

MEETING AGENDA

JOB NO.	1140	PROJECT NAME	ESKOM ARNOT ADF EIA/WULA	
MEETING NO. 1. AUTHORITY CONSULTATION MEETING			PAGE 1 OF 1 PAGES	
MEETING VENUE	DEA		DATE	25/10/2016

AGENDA		
Item	Responsibility	Date
Opening and Welcome		
1. Project Purpose and Description		
2. Proposed Integrated EIA Approach 2.1. Screening 2.2. Scoping 2.3. EIA		
3. Discuss Identified Listed Activities.		
4. Discuss Identified Specialist studies.		
5. Discuss and identify applicable policy, and guideline documents.		
6. Discuss future opportunities for Authority Involvement-possible collaboration between DWS and DEA.		
7. Confirm relevant application forms		
8. Other Discussion Items		

SIGNED	NEXT MEETING :
DATE : 07/11/2016	



MINUTES OF MEETING

JOB NO.	1140	PROJECT NAME	ESKOM ARNOT ADF EIA/WULA	
ITEM NO.	ITEM		ACTION	DATE

MINUTES		
<p>1. The Purpose and Description of the project was provided by EIMS and the following was discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Ash from the power station is pumped in a slurry form to 3 existing ash disposal facilities. ❖ Original ash disposal facilities were designed to operate until the original end of station life of 2026. This date has been revised to 2032. A new ashing facility is therefore required. ❖ A total footprint of 70ha is being identified to cater for the ashing facility as well as its associated infrastructure such as pollution control dams. 		
<p>2. The proposed Intergraded EIA approach was discussed and the following was noted.</p> <p>2.1. EIMS gave a description of the screening/site selection process conducted. The following was specifically noted during the discussion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Inputs used for the mapping, as well as the extent of the study area were discussed in the meeting. ❖ The different specialist disciplines and the respective sensitivity map inputs were highlighted. ❖ It was highlighted that the intention of the screening exercise is to identify approximately 5 sites that will be subjected to field verification where possible. The intention of the field verification being to identify 3 alternative sites that will be subjected to scoping. ❖ Linda asked for clarification on how many sites have been identified thus far and it was highlighted that only 5 sites have been identified but their location is subject to change depending of the information on undermined areas as well as existing infrastructure once received from the various sources. ❖ Linda noted that there seems to be a number of water bodies in the project area and enquired if these will affect the siting of the facility. It was then discussed that the preliminary mapping has already considered existing water bodies as per available GIS data and that the five sites identified avoid these know locations. ❖ Emmy enquired if 3 alternative sites at scoping phase will be adequate or not. DEA confirmed that 3 alternatives sites will be adequate as long as it can be shown how the team determined the 3 alternatives. 		



MINUTES OF MEETING

JOB NO.	1140	PROJECT NAME	ESKOM ARNOT ADF EIA/WULA
ITEM NO.	ITEM	ACTION	DATE
2.2.	<p>The following was discussed with regard to the scoping phase:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ EIMS indicated that the only 3 alternative sites identified during the screening/site selection phase will be considered during the scoping phase. ❖ It was also discussed that the EIA application form will be submitted with the draft scoping report. ❖ EIMS enquired if due to the nature of the project will a landowner notification be adequate or will a landowner consent be required with the application form. DEA highlighted that landowner notification will be adequate during the scoping phase, however, once a preferred site is identified for the EIA phase landowner consent would be required. ❖ EIMS highlighted that preliminary designs will only be provided for the EIA phase. DEA highlighted that preliminary designs will be adequate for the EIR. ❖ Emmy requested for further clarification on weather concept designs are required for all three alternatives or only for the alternative sites. Masina confirmed that only designs for the preferred site would be required as there should be enough motivation to indicate how the preferred site was chosen. 		
2.3.	<p>The following was discussed with regard to the EIA phase:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ EIMS highlighted that due to the time required to complete the detailed designs there will be challenges in meeting the 106 day requirement to submit EIA. In that regard EIMS highlighted that they will submit an application to extend the timeframe in terms of Regulation 3(7) of GN R982. DEA highlighted that the said regulation only refers to a change in the scope of the project and therefore this would not apply for this project as there will not be a scope change. ❖ Emmy highlighted that one of the options available is that the engineering designs start during scoping but the risk is that DEA might not approve our preferred site. DEA noted that based on the extent of the screening process as presented the preferred site alternative can be identified during scoping. ❖ Linda noted that if possible at the end of screening the project can identify a preferred site and get DEA and DWS involved so that they can get an agreement in principle in terms of the preferred site. After that they can then get the engineers to design for the preferred site. 		
2.4.	<p>The proposed public participation was discussed and the following was noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ DEA recommended that were possible due to the 		



MINUTES OF MEETING

JOB NO.	1140	PROJECT NAME	ESKOM ARNOT ADF EIA/WULA	
ITEM NO.	ITEM	ACTION	DATE	
	<p>engineering constraints highlighted, the team can consider putting the Draft Scoping Report out for a 30 day comment period before submitting to DEA so that any issues can be addressed before the report is submitted to DEA and put out for another 30 day review period.</p>			
3.	<p>Currently identified listed activities as presented in pre-application meeting request form were discussed and the following was noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Linda asked for clarification on whether the ash has been classified as hazardous or not. Emmy highlighted that a study is underway for the classification of the ash. Linda then confirmed that in terms of GN R921 Category B Item 7 and item 10 would apply for the project. 			
4.	<p>In terms of specialist studies identified the following was discussed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ EIMS enquired on whether a separate Social Impact Assessment is required or not considering the nature of the project. Masina clarified that the requirement for a social impact assessment is usually dependent on the presence of residential communities next to a project. She also added that if there are social issues identified than a detailed social impact assessment is required. ❖ It was discussed that the requirement for a detailed social impact assessment would be guided by the initial public participation. If no concerns are raised during the initial public participation then they will be no requirement for a standalone social impact study. However, social impacts can be identified by the EAP and included in the EIR. ❖ Emmy noted that on similar projects there has been a request to conduct a social cost benefit study and asked if this might be required for this project. Masina highlighted that the social cost benefits should be included but this does not necessarily have to be a separate study. 			
5.	<p>The following was discussed in terms of applicable policy, and guideline documents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ DEA advised that the team consider the norms and standards for the assessment of waste for landfill disposal (GN R635) as well as GN 634 for the Waste Classification and Management Regulations. 			



MINUTES OF MEETING

JOB NO.	1140	PROJECT NAME	ESKOM ARNOT ADF EIA/WULA	
ITEM NO.	ITEM		ACTION	DATE
6.	<p>In terms future opportunities for Authority Involvement- possible collaboration between DWS and DEA the following was discussed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Linda enquired if there has been any consultation with the DWS thus far. Bongani indicated that as a preferred site is identified consultation with DWS will be initiated. ❖ Linda noted that with regard to the disposal of ash DEA has a Memorandum of understanding with DWS that they forgo the disposal licence as long as DEA incorporates the DWS conditions into the DEA authorisation. They will however need detailed designs before they can provide their RoD to DEA. It is therefore important to consult with the DWS. DEA might not be able to approve the waste management licence without DSW approval. 			
7.	<p>It was discussed that the EAP should make sure that they use the latest application forms on the website as the website always has the latest application forms.</p>			
The meeting was adjourned.				

Document Control

	Name:	Date:	Signature:
Environmental Impact Management Services (Pty) Ltd			
Compiled by:	B. Khupe	2016/10/31	
Approved by:	B. Whitlow	2016/10/31	
Eskom			
Approved	E. Molepo	2016/11/07	