


APPENDIX D7: ISSUES AND RESPONSE REPORT

<p style="text-align: center;">ISSUES AND RESPONSE REPORT :</p> <p style="text-align: center;">ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT PROCESS FOR THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF THE ESKOM VRYHEID NETWORK</p> <p style="text-align: center;">STRENGTHENING: AGULHAS 400/132KV 2X500 MVA TRANSMISSION SUBSTATION AND LOOP-IN LOOP-OUT LINES</p>						
Date Receipt of Comment	Name and contact details	Organization	Issues and comments	Response by Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP)	Date of Response by EAP	
17 July 2015	Jan en Sanet Schoonwinkel Cell: 082 570 6327 Ceil: 076 402 4494 schoonwinkel@vodamail.co.za	Landowner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As a landowner, I will be directly affected by the proposed developments of the substation. The current Vryheid substation is located on my property Kluitjieskraal 256. • There are already a network of poles and power lines that make it very difficult to perform my farming activities. • If there is another substation with more poles and lines it will be nearly impossible to continue farming on the specific lands. • The power station is also a big fire hazard. 	The EAP acknowledged receipt of the correspondence and further notified the I&AP that his comments have been noted and included in the draft Scoping and Environmental Impact Assessment reports will be submitted to them for review and comments. The Scoping report was sent to the I&AP on the 25 February 2016 and comments were received through Mr. Schoonwinkel's representative (Mr. Chris Taylor).	23 July 2015	

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As Site A, B, C and D is on my property the only option acceptable to me is Site E. 		
09 March 2016	<p>Chris Taylor (on behalf of Mr. AJ Schoonwinkel, Jan Schoonwinkel Familietrust, AJ Schoonwinkel Familietrust)</p> <p>PO Box 757 11 Buirski Square Jansen Street Swellendam 6740</p> <p>Tel: 028 514 3927 Fax: 028 514 3928 taylorlaw@mweb.co.za</p>	Chris Taylor Attorney	<p>1. Our Client Jan Schoonwinkel Familietrust: Site Alternative A: Farm 253 (Kluitjieskraal)</p> <p>2. Our Client AJ Schoonwinkel Familietrust: Site Alternative B & C : Kluitjieskraal Farm 256 Portion 5</p> <p>3. Our Client AJ Schoonwinkel Familietrust: Site Alternative D: Kluitjieskraal Farm 256 Portion 2.</p> <p>We act herein on behalf of abovementioned clients, the registered owners as set out above, all represented by the trustee of the respective trusts, Mr. Arnoldus Johannes Schoonwinkel.</p> <p>With reference to your notice to client via e-mail dated 25 February 2016 and with specific reference to your draft scoping report, we wish to comment and bring to your attention the following:</p> <p>A) Site alternative A Page 23 and 24 Summary of specialist findings:</p> <p>1) Agricultural Potential: The proposed site is in fact an active high agricultural potential site that is already</p>	<p>The EAP acknowledged receipt of the comments on the scoping report and assured the I&AP that the comments will be taken into consideration and addressed accordingly.</p>	24 March 2016

			<p>transformed from pasture to grain and is used for the production of grain in a 6 year rotation period and is due to produce crops during the period 2016 to 2022.</p> <p>2) Avifauna: Blue Cranes are observed regularly on the site.</p> <p>B) Site alternative B Page 24 and 25 Summary of specialist findings:</p> <p>We confirm your findings regarding Agricultural Potential, Flora, Heritage and Avifauna and wish to stress that this indeed makes the site highly unacceptable as an alternative site.</p> <p>C) Site alternative C Page 26 and 27 Summary of specialist findings: Agricultural Potential: The proposed site is in fact an active high agricultural potential site. Currently it is under lucern pasture and will in 2017 be transformed from pasture to grain and used for the production of grain in a 6 year rotation period and is due to produce crops during the period 2017 to 2023. It may be mentioned that our client has harvested some of his best and record crops from this land</p> <p>Avifauna: Blue Cranes are observed regularly on the site.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p>D) Site alternative D Page 27 and 28 Summary of specialist findings: We confirm your findings regarding Agricultural Potential, Flora, Heritage and Avifauna and wish to stress that this indeed makes the site highly unacceptable as an alternative site. We wish to further point out that Blue Crane is spotted regularly on site.</p> <p>GENERAL SUBMISSIONS: We wish to point out that our client already has the existing Vryheid substation on one of his properties, which is onerous and an impediment to his existing farming activities and it would be most unfair towards him, should he be further subjected to another portion of his property being earmarked and used for the intended Eskom Vryheid Network Strengthening.</p> <p>FINAL SUBMISSION: It is client's submission that in fact alternative site F is the most viable option and should indeed be the portion to be considered favorably. The year 2015 was the first year in forty years in which crops were planted on this site. The existing 400 kV powerline and N2 Road are located in close proximity, making it</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p>easily accessible.</p> <p>Taking the abovementioned into account, it is clients submission that the site alternative A, B, C and D pertaining to his properties are indeed unacceptable.</p>		
09 March 2016	<p>Chris Taylor (on behalf of PJB Crous)</p> <p>PO Box 757</p> <p>11 Buirski Square</p> <p>Jansen Street</p> <p>Swellendam</p> <p>6740.</p> <p>Tel: 028 514 3927</p> <p>Fax: 028 514 3928</p> <p>taylorlaw@mweb.co.za</p>	Chris Taylor Attorney	<p>We act herein on behalf of Mr. PJB Crous, the registered owner of “Dagbreek 524”</p> <p>With reference to your letter dated 18 February 2015 (Obviously wrong year, should be 2016?)</p> <p>And with specific reference to your draft scoping report, we wish to comment as follows:</p> <p>We wish to echo the important aspects as set out in table 9 , Summary of Specialist Findings-Site alternative G- Page 31 and 32</p> <p>Agricultural Potential: The proposed site is an active high agricultural potential site that is already transformed.</p> <p>Avifauna: The site fall within agricultural land (Cereal cultivation)</p> <p>Blue Cranes were observed within close proximity to the site.</p> <p>The longer powerline associated with this site poses an increased risk of collision to Blue Crane and Denham’s Bustard</p>	<p>The EAP acknowledged receipt of the comments on the scoping report and assured the I&AP that the comments will be taken into consideration and addressed accordingly.</p>	24 March 2016

			<p>In the final instance we wish to point out that this alternative site is situated exactly where our client has a subway underneath the road to ensure safe crossing of livestock from one side to the other.</p> <p>It is the clients submission that site alternative F may in fact be the most viable option as it is situated close to the existing 400 kV powerline and National road, making it easily accessible.</p> <p>Taking the abovementioned into account, it is clients submission that alternative site G is the least acceptable.</p>		
11 March 2016	<p>Rhett Smart Private Bag X5014 Stellenbosch 7599 Tel: 021 866 8017 rsmart@capenature.co.za</p>	CapeNature	<p>CapeNature’s comments only pertain to the biodiversity related impacts and not to the overall desirability of the proposed development.</p> <p>In Section 3.2 of the report the scope of work includes a double circuit powerline linking between the Vryheid Substation and the new substation and extension of the Vryheid substation busbar and additional feeder bays. This requires clarity, as it is likely that the linking powerline would trigger listed activities and would also influence the</p>	<p>The EAP acknowledged receipt of CapeNatures’ valuable comments on the Draft Scoping Report. The I&AP was reassured that the project team will address and clarify all issues raised accordingly. Further comments will be incorporated in the Final Scoping Report for submission to the DEA and recommendations made will be considered during the EIA phase of the project.</p> <p>CapeNatures comments have been taken into consideration and included in the Final</p>	<p>14 March 2016</p> <p>09 May 2016</p>

		<p>impacts associated with the choice of location for the substation.</p> <p>The substation will be 600m × 600m in extent which would be 360 000 m² (this should be corrected in the Introduction on pg 12) or 36 ha. It should be clarified that the polygons indicated on the various layout maps will be the full extent of the substation, or if the substation would only occupy a portion of the polygons as indicated.</p> <p>There does not appear to be any watercourses or wetlands located on any of the seven location alternatives, although some of them are adjacent to watercourses. Some of the riparian areas of the watercourses are classified as Ecological Support Area. These do not appear to be significant constraints on the development proposal at the Scoping Phase, but require further investigation in the EIA Phase.</p> <p>The conclusions are that the only alternative where fatal flaws were identified was Alternative D, as there is a fragment of intact Critically Endangered vegetation located on the site. CapeNature agrees with these findings for a Scoping level assessment. The specialist study has additionally rated all seven alternatives in terms of preference.</p> <p>A further aspect that requires clarity is whether the proposal is only for the</p>	<p>Scoping report and will be assessed further during the EIA phase.</p>	
--	--	---	--	--

Appendix D7 – Issues and Response Report

			strengthening of the existing network or if the substation is proposed to receive electricity from the renewable energy facilities in the vicinity. The project study area is located within one of the renewable energy development zones (REDZ) as identified in the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) for Wind and Solar Photovoltaic Energy for South Africa and is likely to be a focus area for renewable energy development in future.	Cape Nature's comments have been addressed and are included in the EIR.	07 October 2016
15 April 2016	D'Mitri Matthews 2 nd Floor 1 Dorp Street Cape Town 8001 D'mitri.Matthews@westerncape.gov.za Tel: 021 483 8350	Western Cape Environmental Affairs and Development Planning	The Department acknowledged receipt of the draft Scoping Report and made the following comments: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Activity 11 of GN R983 has been listed incorrectly. The correct reference to the proposed activity is in terms of GN R983, Activity 12 and should be reflected in the final Scoping Report. 2. Site A appears to be most suitable location for the proposed substation in terms of the findings of the specialists except for the Heritage Impact Assessment. As such it is recommended that a walkdown 	The EAP acknowledged receipt of the Department's comments and indicated that the comments would be incorporated in the final Scoping Report. The EAP further indicated that the Department would be kept abreast with the project proceedings.	19 April 2016 09 May 2016

			<p>phase for Site A be implemented to further investigate the potential of the site to be used for the location of the proposed substation.</p> <p>3. Site selection for the proposed location of the substation must take into account the existing agricultural practices that are adjacent to the site, particularly Farm Kluintjieskraal No. 256, where sites A, B, C and D are located.</p>		
26 April 2016	<p>Breed-Gouritz Catchment Management Agency (BGCMA) 51 Baring Street Worcester 6850 Private Bag x3055 Worcester 6950</p>	<p>Breed-Gouritz Catchment Management Agency</p>	<p>The BGCMA has reviewed the report and has no objection should the following be adhered to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed construction may require a Water Use Authorization in terms of the National Water Act (36 of 1998) should the construction of foundations be less than 32m from a watercourse and 500m from a wetland. Thus in terms of section 21 of the NWA 21 (c) and (i) water uses may be impacted. 2. The applicant should ensure that Aquatic study be conducted to indicate the impact of the construction on water courses may be impacted. 3. All relevant sections and regulations 	<p>The EAP acknowledged receipt of BGCMA comments regarding the draft scoping report. The EAP highlighted that comments would be incorporated in the final Scoping Report.</p> <p>All relevant sections and regulations of the National Water Act, 1998 (Act 36 of 1998) regarding water use will be adhered to.</p> <p>The EAP further indicated that the Department would be kept abreast with the project proceedings.</p> <p>The BGCMA comments have been taken into consideration and included in the Final Scoping report. Following Authority's decision a WUL will be applied for accordingly.</p>	<p>28 April 2016</p> <p>09 May 2016</p>

			of the NWA regarding water use must be adhered to.	An aquatic study has been conducted and the report is included as Appendix C5 of the EIR.	07 October 2016
10 May 2016	Ron Brunings Town Planning & Building Control Swellendam Municipality rbrunings@swellenmun.co.za Tel: 028 514 8635	Swellendam Municipality	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. As a Municipality we are concerned about the cumulative visual impact on the landscape of the various infrastructures that is being proposed along the R319 of late. It is noted that the municipality recently approved 2 wind farms in the region, with a third in process, and that each of these are also now proposing new power-line infrastructure, even though they were initially motivated on the basis of utilising existing reticulation systems. 2. It is our position that the construction of the new transmission substation and loop-lines should not be proposed / presented / and indeed, assessed, in isolation but rather put forward with full disclosure and illustration of all related existing and recently approved infrastructure in the 	<p>The visual aspect and associated impacts has been identified by the EAP as impacts that will be looked into during the impact assessment phase. As part of the EIA, a visual impact assessment study for this project will be commissioned to thoroughly and cumulatively assess the impact on the environment.</p> <p>The positioning of the proposed new substation and associated power lines has taken into consideration Eskom's 10 year plan that focuses on provision and development of electrical infrastructure in the Cape region. Further consideration of future developments including renewable energy has been considered.</p>	11 May 2016

			<p>region.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. There should be evidence of efforts made to minimise the visual impact of the development, be it through collaboration with existing infrastructure, or installing the loop-lines underground etc. 4. The report does not address the possibility of augmenting the use of the existing Vryheid Substation. 5. As a Municipality we are not in favour of the development of further infrastructure such as power-lines and substations along the eastern 	<p>The Scoping phase of the project has identified various alternatives that will be assessed further during the EIA phase. The advantages and disadvantages of such have been put forward. Such will include consideration of underground cables or overhead lines as well as consideration of various structures that will reduce the visual impact.</p> <p>During the preliminary study, augmentation of the existing substation was considered and from a technical perspective it proved not to be the most viable option. Environmentally, the area around the existing substation was assessed and it also proved not to be the most favourable. Augmentation would not have been a solution to the current constraints that the region is facing.</p> <p>Noted. The study will look deeper into the visual impacts raised and proposed possible mitigation measures to ensure that the Municipality's mandate to provide electricity is put forward without compromising the</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

			side of the R319, as we would like to maintain the views and vistas in that direction as far as possible.	environmental quality. The visual impact study has been conducted and the report is attached as Appendix C6 of the EIR.	07 October 2016
17 May 2016	Department of Environmental Affairs Lerato Mokoena mokoena@environment.gov.za Tel: 012 399 9418	Department of Environmental Affairs	The comments from the Department of Environmental Affairs are as follows: 1. Ensure that all relevant listed activities are applied for; are specific and that it can be linked to the development activity or infrastructure as described in the project description. 2. If activities applied for in the application form differ from those mentioned in the scoping report, an amended application form must be submitted. 3. Ensure that all issues raised and comments received during the circulation of the Scoping Report from registered I&APs and organs of state are adequately addressed in the final	The comments from the Department were noted and all recommendations were taken into account and included in the final scoping report. The listed activities applied for are relevant, specific and linked to the activity. An amended application will be submitted to the together Department with this Final Scoping report. Issues raised and comments received during the circulation of the scoping report have been adequately addressed as illustrated in this Issue and Response Report. Specialist studies conducted are specific to each of the sites applied for. The	30 May 2016

			<p>scoping report. Proof of correspondence must be included in the Final Scoping Report.</p> <p>The specialist studies conducted must be specific to each of the sites applied for. The specialist must provide recommendations and mitigation measures specific to each site and the EAP must provide mitigation measures; an assessment and recommendations for each site as well as the cumulative impacts for each of the facilities.</p> <p>4. Cumulative impact assessment to be undertaken in the final Scoping Report to determine potential fatal flaws.</p> <p>5. The EAP is requested to familiarise themselves with the requirements of Appendix 2 of GNR 982 of the EIA Regulations, 2014 and ensure</p>	<p>specialist reports attached as Appendix C provide recommendations and mitigations measures which are also included in the Scoping Report. Further, the Scoping Report includes the mitigation measures, an assessment and recommendations for each site as well as the cumulative impacts of the facilities. Refer to Sections 7.5 and 12 of the Scoping Report.</p> <p>Cumulative impact assessment is undertaken in the final scoping report. Refer to Section 7.5.</p> <p>The final Scoping Report has been prepared as per Appendix 2 of GNR 982 of the 2014 EIA Regulations and meets the requirements in terms of identifying, assessing and providing mitigation measures for the impacts on the alternative and preferred sites. Refer to Section 7 of the final Scoping Report.</p>	
--	--	--	---	---	--

			<p>that the final Scoping Report submitted to the Department for consideration meets the requirements in terms of identifying, assessing and providing mitigation measures of the impacts on the alternative and preferred sites.</p> <p>6. Provide a description of any identified alternatives for the proposed activity that are feasible and reasonable, including advantages and disadvantages that the proposed activity will have on the environment and the community that may be affected by the activity as per Appendix 2 of GNR 982 of 2014. Alternatively, you should submit written proof of an investigation and motivation if no reasonable or feasible alternatives exist in terms of Appendix 2.</p> <p>7. Must include details and expertise of EAP who prepared the report.</p>	<p>Refer to Section 7.1 of the Final Scoping Report for the description of identified alternatives.</p> <p>Details and expertise of EAP are included in Section 2 of the final Scoping Report.</p> <p>A traffic assessment study will be conducted during the EIA phase.</p> <p>A traffic assessment study conducted during the EIA phase and the report is</p>	<p>07 October</p>
--	--	--	---	---	-------------------

			<p>8. A significant amount of materials and equipment will be delivered to the site during the construction phase of the development. The EIA must include a traffic assessment study. The study must determine the needs during the different phases of implementation.</p>	<p>attached as Appendix C7 of the EIR.</p>	<p>2016</p>
--	--	--	--	---	-------------