



DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

Purpose of	Tutuka Continuous Ashing EIA –		
Meeting:	Landowners' Focus Group		
	Meeting		
Venue:	Tutuka Power Station,		
	Standerton		
Date:	22 November 2012		

Attendance Register				
Attendees:				
Name	<u>Company</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Company</u>	
Ashlea Strong	Lidwala SA	Bongi Mhlanga (BM)	Lidwala SA	
(AS)			Ť	
Nicolene Venter	Imaginative Africa	Tobile Bokwe (TB)	Eskom – EIA Centre	
(NV)			of Excellence	
Belinda Roos (BR)	Eskom – EIA Centre of	Bianca Wernecke (BW)	Eskom – EIA Centre	
	Excellence		of Excellence	
William Mogwase	Eskom – Tutuka Power	Nondwe Nonganza (NN)	Eskom – Tutuka	
(WM)	Station		Power Station	
Egard van	Eskom – Tutuka Power 🐇	Claude Naicker (CN)	Eskom – Tutuka	
Rensburg (EvR)	Station		Power Station	
S.L Riekert (SR)	Landwoner	P.J van Heerden (PvH)	Landowner	
S.L van der Merwe	Landowner			
(SvdM)		•		
Apologies		•		
Name	<u>Company</u>	Name	<u>Company</u>	
Ben Steyn	Landowner	Paul Venter	Landowner	
Michiel Odendaal	Landowner			

Item No	Discussions	Action by whom	Action by when
1.	INTRODUCTION / WELCOME		
	NV welcomed everyone and thanked everyone for taking		
	the time to attend the meeting. WM explained the		
	evacuation procedure in case of an emergency.		
	The team members introduced themselves, and briefly		
	described their roles and responsibilities associated with		
	this proposed project.		
2.	PRESENTATIONS		
	(Due to size of the Presentation Document (5MB),		
	it is not attached. Should you be able to receive a		
	5MB file by e-mail, please request your copy from		
	the Public Participation Consultants)		
2.1	NV presented the draft Agenda, the conduct of the		
	meeting and the purposed of the meeting		

	AC procented the people for the property resident and]
2.2	AS presented the need for the proposed project, and a		
	brief summary of the environmental findings as per the		
	draft Scoping Report.		
2.3	EvR presented the technical information associated with		
	this proposed project.		
2.4	NV presented the Public Participation Process and		
	opened the floor for discussions.		
3.	DISCUSSIONS		
3.1	PvH wanted to know whether there is existing data		
	available that shows the current water quality on his		
	farm.		
	WM stated that they have boreholes around the area	WM	February
	and data is collected and this data will be made		2013
	available to the specialists working on the project, to		
	inform the team.	\mathcal{A}	
	AS informed the attendees that the surface and	AS	Impact
	groundwater specialist would make use of Tutuka Power		Phase
	Station's existing data during his detailed assessment in	The second secon	
	the Impact Phase, as well as ground-truthing the site/s.		
3.2	PvH informed the project team that Tutuka Power		
	Station current ash suppression is not effective as		
	surrounding landowners experience serious problems		
	due to ash settling on their crops and grazing land.		
	During the dusty seasons, ash is often blown to the		
	surrounding atmosphere and it impairs visibility. The		
	situation is so bad that the farm workers do not want to		
	live on the farms anymore due to this health issue.		
	Tutuka Power Station is urged to address the current		
	problems before continuing with more ashing.		
	WM said it should be noted that Tutuka Power Station is	WM	Continuous
	doing dust suppression on top of the ash disposal facility	••••	continuous
	using two mechanisms that is dust suppression by		
	moveable sprinklers and a water tanker driving on top		
	of the ash disposal facility. The dust suppression		
	sprinklers are running 24 hours a day and a tanker is		
	driving around at frequent interval. Tutuka has just		
	started with a project of looking at different dust		
	suppression methods, one of the methods being looked		
	at is dust suppression on the sides/slope of the ash		
	disposal facility as both the sprinklers and the tankers cannot reach those areas.		
2.2			
3.3	SvdM informed the project team that landowners are		
	being approached for prospecting on their farms and		
	wanted to know if they should allow those companies to		
	prospect.		
	TB replied that Eskom cannot tell the landowners to		
	allow prospecting or not, that decision will have to be		
	made by the landowner on his/her discretion.		
	He further explained that if Eskom wants to make use of		

Iand for ashing and if there is a mineral right has been registered with DMR then discussions will take place between Eskom and the mineral right owner. AS requested that the details of the companies that are doing the prospecting on the properties to be forwarded to the public participation team.LandownersA.S.A.3.4SR commented that the stockpile yards at Tutuka Power Station seem like they are not being managed properly. Post-meeting note: WM responded that coal dust at Tutuka Power Station's Coal Stockyard is managed by doing dust suppression.A.S.A.	P
between Eskom and the mineral right owner. AS requested that the details of the companies that are doing the prospecting on the properties to be forwarded to the public participation team. Landowners A.S.A. 3.4 SR commented that the stockpile yards at Tutuka Power Station seem like they are not being managed properly. Post-meeting note: WM responded that coal dust at Tutuka Power Station's Coal Stockyard is managed by doing dust suppression. A.S.A.	Ρ
AS requested that the details of the companies that are doing the prospecting on the properties to be forwarded to the public participation team. 3.4 SR commented that the stockpile yards at Tutuka Power Station seem like they are not being managed properly. <u>Post-meeting note:</u> WM responded that coal dust at Tutuka Power Station's Coal Stockyard is managed by doing dust suppression.	P
doing the prospecting on the properties to be forwarded to the public participation team. 3.4 3.4 SR commented that the stockpile yards at Tutuka Power Station seem like they are not being managed properly. Post-meeting note: WM responded that coal dust at Tutuka Power Station's Coal Stockyard is managed by doing dust suppression.	P
to the public participation team. 3.4 SR commented that the stockpile yards at Tutuka Power Station seem like they are not being managed properly. Post-meeting note: WM responded that coal dust at Tutuka Power Station's Coal Stockyard is managed by doing dust suppression.	
3.4 SR commented that the stockpile yards at Tutuka Power Station seem like they are not being managed properly. Post-meeting note: WM responded that coal dust at Tutuka Power Station's Coal Stockyard is managed by doing dust suppression.	
Station seem like they are not being managed properly. Post-meeting note: WM responded that coal dust at Tutuka Power Station's Coal Stockyard is managed by doing dust suppression.	
Post-meeting note: WM responded that coal dust at Tutuka Power Station's Coal Stockyard is managed by doing dust suppression.	
WM responded that coal dust at Tutuka Power Station's Coal Stockyard is managed by doing dust suppression.	
Coal Stockyard is managed by doing dust suppression.	
The dust suppression is done by the use of water	
The dust suppression is done by the use of water	A
tankers driving around at frequent intervals. It is	1. Alexandre
unfortunate that water sprinklers cannot be utilised at	
the stock yard due to the effect of water on coal, it is a	
huge problem to transport wet coal via conveyers as they trip due to excess weight, it is also a problem to	
burn wet coal as it takes a while to burn. It should also	
be noted that Eskom took the contacts details of SR so	
that he can elaborate more on his comment, so that it	
will give Eskom a better chance to respond to the	
comment.	
3.5 SR informed the project team that Tutuka Power Station	
monitoring is not done properly because buckets have	
been placed at their house, but not collected.	
WM informed the attendee that the matter will be WM Febru	arv
addressed.	ur y
Eskom is in the process of placing a new contract to	
handling fugitive dust management on site inclusive of	
the ash disposal facility and inclusive of maintaining	
dust buckets, target date is 02/2013.	
3.6 PvH wanted to know if the current ash disposal facility	
has a buffer zone.	
EvR responded by saying there is no buffer zone. The	
EIA study would determine if a buffer zone is required.	
The ash disposal facility expansion design has no buffer	
zone. If buffer zone is required, then additional land	
should be purchased.	
PvH commented that generally that buffer zone is inside	
property boundaries of an adjoining landowner's	
property and that limits the usage of that portion of land	
and also any expansions. Roshcon is currently in the	
process to cover the standby ash disposal facility top	
surface with a top soil to reduce the open ash surface.	
Roshcon also investigate to use a binding agent in the	
water to spray this water on the side slopes of the ash	
disposal facility.	
3.7 PvH suggested that the environmental team visit the	
adjoining farms to familiarise themselves with the	

	environmental impacts experienced by the landowners in the area.		
	AS asked, for clarification, if the one-on-one visits	AS	Start of
	requested whether it refers to the specialists only and if		Impact
	so which specialists.		Phase
	PvH replied that the two specialists that he suggests are		
	Air Pollution, and Agriculture and Soil.		
	TB commented that Tutuka Power Station has an ISO		
	certification. He further said that the farmers should		
	make use of the farmer's quarterly meetings to discuss		
	such matters because it is disheartening when one		
	attends meetings to discuss future developments and then be made aware that challenges due to current	1 Alexandre	
	operations are not being discussed or addressed by the		
	power station.	\checkmark	
3.8	WM informed the attendees that Tutuka Power Station	WM	<i>y</i>
	will conduct a few site visits with the landowners and ${}^{\!$		
	requested the public participation team to forward the		
	attendees' contact details to him.	<u>A</u>	
4.	Way Forward &Closure		
	NV presented the way forward and thanked everyone		
	for their valuable comments raised and closed the		
	meeting.		
Minute	d by: Nicolene Venter and Bongi Mhlanga		