

## MOCOLO AND CROCODILE (WEST) WATER AUGMENTATION PROJECT: DE-BOTTLENECKING OF AN EXISTING PIPELINE

### COMMENTS AND RESPONSE REPORT

---

The Comments and Response Report summarizes the salient issues and queries raised, as well as statements made, by I&APs at meetings during the **Basic Assessment** process. This report also attempts to address the comments through input from the project team.

In addition to implementing the Public Participation Process (PPP) as governed by NEMA and Government Notice No. R. 385, DWA also undertook a broader Public Involvement Process (PIP), which started more formally during the January 2009. This broader PIP included the establishment of a two different forums within the agricultural sector called the Water Forum and the Environmental Forum, which later merged into the combined Agri Discussion Forum (chaired by Mr. Roland van Tonder who is the Chairman of the Crocodile West Irrigation Board). Representatives from the different agricultural unions and irrigation boards that are situated in the project area are members of this Forum.

Besides the Agri Discussion Forum, two working groups were also established as part of the DWA-driven PIP, namely the Crocodile (West) Working Group and the Mokolo Working Group. At these working groups water-related issues pertaining to the Crocodile River and Mokolo River are discussed in more depth.

Further there was a Project Steering Committee (PSC) established where all the major stakeholders for the MCWAP project meets and issues and progress are discussed. Five representatives from the Agri Discussion Forum also represent this sector on the PSC.

When reviewing the Comments and Response report, please also take cognizance of the following:

- All the responses written in italics were included subsequent to meetings in order to address the comments in greater detail.
- The majority of the comments were translated from Afrikaans.
- This report does not provide verbatim comments from meetings, but rather reflects the essence of the discussions held with I&APs.
- A substantial portion of the comments received from the members of the agricultural sector relate to the potential impact on the availability of water, which pertains to the MCWAP transfer schemes (i.e. Phase 1 and Phase 2). Although these comments have little bearing on the de-bottlenecking, they were included in this report for the sake of completeness.
- The details of the project team members that responded to the issues and comments are provided below.

Project Team Member	Organisation	Abbreviation
Ockie van den Berg	Department of Water Affairs	OvdB
Amelius Muller	Aurecon	AM
Fanie Vogel	Aurecon	FV
Barend Smit	Aurecon	BS
Johan Pienaar	Aurecon	JP
Donavan Henning	Nemai Consulting	DH
Salomon Pienaar	Nemai Consulting	SP
Nicky Naidoo	Nemai Consulting	NN
Liza van der Merwe	TCTA	LvdM

- The meetings held with I&APs up to 19 June 2009 are tabulated below.

MCWAP Phase 1 & De-bottlenecking Project Meetings				
No.	Date	MCWAP Component	Audience/ Party / Landowner	Venue
1	27-01-09	Phase 1, 2 and De-bottlenecking	Thabazimbi – Lephalale Agri sector	Ben Alberts Nature Reserve
2	05-03-09	Phase 1 & De-bottlenecking	Mokolo Dam – Lephalale – Steenbokpan affected landowners	Ashante Conference Venue
3	06-03-09	Phase 1, 2 and De-bottlenecking	Thabazimbi – Lephalale Water Forum	Rra Dtau Game Lodge
4	06-03-09	Phase 1, 2 and De-bottlenecking	Thabazimbi – Lephalale Environmental Forum	Rra Dtau Game Lodge
5	26-05-09	Phase 1 & De-bottlenecking	Mokolo Working Group	Koedoeskop Agricultural Union Hall
6	26-05-09	Phase 1, 2 and De-bottlenecking	Thabazimbi – Lephalale Agri sector	Koedoeskop Agricultural Union Hall
7	28-05-09	Phase 1	Mokolo Dam – Lephalale – Steenbokpan affected landowners	Mogol Klub , Lephalale
8	28-05-09	Phase 1 & De-bottlenecking	Mokolo Dam – Lephalale – Steenbokpan affected landowners	Ashante Conference Venue
9	22-06-09	Phase 1	Farm Witbank/ Wolvenfontein R/645	Farm Witbank
10	22-06-09	Phase 1 & De-bottlenecking	Farm Goedgedaght	Ashante Conference Venue
11	22-06-09	Phase 1 & De-bottlenecking	Farms Fancy, Fourieskloof & Goedeheop	Waterfall Lodge
12	22-06-09	Phase 1	Farms Fancy and Worcester	Farm: Fancy
13	08-07-09	Phase 1	Farm Fourieskloof	Modimolle (Nylstroom)
14	08-07-09	Phase 1 & De-bottlenecking	Farm Wolvenfontein 3/645	Farm Wolvenfontein 3/645
15	08-07-09	Phase 1	Farm Zeeland R/526	Farm Zeeland R/526
16	08-07-09	Phase 1	Farms Buffelsjagt, Enkeldraai & Kringgatspruit	Farm Buffelsjagt
17	08-07-09	Phase 1	Farm Worcester	Mogol Klub
18	10-07-09	Phase 1 & Phase 2	Steenbokpan Area	Steenbokpan Agricultural Union Hall
19	10-07-09	Phase 1 & Phase 2	Farm Theunispan 23/293 - Phomulong Community Trust	Steenbokpan Winkel
20	14-07-09	Phase 1	Farm Taaiboschpan	Aurecon Offices - Centurion
21	17-07-09	Phase 1 & De-bottlenecking	Farm Wolvenfontein 1/645	KV3 Offices - Pretoria
22	28-07-09	De-bottlenecking Phase	Farm Sterkfontein 3/642	KV3 Offices - Pretoria
23	05-11-09	Phase 1 & De-bottlenecking	Farm Wolvenfontein 3/645	Farm Wolvenfontein 3/645
24	12-11-09	Phase 1	Phase 1 Public Meeting	Mogol Klub, Lephalale
25	12-11-09	De-bottlenecking	De-bottlenecking Public Meeting	Ashante Conference Venue
26	13-11-09	Phase 1	Farm Wolvenfontein 3/645 (Site Visit)	Farm Wolvenfontein 3/645
27	13-11-09	Phase 1	Farm Fancey (Site Visit)	Farm Fancey

- The issues and comments raised by I&APs were grouped under the categories below. Although an attempt was made to assign each issue to the most logical category, some issues could fall under more than one category.

Categories	• Construction	• Operation And Maintenance
	• Water	• Servitude
	• Compensation	• Institutional Arrangements
	• Environmental Impact Assessment	• Broader Public Involvement Process
	• Infrastructure	• General
	• Alternatives	



**Note:** IAPs did not necessarily respond to only the Basic Assessment Report. Instead many provided comments on the Phase 1, Phase 2 and the Basic Assessment Report together. In which case, all comments received are included in this submission however only a response to the comments pertaining to the Basic Assessment report are provided in this report. All remaining comments will be addressed as part of the EIA report for Phases 1 and 2. These comments are also repeated in the Scoping Reports for Phases 1 and 2.

## 1. COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE IAP REGISTRATION PERIOD FOR THE DE-BOTTLENECKING BASIC ASSESSMENT PROCESS

### 1.1 Construction

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
1.1	When will construction commence on the various phases of the project?	Unknown – focus group	Lephalale Focus Group Meeting (24 April 2009)	<p>During the Focus Group meeting the following planning dates were communicated by SP, which were based on the programme that was relevant at that stage of the project:</p> <p><u>Phase 1</u> - Commencement of Construction – Third Qtr 2010 Commissioning – First 2012</p> <p><u>Phase 2</u> - Commencement of Construction – Second Qtr 2011 Commissioning – Third Qtr 2014</p> <p><i>During the compilation of this report, the following programme applied:</i></p> <p><u>Phase 1</u> - Commencement of Construction – First Quarter 2011 Commissioning – End 2013</p> <p><u>Phase 2</u> - Commencement of Construction – Start 2013 Commissioning – End 2015</p>
1.2	The landowner's game must be protected during the construction process. It was also stated that strict supervision and control must be implemented for farm access.	Guy Emslie (Farm Fancy 556 LQ)	Landowners Meeting - Ashante Conference Venue (05 March 2009)	<b>JP</b> stated that the EMP and the contractor's specifications would set requirements to ensure that the contractor complies. Also mentioned there will be independent environmental officer(s) appointed to monitor the contractor to ensure he complies with the EMP and relevant environmental and Occupational Health and Safety legislation.
1.3	Demanded a take-off point from the proposed pipeline for animal drinking purposes and requested additional take off points.	Several directly affected parties	Landowners Meeting - Ashante Conference Venue (05 March 2009)	<p><b>AM</b> mentioned that DWA policy will apply. Landowners must request take-off points. Take-off points will only provide water for household and animal drinking purposes. New agreements will need to be established between DWA and the specific water user.</p> <p><b>Willie du Plessis (Exxaro)</b> noted that these take-off points must be requested in advance and that the landowners have to indicate exactly where they would need these take-off points since it must be included in the designs of the pipeline.</p>
1.4	Landowners on the pipeline section between Lephalale and Steenbokpan requested take off points from the	Several directly affected parties	Landowners Meeting - Ashante Conference Venue (05 March 2009)	<b>AM</b> mentioned they will also have to request these points during the detail design phase. Noted that they must keep in mind that after 2014 the flow direction of water in the pipeline will be reversed and that the source will then be the Crocodile water of which the water

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	proposed pipeline.		2009)	quality is not as good as the water from Mokolo Dam.
1.5	What will be done with the excess rock and material from the excavations?	M. Schoeman (Farm Goedehoop 552 LQ)	Landowners Meeting - Ashante Conference Venue (05 March 2009)	<b>JP</b> mentioned some of it can be used to rehabilitate borrow pits.  <b>AM</b> mentioned it will not be left on top of the pipeline, as was done previously with the existing pipeline.
1.6	How will complaints be dealt with during the construction phase?	R. Viljoen (Farm Wolvefontein & Witbank)	Landowners Meeting - Ashante Conference Venue (05 March 2009)	<b>Willie du Plessis (Exxaro)</b> noted the complaints procedures must be written into the contractor's specifications, which will form part of the tender document and therefore part of the contract, which will ensure for it to be enforced. A communication procedure for urgent response situations must also be in place.  <b>AM</b> mentioned that normally the contractor would be required to have a complaints book on site wherein the public can write any complaints. These complaints would be part of the monthly agenda of issues which the contractor must solve / action. There will also be an Environmental Compliance Officer (ECO) on site that can deal with issues.
1.7	Requested that pictures must be taken of all existing infrastructure (fences, gates, roads, etc.) before construction to serve as reference afterwards.	Guy Emslie (Farm Fancy 556 LQ)	Landowners Meeting - Ashante Conference Venue (05 March 2009)	<b>JP</b> stated that it must be included as a requirement in the contractor's contract. During the compulsory tender briefing all tendering contractors must be present and that they should take note of the infrastructure that could be affected during this site inspection. Noted there will also have to be an agreement established between TCTA and Exxaro regarding access to the proposed pipeline.  <b>AM</b> noted that the site inspection for the tender briefing will be compulsory and absent tendering contractors will be disqualified.
1.8	Can foresee that his game fence will be influenced.	JJ Lamprecht (Farm Fancy 518 LQ)	Public Meeting and Open day - Lephalale (27 May 2009)	<b>JP</b> stated that any damages caused by the contractor must be repaired according to specification for game fencing. For the construction servitude a new fence will be erected, which is of the same standard as the existing fence to protect the landowner's game.
1.9	The construction process must ensure landowners always have access to all parts of their properties.	Several directly and indirectly affected parties	Public Meeting and Open day - Lephalale (28 May 2009)	EMP to suggest mitigation measures to allow for access.  <i>To be investigated further during EIA Phase.</i>
1.10	Provision must be made for the migration of animals and their access to water points during construction.	Several directly and indirectly affected parties	Public Meeting and Open day - Lephalale (28 May 2009)	EMP to suggest measures to allow for animal migration.
1.11	The construction process must not interrupt the hunting activities on farms used for hunting purposes.	A.J. van der Walt (Farm Goedehoop 552 LQ)	Public Meeting and Open day - Lephalale (28 May 2009)	<i>EMP to suggest environmental Best Management Practices. Special measures will be discussed with each property owner. This matter to be investigated further during EIA Phase.</i>
1.12	Game screening to be used during construction.	A.J. van der Walt (Farm Goedehoop 552 LQ)	Public Meeting and Open day - Lephalale (28 May 2009)	<i>EMP to suggest suitable screening.</i>
1.13	Demanded take-off point from the proposed pipeline for animal drinking purposes and requested additional	Several directly and indirectly affected parties	Public Meeting and Open day - Lephalale (28 May 2009)	<b>JP</b> - DWA policy on farm take-offs for drinking purposes to be complied with. Details of take-offs to be finalised during the design phase and during negotiations for registering of servitudes.

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	take-off points. Noted additional take-off points will mean the landowners will have less water losses on long length reticulation pipes on their properties.			
1.14	Existing watering points for game must be moved before the contractor starts with construction on the specific property, should the points be located close to the working area.	Several directly and indirectly affected parties	Public Meeting and Open day - Lephalale (28 May 2009)	<i>EMP to provide measures for the relocation of drinking points. Contractor and Environmental Compliance Officer to negotiate with landowner before construction starts.</i>
1.15	The landowner's game must be protected during the construction period.	S. Sauer (Farm Enkeldraai 314 LQ)	Public Meeting and Open day - Lephalale (28 May 2009)	<i>Special measures to be included in the EMP and conditions regarding fences, gates, screens etc. Normally also included in contract.</i>
1.16	How long the contractor be on a specific landowner's property during construction?	Several directly and indirectly affected parties	Public Meeting and Open day - Lephalale (28 May 2009)	<b>JP</b> - construction will cover approximately 30m per day per construction head, but depends on soil conditions and access constraints.
1.17	The pipeline should be underground.	F.C. Maritz	Public Meeting and Open day - Lephalale (28 May 2009)	<b>JP</b> - normally the pipeline is buried. Only in special cases where will it be above ground.
1.18	How will access control be managed?	Freddy Naude (Farm Fancy 556 LQ)	Public Meeting and Open Day - Ashante Conference Venue (28 May 2009)	<b>LvdM</b> - the contractor normally will fence / screen off the construction servitude but provision must be made for animal migration to watering points (for example). Mentioned the fencing / screening material will depend on the type of game that is present on a farm. For example, buffalo and rhino will require different measures than kudu and impala. Mentioned advice from the landowners will also be valuable in bridging this problem.
1.19	The construction process must ensure landowners always have access to all parts of their properties.	Several directly and indirectly affected parties	Public Meeting and Open Day - Ashante Conference Venue (28 May 2009)	<b>JP &amp; FV</b> mentioned access would be specified for each farm individually. This issue will be further discussed with the landowners during the servitude negotiations. Aerial photos will also be used during the final designs.
1.20	Where will the contractor's camp be situated?	Guy Emslie (Farm Fancy 556 LQ)	Public Meeting and Open Day - Ashante Conference Venue (28 May 2009)	<b>JP</b> mentioned it would be the contractor's responsibility to set up his construction camp and making the requisite associated arrangements. Specifications will prescribe best practices to manage these camps.
1.21	The project team must ensure that existing water reticulation pipes on farms are not damaged during the construction process. The resident engineer must discuss the positions of existing water pipes with the landowner before the contractor accesses a farm.	Guy Emslie (Farm Fancy 556 LQ)	Public Meeting and Open Day - Ashante Conference Venue (28 May 2009)	<i>EMP to provide specific measures for identifying these. Contractor and Environmental Compliance Officer to negotiate with landowner before construction starts.</i>

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
1.22	Suggested that the project team and contractor must make use of two-way radios onsite, as cell phone reception is very poor. Noted they should always be available should there be any urgent matters arising.	Guy Emslie (Farm Fancy 556 LQ)	Public Meeting and Open Day - Ashante Conference Venue (28 May 2009)	<b>DH</b> - This suggestion to be incorporated into EMP.
1.23	When will the different project phases be completed?	Werner Emslie (Farm Goedehoop 552 LQ)	Public Meeting and Open Day - Ashante Conference Venue (28 May 2009)	<b>JP</b> stated that the design process will take 6-8 months for Phase 1. Must be finalized end of 2009. The contractor must start mid 2010 with the 9km of the de-bottlenecking pipeline, which will take approximately 3-4 months. Should be completed 2011.  <b>LvdM</b> noted that construction will not commence until environmental authorisation has been obtained.
1.24	Requested that the old spoil material on the existing Exxaro pipeline be removed. What will be done with the new spoil material?	M. Schoeman (Farm Goedehoop 552 LQ)	Public Meeting and Open Day - Ashante Conference Venue (28 May 2009)	<b>BS</b> mentioned that consideration must be given to the removal of the spoil material on the existing pipeline in the new specifications. Stated the new pipeline debris must be removed from the site and that they will consider dumping it in borrow pits and quarries as part of the rehabilitation.  <b>DH</b> mentioned that the topsoil must be replaced and seeded with an indigenous grass mix.  <b>LvdM</b> noted that the first 150mm of topsoil will be stripped and stored separately. Noted that for the first 12 months after construction it will be the contractor's responsibility to manage the rehabilitated areas. Mentioned there will be a retention period for the contractor of 1 - 1.5 years to ensure that sufficient rehabilitation was done. Therefore the contractor will need access to the rehabilitated areas for monitoring purposes during this retention period.  <b>OvdB</b> mentioned that the contractor would have to arrange access with the respective landowners in advance for these monitoring events.
1.25	The pipeline route must only be fenced off during the construction period.	Guy Emslie (Farm Fancy 556 LQ)	Public Meeting and Open Day - Ashante Conference Venue (28 May 2009)	<b>LvdM</b> noted that the right of way for construction would only be fenced off during the construction period.
1.26	Demanded take-off point from the proposed pipeline for animal drinking purposes and demanded additional take-off point as a form of compensation for the new proposed pipeline.	Several directly and indirectly affected parties	Public Meeting and Open Day - Ashante Conference Venue (28 May 2009)	<b>OvdB</b> - DWA must still decide on this matter. Should it be allowed, it will only be for household- and stockwatering use. There will have to be formal agreements with the landowners. Positions of these take-off points will be discussed with the landowners during the final design stage.
1.27	Request for additional take-off point on northern side of gravel road and	P.C.S. Snyders (FOURIESKLOOF	Public Meeting and Open Day - Ashante	Noted

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	for a take-off point at the existing take-off point at the R32.	1/557LQ)	Conference Venue (28 May 2009)	<i>TCTA to undertake future negotiations with the landowners regarding take-off points.</i>
1.28	Will there be periods when the pipeline will be without water?	De-bottlenecking Public Open Day 28 May 2009	Public Meeting and Open Day - Ashante Conference Venue (28 May 2009)	<b>JP</b> mentioned that they will have to connect the new pipeline at various points to the existing pipeline and therefore there will be short periods where the pipeline will be without water. Landowners will be notified in advance. The pipeline will be managed by DWA or its agent.
1.29	Why was the raising of the Mokolo Dam wall not considered?	Costas Zervas (Farm Sterkfontein 642LQ)	Public Meeting and Open Day - Ashante Conference Venue (28 May 2009)	<p><b>OvdB</b> noted the following constraints:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It will cost approximately R900 million;</li> <li>• Time constraints due to the urgent need for water for the new power station; and</li> <li>• It may be regarded as a risk having all the strategic industries in the area dependant on only one source.</li> </ul> <p>According to studies, should they raise the dam wall with 15m they will only get an additional 20 million m<sup>3</sup> water from the dam. Noted the possibility might be considered again in the future.</p>
1.30	He is currently using percolation water from the Mokolo Dam on his farm and should the dam's water level be lowered he might not receive this water any more. Requested that he must be informed in advance should the dam be mined so that he can erect new watering points for the animals on his farm.	Gerhard Viljoen (Wolvenfontein 645 & Witbank 647)	Public Meeting and Open Day - Ashante Conference Venue (28 May 2009)	<b>OvdB</b> - there will be continuous contact with the Irrigation Board and stakeholders. Dam level will drop gradually.
1.31	Suggested that the contractor stays in Marapong and Lephalale area instead of construction camps being established on someone's farm. The employees can then be transported with busses.	M. Schoeman (Farm Goedehoop 552 LQ)	Public Meeting and Open Day - Ashante Conference Venue (28 May 2009)	Noted
1.32	Will there be transport specifications for the contractor to follow or will the shortest route from the area where material was collected / dumped be used?	M. Schoeman (Farm Goedehoop 552 LQ)	Public Meeting and Open Day - Ashante Conference Venue (28 May 2009)	<i>A traffic Management Study to be undertaken during the EIA Phase.</i>
1.33	Will the landowner have the opportunity to see the contractor's specifications?	Werner Emslie (Farm Goedehoop 552 LQ)	Public Meeting and Open Day - Ashante Conference Venue (28 May 2009)	<b>FV</b> mentioned the consulting engineer would be responsible to ensure the contractor complies with the specifications. There will be ECOs and Community Liaison Officers (CLOs) fulltime on site. Landowners would direct complaints to these parties, and not directly with the contractor. The landowners will have the opportunity to review the EMP, which will include all the requirements the contractor has to abide by. The project



No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
				specifications relevant to his farm will also be discussed with the landowner for his inputs.
1.34	Noted the construction process will have an impact on hunting activities should it be conducted during the hunting season.	Jaco de Bruin - 06 March 2009	Agri Discussion Forums (27 January 2009, 06 March 2009 & 26 May 2009)	<i>EMP to include Environmental Best Practices. Economic Study to be undertaken during EIA Phase.</i>
1.35	The landowner's game must be protected during the construction period.	S. Sauer (Farm Enkeldraai 314 LQ)	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	<b>DH</b> - Measures to be included in the EMP.
1.36	The project team must ensure that existing water reticulation pipes on farms are not damaged during the construction process. The resident engineer must discuss the positions of existing water pipes with the landowner before the contractor accesses a farm.	A.J. van der Walt (Farm Goedehoop 552 LQ)	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	<i>EMP to provide specific measures for safeguarding existing water infrastructure. Contractor and Environmental Compliance Officer to negotiate with landowner before construction starts.</i>

## 1.2 Water

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
2.1	Why is the Limpopo River not considered as a water source for this project?	Unknown – focus group	Lephalale Focus Group Meeting (24 April 2009)	<b>SP</b> - several sources were considered where after the Department decided on the Mokolo Dam and the Crocodile River as the preferred sources. Reasons for not considering the Limpopo River further includes loss of water through infiltration into the sand aquifer and evaporation losses (amongst others).
2.2	Why is the raising of the Mokolo Dam wall not considered?	Unknown – focus group	Lephalale Focus Group Meeting (24 April 2009)	<b>SP</b> - the option was considered at desktop level but the yield gained by raising the dam wall is insignificant in relation to the required demand for the project. The option may be considered further in the future.
2.3	Will the landowners downstream of the Mokolo Dam be affected by this project?	Unknown – focus group	Lephalale Focus Group Meeting (24 April 2009)	<b>SP</b> - there might be a possibility that the irrigation farmers' water rights will have to be leased for a certain period whilst the Phase 2 pipeline is constructed. This issue will be investigated further and will be discussed with the possible affected parties.
2.4	Lephalale is already experiencing water shortages. Will MCWAP (Phase 1) result in further water shortages?	Unknown – focus group	Lephalale Focus Group Meeting (24 April 2009)	<b>SP</b> - MCWAP will not take water away from Lephalale that has been allocated for residential use. Existing water shortages may be related to the new developments and the fact that the distribution network of the municipality has not recently been upgraded. Additional water might be allocated by MCWAP for Lephalale Municipal use.
2.5	It is foreseen that Lephalale will experience water shortages during the construction phase of the Phase 2	Unknown – focus group	Lephalale Focus Group Meeting (24 April 2009)	<b>SP</b> - to be investigated further during the EIA Phase.

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	pipeline, as the Phase 1 pipeline will then have to supply more water for the new power station(s) and other developments in the Steenbokpan area.			
2.6	How much water is available in the Mokolo Dam for new developments?	Unknown – focus group	Lephalale Focus Group Meeting (24 April 2009)	<b>SP</b> - to be investigated further during the EIA Phase.
2.7	The landowners must be allowed adequate time to request take-off points and the cut-off date for such requests must be communicated in advance.	Guy Emslie (Farm Fancy 556 LQ)	Landowners Meeting - Ashante Conference Venue (05 March 2009)	<b>JP</b> noted that the project is still in its feasibility stage and that these take-off points will only be negotiated and finalised during the detail design phase.
2.8	Will there be a change in the cost for the water from the existing pipeline to the new pipeline.	Guy Emslie (Farm Fancy 556 LQ)	Landowners Meeting - Ashante Conference Venue (05 March 2009)	<b>AM</b> mentioned DWA must still decide on the tariff policy and that the outcome thereof will be circulated to the existing users.
2.9	Under his existing agreement with Exxaro he receives water from the existing pipeline. Therefore it is Exxaro's responsibility to ensure there is always water available to the landowners. Requested that since there is going to be a new pipeline, the landowners must receive extra compensation or water from the pipeline.	Guy Emslie (Farm Fancy 556 LQ)	Landowners Meeting - Ashante Conference Venue (05 March 2009)	<b>Willie du Plessis (Exxaro)</b> noted Exxaro will have to do refurbishments on the existing pipeline in future, but this will only start after the new pipeline has been built. The existing Exxaro water delivery contracts stipulate that Exxaro cannot ensure 100% water delivery and that they will give the users notice should there be a period of 72hours+ where they will not be able to deliver water.  <b>JP</b> noted that compensation for the pipeline servitude would still be negotiated with the landowners by TCTA who will appoint land evaluators. Also noted that the leasing of servitudes by the department has complications and that the norm is rather to buy out the land on a once off basis. Also noted the validation of land will be done on an individual basis.
2.10	A technical official at the municipality mentioned water price increases and water restrictions for Lephalale.	Stef Snyders (Lephalale Ward Councillor: Ward 2)	Public Meeting and Open Day - Lephalale (27 May 2009)	<b>Ovdb</b> mentioned the existing capacity problem with the municipality's infrastructure might lead thereto. Until the existing pipe is upgraded the mentioned restrictions might be enforced.
2.11	Will the new upgraded pipe that provides water to Lephalale have an impact on the municipality's water costs?	Stef Snyders (Lephalale Ward Councillor: Ward 2)	Public Meeting and Open Day - Lephalale (27 May 2009)	<b>Ovdb</b> noted the water from the MCWAP will be expensive and that they are currently investigating if there are ways to subsidise the municipal users. The water for the proposed town development at Steenbokpan's might be very expensive.
2.12	Irrigation farmers must be compensated should they be affected by the "mining" of the Mokolo Dam.	Neels Grieshaber	Public Meeting and Open Day - Lephalale (28 May 2009)	<b>FV</b> mentioned there is a 0.5% possibility that the dam water level will reach such a low level that the water from irrigation farmers will have to be bought out. Noted that the final decision will only be made on 01 April of each year. It will be discussed with the irrigators.

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	Can foresee that they will be substantially affected.			
2.13	Until when will water be pumped from Mokolo Dam to Medupi and Steenbokpan?	Neels Grieshaber	Public Meeting and Open Day - Lephalale (28 May 2009)	<b>FV</b> - the Mokolo Dam will be the only water source for Steenbokpan until 2015, where after the Phase 2 pipeline (from the Crocodile River) will be implemented and the direction of the water flow in the delivery pipeline will then be changed.
2.14	Mokolo Dam water is the only clean water to be used for the proposed Steenbokpan residential area. Will the Mokolo Dam still be supplying this residential area as well?	Neels Grieshaber	Public Meeting and Open Day - Lephalale (28 May 2009)	<b>OvdB</b> answered that the technology exists to clean the Crocodile water for household use and therefore they will be able to use the water from this river.
2.15	Will the existing water delivered from the Exxaro pipeline be more expensive when DWA takes ownership of the system?	M. Schoeman (Farm Goedeheop 552 LQ)	Public Meeting and Open Day - Ashante Conference Venue (28 May 2009)	<b>OvdB</b> mentioned that DWA would make a policy decision that is applicable for the scheme.
2.16	Noted that they have a contract with Exxaro to deliver the water at a certain price and that DWA cannot increase this price.	Werner Emslie (Farm Goedeheop 552 LQ)	Public Meeting and Open Day - Ashante Conference Venue (28 May 2009)	<b>OvdB</b> mentioned that DWA would make a policy decision that is applicable for the scheme. This issue will be raised with the relevant decision makers for feedback to the landowners.
2.17	Noted that 3 years ago the irrigation farmers had a 50% water shortage and according to their studies they are using 130-140 million m <sup>3</sup> per annum. Requested that the Feasibility Report currently undertaken by DWA be reviewed by an independent party.  Information was also requested pertaining to the increasing water volumes at Hartbeespoort Dam and Roodeplaat Dam.	Roland van Tonder (Crocodile West Irrigation board) - 06 March 2009	Agri Discussion Forums (27 January 2009, 06 March 2009 & 26 May 2009)	<i>This matter was dealt with in a separate report and meeting held with the Agri Forum on 26 May 2009.</i>
2.18	Noted that Mokolo Dam flowed 2.2m over its wall in 1996 and that raising the dam wall could almost double the dam's capacity. Requested that an application be submitted to SADC for raising the dam wall as well as building a new dam at Boschkop.	Louis Loots (Mokolo Irrigation Board) - 06 March 2009	Agri Discussion Forums (27 January 2009, 06 March 2009 & 26 May 2009)	<b>AM</b> noted there are environmental factors that play a role. Also noted that when you submit such an application at international level you must be sure the application carries enough merits and is not just in a consideration phase.
2.19	Referred to an existing study that was undertaken by the Thabazimbi Municipality for sourcing municipal	George Frits (Makoppa Irrigation	Agri Discussion Forums (27 January 2009, 06 March 2009	Project team present: DWA is aware of this project and it was considered during the planning of MCWAP.

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	water from the Crocodile River. Why all the fragmenting of water users?	Board) - 06 March 2009	& 26 May 2009)	
2.20	Who will be responsible to monitor the water users in the Crocodile River and for the installation of water meters?	Roland van Tonder (Crocodile West Irrigation board) – 06 March 2009 & 26 May 2009	Agri Discussion Forums (27 January 2009, 06 March 2009 & 26 May 2009)	<b>OvdB</b> - the capital cost for implementing and operating the abstraction management must be included in the project cost since the new users created the need. The future management of the operating system must still be finalised. It will be expected that the Crocodile River West Irrigation board should be leading the monitoring function, as it is their responsibility.
2.21	What measures are in place should the Phase 2 pipeline not be completed in time and the Mokolo Dam is over-abstracted? This will result in financial losses for irrigation farmers downstream of the Mokolo Dam. Compensation for such a scenario must be determined before construction starts.	Louis Loots (Mokolo Irrigation Board) & Francois van den Berg (Agri Limpopo) – 06 March 2009	Agri Discussion Forums (27 January 2009, 06 March 2009 & 26 May 2009)	<i>Regional and Local Economic Study to be undertaken during EIA Phase.</i>
2.22	That DWA drilled boreholes in the Lephalale area. Requested water quality data of these holes.	Jaco de Bruin - 06 March 2009	Agri Discussion Forums (27 January 2009, 06 March 2009 & 26 May 2009)	Noted  <i>The holes were drilled as part of a Water Research Commission project. As soon as their reports are finalised the data will be made available to the public.</i>
2.23	Will irrigation farmers upstream of Hartbeespoort Dam, Klipvoor Dam and the Apies River form part of the same management system as downstream user?	Roland van Tonder (Crocodile West Irrigation board) – 06 March 2009	Agri Discussion Forums (27 January 2009, 06 March 2009 & 26 May 2009)	<b>FV</b> noted the water management system must be discussed further at the Crocodile working group and that the input from the irrigation board must be considered when establishing the management and operating rules and to determine how abstraction and river management must be executed. Provision was made in the project budget estimation for capital works in the Crocodile River System to ease the management thereof. The system will be operated with the assistance of the irrigation boards.
2.24	The contaminated Crocodile River water must not be released in the Steenbokpan/Lephalale area since it will negatively impact on the water quality of the local water resources.	Jaco de Bruin & G.H. Visser 06 March 2009 & 26 May 2009	Agri Discussion Forums (27 January 2009, 06 March 2009 & 26 May 2009)	<b>AM</b> mentioned that due to the high cost of this water, the users will basically be forced to recycle and re-use this water to the optimum level.
2.25	The riparian owners and property owners at Hartbeespoort Dam will be dissatisfied about the lowering of the dam's water levels, should the dam be operated to its potential as a dam.	Roland van Tonder (Crocodile West Irrigation board) – 26 May 2009	Agri Discussion Forums (27 January 2009, 06 March 2009 & 26 May 2009)	<b>AM</b> stated that DWA and the Government will have to make a strategic decision on the issue. Issue is being investigated further.
2.26	A cut-off date must be set for users to	Members of	Agri Discussion	<b>OvdB</b> mentioned the final cut-off date for users is for the finalization of the Design..

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	indicate their anticipated future water demands.	the Agricultural Discussion Forum - 06 March 2009 & 26 May 2009	Forums (27 January 2009, 06 March 2009 & 26 May 2009)	
2.27	<p>Disagreed with the statement made by Chris Viljoen that the proposed Vlieëpoort Dam would basically not deliver any water due to evaporation losses and the silting up of the dam. Dams such as Klipvoor Dam have existed for many years and are still contributing to the constant water delivery in the Crocodile River System.</p> <p>The agricultural representatives at the meeting unanimously voted that an independent consultant be appointed to review the studies regarding the following proposed dam building options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>New dams at Vlieëpoort and Boschkop; and</li> <li>Raising the dam walls at Mokolo Dam and Klipvoor Dam.</li> </ul> <p>The Agricultural Forum must be involved in the appointment of the external independent reviewer.</p>	Roland van Tonder (Crocodile West Irrigation board) - 26 May 2009	Agri Discussion Forums (27 January 2009, 06 March 2009 & 26 May 2009)	<p><b>OvdB</b> - DWA made provision in the project for the review of reports. Should the Agricultural Sector require a further study to be undertaken they must send a written request to the Department, which includes a motivation for the review. DWA will then consider carrying the cost of the review. Noted that the Public Finance Management Act does not allow for such a fund to be established.</p> <p><b>FV</b> - it is a requirement from the profession that the consulting engineer considers and evaluates all possible options and provides independent advice to the client.</p>
2.28	Dissatisfied that the Medupi water use license was approved by DWA.	Louis Loots (Mokolo Irrigation Board)	Mokolo Working Group Meeting (26 May 2009)	<b>OvdB</b> noted that ESKOM applied to transfer part of their existing Water Use License for Matimba Powerstation, which they do not use at Matimba, to Medupi Powerstation. Therefore, it is not a new allocation but rather a transfer from an existing license to a new license.
2.29	Dissatisfied that the Medupi license was not communicated through to the public via the MCWAP project.	Louis Loots (Mokolo Irrigation Board)	Mokolo Working Group Meeting (26 May 2009)	Noted

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
2.30	Dissatisfied because of the advanced status of the project even though the negotiations regarding the Mokolo water rights has not started yet.	Louis Loots (Mokolo Irrigation Board)	Mokolo Working Group Meeting (26 May 2009)	<b>OvdB</b> stated there must be more surety on the volume of water required and by when, before these negotiations can kick off.
2.31	Agricultural activities upstream of the Mokolo Dam also impact on the dam's delivery. It is important that the use of this water be monitored and legal water use entitlements must be verified.	Louis Loots (Mokolo Irrigation Board)	Mokolo Working Group Meeting (26 May 2009)	<i>Standard water use management function undertaken by DWA Regional Office.</i>
2.32	The Mokolo Irrigation Board will have its annual meeting on 10 July 2009. Requested that the different water use scenarios for the Mokolo Dam should then be finalised by then and ready for interpretation.	Louis Loots (Mokolo Irrigation Board)	Mokolo Working Group Meeting (26 May 2009)	<b>FV</b> noted the project team would try to attend this meeting and give a presentation on the project and how the landowners might be affected.
2.33	The agricultural sector must know by 01 April 2009 of the water availability in order for them to plan their cultivars for the season.	Louis Loots (Mokolo Irrigation Board)	Mokolo Working Group Meeting (26 May 2009)	Noted that the decision date for the irrigators is based on water availability on 01 April of each year. This will be used in future analysis.
2.34	What quantity of sewage effluent is being discharged into the system at this stage?	Roland van Tonder (Chairperson: Agri Discussion Forum) – 04 February 2009	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	DWA is currently undertaking a reconciliation study on the Crocodile River. The results of this study will quantify the available return flows. According to previous studies there was 310 million m <sup>3</sup> treated effluent discharged into the Upper Crocodile River in 2005.
2.35	3 years ago water restrictions were enforced in the Crocodile system.	Roland van Tonder (Chairperson: Agri Discussion Forum) – 04 February 2009	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	Members of the Crocodile River (West) Irrigation Board receive their allocations from Roodekopjes Dam and Vaalkop Dam at a higher risk than the rest of the system and are more susceptible to water restrictions.  These restrictions were initially required although dams such as the Hartbeespoort Dam were at higher level. The White Paper allocated water to the members of the Crocodile River (West) Irrigation area from the Roodekopjes- and Klipvoor Dams irrespective of the status of dams in other sections of the river system.
2.36	Will the Hartbeespoort-, Roodekopjes-, Klipvoor- and Vaalkop Dams be managed together and by whom?	Roland van Tonder (Chairperson: Agri Discussion Forum)	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	DWA will define the operating rates for the system as a whole. The operator will be identified in due course.

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
		Forum) – 04 February 2009		
2.37	Who will monitor whether all the parties are keeping to their quotas? This includes irrigators as well as industries and municipalities.	Roland van Tonder (Chairperson: Agri Discussion Forum) – 04 February 2009	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	DWA will provide support to a dedicated agent for the operation of the MCWAP Scheme. All affected parties will be required to participate. The irrigation board will be very important in this function.
2.38	Acknowledge receipt of the raw data from measuring stations but requested the processed data to be distributed. Under the impression that such studies have already been completed since ESKOM would not build Medupi without knowing if there is sufficient water available.	Roland van Tonder (Chairperson: Agri Discussion Forum) – 16 April 2009	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	An interpretation of flow data was presented to the Crocodile (West) Working Group meeting held on 14 May 2009.
2.39	During times of water restrictions, will it be enforced throughout the whole catchment and who will monitor it?	Roland van Tonder (Chairperson: Agri Discussion Forum) – 04 February 2009 & 08 May 2009	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	Noted and to be considered in the constitution of the MCWAP operating authority.
2.40	Requested data on the water storing capacity at different heights of the proposed Boschkop- and Vlieëpoort weirs. Such studies should have been completed a long time ago.	Roland van Tonder (Chairperson: Agri Discussion Forum) – 04 February 2009 & 16 April 2009	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	Results of the studies were presented to the Crocodile (West) Working Group meeting held on 14 May 2009.
2.41	Klipvoor Dam and Mokolo Dam were originally built to allow for the raising of the dam walls. What are the volumes in these dams at the raised levels?	Roland van Tonder (Chairperson: Agri Discussion Forum) – 04 February 2009 & 16 April 2009	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	Possible dam building options were discussed during the Crocodile River (West) Working Group Meeting held on 14 May 2009.
2.42	According to their studies should 16 million m <sup>3</sup> water per month be taken for Medupi and associated industries	Roland van Tonder (Chairperson: Agri Discussion Forum) – 04 February 2009 & 16 April 2009	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	The current demand for Medupi power station is 15 million m <sup>3</sup> per “annum”, and not per “month”.

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	from the Crocodile system there would have been shortages in 98 of the 144 month period between 96/97 – 07/08. Requested the figures from the project team and DWA.	Agri Discussion Forum) – 16 April 2009		
2.43	Requested information on studies regarding the raising the Mokolo Dam wall. The dam wall was originally built to be raised. The dam is very deep an ideal to be raised. The dam's water quality is very good.	Roland van Tonder (Chairperson: Agri Discussion Forum) – 04 February 2009, 08 May 2009 & 03 June 2009	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	<i>See response under item 6.2.</i>
2.44	Requested information on studies regarding building a new weir at Boschkop. A full study was not done but three possible positions for the weir exist. It might be required to raise the tar road or re-route it should a dam be built at Boschkop.	Roland van Tonder (Chairperson: Agri Discussion Forum) – 04 February 2009, 08 May 2009 & 03 June 2009	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	<p><b>FV (Thabazimbi and Lephalale Open days 27 May 2009) stated that dam building options were consider for this project but were found not feasible due to:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Time constraints (International Protocols) and;</li> <li>• The fact that the dam options considered would not deliver a large enough yield.</li> </ul> <p><i>New weir options at Boschkop and Vlieëpoort had been considered. The Klipvoor Dam wall can be increased. Further dam building options might be considered in future but not as part of this project.</i></p>
2.45	Requested information on studies regarding building of a new dam at Vlieëpoort. From information supplied by the project team it seems that a dam with a capacity of approximately 48 million m <sup>3</sup> water would not have a big impact on existing infrastructure.	Roland van Tonder (Chairperson: Agri Discussion Forum) – 08 May 2009 & 03 June 2009	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	Provided at Agri forum meeting held on 26 May 2009.
2.46	Mentioned the project team's concern that the proposed dam structures might fill up with silt and not have a good yield. Noted that the existing dams in the Crocodile River have been operational for years and have provided good yield.	Roland van Tonder (Chairperson: Agri Discussion Forum) – 03 June 2009	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	Noted
2.47	Requested processed data of water flowing past the different measuring points.	Roland van Tonder (Chairperson: Agri Discussion	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	Data figures were provided and were discussed at the Crocodile River (West) Working Group Meeting held on 14 May 2009. The presentation information was also sent to Roland van Tonder on 14/05/2009.



No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
		Forum) – 08 May 2009		
2.48	From their own studies they have found that without storage dams, there would not be sufficient water for industries for 4 out of 10 years should Medupi be allocated 16 million m <sup>3</sup> water per month.	Roland van Tonder (Chairperson: Agri Discussion Forum) – 08 May 2009	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	The current demand for Medupi power station is 15 million m <sup>3</sup> per “annum”, and not per “month”.
2.49	With reasonable storage dams there would be an acceptable water assurance for both industries as well as agriculture.	Roland van Tonder (Chairperson: Agri Discussion Forum) – 08 May 2009	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	There are no suitable dam sites.
2.50	Will there be water meters installed on the whole catchment area, and who will be responsible to purchase, install, maintain and read them?	Roland van Tonder (Chairperson: Agri Discussion Forum) – 08 May 2009	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	<i>See response under item 2.20.</i>
2.51	Will the same management principles apply to irrigation boards and other irrigators?	Roland van Tonder (Chairperson: Agri Discussion Forum) – 08 May 2009	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	<i>Detailed River Management and Operating Rules, similar to other systems such as the Crocodile East and Komati System and the Vaal System, will still be developed in consultation with representatives from the users.</i>
2.52	Requested a fund to be established by DWA to appoint independent advisors (from outside of South Africa) to review the investigations undertaken.	Roland van Tonder (Chairperson: Agri Discussion Forum) – 08 May 2009	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	<i>See response under item 2.27.</i>
2.53	How will the Makoppa area be affected? They are of the opinion that they will not be receiving any water.	Roland van Tonder (Chairperson: Agri Discussion Forum) – 08 May 2009	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	Due consideration will be given to the effect that the Vlieëpoort Weir will have on Makoppa farmers. Entitled water use will not be affected.
2.54	Noted that their indications show that without sufficient additional storage	Roland van Tonder	Correspondence received during	Noted

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	capacity the irrigation farmers will only have enough water in 2 out of 10 years.	(Chairperson: Agri Discussion Forum) – 08 May 2009	broader PIP and PPP	
2.55	Noted with the money invested in such a project that they should look at additional storage capacity to ensure for water allocation to neighbors.	Roland van Tonder (Chairperson: Agri Discussion Forum) – 08 May 2009	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	Noted
2.56	Asked for proof of the quota of 230 million m <sup>3</sup> that DWA wants to augment to Ellisras. Asked for proof of flows in the Crocodile River.	Louis Loots (Mokolo Irrigation Board)	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	Flow data has been provided to the forum. DWA has commissioned a reconciliation study in which the quantities of water available are determined.
2.57	Requested the deadline where after new development would no longer be able to occur in Ellisras due to insufficient water.	Louis Loots (Mokolo Irrigation Board)	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	<i>Noted. The purpose of this project is to augment water supply to enable new developments.</i>
2.58	What is the maximum quantity of water available for development in Lephalale? Noted that two years ago Mr. Matukane from DWA indicated that there is 160 million m <sup>3</sup> available in the Crocodile system, whereas the project team has determined that 230 million m <sup>3</sup> is available. Explain the discrepancy.	Louis Loots (Mokolo Irrigation Board)	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	<i>DWA reconciliation study underway, which will confirm the available water of the system. Water will be augmented from the Vaal River system when required.</i>
2.59	Rehabilitation of the Crocodile River is required to improve water quality and quantity.	Wilhelm Schack – 06 March 2009	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	<i>To be investigated further during EIA Phase.</i>
2.60	Requested additional take-off points from the proposed pipeline and for a take-off point next to existing take-off point at R32.	P.C.S. Snyders (Farm Fourieskloof 1/557 LQ) and several directly and indirectly affected parties	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	<i>See response under item 1.26.</i>
2.61	After groundwater investigations were undertaken by DWA his borehole with	Koos Pretorius	Correspondence received during	Matter raised with DWA geohydrological unit. The investigations were undertaken as part of a Water Research Commission (WRC) project, which is separate to MCWAP. To be clarified

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	"sweet" water has turned brackish to the point where he can no longer use the water. As a result, he is now fully reliable on water being released from the Mokolo Dam. Hence, any potential reduction in water availability would be objected to.		broader PIP and PPP	directly by the relevant project consultants.
2.62	No objections to proposed pipeline on condition that he receives two take-off points where the pipeline crosses his property. Also stated that he will indicate where the take-off points must be installed.	T.F.H. Schoeman	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	See response under item 1.26.

### 1.3 Construction

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
3.1	How will compensation be undertaken?	Unknown – focus group	Lephalale Focus Group Meeting (24 April 2009)	<b>SP</b> - TCTA's standard compensation protocol to be followed.
3.2	How will compensation be undertaken?	JJ Lamprecht (Farm Fancy 518 LQ)	Public Meeting and Open Day - Lephalale (27 May 2009)	<b>LvdM</b> stated that two types of compensation will be paid out to the landowner, namely: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact caused by temporary construction process (i.e. impact on hunting activities),</li> <li>• Permanent impact caused by the loss of land for the registration of the servitude.</li> </ul>
3.3	How will compensation be undertaken for servitude registration?	Gerhard Viljoen (Wolvenfontein 645 & Witbank 647)	Public Meeting and Open Day - Ashante Conference Venue (28 May 2009)	<b>LvdM</b> mentioned that an independent evaluator will be appointed who will consider market related transactions in the area. Noted that each property will be evaluated individually.
3.4	How will compensation of damages during the construction phase be undertaken?	Gerhard Viljoen (Wolvenfontein 645 & Witbank 647)	Public Meeting and Open Day - Ashante Conference Venue (28 May 2009)	<b>LvdM</b> stated it would be specified in the contractor's contract that he would be responsible for paying for any damages caused by his activities.
3.5	Noted that he wants the implementing agent (TCTA) to carry the responsibility for compensation if the landowner incurred any damages	Gerhard Viljoen (Wolvenfontein 645 & Witbank 647)	Public Meeting and Open Day - Ashante Conference Venue (28 May 2009)	<b>LvdM</b> noted the issue.

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	during the construction process.	647)		
3.6	Compensation must be paid to representatives from the agricultural sector who act as members on the different project related forums and working groups. It was also suggested that a fund be established by DWA to cover the traveling costs as well as for appointing independent specialists to review studies. During the meeting on 26 May 2009 all the Agricultural representatives present voted that such an independent study must be undertaken.	Members of the Agricultural Discussion Forum – 27 January 2009, 06 March 2009 & 26 May 2009	Agri Discussion Forums (27 January 2009, 06 March 2009 & 26 May 2009)	<b>OvdB</b> stated that DWA does not currently have such a remuneration policy. Should the need exist the forum must submit a motivational letter to the Department.  <b>FV</b> suggested the letter be submitted by Agri SA and TLU at national level to DWA.
3.7	Compensation must be paid to representatives from the agricultural sector who act as representatives on the different project related forums and working groups.	Louis Loots (Mokolo Irrigation Board)	Mokolo Working Group Meeting (26 May 2009)	See response under item 3.6.
3.8	Requested compensation for representatives from Agricultural Sector that acted on the MCWAP forums.	Roland van Tonder (Chairperson: Agri Discussion Forum) – 04 February 2009	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	See response under item 3.6.
3.9	Representatives from the Agri Discussion Forum and working groups must be compensated for their time and travel costs to attend MCWAP project meetings and working groups.	Roland van Tonder (Chairperson: Agri Discussion Forum) – 08 May 2009	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	See response under item 3.6.
3.10	Compensation must be paid to existing water users should they be impacted on by the project due to water shortages in the future.	Wilhelm Schack – 06 March 2009	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	Compensation to be negotiated and paid to all affected parties. Currently it is only foreseen that users downstream of the Mokolo Dam might be affected during the period that the dam will be mined.

**1.4 Environmental Impact Assessment**

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
4.1	The correct project procedures must be followed and an EIA process must be strictly adhered to.	Unknown – focus group	Lephalale Focus Group Meeting (24 April 2009)	<b>SP</b> - issues raised during Focus Group Meeting to feed into EIA process.
4.2	Asked that the Mogol Post also be used as a means of project-related communication.	Stef Snyders (Lephalale Ward Councillor: Ward 2)	Public Meeting and Open Day - Lephalale (27 May 2009)	<b>SP</b> stated it would be done in future.
4.3	How will landowners be notified of when the Basic Assessment Report will be available for public review?	Costas Zervas (Farm Sterkfontein 642LQ)	Public Meeting and Open Day - Ashante Conference Venue (28 May 2009)	<b>DH</b> answered that each registered I&AP will receive such a notification letter and it will also be available on the DWA website. It is anticipated that the draft Basic Assessment Report will be ready for public review by the end of June 09.
4.4	Stated that all the relevant regulations must be captured in the contractor's tender document.	Costas Zervas (Farm Sterkfontein 642LQ)	Public Meeting and Open Day - Ashante Conference Venue (28 May 2009)	Noted
4.5	He did not see the fauna and flora specialists on his property and doubt whether they identified all the fauna on his property that might be affected by this project.	Gerhard Viljoen (Wolvenfontein 645 & Witbank 647)	Public Meeting and Open Day - Ashante Conference Venue (28 May 2009)	To be investigated further during EIA Phase.
4.6	The agricultural sector wishes to see the holistic picture of all the planned projects in the Lephalale area since currently they are only receiving fragmented views in the form of individual projects.	Members of the Agricultural Discussion Forum - 27 January 2009, 06 March 2009 & 26 May 2009	Agri Discussion Forums (27 January 2009, 06 March 2009 & 26 May 2009)	Discussions underway with other proponents and EIA practitioners.
4.7	The agricultural sector should not be negatively affected by the proposed project.	Members of the Agricultural Discussion Forum - 06 March 2009	Agri Discussion Forums (27 January 2009, 06 March 2009 & 26 May 2009)	<b>AM</b> - the irrigation farmers downstream of the Mokolo Dam might be temporarily affected during the period from 2010-2015 should their water rights be acquired for a limited period of time. Also noted that there are no intentions to infringe on any legal water allocations to irrigation farmers on the Crocodile River.
4.8	The project team should determine which parties might be affected by the project should it not be sustainable. It should also be decided how these affected parties would be	Wilhelm Schack – 06 March 2009	Agri Discussion Forums (27 January 2009, 06 March 2009 & 26 May 2009)	<b>AM</b> stated that the agricultural sector obtains their water nationally at a lower assurance level than industrial users. There will be periods in future where water shortages will be experienced due to droughts and during such periods compensation would not be applicable.

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	compensated for their losses.			
4.9	Will there be studies undertaken on global warming and water pollution as part of this EIA? Noted that over the long term, global warming has an impact on water availability.	Wilhelm Schack – 06 March 2009	Agri Discussion Forums (27 January 2009, 06 March 2009 & 26 May 2009)	<b>AM</b> noted global warming studies do not form part of this project study. Due to the national energy crises the project could not follow the normal DWA process, and needed to be accelerated.  <b>SP</b> also noted that studies regarding global warming do not form part of Nema's Terms of Reference  Global warming was considered during the Crocodile River Reconciliation Study.
4.10	The socio-economic impacts of the project must be investigated.	Gerhard Botha (Koedoeskop Agricultural Union) & Jaco de Bruin – 06 March 2009	Agri Discussion Forums (27 January 2009, 06 March 2009 & 26 May 2009)	<b>SP</b> mentioned that a Socio-economic study would be undertaken as part of the EIA Phase to determine the broader economic impact of the project.
4.11	Noted the suggestion was made to ESKOM to establish an Industrial Corridor wherein all their power lines will run. Suggested that DWA also installs their pipeline within this corridor.	Jaco de Bruin - 06 March 2009	Agri Discussion Forums (27 January 2009, 06 March 2009 & 26 May 2009)	It is not advisable to use the same corridor for steel pipelines and high voltage electrical transmission lines due to the currents that are then induced in the pipeline. Separate corridors are preferred.
4.12	Will be special investigations to determine the economic impact on agriculture?	Gerhard Human (Mokolo Irrigation Board)	Mokolo Working Group Meeting (26 May 2009)	<b>OvdB</b> noted this would be partially covered as part of the Economical Module. Noted this team will be appointed within the next 5 months.
4.13	The EIA notice was only published recently although construction work has already commenced on Medupi.	Roland van Tonder (Chairperson: Agri Discussion Forum) – 04 February 2009	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	MCWAP notices were placed on 14 – 15 May 2009, and only focused on the proposed scheme and associated infrastructure.
4.14	Requested an independent study to determine how the abstraction of water from the Crocodile- and Mogol Rivers would affect existing users (national and international) and the environment: 1. Irrigation farmers in the full delivery area of the Crocodile-,	Wilhelm Schack – 06 March 2009	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	Economic study to be undertaken during the EIA Phase.

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	<p>Mogol and Limpopo Rivers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Long-term sustainability of agricultural practices that have been established over 40-50 years.</li> <li>What impact will the expected water shortages in the agricultural sector have on the country's food security?</li> </ul> <p>2. How will eco-tourism / game farming/ conservation operations along all the abovementioned rivers be affected?</p>			
4.15	<p>Requested the Terms of Reference for the EIA:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What input would the Agri Forum have?</li> <li>What impacts are posed to environmental-related organisations (e.g. SANParks - Marekele) that may be affected by the pipeline alignment or that are located in the catchment area of the Mogol- or Crocodile Rivers?</li> <li>Does the ToR include studies to determine the effect of global warming on the area and to what degree it impacts on water delivery to the environment, other power stations and other users in the area?</li> <li>How will agriculture and the environment's water be affected in the study area through: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pollution of water sources and the increase in pollution due to a reduced dilution factor caused by abstraction; and</li> <li>Air pollution and acid rain as a</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<p>Wilhelm Schack – 06 March 2009</p>	<p>Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP</p>	<p><b>Discussed at the Water- and Environmental Forum Meetings held on 06 March 2009.</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Issues raised by the Agri Forum would be essential in determining the impact of the project on the agricultural sector as a whole.</li> <li>All environmental organizations in the area will be registered as I&amp;Aps. SANParks (Marekele) is registered and the pipeline will not go through their property.</li> <li>The ToR for the MCWAP EIA does not include studies on the effect of global warming on the area.</li> <li>Answers: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To be investigated further during EIA Phase; and</li> <li>Not part of the ToR of this study.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	result of the power station/s.			
4.16	Anglo Coal requested to be kept informed, as they have future development interests regarding coal and coal bed methane rights in the Lephalale area.	Ian Hall (Anglo Coal)	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	I&AP Registered

### 1.5 Infrastructure

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
5.1	Do any roads need to be moved?	Unknown – focus group	Lephalale Focus Group Meeting (24 April 2009)	<b>SP</b> - Where the pipeline crosses roads, these roads might temporarily be deviated. All affected roads to be reinstated.
5.2	What structures will be visible after the pipeline is laid?	Several directly and indirectly affected parties	Public Meeting and Open day - Lephalale (28 May 2009)	<b>FV</b> : Air valves and scour valves are build in visible manholes. If possible, these structures will have to blend in with the natural environment.
5.3	He can foresee a risk that the Phase 2 pipeline will not be finalised by 2014.	Neels Grieshaber	Public Meeting and Open day - Lephalale (28 May 2009)	Noted
5.4	Who will be responsible for building the end user dams?	Members of the Agricultural Discussion Forum 06 March 2009	Agri Discussion Forums (27 January 2009, 06 March 2009 & 26 May 2009)	<b>AM</b> mentioned that the end users will be responsible for building their own dams and that they will have to indicate where they will require the take-off points.
5.5	Requested for colour maps of the pipeline routes, proposed dams and other developments.	Roland van Tonder (Chairperson: Agri Discussion Forum) – 04 February 2009	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	Noted



**1.6 Alternatives**

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
6.1	Why does the pipeline not follow the route of the proposed ESKOM Transmission Line?	Unknown – focus group	Lephalale Focus Group Meeting (24 April 2009)	It is not preferred to lay steel water pipes in close proximity to such high voltage power lines due to the associated safety hazards and the impact on pipeline corrosion. Noted that there are mitigation measures where the route crosses high voltage power lines, with high associated costs. Also noted that Eskom's route might be longer.
6.2	Why it is not considered to raise the Mokolo dam wall?	Neels Grieshaber	Public Meeting and Open day - Lephalale (28 May 2009)	<i>See response under item 1.29.</i>
6.3	His inputs are being neglected. The proposed route has still not been discussed with him and he (and other landowners) might suggest better route options if consulted. It was also suggested the technical team walks the route with the relevant landowner for their input.	Gerhard Viljoen (Wolvenfontein 645 & Witbank 647)	Public Meeting and Open Day - Ashante Conference Venue (28 May 2009)	<b>DH</b> mentioned that the routes are not finalised and alternatives can still be investigated if landowners suggest better viable options. Separate onsite meetings will be held with the directly affected landowners during the EIA phase.
6.4	It was requested that DWA consider the following dam options: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Building new dams at Vlieëpoort and Boschkop; and</li> <li>Raising the dam walls at Mokolo Dam and Klipvoor Dam.</li> </ul>	Members of the Agricultural Discussion Forum - 06 March 2009	Agri Discussion Forums (27 January 2009, 06 March 2009 & 26 May 2009)	<b>AM</b> noted these options were considered and that the topographical terrain at Vlieëpoort and Boschkop is not suitable for building dams. Also mentioned that the SADC Protocol entails a protracted procedure.

**1.7 Alternatives**

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
7.1	Who will manage the new pipeline since Exxaro is currently managing the existing line from the Mokolo Dam.	Neels Grieshaber	Public Meeting and Open day - Lephalale (28 May 2009)	<b>OvdB</b> mentioned the preferred option is for one party to manage the system as a whole. Noted they are still in negotiations with Exxaro regarding the ownership of the existing Exxaro pipeline.
7.2	Who will manage the pipeline? Who can be approached to address issues regarding the operation of the pipeline?	M. Schoeman (Farm Goedehoop 552 LQ)	Public Meeting and Open Day - Ashante Conference Venue (28 May 2009)	<b>OvdB</b> mentioned that will be a central management office for the pipeline which the landowners can contact regarding any matters.
7.3	Who will be responsible for the maintenance of the pipeline and	Gerhard Botha (Koedoeskop)	Agri Discussion Forums (27 January	<b>AM</b> confirmed it would be the owner of the pipeline and not the landowner. Also noted the landowner can use the access road.

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	service road?	Agricultural Union) 06 March 2009	2009, 06 March 2009 & 26 May 2009)	

### 1.8 Servitudes

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
8.1	How wide will the new servitude be on the Phase 1 pipeline?	A.J. van der Walt (Farm Goedeheoop 552 LQ)	Public Meeting and Open Day - Lephalale (28 May 2009)	<b>FV</b> noted it will be $\pm 40\text{m}$ during construction phase, where after the operational servitude required is $\pm 20\text{m}$ . Mentioned the total reserve including the existing pipeline reserve will be $\pm 30\text{m}$ at the end of the construction process.
8.2	The engineering team must mark out the existing Exxaro servitude and show them where exactly the new servitude will be.	Werner Emslie (Farm Goedeheoop 552 LQ)	Public Meeting and Open Day - Ashante Conference Venue (28 May 2009)	<b>LvdM</b> mentioned the construction servitude would be approximately 30-40m. The final designs must specify were exactly the construction servitudes will run. Mentioned that they will individually negotiate with landowners regarding the compensation of servitudes. Noted that operational servitude will be approximately 20m wide.
8.3	The Exxaro balancing dams servitude is not currently a registered servitude.	Gerhard Viljoen (Wolvenfontein 645 & Witbank 647)	Public Meeting and Open Day - Ashante Conference Venue (28 May 2009)	<b>JP</b> mentioned DWA to follow up with Exxaro.

### 1.9 Institutional Arrangements

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
9.1	Dissatisfied that the DWA Regional Office is not attending the Mokolo Working Group Meetings and that they have cancelled a previous meeting that the Mokolo Irrigation Board had scheduled with them.	Louis Loots (Mokolo Irrigation Board)	Mokolo Working Group Meeting (26 May 2009)	<b>OvdB</b> noted DWA regional office would be invited to attend future meetings.
9.2	Stated he was disappointed when speaking to Mr. Mdikane (DWA Regional Office) who was not aware of the 50% cut-off limit for Mokolo Dam. Encouraged better	Louis Loots (Mokolo Irrigation Board)	Mokolo Working Group Meeting (26 May 2009)	Noted

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	communication between DWA Departments and the MCWAP Project team.			
9.3	To whom must they report at DWA and who from DWA can assist them with queries?	Roland van Tonder (Chairperson: Agri Discussion Forum) – 04 February 2009	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	Queries must be sent to Mr. Ockie van den Berg and his details were given to the chairperson of the Forum. Mr. van den Berg also attended the working group meetings (14 May 2009 and 26 May 2009), forum meeting (26 May 2007) and several other meetings with landowners.

#### 1.10 Broader Public Involvement Process

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
10.1	Requested confirmation that the Project Steering Committee (PCS) representatives included the following parties: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Roland van Tonder (Crocodile Irrigation Board);</li> <li>• Hennie Barnard (Hartbeespoort Irrigation Board);</li> <li>• Francois vd Berg (Agri SA);</li> <li>• Gerhard Visser (TLU); and</li> <li>• Dr. Wilhelm Schack (Environmental Forum)</li> </ul>	Roland van Tonder (Chairperson: Agri Discussion Forum) – 04 February 2009	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	It was confirmed that these five individuals would represent the agricultural sector on the PSC.
10.2	Noted that they are still waiting for answers to the queries raised in letters sent on 04 and 16 February 2009.	Roland van Tonder (Chairperson: Agri Discussion Forum) – 16 April 2009	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	Noted. Many of the items have been addressed at the Agri forum discussion and through individual consultation.
10.3	Disappointed that the working group meeting originally scheduled for 02 April 2009 was cancelled. Asked for a new date.	Roland van Tonder (Chairperson: Agri Discussion Forum) – 16 April 2009	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	The Crocodile Working group meeting was scheduled and took place on 14 May 2009. The Mokolo working group meeting was scheduled and took place on 26 May 2009.

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
10.4	Dissatisfied about the cancellation of scheduled meetings by the project team.	Roland van Tonder (Chairperson: Agri Discussion Forum) – 08 May 2009	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	Noted. Noted that project team meetings are not necessary if sufficient information for meaningful discussions is not available.
10.5	Feedback required from project team on past issues raised.	Roland van Tonder (Chairperson: Agri Discussion Forum) – 08 May 2009	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	<b>AM</b> acknowledged that feedback from project team must improve.
10.6	Suggested that the Water Forum and Environmental Forum must merge to discuss both commercial and environmental aspects.	Wilhelm Schack – 06 March 2009	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	The Water Forum and Environmental Forum merged into the Agri Discussion Forum.

### 1.11 General

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
11.1	How many people will reside in the proposed new Steenbokpan residential area?	Unknown – focus group	Lephalale Focus Group Meeting (24 April 2009)	<b>SP</b> - Will depend on the extent of development that is going to take place. Estimated to be up to 60 000 people.
11.2	Do the proposed pipeline routes take security risks into consideration?	Neels Grieshaber	Public Meeting and Open day - Lephalale (28 May 2009)	<b>OvdB</b> noted it would be important that the final design team takes this into consideration. <b>JP</b> mentioned it was indicated in their documents that they must investigate whether the Mokolo Dam is still a national key point.
11.3	Requested the name of the senior ESKOM Official in charge of the Medupi Project.	Roland van Tonder (Chairperson: Agri Discussion Forum) – 16 April 2009	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	Suggested that this request be addressed to the team conducting the Medupi EIA and Public Participation Process.
11.4	Expressed concern regarding the manner in which ESKOM and DWA were handling the whole situation.	Roland van Tonder (Chairperson: Agri Discussion	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	Noted

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
		Forum) – 16 April 2009		
11.5	Arbitration procedure to be instituted should they disagree on issues.	Roland van Tonder (Chairperson: Agri Discussion Forum) – 08 May 2009	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	Noted
11.6	Participation from ESKOM is required.	Roland van Tonder (Chairperson: Agri Discussion Forum) – 08 May 2009	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	Noted. The Agri forum should also make use of the participation forums established by Eskom.

## 2. COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE DE-BOTTLENECKING PUBLIC MEETING TO PRESENT THE BASIC ASSESSMENT REPORT

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
12.1	When will the project team visit the landowners to finalise the take-off points?	G. Emslie	De-bottlenecking Public Meeting 12 November 2009	<b>BS</b> noted that the surveyors must in future survey the entire route where they will determine exactly which infrastructure might be affected. Noted therefore that the appointed design team will in future negotiate with each landowner on an individual basis regarding the positions of the take-off points.
12.2	Noted the only water they have on their farms is from the existing Exxaro pipeline. Should their existing take-off points be damaged or decommissioned they will not have any water.	G. Emslie & R. Panther	De-bottlenecking Public Meeting 12 November 2009	<b>DH &amp; BS</b> stated that provision must be made for constant water delivery during construction. Noted there will though be short periods where the water will be cut-off but that the landowners will be informed in advance of such planned cut-of periods. <b>BS</b> noted in terms of the design that these aspects will be taken up in February 2010. <b>OvdB</b> noted that the repositioning can be done on the take-off point to ensure it is not affected by the pipeline construction.

### 3. COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE REVIEW OF THE DE-BOTTLENECKING BASIC ASSESSMENT REPORT

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
13.1	Specialist Geohydrology Study is needed.	P.G. de Witt (Limpopo Dep. of Agriculture)	Correspondence received 07/12/2009	<p>No ground water is utilized in the supply of water to the new users. The users along the pipeline route that are dependent on boreholes, will have access to abstraction of water from the pipeline and as such will be in a better position. There need not be fear that boreholes will be affected by construction activities.</p> <p>DWA and the Water Research Commission did some geohydrological investigations in the vicinity of the Lephalale town to investigate the deep water aquifers. It was found that there is some potential for development but not adequate for the volumes required. It was also found that there was limited interaction between the shallow alluvium close to the Mokolo River and the deep water geological formations along the Eenzaamheid fault.</p>
13.2	<i>Specialist study on water quality (current and expected future)</i>	P.G. de Witt (Limpopo Dep. of Agriculture)	Correspondence received 07/12/2009	<p>As the quality of the Crocodile River (Phase 2) will be consumptively used by users and not be mixed with the water from Mokolo Dam the issue of water quality is not relevant to the Debottlenecking and Phase 1 where the better quality water from Mokolo Dam will be used. The water quality control of the return flows in the catchment will be performed by the relevant authorities as part of the operation as it is already in place.</p> <p>Regarding the acceptability of the water for the bulk users, the users did their own sampling, analysis and studies on the quality of the Crocodile River and is satisfied that it can be utilized. The raw water is currently safely used for irrigation (and for primary purposes after purification).</p>
13.3	<i>Agreement/ Protocol for claims when 2 above (2.71 &amp; 2.72) is breeched. Settlement by court is not acceptable.</i>	P.G. de Witt (Limpopo Dep. of Agriculture)	Correspondence received 07/12/2009	Protocol for claims is not done anywhere in the country or world. The water quality monitoring and control possibilities are defined in the Water Act (Act 36 of 1998) and the relevant Municipalities have responsibilities in this regard.
13.4	Additional security services for personal safety, theft and fires has to be addressed (during construction).	P.G. de Witt (Limpopo Dep. of Agriculture)	Correspondence received 07/12/2009	Addressed in the EMP of the De-bottlenecking Basic Assessment Report ( <i>Refer to Appendix G3</i> ).

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
13.5	<p><b>Mokolo Dam Yield and Water Balance:</b></p> <p>In the Basic assessment report Figure 4: Projected Annual Water Requirement shows that the augmented supply from the Mokolo Dam will be increased to 53.4 M m<sup>3</sup>/a. Yet DWAF in its own report (DWAF Report No. P WMA 01/000/00/0304) states that the yield of the Mokolo Dam is 23 M m<sup>3</sup>/a. and is already over allocated (5.6 M m<sup>3</sup>/a) (see below). <b>How is it possible that the yield can be increased by 230%, even before the Ecological Reserve (as required by law) has been implemented?</b></p> <p>The Minister of DWAF indicated in 2007 that her Department had commissioned number of studies in the Mokolo River Catchment to determine the ecological water requirements of the river and to confirm the yield of the Mokolo Dam.</p>	Mark Berry	Correspondence received 22 November 2009	<p>In the letter by the Minister of DWA(F) to Dr Berry the Minister indicated that further studies will be performed and that the Mokolo River could be considered to supply water to the proposed new development. A number of studies were done or are still in process. The hydrology and yield of the Mokolo River Catchment were updated and report no PWMA 01/A42/01307 issued in June 2008. The report indicated that water use for irrigation in the catchment of Mokolo Dam decreased resulting in increased run-off and the yield of the Dam at 99,5% level of assurance was determined as 39,1 Mm<sup>3</sup>/annum. The latest information indicates that the current allocations to Lephalale Municipality, Exxaro, Eskom and users on the pipeline amount to about 16 Mm<sup>3</sup>/annum, plus an allocation of 10,4 Mm<sup>3</sup>/annum at higher risk to irrigation. This allows about 12 Mm<sup>3</sup>/annum for further longer term allocation from the Dam. The different assurances of supply of the users makes comparison slightly more complex.</p> <p>The short term operation of Mokolo Dam at higher risk under carefully managed conditions is still under consideration whereby the Dam will be utilized at an abstraction rate higher than the assured yield for a short period and then given time to recover after the Crocodile pipeline (Phase 2) is in place. At this stage it is foreseen that the maximum abstraction rate just before commissioning of Phase 2 would be the equivalent of 40 Mm<sup>3</sup>/annum, although at this level only for a few months. An option to lease irrigation water from the farmers against compensation is also under investigation. This is a well controlled process and will not affect irrigators beyond their legal entitlements, without compensation. It is not under consideration to stop all releases for 4 years as is claimed. The short term high risk operation of Mokolo Dam and leasing of irrigation water is relevant to the Phase 1 process and will be dealt with in the Phase 1 EIA report.</p> <p>It should be emphasized that the main augmentation for the new developments will be by the transfer of surplus return flows from the Crocodile River (Phase 2) and the sizing of the</p>

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	<p>confirm the yield of the Mokolo Dam.  <b>Were these studies undertaken and what were the findings?</b>  <b>What is required is the <u>current</u> and <u>future</u> Water Balance for the Mokolo Dam.</b></p> <p>By water balance I mean supply vs consumption (not a series of demand curves as shown by Mr Vogel in his presentation). The water balance should include, <i>inter alia</i>, the following: MAR of the catchment, inflow into the Mokolo Dam and firm yield; evaporation; seepage; consumption by Lephalale municipality; Exaro (Grootgeluk) ; Eskom (Medupi &amp; Matimba); Irrigation; Ecological Reserve.</p> <p>For example: the Lephalale allocation of 1 M m<sup>3</sup>/a was based on a population of 23 000 in 2005, whereas the population has increased considerably in the last two years.</p> <p>In the event that below normal rainfall was recorded and the inflow into the dam was reduced, and consequently the yield, how would the allocation of water be prioritized?</p> <p>The long- demand (2030 and beyond) is estimated to be 200-230 M m<sup>3</sup>/a of which the Crocodile will supply 169 M m<sup>3</sup>/a. Where will be additional water come from and does this mean that the Mokolo Dam will have to supply 30-60 M m<sup>3</sup>/a even beyond 2014?</p>			<p>the transfer of surplus return flows from the Crocodile River (Phase 2) and the sizing of the transfer scheme will also consider the availability of and demands (including the Reserve) for water in the Mokolo River. The purpose of the de-bottlenecking project is only to eliminate a constraint in the capacity of a section of the existing gravity pipeline from Mokolo Dam.</p>



No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
13.6	<p><b>Ecological Reserve:</b></p> <p>From the outset of the Medupi Project (see attached ROD appeal), I have raised the issue of implementation of the ecological reserve for the Mokolo River. And whilst at every instance, we are told this has been “allocated”, it has not been implemented. (It should be noted that the above normal rainfall of the past year has meant that the Mokolo Dam has overflowed). In the event that the Mokolo Dam does not overflow, as will be the case with increased abstraction under the MCWAP, how will the ecological (last estimated at 17 M m<sup>3</sup>/a) be provided for? This should be in addition to the agricultural abstraction, that is the ecological flow should reach the Limpopo, and indeed beyond as the Mokolo is an important tributary for the survival of the Limpopo riparian and aquatic system.</p> <p>In order to meet the water requirements of Medupi, it is proposed to stop all downstream releases from the Mokolo Dam until 2014 when the transfer pipeline from the Crocodile river is operational. It is not possible to stop all flows in the Mokolo River for 4 years without seriously, and probably irreversibly, damaging the Mokolo riparian and aquatic systems. The impact of zero flow in the Mokolo River should be carefully investigated and the potential short-term and long term consequences detailed.</p> <p>The current scope of works for the MCWAP tends to focus on the impacts of construction, that is disturbances caused by the pipeline. Insufficient attention is given to the environmental (ecological and social) impacts of reduced flow in the Mokolo River. It should be noted that unless a credible, pre-impact benchmark has been established (normally over</p>	Mark Berry	Correspondence received 22 November 2009	<p>The reserve study is currently in progress, with the results expected early in 2010. The Reserve required downstream of the Dam is not a consumptive use but a flow in the river. Irrigation releases has in the past and will in future provide partly for this requirement. The Department is currently busy with a national process of determining the reserve for the rivers in a systematic way and the implementation thereof is a national priority.</p>

#### 4. GENERAL COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE PHASE 1 AND PHASE 2 PUBLIC MEETINGS AND THE REVIEW OF THE SCOPING REPORTS.

***These comments will be addressed as part of the Phase 1 and Phase 2 EIR reports. They have been included in the Basic Assessment submission because the public have made general comments on the overall project which included Phase 1, Phase 2 and the Basic Assessment Report. This information is included to give the DEA background to the concerns raised by the public however please note that the concerns raised will be addressed in the Phase 1 and Phase 2 reports.***

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
<b>Comments made during the Phase 1 and Phase 2 Public Meetings</b>				
14.1	Concerned about the independency of the project proponent and enquired whether the proponent is ESKOM or DWA?	Mark Berry	Phase 1 Public Meeting 12 November 2009	<p><b>OvdB</b> noted the Minister of Water Affairs is the custodian of the nation's water. It is therefore the duty of DWA to ensure that the required quantities of water is available for development. Stated that it is a requirement of NEMA that an EIA must be undertaken for this type of a development. In addition, NEMA specifies that the appointed Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) must be independent. Noted that DWA pays the consultant. Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA) must review the EAP's EIA.</p> <p><b>DH</b> also stated that the EAP has a professional obligation to be independent. Should DEA challenge and find independency or competency lacking, they can remove the EAP from the project.</p>
14.2	How can one parastatal judge another parastatal in terms of independence and objectivity? Noted the same people plan, implement and approve the project according to him.	Mark Berry	Phase 1 Public Meeting 12 November 2009	<p><b>OvdB</b> noted the Minister of Water Affairs is the custodian of the nation's water. It is therefore the duty of DWA to ensure that the required quantities of water is available for development.</p> <p>The Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA) will take an independent decision regarding this project. Now that there is one Minister, the Minister of Justice can take an independent decision if required.</p>
14.3	Who is paying the EIA consultant? If it is DWA, how can the consultant be objective and independent in terms of assessing the environmental and social impacts of the project.	Mark Berry	Phase 1 Public Meeting 12 November 2009	<b>OvdB</b> confirmed that DWA has appointed the EAP consultant and this therefore responsible for all payment.
14.4	Noted he received an assurance in writing from the Minister that the Mokolo water will not be used for Medupi	Mark Berry	Phase 1 Public Meeting 12 November 2009	<b>OvdB</b> requested that Mr. Berry sends him a copy of the mentioned letter as he was unaware of such a letter.
14.5	Requested to see the water balance for the entire MCWAP. How much water is going to each user, what's	Mark Berry	Phase 1 Public Meeting 12 November 2009	<p><b>FV</b> noted that until Phase 2 is implemented all the water will come from Mokolo Dam. General rules of allocation include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Irrigation water is provided at a higher risk than others;</li> </ul>

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	the anticipated growth, where are the sources of the water, etc.?. Also asked how will the system be managed during a dry year.			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Domestic use (gardening, etc) is also at a higher risk; and</li> <li>Drinking water (cannot restrict on drinking water).</li> </ul> <p>Stated this practice is reflected in various documents and is an international practice. Noted this is also reflected in the National Water Resources Strategy.</p> <p>It is important to implement mitigation measures for the project, such as the short term use of groundwater, etc.</p>
14.6	Referred to an article in the Business Day on 22 September 2009, which noted according to an internal report and emails between ESKOM and DWA the water requirements had been underestimated by up to 500%.	Mark Berry	Phase 1 Public Meeting 12 November 2009	<p><b>OvdB</b> noted these reports were only internal at ESKOM and that DWA was not involved. The information is flawed. According to the water requirements indicated by ESKOM they would need the following volumes for Medupi:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.6 million m<sup>3</sup> per annum, without the cleaning (FDG) technology; and</li> <li>14 million m<sup>3</sup> per annum, with the cleaning (FDG) technology.</li> </ul> <p>DWA's planning is based on these projections provided by ESKOM. ESKOM will not commission the FDG technology until the Phase 2 pipeline has been commissioned. ESKOM indicated they would start progressively commissioning the first turbine in March 2012, where after the rest will follow in 8-month intervals.</p> <p>When Medupi operates at full capacity it will use 14 million m<sup>3</sup> per annum, and with six turbines each turbine will require 2.3 million m<sup>3</sup> per annum (with FDG technology). When the first turbine is commissioned without FDG technology it will require only 0.766Mm<sup>3</sup>(4.7Mm<sup>3</sup> / 6) per annum per turbine.</p>
14.7	Requested that the water balance be included in the EIR.	Mark Berry	Phase 1 Public Meeting 12 November 2009	<b>FV</b> - noted. The same request was also made by DEA.
14.8	Noted that the Mogol Irrigation farmers had not received any new information since the previous meeting which was held with them. Noted that they are signing their contracts a year in advance and therefore the 3 month notification period from the project on their water availability will not be sufficient. Requested to be invited to the next Mogol working group. Also requested concrete information on how farmers might be affected, inclusive of an action plan.	N. Hendriks	Phase 1 Public Meeting 12 November 2009	<p><b>FV</b> acknowledged that information was not recently shared. Noted that the new information for the project is only 2-3 weeks old and from this new information there is a 12 month delay in the "hazard period" for the irrigation farmers, due to the decrease in demand from the new users.</p> <p><b>OvdB</b> noted that according to the latest graph, the water availability hazard pertaining to the irrigation farmers are delayed and therefore is positive for the irrigators.</p> <p><i>To be investigated further during EIA Phase.</i></p>
14.9	Noted they have spent money on building structures in the river which	N. Hendriks	Phase 1 Public Meeting 12 November	<b>FV</b> will be compensated during the negotiation phase however at this point it is not possible to indicate how much or what will be compensated.

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	enables them to use less water from the Mokolo Dam. Noted these structures are also minimizing the risks on them as irrigation farmers. Should they not be able to irrigate, will they then be compensated for these structures they have built.		2009	possible to indicate how much or what will be compensated.
14.10	Noted the population growth and new town development increases the risk on irrigation farmers with the 50% operational rule at the Mokolo Dam. Requested that these types of questions must be discussed further in future. Requested that the Risk Management Plan must first be in place before construction starts.	N. Hendriks	Phase 1 Public Meeting 12 November 2009	<i>To be investigated further during EIA Phase.</i>
14.11	When will the construction start on the project and at which date will the Economic Study be completed?	L. Fourie	Phase 1 Public Meeting 12 November 2009	<b>DH</b> noted that the Economic Study needs to be completed by April 2010 since it is a requirement of the EIA. Noted construction can only start after an authorisation is granted..
14.12	Why can the Mokolo Dam wall not be raised or an additional dam be built downstream in the Mogol river to collect floodwaters?	L. Fourie	Phase 1 Public Meeting 12 November 2009	<b>FV</b> noted this will always be an option for DWA. Noted they did investigate this option for MCWAP but that the additional yield will not be sufficient. Also noted international aspects to consider and that such processes takes very long before they can start with raising the dam wall. Noted therefore for the purposes of MCWAP that this option is not considered further.
14.13	Suggests DWA starts with these international aspects and negotiations to raise the Mokolo dam wall.	IAP at public meeting who not introduce himself.	Phase 1 Public Meeting 12 November 2009	<b>FV</b> noted that should a dam be build/ raised for irrigation purposes that such water would be very expensive. Should it be build/ raised for users (i.e. ESKOM, SASOL, etc.) that it will over the long-term not improve the position of irrigators. After the Phase 2 pipeline is in operation the Mogol irrigation farmers will not be affected anymore.  OvdB noted that users may not put their developments in operation before the Phase 2 pipeline is in operation.
14.14	Noted that when the Mokolo dam's water level drops, it results in the neighbouring landowner's borehole levels also dropping.	L. Fourie	Phase 1 Public Meeting 12 November 2009	<b>OvdB</b> noted that the water to be used by the project must be licensed water through DWA. Therefore they have to take into consideration the yield of the dam when allocating licenses. Noted the impact on the Mokolo dam would be minimum over the long-term except for possible short periods (a few days) should there for instance be a pipe burst on the phase 2 pipeline. After the Phase 2 pipeline has been commissioned, the minimum demand will be put on Mokolo dam to ensure the dam can recover as fast as possible to its original position.
<b>Comments received on the review of the Scoping Reports for Phase 1 and Phase 2</b>				
14.15	I do not see that any studies have	Sean	Email correspondence	To be investigated during the EIA Phase of Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the MCWAP Project.

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	<p>been or will be conducted on determining if the catchment areas, that form part of the study areas (from Gauteng, North West and Limpopo), will be able to supply enough water to sustain the required water consumption during droughts. It is common that we have dry and wet cycles in SA, but also that we can have droughts. I want to know if there is a dry spell or drought in all of the catchments related to this project, will there still be sufficient water in all of the areas affected to meet the demand. This will include from Gauteng to Limpopo, including the North West (especially Rustenburg and the platinum mines) the Waterburg and Lephalale and Steenbokpan areas. A full geo-hydrological assessment is required to determine the continues supply of water.</p> <p>Please do not say that the pumping of water from the Vaal to the Crocodile systems will take care of this, as this is not a solution until the next phase of the Highland system is build and to date that is still way into the future and droughts can take place before this is a possibility.</p>	Hutcheons	27 November 2009	
14.16	<p>What plans are placed of will be inplace to cater for water shortages when they occur. In discussions with developers and other EIA's being conducted in the area there will be atleast 50 000 people living in that area within the next 5 to 10 years. Extensive plans must be in place to ensure that these people have water</p>	Sean Hutcheons	Email correspondence 27 November 2009	<i>To be investigated during the EIA Phase of Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the MCWAP Project.</i>

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	if , for what ever reason, the water supply via the pipeline are disrupted. I do not see that you have made any effort to address this concern.			
14.17	Lastly can you inform me as to the capacity of the pipelines you will be putting in i.e. how much water will be delivered or possibly delivered at the end user when the pipelines are utilised at full capacity.	Sean Hutcheons	Email correspondence 27 November 2009	<i>To be investigated during the EIA Phase of Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the MCWAP Project.</i>
14.18	Where are the ecological reserve studies and figures? The scam/scheme is illegal without these.	Adam Gunn	Email correspondence 29 October 2009	<b>DH</b> The intermediate Reserve Studies commissioned by DWA for the Mokolo and Crocodile systems are still underway, and we are engaging with the respective Professional Service Providers.  <i>To be investigated during the EIA Phase of Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the MCWAP Project.</i>
14.19	I trust the EIR will be more specific-facts figures. What developments, how much demand for water, how much water will be drawn from Mokolo Dam, what is the yield of Mokolo Dam, how much water will be left in the Crocodile and Mokolo Rivers is the scam is implemented. If you can't answer these questions then the process is a complete waste of time- you may as well just go and put in the pipelines now.	Adam Gunn	Email correspondence 29 October 2009	<b>DH</b> The Scoping Report is only intended to present the scope of the EIR. All other queries raised will be addressed in the EIR report.
14.20	<i>Reply on 4.209 and 4.21 Responses:</i> Yes, except that you have already shot yourself in the foot as the volumes were pre-determined even at scoping phase (with no reserve determinations).  So what the project says is- this is how much we will take forget about the environment/anyone else's rights.  If anyone has the will to take this to court then they already have a good	Adam Gunn	Email correspondence 29 October 2009	The project does not imply that it will go ahead regardless of the outcome of key studies such as the Reserve Determination. The Reserve studies are underway and we will be in a better position to provide feedback on this at a later stage.

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	case.			
14.21	Requested reserve determinations for the Crocodile, Limpopo and Mokolo Rivers. The impression given to the meeting is that the scheme is feasible. You highlight exactly my concern- we don't know if it is feasible because the reserve has not yet been done. Thus it is a foregone conclusion that it will be done regardless of the results of any studies. Please confirm whether the water is required for Medupi.	Adam Gunn	Email correspondence 25 November 2009	<p><b>NN</b> We will request the technical information from the relevant parties in the team. As a point of correction Ockie Van Den Berg mentioned that the reserve determination studies were currently ongoing. I will send you an email regarding the status of the reports mentioned in your email by Tuesday, 01 December 2009.</p> <p>A list of the relevant reports were forwarded to Mr Gunn for him to access on the internet.</p> <p>Concerns raised around the reserve will be addressed as part of the EIA Phase of Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the MCWAP Project as the studies are currently ongoing.</p>
14.22	Requested the catchment studies for Crocodile, Limpopo and Mokolo Rivers.	Adam Gunn	Email correspondence 25 November 2009	A list of the relevant reports were forwarded to Mr Gunn for him to access on the internet.
14.23	<u>Process Flawed:</u> There is a concern as to how the EIA process, review and decision can be objective and independent so as to seek the preferred environmental option when the major client (Eskom) is a parastatal (the shareholder being the Government); the contractor (DWAF) is also government department; and, the review and decision will be made by another government department (DEA). The EIA should be reviewed by a body or specialists that are independent of government.	Mark Berry	Correspondence received 22/11/2009	See response provided under 14.1
14.24	<u>Crocodile River:</u> The future water needs of Lephalale, Eskom, Exaro and future projects is to be met by the transfer of surplus effluent water from Tswane and Johannesburg via the Crocodile River. However, there are indications that much of the effluent water (up to 80%) will have to be recycled to meet	Mark Berry	Correspondence received 22/11/2009	The availability and utilisation of return flows is relevant to Phase 2 of the project. The return flow water in the Crocodile River is a growing resource and dependent on the growth in the Gauteng areas in the Catchment of the Crocodile River. The future growth in the Lephalale is also dependent on a number of factors. The DWA monitor the growth of the reserve through further studies and investigations. In the event that there is inadequate water available in the Crocodile it will be augmented with treated effluent from the Vaal River Catchment. Provision for such augmentation is already made in the Vaal River Bulk supply reconciliation strategy. The availability of water in the Crocodile River and the possible augmentation from the Vaal River will be dealt with in more detail in the EIA report for

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	<p>the growing demand for water in Gauteng.</p> <p>Is there really a surplus of 45 M m<sup>3</sup>/a of effluent water and, if so, for how long?</p> <p>What will be the impact of low quality water releases into the Crocodile River?</p> <p>Will this water be treated prior to release?</p> <p>A water balance (current and future) for the Crocodile River is required.</p>			Phase 2.
14.25	<p><u>Impact on Limpopo River:</u></p> <p>The Limpopo is no longer a permanent river and only flows after heavy rainfall in the catchments of the tributaries.</p> <p>How will the MCWAP, and resultant changes of flows in the Crocodile and Mokolo Rivers affect ephemeral flow in the Limpopo River?</p>	Mark Berry	Correspondence received 22/11/2009	To be investigated during the EIA Phase of Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the MCWAP Project.
14.26	The Mogol Irrigation Board raised queries during the first consultation the consultants had with them. To date these queries has still not been answered and therefore will the Mogol Irrigation Board not further participate in the process until these queries has been answered.	Louis Loots (Mogol Irrigation Board)	Correspondence received 09/12/2009	Refer to comments (queries) and responses under 2.18, 2.21, 2.28, 2.29, 2.30, 2.31, 2.32, 2.33, 2.56, 2.57, 2.58, 3.7, 9.1 and 9.2.
14.27	Who will give MCWAP the right to use more than the 39Mm <sup>3</sup> yield of the Mokolo Dam?	Louis Loots (Mogol Irrigation Board)	Correspondence received 09/12/2009	The Minister of Water Affairs is the custodian of all water in the country and as such is required to make provision for all development within the confines of existing law. Should more water be required a similar study to this will have to be undertaken to determine the feasibility.
14.28	The board requests the timeframes of the construction of the proposed pipelines (Start and end dates).	Louis Loots (Mogol Irrigation Board)	Correspondence received 09/12/2009	<p>Due to the dynamic nature of the project the construction programme changes constantly. However please note that construction can only commence once DEA has awarded a positive authorization, if a negative authorization is awarded then the project will not proceed.</p> <p>A detailed construction programme will be presented during the public meetings of the EIA phase.</p>



No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
14.29	Request proof of the approved budgeted, that will finance the pipelines.	Louis Loots (Mogol Irrigation Board)	Correspondence received 09/12/2009	TCTA (the Implementing Agent) is in the process of sourcing funds for the project.
14.30	The irrigation board request that the process be stopped until there are agreements in place with the farmers on how they will be compensated should they be negatively affected by the project.	Louis Loots (Mogol Irrigation Board)	Correspondence received 09/12/2009	During the Implementation Phase the TCTA negotiators will enter into separate discussions with each affected landowner to discuss issues of compensation.
14.31	Salomon, I check on the DWAF project page, the MCWAP project is not listed there. I also searched for this on the rest of the site and could not find it? Please confirm that it is on the website and send me the link.	Leonard Van Der Walt (ESKOM)	Correspondence received 30/10/2009	<i>Reply from SP on 30/10/2009:</i> Hi Leonard The web page should be up and running by Monday, 02 November 2009 as the public review period is from 02/11/09 to 11/12/09. Please do not hesitate to contact me for any further queries.
14.32	Do not object to the projects but question the technical feasibility thereof in terms of the water availability.	Agri Forum	Correspondence received 08/12/2009	The exact aspects of that the Agri Forum are questioning will be discussed at the next Forum meeting and the response will be included in the Phase 1 and Phase 2 EIA reports.
14.33	Noted the Draft Scoping Report is inadequate and cannot be accepted due to the following reasons: 1. Consultation did take place but was very superficial; 2. Various questions were asked during consultations where some were answered unsatisfying whilst others were not answered; 3. The affected farmers are not convinced that sufficient water is available and no attempts are made to prove it. Planning is still going on without it and there is no plan B available; 4. The Authority Consultation cannot take place with current Local Authorities, because according to the best of our knowledge there	Agri Forum	Correspondence received 08/12/2009	Consultation according to the EIA Regulations did occur. In addition, further meetings were held over and above the EIA requirements. Please refer to the Scoping Reports for Phases 1 and 2 for a list of all held meetings held as well as Page 2 of this report.  It is not possible to answer all questions at this stage as the reserve study and other technical studies are still underway and are only likely to be completed next year.

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	are no officials with the required knowledge and experience to handle this project.			
14.34	<p>As a general note we want to bring the following under your attention which needs to be addressed:</p> <p>1. There must be a guideline agreement set with the parties involved (i.e. farmers, etc) before finale decisions are taken which must include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The abstraction volumes of water and replacement thereof must be proven;</li> <li>• Water quality must be in terms of the existing norms and legislation, and insurances in this regard must be given;</li> <li>• Should irrigation water be taken away or limited, there must be an acceptable remuneration mechanism in place which will take into account all operational losses and associated aspects including socio-economic impacts;</li> </ul> <p>The lack of a total hydrological survey of the wider Limpopo river valley must be addressed as part of this project.</p>	Agri Forum	Correspondence received 08/12/2009	<p>Many of these queries will be addressed as part of the Implementation Phase by the TCTA negotiators.</p> <p>All IAPs are assured that any loss of lawful water rights will be compensated and that all legislative requirements will be met.</p>