ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

FOR THE PROPOSED ISUNDU 765/400 KV SUB-STATION AND TURN-IN TRANSMISSION LINES (DEA EIA REF: 14/12/16/3/3/2/745; 12/12/20/1397/AM2)

PROCEEDINGS OF A KEY STAKEHOLDER MEETING

12 November 2015

RAINBOW FARMS

1. ATTENDANCE

Attendance was as follows:

Name	Organisation
Sanjay Maharaj	RCL Foods
Alan Reddy	RCL Foods
Tyrell Govindasamy	RCL Foods
Aldine Armstrong	Eversheds
Nkosozana Leseka	Eskom – Geotech
Mohammad Nabbie	Eskom – Substation Engineering
Steven van Houten	Eskom – Project Development
Annah Motalane	Eskom – Senior Environmental Advisor
Bernadette Solomon	Eskom – Legal
Dieter Heinsohn	ACER (Africa) Environmental Consultants
Paul Scherzer	ACER (Africa) Environmental Consultants

2. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

Mr Paul Scherzer, ACER (Africa) Environmental Consultants, facilitated the meeting introductions and outlined that the purpose of the meeting was to present findings on the key issues raised to date by RCL Foods, the status of the EIA investigations and to discuss the way forward with the key issues of concern.

3. PRESENTATION

Mr Scherzer made a presentation (Appendix 1). He stated that a wide range of issues had been raised to date by RCL Foods and their legal representative. In order to investigate these, a number of specialist studies had been commissioned, including, among others, the following (some at the suggestion of RCL Foods):

- Avi-fauna.
- EMFs.
- Noise.
- Tourism and Economic Development.
- Visual.
- Air Quality/Dust.
- Social and Spatial Development.
- Poultry Veterinarian.
- Blast Impact.

Based on the outcomes of these investigations, ACER's findings to date are:

- EMFs associated with the transmission lines or sub-station – no significant impact.
- Water/Stormwater – no significant impact.
- Biosecurity in terms of the sub-station – no significant impact.
- Biosecurity in terms of the transmission line – no significant impact if the transmission line avoids RCL's property but it is possible to reduce the impact to low significance if the transmission line needs to cross RCL's property.
- Light – during construction, no significant impact; during operation an impact of potential significance that could be mitigated to one of low significance.

- Noise during operation – no significant impact.
- Noise during construction – no significant impact foreseen, but blasting noise still needs to be investigated further.
- Dust during construction – currently not possible to confirm with certainty that there will be no adverse impact.
- Blasting – currently uncertain about the need for or quantity of blasting that may be required and the noise or dust likely to be generated by blasting. Further geotechnical investigations are being commissioned to better confirm these aspects.

Mr Scherzer concluded the presentation saying that, currently, ACER believed that there will be no significant impact during operation. However, there is uncertainty over the likelihood of dust and noise during the civil earthworks phase during construction, affecting layers in the closest farms either:

- Directly through panic and piling from sudden noise or dust damage to birds' respiratory tracts.
- Indirectly by noise or dust increasing susceptibility to secondary infections or dust affecting the operation of fans.

4. DISCUSSION

General discussions were held with regard to the various impacts.

The key points from the discussions were:

- Mr S Maharaj said that they do not wish to be obstructive and are prepared to work with Eskom to identify solutions on the way forward, but that this willingness to discuss options did not constitute their acceptance of any proposals.
- Mr Maharaj stated that their three main issues with sub-station related to noise, dust and light, and that RCL would like the 765 kV transmission line to stay outside their property. Mr Maharaj requested more details of what transmission line construction would entail. He also requested that any work be fenced off so that no-one could access their property.
- Mr S van Houten undertook to get Eskom line designers to investigate the feasibility of avoiding RCL's property with the 765 kV line and ACER undertook to provide RCL with additional details on transmission line construction.
- RCL requested more details on the blasting noise and shock waves when available.
- RCL requested that a change to the layout of the sub-station be considered so that the part to be constructed first would be furthest from them. Mr van Houten said he did not believe this was a feasible option. ACER agreed to investigate this alternative but it has subsequently been shown to be unfeasible as the sub-station expansion (away from RCL) is anticipated for DC transmission lines that, ultimately, would have a higher impact on RCL than the currently proposed 765 kV transmission line.
- ACER agreed to include a more detailed breakdown of the duration of different construction activities in the EIR.
- With input on the noise levels of various activities to be provided byACER, RCL agreed to provide Eskom/ACER with information on past noise disturbances on their farms and how this affected their production, including the impact of over-

head thunderstorms. This information should ideally include the noise activity, the approximate distance from the laying houses and production statistics to show the level of death or production loss as a result. This information can then be used to estimate the approximate noise tolerance level of the chickens.

- RCL agreed to provide recommendations on building modifications and mitigations they felt may reduce the likelihood of dust, noise and light impacts upon them, as well as an approximate cost for such modifications.

5. CLOSURE

Mr Scherzer thanked all present for their input and participation, and trusted that the discussions had identified the key aspects that needed to be further investigated and discussed during the remainder of the EIA process.

Appendix 1: Presentation