
PAULPUTS CSP PROJECT, NORTHERN CAPE

COMMENTS AND RESPONSES REPORT

CONTENTS

COMMENTS RECEIVED: EIA PHASE.....	2
I&AP REGISTRATIONS AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESS	2
HERITAGE IMPACTS	2
COMMENTS RECEIVED: SCOPING PHASE	6
I&AP REGISTRATIONS AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESS	6
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS RECEIVED FROM ORGANS OF STATE AND PARASTATALS	7
COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS	8
IMPACTS ON THE SKA: SOUTH AFRICA.....	11
IMPACTS ON INFORMATION COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY	12
LANDOWNER CONCERNS	14
ECOLOGICAL IMPACTS.....	16
POTENTIAL IMPACTS ON AVIFAUNA	20
SOCIAL IMPACTS	24
WATER USE LICENSE APPLICATION PROCESS, WATER USES AND PIPELINE	25
GENERAL	27

COMMENTS RECEIVED: EIA PHASE

NO.	ISSUE/COMMENT	ISSUE RAISED BY	RESPONSE
I&AP REGISTRATIONS AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESS			
1.	Can you please add me to the I&AP database for the Paulputs CSP Project?	Vered Karty Project Manager BrightSource Energy Email: 11-01-2016	Vered Karty was registered as an I&AP on the project's database.
2.	Please register BirdLife South Africa on this EIA using my details below.	Simon Gear Policy & Advocacy Manager BirdLife South Africa Email: 29-03-2016	Simon Gear of BirdLife SA was registered as an I&AP on the project's database.
HERITAGE IMPACTS			
3.	Savannah Environmental (Pty) Ltd (Savannah) was contracted by Paulputs CSP RF (Pty) Ltd to complete an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process for the Paulputs CSP Project, near Poffadder, Northern Cape Province. A Scoping Report was completed in terms of the National Environmental Management Act, 1998 (Act No. 107 of 1998) (NEMA) and the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations 2014. Savannah contracted David Morris and John Pether to conduct the Heritage Scoping Study and the Palaeontological Desktop Assessment for the project respectively. Morris, 2015. Paulputs CSP Facility near Poffadder, Northern Cape. Specialist Input for the Scoping Phase of the Environmental Impact Assessment: Archaeology.	Natasha Higgitt Heritage Officer South African Heritage Resources Authority Letter: 15-01-2016	A Heritage Impact Assessment was undertaken. Please refer to Appendix H of the EIR

NO.	ISSUE/COMMENT	ISSUE RAISED BY	RESPONSE
	<p>The author found that heritage resources from the Stone Age and Colonial/Historical periods may be present within the project area, and due to the sparse vegetation the heritage resources are likely to be highly visible.</p> <p>A grave of the Northern Border Police is known on the affected farm portion and a road-side grave is present.</p> <p>Recommendations provided in the report are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » A site visit must be conducted to examine the proposed project area for heritage resources. » Identified heritage resources will be assessed for their significance » Nineteenth and twentieth century cultural heritage and intangible heritage values attached to places that are to be impacted by the development must be assessed during the pending EIA phase. » A Visual Impact Assessment must be conducted on identified heritage resources » Should heritage resources be uncovered during the construction phase of the project, all work in the area must cease immediately and be reported to SAHRA and/or the McGregor Museum, Kimberly. The find should be investigated by a professional archaeologist who will provide further recommendations. Should it be deemed necessary, a Phase 2 Mitigation permit must be applied for in order to conduct any sampling, excavations or collections of heritage deposit before the development can continue. <p><i>Pether, 2015. Brief Palaeontological Impact Assessment (Desktop Study). Proposed Pofadder Solar Thermal Plant.</i></p>		

NO.	ISSUE/COMMENT	ISSUE RAISED BY	RESPONSE
	<p><i>Portion 4 of the farm Scuit-Klip 92, Kenhardt District, Northern Cape.</i></p> <p>The author found that expected palaeontology in the project area includes freshwater clams and snail fossils, abraded bone fragments and loose teeth, however, due to the sporadic occurrences of fossils in the area, there is a low potential for uncovering fossil heritage. Should fossils be identified during the construction phase, they will be considered as significance finds due to the lack of fossil occurrences in the vicinity.</p> <p>Recommendations provided in the report include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » Fossil Finds Procedures must be developed and implemented that details the guidelines and reporting/action protocols to be following when finds are uncovered. » The local Council of Geoscience in Upington may be utilized to contract a local geologist who will inspect excavations and liaise with the Environmental Control Officer and an advising palaeontologist. <p>Interim Comment</p> <p>Regarding archaeological and palaeontological heritage resources, the SAHRA Archaeology, Palaeontology and Meteorites Unit accepts the submitted Archaeological Scoping Report and Palaeontological Desktop Study and their respective recommendations, and has no objections against the development. The following additional conditions must be adhered to and must form part of the final EIA Phase of the project:</p>		

NO.	ISSUE/COMMENT	ISSUE RAISED BY	RESPONSE
	<p>A Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) must be completed for the proposed Paulputs CSP Project. The HIA must include the following studies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> » An Archaeological Impact Assessment (AIA); » An assessment of Burial Grounds and Graves; » An assessment of intangible heritage resources; and » A VIA must be completed on identified heritage resources. <p>No further palaeontological assessment is required. A Fossil Finds Procedure must be developed for the project to ensure that standard protocols and steps are followed should any fossil resources be uncovered during the construction phase of the project. These procedures should outline the steps and reporting structure to be followed in the instance that fossil resources are found. These procedures must be incorporated into the final Environmental Management Plan for implementation.</p> <p>Final comments will be published once the above has been submitted along with the EIA for the project.</p> <p>Decisions regarding Built Environment will be provided by Ngwao-Boswa Jwa Kapa Bokone (NBKB), the Northern Cape Provincial Heritage Resource Authority (Ratha Timothy - rtimothy@nbkb.org.za /053 831 2537).</p>		

COMMENTS RECEIVED: SCOPING PHASE

NO.	ISSUE/COMMENT	ISSUE RAISED BY	RESPONSE
I&AP REGISTRATIONS AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESS			
4.	Your company is currently conducting an Environmental Impact Assessment for the proposed Paulputs 200MW CSP project in the Northern Cape. Please forward me the BID for this application and register me as an Interested & Affected party?	Melanie Miles Content Researcher Leads 2 Business Email: 16-09-2015	Ms Mile's was registered as an Interested and Affected Party (I&AP) on the register of I&APs for the project.
5.	This communique serve as a formal registration on your above mentioned project database. Reason being: As the current CLO of AEPC in the existing project, I'm constantly in contact with stakeholders. And always be in a spot of border concerning questions related to this and future projects. I personally believe it could be advantageous for all involved if and when I know more of the processes and prospects in and around the area. Take into account that I fully understand the confidentiality concerning certain processes, but still think that I can do with more generic info from your site if and when available.	Charles Gregory March Community Liaison Officer Abengoa Abeinsa XiNa Solar One & Khi Solar One Email: 17-09-2015	Mr March was registered as an I&AP on the projects database.
6.	When will public participation meetings take place?	Peter Cloete Research and Developments and Conrad Geldenhuys Research and Developments Northern Cape Department of Environment and Nature Conservation	Focus group meetings with the landowners located adjacent to the proposed site and pipeline route were convened on 18 November 2015. Meetings]convened with key organs of state departments as follow: DWS: 17 November 2015, DENC, today 19 November a meeting with Department of Roads and Public Works has been arranged. 1. A public meeting and follow-up focus group meetings will be convened in the EIA phase of the process.

NO.	ISSUE/COMMENT	ISSUE RAISED BY	RESPONSE
		Meeting: 19-11-2015	
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS RECEIVED FROM ORGANS OF STATE AND PARASTATALS			
7.	We hereby acknowledge your proposed project. For future reference, please quote CPDR0647-15.	Chris Schutte Mvelaphande Trading (on behalf of Telkom) Email: 9-10-2015	Acknowledgment noted, no response required.
8.	Please find attached requirements for works at or near Eskom infrastructure.	John Geeringh Senior Environmental Advisor GC Land Development Eskom Email: 16-11-2015	Eskom's requirements for works at or near Eskom infrastructure is noted. The information received from Eskom has been provided to the project developer for consideration during the design phase of the proposed project
9.	The Department confirms having received the Scoping Report for environmental authorisation of the above-mentioned project on the 18 th November 2015. As required in terms of the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulation, 2014. The application has been assigned the reference number NC/NAT/NAM/KHA/POF1/2015. Kindly quote this reference number in any future correspondence in respect of the application. Please note the responsible officer is going to be Ms. Onwabile Ndzumo.	Ms. L. Tools-Bernado EIA Administration Department of Environment & Nature Conservation (DENC) Letter: 01-12-2015	Acknowledgment noted. Ms Onwabile Ndzumo's details have been included on the database of I&APs. A meeting was held with Peter Cloete and Conrad Geldenhuys from the Research and Developments Department of the Northern Cape Department of Environment and Nature Conservation on 19 November 2015. The minutes have been included here.
10	The Department of Rural Development and Land Reform (DRDLR) would like to convey its gratitude for being notified about the availability of the basic scoping report for	Khathu Muruba Professional Town and Regional Planner	Acknowledgment noted, no response required.

NO.	ISSUE/COMMENT	ISSUE RAISED BY	RESPONSE
	<p>the project. The Department has perused the documentation(s) sent. Based on the above, the Department does not have any objections to the Paulputs CSP Project (200MW concentrated solar power project). However, the Department would like to be notified of anything related to the project in future.</p>	<p>Spatial Planning & Land Use Management Branch National Department Of Rural Development & Land Reform Email: 9-12-2015</p>	
COMMENTS RECEIVED FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS			
11	<p>The draft Scoping Report (SR) dated November 2015 and received by this Department on 18 November 2015, and the acknowledgement letter of the SR issued by this Department on 23 November 2015 refer.</p> <p><u>This Department has the following comments on the abovementioned application:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Please ensure that all relevant listed activities are applied for, are specific and that it can be linked to the development activity or infrastructure as described in the project description. ii. If the activities applied for in the application form differ from those mentioned in the final SR, 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>Mr Sabelo Malaza Chief Director: Integrated Environmental Authorisations Signed by Coenrad Agenbach Deputy Director: Strategic Infrastructure Developments Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA) Letter: 08-12-2015</p>	<p>The Departments comments on the Paulputs CSP Project are noted.</p>

NO.	ISSUE/COMMENT	ISSUE RAISED BY	RESPONSE
	<p>iii. Please ensure that all issues raised and comments received during the circulation of the SR from registered I&APs 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.</p> <p>iv. Proof of correspondence with the various stakeholders must be included in the final SR. Should you be unable to obtain comments, proof should be submitted to the Department of the attempts that were made to obtain comments. The Public Participation Process must be conducted in terms of Regulation 39, 40, 41, 42, 43 & 44 of the EIA regulations 2014.</p> <p>v. Scoping specialist studies, if applicable, must be submitted to the Department with the final SR.</p>		
	<p>vi. This Department requires a cumulative impact assessment to be undertaken in the final SR to determine potential fatal flaws.</p>		<p>Potential cumulative impacts are evaluated in the Scoping Report. Refer to section 6.6 of the Scoping Report. The Scoping Study found no fatal flaws.</p>
	<p>vii. The Department requests the EAP to include the specialist consultants who will conduct the specialist assessments.</p>		<p>The specialist consultants who will conduct the specialist assessments are listed in the Scoping Report in Table 8.1 of Chapter 8.</p>
	<p>viii. This Department requires an avifaunal assessment study to be included as part of the PoSEIA. This must be a separate study and not form part of the ecological impact assessment.</p>		<p>The requirement for a separate avifauna impact assessment study has been included as part of the PoSEIA. Refer to Table 8.1 in Chapter 8 of the Scoping Report.</p>
	<p>ix. This Department requests the EAP to familiarise themselves with the requirements of Appendix 2 of GNR 982 of the EIA Regulations, 2014 and ensure that the final SR submitted to this Department for consideration meets the requirements in terms of identifying, assessing and providing mitigation</p>		<p>Chapter 6 of the Scoping Report identifies and assesses impacts. Chapter 6 provides for mitigation measures to the impacts during the EIA phase</p>

NO.	ISSUE/COMMENT	ISSUE RAISED BY	RESPONSE
	measures of the impacts on the alternative and preferred sites.		
	x. Please provide a description of any identified alternatives for the proposed activity that are feasible and reasonable, including the advantages and disadvantages that the proposed activity or alternatives will have on the environment and on the community that may be affected by the activity as per Appendix 1 (2) (e) and 3 (1) (h) (i) of GN R.982 of 2014. Alternatively, you should submit written proof of an investigation and motivation if no reasonable or feasible alternatives exist in terms of Appendix 1.		A description of identified alternatives that are feasible and reasonable is provided in Section 2.4 of the Scoping Report. Advantages and disadvantages to the environment as well as to the community can only be provided following site investigations which are scheduled to be undertaken during the EIA phase
	xi. In accordance with Appendix 1 (3) (1) (a) of the EIA Regulations 2014, the details of – (i) The EAP who prepared the report; and (ii) The expertise of the EAP to carry out Scoping and Environmental Impact assessment procedures; must be submitted.		The details are provided in Section 1.4 of Chapter 1 and Appendix A of the Scoping Report
	xii. You are further reminded that 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 and Regulation 21 (1) of the EIA Regulations, 2014.		It is noted that the final SR to be submitted to the Department must comply with all the requirements in terms of the scope of assessment and content of Scoping reports in accordance with Appendix 2 and Regulation 21 (1) of the EIA Regulations, 2014. A checklist with the requirements of Appendix 2 of GNR 982 of the EIA Regulations, 2014 has been included in the Scoping Report. Refer to Table 1 of the Scoping Report.
	xiii. 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).		It is noted that in terms of Regulation 45 of the EIA Regulations 2014, this application will lapse if the applicant fails to meet the timeframes prescribed in terms of these Regulations, unless an extension has been granted in terms of Regulation 3(7).

NO.	ISSUE/COMMENT	ISSUE RAISED BY	RESPONSE
	<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>		
IMPACTS ON THE SKA: SOUTH AFRICA			
12	<p>This letter is in response to your email request, to provide an assessment on the potential development of concentrated solar power electricity generation facilities in the Northern Cape Province and the risk they may pose on the Square Kilometre Array Project.</p> <p>A high level risk assessment has been conducted at the South African SKA Project Office to determine the potential impact of such facilities on the Square Kilometre Array. This letter serves to confirm the outcomes of the risk assessment, and proposals for any future investigations associated with this facility.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The location of the proposed facility has been provided background information document compiled by Savannah Environmental (Pty) Ltd; ii. The nearest SKA station has been identified as SKA ID 1896, at approximately 107 km from the proposed installation; iii. Based on distance to the nearest SKA station, and the information currently available on the detailed design of the CSP installation, this facility poses a very low risk of detrimental impact on the SKA; iv. Any transmitters that are to be established, or have been established, at the site for the purposes of voice and data communication will be required to comply with the relevant AGA regulations 	<p>Adrian Tiplady Head of Strategy SKA South Africa</p> <p>Letter: 30-09-2015</p>	<p>It is noted that the proposed Paulputs CSP project will pose a very low risk of detrimental impact on the SKA and that no mitigation measures would be required at this stage. The South African SKA Project Office will be kept informed of progress with this project, and it is acknowledged that the Office reserves the right to further risk assessments at a later stage.</p>

NO.	ISSUE/COMMENT	ISSUE RAISED BY	RESPONSE
	<p>concerning the restriction of use of the radio frequency spectrum that applies in the area concerned;</p> <p>v. As a result of the very low risk associated with the CSP facility, no mitigation measures would be required at this stage. However, the South African SKA Project Office would like to be kept informed of progress with this project, and reserves the right to further risk assessments at a later stage.</p> <p>This technical advice is provided by the South African SKA Project Office on the basis of the protection requirements of the SKA in South Africa, and does not constitute legal approval of the renewable energy project in terms of the Astronomy Geographic Advantage Act, the Management Authority, and its regulations or declarations.</p>		
IMPACTS ON INFORMATION COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY			
13	<p>We want to plot the site of the solar collector to check our surrounding radio network. I cannot find the Paulputs project on your site for more information. Do you have the coordinates of the tower, width and height?</p>	<p>Leonard Shaw Specialist Network Architecture and Planning</p> <p>Telkom</p> <p>Email: 02-10-2015</p>	<p>The height of the tower will be up to 300m. The width will be approximately 40 m in diameter at the base and 30 m in diameter at the top. The exact position of the tower will be finalised during the EIA phase pending the findings and conclusions of the EIA report. Coordinates will be provided during the EIA Phase.</p>
14	<p>With reference to your above- mentioned application, I hereby confirm that the proposed work installation is approved by our Client (Telkom SA SOC Ltd) in terms of Section 29 of the Electronic Communications Act No. 36 of 2005 as amended.</p>	<p>Chris Schutte Mvelaphande Trading (on behalf of Telkom)</p> <p>Email: 30-11-2015</p>	<p>The position of existing Telkom infrastructure is noted, however it is unlikely that the project developer's contractors will damage Telkom's lines. The project developer do not foresee the need to relocate any structures at this point in time.</p>

NO.	ISSUE/COMMENT	ISSUE RAISED BY	RESPONSE
	<p>Our Client (Telkom SA COC Ltd)'s infrastructure is affected by this proposal and the route is marked in Orange on attached sketch as accurately as possible. Therefore any damages occurred during construction of work will be repaired as the customer's account.</p> <p>On completion of this project, please certify that all requirements as stipulated in this letter have been met. Please note that should any of our Client (Telkom SA SOC Ltd) infrastructure has to be relocated or altered as a result of your activities the cost of such alterations or relocation will be for your account in terms of section 25 of the Electronic Communication Act.</p> <p>Mr Vivian Groenewald must be contacted at telephone number 081-362-6738, 2 (Two) weeks prior to commencement of proposed work. It's important that all services are shown on site before construction starts.</p> <p>Approval of the proposed route is valid for six months. If construction has not yet commenced within this period, then the file must be resubmitted for approval. Any changes / deviations from the original planning during or prior to construction must immediately be communicated to this office.</p> <p>Please notify this office and forward an as built plan, within 30 days of completion of construction.</p> <p>Mr Vivian Groenewald must be contacted from our Client (Telkom SA SOC Ltd) Network Fields Services before commencement of any work.</p>		<p>The need for notification prior to construction and as built plans is also acknowledged by the project developer.</p>

NO.	ISSUE/COMMENT	ISSUE RAISED BY	RESPONSE
LANDOWNER CONCERNS			
15	We received a letter yesterday (21 October 2015) about the environmental study on the matter mentioned above. As the owner of the neighbouring farm Konkoonsies I would like to be in on the discussion around some previous problems around the severe dust pollution on my land, during preparing and removal of the dusty topsoil. Due to the late receipt of your letter through the post I hope I am not too late to discuss this serious matter. In the future kindly use this email address for any further correspondence.	Francois van den Heever Adjacent Landowner Konkoonsies Trust Email: 22-10-2015	Mr Van den Heever's email was acknowledged. It was noted that the public participation process for the project was still underway and that I&APs would still be provided with opportunities to raise their concerns or issues within the EIA process. Landowner meetings were convened during the 30-day review period of the Scoping Report in November 2015. A meeting was held with Mr Van der Heever on 18 November 2015. The issues raised have been minuted, included in the Comments and Responses Report and brought to the attention of the project developer. Mitigation measures to suppress dust emissions as a result of the proposed project will be investigated during the EIA Phase and mitigation measures to suppress dust emissions will be included as part of the EMPr.
16	How far will the facility be from the existing road gravel road (MR73)?	Willem Burger Adjacent Landowner (Project Site & Pipeline) Farm Paardeneiland RE/90	The gravel road (MR73) currently bisects the site. The road will need to be realigned so that it does not traverse through the facility. A meeting was held with the road owner on 17 December 2015 (refer to Comment no. 60.) More information will be made available during the EIA Phase.
17	Where will the pipeline be routed?	Meeting: 18-11-2015	The pipeline will run parallel to the existing KaXu Solar One pipeline within the servitude of the existing R357 Onseepkans road until it reaches the farm Vrugbaar. The abstraction point on the Orange River will be located on the remaining extent of the farm Vrugbaar 422.
18	Dust will be an issue during the construction of the pipeline as it settles on the grass. Grazing camps located closest to the facility will be affected as sheep will not eat dust covered grass.		Mitigation measures to suppress dust emissions as a result of the proposed project will be investigated during the EIA Phase and mitigation measures to suppress dust emissions will be included as part of the EMPr.

NO.	ISSUE/COMMENT	ISSUE RAISED BY	RESPONSE
19	Please ensure that the contractors do not damage to the boundary fences along the pipeline route.		Contractors will be required to replace the fences if they are damaged as a result of construction activities.
20	The possibility of stock theft will increase.		Construction workers are supervised. Incidences of stock theft should be reported to the construction team.
21	I have three camps that are located next to the proposed water pipeline. These camps do not have any water sources. Would it be possible to tap into the pipeline to get water for the three camps? I would require at least a 1000l/day.		The proposed project is not intended to provide a water supply service. The feasibility of the request will need to be explored with the Department of Water and Sanitation.
22	Dust caused by construction activities and an increase in traffic and abnormal loads is a serious concern. The surrounding land is used for grazing purposes and my livestock do not eat grass covered in dust.	Fanie van der Heever Adjacent Landowner (Project Site)	Mitigation measures to suppress dust emissions as a result of the proposed project will be investigated during the EIA Phase and mitigation measures to suppress dust emissions will be included as part of the EMPr.
23	Tremors caused by blasting that took place for the previous project have resulted in cracks occurring in the walls of infrastructure on my farm. Will blasting take place for the CSP project?	Konkoonsies Trust Meeting: 18-11-2015	The need for blasting during construction is not confirmed. This would be confirmed through the findings of the geotechnical assessment.
24	Who will be responsible for the upkeep and maintenance of perimeter fencing?		The landowner will be responsible for upkeep and maintenance of his perimeter fence. The contractor will be responsible for repairs to the boundary fence if the fences are damaged as a result of construction activities.
25	We do not have any concerns regarding the project or the construction of the proposed pipeline.	Willem Jannetjis & Elmien Jannetjis Landowners (Pipeline)	It is noted that Mr and Mrs Jannetjis do not have any concerns regarding the project or construction of the pipeline at this time.
26	Would it be possible for the surrounding farmers to tap into the water pipeline? We applied for a water use license with the Department of Water and Sanitation for 4000l/day and we are waiting for a response.	Farm Astof 2/421 Meeting: 18-11-2015	The proposed project is not intended to provide a water supply service. Feasibility of the request will need to be explored with the Department of Water and Sanitation.
27	There are geotechnical issues within the area. Hard rock (klipbanke) as large as 50m x 100m occurs within the vicinity. It will be very costly to lay the pipeline as a lot of blasting will have to be undertaken.	Niel van Rensburg Adjacent Landowner (Pipeline)	It is noted that there may be geotechnical issues which would need to be considered within the EIA. However it must be reiterated that the pipeline will run parallel to the existing KaXu Solar One pipeline within the servitude of

NO.	ISSUE/COMMENT	ISSUE RAISED BY	RESPONSE
		Astof RE/421 Meeting: 18-11-2015	the existing R357 Onseepkans road therefore due to previous geotechnical investigations undertaken for the KaXu Solar One pipeline, the underlying geology is already known. This information has been forwarded to the project developer.
28	How many pumps will be used to extract water from the river and what is the elevation difference between the river and the proposed site?		The number of pumps to be used is not confirmed at this stage however the elevation difference between the river and the proposed site will be similar to that of KaXu Solar One. This information will be provided in the EIA phase.
29	It is preferred that the pipeline traverse as close as possible to the property edge to keep the current land use vacant for future farming purposes.	Lukas van Zyl Impacted Landowner (Pipeline) Vrugbaar Boerdery	The pipeline will run parallel to the existing KaXu Solar One pipeline within the servitude of the existing R357 Onseepkans road until it reaches the farm Vrugbaar. The abstraction point on the Orange River will be located on the remaining extent of the farm Vrugbaar 422.
30	I am concerned that my existing pipeline will be at risk during blasting which will be undertaken for the construction of the new pipeline.	Farm Vrugbaar RE/422 Meeting: 18-11-2015	It is noted that the landowner is concerned that blasting activities may put his existing pipeline at risk. The need for blasting during construction is not confirmed. This would be confirmed through the findings of the geotechnical assessment. This issue has been brought to the attention of the project developer.
31	I am concerned about the impact that the potential increase in dust would have on the vineyards during the construction of the pipeline.		Mitigation measures to suppress dust emissions as a result of the proposed project will be investigated during the EIA Phase and mitigation measures to suppress dust emissions will be included as part of the EMPr.
ECOLOGICAL IMPACTS			
32	DEPARTMENTAL MANDATE The Branch: Forestry and Natural Resource Management in the Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (DAFF) is responsible for implementation of the National Forests Act, Act 84 of 1998 (NFA) and the National Veld and Forest Fires Act, Act 101 of 1998 as amended.	Jacoline Mans Chief Forester: NFA Regulation Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries	The proposed project will comply with the relevant sections on the NFA as required. DAFFs requirements in response to the Background Information Document have been included in the Plan of Study for the EIA (Chapter 8 of the EIA Report) and will therefore be part of the EIA Phase of the project.

NO.	ISSUE/COMMENT	ISSUE RAISED BY	RESPONSE
	<p>The proposed development must comply with the following sections of the NFA:</p> <p>Section 15(1): "No person may-</p> <p>(a) Cut, disturb, damage or destroy any protected tree; or</p> <p>(b) Possess, collect, remove, transport, export, purchase, sell, donate or in any other manner acquire or dispose of any protected tree, or any forest product derived from a protected tree, except-</p> <p>(i) Under a license granted by the Minister; or</p> <p>(ii) In terms of an exemption from the provision of this subsection published by the Minister in the Gazette on the advice of the Council."</p> <p>Section 62(2)(c): "Any person who contravened the prohibition on-</p> <p>(i) The cutting, disturbance, damage or destruction of temporarily protected trees or groups of trees referred to in section 14(2) or protected trees referred to in section 15(1)(a); or</p> <p>(ii) The possession, collection, removal, transport, export, purchase or sale of temporarily protected trees or groups of trees referred to in section 14(2) or protected trees referred to in section 15(1)(b), or any forest product derived from a temporarily protected tree, group of trees or protected tree, is guilty of a first category offence."</p> <p>Section 58(1): "Any person who is guilty of a first category offence referred to in sections 62 and 63 may be sentenced to a fine or imprisonment for a period of up to three years, or to both a fine and such imprisonment."</p>	<p>Letter: 30-10-2015</p>	<p>The specialist Ecologist responded to DAFFs comments on the Background Information Document in the Ecology Report (refer to page 30 of Appendix E of the Scoping Report).</p> <p>The land has been rezoned as Special Solar by the landowner who is the same entity as the applicant.</p> <p>The Forestry Office in Upington has been registered as a commenting authority.</p>

NO.	ISSUE/COMMENT	ISSUE RAISED BY	RESPONSE
	<p>COMMENTS ON BACKGROUND INFORMATION DOCUMENT</p> <p>Kindly ensure that you assess the potential impact on slow growing protected trees (if any) and where possible avoid such trees. The assessment should include the impact on riparian vegetation at the water abstraction point at the Gariep (locally known as the Orange) River. The riparian Lower Gariep Alluvial Vegetation type is classified as 'endangered' and the NFA listed protected and rare Ebony tree (<i>Euclea pseudebenus</i>) species is associated with this vegetation type in the vicinity of Onseepkans.</p> <p>The proposed development, with a footprint of 900 ha, is located adjacent to the existing Xina CSP and KaXu CSP. It is important to note that this Department will assess cumulative impacts on NFA listed protected tree species.</p> <p>The indigenous and endemic <i>Schotia brachypetala</i> var. should also be avoided as far as possible and if impacts cannot be avoided, rehabilitation with the same species should be included as mitigation in the EMP.</p> <p>For land zoned for agriculture, the Sub-division of Agricultural Land Act 70 of 1970 may also be applicable, requiring inputs from the DAFF. Any land demarcated under the Act, thus agricultural land, cannot be changed to another land use without the supported recommendation under Act 70 of 1970. A local authority cannot change the zoning of demarcated agricultural land to any other zoning without a letter from the Registrar of this Act. The contact persons are: Ms Mashudu Marubini (Delegate of the Minister for Act 70 of 1970, MashuduMA@daff.gov.za, tel (012) 319 7619); Ms Thoko Buthelezi (AgriLand Liaison</p>		

NO.	ISSUE/COMMENT	ISSUE RAISED BY	RESPONSE
	<p>office, ThokoB@daff.gov.za, tel (012) 319 7634) or Ms. Hettie Buys Act 70/70 Registry (HettieB@daff.gov.za).</p> <p>Kindly ensure that you register the Forestry Office in Upington as a commenting authority and supply copies (hardcopies or electronic) of the ecological impact assessment specialist report, as well as other relevant documentation, for commenting purposes.</p>		
33	<p>With reference to the sensitivity map, what criteria were used to identify the sensitive areas on the site?</p>	<p>Peter Cloete Research and Developments and Conrad Geldenhuys Research and Developments Northern Cape Department of Environment and Nature Conservation Meeting: 19-11-2015</p>	<p>The criteria used by the ecologist, Adrian Hudson of Hudson Ecology, to identify sensitive ecological areas included a literature review, review of previous work conducted for the property and a site investigation which was conducted from 4 August 2015 – 14 August 2015. Twelve study sites within the study area were randomly selected to describe the character of the environment as well as flora and fauna species that may be impacted by the proposed activities. The ecologist based his assessment on the Precautionary Principle (COMEST 2005) which assumes a higher conservation importance. The methodology and criteria used to identify areas of sensitivity are described in the Ecological Scoping Study. Please refer to Appendix E of the Scoping Report, Section 8, specifically Section 8.5 which as used to develop the sensitivity map.</p>
34	<p>The term "Natural Areas" on the sensitivity map needs to be clarified. How do the natural areas identified differ from the areas identified as "moderate ecological function" shown in pink? Does it imply that the pink areas are not natural areas? There needs to be a better description of "natural areas" and areas of "moderate ecological sensitivity".</p>		<p>The Ecological Scoping Study provides a description of these terms and is included as Appendix E of the Scoping Report. In terms of Section 8.5 of the Ecological Scoping Study (Appendix E): Natural area: The natural areas are considered of very high conservation importance due to the presence of Red Data species in these areas and the intrinsic importance of these areas.</p>

NO.	ISSUE/COMMENT	ISSUE RAISED BY	RESPONSE
			<p>Moderate ecological function area: Areas that have been disturbed by farming are considered of moderate conservation importance due to the fact that rehabilitation of these areas is possible.</p> <p>The pink areas are not natural areas in terms of the Ecological Scoping Study. The pink area is showing an area that has been disturbed by farming and is considered of moderate conservation importance due to the fact that rehabilitation of this area is possible (in the long term).</p>
35	In what season is the ecological specialist study scheduled to take place?		The ecological study will take place in the wet season. The specialist plans to conduct the assessment after January 2016.
36	The Northern Cape is currently experiencing drought conditions. It is advised that the specialist notes that drought conditions in their reporting.		It is noted that the specialist should note the drought conditions on site. This has been communicated to the specialist. Due to staff being located on the project site, it is definitely possible for the ecologist to be alerted to rainfall events and co-ordinate field work accordingly.
37	It is recommended that bat populations will have to be investigated and assessed, especially in the mountainous areas. It is understood that insects are attracted to the residual glow from the tower in the evening which may attract bats. The impact of this would need to be understood. Marnus Smit, a previous employee of the DENC, may have existing data on bat populations in the area which the specialist could use.		The specialist has been requested to include an assessment on the impact on bat species within the EIA phase assessment.
POTENTIAL IMPACTS ON AVIFAUNA			
	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above report. BirdLife South Africa supports the responsible development of renewable energy in South Africa and we recognise the potential benefits of Concentrated Solar Power (CSP). Our goal is to ensure that the impacts on birds are properly understood and minimised, so that the	Samantha Ralston Birds and Renewable Energy Manager Simon Gear	The Mattheus-Gat Conservation Area is defined as a natural area in terms of the Ecological Scoping Study. The study site falls outside of this area. The Ecological Study identified the area as an area that is considered of potential high conservation importance due to the presence of Red Data species in these areas and the

NO.	ISSUE/COMMENT	ISSUE RAISED BY	RESPONSE
	<p>renewable energy is developed in an environmentally sustainable manner. Key to this is developing the right technology in the right place.</p> <p>Worldwide there has been little rigorous monitoring of the effects of CSP on birds, and where monitoring has been done, the data are rarely made publically available. What is understood, is that potential impacts could be significant. Impacts include habitat loss, disturbance, displacement, and mortality as a result of impact trauma (e.g. collisions with the reflective heliostats) or solar flux related injuries (i.e. burning). It has also been suggested that the CSP facilities could act as an ecological trap, attracting insects and birds.</p> <p>One of the first power tower facilities to be studied was Solar One (10MW) in California, where the fatality rate has been estimated to be 215 birds per year. More recently, fatality rates at the 377 MW Ivanpah Power Tower Facility in California were estimated to be approximately 3500 birds per year. A number of incidental fatalities have also been reported at CSP trough facilities in California (e.g. 183 dead birds were found at the Genesis Solar Plant over a 28 month periods). It is not clear if similar mortality rates will be experienced in South Africa, but a precautionary approach is warranted. We are therefore extremely concerned that the proposed Paulputs CSP facility is located on the border of the Mattheus-Gat Conservation Area Important Bird and Biodiversity Area (SA034). This important fact was not reported in the draft Scoping Report or the avifaunal assessment.</p>	<p>Programme Manager: Policy and Advocacy</p> <p>BirdLife SA</p> <p>Letter: 03-12-2015</p>	<p>intrinsic importance of this area. The location of the proposed Paulputs CSP facility on the border of the Mattheus-Gat Conservation Area Important Bird and Biodiversity Area (SA034) will be assessed in the EIA Phase and has been included in the Plan of Study for the EIA.</p> <p>As stated in the Scoping Report there is an operating CSP plant on this same farm portion – KaXu Solar One, as well as a second facility under construction – Xina Solar One. The existing operating CSP plant presented a unique opportunity to understand the nature and extent of avifauna interactions with a CSP facility in this area and specifically on this property. Therefore, although a precautionary approach was taken as part of the ecological assessment, this survey and findings were fully informed by observations at an operational plant.</p> <p>BirdLife SA visited the KaXu facility in October 2015 and so also have a first-hand understanding of the nature of the area and the birds active in the study area. No concerns regarding this area being fatally flawed for CSP development were raised when on the site.</p> <p>It is noted that Birdlife SA locates the site on the border of the IBA and not within the IBA itself.</p> <p>The avifaunal fieldwork consisted of a six day field study. During this period six vantage point surveys were conducted and transects were conducted in the washes (riparian zones). Red Larks although occurring regionally was not observed during the six day field study. Sclater's</p>

NO.	ISSUE/COMMENT	ISSUE RAISED BY	RESPONSE
	<p>Important Bird and Biodiversity Areas (IBAs) are places of international significance for the conservation of birds and other biodiversity. The Mattheus-Gat IBA is one of a few sites protecting both the Red Lark (<i>Certhilauda burra</i>; globally Vulnerable) and Sclater's Lark <i>Spizocorys sclateri</i>; near-threatened). Both are endemic species with restricted ranges. Red Lark inhabits red sand dunes and sandy plains with a mixed grassy dwarf shrub cover while Sclater's Lark occurs erratically on gravel plains. The area around the IBA has been poorly atlased, but the IBA potentially supports 16 of the 23 Namib-Karoo biome-restricted assemblage species and a host of other arid-zone birds. It is seasonally important for nomadic larks, such as Stark's Lark, and sparrow-larks, which are abundant after good rains.</p> <p>IBA trigger species include globally threatened Red Lark, Sclater's Lark, Kori Bustard <i>Ardeotis kori</i>, Ludwig's Bustard <i>Neotis ludwigii</i> and Black Harrier <i>Circus maurus</i>, and regionally threatened Karoo Korhaan <i>Eupodotis vigorsii</i>. Biome-restricted species include Stark's Lark, Karoo Long-billed Lark <i>Certhilauda subcoronata</i>, Black-eared Sparrow-lark <i>Eremopterix australis</i>, Tractrac Chat <i>Cercomela tractrac</i>, Sickle-winged Chat <i>C. sinuata</i>, Karoo Chat <i>C. schlegelii</i>, Layard's Tit-Babbler <i>Sylvia layardi</i>, Karoo Eremomela <i>gregalis</i>, Cinnamon-breasted Warbler <i>Euryptilasubcinnamomea</i>, Namaqua Warbler <i>Phragmacia substriata</i>, Sociable Weaver <i>Philetairus socius</i>, Pale-winged Starling <i>Onychognathus nabouroup</i> and Black-headed Canary <i>Serinus alario</i>. Additional priority species in the IBA include Martial Eagle <i>Polemaetus bellicosus</i>, Secretarybird <i>Sagittarius serpentarius</i>, Verreaux's Eagle <i>Aquila verreauxii</i>, Booted Eagle <i>Hieraaetus pennatus</i>, Black-chested Snake Eagle <i>Circaetus pectoralis</i>, Cape Eagle-Owl</p>		<p>Lark is not known to occur in the area and was not observed during the avifaunal field study. Starks lark and sparrow-Larks are known to occur regionally however were not observed during the six day field study.</p> <p>It is noted that although the IBA trigger species are known to occur regionally, however only one – the Sociable Weaver - was observed during the six day field study.</p> <p>Of the biome restricted species none, were observed during the field study, however it is noted that these species are known to occur in the region.</p> <p>There is low abundance and activity in the area, and specifically on this farm portion, primarily as a result of existing and on-going disturbance in the area (that is, 2x CSP facilities plus granite mining activities).</p> <p>The avifauna monitoring programme considers a wet season and a dry season survey, includes Vantage point surveys, conducted over at least 10 days, transects, as well as monitoring at an operational facility, and a second facility under construction.</p> <p>The BirdLife South Africa's draft Best Practice Guidelines for bird and solar energy were not attached to the submission. It is however, noted that the draft guidelines are out for comment until 11 January 2016, and only thereafter will be finalised and circulated for implementation.</p>

NO.	ISSUE/COMMENT	ISSUE RAISED BY	RESPONSE
	<p><i>Bubo capensis</i>, and Spotted Eagle-Owl <i>B. africanus</i>. A pair of Verreaux's Eagles was observed on two consecutive days in that area when BirdLife South Africa visited the IBA in early 2014. In light of the risks associated with CSP projects, particularly power towers, and the uncertainty in predicting impacts, BirdLife South Africa cannot support the development of further CSP projects in, or close to IBAs. There are already at least two CSP (trough) projects (KaXu and Xina) and two PV projects (Konkoonsies 1 and II) on the border of the Mattheus- Gat Conservation Area IBA. Cumulative impacts from renewable energy are therefore a significant concern, adding to existing pressures of overgrazing, drought linked to climate change, powerlines and quad biking.</p> <p>In light of the above, BirdLife South Africa strongly urges that alternative locations for the CSP facility are considered in the EIA. Alternatively, we suggest that this application should be withdrawn.</p> <p>Should the applicant wish to pursue development of this site we suggest that the burden of proof must be on demonstrating that the project will not negatively impact on any IBA trigger species, or their habitats. This will be hard to do, even with rigorous impact assessment in accordance with BirdLife South Africa's draft Best Practice Guidelines for bird and solar energy (attached), as there is the risk that birds will be attracted to the solar facilities, and seasonal and inter-annual fluctuations in bird populations are likely. The current methods suggested for the avifaunal study are definitely inadequate and more regular field surveys are strongly encouraged, although unlikely to change our position. BirdLife South Africa's</p>		

NO.	ISSUE/COMMENT	ISSUE RAISED BY	RESPONSE
	<p>position with regards to locating CSP facilities near IBAs and other important bird areas for birds is only likely to change once the results of monitoring existing CSP facilities are made available and we have a better understanding of the impacts and how to mitigate them.</p>		
SOCIAL IMPACTS			
38	<p>We wish to greet you with happiness and blessings to all of you and your colleagues. We had just saw the news regarding new CPS in 'Die Gembok' about projects soon to start within the Khai Ma Municipality area. As we wasn't involve in the meetings and previous discussion we had took the time to do research and read through some of your content as published on your website. The reason for our email is thus:</p> <p>» We believe that this position must be filled by someone locally (from within the Khai Ma Municipality). Reason being is that the current CLO of Abengoa / Abeinsa EPC is not from this area and therefore. This is problematic as our people from the Municipality never got the opportunity to partake in such jobs, to be of service in their own area. Our request and plea is therefore that jobs relating to the upcoming projects, must include mostly local (Pella; Pofadder; Onseepkans; Witbank; Aggeneys; etc.) people, as we believe that they too can do a great job if given the opportunity and skills development.</p> <p>We there request that more public participation must be involve in such job opportunities. We do not want people within jobs to take over where unemployed people could've serve. We also would like to get more information regarding meeting dates, database applications (to inform our local businesses) to ensure that if there is work that</p>	<p>A.A. Silo Community Mentoring Forum (CMF)</p> <p>Khai Ma Local Municipality</p> <p>Letter: 20-11-2015</p>	<p>Your comment is noted however it is not the intention of the public participation process to fill a position as you have implied.</p>

NO.	ISSUE/COMMENT	ISSUE RAISED BY	RESPONSE
	<p>local companies can do, privilege should be given to them. Further we would like to request the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. More Joint Ventures (JV's) must be implemented with local companies 2. Services such as basic construction, fencing, cleaning services, water purification services, transport, catering should be allocated more to Khai Ma Businesses. We believe that companies do get businesses from outside the Municipality do to such work, where as we do have companies within our sector who are able to such jobs. 3. Labour brokers as you must have heard and know are problematic as we would further like to encourage you to make use of appointing workers straight under you or through joint venture with local labour companies. <p>We believe that we all are feeling the change of perhaps work for the people, and we also need to see that our local business are been lift up for the better of us all.</p>		
WATER USE LICENSE APPLICATION PROCESS, WATER USES AND PIPELINE			
39	Will the new pipeline cross any drainage lines?	Shaun Cloete Lower Orange Water Management Area	Infrastructure such as roads and pipelines could possibly cross drainage lines, however this will be confirmed in the EIA phase.
40	Where will water for the project be sourced?	Department of Water and Sanitation Meeting: 17-11-2015	Water will be required to be abstracted from the Gariiep (Orange) River directly. Water sources considered within the Scoping Report include: abstracting water directly from the Gariiep (Orange) River; obtaining water from a Khai Ma Local Municipality and direct abstraction from boreholes. Obtaining water from the municipality is not considered as a viable source of water. Groundwater is also not considered a viable water source due to its scarcity and brackish quality.
41	A non-binding confirmation of water availability letter, stating that a reserve determination study would need to		It is noted that the existing reserve would be utilised to determine water availability for the project. A water use

NO.	ISSUE/COMMENT	ISSUE RAISED BY	RESPONSE
	<p>be undertaken, will be provided to the applicant. If there is an existing reserve, permission must be acquired from RDM to use this reserve, as long as the existing reserve is not older than 5 years. Existing reserves were identified for the surrounding projects in the area and could be used to determine the water availability for the project.</p> <p>DWS is required to prioritise the processing of water use applications that are considered strategic water users. Renewable energy projects are identified as strategic water users, therefore water use license applications (WULAs) will be processed faster.</p>		<p>license application will be submitted by the applicant in preparation for bidding the project to the Department of Energy's (DoE) Renewable Energy Independent Power Producers Procurement (REIPPP) programme.</p>
42	Will there be evaporation ponds?		There will be six lined evaporation ponds of approximately 1 ha each at this facility.
43	Will raw water abstracted from the Orange River be stored on site?		Raw water abstracted from the Gariep/Orange River will be stored in water reservoir/s on site. Section 21(b) of the Water Act (Act No 36 of 1998) will be triggered. This water use will be applied for in the WULA.
44	<p>DWS would need to be informed of the type of pump station that would be installed. Will a new pump station be constructed? What type of pump station would be used? How far will it be located from the river bank?</p> <p>Details relating to the pump station will need provided in the WULA.</p>		This level of detail is not yet known and will be provided in the EIA phase.
45	Will the pipeline traverse along the river bed?	Peter Cloete Research and Developments and	The abstraction point will be located adjacent to the river on the bank. The pipeline will follow the same alignment as the KaXu pipeline, taking the water south to the project site.
46	Will the project have evaporation ponds? Will monitoring of the evaporation ponds be undertaken during the operational phase?	Conrad Geldenhuys Research and Developments	There will be six evaporation ponds on site. These ponds will be required to be lined, in accordance with the WULA to be made to DWS. Long-term monitoring a leak

NO.	ISSUE/COMMENT	ISSUE RAISED BY	RESPONSE
		Northern Cape Department of Environment and Nature Conservation	detection will be undertaken through the operation phase and up to final closure.
47	Is there an alternative for the pipeline route?	Northern Cape Department of Environment and Nature Conservation	No alternative pipeline routes have been identified by the applicant at this stage because the proposed pipeline will run parallel to the existing KaXu Solar One pipeline within the servitude of the existing R357 Onseepkans road.
48	Please note that the proposed activity will require a water use authorisation from this department as in terms of Section 21(a), (b), (c), (i) and (h) of the National Water Act (Act 36 of 1998)	Meeting: 19-11-2015	A Water Use License application will be prepared and submitted to the DWS for the planned water uses.
49	Due to the high number of renewable energy projects that are taking part in the Department of Energy (DOE) bidding process, the Department (DWS) has resolved to only processing applications for water use authorisations received from applicants who have attained preferred bidder status. Developers who wish to submit applications for water use authorisations may however proceed to do so, with the understanding that their applications will be processed as soon as we have confirmation of their status with the DOE	SA Manamthela Lower Orange Water Management Area Department of Water and Sanitation Letter: 18-12-2015	It is noted that the applicant who wishes to submit applications for water use authorisations may proceed to do so, with the understanding that their applications will be processed as soon as we have confirmation of their status with the DOE.
GENERAL			
50	What is the generating capacity of the solar facility? What will be the output of the plant? What kind of technology will be used?	Shaun Cloete Lower Orange Water Management Area	The CSP facility will have a generating capacity of up to 200MW. Concentrated Solar Power (with molten salt storage technology) is proposed to be utilised for this project.
51	When will the applicant bid the project to the DoE?	Department of Water and Sanitation	The applicant intends on bidding this project into Bidding Window 5 in of the REIPPP programme in 2016.
52	Who is the developer of the proposed project?	Meeting: 17-11-2015	Abengoa Solar Power South Africa is the developer for the project.
53	Will new roads be constructed?		The MR73 gravel road will need to be realigned in order to accommodate the heliostat field. The site has existing access which was constructed for the KaXu and Xina

NO.	ISSUE/COMMENT	ISSUE RAISED BY	RESPONSE
			projects therefore existing roads will be used as far as possible during the construction phase of the Paulputs CSP Project and two alternative access roads have been considered within the Scoping Report (refer to Section 2.4.5).
54	Will a wet or dry-cooling system be used for this CSP facility?		A dry-cooling system will be used for the proposed project.
55	What is the development footprint of the neighbouring CSP projects?	Peter Cloete Research and Developments	The existing KaXu Solar One facility is approximately 450ha in extent and the Xina Solar One project, currently under construction, is approximately 600ha in extent.
56	Why is a new pipeline route being investigated? Why can't the developer use the existing pipeline that provides water to the other two projects?	and Conrad Geldenhuys Research and Developments	Each project is required to be considered a stand-alone facility by the Department of Energy. Shared or common infrastructure is preferred, but would need to be negotiated through the project development process. As such, this EIA must consider a project-specific pipeline, access road, grid connection etc.
57	Will cumulative impacts be assessed within the EIA?	Northern Cape Department of Environment and Nature Conservation	A cumulative impact assessment will be undertaken as per the EIA Regulations, 2014.
58	Will dust suppression methods be applied?		Dust suppression methods will be applied. The need for measures will be stipulated within the EMPr.
59	Does the development area fall within the SEA process? It seems that the government is trying to roll out the SEA process in specific areas to streamline renewable energy developments.	Meeting: 19-11-2015	The SEA process for determining REDZ focus areas did not consider CSP technology – only wind and PV. However the project is located within the Eskom “Critical Power” Corridor as identified through the Eskom SEA.
60	Will the heliostats be constructed on terraces around the tower or will they be constructed on a flat surface?		Terracing is not required for the heliostat field, as is typical for a trough plant facility. Limited vegetation clearing will be required around heliostat pedestals.
61	How large are the heliostats in comparison to the troughs?		Trough plants comprise rows/trough of mirrors, which are close to ground level and up to 8m in height when in the stowed position. Each heliostat is approximately 36m ² in surface area.

NO.	ISSUE/COMMENT	ISSUE RAISED BY	RESPONSE
62	Do the size of the heliostats have an impact on the generation capacity?		All technology providers have varying dimensions for the heliostats. The larger the heliostat, the fewer heliostats are constructed within the heliostat field. The smaller the heliostat, the more are constructed within the field.
63	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Northern Cape Department of Roads and Public Works is the road owner. Realignment of the road will require the following process to be followed; the applicant must apply for realignment of the road on behalf of the road owner. • The applicant must arrange a site walk with the DR&PW before the application is submitted. • The contact person regarding the realignment application and site walk is Romeo Chivhase (Contact Number: 0790615015). He will be available from 4 January 2015 until 8 January 2015 and then 18 January 2015 onwards. • Mr Roberts suggested making contact with Mr Jaco Rudolphse from the Kimberly DR&PW Office (Contact Number: 0768116206) before submitting the application to ensure all requirements are met. • It is important to use the client's letter head in the application. • The application must be addressed to the Namakwa (Springbok) Office. From here the application will be sent to Kimberly office for final assessment. 	<p>Harold Roberts District Manager – Department Roads and Public Works</p> <p>Meeting: 17-12-2015</p>	The Department of Roads and Public Works have confirmed that they do not oppose the realignment of the road, and that an application for the realignment of the MR73 may be filed with DENC. The process for the route deterioration will be initiated between the developer and the Department of Roads and Public Works.