

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

Purpose of Meeting:	Majuba & Tutuka Continuous Ashing EIAs Key Stakeholders Workshop
Venue:	Highveld Visitor Centre 59 Kerk Street, Ermelo
Date:	21 November 2012

Attendance Register

Attendees:			
Name	Company	Name	Company
Ashlea Strong (AS)	Lidwala SA	Bongi Mhlanga (BM)	Lidwala SA
Nicolene Venter (NV)	Imaginative Africa	Tobile Bokwe (TB)	Eskom – EIA Centre of Excellence
Belinda Roos (BR)	Eskom – EIA Centre of Excellence	Bianca Wernecke (BW)	Eskom – Graduate in training
William Mogwase (WM)	Eskom – Tutuka Environmental	Zama Mkhize (ZM)	Eskom – Majuba Environmental (GIT)
D.J Du Plessis (DdP)	TAUSA	Johan Celliers (JC)	TAUSA
Martin Struthers (MS)	DARDLA	Jan Venter (JV)	DARDLA
Hendrik Mills (HM)	EPA	Feziwe Ludidi (FL)	Mpumalanga Dept of Environmental Health

Item	Actions	Action by whom	Action by when
1.	INTRODUCTION / WELCOME		
	NV welcomed everyone present for taking the time to attend the meeting.		
	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 (9.5MB), it is not attached. Should you be able to receive a 9.5MB file by e-mail, please request your copy from the Public Participation Consultants)		
2.1	NV presented the draft Agenda, the purpose of the meeting and the conduct of the meeting.		
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	NV presented the Public Participation Process and opened the floor for discussion.		
3.	DISCUSSIONS		
3.1	JV informed the project team that cumulative impacts should be assessed during the EIA as there are a number of projects taking place in the area. e.g. Tutuka and proposed prospecting activity AS responded that cumulative impacts are being taken into account as it is a requirement in terms of EIA legislation. e.g. existing infrastructure, future applications, etc. It is accepted that the limitation is on what is known about future planning.		
3.2	JV raised the following questions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> When Eskom establish an ash disposal facility, does it have an impact on the topsoil; will the topsoil be removed before the ash is disposed of on that site; and will the ash disposal facility be lined. AS responded as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Before Eskom can dispose of the ash, the topsoil is removed, and stockpiled; In terms of the new legislation, the Authorities, e.g. DWA and DEA, tend to require that waste facilities should be lined, but they make a decision on each case based on its merits. WM informed the attendees that topsoil is used to rehabilitate the ash disposal facility as they continue with the ashing process.		
3.3	MS asked how thick is the topsoil that is removed when establishing a ash disposal facility. This question relates to agricultural soil classification. WM replied that when Eskom (Tutuka Power Station) establishes an ash disposal facility that Eskom removes about 25 to 30 cm of topsoil.		
3.4	JC asked can concrete be made from the ash and if so why can't it be used to fix gravel roads? TB responded that Eskom has just established a contract with a consultant who specialises in waste, to investigate whether there are uses for the ash. Once these results are available, it will be made available to the attendees. It was also mentioned that this study is being undertaken to inform the Eskom-Mpumalanga Forum. Post meeting Note: The Majuba Power Station Team confirmed that they currently sell approximately 10% of their fly ash to external companies for alternative uses.	TB	Once information is available
3.5	JC asked can ash be back-ashed to mine. TB responded that suggestions such as this that could		

	<p>reduce the footprint of an ash disposal facility and are always appreciated, but this specific question has its challenges. Typical challenges include liability with respect to groundwater pollution between the mining houses and Eskom, and these are never sorted out. Eskom will continue to keep this option under investigation to ensure the reduction of footprint.</p>		
3.6	<p>JV asked whether the area where coal is discarded is also lined.</p> <p>TB responded that Tutuka Power Station is in the planning process to line waste facilities, as informed by WULs and Duty of Care from Eskom.</p>		
3.7	<p>DdP asked does Lidwala have access to information of ash disposal facilities which were closed in the past and the impacts they have on the environment.</p> <p>AS responded that Lidwala is not aware of any ash disposal facilities that have been closed.</p> <p>DdP asked has Lidwala looked at existing information on Eskom's business.</p> <p>AS responded that information was received from Eskom regarding their existing ashing facilities and processes and Eskom will continue to forward the required information as and when needed.</p>		
3.8	<p>JV raised the following questions / comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When Eskom rehabilitate ash disposal facilities, do they look at the land use? AS responded that this issue would be addressed under the land capability study. • JV commented the rehabilitation should be done in such a way that the same land capability is established after rehabilitation has taken place. • When the top soil is removed it is left outside for a long period of time and this sterilizes the soil. Also, when excavation is done, the topsoil is removed horizontally and tipped overturned over and during rehabilitation it is not replaced in the correct soil condition order. WM replied the stockpiling of topsoil is for a short period of time (up to a month), by which time the soil is used for rehabilitation. • JV commented that it is believed that Eskom manages its stock pile in such a manner as to prevent erosion. WM thanked this comment, and it was well received. 		
3.9	<p>HM asked what is the process involved for the underground coal gasification.</p> <p>AS responded the project team is not able to answer the question as that project does not form part of this</p>	AS	21 November 2012

	EIA. She committed to providing him with contact details to the team dealing with the UCG project		
3.10	HM commented that Majuba Power Station's ash sites are moving over a wetland. AS responded that that is exactly the reason why alternatives sites have been identified and what will be assessed in the Impact Phase.		
3.11	HM informed the project team that the Association does not have a major concern regarding the proposed expansion of the ash disposal facilities, but the Association's other main issue is mining. The heavy metals that end up in the water systems, for e.g the Vaal river, and this is unacceptable and a great concern. He enquired whether the project team is aware of the negative effects heavy metals have on humans i.e. it affects ones brain, behaviour and emotions. Women become infertile, people get brain damaged. The biggest irrigation system is in the Vaal River. If the water is polluted it affects the agriculture sector, hence food production which in the end we as humans take in.		
3.12	HM noted that looking at the diagram presented, that the surface of the ash disposal facility is flat and ask whether it will remain flat. If so, it would look unnatural and will also cause erosion. TB responded that the delegate is correct, a flat surface would cause erosion problems due to water seepage. It is expected that the concept design would provide a design that would be more visually acceptable, avoid standing water, and would allow collection of any run-off water.		
3.13	HM asked if heavy metal present in the ash and if the ash is toxic. AS replied samples from the most recent ash were taken and the preliminary results will be in the Draft Environmental Impact (DEIR).		
3.14	JC commented that it is sometimes difficult to work through these Reports on the websites as they are not properly named, especially the Appendices and one needs to open them all to find the one that you are looking for. AS assured this proposed project's Report is properly indexed with a Table of Context and the Appendices clearly indicates which specialists' report it is. This demarcation is clearly presented even on the websites.		
3.15	JC said it is Lidwala Environmental responsibility to advise Eskom as to why they are not the most famous neighbour and that they must, at all times, adhere to		

	environmental standards. Eskom is damaging the country with their environmental impacts.		
3.16	HM enquired as to whether Eskom is looking at other energy sources than coal. TB responded that Eskom does have a Research and Development Department and Eskom is looking at renewable energy i.e. wind farm, hydro and solar.		
3.17	WM commented there are different regulations that Eskom must adhere to e.g. Eskom has to adhere to sewerage, air quality standards, etc, and if Eskom does not adhere to these standards they are penalised. TB added Eskom (Generation) has an ISO 14001 EMS Certification. Therefore, should landowners notice any non-compliance; it needs to be communicated with the station. TB provided the attendees with the name and contact details of Eskom's Environmental Manager, Ms Deidre Herbst, and said if there are any issues that they have reported to the station, and are not getting attention, they are most welcome to give her a call.		
4.	Way Forward & Closure		
	NV presented the way forward and thanked everyone for their valuable comments raised and closed the meeting.		

Minuted by: Nicolene Venter and Bongji Mhlanga