

PROPOSED SURFACE WATER DEVELOPMENTS FOR AUGMENTATION OF THE WESTERN CAPE WATER SUPPLY SYSTEM

SCOPING AND EIA REPORT

COMMENTS AND RESPONSE REPORT

1 INTRODUCTION

This Comments and Response Report summarises the salient issues and queries raised, as well as statements made, by Interested and Affected Parties (IAPs) through correspondence received (including completed Reply Forms and Comments Sheets, letters, faxes and emails) and discussions at meetings during the **Public Participation** phase. This report also attempts to address the comments through responses and input provided by the project team.

The Public Participation phase serves to identify and prioritise issues for further assessment during the EIA phase. Accordingly, the comments received from IAPs during public participation will be considered and will be investigated further during the Final EIA stage.

The Comments and Response Report is separated into the following main categories:

1. Announcement Phase
 - 1.1 General
 - 1.2 PSC Invitation Responses
 - 1.3 Water Quality
 - 1.4 Dam Capacity
 - 1.5 Impacts to Adjacent Properties
 - 1.6 Project Designs
 - 1.7 EIA Requirements
2. Scoping Phase
 - 2.1 General
 - 2.2 Authority Comments
 - 2.3 Concerns Raised
 - 2.4 Focus Group Meeting 01
 - 2.5 Focus Group Meeting 02
 - 2.6 Focus Group Meeting 03
 - 2.7 Focus Group Meeting 04
 - 2.8 Focus Group Meeting 05
 - 2.9 Public Meeting 01

1. ANNOUNCEMENT PHASE

1.1 GENERAL				
No	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
1.	Izak JP Badenhorst (IB) registered as an Interested and Affected Party (IAP). IB stated that is a surveyor and interested in plotting the pipeline route.	Izak JP Badenhorst	Reply Form 24/05/2016	Noted. IB was registered as an IAP.
2.	The Welgevonden Trust acknowledged having been notified of the project.	Welgevonden Trust Half Gewaagd Farm Sonquas Doordrift Farm	Acknowledgment of Receipt 24/05/2016	Noted.
3.	Paul Rhode (PR) asked that the WTW plant operators be added to the IAP database.	Paul Rhode Head: Resource and Infrastructure Planning (Bulk Water) City of Cape Town	PSC Meeting 01 25/05/2016	The operators were added to the IAP database.
4.	Joggie Scholtz (JS) from the Swartland Municipality registered as an Interested and Affected Party (IAP). JS also requested Louis Zikmann (LZ) be registered as an IAP.	Joggie Scholtz Swartland Municipality	Reply Form 26/05/2016	Both JS and LZ have been registered as IAPs.
5.	Peter Keuck (PK) from the Western Cape Department of Agriculture registered as an IAP.	Peter Keuck Western Cape Department of Agriculture	Reply Form 27/05/2016	PK has been registered as an IAP.
6.	Bev le Suer (BS) stated she would like to receive a download of the report to enable her to properly educate the members of the Voelvllei Yacht Club before the first meeting. BS requested confirmation on how best to do this.	Bev le Suer Vogelvllei Yacht Club	Email and Phone Call 27/05/2016	VS explained that at this point, the project was at the initial registration period and so it would be great if BS could urge her members to complete the registration form. VS stated that she will notify all registered IAPs of the public meetings and the review of the Draft Reports (when they are available). VS sent BS a BID.
7.	CJ van Santen (CVS) registered as an IAP on behalf of Schoongezicht Boerdry (landowner).	CJ van Santen Schoongezicht Boerdry	Reply Form 27/05/2016	VS sent through landowner notification on 01/06/2016.
8.	Michelle Leibbrandt (ML) on behalf of the Tomis Group registered the Tomis Group as an IAP.	Michelle Leibbrandt Tomis Group	Email and Reply Form 31/05/2016	ML and Tomis Group were registered as IAPs.
9.	DHC van Rooyen (DVR) registered as an IAP.	DHC van Rooyen Pompstasie Iwwowers	Email and Reply Form 01/06/2016	DVR has been registered as an IAP.

1.1 GENERAL

No	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
10.	Samuel Walters (SW) registered as an IAP and registered Helius Walters (HW).	Samuel Walters Media 24	Form 01/06/2016	SW and HW have been registered as an IAP.
11.	Karin Muller (KM) requested to be part of the process.	Karin Muller Silwerfontein Farm Gouda Voelvllei Dam	Email and Reply Form 06/06/2016	KM was added to the IAP database.
12.	JF Kirsten (JK) registered as an IAP.	JF Kirsten Zonquasdrift	Reply Form 06/06/2016	JK was registered as an IAP.
13.	A Mettenheimer (AMe) registered as an IAP.	A Mettenheimer Zonquasdrift	Reply Form 06/06/2016	AMe was registered as an IAP.
14.	AJ Van Santen (AJVS) on behalf of Bo Herman Boerdery requested to be registered as an IAP and registered Andre Coetze (AC) and Samuel Walter (SW) as IAPs.	AJ Van Santen Bo Herman Belangegroep	Reply Form 07/06/2016	AJVS and SW were registered as IAPs.
15.	AJVS submitted a second reply form and registered CJ Van Staten (CJVS) and Norman De Jager (NDJ) as IAPs.	AJ Van Santen Bo Herman Belangegroep	Reply Form 07/06/2016	CJVS and NDJ were registered as IAPs.
16.	AJ Burger (AB) from the Swartland Municipality registered as an IAP.	AJ Burger Swartland Municipality	Reply Form 13/06/2016	AB has been added to the IAP database as an authority.
17.	Hannes Bezuidenhout (HB) on behalf of WPALAS registered as an IAP and also registered Reteit Malherbe (RM), Albertus van der Merwe (AVM) and Urs Schwartz (US) as IAPs.	Hannes Bezuidenhout WPALAS	Reply Form 14/06/2016	HB as well as RM, AVM and US were registered as IAPs.
18.	Kai-Uwe Molzahn (KUM) registered as an IAP.	Kai-Uwe Molzahn Wydzicht Boerdery BK	Reply Form 14/06/2016	KUM has been registered as an IAP. The property is not affected by the pipeline. Only the potential access roads may affect the property. VS sent through landowner notification on 01/06/2016.
19.	Stuart Barrow (SB) requested background on the project.	Stuart Barrow Blue Science	Phone Call and Email 22/07/2016	VS registered SB as an IAP and emailed through a BID to be completed.

1.2 WATER QUALITY

No	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
20.	The Welgevonden Trust stated that the water was currently polluted so what would the impact of the project be on water quality.	Welgevonden Trust Half Gewaagd Farm Sonquas Doordrift Farm	Acknowledg ement of Receipt 24/05/2016	The feasibility studies included water quality studies to determine the impact of the project on the water quality in the Dam. This will be assessed fully in the EIA phase.

1.2 WATER QUALITY

No	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
21.	Glen Booyesen (GB) noted that there is often a lot of pollution in the river so it may be necessary that the first flood is not abstracted (as that is usually more polluted).	Glen Booyesen Berg River Irrigation Board	PSC Meeting 01 25/05/2016	Graham English (GE) explained that the feasibility studies included water quality studies to determine the impact of the project on the water quality in the Dam. The study found that the project would not impact on the water quality in the dam however this would be investigated in the EIA report.
22.	Deon Rossouw (DR) asked about the water quality in the Berg River.	Deon Rossouw Cape Nature	PSC Meeting 01 25/05/2016	GE added that the Dam used to be a clear water Dam however after a previous drought, the Dam became turbid for a number of reasons. Regardless, water quality modelling was undertaken and informed the three discharge point options.
23.	BS thanked VS for explaining the project over the phone and submitted a completed questionnaire. The questionnaire is contained in Appendix D6 . BS's main concerns from the questionnaire was water pollution: The Dam water is already the most toxic of all dams in WC. How will this impact water being transferred to the Berg River? Living in Paarl for 14 years, I am also aware that the Berg River's water is not the cleanest either. Not sure how this will impact on water ending up in the dam; will we start finding plant growth which may become a problem in the future, etc?	Bev le Suer Vogelvllei Yacht Club	Email 31/05/2016	VS thanked BS for the call and for completing the questionnaire. Water quality issues will be investigated further during the EIA phase. An Aquatic and Wetland Study will be conducted which will also comment on water quality and its impact on the aquatic environment. Mitigation measures will be included in the Environmental Management Programme (EMPr).

1.3 DAM CAPACITY

No	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
24.	WE from the Berg Main Irrigation Board/Waterright Consulting asked whether it would be possible to increase the capacity of the Dam.	Willie Enright Berg Main Irrigation Board/Waterright Consulting	PSC Meeting 01 25/05/2016	GE explained that it may be possible as part of future phases but that it was not included in the scope of the current project as currently the full capacity of the Dam is not used.
25.	WE noted that there is a problem with the Dam in that once the level reaches 25% it is not possible to abstract water efficiently. WE also noted that changed allocations to farmers would need to be taken into account. He explained that of the 95 million m ³ currently available, 16 million m ³ was allocated to	Willie Enright Berg Main Irrigation Board/Waterright Consulting	PSC Meeting 01 25/05/2016	Noted.

1.3 DAM CAPACITY

No	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	irrigators but only 10 million m ³ was available. Thus an additional 6 million m ³ would need to go to irrigators from the 23 million m ³ .			
26.	BS stated that when the Dam is at capacity, the water level reaches the access road at the Yacht Club. If this level is not monitored carefully and there is an overflow, I fear that our infrastructure at the Yacht Club may be at risk; worse than this, our member's boats as well as the Club's Safety power boats will be at risk as they are the closest to the road/edge of dam.	Bev le Suer Vogelvlei Yacht Club	Email 31/05/2016	Noted, it will be addressed in the EIA phase and mitigation measures will be included in the EMPr.

1.4 IMPACTS TO ADJACENT PROPERTIES

No	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
27.	PK from the Western Cape Department of Agriculture asked whether the proposed pipeline route followed the farm boundaries.	Peter Keuck Western Cape Department of Agriculture	PSC Meeting 01 25/05/2016	GE explained that this was the case.
28.	CVS asked where the pipeline route would be since based on the map, it was on the boundary of his property.	CJ van Santen Schoongezicht Boerdry	Reply Form 27/05/2016	It was confirmed that his property is not affected by the pipeline. Only the potential access roads may affect his property.
29.	Almarie van Santen (AVS) requested to be registered as an IAP and asked whether there would be an impact to her property.	Almarie van Santen Schoongezicht Boerdery	Email 29/05/2016	AVS and Nelius van Santen were registered as IAPs. With regards to AVS's query, VS sent a map which shows their farm (Tulburgh Road Farm 441 - C0750000000044100000) and that the proposed pipeline does not go through their property. VS stated that Nemaï are still in the process of determining where the access roads would go and there is a chance that existing farm roads would be used and formalised. This may impact on AVS's property. Impacts to their property may include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dust and noise impacts during construction; and • Safety and security. Mitigation measures will be included in the EMPr to minimise these impacts.
30.	SW stated that the project is a good idea but can cause long-term legal problems because the water pipes pass through	Samuel Walters Media 24	Noted.	SW's suggestion will be submitted to DWS for consideration. However, affected landowners have been

1.4 IMPACTS TO ADJACENT PROPERTIES

No	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	different landowners properties. What will happen if they refuse use of their land? The legal process of expropriation can take years in court and is costly. SW suggested 4 boreholes along the resistant channels on fresh high-water mark for Voelvllei Dam. SW's stated that his personal opinion is underground boreholes.			notified throughout the project as per the EIA Regulations, 2014 and no legal issues have been brought up by the landowners as a result of the project.

1.5 PROJECT DESIGNS

No	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
31.	The Welgevonden Trust enquired what impact the dam wall would have on the height of the water.	Welgevonden Trust Half Gewaagd Farm Sonquas Doordrift Farm	Acknowledgment of Receipt 24/05/2016	The impact is unclear at this stage but will be addressed in the EIA phase.
32.	DR from Cape Nature requested clarity regarding the figure showing the Western Cape Water Supply System (WCWSS) reconciliation of supply and demand.	Deon Rossouw Cape Nature	PSC Meeting 01 25/05/2016	GE explained that the brown step below the Berg River Voelvllei Augmentation Scheme (BRVAS) was most likely the option of managing the system better (water conservation).
33.	DR asked for information on the six initial options assessed as part of the Pre-feasibility studies.	Deon Rossouw Cape Nature	PSC Meeting 01 25/05/2016	GE explained that Molenaars River Diversion and the Upper Wit River Diversion were found to be unlikely due to the environmental risks associated with the schemes. GE also noted that Michell's Pass Diversion Scheme and the First Phase Augmentation of Voelvllei Dam were found to be the most feasible so were taken further into the feasibility study.
34.	DR asked for confirmation regarding the diameter of the pipe.	Deon Rossouw Cape Nature	PSC Meeting 01 25/05/2016	GE explained that the pipe diameter was between 1.7 and 1.9m. GE also added that the area of the pump station would be approximately 80m x 50m.
35.	PK asked whether a fish ladder and canoe chute would be put in place at the weir.	Peter Keuck Western Cape Department of Agriculture	PSC Meeting 01 25/05/2016	GE explained that a fish ladder was proposed. However, the water level would be very similar even when the weir was in place and therefore should not impact recreational users. He also explained that the scheme would only be winter operated.

1.5 PROJECT DESIGNS

No	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
36.	DR asked how much power would be required.	Deon Rossouw Cape Nature	PSC Meeting 01 25/05/2016	GE explained that the requirements were not yet determined.
37.	Nic Faasen (NF) from West Coast District Municipality (WCDM) asked for more information on the size of the pumps.	Nic Faasen West Coast District Municipality	PSC Meeting 01 25/05/2016	GE explained that the pumps would be 4m ³ /s in size.
38.	NF asked whether the project would have sufficient yield as the WCWSS is so constrained.	Nic Faasen West Coast District Municipality	PSC Meeting 01 25/05/2016	GE explained that the proposed scheme is quite small and would only be operated in winter and thus additional schemes would be required in the future.
39.	PR noted that in times like the current drought the potential of transferring water along the Berg river would be very useful. The project was helpful in that it would potentially provide the infrastructure required for emergencies.	Paul Rhode City of Cape Town	PSC Meeting 01 25/05/2016	Noted.
40.	NF asked what would happen to the outlet works for the Swartland Water Treatment Works (WTWs).	Nic Faasen West Coast District Municipality	PSC Meeting 01 25/05/2016	GE explained that currently, water is abstracted from the Dam and is transferred via canal to the WTWs. Thereafter, some of the water is treated by Swartland WTWs but some is transferred via canal to the river. The water is then abstracted from the river by Withoogte WTWs. However the canal is in a mixed state of repair and it appears that there are leaks from the canal which feed a wetland. The project offers an alternative in that there is potential to use the pipeline to transfer water to the river instead of the canal which would be more efficient. The canal however would not be decommissioned as it would be necessary to use it during the construction of the pipeline.
41.	PR noted that the project offered opportunities for possible linkages between the various WTWs in the area.	Paul Rhode City of Cape Town	PSC Meeting 01 25/05/2016	Menard Mugumo (MM) of DWS noted that there is potential but that it would be part of a separate process.
42.	GB from the Berg River Irrigation Board asked how the volume to be abstracted was determined.	Glen Booyen Berg River Irrigation Board	PSC Meeting 01 25/05/2016	GE explained a number of aspects were assessed including the reserve determination and flow duration frequency curves (i.e. looking at what volume of water you can take without impacting the Berg River Estuary).
43.	GB asked whether the dam wall could be raised.	Glen Booyen Berg River Irrigation Board	PSC Meeting 01 25/05/2016	GE explained that it was looked at as part of the pre-feasibility studies but that it was not as favourable as it could only be raised by 1m and the catchment of the Dam is quite small. The BRVAS scheme was more favourable.

1.5 PROJECT DESIGNS

No	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
44.	BB van der Merwe (BvdM) requested that bigger pipes and pumps be used (i.e. 6m ³ /s versus 4m ³ /s) because there may be future need for more water.	BB van der Merwe West Coast District Municipality	PSC Meeting 01 25/05/2016	DR and Morris Floris (MF) from Cape Nature highlighted that this may not be possible as the abstraction from the river must not impact on the estuary.
45.	NF noted that there was increased demand and perhaps additional options would be required for example, Molenaars.	Nic Faasen West Coast District Municipality	PSC Meeting 01 25/05/2016	GE explained that Molenaars went through a World Heritage Site so there was lots of objections. DR emphasised that impacts to the World Heritage Site would not be acceptable. He also noted that Michell's Pass project may be less costly because there are no pumping costs.
46.	PK asked what the additional yield of the system would be.	Peter Keuck Western Cape Department of Agriculture	PSC Meeting 01 25/05/2016	GE stated that it would be 23 million m ³ .
47.	WE asked whether there was potential for hydropower.	Willie Enright Berg Main Irrigation Board/Wateright Consulting	PSC Meeting 01 25/05/2016	VS explained that at this stage it has not been investigated however we will raise it with DWS and the Engineers on the feasibility of such a scheme.
48.	DR noted that Cape Nature would prefer if the pipeline crossed the river at the weir as this would negate the need for an additional crossing.	Deon Rossouw Cape Nature	PSC Meeting 01 25/05/2016	Noted, the team will investigate further during the EIA phase.
49.	DVR stated that he thought that the project was a good way of supplementing the dam yield. In years of good rainfall, too much water flows towards the ocean and is not used. Other alternatives should be considered such as canals from the mountain.	DHC van Rooyen Pompstasie Iwwowers	Email and Reply Form 01/06/2016	Noted.
50.	AJVS stated that best practices should be looked at and that an alternative which will have limited impacts on the environment as well as a possible solution for issues with unintentional consequences due to floods and damming which has drastic negative impacts on established farming should be considered.	AJ Van Santen Bo Herman Belangegroep	Reply Form 07/06/2016	During the feasibility phase, 6 different schemes were considered. The BRVAS scheme was found to be the best scheme from a technical perspective. Three alternate discharge points and 3 alternate access roads will be considered to ensure that the project has a minimal impact on the environment.
51.	Abri van Santen (ABVS) stated that thorough consideration must be given to the type of structures and the capacity of the project and the impact on the flow of the river.	Abri Van Santen AJ Van Santen Boerdry	Reply Form 07/06/2016	Noted.

1.6 EIA REQUIREMENTS

No	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
52.	<p>AM from the Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning (DEA&DP) Western Cape Government replied to the email inviting authorities and government role-players to join the PSC for the project. AM stated that she is within the Directorate: Development Facilitation and they collate the Department's comments on EIA applications where DEA&DP is not the competent authority and where more than one directorate is commenting. She attached the Department's circular on the One Environmental System, which contains information on NEMA S24O requests for comment. In particular, attention is drawn to Section 10, page 42, which contains the contact details for submitting requests for comments. AM stated that such requests could be submitted to her.</p> <p>AM said she would forward the email to the relevant directorates within the Department and request them to respond on the preferred date for the site visit and interest in serving on the PSC. She also advised that the Department have 3 EIA directorates (Development Management: Regions 1, 2 and 3). She also enquired about the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What Municipality (ies) are affected by the EIA study? I assume it would be Drakenstein. Does it also fall under the jurisdiction of Swartland Municipality? 2. The invitation indicates that "A new summer release connection at the existing Swartlands WTW to facilitate summer releases". What is the name of the WTW? Are you referring to West Coast District Municipality's Withoogte water treatment works? 3. What are the EIA listed activities being triggered, especially in terms of Listing Notice 2 (GN No. R. 984)? 	<p>Adri La Meyer Directorate: Development Facilitation Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning Western Cape Government</p>	<p>Email 10/05/2016</p>	<p>VS from Nemai Consulting replied that she had initially included Piet Van Zyl on the database as he is the Head of Department (in addition to Tammy and some other representatives with whom I have worked with before) however going forward she will ensure that AM and Andre Oosthuizen are notified.</p> <p>VS requested confirmation on the AM's date preference for the PSC meeting.</p> <p>VS provided the following responses to AM's queries:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The development is primarily in the Drakenstein Local Municipality however a small section does fall within the Swartland Municipality (please see attached map). 2. The WTW is called the Swartland WTW which is owned and operated by the West Coast District Municipality (see attached map). 3. The EIA activities are still being confirmed as we are in the process of getting clarity from the Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA) regarding Activity 11 of GN 983 of 4 December 2014. The project does involve the transfer of 23 million cubic metres per annum from the Berg River to the existing Voëlvlei Dam. Water from the Dam is then abstracted for treatment at Voëlvlei WTWs which is owned and operated by CCT and the existing Swartlands WTWs which is operated by the West Coast District Municipality. However it should be noted that both the Dam and the proposed abstraction point occur within the same quaternary catchment. <p>In response to VS, AM stated that Andre Oosthuizen was no longer involved in S24O applications and all correspondence wrt the application was to be forwarded to her. AM stated that she would not be attending the meeting or comment on the EIA application as she only provides admin support to the Department. AM said she would ask</p>

1.6 EIA REQUIREMENTS

No	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
				the Directorates to confirm their attendance and preferred date for the PSC meeting.
53.	PK asked whether the EIA included power supply. He recommended that this be taken into account if necessary.	Peter Keuck Western Cape Department of Agriculture	PSC Meeting 01 25/05/2016	VB and GE explained that as part of the Aurecon Technical Support scope, the electrical supply requirements would be confirmed. It was also explained that Eskom may choose to select the power line route itself.
54.	A Collison (AC) from Cape Nature requested that the EIA extends the biodiversity study into the spring period (not just winter).	A Collison Cape Nature	PSC Meeting 01 25/05/2016	VS explained that she had contacted the Western Cape Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning (DEA&DP) to confirm the best season for the specialist study and that they had confirmed that the specialist should advise the best season. The specialist therefore would provide input into this however at this stage, a multi-season study was not envisioned. The study will not be undertaken during winter.
55.	PR asked for clarity on the triggers for the EIA.	Paul Rhode City of Cape Town	PSC Meeting 01 25/05/2016	VS explained that the only triggered activity from Listing Notice 2 was Activity 11 however Nema Consulting was in the process of obtaining clarity regarding whether this activity was triggered.
56.	In response to receiving the Background Information Document (BID), AM stated that the Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning Western Cape Government will not provide any detailed comment on the BID and will await the Scoping Report. AM requested that all reports/documentation be marked for her attention and she will then distribute it to the relevant directorates within the Department. AM requested at least 1 hardcopy and 4 CDs of the Scoping Report to be provided once it become available for comment. AM also stated that in terms of the 2014 EIA Regulations, the EIA Application Form must first be submitted to the competent authority, whereafter a Public Participation must be conducted, including making a Scoping Report and Plan of Study for EIA available to IAPs for a minimum period of 30 days. The Scoping Report cannot therefore be submitted simultaneously with the Application Form. AM also requested confirmation that Heritage Western Cape, Provincial	Adri La Meyer Directorate: Development Facilitation Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning Western Cape Government	Email 26/05/2016	At least 1 hardcopy and 4 CDs of the Scoping Report will be provided. The Application Form will be submitted prior to Public Participation and the submission of the Draft Scoping Report. In addition, Heritage Western Cape, Provincial Department of Agriculture and Cape Nature are included on the database. 1 hardcopy and 4 CDs were delivered to DEA&DP on 22/09/2016. The application was submitted on 22/09/16 to DEA while the public participation review period commenced on 23/09/16.

1.6 EIA REQUIREMENTS

No	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	Department of Agriculture and Cape Nature were included on the IAP database.			
57.	<p>Alana Duffell-Canham (ADC) on behalf of Cape Nature requested that Cape Nature be registered as a Commenting Authority and sent through a standard letter which outlined their requirements for commenting on development applications. ADC stated that project specific comments would be provided once the Draft Scoping Report is available. The following topics are discussed in the letter which is contained in Appendix D6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimizing negative impacts on biodiversity; • Guidelines and biodiversity plans; • Biodiversity 'red flags' in the Western Cape; • Commissioning of biodiversity specialists; • Permit requirements; • Format of reports; • Mining and Prospecting Applications; and • Status of Cape Nature's comment. 	Alana Duffell-Canham Cape Nature	Email and Letter 27/05/2016	Noted. The recommendations made in the letter will be followed and implemented.
58.	<p>The Western Cape Government Environmental Affairs and Development Planning sent a letter acknowledging having received the BID and stated the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This Directorate, together with other relevant Organs of State will act as a commenting authority regarding the proposed development. This Directorate must therefore be provided with a copy of each environmental report compiled for the proposed development that will be made available for public participation and that will be submitted to the relevant competent authority for decision-making. • Please note that the proposed development must not be undertaken without an environmental authorisation from the competent authority. It is prohibited in terms of the National Environmental Management Act, 1998 (Act No. 107 of 1998) (NEMA) to commence with a listed activity without an environmental authorisation from the competent authority. Any person convicted of an offence in terms of the above is liable for a fine of not more than 	Maboe Nthejane Western Cape Government Environmental Affairs and Development Planning	Letter 07/06/2016	Noted.

1.6 EIA REQUIREMENTS

No	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	<p>R5 000 000 and imprisonment of not more than 10 years or to both such fine and such imprisonment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kindly quote the above-mentioned reference number in any future correspondence submitted to this Directorate in connection with the proposed development. The Directorate reserves the right to revise initial comments and request further information based on any new or revised information received. 			
59.	<p>Stanley Tshitwamulomoni (ST) on behalf of the Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA) submitted comments on the BID. Recommendations were made to be included in the Scoping and EIA phase:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The detailed layout plan underlined with the development footprint with a detailed legend showing all sensitive areas within the proposed area. A detailed Ecological, Aquatic Impact Assessment Specialists Reports must be submitted during the EIA phase. The Wetlands Delineation Report must be compiled and submitted. 	Stanley Tshitwamulomoni Department of Environmental Affairs	Letter 09/06/2016	The recommendations were included in the Scoping Report and will be carried forward to the EIA phase.
60.	<p>ML Watters (MW) on behalf of the Western Cape Road Network Management Department submitted a letter stating that they had no objection to the project but the necessary wayleaves must be obtained. The letter also provided the roads that would be affected by the proposed development.</p>	ML Watters Western Cape Road Network Management Department	Letter 29/06/2016	Noted.
61.	<p>Adri La Meyer wrote: My previous e-mail dated 15 August 2016 and the PSC meeting held on 16 August 2016 at the DWS offices in Bellville, refer. Please be advised of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Scoping Report that was made available from 12 – 26 August 2016, was for distribution to PSC members only. A Draft Scoping Report for 30 days public comment will be released once the Application Form is submitted to DEA. You will be provided with a copy of the DSR for your comment once this becomes available. 	Adri La Meyer Directorate: Development Facilitation Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning Western Cape Government	Email 19/08/2016	<p>The following responses apply:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Scoping Report will be made available from 24 September 2016 to 25 October 2016. The Application Form will be submitted to DEA on 23 September 2016. All registered IAPs and authorities will be notified of the DSR. No confirmation has been received as of yet regarding whether a BA process applies rather than a Scoping and EIA process. Impacts of the roads will be assessed during the EIA phase of the project.

1.6 EIA REQUIREMENTS

No	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DWS (the applicant) had a pre-application meeting with DEA officials and is still awaiting confirmation from DEA that the project requires a S&EIR assessment. The only S&EIR listed activity is activity 11 of LN 2 (GN No. R. 984): transfer of water between water catchments. It is unclear whether this activity is triggered as the project falls within the same quaternary catchment area. DEA officials have requested an internal legal opinion on the applicability of this listed activity as the EIA Regulations do not have a definition for “catchment” and the definition of the NWA must be applied. • Since the project is deemed urgent by DWS, they will continue to proceed with a S&EIR process. Should DEA however indicate that a BA process must be followed, then a pre-application BAR will be made available before submission of the Application Form to DEA. • Existing roads will be used as far as possible, with the exception of one new access road that is required for one of the alternatives. The road, although within a CBA, will be below the road construction threshold. It is unlikely that listed activities pertaining to road construction and electricity distribution are triggered. The impacts of these associated infrastructures will however be assessed during the EIA process. • The Department informed the EAP that they need to consult with HWC to clarify who the responsible heritage authority is as they have consulted with SAHRA on this application. • The EAP further needs to clarify whether Swartland Municipality is affected by the proposed development as they have not been engaged/consulted with thus far. This also has implications for the DM Regions (Regions 1 and 2) for commenting on the application. • Date for the next PSC meeting is proposed for 21 September 2016; to be confirmed. 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultation with HWC has occurred. A notice of intent was submitted whereby HWC will advise going forward. • Swartland Municipality have been notified of the project and are provided the opportunity to comment on the DSR. • The next PSC meeting may be held on 04 November 2016. This has yet to be confirmed.

2. SCOPING PHASE

2.1 GENERAL				
No	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
62.	Jonathan Windvogel (JM) of HWC requested the Heritage Western Cape be supplied with a copy of the Draft Scoping Report.	Jonathan Windvogel Heritage Western Cape	Email 20/09/2016	A hardcopy of the Draft Scoping Report was delivered to WCH on 22/09/2016.
63.	Zwelibanzi G Shiceka (ZS) stated that HWC will only be able to comment to your application when you have submitted the NID form. Please be informed that you must first request a reference number, NID and fee information.	Zwelibanzi G Shiceka Heritage Western Cape	Email 20/09/2016	A reference number had already been obtained and an Notification of Intent to Develop Form had been completed and submitted.
64.	Seoka Lekota (SL) requested for the relevant documents in order for the Department to comment.	Seoka Lekota Department of Environmental Affairs: Biodiversity Conservation	Email 20/09/2016	SG stated that hardcopies of the Draft Scoping Report would be delivered to DEA on 23/09/2016. Proof of Delivery is contained in Appendix D1 .
65.	Laurie Terblanche (LT) of Tomis Group requested an electronic copy of the Draft Scoping Report.	Laurie Terblanche Tomis Group	Email 22/09/2016	SG sent LT the Dropbox link for the report on 22/09/2016.
66.	AM requested 4 CDs of the Draft Scoping Report be sent to her Department and marked for her attention.	Adri La Meyer Directorate: Development Facilitation Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning Western Cape Government	Email 22/09/2016	SG confirmed that 1 hardcopy and 4 CDs had been sent to AM. Proof of Delivery is contained in Appendix D1 .
67.	BS stated that no one from the Voelvllei Yacht Club would make the public meeting but that they are keen to remain informed. BS stated she had raised concerns in her previous submission and await the outcome of the meeting.	Bev le Suer Vogelvllei Yacht Club	Email 27/09/2016	Noted.
68.	Sakkie Rust (SR) acknowledged having received landowner notification with regards to the project.	Sakkie Rust Sonquas Doordrift 648 Portion 1	Acknowledg ement 27/09/2016	Noted.
69.	Aretha Visser (AVi) phoned to ask for the minutes of the first PSC meeting and for the notification email sent out for the Draft Scoping Report.	Aretha Visser Berg River Use Association	Phone call and Email 13/10/2016	SG forwarded the minutes of the PSC meeting and the notification email to AVi.
70.	IB stated that he was a surveyor and asked if he could conduct the survey for the project.	Izak JP Badenhorst	Letter 11/10/2016	D Henning replied that Nemai Consulting are only responsible for the EIA on the project. The surveyor will be appointed by DWS as part of the implementation phase.

2.1 GENERAL

No	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
71.	<p>HB stated that at the public meeting, proposals had been made and the points that were brought up were very informative. The WPALAS also emphasised that the discharge at route option 1 from the Berg River is a sore point because it is an issue and it is far from the dam and used by all people under WPALAS supervision. The cost of constructing it at discharge point 1 will be high and it will be detrimental to the two existing channels and successive accumulation of sand is already a problem for water affairs. Discharge Point 3 will be a better option than any of the other two points because it will not be a problem for the sand wells and won't be as costly. HB also drew attention to possible loss of the mountain river runoff, therefore they will have no water from the mountain river if they need it. A proposal to get the water from a catchment area at Wolseley will be much cheaper and sustainable.</p>	Hannes Bezuidenhout WPALAS	Email 22/10/2016	These points have been captured and will be forwarded to DWS for consideration. This will be taken into account in the EIA phase. It must be noted that discharge option 3 is considered to be the proposed option for the development.

2.2 AUTHORITY COMMENTS

No	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
72.	<p>HWC submitted a letter notifying that, since there is no reason to believe that the proposed water distribution lines and associated infrastructure will impact on heritage resources, no further action under Section 38 of the National Heritage Resources Act (Act 25 of 1999) is required. However, should any heritage resources, including evidence of graves and human burials, archaeological material and palaeontological material be discovered during the execution of the activities above, all works must be stopped immediately and HWC must be notified without delay.</p>	Andrew September Heritage Western Cape	Letter 30/09/2016	Noted.
73.	<p>Delmarie Stellenberg (DS) submitted a letter from the Swartland Municipality stating that the Municipality has no comments on the Draft Scoping Report.</p>	Delmarie Stellenberg Swartland Municipality	Letter 07/10/2016	Noted.
74.	<p>DEA had the following comments on the application and Draft Scoping Report:</p>	Sabelo Malaza Department of Environmental Affairs	Letter 21/10/2016	The following responses apply:

2.2 AUTHORITY COMMENTS

No	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	<p>i) Please ensure that only the relevant listed activities and sub listed activities are applied for. The activity descriptions must be specific and be linked to the listed activities and sub listed activities applied for. The listed activities and the activity descriptions must also correlate with the development activity or infrastructure as described in the project description.</p> <p>ii) You have applied for GN No. R983 activity 19(i); you are advised to consider the inclusion of activity 19(b) which caters for the maintenance activities undertaken in accordance with a maintenance management plan. This will ensure that future maintenance activities associated with the proposed development are assessed and taken into consideration during the decision making process.</p> <p>iii) Please ensure that all issues and comments received during the circulation of the SR from registered IAPs and Organs of State which have jurisdiction (including this Department's Biodiversity Section) in respect of the proposed activity are adequately addressed in the Final SR. Proof of correspondence with the various stakeholders must be included in the Final SR. Should you be unable to obtain comments, provide proof to show that the registered IAPs and Organs of States received written notification of the proposed activities. This proof may include any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Email delivery reports; • Registered mail receipts; • Courier waybills; • Signed acknowledgement of receipt; and/or any other proof as agreed upon by the competent authority. <p>The public participation process must be conducted in terms of Regulation 39, 40, 41, 42, 43 and 44 of the EIA Regulations 2014.</p> <p>iv) The final SR to be submitted to this Department must comply with all the requirements in terms of the scope of assessment and content of Scoping reports in accordance with Appendix 2 of the EIA Regulations, 2014.</p>			<p>i) All listed activities in the Application Form and Scoping Report are applied for. These activities correlate to the activity descriptions provided.</p> <p>ii) Noted. This will be forwarded to the applicant and considered.</p> <p>iii) All public participation, including proof of deliveries and email notifications, is contained in Appendix D. The public participation process was conducted in terms of Regulation 39, 40, 41, 42, 43 and 44 of the EIA Regulations 2014.</p> <p>iv) The final SR submitted to DEA complies with all the requirements in terms of the scope of assessment and content of Scoping reports in accordance with Appendix 2 of the EIA Regulations, 2014.</p>

2.2 AUTHORITY COMMENTS

No	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	<p>Further note that in terms of Regulation 45 of the EIA Regulations 2014, this application will lapse if the applicant fails to meet any of the timeframes prescribed in terms of these Regulations, unless an extension has been granted in terms of Regulation 3(7).</p>			
75.	<p>AM from the Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning (DEA&DP) Western Cape Government submitted consolidated comments on the Draft Scoping Report from various Directorates within the Department.</p> <p>1. Directorate: Development Management (Region 2) – D'mitri Matthews</p> <p>a. This directorate is of the opinion that Activity 14 of GN No R985 of 04 December 2014 is not applicable as the site is not located in a protected area in terms of the National Environmental Management: Protect Areas Act, 2003 (Act No. 57 of 2003); no environmental management framework and/or systematic biodiversity plans have been adopted by the competent authority; and the site is not located in a core area in a biosphere reserve.</p> <p>b. The EMPr to be submitted as part of the Draft EIA Report must include a Maintenance Management Plan (MMP) for future maintenance of infrastructure and/or structures located within and adjacent to the Berg River in relation to Activity 19 of GN No. R 983 of 04 December 2014. The following information must be included as part of the MMP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The frequency of maintenance activities to be carried out, in this instance the frequency of clearing sediment or any other material from the weir (i.e. during summer months or the months before the onset of winter or as a result of flooding); • The manner in which maintenance will be implemented i.e. will maintenance activities be 	<p>Adri La Meyer Directorate: Development Facilitation Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning Western Cape Government</p>	<p>Letter 25/10/2016</p>	<p>Noted. The following responses apply:</p> <p>1a. This activity will be removed from the project application and an Amended Application Form will be submitted with the Final Scoping Report to DEA.</p> <p>1b. Noted. The MMP will be included in the EMPr and include the information requested.</p> <p>2a. Noted. The engineers appointed on the project will finalise details on the energy supply for the project and this information will be included in the Draft EIA Report.</p> <p>3a. Noted.</p> <p>3b. These impacts will be assessed as part of the Aquatic Specialist Study.</p> <p>3c. Noted.</p>

2.2 AUTHORITY COMMENTS

No	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	<p>done by hand or mechanically. Method statements for each scenario must be included in the MMP;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to the site if maintenance is carried out mechanically (i.e. if existing access will be used or will a new access be created for the maintenance activity and if a new access is created, will the access be rehabilitated after maintenance activities are completed or will it be permanent; and • An appropriately scaled map that highlights the specific area where maintenance will occur, the access routes to be used and where applicable, site camp areas must be included in the MMP. <p>2. Directorate: Waste Management – Hadjira Peck</p> <p>a. This directorate awaits the Draft EIA Report to provide detailed comment. The Draft EIA Report must provide more information on the applicability of Activity 11 of GN No. R983 of 04 December 2014 and provide an assessment of impacts associated with said activity.</p> <p>3. Directorate: Pollution and Chemicals Management – Catherine Bill</p> <p>a. The need for the proposed surface water augmentation is supported and the studies resulting in the selection of this preferred option have been noted.</p> <p>b. This directorate is satisfied that the proposed specialist studies as indicated in the Plan of Study for the EIA will address potential impacts on the wetland identified during the authorities' site inspection, on aquatic biodiversity including the need for a fish way, and on the riparian habitat. These studies must also assess the impacts of the removal of vegetation from the riparian zone on the</p>			

2.2 AUTHORITY COMMENTS

No	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	<p>sediment and flow in the river and the potential for alien invasive plant invasion.</p> <p>c. With regards to the Ecological Impact Study, the removal of any protected trees and/or endangered plant species should be seen as a last resort and alternative routes should be considered.</p>			

2.3 CONCERNS RAISED

No	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
76.	<p>1) Water quality – the water that will be added from the Berg River is most likely high in nutrients and will add potentially substantially to the eutrophication of Voelvllei dam. This will result in possible algal blooms in Voelvllei dam with high treatment cost associated and the potential for the formation of bluegreen algal blooms in the dam. This needs to be clarified and the public must be given the guarantee that this scheme will not compromise water quality of potable water even further or will increase treatment cost? What data will be used to verify the eutrophication state and the occurrence of toxic algal blooms in the dam? Is the occurrence of taxi algae being monitored and if not why not? What guarantee can users of the potable water of the City of Cape Town be given that the monitoring will take place and that transparent information will be provided with regard to the occurrence of algae in the dam in the future?</p> <p>2) The Berg River is already highly regulated and the storage of additional winter water will increase the need and dependency on water stored in the dam to be released for summer use. This will further manipulate the Berg River system and control the flow in the low flow season of the river. This will lead to more deterioration of the river ecosystems.</p> <p>3) The City of Cape Town and the DWS (as users and owners of the dam) should provide evidence that the</p>	<p>Dana Grobler Blue Science</p>	<p>Email 25/10/2016</p>	<p>The following responses apply to the concerns raised:</p> <p>1) The feasibility studies included water quality studies to determine the impact of the project of the water quality in the Dam. The study found that the project would not impact on the water quality in the dam however this will be investigated in the EIA report. An aquatic and wetland assessment will be conducted whereby the concerns raised with regards to monitoring and guarantee of water users will be addressed.</p> <p>2) Noted. An aquatic and wetland assessment will be conducted and will identify the impacts to the river ecosystems as well as provide mitigation measures to be included in the EMP to minimise impacts.</p> <p>3) A WULA will be undertaken as part of the project. Both the EA and WULA will be adhered to during pre-construction, construction and operation of the proposed development. An Environmental Control Officer (ECO) will be appointed during construction to monitor compliance with the EA and WULA.</p> <p>4) The Reconciliation Strategy Study for the Western Cape Water Supply System, which includes the Berg River Dam, undertaken in 2007 concluded that water requirements would surpass system yield by about 2019. A new scheme should therefore be in place before 2019 to avoid the system running out of water.</p>

2.3 CONCERNS RAISED

No	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	<p>management of the Berg River dam is in accordance with the conditions stipulated in the license conditions and ecological Reserve determination studies on which the license was based; If further flow manipulation of the Berg River is to take place and operating rules are recommended in the EIA and ROD what guarantee is provided that these conditions will be adhered to?</p> <p>4) When was the use of the Berg River dam initiated for the City of Cape Town and when was the full capacity of the storage of the Berg River dam taken up for its planned and intended use?</p> <p>5) The options that are listed as future augmentation options for the City of Cape Town from the Breede River and other resources form part of your motivation for the current augmentation and construction of the scheme. When and how was public participation conducted (historically when these options were brought into the public domain) to inform the users in the Breede River and the public in general of the potential impacts and economic consequences of these options? Surely the economic social and environmental consequences of these options needs to be provided to allow realistic participation in the decisions to be taken?</p> <p>6) The water use verification and validation process is under way. What is the over registered volume of water use that could potentially be used to supplement the need of Cape Town instead of implementing new schemes? Over registration of water use does not permit a legal entitlement to the water?</p> <p>7) How will this decision be synchronised with the classification of the water resources that are under way for the Berg and Breede? To what degree are the outcome of the classification process going to influence the decision that are taken now for the Voelvlei augmentation? If this decision is going to pre-empt the classification outcome which ecological Reserve</p>			<p>This will be investigated further in the EIA Phase of the project.</p> <p>5) The Public Participation conducted during the Feasibility Study is well documented in reports that are available on the Department of Water and Sanitation website. For any assistance with access to the website, please contact the DWS.</p> <p>As per the EIA Regulations, only public participation directly related to the current project has been included in the Final Scoping Report. Please refer to Appendix D for the full public participation conducted as part of this application.</p> <p>6) Details about over registration (or over abstraction) will become available only at the end of the Verification and Validation exercise. In the meantime, the City of Cape Town and surrounding smaller towns urgently need augmentation of their water supply, and it would be imprudent to wait for the outcome of the Verification and Validation study before implementing the scheme.</p> <p>A WULA will be undertaken as part of the project. This will be investigated further in the EIA Phase of the project.</p> <p>7) The scheme design and operation is based on the outcome of a comprehensive Reserve determination undertaken in support of the feasibility investigations. This will be investigated further in the EIA Phase of the project.</p>

2.3 CONCERNS RAISED

No	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	determination will be used to make this decision? Which capping flows for the mainstream of the river is going to be used?			
77.	<p>Comments were submitted by Werksmans Attorneys on behalf of Bonnaire Projects (Pty) Ltd ("our client"), the landowner of two farms:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Werksman Attorneys requested to be registered as an IAP separately to Bonnaire Projects (Pty) Ltd. 2) Our client focuses on secondary and primary agriculture. Principle activities include fruit exports and farming operations. Our client farms 35ha of soft citrus on the properties that form part of the affected study area. Our client's properties have the potential for an additional 40ha of soft citrus. Our client has the registered rights to 7000m³ of water from the Benedeberg River. Over time, a wetland system has developed on and adjacent to our client's properties that is fed by a canal and from runoff from the Voelvllei Dam. The wetland system, in turn, feeds our clients dam. The pipeline runs inside or parallel to the existing canal on portion 25 of the Farm Halfgewaagd No. 73. On portion 3 of the Farm Zonquasdrift No. 1129, the first portion of the route is in or parallel to the existing canal but at the point where the canal transforms into a "sloot", the pipeline route moves westwards in a straight line towards the river. This will impact on the proposed location of our client's new pump house. 3) The width of the proposed servitudes and construction areas are not indicated in the DSR and it is therefore not possible to assess the impacts of the pipelines on our client's orchards or to get a clear picture of the impacts that the proposed pipelines and associated construction works will have on our clients farming operations. Considering the proposed pipeline diameter it is likely that the construction area and associated pipeline servitude will be significant and may be adversely impact on our client's orchards and farming operations. 	Werksman Attorneys on behalf of Bonnaire Projects (Pty) Ltd	Letter 25/10/2016	<p>The following responses apply to the concerns raised:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Werksman Attorneys has been registered as an IAP separately to Bonnaire Projects (Pty) Ltd. 2) Noted. 3) The construction servitude for the roads are 10m on each side (the access road width is approximately 6m) and the construction servitude for the pipeline is 25m on each side (the pipeline itself is 1.7m wide). The construction sites proposed are also included in the Scoping Report. Impacts of the construction servitude and pipeline will be assessed in detail in the EIA Phase of the project. An agricultural impact assessment and socio-economic assessment will be conducted for the project to adequately assess the impacts to Bonaire Projects properties. 4) As per Regulation 39(1) of the 2014 NEMA EIA Regulations, if the proponent is not the owner or person in control of the land on which the activity is to be undertaken, the proponent must, before applying for an environmental authorisation in respect of such activity, obtain written consent of the landowner or person in control of the land to undertake such activity on that land. However, this only applies if Regulation 39(2) does not apply. Regulation 39(2) states that Regulation 39(1) does not apply in respect of (a) linear activities. As this project proposes the construction of a pipeline which will impact Bonnaire Projects properties, Regulation 39(1) of the 2014 NEMA EIA Regulations does not apply and landowner consent is not required. Landowner notification was undertaken and is contained in Appendix D1. In addition, a focus group meeting was conducted with the Bonnaire Projects farms managers through the landowners and

2.3 CONCERNS RAISED

No	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	<p>4) We note furthermore that, in accordance with Regulation 39(1) of the 2014 NEMA EIA Regulations, if the proponent is not the owner or person in control of the land on which the activity is to be undertaken, the proponent must, before applying for an environmental authorisation in respect of such activity, obtain written consent of the landowner or person in control of the land to undertake such activity on that land.</p> <p>5) As the owner of land on which activities are proposed for which authorisation under NEMA is required, our instructions are to record that our client does not consent to those activities unless the impacts of the proposed activities are mitigated and/or offsets agreed, to our clients satisfaction. These conditions and proposed offsets are addressed in more detail below.</p> <p>Grounds of Objection: The ground on which our client objects to the proposed pipeline route may be summarised as follows:</p> <p>6) The DSR was preceded by a Feasibility Study which purportedly found that the Berg River-Voelvlei Augmentation Scheme option was the most favourable surface water intervention and as such DWS proposes to implement this scheme which involves the transfer of approximately 23 million m³ per annum from the Berg River to the existing Voelvlei Dam. Our client and the other IAPs had no insight into or opportunity to comment on this process which underpins the need and desirability must afford our client and other IAPs an opportunity to also consider and comment on the selection of Berg River-Voelvlei Augmentation Scheme as the preferred and purportedly most feasible option.</p> <p>7) Once the pipeline is in place, the wetland will no longer be fed through the canal and the runoff from this wetland system will no longer feed our client's dam with the effect that there will be less water available for irrigation of our client's crops.</p>			<p>the minutes of the meetings are contained in Appendix D8.</p> <p>5) Noted. Landowner consent is not required from Bonnaire Projects due to the proposed development being a linear development. Landowner notification was undertaken and is contained in Appendix D1. In addition, a focus group meeting was conducted with the Bonnaire Projects farms managers through the landowners and the minutes of the meetings are contained in Appendix D8. However, this has been forwarded to DWS for consideration.</p> <p>6) A public participation process was conducted during the Feasibility Study.</p> <p>7) Noted.</p> <p>8) Noted. An Aquatic and Wetland Assessment and an Ecological Impact Assessment will be conducted which will address potential impacts and identify species of conservation importance which require consideration.</p> <p>9) Noted.</p> <p>10) Noted. The feasibility studies included water quality studies to determine the impact of the project of the water quality in the Dam. The study found that the project would not impact on the water quality in the dam and the river, however this would be investigated in the EIA report.</p> <p>11) The upstream water level will only be approximately 0.6m higher in terms of the 1:100 year floodline with the weir in place. This will be addressed in the Aquatic and Wetland Assessment to be conducted.</p> <p>12) Noted.</p> <p>13) As discussed in the Scoping Report, a number of Specialist Studies were identified in order to address the potential impacts the proposed project may have on the receiving environment:</p>

2.3 CONCERNS RAISED

No	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	<p>8) The proposed pipeline and associated construction will also impact adversely on the wetland ecology with impacts on at least three threatened bird species and the loss of the wetland.</p> <p>9) The pipeline construction area is likely to result in the loss of a portion of our client's orchard and may also impact on our clients farming operations during the construction phase.</p> <p>10) Our client will need to incur costs to install a pump and pipeline to abstract water from the Berg River and pump it to its dam. It cannot be disputed that the Berg River's water quality is considerably worse than the water stored in our client's dam which derives from the Voelvlei Dam and is filtered through the wetland system before finding its way into our client's dam. This will adversely affect the quality of our client's irrigation water and ultimately place its crops at risk considering the poor quality of the Berg River's water.</p> <p>11) The construction of the weir may also cause flooding on our clients Zonquadrift farm and this requires proper assessment by a reputable specialist.</p> <p>12) The proposed pipeline route will traverse the Zonquadrift farm at a location reserved by our client for its new pump house.</p> <p>13) There are a number of material impacts which are not identified for specialist's assessment and, in this sense, the DSR and Plan of Study for EIA needs to be supplemented and re-circulated for public and stakeholder consideration. The following impacts require independent specialist assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The fauna (including avifauna) impacts caused by construction noise and the loss of wetland habitat as a result of the construction activities and the impacts of the pipeline on the wetland habitat; b. Dust impacts on orchards and crops during construction phase; 			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. An Ecological Impact Assessment will be conducted on the fauna (including avifauna) which will assess the impacts caused by construction noise and the loss of wetland habitat as a result of the construction activities and the impacts of the pipeline on the wetland habitat. This will be included in the EIA Report b. Mitigation measures will be included in the EMPR to address the dust impacts on orchards and crops during construction phase. c. An Aquatic and Wetland Assessment will be conducted to address the freshwater ecology. This will be included in the EIA Report. d. A floodline study was conducted during the feasibility stage of the project. This study found that the upstream water level will only be approximately 0.6m higher in terms of the 1:100 year floodline with the weir in place. e. Noted. This will be taken into account in the socio-economic study. <p>14) Noted.</p> <p>Due to time constraints, it is not possible to arrange a meeting before submitting the Final Scoping Report. However, the engineer and the applicant will aim to engage with this landowner further in the EIA phase.</p>

2.3 CONCERNS RAISED

No	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
	<p>c. A specialist freshwater ecological assessment</p> <p>d. A proper, specialist floodline determination and assessment of the potential for flooding that may be caused by the proposed weir and associated infrastructure; and</p> <p>e. The socio-economic impact assessment must take into consideration and assess the impacts on our client and its employee's rights and interests considering the impacts that will be caused to its operations as outlined above.</p> <p>14) These are our client's preliminary grounds of objection and points of concern for further consideration by the EAP. Our client reserves the right to supplement and add to these grounds of objection once further clarity and detail in respect of the impacts becomes available.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the reasons motivated above, we submit that the DSR must be supplemented in the respects identified so as to avoid the impacts or propose adequate mitigation measures. • Additional alternative pipeline routes must be identified and assessed. • Finally, we record that our client wishes to engage with the applicant in order to discuss and interrogate the available alternatives and mitigation measures and the nature and form that the development will take and we would invite you to consult and engage with our client before finalising the Final Scoping Report. 			

2.4 FOCUS GROUP MEETING 01

No	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
78.	Julian Joubert (JJ) asked how long construction would last.	Julian Joubert Zonquasdrift 1129 Portion 5	Focus Group Meeting 27/09/2016	Donavan Henning (DH) of Nema Consulting stated that construction may last approximately 18 months.

2.4 FOCUS GROUP MEETING 01

No	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
79.	<p>JJ explained that the vineyards start growing from September and that dust from the dirt roads close to the vegetation which impacts the growth. JJ further explained that dustix (a combination of polymer and water) is used on the roads to bind the soil and prevent dust clouds which may work better than dust suppression through the use of water.</p> <p>JJ raised a concern about security between farm labourers and construction crew, noise and visual impacts.</p>	<p>Julian Joubert Zonquasdrift 1129 Portion 5</p>	<p>Focus Group Meeting 27/09/2016</p>	<p>DH stated that an EMPr will recommend best practices be used for the dust suppression on the access roads during construction in order to ensure that there are no adverse impacts to the vineyards.</p> <p>DH explained that security would also be included in the EMPr and the social team will consider the issue raised about the interaction between farm labourers and construction labourers.</p> <p>In addition, DH explained that there would be no visual or noise impacts during the operational phase of the project to JJ's farm.</p>
80.	<p>JJ voiced concern that the project would exacerbate flooding events as in winter the Berg River currently overflows into vineyards and also impacts buildings and infrastructure on his property.</p>	<p>Julian Joubert Zonquasdrift 1129 Portion 5</p>	<p>Focus Group Meeting 27/09/2016</p>	<p>DH explained that feasibility studies were conducted and severe flood events were evaluated to determine the 1:100 year floodline. DH further explained that the weir will not have an impact that will exacerbate the flooding events as the weir design incorporates a hopper and jet jumps that serve to minimise any potential rise of upstream water levels.</p>
81.	<p>JJ asked about the timeframes for the EIA process and when construction was expected to start.</p>	<p>Julian Joubert Zonquasdrift 1129 Portion 5</p>	<p>Focus Group Meeting 27/09/2016</p>	<p>DH stated that the EIA process would take about a year and that construction was expected to start in 2018.</p>
82.	<p>JJ asked whether the feasibility studies including the flood modelling are available to the public</p>	<p>Julian Joubert Zonquasdrift 1129 Portion 5</p>	<p>Focus Group Meeting 27/09/2016</p>	<p>DH stated that the reports are on the DWS website.</p>
83.	<p>JJ enquired about what would happen if flooding was linked to the weir.</p>	<p>Julian Joubert Zonquasdrift 1129 Portion 5</p>	<p>Focus Group Meeting 27/09/2016</p>	<p>DH explained that if there was significant damage caused to a landowner's property, a legitimate claim can be made against DWS.</p> <p>DH explained that in smaller flood levels, more water would be taken from the river so the flooding events would not be as severe. DH explained that during the summer months, there would be no difference in the water levels as there would be insignificant streamflow during summer.</p>

2.5 FOCUS GROUP MEETING 02

No	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
84.	Kai-Uwe Molzahn (KM) asked how high the weir would be as storage of water may cause flooding.	Kai-Uwe Molzahn Zonquasdrift 1129 Portion 0	Focus Group Meeting 27/09/2016	DH explained that the height of the weir was not known at this stage but that the weir would not have storage ability as it was designed to be notched to allow flow through the weir without inundation.
85.	KM stated that he was concerned about the summer months and asked if the river level would be lifted as a result of the project as he had a pump station on one of the other properties. KM explained that his pump station would need to be removed during summer months if river levels were raised as a result of the project.	Kai-Uwe Molzahn Zonquasdrift 1129 Portion 0	Focus Group Meeting 27/09/2016	DH confirmed that there would be minimal change to the river levels as the project was designed to maintain the current flow of the river. However, any impact on his pump station will be investigated further in the EIA Phase.
86.	KM stated that one of the roads proposed to be used as an access road during construction is currently an issue due to the public using it as a detour road rather than using the road past Voëlvelei Dam which impacts the quality of the dirt road.	Kai-Uwe Molzahn Zonquasdrift 1129 Portion 0	Focus Group Meeting 27/09/2016	Noted.
87.	KM asked about the timeframes for the project.	Kai-Uwe Molzahn Zonquasdrift 1129 Portion 0	Focus Group Meeting 27/09/2016	DH stated that the applicant aimed to start construction by 2018 in order for the project to be operating by 2020.
88.	KM stated that he had not received the email notification of the 30 day review period or the public meeting.	Kai-Uwe Molzahn Zonquasdrift 1129 Portion 0	Focus Group Meeting 27/09/2016	SG resent the email notification on 28/09/2016.

2.6 FOCUS GROUP MEETING 03

No	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
89.	Rudolf Grobler (RG) stated that his main concern was with the summer release as the releases may influence the location of the existing pump which is in a part of the river where there is a pool that he doesn't want to dry up.	Rudolf Grobler Zonquasdrift 1129 Portion 3 Half Gewaagd 73 Portion 25	Focus Group Meeting 27/09/2016	Noted, the concern will be raised with the Engineers.
90.	RG asked if they would be able to keep sourcing water from the canal, if possible.	Rudolf Grobler Zonquasdrift 1129 Portion 3 Half Gewaagd 73 Portion 25	Focus Group Meeting 27/09/2016	DH stated that Nema Consulting would forward the request to DWS. This will be taken into account in the EIA phase.
91.	RG asked what would happen to the wetland.	Rudolf Grobler Zonquasdrift 1129 Portion 3 Half Gewaagd 73 Portion 25	Focus Group Meeting 27/09/2016	DH explained that the wetland would dry up if the canal leaks are what feed the wetland and the canal is no longer operational. This will need to be confirmed by the Aquatic

2.6 FOCUS GROUP MEETING 03

No	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
				and Wetland Specialist. DH also explained that the existing servitude for the canal would not apply to the pipeline.
92.	RG requested that the pipeline run as close to the canal as possible in order to minimise the disturbance to the land. RG also asked whether the pipeline could be within the footprint of the canal.	Rudolf Grobler Zonquasdrift 1129 Portion 3 Half Gewaagd 73 Portion 25	Focus Group Meeting 27/09/2016	DH stated that the canal belongs to the District Municipality and it is not planned for the pipeline to be built in the footprint of the canal.
93.	RG asked about the possible impacts to the water level as a result of the proposed weir.	Rudolf Grobler Zonquasdrift 1129 Portion 3 Half Gewaagd 73 Portion 25	Focus Group Meeting 27/09/2016	DH explained that the upstream water level will only be approximately 0.6m higher in terms of the 1:100 year floodline with the weir in place.
94.	RG stated that he is not against the project but just wants it to be done in the right way.	Rudolf Grobler Zonquasdrift 1129 Portion 3 Half Gewaagd 73 Portion 25	Focus Group Meeting 27/09/2016	Noted.

2.7 FOCUS GROUP MEETING 04

No	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
95.	Arno Vlok (AV) explained that with regards to the water quality in the dam in relation to the discharge points, option 1 should be the preferred option based on the prevailing wind direction. AV explained that the wind would push the polluted Berg River water discharged from the option 1 to the north of the dam and keep it there, therefore the water in the rest of the dam would remain clean.	Arno Vlok Half Gewaagd Portion 10 Sonquas Doordrift 647 Portion 2	Focus Group Meeting 27/09/2016	Noted.
96.	AV stated that he was concerned about the location of his pump station and asked whether his pump would be affected by the summer release point.	Arno Vlok Half Gewaagd Portion 10 Sonquas Doordrift 647 Portion 2	Focus Group Meeting 27/09/2016	DH explained that the weir would not prevent water from flowing during the summer months however his concern will be raised with the Engineers.
97.	AV stated that he would prefer if the weir did back water up during summer as it would protect his pump by keeping the location full of water.	Arno Vlok Half Gewaagd Portion 10 Sonquas Doordrift 647 Portion 2	Focus Group Meeting 27/09/2016	Noted.
98.	AV asked what would happen to the spoil generated and stated that he would be willing to take some of the spoil material.	Arno Vlok Half Gewaagd Portion 10 Sonquas Doordrift 647 Portion 2	Focus Group Meeting 27/09/2016	DH stated that this would be forwarded to DWS for consideration. This will be taken into account in the EIA phase.

2.7 FOCUS GROUP MEETING 04

No	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
99.	AV wanted to confirm the exact location of the weir due to the bedrock in the river and asked about the methodology for the construction of the weir due to possible diversion onto his property.	Arno Vlok Half Gewaargd Portion 10 Sonquas Doordrift 647 Portion 2	Focus Group Meeting 27/09/2016	DH explained that the method of construction will be confirmed with the Engineers and will be fully explained in the EIA report.
100.	AV asked about the timeframes for the project.	Arno Vlok Half Gewaargd Portion 10 Sonquas Doordrift 647 Portion 2	Focus Group Meeting 27/09/2016	DH stated that construction was expected to start in 2018 and the pipeline to be operational by end of 2020.

2.8 FOCUS GROUP MEETING 05

No	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
101.	SR explained that during the construction of the existing water pipes on the property, the agricultural land was rehabilitated improperly which impacted on the farming operations. SR emphasised that this must not happen again.	Sakkie Rust Sonquas Doordrift 648 Portion 1	Focus Group Meeting 27/09/2016	DH noted that provision will be made in the EMPr to reinstate the areas affected by construction activities.
102.	SR explained that he intends to plant citrus in the area that will be affected by the proposed pipeline. SR stated that he is not willing to plant on the servitude due to the pipeline maintenance, which will disturb the land he has planted on.	Sakkie Rust Sonquas Doordrift 648 Portion 1	Focus Group Meeting 27/09/2016	Noted.
103.	SR proposed that his existing water allocation be increased by DWS in exchange for the loss of land due to the project, which would allow him to increase his citrus farming and would have socio-economic benefits in terms of creating more employment opportunities.	Sakkie Rust Sonquas Doordrift 648 Portion 1	Focus Group Meeting 27/09/2016	DH stated that this request would be forwarded to DWS for their consideration. This will be taken into account in the EIA phase.
104.	SR stated that he understood the need for the project, as the absence of storage would mean high water flows are lost.	Sakkie Rust Sonquas Doordrift 648 Portion 1	Focus Group Meeting 27/09/2016	Noted.
105.	SR emphasised that existing farming infrastructure must be avoided close to the weir site.	Sakkie Rust Sonquas Doordrift 648 Portion 1	Focus Group Meeting 27/09/2016	Noted.
106.	SR recommended the best routes for the access roads, which included a combination of the existing options.	Sakkie Rust Sonquas Doordrift 648 Portion 1	Focus Group Meeting 27/09/2016	These route recommendations will be forwarded to the Engineers for consideration. This will be taken into account in the EIA phase.

2.9 PUBLIC MEETING 01

No	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
107.	HB stated that the public were interested in the overall impact of the project, as there is currently not enough water in the Berg River.	Hannes Beziudenhout	Public Meeting 01 04/10/2016	Noted.
108.	AV asked how long the weir would extend onto his property and where the end point would be.	Arno Vlok	Public Meeting 01 04/10/2016	DH stated that a map would be compiled that would show the weir footprint on this property.
109.	AV enquired about the effect of decreasing the water level in the river and dam. He also asked how the weir would influence the flow of water.	Arno Vlok	Public Meeting 01 04/10/2016	DH explained that the weir has been designed as a low structure with a series of notches in it to minimise the impact of inundation. He noted that the weir is designed to allow for a certain base flow to pass the site at all times to cater for downstream water users as well as the Ecological Water Requirements (EWR).
110.	ABVS mentioned that the water quality of the Berg River needed to be taken into consideration, particularly the high sediment loads following rainfall events.	Abri van Santen	Public Meeting 01 04/10/2016	Bertrand van Zyl (BvZ) from DWS explained the operating rule that had been employed on another scheme to deal with high levels of sedimentation. DH indicated that sediments would be managed through the abstraction works.
111.	HB mentioned the low water levels in the dam and indicated that water is not available from the Berg River in the summer months, which is the period during which it is most needed in the dam.	Hannes Beziudenhout	Public Meeting 01 04/10/2016	DH explained that the overall operating rule for the system is that only surplus winter water would be abstracted. He further noted that augmenting the dam would allow for additional water to be abstracted to supply demands. BvZ indicated that further Phases of augmenting the Voëlvele Dam would involve increased abstraction from the Berg River with additional storage being made available in the dam by means of a low raising of the existing dam wall.
112.	AV asked about the costs of running the pump station.	Arno Vlok	Public Meeting 01 04/10/2016	BvZ explained that the costs are estimated at around 2 to 3 million Rand per year.
113.	ABVS asked about storing water in cleaner rivers such as the Breede River, Boontjies River and Kleinberg River. He also stated that wind energy could be used to pump this water.	Abri van Santen	Public Meeting 01 04/10/2016	BvZ explained that various options had been considered, however, those options mentioned are not viable at present.
114.	SR enquired about the depth of the pipeline.	Sakkie Rust	Public Meeting 01 04/10/2016	DH indicated that the average depth for the pipeline is about 3.5 m with a minimum cover of 1 m. He noted that the trench backfill will be compacted.

2.9 PUBLIC MEETING 01

No	COMMENT / QUERY / ISSUE	RAISED BY	SOURCE	RESPONSE
115.	SR suggested alternative routes for the access road based on his knowledge of the area and risks from flooding. He also stated that option 1 for the access road would be costly.	Sakkie Rust	Public Meeting 01 04/10/2016	DH stated that the alternative routes suggested will be considered by the project team.
116.	ABVS asked whether phase 2 would include the raising of the weir structure.	Abri van Santen	Public Meeting 01 04/10/2016	BvZ indicated that it would not.
117.	ABVS enquired about the dimension of the pipeline and the pipe material to be used.	Abri van Santen	Public Meeting 01 04/10/2016	DH stated that the pipeline would be between 1.7m and 1.9m in diameter and the material would either be Glass Fibre Reinforced Plastics or Ductile Iron.
118.	Ryno Rademeyer (RR) asked about the construction timeframes.	Ryno Rademeyer	Public Meeting 01 04/10/2016	DH explained that according to the planning, DWS had intended to start augmenting the Western Cape Water Supply System by 2020. This suggests a construction period of approximately three years.
119.	JH Smuts (JHS) asked about the impacts to the farms and properties on the lower (east) side of the Berg River who rely on the river as a water source. She indicated that this will also affect her long term-planning for the farm.	JH Smuts	Public Meeting 01 04/10/2016	DH indicated that in terms of the National Water Act of 1998, the existing water uses downstream of the weir as well as the EWR were catered for during the planning of the scheme.