

## APPENDIX L

---

### COMMENTS AND RESPONSES REPORT (CRR)

The CRR will be available in the Final Scoping Report



**water & sanitation**

Department:  
Water and Sanitation  
**REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA**



REPORT NO:  
P WMA P RSA 000/A00/22118/5

# **PROPOSED MOKOLO AND CROCODILE RIVER (WEST) WATER AUGMENTATION PROJECT (PHASE 2A) (MCWAP-2A): WATER TRANSFER INFRASTRUCTURE**

## **SCOPING REPORT (DRAFT)**

### **COMMENTS AND RESPONSES REPORT**

**February 2018**



---

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

---

1	INTRODUCTION	3
2	COMMENTS AND RESPONSES – PROJECT ACCOUNCEMENT PHASE	5
2.1	Project Motivation	5
2.2	Water Use and Availability	7
2.3	Alternatives	26
2.4	Aquatic Ecology	27
2.5	Terrestrial Ecology	29
2.6	Visual, Air, Noise and Light Pollution	34
2.7	Technical & Land Matters	37
2.8	Borrow Pits	50
2.9	Socio-Economic Issues	51
2.10	Climate	53
2.11	Hartbeespoort Dam	53
2.12	Other Planned Developments	55
2.13	EIA Process	57

## 1 INTRODUCTION

---

Water demand will increase in the Lephalale area due to various planned and anticipated developments associated with the Waterberg coalfields. The Department of Water and Sanitation (DWS) commissioned the Mokolo and Crocodile River (West) Water Augmentation Project (MCWAP) Feasibility Study to investigate the options for meeting the aforementioned water requirements.

Nemai Consulting was appointed by the DWS and the Trans-Caledon Tunnel Authority (TCTA) (implementing agent) to conduct the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) for MCWAP Phase 2A (MCWAP-2A) in terms of Government Notice (GN) No. R. 982 of 4 December 2014, as amended. This document serves as the Comments and Responses Report which accompanies the draft Scoping Report for the proposed **MCWAP-2A Water Transfer Infrastructure** (WTI).

This Comments and Responses Report summarises the issues and queries raised, as well as statements made, by authorities as well as Interested and Affected Parties (IAPs) through correspondence received (including completed Reply Forms and Comments Sheets, letters, faxes and emails) and discussions at meetings during the Announcement Phase of the EIA process. This report also attempts to address the comments through responses and input provided by the relevant members of the project team (DWS, TCTA, Nemai Consulting and consulting engineers).

Scoping serves to identify and prioritise issues for further assessment during the EIA phase. Accordingly, the comments received from IAPs during public participation as part of Scoping will be afforded due consideration and will be investigated further during the pending EIA stage, as required.

When reviewing the Comments and Response Report, please take cognisance of the following:

1. It is acknowledged that the project team may not necessarily be in a position to thoroughly address all the comments raised, as the EIA is only in the Scoping Phase. As is the nature with the EIA process, a better understanding of the impacts and the concomitant mitigation thereof, will only ensue in the EIA phase following the execution of specialist studies. As part of the Technical Study there is also an on-going refinement of the project infrastructure and alternatives, which may only come to the fore during the EIA phase. Where necessary, the Comments and Responses Report will evolve and the responses will be updated or expanded upon as new information becomes available.
2. The two primary sources of comments that were received to date are (1) correspondence and (2) meetings with IAPs.
3. A number of key issues were echoed by various IAPs. In these instances where related issues were raised multiple times, a reference is provided to the comment number where the associated response is recorded.

4. Where necessary, additional information from the project team was included in certain responses that were provided to comments raised during IAPs meetings and feedback from focus groups. This was done to allow for these comments to be addressed in greater detail. All these responses are recorded in italics font type.
5. This report does not necessarily provide verbatim comments from meetings but rather reflects the essence of the discussions held with IAPs.
6. The following project team members responded to the comments received during meetings (refer to minutes of meetings):

Name	Affiliation	Role
O. van den Berg	DWS	Applicant
R. Gillmer	DWS	Applicant
A. Nelwamondo	TCTA	Implementing Agent
S. Kelefetswe	TCTA	Implementing Agent
P. le Roux	MCC	Technical Team
J. Kroon	TCTA/Aurecon	Technical Team
R. Botha	DWS	Presentation of Validation and Verification of water use in the Crocodile (West)-Marico catchment
S. Ndwandwe	Limpopo-North West Proto CMA	
P. van Rooyen	WRP Consulting Engineers	Water Resources Specialist
F. Vogel	-	Chairman of Focus Group Meetings with Agricultural Groups
S. Pienaar	Nemai Consulting	Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP)
D. Henning	Nemai Consulting	EAP

7. The majority of the comments were translated from Afrikaans.
8. For ease of reference, the comments and accompanying responses are separated into the categories below. The reader is urged to also read the comments received from the various IAPs which are appended to the Scoping Report for the contextualisation of the comments.

<b>Categories</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project Motivation</li> <li>Water Use and Availability</li> <li>Alternatives</li> <li>Aquatic Ecology</li> <li>Terrestrial Ecology</li> <li>Visual, Air, Noise &amp; Light Pollution</li> <li>Technical &amp; Land Matter</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Borrow Pits</li> <li>Socio-Economic Issues</li> <li>Climate</li> <li>Hartbeespoort Dam</li> <li>Other Planned Developments</li> <li>EIA Process</li> </ul>
-------------------	---	---

## 2 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES – PROJECT ACCOUNCEMENT PHASE

### 2.1 Project Motivation

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
1.	<p>Medupi Power Station is one of the intended recipients of the bulk water supply for this planned infrastructure and the delivery of this is linked to our ability to complete and operate our FGD plant to ensure continued compliance to licence conditions. Timeline for the commencement and completion of this project are therefore of strategic importance to Eskom.</p> <p><i>Specific requirements in terms of the EIA process?</i> To be included in all communications related to the PPP and to be able to comment on all documents associated with the EIA process.</p>	Emile Marell	Reply Form (17/06/2016)	<p>The Scoping Report indicates that without MCWAP-2A Eskom will not be able to implement the Flue-Gas Desulphurisation (FGD) technology at the Medupi Power Station to reduce sulphur emissions, which will violate the related condition in Eskom's World Bank loan which can lead to the withdrawal of the loan with associated risks to the Republic of South Africa's (RSA) economy.</p> <p>Contact details of E. Marell included in the IAP database.</p>
2.	With current strain on all the SA water sources is the augmentation seen as being fully sustainable during wet and dry periods.	Filomaine Swanepoel	Reply Form (18/05/2016)	<p>Section 10 of the Draft Scoping Report lists the various alternatives to the project.</p> <p>Alternative water resources, which were considered include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ground Water;</li> <li>• Re-use of effluent at Lephalale;</li> <li>• Mokolo Dam raising;</li> <li>• Crocodile Water;</li> <li>• Return flows in Crocodile River (West) and Vaal River Catchments;</li> <li>• Creating more storage by raising of existing dams and/or building new dams;</li> <li>• Abstraction point at Faure Weir; and</li> <li>• Water for transfer from rivers beyond the borders of South Africa.</li> </ul> <p>MCWAP-2A as configured in the Draft Scoping Report was identified as the feasible option to supply the long-term water requirements.</p>
3.	The project does not make sense. Sizes of the proposed pipe diameters don't make sense. Reasoning, starting point,	J. L. Pretorius	Reply Form (22/06/2016)	Refer to Section 3 of the Draft Scoping Report, which provides an overview of the project background and

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	feasibility, practicality and reasons for the project don't make sense and are invalid.			<p>motivation.</p> <p>The following technical reports are of particular relevance to the information contained within the Scoping Report, and provide further details of the context of the project (refer to project website - <a href="http://www.dwa.gov.za/Projects/MCWAP/technicalID.aspx">http://www.dwa.gov.za/Projects/MCWAP/technicalID.aspx</a>):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P RSA A000/00/8809 - Pre-feasibility Stage: Supporting Report 1: Water Requirements;</li> <li>• P RSA A000/00/8909 - Pre-feasibility Stage: Supporting Report 2: Water Resources;</li> <li>• P RSA A000/00/9109 - Pre-feasibility Stage: Supporting Report 4: Dam, Weir and River Engineering;</li> <li>• P RSA A000/00/9309 - Pre-feasibility Stage: Supporting Report 6: Crocodile River Transfer Scheme Options;</li> <li>• P RSA A000/00/8109 - Feasibility Stage: Main Report: MCWAP Feasibility Study Technical Module Summary;</li> <li>• P RSA A000/00/8609 - Feasibility Stage: Supporting Report 10: Requirements for the Sustainable Delivery of Water;</li> <li>• P RSA A000/00/8309 - Feasibility Stage: Supporting Report 12: Phase 2 Feasibility Stage; and</li> <li>• P RSA 000/A00/18413 - Feasibility Bridging Stage: MCWAP-2: Post Feasibility Bridging Study; Review Report.</li> </ul> <p>The water requirements of users in the MCWAP System were obtained from the Post Feasibility Bridging Study Report. They are reflected in Section 3.5 of the Draft Scoping Report and are aligned to a transfer capacity of 75 million m<sup>3</sup>/a, which is marginally (&lt;10%) less than the maximum requirements beyond 2040. The pipe sizes were selected to convey the transfer capacity and would be further optimised during the tender design phase.</p>

## 2.2 Water Use and Availability

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
4.	<p>Guarantee the use of water. Acknowledge water use entitlements downstream of the abstraction weir – application of the National Water Act.</p> <p>Everything mentioned above must be discussed and dealt with comprehensively. To identify the various impacts and how it will be addressed for landowners who will adversely affected as a result of the planned construction and infrastructure</p> <p>The most important point is water and the insurance that he can continue unhindered with his operations on his land.</p> <p>Louma Farming is a major player in the region in terms of job creation, food cultivation and the intensive use of its irrigation projects. Every aspect of the farming is planned and coordinated to achieve optimal utilization of all resources and no deviations are accepted. It is a farming operation and company that stands strong in a difficult environment and provides work for various people and actually contributes to the well-being of the environment.</p> <p>Any kind of risk that does not go through Louma farm management or that cannot be controlled would result in negatively impacts to the farming operations.</p> <p>The farming operations consist of various facets that include breeding of exotic wildlife but mainly relies on the irrigation of crops. Any deviation in resources and availability would indicate that the industry cannot be economically managed, which would be a disaster for the company and the staff.</p> <p>All kinds of risk and guarantees for the availability of water for Louma Farming must please be extensively examined and considered.</p> <p>All the other aspect mentioned in point 2.1 of the Reply Form must also please be extensively examined and considered,</p>	Bernard Enslin	Reply Form & Letter (17/05/2016)	<p>The water requirements of the lawful water users are secured through existing entitlements (i.e. Existing Lawful Use – Section 32 of the National Water Act, No. 36 of 1998). Existing water use entitlements were accounted for in assessing the availability of water for the transfer scheme. DWS does not guarantee the assurance of supply in accordance with the National Water Act.</p> <p>The Vlieëpoort Abstraction Weir will make provision for a gauging facility to monitor flows downstream of the abstraction works.</p> <p>The Draft Scoping Report addresses the impacts and how it will be addressed.</p>



No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	<p>due to the fact that there are many construction activities and infrastructure planned right next to his game breeding and living areas.</p> <p>We hope that you understand our problem and we want to work with you to ensure that Louma Farming is duly acknowledged in the MCWAP project.</p>			
5.	<p>Can you please register me as an IAP for the MCWAP 2 EIA (both the Water Transfer Infrastructure and the Bulk Power Supply). Contact details provided.</p> <p>We hold a prospecting right for coal in Lephalale and are in the process of applying for a mining right and EA. We have been engaging TCTA since around 2012 concerning obtaining water from MCWAP 2.</p>	Clive Machingaifa (Groothoek Coal Mining Company (Pty) Ltd)	Email (16/05/2016)	Contact details included in the IAP database.
6.	Not enough water for farmers and Eskom.	Henu Schutte	Reply Form (17/05/2016)	<p>Refer to no. 4 for response to existing lawful water users.</p> <p>The increasing surplus return flow in the Crocodile River (West) catchment that can be transferred is set out in the on-going review of the Crocodile River (West) Water Supply System Reconciliation Strategy. Given that the growth in water requirements for the main urban centres (Johannesburg, Midrand, Pretoria, Rustenburg) will continue to be supplied from the Vaal River System via Rand Water's network, and the commensurate growth in urban return flows towards the Crocodile River (West) and its tributaries, sufficient water is expected to be available to meet all the requirements for water in its catchment.</p> <p>Return flows to the Crocodile River (West) are discharged into various tributaries. These mainly converge upstream and at the confluence of the Pienaars River with the Crocodile River (West), which offers the opportunity for large scale abstraction (such as for the Lephalale area) and possible regulation downstream of that point.</p> <p>The transfer of water from the Vaal River System for use in the Crocodile River (West) catchment (potable water</p>

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
				<p>via Rand Water network) continues to grow for all the identified planning scenarios.</p> <p>Should the need for water transfer from the Crocodile River (West) catchment to the Lephalale area be taken into account, together with the effluent flows from the Rand Water transfers to the Crocodile River (West) catchment, the low water use scenarios in the Crocodile River (West) catchment also result in the lowest total transfers from the Vaal River System, despite the need for additional augmentation (raw water) in the Lephalale area to meet the growing needs.</p> <p>The planning phase therefore concluded that the requirement for additional water to the project area should be augmented from the Crocodile River (West) and that adequate volumes of water should be available for such transfer.</p>
7.	Guarantee of water.	Hennie Du Plessis	Reply Form (18/05/2016)	Refer to no. 4 for response to existing lawful water users.
8.	<p>1. Loss of agricultural water allocations i.e. irrigation. Commercial agriculture is one of the key economic activities along the Mokolo River. The main crops grown in the Mokolo catchment include maize, citrus fruits, tropical fruits and vegetables. Crops are watered mainly through irrigation from the river, although in some instances groundwater is also used. Around 1000 hectares of land is under irrigation in the Mokolo Catchment.</p> <p>2. Loss of high agricultural soils/land.</p> <p>3. Water Quality Farmers have indicated that water quality is a main issue affecting agricultural production in the Mokolo Catchment. Deteriorating water quality will harm export market more especially citrus farmers.</p> <p>Conduct Agricultural Impact/Assessment Study. Conduct Hydrological Study.</p>	Ramabulana Ndwamato (DAFF)	Reply Form (19/05/2016)	<p>Note that the Mokolo River forms part of the MCWAP Phase 1.</p> <p>Refer to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No. 4 for response to existing lawful water users; and</li> <li>• No. 6 for response to water availability for the scheme.</li> </ul> <p>Section 14.4.3.4 of the Draft Scoping Report provides an overview of the Agricultural Impact Assessment.</p> <p>A Hydrological Assessment was conducted as part of the Feasibility Study (refer to project website - <a href="http://www.dwa.gov.za/Projects/MCWAP/FeasibilityStage.aspx">http://www.dwa.gov.za/Projects/MCWAP/FeasibilityStage.aspx</a>). Findings from this study will be included in the EIA Report.</p>

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
9.	Noted the poor water quality in the Crocodile River.	S Phasha (DWS)	Authorities Meeting (25/05/2016)	O van den Berg indicated that only the sediment will be removed as part of the transfer scheme and that the respective end users would need to treat the raw water to meet their requisite standards. He also indicated that the Zeeland Water Treatment Works will only receive water from Mokolo Dam.
10.	Will water be taken from Mokolo Dam? There is not sufficient water downstream of this impoundment.	S Phasha (DWS)	Authorities Meeting (25/05/2016)	O van den Berg explained that MCWAP-2 entails the transfer of water from the Crocodile River.
11.	Indicated that the proposed return of sediment back to the Crocodile River from the desilting works would constitute a Section 21(f) water use in terms of the National Water Act (No. 36 of 1998).	R Botha (DWS)	Authorities Meeting (25/05/2016)	D Henning indicated that the Integrated Water Use Licence Application (IWULA) requirements will be discussed with the DWS Regional Office during a separate pre-application meeting.
12.	Indicated that for Section 21(i) water use all wetlands within a 500 m radius of the project infrastructure would need to be identified. He noted that the new General Authorisation would be published soon, which needed to be taken into consideration in this regard.	R Botha (DWS)	Authorities Meeting (25/05/2016)	Refer to no. 11 for response to the IWULA.
13.	The water use entitlement needs to lie with the operator of the scheme.	R Botha (DWS)	Authorities Meeting (25/05/2016)	Refer to no. 11 for response to the IWULA.
14.	The project cannot be implemented without an Integrated Water Use Licence.	S Phasha (DWS)	Authorities Meeting (25/05/2016)	Refer to no. 11 for response to the IWULA.
15.	Where will water for construction purposes be obtained from?	S Phasha (DWS)	Authorities Meeting (25/05/2016)	A Nelwamondo indicated that boreholes would be used if existing services are not available.  D Henning noted that water used for this purpose may fall within the conditions of the General Authorisation, which needed to be confirmed.
16.	A large number of the attendees include the Makoppa farmers and that they are concerned about the availability of water.	J Nel	Public Meeting (25/05/2016)	O van den Berg stated that the surplus water in the system, which is associated with the effluent from various Wastewater Treatment Works, was confirmed as part of the Reconciliation Study through detailed analyses. He further explained the standard principle that is applied in terms of the storage of water in a system and that Hartbeespoort Dam is currently not operated as a dam. He indicated that Vlieëpoort Abstraction Weir will not be a

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
				<p>storage facility but simply a diversion structure. Gazetted water rights for irrigation out of the dams in the system will be respected and protected. He noted that the assurance of water supply planned for power generation is 99,5%, whilst it is 91% for irrigation, if available. Any high flows will overtop the weir and recharge the downstream aquifer.</p> <p>D Henning mentioned that separate meetings will still be arranged with the Hartbeespoort Irrigation Board, Crocodile-West Irrigation Board and farmers from the Makoppa Irrigation Area.</p> <p><i>Note that the abovementioned meetings were held and the minutes of the meetings have been incorporated into the Comments and Responses Report, and are attached to the Scoping Report.</i></p>
17.	Currently there is not enough water available in the Crocodile River.	J Botes	Public Meeting (25/05/2016)	Refer to no. 16 for response provided by O van den Berg during the public meeting.
18.	It is the worst drought experienced in a long time. There is not enough water in the system for the transfer scheme.	R van Tonder	Public Meeting (25/05/2016)	Refer to no. 16 for response provided by O van den Berg during the public meeting.
19.	It is critical to properly manage the water in the system. Hartbeespoort Dam is full while water is required downstream.	H Bloem	Public Meeting (25/05/2016)	<p>Refer to no. 16 for response provided by O van den Berg during the public meeting.</p> <p><i>In addition, water is released in accordance with the existing entitlements.</i></p>
20.	Will storage be provided at the pipeline's terminal point?	J Botes	Public Meeting (25/05/2016)	O van den Berg explained that the pipeline will feed multiple users Terminal Reservoirs (at each of the large users) with 18 days storage capacity to be provided by such users. Storage will also take place at the balancing dams, Break Pressure Reservoir and Operational Reservoir. This is required to allow for the maintenance of the pipeline and to provide a buffer for operational shortages in the system.
21.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will water be pumped constantly from the river?</li> <li>How will water supply be ensured to the downstream farmers?</li> <li>Will large volumes of water associated with floods be stored?</li> </ol>	J Botes	Public Meeting (25/05/2016)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>S Pienaar indicated that water will be pumped constantly.</li> <li>Refer to No. 4. O van den Berg also explained that a River Management System is required to monitor, control and manage the releases into the river, the</li> </ol>

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
				flows in the river and abstractions from the river enabling honouring existing entitlements. 3. O van den Berg indicated that there are no suitable dam sites for the storage of flood water due to the surrounding topography.
22.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. According to his calculations one third of the current yield of the river will be abstracted for the transfer scheme. How will the water in the system be augmented?</li> <li>2. Motivation for the location of the proposed abstraction weir and alternative sites that were considered.</li> <li>3. There is no confidence amongst the farmers in the findings of the Reconciliation Study and the results will need to be investigated further.</li> </ol>	W Potgieter	Public Meeting (25/05/2016)	<p>To form part of the discussions with the various irrigation groups.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <i>Refer to no. 6 for response to water availability for the scheme.</i></li> <li>2. <i>Refer to Section 9.3.1 of the Draft Scoping Report. Several possible weir sites along the Crocodile River (West) were evaluated as part of the Pre-feasibility Study for suitability with respect to topography, access, founding conditions and river morphology. Of these sites the following two abstraction locations were identified as viable for further consideration during the pre-feasibility stage of the project: Boschkop Lower Site on the farm Boschkop 138 JQ and Vlieëpoort Upper Site on the farm Mooivalei 342 KQ. The choice of abstraction point was largely determined by the extent of river losses and additional costs associated with river management actions between the aforementioned two abstraction sites, as well as the need for and benefit of implementing a phased approach to deliver water to the end users. Based on these criteria, the Vlieëpoort site is regarded as the preferred option due to the following: more favourable topographical conditions, shorter rising main to the proposed Break Pressure Reservoir and better founding conditions.</i></li> <li>3. <i>The agricultural sector needs to partake in the Reconciliation Studies.</i></li> </ol>
23.	<p>Only one of the dams in the system has sluice gates that make provision for releases.</p> <p>Concerned about poor water quality in the Crocodile River.</p>	J Swanepoel	Public Meeting (25/05/2016)	<p><i>A River Management System is required to monitor, control and manage the releases into the river, the flows in the river and abstractions from the river.</i></p> <p><i>The proposed components of the River Management System include the following (see Section 9.11 of the</i></p>

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
				<p><i>Draft Scoping Report):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Four existing dams (i.e. Hartbeespoort, Roodekopjes, Klipvoor and Vaalkop);</li> <li>• Possible new river outlet at Hartbeespoort Dam or revised operating procedures;</li> <li>• Possible new river outlet at Roodekopjes Dam or revised operating procedures;</li> <li>• Thirteen existing river gauging stations;</li> <li>• Three and possibly four new river gauging stations;</li> <li>• Smart metering of direct abstraction;</li> <li>• Smart metering of indirect abstraction (boreholes);</li> <li>• Conveyance capacity in Crocodile River (West);</li> <li>• Data communication network; and</li> <li>• Integrated operational centre.</li> </ul> <p><i>Refer to item No 9 with regard to water quality.</i></p>
24.	Noted that he was involved with the previous EIA for MCWAP-2. He submitted a legal letter to DWS wherein he stated that he reserves his right to further dispute water-related matters.	R van Tonder	Public Meeting (25/05/2016)	<i>Noted. Provision is made as part of the EIA's Public Participation process to raise concerns for consideration by the project team.</i>
25.	How will water shortages be managed during drought periods?	B Enslin	Public Meeting (25/05/2016)	<p>O van den Berg indicated that the system is analysed on an annual basis and is discussed with the water users during talks of the System Operating Forum. Explained DWS' protocol for managing water shortages during droughts.</p> <p><i>Refer to the presentation during the Focus Group Meetings with the agricultural groups.</i></p>
26.	Who will be the end user of the water? If it is private then the Expropriation Act cannot be applied. The sustainability of farming needs to be ensures, with specific reference to water requirements.	H Prinsloo	Public Meeting (25/05/2016)	<p>O van den Berg indicated that the end users include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Power generation in Waterberg;</li> <li>• Coal for power generation in the Waterberg;</li> <li>• Industrial/mining for other purposes;</li> <li>• Urban use by Lephalale Municipality; and</li> <li>• Authorised water for game and/or livestock watering purposes along the pipeline.</li> </ul> <p><i>Refer to no. 4 for response to existing lawful water users.</i></p>
27.	Concerned about the curtailment of his water allocation.	B de Beer	Public Meeting (25/05/2016)	O van den Berg indicated that the existing water entitlements will be respected and protected.

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	Will it be possible to receive an offtake point from the pipeline?			<p>It is DWS' standing policy to only provide offtake points for livestock and/or game watering to authorised directly affected landowners. The water will be too expensive for irrigation purposes. This matter will form part of the negotiations with the individual landowners.</p> <p><i>A limited volume of water will be set aside for this purpose. Such users will have to apply for a water use licence (Chapter 4 of the NWA) and enter into an agreement with DWS. Water tariffs will be payable in accordance with the prevailing Pricing Strategy.</i></p>
28.	Can the transfer scheme not supply water for agricultural purposes? The significance of food security must be taken into consideration.	R Peyper	Public Meeting (25/05/2016)	O van den Berg indicated that Phase 2 of the Lesotho Highlands Water Project is being developed, which will supply additional water to the Crocodile System. According to analyses of the Crocodile System water must be supplied to projects that are of strategic national importance. The water will be too expensive for irrigation purposes. This will be discussed further during pending meetings with the irrigators following the Public meetings.
29.	What will happen with the water once it has been used by the end user?	K Herman	Public Meeting (25/05/2016)	O van den Berg indicated that the maximum reuse of the water will be promoted, and the water will thus not be discharged.
30.	What will the water quality be at the off-take points?	P Jordaan	Public Meeting (25/05/2016)	S Pienaar indicated that it will be raw water as part of the transfer scheme.
31.	Will it be possible to receive offtakes from the pipeline?	K Janse van Rensburg	Public Meeting (26/05/2016)	Refer to No. 27.
32.	Require further information pertaining to the water balance.	W du Plessis	Public Meeting (26/05/2016)	The water balance was considered as part of the technical studies. One of the objectives of the Reconciliation Strategy 2015 includes maintaining a positive water balance in future and reconciling growing water requirements and availability. Refer to No. 6.
33.	Would it be possible to receive an off-take from the pipeline?	H Steenkamp	Public Meeting (26/05/2016)	Refer to No. 27.
34.	This will have a massive impact on the ecology and downstream water users.	Willem Hazewindus (WESSA)	Reply Form (09/06/2016)	<p>Refer to no. 4 for response to existing lawful water users.</p> <p>An Aquatic Impact Assessment (see Section 14.4.3.1 of the Draft Scoping Report) and Terrestrial Ecological Study (see Section 14.4.3.2 of the Draft Scoping Report) will be undertaken during the EIA phase to assess the</p>

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
				impacts of the proposed project to aquatic and terrestrial ecology, respectively.
35.	Water users under the dam wall. The project will have a significant impact on the farming activities. No water in the river.	Kobus van Graan	Reply Form (20/06/2016)	Refer to no. 4 for response to existing lawful water users.
36.	<p>Concerns include the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The dam wall which is going to be built in the Crocodile River at Mooivalei;</li> <li>2. The volume of water (m<sup>3</sup>/s) that will be abstracted and pumped away.</li> </ol> <p>Specific requirements include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Department must provide me with my volume of registered water through a sluice in the weir; or</li> <li>2. The Department must buy out my volume of water at an acceptable price.</li> </ol>	L. J. van Rensburg	Reply Form (21/06/2016)	<p>Refer to no. 4 for response to existing lawful water users.</p> <p>75 million m<sup>3</sup>/a will be transferred.</p> <p>Your legal entitlement will be released.</p>
37.	<p><i>Linked to No. 3.</i></p> <p>Water scarce area, constant water shortages, droughts – in other words there is no water.</p>	J. L. Pretorius	Reply Form (22/06/2016)	<p>Refer to No. 6 for response to water availability for the scheme.</p> <p>The water to be transferred via MCWAP-2A relate to the return water emanating from upstream.</p>
38.	<p>We are already experiencing a problem with too little irrigation water. Less water will also negatively affect the quality of the water.</p> <p>Cannot fathom how the project is being considered in an area that already has too little water.</p>	Z. W. Pienaar	Reply Form (23/06/2016)	<p>Refer to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No. 4 for response to existing lawful water users; and</li> <li>• No. 6 for response to water availability for the scheme.</li> </ul>
39.	<p>Dear Mr Henning</p> <p>SUBMISSIONS ON THE BACKGROUND INFORMATION DOCUMENT FOR THE PROPOSED MOKOLO CROCODILE (WEST) WATER AUGMENTATION PROJECT PHASE 2</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. We act for Earthlife Africa Johannesburg (ELA or “our client”), an organisation founded in 1988 to mobilise civil society around environmental issues in relation to people. It is a membership organisation, with currently approximately 100 members, led by a Core Group which serves as its management committee. ELA challenges</li> </ol>	Centre for Environmental Rights	Email (24/06/2016)	Introductory section of correspondence, which provides an overview of the BID. No response necessary.



No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	<p>environmental degradation and aims to promote a culture of environmental awareness and sustainable development in South Africa.</p> <p>2. We refer to the Background Information Document (BID) for the Proposed Mokolo Crocodile (West) Water Augmentation Project Phase 2 (MCWAP-2) published on 16 May 2016. We confirm that our client has been duly registered as an interested and affected party (I&amp;AP) in relation to this project.</p> <p>3. While we do not intend to make full and detailed submissions on the content of the BID, we are instructed to place on record that we reserve our client's rights to make full submissions during the subsequent stages of the environmental impact assessment (EIA) process for MCWAP-2. The absence of extensive comments at this stage is not, by any means, to be construed as approval for or acceptance of the proposed MCWAP-2 project.</p> <p>4. We note that the purposes of the BID, as stated, is to:</p> <p>4.1. provide an overview of the proposed MCWAP-2;</p> <p>4.2. provide an outline of the EIA process that will be undertaken for the project; and</p> <p>4.3. grant the opportunity to be registered as an I&amp;AP and allow for comments to be made on the proposed project.</p>			
40.	<p><i>Linked to number 39.</i></p> <p>8. We state, at the outset, that our client has significant reservations about the feasibility and sustainability of the proposed MCWAP-2 project based on, inter alia;</p> <p>8.1 the current water shortages throughout South Africa, and the predictions that the water shortage will worsen;</p> <p>8.2 the impending and increasing impacts of climate change; and</p> <p>8.3 the communities and the agricultural industry which are dependent on water sources such as the Crocodile</p>	Centre for Environmental Rights	Email (24/06/2016)	<p>As is common accepted practice, the potential impact of climate change to river flows has been considered in the hydrological modelling, where a margin for error in the future predictions has been considered. This is based on historical data of wet and dry periods for the area, as well as all known water use that affects river runoff.</p> <p>Due to the small surface area of the inundation area behind the abstraction weir, in terms of global climate change factors, no noticeable impact on the climate of the region is anticipated.</p>

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	River, which will be impacted and affected by MCWAP-2.			<p><i>It must be noted that the majority of water for the proposed transfer would be return flows.</i></p> <p>Refer to No. 4 for response to existing lawful water users.</p>
41.	<p><i>Linked to number 39.</i></p> <p>10. All potential impacts of MCWAP-2 must be fully assessed, and, as part of the requisite assessments, adequate consideration must be given to, amongst other things:</p> <p>10.1 impacts both on the 'giving' (Crocodile River West) and receiving water systems;</p> <p>10.2 water scarcity, water quality, ecological flow, and the cumulative impacts that the project will have on existing water resources in South Africa;</p> <p>10.3 potential and predicted flood patterns and flows, and associated risks;</p> <p>10.6 impacts of population growth and foreseeable demand for water from both water systems over the life of the proposed project, in terms of anticipated trends, taking into account 'the reserve'.</p>	Centre for Environmental Rights	Email (24/06/2016)	<p>The MCWAP will also aim to satisfy most of the water requirements of the new anticipated developments from the increasing source of return flows from the Gauteng area. Operating rules for both the Mokolo and the Crocodile River (West) systems will be developed by DWS in a separate process and take cognisance of this and ensure that existing lawful use is respected and protected. Similarly, it is a legal requirement that provision is made for meeting the requirements of the Reserve, as catered for in the National Water Act (Act No. 36 of 1998).</p> <p>The available storage in the Crocodile River (West) is not being used optimally at this stage due to the steady stream of return flows that has kept Hartbeespoort Dam spilling most of the time during the past decade and a half. This storage capacity will be better utilised once the transfer of water to the Lephalale area commences.</p> <p>The water requirements between the four upstream dams (i.e. Hartbeespoort, Roodekopjes, Klipvoor and Vaalkop) and Vlieëpoort, the flows required past Vlieëpoort Abstraction Weir and the other factors that will affect the flow in the river at the weir such as rainfall, evaporation from the river water surface, evapo-transpiration from the riverine vegetation, tributary and diffuse inflows and diffuse seepage outflows from the river, will be considered as part of the overall River Management System.</p>
42.	Asked why a large dam could not be built at Vlieëpoort.	D. van Vuuren	Focus Group Meeting – Hartbeespoort Irrigation Board (24/01/2018)	J. Kroon explained that the topography is steep on both sides at the proposed weir site, however, the conditions for a foundation are poor. A large portion of the water consists of return flows that create a constant stream and only a weir is thus required to allow for abstraction. The costs associated with building a dam due to the foundation conditions renders this option as economically unviable.

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
				F. Vogel also noted that the 4 to 6 m weir already creates a backwater effect. A dam will increase this effect, which will result in significant impacts on upstream infrastructure such as roads, railway line and access to the mine. There is thus a restriction on the volume of water that can be stored at this point.
43.	Asked what will happen to the farmers that over-abstract.	N. Fourie	Focus Group Meeting – Hartbeespoort Irrigation Board (24/01/2018)	<p>S. Ndwandwe indicated that when such a person is identified the matter will be referred to the appropriate unit within DWS and the water used by this party will then be monitored. He noted that he did know the intricate details of this process. He stated however that this is a problem to the downstream water users when water is over-abstracted upstream.</p> <p>F. Vogel noted that the situation in the Crocodile River (West), where there has been a surplus of water for many years, may change and that this may not be the case in the future. It will form part of the Irrigation Board's responsibility to ensure that water is available.</p>
44.	Asked if the verification process included the Makoppa water users.	H. Barnard	Focus Group Meeting – Hartbeespoort Irrigation Board (24/01/2018)	S. Ndwandwe indicated that the process is being undertaken for the entire Limpopo area, up to the start of the Olifants River.
45.	Asked why does DWS not just issue a Water Use Licence.	N. Fourie	Focus Group Meeting – Hartbeespoort Irrigation Board (24/01/2018)	S. Ndwandwe explained that the Section 34 letter forms part of the authorisation in terms of the National Water Act for an Existing Water Use. He explained that these uses relate to a transition period between the 1956 and 1998 Acts.
46.	Asked about the actual capacity of Hartbeespoort Dam. He also enquired about the volume of silt in the dam.	D. van Vuuren	Focus Group Meeting – Hartbeespoort Irrigation Board (24/01/2018)	<p>Post meeting note: the capacity of the dam is 186,5 million cubic meters.</p> <p>P. van Rooyen indicated that a silt analysis was taken into consideration.</p>
47.	Indicated that 75 million cubic meters of water will be required from Hartbeespoort Dam. He noted that the Hartbeespoort Irrigation Board has an annual allocation of 80 million cubic meters, without losses. He asked what will happen if the same	D. van Vuuren	Focus Group Meeting – Hartbeespoort Irrigation Board	F. Vogel and P. van Rooyen indicated that the presentation attempts to provide answers to these questions.

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	situation arises in the system as what is being experienced in the Western Cape. He also asked whether preference will be given to the irrigators or the Medupi Power Station.		(24/01/2018)	
48.	Asked how the water used by the farmers along the river will be monitored. He also asked how much water is being abstracted.	H. Barnard	Focus Group Meeting – Hartbeespoort Irrigation Board (24/01/2018)	F. Vogel and P. van Rooyen indicated that the presentation attempts to provide answers to these questions.
49.	Asked wat will happen if there is an increase in the re-use of return flows in Tshwane and Johannesburg, especially as water becomes scarcer.	N. Fourie	Focus Group Meeting – Hartbeespoort Irrigation Board (24/01/2018)	P. van Rooyen explained that this is exactly why the strategy exists. DWS approved the first phase of Tshwane's re-use project, however, the Department indicated that if any further phases of re-use are contemplated by the municipality then they will need to submit this to DWS to ensure that it forms part of the reconciliation strategy and projections.
50.	Asked about the period in May during the wet season, as indicated in the presentation.	D. van Vuuren	Focus Group Meeting – Hartbeespoort Irrigation Board (24/01/2018)	<p>It was explained that the Irrigation Board's new allocations only commence in September / October. If the dam is full at the end of May and water is only abstracted by the farmers in October then the board will need to adjust the rules as large volumes of water will be lost due to quotas only being allocated to farmers during the driest periods.</p> <p>P. van Rooyen noted that DWS does not want to make a decision already in March or April regarding water restrictions as water may still flow into the dam thereafter. Although there is some flexibility the date of 1 May is anchored, based on the resource availability.</p> <p>J. Kroon indicated that Mokolo Dam also has a rule related to 1 May of every year.</p> <p>P. van Rooyen noted that they had analysed this rule prior to setting up the model and had confirmed that the rule is acceptable and does not need to change. As another example, when Tzaneen Dam in the Letaba area was analysed it was found that there is a rule that when the dam is 95% full then half of the demand gets restricted. Variations in the restriction rules and the</p>

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
				implications to specific users are analysed. It is important that the restrictions are not too severe to prevent the proper utilisation of water in the dam, or that the rules are not severe enough. Hence, it needs to be evaluated.
51.	Stated that the Bierspruit and Sand River run dry within one week and have insufficient water. F. Vogel indicated that the point is that the Makoppa irrigators must use the water that is available in the Bierspruit and Sand River. The Vlieëpoort Abstraction Weir will also receive water from these watercourses and water must thus be measured to ensure that the Makoppa irrigators that abstract water further downstream receive sufficient water and that their water is not pumped to the power station.	N. Fourie	Focus Group Meeting – Hartbeespoort Irrigation Board (24/01/2018)	F. Vogel indicated that the point is that the Makoppa irrigators must use the water that is available in the Bierspruit and Sand River. The Vlieëpoort Abstraction Weir will also receive water from these watercourses and water must thus be measured to ensure that the Makoppa irrigators that abstract water further downstream receive sufficient water and that their water is not pumped to the power station.
52.	Asked why is a new dam not being planned to store the water.	J. Steenkamp	Focus Group Meeting – Crocodile River (West) Irrigation Board (24/01/2018)	<p>F. Vogel explained that various options were initially considered when the transfer scheme was envisaged. This included, amongst others, building new dams and increasing existing dams, but some of these were not economically viable. Refer to presentation by P van Rooyen in terms of the additional delivery of water in the system.</p> <p>P. van Rooyen explained why no dams were built in the area. He explained that if Klipvoor Dam would increase for example, it would be a significant expense for very little additional delivery. Another dam will not provide adequate delivery because the river system is already well utilized by the existing dams in the system, and the available volume of water is already stored in those dams.</p>
53.	Asked how the Validation and Verification of water use in the Crocodile (West)-Marico catchment is being undertaken.	K. Schutte	Focus Group Meeting – Crocodile River (West) Irrigation Board (24/01/2018)	F. Vogel explained that the original arrangement (approximately 1998) was that the individual irrigators that formed part of the Crocodile River (West) Irrigation Board did not have to provide proof of water use. However, the schedule of the Board and the list of taxable surface area, with up to date payments, needed to be provided to DWS, which would serve as verification of the area's water users.
54.	Indicated that the table in the presentation pertaining to existing water use in quaternary catchment A21J, where 452 000 cubic meters of water is indicated, does not tally with what	J. Swanepoel	Focus Group Meeting – Crocodile River	S. Ndwandwe explained that this value reflects what the Department currently assumes to be the existing water use, as determined during the Validation and Verification

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	is the reality on the ground.		(West) Irrigation Board (24/01/2018)	process.
55.	Requested clarity on the value of 1 040 389 cubic meters shown in the table.	Unidentified attendee at meeting	Focus Group Meeting – Crocodile River (West) Irrigation Board (24/01/2018)	S. Ndwandwe explained that this value indicates the potential existing water use in this particular quaternary catchment.  F Vogel noted that the process is still underway and that the values reflected in the presentation may change.
56.	Asked about the statement in the summary of the presentation that indicates that there will be sufficient water for irrigators. Is this only applicable to the Crocodile River (West) scheme, or does it also apply to the irrigators downstream of the Vlieëpoort Abstraction Weir?	L. Scheepers	Focus Group Meeting – Crocodile River (West) Irrigation Board (24/01/2018)	P. van Rooyen presented the Water User Priority Classification. He indicated that this will not be the case and noted that the water users downstream of the proposed Vlieëpoort Abstraction Weir only have access to the incremental flow downstream of the weir. This is currently the case and will remain the same in the future.
57.	Asked if the return flows from Lephalale can also be used? This will certainly also increase.	K. Schutte	Focus Group Meeting – Crocodile River (West) Irrigation Board (24/01/2018)	P. van Rooyen and J. Kroon explained that when the system of MCWAP-1 and MCWAP-2A were integrated, it was estimated that domestic water was less than 15% of the total demand, with industrial demand at 85%. The reuse of water in Lephalale can certainly be considered but when the total picture is analysed, it is very little.  F. Vogel also added that there are already mines which utilize the return water from the municipality, which thus reduces the need to use water from the Crocodile River.
58.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A dam is only considered in the case of a new irrigation scheme. The volume of water that flows past in a year is about two and a half times of the volume of Roodekopjes Dam, which justifies another dam. There is 200 million cubic meters of water that flows past, which is currently in the calculations as runoff;</li> <li>2. There is really only one dam (Roodekopjes Dam) in the whole system with sluices. If a sluice mechanism can be built at Klipvoor Dam, it will assist significantly; and</li> <li>3. How many units are to be commissioned at the Medupi Power Station?</li> </ol>	J. Swanepoel	Focus Group Meeting – Crocodile River (West) Irrigation Board (24/01/2018)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. P. van Rooyen explained that the water stored within a dam needs to be converted into a steady supply, which must also take into account evaporation. A single dam of 200 000 000 cubic meters will not ensure the same steady delivery as there is no river system that works like this. The water that currently flows past is due to Hartbeespoort Dam being "too full". F. Vogel added that, over the years, numerous analyses have been done and costs calculated to build another dam in the system and it was found to be economically unviable.</li> <li>2. Noted. <i>To be considered as part of the River Management System.</i></li> <li>3. J. Kroon explained that the need for 75 million cubic</li> </ol>

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
				meters per year provides for all 6 new units at the Medupi Power Station. The transfer capacity is unlikely to be necessary immediately, but it is the long-term plan by 2040. F. Vogel added that 75 million cubic meters a year does not represent the full need, as the capacity allows for other developments apart from the Medupi Power Station.
59.	Asked whether the Hartbeespoort Dam would be used as a normal storage dam and not as a recreational dam for tourism, which is currently the case and that it will not be kept 100% full all the time but can also be utilised throughout the year	B. Breedt	Focus Group Meeting – Crocodile River (West) Irrigation Board (24/01/2018)	F. Vogel stated that the system uses the dam as a normal storage dam. H. Pretorius added that the dam is not 100% full for tourism, but it is always full because large volumes of return flow upstream of the dam.
60.	Mentioned that the graphs in the presentation show that their dam (Roodekopjes Dam) becomes full and then empty, but the level of Hartbeespoort Dam shows that only a little water is withdrawn. In the past when their dam level drops water could not be supplied from Hartbeespoort Dam. He also asked what will happen if they experience the same situation that is happening in the Cape, and if the system does not work as planned, what is going to be "Plan B". He further asked if the irrigators are in the low priority list.	J. Steenkamp	Focus Group Meeting – Crocodile River (West) Irrigation Board (24/01/2018)	<p>F. Vogel explained that all irrigators in South Africa fall under the same low priority level.</p> <p>P. van Rooyen indicated that according to the Roodekopjes Dam White Paper the 70/30 rule (100% volume available for 70% of the time and 70% of the volume is available for 30% of the time) applies.</p> <p>J. Kroon added that White Papers were drafted when Roodekopjes Dam was built which state that Hartbeespoort Dam does not supplement Roodekopjes Dam. In the MCWAP-2A system the water flows through the Roodekopjes Dam and the River Management System is going to release water to ensure that the rights of lawful water users are protected. The confirmation of legal water users will assist the system in this regard. It was mentioned that when Medupi requires water, water will be released from Hartbeespoort Dam and will be conveyed via Roodekopjes Dam and the proposed MCWAP-2A.</p> <p>P. van Rooyen explained that there is currently a problem as not all of the water in the system is being utilised. Water must be released from Hartbeespoort Dam to allow the system to utilise the stored water, based on the additional demand. The assurance of supply is 90% for</p>

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
				irrigators.
61.	Stated that a plan must be in place to release water to Roodekopjes Dam before this dam is empty.	J. Steenkamp	Focus Group Meeting – Crocodile River (West) Irrigation Board (24/01/2018)	P. Van Rooyen explained the River Management System aims to avoid this situation and to ensure that everyone can use their lawfully allocated water.
62.	Asked what percentage of the Mokolo Dam's water is required for the project.	B. Breedt	Focus Group Meeting – Crocodile River (West) Irrigation Board (24/01/2018)	J. Kroon explained that water from the Crocodile River (West) would not be transferred to the Mokolo Dam. The existing rule for the Mokolo irrigators that utilise this dam is that they may receive their full quota if the dam is at least 60% full at the beginning of the irrigation season, but if the dam it is not at 60% no water can be abstracted. The plan is to provide Medupi Power Station with water from the Crocodile River (West) in the future. Mokolo Dam will be utilised by its supply area, especially by Lephalale Municipality, as the water quality of the Mokolo River is better and easier to purify for domestic use.
63.	Asked whether the flow in the river will be higher and more constant, based on volume of 75 million cubic meters per year that is required.	F. Furstenberg	Focus Group Meeting – Crocodile River (West) Irrigation Board (24/01/2018)	F. Vogel explained that the current changes that the irrigators experience will still be there, with the additional water needed for abstraction, which will grow with time.  J. Kroon explained that the water needed is a fraction of the water currently in the system, and in his opinion the water should always flow as Eskom's water needs should be constant in any year. A servitude of aqueduct will be required to protect the state as well as the landowner's rights. Efforts will be made to stop releases when floods occur in certain river reaches.
64.	Asked what is Plan B or Plan C if the project fails.	J. Steenkamp	Focus Group Meeting – Crocodile River (West) Irrigation Board (24/01/2018)	P. van Rooyen explained that the team endeavours to determine risks that are as realistic as possible. The model was also built with knowledge from other areas.  F. Vogel emphasised the need for regular monitoring of the system as well as for the involvement of the Irrigation Board, which was echoed by P. van Rooyen.  P. van Rooyen further stated that the system must be managed efficiently to ensure that it is optimally utilised.



No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
65.	It was mentioned that the impacts to permanent crops and irrigation systems were not discussed, which need to be considered further.	J. Steenkamp	Focus Group Meeting – Crocodile River (West) Irrigation Board (24/01/2018)	To be considered in the EIA phase as part of the relevant specialist studies.
66.	Enquired about the process to remove silt from the water that is to be conveyed.	J. Botes	Focus Group Meeting – Makoppa Agriculture (Irrigators) (25/01/2018)	J. Kroon explained that the sediment has different grain sizes, including sand and even rocks during floods, and that this cannot be pumped to the power station. In addition, the sand fraction can cause problems for the pumps. A channel is planned to return the sediment back to the river during high flow conditions.  <i>Refer to Section 9.3.4 of the Draft Scoping Report for a description of the desilting works and sediment management.</i>
67.	Explained that irrigation in the area is based on the abstraction of water from an underground sand aquifer in the river bed. The proposed project may increase the depth of the sand on top of the aquifer and may inhibit the accumulation of water. This is a major problem as it will limit water abstraction by farmers.  Asked whether the sediment cannot be completely removed and suitably disposed of. He also added that sediment, no matter how it is released, will definitely cause a problem and impact on the river and sand aquifer.	J. Botes	Focus Group Meeting – Makoppa Agriculture (Irrigators) (25/01/2018)	J. Kroon explained that the desilting works have compartments where the silt fraction can be stored.  D. Henning added that an analysis was undertaken to establish a quality profile of the silt to be abstracted from the Crocodile River. The results were found to be within allowable limits of various standards. This study found that the silt is not contaminated and will not decrease the quality of the water in the river. The study further indicated that the only a small percentage of the sediment will be returned to the river when compared to the existing sediment load in the river.  <i>Further information to be provided in the EIA Report.</i>
68.	Enquired about the validity period of the certificate (Section 34 letter) issued by DWS to the farmers.	J. Botes	Focus Group Meeting – Makoppa Agriculture (Irrigators) (25/01/2018)	R. Botha explained that the certificate is a confirmation of the existing lawful use and is an important document that will remain valid until the Department requests water users to apply for new licenses.
69.	Argued that Schoeman and Associated convened with the farmers in 2013/2014 to confirm their water uses, and at that time there was no indication that a weir was proposed at	A. Pieterse	Focus Group Meeting – Makoppa	F. Vogel explained that the verification process of existing water uses is a national project that was already launched nationwide in 2001, and that is not part of the proposed

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	Mooivallei. At that stage, the farmers obtained a certificate of legal water use from DWS. The problem is that the water allocated by the Department will be taken away by the proposed abstraction at the weir. There is an infringement on their rights as the irrigation water available in the river is their source of life. How will the directly affected parties be compensated? It must be ensured that all the comments are included and that their concerns are taken into consideration in the EIA Process.		Agriculture (Irrigators) (25/01/2018)	MCWAP project.  <i>Refer to No. 4 for response to existing lawful water users.</i>
70.	It was mentioned that MCWAP Phase 4 (transfer scheme from Johannesburg Klip River Wastewater Treatment Works to head waters of Crocodile River) should become Phase 1 as there is already no water available.	Unidentified attendee at meeting	Focus Group Meeting – Makoppa Agriculture (Irrigators) (25/01/2018)	<i>Refer to no. 6 for response to water availability for the scheme.</i>
71.	<p>Explained that they are the first users downstream of the proposed weir, and they already face the problem that in dry months there is not enough water to produce two crops a year. There is enough water if you see the total sum that was calculated, however, it will be better if a dam is built upstream to store the constant flow of water. The problem is that water will be abstracted in difficult times when there is low flow, and only some farmers can then use water. This means that the volume of water available for the Makoppa irrigation area will be less with the constant abstraction for the proposed project in dry periods (7 months of the year). What will happen in the 7 month period when there is no rainfall, as farmers who abstract will not be prioritised due to the abstraction of water for the project? The modelling and analysis do not tally with what is experienced on the ground.</p> <p>Stated that the users believe that the water use right that existed and that was recently verified, means that a certain volume of water may be abstracted throughout the year and that is what is paid for. The proposed project will abstract a constant volume of water that the Makoppa irrigators believe will adversely affect the water that the farmers rely on and that can be lawfully used for irrigation. If it is ensured that water will flow constantly past the weir and that water will be available,</p>	J. Botes	Focus Group Meeting – Makoppa Agriculture (Irrigators) (25/01/2018)	<p>F. Vogel explained that several previous studies have been conducted to determine whether a dam should be built for the Makoppa area. It was found that it would not be economically viable to build a dam for an area entirely dependent on the natural incremental flow from the river. The return flows from growing urban areas that feed into the Hartbeespoort Dam provide surplus water that is available for the proposed water transfer. The question that needs to be answered is if water will be abstracted at the weir, how do you ensure that the water that is available from the natural incremental runoff will reach the Makoppa area?</p> <p><i>Refer to no. 23 for response in terms of the River Management System.</i></p>

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	as it has been for the past 20 years, then there will be no problem. The model and scenarios considered should make provision for this.			
72.	Asked if information pertaining to historical flow data is available.	J. Botes	Focus Group Meeting – Makoppa Agriculture (Irrigators) (25/01/2018)	R. Botha indicated that it can be downloaded from DWS website.
73.	It was proposed that the volume of water of the Makoppa Farmers be calculated and expropriated by DWS, with financial compensation.	Unidentified attendee at meeting	Focus Group Meeting – Makoppa Agriculture (Irrigators) (25/01/2018)	<i>Refer to No. 4 for response to existing lawful water users.</i>
74.	Indicated that Makoppa moves into a negative use in 2024. A water shortage is already anticipated in the years 2022 to 2026. The project will take longer than seven years to complete. In those seven years everyone in Makoppa will become bankrupt. This will then cause a major socio-economic impact in the area. Why are all water supply projects and management requirements not addressed concurrently?	J. Botes	Focus Group Meeting – Makoppa Agriculture (Irrigators) (25/01/2018)	F. Vogel explained that the analysis and scenarios for the project were based on the Department's abstraction of the return flows and not the natural flow to Makoppa. The project may also be delayed due to a lack of funding.  <i>Refer to No. 4 for response to existing lawful water users.</i>
75.	Asked what is the volume of water to be abstracted.	J. Botes	Focus Group Meeting – Makoppa Agriculture (Irrigators) (25/01/2018)	D. Henning indicated that it is 75 million cubic meters per year.  J. Kroon added that this volume represents the estimated abstraction by 2040, which will grow over time. The reason for this is that industrial developments and population growth will increase water demand in the future.

### 2.3 Alternatives

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
76.	Please update me on which route the pipeline is going to be built.	Leoni Barnard	Email (04/08/2016)	The Best Practicable Environmental Options for the proposed project infrastructure (including the pipeline

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
				alignment) will be identified in the EIA phase. This will be done through a comparative analysis of the project options based on technical and environmental factors as well as input from IAPs.  Provided a map of the pipeline route in proximity to the property in question.

## 2.4 Aquatic Ecology

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
77.	<p>The pan Taaiboschpan is located on the eastern boundary of the farm and extends through the fence to Enkeldraai. If a trench of 4 meters is to be dug in or nearby the area of the pan it would threaten the pan's water retention capacity, drain the pan and disturb the whole ecology of the farm altogether. The sensitivity of the pan and environment should be taken into account.</p> <p>A pan's feeding area is very wide as the underground water drains to the lowest point, which is the pan. After extensive rains the pan is fed for months from the area's underground drainage water. The intersection of this underground flow through trenching will accelerate the drying of the pan, which will cause an ecological disaster for the animals that use the pan.</p>	Prof J. H. Meiring	Reply Form (16/05/2016)	<p>The status of wetlands (including pans) in the project area and the potential impact of the project and concomitant management measures will be considered during a specialist Aquatic Ecological Study (including delineation), earmarked for the EIA phase.</p> <p>Mitigation measures to manage the local drawdown as a result of dewatering during excavation (including trenching) will be included in the EMP.</p>
78.	The specific requirements in terms of the EIA process include the hydrological impact, ecological impact focusing on river dynamics and ecosystems and the quality of the Crocodile River water.	Filomaine Swanepoel	Reply Form (18/05/2016)	<p>An Aquatic Impact Assessment will be undertaken during the EIA phase to assess the impacts of proposed project to aquatic environments/watercourses. Refer to Section 14.4.3.1 of the Draft Scoping Report for the triggers and scope of this study.</p> <p>A HEC-RAS model of the Crocodile River (West) was set up to determine the flood levels in the Crocodile River. The model was also used to determine and check the impact of the proposed Abstraction Works on flood levels</p>

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
				and on infrastructure up- and downstream of the Works.
79.	<p>Our comments for the WULA:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Alternatives must be described.</li> <li>2. Modifications to flow drivers (surface flows, interflow, groundwater flow), water quality and responses (geomorphology, habitat, biota) and mitigation measures must be described.</li> <li>3. Ecological connectivity and category must be maintained.</li> <li>4. Fishway requirements must be investigated.</li> <li>5. The Hoxane Abstraction weir design in the Sabie River at Hazyview can be used as a guide and improved upon. Kobus van Deventer designed the weir with a fishway and hippo crossing.</li> </ol>	Pieter Ackerman (DWS)	Email (19/05/2016)	<p>Refer to No. 2 for response to alternatives.</p> <p>An Integrated Water Use Licence Application will be submitted separately to the DWS Limpopo Regional Office. The following requirements of the NWA will be catered for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provision for the Reserve requirements of the Crocodile River (West); and</li> <li>• Ensure that existing lawful use is respected and protected.</li> </ul> <p>An Aquatic Impact Assessment will be undertaken during the EIA phase to assess the impacts of proposed project to aquatic environments/watercourses. Refer to Section 14.4.3.1 of the Draft Scoping Report for the triggers and scope of this study. The need for a fish ladder at the weir will also be investigated further as part of this study.</p>
80.	Require further information pertaining to the Ecological Reserve.	W du Plessis	Public Meeting (26/05/2016)	<p>Refer to No. 41 and 79 for responses to the Reserve.</p> <p><i>A crucial part of the river management functions during the operational stage of MCWAP-2A, will be to determine the timing and magnitude of water releases required from the Hartbeespoort and Roodekopjes Dams (and possibly also the Klipvoor and Vaalkop Dams) in order to supply the water allocated to the MCWAP Scheme Management Authority and the other authorised users between these three upstream dams and Vlieëpoort and other authorised users downstream of Vlieëpoort, which includes the Ecological Water Requirements (EWR).</i></p>
81.	The land is part of the Matlabas Reserve and the project must be considered with due caution.	Harold Prinsloo	Reply Form (01/06/2016)	<p>The impacts to the watercourses that are affected by the project infrastructure will be evaluated as part of an Aquatic Impact Assessment during the EIA phase.</p> <p>The pipeline will traverse the Matlabas River via a trenchless technique.</p>

## 2.5 Terrestrial Ecology

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
82.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pipeline passes through exotic wildlife camp.</li> <li>Noted that the area includes large tree bushveld - includes many Camel Thorn and Marula trees.</li> </ol>	Gawie Du Preez	Reply Form (23/05/2016)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A Wildlife Impact Assessment will be undertaken as part of the EIA (refer to Section 14.4.3.7 of the Draft Scoping Report), taking into consideration the types of game kept on the farms and the requisite mitigation measures. The Wildlife Impact Assessment will be appended to the EIA Report for review by IAPs.</li> <li>The status of vegetation in the project footprint is to be confirmed as part of the Terrestrial Ecological Study (refer to Section 14.4.3.2 of the Draft Scoping Report). Optimisation of final pipeline route to be considered in the design phase to avoid sensitive features (where possible). Provision will be made in the EMPr for the reinstatement and rehabilitation of the areas affected by construction activities, as well as managing impacts to flora and fauna. Where avoidance is not possible, permits will be obtained from the Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (DAFF) if protected trees are to be cut, disturbed, damaged, destroyed or removed in terms of the National Forests Act (No. 84 of 1998).</li> </ol>
83.	Mentioned that he has exotic game on his farm which will be adversely affected by dust, noise and light pollution during the construction period.	H Bloem	Public Meeting (25/05/2016)	<p>D Henning indicated that these matters will be addressed by mitigation measures that will be identified during the EIA phase.</p> <p><i>The Environmental Management Programme (EMPr), which will be developed during the EIA phase, will include best practices to manage impacts associated with construction activities, including aspects such as dust, noise and light pollution.</i></p>

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
84.	The pipeline route will traverse a Camel Thorn Forest on his property.	H Prinsloo	Public Meeting (25/05/2016)	D Henning indicated that all sensitive environmental features will be identified and assessed as part of the EIA. All vegetation within the 40m wide construction servitude will be cleared.  <i>Refer to No. 82 for response in terms of vegetation.</i>
85.	Will the pipeline run on the western side of the railway line?  The proposed pipeline route will traverse a camp that holds exotic game on his property. What will be done to manage impacts to the game?	G du Preez	Public Meeting (26/05/2016)	D Henning confirmed that the pipeline will run on the western side of the railway line.  A Nelwamondo indicated that the camp may need to be moved prior to construction.  S Pienaar mentioned that the fencing will need to comply with the relevant specifications.
86.	The farm is already burdened with Eskom's servitude.  The proposed routes traverse the exclusive breeding camps of Kremetartpan Game Breeders. The species in the camps include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Golden Wildebeest;</li> <li>• Sable;</li> <li>• Black Impala;</li> <li>• Black Springbuck;</li> <li>• Nyalas;</li> <li>• Copper Springbuck; and</li> <li>• Normal Heartwater Springbuck.</li> </ul> The risk to the buck whilst the trenches are being dug is too great. There are no alternative camps where these buck can be relocated to. The costs of creating new camps are exorbitant. The camps cannot be "shielded" or fenced of alongside the work area as this would render the camps too small in terms of the required carrying capacity. Hence, the buck will need to be relocated to new camps, which will have significant cost implications.	Pieter Botha	Reply Form (26/05/2016)	To minimise impacts to the receiving environment and current land uses, the proposed pipeline route attempts to remain alongside existing linear-type infrastructure, such as roads (main roads and dirt roads), the railway line (i.e. section of approximately 56km), transmission lines, industrial corridors and farm boundaries.  Refer to No. 82 for response in terms of the Wildlife Impact Assessment. Further details in terms of the approach to dealing with sensitive game and the related mitigation measures will be included in the EIA Report.

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	<p>Further comments regarding this matter can only be made once you have indicated exactly what and how this will be done.</p> <p>The additional problems are significant. The breeding phases of the game will be influenced if they are relocated to new camps. It will also take too long to ensure that a camp is free from predators. If other camps are created for the relocation of game while construction is underway there may be a risk that the predators are not all removed if the fencing of the camp is done too hastily, which will result in the predation of the young with resultant financial losses.</p> <p>Specific requirements of the EIA include the impact of the construction works on the camps and the breeding of buck.</p> <p>General comments: As mentioned, the impact of construction within the camps on the breeding of exclusive game with the associated loss of income is too large to calculate.</p>			
87.	How will construction related impacts to sensitive game species be managed? Recommend that a specialist be used in this regard.	B Enslin	Reply Form (26/05/2016)	D Henning indicated that the recommendation will be considered. The EMPr will include specified mitigation measures to safeguard sensitive game. Landowners may also recommend mitigation measures for consideration.
88.	<p><i>Linked to number 81.</i></p> <p>Impacts on Camel Thorn trees and other big trees.</p>	Harold Prinsloo	Reply Form (01/06/2016)	Refer to No. 82 for response to vegetation.
89.	<p>Influence of proposed Mokolo and Crocodile West Water Scheme on Farm Diepkuil 135 KQ</p> <p>With regards to the above subject I would like to share the following with you.</p> <p>The farm Diepkuil is mainly used as breeding farm for exotic game such as Roan Antelope, Sable Antelope, Buffalo, Black Impala, Golden Gnu and Njals.</p> <p>We also applied for Rhino and Lion permits which is in final stages of approval.</p>	Willie De Swart	Letter (19/06/2016)	Refer to No. 82 for response in terms of the Wildlife Impact Assessment. Further details in terms of the approach to dealing with sensitive game and the related mitigation measures will be included in the EIA Report.



No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	<p>We believe that the level of noise and traffic generated by a major project such as this will have a detrimental effect on these animals.</p> <p>A powerline also runs from West to East on the Southern side of the servitude road, furthermore the Farm Diepkuil's major borehole is situated in close proximity to the North Eastern corner of the farm.</p> <p>I sincerely hope that you will take into consideration the effects of your decision on the above.</p>			
90.	I represent Mr. Pieter Bothma from Cheetah Safaris. Many kilometres of construction will take place alongside his rare game breeding camps. We need to determine how to minimise impacts to his operations. He also receives international hunters, which will be a problem during construction.	Bernard Enslin	Email (20/06/2016)	Refer to No. 82 for response in terms of the Wildlife Impact Assessment.
91.	<p><i>Linked to No. 3.</i></p> <p>Habitat destruction of wild species, trees etc.</p>	J. L. Pretorius	Reply Form (22/06/2016)	<p>To be assessed as part of the Terrestrial Ecological Impact Assessment (refer to Section 14.4.3.2 of the Draft Scoping Report), which will be undertaken as part of the EIA phase.</p> <p>Refer to No. 82 for response to vegetation.</p>
92.	<p>The visual and noise impact from the Break Pressure Reservoir on Portion 1, Farm Leeuwbosch, with related impacts to ecotourism and game farming on my farm, the remainder of the farm Leeuwbosch, in the long-term.</p> <p>The short-term impact of the servitude and Break Pressure Reservoir on my ecotourism business and game farming.</p> <p>Specific EIA process requirements include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The impact of the development on the habitat of the northern Vliegpoortberg and hills.</li> </ul> <p>General Concerns:</p> <p>The true impact of this planned development inside the Waterberg Biosphere Reserve on this environment's main water source, namely the Crocodile River, as well as the natural nature is irreversible. It places the entire development</p>	Dr L. F. Fouche	Reply Form (24/06/2016)	<p>Refer to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No. 97 and 99 for responses to noise;</li> <li>No. 98 for response to visual impacts;</li> <li>No. 82 for response in terms of the Wildlife Impact Assessment.</li> </ul> <p>Impacts of the project on habitats within the receiving environment will be assessed as part of the Terrestrial Ecological Impact Assessment (refer to Section 14.4.3.2 of the Draft Scoping Report), which will be undertaken as part of the EIA phase.</p> <p>A Socio-Economic Impact Assessment earmarked for the EIA phase will need to consider the impacts of the MCWAP-2A on local tourism. Compensation will be payable in terms of the then prevailing Expropriation Act.</p>

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	plan of the Waterberg District under suspicion in terms of ecotourism development. No remuneration model can adequately compensate the local residents.			Refer to No. 6 for response to water availability for the scheme.
93.	<p>I have already had a meeting with TCTA and it is clear that they understand that animals near the construction area need to be moved.</p> <p>I also already identified a landowner that has land available to where the animals can be moved in those instances where affected parties do not have any alternatives. However, camps will need to be built for the relocated wildlife. This matter must be attended to. We hereby express our willingness to assist with this, however, everyone will have to work together. I'm in the process of seeking quotations from contractors if fences or camps need to be moved. Provision is made in the quotes for the clearance or areas to create the camps and for the relocation of wildlife.</p> <p>Another major concern is that planning will need to be done for farms where hunting takes place prior to construction, where many clients book ahead. How will Eco-tourism be addressed?</p> <p>What will be the duration of the construction period?</p>	Bernard Enslin	Email (27/06/2016)	<p>Refer to No. 97 and 99 for responses to noise.</p> <p>Refer to the indicative implementation programme Section 9.9 of the Draft Scoping Report.</p>
94.	<p>Specific requirements in terms of the EIA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Game or breeding camps which are cleared;</li> <li>• Specifications for game fences. I require that my area is restored to current fence and gates.</li> </ul>	Tuffy Reyneke	Reply Form (28/06/2016)	<p>Refer to No. 82 for response in terms of the Wildlife Impact Assessment.</p> <p>Provision will be made in the EMPr for fencing arrangements, where the management objectives will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protect and maintain existing fences;</li> <li>• Fencing arrangements to adequately protect livestock and game animals from construction activities;</li> <li>• Adhere to agreements made with individual landowners and/or land users regarding fencing; and</li> <li>• Minimise disturbance to animals.</li> </ul> <p>Specific measures will be included in the EMPr for game fences and for the reinstatement of areas affected by construction.</p>

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
95.	<p>Have you already appointed the specialist to complete the study of the wildlife in camps adjacent to the construction area? You need to take into account that the relocation of wildlife, clearing and creating camps cannot take place if inadequate notice is given.</p> <p>TCTA will need to make sufficient provision for these activities to take place in advance, otherwise it will not work. We must realize these are wild animals and there are mating seasons and calf and lamb seasons that will need to be taken into consideration.</p> <p>To reiterate, all my clients want to cooperate but we require everyone's cooperation. Please let me know as I want to get started with seeking quotations and arranging for people to be in place, to allow for adequate preparations.</p> <p>Any dates for me about meetings with your specialists? We do not have much time.</p>	Bernard Enslin	Email (22/08/2016)	<p>It is anticipated that the Wildlife Impact Assessment will only be undertaken during the EIA phase (refer to Section 14.4.3.7 of the Draft Scoping Report). The various factors stated will be taken into consideration by the specialist.</p> <p>All requisite mitigation measures need to be implemented at the appropriate stages of the project life-cycle.</p> <p>Procurement should be delayed until a decision is received from DEA that approves the application (if received).</p>
96.	I have Buffalo and Sable Antelope (amongst others) which are hunted by international trophy hunters. I am also a qualified professional hunter.	Tertius Roux	Email (24/10/2016)	<p>Refer to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No. 82 for response in terms of the Wildlife Impact Assessment;</li> <li>No. 92 for response to compensation.</li> </ul>

## 2.6 Visual, Air, Noise and Light Pollution

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
97.	<p>The impact during construction on all facets such as security, dust, noise, workers, disturbance to the environment and impact on all aspects of the project and surrounding environment as a whole.</p> <p>Everything mentioned above must be discussed and dealt with comprehensively. To identify the various impacts and how it will be addressed for landowners who will adversely be affected as a result of the planned construction and</p>	Bernard Enslin	Reply Form & Letter (17/05/2016)	The EMP, which will be developed during the EIA phase, will include best practices to manage impacts associated with construction activities, including aspects such as dust, noise, workers and disturbance to the environment.

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	infrastructure.			
98.	<p><i>Linked to number 81.</i></p> <p>River crossing – impact on aesthetics values.</p>	Harold Prinsloo	Reply Form (01/06/2016)	<p>The pipeline will traverse the Matlabas River via a trenchless technique.</p> <p>The findings of the Visual Impact Assessment that was conducted as part of previous EIA for MCWAP-2 will be included in the EIA Report.</p> <p>Provision will be made in the EMPr to mitigate impacts to the study area's visual quality. In addition, measures will be included in the EMPr for the reinstatement and rehabilitation of the areas affected by construction activities. Specific measures will be included for river crossings.</p>
99.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Pollution, noise and spoiling of the current view.</li> <li>2. Effect on the tourism industry.</li> <li>3. Create permanent staff accommodation.</li> <li>4. Farm boundary is approximately 300m from the proposed site – effect of noise from construction and future activities. Specify in decibels on site and 300m away from it.</li> <li>5. Loss of aesthetical value.</li> </ol>	Jan & Bertus Grobler	Reply Form (14/06/2016)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Noise that emanates from construction activities will be addressed through targeted best practices for noise management in the EMPr. The EIA will further pay special attention to the management of noise from the pumping stations, by investigating measures to attenuate noise to remain within regulated standards. The findings of a Noise Study that was undertaken will be included in the EIA Report. Measures will also be included in the EMPr to mitigate against other potential forms of pollution.</li> <li>2. Refer to No. 92 for response to impacts to ecotourism.</li> <li>3. The intention is to not provide any accommodation on site for the abstraction works during the construction phase, however security staff will be needed at all times. Alternative accommodation (e.g. in Thabazimbi) will be sought. Provision is made for ancillary structures (accommodation, offices, and workshops) adjacent to the desilting works and high-lift pumping station for the operational phase.</li> <li>4. Refer to No.1 above for response to noise.</li> <li>5. Refer to No. 98 for response to visual impacts.</li> </ol>
100.	<p><i>Linked to No. 89.</i></p> <p>The farm Diepkuil is mainly used as breeding farm for exotic</p>	Willie De Swart	Letter (19/06/2016)	<p>Refer to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No. 97 and 99 for responses to noise;</li> <li>• No. 82 for response in terms of the Wildlife Impact</li> </ul>

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	<p>game such as Roan Antelope, Sable Antelope, Buffalo, Black Impala, Golden Gnu and Njals.</p> <p>We also applied for Rhino and Lion permits which is in final stages of approval.</p> <p>We believe that the level of noise and traffic generated by a major project such as this will have a detrimental effect on these animals.</p>			Assessment. Further details in terms of the approach to dealing with sensitive game and the related mitigation measures will be included in the EIA Report.
101.	I heard about the study that will be done to assess noise impacts to wild animals located in camps nearby to the construction area. May you please provide more information regarding the size of the pumps in Mooivalei, and the noise associated with the pump station?	Bernard Enslin	Email (20/06/2016)	Refer to No. 97 and 99 for responses to noise.
102.	Operate Eco tourism on the farm with international clients. Noise pollution.	J. J. Jansen van Vuuren	Reply Form (21/06/2016)	Refer to No. 97 and 99 for responses to noise.
103.	<p><i>Linked to No. 3.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noise pollution;</li> <li>Air pollution;</li> <li>Light pollution;</li> <li>Large cement structures</li> </ol>	J. L. Pretorius	Reply Form (22/06/2016)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Refer to No. 97 and 99 for responses to noise.</li> <li>Specific mitigation measures will be included in the EMPr to manage impacts in terms of air pollution.</li> <li>Specific mitigation measures will be included in the EMPr to manage impacts in terms of light pollution.</li> <li>Refer to No. 98 for response to visual impacts.</li> </ol>
104.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Break Pressure Reservoir along the Ellisras Road affects our business directly.</li> <li>The alternative pipeline routes through Buffelsvley 127 KQ and between Buffelsvley 127 KQ and Rietkuil 101 KQ, as well as through Zondasskuil 130 KQ, affect our breeding camps directly.</li> </ol> <p>Specific requirements in terms of the EIA process include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noise and air pollution during construction; and</li> <li>Noise and light pollution after construction.</li> </ol> <p>Our business includes hunting (overseas clients) and breeding of exotic wildlife. Any air, light or noise pollution and dust have a direct impact on our business.</p>	Hannes Bloum	Reply Form (24/06/2016)	<p>Refer to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No. 82 for response in terms of the Wildlife Impact Assessment;</li> <li>No. 97 and 99 for responses to noise.</li> </ul> <p>Specific mitigation measures will be included in the EMPr to manage impacts in terms of air pollution.</p> <p>Specific mitigation measures will also be included in the EMPr to manage impacts in terms of light pollution.</p>
105.	<p><i>Linked to No. 92.</i></p> <p>The visual and noise impact from the Break Pressure</p>	Dr L. F. Fouche	Reply Form (24/06/2016)	<p>Refer to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No. 97 and 99 for responses to noise;</li> <li>No. 98 for response to visual impacts.</li> </ul>

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	Reservoir on Portion 1, Farm Leeuwbosch, with related impacts to ecotourism and game farming on my farm, the remainder of the farm Leeuwbosch, in the long-term.  Specific EIA process requirements include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide technical information with regards to the Break Pressure Reservoir for example the surface, lighting, design, accommodation.</li> </ul>			A description of the proposed Break Pressure Reservoir is included in the Scoping Report, which also includes a general layout drawing.  Refer to No. 99 for response to accommodation.
106.	We have invested in ecotourism and the project will thus not be acceptable to us. Silence is going to be replaced with noise and hikers in the mountain are going to see an unsightly pump station. We also rehabilitate wildlife.  It is thus our general feeling that the pump station is going to negatively influence us and that we will lose income. In addition, our property value will depreciate.	P. Ellis	Reply Form (24/06/2016)	Refer to the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No. 97 and 99 for responses to noise;</li> <li>No. 98 for response to visual impacts;</li> <li>No. 92 for response to impacts to ecotourism.</li> </ul>
107.	When will you be able to provide the Noise Study that was conducted for the pump station next to Louma Farming on the farm Hampton to us? How far is the distance that the pumps can be heard from?  Have you already appointed a specialist to undertake the study on the impact from the construction and associated noise on the animals and exotic animals in breeding camps close to and next to the planned servitude?	Bernard Enslin	Email (27/06/2016)	Refer to No. 97 and 99 for responses to noise.
108.	<i>Linked to No. 94.</i>  Potential issues include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Noise.</li> </ul>	Tuffy Reyneke	Reply Form (28/06/2016)	Refer to No. 97 and 99 for responses to noise.

## 2.7 Technical & Land Matters

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
109.	Although the pipeline will run $\pm$ 3 km from my farm, an accident where the pipeline is damaged will influence my property.	Ampie Venter	Reply Form (16/05/2016)	Provision to be made in the EMP for managing impacts during the operational phase of the project.

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
110.	Location of substation and 132kV powerlines.	Xander Neethling (ESKOM)	Reply Form (16/05/2016)	Bulk power is required for the operation of the high-lift and low-lift pump stations associated with the MCWAP-2A WTI. Eskom has confirmed that the proposed MCWAP-2A substation can be accommodated into the network without any capacity constraints. The proposed substation will be supplied from the new planned Thabatshipi – Thabazimbi Combined 132 kV Power Line. A separate application will be submitted by Eskom to seek approval for the bulk power required for MCWAP-2A.
111.	<p>Servitude – width and compensation value? Safeguarding against possible pollution (e.g. oil, diesel, etc.) during site preparation.</p> <p>Are all the objections previously provided still in your possession (2011)?</p>	T. de Clercq	Reply Form (16/05/2016)	<p>The pipeline specifications, as included in the Draft Scoping Report, are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pipe diameter – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Up to 2 400 mm;</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Pipe material – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Steel pipes with welded joints;</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Installation – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Underground, with a minimum cover above the pipe of 1,0m;</li> <li>○ Access/valve chambers will be located at approximately 500 m intervals along the route. It will be concrete structures protruding slightly above natural ground level;</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Servitude Width – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Typically 40 m during construction (temporary) and 25 m permanent;</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Servitude Conditions – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Permanent access to the pipeline servitude will be required after construction;</li> <li>○ Pipeline markers (concrete posts) will be installed at changes in direction and at regular intervals along the route; and</li> <li>○ Farming activities (stock and crop farming) can continue within the servitude area after rehabilitation (between 1 and 2 years after construction), taking cognisance of the need for permanent access to the pipeline servitude.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Negotiations with the landowners to acquire and register</p>

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
				<p>the relevant land rights (servitudes and purchases) will be undertaken by TCTA, as the project's implementing agent. TCTA's land rights acquisition strategy will adhere to all statutory requirements prevailing at the time, as per the Promotion of Administrative Justice Act (No. 99 of 2000), the Expropriation Act (No. 63 of 1975) and the National Water Act (Act No. 36 of 1998) as already delegated by the Minister of Water and Sanitation to TCTA.</p> <p>Determination of compensation will be done in terms of the prevailing Expropriation Act when the acquisition is done (currently Section 12 of the Expropriation Act (No. 63 of 1975)), which in case of the servitude right will include an amount to make good actual financial losses caused by the acquisition of the right. In case of the servitude-of-aqueduct along the new pipeline rights, in principle, compensation is payable for both temporary (during construction and rehabilitation) and permanent servitude rights, as may be required. In the case of existing permanent servitudes (where applicable), the available rights will need to be investigated.</p>
112.	Please let the project begin as soon as possible.	Chris Maritz (Steenbokpan Development Consortium)	Reply Form (16/05/2016)	Refer to the indicative implementation programme Section 9.9 of the Draft Scoping Report.
113.	<i>Linked to No. 7.</i> Construction period.	Hennie Du Plessis	Reply Form (18/05/2016)	Refer to the indicative implementation programme Section 9.9 of the Draft Scoping Report.
114.	<i>Linked to No. 82.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pipeline goes over windmill and dam.</li> <li>Inhibits further fencing of the farm.</li> <li>Time elapsed on farm.</li> <li>What will be done to restore area to original condition?</li> </ul>	Gawie Du Preez	Reply Form (23/05/2016)	<p>The infrastructure and structures affected by the proposed development will be relocated, as necessary. Alternatively, compensation will also be considered, where relevant. Optimisation of final pipeline route to be considered in the design phase to avoid existing structures and buildings, as well as other sensitive features (where possible).</p> <p>Provision will be made in the EMPr for the reinstatement and rehabilitation of the areas affected by construction</p>



No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
				activities.
115.	Will the proposed abstraction weir be standardised?	S Phasha (DWS)	Authorities Meeting (25/05/2016)	O van den Berg explained that it will not serve as a gauging weir but as a diversion weir to allow for water abstraction. He indicated that gauging weirs formed part of the River Management System.
116.	Questioned the location of the abstraction weir at Vlieëpoort.	A Pieterse	Public Meeting (25/05/2016)	Refer to No. 22 for the response to the location of the abstraction weir.
117.	Concerned with the statement made by TCTA that they will not negotiate with landowners in cases where there is insufficient time.	B Enslin	Public Meeting (25/05/2016)	A Nelwamondo mentioned that consultation will take place with landowners. Explained TCTA's land acquisition process, refer to No. 111.
118.	Will discussion be held with the landowners as part of the land acquisition process?	G Bower	Public Meeting (25/05/2016)	<p>A Nelwamondo emphasised that the landowners will be consulted with.</p> <p>D Henning indicated that a more comprehensive description of the land acquisition process will be provided to the landowners.</p> <p><i>The Land Acquisition process is discussed in Section 9.12 of the Draft Scoping Report.</i></p> <p><i>Refer to No. 111 for the response to compensation.</i></p>
119.	Will the servitude be 100m or 40m?	P Jordaan	Public Meeting (25/05/2016)	S Pienaar explained that a 100m wide corridor (i.e. 50m on either side of the centre line) was adopted as the study area for the pipeline during the Scoping phase, which allows for possible deviations from the proposed alignment within this corridor (e.g. avoidance of sensitive features, if possible). He noted that the temporary servitude will be 40 m wide and the permanent servitude 25 m wide.
120.	Where will the pipeline's servitude start in the part of the route that follows the railway line?	H Prinsloo	Public Meeting (25/05/2016)	S Pienaar indicated that the pipeline's servitude will be alongside the reserve of the railway line, on the adjoining property.
121.	Two of the possible pipeline routes traverse his property, which may influence boreholes, pipelines and camps.	B de Beer	Public Meeting (25/05/2016)	<p><i>Refer to No. 146 for response to impacts to existing infrastructure and structures. Provision will be made in the EMP for the reinstatement and rehabilitation of the areas affected by construction activities.</i></p> <p><i>This will also form part of the negotiations with the</i></p>

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
				<i>individual landowners.</i>
122.	When will the preferred pipeline route be confirmed?	B de Beer	Public Meeting (25/05/2016)	D Henning indicated that the preferred options for all the project components will only be identified in the EIA phase, taking into consideration the findings from the specialist studies, input from the technical team and matters raised by IAPs.
123.	Mentioned that he receives water from the eastern side of the railway line, which is conveyed to the western side.	M Benade	Public Meeting (25/05/2016)	<i>Refer to No. 146 for response to impacts to existing infrastructure and structures. Provision will be made in the EMP for the reinstatement and rehabilitation of the areas affected by construction activities.</i>  <i>This will also form part of the negotiations with the individual landowners.</i>
124.	What is the project's budget?	C Vos	Public Meeting (25/05/2016)	O van den Berg explained that the funding depends on South Africa's energy policy and that there are discussions with National Treasury and the Department of Energy in this regard. The project will be funded through loans and tariffs will be set with the end users as part of the user agreements.
125.	Noted that the project team spent a total of 27 days on his property as part of the previous study for MCWAP-2. Will further site visits be required on his property?	J Erasmus	Public Meeting (26/05/2016)	A Nelwamondo indicated that it depends on whether all the necessary studies have been completed.
126.	Provide an indication of the preferred pipeline route.	J Erasmus	Public Meeting (26/05/2016)	D Henning indicated that the preferred options for all the project components will only be identified in the EIA phase, taking into consideration the findings from the specialist studies, input from the technical team and matters raised by IAPs. Although the technical studies identified Steenbokpan as the preferred terminal point, the EIA still needs to confirm which of the alternative routes are the most preferred.
127.	Where will the construction camps be located and how many staff will be housed at the camps?	B Enslin	Public Meeting (26/05/2016)	A Nelwamondo indicated that as far as possible, preference will be given to local labour. There will be a maximum of 1 000 construction workers. Existing facilities on surrounding farms will be utilised, if possible, where landowners are willing and interested. The requisite mitigation measures will be implemented to manage the impacts associated with construction camps.
128.	Although the pipeline is planned to follow farm boundaries,	K Janse van	Public Meeting	D Henning indicated that landowners are obligated to

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	<p>certain farms have more than one title deed in place and these farms function as a unit. In these instances the pipeline will traverse the farm.</p> <p>Exchange of farms through sales creates problems in terms of the compensation received by the farmers for the pipeline where the pipeline is only constructed once the new owner has taken ownership. This needs to be clearly set out in the contract with the landowner.</p>	Rensburg	(26/05/2016)	<p>provide the details of the servitude to the new landowners.</p> <p>A Nelwamondo explained that the landowners' details will be confirmed as part of the land acquisition process. The expropriation notice will be lodged at the Deeds Office.</p>
129.	Ensure that when communicating with farm managers that the owners are also informed of all correspondence and decisions and that the contract entered into is endorsed by the owners.	K Janse van Rensburg	Public Meeting (26/05/2016)	<i>Where the details of the landowners are not available, correspondence is sent to the person in control of the land (e.g. farm manager).</i>
130.	The pipeline will influence a dam and borehole on his property.	G du Preez	Public Meeting (26/05/2016)	<p>A Nelwamondo explained that the proposed servitude will be surveyed as part of the compensation process to identify all assets.</p> <p><i>Refer to No. 146 for response to impacts to existing infrastructure and structures. Provision will be made in the EMPr for the reinstatement and rehabilitation of the areas affected by construction activities.</i></p> <p><i>This will also form part of the negotiations with the individual landowners.</i></p>
131.	Will rehabilitation take place after construction?	G du Preez	Public Meeting (26/05/2016)	<p>A Nelwamondo confirmed that rehabilitation will take place and that a seed mix will be sown. Input will also be sought from the landowners.</p> <p><i>Provision will be made in the EMPr for the reinstatement and rehabilitation of the areas affected by construction activities.</i></p>
132.	The water that will be released during maintenance activities associated with the infrastructure will possibly pollute the surrounding water sources.	J Erasmus	Public Meeting (26/05/2016)	<i>The Scoping Report acknowledges that during the maintenance of the pipeline and reservoirs the raw water conveyed and stored within this system, which is water of poor quality from the Crocodile River, will be released into the Matlabas River and other watercourses from scour valves. This matter will be investigated further during the EIA stage.</i>
133.	When will the negotiations commence with the landowners regarding land acquisition?	J Erasmus	Public Meeting (26/05/2016)	A Nelwamondo indicated that these negotiations will only commence after Environmental Authorisation is obtained,

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
				if granted by DEA.
134.	Will there be a separate access road for the servitude?	G du Preez	Public Meeting (26/05/2016)	S Pienaar confirmed that this will be the case. The permanent servitude will allow access along it.
135.	His property is affected by various linear infrastructure, including a railway line, road, power lines and the proposed pipeline. How will this be factored into compensation?	J Erasmus	Public Meeting (26/05/2016)	<p>D Henning indicated that this matter will need to be considered further.</p> <p><i>To minimise impacts to the receiving environment and current land uses, the proposed pipeline route attempts to remain alongside existing linear-type infrastructure, such as roads (main roads and dirt roads), the railway line (i.e. section of approximately 56km), transmission lines, industrial corridors and farm boundaries. This is also aligned with the Environmental Management Framework (EMF) for the Waterberg District Municipality.</i></p> <p><i>Compensation is payable in accordance with prevailing legislation.</i></p>
136.	Require further information pertaining to the updated project timeframes.	W du Plessis	Public Meeting (26/05/2016)	<i>Refer to the indicative implementation programme Section 9.9 of the Draft Scoping Report.</i>
137.	Will the servitude be fenced on both sides?	A Pugh	Public Meeting (26/05/2016)	D Henning confirmed that during construction land used for agriculture and game farming will be fenced off along the temporary servitude. The permanent servitude will not be fenced off following construction and no improvements may be erected or established within such area.
138.	When will the valuation of the servitude take place?	H Steenkamp	Public Meeting (26/05/2016)	<i>Negotiations with landowners will only commence after Environmental Authorisation is obtained, if granted by DEA.</i>
139.	Request made that the pipeline follows the farm boundaries as opposed to the road to Steenbokpan.	H Steenkamp	Public Meeting (26/05/2016)	To be investigated further during the EIA phase.
140.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Although the pipeline is planned to follow farm boundaries you are aware that farms have more than one title deed in place and that these farms function as a unit. In these instances the pipeline will traverse the farm.</li> <li>Possibility of offtake points for the farmers.</li> <li>Exchange of farms through sales creates problems in terms of the compensation received by the farmers for the pipeline where the pipeline is only constructed once the new owner has taken ownership. This needs to be clearly</li> </ol>	Kobus Janse Van Rensburg	Reply Form (26/05/2016)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To minimise impacts to the receiving environment and current land uses, the proposed pipeline route attempts to remain alongside existing linear-type infrastructure, such as roads (main roads and dirt roads), the railway line (i.e. section of approximately 56km), transmission lines, industrial corridors and farm boundaries. However, we are aware that in some instances adjoining farms have been consolidated and that there are no boundary fences.</li> </ol>

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	<p>set out in the contract with the landowner.</p> <p>4. Mandate of communication. Ensure that when communicating with farm managers that the owners are also informed of all correspondence and decisions and that the contract entered into is endorsed by the owners (especially in the case of foreign owners).</p> <p>5. Consider land claimants, especially gazetted claims. Land owners are not always aware of claims.</p> <p>6. Property agents - allow agencies to become a vendor to avoid discord and to sign a mandate with the owner of the property to be leased.</p>			<p>2. Refer to No. 27.</p> <p>3. This will form part of the land acquisition process, which will be undertaken in accordance with prevailing legislation. See response to No. 111 with regards to servitudes.</p> <p>4. Where the details of the landowners are not available, correspondence is sent to the person in control of the land (e.g. farm manager).</p> <p>5. The status of land claims will be assessed when the land is acquired.</p> <p>6. DWS and TCTA to consider request further.</p>
141.	<p><i>Linked to No. 81.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Expropriation versus negotiated settlement.</li> <li>Diplomatic consequences – the landowner is a foreign head of state.</li> <li>Impact on river and aesthetics at river crossing.</li> <li>The land is part of the Matlabas Reserve and the project must be considered with due caution.</li> </ul>	Harold Prinsloo	Reply Form (01/06/2016)	<p>Refer to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No. 111 for the response to compensation;</li> <li>No. 81 for the response to the crossing of watercourses (including the Matlabas River).</li> </ul>
142.	<p>Farm No KQ 629 (Grootfontein) – questions</p> <p>1. Is a “weir” a “stuwal”</p> <p>2. How far does the water push up in KQ 629 (Vliegepoort weir)?</p> <p>3. Please indicate on a map a 20km buffer around weir, roads, bridges, power infrastructure.</p> <p>4. Accommodation for construction staff: where, when and how long?</p>	J. P. Grobler	Reply Form (02/06/2016)	<p>1. Yes, a weir is a “stuwal”.</p> <p>2. A HEC-RAS model of the Crocodile River (West) was set up to determine the flood levels in the Crocodile River. The model was also used to determine and check the impact of the proposed Abstraction Works on flood levels and on infrastructure up- and downstream of the Works. The weir is not designed for storage and it is assumed it will silt up. Further details on the implications of the project on the flood hydrology are included in the Scoping Report. Land matters within the weir basin will be dealt with when the land is acquired in terms of the Expropriation Act for the construction of the abstraction weir including the impoundment up to the 1:100 year flood level and a buffer zone.</p> <p>3. Map to be provided.</p> <p>4. Refer to No. 99 for the response to accommodation.</p>
143.	How is my farm Honingvley influenced (located 30km north of Thabazimbi along the R510). Please keep me informed.	Francois van der Walt	Email (03/06/2016)	Alternative C of the pipeline route (map provided) runs on the western boundary of your property (Honingvley 99 KQ

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
				<p>Portion 13). As part of the EIA the preferred route must still be confirmed.</p> <p>Contact details included in IAP database. To be informed as the EIA process unfolds.</p>
144.	<p>Thank you for your prompt response. Just a few questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Are the servitudes bought out?</li> <li>2. How deep is the pipeline?</li> <li>3. Is the topsoil available again after work has been completed, for the owner, such as for agriculture, roads etc.?</li> <li>4. The pipe will certainly not be on the property boundary, otherwise the fence will be destroyed. Provided that cases 1 &amp; 3 apply, my land will be available on my side on condition that the access road along the boundary fence is on top of the pipeline, and will be left in a useable condition.</li> </ol> <p>Please keep me informed I'm not on the farm but next week. I would like to meet you.</p>	Francois van der Walt	Email (06/06/2016)	<p>Refer to No. 111 for the response to the servitude.</p> <p>The defined servitude area will not be fenced off following construction and no improvements may be erected or established within such area. Access to pipeline servitudes will not be controlled, but restrictions will be placed on activities inside the servitudes. Existing fencing will be reinstated and gates installed where these fences cross the servitude-of-aqueduct. A permanent right-of-way servitude to accommodate the permanent accesses, need to be acquired and registered. A service road (to basic standards) will be provided along the servitude for maintenance purposes and will be patrolled on a regular basis. Refer to Section 9.4.2 in the Draft Scoping Report. Depth of pipeline: Refer to No. 111.</p> <p>Specific measures to manage topsoil will be included in the EMP. The primary management objective will be to ensure the suitable removal, storage, and transportation of topsoil for re-use during rehabilitation.</p>
145.	<p><i>Linked to No. 99.</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase high-water mark.</li> <li>2. Impacts to borehole, roads, fences and landscape.</li> </ol>	Jan & Bertus Grobler	Reply Form (14/06/2016)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Refer to No. 142 for response to flood hydrology.</li> <li>2. Refer to No. 94 for response to fences. Refer to No. 146 for response to impacts to existing infrastructure and structures. Provision will be made in the EMP for the reinstatement and rehabilitation of the areas affected by construction activities.</li> </ol>
146.	<p><i>Linked to No. 89.</i></p> <p>A powerline also runs from West to East on the Southern side of the servitude road, furthermore the Farm Diepkuil's major borehole is situated in close proximity to the North Eastern corner of the farm.</p>	Willie De Swart	Letter (19/06/2016)	<p>The infrastructure and structures affected by the proposed development will be relocated, as necessary. Alternatively, compensation in accordance with prevailing legislation will also be considered, where relevant. Optimisation of final pipeline route to be considered in the design phase to avoid existing structures and buildings, as well as other sensitive features (where possible).</p>

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
				Provision will be made in the EMPr for the reinstatement and rehabilitation of the areas affected by construction activities.
147.	Operate Eco tourism on the farm with international clients. 1. Loss of grazing, Crocodile river and Bier stream; 2. Loss of irrigation crops; 3. Extra flood damage to lodge along the Crocodile River; 4. Lost access to border fences; 5. Flood damage to wild bomas.	J. J. Jansen van Vuuren	Reply Form (21/06/2016)	1 – 2. Land to accommodate the Vlieëpoort Abstraction Weir (including the basin) and Abstraction Works and ancillary structures (pumping stations, housing, workshops, Break Pressure Reservoir, Operational Reservoir) will need to be acquired (purchased). Refer to No. 111 for response to land matters within the weir basin. 3 & 5. Refer to No. 142 for response to flood hydrology. 4. Refer to No. 94 for response to fences and access to the servitude.
148.	<i>Linked to No. 3.</i>  Water table.	J. L. Pretorius	Reply Form (22/06/2016)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Surface water and groundwater interactions were taken into account from a regional perspective when determining the hydrology of the river catchment during the Technical Feasibility Study.</li> <li>• Monitoring of the ground-, and surface water levels as well as chemistry to confirm the link between surface and groundwater. Borehole water level monitoring to be instituted at Vlieëpoort to compliment surface flow measurements and to ensure that the alluvial aquifer downstream of Vlieëpoort would not be negatively impacted on by the proposed Vlieëpoort abstraction works. Continued borehole water level monitoring would be required after construction of the abstraction works to confirm the adequacy of releases from the abstraction weir to recharge the aquifer downstream of Vlieëpoort.</li> <li>• Geotechnical Study undertaken as part of the Feasibility Study. Additional findings will be included in the EIA Report, as necessary.</li> <li>• Further geotechnical investigations will be undertaken during the design phase. This investigation would result in more information to evaluate the geohydrological conditions.</li> </ul>
149.	I am in the process of planning citrus production on Portion 1 of the Farm Mooivalley. I have already had a climate study done on the farm (direct environment) by Dr Graham Barry	Marius Coetzee	Email (23/06/2016)	The position of the desilting works, balancing dams and high lift pump station is largely determined by the topography, property boundaries and floodlines.

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	<p>and it was found that it is suitable and possibly also one of the earlier areas in the Northern and South Africa. The planned production entails high value mandarin cultivars, which will complement our citrus basket and season in relation to our citrus production in the Western Cape. My concern is the possible construction of the balancing dam at Mooivalei, and I thus require definite clarification about the building or planning of the proposed balancing dam. I want to state on record that the purpose of our citrus development is not to make money from the State, but it is hoped and requested that the proposed dam be built on another property. Citrus production is a labour intensive agricultural operation which can provide highly necessary employment to hundreds of people in the Thabazimbi area.</p>			<p>The following alternative sites were initially identified for the proposed balancing dam:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Option 1: Portions 1 and 2 of the Farm Mooivalei 342 KQ; and</li> <li>• Option 2: Portions 5, 6, 7 and 23 of the Farm Mooivalei 342 KQ.</li> </ul> <p>Option 2 was discarded due to geotechnical constraints (dolomitic conditions) associated with the underlying geological conditions.</p> <p>Refer to No. 111 for the response to compensation.</p>
150.	<p><i>Linked to No. 92.</i></p> <p>Specific EIA process requirements include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide exact information on where the servitude will run between the boundaries of the Farms Leeuwbosch and Zondagskuil.</li> </ul>	Dr L. F. Fouche	Reply Form (24/06/2016)	<p>An overview of the pipeline route options is provided in the Draft Scoping Report.</p> <p>The following aspects were considered in defining the MCWAP-2A pipeline alternative routes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Abstraction and water supply locations;</li> <li>• Existing linear infrastructure (e.g. roads, railway line, power lines) as well as boundaries between landowners along the routes;</li> <li>• Environmental impacts;</li> <li>• Social impact of pipeline location;</li> <li>• Comments received from IAPs during the public participation for the Scoping phase and the broader Public Involvement Process;</li> <li>• Existing servitudes;</li> <li>• Historical and planned future mining activities in the area, both sub-surface and open cast;</li> <li>• Site constraints, potential watercourse crossings, road and railway crossings; and</li> <li>• Geotechnical overview.</li> </ul> <p>In some instances where the pipeline follows linear infrastructure (e.g. railway line) and between farm boundaries, the exact route still needs to be finalised in terms of which side of the aforementioned features it will</p>



No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
				run alongside to. All feasible alternatives will be investigated in greater detail during the EIA phase through a technical and environmental comparative analysis. Note that it is not possible to locate the pipeline within servitudes or reserves of existing infrastructure, and it will thus need to be constructed on the adjoining private properties.  Detailed maps on the pipeline alternative routes are appended to the Draft Scoping Report.
151.	What will be the duration of the construction period?	Bernard Enslin	Email (27/06/2016)	Based on indicative implementation dates for the construction phase of MCWAP-2A WTI the duration of construction is 42 months. Refer to the indicative implementation programme Section 9.9 of the Draft Scoping Report.
152.	When will the specialist be available for a meeting to discuss the planned dam wall at Vlieëpoort and the anticipated impact on water users?	Bernard Enslin	Email (27/06/2016)	The details of the proposed Vlieëpoort Abstraction Weir on the Crocodile River (West) were discussed during the public meetings on 25 and 26 May 2016 and subsequent Focus Group meetings in January 2018, which included a presentation that provides an overview of the infrastructure proposed as part of MCWAP-2A. The details of further meetings still need to be confirmed.  Refer to the write-up on the abstraction weir contained in Section 9.3.1 of the Draft Scoping Report, which includes an overview of the alternative sites considered as well as a description of the proposed infrastructure.
153.	<i>Linked to No. 94.</i>  Specific requirements in terms of the EIA: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Specifications for game fences. I require that my area is restored to current fence and gates.</li> </ul> Potential issues include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maintenance of servitude;</li> <li>Road from railway line to Matjiesfontein dirt road;</li> <li>Compensation for loss of income related to hunting;</li> <li>My two water pipes that cross the railway line;</li> <li>Road crossings or thoroughfares;</li> </ul>	Tuffy Reyneke	Reply Form (28/06/2016)	Refer to the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No. 94 for response to fences;</li> <li>No. 146 for response to impacts to existing infrastructure and structures;</li> <li>No. 111 for response to compensation.</li> </ul> Provision will be made in the EMP for the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reinstatement and rehabilitation of the areas affected by construction activities;</li> <li>Access control;</li> <li>Fencing arrangements.</li> </ul>

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Excavations of 6-8 meter.</li> </ul> <p>Between Matsulan and Matlabas there is a railway line approximately 6 to 8 meters excavation.</p>			<p>One of the triggers for the Socio-Economic Impact Assessment, which will be undertaken during the EIA phase, includes the potential loss of income in the eco-tourism sector (hunting and game farming) (refer to Section 14.4.3.5 of the Draft Scoping Report).</p> <p>Following site rehabilitation to the satisfaction of the landowner of the servitude area, the maintenance of the servitude reverts back to the landowner.</p>
154.	<p><i>Linked to No. 96.</i></p> <p>Do you still have my correspondence pertaining to the alternatives on my property?</p> <p>My farm has been ruined by all the Eskom lines that traverse the property. Two new lines are being constructed, which make it five lines in total.</p> <p>However, if you want to save time and money, use one of the alternative routes.</p> <p>I have also received legal advice which confirmed that it can become a feasible case, especially if alternatives exist and secondly my property value will depreciate such that it will no longer have any economic value.</p> <p>As you know a legal case such as this can considerably delay the project.</p> <p>I see that they have not yet discussed compensation.</p> <p>If they need to traverse my property, which would be the last option, my compensation should start at a minimum of R10 million, which is the current value of the farm.</p> <p>In the next 20 years I may want to sell the property, then the pipeline will be forgotten and all you interested parties will be well off and away and I get nothing for the property due to the power lines, pipelines and land transformation.</p>	Tertius Roux	Email (24/10/2016)	<p>Section 10.3.3, which includes alternatives suggested by IAPs, notes the following based on previous correspondence: <i>Mr. T. Roux from the Remainder of the Farm Paarl 124 KQ recommended that the route follows existing roads along the western and northern boundary, rather than traverse the property alongside high voltage power lines. The lead to the adoption of the current Alternative A1.</i> The various route alternatives will be assessed during the EIA phase through a comparative analysis, based on input from environmental specialists and technical factors, as well as input from IAPs.</p> <p>Refer to response to no. 111 for response to compensation.</p> <p>Once the land is acquired the compensation payable is determined in accordance with prevailing legislation and if an agreement is not reached it can be referred to a relevant court to determine the compensation payable.</p>

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
155.	Enquired about the pipeline servitude that falls on farm boundaries.	P. Welgemoed	Focus Group Meeting – Makoppa Agriculture (Irrigators) (25/01/2018)	J. Kroon explained that during the construction of the pipeline, the servitude (temporary and permanent) will be fenced off on both sides. After the construction period, the fences are removed and the permanent servitude protects the state's rights, but the landowner remains the legal landowner and can still conditionally use the land. Restrictions will be placed on the use of the land within the permanent servitude and access will be necessary for inspection and maintenance of the pipeline. As part of the EIA Process, a 100m wide corridor was assessed to facilitate optimisation of the pipeline route. The servitude widths are 40 m during construction (temporary) and 25 m permanent.
156.	Asked whether the project team will conduct further consultation with the farmers, or will they proceed directly with the expropriation process.	G. Bauer	Focus Group Meeting – Makoppa Agriculture (Irrigators) (25/01/2018)	D. Henning explained that expropriation is a separate legal process that can only take place if Environmental Authorisation is obtained. The expropriation process will be undertaken by TCTA in accordance with the prevailing legal requirements.

## 2.8 Borrow Pits

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
157.	Requested that a CD with the application for the borrow pits be delivered to the regional offices of the Department of Mineral Resources (DMR). He also confirmed that all borrow pits can be included in a single application.	T Kolani (DMR)	Authorities Meeting (25/05/2016)	To be actioned.
158.	What are the locations of the borrow pits?	B Enslin	Public Meeting (26/05/2016)	A Nelwamondo also indicated that further geotechnical investigations need to be conducted to confirm the locations of the remaining borrow pits not yet identified.
159.	<i>Linked to No. 3.</i> Borrow pits.	J. L. Pretorius	Reply Form (22/06/2016)	Construction material will need to be sourced from approximately 30 borrow pits that will be located at about 5 km intervals along the project footprint. A separate application will be submitted to DMR to seek approval for the borrow pits.
160.	<i>Linked to No. 92.</i>	Dr L. F.	Reply Form	The impacts of the proposed borrow pits will be assessed

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	Specific EIA process requirements include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The damage of borrow pits and their exact locations must be indicated.</li> </ul>	Fouche	(24/06/2016)	as part of the EIA. Details of the locations and proposed footprints of the borrow pits will be provided as part of the EIA.

## 2.9 Socio-Economic Issues

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
161.	<i>Linked to No. 7.</i> Security.	Hennie Du Plessis	Reply Form (18/05/2016)	Specific measures will be included in the EMPr to manage security related matters.
162.	Concerned about the security risks posed to landowners by the project.	J Erasmus	Public Meeting (26/05/2016)	A Nelwamondo explained the security measures that will be employed and mentioned that there were no security related incidents during the construction period of MCWAP Phase 1.  D Henning indicated that provision will be made in the EMPr for security measures, such as fencing arrangements, access control, identification of construction staff, etc.  S Pienaar noted that access will be strictly controlled in terms of the locking of gates and access to the servitude. Construction working times will also be managed.
163.	Recommends that the project team gets into contact with the Community Policing Forum that is active in the area.	J Coetzee	Public Meeting (26/05/2016)	D Henning indicated that this can be included in the EMPr as an additional security measure.
164.	How will the security of landowners be ensured during the operational phase of the project. Noted the various security problems experienced due to poor practices by Eskom.  It is requested that the relevant members of the operational team also attend the Community Security Meetings.	J Erasmus	Public Meeting (26/05/2016)	A Nelwamondo explained the access control protocol to the permanent servitude during the operational phase.  D Henning indicated that there will be mitigation measures dedicated to the operational phase in the EMPr, which will include security measures.
165.	Will land claims be taken into consideration?	K Janse van Rensburg	Public Meeting (26/05/2016)	D Henning indicated that that will be considered as part of the EIA.  <i>The status of land claims needs to be assessed when the</i>

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
				land is acquired.  The Socio-Economic Study will also take this into consideration.
166.	Will local labour be used during construction?	D Mochambi	Public Meeting (26/05/2016)	S Kelefetswe indicated that preference will be given to local labour as far as possible and that skills transfer will be promoted.
167.	As a small/medium size business in the Thabazimbi area I would like to register as an interested party for this project as we supply equipment, sit toilets, etc. to the contractors in similar projects. We would also like to be involved in the project to stimulate the local economy and keep the business in the area especially with the current economic situation in the land, province and especially in the Thabazimbi area.	J.C Havenga	Reply Form (30/05/2016)	Measures to promote opportunities for SMMEs will be included in the EMPr.  Procurement also need to comply with Section 217 of the Constitution.
168.	<i>Linked to No. 99.</i>  1. Theft of goods and wildlife by staff or their connections. 2. Thoroughfare. 3. Day visitors. 4. Increase in life risks. 5. Reduce the exclusivity of the farm as thus also the property value. 6. The value of our property is greatly dependent on its tourism value, which will be adversely affected by the above-mentioned issues and impact. The development potential of the farm portions nearest to the site where construction will take place can be negatively affected which could reduce the property value. Compensation through assisting with the construction of alternative structures and landscaping.	Jan & Bertus Grobler	Reply Form (14/06/2016)	1 – 4. Specific measures will be included in the EMPr to manage security related matters. Security and control access will be monitored during the construction and operational phases. The low-lift pump station as well as the balancing dam, desilting works and high-lift pump station will be manned 24 hours a day, 7 days a week by both security personnel and operators. All structures will be fenced off (except the pipelines) with a permanent security fence.  5 – 6. One of the triggers for the Socio-Economic Impact Assessment, which will be undertaken during the EIA phase, includes the potential loss of income in the eco-tourism sector (hunting and game farming) (refer to Section 14.4.3.5 of the Draft Scoping Report).
169.	<i>Linked to No. 3.</i>  Loss of income due to project.	J. L. Pretorius	Reply Form (22/06/2016)	To be assessed as part of the Socio-Economic Impact Assessment (refer to Section 14.4.3.5 of the Draft Scoping Report).
170.	<i>Linked to No. 39.</i>  10. All potential impacts of MCWAP-2 must be fully assessed, and, as part of the requisite assessments, adequate consideration must be given to, amongst other things: 10.4 socio-economic aspects, such as livelihoods and	Centre for Environmental Rights	Email (24/06/2016)	Socio-economic aspects (such as livelihoods and health) associated with the project will be assessed as part of the Socio-Economic Impact Assessment and Social Impact Assessment. These studies will be undertaken during the EIA phase and the reports will be appended to the EIA Report.

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	health.			
171.	I thought we would finish with the selling of a portion of Julius Erasmus' land, but the transaction has run aground due to MCWAP. Julius will thus please appreciate your consideration of his situation and that he must not be in the way of infrastructure development and that any current use of land can at a stage become useless. TCTA can possibly purchase his property to use as a construction camp as currently there are buildings, power and water available and it is centrally situated for some labourers.	Bernard Enslin	Email (27/06/2016)	Landowners are advised to continue with their farming activities to maintain the market value of their land as the project may only proceed following EA.
172.	Another major concern is that planning will need to be done for farms where hunting takes place prior to construction, where many clients book ahead. How will Eco-tourism be addressed?	Bernard Enslin	Email (27/06/2016)	Refer to No. 92 for response to impacts to ecotourism.

## 2.10 Climate

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
173.	<i>Linked to No. 39.</i>  10. All potential impacts of MCWAP-2 must be fully assessed, and, as part of the requisite assessments, adequate consideration must be given to, amongst other things: 10.5 impacts of climate change on both the giving and receiving water systems over the life of the proposed project, with reference, inter alia, to: 'the ecological reserve', and flood patterns and flows.	Centre for Environmental Rights	Email (24/06/2016)	Refer to No. 40 for response to climate change.

## 2.11 Hartbeespoort Dam

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
174.	Negative impact on properties or residents represented by Pecanwood Estate.	Francois Schoeman & Japie	Reply Form (26/09/2016)	A broader Public Involvement Programme will be undertaken as part of the proposed River Management System, which extends beyond the scope of the EIA's

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	Require regular communication and feedback and factual information regarding the process as relating to Pecanwood Estate.	Steenkamp		public participation process. This will entail engaging with the relevant interest groups, which include Hartbeespoort Dam IAPs.  Contact details of included in the IAP database.
175.	<p>As discussed at the time of the email below – herewith my comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Please register me as an IAP.</li> <li>2. Please include the stakeholders that are captured on the DWS Hartbeespoort Dam Remediation Programme's (HBPDRP) database – so as not to leave anyone out who has previously engaged with DWS regarding HBPD aspects.</li> <li>3. As someone who was involved with the HBPDRP for several years (2007 – 2014) – and my involvement included Floating Wetlands, Shoreline Remediation, Biodiversity Improvement, Water Quality, Wetlands, Rivers &amp; Water Courses, Operational Best Practices (OBP)'s and Site Plans – herewith my questions, comments and concerns:</li> <li>4. What is the lowest level the dam is envisioned to drop to?</li> <li>5. Surely the lower the level drops – this will negatively affect the structure/integrity of the dam wall?</li> <li>6. Surely the level of the dam needs to be managed – to effectively balance the A) incoming volume of water and the B) outgoing volume of water – taking into consideration the seasons (summer rainfall etc.)?</li> <li>7. My concerns include the impact/effects to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The current Floating Wetlands (FW)'s: They will have to be moved to a 'lower' contour, as I have included in the Site Plans, where FW's were placed. Who will do this?</li> <li>b. The Shoreline vegetation surrounding HBPD: Certain plants need/flourish in certain conditions, this includes conditions such as the amount of water. If the water fluctuates too dramatically, this will detrimentally impact the vegetation. We all know that the vegetation 'cleans/filters' the water, therefore, the loss of vegetation will have a detrimental impact on the Water Quality. The Shoreline vegetation also is part of a crucial Food-Web – therefore, those species will be negatively impacted, resulting in 'Un-Balance' – thereby providing conditions for Toxic Blue-Green Algae to flourish.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	Gill Ledger	Email (20/10/2016)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Contact details included in IAP database. To be informed as the EIA process unfolds.</li> <li>2. Refer to No. 190 and 198 for responses to engagement with the Hartbeespoort Dam IAPs.</li> <li>3. Noted.</li> <li>4. The water levels have been modelled for various scenarios. Further information to be provided in the EIA Report and during the meeting scheduled with the Hartbeespoort Dam community.</li> <li>5. The water level will be managed during flooding to ensure structural integrity.</li> <li>6. This will form part of the Operating Rules and River Management System. Further information to be provided in the EIA Report.</li> <li>7. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Suitable mitigation measures will be evaluated during the EIA phase.</li> <li>b) Specialist studies to be undertaken during the EIA phase to determine impacts and to consider mitigation measures.</li> <li>c) Refer to No. 40, 79 and 80 for responses to the Reserve.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	<p>c. The Ecological Reserve within the NWA: These are similar to the aspects mentioned above.</p> <p>Note: In about 2012, after 500 FW's were placed at Kurperoord (Metsiame's demonstration site) as well as the implementation of two Shoreline Remediation berms – I saw a new Water Grass in the shallows – it was at a 'clear water state' time period. I had not seen it previously and I documented it. Currently, at the Pecanwood estate shoreline, I have seen this Water Grass for a couple of weeks – it has been a 'clear water state' - and have been documenting it by collecting samples and taking photographs. I have contacted several of the Aquatic Vegetation Scientists who previously conducted Floristic Surveys at HBPD. With the photos I have sent, at this stage, it seems that this is a 'new' species to HBPD! – this is very exciting. Please, consider the good work which has been done at Harties – which was to establish Aquatic Vegetation – in the aim of the vegetation being in competition for nutrients and sunlight – with the Toxic Blue/Green Algae. This would enable longer periods where the Toxic Blue/Green Algae was not dominating the System.</p>			

## 2.12 Other Planned Developments

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
176.	Has the expansion of the railway line been taken into consideration and is there confirmation that it will proceed?	P Jordaan	Public Meeting (25/05/2016)	<p>O van den Berg mentioned that the MCWAP-2 technical team is in contact with Transnet.</p> <p><i>Refer to No. 178 for response to engagement with Transnet.</i></p>
177.	The pipeline routes follow the options of the power lines that form part of the proposed Namane Generation Power Station.	A Pugh	Public Meeting (26/05/2016)	<p><i>The proposed alternative routes for the 400 kV power line for the Namane Generation IPP Project were investigated further.</i></p> <p><i>Extracts from the EIA Report on the analysis of the</i></p>



No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
				<p><i>alternative routes follow:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Two alternatives are being considered for the 400 kV lines, referred to as the Spitzkop Line and the Steenbokpan Line.</li> <li>• The Spitzkop Line is economically and technically the preferred option for Namane due the more direct route to connect with the existing transmission line, at a length of approximately 39,7 km. Namane's preferred route will require less capital expenditure, thereby reducing over-all project costs. The Steenbokpan Line is a slightly longer route at approximately 50,6 km, but will result in the majority of the transmission line being constructed within an existing servitude.</li> <li>• Over all, the weighing system found the Steenbokpan Line to be the more suitable option.</li> </ul> <p><i>The Steenbokpan Line follows the MCWAP-2 Alternative D3 route. This will be considered further as part of the EIA phase.</i></p>
178.	<p>With reference to the study you are currently doing. I do not know if you approached the following people as interested and affected parties. Their planning may significantly affect your proposed route.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. RCE Consultants are involved with the railway, and there is a possibility that they will build rail to load rocks on the farm Ruigtevlei KQ97, which may be required for the construction of a new railway line. Details are attached.</li> <li>2. Then there is a mining group "Thubatse Community Mining Solutions" that applied for the mining of stone on the farm Ruigtevlei 1/97 KQ, to supply it to interested parties at the development of new projects such as the new mines, power stations, water pipeline, railway line, ESKOM power lines and other contractors. Details are provided below.</li> </ol>	D. Smit	Email (05/06/2016)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Contact made with RCE Consultants. Shared spatial data for the proposed pipeline routes (including alternative alignments). Also made direct contact with Transnet to establish their plans to increase the capacity of the existing railway line, to determine how this will potentially influence the proposed MCWAP-2A footprint.</li> <li>2. Contact made with Thubatse Community Mining Solutions. Awaiting feedback on status of proposed rock quarry on the farm Ruigtevlei 1/97 KQ to determine how this project may potentially influence the proposed infrastructure associated with MCWAP-2A.</li> </ol>

**2.13 EIA Process**

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
179.	<p><i>Linked to No. 111.</i></p> <p>Safeguarding against possible pollution (e.g. oil, diesel, etc.) during site preparation.</p> <p>Are all the objections previously provided still in your possession (2011)?</p>	T. de Clercq	Reply Form (16/05/2016)	<p>Provision will be made in the EMP to ensure that all known possible causes of pollution are mitigated as far as possible to minimise impacts to the surrounding environment.</p> <p>Due to the time that has passed since the previous EIA, which exceeds 5 years, a new Comments and Responses Report has been compiled which focuses on the comments received under the new Application for MCWAP-2, starting from the notification (announcement phase) in May 2016. However, the issues raised under the previous EIA will be considered during the execution of the current environmental assessment.</p>
180.	Wish to be kept informed.	Ian Hall (Anglo Operations Limited)	Reply Form (17/05/2016)	Contact details included in IAP database. To be informed as the EIA process unfolds.
181.	Hard copies to be delivered and comments will follow.	Koogan Naidoo (Mogale City Local Municipality)	Reply Form (18/05/2016)	The project area does not fall within the Mogale City Local Municipality. Notification of the locations where the EIA related reports (hard and soft copies) can be obtained (including website link) will be provided.
182.	Will a site visit be held after the meeting?	S Phasha (DWS)	Authorities Meeting (25/05/2016)	D Henning indicated that the site visit will be held as part of the authorities meeting in the Scoping phase or if specifically requested by an authority.
183.	Had there been any engagement with the Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA) to date.	S Phasha (DWS)	Authorities Meeting (25/05/2016)	<p>O van den Berg indicated that DEA had been invited to the authorities meeting. He further noted that the following two meetings have been held with DEA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DEA Pre-Application Consultation Meeting (August 2015); and</li> <li>• DEA follow-up meeting to confirm the approach to the EIA (March 2016).</li> </ul>
184.	Enquired about the notification of the public.	S Phasha (DWS)	Authorities Meeting (25/05/2016)	D Henning explained that the EIA process for MCWAP-2 makes provision for engagement during the announcement, scoping and EIA phases. He further listed the various forms of notification undertaken to date, which primarily included:

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>On site notices;</li> <li>Newspaper notices; and</li> <li>Direct notification via emails and registered mail.</li> </ul>
185.	Noted the dissatisfaction of the landowners in terms of the protracted period since the last consultation regarding the project. It adversely affects their long-term planning.	J Erasmus	Public Meeting (26/05/2016)	<p><i>The MCWAP Environmental Module was originally initiated at the end of 2008 under the EIA Regulations of 2006. The EIA application was withdrawn following the Scoping phase due to uncertainty with regards to water demands.</i></p> <p><i>MCWAP-2A was resuscitated for the following reasons:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Government identified and approved 18 SIPs across the RSA to support economic development and address service delivery in the poorest provinces. SIP 1 entails the unlocking of the Northern Mineral Belt with Waterberg as the catalyst. Investment in rail, water and transmission infrastructure and energy generation will catalyse unlocking rich mineral resources in Limpopo resulting in thousands of direct jobs across the areas covered. The MCWAP includes the water infrastructure needed for SIP 1. Due to the priority accorded by Government to such SIP projects, it was prudent to give priority to the future water needs of the Lephalale area in support of the national development imperatives;</i></li> <li><i>MCWAP-1 augments the supply from Mokolo Dam and is already operational since June 2015. It serves as an interim measure to supply in the growing water requirements of Lephalale, Eskom and Exxaro. The sustainable yield of Mokolo Dam is not sufficient to meet the increased needs of the users including the pollution abatement measures which is an environmental and funding condition;</i></li> <li><i>A suitably sized transfer pipeline from the Crocodile River (West) can be implemented timeously to meet the increased requirements to support the RSA's economy. The solution will over the long term optimally utilise the full yield from Mokolo Dam and will be operated as a system together with proposed MCWAP-2A when the latter is completed. MCWAP-</i></li> </ul>

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
				<p>2A will also serve to provide the necessary assurance of water supply to the large end users from independent sources; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The water requirements have been finalised to the degree that is adequate to make informed economic decisions with respect to the transfer capacity of MCWAP-2A.</li> </ul> <p>In the meantime, landowners must continue with their farming activities to maintain the market value of their properties.</p>
186.	When will the various specialist studies be conducted?	G du Preez	Public Meeting (26/05/2016)	D Henning indicated that the landowners will be contacted to arrange access for the specialists.
187.	The purpose of the EIA is to assess the impacts to the environment. MKWAP-2 will have a much wider impact on the bushveld due to the cumulative impacts associated with the water end users' developments.	E Greyling	Public Meeting (26/05/2016)	<p>D Henning stated that cumulative impacts will be assessed as part of the EIA. An Environmental Management Framework (EMF) has been developed for the Waterberg District Municipality. The purpose of the EMF is to facilitate environmental decision-making to promote sustainable development. As part of the EMF various Environmental Management Zones have been delineated. The WTI pipeline for MCWAP-2A aims to follow the major infrastructure corridors in the EMF, as far as possible.</p> <p>A Nelwamondo noted that the Medupi Power Station requires the water from MWAP-2A to implement technology (FGD) to improve its emissions to reduce air pollution.</p>
188.	He was not aware of the public meeting in Steenbokpan. Requested that notifications be placed at the community centre and that the Lephalale Community Radio be used.	D Mochambi	Public Meeting (26/05/2016)	To be considered during the EIA Public Participation process.
189.	Please register Mr. Roland van Tonder as an IAP on the above-mentioned project. He wants to be kept updated on the progress and wants to attend all meetings. Please let us know when the next meeting will be held.	L. du Plessis	Email (30/05/2016)	Contact details included in IAP database. To be informed as the EIA process unfolds.
190.	<p>Thanks for the MCWAP-2 BID.</p> <p>We act for Earthlife Africa Johannesburg. Our client is concerned no public consultation meetings have been</p>	Nicole Löser (Centre for Environmental Rights NPC)	Email (02/06/2016)	Thank you for the correspondence. Your request for meetings in the North West Province and Gauteng are duly noted.

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	<p>arranged for anywhere in Gauteng or in the North West. Yet, the BID proposes to look at the river management system (p 6 of the BID) and specifically at water requirements between the four upstream dams (i.e. Hartbeespoort, Roodekopjes, Klipvoor and Vaalkop) – all of which are based in the North West.</p> <p>While it is clear that this project will have far-reaching and broad impacts throughout the country – which necessitates geographically broad and substantial public consultation - it is our client's view that, at the very least, public consultation meetings should be held, at relevant and appropriate locations, in Gauteng and the North West, where many potentially impacted water sources and water users are based.</p> <p>Please ensure that additional public consultation meetings are arranged accordingly, and please provide us with the relevant dates and venues.</p>			<p>We wish to bring it to your attention that the public meetings on 25 and 26 May 2016 were only the start of the Public Involvement Programme for MCWAP-2A.</p> <p>As part of the broader Public Involvement Programme for the River Management System, which extends beyond the scope of the EIA's Public Participation Process, we intend to schedule meetings with key interest groups, which include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Formal Agricultural Groups (including the Hartbeespoort Irrigation Board, Crocodile-West Irrigation Board, Makoppa Water Users and the Transvaal Agricultural Union-SA; and</li> <li>• Hartbeespoort Dam Interested and Affected Parties.</li> </ul> <p>The abovementioned interest groups were specifically identified based on the nature and scope of the River Management System.</p> <p>Please bear in mind the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• An extensive stakeholder involvement process is being followed in the development and continuation of the Reconciliation Strategy for the Crocodile River (West) and Marico River where the impacts of the transfer of water from the Crocodile River (West) to the Lephalale area were extensively communicated in the Strategy Steering Committee meetings. Refer to <a href="https://www.dwa.gov.za/Projects/crocodilemaintenance/default.aspx">https://www.dwa.gov.za/Projects/crocodilemaintenance/default.aspx</a> for further information pertaining to the aforementioned.</li> <li>• Phase 2 of the water augmentation project aims to supply demands in the Waterberg Coal Fields by utilizing surplus return flows from Gauteng being discharged in the Crocodile River (West) Catchment. Refer to the attached map, which contextualizes the source of the surplus water in the Crocodile System.</li> <li>• The water requirements of the water users are secured through existing entitlements (i.e. Existing Lawful Use – Section 32 of the National Water Act,</li> </ul>

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
				<p>No. 36 of 1998).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meetings are convened in other areas but this is done on an <i>ad hoc</i> basis. An example includes meeting with directly affected landowners who reside in Gauteng.</li> <li>• The project is presented regularly on a host of other forums and is well broadcasted in the greater public domain.</li> <li>• Key groups in various sectors in particularly Limpopo, North West and Gauteng were notified of the project and are included in the I&amp;AP database.</li> </ul> <p>Nemai Consulting will keep you informed as the EIA process unfolds.</p>
191.	<p>In response to the request for Interested and Affected Parties to apply in relation to the MCWAP Phase 2 project EIA, please find attached completed form.</p> <p>I would also like to urge you to conduct public participation meetings in the Marapong area (and other formal and informal settlements associated with the pipeline route). This will go a long way to ensuring citizens of all walks of life have an opportunity to be consulted without being burdened with additional travel costs they cannot afford. Also, as a lesson learned from the Medupi EIA, I would recommend that farm labourers be expressly included in focus group meetings with farmers to ensure necessary effort to identify all potential heritage related issues are appropriately identified as part of the EIA specialist work.</p>	Emile Marell	Email (17/06/2016)	<p>The Marapong area is in excess of 20 km to the north-east of the project footprint (Pipeline Route Option D1). There is a settlement in the Steenbokpan area, which is located adjacent to the terminal point for Pipeline Route Option D3, and a dedicated meeting will be held with this community in the future. The first public meeting in Steenbokpan was held on 26 May 2016.</p> <p>Requirement to engage with farm labourers included in specific Terms of Reference for Heritage Impact Assessment.</p>
192.	<p><i>Linked to No. 3.</i></p> <p>Specific EIA requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Visits only by arrangements;</li> <li>• No heavy vehicles;</li> <li>• Visits only between 9:00 and 17:00 weekdays;</li> <li>• Speed limits of 40 km/h</li> <li>• Numbers of personnel per visit as arranged;</li> <li>• All visitors must have an ID;</li> <li>• All visitors must sign an indemnity form before access is</li> </ul>	J. L. Pretorius	Reply Form (22/06/2016)	<p>Access protocols of formal agricultural groups will be adhered to for any access required by members of the EIA project team and specialists.</p>

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	granted to land. Please note that these are not the last and only requirements.			
193.	<p><i>Linked to No. 39.</i></p> <p>5. We note that no mention is made of the need to remedy negative impacts (through, for example, appropriate restoration, compensation, or offsets) – as required in terms of the National Environmental Management principles encompassed in section 2 of the National Environmental Management Act, 1998 (NEMA). That must be addressed.</p>	Centre for Environmental Rights	Email (24/06/2016)	<p>During the EIA stage a detailed assessment will be conducted to evaluate all potential impacts (paying particular attention to the significant issues listed in the Scoping Report), with input from the project team, requisite specialist studies and IAPs and through the application of the impact assessment methodology contained in Section 13.4 of the Draft Scoping Report.</p> <p>Suitable mitigation measures will be identified to manage the environmental impacts according to the following hierarchy:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Initial efforts will strive to prevent the occurrence of the impact;</li> <li>2. If this is not possible, mitigation will include measures that reduce or minimise the significance of the impact to an acceptable level;</li> <li>3. Remediation and rehabilitation will take place if measures cannot suitably prevent or reduce the impacts, or to address the residual impacts; and</li> <li>4. As a last measure, compensation will be employed as a form of mitigating the impacts associated with a project.</li> </ol> <p>The mitigation measures will be incorporated into the EMP, which will form part of the EIA Report.</p>
194.	<p><i>Linked to No. 39.</i></p> <p>6. The BID notes that MCWAP-2 consists of the following components: “1. <i>Water Transfer Infrastructure (topic of this BID) - transfer of water from the Crocodile River to Lephalale</i>; 2. <i>Bulk Power Supply (topic of this BID)</i>; 3. <i>Borrow Pits - sourcing of construction material</i>; and 4. <i>River Management System - manage abstractions from, and the river flow in, the Crocodile River (West) between Hartbeespoort Dam and Vlieëpoort Weir as well as the Moretele River from Klipvoor Dam to the confluence with</i></p>	Centre for Environmental Rights	Email (24/06/2016)	<p>The EIA Regulations of 2014 (as amended) include a number of provisions in terms of the transition of the environmental regulation of mining from the Mineral and Petroleum Resources Development Act (MPRDA) (Act No. 28 of 2002) to NEMA. Amongst others, this is facilitated by the inclusion of mining activities under the 2014 Listing Notices (as amended). Separate approval thus needs to be sought from DMR for the Borrow Pits in terms of the activities triggered under the Listing Notices of 4 December 2014 (as amended). However, the intention is for the EIAs for the WTI and Borrow Pits to run</p>

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	<p><i>the Crocodile River (West), and also the required flow past Vlieëpoort."</i></p> <p>7. It is not clear if, and how, components 3 and 4 above – which are clearly integral to the MCWAP-2 and will require environmental authorisation (Table 2 in the BID) – are to be addressed in a 'combined application' process, particularly given that separate applications will be submitted for different components. Our client requests clarity on this approach and an explanation of why there is a need for these 'separate applications' rather than one combined application.</p>			<p>concurrently, as far as possible.</p> <p>A River Management System is required to monitor, control and manage the releases into the river, the flows in the river and abstractions from the river. Not all of the associated components (e.g. existing dams, existing river gauging stations, smart metering of direct and indirect abstraction, new operating rules) will require authorisation. The components of the River Management System will be confirmed as part of the design phase of the project. It is anticipated that authorisation will need to be sought for components such as 4 new river gauging stations, possible new river outlets at Hartbeespoort Dam Roodekopjes Dam, data communication network and integrated operational centre.</p>
195.	<p><i>Linked to No. 39.</i></p> <p>9. Our client is very concerned about the impacts that the proposed MCWAP-2 poses for human health and the environment. We note, in this regard, that the BID focuses on the engineering designs (which themselves are far from clearly understandable), and provides very little information on potential environmental and social impacts.</p>	Centre for Environmental Rights	Email (24/06/2016)	<p>The BID only provides an overview of the project. Drawings and maps of the proposed MCWAP-2 infrastructure accompany the Draft Scoping Report.</p> <p>The potentially significant environmental issues associated with the project are included in Sections 11 and 13 of the Draft Scoping Report.</p> <p>Refer to No. 193 for response to the assessment of potential impacts.</p>
196.	<p><i>Linked to No. 39.</i></p> <p>10. All potential impacts of MCWAP-2 must be fully assessed, and, as part of the requisite assessments, adequate consideration must be given to, amongst other things:</p> <p>10.7 section 24 of the Constitution, which guarantees a right to an environment not harmful to health or wellbeing and the right to have the environment protected for the benefit of present and future generations; and</p> <p>10.8 the National Environmental Management principles set out in NEMA's section 2; including, in particular, the precautionary, preventive and "polluter pays" principles.</p>	Centre for Environmental Rights	Email (24/06/2016)	<p>Refer to No. 193 for response to the assessment of potential impacts.</p>



No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
197.	<p><i>Linked to No. 39.</i></p> <p>11. In relation to the proposed specialist studies set out in the BID:</p> <p>11.1 a land use impact assessment, rather than an “agricultural” assessment should be conducted;</p> <p>11.2 a freshwater ecologist could be appointed to conduct both the “aquatic and riverine impact assessment” and the “wetland assessment and delineation”; and</p> <p>11.3. if biodiversity components of concern arise either from a terrestrial or freshwater aquatic system perspective, additional, more focussed taxa studies would need to be conducted; and</p> <p>11.4 the socioeconomic impact assessment must assess the impacts of both ‘giving’ and receiving water systems on livelihoods, health and safety of affected communities.</p>	Centre for Environmental Rights	Email (24/06/2016)	<p>The proposed infrastructure is mostly located on privately-owned properties that are primarily used for agricultural practices and game-farming. An Agricultural Impact Assessment is triggered by various aspects associated with the project, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of cultivated land and grazing land within the construction domain;</li> <li>• Loss of stock watering points within construction domain;</li> <li>• Disruptions to farming operations as a result of construction-related use of existing access roads; and</li> <li>• Loss of fertile soil through land clearance.</li> </ul> <p>Sections 14.4.3.1 and 14.4.3.2 of the Draft Scoping Report provide an overview of the Aquatic Impact Assessment and Terrestrial Ecological Impact Assessment, respectively. No trigger for a species-specific study has been identified to date.</p> <p>Provision is made in Section 14.4.3.5 of the Draft Scoping Report for a Socio-Economic Impact Assessment, which will include the assessment of ‘giving’ and receiving water systems.</p>
198.	<p><i>Linked to No. 39.</i></p> <p>12. We point out that the MCWAP-2 has potential to have significant and far-reaching impacts on water sources which will affect substantial portions of the country, and not only Limpopo. In particular, it appears from the BID that it will, at the very least, impact on water sources in North West and Gauteng. In this regard, we record that, on 2 June 2016, we wrote to you to request that additional public consultation meetings be arranged for, at the very least, the North West and Gauteng. You responded on 3 June 2016, advising that, as part of the broader Public Involvement Programme for the River Management System - which extends beyond the scope of the EIA's Public Participation Process - meetings would be scheduled with key interest groups, which include: Formal</p>	Centre for Environmental Rights	Email (24/06/2016)	<p>Public meetings are only earmarked in the MCWAP-2A's area of influence in terms of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Hartbeespoort Dam;</li> <li>2. Water users downstream of Hartbeespoort Dam, namely Hartebeespoort Irrigation Board, Crocodile-West Irrigation Board and Makoppa Water Users (refer to Section 11.8.4 of the Draft Scoping Report); and</li> <li>3. The physical footprint of the project's proposed infrastructure.</li> </ol> <p>Due to the nature of the discussions, the focus group meetings with the Formal Agricultural Groups will not be open to all IAPs. Separate public meetings will be held as part of the EIA, where all IAPs are welcome to attend.</p>

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	Agricultural Groups (including the Hartebeespoort Irrigation Board, Crocodile-West Irrigation Board, Makoppa Water Users and the Transvaal Agricultural Union); and Hartebeespoort Dam Interested and Affected Parties. You advised that the abovementioned interest groups were specifically identified based on the nature and scope of the river management system. Kindly confirm that these invitations will be sent to all I&APs, and not only these interest groups.			
199.	13. We trust that you will give due consideration to the above recommendations as you prepare the scoping report for MCWAP-2.	Centre for Environmental Rights	Email (24/06/2016)	Refer to individual responses to matters raised in the correspondence from Centre for Environmental Rights.
200.	12. Kindly respond to our queries regarding the separate EIA applications and regarding the expansion of the I&AP interest groups as set out above in paragraphs 7 and 12 respectively	Centre for Environmental Rights	Email (24/06/2016)	Refer to No. 194 for response to separate EIA applications.  Refer to No. 190 and 198 for responses to the expansion of the IAP interest groups.
201.	<i>Linked to No. 94.</i>  Potential issues include: • Timeframes.  Please send Tarentaal Pan NG church correspondence to me. The Church Council has appointed me as negotiator.	Tuffy Reyneke	Reply Form (28/06/2016)	Refer to the indicative implementation programme Section 9.9 of the Draft Scoping Report.
202.	Asked in the comments provided in 2016 will be included in the Comments and Responses Report.	N. Fourie	Focus Group Meeting – Hartbeespoort Irrigation Board (24/01/2018)	D. Henning confirmed that will be the case. Comments received in writing or during meetings will be included in the Comments and Responses Report.  J. Kroon added that the Comments and Responses Report will be appended to the draft Scoping Report that will be lodged in the public domain in March 2018. This will allow the parties that commented to determine whether the responses provided are adequate.
203.	Stated that the Irrigation Board will convene a meeting with its members and thereafter their formal comments will be forwarded to D. Henning for inclusion into the EIA process.	J. Swanepoel	Focus Group Meeting – Crocodile River (West) Irrigation Board (24/01/2018)	<i>Awaiting formal comments from the Crocodile River (West) Irrigation Board.</i>

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
204.	Requested that the minutes of public meetings held in 2016 be sent together with the minutes of the focus group to all the attendees.	G. Bauer	Focus Group Meeting – Makoppa Agriculture (Irrigators) (25/01/2018)	D. Henning said that previous minutes of the public meetings and the minutes of this focus group meeting will be distributed.
205.	Asked what the purpose of the meeting was, and whether it was to inform the attendees about the proposed project or whether the project had already commenced.	A. Pieterse	Focus Group Meeting – Makoppa Agriculture (Irrigators) (25/01/2018)	F. Vogel explained that the focus group meeting is part of the Scoping phase of the EIA process. The meeting serves to provide information and to obtain comments and concerns from the affected parties which will be included in the EIA.
206.	Asked whether the final decision to build the weir at Mooivallei had been made.	A. Pieterse		<p>F. Vogel explained that the final decision on whether the project could be implemented depends on whether Environmental Authorisation is obtained for the project.</p> <p>J. Kroon added that there is a proposed project layout, with options regarding the pipeline routes. The DEA will need to review the EIA and make a decision.</p> <p>D. Henning explained that a separate focus group meeting will be convened with the owners of Mooivallei to discuss all their specific concerns about the project. He added that different options for the location of the weir were investigated but were discarded due to the geological conditions.</p>
207.	Proposed that all the questions and issues from the Makoppa Farmers be discussed and formally captured at their next internal Makoppa Agricultural Meeting in February 2018. This will then be sent to D. Henning for feedback from the project team. F. Vogel mentioned that this is a positive proposal. The proposal was accepted by the attendees.	W. Potgieter	Focus Group Meeting – Makoppa Agriculture (Irrigators) (25/01/2018)	<i>Formal comments received on 28 February 2018.</i>
208.	Mentioned that the general sentiment is that the project has already been approved and cannot be changed. Is the purpose of the focus group meeting to say what will happen or that changes can still take place?	A. Pieterse	Focus Group Meeting – Makoppa Agriculture (Irrigators) (25/01/2018)	<p>J. Kroon explained that it is a proposed project with alternatives to be assessed as part of the EIA Process, including specialist studies.</p> <p>D. Henning added that various options to supply the required water were considered during the Technical Pre-Feasibility and Feasibility Studies. The proposed water</p>

No.	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
				transfer scheme was identified to be the most preferable due to a variety of factors, and it is now being assessed as part of the EIA. Only layout alternatives are under consideration.
209.	Asked whether this implied that he needed to speak to the person who initially undertook these investigations to enquire how the weir site at Mooivallei was identified.	A. Pieterse	Focus Group Meeting – Makoppa Agriculture (Irrigators) (25/01/2018)	D. Henning explained that all comments, questions and issues raised during public participation will be incorporated into the Comments and Responses Report and that feedback would be sought from the relevant members of the project team to provide responses. This includes the members of the technical team.