



Ck No. 2007/196934/23 VAT No: 4030265740

Physical Address: 49 3rd Avenue, Highlands North, 2192

Postal Address: P O Box 2363, Highlands North, 2037

Tel: 011 4401817 **Fax:** 086 607 9841

Contact Person : Judith Alford, **Cell:** 076 876 2672, **Email:** judy@mokgope.co.za

Dear all,

Thank you for attending the public meeting on 21st July 2014

We would like to draw your attention that these minutes were drawn from notes taken from the Public Meeting; please provide corrections / additions if applicable.

We would like to advise that while utmost care was taken to record your comments accurately and faithfully, there may be some discrepancies between what has been written in the minutes that follow and what was actually said. We apologise for this and request that you contact us should you wish to have something changed.

Many thanks for your participation at the meeting, as well as for your understanding regarding the minutes.

Regards

Judith Alford
Mokgope Consulting cc
Cell: 076 876 2672



Ck No. 2007/196934/23 VAT No: 4030265740

Physical Address: 49 3rd Avenue, Highlands North, 2192

Postal Address: P O Box 2363, Highlands North, 2037

Tel: 011 4401817 **Fax:** 086 607 9841

Contact Person : Judith Alford, **Cell:** 076 876 2672, **Email:** judy@mokgope.co.za

**Proposed “Kronos-Perseus” 765kV Transmission Power line & Substations
Upgrade, Northern Cape and Free State Provinces
DEA Ref: 14/12/16/3/3/2/438**

Meeting with I&APs held at 15h00 on 21st July 2014 at NG Kerk, Jacobsdal

Attendees:

Judith	Alford	JA	Mokgope Consulting
Victoria	Somo	VS	Mokgope Consulting
Bruce	Sebolai	BS	Mokgope Consulting
Lerato	Mokgwatheng	LM	Eskom
Wimpie	Henning	WH	Eskom
Linda	Haarhoff	LH	Eskom
E.J	Brand	EJB	Private
N.C	Du Plooy	NCG	Private
J.C	Groenewald	JCG	Private
A	Hoogson	AH	Private
P.J	Nell	PJN	Private KWEV
H.M	Schoorman	HMS	KWGV
B.A	Badenhorst	BAB	Weitleistudiegroep
Andrian	Van Wyk	AV	Silver Solution 1636cc
Esmeralda		E	Essie Engineering
Nici	Faber	NF	Faber Familie Trust
Rosie	Du plooy	RD	Jed Boerdeg B k
C.J	Lourens	CJL	
G	Groenevald	GG	
A.J	Robuisen	AJR	A C Trust
A	Robuisen	AR	Sorgorg Landget
E.A	Robuisen	EAR	
A.M	Ferreira	AMF	
J.M	Du Plooy	JMD	
S.M	Squires	SMS	O.Rut Water Users
Ian	Conroy	IC	
Kempen	Nel	KN	Rietrivier Boereverenigig
Andrew	Conroy	AC	Jacobsdal Pilots Association

Lukas	Joubert	LJ	
A	De Villiers	AD	

*Unknown in list above will be indicated as **I&AP** in discussion below.

Item No	Item Description	Response / Comment
1	JA: Welcome and Introduction	
2	Open with prayer	
3	JA: Presentation	
4	<p>DISCUSSION</p> <p>KN: From what has been presented, it seems as if it's only Corridor 1 that is chosen. Basically, the other two corridors are not an option.</p> <p>I&AP: Why wasn't the deviation considered for the pink and green Line as it was considered for the blue line?</p> <p>It seems the only problem with the green and pink line is crossing over Mokala. It would have been much shorter for the green line to go around the Park than to choose Deviation 1a which has a lot of great impact on agricultural areas.</p> <p>Therefore my request is that a deviation for Corridor 3 should be considered.</p> <p>Where is the drainage areas on Corridor 2 and 3 that are not on the blue line?</p> <p>If the National Park was taken out of consideration, would the Blue line still be the most preferred route?</p> <p>SMS: First of all, your notification for the first meeting in May 2013 was atrocious. This one is not far behind it either. We are here because some people got registered letters and some have not.</p> <p>Secondly why hasn't Eskom considered</p>	<p>JA: Comparing Corridor 1 to the other two corridors, it was identified as the suitable route. Corridor 1 has the least impacts compared to the other two corridors.</p> <p>JA: All routes were taken into consideration but only one route had to be chosen. We took into consideration the various specialists impacts and weighed their options. The problem with the pink and green line is not only crossing over Mokala. For instance, Corridor 2 and 3 have more impact on wetland and riparian areas and Freestate Highveld Grassland protected areas.</p> <p>Your comment has been noted.</p> <p>The Blue line also crosses wetland areas. According to the wetland areas, Corridor 1 has the least amount of wetlands such as pans or drainage lines.</p> <p>Considering the wetlands and impact on vegetation, the Blue line may have probably been suitable. If the park did not exist, the deviation also would not have been considered to avoid future expansions of the Park.</p> <p>JA: Landowners affected by the proposed alternative corridors were identified at the initial stages of the EIA process. Unfortunately challenges are encountered through the mailing system. We can't always guarantee that each and every landowner collected their registered mails at the post office. We have also had returned mails that were not collect in a period of a month and more. Therefore, we have other alternatives to notify I&APs such as: advertising in local and regional newspapers; and putting up site notices at popular focal points in nearby towns.</p> <p>There is already a proposed power line running</p>

Item No	Item Description	Response / Comment
	<p>using the existing servitudes that run from Perseus to De Aar?</p> <p>IC: Why do you have to create new servitude lines on sensitive areas?</p>	<p>from Perseus to De Aar, called the proposed Perseus-Gamma 765KV Line.</p> <p>JA: The proposed project has alternative routes which have been assessed by various specialists. Subsequently all findings are weighed according to significant impacts. Hence the EIA Process has been undertaken and decision will be taken in consideration of the minimising impacts on the feasible route.</p>
	<p>None of your findings have mentioned anything about irrigation. No comment has been given about the irrigation on the blue line. The Agriculture reports only highlight a very small portion about the irrigation areas in our region.</p> <p>SMS: The Agriculture specialist is a complete daunt.</p>	<p>We appointed the agricultural specialist to identify such areas of concern and it is highlighted in his report that the blue line does impact on irrigation areas.</p> <p>Your comments have been highly taken into consideration and they will be included in the Comments and Response Report for DEA's review.</p>
	<p>Generally your report shows ignorance. In your report a lot has been said about tourists and tourism and how it's going to affect passersby. Nothing has been mentioned about how it's going to affect us here in the Jacobsdal area.</p>	
	<p>We do not want towers going across our properties.</p>	
	<p>Take note of the following comments:</p>	
	<p>I have read through your Agricultural and Socio-economic Reports.</p> <p>The Socio-economic report states "Jacobsdal magisterial district has around 7000ha of land under cultivation". The correct figure is roughly 15000ha of land under cultivation, hence roughly double. The report states that the total product of field crop is about 20 000 tons. I produce a load of about 7000 tons and I am a tiny fraction of this area. These figures are just completely wrong. The person who has done this report has not got out of his office. He looked at stats SA from 2007, Google Earth from 2008. We are now in 2014 and you have come with a report with wrong figures that you take seriously and you</p>	<p>The comments regarding the Socio-economic Agricultural section will be forwarded to the specialist for their response and we'll consider a review of the reports.</p>

Item No	Item Description	Response / Comment
	<p>expect us to do the same? I don't think so. I suggest you redo the agriculture report (from the socio-economic section) as it is disgraceful. He further talks about agriculture land values; and he talks about the total land value in Jacobsdal as R17000. Go and work out you current land values, we are talking about R450 million. This includes taking agriculture and irrigation land out of production and it is before you take out the pivot out of the way. From an agriculture point of view, you are barking on the wrong side of the tree. My suggestion is go back and get a proper Agricultural economist to do the job properly, and then we can talk further.</p>	
	<p>The avifauna report states that you stick to existing servitudes. There is absolutely no reason why that shouldn't be the case. You've got plenty of them running north, south, east and west from De Aar to Copperton. That is a perfectly feasible option. Nowhere in the report have I seen why that shouldn't take place.</p>	<p>Please check Sec 1.1.1. "Need and Desirability" which indicates the reasons why the proposed line is planned to cross the northern alignment region.</p>
	<p>In a normal society, you start off with the brown fields and then you go to the green field development. That is if the brown fields won't work. Now you've got a whole area of the Central Free State and Northern Cape that has already been wrecked by Eskom. You might as well put this proposed line there and not over this undisturbed pristine area. Most of the area from the deviation and within the deviation runs through game farms, where people earn a living from overseas hunters that want unspoiled habitat. They don't want a 765kV line going through it. A lot of us live in pristine environments and we don't want them spoiled. So use what you have in the existing servitudes and leave us out of it.</p>	
	<p>The wetland report talks about wetlands, and they have not done a walk through, now I ask you, can you identify wetlands from 2008? The same with the avifaunal, they haven't even been here. They have done studies based on paper, yet they are making</p>	<p>Field surveys were done by different specialists randomly near and at known sensitive areas (i.e. The wetland and avifauna specialists did report to have conducted a field survey, which have been provided in their reports; Methodology sections.</p>

Item No	Item Description	Response / Comment
	<p>recommendations on which you are placing the power line that is going to be there forever. I think your specialists have sat down and done desktop studies with you basing some fairly fundamental findings. Hence a lot of that information in those studies are incorrect.</p> <p>Your access along the 80m servitude includes a road and a lot of affected farms in this region are occupied by endangered animals. The owners of those animals do not want roads going through their properties and the reasons why they have those animals there is because other people can't get to them. The owners want to keep their land pristine. Therefore, It's not only Mokala National Park that counts.</p> <p>To summarize: We've got very high agricultural activities in this region which is almost ignored completely all along the rivers and right across Jacobsdal. Once Eskom has builds a line there, the land will be useless for agricultural purposes and its future expansions.</p> <p>All of us in this meeting will not want to have Eskom lines that would inhibit development. Once the power line is there you cannot take it away. So it is better not to have the power line.</p> <p>I speak for the Orania Water Use Association – All of our farmers have water rights and anywhere on our farms we can develop irrigation but not if there is an Eskom line through it.</p> <p>Nowhere on your maps have you shown farms that have water use rights vs farms that don't have water rights. I doubt If anyone has heard of the water use association. In Jacobsdal area you will be crossing the Kalkfontein Water Uses Association and the Orania Reit Water Uses Association. They haven't been invited to any meetings and have not been asked for their opinions. So I</p>	<p>Wetlands don't change significantly in extent over time so using google earth imagery to refine sites visited is acceptable methodology for this type of linear development at this stage of investigation</p> <p>The avifaunal specialist did do field visits, see report with map of route in appendix m; plus the specialist has done other work for other projects & has drawn all that into a comprehensive report.</p> <p>Furthermore, a thorough walk-down will lead to local deviations, usually within the corridor. This is yet to be conducted prior to the construction phase along the profiled-servitude, when the specific site EMPr is compiled. The final EMPr would consider the Environmental Authorisation conditions, Landowners conditions and specialists recommendations. This EMPr will also be placed out for public comment too.</p>

Item No	Item Description	Response / Comment
	<p>suggest so strongly that you go back and start there.</p> <p>The last thing, Eskom, as a company to do business with is, in my opinion and experience, just not to be trusted because they say one thing and they do another thing. Or they don't do it at all. We've been asked to use electricity from 6/7 years ago, and Eskom would encourage us to use more electricity. In the recent years, Eskom have encouraged us to use less electricity because the price increases by 25% a year. We've been asked to put up variable speed drives, Eskom said they would compensate it, but I'm still waiting. Eskom hasn't come to the party. Eskom has disappeared. Eskom doesn't answer their calls and don't respond to their correspondence. Now you are asking us to do business with them and give them servitudes on our properties, No!</p> <p>I&AP: Hoekom gebruik nie die bestaande lyne vir krag voorsienning nie en bou substansies om die krag voorsienning probleem op te los nie? (<i>Why does ESKOM not make use of the current existing lines and build more substations to resolve the current power demand?</i>)</p> <p>I&AP: Having to second my colleague's concern about not being notified for these meetings last year, we don't understand why we received notifications now and not last year. Ignorance is no excuse.</p> <p>I&AP: At this stage we cannot accept the recommendations because the recommendations are wrong.</p>	<p>This study is on a 2km corridor width. Therefore various assessments have been conducted considering this width. When this is narrowed during negotiation stage, water use rights and other concerns on individual farms will then be identified and the recommendations and conditions on each traversed farm thereof will form part of the specific EMPr.</p> <p>LH: Eskom needs an additional line in order to keep up with the demand and expand for future usages for generations to follow. Therefore Eskom needs your permission to proceed with the project to cross over your properties.</p> <p>JA: I don't know what the reasons are for not receiving last year's mail. But what I understand is that there was an incident where the post offices in Johannesburg were on strike around the period we were posting. Apparently when they resumed work the letters were sent out. We sent out notifications to the same addresses that were sent to last year.</p> <p>Your comments have been noted.</p>
5	Close with prayer	