

NAMAS WIND FARM AND ZONNEQUA WIND FARM, NORTHERN CAPE

**NOTES OF FOCUS GROUP MEETING WITH BIRDLIFE SA
HELD ON 14 AUGUST 2018
KIRSTENBOSCH BOTANICAL GARDENS, CAPE TOWN**

Notes for the Record prepared by:

Savannah Environmental (Pty) Ltd

Contact: Ms Rozanne Els

Position: Public Participation Co-Ordinator

E-mail: publicprocess@savannahsa.com

Please address any comments to Rozanne Els at the above address

NAMAS WIND FARM AND ZONNEQUA WIND FARM, NORTHERN CAPE

Venue: Room A3, Centre for Biodiversity Conservation, Kirstenbosch Botanical Gardens, Rhodes Drive, Cape Town

Date: 14 August 2018

Time: 10:00

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

The Namas Wind Farm and the Zonnequa Wind Farm are 140MW wind projects located within the Springbok Renewable Energy Development Zone (REDZ). As the abbreviated process is applicable for the applications for authorisation, it is considered necessary to engage with key stakeholders prior to the release of the report in order to ensure that key requirements/comments are noted and addressed ahead of finalising the reporting. This will enable the application to remain within the prescribed timeframes.

The projects were introduced at a meeting held with BirdLife SA (BLSA) on 18 July 2018. At the focus group meeting held in July 2018, BLSA had raised a comment regarding the Secretarybirds that had been observed on both the project sites proposed for the wind farms, and specifically the need for a buffer where the nest sites had been identified. Comment was also raised regarding the potential relocation of the Secretarybird nest located within the Zonnequa Wind Farm project site. This meeting provides the opportunity for clarity to be sought regarding these issues. The purpose of the meeting is to provide an opportunity for Rob Simmons (appointed as the avifauna specialist) to give a brief summary of his findings following the 12-month pre-construction monitoring campaign at both the Namas and the Zonnequa sites, and specifically regarding the use of the site by Priority bird species.

Rob Simmons advised the following regarding the observed behaviour of the Secretarybirds for the two sites:

- » Namas Wind Farm: One inactive nest site observed; one flight of Secretarybird recorded only during the 12-month monitoring campaign; rest of the activity was at ground level.
- » Zonnequa Wind Farm: One inactive nest site observed.

A low number of flights were observed over the monitoring period and the Secretarybirds were only noted as a pair in August/September 2017. Other than the pair observed in August/September 2017, only a single bird was noted during the monitoring campaign. Throughout the duration of the monitoring period (in more than 300 hours), the Secretarybirds were never seen on both sites, and therefore it is believed to be the same bird moving between the two nests located within the project sites.

During the monitoring campaign, the farmers were consulted regarding the sightings. One farmer reported a Secretarybird nest close to the Kommagas road and off the project site, albeit several years before. Following the fatality of one adult, the single individual has since left the area.

Rob Simmons advised that a cautious approach is being taken on the projects. As there is no active breeding being undertaken at the nests, and limited individuals recorded within the area, a 1km exclusion area around each inactive nest is still recommended. The justification for a 1km exclusion zone was based on a collation of thoughts from specialists in the field; and explained by Rob Simmons to include the following:

1. This is not an active breeding site, and the 1km exclusion zone is put forward as a precautionary measure.
2. Craig Whittington-Jones advised that a distance of 2500m from a nest is considered a "sensitive" area.
3. Ernest Retief has, from the results of a juvenile tagged Secretarybird, demonstrated that the bird stayed within 1.3km from its nest, and that the findings were from an open grassland habitat.
4. There is no good usage data available.
5. The Secretarybird is a terrestrial species and rarely takes flight.
6. Records from breeding Secretarybirds on an Eastern Cape wind farm site showed that the birds spend less than 0.2% of the time in flight, but 85% of that time is in the rotor swept area.
7. There is one recorded fatality of a Secretarybird at a wind farm in South Africa.
8. Collision with fences result in more deaths of Secretarybirds (than collision with wind turbines).

MEETING ATTENDEES

Name	Organisation	Position
Samantha Ralston-Paton (SRP)	BirdLife SA	Birds and Renewable Energy Project Manager
David Peinke (DP)	Atlantic Renewable Energy Partners (Pty) Ltd	Project Developer
Tamsin Sheard (TS)	Genesis Eco-Energy Developments (Pty) Ltd	Project Developer
Sonia Mischczak (SM)	Atlantic Renewable Energy Partners (Pty) Ltd	Project Developer
Karen Jodas (KJ)	Savannah Environmental (Pty) Ltd	Environmental Assessment Practitioner
Marlei Martins (MM)	Birds and Bats Unlimited	Avifauna Specialist
Rob Simmons (RS)	Birds and Bats Unlimited	Avifauna Specialist

APOLOGIES

None

DISCUSSION SESSION

Question / Comment	Response
SRP: As the nests are not active, this is encouraging. The question will remain what if this situation changes, what can be done to safeguard the birds until more answers become available?	RS: One key mitigation for the area is to remove all roads from use within the recommended 1km buffer applied around the nests, as well as the removal all fences in these areas. There is no record of breeding on the sites, and no current breeding activity. The nests are inactive, and a second bird was only briefly observed on one occasion.
SRP: BirdLife SA is satisfied with the 1km buffer proposed for the Secretarybirds nests considering the justification provided by Rob Simmons. What management measures can be included into the Environmental Management Programme (EMPr) as long-term management or mitigation measures? The nest sites should be monitored continually for any breeding activity.	RS: The recommendation for long-term monitoring during the operation phase has been included in the Avifauna Impact Assessment Report. A change in activity during the operation phase monitoring will be noted.
SRP: Should a nest become an active breeding site, it may be necessary to consider shut down on demand during high risk periods.	RS: The potential for risk to a provisioning male during the breeding period (that is, when bringing food back to the nest, the bird will soar/glide into the nest area) is acknowledged, and this risk can also impact the survival rates in juveniles.
SRP: As not enough data is on hand to know success rate of black blade painting as a mitigation measure, the success of this cannot be relied on alone. However, the remoteness of this area (with the lack of visual observers) may lend this site to being a good test site for this mitigation measure.	DP: In the scenario that an inactive nest becomes active, as a developer the potential to paint one blade on each turbine for those few turbines close to the 1km buffer may be viable. This will depend on the turbine supplier's requirements.

SUMMARY, WAY FORWARD AND CLOSURE

In summary, the 1km exclusion zone put forward as a precautionary measure is supported by BLSA, following the rationale provided by the specialists. BLSA will review the report once made available and provide any written comments as may be required. Karen Jodas thanked the meeting attendees for availing themselves for the meeting and closed the meeting.

Post Meeting Notes

Following the meeting, further correspondence was undertaken between the avifauna specialist and BirdLife and the size of the buffer around the nest located on the Namas Wind Farm project site and the recommendation of the relocation of the nest located on the Zonnequa Wind Farm project site was accepted. This is confirmed in the Avifauna Impact Assessment included as **Appendix E** of the Basic Assessment report.

NAMAS WIND FARM AND ZONNEQUA WIND FARM, NORTHERN CAPE

**NOTES OF FOCUS GROUP MEETING WITH BIRDLIFE SA
HELD ON 18 JULY 2018
KIRSTENBOSCH BOTANICAL GARDENS, CAPE TOWN**

Notes for the Record prepared by:

Savannah Environmental (Pty) Ltd

Contact: Ms Rozanne Els

Position: Public Participation Co-Ordinator

E-mail: publicprocess@savannahsa.com

Please address any comments to Rozanne Els at the above address

NAMAS WIND FARM AND ZONNEQUA WIND FARM, NORTHERN CAPE

Venue: Room A3, Centre for Biodiversity Conservation, Building Kirstenbosch Botanical Gardens, Rhodes Drive, Cape Town

Date: 18 July 2018

Time: 13:00

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

Lisa Opperman, of Savannah Environmental, welcomed all present and thanked the attendees for availing themselves for the meeting. She noted that Genesis Namas Wind (Pty) Ltd and Genesis Zonnequa Wind (Pty) Ltd propose the development of two 140MW wind farms on adjacent sites within the Springbok Renewable Energy Development Zone (REDZ), approximately 20km south-east of the town of Kleinsee in the Northern Cape. The wind farms are known as the Namas Wind Farm and the Zonnequa Wind Farm and are located within the Nama Khoi Local Municipality and the Namakwa District Municipality. A suitable project site for the development of each of the wind farms has been identified by the project development companies.

Lisa Opperman noted that Genesis Namas Wind (Pty) Ltd and Genesis Zonnequa Wind (Pty) Ltd have appointed Savannah Environmental as the independent Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) responsible for undertaking a Basic Assessment (BA) process to identify and assess all potential environmental impacts associated with the projects, and propose appropriate mitigation measures in an Environmental Management Programme (EMPr). She stated that the purpose of the meeting was to introduce the Namas Wind Farm and the Zonnequa Wind Farm and to provide feedback on the Avifaunal Impact Assessment and provide a description of the BA and public participation process being undertaken. She also noted that the comments raised during the meeting will be included and addressed as part of the BA reports for the projects and will also be considered by the avifaunal specialist appointed to undertake the Avifauna Impact Assessments (i.e. Rob Simmons). As the abbreviated process is applicable for the applications for authorisation, it is considered necessary to engage with key stakeholders prior to the release of the report in order to ensure that key requirements/comments are noted and addressed ahead of finalising the reporting. This will enable the application to remain within the prescribed timeframes.

MEETING ATTENDEES

Name	Organisation	Position
Samantha Ralston-Paton (SRP)	BirdLife SA	Birds and Renewable Energy Project Manager
Ralph Damonse (RD)	Genesis Eco-Energy Developments (Pty) Ltd	Project Developer
David Peinke (DP)	Atlantic Renewable Energy Partners (Pty) Ltd	Project Developer

Tamsin Sheard (TS)	Genesis Eco-Energy Developments (Pty) Ltd	Project Developer
Sonia Miszczak (SM)	Atlantic Renewable Energy Partners (Pty) Ltd	Project Developer
Lisa Opperman (LO)	Savannah Environmental (Pty) Ltd	Environmental Assessment Practitioner

APOLOGIES

None

BACKGROUND & TECHNICAL ASPECTS REGARDING THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Lisa Opperman of Savannah Environmental presented the background and technical aspects relating to the Namas Wind Farm and the Zonnequa Wind Farm to the meeting attendees.

DISCUSSION SESSION

Question / Comment	Response
SRP: Are the same specialists beings used to assess the proposed wind farms and the power lines for the facilities?	LO: Yes, the wind farms and their associated infrastructure, including the power lines, are assessed as part of one application for environmental authorisation. The same specialists are used to assess all infrastructure for both of the facilities.
SRP: Is a full Avifaunal Impact Assessment being undertaken as part of the shortened timeframe of the BA process considering the location of the projects within a REDZ?	LO: Yes, a 12-month monitoring programme has been undertaken and completed for birds for both wind farms in line with the best-practice guidelines of BirdLife, and a full impact assessment to assess the impacts on birds within the project sites will be included as part of the BA reports, which will be made available for comment and review.
SRP: This is the first process I have encountered which falls within a REDZ.	LO: Comment noted.
SRP: The size of the Secretarybird buffers identified within the project sites will need to be discussed further. There have not been a lot of Secretarybird collisions, but it is a threatened species so care must be taken in this regard. We are still in the process of developing the science to get a better understanding of the buffer sizes for the birds. Rob Simmons will have to provide a basis and justification for why a 1km buffer has been	LO: The concern raised regarding the size of the Secretarybirds buffers proposed for the wind farms is noted. This concern will be communicated to the avifaunal specialist to consider the comment and address the concern as part of the Avifaunal Impact Assessment Reports.

<p>applied for the Secretarybird nests. We have some tracking data for Secretarybirds which have been analysed to understand how far the birds move from their nests during the critical times. A 1km buffer around the Secretarybird nests will be too little, this will have to be considered further by the specialist.</p>	
<p>SRP: It is not considered favourable to move the nests of threatened species as mitigation as is being proposed for the Zonnequa Wind Farm project. It is preferred to move turbines, rather than nests; it is a safer option as you can't always predict how birds are going to respond. There is a reason the birds started nesting there and they may go back to the same area again.</p>	<p>LO: The concern raised, regarding the relocation of the nest is noted. The avifauna specialist will consider the comment and address it as part of the avifauna impact assessment report.</p>
<p>SRP: Previous correspondence has been undertaken with Rob Simmons regarding buffer sizes for birds. Craig Whittington-Jones from the Gauteng Department recommends a 3km buffer. There is also a risk that birds behave differently in the north than here.</p>	<p>LO: The concern raised, regarding the size of the Secretarybirds buffers proposed for the wind farms and the risk of differing bird behaviour, is noted. This concern will be communicated to the avifaunal specialist to consider the comment and address the concern as part of the Avifaunal Impact Assessment Reports.</p>
<p>RD: From the few instances where tracking technology has been applied [to Secretarybirds], the tracking pattern was very different from what was expected from the trackers on an existing wind farm. Have you reached a conclusion about the behaviour of and the ranges that the birds are actually moving?</p>	<p>SRP: I am not aware of a Secretarybird that has been tracked at a wind farm. The birds have however been tracked in other environments. The birds generally spend a lot of time close to the nests during the critical breeding time. The juvenile will start exploring to and from the nest and can also move hundreds of kilometres away. I will commit to speaking to other experts in BirdLife to get an agreement.</p> <p>LO: The Avifaunal Impact Assessment report will consider the behaviour of the species and provide justification for the recommended buffers.</p>
<p>SRP: How do the developers feel about the mitigation recommended by the avifaunal specialist to paint one blade of the wind turbines black? Is that something the developer will be happy to experiment with? An experiment in Norway has shown very promising results with the implementation of</p>	<p>DP: It is dependent on whether the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA) will accept this and whether the Original Equipment Manufacturers (turbines suppliers) will be able to cater for this change. The developers are not averse to this mitigation measure.</p>

<p>this mitigation measure. Birdlife would like to see this measure tested more, however the challenges related to this measure are recognised.</p>	
<p>RD: We are open to suggestions for mitigation.</p>	<p>SRP: Comment noted</p>
<p>SRP: The Booted Eagle is not a threatened species, but there have been fatalities.</p>	<p>LO: Commented noted.</p>
<p>SRP: Are there any other raptors or Jackal Buzzards present?</p>	<p>LO: No, none have been identified to date.</p>
<p>SRP: The projects are located south of a very localised lark, called Barlow's Lark, found near Port Nolloth. It is not a threatened species, but it is has a localised range. It will not be a red-flag to development as it is not threatened. However, the distance between the lowest blade tip and the ground will need to be considered o ensure that the species does not get hit.</p>	<p>LO: The concern raised regarding the potential presence of the Barlow's Lark is noted.</p>
<p>SRP: With the information available I do not predict any red flags to development in the area. Ludwig's Bustard is a problem, probably more for the power line than for the actual wind turbines. Bird flight diverters on the power lines do not seem to be that effective for this species. The species also tend to be more nomadic.</p>	<p>LO: Eskom is in the process of starting with the construction of a 400kV power line (Gromis Juno 400kV) to the Gromis Substation and the 132kV power lines proposed for the wind farms will be located directly adjacent and parallel to the Eskom line. The specialist is proposing to stagger the pylons of the power lines to increase the visibility of the lines for birds.</p>
<p>DP: The ideal for the two projects is to have one collector substation and a single power line to connect the facilities to Gromis Substation. There are other projects in the area and the intention would be to connect all the projects to the one collector substation and have only one power line which connects the facilities to Gromis substation. This effort is a collaboration between the developers within the area and Eskom.</p>	<p>RD: This enables the sharing of infrastructure between developers and therefore reduce the impacts of power lines.</p>
<p>SRP: What has recently come to light is that some wind farms are constructing their internal reticulation lines between the turbines above-ground as these do not trigger a listed activity. But within an environment like this it would be preferred to have the lines placed below-ground due to the Bustard collision risk.</p>	<p>DP: The internal lines will be below-ground.</p>

<p>LO: The process for the Kap Vley wind energy facility is currently being undertaken, is there any insight to add from a cumulative perspective?</p>	<p>SRP: No comment has been submitted for the Kap Vley Wind Farm project as yet, but cumulative impacts need to be assessed.</p>
<p>LO: Is there anything else that would specifically need to be covered in the Avifaunal Impact Assessment report?</p>	<p>SRP: Due to not having sight of the Avifaunal Impact Assessment reports as yet this will be difficult. But I can look at the reports when they are finalised and available, prior to the release of the BA reports to provide some input.</p>
<p>LO: Feedback will be provided to the specialist regarding the comments raised here today so that they can be considered and addressed as part of the reports.</p>	<p>SRP: Comment noted.</p>
<p>RD: Regarding Craig Whittington-Jones from the Gauteng Department and his recommendation on the Secretarybird buffer, is he a colleague or part of a government organisation?</p>	<p>SRP: The correspondence referred to here was internal communication with a few experts. The tracking data referred to was undertaken by BirdLife SA and analysed to see where the birds spend most of their time and predict what their core range is likely to be and, through the analysis, predict what the size of an appropriate buffer would be.</p>
<p>DP: What does it cost to tag a bird?</p>	<p>SRP: Probably less than R 50 000.00, however, depending on how much detail is required.</p>
<p>SRP: Are you considering tagging the birds?</p>	<p>DP: If we have to increase the buffer from 1 km to 3km I would prefer to keep the buffer at 1km but monitor in the form of pre-construction monitoring to see what the activity is, and if it is indeed more severe then we extend it.</p> <p>SRP: If additional studies are undertaken outside of the EIA process it will not be considered as part of the decision-making process. The data would need to inform the EIA. The tagging of the birds is supported, however I would be more comfortable with applying a precautionary buffer and if the tracking data indicates that the area where the bird spends its time is less than the buffer, then the buffer can be reduced.</p>
<p>DP: What if the pre-construction monitoring looks specifically at the movement of the birds through tagging and if the requirement is specifically included as a condition of the Environmental Authorisation?</p>	<p>SRP: This would not be sound decision-making. The purpose of the EIA is to inform development and inform mitigation. Something as key as the layout of your turbines, is critical mitigation. And if the decision on the layout is postponed till after the decision on the Environmental Authorisation, it is not legally correct.</p>

DP: If a 3km buffer is required then there must be a sound reason for it.	SRP: This is also true for the application of a 1km buffer. If the specialist says a 1km buffer is sufficient, the reasoning behind it must be provided.
SRP: I would really support tracking as it is really useful, however the timing of it is quite tricky.	LO: Comment noted.
SRP: The location of the nest relative to what is planned in the surrounding area would also need to be considered by the specialist. If you have a nest completely surrounded by turbines, then the bird is going to fledge and go through a dangerous environment.	RD: Comment noted. The lay of the land limits the number of turbines where the land parcel narrows. The geography of the land also needs to be considered.

WAY FORWARD AND CLOSURE

Lisa Opperman noted that the comments raised in the meeting will be provided to the avifaunal specialist for his consideration. She also stated that the interested and affected parties (I&APs) will be notified of the availability of the BA reports for review and comment, as well as the 30-day review period. She noted that comments received would be included in the final BA reports that would be submitted to the Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA) for decision-making. She thanked the meeting attendees for availing themselves for the meeting and closed the meeting.

Post Meeting Notes

Following the meeting with BirdLife a follow-up technical meeting was held on 14 August 2018 to further discuss the buffers of the Secretarybird nest recommended by the specialist and the justification for the size of the recommended buffers.

NAMAS WIND FARM AND ZONNEQUA WIND FARM, NORTHERN CAPE

**NOTES OF FOCUS GROUP MEETING WITH ESKOM
HELD ON 18 JULY 2018
DOODLES RESTAURANT, BLOUBERGSTRAND**

Notes for the Record prepared by:

Savannah Environmental (Pty) Ltd

Contact: Ms Rozanne Els

Position: Public Participation Co-Ordinator

E-mail: publicprocess@savannahsa.com

Please address any comments to Rozanne Els at the above address

NAMAS WIND FARM AND ZONNEQUA WIND FARM, NORTHERN CAPE

Venue: Doodles Restaurant, Bloubergstrand

Date: 18 July 2018

Time: 11:00

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

Lisa Opperman, of Savannah Environmental, welcomed all present and thanked the attendees for availing themselves for the meeting. She noted that Genesis Namas Wind (Pty) Ltd and Genesis Zonnequa Wind (Pty) Ltd propose the development of two 140MW wind farms on adjacent sites within the Springbok Renewable Energy Development Zone (REDZ), approximately 20km south-east of the town of Kleinsee in the Northern Cape. The wind farms are known as the Namas Wind Farm and the Zonnequa Wind Farm and are located within the Nama Khoi Local Municipality and the Namakwa District Municipality. A suitable project site for the development of each of the wind farms has been identified by the project development companies.

Lisa Opperman noted that Genesis Namas Wind (Pty) Ltd and Genesis Zonnequa Wind (Pty) Ltd have appointed Savannah Environmental as the independent Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) responsible for undertaking a Basic Assessment (BA) process to identify and assess all potential environmental impacts associated with the projects, and propose appropriate mitigation measures in an Environmental Management Programme (EMPr). She stated that the purpose of the meeting was to introduce the Namas Wind Farm and the Zonnequa Wind Farm and provide a description of the BA and public participation process being undertaken. She also noted that the comments raised during the meeting will be included and addressed as part of the BA reports for the projects. As the abbreviated process is applicable for the applications for authorisation, it is considered necessary to engage with key stakeholders prior to the release of the report in order to ensure that key requirements/comments are noted and addressed ahead of finalising the reporting. This will enable the application to remain within the prescribed timeframes.

MEETING ATTENDEES

Name	Organisation	Position
Gert Greeff (GG)	Eskom (adjacent landowner)	Manager: Land Management
Ralph Damonse (RD)	Genesis Eco-Energy Developments (Pty) Ltd	Project Developer
David Peinke (DP)	Atlantic Renewable Energy Partners (Pty) Ltd	Project Developer
Tamsin Sheard (TS)	Genesis Eco-Energy Developments (Pty) Ltd	Project Developer
Sonia Mischczak (SM)	Atlantic Renewable Energy Partners (Pty) Ltd	Project Developer

Lisa Opperman (LO)	Savannah Environmental (Pty) Ltd	Environmental Practitioner	Assessment
--------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------------	------------

APOLOGIES

None

BACKGROUND & TECHNICAL ASPECTS REGARDING THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Lisa Opperman of Savannah Environmental presented the background and technical aspects relating to the Namas Wind Farm and the Zonnequa Wind Farm to the meeting attendees.

DISCUSSION SESSION

Question / Comment	Response
GG: No issues are foreseen with the development of the projects. The developers and Eskom will just need to conclude on the issues of the roads within the area that are proposed to be used for the developments. Eskom has confirmed that access for the use of these roads will not be denied.	LO: Comment noted.
GG: Eskom has a property next to the project sites which is also earmarked for the development of a wind energy facility. The rest of the Eskom properties might be used for the future development of solar energy, however no application for Environmental authorisation has been lodged.	LO: It is noted that Eskom is proposing the development of the Eskom Kleinsee Wind Farm, which is authorised and will have a capacity of 300MW and that solar energy facilities might be developed in future.
GG: Eskom have, in principle, already given approval for the 132kV power line servitudes to connect the facilities to the Gromis Substation.	LO: Comment noted.
GG: Eskom will not be registering servitudes on the properties owned by Eskom for the 400kV power line connecting to the Gromis Substation. Should Eskom decide to sell the properties in future then the servitudes will be registered.	LO: Comment noted.
GG: The three farm houses that are located along the road are unoccupied, with occasional occupation, about once a year, by farm labourers.	LO: The intermittent use of the farm houses located along the road is noted.

<p>DP: On the Zonnequa Wind Farm site, access will need to be gained by crossing underneath the 400kV Eskom line. Will that be an issue as turbine towers etc. will need to be transported?</p>	<p>GG: Eskom won't necessarily give approval to use the Eskom service road which will zigzag underneath the 400kv power Line to be constructed. Rather use the farm access road and cross under the line at one point, especially for the transporting of turbines.</p>
<p>GG: Remainder of the Farm No. 655 does not exist. The portion we are referring to is in fact Remainder of the Farm Brazil No. 329. This property is owned by Dep. of Public Works (DPW)</p>	<p>LO: Comment noted.</p>
<p>GG: The road which traverses the properties is a proclaimed road (i.e. public road), and an application to have the road de-proclaimed will be actioned in the future. Should the road be de-proclaimed, Eskom will not deny a right of way servitude.</p>	<p>LO: Comment noted.</p>
<p>GG: A way leave application can be made for power lines over any of the Eskom properties; the applications won't be denied by Eskom.</p>	<p>LO: Comment noted.</p>

WAY FORWARD AND CLOSURE

Lisa Opperman stated that the interested and affected parties (I&APs) will be notified of the availability of the BA reports for review and comment, as well as the 30-day review period. She noted that comments received would be included in the final BA reports that would be submitted to the Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA) for decision-making. She thanked the meeting attendees for availing themselves for the meeting and closed the meeting.