

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT (EIA) FOR THE PROPOSED WESKUSFLEUR SUBSTATION, WESTERN CAPE PROVINCE

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES REPORT – FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REPORT

SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES/CONCERNS AND SUGGESTIONS RAISED BY INTERESTED AND/OR AFFECTED PARTIES

APRIL 2013 – MAY 2016

- This Comments and Responses Report (C&RR) is a record of all the contributed issues raised by Stakeholders ranging across all sectors of society.
- The name, affiliation (as at that time) and date of the commentator are also indicated.
- The comments under each category have been captured *according to date and time received*.
- Issues raised by technical specialists and Eskom, the project proponent, are not included in the C&RR.

INDEX TO ISSUES IN THIS TABLE

1.	General	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.	City of Cape Town	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3.	Cape Nature	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.	Western Cape Provincial Government	Error! Bookmark not defined.
5.	Land Owners	Error! Bookmark not defined.
6.	Melkbosstrand Ratepayers Association (MRA)	Error! Bookmark not defined.
7.	Heritage	Error! Bookmark not defined.
8.	Nuclear 1	Error! Bookmark not defined.
9.	General Comments/ Issues	Error! Bookmark not defined.

ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THIS ISSUES TRAIL:

AIS	Air Insulated Substation	POS	Plan of Study
BID	Background Information Document	SOC	State Owned Company
CV	Curriculum Vitae		
DAFF	Department of Agriculture, Forestry & Fisheries		
DEA	Department of Environmental Affairs		
DSR	Draft Soping Report		
EAP	Environmental Assessment Practitioner		
EIR	Environmental Impact Report		
EMP	Environmental Management Plan		
FEIR	Final Environmental Impact Report		
GIL	Gas Insulated Line		
GIS	Gas Insulated Substation		
I&AP	Interested and Affected Party		

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
1. General		
<p>Please register me as an interested and affected party.</p>	<p>Trevor Moodley Quality Control Inspector (Mech/Corr) Eskom(Koeberg Nuclear Power Station) Correspondence received: 24/04/2013</p>	<p>Lionel Skeffers response on: 25/04/2013 Thank you for your interest in the proposed project. You will be registered on the database for this proposed project.</p>
<p>As an environmental consultant working for the City of Cape Town in the nearby area, please could I request a copy of the BID. I assume that the BID provides proposed locations for the substation? I am looking for the Eskom Weskusfleur Sub-station project?! You sent me something else.</p>	<p>Jonathan Crowther Pr.Sci.Nat., CEAPSA Managing Director CCA Environmental (Pty) Ltd • Consulting Services Correspondence received: 25/04/2013</p>	<p>Lionel Skeffers response on: 25/04/2013 Hi Jonathan Herewith the BID. May I register you as an I&AP on the proposed project? Apologies, herewith the correct project documentation</p>
<p>Considering the existing EIA process re a proposed Landfill facility on the farm Brakkefontein, Alternative site 4, as well as a 'Parked' (by the minister) Solar Plant EIA process on the same property, it is our respectful view that it will be unlawful for DEA to authorise a substation etc on the same property in these circumstances. It would be a breach of the cooperative governance Provisions of the Constitution. It is also a breach of the EIA regulations. Alternative sites 1, 2, 3 & 5 are all on Eskom land, while Alternative 4 is on private owned property. The substation should be built on Eskom land.</p>	<p>H.L. Brandt BCD Town Planners Correspondence: emailed on 3 July 2013</p>	<p>Lionel Skeffers response on: 27/08/2013 Good day I trust you are well- Kindly note that you have been registered on the Proposed Weskusfleur Substation project database Comment noted and will be taken in consideration.</p>

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
<p>In reviewing the documentation provided re the proposed substation, mention is made of a registration form that is required to be submitted. This form is not available on the email addressed to myself and the website address leads to a still to be released page. Would you provide the required registration form for our records please. In the interim, the CAA would be registering as I&AP via the Acting Manager AOG, Mr Koos Pretorius, telephone 011 545 1066, emailpretoriusk@caa.co.za.</p>	<p>Harry Roberts Aviation Obstacle Assessor Air Navigation Services Correspondence: emailed on 9 July 2013</p>	<p>Kindly note that you have been registered on the Proposed Weskusfleur Substation project database and registration form supplied to you.</p>
<p>Thank you for the information supplied. As the proposed project does not affect any airspace in the vicinity of the planned sub stations and appears to be contained in an already declared, the Civil Aviation Authority will be registering as I&AP in this instance.</p>	<p>Harry Roberts Aviation Obstacle Assessor Air Navigation Services Correspondence: emailed on 9 July 2013</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>Mr Situma agreed that you can include him on your database.</p>	<p>Sakhile Nzimande Department of Transport Correspondence received: 10/07/2013</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>Please note that SANRAL has no comments with regard to this application as a national road will not be affected. It is therefore not necessary to register SANRAL as and I&AP for this particular project.</p>	<p>Ms Colene Runkel SANRAL Statutory Control- Western Region Correspondence: emailed on 16 July 2013</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>Hi Lionel,</p>	<p>Michelle Herbert</p>	<p>Lionel Skeffers response on: 29/07/2013</p>

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
<p>Please direct me to where I can find the DSR. I can't find on the link provided below.</p> <p>Many thanks,</p>	<p>Eskom Koeberg</p> <p>Correspondence received: 29/07/2013</p>	<p>Good day Michelle</p> <p>I trust you are well, please see below link as requested http://www.lidwala.com/expertise/environmental-planning-and-scientific-services/eskom-ei/</p> <p>Also note that the DSR is also available at the venues as indicated on the Notification letter which include the Koeberg Visitors Centre.</p>
<p>I have recently come across an EIA application for the Weskusfleur substation. Unfortunately it is in Afrikaans, and at this high level of language I am unable to translate it sufficiently for my complete understanding. Please can you send me any and all related information in English.</p> <p>Thank you very much for the information. I really appreciate it. I am the chairperson of the Koeberg Public Safety Information Forum and I liaise closely with the Melkbosstrand Ratepayers Association. Please keep me on your database.</p>	<p>(Mrs) SM La Grange</p> <p>Melkbosstrand Ratepayers Association</p> <p>Correspondence: emailed on 3 August and 17th of August 2013</p>	<p>Marinus Boon response:</p> <p>Hi Mrs La Grange,</p> <p>I only found your email now in my junk email box. I will forward you the latest project correspondence in another email. We will also register you on our database if you are interested. We had our public meeting and open day earlier this week for the public review period of the Draft Scoping Report, but there is still time for comments until the 02 September 2013 when the 40 day review period end. Please refer to the details in the latest correspondence forwarded to you.</p> <p>You have been registered on our database for the Weskusfleur Substation project.</p>
<p>Please receive my application for acceptance as an I&AP regarding the Proposed Weskusfleur Substation EIA.</p>	<p>Raymond Williamson.</p> <p>CoCT Ward Committee</p> <p>Representative: (Ward 23)</p> <p>Correspondence received: 17/08/2013</p>	<p>Lionel Skeffers response on: 22/08/2013</p> <p>Good day Mr. Raymond Williamson</p> <p>I trust you are well-</p>

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
		Herewith please be advised that you are now registered on the Proposed Weskusfleur Substation Project as an- Interested and Affected Party.
Please note that the South African National Roads Agency SOC Limited (SANRAL) is not an I&AP in this process as the application does not border onto a national road.	Ms Colene Runkel Statutory Control- Western Region Correspondence: emailed on 7 August 2013	Comment noted.
Thank you for your notification. Please note that the N7 in the vicinity of Koeberg is a Provincial road and you are advised to request their comments. SANRAL is not an I&AP in this project.	Ms Colene Runkel Statutory Control- Western Region Correspondence: 28/08/2013	Lionel Skeffers response on: 03/09/2013 Good day Ms Colene Runkel Your comment has been noted.
We are a community newspaper and normally place these adverts at a reduce rate – we serve Atlantis, Mamre, Darling, Phillidelphia Melkbosstrand, Witsand, Pella, Duynfontein and farming communities in all three WC official languages. We have three other community publications in our group – please see attached profile. Please would you send me document how to be placed on your data-base of suppliers for future adverts.	Peter Lategan Publisher / Managing Editor Impact 24/7 Correspondence: emailed on 22 August 2013	Comment noted.
I would anticipate that the Braakefontein 32 site would probably be Eskom's preferred site because it would entail the least transmission lines alterations, including additions and route changes. I am assuming here that there are no problems with rare	R Mike Longden-Thurgood Retired from Eskom Koeberg Correspondence: emailed on 23 August 2013	Lionel Skeffers response on: 23/08/2013 Good day Mr. Mike Thurgood I trust you are well- We did managed to open your attachment with your comments.

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
<p>indigenous vegetation to be considered, and that this site isn't subject to flooding.</p> <p>I have no concerns over the necessity for the additional "strengthening" of the ability to guarantee power supplies to the KNPS in the event of some incident.</p> <p>Thus the accident which occurred at the Fukushima Dai-Ichi NPS in Japan in March 2011 (which would appear to have been elevated to the second worst accident involving the nuclear power industry, after Chernobyl) has changed the concepts, internationally, about nuclear safety as specifically applied to nuclear power generating plants, with additional potential safety concerns requiring to be applied.</p>		<p>You are registered.</p> <p>Comment noted and will be taken in consideration.</p>
<p>Sorry I cannot comment at this moment in time as I don't have enough of the relevant information to make an informed decision on these proposals.</p>	<p>Robert Mayhew Correspondence: faxed on 26 August 2013</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>I would like to register as a stakeholder for the proposed Weskusfleur Substation EIA process Lidwala is currently running in the vicinity of the Koeberg Power Station (DEA Reference Number: 14/12/16/3/3/2/508).</p>	<p>Kirsty McQuaid Environmental Scientist: SRK Consulting Correspondence: emailed on 5 June 2015</p>	<p>Kindly note that you have been registered on the Proposed Weskusfleur Substation project database.</p>

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
2. City of Cape Town		
<p>Find <u>attached</u> herewith City of Cape Town technical comment on the abovementioned Draft Environmental Impact Assessment Report.</p> <p><i>Please see attached Appendix E.1 for the full comments submitted by City of Cape Town.</i></p>	<p>Morné Theron Senior Environmental Practitioner: Environmental and Heritage Management Branch Correspondence: emailed on 5 October 2015</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p><i>A meeting was held on 13 October 2015 between Lidwala SA and City of Cape Town (CoCT), in order to discuss CoCT comments on the project. Below are the notes from that meeting.</i></p> <p>The following notes on issues will be used to update the Draft EIR to complete the Final EIR:</p> <p>Biodiversity –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is accepted that the cumulative impact of all Eskom’s operations in the City of Cape Town (CCT) should be looked at from a strategic point of view. It falls however outside the scope of this study in deciding the best alternative for the new substation; • A comprehensive or more detailed list of all Eskom environmental studies for new projects in the CCT should however be included into the final EIR; • Although the preferred site is seen as degraded or heavily impacted it still forms part of the decreasing <u>[critical endangered habitat loss]</u> in the CCT area which includes the important conservation corridor/link between the south to the north <u>(as required in terms of the City of Cape Town</u>

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
		<p>Spatial Development Framework, <u>the Blaauwberg District Plan and Environmental Management Framework (2012)</u>) of the area and should therefore be seen as important to the protection of scarce habitat - CFDS;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although no “off-set” is proposed some alternative contribution towards conservation can be expected from Eskom and should form part of the final EIA recommendations as well as part of the EMP. This will be discussed with the ecologist and some suggestions were made in this regard. <p>DRMC –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CCT is responsible for the evacuation planning which includes Koeberg Nuclear Power Station (KNPS) and therefore need estimates on people and way of transport to determine what risks are involved in the case of an emergency. The model used estimates the time and way people must be evacuated during a crisis; • Important to link the alternatives 1 and 4 to the number and level of workers necessary for the construction period (duration); • Use the table <u>[below]</u> as an <u>[proforma]</u> and change to the applicable situation – e.g. 30 workers per day will come

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
		<p>mainly from Atlantis by bus and 5 supervisors with their own transport while the project manager will be on site once a week coming in with own transport etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>[A separate duly populated table must be included in the final EIR for each of the alternatives]</u> • On site <u>[emergency]</u> risk management plan - <u>[Due to the fact that the preferred Alternative will be located within the KNPS property]</u>, temporary workers have to align with KNPS <u>[existing]</u> risk management plan. This must be included as a condition into the specific EMP. <p>Land use management –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KNPS <u>[will be required to apply for a Consent Use in terms of the City of Cape Town Municipal Planning By-Law, 2015 as promulgated into the]</u> Spatial and Planning Development Act (2013) – <u>[General requirement for an application in terms of the said By-Law is stipulated in Chapter 5 of the By-Law]</u>. <u>[The following hyperlink to the City of Cape Town website can be utilized to gain access to the Municipal Planning By-Law: http://www.capetown.gov.za/en/Planningportal/Pages/Legislation.aspx]</u> • This can just be mentioned in the final EIR but no need to go more specific – note – we also included in our proposal to Eskom that we will look at the relevant legislation on <u>[Land Use Planning]</u> etc.

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
<p>1. Be advised that the landline telephone that your latest draft EIR notification supplied for Lidwala is not functional. The voicemail indicated that: <i>"This number is no longer available"</i>. Please provide an alternative landline.</p> <p>2. It is noted that the <u>attached</u> City of Cape Town comment on the Final Scoping report was not included in the draft EIR or responded to at all. Below is proof that the comment was indeed dispatched to Lidwala on 6 July 2015 with a copy to your own e-mail address.</p> <p>3. It is recorded that Lidwala this morning acknowledged that you did receive the City comment on the FSR, but that the same appeared to have been mislaid internally by Lidwala.</p> <p>The City of Cape Town will still provide official comment on the draft EIR before next Monday's commenting deadline, but</p>	<p>Morné Theron Senior Environmental Practitioner: Environmental and Heritage Management Branch Correspondence: emailed on 2 October 2015</p>	<p>Bongi Mhlanga response on: 02/10/2015</p> <p>1.I dialed our landline number (0861 543 9252) and it seemed to be working. May I please request that you try dialing the number again and let me know of the outcome.</p> <p>2.Lidwala SA humbly apologizes for the exclusion of your comments in the DEIR, as it was an oversight on our side. We will ensure, that such an incident doesn't occur again and, that all your comments are acknowledged and addressed in the FEIR that will also be made available for public review and comments. Furthermore as per our telephonic discussion. Lidwala SA represented by Mr Frank van der Kooy, would like to have a meeting with you to discuss and get clarity regarding some of the comments you submitted on the FSR.</p> <p>3.Lidwala SA would like to thank the City of Cape Town for their active and meaningful contribution in the proposed Weskusfleur project. Your inputs and involvement in these EIA projects are very insightful and highly appreciated.</p>

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
<p>understand that it is extremely difficult to provide positive and/or informed comment if our previous comment was not addressed.</p>		
<p>I refer you to the last paragraph of the City of Cape Town comment that we submitted to you in July 2015 (refer below). The City specifically requested that 1 x CD version of the Draft EIR must be submitted, yet if only now realized that you only provided 1 x hard copy.</p> <p>It is impossible for this Branch to circulate your document to the 12+ internal city departments which is located at different locations throughout the City. In order to achieve the save we have an internal Sharepoint Site unto which we upload the CD that enable us to distribute a large document such as your DEIR. All other EAPs have accommodated the City in this regard over the past 8 years (as did you during the previous phases)</p> <p>As such please provide us with the CD version asap.</p>	<p>Morné Theron Senior Environmental Practitioner: Environmental and Heritage Management Branch Correspondence: emailed on 2 September 2015</p>	<p>Comment noted. A soft copy of the DEIR will be delivered to your offices. Kindly also note that Lidwala will ensure that the City of Cape Town receives a 1 hard copy and 1 soft copy of the FEIR.</p>
<p>Find attached herewith City of Cape Town technical comment on the abovementioned revised Final Scoping Report.</p> <p><i>Please see attached Appendix E.1 for the full comments submitted by City of Cape Town.</i></p>	<p>Morné Theron Senior Environmental Practitioner: Environmental and Heritage Management Branch Correspondence: emailed on 6 July 2015</p>	<p>Comments noted and will be taken into consideration during the EIA Phase.</p>

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
<p>Please register the City of Cape Town: Environmental & Heritage Management Branch (this office) as the official City of Cape Town commenting entry and exit point pertaining to this project as follows:</p> <p>In the interim the following comment is raised with regards to the BID:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed Terrestrial fauna & flora specialist study: It is understood that Mr Simon Todd (Simon Todd Consulting) has worked mainly as a research ecologist in arid systems (i.e. the Nieuwoudville area). As such it should be ensured that the appointed qualified botanist is familiar with the local vegetation types and species. Surveys must be conducted in the late winter-spring period when ephemerals are visible and can be identified. Previous detailed Botanical studies were undertaken by Nick Helme Botanical Surveys on the subject site (CapeFarm 34) as part of the (1) Eskom Training Facility EIA and the (2) proposed second nuclear power plant EIA should be consulted as part of the botanist's Terms of Reference. Attention is drawn to Condition 1.46 of the Environmental Authorization (DEA&T/12/12/20/997, dated 23/11/2010) pertaining to the Koeberg Training Facility that states: <i>'Further, before any development on Cape Farm 34 is subr environmental authorisation, the applicant must submit its</i> 	<p>MornéTheron Senior Environmental Professional: Environmental and Heritage Management: District B & C Environmental Resource Management Department (ERMD) Correspondence: emailed on 27 May 2013</p>	<p>Comment noted and will be taken in consideration. The City of Cape Town: Environmental & Heritage Branch have been registered on the database as the official commenting point.</p>

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
<p><i>managed for its private nature reserve to CapeNature for approval and must enter into a stewardship agreement with CapeNature'.</i></p>		
<p><u>PT question:</u> If only 2 alternatives are viable, what is the point of looking at all 5 alternatives?</p> <p><u>MT comment:</u> To save time of I&AP's, further studies should be done only on the 2 viable alternatives (1 and 4) and that the edited technical analysis summary table should be included in the final environmental scoping report.</p> <p><u>RS question:</u> What alternatives will go into next phase?</p> <p><u>MT question:</u> What does the abbreviation GIL stand for?</p> <p><u>MT question:</u> Stating that a stewardship agreement between Eskom Holdings SOC Ltd and Cape Nature is required for the proposed development.</p>	<p>Focus Group Meeting Held on:</p> <p>Tuesday, 13 August 2013, 11:00</p> <p>Milnerton Library Auditorium</p>	<p><u>Response by MG:</u> At start-off all the alternatives were viable and as the EIA process continued it produced that only 2 alternatives are technically preferred.</p> <p>A technical analysis of all the alternatives was undertaken the same period as the scoping studies was undertaken.</p> <p><u>Response by MB:</u> The preferred alternatives will only be indicated in the Final Environmental Scoping Report as to also take the full public review period in consideration.</p> <p><u>Response by MB:</u> It stands for Gas Insulated Lines.</p> <p><u>AH comment:</u> Gas Insulated Lines are only possible over short distances between Gas Insulated Substation and the power station. This is to avoid any power failures and problems that might occur over long distances.</p> <p><u>Response by MB:</u> States that it is written as "required" in the draft scoping report.</p> <p><u>Response by DJ:</u> Eskom Holdings SOC Ltd is finalizing a document that includes all current and future proposed developments on its</p>

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
<p>“The Environmental Authorization (12/12/20/997) and subsequent City of Cape Town appeal approval on 23/11/2010 led to the inclusion of Condition 1.46 which states: <i>‘Further, before any further development on Cape Farm 34 is submitted for environmental authorization, the applicant must submit its management plan for its private nature reserve to CapeNature for approval and <u>must</u> enter into a stewardship agreement with CapeNature.’</i> MT pointed out in the meeting that both the draft scoping report and the presentation did not pertinently highlight that Condition 1.46 has not been met yet. The opinion was also held that it would therefore be problematic if the Weskusfleur EIA process is conclude without the said Condition being met (i.e. finalization of the Stewardship Agreement). MT expressed the concern that Eskom and the EAP might have ‘downplayed’ the urgency/necessity to finalize this condition in the draft scoping report.”</p> <p><u>RS comment:</u> Recommending that the long term plans for the Koeberg property need to be taken into account in order to finalise the stewardship agreement, and that the details need to be determined through further negotiations between Eskom and CapeNature.</p>		<p>land and would from there conclude a stewardship agreement with Cape Nature.</p>

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
<p><u>PT comment:</u> Recommends that a summary of all applications (past, present and future) for development is prepared to be used as a background information tool when presenting to stakeholders.</p> <p><u>MT comment:</u> That updates on biodiversity on Eskom land (Ankerlig) should be on-going on a regular basis to stakeholders and at the moment the last update was a year ago.</p> <p><u>MT comment:</u> That Eskom Holdings SOC Ltd is seen as one applicant for all applications for development.</p> <p><u>MT comment:</u>The determination of a biodiversity off-set should form part of the Ecologist's Terms of Reference</p> <p><u>MT comment:</u> TOR for both Geohydrologyand Freshwater studies should refer to detailed studies done for Koeberg Training Facility.</p>		<p>Comments noted and will be taken in consideration.</p> <p><u>Response by MB:</u> Comments noted.</p> <p>Response MB: Large quantities of transformer oil will be temporarily stored during the transfer into transformers. Smaller quantities of hydro carbons used during construction which can</p>

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
<p><u>CB question:</u> What are the hazardous chemicals and how will it be stored before and during operation for this proposed development?</p> <p><u>MS question:</u> Is the proposed project expected to impact the timing of the construction of the new Eskom – City intake point at Atlantis? Will a builders supply be required from the City and if so, how large?</p> <p><u>MT comment:</u> Alternative 4 for this proposed development is in the City of Cape Town’s biodiversity network and needs to be retained as botanical area.</p> <p><u>PT comment:</u> Register Melkbosstrand Ratepayers Association as I&AP on project.</p> <p><u>MS question:</u> Can the parking area at Koeberg Power Station be included as a viable alternative 1 (B) for GIS option, provided that the existing power lines’ position does not renders such an option impractical?</p>		<p>include, fuel, paint, oil etc. will be stored according to legislative requirements.</p> <p><u>Response by AH:</u> This project is not likely to impact on the Atlantis project. The builders supply would be small and could probably be provided from the Koeberg Power Station’s LV infrastructure.</p>
<p>Below please find the consolidated comment of the City of Cape town on Draft Scoping Report for the above mentioned application:</p>	<p>City of Cape Town Economic, Environment and Spatial Planning – Environmental Resource Management Department:</p>	

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
<p><u>City of Cape Town: Transport Roads & Stormwater: Catchment Management Branch (Melvin James Adonis- Tel: 021 400 3120)</u></p> <p>The branch indicated that from a Catchment Management Perspective there is no objection to any of the various alternatives at this stage. However, as the property is larger than 4000m² in extent, the submission of a Stormwater Management Plan in terms of the City of Cape Town: Management of Urban Stormwater Policy (2009) at building plan submission stage will be required.</p>	<p>Environmental and Heritage Management Services: Districts B & C</p> <p>Correspondence received on 02 September 2013</p>	<p>Comment noted and will be taken in consideration.</p>
<p><u>City of Cape Town: Environmental Health Services- Air Quality Management- (LynelleMatthys – Tel: 021 590 1419)</u></p> <p>From an air quality perspective the following comment is relevant, irrespective of the location alternative that is finally chosen:</p> <p>1.1 Dust control mitigation measures must be implemented during the construction phase in order to prevent dust emission from causing a health nuisance to the surrounding environment and said dust control measures must be documented in the Environmental Management Plan.</p> <p>1.2 No burning of vegetation is to be conducted during the clearing of the erven or during the construction phase of the project. Should it be necessary for open burning to be conducted, application forms for this activity is available from</p>		<p>Comment noted for consideration within the EIA phase and the compilation of the EMP.</p>

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
<p>the Air Quality Management office. Application is to be made well in advance of the proposed open burning dates, if necessary.</p> <p>1.3 Should any fuel burning appliances (eg. Stand-by generators) be installed on site, said appliances must be brought to the attention of the Air Quality Management office prior to installation and be operated in accordance with the City of Cape Town:Air Quality Management By-law,2010.</p> <p><u>City of Cape Town:Utility Services: Electrical Department (Mr. Michael Schmidt- Tel: 021 506 3834)</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Electrical Department has no objection to any of the proposed site locations. It is cautioned that the provision of construction supply to some of the sites may be a problem. However, as the only really viable option appears to be a GIS within Koeberg Power Station Site, the aforementioned concern no longer appears to be an issue. 2. Contrary to the initial perception, as raised during the Focus Group meeting on 13 August 2013, construction of the GIS on the parking area is not an option as the existing power lines cross the entire parking area and an equally large area to the north of the parking area. 		<p>Comments noted and will be taken in consideration.</p>

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
<p>3. An apparently likely viable solution is to construct the GIS between the existing perimeter fences and patrol track north of the existing power station infrastructure.</p> <p>4. It is cautioned that the position of the substation should be planned and designed such that there is space for an additional nuclear reactor and generator set. The department viewed the opinion that it is an unfortunate fact that additional base load generation capacity must be constructed in the vicinity of Cape Town as Eskom's combined generation and transmission capacity for supply the Western Cape has reached its limit and construction of additional power lines cannot solve the problem.</p> <p><u>City of Cape Town: Environmental Resource Management</u> <u>(Mr.MornéTheron- Tel: 021 444 0601)</u></p> <p><u>Background Information</u></p> <p>The current 400kV Gas Insulated System substation at Koeberg Nuclear Power Station is regarded as unreliable, as it has been operating for the past 30 years. As repair is regarded as difficult because of technology constraints, Eskom is proposing a new 400/132 kV substation to be constructed. Six Alternative Options were presented for possible development. All alternatives (apart from Alternative 5) were opted for either AIS (Air Insulated System) or GIS (Gas Insulated System). AIS would have a</p>		<p>The final location for example the GIS at alternative 1 is still to be finalised and the final layout plans/design will affect final positioning. Alternative 1 GIS is planned in the area of the existing perimeter fences and patrol track as indicated in comment 3.</p>

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
<p>development footprint of 42ha whereas GIS would have a smaller footprint of 7.4ha</p> <p>The GIS option for Alternative 5 is not possible as this alternative (near Sterrekus Substation) is 7km away from Koeberg Station and because of this far distance and concerns of faulty and problematic impacts on power lines it cannot be accommodated.</p> <p><u>Alternatives</u></p> <p>Alternative 1 to 3 falls within the Endangered Cape Flats Dune Strandveld vegetation type. Alternative 3 has both Cape Flats Dune Strandveld and Atlantis Sand Fynbos. Atlantis Sand Fynbos vegetation has a conservation status of Critically Endangered. Alternative 4 falls within the Critically Endangered Atlantis Sand Fynbos and Alternative 5 in the Critically Endangered Cape Flats Sand Fynbos; however this area is considered transformed (by previous ploughing)</p> <p><u>Environmental specialist findings</u></p>		<p><u>Response from Ecologist:</u> It is correct that the map was referred to as the 2009 map. However, the actual GIS layer illustrated in the maps in the report are from the recent 2013 Bionet and the</p>

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
<p>The specialist conducted a desktop assessment therefore no detailed studies were conducted apart from brief site visits. It should be noted that the specialist referred to an outdated version of the Biodiversity Network (2009) and omitted to state that Cape Flats Dune Strandveld is a nationally Endangered vegetation type. The Biodiversity Network (BioNet) is continuously updated and the latest version should be requested from the environmental Resource Management Department of the City. The BioNet also includes a wetlands component which may also be requested. There also is a more detailed vegetation map available for the city area on request.</p> <p>It was assumed that any listed species of conservation concern were likely to be encountered at alternatives with intact vegetation. Atlantis Sand Fynbos is critically Endangered owing to its high density of species of conservation concern. Alternative 4, although invaded by alien acacias has good potential for restoration from the seed bank, and is likely to harbour several of these species. During a preliminary site visit, <i>Leucospermum hypophyllocarpodendron</i> subsp. <i>Canaliculatum</i>, a fynbos species, was observed in alternative 3. The specialist failed to consider the importance of the alternative 4 site for connectivity and ecological functioning in the regional context.</p>		<p>reference has been corrected. The conservation status of all the vegetation types at the site are listed in Section 3.1.2. according to the National List of Threatened Ecosystems (2011), including Cape Flats Dune Strandveld. Noted and the map will be requested for the EIA phase. Additional fine-scale vegetation mapping will also be conducted by the consultant as part of the EIA phase of the development.</p> <p><u>Response from Ecologist:</u> The comments and view of the City are noted. However, section 3.4 states “In terms of the different alternatives and the potential of the development to disrupt broad-scale ecological processes, it is clear that Alternatives 3 and 4 pose the greatest risks.” Therefore, the Scoping study clearly recognizes the value of Alternative 4 for connectivity and ecological functioning. The additional comments with regards to the long-term security of the Koeberg Nature Reserve as a conservation area have been noted and included in the FSR.</p>

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
<p>From a biodiversity perspective this site is not supported for development.</p> <p>Impacts associated with the development were identified, including the loss of Endangered and Critically Endangered vegetation types, intact vegetation and listed plant species, the disruption of landscape connectivity and ecological functionality; the negative impacts of construction on fauna; habitat loss of avifauna and increased risk of collisions with power lines.</p> <p>No wetlands were found within the affected areas, however the preliminary site visit was done during the dry season. The biodiversity Network indicates several wetlands either on a close to Alternatives 1-3 and potentially Alternative 5.</p> <p><u>Focus meeting with Lidwala Consulting</u></p> <p>During the focus meeting that was held with Lidwala Consulting Engineers, Eskom and Interested and Affected Parties on 13 August 2013, Eskom representatives stated that their preferred alternatives are either Alternative 1 GIS or Alternative 4 AIS, as the other alternatives are deemed technically unviable. It is argued that the final Scoping report should clearly indicate the aforementioned and reduce the amount of alternatives to only the</p>		<p><u>Response from Ecologist:</u> The plan of study for the EIA states that surveys during the wet season will be conducted to confirm the presence or absence of wetlands within the affected areas.</p> <p><u>Response from Marinus Boon:</u> A separate wetlands study will also be conducted in the EIA phase.</p> <p><u>Response from Marinus Boon:</u> Comments noted. The preferred alternatives that will be assessed in the EIR phase have been indicated in the FSR. In terms of the current technical analysis for all the alternatives, alternative 1 GIS and 4 AIS is the only viable options as indicated in the draft scoping report</p>

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
<p>options that are technically viable for further assessment in the EIR phase.</p> <p><u>Concerns to be addressed</u></p> <p>A detailed botanical and freshwater study should be conducted on all proposed sites to identify potential negative impacts on threatened ecosystems (including wetlands), Species of Conservation Concern and disruption of regional ecological connectivity and functioning. A groundwater assessment should also be done to identify any possible impacts on the surrounding aquifers and hence wetlands;</p> <p>All alternatives with their power line arrangements should be clarified and new proposed power lines needed should also be presented. Bird activity should be properly evaluated where these new power lines are required. Presence of fire-requiring vegetation (fynbos and renosterveld) should also be evaluated under new power line routes in order to assess impacts of power line management on vegetation;</p> <p>Be advised that Alternative 4 is considered completely non-negotiable from a biodiversity perspective as it represents the last</p>		<p><u>Response from Ecologist:</u> Noted. These items form part of the activities planned for the EIA and no additional actions are required to meet these concerns.</p> <p><u>Response from Marinus Boon:</u> A wetlands study and groundwater study will be conducted in the EIA phase as indicated in the POS.</p> <p><u>Response from Marinus Boon:</u> Comment noted for consideration within the EIA phase.</p> <p><u>Response from Ecologist:</u> The consultant supports these recommendations in their entirety and these activities will form part of the EIA as suggested.</p>

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
<p>available north-south ecological corridor between Blaauwberg Nature Reserve and the Dassenberg Coastal Catchment Corridor to the north. It is considered essential to conserve for ecological connectivity into the future as Koeberg cannot be considered as a perpetuity conservation area. Eskom as not agreed to enter a Stewardship Agreement for any portion of Koeberg Nature Reserve, therefore none is secure. An ecological corridor needs to be retained in perpetuity between Blaauwberg Nature Reserve and the Dassenberg Coastal Catchment Corridor area to the north. In order to conserve ecological functioning in fynbos ecosystems, a 300m-wide ecological corridor is considered the minimum for a fully functional corridor.</p> <p><u>Terms of reference</u></p> <p>It is requested that the following terms of reference be specified:</p> <p>A table by Eskom listing all Environmental Assessments in this area (past, current and future possible developments) and progress of the past and present environmental assessments must be included in the final scoping report. The aim of the Table will be to illustrate the cumulative extent of Cape Floral Kingdom critical endangered and/or endangered habitat (in square metres) that has been compromised/lost due to Eskom Holdings developments versus</p>		<p><u>Response from Ecologist:</u> The concern of the City with regards to Alternative 4 and the long-term security of the Koeberg Nature Reserve has been noted and will be included in any assessment of development within Alternative 4. It is however important to note that the long term security of the land within Alternative 4 is also not secure, and so it is difficult to justify selecting Alternative 4 as a preferred location for the development over Alternative 3 which is currently intact and contains exceptional biodiversity.</p> <p><u>Response from Marinus Boon:</u> Comment noted and will be taken in consideration.</p> <p><u>Response from Marinus Boon:</u> Comment noted. A table indicating the past, current and future possible Eskom developments/EIA's have been included in the FSR.</p>

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
<p>the total amount of biodiversity off-set habitat that has subsequently been secured in return;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The biodiversity specialist must consider local biodiversity pattern as well as regional biodiversity pattern and processes in their assessment. This regard is it cautioned that the appointed botanical-and wetland specialists' comment must to be augmented with specialists with local knowledge of the endemic vegetation. • Mitigation for potential loss of biodiversity should be presented in order to strive for no net loss of biodiversity; • City biodiversity information and tools (e.g. latest Biodiversity Network, including wetlands, and fine-scale vegetation map) should be consulted; • The studies done on the training centre/facility (<i>DEA reference: 12/12/20/997</i>) should be referred to, as these had essential information about the potential footprint and impacts thereof for future developments. <p><u>Conclusion</u></p> <p>From the ERDM perspective the preferred alternative is Alternative 5 as it has the least ecological risk and direct biodiversity impacts. However, since this alternative (and others) are, deemed technically unviable, and possibly would be disregarded, it is requested that other alternatives should be brought forward within the Final Scoping Report preferably, that the technically viable and have lower impact on the natural environment.</p>		<p><u>Response from Marinus Boon:</u> Comments noted for consideration within the EIA phase.</p> <p><u>Response from Marinus Boon:</u> Comment noted and will be taken in consideration.</p>

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
<p>Finally it is reiterate that the Environmental Authorisation (DEA reference: 12/12/20/997) and subsequent City of Cape Town appeal approval on 23/11/2010 led to the inclusion of Condition 1.46 which stated: <i>Further, before any further development on Cape Farm 34 is submitted for environmental authorisation, the applicant must submit its management plan for its private nature reserve to CapeNature for approval and <u>must enter into a stewardship agreement with CapeNature</u></i>’.</p> <p>The draft scoping report does not pertinently highlight that Condition 1.46 has not been met yet. The opinion is thus held that it would therefore be problematic if the Weskusfleur substation EIA process is conclude without the said condition being met (i.e. finalization of the Stewardship Agreement).</p> <p>All of the comments raised in this letter must be addressed in the final Scoping Report and submitted to this office in the form of 1 hard copy and 1 electronic CD version</p>		<p><u>Response from Marinus Boon:</u> Comment noted and will be taken in consideration. The DSR state in chapter 8 8.3.4 bullet point 2” <i>A stewardship agreement with Cape Nature is not in place and so this status has not been formalized.</i>” Comments raised in this letter have been taken in consideration in the FSR.</p> <p><u>Response from Eskom: The Koeberg Training and Admin Complex</u> <u>EIA authorisation requires a Stewardship Agreement for the Nature Reserve to be agreed with CapeNature. A Number of discussions have been held with CapeNature and are still ongoing. No formal agreement has yet been concluded but is being progressed.</u></p>
<p>I confirm that I would like to be registered as an interested and affected party; please find attached a copy of the registration sheet, duly completed, for your attention.</p> <p>Our concerns relate to –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the impact of the siting of the proposed substation sites on future road network planning; and, 	<p>Chris Atkins Head : Policy & Statutory Compliance Transport for Cape Town Correspondence received on 02/09/2013</p>	<p>Lionel Skeffers response on 03/09/2013:</p> <p>Good day Chris Atkins</p> <p>We hereby confirm receipt of your e-mail and your comments are noted.</p>

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The impact of the movement of construction traffic and ultimately the transport of the large transformers (Abnormal loads) on the road network. 		<p><u>Response from Marinus Boon:</u> Comments noted for consideration within the EIA phase. A traffic study will form part of the specialist studies in the EIA phase as indicated in the POS.</p>
<p>The application for an EIA for the proposed Weskusfleur Substation in the vicinity of the Koberg Power Station is situated within the 5-10 km Urgent Protective Active Planning Zone (UPZ) boundary of Koberg Nuclear Power Station (KNPS). Attached please find a map indicating the location of the proposed site for Weskusfleur Substation.</p> <p>Eskom Holdings SOC Limited initiated a study to investigate possible alternatives and solutions to address the long term reliability and improvement of the existing 400kV Gas Insulated System substation (GIS) at Koberg Nuclear Power Station. The study also includes the future long term 400/132kV transformation requirements at Koeberg.</p> <p>Eskom Holdings SOC Limited core business is the generation, transformation and distribution of electricity throughout South Africa. Electricity by its nature cannot be stored and must be used as it is generated. Therefore electricity is generated according to supply-demand requirements. Being a nuclear power station, it is vital that the reliability of electricity infrastructure associated with this power station is never compromised. The station is also critical for grid stability in the Western Cape.</p>	<p>E Steyn Head Special Planning and Critical Infrastructure Correspondence: emailed on 4 September 2013</p>	<p>Lionel Skeffers response on: 04/09/2013</p> <p>Good day Amina</p> <p>We have received your comments.</p> <p><u>Response from Marinus Boon:</u> Comments noted for consideration within the EIA phase. A traffic study will form part of the specialist studies in the EIA phase.</p>

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
<p>The current 400kV GIS substation was in operation for almost 30 years and there is concerns regarding its its reliability as it are difficult to repair as a result of discontinued technology. There is also no space for additional 132kV feeder bays at Koeberg Substation to accommodate future requirements for new lines.</p> <p>It is for the aforementioned reasons that a new 400/132kV substation (Weskusfleur Substation) will be required in the vicinity of the Koeberg Power Station to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve the existing 400kV reliability • Cater for load growth on the 132kV network for the 20 year horizon • Prevent overloading of existing 400kV busbar and, • Replace 30 year old technology/equipment. <p>The required area size for the substation location will be approximately 760 x 550m depending on the final location and the technology option as per the outcomes of the EIA process. The Substation will need to account for the current and future needs/plans. The length of the diversion of the power lines will also determine the final substations location.</p> <p>The Disaster Risk Management Centre (DRMC) is the custodian for the execution of the Koeberg Nuclear Emergency Plan (KNEP) and</p>		

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
<p>is tasked with the responsibility of ensuring that the public safety arrangements are in place in the case of a nuclear emergency and that individual citizens are not endangered with particular emphasis on the population residing in the UPZ of the 0-16km area from the KNPS.</p> <p>The DRMC cannot support this application at this stage. The DRMC may, in future, be able to support this application once the updated Traffic Evacuation Model (TEM) is approved by the National Nuclear Regulator (NNR). The revised TEM process has thus far included submission to the Koeberg Nuclear Emergency Plan Structures viz: Emergency Planning Committee (EPC), Emergency Planning Steering and Oversight Committee (EPSOC) and the City of Cape Town Portfolio Committees that culminated in full Council endorsement on 27th September 2012. Following this, the TEM has been submitted twice (during October 2012 and April 2013) to the NNR for approval, upon which a final reply is awaited.</p> <p>Any enquiries regarding the DRMCs decision to object towards the application for an EIA for the proposed Weskusfleur Substation in the vicinity of the Koeberg Power Station could be directed to this office, should you require any additional information.</p>		

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
3. Cape Nature		
<p>CapeNature would like to thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed development and would like to make the following comments. Please note that our comments only pertain to the biodiversity related impacts and not to the overall desirability of the proposed development.</p> <p>CapeNature commented on the Draft and Final Scoping Report for the proposed project. In our comments we raised the issue of compliance with conditions of approval for a previous application which are binding on the subject property. The condition of approval was from the Appeal Decision for the Administrative Centre and Training Campus for the Koeberg Nuclear Power Station dated 23/11/2010 (ref. no. 12/12/20/997):</p> <p>“1.46 Further before any development on Cape Farm 34 is submitted for environmental authorisation, the applicant must submit its management plan for its private nature reserve to CapeNature for approval and must enter into a stewardship agreement with CapeNature.”</p> <p>Subsequent to our comments, negotiations were held with CapeNature in order to ensure that these conditions are complied with before the process could continue for the subject application.</p>	<p>Rhett Smart Cape Nature Scientist: Land Use Advisor Scientific Services Correspondence: emailed on 6 July 2015</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p><i>A meeting was held on 13 October 2015 between Lidwala SA and Cape Nature, in order to discuss Cape Nature’s comments on the project. Below are the notes from that meeting.</i></p> <p>The following is noted that will receive the necessary attention:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alien vegetation at site 4 but still on KNPS (Eskom) property will be linked somehow to site one as a condition that KNPS must clear as an token to site 1 is used; • Although site 1 is degraded it is still seen as part of the continual decline in habitat of the Cape Flats Dune Strandveld (CFDS). Site 4 is part of the important Atlantis Sand Fynbos (ASF) and therefore we can link the “off set” to the alien vegetation clearing on Eskom’s property on the other side of the road (R27); • All conditions will be addressed in the EIA as well as in the site specific EMP; • The cumulative impact of all Eskom’s operations in the Western Cape should actually be dealt with as a matter of urgency. This should form part of a strategic assessment. It is

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
<p>This included negotiations regarding the stewardship agreement and updating the management plan for the property to the prescribed format for protected area management plans (PAMPs) in terms of the National Environmental Management: Protected Areas Act (NEM:PAA – Act 57 of 2003).</p> <p>Cover letters for the signed stewardship agreement and the updated management plan respectively have been included as appendices of the Amended Final Scoping Report. CapeNature can confirm receipt of the above-mentioned documents and therefore can confirm that the provisions of condition 1.46 of the appeal decision for the Koeberg Training Centre have been complied with. While the condition states that the management plan must be submitted and therefore the condition has been fulfilled, it is recommended that the approval letter for the management plan is included as an appendix in the EIA Phase.</p> <p>CapeNature’s comments on the Draft and Final Scoping Reports remain relevant in terms of the proposed project and for further consideration in the EIA Phase of the project.</p> <p>CapeNature reserves the right to revise initial comments and request further information based on any additional information that may be received.</p>		<p>however just as important to remind and motivate Eskom to keep those areas well managed that already contribute to biodiversity management and protection. Good example is the Plattekloof Natural Heritage site (Montvista/Edgemead). Many other areas under their control can be managed positively.</p>

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
<p>What are the commenting timeframes for the BID? Thank you</p>	<p>Rhett Smart Scientist: Land Use Advisor Scientific Services Correspondence: emailed on 25 April 2013</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>Please see attached the latest version of CapeNature standard response letter indicating our requirements for commenting on land use applications (EIA, mining, agriculture, LUPO). In particular, take note of our requirements in terms of provision of reports for review.</p>	<p>Rhett Smart Scientist: Land Use Advisor Scientific Services Correspondence: emailed on 21 June 2013</p>	<p>The CapeNature standard response letter have been received have been taken in consideration for the DSR and also the FSR.</p>
<p>Thank you for the notification. Please can you forward us a hard copy of the report? I have also attached our standard commenting letter indicating or requirements for commenting on land use applications.</p>	<p>Rhett Smart Scientist: Land Use Advisor Scientific Services Correspondence: emailed on 25 July 2013</p>	<p>Lionel Skeffers response on 25/07/2013: A hard copy and a CD was hand delivered to your office in Jonkershoek on the 24 July 2013. We are still awaiting the acknowledgement receipt letters from our delivery person in Cape Town. When we get confirmation from him, we will get back to you. We have received your commenting letter.</p>
<p>Potential Project Alternatives CapeNature takes note that there are five location alternatives for the proposed substation presented in the Draft Scoping Report. There are also two technology alternatives presented, thereby resulting in 10 potential alternatives of a combination of technology and location. Three of the proposed location</p>	<p>Rhett Smart Scientist: Land Use Advisor Scientific Services Correspondence: emailed on 2 September 2013</p>	<p>Lionel Skeffers response on 03/09/2013: Good day Mr. Rhett Smart We hereby confirm receipt of your e-mail.</p>

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
<p>alternatives are located on the property of Koeberg Power Station, Farm Duynfontein 34, and the other two are located on adjacent properties.</p> <p>Farm Duynfontein 34 forms part of the Koeberg Private Nature Reserve, declared under the Western Cape Nature and Environmental Conservation Ordinance, 1974 (Ordinance 19 of 1974), and is therefore listed as a Conservation Area according to the Biodiversity Network for the City of Cape Town (BioNet). It is likely that sections of the three alternatives fall outside of the area declared as nature reserve within the power station precinct.</p> <p>Location Alternative 4 is located on Portion 1 of the Farm Brakkefontein 32, and the site is classified as Critical Biodiversity Area according to the BioNet, and the vegetation type is Atlantis Sand Fynbos classified as Critically Endangered. Location Alternative 5 is located on the Farm Groot Oliphantskop 81 and is not listed as a CBA or Ecological Support Area on the BioNet. The vegetation type that would have occurred on site is Cape Flats Sand Fynbos (Critically Endangered), but the site has evidently been transformed according to the Scoping Level Fauna and Flora Specialist Study.</p>		<p><u>Response from Marinus Boon</u>: Comment noted and will be taken in consideration.</p>

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
<p>The two technology alternatives are Gas Insulated Substation (GIS) or Air Insulated Substation (AIS). It is evident that the AIS requires a much larger footprint (760m × 550m = 41.8 ha) than the GIS (400m × 180m = 7.2 ha) – almost six times the size. The GIS would therefore be the preferred technology from a biodiversity perspective in all instances.</p> <p>It is evident that further technical feasibility studies were only undertaken once the initial ten potential location × technology alternatives were identified. Following the technical feasibility studies only two of the ten were identified as being technically feasible, namely the GIS for Alternative Location 1 and the AIS for Alternative Location 4. The other alternatives should therefore not be included for further consideration if they cannot be implemented, unless the feasibility study was too conservative.</p> <p>In terms of the two identified feasible alternatives, the GIS for Alternative 1 would be the preliminary preferred alternative from the biodiversity perspective based on the desktop information and Scoping level studies, due to the smaller footprint and the more disturbed location adjacent to the existing power station.</p> <p>More detailed specialist studies are required to verify the preferred alternative and its acceptability. EIA Phase specialist</p>		

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
<p>studies should include detailed fieldwork undertaken during Spring for the fauna and flora specialist study to identify any potential Red listed annuals or geophytes, as well as other faunal and floral species.</p> <p>In terms of the potential impacts on avifauna, it is recommended that the experiences from the past 30 years of the existing power lines is used to inform potential impact, taking into account existing impacts.</p> <p>CapeNature also supports the proposal to undertake a freshwater specialist study for the EIA Phase of the project, as there are small wetlands scattered throughout the Koeberg property according to the BioNet and previous studies undertaken on site.</p> <p>Formal Conservation Status</p> <p>An important aspect to consider for this application is the existing Conditions of Approval for previous Environmental Authorisations that are binding on the Farm Duynfontein 34 for any further development. In the Appeal Decision for the Administrative Centre and Training Campus for the Koeberg Nuclear Power Station dated 23/11/2010 (ref. no. 12/12/20/997), the following condition is of relevance:</p>		

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
<p>“1.46 Further before any development on Cape Farm 34 is submitted for environmental authorisation, the applicant must submit its management plan for its private nature reserve to CapeNature for approval and must enter into a stewardship agreement with CapeNature.”</p> <p>Therefore, despite the fact that the condition above was for a development of Eskom Generation, this condition is still relevant to any development located on the property (Farm 34 Duynefontein), even if the applicant for the development is not Eskom Generation. Therefore this proposed development should not be approved until the above condition is complied with.</p> <p>In terms of compliance with this condition, the management plan for the private nature reserve has been submitted to CapeNature and we have provided comment. The plan needs to be updated to reflect the requirements of the Protected Areas Act.</p> <p>In terms of the stewardship agreement, preliminary meetings have been held prior to the initiation of this process. It is recommended that follow-up meetings are held prior to the release of the Draft Environmental Impact Report and that a draft proposal for</p>		

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
<p>stewardship must be compiled and included with the submission, as agreed to by both Eskom and CapeNature.</p> <p>The consideration of the stewardship agreement should take into account any long term plans for the site, the current status as a protected area and other outstanding conservation obligations of Eskom Generation (e.g. offset for Ankerlig Power Station).</p> <p>It is recommended that the consideration of stewardship and offsets be included in the terms of reference of the fauna and flora and freshwater specialists for the EIA Phase. This will be more efficient in the long term regarding the stewardship agreement. The specialist studies should therefore consider both the impacts of the current development and stewardship taking into consideration the long terms plans.</p> <p>CapeNature reserves the right to revise initial comments and request further information based on any additional information that may be received.</p>		
4. Western Cape Provincial Government		
<p>Find <u>attached</u> herewith the Western Cape Government: Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning</p>	<p>Ms Keagan-Leigh Adriaanse</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p><i>A meeting was held on 12 October 2015 between Lidwala SA and Western Cape Government: Department of Environmental Affairs</i></p>

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
<p>comments on the abovementioned Draft Environmental Impact Assessment Report.</p> <p><i>Please see attached Appendix E.1 for the full comments submitted by City of Cape Town.</i></p>	<p>Western Cape Government: Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning</p> <p>5 October 2015</p>	<p><i>and Development Planning in order to discuss the departments comments on the project. Below are the notes from that meeting.</i></p> <p>The following points were discussed to clarify certain points from the comment letter sent 5 October 2015:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Detailed infrastructure – meaning that more description is needed to explain the impacts associated with site alternative 1, the preferred site. Examples are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Security fence additional expansion of the security fence including the GIS substation; • The firebreak associated with the security fence; • Dismantling of power lines coming out of the old GIS substation; • The laydown area for materials; • The power lines turn inns; <p>In essence paint the maps must be clear and easy to see development alternatives so that it is clear what is going to happen.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Activities – all actions must be linked to an activity for site 1 and 4. If only applicable to one site then this must be mentioned for example activity 11 – closer to a water course is only applicable to site 4; 3. Discuss activities as defined in 2010 as well as 2014 if applicable. This must be included into the final EIR;

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
		<p>4. All comments on the final scoping as well as the draft EIA must be addressed in the final EIA;</p> <p>5. Font size – it must just be legible for the public to see and the maps.</p>
<p>1. Your email correspondence with DEA Ref 14/12/16/3/3/2/508 and NEAS Ref DEA/EIA/0001780/2013 of 25 August 2015, refers :-</p> <p>2. Please register this Branch as an IAP.</p> <p>3. Comment is required on an EIA for the proposed Weskusfleur Substation on a ±7,2ha portion of Farm Duynefontyn number 34, division Cape (Koeberg power station property).</p> <p>3.1 An alternative site is on portion of Portion 1 of Farm 32, division Cape.</p> <p>3.2 The Lidwala locality plan with information from this Branch added has been attached for ease of reference.</p> <p>4. This Branch, the Road Authority of Trunk Road 77/1 (TR07701) adjacent to the development, has the following initial comments :-</p> <p>4.1. TR07701 with a proclaimed width of 60m will be affected at Km 30,06 by the proposed development;</p> <p>4.2. In terms of Section 9 of Act 21 of 1940 (Ribbon Development Act) there is a 95 meter building restriction line along TR07701 as</p>	<p>Rod Boyes for the Chief Engineer: Land Transport Transport and Public Works Western Cape Government Correspondence: E-mail on 21 october 2015</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Kindly note that you have been registered as an I&AP on the project's database.</p>

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
<p>measured from the centre line of the road reserve;</p> <p>4.3. In terms of Section 17 of Roads Ordinance 19 of 1976, there is a statutory 5 metre building line applicable along all proclaimed roads. The 5m is measured from the statutory boundary of the road;</p> <p>4.4. In terms of Roads Ordinance 19 of 1976 no new accesses may be built or existing access layouts or access uses changed without the approval of this Branch and</p> <p>4.5. The traffic study provided in the EIA must be brought up to date for the Land Use Ordinance application stage.</p> <p>5. As this Branch is not opposed to the proposed development, it will comment in detail during the Land Use Ordinance application stage.</p> <p>6. Please refer to Job 16301 and to Job 23375 in future correspondence.</p>		
<p>Thank you for your email. Please be sure to send through a hard copy of the draft report to this Directorate for commenting purposes.</p>	<p>Mr Alvan Gabriel Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning</p>	<p>Comment Noted.</p>

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
	Correspondence: Email on 26 August 2015	
<p>We acknowledge receipt of your correspondence dated 05 July 2013, the content of which has been noted. Your correspondence has been referred to the office of the Head of Department for necessary attention. Please quote our tracking number (2013/1123) as reference in all correspondence and enquiries.</p> <p>Please be advised that Dr Fast has referred your email to our Chief Directors: Mr Graham Paulse and Mr Colin Deiner who are nominated to assist you in any future queries.</p>	<p>Amanda Willett Assistant Director Office of the Head of Department Local Government</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
<p><u>TD question:</u> Which are the preferred option(s)?</p> <p>.</p> <p><u>TD question:</u> Are cumulative impacts considered? If any, what are they?</p> <p><u>TD question:</u> Conflict on development, in terms of Stewardship agreement(s)?</p>	<p>Focus group meeting held on:</p> <p>Wednesday, 14 August 2013, 08:30</p> <p>Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning (DEA&DP) 7th Floor Boardroom, Utilitas Building, 01 Dorp Street, CapeTown</p>	<p><u>Response by MB:</u> The preferred alternatives will only be finalised in the Final Environmental Scoping Report. In terms of the current technical analysis for all the alternatives, alternative 1 GIS and 4 AIS is the only viable options as indicated in the draft scoping report</p> <p><u>Response by MB:</u> Cumulative impacts will be addressed in the EIA phase which will include a list of other developments in the area.</p> <p><u>Response by DJ:</u> DJ provided background in terms of the Stewardship agreement and the status thereof. From the City of</p>

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
<p><u>TD question:</u>What is the footprint into Nature reserve?</p> <p><u>TD comment and question:</u> Alternative 4 does have indigenous plants underneath Port Jacksons. How will Port Jacksons be cleared?</p> <p>In closing, DEA&DP suggested to Lidwala that in future one focus group meeting should be arranged for the attendance of all the commenting authorities instead of the individual focus group meetings with the commenting authorities. The suggestion was noted and will be effected in the EIA phase consultative process.</p>		<p>Cape Town Focus Group Minutes: Eskom Holdings SOC Ltd is finalizing a document that includes all current and future proposed developments on its land and would from there conclude a stewardship agreement with Cape Nature.</p> <p><u>Response by DJ & MB:</u> DJ explained and indicated the proclaimed nature reserve areas, none of the alternatives fall within the proclaimed nature reserve area. MB also indicated that the final designs will indicate proximity or intrusion into sensitive areas</p> <p><u>Response by MB:</u> The clearance of vegetation and aliens will be addressed in the EMP in the EIA phase.</p>
<p>The following refer:</p> <p>This branches letter 13/3/5/6/2-31/08 (taak 21235) dated 15 May 2013 to you.</p>	<p>Grace Swanepoel /ML Watters Executive Manager: Road and Transport Management</p>	<p>Lionel Skeffers response on: 22/08/2013</p> <p>Good day Grace Swanepoel</p> <p>I trust you are well-</p>

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
<p>Your email notification of DESR availability and Invitations to the Public Meetings, of 24 July 2013.</p> <p>This branch is the Road Authority of the following roads that are in the immediate vicinity of your various Alternatives:</p> <p>Trunk Road 77 Section 1 (R27) and main road 199 (M19) are in the vicinity of Alternatives 1.</p> <p>Main road 199 and main road 215 (R304) are in the vicinity of Alternatives 5.</p> <p>Submitting a Transport Impact Assessment (TIA) for the construction phase of the substation is a requirement from this branch, as that could impact on the current road and traffic conditions.</p>	<p>Correspondence: emailed on 16 August 2013</p>	<p>Herewith please be advised that your e-mail is noted.</p> <p>Comment noted. A traffic study is included in the plan of study for the EIA.</p>
<p>The following comments are related to the draft scoping report (SR) and Plan of Study (POS) for EIA.</p> <p>1.1 Alternatives</p> <p>This Directorate notes that the preferred technology alternative is a Gas Insulation System (GIS) for alternative 1, however GIS is not easily expandable therefore the influence regarding future developments must be clarified.</p> <p>1.1.2 This Directorate notes that there are several tower design options available for use with the transmission line development, however the description of the design of the tower is inadequate.</p>	<p>DEA&DP- Directorate: Land Management Region 2</p> <p>Enquiries: Mr. A. Osborne</p> <p>Correspondence faxed on 02 September 2013</p>	<p><u>Eskom</u>: Spare bays will be catered for as part of the design. This will be applicable for future 400kV and 132kV expansion.</p> <p><u>Eskom</u>: The height of the towers will be in the region of 50m, but depend on the terrain and clearances required.</p> <p><u>Response from Marinus Boon</u>: A description of the tower design have been included in the FSR chapter 4</p>

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
<p>An adequate description of the tower design (eg height) is required.</p> <p>1.1.3 It is noted that for alternative 1, the Air Insulated System (AIS) yard extends over the proposed Nuclear 1 site. This must be clarified.</p> <p>1.1.4 It is noted that Alternative 2 will cause high marine pollution and heavy corrosion. This must be further investigated in the EIAR and EMP of the EIA.</p> <p>1.1.5 The Directorate notes that Alternative 4 includes the clearance of alien vegetation. However indigenous vegetation occurs under the alien vegetation. The method for clearance of alien vegetation must be addressed in the EIAR and EMP of the EIA.</p> <p>1.1.6 This Directorate notes that a small tributary of the Sout River runs through the western corner of the proposed alternative 5, it is therefore highlighted that specific mitigation measures in</p>		<p><u>Response from Marinus Boon:</u> A map showing the alternatives and their relation to Nuclear 1 has been included in the FSR.</p> <p><u>Response from Marinus Boon:</u> This has been clarified and input from Nuclear 1 have been obtained and included in the FSR. Please also refer to 8. Nuclear 1 below.</p> <p><u>Response from Marinus Boon:</u> Alternative 2 is not a preferred or technical viable alternative for investigation in the EIA phase. The preferred alternatives that will be taken into the EIA have been indicated in the FSR. The high marine pollution referred to here is only in terms of pollution to the substation infrastructure – corrosion to the substation components.</p> <p><u>Response from Marinus Boon:</u> Comment noted. The method of clearance will be addressed in the EIR and EMP.</p> <p><u>Response from Marinus Boon:</u> Comment noted. Alternative 5 is not a preferred or technical viable alternative for investigation in the EIA phase. The preferred alternatives that will be taken into the EIA have been indicated in the FSR.</p>

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
<p>1.3.2 No wetlands appear to be within the affected areas, however the site visit was carried out during the dry season and the lack of such features within the affected areas must be confirmed with a site visit during the wet season.</p> <p>1.4 General</p> <p>1.4.1 On page 5-12 of the draft SR, reference is made of this Department's Guidelines (Need and Desirability; Public Participation), dated 2010. Please note that the relevant Departmental Guidelines are dated March 2013. These guidelines must be utilised since the 2010 versions are outdated.</p> <p>1.4.2 On completion of proposed development all areas should be cleared of any contaminated soil and oil spillage should be prevented.</p> <p>1.4.3 Appendix A shows that the description of the routes of the power lines, investigated in the draft SR and POS for EIA are omitted in the legend of the updated locality map. As such you are required to re-amend the amended locality map accordingly.</p>		<p><u>Response from Marinus Boon</u>: Comment noted. A wetland study will be undertaken for the EIA phase during the wet season.</p> <p><u>Response from Marinus Boon</u>: Comments 1.4.1-1.4.3 noted.</p>
<p>Please note that Department of Local Government has referred the matter to Department of Human (Planning or Property</p>	<p>Nwabisa Geca Senior Administration Clerk</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
<p>Section) in order to determine whether this proposed development impacts on any future housing projects.</p>	<p>Office of the Head of Department Local Government Western Cape Correspondence: 05 September 2013</p>	
5. Land Owners		
<p>Further to receipt of your email dated 11 June 2013, I hereby lodge my objection to the 'alternative 4' location of the proposed substation as follows:</p> <p>If it is implemented, the proposed location 'alternative 4' will rule out any further use of the two existing domestic dwellings on my property, as they fall directly in the area covered by the proposed HV yard, and the overhead lines emanating from the yard, will traverse most of the remaining property, rendering it no longer fit for residential occupation.</p> <p>As you may appreciate, this scenario will not only negate any further use of the property for residential purpose immediately, forcing both families currently living on the property to find alternative housing, but it will also influence future plans for the use of the land, being sand mining and final development into industrial plots.</p> <p>In other words, a servitude scenario is not an option, and the property will have to be purchased outright, in its entirety, and</p>	<p>J.W. Bantjies Correspondence: emailed on 14 June 2013</p>	<p>Comment noted and will be taken into consideration.</p>

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
<p>compensation based on the replacement value of the land, dwellings, as well as potential future income.</p> <p>Trusting that this clarifies my position on this matter. I may be contacted in future on the contact details provided.</p>		
<p>I was very surprised to here that Eskom plans to build the Weskusfleur Substation as the 4th Alternative where our house stands and run 400 kV lines over the remainder of the property. I was under the impression that additional lines would run South West of our property well clear of the dwellings on land Eskom already owns.</p> <p>My parents bought the property ERF:1/1063 when I was in boarding school and it has always been home. I live in the second dwelling South West of the main house and my wife and I have been living here since June 2005. I would like my daughter to have the same stability and upbringing I had here and for her to inherit the property from me one day as my brother and I will from my parents.</p> <p>When we found out my wife was pregnant last year we commissioned an architect to help us transform our house into the perfect family home. We completed our phase one renovations in December 2012 and to date we have spent over R520 000 improving the home. We also have further plans to expand the house to accommodate a second child and swimming pool.</p>	<p>Curtis Bantjies</p> <p>Correspondence: emailed on 17 June 2013</p>	<p>Comment noted and will be taken into consideration.</p>

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
<p>Approved building plans and supporting invoices can be supplied on demand.</p> <p>Understanding that due to the proximity of the land in relation to Koeberg Nuclear Power Station my family and I have plans to mine sand on the property and then later stabilize it to build industrial units to rent out. This will provide a stable income for us and our children for many years to come.</p> <p>If a decision is made to utilise Alternative Site 4 we would have to move and be compensated.</p>		
<p>Heeltemalgekant teen ontwikkeling op eie en buurplaas se eiendom/ grond. Eskom besit reeds meer as voldoende van huleiegrond, waar hulle kan ontwikkel en mors na hartelus (oliphantskop en Koeberg).</p> <p>English translation: Completely against the development on my property and my neighbour's property. Eskom already owns more than enough of their own property where they can develop and litter (oliphantskop & Koeberg).</p>	<p>NicoStoffberg</p> <p>Correspondence: emailed on 9 July 2013</p>	<p>Comment noted and will be taken into consideration.</p>
<p><u>Comment:</u> The Land Owner representatives were interested in the possibilities of the proposed Weskusfleur Substation with regards to their proposed Solar Park at alternative 4</p>	<p>Land owner meeting (alt 4) held on:</p> <p>Thursday, 15August 2013, 09:30</p> <p>Koeberg Power Station – Conservation</p>	<p><u>Response by MB:</u> This depends on the final preferred alternative and final substation design and alignment of the transmission lines.</p>

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
<p><u>MB question:</u> Where are all the access routes to farm Brakkefontein?</p> <p><u>Response by PR:</u> Indicated on proposed Weskusfleur locality map where all access route to farm Brakkefontein is and to the proposed alternative 4.</p>	Offices	
Please note your plan does not reflect all dwellings and some are indicated incorrectly.	<p>Ralene de Necker Erf 1063 portion 2 Correspondence received: 29/07/2013</p>	<p>Marinus Boon response on: 30/07/2013</p> <p>Hi Ralene, Your comment is noted. The proximity of dwellings to the preferred alternatives will be reassessed in the EIA phase when the final design and layout is available.</p>
<p>Further to our registration as an Interested and Affected party, we would like to make the following comments as owners of the farm Vaatjie (KleineZouteRivier 84, remaining extent- Cape Town.):</p> <p>1. Eskom's Koeberg lines are already crossing our farm, endangering our livestock breeding and curtailing our planting activities. Research has proven that proximity to electric power lines and substations prove a real radiation threat to humans and livestock, leading to cancer. We take pride in our free grazing cattle stock and as such realise premium prices for our organic beef, and at this stage the current power line area are used for planting purposes only after we did experience problems (cancerous growths, abortions) when our cattle grazed in the area for prolonged periods.</p>	<p>Nico Stoffberg. Stoffberg Beleggings Trust. E-mail received on 30/08/2013</p>	<p>Lionel Skeffers response on: 03/09/2013</p> <p>Good day Mr.Nico Stoffberg We hereby confirm receipt of your e-mail and your comments are noted</p>

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
<p>2. Currently Eskom's poor line access control poses a security risk and threat to the owners, employees and livestock. Eskom's access gates remains unlocked and in a bad state of repair, even after several requests and contrary to our Servitude agreement with Eskom, leading to unwanted vehicle access, stock theft and an invasion of our privacy.</p> <p>3. Sand mining rights have been registered for the area indicated as a possible power line servitude on our farm.</p> <p>4. The proximity of a sub station and additional power lines poses a threat to the value of our property and future development. We are currently in advanced negotiations with a major developer regarding an eco friendly development on our farm.</p> <p>5. Eskom owns the adjoining farm Oliphantskop, as well as the whole Koeberg area, consisting of 1000's of hectares where they can develop and build substations. It makes absolutely no sense to purchase more property for such purposes, and upset the whole community in the process.</p> <p>6. We have an eco 4x4 route running through the affected area. The affected area is also home to caracals (often seen in the area), steenbokkies, duikers, a cape meerkat family, breeding blue cranes and a secretary bird nest. To mention a few. Fossilised sponges dated to the pre Cambrian period have been found in the</p>		

Issue/Comment	Raised By	Response
<p>area by paleontologists, and the area is abound with stone age artifacts dated as old as 350,000 years by Dr. Tim Hart of the U.C.T. archaeology department.</p> <p>Leading from the above, our family and other affected parties with an interest in our farm, obviously strongly oppose Ekom's development on our farm and adjoining properies.</p>		

6. Melkbosstrand Ratepayers Association (MRA)		
<p>Herewith notification of registration. Please confirm our registration.</p>	<p>John Taylor Chairperson Melkbosstrand Neighbourhood Watch Chairperson, Melkbosstrand Ratepayers Association Correspondence received on: 21/08/2013</p>	<p>Lionel Skeffers response on: 22/08/2013 Good day Mr. John Taylor I trust you are well- Herewith be advised that you are now registered on the Proposed Weskusfleur Substation project database as an Interested and Affected Party.</p>
<p>The main concern of MRA at this stage is the visual impact of the proposed sites (4 and 5) outside of the Koeberg plant area. Preference is given to sites 1 to 3 to minimise additional footprint of Eskom activities, minimise visual impacts associated with sites outside of this area and make best use of the brownfields status of the Koeberg plant area.</p> <p>Exposure long-term of animals in the Koeberg reserve and employees of Eskom to the additional overhead lines from the new proposed Substation should sites 1 to 3 be chosen.</p> <p>Additional safety considerations associated with the new substation (the Occupational Health and Safety Act should also be included for consideration in the legal section of the Scoping report).</p>	<p>The Melkbosstrand Ratepayers Association (MRA) Correspondence: emailed on 2 September 2013</p>	<p>Lionel Skeffers response on: 03/09/2013 Good day Amanda Fritz-Whyte Hereby we confirm receipt of your e-mail and that your comments are noted.</p> <p><u>Response from Marinus Boon:</u> Comments noted and will be taken into consideration. A geohydrological study will be undertaken during the EIA phase as indicated in the POS.</p>

<p>Impacts associated with the decommissioning and removal of the old substation that the new Wesfleur Substation is supposed to replace (hazardous waste disposal, recycling of materials where possible, rehabilitation of the old site, etc).</p> <p>What is the effect of the new substation on the internal processes, licence considerations and outputs of the Koeberg power plant? The EAP should consider whether there should be a need for a localised geohydrological study associated with site dewatering during pillar establishment for the new substation. Disposal of water extracted to enable site establishment should also be considered.</p> <p>Overhead powerlines interfere with radio and cellphone functionality. This additional social impact should be considered especially for sites 4 and 5.</p>		
7. Heritage		
<p>Heritage Western Cape requires a Notification of Intent to Develop (NID) to be submitted regarding the EIA for Proposed Weskusfleur Substation, Western Cape, as required by Section 38 of the National HeritageResource Act (Act 25 of 1999). If this form has not already been submitted, please complete and submit the</p>	<p>Guy Thomas Heritage Officer (Archaeology) Heritage Western Cape Department of Cultural Affairs and Sport</p>	<p>Marinus Boon response on 08/08/2013: Hi Guy/Genna, Thanks for the email.</p>

<p>attached NID form and checklist, and send through one hardcopy and one digital copy (on a CD) along with any associated documentation to the HWC offices.</p>	<p>Correspondence: 02 August 2013</p>	<p>We are aware of the NID to be submitted. We are currently in the scoping phase and currently in the public review period for the draft scoping report for the project.</p> <p>The heritage sub consultant on the project already completed the draft NID. We have 5 different locality alternatives for the project and is still in the process to identify the preferred locality through the EIA process- is there a specific time that we have to submit the NID. We have submitted a hard copy and CD of the Draft Scoping Report to your office : Ntombi Nkoane at HWC received the Copy.</p> <p>Please advise.</p>
<p>Hi Marinus</p> <p>The submission of the NID following your finalisation of which alternative will be followed in your project is fine. You should be aware however that HWC will not comment on the Draft Scoping Report until the NID has been submitted.</p> <p>No development should take place until HWC has commented, as we are both the relevant Heritage Authority in terms of the National Heritage Resources Act (Act 25 of 1999) as well as a registered commenting authority for NEMA. The NID should form part of your public commenting phase when the final alternative is decided on.</p>	<p>Guy Thomas Heritage Officer (Archaeology) Heritage Western Cape Department of Cultural Affairs and Sport</p> <p>Correspondence: 12/08/2013</p>	<p>Marinus Boon response on 03/09/2013:</p> <p>Hi Guy,</p> <p>Thanks for the information. We will take this in consideration.</p>
<p>Heritage Western Cape requires a Notification of Intent to Develop (NID) to be submitted for the proposed Weskusfleur</p>	<p>Troy Smuts Heritage Officer (Archaeology)</p>	<p>Marinus Boon response on: 29/08/2013</p>

<p>Substation, Western Cape Province (DEA: 14/12/16/3/3/2/508), as required by Section 38 of the National Heritage Resource Act (Act 25 of 1999). If this form has not already been submitted, please complete and submit the attached NID form and checklist, and send through one hardcopy and one digital copy (on a CD) along with any associated documentation to the HWC offices.</p>	<p>Heritage Western Cape Department of Cultural Affairs and Sport Correspondence received on: 29/08/2013</p>	<p>Hi Troy, With reference to your attached email please see the correspondence below. (Refers to e-mail received from Guy Thomas on 12/08/2013)</p>
<p>8. Nuclear 1</p>		
<p>The current location of the Alternative 1 AIS (Air Insulated Substation) GIS (Gas Insulated Substation) 400 kV Yards encroaches on the land currently earmarked for development for Nuclear 1 on the Duynefontein site. This area has been committed as such in Nuclear-1 in EIA in 2008.</p> <p>Land that is available for construction needs to be maximised for the New Build project as a Nuclear-1 vendor has not yet been identified. As such the location of the proposed plant is subject to change, and the total area currently allocated in the Nuclear-1 EIA would need to be available.</p> <p>As part of the Nuclear-1 EIA process, Eskom as indicated a site layout that would be required for an assumed vendor. This layout is concentrated to the South of the available EIA corridor in order to avoid impact on the mobile dune fields further north. This</p>	<p>TasneemVawda Eskom Correspondence: emailed on 2 September 2013</p>	<p>Lionel Skeffers response on: 03/09/2013</p> <p>Good day TasneemVawda Your comments are noted and you have been registered on the proposed Weskusfleur project database.</p> <p><u>Reponse Eskom</u>: This is currently the only viable GIS option and it is noted that the location for alternative 1 encroaches on the land earmarked for development. Obviously this will be taken into account during the design phases.</p> <p><u>Response from Marinus Boon</u>: Comments noted and will be taken into consideration. The final designs/layouts will be determined in the EIA phase. The AIS at alternative 1 is not a preferred/technical viable option to be taken into the EIA phase.</p>

<p>means that any new development north of the existing Koeberg Power station will be constrained with regard to space.</p> <p>The attached drawing (Drawing No: 0.96/20085) indicates the Eskom EIA corridor for Nuclear-1 and the impact of Weskusfleur Alternative 1 on the Nuclear-1 EIA. The AIS subtraction encroaches significantly on the Nuclear-1 terraces.</p> <p>Land cannot be allocated to two projects at the same time.</p>		
---	--	--