
	DRAFT MINUTES OF AUTHORITIES 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:	25 March 2015	Time:	10h00 – 12h30
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.
<p><u>Apologies:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Menard Mugumo - Department of Water and Sanitation (DWS) 2. S Lekota – Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA); 3. T Geldenhuys – DWS 4. P Futhsane – Eastern Cape (EC) Department of Rural Development and Agrarian Reform (DRDAR); 5. SMayedwa – EC DRDAR.

Item.	Description	Action	Target Date
1.	Opening and Welcome		
1.1	<p>The meeting commenced at approximately 10H15. D Henning acted as the chairperson and welcomed everyone present.</p> <p>The following members of the project team were introduced:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • S van Jaarsveld – DWS (Project Proponent); • J Bristow – Arup (Engineering Feasibility Study); and • D Henning – Nemai Consulting (Environmental Assessment Practitioner). <p>The attendees were also requested to introduce themselves.</p>	-	-
2.	Purpose of the Meeting		
2.1	<p>D Henning indicated that the aims of the meeting included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To introduce the project; • To seek clarification regarding certain matters that pertain to the environmental authorisation processes; • To determine the authorities' requirements; and • To confirm the processes and timeframes. 	-	-
3.	Confirmation of Agenda		
3.1	The agenda was accepted without any amendments.	-	-
4.	Project Overview		
	Refer to a copy of the presentation contained in Appendix B.	-	-

Item.	Description	Action	Target Date
4.1	J Bristow presented the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project background and motivation; • High-level project programme; • 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 • Stakeholder engagement and public consultation (Feasibility Study). 	-	-
5.	Environmental Authorisation Processes		
	<i>Refer to a copy of the presentation contained in Appendix B.</i>	-	-
5.1	D Henning presented the following: <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; • Aims of Scoping phase; • Preliminary list of specialist studies; • Mining-related activities; • Water uses; • Heritage and cultural resources; and • EIA timeframes. 	-	-
6.	Authorities' Requirements / Discussion		
6.1	G Sgwabe requested a copy of the presentation. D Henning indicated that the environmental component of the presentation was included in the handouts provided at the meeting. A condensed copy (due to size constraints) of the presentation would be appended to the minutes and would also be uploaded to the project website.	DH	-
6.2	D Malgau requested clarification regarding the positioning of the dam wall site in relation to a photograph shown during the presentation. D Henning explained the location of the site in relation to the meeting venue and R344. S van Jaarsveld further explained the location from where the photograph of the dam site had been taken, which was on the left bank looking downstream.	-	-
6.3	S Rousseau enquired whether it would not be better to gravity feed water to the Adelaide Water Treatment Works (WTW) from downstream of dam rather than pumping. J Bristow indicated that this had been considered during the Feasibility Study.	-	-
6.4	N Muller requested clarification on the locations of the sites used to determine the Ecological Water Requirements (EWR). J Bristow noted that a map indicating these points was not available at the meeting, but this information would be supplied afterwards.	JB	Issued 26 March 2015
6.5	S Genu indicated that it was necessary to provide feedback to the community and to involve them in the project. D Henning noted that this would be undertaken as part of the public participation process.	-	-

Item.	Description	Action	Target Date
6.6	<p>D Malgau asked why the capacity of the existing Adelaide Dam was not being increased as opposed to building a new dam. J Bristow explained that the existing water supply infrastructure for Adelaide Town had been considered during the Feasibility Study. The following options to meet the objectives of the project and to satisfy the water requirements were also assessed: (1) increase capacity of Fish River transfer scheme, (2) increase capacity of Adelaide canal and Adelaide Dam, and (3) groundwater potential. Foxwood Dam was identified as the solution to augmenting the regional domestic water supply as well as to develop irrigated agriculture to support regional socio-economic development. Foxwood Dam is thus regarded as “enabling” infrastructure to allow for the proposed irrigation development.</p> <p>S Nash also noted that if Foxwood Dam was implemented the existing domestic water supply infrastructure for the town of Adelaide needed to remain in place and the water from the proposed dam would also be very expensive.</p>	-	-
6.7	<p>G Sgwabe asked when the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) for the irrigation development would commence. D Henning emphasised that the current EIA was only for the proposed Foxwood Dam and associated infrastructure. As the proposed dam and irrigation development are intrinsically linked, it is assumed that DEA may consider issuing a conditional Environmental Authorisation that is dependent on the feasibility of the irrigation development. S van Jaarsveld stated that it is not the mandate of DWS to take the irrigation development forward and discussions were held with EC DRDAR in this regard during the Feasibility Study.</p> <p>K Joubert indicated that if EIAs were required for the irrigation development the applicants would be individual farmers. The infrastructure associated with the irrigation development was not expected to exceed the thresholds that would trigger the need for an EIA and the land portions in question were also disturbed. Weirs might be required, which would need to undergo EIAs. In addition, other approval would also be required.</p> <p>S Dlomo noted that the lead authority for the irrigation EIA should be the provincial Department Economic Development, Environmental Affairs and Tourism (DEDEAT), depending on the applicant. DEA would struggle to issue a decision if there is uncertainty with regards to the feasibility of the irrigation development. DEDEAT needed to be involved in any associated discussions.</p>	-	-
6.8	N Muller expressed concern over the possible separation of the EIA applications for the irrigation development, as the cumulative impacts of this component to the EWR needed to be assessed. This included the assessment of water quality related impacts as a result of agricultural activities. D Henning indicated that in terms of the EIA Regulations it was anticipated that a combined application would be submitted for the irrigation development, which would allow for an assessment of the cumulative impacts.	-	-
6.9	G Sgwabe noted that the findings of the Terrestrial Fauna and Flora Study would be assessed by the Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (DAFF). The National Forests Act states that forests should not be destroyed. DAFF will partake further in the remainder of the EIA process.	-	-
6.10	S Mullineux asked whether a Water User Association would be	-	-

Item.	Description	Action	Target Date
	created, to which S van Jaarsveld responded that it is recommended. This body would thus apply for the Water Use Licence for the irrigation development.		
6.11	S Genu reiterated the need to keep the community informed. D Henning suggested that the municipality needed to advise whether a presentation on the project needed to be made to council.	-	-
6.12	N Muller asked how the impacts during the construction phase of the proposed dam would be managed. D Henning explained that as part of the EIA an Environmental Management Programme (EMPr) will be developed which will include management requirements for the pre-construction and construction phases, amongst others. Specific requirements will also be included for managing impacts to the river, through water quality monitoring and appropriate mitigation measures. An Environmental Control Officer will be appointed to check compliance against the Environmental Authorisation and EMPr. In addition, an Environmental Monitoring Committee may be established with representatives from the relevant stakeholders.	-	-
6.13	S Dlomo stated that the assessment of cumulative impacts during the EIA for Foxwood Dam needed to include a high-level appraisal of these impacts associated with the irrigation development.	-	-
6.14	S Dlomo asked if a Resource Management Plan (RMP) would be developed for Foxwood Dam. D Henning provided an overview of the RMP process. S van Jaarsveld indicated that the RMP would be developed by another unit of DWS.	-	-
7.	General		
7.1	No matters discussed under this item.	-	-
8.	Way Forward		
8.1	No matters discussed under this item.	-	-
9.	Close		
9.1	The meeting was concluded at approximately 12h00. The site visit commenced thereafter.	-	-

Annexures	
Completed Attendance Register	
Presentations	

APPENDIX A

COMPLETED ATTENDANCE REGISTER

APPENDIX B

PRESENTATION