

**MOKOLO AND CROCODILE (WEST) WATER AUGMENTATION PROJECT: PHASE 2****COMMENTS AND RESPONSE REPORT**

The Comments and Response Report summarises the salient issues and queries raised, as well as statements made, by I&APs through correspondence received (including completed Reply Forms, letters, faxes and emails) and discussions at meetings during the **Scoping** phase. This report also attempts to address the comments through input from the project team.

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

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 for 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 Dam 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.
- 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
Kobus Prinsloo	Aurecon	KP
Werner Comrie	Aurecon	WC
Dawid van Coller	VelaVKE	DvC
Donavan Henning	Nemai Consulting	DH
Salomon Pienaar	Nemai Consulting	SP
Liza van der Merwe	TCTA	LvdM

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

MCWAP Phase 2 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	06-03-09	Phase 1, 2 and De-bottlenecking	Thabazimbi – Lephalale Water Forum	Rra Dtau Game Lodge
3	06-03-09	Phase 1, 2 and De-bottlenecking	Thabazimbi – Lephalale Environmental Forum	Rra Dtau Game Lodge
4	09-04-09	Phase 2	Vlieëpoort Area	Ben Alberts Conference Venue
5	14-05-09	Phase 2	Crocodile (West) 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	27-05-09	Phase 2	All Phase 2 affected parties	Kumba Bioscope Hall, Thabazimbi
8	27-05-09	Phase 2	All Phase 2 affected parties	Mogol Club, Lephalale
9	08-06-09	Phase 2	Farms Inmalkaar and Rooibokkraal	Aurecon Offices
10	18-06-09	Phase 2	Farm Welgevonden	Aurecon Offices
11	18-06-09	Phase 2	Farm Haarlem Oost	Aurecon Offices
12	19-06-09	Phase 2	Farm Mabulskop	Aurecon Offices
13	23-06-09	Phase 2	Vlieëpoort Area	Kumba Auditorium
14	23-06-09	Phase 2	Farms Mecklenburg, Meklenburg, Paarl and Thaba Tholo	Farm Mecklenburg
15	24-06-09	Phase 2	Farms Diepkuil, Leeuwbosch, Zondagskuil	Farm Zondagskuil
16	24-06-09	Phase 2	Farms Tarentaalpan and Honingvlei	Farm Tarentaalpan
17	24-06-09	Phase 2	Farms Witklip, Vaalpenspan and Honingvlei	Farm Witklip
18	24-06-09	Phase 2	Farms Matlabas, Groenrivier, Welgevonden, Matsulan, Grootfontein and Haarlem Oost	Farm Matsulan
19	25-06-09	Phase 2	Farms Rooipan and Zandfontein	Farm Rooipan
20	01-07-09	Phase 2	Farm Hampton and others	Aurecon Offices
21	09-07-09	Phase 2	Farms Koroobult and Bridgewater	Farm Bridgewater
22	09-07-09	Phase 2	Farm Tarentaalpan	Farm Tarentaalpan
23	09-07-09	Phase 2	Farm Honingvlei	Farm Honingvlei
24	09-07-09	Phase 2	Farms Welgevonden, Rietfontein and Schoonwater	Farm Schoonwater
25	09-07-09	Phase 2	Farm Diepsruit	GM Lephalale
26	10-07-09	Phase 1 & Phase 2	Steenbokpan Area	Steenbokpan Agricultural Union Hall
27	10-07-09	Phase 1 & Phase 2	Farm Theunispan 23/293 - Phomulong Community Trust	Steenbokpan Winkel
28	10-07-09	Phase 1 & Phase 2	Farms Rooipan and Zandheuveld	Farm Zandheuveld
29	10-07-09	Phase 1 & Phase 2	Farm Rhenosterpan	Farm Rhenosterpan
30	23-07-09	Phase 2	Mooivalei Landowners	Farm Mooivalei
31	23-07-09	Phase 2	Kumba Iron Ore	Kumba Iron Ore
32	05-08-09	Phase 2	Mooivalei Landowners	Farm Mooivalei
33	05-08-09	Phase 2	Farm Witklip	Aurecon Offices

MCWAP Phase 2 Project Meetings				
No.	Date	MCWAP Component	Audience/ Party / Landowner	Venue
34	06-08-09	Phase 2	Farm Mooipan & Steenbokpan Action Forum	Aurecon Offices
35	06-08-09	Phase 2	Farm Paarl	Aurecon Offices
36	08-09-09	Phase 2	Farms Doornhoek & Hervormde Kerk Vliegpoort	Hervormde Kerk Vliegpoort
37	08-09-09	Phase 2	Farms Cornwall, Leeuwbosch, Vlakplaats & Honingvlei	Thaba Nkwe
38	08-09-09	Phase 2	Farms Vlakplaats	Panorama Guesthouse (Vlakplaats)
39	09-09-09	Phase 2	Farm Kua Metswiri/ Hartebeesbult	Kua Metswiri: N. Lombaard
40	09-09-09	Phase 2	Farm Enkeldraai	Lephalale: S. Sauer
41	09-09-09	Phase 2	Farm Rhenosterpan (Fred Welman)	Farm Rhenosterpan
42	09-09-09	Phase 2	Farm Rhenosterpan (M. Barnard)	Farm Rhenosterpan
43	09-09-09	Phase 2	Mooivalei Landowners	Farm Mooivalei
44.	10-09-09	Phase 2	Kumba Iron Ore	Kumba Iron Ore
45.	10-09-09	Phase 2	Farm Doornhoek (J. Bender)	Farm Doornhoek
46.	10-09-09	Phase 2	Farm Kua Metswiri/ Hartebeesbult & Limpopo Omgewingsbewaring Komitee (TLU)	Kua Metswiri: A. de Buys
47.	10-09-09	Phase 2	Farm Geelhoutskloof	H.J.L. Hills (Brits)

- 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		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction</li> <li>Water</li> <li>Compensation</li> <li>Environmental Impact Assessment</li> <li>Infrastructure</li> <li>Alternatives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Operation And Maintenance</li> <li>Servitude</li> <li>Institutional Arrangements</li> <li>Broader Public Involvement Process</li> <li>General</li> </ul>



**Note:** All comments (as raised during meetings or included in correspondence) which were received after 19 June 2009 will be conveyed during the public participation of the EIA phase and will be incorporated into the draft EIA report, which will be lodged in the public domain.

## 1. CONSTRUCTION

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
1.1	How will the contractor obtain access to the construction servitude e.g. along railway line?	Unknown – focus group	Lephalale Focus Group Meeting (24 April 2009)	<i>Access to servitude to be investigated further during the Design Phase. Temporary Roads maybe required and in consultation with affected landowners existing infrastructure may be upgraded for this purpose.</i>
1.2	The breeding patterns of game will be impacted during the construction phase of the project (specifically July / August).	Unknown – focus group	Lephalale Focus Group Meeting (24 April 2009)	<b>SP</b> - screens can be used to mitigate the visual impact from the construction activities.  To be investigated further during the EIA Phase.
1.3	Concerned that the construction workers will set snares on the farms along the pipeline route.	Unknown – focus group	Lephalale Focus Group Meeting (24 April 2009)	<i>Measures to safeguard fauna and prevent poaching and other impacts to be included in the EMP and strict compliance monitoring will be implemented during construction.</i>
1.4	How will possible damages caused by blasting activities be prevented?	Nolte Roets	Vlieëpoort Landowners Meeting (09 April 2009)	<b>JP</b> noted the contractor will have to inspect structures before and after blasting activities and photographic records must be kept. The contractor will also be required to compensate for any possible damages caused by his activities.
1.5	Where will the contractor's camp be and who will manage it?	Several directly and indirectly affected parties	Vlieëpoort Landowners Meeting (09 April 2009)	<b>JP</b> stated that the contractor's construction camp will need to comply with the set Occupational Health and Safety Act and Regulations, relevant environmental legislation and the EMP.
1.6	What is the expected impact on property values in the Vlieëpoort area?	Several directly and indirectly affected parties	Vlieëpoort Landowners Meeting (09 April 2009)	<b>JP</b> noted that there may be visual and noise impacts and the project may have impacts on game farming and tourism. Noted that the buying- out of land would be considered where necessary.  <i>Economic Study to be undertaken during EIA phase.</i>
1.7	No construction camp wanted at Vlieëpoort (Mooivallei farms).	Several directly and indirectly affected parties	Thabazimbi Open Day (27 May 2009)	<b>JP</b> stated that the contractor's construction camp will need to comply with the set Occupational Health and Safety Act and Regulations, relevant environmental legislation and the EMP.
1.8	What will be done with the surplus material after construction?	Frans du Toit	Landowner meeting - Farm Welgevonden KQ 5/16 (18 June 2009)	<b>KP</b> mentioned that it must be disposed off at an approved waste disposal site. Would also consider using the spoil material to rehabilitate existing borrow pits and quarries.
1.9	When will the construction process commence?	Frans du Toit	Landowner meeting - Farm Welgevonden KQ 5/16 (18 June 2009)	<b>KP</b> noted the according to the preliminary programme, the construction period is between 2011 – 2014.
1.10	What will be done with the spoil material after construction?	Ernst Sonntag	Landowner meeting - Farm Haarlem Oost (18 June 2009)	<i>See response under item 1.8.</i>
1.11	When will the construction process start?	Kevin Miles	Landowner meeting - Farm Haarlem Oost	<i>See response under item 1.9.</i>

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
			(18 June 2009)	
1.12	Will a game fence be erected as part of the construction servitude? Noted they currently have an existing game fence.	Kevin Miles	Landowner meeting - Farm Haarlem Oost (18 June 2009)	<b>KP</b> indicated that the same type of fence as the existing fence will be erected as part of the construction process.
1.13	Noted that that their farm has a bridge and two level crossings, which crosses the railway line.	Ernst Sonntag	Landowner meeting - Farm Haarlem Oost (18 June 2009)	<b>KP</b> – May need to dig through the side of the bridge to lay the pipe instead of drilling through it. Noted they can also move the section of the pipe passing the bridge further away from the railway servitude to avoid the bridge foundations.
1.14	Requested that the temporary construction servitude fence be left in place after construction. Noted that they prefer the pipeline servitude to be fenced off and that it will be safer for their farming activities since they do not want other people having access to their property. Requested that this must be an option to landowners.	Kevin Miles	Landowner meeting - Farm Haarlem Oost (18 June 2009)	<i>To be investigated further during EIA Phase. Management of fences to be considered in the EMP. Matter to form part of specific agreements between landowners and TCTA during implementation.</i>
1.15	Requested that during the construction phase they should have access across the railway bridge on their farm at all times. Indicated that their houses are on the other side of the railway line.	Kevin Miles & Ernst Sonntag	Landowner meeting - Farm Haarlem Oost (18 June 2009)	<i>To be investigated further during EIA Phase. Access to be considered in the EMP. Matter to form part of specific agreements between landowners and TCTA during implementation.</i>
1.16	What will be done with the spoil material after construction?	Collin Wood	Landowner meeting - Farm Mabulskop (19 June 2009)	<i>See response under item 1.8.</i>
1.17	Will the pipeline be lined on the inside?	Collin Wood	Landowner meeting - Farm Mabulskop (19 June 2009)	<b>KP</b> mentioned the pipe would have an epoxy lining on the inside.
1.18	Will the pipes be imported?	R.F. van Vuren	Landowner meeting - Farm Mabulskop (19 June 2009)	<b>KP</b> - there are only two suppliers for this size pipes in South Africa. Also noted there is a new supplier in Maputu but that the diameter of their pipes are only up to 600mm. Therefore the pipes will probably be sourced locally.
1.19	When will the Phase 2 construction start and where?	R.F. van Vuren	Landowner meeting - Farm Mabulskop (19 June 2009)	<b>KP</b> – commencement earmarked for 2011. Contractor would be working at different construction heads/fronts, which will only be determined at a later stage.
1.20	During construction they must have access over the rail bridge crossing on their farm. The water crossing at the railway line that must not be cut-	Collin Wood, R.F. van Vuuren and Ben Bos	Landowner meeting - Farm Mabulskop (19 June 2009)	<b>KP</b> - the contractor will have to take these matters into consideration and the water pipe might have to be moved temporarily during construction.

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
1.21	off. It would be best for their farms' operation if the pipe is laid on the western side of the railway line since they are using the eastern side for hunting purposes. Noted there are no game fences or game on the portion west of the railway line	Collin Wood, R.F. van Vuuren and Ben Bos	Landowner meeting - Farm Mabulskop (19 June 2009)	<b>KP</b> - currently they are planning on laying the pipe on the western side of the railway line since the pipe enters and exits the railway servitude from the western side.
1.22	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>Noted. EMP to include Environmental Best Practices. Economic Study to be undertaken during EIA Phase.</i>
1.23	With the pipeline construction activities and even beyond into the operational period we believe the safety and security of our personal and the game will be at high risk due to the large amount of people and machinery moving up and down the servitude.	PN Jordaan (Farm Witklip, Portion 4)	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	Noted. Environmental Best Practices to be included in EMP to address safeguarding of game and ensuring security.
1.24	Mentioned they will encounter loss of income from hunting activities due to the construction of the pipeline. Noted due to the narrow shape of the farm the game will be highly impacted on and disturbed by the construction process.	PN Jordaan (Farm Witklip, Portion 4)	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	Noted. Economic Study to be undertaken during the EIA Phase.
1.25	Stipulated the following points on how the pipeline will impact on the value of his property: a) The possibility that this route will be earmarked for other future services; b) The future of this property will then become valueless in terms of being an economical and viable game farm that for which this area is well known for, because it will continuously be cut up and be reduced to an uneconomical unit for which	PN Jordaan (Farm Witklip, Portion 4)	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	Noted. Economic Study to be undertaken during the EIA Phase.

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	<p>there will be no buyers;</p> <p>c) Generally hunters prefer the experience of some distant secluded area and not that of unsightly structures e.g.: rail line, power lines, water lines with manholes protruding above ground etc. to add another service will 'ad insult to injury' that to an extent already exists and this farms future potential will almost certainly be doomed.</p> <p>d) Loss of grazing potential due to damage to vegetation, which will result in him having to feed the animals for longer periods. This will be additional expenses incurred by him.</p>			
1.26	The construction camp should be between Thabazimbi and Mooivalei and not at the construction site. Requested this for the tranquility and security of the Mooivalei area.	Wessel de Clercq (Farm Mooivalei 9/342 KQ)	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	Construction camp to be sited so as to minimize environmental impacts. To be investigated further during EIA Phase.

## 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 which 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	Concerned that the ecological flow of the river might be impacted on because of the large quantities to be abstracted? Noted the Crocodile River has been without water several times before.	Unknown – focus group	Lephalale Focus Group Meeting (24 April 2009)	<i>The National Water Act gives priority to the ecological flow in the river.</i>
2.3	Will the Thabazimbi golf course be	Unknown –	Lephalale Focus	<i>Will be investigated further during the Design Phase. Minimal impacts on low-lying areas</i>

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	flooded as a result of the proposed weir at Vlieëpoort?	focus group	Group Meeting (24 April 2009)	<i>expected.</i>
2.4	How much water is available in the Crocodile River?	Unknown – focus group	Lephalale Focus Group Meeting (24 April 2009)	<b>SP</b> - The return flows is a growing recourse. The project team will discuss this in further detail during future meetings.
2.5	Why is the proposed abstraction point not closer to Steenbokpan instead of at Thabazimbi?	Unknown – focus group	Lephalale Focus Group Meeting (24 April 2009)	<i>The river morphology is most suitable at Vlieëpoort.. Referring to discussions held with the agricultural sector on this matter the engineering team indicated that while investigating this issue they concluded that the evaporation losses and losses due to infiltration in the Makoppa sand aquifers will be too great.</i>
2.6	Why has the building of additional dams not been considered?	Unknown – focus group	Lephalale Focus Group Meeting (24 April 2009)	<i>Referring to discussions held with the agricultural sector, specifically the Crocodile (West) Working Group, the building of dams were investigated at a desktop level and from these studies they would not be feasible for the requirements of this project.</i>
2.7	Noted the following comments from Kumba Iron Ore: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Their ore access road across the river might be impacted because of the increased water levels;</li> <li>• There exists a strong possibility that Kumba might mine in the Ben Alberts flood level;</li> <li>• Planned blasting activities until 2015 near the proposed abstraction works and that might negatively impact on the proposed works;</li> <li>• High slimes deposits from their waste dumps flowing in the direction of the proposed weir.</li> </ul>	Albert du Plessis (Kumba)	Vlieëpoort Landowners Meeting (09 April 2009)	Noted  <i>Refer to comments of Kumba Meeting held on 23 July 2009 – in Final Scoping Report.</i>
2.8	A dam at Vlieëpoort would result in a portion of the Kumba mining area to be inundated.	Heilet Hatting (Kumba Mine)	Vlieëpoort Landowners Meeting (09 April 2009)	Noted.  <i>To be investigated further during EIA Phase.</i>
2.9	Enquired whether the following alternative locations for the weir had been considered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The area where the Eskom servitude crosses the Crocodile River. Noted there is already electricity for the proposed works; and</li> <li>• The area approximately 2km</li> </ul>	Several directly and indirectly affected parties	Vlieëpoort Landowners Meeting (09 April 2009)	<b>JP</b> stated that the project team had consider these alternatives and other alternatives such as at Farm Faure, but that Vlieëpoort is the most feasible option due to the river morphology.  <b>DvC</b> mentioned that they would look at the mentioned options again.



No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	downstream of Vlieëpoort where the river makes a sharp bend. Noted that dolomite was absent in this area.			
2.10	Requested that the storage capacity of the Crocodile River be increased. Requested additional infrastructure such as weirs and dams.	P.I.L. du Plessis (Louwna Boerdery)	Thabazimbi Open Day (27 May 2009)	<b>FV</b> responded that the storage capacity at Vlieëpoort will not be increased significantly in order to minimize impact on surplus flow downstream. Also mentioned that Hartebeespoort Dam is mostly full and is therefore not able to hold floodwater. Operating it normally will allow better use of existing storage capacity in Hartbeespoort Dam.
2.11	Requested that existing infrastructure such as weirs and dams be upgraded and improved.	P.I.L. du Plessis (Louwna Boerdery)	Thabazimbi Open Day (27 May 2009)	<b>FV</b> mentioned the DWA Regional Office manages these structures. Noted he will make it known to DWA. The existing works will be considered when operational rules for the scheme are established.
2.12	Suggested dam building options, including new dams at Vlieëpoort and Boschkop, and raising of the dam wall of Klipvoor Dam.	Several directly and indirectly affected parties	Thabazimbi Open Day (27 May 2009)	<b>FV</b> stated that dam building options had been considered but were found to be unfeasible due to: <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 sufficient yield.</li> </ul> Mentioned that new dam options were considered at Boschkop and Vlieëpoort. Noted that the Klipvoor Dam wall can be raised. Further dam building options might be considered in future but not as part of this project.
2.13	Requested take-off point from the proposed pipeline for irrigation purposes and stock watering.	Several directly and indirectly affected parties	Thabazimbi Open Day (27 May 2009)	<b>FV</b> mentioned the water may cost approximately R12-R20/m <sup>3</sup> and will therefore not be economically feasible to be used as irrigation water. Landowners may request take-off points for animal- and game drinking points. DWA will then have to decide whether it is possible. <p><i><b>OvdB</b> (Public Open Day Lephalale 27 May 2009) mentioned that DWA must still decide on this matter. Should it be allowed, it will only be for household and animal drinking purposes, and there will have to be negotiations and agreements set up with the landowners.</i></p>
2.14	Makoppa landowners requested that a larger structure be built in the Crocodile River to improve their water management during dryer seasons.	Unknown	Thabazimbi Open Day (27 May 2009)	<i>To be investigated further during EIA Phase, but it is not the objective of the project and the impact on the surplus flow must be considered.</i>
2.15	Makoppa landowners requested to be registered as water users with water rights and to be able to pay for their water used.	Unknown	Thabazimbi Open Day (27 May 2009)	<b>FV</b> mentioned that this issue should be escalated to DWA.
2.16	Concern was raised whether the transferred contaminated Crocodile River water might pollute other clean water sources in the Lephalale/Steenbokpan area.	Several directly and indirectly affected parties	Thabazimbi Open Day (27 May 2009)	<b>FV</b> indicated that the industrial end users will not be licensed to discharge any of this water and will have to recycle and reuse all of it. The high cost of this water will also encourage this process.

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
2.17	How will the water quantity be managed in the Crocodile system?	Several directly and indirectly affected parties	Thabazimbi Open Day (27 May 2009)	<b>FV</b> mentioned that certain management and operational rules and processes would have to be put in place. Abstraction control and river management on the system must be improved. These principles would be established with input from the irrigation boards.
2.18	Will the transfer scheme from the Vaal system be in place in time before 2014 when this additional water will be required?	Unknown	Thabazimbi Open Day (27 May 2009)	<b>FV</b> mentioned that the pipeline for this transfer system would be approximately 30 km in length whereas the Phase 2 pipeline is approximately 120km in length. Should thus be possible to transfer water before a long-term shortage arise.
2.19	Existing water users must not be adversely affected by the project.	Several directly and indirectly affected parties	Thabazimbi Open Day (27 May 2009)	<b>FV</b> stated the DWA approach is not to impact on the legal water rights of users.
2.20	Was it considered to rather abstract the water from the Crocodile River closer to the Steenbokpan area.	Several directly and indirectly affected parties	Thabazimbi Open Day (27 May 2009)	<b>FV</b> mentioned that it had been considered but the evaporation and infiltration losses would be too great. The Vlieëpoort is also the most suitable site for the weir.
2.21	Was the Zambezi River considered as a source?	Several directly and indirectly affected parties	Thabazimbi Open Day (27 May 2009)	<b>FV</b> mentioned that DWA has continuous negotiations with neighbouring states but that South Africa does not have any rights to this source. Constraints include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreement between Governments;</li> <li>• High costs due to distance.</li> </ul>
2.22	Legislation stipulates that the normal flow in a river may not be affected. If affected there must be compensation.	Unknown	Thabazimbi Open Day (27 May 2009)	<b>FV</b> mentioned that the downstream users from the Mokolo Dam might be negatively affected. Do not expect a negative impact on the water availability of legal water users in the Crocodile River. Noted possible impacts are considered further and that a Socio- and Agricultural Economic Study will be undertaken
2.23	Sufficient water must still flow down the Crocodile River towards Makoppa and the Limpopo River to satisfy the Ecological Reserve.	Several directly and indirectly affected parties	Thabazimbi Open Day (27 May 2009)	<b>FV</b> noted DWA has a separate process to determine the reserve. The weir at Vlieëpoort is envisaged not to have significant storage and little impact on the natural flows running down that section of the river.
2.24	Had the construction of a dam at the Farm Witvogelfontein been considered.	Unknown	Thabazimbi Open Day (27 May 2009)	<b>FV</b> noted initially a delivery dam to receive the water from the Crocodile River was considered, but the idea was not feasible because of costs and its environmental impact.
2.25	BKS undertook an ecological survey of the Crocodile River in the Makoppa area. The project team must review this study. The study found that the Crocodile River had no additional capacity.	Mr. J. Faber	Landowner meeting - Farms Inmalkaar and Rooibokkraal (08 June 2008)	<b>FV</b> noted the result of the Crocodile River Reconciliation Study by BKS will be utilized in the project.
2.26	Study to determine percentage of entitled water users in the Crocodile River should have been done before MCWAP commenced.	Adam Gunn	Landowner meeting - Farms Inmalkaar and Rooibokkraal (08 June 2008)	<b>OvdB</b> stated that the study is underway and will run parallel with the project.  <b>WC</b> stated that the database for licensed users is already available. Noted that such study was aimed at identifying illegal water users.
2.27	Suggested the Makoppa users must also be monitored for water use.	M. Siddle	Landowner meeting - Farms Inmalkaar and	<b>FV</b> noted this issue must be stated on the Reply Form, inclusive of a motivation. This matter will be included in the EIA documentation that will be submitted to the Department of

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
			Rooibokkraal (08 June 2008)	Environmental Affairs. Mentioned either DWA or the Water Users Association can monitor it.  <b>OvdB</b> stated as part of MCWAP their current scope is only to monitor water users up to Vlieëpoort.
2.28	Why is the Zambezi River not being considered as a source?	Mr. J. Faber	Landowner meeting - Farms Inmalkaar and Rooibokkraal (08 June 2008)	<b>OvdB</b> – South Africa will have to go through a process at international level to seek permission to use water from the Zambezi. South Africa does not form part of the Zambezi Basin. The pipeline from the Zambezi will be much longer than the MCWAP pipeline which will be approximately 130 km
2.29	Until when will excess water be available in the Vaal River system? Referred to newspaper articles stating that possible water shortages were projected by 2015.	Mr. J. Faber	Landowner meeting - Farms Inmalkaar and Rooibokkraal (08 June 2008)	<b>OvdB</b> mentioned additional water augmentation projects are planned from Lesotho and the Tugela River and the water use in the Crocodile River is included in those plans.
2.30	Where can illegal water users be reported?	Mr. J. Faber	Landowner meeting - Farms Inmalkaar and Rooibokkraal (08 June 2008)	<b>OvdB</b> encouraged them to inform the DWA Compliance Office (“Blue Scorpions”). The name of Nigel Adams was provided as a contact from this unit.
2.31	How will the pipeline cross the Matlabas River?	Frans du Toit	Landowner meeting - Farm Welgevonden KQ 5/16 (18 June 2009)	<b>KP</b> mentioned there are two options, namely the building of a pipeline bridge across the river or laying the pipe underneath the river (preferable choice). Noted that should they decide on the last mentioned option, the river's flow would have to be diverted during construction.
2.32	Sufficient communication with landowners will be important during construction.	Frans du Toit	Landowner meeting - Farm Welgevonden KQ 5/16 (18 June 2009)	<b>SP</b> noted that TCTA would implement the project and that they would appoint full-time Environmental Control Officers and Community Liaison Officers to ensure the requirements of the EMP are adhered too. Landowners would have to contact these persons regarding any complaints or queries. These parties would be introduced to the landowners before construction start and the communication channels would also be established.
2.33	How will the pipeline cross the Matlabas River?	Kevin Miles	Landowner meeting - Farm Haarlem Oost (18 June 2009)	<i>See response under item 2.31.</i>
2.34	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		<b>FV</b> stated that dam building options had been considered but were found to be unfeasible due to: <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 sufficient yield.</li> </ul> Mentioned that new dam options were considered at Boschkop and Vlieëpoort. Noted that the Klipvoor Dam wall can be raised. Further dam building options might be considered in future but not as part of this project.
2.35	Noted that 3 years ago the irrigation farmers had a 50% water shortage and according to their studies they	Roland van Tonder (Crocodile	Agri Discussion Forums (27 January 2009, 06 March 2009)	<i>This matter dealt with in a separate report and meeting held with the Agri Forum on 26 May 2009.</i>

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	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.	West Irrigation board) - 06 March 2009	& 26 May 2009)	
2.36	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 it is still too early to follow SADC Protocol procedures and there are also environmental factors that play a role.
2.37	Referred to an existing study that was undertaken by the Thabazimbi Municipality for sourcing municipal water from the Crocodile River. Why all the fragmenting of water users?	George Frits (Makoppa Irrigation Board) - 06 March 2009	Agri Discussion Forums (27 January 2009, 06 March 2009 & 26 May 2009)	Project team present: DWA is aware of this project and it was considered during the planning of MCWAP.
2.38	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.
2.39	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>Economic Study to be undertaken during EIA Phase.</i>
2.40	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>

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
2.41	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.
2.42	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.
2.43	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.
2.44	A cut-off date must be set for users to indicate their anticipated future water demands.	Members of the Agricultural Discussion Forum - 06 March 2009 & 26 May 2009	Agri Discussion Forums (27 January 2009, 06 March 2009 & 26 May 2009)	<b>OvdB</b> mentioned the final cut-off date for users is for the finalization of the Design.
2.45	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.  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: • New dams at Vlieëpoort and	Roland van Tonder (Crocodile West Irrigation board) - 26 May 2009	Agri Discussion Forums (27 January 2009, 06 March 2009 & 26 May 2009)	<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.  <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.

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	<p>Boschkop; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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>			
2.46	Concerned that only a weir was discussed with I&APs, although it was requested that dams be built.	Roland van Tonder (Crocodile West Irrigation board)	Crocodile River (West) Working Group Meeting (14 May 2009)	Noted.
2.47	Referred to numerous letters sent to the Department, and no response was received to date. Still insists on the building of the four dams to address the water requirements. A study has been done with Koos Schutte on the surplus water flowing past Hugo Weir which found that the agricultural sector would not have enough water for irrigation 80% of the time in the future.	Roland van Tonder (Crocodile West Irrigation board)	Crocodile River (West) Working Group Meeting (14 May 2009)	<b>OvdB</b> requested that these questions be captured in a consolidated report and be made available. Highlighted the fact that water that was identified and earmarked for the developments is from the growing volumes of discharges (return flows) from the Gauteng area. Crocodile system will also be augmented by surplus flows from the Vaal system. Emphasised that planning for the project was a dynamic process.
2.48	According to the presentation provided, a large quantity of water from the treatment works will be available. What will happen during periods of drought? Will the irrigators be restricted first? Who will enforce the restrictions and how will they determine which area will be affected by the restrictions?	Roland van Tonder (Crocodile West Irrigation board)	Crocodile River (West) Working Group Meeting (14 May 2009)	<b>OvdB</b> – complexities regarding the integrated approach of the two different catchment areas. The processes to be followed will have to consider the water use in both systems. According to policy, agriculture receives water at a lower assurance than household or industrial use. Operational rules will have to be established in consultation with all the affected users.
2.49	Hartbeespoort Dam is still using a canal system, which needs to be upgraded. Experience between 30-50% water losses in these canals which adds up to between 18-20 million m <sup>3</sup> per annum losses. Requested assistance with the maintenance on these channels.	Hennie Barnard (Chairman Hartbeespoort Irrigation Board)	Crocodile River (West) Working Group Meeting (14 May 2009)	<b>OvdB</b> - It is important that the losses of the system be correctly calculated and managed in the water system. At this stage the project does not provide for the upgrading of the canal system.
2.50	What quantity of sewage effluent is	Roland van	Correspondence	DWA is currently undertaking a reconciliation study on the Crocodile River. The results of

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	being discharged into the system at this stage?	Tonder (Chairperson: Agri Discussion Forum) – 04 February 2009	received during broader PIP and PPP	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.
2.51	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.
2.52	Will the Hartbeespoort-, Roodekopjes-, Klipvoor- and Vaalkop Dams be managed together and by whom?	Roland van Tonder (Chairperson: Agri Discussion Forum) – 04 February 2009	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.
2.53	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 has an important function and responsibility in this regard.
2.54	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.
2.55	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.
2.56	Requested data on the water storing	Roland van	Correspondence	Results of the studies were presented to the Crocodile (West) Working Group meeting held



No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	capacity at different heights of the proposed Boschkop- and Vlieëpoort weirs. Such studies should have been completed a long time ago.	Tonder (Chairperson: Agri Discussion Forum) – 04 February 2009 & 16 April 2009	received during broader PIP and PPP	on 14 May 2009.
2.57	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.
2.58	According to their studies should 16 million m <sup>3</sup> water per month be taken for Medupi and associated industries 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.	Roland van Tonder (Chairperson: Agri Discussion Forum) – 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”.
2.59	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	See response under item 2.34. This information will be in the feasibility reports when finalized.
2.60	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	<i><b>FV (Thabazimbi and Lephalale Open days 27 May 2009) stated that dam building and dam raising options were considered for this project but were found not feasible due to:</b></i> <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 physically be raised. Further dam building options might be considered in future but not as part of this project.</i></p>
2.61	Requested information on studies regarding building of a new dam at Vlieëpoort. From information supplied	Roland van Tonder (Chairperson:	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	Provided at Agri forum meeting held on 26 May 2009.



No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	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.	Agri Discussion Forum) – 08 May 2009 & 03 June 2009		
2.62	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
2.63	Requested processed data of water flowing past the different measuring points.	Roland van Tonder (Chairperson: Agri Discussion Forum) – 08 May 2009	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.
2.64	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".
2.65	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.
2.66	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>Ovdb (Agri Discussion Forums - 27 January 2009, 06 March 2009 &amp; 26 May 2009) - 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.</i>
2.67	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	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.

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
2.68	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	<b>Ovdb</b> (Agri Discussion Forums - 27 January 2009, 06 March 2009 & 26 May 2009)- 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.  <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.
2.69	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.
2.70	Noted that their indications show that without sufficient additional storage capacity the irrigation farmers will only have enough water in 2 out of 10 years.	Roland van Tonder (Chairperson: Agri Discussion Forum) – 08 May 2009	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	Noted
2.71	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
2.72	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 being determined.
2.73	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	Noted. The purpose of this project is to augment water supply to enable new developments.
2.74	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	Louis Loots (Mokolo Irrigation Board)	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	DWA reconciliation study underway, which will confirm the available water of the system. Water will be augmented from the Vaal River system when required.

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	project team has determined that 230 million m <sup>3</sup> is available. Explain the discrepancy.			
2.75	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	To be investigated further during EIA Phase.
2.76	Will any water be supplied to mines in the direct vicinity of the Vlieëpoort Weir (any future possibility)?	Hendrik Jones (Rhino Andalusite Mine)	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	The known water needs of mines in the Brits-Rustenburg-Thabazimbi areas are considered in ongoing studies by DWA and is not part of this project.
2.77	The area is subjected to regular drought conditions and the river only flows for short periods after rainfall events.	M. Siddle (Farm Inmalkaar)	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	Noted. This is important to know the natural conditions of the lower Crocodile River.
2.78	During the construction of Roodekoppies Dam (1980-1990) there was a noticeable impact on their trees and a number of them died off. If less water is going to be available in the river this scenario might reoccur.	M. Siddle (Farm Inmalkaar)	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	The requirements of the Ecological Reserve will need to be satisfied. An Ecological Study to be undertaken during the EIA Phase.
2.79	They have riparian rights and irrigate lucerne. Should there not be water available they will have a loss of income.	M. Siddle (Farm Inmalkaar)	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	An Economic Study to be undertaken during EIA Phase.
2.80	Better policing of water abstraction by irrigation farmers must be implemented because with the releasing of extra water into the system illegal water usage might increase.	Pieta Badenhorst (Makoppa) & E.A. Faber (Farm Rooibokkraal 14 KP)	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	The future management of the system must still be finalized. In the project area it would need to be the responsibility of the irrigation board or a new operating authority to be established. Outside of the project area it will be a DWA function.
2.81	Is it the intention of MCWAP to cut-off or minimize the water flowing towards the Makoppa area in order to supply more water to the Lephalale area? Will water still be available for the Makoppa area? Will only additional water be conveyed to the Lephalale area?	Pieta Badenhorst (Makoppa) & E.A. Faber (Farm Rooibokkraal 14 KP)	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	<b>FV</b> noted DWA has a separate process to determine the reserve. The weir at Vlieëpoort is envisaged not to have significant storage and little impact on the natural flows running down that section of the river.
2.82	There is a DWA measuring structure	Pieta	Correspondence	See response under 2.81.

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	on his farm and asked if this structure can be used to monitor and ensure that firstly enough water flows passed this structure before DWA abstracts water upstream (Vlieëpoort)?	Badenhorst (Makoppa) & E.A. Faber (Farm Rooibokkraal 14 KP)	received during broader PIP and PPP	The monitoring and management system must still be designed. It is not clear if this structure will be used.
2.83	Who will be firstly entitled to the water in the system during periods of drought? Will it be nature or human needs?	Pieta Badenhorst (Makoppa) & E.A. Faber (Farm Rooibokkraal 14 KP)	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	Country wide different classes of users have different assurances of supply such as domestic use, strategic industries, etc. Irrigation has lower assurance.
2.84	If less water is available downstream of Vlieëpoort weir, the trees on the Crocodile River's banks could die, which will result in erosion.	E.A. Faber (Farm Rooibokkraal 14 KP)		Noted. To be investigated further during the EIA Phase. Suitable mitigation measures to be considered in EMP.
2.85	We have been notified that the pipeline will run the entire length of our farm that is south – north, the exact location to be determined, expected position in the servitude of the railway line. Your requirements for the construction phase spelt out at the meeting for a servitude of some 40m in width plus an additional 10m for a access road on the inside of the temporary fence line. Problem is this will consume some 21ha of vegetation and will destroy my only two earth dams located within the required servitude, which presently feed the game some ten months in the year. Noted that he does not have any other sources of water on the farms besides for an agreement with a neighbouring farmer, which expires Nov 2009. Had made numerous attempts to drill for water on the farm without much success. This emphasized the importance of these	PN Jordaan (Farm Witklip, Portion 4)	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	<i>Matter to be investigated further during the EIA phase.</i>

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
2.86	earth dams. How will property be impacted on due to the weir and the anticipated higher flood level?	JN Rheeders Eiendomme BK (Farm Grootfontein 352 JQ)	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	<i>Matter to be investigated further during the EIA phase.</i>

### 3. COMPENSATION

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 the land evaluation be undertaken? Properties cannot only be valued at agricultural value since it is only 10-15km outside Thabazimbi and that such factors must be taken into consideration.	Several directly and indirectly affected parties	Vlieëpoort Landowners Meeting (09 April 2009)	<p><b>AM</b> suggested the landowners draft a letter with the principles to be considered during land evaluation. Stated the minimum requirements must also be stipulated so that it can be submitted to TCTA for consideration.</p> <p><i>LvdM (Public Meeting and Openday – Lephalale 27 May 2009) stated that two types of compensation will be paid out to the landowner, namely:</i></p> <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> <p><i>LvdM (Public Meeting and Openday – Ashante Conference Venue 28 May 2009) An independent evaluator will be appointed that considers market related prices in the area. Each property will be evaluated individually.</i></p>
3.3	Requested to be compensated should he be forced to plant less because of the water abstracted from the Crocodile River.	P.I.L. du Plessis (Louwna Boerdery)	Thabazimbi Open Day (27 May 2009)	<p>Noted.</p> <p><i>Economic study to be undertaken during EIA Phase.</i></p>
3.4	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	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)	<p><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.</p> <p><b>FV</b> suggested the letter be submitted by Agri SA and TLU at national level to DWA.</p>

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	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.			
3.5	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	<i>See response under item 3.4.</i>
3.6	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	<i>See response under item 3.4.</i>
3.7	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.
3.8	Stated that according to him the pipeline will benefit none of the landowners and will have a major impact on the bushveld. Requested that since it is a project of national interest the compensation paid to the affected parties must also be "national compensation".	PN Jordaan (Farm Witklip, Portion 4)	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	<i>See response under item 3.1.</i>
3.9	Requested that if the development at Vlieëpoort goes ahead that his property should be bought out at the value that is acceptable to him.	M.F. Reinecke (Farm Mooivalei 5/342 KQ)	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	Noted. <i>See response under item 3.1.</i>

#### 4. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
4.1	Project will negatively affect the eco-tourism industry in the area.	Several directly and indirectly	Thabazimbi Open Day (27 May 2009)	<i>Economic study to be undertaken during the EIA Phase.</i>

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	Properties will lose their eco-tourism values.	affected parties		
4.2	The Mooivallei farms consist of narrow sections and the planned infrastructure will substantially affect them as well as farming activities since certain portions will be cut-off and be without water.	Several directly affected parties	Thabazimbi Open Day (27 May 2009)	<i>Economic study to be undertaken during the EIA Phase.</i>
4.3	Noise-related impacts from pump stations at Vlieëpoort.	Several directly and indirectly affected parties	Thabazimbi Open Day (27 May 2009)	<i>To be investigated further during the EIA Phase. EMP to contain suitable noise-related mitigation measures.</i>
4.4	Will the landowner have input in identifying protected and endangered trees within the proposed pipeline servitude?	Frans du Toit	Landowner meeting - Farm Welgevonden KQ 5/16 (18 June 2009)	<b>SP</b> mentioned that such input is welcome. Protected trees will be identified and marked before construction starts. Some of the trees can be left in place, however certain trees that are situated directly in the pipeline route will have to be removed.
4.5	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)	<i>Discussions underway with other proponents and EIA practitioners.</i>
4.6	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 period of time. Also noted that there are no intentions to infringe on any legal water allocations to irrigation farmers on the Crocodile River.
4.7	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 compensated for their losses.	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. In the case of Mokolo Dam where water rights may be leased and where water might be over-abstracted for a certain period, compensation will be applicable due to abnormal conditions.
4.8	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 needed to be accelerated.  <b>SP</b> also noted that studies regarding global warming do not form part of Nemai's Terms of Reference  <i>Global warming was considered during the Crocodile River Reconciliation Study.</i>
4.9	The socio-economic impacts of the	Gerhard Botha	Agri Discussion	<b>SP</b> mentioned that a Socio-economic study would be undertaken as part of the EIA Phase to

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	project must be investigated.	(Koedoeskop Agricultural Union) & Jaco de Bruin– 06 March 2009	Forums (27 January 2009, 06 March 2009 & 26 May 2009)	determine the broader economic impact of the project.
4.10	Noted the suggestion was made to ESKOM to establish an Industrial Corridor wherein all their power lines will run. Suggested that DWA also install 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 electrical transmission lines due to the currents that are then induced in the pipeline. Separate corridors are preferred.
4.11	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.
4.12	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-, Mogol and Limpopo Rivers. • Long-term sustainability of agricultural practices that have been established over 40-50 years. • What impact will the expected water shortages in the agricultural sector have on the country's food security? 2. How will eco-tourism / game farming/ conservation operations along all the abovementioned rivers be affected?	Wilhelm Schack – 06 March 2009	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	Economic study to be undertaken during the EIA Phase.
4.13	Requested the Terms of Reference for the EIA: 1. What input would the Agri Forum	Wilhelm Schack – 06 March 2009	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	<u>Discussed at the Water- and Environmental Forum Meetings held on 06 March 2009.</u> 1. Issues raised by the Agri Forum would be essential in determining the impact of the project on the agricultural sector as a whole.



No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	<p>have?</p> <p>2. 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?</p> <p>3. 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?</p> <p>4. How will agriculture and the environment's water be affected in the study area through:</p> <p>a) Pollution of water sources and the increase in pollution due to a reduced dilution factor caused by abstraction; and</p> <p>b) Air pollution and acid rain as a result of the power station/s.</p>			<p>2. 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.</p> <p>3. The ToR for the MCWAP EIA does not include studies on the effect of global warming on the area.</p> <p>4. Answers:</p> <p>a) To be investigated further during EIA Phase; and</p> <p>b) Not part of the ToR of this study.</p>
4.14	Several farmers downstream of Vlieëpoort noted they have protected tree species ( <i>Combretum Imberbe</i> & <i>Acacia Albida</i> ) on their farms, which might be at danger if water levels drop.	Several directly and indirectly affected parties	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	The requirements of the Ecological Reserve will need to be satisfied. To be investigated further during the EIA Phase. The intention of the project is to abstract return flows that are not part of the natural runoff to the river.
4.15	Impacts of additional power line to feed the new pump stations must be determined and indicated to landowners.	JN Rheeders Eiendomme BK (Farm Grootfontein 352 JQ)	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	ESKOM is still busy with the EIA for this power line. Representatives from ESKOM attended a meeting held with the Mooivallei landowners on 23 July 2009, and indicated the preferred route for the power line. They also indicated that this route is not final and that they are still planning to visit the Vlieëpoort landowners for their input.
4.16	The owner received the necessary environmental approval for a lodge on farm Grootfontein 352 JQ. How will the weir and associated infrastructure affect him?	JN Rheeders Eiendomme BK (Farm Grootfontein 352 JQ)	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	To be investigated further during the EIA Phase.
4.17	Requested a letter from the project	JN Rheeders	Correspondence	To be investigated further during the EIA Phase.

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	team which he can use as motivation to LEDET to extend the validity period of his environmental authorisation.	Eiendomme BK (Farm Grootfontein 352 JQ)	received during broader PIP and PPP	
4.18	The owner received the necessary environmental authorisation for a lodge on farm Hanover 341 KQ. The project will severely impact his development.	P.F. Janse van Rensburg (Hanover 342 KQ)	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	To be investigated further during the EIA Phase.
4.19	They are busy erecting a game fence and are planning to build a lodge in the Vlieëpoort area, which will be affected.	R. Kearney (Farm Mooivalei 23/342 KQ)	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	To be investigated further during the EIA Phase.
4.20	The project has a substantial impact on his property, livelihood and future planning.	Marthinus C. Mare (Farm Mooivalei 7/342 KQ)	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	To be further investigated during the EIA Phase.
4.21	The project will require bush clearing, which will minimize the existing available natural habitat for fauna in the area.	Marthinus C. Mare (Farm Mooivalei 7/342 KQ)	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	Ecological study to be undertaken during the EIA Phase. Suitable mitigation measures regarding vegetation to be included in the EMP.
4.22	An increase in human traffic to the Vlieëpoort area will increase the likelihood of crime in the area. Landowners will have to upgrade their security measures at their houses and properties, which will lead to additional costs.	Marthinus C. Mare (Farm Mooivalei 7/342 KQ)	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	Mitigation measures regarding security to be included in EMP.
4.23	The Mooivalei farms are close to Thabazimbi and have certain locality characteristics creating a unique position for farmers working in Thabazimbi. This benefit would not easily be duplicated elsewhere.	Marthinus C. Mare (Farm Mooivalei 7/342 KQ)	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	To be investigated further during the EIA Phase.
4.24	To what extent will the Thabazimbi Golf Course be affected (at Ben Alberts Nature Reserve) by the project?	Ettiëne le Roux (Thabazimbi Golf Club)	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	To be investigated further during the EIA Phase.
4.25	There is a cave which serves as habitat for bats (e.g. horseshoe Bat) on Farm Mooivalei 10/342 KQ close	G.J. Swanepoel (Farm	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	The issue was discussed further with the landowner and he provided copies of a map of the cave to the project team. To be further investigated during the EIA Phase.

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	to the location of the pipeline route crossing the farm portion. Noted that blasting and excavation work can influence the stability of the soil surface in the area.	Mooivalei 10/342 KQ)		
4.26	Project will adversely affect the eco-tourism industry in the area. Properties will lose their eco-tourism values.	Dana Smith (Farm Blaauwpan 133, Hoopdal 96 & Kameeldraai 266)	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	Economic Study to be undertaken during EIA Phase. EMP to contain mitigation measures to manage potential impacts on eco-tourism.
4.27	The permanent footprint of the pipeline will be a visual impact.	Dana Smith (Farm Blaauwpan 133, Hoopdal 96 & Kameeldraai 266)	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	Visual Impact Assessment to be undertaken during EIA Phase.
4.28	Loss of flora due to bush clearing.	Dana Smith (Farm Blaauwpan 133, Hoopdal 96 & Kameeldraai 266)	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	Ecological Study to be undertaken during EIA Phase.
4.29	That intensive bush clearing will have to be done on the Farm Paarl 124 KQ, which includes the removal of protected tree species including the "Leadwood/Hardekool" ( <i>Combretum imberbe</i> ) and Marula ( <i>Sclerocarya birrea</i> ) trees.	Tertius Roux (Farm Paarl 124 KQ)	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	Ecological Study to be undertaken during EIA Phase.
4.30	Visual impact on property since there is already an ESKOM distribution line crossing his property alongside the proposed pipeline route.	Tertius Roux (Farm Paarl 124 KQ)	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	Visual Impact Assessment to be undertaken during EIA Phase.
4.31	The pipeline will have a negative impact on the hunting and ecotourism industry. Loss of business during construction.	Several directly and indirectly affected parties	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	Economic Study to be undertaken during EIA Phase.

## 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 will happen to fences along the pipeline route? Will Big 5 game fences be replaced with the same type of fence?	Unknown – focus group	Lephalale Focus Group Meeting (24 April 2009)	The construction servitude will have to be fenced off which will include moving the existing fence further back into the affected property to make way for the construction servitude. The new temporary fence must be of the same quality as the existing fence e.g. cattle fence – replaced with a cattle fence; or a Big 5 fence replaced with a Big 5 Fence.
5.3	What is the size of the planned reservoirs and have their designs and localities been finalised?	D.E. Robinson (Farm Franksvley)	Thabazimbi Open Day (27 May 2009)	<b>FV</b> - Size is approximately 100m x 30m. Localities have not yet been finalised. Currently it is only the preliminary designs that have been completed.
5.4	Will the pipeline be above- or underground?	D.E. Robinson (Farm Franksvley) & Mr. F.C.Maritz	Thabazimbi Open Day (27 May 2009)	<b>FV</b> - Underground.
5.5	The proposed Break Pressure Reservoir (BPR) is located on their lodge development. Would it be possible to move this structure?	D.E. Robinson (Farm Franksvley)	Thabazimbi Open Day (27 May 2009)	<b>FV</b> - Needs to be considered by the technical team. <i>To be investigated further during the EIA Phase</i>
5.6	What structures will be visible after the pipeline has been installed?	Several directly and indirectly affected parties	Thabazimbi Open Day (27 May 2009)	<b>FV</b> – Manholes containing air valves, scour valves, etc.
5.7	Concerned about the layout of the pipeline route. Noted there are no fences erected between farm Franksvlei 100 KQ and Zondagskuil 130 KQ.	D.E. Robinson (Farms Franksvlei and Zondagskuil)	Thabazimbi Open Day (27 May 2009)	<i>To be investigated further during the EIA Phase</i>
5.8	Environmental authorisation had been received for a lodge on the Farm Grootfontein 352 JQ. How will the weir and associated infrastructure affect him?	JN Rheeders Eiendomme BK (Farm Grootfontein 352 JQ)	Thabazimbi Open Day (27 May 2009)	<i>Direct and indirect impacts to be confirmed during EIA phase.</i>
5.9	Who will carry the costs already undertaken for the EIA for the lodge development on the Farm Grootfontein 352 JQ should the proposed development not be	JN Rheeders Eiendomme BK (Farm Grootfontein 352 JQ)	Thabazimbi Open Day (27 May 2009)	<i>To be confirmed during EIA phase.</i>

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
5.10	feasible due to MCWAP? 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
5.11	The pipeline servitude across Farm Mooivalei KQ 342 (Portions 8-11) must be aligned as far as possible on the existing road reserve to minimize its impact.	Wessel de Clercq (Farm Mooivalei 9/342 KQ)	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	Pipeline to follow existing infrastructure as far as possible. Mooivalei infrastructure layout still to be finalised.
5.12	The access road on Farms Mooivalei 342 KQ must be maintained from the start, and at regular intervals.	Wessel de Clercq (Farm Mooivalei 9/342 KQ)	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	Mitigation measures regarding road maintenance must be included in the EMP.

## 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 does the pipeline route not run parallel to the ESKOM power lines?	Unknown	Thabazimbi Open Day (27 May 2009)	<b>FV</b> mentioned the risks of corrosion to the pipe associated with the high voltage lines. This impact could however be managed through AC Mitigation and Cathodic Protection.
6.3	How was the pipeline route selected?	Unknown	Thabazimbi Open Day (27 May 2009)	<b>FV</b> mentioned that they had attempted to align the pipeline route with existing linear infrastructure such as railway lines, road reserves and distribution lines as far as possible. Where this was not possible they had to align the route with the farm boundaries in order to minimise negative impacts on landowners. Possibility that some landowners at Vlieëpoort may be substantially affected because of the narrow widths of their farms.
6.4	Suggested that the pipeline alignment follows the eastern boundary of the Farm Grootlaagte 354 LQ, instead of alongside the road reserve. Noted this route would be shorter.	Danie de Waal (Farm Grootlaagte 354 LQ)	Lephalale Public Open day (27 May 2009)	<b>JP</b> – option to be investigated further. Noted though that the position of the reservoir is driven by topographical constraints, which is required for the hydraulic gradient of the pipeline
6.5	Suggested that the Operational Reservoir be built on a small section of his property (i.e. Farm Grootlaagte	Danie de Waal (Farm Grootlaagte	Lephalale Public Open day (27 May 2009)	<b>JP</b> – option to be investigated further. Noted though that the position of the reservoir is driven by topographical constraints.

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
6.6	<p>354 LQ), which is cut-off by the road.</p> <p>It was requested that DWA consider the following dam options:</p> <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>	<p>354 LQ)</p> <p>Members of the Agricultural Discussion Forum - 06 March 2009</p>	<p>Agri Discussion Forums (27 January 2009, 06 March 2009 &amp; 26 May 2009)</p>	<p><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.</p>
6.7	<p>It was requested that the proposed pipeline should not run east of the R510 Road because this area forms part of the Waterberg Biosphere. Also noted the Marekele National Park might be extended to this road in future.</p>	<p>Dana Smith (Farm Blaauwpan 133, Hoopdal 96 &amp; Kameeldraai 266)</p>	<p>Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP</p>	<p>To be investigated further during the EIA Phase.</p>
6.8	<p>Requested that the pipeline must not go through the area east of Thabazimbi – Lephalale Road (R510) because of National Importance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The area forms part of the Waterberg Biosphere;</li> <li>New Government signed an International Agreement to protect a minimum of 10% of its total surface in the form of National Parks;</li> <li>SANParks has obtained permission in Feb 1994 to include certain properties into the Marekele National Park. The minister also acknowledged this in June 2001.</li> <li>Large part of the properties in mentioned area has already been proclaimed as a National Park;</li> <li>The area is filled with various archeological sites from the Stone Age and Iron Age and the proposed pipeline route will pass one of these sites.</li> <li>The only area where the National</li> </ul>	<p>Dana Smith (Farm Blaauwpan 133, Hoopdal 96 &amp; Kameeldraai 266)</p>	<p>Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP</p>	<p>The relevant specialist studies (including Heritage, Ecological, Visual and Economic Studies) to be undertaken during the EIA Phase.</p>

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	Park can extent to is westwards up to the R510 road.			
6.9	<p>Requested that the pipeline must not go through the area east of Thabazimbi – Lephalale Road (R510) because of the visual impact:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The MCWAP Pipeline runs close to the main access road to the Marekele National Park;</li> <li>• 95% of properties in the area are used for Eco tourism;</li> <li>• The width of the proposed pipeline servitude will have a negative impact on the area because of bush clearing during construction and the permanent footprint left behind.</li> <li>• It will influence the wilderness feeling that the park area has.</li> </ul>	Dana Smith (Farm Blaauwpan 133, Hoopdal 96 & Kameeldraai 266)	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	The relevant specialist studies (including Heritage, Ecological, Visual and Economic Studies) to be undertaken during the EIA Phase.
6.10	<p>Requested that the pipeline must not go through the area east of Thabazimbi – Lephalale Road (R510) because of the ecological impact:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The width of the servitude will cause the destruction of many of the bushveld trees in the proposed Marekele National Park and Protection Area;</li> <li>• 80% of the National Park's surface area includes mountains and the only plain savanna area the park can extent to is to the west (R510 road);</li> <li>• The existing and future industrial developments are going to have a huge influence on the Bushveld and surrounding areas.</li> </ul>	Dana Smith (Farm Blaauwpan 133, Hoopdal 96 & Kameeldraai 266)	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	The relevant specialist studies (including Heritage, Ecological, Visual and Economic Studies) to be undertaken during the EIA Phase.
6.11	Requested that the pipeline must not go through the area east of Thabazimbi – Lephalale Road (R510)	Dana Smith (Farm Blaauwpan	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	The relevant specialist studies (including Heritage, Ecological, Visual and Economic Studies) to be undertaken during the EIA Phase.

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	because of the economical impact: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can have a long-term impact on the tourism market since the area will lose its wilderness feeling;</li> <li>• The properties will lose their Eco-tourism values; and</li> <li>• The national park can only extend to the west.</li> </ul>	133, Hoopdal 96 & Kameeldraai 266)		
6.12	Suggestions made: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That the proposed pipeline route stays alongside existing routes and lines west of the R510 road; and</li> <li>• Water must be obtained from the Zambezi River since it is a sustainable source over the long term.</li> </ul>	Dana Smith (Farm Blaauwpan 133, Hoopdal 96 & Kameeldraai 266)	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	The relevant specialist studies (including Heritage, Ecological, Visual and Economic Studies) to be undertaken during the EIA Phase.
6.13	An alternative route was proposed for the pipeline section running through Farms Paarl 124 KQ.	Tertius Roux (Farm Paarl 124 KQ)	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	The alternative routes proposed in this area will be investigated further during the EIA Phase.

## 7. OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
7.1	Can trees grow in the pipeline servitude after construction?	Ernst Sonntag	Landowner meeting - Farm Haarlem Oost (18 June 2009)	<b>SP</b> noted that grass and shrubs could grow on top of the pipeline. Trees could grow in the servitude, but not on the pipeline nor on the service road.
7.2	Who will be responsible for the maintenance of the pipeline and service road?	Gerhard Botha (Koedoeskop Agricultural Union) 06 March 2009	Agri Discussion Forums (27 January 2009, 06 March 2009 & 26 May 2009)	<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.

## 8. SERVITUDE

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
8.1	The road reserve in Steenbokpan is	Unknown –	Lephalale Focus	SP - Alignment was selected to minimise impacts. This issue will be addressed during the



No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	very narrow, and certain buildings will most likely be affected by the pipeline's servitude.	focus group	Group Meeting (24 April 2009)	design phase. Compensation to be paid for all damages caused to properties.
8.2	What is the width of the pipeline servitude?	Several directly and indirectly affected parties	Thabazimbi Open Day (27 May 2009)	<b>FV</b> - Construction servitude: 40-50m. Operational servitude: 15-20m. Mentioned that a new servitude will have to be established alongside the railway line.

## 9. INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
9.1	Has Botswana been informed of the project?	Adam Gunn	Landowner meeting - Farms Inmalkaar and Rooibokkraal (08 June 2008)	<b>FV</b> stated that all the neighbouring states had been informed. The existing water they receive will not be restricted.
9.2	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.

## 10. BROADER PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PROCESS

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
10.1	It was requested that communication with the agricultural sector be improved.	P.I.L. du Plessis (Louwna Boerdery)	Thabazimbi Open Day (27 May 2009)	Noted.  <i>Apart from PPP, the Agricultural sector is engaged through Agri Discussion Forum, technical working groups and the PSC (as part of PIP).</i>
10.2	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.
10.3	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	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	Noted. Many of the items have been addressed at the Agri forum discussion and through individual consultation.

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
10.4	Disappointed that the working group meeting originally scheduled for 02 April 2009 was cancelled. Asked for a new date.	April 2009 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.
10.5	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.
10.6	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.
10.7	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.

## 11. GENERAL

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
11.1	There was an objection because there were no senior representatives from DWA present at the meeting.	Unknown	Thabazimbi Open Day (27 May 2009)	<b>FV</b> : Mentioned the relevant representative from DWA Head Office had to attend a funeral on the day of the meeting. However, two officials from the DWA Limpopo Office and representatives of the project team were present at the meeting.
11.2	Requested 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.	Several directly and indirectly affected parties	Thabazimbi Open Day (27 May 2009)	<b>FV</b> mentioned that the Environmental Management Framework (EMF) for the area would assist in this regard.
11.3	Anglo Coal requested to be kept informed as they have future development interests of coal and coal bed methane rights in the	Ian Hall (Anglo Coal)	Thabazimbi Open Day (27 May 2009)	Noted  <i>Ian Hall from Anglo Coal registered as an I&amp;AP, and will be kept posted as the EIA unfolds.</i>

No.	ISSUE / COMMENT	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
11.4	Lephalale area. His clients are opposing the ESKOM-driven developments in the Lephalale area. Main concern is global warming and loss of biodiversity. Also concerned that the applicant and authorising authority now falls under the same Department.	Adam Gunn	Landowner meeting - Farms Inmalkaar and Rooibokkraal (08 June 2008)	<b>FV</b> – the proposed scheme would not take water from the natural runoff, which is currently flowing past the property in question.  <i>It is now clear that the Department of Water Affairs (DWA) and the Department of Environmental Affairs(DEA) are two different departments.</i>
11.5	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.
11.6	Expressed concern regarding the manner in which ESKOM and DWA were handling the whole situation.	Roland van Tonder (Chairperson: Agri Discussion Forum) – 16 April 2009	Correspondence received during broader PIP and PPP	Noted
11.7	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
11.8	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 representatives should also make use of the participation forums established by Eskom.