIA report	
Name of reviewer	Strategic Environmental Focus (SEF)
Date of review	30 August 2010

**Narrative report** (reviewers general opinion of the EIA report):

Summary appraisal of the EIA report (completed only after the detailed review has been done)

Review Components	Judgement (C/I)	Comments
1. Methodology utilised in compiling the EIA report	C	Still Draft Report, so stakeholder consultation not completed as yet, but is compliant as to date.
2. Description of the project	C	
3. Assessment of alternatives to the project	C	
4. Description of the environment	C	
5. Description of impacts	C	The impacts that have been identified have been fully described.
6. Consideration of measures to mitigate impacts	C	Comprehensive mitigation measures have been included in the report and EMP.
7. Legal Review		
8. Non-technical summary	N/A	Standard form
9. General approach	C	

The overall report is graded as follows: (tick one box)

- Excellent:** The EIA report contains everything required for decision-making on the project. There are no gaps.
- Good:** The EIA report contains most of the information required as far as it is relevant in the particular circumstances of the project; any gaps are relatively minor.
- Poor:** The information required has not been provided or is far from complete and, in the context of the proposed project, the omissions must be addressed before a decision on whether the project should be allowed to proceed can be taken.

In your opinion:

	Yes	Don't know	No
* Did the EIA process include public participation Compliant to Sections 56; 57; 58; 59 set out in Chapter 6 of GN 385?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
* Were the consultants unduly influenced by the proponent or the Authorities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
* Did the EIA report focus on the most important issues?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
* Is the EIA report of acceptable quality?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
* Will the EIA report help to make a more informed decision about the project?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

1. METHODOLOGY	Relevant?	Judgment	Comments
	Yes/No	(C/I)	
1.1 Does the report clearly explain the methodology used and how these helped to reach the conclusions of the study?	Yes	C	
1.2 Does the report indicate what data are inadequate or absent?	Yes	C	Even though there is no specific space in a BAR to fill this in, it is always good to indicate in the activity description if any gaps in information exist.
1.3 Did the EIA process include genuine stakeholder consultation that is 100% Compliant to Sections 56;57;58;59 set out in Chapter 6 of GN 385	Yes	C	Still Draft Report. Stakeholder consultation period not closed, but has been compliant to date.
1.4 If so, were the general public and/or affected communities included in the consultation?	Yes	C	
1.5 Have the views of stakeholders been meaningfully incorporated into the findings of the EIA?	Yes	C	
1.6 Is the EIR 100% Compliant to the POS for EIA?	No		

2. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT	Relevant?	Judgment	Comments
	Yes/No	(C/I)	
<b>Land requirements</b>			
2.1 Has the land required for the project and any associated services, been described and clearly shown on a scaled map?	Yes	C	
2.2 For a linear project, has the land corridor and need for earthworks been described and shown on a scaled map?	Yes	C	
2.3 Has the re-instatement after use of temporary land been described?	Yes	C	
2.4 Is the approval from Dept. of Environment exempting the EAP from getting landowner consents for a linear EIA been attached?	Yes	I	No indication that this has been applied for.
<b>Waste and emissions</b>			
2.4 Have the types and quantities of waste generated during construction and operation been estimated?	Yes	C	
2.5 Have the ways in which these wastes will be handled or treated prior to disposal been explained?	Yes	C	
2.6 Has the receiving environment where such waste will be disposed, been identified and described?	Yes	C	
2.7 Has the project triggered any listed activities in terms of the NEMA Waste Act?	No		
<b>Project inputs</b>			
2.8 Are the nature and quantities of materials needed during construction and operation,	Yes	C	

clearly indicated?			
2. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT Project Inputs	Relevant?	Judgment	Comments
	Yes/No	(C/I)	
2.9 Are the sites where these materials will be sourced from, identified and assessed in terms of impacts, in the EIA report?	No		
2.10 Have the impacts of workers and visitors entering the project site during construction and operation been assessed?	Yes	C	
2.11 Have the means of transporting materials, products, workers and visitors to and from the site during construction and operation, been explained?	Yes	C	
Need and Desirability of the Project			
2.12 Has the "Need and Desirability" of the Project been explicitly provided and explained in detail?	Yes	C	
2.13 Has supporting documents (graphs, projections, Master Plans, NDP's, long term plans etc.) been included in the report that may assist in explaining the Need of the project.	Yes	C	
2.14 Has the Economic and Social Impacts that will result as a consequence of the project not materializing been explained?	Yes	C	

3. ALTERNATIVES	Relevant?	Judgment	Comments
	Yes/No	(C/I)	
3.1 Were alternatives to the project (including the "no-go" alternative) considered in the EIA?	Yes	C	
3.2 If alternatives were considered, are the reasons for selecting the proposed project adequately described?	Yes	C	
3.3 Does the EIA assess various "within-project" alternatives (e.g. design, location)?	Yes	C	No 'within - project' alternatives are feasible.
3.4 Does the Report provide the reader with an idea of the Methodology and contributing factors (space, flat terrain, close to load centres etc.) that resulted in the current alternatives being identified?	Yes	C	
3.5 Has the Advantages and Disadvantages that the proposed activities/alternatives may have on the environment been explained?	Yes	C	
3.6 Does the discussion on Alternative satisfy the requirements as set out in GN 385?	Yes	C	

3.7 Does the Report contain a Comparative Assessment of Alternatives considered?	Yes	C	
<b>3. ALTERNATIVES</b>	<b>Relevant? Yes/No</b>	<b>Judgment (C/I)</b>	<b>Comments</b>
3.8 Does the Comparative Assessment of Alternatives suggest a least Impact Alternative?	Yes	C	
3.9 Does the Maps/Cartography in the Report clearly identify the Alternatives Considered?	Yes	C	
<b>4. DESCRIPTION OF THE ENVIRONMENT</b>			
4.1 Have the areas expected to be significantly affected by the various aspects of the project been indicated with the aid of suitable maps?	Yes	C	
4.2 Have the land uses on the project site(s) and in the surrounding areas been described and their use and non-use values adequately assessed?	Yes	C	
4.3 Have the ecological components of the environment likely to be affected by the project been identified and described sufficiently for the prediction of impacts?	Yes	C	
4.4 Have the social components (including archaeological and historical) of the environment likely to be affected by the project been identified and described sufficiently for the prediction of impacts?	Yes	C	
4.5 Has the EIA adequately consulted the latest literature and/or unpublished reports and/or data relevant to the study?	Yes	C	
4.6 Have local, regional and national plans and policies been reviewed in order to place the project into context?	Yes	I	No local or provincial spatial plans or development plans have been mentioned
<b>5. DESCRIPTION OF IMPACTS</b>			
<b>Impact Identification</b>			
5.1 Have direct and indirect/ secondary impacts of constructing, operating and, where relevant, after use or decommissioning of the project been clearly explained (including both positive and negative effects)?	Yes	C	
5.2 Is the investigation of each type of impact appropriate to its importance for the decision, avoiding unnecessary information and concentrating mainly on the key issues?	Yes	C	
5.3 Are cumulative impacts considered?	Yes	C	
5.4 Are transboundary impacts considered?	No		
5.5 Has consideration been given to impacts which might arise from non-standard operating conditions, (i.e. equipment failure or unusual environmental conditions such as flooding), accidents and emergencies? (i.e. risk assessment)	Yes	C	

5. DESCRIPTION OF IMPACTS	Relevant?	Judgment	Comments
	Yes/No	(C/I)	
<b>Magnitude and significance of Impacts</b>			
5.6 Has the timescale over which the effects will occur been predicted such that it is clear whether impacts are short, medium or long term, temporary or permanent, reversible or irreversible?	Yes	C	
5.7 Does the EIA give a clear indication of which impacts may be significant and which may not?	Yes	C	
5.8 Have the magnitude, location and duration of the impact been discussed in the context of the value, sensitivity and rarity of the resource or environment?	Yes	C	
5.9 Is a table provided indicating the weighted impacts as discussed at the specialist integration meeting?	No		
5.10 Has the criteria of the weighting been described?	No		
5.11 Does the table for ease of reference have colour coding indicating the magnitude of impact?	No		
<b>Mapping of Impacts and Sensitivities</b>			
5.9 Does the Maps/Cartography in the Report clearly illustrate the descriptions of Impacts and Sensitivities?	No		
5.10 Are Maps/Cartography used in Specialist Studies clear (Sensitivities, Delineations etc.) and comprehensible?	No		
<b>6. MITIGATION</b>			
<b>Description of mitigation measures</b>			
6.1 Has the mitigation of negative impacts been considered and, where feasible, have specific measures been proposed to address each impact? Are they practical and implementable?	Yes	C	
6.2 Is it clear to what extent the mitigation methods are likely to be effective?	Yes	C	
6.3 Has the EIA report clearly explained what the costs of mitigation are likely to be, and compared these to the benefits (including the costs of non-mitigation)?	No		
6.4 Have details of how the mitigation will be implemented and function over the time span for which they are necessary, been presented?	Yes	C	The EMP indicates as to where and by whom mitigations are to be implemented.
<b>Monitoring Proposals</b>			
6.5 Has the EIA proposed practical monitoring arrangements to check the environmental impacts resulting from the implementation of the project and their conformity with the predictions made? Are they practical and	Yes	C	A proposed form of auditing is attached to the EMP to monitor implementation of mitigations.

implementable?			
	Relevant?	Judgment	Comments
	Yes/No	(C/I)	
6.6 Has the EIA proposed Limits of Acceptable Change that Eskom can use to track impacts and trigger management intervention?	Yes	C	The EMP clearly states the no-go areas.
<b>Environmental Effects of Mitigation</b>			
6.7 Have any adverse environmental effects of mitigation measures been investigated and described?	Yes	C	
<b>7. LEGAL REVIEW</b>			
7.1 Has the Entire report been checked against all requirements as set out in GN 385? If not, Identify shortcomings and correct.	Yes	C	Limited information relating to public participation is included in the report as this has not been concluded yet. We have not seen the application form, so have no indication of whether any application for exemption has been made. No details of the EAP are included in the report.
7.2 Have all identified listed activities been applied for?	Yes	C	
7.3 Are any permits required in terms of other legislative requirements required/included?	Yes	C	As per the project description we could not identify any additional permits.
7.4 Has the impact of local by-laws been included/considered?	Yes	C	No by-laws have been identified.
<b>8. NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY</b>			
8.1 Does the EIA contain a brief but concise non-technical summary that clearly explains the project and the environment, the main issues and mitigation measures to be undertaken, and any remaining or residual impacts?	No		Completed on standard form.
8.2 Does the summary include a brief explanation of the overall approach to the assessment?	No		
8.3 Does the summary provide an indication of the confidence which can be placed in the results?	No		
8.4 Does the summary indicate whether the project is or is not environmentally acceptable	No		
<b>9. GENERAL APPROACH</b>			
<b>Organisation of the information</b>			
9.1 Is the information logically arranged in sections?	No		Completed on standard form.
9.2 Is the location of the information identified in an index or table of contents?	No		
9.3 When information from external sources has been introduced, has a full reference to the source been included?	No		No external references

Presentation of the information			
9.4 Has information and analysis been offered to support all conclusions drawn?	Yes	C	
9.5 Has information and analysis been presented so as to be comprehensible to the non-specialist, using maps, tables and graphical material as appropriate?	Yes	C	
9.6 Has superfluous information (i.e. information not needed for the decision) been avoided?	Yes	C	
9.7 Have prominence and emphasis been given to severe adverse impacts, to substantial environmental benefits, and to controversial issues?	Yes	C	
9.8 Is the information objective?	Yes	C	
9.9 Is all information referred to in the Report part of the Appendix?	Yes	C	As the public participation phase has not been concluded, additional information may be included.

SUMMARY	TOTAL Relevant?		TOTAL Judgment		Overall Comments Refer to Letter
	Yes	NO	C	I	
	56	17	54	2	