

Comments and Response Report Khobab Switching Station

Draft Basic Assessment

July/August 2021

No.	Date	Author	Type	Comment	Response
1.	9 July 2021	Natasha Higgitt SAHRA	Email	<p>Good afternoon,</p> <p>Please note that all development applications are processed via our online portal, the South African Heritage Resources Information System (SAHRIS) found at the following link: http://sahra.org.za/sahris/. We do not accept emailed, posted, hardcopy, faxed, website links or DropBox links as official submissions.</p> <p>Please create separate applications for each development on SAHRIS and upload all documents pertaining to the Environmental Authorisation Application Process. As per section 24(4)b(iii) of NEMA and section 38(8) of the National Heritage Resources Act, Act 25 of 1999 (NHRA), an assessment of heritage resources must form part of the process and the assessment must comply with section 38(3) of the NHRA.</p> <p>Once all documents including all appendices are uploaded to the case applications, please ensure that the status of the cases is changed from DRAFT to SUBMITTED. Please ensure that all documents produced as part of the EA process are submitted as part of the application.</p>	<p>All documents were submitted via SAHRIS on the 2021/07/09. (Official comment provided under heading no.10 here below).</p>
2.	12 July 2021	John Geeringh Eskom	Email	<p>Please find attached Eskom general requirements for works at or near Eskom infrastructure. Please send me KMZ files of the proposed grid connections.</p> <p>TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN</p> <p>Eskom requirements for work in or near Eskom servitudes.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Eskom's rights and services must be acknowledged and respected at all times. 2. Eskom shall at all times retain unobstructed access to and egress from its servitudes. 3. Eskom's consent does not relieve the developer from obtaining the necessary statutory, land owner or municipal approvals. 4. Any cost incurred by Eskom as a result of non-compliance to any relevant environmental legislation will be charged to the developer. 5. If Eskom has to incur any expenditure in order to comply with statutory clearances or other regulations as a result of the developer's activities or because of the presence of his equipment or installation within the servitude restriction area, the developer shall pay such costs to Eskom on demand. 6. The use of explosives of any type within 500 metres of Eskom's services shall only occur with Eskom's previous written permission. If such permission 	<p>Thank you for the Eskom requirements.</p> <p>The requirements have been shared with the Applicant, who has confirmed that Eskom's requirements and setbacks will be taken into consideration during the final detail design of the facility.</p> <p>These requirements have also been added to the EMPr.</p>

No.	Date	Author	Type	Comment	Response
				<p>is granted the developer must give at least fourteen working days prior notice of the commencement of blasting. This allows time for arrangements to be made for supervision and/or precautionary instructions to be issued in terms of the blasting process. It is advisable to make application separately in this regard.</p> <p>7. Changes in ground level may not infringe statutory ground to conductor clearances or statutory visibility clearances. After any changes in ground level, the surface shall be rehabilitated and stabilised so as to prevent erosion. The measures taken shall be to Eskom's satisfaction.</p> <p>8. Eskom shall not be liable for the death of or injury to any person or for the loss of or damage to any property whether as a result of the encroachment or of the use of the servitude area by the developer, his/her agent, contractors, employees, successors in title, and assignees. The developer indemnifies Eskom against loss, claims or damages including claims pertaining to consequential damages by third parties and whether as a result of damage to or interruption of or interference with Eskom's services or apparatus or otherwise. Eskom will not be held responsible for damage to the developer's equipment.</p> <p>9. No mechanical equipment, including mechanical excavators or high lifting machinery, shall be used in the vicinity of Eskom's apparatus and/or services, without prior written permission having been granted by Eskom. If such permission is granted the developer must give at least seven working days' notice prior to the commencement of work. This allows time for arrangements to be made for supervision and/or precautionary instructions to be issued by the relevant Eskom Manager</p> <p>Note: Where and electrical outage is required, at least fourteen work days are required to arrange it.</p> <p>10. Eskom's rights and duties in the servitude shall be accepted as having prior right at all times and shall not be obstructed or interfered with.</p> <p>11. Under no circumstances shall rubble, earth or other material be dumped within the servitude restriction area. The developer shall maintain the area concerned to Eskom's satisfaction. The developer shall be liable to Eskom for the cost of any remedial action which has to be carried out by Eskom.</p> <p>12. The clearances between Eskom's live electrical equipment and the proposed construction work shall be observed as stipulated by Regulation 15 of the Electrical Machinery Regulations of the Occupational Health and Safety Act, 1993 (Act 85 of 1993).</p> <p>13. Equipment shall be regarded electrically live and therefore dangerous at all times.</p> <p>14. In spite of the restrictions stipulated by Regulation 15 of the Electrical Machinery Regulations of the Occupational Health and Safety Act, 1993 (Act 85 of 1993), as an additional safety precaution, Eskom will not approve the erection of houses, or structures occupied or frequented by human beings, under the power lines or within the servitude restriction area.</p>	

No.	Date	Author	Type	Comment	Response
				<p>15. Eskom may stipulate any additional requirements to highlight any possible exposure to Customers or Public to coming into contact or be exposed to any dangers of Eskom plant.</p> <p>16. It is required of the developer to familiarise himself with all safety hazards related to Electrical plant.</p> <p>17. Any third party servitudes encroaching on Eskom servitudes shall be registered against Eskom's title deed at the developer's own cost. If such a servitude is brought into being, its existence should be endorsed on the Eskom servitude deed concerned, while the third party's servitude deed must also include the rights of the affected Eskom servitude.</p>	
3.	16 July 2021	Riana Lock Hantam Municipality Calvinia	Email	<p>Good day Genie</p> <p>Hantam Municipality want to register as affected party on the proposed environmental authorisation for the Kokerboom 1, 2 and 3 transmissions lines.</p> <p>Regards</p>	<p>Good morning Riana</p> <p>Thank you for your response. I can confirm that the Hantam Municipality is on our database- Mr Jan Swartz, the Municipal Manager, as well as yourself representing Town Planning, as registered I&APs. We also have Mr Noel Viljoen under our list of authority contacts.</p> <p>Kind regards</p>
	19 July 2021	Riana Lock Hantam Municipality Calvinia	Email	<p>Good day Genie</p> <p>Please replace mr. Viljoen with mr. Garth Matthys. Mr. Viljoen resign at Hantam Municipality.</p> <p>Regards</p> <p>Riana Lock</p>	<p>Thank you Riana – we will update our databases accordingly.</p> <p>Kind regards Genie</p>
4.	19 July 2021	Lydia Kutu Integrated Environmental Authorisations: Coordination, Strategic Planning and Support	Email	<p>Dear Sir/Madam</p> <p>ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RECEIPT OF THE NEW APPLICATION FOR ENVIRONMENTAL AUTHORISATION (BASIC ASSESSMENT PROCESS) AND BASIC ASSESSMENT REPORT FOR THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF KHOBAB SWITCHING STATION NEAR LOERIESFONTEIN, IN THE NORTHERN CAPE PROVINCE.</p> <p>The Department confirms having received the Application form and draft Basic Assessment Report for Environmental Authorisation for the abovementioned project on 09 July 2021. You have submitted these documents to comply with the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations, 2014, as amended.</p> <p>Kindly note that your application for Environmental Authorisation falls within the ambit of an application applied for in terms of Part 2 of Chapter 4 of the</p>	<p>The provisions of the acknowledgement of receipt of the application for Environmental Authorisation are acknowledged. The application for Environmental Authorisation will be undertaken in terms of Part 2 of Chapter 4 of the EIA Regulations, 2014, as amended; Regulation 19 of the EIA Regulations, 2014, as amended; Regulation 40(3) of the EIA Regulations, 2014, as amended; Regulation 45 of the EIA Regulations, 2014, as amended; and duly note that no activity may commence prior to an Environmental Authorisation as per Section 24F of the NEMA, Act No. 107 of 1998, as amended.</p>

No.	Date	Author	Type	Comment	Response
				<p>EIA Regulations, 2014, as amended. You are therefore referred to Regulation 19 of the EIA Regulations, 2014 as amended.</p> <p>Please take note of Regulation 40(3) of the EIA Regulations, 2014, as amended, which states that potential Interested & Affected Parties, including the Competent Authority, may be provided with an opportunity to comment on reports and plans contemplated in Regulation 40(1) of the EIA Regulations, 2014, as amended, prior to the submission of an application but must be provided an opportunity to comment on such reports once an application has been submitted to the Competent Authority.</p> <p>Note that in terms of Regulation 45 of the EIA Regulations, 2014, as amended, this application will lapse if the applicant fails to meet any of the time-frames prescribed in terms of these Regulations, unless an extension has been granted by the Department in terms of Regulation 3(7) of the EIA Regulations, 2014, as amended.</p> <p>You are hereby reminded of Section 24F of the National Environmental Management Act, Act No. 107 of 1998, as amended, that no activity may commence prior to an Environmental Authorisation being granted by the Department.</p> <p>Kind Regards, Lydia Kutu</p>	
5.	21 July 2021	Lizell Stroh Civil Aviation Authority	Email	<p>Good day Genie, kindly please follow the SACAA obstacle application process, to grant approval with Conditions to the proposed Kokerboom Transmission line..</p> <p>http://www.caa.co.za/Pages/Default.aspx</p> <p>http://www.caa.co.za/Pages/Obstacles/Urgent-notice.aspx</p> <p>http://www.caa.co.za/Obstacles%20Forms/CA139-27.pdf</p> <p>Kindly provide a .kml (Google Earth) file reflecting the footprint of the proposed overhead electric power line route that will evacuate the generated power to the national grid.</p> <p>Also indicate the highest structure of the project & the Overhead electric power transmission line.</p>	<p>Dear Lizell,</p> <p>Please find attached herewith the a .kml file reflecting the footprint of the proposed Kokerboom 4 overhead electric power line route and Khobab switching station that will evacuate the generated power to the national grid.</p> <p>The highest structure on the project will be up to 32m in height.</p> <p>Also please find attached herewith the updated Initial Obstacle Limitation Surface Assessment Report for the Kokerboom 3 and Kokerboom 4 Wind Energy Facility and Kokerboom 1, 2 and 3 Transmission Lines, Switching Stations (including the new Khobab Switching Station).</p> <p>The SACAA obstacle application process, to grant approval with Conditions to the proposed Kokerboom Transmission lines and associated grid connection infrastructure will be undertaken by the applicant, i.e. Business Venture Investments No 1733 (Pty) Ltd external to the EIA process. SACAA approval (to the extent required) will be obtained before construction commences.</p> <p>Kind regards</p>
6.	21 July 2021	Nicole Abrahams SANRAL	Email	Dear Genie De Waal	SANRAL registered as I&AP.




No.	Date	Author	Type	Comment	Response
				<p>The above listed project bears reference. The South African National Roads Agency SOC Limited (SANRAL) has received background information and could be impacted by the proposed development. I therefore would like to register SANRAL as I&AP.</p> <p>Do not hesitate to contact the sender should you have any further queries.</p> <p>I trust that you will find the above in order.</p>	
7.	26 July 2021	Shalot Sekonko DFFE Directorate: Biodiversity Conservation		<p>Dear Sir/Madam</p> <p>DFFE Directorate: Biodiversity Conservation hereby acknowledge receipt of the invitation to review and comment on the proposed Kokerboom 1,2,3 and 4 transmission lines, switching station and khobab switching station, near Loeriesfontein, Northern Cape . Kindly note that the project has been allocated to Ms Rabothata (both copied on this email) and myself.</p> <p>Please note: All Public Participation Process documents related to Biodiversity EIA review and any other Biodiversity EIA queries will be submitted to the Directorate: Biodiversity Conservation at Email: BCAdmin@environment.gov.za for the attention of Mr Seoka Lekota.</p> <p>Regards Ms Sekonko</p>	<p>Thanks for acknowledging receipt of the invitation to review and comment on the proposed Kokerboom 1,2,3 and 4 transmission lines, switching station and Khobab switching station, near Loeriesfontein, Northern Cape .</p>
8.	26 July 2021	Sabelo Malaza DFFE Directorate: Integrated Environmental Authorisations	Email	<p>This letter serves to inform you that the following information must be included to the final BAR:</p> <p>Listed Activities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that all relevant listed activities are applied for, are specific and can be linked to the development activity or infrastructure as described in the project description. Only activities applicable to the development must be applied for and assessed. In addition, the onus is on the applicant and the environmental assessment practitioner (EAP) to ensure that all the applicable listed activities are included in the application form. Failure to do so may result in unnecessary delays in the processing of the application. • If the activities applied for in the application form differ from those mentioned in the final BAR, an amended application form must be submitted. Please note that the Department's application form template has been amended and can be downloaded from the following link https://www.environment.gov.za/documents/forms. <p>Cumulative Assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It has been noted on page 18-19 of the draft BAR that there are renewable energy projects within a 30km radius of the proposed 	<p>All comments/actions listed below were made to the final BAR report/application.</p> <p>Listed Activities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All relevant listed activities have been applied for and specifically linked to the development activity (infrastructure components) as described in the project description. • Updated application submitted with the final BAR, to ensure alignment between the BAR and application form. <p>Cumulative Assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The cumulative impact assessment for all identified and assessed impacts have been refined to indicate the following:

No.	Date	Author	Type	Comment	Response
				<p>development site, the cumulative impact assessment for all identified and assessed impacts must be refined to indicate the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identified cumulative impacts must be clearly defined. - Detailed process flow and proof must be provided, to indicate how the specialist's recommendations, mitigation measures and conclusions from the various similar developments in the area were taken into consideration in the assessment of cumulative impacts and when the conclusion and mitigation measures were drafted for this project. - The cumulative impacts significance rating must also inform the need and desirability of the proposed development. - A cumulative impact environmental statement on whether the proposed development must proceed. <p>Specialist studies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that specialist studies where applicable comply with the requirements of GN 320 of 20 March 2020 and GN 1150 of 30 October 2020 unless proof is provided that indicates that the specialist study was commissioned within 50 days after the date of gazetting of the notice i.e. 20 March 2020 and was commissioned prior to 30 October 2020 respectively. <p>Undertaking of an Oath</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Department has noted that the submitted application form has an undertaking under oath or affirmation by the EAP. However, the aforementioned oath was not included in the draft BAR, but rather an appendix of the application form attached to the BAR. Please note that the final BAR must also have an undertaking under oath/ affirmation by the EAP. • Based on the above, you are therefore required to include an undertaking under oath or affirmation by the EAP (administered by a Commissioner of Oaths) as per Appendix 1(3)(r) of the NEMA EIA Regulations, 2014, as amended, which states that the BAR must include: “an undertaking under oath or affirmation by the EAP in relation to: (i). the correctness of the information provided in the reports; (ii). the inclusion of comments and inputs from stakeholders and I&APs; (iii). the inclusion of inputs and recommendations from the specialist reports where relevant; and (iv). any information provided by the EAP to interested and affected parties and any responses by the EAP to comments or inputs made by interested and affected parties”. <p>Public Participation Process (PPP)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please ensure that comments from all relevant stakeholders are submitted to the Department with the final BAR. This includes but not 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clearly defined cumulative impacts. - Process flow and proof to indicate how the specialist's recommendations, mitigation measures and conclusions from the various similar developments in the area were taken into consideration in the assessment of cumulative impacts and when the conclusion and mitigation measures were drafted for this project. - Cumulative impacts significance rating informed the need and desirability of the proposed development. - A cumulative impact environmental statement on whether the proposed development must proceed. <p>Specialist studies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The specialist studies comply with the requirements of GN 320 of 20 March 2020 and GN 1150 of 30 October 2020. <p>Undertaking of an Oath</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The final BAR has an undertaking under oath/ affirmation by the EAP which include: “an undertaking under oath or affirmation by the EAP in relation to: (i). the correctness of the information provided in the reports; (ii). the inclusion of comments and inputs from stakeholders and I&APs; (iii). the inclusion of inputs and recommendations from the specialist reports where relevant; and (iv). any information provided by the EAP to interested and affected parties and any responses by the EAP to comments or inputs made by interested and affected parties”. <p>Public Participation Process (PPP)</p>

No.	Date	Author	Type	Comment	Response
				<p>limited to the Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment (DFFE); Biodiversity Planning and Conservation; Department of Environment and Nature Conservation: Northern Cape; SANDF (Department of Defence); Department of Agriculture, Land Reform & Rural Development, Northern Cape; Department of Water and Sanitation (DWS); Deputy Director Lower Orange Water Management Authority (WMA); Khai-Ma Local Municipality; Hantam Local Municipality; Namakwa District Municipality; ESKOM; South African Astronomical Observatory (SAAO); Transnet; South African National Roads Agency (SANRAL); South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA); South African Large Telescope (SALT); Square Kilometre Array (SKA); Mainstream Asset Management South Africa; South African Bat Assessment Association (SABAA); African Clean Energy Developments(Pty) Ltd (ACED); Endangered Wildlife Trust (EWT)-Wildlife Energy Programme and Wildlife and Environment Society of South Africa (WESSA).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Furthermore, ensure that all issues raised and comments received during the circulation of the draft BAR from registered I&APs and organs of state which have jurisdiction in respect of the proposed activity are adequately addressed in the final BAR. • Proof of correspondence with the various stakeholders must be included in the final BAR. This must indicate that this draft BAR has been subjected to 30 days public participation process, stating the start and end date of the PPP. Should you be unable to obtain comments, proof must be submitted to the Department of the attempts that were made to obtain comments. • The Public Participation Process must be conducted in terms of Regulations 39, 40 41, 42, 43 & 44 of the EIA Regulations 2014, as amended. <p>General</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please also ensure that the Final BAR includes the period for which the Environmental Authorisation is required and the date on which the activity will be concluded as per the Appendix 1(3)(1)(q) of the NEMA EIA Regulations, 2014, as amended. • You are further reminded to comply with Regulation 19(1)(a) of the NEMA EIA Regulations, 2014, as amended, which states that: • “Where basic assessment must be applied to an application, the applicant must, within 90 days of receipt of the application by the competent authority, submit to the competent authority - • (a) a basic assessment report, inclusive of specialist reports, an EMPr, and where applicable a closure plan, which have been subjected to a public participation process of at least 30 days and which reflects the incorporation of comments received, including any comments of the competent authority.” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment from all relevant stakeholders were requested and all received comments are included in this CRR and submitted to the Department with the final BAR. Proof of notification and attempts to obtain comment are included in Annexure C of the final BAR. • All issues raised and comments received during the circulation of the draft BAR from registered I&APs and organs of state are adequately addressed in the final BAR. • Proof of correspondence with the various stakeholders have been included in the final BAR. Proof of the attempts that were made to obtain comments are submitted with the final BAR to the Department. • The Public Participation Process has been be conducted in terms of Regulations 39, 40 41, 42, 43 & 44 of the EIA Regulations 2014, as amended. <p>General</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Final BAR includes the period for which the Environmental Authorisation is required (10 years) and the date on which the activity will be concluded as per the Appendix 1(3)(1)(q) of the NEMA EIA Regulations, 2014, as amended (a construction period of no longer than 18 months is expected), • In accordance to Regulation 19(1)(a) of the NEMA EIA Regulations, 2014, as amended: this basic assessment report will be submitted within 90 days of receipt of the application by the competent authority. The basic assessment report includes specialist reports, an EMPr, (closure plan not applicable), which have been subjected to a public participation process of 31 days. It also reflects the incorporation of comments received, including comments of the competent authority. No significant changes or new information has been added to the BAR or EMPr which changes or information was not contained in the reports or plans consulted on during the initial public participation process.

No.	Date	Author	Type	Comment	Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should there be significant changes or new information that has been added to the BAR or EMPr which changes or information was not contained in the reports or plans consulted on during the initial public participation process, you are therefore required to comply with Regulation 19(b) of the NEMA EIA Regulations, 2014, as amended, which states: • “the applicant must, within 90 days of receipt of the application by the competent authority, submit to the competent authority – (b) a notification in writing that the basic assessment report, inclusive of specialist reports an EMPr, and where applicable, a closure plan, will be submitted within 140 days of receipt of the application by the competent authority, as significant changes have been made or significant new information has been added to the basic assessment report or EMPr or, where applicable, a closure plan, which changes or information was not contained in the reports or plans consulted on during the initial public participation process contemplated in subregulation (1)(a) and that the revised reports or, EMPr or, where applicable, a closure plan will be subjected to another public participation process of at least 30 days”. • Should you fail to meet any of the timeframes stipulated in Regulation 19 of the NEMA EIA Regulations, 2014, as amended, your application will lapse. • You are hereby reminded of Section 24F of the National Environmental Management Act, Act No. 107 of 1998, as amended, that no activity may commence prior to an Environmental Authorisation being granted by the Department. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The timeframes stipulated in Regulation 19 of the NEMA EIA Regulations, 2014, as amended, are noted. • The applicant is aware that no activity may commence prior to an Environmental Authorisation being granted by the Department.
9.	03 August 2021	Mike Dyssel UWC	Email	<p>Dear Ms De Waal, herewith my comments - more clarity seeking though - on the project:</p> <p>There are indeed compelling arguments, in line with the NDP for 2030 and the principles of NEMA, in favour of the approval of the application. I'd like to get clarity on the following though:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With reference to “The requisite water authorisations and other necessary permits required for construction will be applied for, upon a successful REIPPPP bid for the associated WEF.” (p.3). Based on holistic approaches that should underpin the mitigation of impacts, this ‘chicken and egg’ assumption, i.e. first a successful REIPPPP bid and then water authorisation application is problematic, albeit theoretical, in the context of the drought-stricken N-Cape. • Does the fact (p. 8) that no obligatory Noise Control Regulations exist in the N-Cape and therefore that no approval is required, not make such rural sites ‘easy havens’ for such projects? 	<p>Dear Mr Dyssel.</p> <p>Thanks for your comments below.</p> <p>Herewith clarifications as requested:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By postponing the water use application to after successful REIPPPP bid the Department of Water and Sanitation is better placed to make an informed decision on whether to grant or refuse the water use licences. This is especially important in the context of the drought stricken Northern Cape where resources are limited and should only be allocated to projects that have a high likelihood chance of commencing • It's unclear what is meant by “easy havens” for such projects. However, it should be noted that noise impacts typically associated with transmission lines are largely confined to the construction phase of these projects and that the anticipated noise impacts are likely to be of minor to negligible significance when mitigation measures are undertaken, given the absence of noise sensitive receptors in the area of influence.

No.	Date	Author	Type	Comment	Response
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Page 12: The uncertainties associated GN R985 Activity 4 and GN R985 Activity 12 associated with CBAs, systematic biodiversity plans and bioregional plans need clarification for the ill-informed I&APs. <p>Regards Mike Dyssel</p>	<p>For the purpose of this application we have accepted that the CBAs as per the Northern Cape Biodiversity Spatial Plan mapped by Oosthuysen and Holness in 2016, are applicable and therefore will be applied for.</p>
10.	03 August 2021	Lieutenant Colonel Francois P Strydom Department of Defence Command and Management Information Systems Division	Email	<p>Good Afternoon, Sir</p> <p>Please forward all new requests / feedback required to the following e-mail addresses, as the nodal entry point for the DOD / SANDF. Contact person is Maj L.R. Kenny</p> <p>dfacmiem@gmail.com; diropsdwfmn@gmail.com</p>	<p>Thank you Lieutenant Colonel Strydom – I have sent an email to Major Kenny.</p> <p>Kind regards Genie</p> <hr/> <p>Dear Major L.R. Kenny</p> <p>I refer to Lieutenant Colonel Francois Strydom's email below and herewith wish to notify you of this proposed grid infrastructure project for the Kokerboom wind energy facilities near Loeriesfontein, and request your input/comment should you wish to provide such.</p> <p>We look forward to having your feedback.</p> <p>Kind regards Genie</p>
11.	03 August 2021	Chris Bellingham Mainstream Renewable Power	Email	<p>Dear Genie</p> <p>The following feedback from Loeriesfontein and Khobab Windfarms. Can I please request that you include Pieter de Villiers, the Plant Manager for both these windfarms, into your I&AP database. (Pieter included in this email.)</p> <p>Ref: <u>REF NO 14/12/16/3/3/1/2367: Environmental Application 1: Kokerboom 1, 2 & 3 transmission lines and switching stations</u> <u>REF NO 14/12/16/3/3/1/2366: Environmental Application 2: Kokerboom 4 transmission line and switching station</u> <u>REF NO 14/12/16/3/3/1/2368: Environmental Application 3: new Khobab switching station</u></p> <p>We find some of the information in your reports to be contradictory and request clarification please. In the first Figure 1 below, you indicate the new proposal but in Figure 3, you have the new Khobab Switching Station with powerlines that link Kokerboom 2 and then Kokerboom 4. (second Figure 1) From what we can deduce is that the plan is not as per the proposal in the first graphic but to rather to extend the existing Khobab Switching Station and use that as the link.</p>	<p>Dear Chris,</p> <p>Thank you for your comment, please see clarifications below. Pieter is now included in the I&AP database.</p> <p>The plan for the proposed Kokerboom 1, 2 & 3 transmission lines and switching stations are exactly as provided in Figure 1 (First one) below. Figure 3, also included below has reference to the transmission lines previously applied for to evacuate electricity from Kokerboom 1, 2 and 3 WEFs. Figure 3 below shows the three alternatives that were assessed in the original grid connection EIA, but only one of the alternatives (the so-called "Alternative B" which accesses Helios from the south) was authorised, as shown in the first image below (EA Kokerboom 2018).</p>

No.	Date	Author	Type	Comment	Response
				<p>05.1 Annexure D1 Agri KK 1-3 Grid_Final.pdf</p>  <p>Figure 1. Proposed layout of the Kokerboom 1, 2 & 3 transmission lines and switching station.</p>  <p>Figure 3. Satellite image map of the site showing the development layout.</p>	<p>The second Figure 1 relates only to the evacuation of electricity from the Kokerboom 4 WEF and does not connect to the powerlines that link Kokerboom 2 and then Kokerboom 4.</p> <p>To clarify the above we refer you to Figure 5.1 (Proposed Kokerboom Transmission lines 1, 2 and 3 and associated switching stations in comparison to the previously authorised Kokerboom OHL Grid), image below. Note that currently there is no authorised alternative that connects the Kokerboom WEFs to the Khobab Switching Station or proposed new Khobab Switching Station.</p> 

No.	Date	Author	Type	Comment	Response
				<div> </div> <p>Figure 1. Proposed layout of the Kokerboom 4 transmission line and switching station.</p> <p><u>Regardless of the alternatives, please find general comments below:</u></p> <p>EA 1: Kokerboom 1, 2 and 3 transmission lines and Switching Stations: We have no objections to the proposed powerlines nor switching stations but subject to the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. If the first Figure 1 is the requested end state, then there is no objection from the wind facility in principle but given the land leased area by Khobab Windfarm, permission would have to be granted by the SPV Board as well as the Landowner. 2. That the distance of the powerline from the turbine complies with the minimum requirement as stipulated by Eskom. (Please confirm 3 x tip-height?) <p>EA 2: Kokerboom 4 transmission line and switching station: We have no objections to the proposed powerlines nor switching stations but subject to the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Given the Land Lease agreement by Khobab Windfarm, that permission for the Khobab Switching Station extension be granted by the SPV Board as well as the Landowner. 2. Given the Land Lease agreement by Khobab Windfarm, that permission for the powerline access route be granted by the SPV Board as well as the Landowner. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Correct the first Figure 1 is the requested end state for the Kokerboom 1, 2 and 3 grid connection infrastructure (being assessed in a separate application). Note that the proposed Kokerboom 1, 2 & 3 grid connection infrastructure will not intersect the Khobab Wind Farm Lease Area. To the extent required by the Deeds Office, permission will be sought from the Khobab SPV board to register the proposed servitude against the title deed of the property on which Khobab is located. The applicant will liaise directly with the Khobab SPV board in this regard, external to the EIA process. 2. For a 132kV powerline, Eskom requires a setback of 1 X tip-height from the edge of the powerline servitude. This setback distance will be adhered to (a setback of 3 X tip-height is only required in respect of powerlines in excess of 132kV). <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Permission will be obtained from the Khobab SPV Board as well as the Landowner as part of the servitude registration process. The land owner has provided consent for the current EIA process. The applicant will liaise directly with the Khobab SPV board in this regard, external to the EIA process. 2. Permission will be obtained from the SPV Board as well as the Landowner. The applicant will liaise directly with the Khobab SPV board in this regard, external to the EIA process.

No.	Date	Author	Type	Comment	Response
				<p>3. That the distance of the powerline from the turbine complies with the minimum requirement as stipulated by Eskom. (Please confirm 3 x tip-height?)</p> <p>Please clarify the intent as requested so that the SPV Board can be approached for a decision.</p> <p>Many thanks.</p> <p>Regards – Chris</p>	<p>3. For a 132kV powerline, Eskom requires a setback of 1 X tip-height from the edge of the powerline servitude. This setback distance will be adhered to (a setback of 3 X tip-height is only required in respect of powerlines in excess of 132kV).</p>
12.	5 August 2021	Natasha Higgitt SAHRA	Email	<p>Final Comment: In terms of Section 38(4), 38(8) of the National Heritage Resources Act (Act 25 of 1999) Attention: Business Venture Investments No. 1733 (Pty) Ltd. Basic Assessment (BA) process for the switching station connecting the Kokerboom 4 WEF to the existing Khobab Substation. The development site is located approximately 59 kilometres (km) north of Loeriesfontein, 85 km west of Brandvlei and 160 km south-east of Springbok in the Northern Cape. Zutari (Pty) Ltd has been appointed by Business Venture Investments No. 1788 (Pty) Ltd to conduct an Environmental Authorisation (EA) Application for the proposed development of the Khobab Switching Station near Loeriesfontein, Northern Cape Province.</p> <p>A draft Basic Assessment Report (dBAR) Report has been submitted in terms of the National Environmental Management Act, 1998 (NEMA) and the 2017 NEMA Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations.</p> <p>The proposed development will include the construction of one switching station within a footprint of 50 m x 50 m and associated infrastructure such as a temporary laydown area and site camp.</p> <p>Natura Viva C and ASHA Consulting were appointed to provide heritage specialist input as required by section 24(4)b(iii) of NEMA and section 38(8) of the National Heritage Resources Act, Act 25 of 1999 (NHRA).</p> <p>Almond, J. E. 2021. Palaeontological Heritage Comment: Site Sensitivity Report & Letter of Exemption from further Specialist Studies. Khobab Switching Station near Loeriesfontein, Namaqua District Municipality, Northern Cape.</p> <p>The proposed development area is underlain by potentially fossiliferous igneous rocks of the Eccca Group that are intruded by the unfossiliferous rocks of the Early Jurassic Karoo Dolerite Suite. The Eccca groups are poorly exposed and have ben baked by the dolerite intrusions. Low diversity trace fossils of no scientific interest are known to occur in the area. No</p>	Final comment from SAHRA acknowledged.

No.	Date	Author	Type	Comment	Response
				<p>palaeontological resources were identified as part of the conducted field-work. The proposed development will have a very low to low impact significance on local palaeontological heritage and Chance Fossil Finds Procedure is recommended to be implemented and is provided in the report.</p> <p>Orton, J. 2021. Heritage Impact Assessment: Proposed Grid Connection Infrastructure to support the Kokerboom 4 Wind Energy Facilities, Calvinia Magisterial District, Northern Cape.</p> <p>No heritage resources were identified within the proposed development footprint, although surface scatters of Stone Age lithics of low heritage significance were identified in the surrounding areas.</p> <p>Recommendations provided in the report include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The environmental control officer (ECO) should ensure that all work occurs within the authorised footprints; • If any heritage materials (stone artefacts, pottery, fossils, human remains) are found during construction then they should be protected in place and reported to the heritage authorities and/or a heritage consultant for further action as may be required. <p>Final Comment</p> <p>The following comments are made as a requirement in terms of section 3(4) of the NEMA Regulations and section 38(8) of the NHRA in the format provided in section 38(4) of the NHRA and must be included in the Final BAR and EMPr:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 38(4)a – The SAHRA Archaeology, Palaeontology and Meteorites (APM) Unit has no objections to the proposed development; • 38(4)b – The recommendations of the specialists are supported and must be adhered to. No further additional specific conditions are provided for the development; • 38(4)c(i) – If any evidence of archaeological sites or remains (e.g. remnants of stone-made structures, indigenous ceramics, bones, stone artefacts, ostrich eggshell fragments, charcoal and ash concentrations), fossils or other categories of heritage resources are found during the proposed development, SAHRA APM Unit (Natasha Higgitt/Phillip Hine 021 462 5402) must be alerted as per section 35(3) of the NHRA. Non-compliance with section of the NHRA is an offense in terms of section 51(1)e of the NHRA and item 5 of the Schedule; • 38(4)c(ii) – If unmarked human burials are uncovered, the SAHRA Burial Grounds and Graves (BGG) • Unit (Thingahangwi Tshivhase/Mimi Seetelo 012 320 8490), must be alerted immediately as per section 36(6) of the NHRA. Non-compliance 	<p>Recommendations added to the EMPr to be implemented by the developer.</p> <p>Final comment acknowledged. Further recommendations provided have been included into the EMPr and are for the developer to implement pre- and during construction.</p>

No.	Date	Author	Type	Comment	Response
				<p>with section of the NHRA is an offense in terms of section 51(1)e of the NHRA and item 5 of the Schedule;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 38(4)d – See section 51 of the NHRA for offences; • 38(4)e – The following conditions apply with regards to the appointment of specialists: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With reference to the mitigation work noted above, a qualified archaeologist must be appointed to undertake the work in terms of the permit applied for as noted above; • If heritage resources are uncovered during the course of the development, a professional archaeologist or palaeontologist, depending on the nature of the finds, must be contracted as soon as possible to inspect the heritage resource. If the newly discovered heritage resources prove to be of archaeological or palaeontological significance, a Phase 2 rescue operation may be required subject to permits issued by SAHRA; • The Final BAR and EMPr must be submitted to SAHRA for record purposes; • The decision regarding the EA Application must be communicated to SAHRA and uploaded to the SAHRIS Case application. <p>Should you have any further queries, please contact the designated official using the case number quoted above in the case header.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Final BAR and EMPr inclusive of provided recommendations will be submitted to SAHRA (uploaded to the SAHRIS). • The decision regarding the EA Application will be communicated to SAHRA and uploaded to the SAHRIS.
13.	8 August 2021	Rebecca Thomas Senior Development Manager Mainstream Renewable Power (South Africa Mainstream Renewable Power)	Email	<p>Good Day Genie,</p> <p>Please note South Africa Mainstream Renewable Power (Mainstream) has not received the below correspondence related to the various Kokerboom Projects. Please note this was received by Mainstream Asset Management South Africa (MAMSA), which operates only in respect to operational assets being managed. Please ensure myself, Eugene Marais and David Dean are added to the I&AP database accordingly.</p> <p>The below projects potentially impact directly on Mainstream Projects under development and we need to comment accordingly.</p> <p>Furthermore, I see reference to Kokerboom 4 Transmission Line but to date have not seen any correspondence regarding K4 Wind Farm. This project is likely to have potential shadow casting impacts on our adjacent authorised solar project – Loeriesfontein 3.</p> <p>Please could I request a status of each of the Kokerboom Projects (i.e. EAs granted, amendments underway, public review periods).</p>	<p>Dear Rebecca,</p> <p>We note your request and have added Eugene Marais, David Dean and you to the I&AP list.</p> <p>Status of each of the Kokerboom project are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kokerboom 1 WEF, EA granted • Kokerboom 2 WEF, EA granted • Kokerboom 3 WEF (EA granted, EIA for new layout in process, EIR phase) • Kokerboom 4 WEF (EIA in process, EIR phase) • Kokerboom 1, 2 and 3 Transmission lines and Switching Station, Basic Assessment (comment on Draft ends 10 August 2021) • Kokerboom 4 Transmission line and Switching Station, Basic Assessment (comment on Draft ends 10 August 2021) • Khobab Switching Station, Basic Assessment (comment on Draft ends 10 August 2021) <p>Note that the Basic Assessments deal with the proposed Kokerboom transmission lines and switching stations. Accordingly, your comment which relates to the Kokerboom 4 WEF and potential shadow casting will be dealt with through the EIA process for the Kokerboom 4 WEF which is currently being undertaken.</p> <p>Kind regards,</p>

No.	Date	Author	Type	Comment	Response
14.	12 August 2021	Seoka Lekota DFFE Control Biodiversity Officer Grade B; Biodiversity Conservation	Email	<p>Kind Regards,</p> <p>The Directorate: Biodiversity Conservation reviewed and evaluated the aforementioned draft report.</p> <p>Based on the information provided in the report, the site has generally low environmental sensitivity, and is suitable for development. As such, the switching station is located within the footprint of the Kokerboom 4 Wind Energy Facility (WEF), which have been rezoned for agricultural use.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, the following recommendations must be considered in the final report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preconstruction walk-through of the approved development footprint must be conducted to ensure that sensitive habitats and species are avoided where possible. • Sensitive habitats in close proximity to the development footprint must be avoided or demarcated as No-Go area (i.e. Drainage lines). • Permits from relevant authorities must be obtained for the removal or disturbance of any TOPs, Red Data listed or provincially protected species. • Erosion and Alien Invasive Plant Species Management Plan, and Rehabilitation Plan must be developed to mitigate on habitat degradation due to erosion and alien plant invasion and submitted as part of the final report. <p>In conclusion please note that all Public Participation Process documents related to Biodiversity EIA review and any other Biodiversity EIA queries must be submitted to the Directorate: Biodiversity Conservation at Email: BCAdmin@environment.gov.za for attention of Mr Seoka Lekota.</p>	<p>The recommendations highlighted below have been included in the EMPr.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A preconstruction walk-through of the approved development footprint will be conducted to ensure that sensitive habitats and species are avoided where possible during final micro-siting of infrastructure. • Specific sensitive habitats in close proximity to the development footprint will be avoided/demarcated as No-Go area (i.e. Drainage lines). This will be initiated by the Environmental Control Officer. • Permits from relevant authorities will be obtained for the removal or disturbance of any TOPs, Red Data listed or provincially protected species. This will be initiated by the contractor prior to construction commencing. • An Erosion and Alien Invasive Plant Species Management and Rehabilitation Plans will be developed and implemented on site, in accordance with the provisions of the generic EMPr adopted by the Competent Authority, which are applicable to this development. The Generic EMPr included with the BAR already provides for the management of alien invasive plants, erosion management and site rehabilitation. Accordingly, separate plans have not been developed for inclusion with the final BAR