

**THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF A LIQUIFIED PETROLEUM GAS (LPG)-TO-POWER FACILITY, OVERHEAD ELECTRICITY TRANSMISSION LINE AND ASSOCIATED PIPELINE
INFRASTRUCTURE ON VARIOUS FARM PORTIONS, SALDANHA – COMMENTS AND RESPONSES TABLE**

PREVIOUS DEFF Land Use Reference Number: 14/12/16/3/3/2/2008 (this number belongs to the lapsed application)

CURRENT DEFF Land Use Reference Number: Pending

DEFF Air Quality Reference Number: Pending

The comments received below are in relation to the Draft Scoping Report which was compiled in terms of the previous Application that lapsed. These comments are still valid and have contributed towards the current report which is an update on the previous Final Scoping Report. As such, it is important to note the following:

- Any references made to the DSR means the Draft Scoping Report compiled in the previous lapsed Application.
- Any references made to the FSR mean the Final Scoping Report compiled in the previous lapsed Application.
- The previous FSR has been updated to be called the Draft Scoping Report 2A (which is this report). The content of the Draft Scoping Report 2A is primarily the same as the previous FSR.

This phase will be followed by an Impact Assessment Phase which will take the comments made on this Draft Scoping Report 2A into account. Should I&APs have commented previously, and the comment was adequately responded to, it is not necessary to repeat the comment for the Impact Assessment Phase. New comments from I&APs will be welcomed.

COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING DRAFT SCOPING PHASE AND ATTENDANCE TO FGM			
No.	COMMENTATOR	COMMENT	RESPONSE
1.	Patrick Dowling The Wildlife and Environment Society of South Africa (WESSA) 1 November 2020 Received via email	My initial questions are: Is this in anyway related to the similar Karpower application that is happening in the same area?	No. This is not related to the Karpower application.
2.	Patrick Dowling The Wildlife and Environment Society of South Africa (WESSA) 1 November 2020 Received via email	Is this project consistent with SA's commitment to GHG emissions reduction in accordance with its NDCs?	While LPG remains a non-renewable fuel for power generation, it does present a reduction in GHG emissions when compared to the energy generation from coal, which still represents 90% of the electricity generated in South Africa. As such, it represents an improvement to the current scenario. Emission of GHGs will be investigated by Air Quality Specialist and appropriate mitigation implemented to bring the emissions in line with minimum emission standards. In line with regulatory requirements, the facility will report on their GHG emissions.
3.	Patrick Dowling	LPG is a fossil fuel which it is well known contributes unequivocally to global heating and loss of biodiversity. How	It is acknowledged that renewable power is the cleanest way in which to generate electricity. It does however need to be noted that the Department of Mineral Resources and Energy (DMRE)

	<p>The Wildlife and Environment Society of South Africa (WESSA) 1 November 2020</p> <p>Received via email</p>	<p>could this be argued not to conflict with section 24 of the SA constitution?</p>	<p>circulated an RFP which calls for the option of renewable and non-renewable power sources as part of their Risk Mitigation strategy. This risk mitigation strategy requires power at short notice to support the grid in peak usage conditions. The evacuation of this 'on demand' power is more technically suited to fuel burning facilities due to the nature in which energy is generated from non-renewable sources. In circulating an RFP of this nature, the government would have considered Section 24 of the Constitution. The Applicant is within their rights to respond to the request, which government has put forward in order to support the emergency power requirements while a more strategic plan is executed to respond to the overall energy crisis. Opposing viewpoints to the scope contained within the RFP would need to be addressed with the DMRE, and not at a project level EIA.</p> <p>Regardless, LPG would contribute materially to the cleaner production of electricity in South Africa when compared to the current scenario.</p> <p>Impacts of health and wellbeing of the receiving environment will be assessed by the Air Quality Specialist in EIA.</p>
<p>4.</p>	<p>Patrick Dowling The Wildlife and Environment Society of South Africa (WESSA) 1 November 2020</p> <p>Received via email</p>	<p>How will locals in the Saldanha area be capacitated to participate fully in this process as required by NEMA? Viz: The National Environmental Management Principles include the principle that "The participation of all interested and affected parties in environmental governance must be promoted, and all people must have the <u>opportunity to develop the understanding, skills and capacity necessary to achieving equitable and effective participation</u>, and participation by vulnerable and disadvantaged persons must be ensured".</p> <p>I ask this because the project is far-reaching, highly contentious, at odds with climate science and taking place in an area where many people will not have the skills, understanding or inclination to be involved. They and successive generations will be affected by the outcomes which have to be seen in terms more broadly stated than jobs created today. It has to be done properly in an ethically grounded way.</p>	<p>The public participation process has however accommodated the notification of disadvantaged and vulnerable persons by the placement of notifications in the local clinic and the library. Investigation revealed that there is no free community newspaper in the area, so the regulatory advertisement was placed in die Weslander. While it is acknowledged this paper is not free of charge, it was a means to notify the local community of the project. Furthermore, a dedicated whatsapp/ sms line was made available for the registration of I&APs and the receipt of comments.</p> <p>With a view to understanding the local protocol of engaging vulnerable and disadvantaged communities, a discussion was held with the local councillor. It was indicated that these parties are engaged via the councillors and their established communication structures. A dedicated focus group meeting has been held with the local councillor and the environmental officer for Saldanha Bay Municipality. It was confirmed in the meeting that there are no low-income communities in the vicinity of the site. It was also emphasised that the low-income communities are mainly concerned with potential employment opportunities and possible economic upliftment that may arise from the Applicant's Corporate Social Responsibilities. To this end, the Applicant is engaging with the Saldanha Bay Economic Development office in order to</p>

			<p>provide the focus on areas where the local community requirements are as part of the Assegai Power CSR. Thus far, inputs from the Councillor and the SBM Environmental Officer indicate a need for upliftment in the education sector.</p> <p>The public participation plan also includes the possibility to host a community meeting with individuals needing simplified information. Should the need for such a meeting be identified, this will take place in a public park with a series of non-technical posters.</p> <p>In all engagements, the EAP will consider illiteracy, disability or any other disadvantage of I&APs.</p>
5.	<p>Judy Bell FrackFreeSA and KZN Coastwatch: Member 3 November 2020</p> <p>Received via email</p>	<p>A series of emails were received from this I&AP, as detailed below and as per the correlating responses.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Please would you register me as an I&AP for this project. Please would you also explain why the need for divide and rule tactics for these meetings? It is really important for all stakeholders to engage on this issue, not just a one way discussion with the EAP. 2) Thanks, but this is not what is achieved by doing it this way. Please record my comment in the response table 3) I think you are not getting my point. We need to have multi-stakeholder meetings so we can hear all the points of view and understand the issues from a broad spectrum, not just from similar groupings. This goes against the spirit of public participation – we need to be well informed and supported to provide our input on all these applications for gas that are taking place across the country. It is a cumulative impact that needs to be assessed, as well as the needs and desirability of gas-fired power stations. This application for Saldanha Bay is not the only one and should not be considered in isolation. It is part of a broader gas initiative, with oh so much more involved - infrastructure, exploration and extraction, including fracking and then burning as a fuel. <p>As you well know, LPG is a fossil fuel which is going to perpetuate the climate heating crisis in which we find ourselves locally and worldwide. Methane is a more potent greenhouse gas than carbon dioxide (84 times worse). We are in a climate change hot spot</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) You are most welcome to join any session that suits you. We have divided the I&APs in terms of the types of questions that may be raised with a view to being efficient and not exclusive. 2) I'm happy to record your comment as you've submitted it. It will appear in the Comments and Responses Table in the Final Scoping Report. 3) Thank you very much for you feedback and questions. These will be tabled for a response in our FGM and will most certainly be included in the Comments and Responses Report in the Final Scoping Report. <p>The meetings for these FGMs have been scheduled and invitations circulated accordingly. With a view to honouring these arrangements, we will follow through as invited. We do however want to acknowledge your perspective and will send out a notification to those invited I&APs to join any session that suits them, with a view to I&APs being exposed to multi-disciplinary comments.</p> <p>Furthermore, it should be noted that each meeting will be minuted and the questions raised will be recorded in the Comments and Responses Report. Participants with this process will have an opportunity to review all the comments received which supports the need to be aware of all view points and understand the issues from a broader spectrum.</p>

and need to do everything we can to reduce our emissions and then mitigate the impacts to enable our survival in the next decade. Why is there no consideration of either solar or wind energy for this application? Why the rush to invest in another fossil fuel, when we know we need to avoid greenhouse gas emissions?

According to the climate scientists, we have anything from a few months to only 7 years maximum, to change the trajectory of global heating and in South Africa we are heading for double the global average. We will not be able to survive this crisis unless drastic action is taken and this proposal seeks to maintain the status quo. A gas-fired power station is using a fuel which is neither clean nor renewable and experts are warning that the booming gas industry is seen as bad for climate as is coal (Guardian online article 2nd July 2019).

In the Reuters on line article (14th October 2020) it reports that the EU is considering binding methane emission standards for gas, as methane is the second largest contributor to global heating after carbon dioxide. They claim that curbing methane is key to plans to cut greenhouse gas emissions. It is emitted from leaky oil and gas pipelines and infrastructure, no matter how well built or modern the facilities are. They are also considering banning venting and flaring into the atmosphere or its deliberately burning.

Why then are you hell-bent on helping your clients to replace coal with gas, another fossil fuel, when we are already suffering the impacts from burning fossil fuels? We do not need a "transition" fuel – we need to invest in renewable energy with local grids to reduce wastage and focus on making South Africans energy efficient in all aspects of our lives and livelihoods. Please ensure my comments are recorded.

4) Thanks for your response.

I feel it is important for me to clarify roles and responsibilities in response to your comment "Why then are you hell-bent on helping your clients to replace coal with gas, another fossil fuel, when we are already suffering the impacts from burning fossil fuels?"

As independent EAPs, our role is to conduct an environmental assessment according to the regulations set out by the NEMA. Broadly, we need to be independent of the Applicant, assess the impacts of what is being proposed and compile information which will assist the authority in making a decision. Our assessment of the project looks at alternatives which may or may not include project alternatives (i.e. wind vs solar vs gas etc). This will be dependent on the Applicant. Alternatives may also be applied to design, layout and technology. Incumbent on the EAP is to document the assessment of the project against the No-Go Alternative. It is critical to note that we are appointed as independent EAPs to investigate the impacts for a specific project proposal. As such we are not "hell bent" on helping the Applicant ("our client") replace coal with gas. The Request for Proposal which was circulated by the Department of Mineral Resources and Energy includes the possibility of renewable and non-renewable power sources. As such, your opposition to this possibility needs to be taken up at a more strategic level. The Applicant is within their rights to submit a proposal which is in line with the RFP. By undertaking an environmental investigation on any given project (in this case LPG to power) by no means indicates alignment of the EAP with the proposal (hence the term independent EAP). It should further be noted that as EAPs, we are the co-ordinators of the environmental investigation which includes attaining independent specialist input. Hence, specialist expertise in their respective fields will inform our report which the authorities will assess in order to make a decision accordingly.

As we enter into the public participation process with you and other I&APs, it needs to be said that as the EAPs, we respectfully engage in good faith and are willing to hear issues raised by I&APs. It is hoped that I&APs engage with the EAPs and the process in an equally respectful fashion and recognise what can be responded to within the scope of our mandate (i.e. issues related to national government vs issues

		<p>Just in way of explanation – this is not the first gas power station EIA process requiring civil society to respond in double quick time, as apparently there is a problem with Eskom. It is one of many, along with the Gas Pipeline network and REDDZ related stuff (gazillions we noted during lockdown!), the power ships, the offshore drilling, the onshore fracking applications, the coal mining, the loss of protected areas and functioning ecosystems – our life support systems on which we all rely for our lives and livelihoods.</p> <p>We are jaded, tired and extremely despondent, that with all the science saying we need to change and do things differently and despite the Covid-19 snotklap, it is business as usual. We all still have to respond to it all, in case one gets by unnoticed.</p> <p>I agree, this is not only about your application process – it is a national issue. I'm afraid that we are not winning there either. We have been told it is a done deal – the GreatGasGrab will happen, no matter how nonsensical, how significant the impacts or the serious the implications to current and future generations. We are not protecting our life support systems and nature is letting us know that this is completely unsustainable. We know all this. Yet, we carry on regardless...</p> <p>The principles of NEMA are well and good, but inappropriate development continues to be authorized after the boxes get ticked.</p>	<p>related to this proposal). It would be good to set the tone of our future engagements bearing this in mind.</p> <p>4) On the comment around solar and wind plants vs fuel-based plants, it should be noted that the RFP calls for dispatchable power. This not suited for stand-alone wind and solar plants. LPG is one of the fuels that supports a dispatchable plant and the LPG favoured over diesel which is currently used at peaking plants. The Project will provide the required energy and reduce the environmental impact resulting from the use of the Diesel plants. Assegai Power is responding to the requirements of the RFP and will be adhering to the Minimum Emission Standards for the selected fuel i.e. LPG. This is currently the most environmentally friendly of the available fuels that responds effectively to the RFP i.e. – Diesel and HFO and certainly is an improvement when compared to coal.</p>
6.	<p>Francois du Toit Project Rhino Ambassador African Conservation Trust CEO World Youth Wildlife Summit Director 3 November 2020</p> <p>Received via email</p>	<p>Agree with Judy...</p> <p>I would also have thought that as an Independent EAP you would have brought a cost benefit scenario into play, and would not have needed us to explain how to do your job of protecting the environment rather than your client. The cumulative effects both offshore and onshore, and the long term economic, social and environmental cost of pursuing fossil fuel can no longer be ignored.</p> <p>If these 2 issues, namely cost of gas vs renewable and cumulative effects are not included in your report I would argue that it is grossly incomplete.</p>	<p>Refer to the response to comment number 5. Cost benefit analysis of gas vs renewables falls outside of the ambit of the EIA – this is a strategic matter that must be addressed at a national level.</p> <p>Refer to the response to comment #3 as it relates to the RFP that allows for renewable and non-renewable power generation options. Refer to response to comment #5 as it relates to the role of the EAP in an EIA process.</p> <p>I would like to draw your attention to the tone and accusatory nature of your statement: <i>"I would also have thought that as an Independent EAP you would have brought a cost benefit scenario</i></p>

			<i>into play, and would not have needed us to explain how to do your job of protecting the environment rather than your client."</i> I don't believe the sentiment expressed is accurate. I would hope that further engagements with you and all other I&APs will be centred around respectful and professional interactions as in our mandate as EAPs.
7.	John Selby Saldanha Bay Clean Air Association 3 November 2020	I have just become aware of this project which appears to be managed by your company. Is the project open for comments? also please register me as an I&AP under the name Saldanha Bay Clean Air Association	I&AP registration complete. The synopsis document and link to the full Scoping documentation was sent to this party.
8.	Aldrich Louis Site Manager: ArcelorMittal South Africa 3 November 2020 Received via email	Please register myself and Shoenay for the focus group. I can already state that transmission line options 2 and 3 will not be supported by AMSA. It sterilizes important portions of Farm 129/0 and farm 195/2 for which AMSA aspirations to develop.	I&AP registrations completed and FGM attendance confirmed. The objection is noted and the technical team was informed. In consultation with this commenting party, a new transmission line route alternative was conceived and adopted by the technical team as 'Route Alternative 6'. In addition, the Applicant also identified the option of upgrading an existing transmission line from 66kV to 132kV. This is being assessed as Route Alternative 7. This new route will be assessed in the impact assessment phase.
9.	Angela Conway Interested Party 4 November 2020 Received via email	Please register me as a I&AP for this project. I would like to register my objection to a proposal for a gas power station which we know will contribute to climate change. Surely, we should be investing resources in exploring renewable sources of energy.	I&AP registration complete. Refer to the response to comment #3.
10.	Angela Conway Interested Party 4 November 2020 Received via email	How will you ensure local people whose lives and livelihoods will be impacted upon are informed and given opportunity to respond meaningfully? I for one struggle to keep up with the technical information distributed but I do know the urgency of preserving our world.	Refer to the response to comment #4. It is understood that the technicalities and terminologies in the EIA process needs to be simplified. A synopsis of the Scoping Phase documentation was prepared and in response to your comment, it was uploaded to the website for wider distribution. I&APs were notified of the availability of this document.
11.	Keith Harrison West Coast Bird Club 4 November 2020 Received via email	Thank you for sending notification for this proposed Project. The West Coast Bird Club endorses this project, however I have some comments. 1. There will be a number of additional 132kV power lines crossing major flyways of birds travelling from Langebaan to the Berg River estuary and St, Helena Bay, also the Vredenburg waste site daily due to the Gas to Power projects. Also, birds follow the original Berg River valley which passes through the West Coast Fossil Park.	1. ESKOM only constructs underground cable solutions at 132kV inside large cities where procuring servitudes is not possible. The Applicant supports a common servitude with other services. This is very common and would only require compliance with ESKOM's servitude requirements (full access and no construction that would affect maintenance of the lines).

		It would be preferable if the lines could be buried, but should be defended with bird deflectors if above ground. A suggestion would be that together with other developers of similar energy projects, to consider a common servitude for all the 132 kV lines going into the area around Blouwater Substation, either airily or buried.	The need for bird deflectors on the lines will be included as a recommendation in the EIR and be included in the EMPr. An avian specialist will contribute to the Faunal Impact Assessment in the EIA phase.
12.	Keith Harrison West Coast Bird Club 4 November 2020 Received via email	2. The 132kV power lines will cross areas renowned for their spring flowers and are a tourist attraction, where the project destroys an important piece of vegetation the developer should carry the cost of conserving an offset of similar proportions of comparable biodiversity locally, for example the WWF property at Jacobs Bay. This will also apply to buried gas pipelines.	2. The terrestrial ecologists (botanist and faunal specialists) will investigate and determine the need for biodiversity offsets based on verified site sensitivities and the significance of impact.
13.	Keith Harrison West Coast Bird Club 4 November 2020 Received via email	3. <i>Echium plantigeum</i> is a1A category invasive alien infesting the Western Cape. The ECO during construction must record and only allow vehicles transporting soil, sand or gravel onto the site from <i>Echium</i> free areas. Also, the ECO must recognize and remove growing plants from the site.	3. Noted and marked for inclusion in the EMPr.
14.	Keith Harrison West Coast Bird Club 4 November 2020 Received via email	4. If areas are to be re-seeded, the seeds must be harvested with records from the Western Cape.	4. Noted and marked for inclusion in the EMPr.
15.	Keith Harrison West Coast Bird Club 4 November 2020 Received via email	5. Semi-skilled and unskilled labour should be recruited from the Saldanha Bay Municipal area with 5 years proven residence or are on the voters roll. If there is a requirement for the removal of alien vegetation, there are teams available which have been trained by local NGOs, for example Cape West Coast Biosphere Reserve.	5. Noted and marked for inclusion in the EMPr. In terms of the RFP, local skills building is a requirement of all potential bidders. While the operation of the plant will be undertaken by skilled individuals with expertise in operating the plants, the skills transfer will take place at the early stages of the project with the aim to have in excess of 70% local employees skilled through skills transfer and development with the local employees replacing the initial team.
16.	Keith Harrison West Coast Bird Club 4 November 2020 Received via email	6. Vehicles of Developers, Contractors and Sub-contractors should be registered with the Vredenburg Traffic Department, so that a portion of the license fees can be used for maintaining the local road infrastructure.	6. It is acknowledged that construction vehicles could damage road infrastructure, however the suggested means of funding road maintenance is not realistic or practical for many reasons. This matter is not exclusive to this project and is an aspect considered in all environmental assessments. The EMPr would make provision for rehabilitation of roads where deterioration / damage can be attributed to the project. Should the municipality apply development contributions to this project, the funds will be channelled towards infrastructure development / maintenance in the area.

			Importantly, it should be noted however that the road traffic generated by this project is negligible during the construction and operational phases.
17.	<p>Sue Bellinger Interested Party 4 November 2020</p> <p>Received via email</p>	<p>Ref Sadia's email of today's date iro the Focus Group Invitation for the above, this is to check that my name's been included amongst the IAP's?</p> <p>Justinne, I do not represent any specific organization, but wish to participate in the role of a concerned citizen/interested & affected party. Of the focus group discussion dates/times, I can only make the 9 Nov sessions, preferably the 17.30-18.30 one.</p> <p>My concerns/queries relate to current and future offspring - of all species - who deserve better than the polluted and damaged world that will be our generation's legacy if we do not curb government's current scramble to fill South Africa's energy deficit from non-renewable resources, rather than from renewable sources. Whilst this proposed development will have local implications & issues, there are broader implications & issues relating to Climate Change not only for South Africa, but globally. Surely pursuing new energy generation projects from non-renewable resources would not serve us well in our need to attract outside investors who specifically seek to fund projects/programmes which mitigate against Climate Change. Why would they want to invest in such a mitigation activity when on the other hand the country is itself pursuing other climate damaging activities?</p>	<p>I&AP registration confirmed and FGM attendance confirmed.</p> <p>Your concern around escalating environmental consciousness and taking appropriate action to attract investors is shared and noted. Please refer to the response to comment #3 as it relates to the scope of this risk mitigation RFP that do not favour renewable energy projects.</p>
18.	<p>MaxhobaA Jezile Department of Fisheries and Forestry: Sustainable Aquaculture Management 5 November 2020</p> <p>Received via email</p>	<p>Please register me for the meeting. I would like to know how the project would impact the aquaculture operations in the Bay.</p>	<p>I&AP registration confirmed and FGM attendance confirmed.</p> <p>Assegai will purchase LPG from Avedia Energy. Avedia Energy will make use of existing infrastructure in the sea and the port area to offload and transport gas to the site. Assegai's construction requirements for the portion of new interconnection pipeline and the installation of the technology on site will have no impact on aquaculture. This was discussed in more detail at a Focus Group Meeting (09/11/2020) with this commenting party. The commenting party was satisfied with the information shared. Refer to the minutes of this meeting appended to the final Scoping Report.</p>
19.	<p>Margie Pretorius Interested Party 6 November 2020</p> <p>Received via email</p>	<p>Please register me as an IAP for the Saldana Gas Power Station. I have grave concerns about the cumulative impacts of gas extraction on climate change, especially in South Africa, which as you well know is a climate change hotspot.</p>	<p>I&AP registration confirmed. This commenting party attended the Focus Group Meetings on 09/11/2020 and 10/11/2020.</p> <p>The cumulative impact of the air emissions generated by this facility will be assessed by the Air Quality Specialist to understand the</p>

		Please send me the link for the focus group meeting on November 9.	impact on the receiving environment, ambient air quality and climate change. Note that this project excludes gas extraction.
20.	Neno FJ Haasbroek Parklands Township Developers (Pty) Ltd 10 November 2020 Received via email	1. I support the development. 2. Who is the developer or operator?	1. Support noted and the Synopsis document was emailed for information purposes. 2. The developer is Assegai Power and the Operations and Maintenance Contractor is KSE should this project be approved.
21.	April Gehle Interested Party 10 November 2020 Received via email	I hope that you are well. I have only now become aware of the fact that I need to register as an IAP with you in order to comment on the gas to power development. I am already registered and have commented on this proposed development with Triplo 4 and have attended a zoom meeting (13-10-2020). So now I am wondering what is going on? Please could you enlighten me. Thanks for your time.	The developers on this proposal are Assegai Power. The Synopsis document was forwarded to provide information. Triplo 4 is another proposal.
22.	Francois du Toit Project Rhino Ambassador African Conservation Trust CEO World Youth Wildlife Summit Director 10 November 2020 Received via email	What sessions are still open? I understand there has been limited response to this set of focus group platforms and quite frankly, not sure how you justify interaction and commentary with communities without data connection?	As reflected in this table, we have received comments to the proposal outside of the Focus Group Meetings (FGMs) from various parties. These meetings are aimed at providing what we consider to be Key I&APs an opportunity to directly engage with the EAP and Applicant. Attendance at these meetings is not mandatory to provide comment. We are working through the local structures for the engagement of disadvantaged/vulnerable communities. Furthermore, the process has a dedicated WhatsApp/SMS line which has been put in place to accommodate registration and comment from disadvantaged/vulnerable communities. Via the local structures (in a meeting with the local councillor and environmental officer for the Municipality) it was determined that a dedicated meeting was not deemed necessary at this stage.
23.	Doretha Kotze West Coast District Municipality: Town and Regional Planner 11 November 2020 Received via email	The West Coast District Municipality takes note of the information contained in the Draft Scoping Report and will provide comments once the EIA Report and Specialist Studies are available.	This is acknowledged.
24.	Mr Derrick Makhubele (Director) / Edward Mahosi	2.1 Triggered S21 listed activities 2.1.1 In terms of section 21 of the National Environmental Management: Air Quality Act (NEM:AQA), the	2.1 This is correct and reflected in the Scoping Report. Co-feeding with waste materials is not relevant to this project.

	<p>Department: Environment, Forestry and Fisheries: Air Quality Management 11 November 2020</p> <p>Received via email</p>	<p>following listed activities will be triggered by the proposed project: a) Category 1 Sub-category 1.4: Gas Combustion Installations.</p> <p>2.1.2 According to the report, where co-feeding with waste materials with calorific value allowed in terms of Waste Disposal Standards published in terms of the Waste Act, 2008 (Act No. 59 of 2008) occurs, additional requirements under subcategory 1.6 shall apply.</p> <p>2.2 Licencing Authority 2.2.1 In terms of Section 36(5)(d) of the act as amended, the Minister of Environmental, Forestry & Fisheries is the Licensing Authority and must perform the functions of the licensing authority if the listed activity relates to the activities listed in terms of section 24(2) of the National Environmental Management Act, 1998, or in terms of section 19(1) of the National Environmental Management: Waste Act, 2008, or the Minister has been identified as the competent authority. Electricity generation relates to activities wherein the Minister is the competent authority, which is listed in terms of section 24(2) of the National Environmental Management Act, 1998. Based on the above, DEFF would be the relevant licensing authority for the required Atmospheric Emissions Licence and an application in that regards must be submitted to DEFF.</p> <p>2.3 Cleaner Technology 2.3.1 The Department encourages use of cleaner technology processes or modification of existing plants in order to reduce climate change impact.</p> <p>2.4 Atmospheric Impact Assessment 2.4.1 According to the report, the appointed air quality specialist will assess the air quality impacts identified during scoping in more detail, focussing on the impacts of harmful emissions associated with the electricity generation activity in terms of the NEM: AQA. 2.4.2 The report further states that the air emissions will be quantified during the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) phase to gain detailed understanding of the</p>	<p>2.2 This is correct.</p> <p>2.3 It is acknowledged that LPG is a cleaner burning fuel when compared to coal.</p> <p>2.4 This will be included in the Terms of Reference for the Air Quality Specialist for the impact assessment phase.</p>
--	---	--	--

		<p>potential air quality and human health impacts associated with the project.</p> <p>2.4.3 In order to effectively and adequately make an assessment of the potential atmospheric impact of the project, it is recommended that an Air Quality Specialist Study be undertaken during the next phase of the EIA process.</p> <p>2.4.4 The Study must amongst other,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) quantify the extent to which existing ambient pollutant levels will change as a result of the project activities. (b) include a study of the receiving environment and the quantification and assessment of the impact of the project activities on human health and the environment. (c) analyse the receiving environment as described in terms of local atmospheric dispersion potential, including the location of potential air quality sensitive receptors (AQSRs) in relation to proposed activities as well as ambient pollutant levels and dustfall rates. (d) compile a comprehensive atmospheric emissions inventory for the project. (e) estimate emissions along with information on the receiving environment (used as input to an atmospheric dispersion model) to simulate ground level pollutant concentrations and dustfall rates. (f) simulated ground level pollutant concentrations and dustfall rates are to be screened against National Ambient Air Quality Standards and National Dust Control Regulations. <p>2.4.5 Air quality management actions to be undertaken to mitigate the negative impacts, as informed by the impact assessment.</p>	
25.	<p>Mr Derrick Makhubele (Director) / Edward Mahosi Department: Environment, Forestry and Fisheries: Air Quality Management 11 November 2020</p> <p>Received via email</p>	<p>COMPLIANCE</p> <p>3.1 The proposed project must comply with the minimum emission standards for new plants as contained in part of the Air Quality Act upon commencement of the listed activities.</p> <p>3.2 Comply with the National Dust Control Regulations, 2013 in terms of section 32 of the National Environmental Management: Air Quality Act, 2004 (Act No. 39 of 2004).</p>	<p>This is acknowledged and included in the legislative context discussion of the Scoping Report.</p>

26.	Mr Derrick Makhubele (Director) / Edward Mahosi Department: Environment, Forestry and Fisheries: Air Quality Management 11 November 2020 Received via email	CONCLUSION 4.1 The Directorate Air Quality Authorisation recommends that the Air Quality Specialists Study detailing the issues raised in 2.4.3 above be included in the EIR. 4.2 Should the Air Quality Specialist Study not included in the EIR, DEFF reserves the right to request required information for the purpose of Atmospheric Emission Licence.	The Air Quality Specialist study that takes account of the issues raised by the DEFF Air Quality Management Directorate will be included in the EIR.
27.	Makhosazane Yeni Department: Environment, Forestry and Fisheries: Integrated Environmental Authorisations 11 November 2020 Received via email	This letter serves to inform you that the following information must be included in the Final Scoping Report" (a) List Activities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please ensure that all relevant listed activities are applied for, are specific and can be linked to the development activity or infrastructure as described in the project description. • The sizes of the proposed development activities and/or its infrastructure such as the gas turbines, pipelines (inbound and outbound), power lines, substation and roads must be clearly articulated. • 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 can can be downloaded from the following link https://www.environment.gov.za/documents/forms. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A table was included in Chapter 2 of the Final Scoping Report that shows the link between the project description, listed activities are specific related development component. • The infrastructure sizes have been included in Chapter 3, Project Description.
28.	Makhosazane Yeni Department: Environment, Forestry and Fisheries: Integrated Environmental Authorisations 11 November 2020 Received via email	(b) Layout & Sensitivity Maps Please provide a layout map which indicated the following" <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The gas turbines, inbound pipeline from an existing bulk LPG pipeline and outbound connection pipeline from the LPG terminal to another gas pipeline; • A 132kV overhead electricity transmission line leading from the site and connecting to an existing line or an off-site sub-station; • All supporting onsite infrastructure e.g. roads (existing and proposed); • The location of sensitive environmental features on site e.g. CBAs, heritage sites, wetlands, drainage lines, etc. that will be affected; • Buffer areas; and • All no-go areas. • A sensitivity layout plan overlaid by the sensitive features and the buffer zones i.e. wetland, etc. and also the existing structure on site and in the vicinity of 	b) A layout plan that shows all the development components and infrastructure was prepared and included in the final Scoping Report. This plan will be updated in the EIR phase to show any required buffers, environmental sensitivities and/or no-go areas identified by the specialists in their further assessments.

		<p>the proposed activity must be submitted as part of the final report for analysis of the effect of the proposed project on the environment. Please ensure all features are clearly indicated on the legend of the sensitivity layout plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Google maps will not be accepted. <p>(c) Public Participation Process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please ensure that all issues raised and comments received during the circulation of the draft SR from registered I&APs and organs of state which have jurisdiction (including this Department's Biodiversity and Climate Change Sections) in respect of the proposed activity are adequately addressed in the final SR. 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. • A comments and response trail report (C&R) must be submitted with the final SR. The C&R report must incorporate all historical comments for this development. The C&R report must be a separate document from the main report and the format must be in the table format. Please refrain from summary comments made by I&APs. All comments from I&APs must be copied verbatim and be clearly responded to. Please note that a response such as "Noted" is not regarded as an adequate response to I&AP's comments. • The final SR must provide evidence that all identified and relevant competent authorities have been given an opportunity to comment on the proposed development; particularly the South African Astronomical Observatory, the Western Cape Environmental Department, the District and Local Municipalities. • The Public Participation Process must be conducted in terms of Regulations 39, 40, 41, 42, 43 & 44 of the EIA Regulations 2014, as amended. 	<p>c) The opportunity to comment on the draft Scoping Report was advertised in the local and provincial newspaper. Furthermore, notification to I&APs was emailed or posted by registered mail. Five Focus Group Meetings were held with key identified I&APs, some of which were attended by a wider range of I&APs as the word of the meetings circulated amongst interested parties.</p> <p>The DEFF: Biodiversity Section was included in the I&AP database and notified accordingly (proof of Public Participation included in the final Scoping Report). No specific comment was received from this Section, however a representative from this section was present at the pre-application meeting. Further to receiving this comment, correspondence was immediately sent to the Climate Change Department accompanied by the synopsis document to assist in providing background to the development proposal. A one-on-one meeting was also offered to facilitate comment. A follow-up email was sent, and phone calls made, but a response was not received up until the time of the finalisation of the Scoping Report. This department will be fully engaged at the inception of the EIA phase.</p> <p>This table presents the full Comments and Responses trail in the format requested.</p> <p>The Western Cape Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning as well as the District and Local Municipalities provided comment on the draft Scoping Report, as recorded in this table. The environmental officer for the local Saldanha Bay Municipality participated in a Focus Group Meeting (10/11/2020) and hence provided verbal inputs to the environmental team (refer to minutes of the Focus Group Meeting appended to the Scoping Report).</p> <p>The South African Astronomical Observatory was not initially included in the I&AP database, however in response to this</p>
--	--	---	--

			comment, an email was immediately sent to this organisation to notify them of the project and the opportunity to comment. The synopsis document was also shared with them and follow-up emails was sent to facilitate comment. A response has not yet been received. Effort will again be made to engage with the society at the inception of the EIA phase.
29.	<p>Makhosazane Yeni Department: Environment, Forestry and Fisheries: Integrated Environmental Authorisations 11 November 2020</p> <p>Received via email</p>	<p>(d) Specialist Assessments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specialist studies to be conducted must provide a detailed description of their methodology, how the impacts were assessed and the significance rated, consideration of mitigation hierarchy, the monitoring of impacts as well as the recommendations based on their findings. The specialist studies must also provide a detailed description of all limitations to their studies. All specialist studies must be conducted during the correct season and providing that as a limitation, will not be accepted. Should the appointed specialists specify contradicting recommendations, the EAP must clearly indicate the most reasonable recommendation and substantiate this with defensible reasons; and were necessary, include further expertise advice. You are advised to seek a specialist to assess and give guidance on Air Emissions as well as Climate Change impacts that this development will have on the receiving environment. An identification of the levels of possible pollutant impacts on the atmospheric air condition in the area, to examine the dispersion of gases or pollutants emitted from a gas turbine power plant. Assessment of waste management with the purpose of providing the maximum reduction of the impact level connecting with generation and disposal of waste. The noise impact assessment connecting with the activity operation on the receiving environment, in the context of the existing regulatory requirements. The gas turbines are very sensitive to temperature; therefore, you are required to indicate how to cool the facility. Should water be considered for cooling 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is acknowledged for the Impact Assessment phase and included in the Terms of Reference for further specialist inputs. The limitations to the respective specialist studies conducted to date were included in their reports and the Scoping Report. Limitations to the specialist studies in the EIA phase will be recorded. None of the specialists had limitations to seasonality. This will be clearly detailed in the EIR, should any contradicting recommendations be received by the specialists. A specialist was appointed to conduct the requisite Air Quality Specialist study and report on climate change impacts in the EIA phase. This will be taken into account in the air quality specialist study. Waste generation on the site will be limited to waste items and streams typical of a small office. The operation of this facility is not a waste generating activity. The EAP will give guidance on integrated waste management practices and include such in the EMPr for the construction and operational phases. The noise impact assessment will determine the noise levels associated with the proposed activity and report on this in relation to the regulatory requirements and the current noise conditions in the vicinity of the site. The receiving environment was documented in the Scoping Report.

		<p>purposes, please explain how the wastewater would be disposed of?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Considering that the climate conditions i.e. moisture, dust, salt, etc., might impact negatively on the proposed development, please describe the environmental challenges that might affect the operation of the proposed development and how to manage them. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Turbines do not require water for cooling. The TM 2500 Turbines are air units. Not water required for cooling. The technology (TM 2500 Turbines) is designed to be durable in the most unfavourable conditions. Built in air filters ensure the units are able to perform at peak levels for the 25 year operation. The regular planned maintenance program as prescribed by the OEM has been incorporated to ensure optimal performance. There are more than 100 units installed globally with proven performance.
30.	<p>Makhosazane Yeni Department: Environment, Forestry and Fisheries: Integrated Environmental Authorisations 11 November 2020</p> <p>Received via email</p>	<p>(e) The EMPr</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The impact management outcomes and impact management actions regarding the mitigation measures for the climate change impacts must be recorded in an EMPr. The EMPr must comply with the requirements of Appendix 4 of the EIA Regulations, 2014, as amended. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This requirement is noted for inclusion into the EMPr. The EMPr will meet the requirements of Appendix 4 of the 2014 EIA Regulations, as amended.
31.	<p>Makhosazane Yeni Department: Environment, Forestry and Fisheries: Integrated Environmental Authorisations 11 November 2020</p> <p>Received via email</p>	<p>(f) Cumulative Assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should there be any other similar projects within a 30km radius of the proposed development site, the cumulative impact assessment for all identified and assessed impacts must be refined to indicate the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identified cumulative impacts must be clearly defined, and where possible the size of the identified impact must be quantified and indicated, i.e. hectares of cumulatively transformed land. Detailed process flow and proof must be provided, to indicate how the specialist's recommendations, mitigation measures and conclusions from the various similar developments in the area were taken into consideration in the assessment of cumulative impacts and when the conclusion and mitigation measures were drafted for this project. The cumulative impacts significance rating must also inform the need and desirability of the proposed development. 	<p>Ms N Duarte the Environmental Officer at the Saldanha Bay Municipality was engaged to determine if there are any other similar projects of this nature within a 30 km radius. She was able to confirm that there is a proposal from Karpower within a 30 km radius of the site. It was agreed that a map marking a 30 km radius would be sent to her for a formal response as to whether or not there are any other application of this nature. Should data from these other Applicants be available, this will be considered in terms of the cumulative impact. It should however be noted that only if a Bid is successful would the cumulative impact be relevant.</p>

		<p>➤ A cumulative impact environmental statement on whether the proposed development must proceed.</p>	
32.	<p>Makhosazane Yeni Department: Environment, Forestry and Fisheries: Integrated Environmental Authorisations 11 November 2020</p> <p>Received via email</p>	<p>General You are further reminded to comply with Regulation 21(1) of the NEMA EIA Regulations 2014, as amended, which states that: <i>"if S&EIR must be applied to an application, the applicant must, within 44 days of receipt of the application by the competent authority, submit to the competent authority a scoping report which has been subjected to a public participation process of at least 30 days and which reflects the incorporation of comments received, including any comments of the competent authority"</i></p> <p>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, as amended.</p> <p>Further note that in terms of Regulation 45 of the EIA Regulations 2014, as amended, 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).</p> <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>	<p>The final Scoping Report, which meets the minimum requirements of Appendix 2 of the 2014 EIA Regulations, as amended, will be submitted to the DEFF within 44 days of receipt of the Department's receipt of the application.</p>
33.	<p>Melanie Attwell Melanie Attwell and Associates 13 November 2020</p>	<p><i>A Notice of Intent to Develop was submitted to Heritage Western Cape by the Heritage Specialist. Upon request, minutes of the APM Committee meeting was issued to the Heritage Specialist. Neither the Heritage nor the Palaeontological specialists were able to present the findings of their respective reports at the committee meeting. The outcome of the meeting seemed inconsistent with what would reasonably be expected of a project of this nature and specific location. In response to this, the Heritage Specialist made contact with the relevant parties and set up a meeting to discuss this matter in more detail. The below notes reflect the key points discussed and the outcome of the discussion.</i></p>	<p>Subsequent to this meeting, HWC provided official comment, as captured in this table. A response is provided accordingly.</p>

Re: HWC Case 20100508, Portion 69, Farm 127, Saldanha

Just to confirm the comments and decisions made at our meeting this morning:

The meeting between Melanie Attwell and Stephanie Barnardt of HWC on 13/12/2020 refers.

MA made the following comments:

- The site concerned is Portion 69, Farm 127, Saldanha, and NOT Portion 13, Farm 127, as identified in the APM Committee decision. This was clearly identified on the NID and attached report. This leads me to question whether the Committee read the correct information, i.e. the most up to date report by John Pether.
- The latest Pether report (2020) was submitted to HWC and the Committee had access to reading it.
- The Committee has requested a combined HIA for the site. The time constraints attached to this request are particularly problematic given the tight deadlines applied nationally for bids to be included in the procurement programme for new power generation in early 2021.
- I also draw your attention to HIA/EIA requirements that public consultation is not permitted during the end of year period.
- This proposal forms part of a national energy project with full government support and initiated by them. It is considered a priority project with tight deadlines.
- The request for a VIA with special reference to the view from the Visitors Centre of the West Coast Fossil Park is problematic because the site is 10 kms away, and on the opposite side of the Saldanha Steel Works. We therefore question why a VIA would be required. A photographic assessment will be submitted.
- The following reports have already been conducted on the site by palaeontologist John Pether:
 1. In 2012, Pether submitted a Palaeontological Impact Assessment (PIA) for the development currently on the same site. This was endorsed by HWC. The report included detailed monitoring and mitigation measures to be applied for the

development which were adopted by HWC and reflected in an RoD.

2. Pether subsequently submitted a second PIA (2020) for the latest proposed development on the same site, i.e. the gas to power facility, including detailed monitoring and mitigation measures. This was submitted to HWC as part of the NID application made by Melanie Attwell and Associates.

To provide a further PIA (HIA) would mean that the same site would be assessed for a third time. This process had been made clear in the report attached to the NID and submitted by Melanie Attwell.

- Time is absolutely of the essence given the national deadlines for submitting authorisations.

After discussion, the following decisions were agreed.

- HWC would correct the incorrect farm number and ensure that the correct site is assessed.
- HWC acknowledges the importance of the time issue for the project and will assist where possible in expediting this matter.
- HWC acknowledged that the project is important as it addresses the national energy program and forms part of an urgent national energy provision initiative endorsed at the highest level.
- An appeal process is not possible as the final appeal meeting for the year is next week.
- A consolidated heritage report entitled as an HIA would be undertaken by MA&A. This would combine and reformat the mitigation findings of the Pether Report (2020).
- HWC agreed that consultation attached to the initial scoping EIA process undertaken by Chand Environmental Consultants would be sufficient to fulfil any consultation requirements of the HIA.
- A report entitled an HIA would take all the available information and analysis already done and convert it into an HIA format and would submit as soon as possible.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Visual Statement will be undertaken by Melanie Attwell and Associates. This will be because there is no time to appoint a VIA specialist and because Melanie Attwell has sufficient experience to undertake such a study. It should be noted that the VS will limit itself to indicating that the site is situated 10kms from the Visitors Centre of the WCFP and behind the Saldanha Steel works. HWC will ensure that the item is included on the next agenda for the final APM meeting in early December which will be attended by the heritage consultants. 	
34.	<p>Adri La Meyer Directorate: Development Facilitation Environmental Affairs and Development Planning Western Cape Government 16 November 2020</p> <p>Received via email</p>	<p>I hope you are well. The above application refers as received from Keagan-Leigh refers. I'm terribly sorry to have to ask you for a one-day time extension to submit comments on the DSR, knowing the very tight deadlines for the Risk Mitigation IPP Procurement Programme and submission of the FSR to DEFF within the legislative timeframes.</p> <p>I would really appreciate the one-day extension please, as I am still waiting for comments from our EIA and Air Quality Management sections on the DSR! I have no idea what time during the day to expect the comments and preparing for the worst-case scenario to only get comments by tonight. Thus far I have received comments from our Waste and Pollution & Chemicals Management sections. I think Coastal will only give comments on the Draft EIAR.</p> <p>I would really appreciate a time extension to give me adequate time to collate the comments in document that would make sense to you. Hope you would be able to accommodate my request please.</p>	Email was acknowledged and extension was granted by one day, as requested by the Department.
35.	<p>Mohale Mokoena / Nazeema Duarte Saldanha Bay Municipality 16 November 2020</p> <p>Received via email</p>	<p>RE: DRAFT SCOPING REPORT OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF A LIQUIFIED PETROLEUM GAS (LPG)-TO-POWER FACILITY, OVERHEAD ELECTRICITY TRANSMISSION LINE AND ASSOCIATED PIPELINE INFRASTRUCTURE ON VARIOUS FARM PORTIONS, SALDANHA</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Draft Scoping Report of the Proposed Development of a Liquefied Petroleum Gas (LPG) To Power Facility, Overhead Electricity Transmission Line and Associated Pipeline Infrastructure on Various Farm Portions, Within the Jurisdiction of the Saldanha Bay Local Municipality, Western Cape, dated October 2020 refers. According to Page 58 point 6.4.3 of the draft Scoping Report, Air Quality is affected due to dust caused during 	The Saldanha Bay Municipality was included in the Scoping Phase engagements. A meeting was held with the environmental officer from the Saldanha Bay Municipality (Miss N Duarte). In the meeting it was said that the Air Quality specialist should liaise with the Municipality's Air Quality Officer to gather data for the ambient air quality, and to further set up communication for the exchange of monitoring data that will be captured at the facility. A dedicated meeting with the Air Quality Officer will be undertaken for the impact assessment phase, when the Air Quality specialist commences his in-depth investigation. The Municipality's Air Quality branch will also have the opportunity to comment on the EIR and the Air Emission Licence Application.

		<p>earthworks and construction activities. Furthermore, air quality is affected during the operational phase as gas turbines combust emissions, vehicle exhaust emissions etc. The Saldanha Bay Municipality is responsible for the monitoring of Ambient Air Quality. Please contact the Air Quality Officer, Ms Rene Toesie (022 701 7052, rene.toesie@sbm.gov.za), for more information and assistance.</p>	
36.	<p>Ross Holland Holland & Associates 16 November 2020</p> <p>Received via email</p> <p>Representing: Sunrise Energy (Pty) Ltd: Mr Pieter Coetzee; Ms Samantha Potgieter; and Mr Hein Brand</p>	<p>SUBMISSION OF COMMENTS IN RESPECT OF THE DRAFT SCOPING REPORT FOR THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF A LIQUIFIED PETROLEUM GAS (LPG)-TO-POWER FACILITY, OVERHEAD ELECTRICITY TRANSMISSION LINE AND ASSOCIATED PIPELINE INFRASTRUCTURE ON VARIOUS FARM PORTIONS, SALDANHA, WESTERN CAPE DEFF REFERENCE NUMBER: 14/12/16/3/3/2/2008</p> <p>1. Introduction Holland & Associates Environmental Consultants has been appointed by Sunrise Energy (Pty) Ltd, to assist the latter with the substantive review of a Draft Scoping Report (referred to herein as the "DSR") and its associated Annexures in respect of the proposed development of a Liquefied Petroleum Gas (LPG) – to - Power facility, and associated infrastructure, by Assegai Power (Pty) Ltd.</p> <p>The comment below is submitted on behalf of Sunrise Energy (Pty) Ltd (herein after referred to as "SE") and is based upon a review of the DSR dated October 2020, its associated Annexures, as downloaded from the website of Chand Environmental Consultants (www.chand.co.za) on 9 November 2020.</p> <p>We note the following comments in respect of the proposed project and DSR:</p> <p>1. As a general matter, we note that the lack of specific detail regarding the project description put forward within the DSR and its associated Annexures, currently limits the extent to which SE is able to assess and comment on the nature of the potential impact of Assegai Power (Pty) Ltd's proposed facility (including associated infrastructure) on SE's immovable property and existing lawful operations. The DSR mentions that the proposed inbound pipeline, to which the proposed project would connect, has</p>	<p>The Final Scoping Report was updated to reflect more detail based on the most current project description, noting that during the Scoping Phase, aspects of the proposal evolved as a result of comments received from various parties, as well as the technical considerations to provide for more environmentally sound development proposal. The amendments to the draft Scoping Report are clearly differentiated in the Final version of the report.</p> <p>With regards to the Avedia's previously approved pipeline, construction commenced with the excavation of trenches but was never completed. Avedia's Environmental Authorisation (Appendix A of the draft and final Scoping Report), including the pipeline component, therefore remains valid. This information came to light during the scoping phase and was clarified in the final Scoping Report. With respect to the new pipeline portion that is included in the Assegai application in question, this covers a pipeline interconnection that runs between the Sunrise Energy pipeline and the approved Strategic Fuel Fund (SFF) pipeline (EIA Ref. No. 14/12/16/3/3/2/1069). If this application is approved, Assegai Power would be the holders of the Authorisation that includes this portion of the pipeline. As such, Avedia Energy has entered into an agreement with Assegai Power to allow for the use of this pipeline portion.</p> <p>The approved SFF pipeline has yet to be constructed. All of this was clarified in the Final Scoping Report.</p> <p>With regards to the SFF Environmental Authorisation, this would need to be sought from them directly. The Applicant however confirms that the EA was upheld by the Minister early in 2020 after an appeal was submitted by Sunrise Energy. The Applicant further confirms that SFF have agreed to allow connection into their pipeline which is in any case a legislated requirement in terms of the Pipeline Act (which allows for third party connections).</p>

		<p>previously received an Environmental Authorization. The DSR is however silent on whether or not the aforementioned pipeline has actually been constructed, or whether or not the Environmental Authorization is still valid. Furthermore, a copy of this purported Environmental Authorization is not appended to the DSR, thereby foreclosing the opportunity to assess the proposed projects compatibility with the purportedly already authorized infrastructure. The current level of detail provided regarding the proposed project leaves SE unable to determine the potential impacts and risks arising from Assegai's proposed project to SE's existing pipeline and other terminal infrastructure. We note that whilst the documentation makes several references to the use of SFF infrastructure, the project description refers to the inbound pipeline connecting to "existing pipeline infrastructure". To SE's knowledge, the only "existing" LPG inbound pipeline is that owned and operated by SE. The confusion created by the current wording therefore requires clarification. Only upon receipt of more appropriately detailed technical information, will SE be in a position to deliver substantive comment on the potential impact of Assegai Power (Pty) Ltd's proposed facility (including associated infrastructure) on SE's immovable property and existing lawful operations.</p>	<p>We look forward to receiving your further comment in the EIA phase.</p>
37.	<p>Ross Holland Holland & Associates 16 November 2020</p> <p>Received via email</p> <p>Representing: Sunrise Energy (Pty) Ltd: Mr Pieter Coetzee; Ms Samantha Potgieter; and Mr Hein Brand</p>	<p>2. We note that there is currently a significant discrepancy in the information provided within various documents related to the DSR that are currently in the public domain, as part of the Public Participation Process. In particular, we note that the "Synopsis & Project Description", document, dated November 2020, refers to a 150MW facility, while the DSR and I&AP notification letter refer to a 300MW facility, thereby creating confusion over the exact nature and scale of the project that is proposed. We hereby request clarification of this aspect.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged that the Draft Scoping Report referred to a 300MW while the synopsis document refers to a 150MW facility. The synopsis document was compiled after public review of the draft Scoping Report has commenced. During this time, it came to light that the on-site space requirement for emission abatement equipment necessitated the reduction in space allocated to turbines. This in turn led to the reduced electricity generation capacity that can be proposed. This is reflected in the Final Scoping Report.</p> <p>Such amendments are typical of the iterative nature of the environmental process, which aims to guide a proposed development towards a more environmentally sound outcome.</p>
38.	<p>Ross Holland Holland & Associates 16 November 2020</p> <p>Received via email</p>	<p>3. We note that there appears to be no discussion within the DSR of the Petroleum Pipelines Act (No. 60 of 2003, as amended) and/or the Gas Act (No.48 of 2001), as a substantively relevant Statutes to the proposed project. In this regard, the entire proposed project appears to be premised upon the assumption that the proposed</p>	<p>Both these Acts dictate that interconnection by third parties are permitted as long as it is technically feasible. It should be noted that LPG pipeline interconnections are routinely performed in South Africa, including within the port of Saldanha. SFF have already issued an in principle agreement to Assegai for this interconnection to take place at a future date. Capacity has thus been confirmed.</p>

	<p>Representing: Sunrise Energy (Pty) Ltd: Mr Pieter Coetzee; Ms Samantha Potgieter; and Mr Hein Brand</p>	<p>inbound and outbound pipeline connections are a fait accompli, with no discussion, explanation, or information provided in respect of how the legally required "technical feasibility" criteria for the proposed connections are proposed to be met. The absence of a thorough exposition of this aspect of the proposed project is a significant oversight since this information is fundamental to the demonstration of the connection alternatives being both "feasible and reasonable" as required in terms of the NEMA EIA Regulations (2014, as amended).</p>	<p>The details around the specifications of the interconnection will be addressed during the detailed design phase.</p>
<p>39.</p>	<p>Ross Holland Holland & Associates 16 November 2020</p> <p>Received via email</p> <p>Representing: Sunrise Energy (Pty) Ltd: Mr Pieter Coetzee; Ms Samantha Potgieter; and Mr Hein Brand</p>	<p>4. We note that since the proposed project is reliant upon the use of the existing Avedia Energy (Pty) Ltd, LPG Terminal and would inter-connect to existing Avedia terminal infrastructure, that the lawfulness and compliance history of the existing Avedia operation, is fundamentally material to the feasibility of the current proposal by Assegai Power (Pty) Ltd. In this regard, Appendix A of the DSR contains the Avedia Energy (Pty) Ltd Environmental Authorization (EA), which includes a wide-ranging suite of conditions of authorization that have to be complied with. In this regard, we note the following provision within Condition 11 of the EA: "Non-compliance with a condition of this environmental authorisation or EMP may result in suspension of this environmental authorization and may render the holder liable for criminal prosecution". We note further that Condition 30 of Avedia's EA, obliges the submission of a series of Audit Reports which must report on the levels of compliance with the EA and Environmental Management Programme (EMP) for the facility. SE hereby requests confirmation as to whether or not the aforementioned Audit Requirements were complied with, and if so, hereby requests copies of the Audit Reports, in order to ascertain the extent to which the levels of compliance at the current facility (against the context of Assegai's proposals for further development and interconnection to existing infrastructure on the site) may pose a risk to SE's immovable property and lawful operations. In the event that the requisite Audit requirement has not been complied with, or has only been partially complied with, SE contends that, in such circumstances, any further consideration of Assegai's currently proposed project, must be made contingent upon a thorough independent audit of compliance of Avedia Energy (Pty) Ltd's EA &</p>	<p>Avedia Energy (Pty) Ltd and Assegai Power are two separate legal entities. Assegai will be purchasing LPG from Avedia Energy, who then becomes a service provider to Assegai Power in line with a Service Level Agreement. Avedia's Environmental Authorisation remains valid and compliance matters are the responsibility of the Competent Authority. Sunrise Energy's consideration of risk to their immovable property and lawful operations in relation to Avedia Energy's compliance, falls outside the Assegai application for environmental authorisation and should be dealt with separately.</p> <p>The suggestion that Assegai's application for Environmental Authorisation be made contingent upon a thorough independent audit of Avedia Energy's compliance is unreasonable. Considered in the context of how environmental applications are made in South Africa, it would then suggest that any possible service providers required to realise a proposed development must be subjected to full independent legal audits prior to the application being considered. For example, a proposed hotel, which would require food and beverage, gas, transport and a myriad of other suppliers are not required to conduct full legal audits on all of these service providers prior to their environmental application being considered. This is a non-sensical approach and not required in terms of law for environmental applications.</p> <p>It should be reiterated that Avedia Energy's Environmental Authorisation is valid, and compliance matters is the responsibility of the competent authority's law enforcement division.</p>

		EMP (including MHI and local authority Fire Department compliance), in order to accurately assess the risk profile associated with any further development on the site.	
40.	<p>Ross Holland Holland & Associates 16 November 2020</p> <p>Received via email</p> <p>Representing: Sunrise Energy (Pty) Ltd: Mr Pieter Coetzee; Ms Samantha Potgieter; and Mr Hein Brand</p>	<p>5. The DSR's only consideration or acknowledgement of the proposed projects potential impacts on Marine Traffic within the Port is the following brief statement: "Off-loading of LPG via a pipeline from a Very Large Gas Carrier (VLGC) at the Port of Saldanha" (Section 3.3 of the DSR). In spite of this activity forming a key component of the overall project proposal, as acknowledged within the DSR, the DSR contains no discussion of the feasibility of this aspect, and no discussions of any potential impacts arising from this component such as existing use conflicts, safety considerations and impacts on existing vessel traffic within the Port. The contention within the DSR appears to be that since the SFF pipeline and berth are already authorized (albeit that no information regarding the nature and scope of such purported authorization is provided), that no consideration of impacts associated with these components is required within the current Environmental Authorization process. SE contends that this approach is flawed, since it is implausible that Assegai Power (Pty) Ltd's current proposal would have formed part of the considerations within any SFF Environmental Authorization process which may previously have taken place. The SFF Environmental Authorisation Process therefore could not have considered or assessed the project specific potential impacts associated with Assegai Power (Pty) Ltd's proposed use of this infrastructure. In the circumstances, this is a significant oversight, and the current scope of the EIA process should be revised accordingly.</p>	<p>The Final Scoping Report clarified the development proposal in relation to the respective Assegai Power and Avedia Energy entities. As mentioned above, Assegai Power will be purchasing LPG from Avedia Energy.</p> <p>Cumulative impacts on the marine environment and port facilities that are associated with the delivery and offloading of LPG in the port were considered in the Avedia Energy EIA process, which informed the Competent Authority's decision to grant Environmental Authorisation. This aspect was further considered in the Minister's decision to uphold the Environmental Authorisation subsequent to Sunrise Energy's appeal. Clause 5.3 of the Minister's decision specifically highlights that the number of vessels required to deliver LPG would be approximately 8 per year. The proposal by Assegai Power will not necessitate an increase in vessels entering the port. Hence, impacts on the marine environment and operational functionality of the port as a result of Assegai Power's proposal will not increase beyond what was previously assessed and approved for Avedia Energy.</p> <p>Therefore, there is no requirement for the current scope of this EIA process to include consideration of impacts on the marine/port environment.</p>
41.	<p>Ross Holland Holland & Associates 16 November 2020</p> <p>Received via email</p> <p>Representing: Sunrise Energy (Pty) Ltd: Mr Pieter Coetzee; Ms Samantha Potgieter; and Mr Hein Brand</p>	<p>6. Related to the point above, since the proposed project appears to be premised upon the use of SFF infrastructure which is purportedly authorized, it is requested that the relevant Environmental Authorizations be included within the EIA Phase documentation, including a comprehensive exposition of how the currently proposed projects use of this infrastructure complies the Authorized Project Description(s) and conditions of authorization.</p>	<p>Assegai Power will purchase LPG from Avedia for the generation of electricity. Therefore, Avedia Energy will utilise the SFF infrastructure. This will be undertaken in terms of an agreement between these parties that would have to take cognisance of compliance aspects.</p>

<p>42.</p>	<p>Ross Holland Holland & Associates 16 November 2020</p> <p>Received via email</p> <p>Representing: Sunrise Energy (Pty) Ltd: Mr Pieter Coetzee; Ms Samantha Potgieter; and Mr Hein Brand</p>	<p>7. The Assegai Power (Pty) Ltd DSR contends that: "This proposal does not have any listed activities that fall within the coastal zone (noting that the relevant erf for the inbound pipeline does not trigger a listed activity). Furthermore, there are no likely impacts from the activity on the coastal zone. Thus, NEM:ICMA is not applicable to this development proposal (underlining supplied)." SE questions whether the aforementioned interpretation regarding the applicability of NEM:ICMA is correct, given Assegai's proposed use of the SFF pipeline and berth, and stated intention to import LPG for the facility via Very Large Gas Carrier (VLGC). There is therefore a clear and direct link between Assegai's proposed development and activities and potential impacts within the coastal zone, which the aforementioned interpretation appears to ignore.</p>	<p>Refer to the response to comment number 40. The Final Scoping Report clarified the development proposal in relation to the respective Assegai Power and Avedia Energy entities. As mentioned above, Assegai Power will be purchasing LPG from Avedia Energy. Avedia Energy will be using the SFF and Assegai power pipeline infrastructure to transport LPG from the port to Avedia's LPG facility. As indicated in the Scoping Report, the Assegai portion of the pipeline lies outside of the coastal zone. Impacts associated with the SFF pipeline within the coastal zone would have been considered and approved in the SFF environmental application and resultant Environmental Authorisation. Impacts on the marine and coastal environment (and applicability of NEM:ICMA) resulting from vessels entering the port with Avedia Energy's LPG, were considered and approved in Avedia Energy's Environmental Authorisation.</p>
<p>43.</p>	<p>Ross Holland Holland & Associates 16 November 2020</p> <p>Received via email</p> <p>Representing: Sunrise Energy (Pty) Ltd: Mr Pieter Coetzee; Ms Samantha Potgieter; and Mr Hein Brand</p>	<p>8. SE questions the assertion within section 3.5.5 of the DSR that "<i>No hazardous waste would be produced by the proposed activity.</i>" Given that the proposed project involves industrial infrastructure (which would require, inter alia, the use of lubricants and would require periodic maintenance) and the use of a hydro-carbon as its primary throughput, the aforementioned assertion within section 3.5.5 of the DSR is not credible, and requires further consideration, investigation and revision.</p>	<p>This was rectified in the Final Scoping Report.</p>
<p>44.</p>	<p>Ross Holland Holland & Associates 16 November 2020</p> <p>Received via email</p> <p>Representing: Sunrise Energy (Pty) Ltd: Mr Pieter Coetzee; Ms Samantha Potgieter; and Mr Hein Brand</p>	<p>9. We note significant shortcomings in the consideration of potential impacts on Avifauna, related to the proposed 132 kV overhead transmission line, as set out below:</p> <p>In relation to the statement that "<i>It is acknowledged that the pylons and transmission lines will present new structures that avian species would need to navigate around, however this is the case for all other transmission lines in the area.</i>" The author acknowledges that transmission lines present new structures that birds need to avoid (in order to avoid collision or electrocution), but appears to incorrectly deduce that the proposed new infrastructure would not create any additional impacts, due to the presence of other transmission lines in the area. This assumption is inherently incorrect. The cumulative impact of another transmission line, added to the existing</p>	<p>Following engagement with the West Coast Birdlife organisation, the need for further faunal inputs, especially as it relates to potential impact on avifauna, was confirmed. As indicated in the Plan of Study for EIA, a full faunal impact assessment will be undertaken by the specialist Simon Todd. An avifaunal specialist will contribute to the faunal impact assessment.</p> <p>The statements quoted in this comment were removed or further clarified in the Final Scoping Report as it relates to the cumulative impact on avifauna.</p> <p>Specialist reporting will be undertaken in accordance with the Protocol requirements.</p>

impacts, requires assessment in order to determine if this cumulative impact is acceptable or not.

In relation to the statement that “*Unlike wind turbines, the static nature of these transmission lines means that fatal or other injuries to birds due to collision is unlikely*”, it is noted that this statement is factually incorrect. The negative impacts of overhead powerlines on avifauna are well known and documented, worldwide for approximately 350 species (Ferrer et al. 2020). In South Africa, they pose an increasing concern for certain species at a population level, including Blue Crane and Ludwig’s Bustard, which both occur in the broader impact zone of the proposed development (Shaw et al 2010, Jenkins et al 2011, SABAP2), and a variety of raptors (Slater et al. 2020). Eskom acknowledges the impact of their infrastructure on avifauna and has a formalized strategic partnership with the Endangered Wildlife Trust since 1995 that is working to minimise these impacts. Part of this strategy is to conduct avifaunal impact assessments for proposed overhead powerlines. At a minimum, best practice and compliance with the NEMA “Duty of Care” obligations is indicative that the current lack of commitment to undertake a Avifaunal Specialist study to properly determine the potential impacts on Avifauna and determine any appropriate mitigation measures, is a significant oversight, which must be addressed.

With regard to the statement that “*The impact on avian habitat and movement corridors will be determined by the associated sensitivity of the site and its airspace*”, it is noted that it is standard best practice to conduct an avifaunal impact assessment for overhead grid connections by an avifaunal specialist who is able to determine the sensitivity of the site accurately. As the Screening Tool Report points out, the Species of Conservation Concern (SCC) Black Harrier, African Marsh Harrier and Secretary Bird are likely to occur in the proposed development area.

According to the recently gazetted *Protocol for the Assessment and Minimum Report Content Requirements for Environmental Impacts on terrestrial Animal Species* it is now a legal requirement for studies commissioned from

		<p>the date of publication of the Protocol that a specialist registered with SACNASP in the specific taxonomic group (in this case Aves) conducts a site inspection to determine the sensitivity of the site and if SCCs are likely to be present and a full terrestrial Animal Species Specialist Assessment will be required.</p> <p>With regard to the statement that <i>“Unless otherwise indicated by the terrestrial biodiversity specialist, no avifaunal study will be undertaken.”</i>, we note that given the presence of several avian SCCs, proximity to a Ramsar wetland, and two IBAs, as well as the location being within a major migratory flyway, that it is clear, in the circumstances, that a specialist avifaunal impact assessment is warranted. In addition, a Black Harrier (Endangered) nest is located approximately 5 km north of the site and Black Harrier have been observed foraging in the coastal fynbos less than 3 km south of the site (R. Simmons, pers. comm), which means that the proposed development site may cross a major flyway between nesting and foraging ground for this Black Harrier pair.</p>	
45.	<p>Ross Holland Holland & Associates 16 November 2020</p> <p>Received via email</p> <p>Representing: Sunrise Energy (Pty) Ltd: Mr Pieter Coetzee; Ms Samantha Potgieter; and Mr Hein Brand</p>	<p>10. SE notes that the Application Form does not appear to have been made available for review during the current I&AP comment period. SE hereby requests a copy of the Application Form (including all Annexures) for review.</p> <p>Sunrise Energy (Pty) Ltd and Holland & Associates Environmental Consultants reserve their rights to revise initial comments and to request further information based on any additional information that may be received as the Environmental Authorization Process progresses.</p>	<p>The application form was sent to the commenting party, noting that the project description was subject to change in the final version of the scoping report.</p> <p>The amended application form will be appended to the final Scoping Report and the final scoping documentation will be made available to I&APs.</p>
46.	<p>Adri La Meyer DEA&DP: Directorate: Development Facilitation 17 November 2020</p>	<p>COMMENT ON THE INTEGRATED DRAFT SCOPING REPORT AND PLAN OF STUDY FOR ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE PROPOSED GENERATION OF ELECTRICITY VIA THE DEVELOPMENT OF A LIQUIFIED PETROLEUM GAS-TO-POWER FACILITY ON PORTION 69 (A PORTION OF PORTION 13) OF THE FARM YZERVARKENSRUG NO.127, AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF A 132KV OVERHEAD ELECTRICITY TRANSMISSION LINE AND ASSOCIATED GAS PIPELINE INFRASTRUCTURE ON VARIOUS FARM PORTIONS IN SALDANHA BAY</p> <p>The e-mail correspondence of 15 October 2020 notifying potential interested and affected parties (“I&APs”) of the integrated environmental impact assessment (“EIA”) process</p>	<p>Comments raised by the various Directorates are responded to below.</p>

		<p>for an application for an environmental authorisation ("EA") and an atmospheric emission licence ("AEL"), and informing I&APs of the availability of the Draft Scoping Report for comment, refer.</p> <p>Thank you for graciously allowing a one-day time extension to allow all directorates within the Department to provide comments on the Draft Scoping Report ("DSR") and Plan of Study for EIA dated October 2020 that was downloaded from the website of the environmental assessment practitioner.</p> <p>Please find consolidated comment from various directorates within the Department on the DSR and Plan of Study for EIA.</p> <p>Please direct any enquiries to the official/s indicated in this correspondence should you require any clarity on any of the comments provided.</p> <p>The Department reserves the right to revise initial comments and request further information based on any information received.</p>	
47.	<p>Saa-rah Adams DEA&DP: Directorate: Development Management (Region 1) 17 November 2020</p> <p>Ref no. 16/3/3/6/4/2/1/F4/17/3170/20</p> <p>Consolidated comment received via DEA&DP: Directorate: Development Facilitation</p>	<p>1. Directorate: Development Management (Region 1) – Ms Saa-rah Adams (Saa-rah.Adams@westerncape.gov.za; Tel: (021) 483 0773):</p> <p>1.1 According to the DSR, five transmission line route alternatives were considered during the Scoping phase, with only Route Alternatives 2 and 3 to be considered for assessment during the environmental impact reporting ("EIR") phase. Please ensure that a comparative assessment of the two transmission route alternatives is undertaken, and that the investigation and/or assessment of alternatives is adequately described in the Draft EIA Report, i.e. the advantages and disadvantages of each route alternative must be provided.</p> <p>1.2 According to the Site Sensitivity Verification Report (Appendix G of the DSR) compiled in relation to all four respective screening reports for the proposed development, the site represents a high sensitivity for the civil aviation theme as the site is located within 8km of an aerodrome, and the airspace is dangerous and restricted. Considering this, official comment from the relevant aviation authority must be obtained and</p>	<p>1.1 Comment received by one of the affected landowners (AMSA), on the Draft Scoping Report, revealed that Alternatives 2 and 3 were no longer viable as it conflicted with the proposed future land use by the commenting party. In consultation with AMSA, the Applicant conceived of a viable 6th Alternative for the transmission line. Further investigation by the Applicant also revealed a 7th Alternative for consideration. The Final Scoping Report indicates that Alternatives 2 and 3 are no longer under consideration and that the newly identified Alternatives 6 and 7 will be taken into the EIA phase for assessment. The draft EIR will contain full descriptions and a comparative assessment of the two new transmission line Alternatives as requested.</p> <p>1.2 In response to this comment, effort was made to obtain the contact details for the Saldanha/Vredenburg Airport but without success. Instead, the principal users of the airfield the West Coast Flying Club was notified and added as an I&AP for the project. The synopsis document was shared with this I&AP. Continued effort will be made to notify the owner of the airfield (which is believed to be military-owned). Should comment be received, it will be included in the draft EIR.</p>

		<p>included in the Final Scoping Report ("FSR") or where this is not possible, in the Draft and Final EIA Reports.</p> <p>1.3 It is noted that no visual impact assessment will be undertaken, unless required by Heritage Western Cape ("HWC"). Should HWC deem that no visual impact assessment is required, please note that the potential visual impacts associated with the proposed development (liquified petroleum gas ("LPG") facility and overhead electricity transmission line) during the operational phase must be adequately reported on in the Draft EIA Report. Further note that the anticipated visual impacts during the construction phase for all components of the proposed development (including the gas pipeline infrastructure) must be reported on in the Draft EIA Report.</p> <p>1.4 It is further noted that no hydrological assessments will be undertaken as part of the EIA process to assess the potential impacts on groundwater, as an opinion on hydrogeological conditions was obtained from a specialist who has existing knowledge of the area. Details regarding the efficient use of water, management of runoff, along with an assessment of any impacts on the underlying aquifer, must be addressed in the Draft EIA Report.</p> <p>1.5 It is imperative that HWC's response to the Notification of Intent to Develop must be included in the FSR to be submitted to the competent authority.</p>	<p>1.3 A Notice of Intent to Develop that was submitted to Heritage Western Cape by the Heritage Specialist. HWC response to the NID is included in this comment and response table. The Heritage Specialist came to an agreement with HWC that the draft EIR will incorporate the visual impacts from the West Coast Fossil Park, as identified in a Visual Impact Statement. There is a movement in the EIA field to focus only on those impacts that are deemed significant and considered material for decision-making by the Competent Authority. In other words, impacts that may occur, but that would be insignificant in the context of the nature of the proposal or the environmental setting, are excluded from the assessment of impacts. In line with this approach and in the context of the industrial land use of the site surrounds, other visual impacts are not considered significant, unless the Visual Impact Statement indicates otherwise.</p> <p>1.4 Subsequent to the Draft Scoping Report being circulated, it was clarified that the boreholes on site would not be utilised to provide for the water demand of this development proposal. The Saldanha Bay Municipality confirmed capacity to provide for all the water requirements. At this point, there will be no impact on the aquifer as a result of groundwater abstraction. Should the Applicant choose to supplement the municipal water with groundwater in the future, this will be subjected to a Water Use Authorisation process, which would necessitate consideration of the impact on the aquifer. With regard to the impact on the aquifer from stormwater runoff, this will be addressed in a stormwater management plan and taken into account in the EIR.</p> <p>1.5 HWC's response has been included in the Final Scoping Report.</p>
48.	Lize Jennings-Boom DEA&DP: Directorate: Climate Change 17 November 2020	<p>2 Directorate: Climate Change – Ms Lize Jennings-Boom (Lize.Jennings@westerncape.gov.za; Tel: (021) 482 0769);</p> <p>2.1. The DSR states that proposed project has been formulated in response to the request for proposals for new generation capacity under the Risk Mitigation Independent Power Producer Procurement Programme</p>	<p>2.1 The Air Quality Report will have a dedicated section on Climate Change which will document the relevant emission quantities, the global warming potential due to the</p>

	<p>Consolidated comment received via DEA&DP: Directorate: Development Facilitation</p>	<p>issued by the Department of Mineral Resources and Energy to alleviate the immediate and future capacity deficit. This development proposal looks at a decentralized approach and moves away from the South African coal-based electricity supply which is responsible for most of the greenhouse gas ("GHG") emissions in the country. Natural gas has a lower carbon emitting factor than coal-based energy sources, but there are still concerns from a climate change perspective with regards to this development proposal and the use of natural gas in the broader energy mix of the country.</p> <p>2.2. The DSR has limited reference of the impact that the proposed project will have on the GHG emissions profile of the area and of the country. Although it is noted that natural gas has a lower carbon emitting factor than coal-based energy sources, one must consider the full lifecycle emissions of this type of project proposal. South Africa as a signatory to the Paris Agreement (which was ratified in 2016), has committed to reducing our GHG emissions and as the majority of our emissions are derived from energy related activities, there is a strong need to ensure that any new energy related activities do not negatively impact on the GHG profile of the country.</p> <p>2.3. Although the DSR makes limited reference to the GHG emissions linked with the project and in the region, there is information on the expected air pollutants that may be emitted. Please ensure that cumulative air quality impacts in the area (which is already experiencing air quality concerns due to existing and proposed industrial activities), are addressed in the Draft EIA Report – this must also be addressed in the Atmospheric Impact Assessment. Ideally, climate change impacts should have been a separate specialist study, considering all climate change related impacts linked to both adaptation and mitigation.</p>	<p>emissions, as well as the relevant legislation and reporting requirements for the plant's operation.</p> <p>2.2 The Air Quality Specialist will consider the cumulative impact on climate change. As indicated above, this may be supplemented with inputs from a climate change expert. Furthermore, it was highlighted in Chapter 2 of the Draft Scoping Report that the facility will be subject to monitoring and reporting of GHG emissions. It should also be noted that the Applicant is responding to the RFP which is primarily focussed on emergency power generation in terms of DMRE's risk mitigation strategy. As such, renewable energy sources are not technically favoured for this particular RFP which will necessitate electricity on demand. While it is acknowledged that renewable energy sources are a more sustainable solution in relation to GHG emissions, it does not effectively respond to the needs of the risk mitigation strategy and this RFP by DMRE.</p> <p>2.3 Refer to the responses in points 2.1 and 2.2 above.</p>
<p>49. 49</p>	<p>Waleed Galvaan DEA&DP: Directorate: Waste Management 17 November 2020</p> <p>Ref no. 19/2/5/3/F4/16/WL00100/20</p>	<p>3. Directorate: Waste Management – Mr Waleed Galvaan (Waleed.Galvaan@westerncape.gov.za; Tel: (021) 483 8788):</p> <p>3.1. This Directorate is supportive of this type of development because it will aid the shortage of electrical energy supply in the Republic of South Africa. 300 megawatts ("MW") could supply electricity to 360 000 households</p>	<p>3.1 Thank you for the valuable figures provided, which will serve to inform the expanded need and desirability discussion in the Draft EIR. As requested, this expanded discussion will include a comparative indication of alternative energy generation facilities that are appropriate to the Risk Mitigation Strategy. It should also</p>

	<p>Consolidated comment received via DEA&DP: Directorate: Development Facilitation</p>	<p>that use 600kWh or 0.833kW per month. This figure ignores peak electrical demands but illustrates the potential of this development to aid the shortage of electricity supply in the country, which may be a reasonable assumption as the other electricity power stations accommodate the peaks. Furthermore, if 58.8 million people reside in 14.7 million households (4 people per household), then this development could supply electricity to about 2.54% of households, or 1 440 000 people. These figures will be less, when the peak demands are considered, thus the figures discussed above may be inaccurate, but the positive impact from this development proposal in terms electricity supply, is substantially evident. The need and desirability for this project should be discussed in more details in the Draft EIA Report and should be compared to other electricity generation facilities, particularly in consideration of the project cost.</p> <p>3.2. Since the proposed development is located near the coast and the topography is about less than 10m above mean sea level, it is recommended that the anticipated groundwater impacts be mitigated appropriately. The Desktop Geotechnical Investigation as proposed in the Plan of Study for EIA is supported by this Directorate. Since stormwater could become contaminated at the LPG facility, which could then impact on/ contaminate groundwater, the mitigation should also address any concerns about the geohydrology of the study area. Furthermore, the Draft EIA Report must specify whether contaminated stormwater will be managed in a particular manner.</p> <p>3.3. It is noted that an existing borehole is used to abstract groundwater, for storage in two reservoirs at the site for the proposed gas-to-power facility. Kindly specify the volume of water abstracted per day and what this water is being used for. It is also noted that sewage is piped to a septic tank before removal to a waste treatment facility. Please provide clarity whether the sewage is taken to a wastewater treatment works or a waste treatment facility as indicated. Kindly also indicate the contents of the sewage or where it originated from, and whether it is general or hazardous waste. Please also confirm that additional sewage generated the proposed LNG facility will also be</p>	<p>be noted that the revised proposal will only produce up to 150MW given that some of the on-site space for turbines will be lost to allow for emission abatement equipment.</p> <p>3.2 The engineers are compiling a stormwater management plan for inclusion into the draft EIR and EMPr. The results of the Geotechnical Investigation will be incorporated into the EIR.</p> <p>3.3 Further investigation revealed that additional groundwater abstraction from boreholes would not be necessary to serve the needs of the Assegai Power generation proposal. The Saldanha Bay Municipality confirmed capacity in the bulk water infrastructure and reserves to supply the proposed development with its water demands.</p> <p>In terms of sewage, the proposal was amended to indicate that the facility will be linked to the municipal sewage infrastructure, in lieu of the septic tank previously considered. This is a more ecologically acceptable solution. Confirmation of capacity in the bulk sewage reticulation and treatment infrastructure will be sourced from the Saldanha Bay Municipality and included in the EIR.</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>discharged to the septic tank? (Please confirm that it is indeed a septic tank as opposed to a conservancy tank being used.)</p> <p>3.4. In addition to paragraph 3.3. above regarding sewage taken to a wastewater treatment works or a waste treatment facility, please note that the <i>National Norms and Standards for Disposal of Waste to Landfill</i>, promulgated in Government Notice ("GN") No. R. 636 of 23 August 2013, has limited the water content of waste disposed of, to less than 40% and an angle of repose of waste to be more than 5 degrees. Most of the general waste disposal facilities in the Western Cape may only accept a limited percentage of general organic waste. It is important that the correct waste management process be planned for.</p> <p>3.5. It should be noted that construction, operation and maintenance of the gas-to-power facility may lead to spills of soaps, grease, lubricants and oils, etc. The construction, operation and maintenance impacts of the proposed LPG facility must be managed by implementing the appropriate avoidance and mitigation measures, which must be addressed in the forthcoming Environmental Management Programme ("EMPr").</p>	<p>3.4 The content of the referenced National Norms and Standards are acknowledged, but is not relevant to this proposal given that the sewage will be disposed of at the wastewater treatment works and not to landfill.</p> <p>3.5 The EMPr for the proposed facility will incorporate all the required management and mitigation measures to prevent / limit impacts on soil, groundwater and stormwater as a result of incidental spills of substances referenced in this comment.</p>
4.	<p>Anthony van Wyk / Russell Mehl DEA&DP: Directorate: Pollution and Chemicals Management 17 November 2020</p> <p>Ref No.: 19/3/2/4/F4/23/DDF054/20</p> <p>Consolidated comment received via DEA&DP: Directorate: Development Facilitation</p>	<p>3 Directorate: Pollution and Chemicals Management – Mr Anthony van Wyk / Mr Russell Mehl (Anthony.vanWyk@westerncape.gov.za / Russell.Mehl@westerncape.gov.za; Tel: (021) 483 2980):</p> <p>4.1. It is anticipated that harbour traffic would increase during the operational phase where LPG is offloaded from the Very Large Gas Carrier, which could increase pollution in the Bay area from either LPG, oil, wastewater, and the discharging of ballast water. How will oil and LPG spills be mitigated and managed? This must be reported on in the Draft EIA Report and EMPr.</p>	<p>4.1 The Final Scoping Report clarified the development proposal in relation to the respective Assegai Power and Avedia Energy entities. Assegai Power will be purchasing LPG from Avedia Energy.</p> <p>Cumulative impacts on the marine environment and port facilities that are associated with the delivery and offloading of LPG in the port were considered in the Avedia Energy EIA process, which informed the Competent Authority's decision to grant Environmental Authorisation to this entity. This aspect was further considered in the Minister's decision to uphold the Environmental Authorisation subsequent to Sunrise Energy's appeal. Clause 5.3 of the Minister's decision specifically highlights that the number of vessels required to deliver LPG would be approximately 8 per year. It was confirmed by the Applicant and Avedia Energy that the</p>

		<p>4.2. How will the effects of increased ballast water discharge into the harbour be mitigated and managed in order to prevent pollution and prevent the possible introduction of alien species to the West Coast?</p> <p>4.3. How will the vessel wastewater be managed in order to prevent spills into the harbour?</p> <p>4.4. Please provide an indication of the operating hours of the proposed gas-to-power facility, especially with regards to the time of the release of emissions (gaseous emissions at night) and the release of effluent preferably during the non-peak demand periods for municipal infrastructure such as sewer and water supply systems.</p> <p>4.5. Section 3.5.2, page 23 of the DSR indicates that municipal water supply is available to use for the required water injection for the gas turbines, should the technology alternative of Selective Catalytic Reduction ("SCR") be preferred. Should the SCR technology be used, and water is used during this process, the following questions must be responded to in the Draft EIA Report:</p> <p>4.5.1. Whether wastewater is generated from this process;</p> <p>4.5.2. Where wastewater will be generated from this process, including particulates captured in the liquid stream of the mitigation equipment, what volumes are expected to be generated and what is the chemical composition of the particulates; and</p> <p>4.5.3. How would these pollutants be;</p> <p>4.5.3.1. Stored;</p> <p>4.5.3.2. Treated; and</p> <p>4.5.3.3. Discharged?</p>	<p>proposal by Assegai Power will not necessitate an increase in vessels entering the port to offload LPG to Avedia Energy. Hence, the impacts on the marine environment and operational functionality of the port as a result of Assegai Power's proposal will not increase beyond what was previously assessed and approved for Avedia Energy.</p> <p>Therefore, there is no requirement for the current scope of this EIA process to include consideration of impacts on the marine/port environment.</p> <p>4.2 Refer to the response above.</p> <p>4.3 Refer to the response above.</p> <p>4.4 The hours of operation would be 05:00 to 21:30 daily (16.5Hours). Emissions would be released only during plant operation i.e. from 05:00 - 21:30.</p> <p>4.5 This information will be included in the draft EIR.</p>
50.	<p>Deon Stoltz DEA&DP: Directorate: Air Quality Management 17 November 2020</p> <p>Ref no. 19/4/4/1/BS1 – LPG to Power Facility, Saldanha</p>	<p>5. Directorate: Air Quality Management – Mr Deon Stoltz (Deon.Stoltz@westerncape.gov.za; Tel: (021) 483 2805):</p> <p>5.1. Dust created from the construction and operational phases must comply with the National Dust Control Regulations (GN No. R. 827 of 1 November 2013), promulgated in terms of the National Environmental Management: Air Quality Act, 2004 (Act No. 39 of 2004) ("NEM: AQA"). These regulations prohibit a person from</p>	<p>5.1 The requirements of the National Dust Control Regulations will be taken into account by the Air Quality specialist and the necessary mitigation measures will be proposed and included in the EMP to ensure that dust generation is avoided as far as possible or reduced to within the allowable limits.</p>

	<p>Consolidated comment received via DEA&DP: Directorate: Development Facilitation</p>	<p>conducting any activity to give rise to dust in such quantities and concentrations that the dust, or dust fall, may have a detrimental impact on human health and the environment.</p> <p>5.2. Dust and exhaust emissions will likely be generated during various activities of the construction and operational phases – such activities may likely result in nuisances. This Directorate recommends that dust suppression/collection methods be implemented through a dust monitoring programme or fugitive dust control plan to be included in the EMPr.</p> <p>5.3. Noise generated from the installation and operation of the proposed gas-to-power facility (air filters, gas compressors, gas turbines, electricity generators, electricity transformers, stacks, heat recovery equipment, steam turbines. etc.) must comply with the Western Cape Noise Control Regulations (Provincial Notice 200/2013) of 20 June 2013.</p> <p>5.4. In terms of section 35(2) of the NEM: AQA, 2004, the applicant must take all reasonable steps to prevent the emission of any offensive odour caused by any activity. It should be noted that all offensive odour complaints must be recorded, reported and investigated, should it be required.</p> <p>5.5. Potential emissions to air from a gas turbine facility include carbon and sulphur dioxide, water vapour, carbon monoxide, oxides of nitrogen, nitrous oxide, particulate matter and minor emissions of metals and metal compounds and organics. Other emissions of air pollutants are expected from gas venting during commissioning, maintenance shutdowns and from process vents. With appropriate management, these emission sources are expected to be minor for power stations. During the construction phase and maintenance activities, engine emissions from construction and operational traffic are expected.</p> <p>5.6. It should be noted that the proposed gas-to-power facility must comply with the Minimum Emission Standards applicable to the relevant AEL listed activity.</p>	<p>5.2 The EMPr will include management and mitigation measures in respect of fugitive dust emissions. This will be guided by inputs from the Air Quality specialist, as well as best practice. It is unlikely that significant volumes of dust will be generated during the construction or operational phase, however should the Air Quality specialist indicate otherwise, a dust monitoring programme will also be included in the EMPr.</p> <p>5.3 The noise limits imposed by the Western Cape Noise Control Regulations (Provincial Notice 200/2013) of 20 June 2013 will be taken into account by the Noise Specialist in the Noise Impact Assessment.</p> <p>5.4 The development is not expected to result in any offensive odours or any change to current olfactory conditions. This will however be confirmed by the Air Quality Specialist. A recommendation will include the need to maintain a complaint register.</p> <p>5.5 The Air Quality Specialist will compile an emissions inventory and assess the associated direct and cumulative impacts on ambient air quality. The emissions from traffic in the construction and operational phase will also be considered.</p> <p>5.6 This is acknowledged. The emission modelling undertaken by the Air Quality Specialist will indicate the likely emissions to be generated by the facility and appropriate mitigation will be proposed to ensure that the Minimum Emission Standards are met for this listed activity.</p>
--	--	---	---

<p>51.</p>	<p>Stephanie-Anne Barnardt Heritage Western Cape: Case officer 13 November 2020</p> <p>Received via email</p>	<p>NOTIFICATION OF INTENT TO DEVELOP: proposed gas to power electricity generation plant on Portion 69 of Farm 127, SUBMITTED IN TERMS OF SECTION 38(1) OF THE NATIONAL HERITAGE RESOURCES ACT (ACT 25 OF 1999) CASE NUMBER: 20100508SB1019E</p> <p>The matter above has reference.</p> <p>Heritage Western Cape is in receipt of your application for the above matter received. This matter was discussed at the Archaeology, Palaeontology and Meteorites Committee (APM) held on 4 November 2020.</p> <p>You are hereby notified that, since there is reason to believe that the proposed gas to power electricity generation plant on Portion 69 of Farm 127 will impact on heritage resources, HWC requires that a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) that satisfies the provisions of section 38(3) of the NHRA be submitted. This HIA must have specific reference to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Integrated HIA comprising of archaeological and palaeontological specialist reports as well as a visual statement which considers the impact on the visitor center at the West Coast Fossil Park. <p>The required HIA must have an integrated set of recommendations.</p> <p>Please note, should you require the HIA to be submitted as a Phased HIA, a written request must be submitted to HWC prior to submission. HWC reserves the right to determine whether a phased HIA is acceptable on a case by case Basis.</p> <p>The comments of relevant registered conservation bodies; all Interested and Affected parties; and the relevant Municipality must be requested and included in the HIA where provided. Proof of these requests must be supplied.</p> <p>HWC reserves the right to request additional information as required.</p> <p>Applicants are strongly advised to review and adhere to the time limits contained the Standard Operational Procedure (SOP) between DEADP and HWC. The SOP can be found using the following link http://www.hwc.org.za/node/293</p>	<p>The heritage practitioner (M Attwell) and palaeontologist (J Pether) considers the documentation submitted to HWC as sufficient for HWC to make an informed decision.</p> <p>In the NID and the accompanying report it was recommended by the heritage practitioner (after an analysis of the site and based on existing knowledge) that the only heritage resources likely to be of heritage significance would be paleontological. There are no heritage structures or landscapes of any significance. The likelihood of heritage finds, whether archaeological or paleontological, based on the supporting documentation, was low, and thus accordingly recommended that the site did not require a HIA or any further study.</p> <p>It is unclear on what basis and on what available information HWC have "reason to believe" that the proposal impacts on heritage resources.</p> <p>The area, including the site of the proposed development, has been subject to intense archaeological and paleontological study and analysis over the years. The paleontological study has already been undertaken and was submitted to HWC together with the NID. An archaeological study was not considered necessary because the site is highly (totally) disturbed. A previous archaeological study was included in the NID documentation concerning the same site which recommended a focus on palaeontology. The paleontological study by John Peter included detailed recommendations for monitoring excavations and mitigation measures to be followed. A Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) of the possible impact on the West Coast Fossil Park was not considered, given the distance of about 7.5 km between the two sites, and the undulating landscape.</p> <p>Ms Stephanie Barnardt from HWC was contacted, to ascertain the reasons for HWC's decision. A meeting was subsequently held at which the at which the heritage practitioner explained the significance of the project in terms of the South African economy. The concern pointed out at the time was that time would be wasted undertaking work based on studies that had already been done as the area had been thoroughly researched. Furthermore, since this is a Section 38 (8) application, attached to DEFF authorisation process, HWC is a commenting authority only and an environmental condition attached to the environmental report</p>
------------	---	--	--

		<p>Should you have any further queries, please contact the official above and quote the case number.</p>	<p>would be sufficient to ensure that all archaeological and paleontological heritage requirements will be met.</p> <p>It was also pointed out that the public consultation attached to an HIA would slow down the process immeasurably and Ms Barnardt agreed that the EIA process would be sufficient to meet the 30-day consultation requirements, as long as the necessary documentation was attached to the HIA.</p> <p>The following way forward will be implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A photographic study by the heritage practitioner to assess the relationship between the West Coast Fossil Park and the site; • An investigation into potential archaeological impacts by an archaeologist; • The incorporation of the findings of the heritage practitioner and the palaeontological impact assessment undertaken during Scoping (Pether, 2020) into the HIA, particularly recommended mitigation measures related to required monitoring during excavations; • A further assessment of newly identified transmission route alternatives; and • The circulation of the HIA for public comment during public review of the Draft EIR to ensure that the comments of I&APs could be tabled upon or shortly after submission of the HIA to HWC.
52.	<p>Funanani Ditinti Department of Environment Affairs (DEA), Branch: Oceans and Coast 20 November 2020</p>	<p>The Oceans & Coast (O&C) Branch of the Department of Environment, Forestry, and Fisheries (DEFF) has reviewed the Draft scoping report for the proposed development of a liquefied petroleum gas (LPG)-to-power facility, overhead electricity transmission line and associated pipeline infrastructure on various farm portions in Saldanha in terms of the National Environmental Management Act, 1998 (Act No. 107 of 1998), ("NEMA") and has provided inputs based on coastal considerations and objectives in terms of the National Environmental Management: Integrated Coastal Management Act, 2008 (Act No. 24 of 2008) ("ICM Act").</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) must take note that the O&C Branch of the DEFF has a mandate to protect the ecological integrity, natural character and the economic, social and aesthetic value of the coastal zone; as well as to protect people, 	<p>The role of the O&C branch is acknowledged.</p> <p>Section 7 and 14 of ICMA: The air quality specialist will have a dedicated section in his assessment around climate change and the impacts thereof related to this proposed facility. This will take cognisance of the possibility of sea level rise. With regards to emergency incidents, the MHI will consider risk associated with seismic activity and the related procedures/design requirements to accommodate this.</p> <p>Section 13 of ICMA: The site is located 1.5 kms from the coast and will thus not hamper public access to the coastline, noting that the closest coastline is a port.</p> <p>Section 15 of ICMA:</p>

property and economic activities from risks arising from dynamic coastal processes. It further ensures that the use of natural resources in the coastal zone and development associated with the coastal zone is socially and economically justifiable and ecologically sustainable.

Furthermore, the EAP is reminded that comments and recommendations as provided below are intended to ensure the achievement of the objectives of the ICM Act and guarantees that the coastal environment will be protected and conserved throughout all phases of the proposed project.

2. National Environmental Management: Integrated Coastal Management Act, 2008 (Act No. 24 of 2008) ("ICM Act")- Sections to be adhered to and implemented by the applicant and Competent Authority (CA):

2.1 Section 7 and 14 of the ICM Act: Composition of Coastal Public Property (CPP) & Position of High-Water Mark:

Considering the proposed site location for this project, the applicant is advised to take cognisance of the purpose of the CCP. The functioning of the CPP should not be altered to the detriment of its purpose. These provisions seek to strike a balance between environmental protection and socio-economic development that should be sustainable. Due to Climate Change impacts, the development of LPG power facility needs to be protected against coastal dynamic processes. The consideration of coastal evolution or coastal response to sea-level changes need to come to the fore when development along the coast is to be undertaken to ensure sustainability. This is relevant since most coast lines undergoes retrogradation processes as opposed to progradation processes. Section 14 of the ICM Act has implications to coastal evolution. The Scoping report do not anticipate conducting the seismicity specialist studies, yet Cape Town is one of the three areas of greatest seismic hazard

It is acknowledged that the construction and maintenance of the power plant and pipelines will be the full responsibility of the Applicant. The construction of the transmission lines will be the responsibility of the Applicant who will build in accordance with specifications received from ESKOM, thereafter, the asset will be transferred to ESKOM who will take responsibility of maintenance.

Section 63 ICMA:

- The site is outside of the coastal protection zone. However, due cognisance will be taken of relevant impacts that need to be monitored during the construction and operational phases, and these will be documented in the EMPr. Some of the listed recommendations are not relevant to this Application, for example, "No camping site should be planned to be established within the CPP".

This comment is submitted to the CA via the FSR Appendix D. Furthermore, the comment in its entirety is documented in this C&R table.

and the recent earthquake swarms demonstrate that, even though this might be less frequent.

2.2 Section 13 of the ICM Act: Access to coastal public property:

We recommend that coastal access to the general public should not be restricted nor prohibited as a result of implementation of the proposed development of a Liquefied Petroleum Gas (LPG)-to-power facility, overhead electricity transmission line and associated pipeline infrastructure on various farm portions in Saldanha. Therefore, should the competent authority decide to grant this proposed project, we recommend that the CA must ensure that they include a condition within the EA that will ensure that public access will not be affected, for the applicant to adhere and implement.

2.1 Section 15 of the ICM Act: Measures affecting erosion and accretion

(1) No person, owner or occupier of land adjacent to the seashore or other coastal public property capable of erosion or accretion may require any organ of state or any other person to take measures to prevent the erosion or accretion of the seashore or such other coastal public property, or of land adjacent to coastal public property, unless the erosion is caused by an intentional act or omission of that organ of state or other person.

(2) No person may construct, maintain or extend any structure, or take other measures on coastal public property to prevent or promote erosion or accretion of the seashore except as provided for in this Act, the National Environmental Management Act or any other specific environmental management Act.

[Subs. (2) substituted by s. 11 of Act 36/2014 w.e.f. 1 May 2015]

The construction and maintenance of the proposed development of a liquefied petroleum gas (LPG)-to-power facility, overhead electricity transmission line and associated pipeline infrastructure on various farm portions in Saldanha, will remain the responsibilities the applicant. Should the area experience any natural/un-natural disasters, and as a result of

such debris and loose equipment are washed up to the coast and sea, the applicant will be held liable for the clean-up and rehabilitation of the area. Additionally, should any member of the public suffer injuries from the proposed stabilization structure, as a result of negligence by the applicant, the applicant will be held liable. Lastly, CA must state clearly within the condition of the EA that no Organ of State will be held liable for the maintenance and up keep of the proposed (project) .

2.2 Section 63 of the ICM Act: Environmental authorisations for coastal activities:

Considering what the CA must take into account in terms of Section 63 of the ICM Act, it should be noted that we strongly recommend that, before an EA is granted, the CA must ensure that sufficient measures to avoid, manage, minimize and mitigate potential adverse impacts in the coastal zone have been identified, addressed and mitigation measures are provided adequately within the Environmental Management Programme report (EMPr) and EA conditions.

O&C Branch Recommendations and Conditions to include in the EMPr and Environmental Authorisation:

- The applicant must take into account, adhere to and implement the relevant section of the National "ICM Act" applicable to this project;
- No construction activities with potential to affect the public to enjoy the coast should be scheduled and take place during peak season;
- Construction period to be scheduled avoiding heavy rain and stormy season. Historical data must be used for best time period allocation;
- No camping site should be planned to be established within the CPP;
- Construction activities and pipeline routes should be planned to avoid area that has been identified as sensitive and offer important functions, such as habitat, breeding areas, areas where natural resources that are considered of important status occur and migration route. Additionally, construction should be scheduled to avoid local species breeding and migration seasons. Historical data must be used

to identify local species and check previous breeding and migration seasons and movements that has potential of being affected by this proposed project;

- Clearance of indigenous vegetation should be carefully identified and removed with care that will allow its re-plantation.
- The EAP is requested to provide a detailed documentation with advantages and disadvantages on comparison of the proposed site locations, alternatives, technologies and methodologies proposed for this project. The options presented should take into account the receiving environment, potential impacts and threat to sustainability of the marine environment and function of natural ecosystems;
- The marine environment and ecosystems serve a significant role in protecting and conserving ecological species of significance and ensure sustainable use of natural resources to ecological and economic benefits to the public. Therefore, you are kindly reminded of your duty of care towards the coastal environment in accordance with section 58 of the ICM Act read together with section 28 of NEMA which states that "Every person who causes, has caused or may cause adverse effect on the coastal environment must take reasonable measures to prevent such adverse effect from continuing, recurring or occurring or, in so far as such harm to the coastal environment is authorised by law or cannot reasonably be avoided or stopped, to minimise and rectify such adverse effect on the coastal environment." by taking into consideration and implementing recommendations provided in this letter, to ensure the coastal zone is protected, preserved and managed throughout all phases of the proposed project;
- Kindly note that the activity may not commence prior to an environmental authorisation being granted by the CA. It is an offence in terms of section 49A "NEMA" for a person to commence with a listed activity unless the CA has granted an environmental authorisation for the undertaking of the activity. A person convicted of an offence in terms of the above is liable to a fine not

exceeding R10 million or to imprisonment for a period not exceeding 10 years, or to both such fine and imprisonment;

- Please be advised that there is an EIA Unit that facilitate EIA comments on behalf of the Oceans and Coast Branch. Kindly forward request of EIA Comments to, Email: OCeia@environment.gov.za.

These comments must be sent to the CA for consideration and implementation, and the EAP is kindly requested to submit proof of such submission to us.

Kindly note that the Department reserves the right to revise its comments and request further information based on any additional information that might be received. All future correspondence and documentation (hard copy and an electronic copy) must be submitted to our office via OCeia@environment.gov.za / or Physical Address: Department of Environment Affairs (DEA), Branch: Oceans and Coast, 2 East Pier Building, East Pier Road, Victoria and Alfred Waterfront, Cape Town, 8001.