

	DRAFT MINUTES OF PUBLIC MEETING Announcement Phase	Queries:	Donavan Henning ☎ 011 781 1730 ☎ 011 781 1731 ✉ donavanh@nemai.co.za
Client Details:	 water & sanitation Department: Water and Sanitation REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA	Project Name:	EIA for the Development of Foxwood Dam
Date:	24 March 2015	Time:	14h00 – 16h30
Chairperson:	D Henning	Venue:	Adelaide Golf Club, Winterberg Lane, Adelaide

Note: These minutes are not intended as a verbatim transcript of the meeting, but rather as a summary of the salient discussions which took place.

Attendance

Refer to the completed Attendance Register contained in Appendix A.

Item.	Description	Action	Target Date
1.	Welcome and Introduction		
1.1	The meeting commenced at approximately 14H00. D Henning acted as the chairperson and welcomed everyone present. The following members of the project team were introduced: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • S van Jaarsveld – Department of Water and Sanitation (Project Proponent); • J Bristow – Arup (Engineering Feasibility Study); and • D Henning – Nemai Consulting (Environmental Assessment Practitioner). 	-	-
2.	Purpose of the Meeting		
2.1	D Henning indicated that the aims of the meeting included the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To introduce the project; • To provide an overview of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process; • To provide a platform for project-related discussions; and • To obtain input into the Scoping Phase. 	-	-
3.	Presentations		
	<i>Refer to a copy of the presentation contained in Appendix B.</i>	-	-
3.1	S van Jaarsveld provided an overview of the project background and motivation, and presented a high-level project programme.	-	-
3.2	J Bristow presented the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Koonap River water resources; • Ecological Water Requirements; • Water requirements and resources; • Strategic socio-economic development opportunity; • Regional context – Great Fish River; • Physical project works for EIA; • Potential for irrigation development; • Economic impacts; and 	-	-

Item.	Description	Action	Target Date
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholder engagement and public consultation (Feasibility Study). 		
3.3	<p>D Henning indicated that the EIA is currently in the Scoping phase, which served to (amongst others):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify and engage with Interested and Affected Parties (I&APs); Prioritise environmental issues and impacts; Select suitable and feasible alternatives to be investigated further; Identify of relevant specialist studies; and Determine public participation requirements. <p>D Henning further presented the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental legal framework; Overview of EIA process; Alternatives to be assessed as part of the EIA; Public participation – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Landowner identification; Discussions to date; Notification; Preliminary list of specialist studies; Mining-related activities; Water uses; Heritage and cultural resources; and EIA timeframes. 	-	-
4.	EIA Matters		
4.1	A Ballantyne enquired about the location of the alternative quarry site. J Bristow explained the approximate locality. It was confirmed that the site is situated on the Kaga road. A Ballantyne noted that during the EIA for a new quarry the local farmers had opposed the development and stopped the development thereof.	-	-
4.2	R Crossman asked why the government departments were not present at the public meeting. D Henning explained that a dedicated meeting had been scheduled for 25 March 2015 with those government departments with specific mandates in terms of the governance of the project. This included regulatory and commenting authorities.	-	-
4.3	S Mana enquired whether the municipal revenue generation associated with the proposed project had been calculated. J Bristow noted that this information was not available. S van Jaarsveld indicated that the project needed to be included into the future planning of the municipality, such as the Integrated Development Plan. D Henning suggested that this matter be considered further by the project team.	-	-
4.4	S Mana recommended that the Daily Dispatch also be used in the future for EIA related notices. D Henning explained that the regional and local newspapers that had been used were identified in consultation with local members of the community. Recommendation noted and will be considered further.	DH	-
4.5	S Mana asked if the tourism potential of the proposed dam had been considered. It was noted that the economic impact assessment has only considered direct, indirect and induced job creation and economic activity related to the primary activities of dam construction and implementation of the proposed irrigation scheme. S van Jaarsveld noted that a different unit within DWS will conduct a process to determine the recreational potential of the dam and to develop a Resource Management Plan. The potential economic benefit of potential tourism and recreational opportunities would be assessed at	-	-

Item.	Description	Action	Target Date
	this later stage.		
4.6	G King noted that he used the MR00639 to move his livestock between grazing areas located in the north and south. D Henning indicated that this needed to be assessed further as part of the EIA.	-	-
4.7	A Ballantyne enquired what the new cost of water would be per hectare for farmers downstream of the dam with existing water rights. J Bristow explained that as part of the Feasibility Study allowance has been made for all existing licensed water use upstream and downstream of the proposed dam. However, as part of the development of the water resource of the Koonap River, it is anticipated that a full review of water allocation would be carried out by DWS. D Henning suggested that a formal response in this regard be provided to the Adelaide Farmers Associations.	SvJ	-
4.8	M Locket asked whether land would be set aside at the dam for emerging farmers. S van Jaarsveld noted that portions of land had been identified downstream of the dam as part of the Feasibility Study to allow for commercial farming by emerging farmers. This forms part of the irrigation development and the appropriate government department will need to pursue this component of the project further.	-	-
4.9	S Cockroft asked whether the canals downstream of the proposed dam would be affected by the project. S van Jaarsveld confirmed that these canals would not be affected but it will be confirmed.	-	-
4.10	L van der Meulen wanted to know if the abstraction weirs downstream of the proposed dam would be affected. D Henning indicated that the formal response from DWS would also need to address this query (<i>refer to item 4.7</i>)).	SvJ	-
4.11	C Muir asked whether the furrow below the dam site would be affected. D Henning indicated that this would need to be assessed further as part of the EIA.	-	-
5.	Way Forward		
5.1	D Henning requested that all comments regarding the project be submitted to Nema Consulting by 06 April 2015.	-	-
6.	Close		
6.1	The meeting was concluded at approximately 16h00.	-	-

Annexures
Completed Attendance Register
Presentations

APPENDIX A

COMPLETED ATTENDANCE REGISTER

APPENDIX B

PRESENTATION