

PROPOSED HARTEBEEST WIND FARM NEAR MOORREESBURG, WESTERN CAPE PROVINCE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

COMMENTS RECEIVED: EIA PHASE 2

LATE COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE SCOPING REPORT 2

I&AP REGISTRATIONS AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESS 6

POTENTIAL IMPACTS TO BATS 6

COMMENTS RECEIVED: SCOPING PHASE10

ACKNOWLEDGMENT LETTERS RECEIVED FROM ORGAN OF STATE DEPARTMENTS.....10

SITE ACCESS.....10

HERITAGE IMPACTS10

IMPACTS TO ESKOM INFRASTRUCTURE11

IMPACTS ON ECOLOGY11

IMPACTS ON AVIFAUNA AND BATS.....12

IMPACTS ON FRESHWATER SYSTEMS13

IMPACTS TO FARMING ACTIVITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE13

AIR QUALITY IMPACTS.....17

VISUAL AND NOISE IMPACTS18

GENERAL20

COMMENTS RECEIVED: EIA PHASE

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
LATE COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE SCOPING REPORT			
1.	<p>1. Your letter dated 09 September 2016 refers.</p> <p>2. Hartebeest Wind Farm (Pty) Ltd is proposing to establish a commercial wind energy facility of up to 160MW and associated infrastructure on a site located approximately 4km south-east of Mooresburg.</p> <p>3. This Branch would like to register as an Interested and Affected party.</p> <p>4. The proposal affects Provincial Roads Main Road 227, Divisional Road 1149 and various Minor Roads.</p> <p>5. The N7 is also affected, of which SANRAL is the roads authority.</p> <p>6. In terms of Act 21 of 1940 and Ordinance 19 of 1976, the following conditions apply:</p> <p>6.1. A building restriction line of 95m is applicable along trunk, main and divisional roads and is measured from the centreline of the road reserve.</p> <p>6.2. A building restriction line of 500m is applicable from the centrelines of intersecting trunk, main, and divisional roads; and where these roads intersect other roads.</p> <p>6.3. No advertising of any nature is allowed on the turbine structures.</p>	<p>Mr Malcom Watters Chief Director: Road Network Management</p> <p>Western Cape Department of Transport and Public Works</p> <p>Letter: 06-10-2016</p>	<p>The Western Cape Department of Transport and Public Works has been registered as an I&AP on the project database.</p> <p>6.1. It is noted that a building restriction line of 95m is applicable along trunk, main and divisional roads measured from the centreline of the road reserve. The final road layout for the Hartebeest Wind Farm will adhere to this requirement before the commencement of construction.</p> <p>6.2. The final road layout for the Hartebeest Wind Farm will adhere to a building restriction line of 500m before the commencement of construction.</p> <p>6.3. No advertising of any nature will be located on the turbine structures. It should however be noted that the supplier's name will be visible on some of the infrastructure (i.e. nacelle). This is considered to be branding and not advertising.</p> <p>6.4. Turbines will be located a distance equal to or greater than their toppling distance plus 5m from the road reserve boundary. This will be applied to the final road layout before the commencement of construction.</p> <p>6.5. The locations of the turbines proposed are situated far enough from the road reserve boundary so that they do not present a significant distraction to motorists. In the visual specialist's view, distraction to motorists is likely to arise if sudden movement is experienced in a driver's close</p>

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>6.4. Turbines should be located a distance equal to or greater than their toppling distance plus 5m from the road reserve boundary.</p> <p>6.5. Turbines shall be located far enough from the road reserve boundary so that they do not present a distraction to motorists and this Branch may require the applicant to engage the services of a traffic engineer to assess such impact once the location of the wind turbines have been determined.</p> <p>6.6. A 5m building line is applicable.</p> <p>6.7. A Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) will be required when the land use application is made. Amongst the usual items that the TIA addresses it should also consider the impact on road infrastructure what maintenance measures may be required during construction and decommissioning of the facility.</p>		<p>peripheral vision that is sufficiently sudden to draw attention away from the road. This is most likely to occur if the fast moving tips of the rotors are experienced in close proximity to the road where the speed of the blade tips is most obvious and particularly if the driver comes upon the development at close quarters suddenly.</p> <p>At the Hartebeest Wind Farm project site, the approaching driver will see turbines at a distance of approximately 3.9km approaching on the N7 from the north and intermittently for in excess of 10km approaching on the N7 from the south. The development will therefore not appear suddenly within the driver's vision. The rotor blades should also be sufficiently distant that their apparent speed does not cause a sudden shock that will draw attention away from the road.</p> <p>The requirement for the services of a traffic engineer to assess the impact of distraction will be determined once the location of the wind turbines have been finalised.</p> <p>6.6. The applicant has been advised of the 5m building line as per the comments received.</p> <p>6.7. A Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) has been undertaken as part of the EIA phase and has considered the impact on road infrastructure and what maintenance measures will be required during the construction and decommissioning of the wind energy facility.</p>
2.	Your email dated 09 September 2016 has reference.	Cor Van Der Walt	The Hartebeest Wind Farm is proposing the establishment

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>Your proposal is to develop a renewable energy project consisting of 40 wind turbines with a total generating capacity of 160MW.</p> <p>Please note that the Western Cape Department of Agriculture (WCDOA) has already gone through an extensive consultation process to determine the micro-siting of 25 turbines and footprints as well as the best road alternatives with Juwi Renewable Energies (Pty) Ltd. believed to be a partner on this project.</p> <p>Please find attached letter dated 2016/09/05 addressed to Renewable Energies (Pty) Ltd. confirming the micro-siting of turbines and access roads as being acceptable to the WCDOA with an agricultural off-set (refer to <i>Item 3</i> below).</p> <p>If it is the intention to divert from the agreed-upon micro-citing's, access roads and additional turbines the WCDOA insist on the whole extensive process of renegotiating micro-sites, roads and the off-set.</p> <p>Please take note:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That this is only a recommendation to the relevant deciding Authorities in terms of the Subdivision of Agricultural Land Act 70 of 1970. • Kindly quote the above-mentioned reference number in any future correspondence in respect of the application. • The Department reserves the right to revise 	<p>Land Use Management</p> <p>Western Cape Department of Agriculture</p> <p>Letter: 18-11-2017</p>	<p>of a wind energy facility consisting of a maximum of 32 turbines. The comments referred to are those received from the WCDOA on the previous EIA process undertaken for this project (process not completed). The current EIA process recommends the 25 turbine layout as the preferred alternative for implementation. Should the layout change from that presented, the WCDOA will be engaged with as required.</p>

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	initial comments and request further information based on the information received.		
3.	<p>The Western Cape Department of Agriculture (WCDOA) has no objection against the Renewable Energy project: Hartebeest Wind Farm on above-mentioned farming units on the following conditions:</p> <p>a) That the Final Layout for the 25 wind turbine, roads and associated infrastructure are implemented as proposed on maps dated 05/08/2016 (Roads) and 12/08/2016 (Turbine Layout).</p> <p>b) That your letter of comfort and commitment of 19/05/2016 be adhered to, reading as follows: "We confirm that should the Project be bid under the Department of Energy's Renewable Energy Independent Power Producer Programme ("REIPPPP") the contents of the Proposal will form part of the Economic Development Plan submitted as part of the bid to the Department of Energy under REIPPPP. Should the Project achieve commercial operation and transmit electricity into the grid, the entity owning the Project will be obliged to implement the aforesaid Economic Development Plan to the satisfaction of the Department of Energy".</p> <p>c) The proposal referred to as being: "Proposal for new No-till Planting System with Cover Initiative for the Agricultural Offset of the Hartebeest Wind Farm" dated 26/01/2016.</p> <p>Please take note:</p>	<p>Cor Van Der Walt Land Use Management Western Cape Department of Agriculture Letter: 05-09-2016</p>	<p>The condition letter of no objection against the Renewable Energy project: Hartebeest Wind Farm received from the WCDOA is noted.</p>

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That this is only a recommendation to the relevant deciding Authorities in terms of the Subdivision of Agricultural Land Act 70 of 1970, Conservation of Agricultural Resources Act No 43 of 1983 and the Land Use Planning Ordinance 15 of 1985. • Kindly quote the above-mentioned reference number in any future correspondence in respect of the application. • The Department reserves the right to revise initial comments and request further information based on the information received. 		
I&AP REGISTRATIONS AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESS			
4.	<p>Could you kindly please register Infrastructure Asset Management (IAM) as an Interested and Affected Party (I&AP) for the above-mentioned project. IAM is a renewable energy project developer with interests in the region, and would like to stay informed of the progress of the EIA for the proposed Hartebeest Wind Farm.</p>	<p>Stephnie Kot Infrastructure Asset Management Email: 17-11-2016</p>	<p>Infrastructure Asset Management has been registered as an I&AP on the project's database.</p>
5.	<p>Kindly register G7 Renewable Energies as an I&AP to the EIA process for the Hartebeest Wind Energy Facility.</p>	<p>Karen de Bruyn Project Manager G7 Renewable Energies Email: 09-01-2017</p>	<p>G7 Renewable Energies has been registered as an I&AP on the project's database.</p>
POTENTIAL IMPACTS TO BATS			
6.	<p>My comments with regard to Hartebeest Wind Farm (14/12/16/3/3/2/961) Pre-construction Bat Monitoring</p>	<p>Kate MacEwan Chairperson</p>	<p>1) The bat activity recorded at rotor height during the pre-construction monitoring programme was subjected</p>

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>and Impact Assessment and the concern raised by the DEA are included below and are based on my opinion as the chairperson of the SABAA and do not include comments from the remainder of the panel.</p> <p>Reading through the documentation and original report I have received, the following points are important to pull out:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The original assessment was conducted May 2013 and September 2014. • Five detectors were installed within the WF project site. Two of these detectors were placed at the met mast, one at ground level and the other within rotor height (50 m) by a specialised team. • The detectors were running for a minimum of 7 nights per month. • Roost searches and seasonal point sampling was undertaken. • A follow up site visit was conducted in September 2016 to check whether environmental variables had changed that may affect bat activity. <p>Based on the 2012, 2014 and 2016 – 2nd, 3rd and 4th editions of the South African Good Practice Guidelines for Surveying Bats at Wind Energy Facility Developments - Pre-construction, the following is noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The field work for the bat assessment above was commissioned under the 2012 2nd edition and did meet the requirements of that edition, however, does not meet the requirements of the 2014 or 2016 guidelines. 	<p>South African Bat Assessment Association (SABAA)</p> <p>Email: 19-01-2017</p>	<p>to an intensive and detailed analysis, to the best detail the data permitted, which included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • seasonal variations of the bat activity (section 3.3.1 of Appendix F) • relation between activity at rotor height and ground level (section 3.3.2 of Appendix F) • bat activity throughout the nocturnal period (3.3.3 of Appendix F) • influences of the environmental variables on the bat activity (3.3.4 of Appendix F) <p>Results of the pre-construction bat monitoring program indicated a low bat activity at rotor level and, in the specialist’s opinion, no further mitigation is required to be recommended above the recommendations made in the report at this stage. An adaptive mitigation program is recommended to be put in place in order to detect any unforeseen impact and responded adequately during the operation phase.</p> <p>2) Know bat roosts in the broader area of the proposed wind development are detailed in section 3.1.3 of Appendix F. The closest known bat roost is located at approximately 22km from the site where only 1 individual was observed. There is no population dynamics or utilization data available to consider at a cumulative impact analysis level. Therefore, any more in depth analysis of the potential cumulative impacts will be significantly lacking in supporting baseline information and would be considered pure speculation at this time.</p>

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The impact assessment was written based on the 2016 4th edition and mostly meets the write up requirements, with the exception of some recommendations made in this email below in red. • The validity of fieldwork is not mentioned in the 2012 2nd edition and is only introduced in the 2014 3rd edition as 3 years from the completion of monitoring. In the 2016 4th edition, this validity period is 3 to 5 years depending on any changes to environmental conditions on site. • As the fieldwork for the current assessment in question ended in September 2014 and the site was checked by the same specialist in September 2016, I am of the opinion that the fieldwork is still valid. <p>Conclusions and Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whilst the fieldwork does not fully meet the requirements of the 2014 or 2016 guidelines, it was commissioned and conducted under the 2012 guidelines and does meet these requirements. • The 2012 guidelines do not specify a validity period but validity period as specified in the 2014 and 2016 is currently in order, especially based on the site inspection by the original specialist. • However, I am of the opinion that operational fatality minimization recommendations are lacking and should be revised. Based on data collected on site, especially from the microphone with the rotor swept zone, season specific, turbine specific and time-of-night specific recommendations should be made. Data from the top microphone needs to be 		

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>teased out and analysed in more per season and against weather parameters, rather than an average across all microphones. It is not sufficient to wait for the operational monitoring. From my experience, mitigation measures need to be built into the financial model of the project from the start and it is very difficult to make changes once operation has commenced. In addition, there is currently very little involvement from the DEA's compliance and biodiversity departments after the EA has been granted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In addition to the near-by cave roosts mentioned by the specialist, there are other roosts. The cumulative impact of wind farms in this region could be more severe than mentioned in the report. 		

COMMENTS RECEIVED: SCOPING PHASE

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
ACKNOWLEDGMENT LETTERS RECEIVED FROM ORGAN OF STATE DEPARTMENTS			
7.	We acknowledge receipt of your letter dated 2016-08-30 regarding the proposed Hartebeest Wind Farm near Moorreesburg, Western Cape Province – Notification of Environmental Impact Assessment Process and confirm that the correspondence is being referred to the relevant Department for attention. Reference Number: 1873633.	Joggie Scholtz Municipal Manager, Swartland Local Municipality Email: 30-08-2016	Acknowledgment noted, no response required.
SITE ACCESS			
8.	Thank you for the email. Please provide me with the access details. Where will access be obtained from?	René de Kock Statutory Control, South African National Roads Agency Limited (SANRAL) Email: 30-08-2016	A locality map was emailed to Rene de Kock on 01 September 2016. Access to the site will be via several existing farm accesses from the Main Road, off the N7 which transects the project site.
HERITAGE IMPACTS			
9.	Heritage Western Cape is in receipt of your heritage impact assessment on the above matter dated April 2015 (Proposed Wind Energy Facility on farm Zwartfontein, Moorreesburg Wind Farm, Moorreesburg, Swartland). Final Comment 1. S.38 (3) of the NHRA has been satisfied. 2. The Committee supports the proposed development and the recommendations of the consultant that:	Andrew September Heritage Officer, Heritage Western Cape (HWC) Letter: 08-07-2015 (re-issued on 30-08-2016)	It is noted that the comments submitted by HWC dated 08-07-2015 were submitted under the previous environmental authorisation for the same project (DEA Ref: 12/12/20/2200). An updated Heritage Impact Assessment will be submitted to HWC for further evaluation.

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Impacts to ruins, historical farm building and cemeteries must be avoided. b. The final road routes must be referred to the heritage consultant, and design mitigation proposed if necessary. c. No historical structures may be demolished without approval from HWC. 		
IMPACTS TO ESKOM INFRASTRUCTURE			
10.	Please find attached Eskom requirements for developments at or near Eskom infrastructure. Please send me KMZ files of the properties and infrastructure layouts as it becomes available.	John Geeringh Senior Consultant Environmental Management CG: Land Development, Eskom Email: 07-09-2016	Eskom's requirements for developments at or near Eskom infrastructure are noted and have been forwarded to the project developer. The requested information will be provided once it is available.
IMPACTS ON ECOLOGY			
11.	<p>CapeNature would like to thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposed activity and wish to make the following comments:</p> <p>Historically, the site was covered by Swartland Shale Renosterveld, which is considered to be a Critically Endangered vegetation type. Although most of the site has been transformed by agriculture, there are several natural vegetation remnants remaining.</p> <p>No turbines and ideally no infrastructure should be placed in these vegetation remnants although we do</p>	<p>Alana Duffel- Canham Manager (Scientific Services)</p> <p>CapeNature Letter: 23-09-2016</p>	<p>Several natural vegetation remnants remain on site and these have been identified by the ecological specialist in the scoping report. Any no-go areas identified by the ecological specialist in his EIA phase will be avoided.</p> <p>The current study is based primarily on a desktop review of the available information as well as a site visit which was conducted by the ecologist on 26 March 2015. The site is however strongly seasonal and as the site visit took place during the summer months, it was very dry and the vegetation was largely dormant. As a result, the natural vegetation of the site could not be adequately</p>

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>recognise that in the case of linear infrastructure such as power lines, it is often extremely difficult or impossible to avoid these areas.</p> <p>We note that a sensitivity map has been drawn up for the site. Additional ground-truthing of the preliminary turbine layout should occur during the appropriate season (end July to September) as the fieldwork that the Ecology Scoping Report was based on was conducted in late summer.</p>		<p>characterized as a large proportion of the species are annuals and geophytes which are difficult to identify during the summer. Although, this is a potentially significant problem, the remnants of renosterveld at the site are all considered highly sensitive regardless of composition and due to their high conservation value are considered irreplaceable. In addition, there is no infrastructure presently planned within the intact patches and as a result, it is not considered to be directly important to evaluate their condition as they would not be impacted by the development.</p>
IMPACTS ON AVIFAUNA AND BATS			
12.	<p>Bird surveys were previously conducted as part of the previous application on the same site (known as Moorreesburg Wind Farm). Please confirm whether this monitoring data will be used (even where there has been a change of specialists) and how much additional monitoring will still be carried out. All monitoring must be done according to the Birds and Wind Energy Best Practice Guidelines (BirdLife South Africa and Endangered Wildlife Trust, 3rd Edition 2015).</p> <p>Night time monitoring should also be undertaken as several of the bird species present on site travel at night.</p> <p>Potential impacts that may arise as a result of the power line must also be discussed in detail.</p> <p>We note that buffers have been recommended. It must be confirmed that these will be adequate during the EIA</p>	<p>Alana Duffel-Canham Manager (Scientific Services)</p> <p>CapeNature</p> <p>Letter: 23-09-2016</p>	<p>The bird specialists were made aware of the existing monitoring data that exists for the area.</p> <p>All monitoring is being completed in line with current Best Practice Guidelines (refer to Appendix N – Letter of Validity). Night time monitoring will also be undertaken. The avifaunal specialist scoping report (Appendix N) includes detail of how the current guidelines have informed the monitoring and the avifaunal study.</p> <p>The power line will be assessed in detail in the EIA phase avifaunal assessment.</p> <p>The effectiveness of recommended buffers will also be confirmed during the EIA phase and updated in terms of the most recent results of the bird monitoring programme.</p> <p>Details regarding the post-construction monitoring programme recommended through the specialist study will</p>

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>phase based on the existing data and any additional monitoring data that may be obtained.</p> <p>The Environmental Impact Report must also provide details on all post-construction monitoring activities and methodology.</p> <p>Consideration must be given to reducing the number of turbines as per the previous application from 40 to 25 turbines as the specialists were confident during the previous process that this would have less impact on avifauna and bats.</p>		<p>be included in the EMPr which will form part of the EIA report.</p> <p>Layout alternatives will be presented in the EIA phase report and one layout option will be selected as the preferred option based on environmental and technical feasibility issues.</p>
IMPACTS ON FRESHWATER SYSTEMS			
13.	<p>All stream crossings/bridges should be assessed as part of the EIA process. Site specific recommendations should be made for each crossing.</p> <p>Ground truthing should be undertaken at the end of the wet season to ensure that additional recommendations regarding the impacts of all infrastructure can be made and to ensure that current buffer recommendations will be adequate.</p>	<p>Alana Duffel-Canham Manager (Scientific Services)</p> <p>CapeNature</p> <p>Letter: 23-09-2016</p>	<p>All stream crossings/bridges will be assessed and relevant recommendations will be made as part of the EIA process.</p> <p>Management of potential impacts on streams and wetlands in the broader site will also be addressed in the EMPr included as part of the EIA. A Water Use License for stream crossings will be applied for as a separate process, if required, and as determined by the freshwater impact assessment.</p>
IMPACTS TO FARMING ACTIVITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE			
14.	<p>The completed form is enclosed herewith and you are requested to note the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The telephone line to the farm has been stolen so often that it is no longer a form of communication. Only the cell phone numbers work. The form is completed in Afrikaans. Please advise if 	<p>Roux & Van Dyk Attorneys (on behalf of Louis Henze Carstens)</p> <p>Zwartfontein 5/416</p> <p>Letter:</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Comment noted. No further response required. Comment noted. The form has been translated to English and is also included in Appendix C5 of this report. Savannah Environmental will update the diagram/map after negotiations with the developer and Mr Carstens

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>you do not understand the submission.</p> <p>3. The enclosed diagram includes a portion of client's farm for which they did not conclude an agreement with any party.</p> <p>4. Client reserves the right to add to or amend any of his submissions in this form as more information becomes available.</p> <p>5. Client may send additional contact details in due course.</p> <p>Savannah Environmental (Pty) Ltd is currently undertaking an Environmental Impact Assessment for the establishment of 40 wind turbines for Hartebeest Wind Farm (Pty) Ltd. According to the map and report, several farms have the name Zwartfontein. Large portions of these farms form part of the proposed project. The farm Swartfontein does not form part of the proposed project.</p> <p>Previously, wind farm companies insisted on the establishment of turbines on soil with a high wheat production potential. Scrubland was not acceptable. There was thus decided against participation as it will infringe on agricultural processes. The remaining area not utilised by the project would have been economically unviable.</p> <p>Hartebeest Wind Farm proposes the establishment of 40</p>	<p>19-09-2016</p>	<p>have been finalised.</p> <p>4. Comment noted. No response required.</p> <p>5. Comment noted. No additional contact details have been received to date.</p> <p><u>Safety and security issues:</u> Impacts relating to safety and security were noted as an issue in the Social Scoping Report (refer to Appendix K of the Draft Scoping Report). Safety and security impacts will be assessed in the EIA phase of the process. Impacts can potentially be mitigated through fencing of the site and having access controlled entrances and exists. Compensation can also be paid for a loss of livestock and damages to the farm. The Social Impact Assessment to be undertaken for the EIA phase will recommend the appropriate mitigation measures to address safety and security concerns.</p> <p><u>Location of the project:</u> Due to the nature of the development (i.e. a wind energy facility), the location of the project site is largely dependent on technical factors such as the availability of wind (i.e. the fuel source), wind characteristics (including speed), availability of suitable land (extent and topography of the site), suitable proximity in relation to the existing electricity grid, estimated grid capacity available at the nearest Eskom substation and construction and technical point of view. The developer has determined the proposed project site to be technically suitable for the development</p>

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>turbines with concrete foundations which will be connected with cables. Access roads will need to be established to the site and between turbines. An on-site substation, overhead power line and a workshop area/office for control, maintenance and storage will need to be established. Soil with a high potential of wheat production will be used for the establishment of some infrastructure.</p> <p>Most wind farm applicants are however not actively involved in agricultural processes anymore and several applicants make use of shared seeding. Their families and children live elsewhere and won't be affected or inconvenienced by disruption, noise etc. Given the crime situation in the country, the possibility of unlawful entry, theft and worst crimes arises.</p> <p>It is tragic that the project is proposed in an area with one of the best wheat production potential in Swartland, even during years of drought. Isn't there an area elsewhere with soil of lower agricultural potential available for these kind of projects? Or is power supply more important than food supply?</p> <p>A lot of people will have aesthetic objections. The facility will be visually disturbing from the N7. This does not inconvenience me. The establishment of wind turbines forms part of progress. The whole Europe is full of turbines and Green energy is here to stay. The location of the project inconveniences me as well as if we can continue with our decisions and not because</p>		<p>of a wind energy facility due to the prevailing wind resources based on on-site data collected for more than a 12-month period using strategically placed 80m and 100m wind monitoring masts. The monitoring confirmed the wind resource and regime on the project site. The site is also located within an area which has become a node for renewable energy projects with three preferred bidder projects located within 25km of the project development site.</p> <p>Furthermore, the project is proposed to be constructed over an area of approximately 3830ha in extent. The total footprint of all infrastructure, including the turbines will be less than 1% of that area. The EIA for the project will assess the environmental feasibility of the placement of the facility. This assessment will consider, inter alia, impacts on agricultural potential and visual impacts.</p> <p>Specific questions raised in Appendix B:</p> <p>6. Correctness of Map. Savannah Environmental will update the map after negotiations with the developer and Mr Carstens have been finalised.</p> <p>7. Western Cape Department of Agriculture – Is it acceptable to utilise soil with a high wheat production potential for wind power? The project is proposed to be constructed over an area of approximately 3830ha in extent and the total footprint of all infrastructure, including the turbines</p>

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>others decisions force us to go along with the stream.</p> <p>6. Correctness of Map.</p> <p>7. Western Cape Department of Agriculture– Is it acceptable to utilise soil with a high wheat production potential for wind power?</p> <p>8. Overhead power line. Can Eskom force us?</p> <p>9. If yes, to which degree will this prevent us from using crop spraying? Will companies be prepared to spray in areas adjacent to such power lines and 40 turbines? How close can the nearest turbine be to homestead? Is this determined by law?</p>		<p>will be less than 1% of that area. Impacts of the proposed project on agricultural potential will be assessed in the EIA phase.</p> <p>8. Overhead power line. Can Eskom force us? The servitude for the power line for the Hartebeest WEF will be secured by the developer, constructed by the developer and only handed over to Eskom at the operation phase. The servitude will be determined and communicated in the EIA phase.</p> <p>9. If yes, to which degree will this prevent us from using crop spraying? Will companies be prepared to spray in areas adjacent to such power lines and 40 turbines? Impacts of the proposed project on agricultural activities will be assessed in the EIA phase of the project. Crop spraying may be affected and as more towers are erected a helicopters may be recommended because they travel at slower speeds and can work in more confined spaces.</p> <p>10. How close can the nearest turbine be to homestead? Is this determined by law? Turbines should have a minimum setback distance from a homestead to be in line with provincial legislation. The setback distance is equal to 1,5 times the overall blade tip height of the turbine from any homestead. However, the clearance distance of a turbine to a homestead is generally determined through consideration of noise impacts and impacts</p>

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
			associated with shadow flicker. These impacts will be assessed during the EIA phase of the project.
AIR QUALITY IMPACTS			
15.	<p>The D: AQM has the following comments on the DSR in terms of the National Environmental Management Air Quality Act, 2004 (No 39 of 2004):</p> <p><u>Noise and dust management</u></p> <p>1.1 It is expected that dust and noise emissions will be generated during various construction phases of the proposed development and could therefore potentially be a significant nuisance.</p> <p>1.2 Noise generated from construction and operation of the facility must conform to the Western Cape Noise Control Regulations of 2013 (PN 200/2013).</p> <p>1.3 It is recommended that contractors implement noise reduction measures during construction and operation.</p> <p>1.4 It should be noted that the DEA has gazetted dust regulations – the applicant must comply with the NEM: AQA (Act 39 of 2004) National Dust Control Regulations (GN 827) of 1 November 2013.</p> <p>1.5 These regulations prohibit a person from conducting any activity in such a way as to give rise to noise and /or dust in quantities and concentrations in which it may have a detrimental effect on the environment, including the health of the public.</p> <p><u>General</u></p> <p>2.1. The D: AQM would like to draw your attention to Section 28 of NEMA (Act 107 of 1998) i.e. Duty of</p>	<p>Joy Leaner, Directorate: Air Quality Management</p> <p>Western Cape DEA&DP</p> <p>Letter: 07-10-2016</p>	<p>1.1 Comment noted. Management measures for dust and noise emissions will be included in the EMPr for the project.</p> <p>1.2 A noise impact assessment is being conducted as part of the EIA process. Noise levels will need to be assessed to ensure that any emissions are in line with provincial regulations.</p> <p>1.3 Mitigation measures in this regard will be included in the EMPr to be drafted during the EIA phase.</p> <p>1.4 Comment noted. All necessary regulations will be complied with.</p> <p>1.5 Comment noted. All necessary regulations will be complied with.</p> <p>2.1: Comment noted. This section of NEMA is referenced in the environmental scoping report and these principals are fundamental to the EIA process.</p>

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>Care which states that: "Every person who causes, has caused or may cause significant pollution or degradation of the environment must take reasonable measures to prevent such pollution or degradation from occurring, continuing or recurring, or , in so far as such harm to the environment is authorized by law or cannot reasonably be avoided or stopped, to minimize and rectify such pollution or degradation of the environment."</p>		
VISUAL AND NOISE IMPACTS			
16.	<p>1. Your letter dated 9 September and the Draft Scoping Report for the proposal refer.</p> <p>2. The WCDM is of the opinion that the proposal will not only have a negative visual impact on the N7 national road but particularly on the town of Moorreesburg. Due to the expected lifetime of the project it is imperative that Moorreesburg residents be fully aware of the consequences of the proposal, especially in view of the number of turbines proposed. Public Participation must go beyond the usual open days and meetings. It is recommended that the developer be encouraged to reach a wider audience by: i) including information regarding the project in Swartland municipal accounts distributed to Moorreesburg households and / or ii) extensive coverage in local newspapers. Too frequently local residents only become aware of the project during the construction phase.</p> <p>3. The municipality only supports wind facilities adhering to the parameters laid down in the</p>	<p>Doretha Kotze, Municipal Manager West Coast District Municipality Letter: 10-10-2016</p>	<p>1. Comment noted</p> <p>2. A visual impact assessment is being conducted as part of the EIA process. A scoping phase visual assessment is included as Appendix J of this report. The impact on the N7 and the town of Morreesburg will be assessed in detail in the EIA phase report, however at this stage, this is not considered to be a fatal flaw from a visual perspective.</p> <p>Public participation will be in line with the current DEA requirements. The recommendations made by WCDM to reach more of the public has been communicated to the developer and Public Participation Consultant at Savannah Environmental for consideration of the most appropriate means to meet this.</p> <p>3. The Western Cape Regional Methodology for Wind Energy Site Selection (May, 2006) was used to inform the site selection process. The concepts included in</p>

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>Strategic Environmental Assessment of Wind Farms in the Western Cape drafted by DEA&DP in 2010. The area in question is indicated as "restricted" and "highly restricted" on the composite map due to the proximity to residential areas, scenic routes and prominent hills and ridges.</p> <p>4. However should the development be approved the following must be addressed:</p> <p>4.1 Noise impacts especially on nearby farming communities. This must receive attention during the construction and operation phases. Site specific noise mitigation measures need to be investigated and reported on during the specialist study phase.</p> <p>4.2 An EMPr must be compiled detailing amongst other issues how dust suppression, noise control, storage and disposal of general and hazardous waste as well as the provision of ablution and other facilities will be dealt with during construction.</p> <p>4.3 Copies of the EA and approved EMPr must be submitted to the WCDM to facilitate monitoring of the construction and operational phases of the development by the Environmental Health Division.</p> <p>4.4 Comments must be obtained from SANRAL and the Department of Transport and Public Works since heavy vehicle traffic to the wind farm will increase significantly during construction thus impacting existing roads.</p>		<p>this document formed the basis of the Strategic Environmental Assessment of Wind Farms in the Western Cape drafted by DEA&DP in 2010. It must be noted that this methodology and the SEA are based on desk-top information and are not informed by detailed assessments. The categories indicated on the maps in the SEA provide guidance for development and are not prohibitive. The suitability of the site from an environmental perspective for the development will be determined through the EIA process.</p> <p>4.1 A Noise Impact Assessment will be undertaken within the EIA phase of the process.</p> <p>4.2 An EMPr will be included with the EIA report. Noise control measures and measures to manage storage and disposal of waste will be addressed in this EMPr.</p> <p>4.3 Copies of the EA and approved EMPr will be submitted to the WCDM in line with the request made.</p> <p>4.4 SANRAL and the Department of Transport and Public Works are included as stakeholders on the project and have been requested to provide comment on the project. A traffic impact statement is also included in Appendix M of this report.</p> <p>4.5 Comment noted. A rezoning application will be undertaken as a separate process by the developer and all other relevant legislation governing land use in the province will be observed.</p>

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	4.5 The provisions of the relevant legislation governing land use planning in the province must be observed.		
GENERAL			
17.	<p>I acknowledge with thanks receipt of your email dated 09 September 2016, regarding the above mentioned subject matter.</p> <p>Kindly note that the matter has been brought to the attention of the Deputy Director General: Spatial Planning & Land Use: Dt Nozizi Makgalemele for attention and response.</p>	<p>Samuel Masemola</p> <p>Office of the Director General Department of Rural Development and Land Reform</p> <p>Letter: 14-09-2016</p>	<p>Acknowledgement noted. No further response received to date.</p>
18.	<p>The farms referred to are zoned Agricultural zone 1 in terms of the Swartland Integrated zoning scheme regulations. A consent use application for a renewable energy structure needs to be made in order to obtain the correct land use rights for the proposed windfarm.</p> <p>Please note that you refer to the farm 1066/0 as part of the relevant properties which is not registered in the Deeds Office. Farm 1066/0 consists of farms 416/3, 416/7 and 414/23.</p>	<p>AJ Burger</p> <p>Swartland Local Municipality</p> <p>Reply Form: 19-09-2016</p>	<p>A rezoning application will be undertaken as a separate process by the developer and all other relevant legislation governing land use in the province will be observed.</p> <p>Comment noted. The final scoping report refers to Farm 1066/0 as Portion 3 of the Farm Zwartfontein 416, Portion 7 of the Farm Zwartfontein 416 and Portion 26 of the Farm Zwartfontein 414.</p>
19.	<p>We approved the previous wind farm and can approve this farm as well. We have recorded this ownership change. Let us know if written approval is require.</p>	<p>Leonard Shaw</p> <p>Open Serve</p> <p>Email: 22-09-2016</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
20.	<p>Please register West Coast Bird Club as an I&AP on the</p>	<p>Keith Harrison</p>	<p>West Coast Bird Club has been registered on the project</p>

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	project database.	West Coast Bird Club Reply Form: 30-09-2016	database.
21.	<p>The draft scoping report dated September 2016 and received by this department on 9 September refer.</p> <p>i) Please ensure all relevant listed activities are applied for, are specific and that it can be linked to the development activity or infrastructure as described in the project description.</p> <p>ii) If the activities applied for in the application differ from those in the final SR and amended application form must be submitted.</p> <p>iii) Please ensure that the application form is signed by the applicant and that a signed landowner notification form is submitted to the department.</p> <p>iv) The final SR must investigate and identify all traffic impacts associated with the proposed development</p> <p>v) Please ensure all issues raised and comments received during circulation of the SR from registered I&APs and organs of state which have jurisdiction (including this departments biodiversity section) in respect of the activity are adequately addressed in the final SR. Should you be unable to obtain comments, proof should be submitted that attempts were made to obtain comments. The PP process must be undertaken in terms of Regulation 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, and 44 of the EIA Regulations</p>	<p>Thabile Sangweni</p> <p>National Department of Environmental Affairs</p> <p>Letter: 05-10-2016</p>	<p>i) All relevant listed activities applied for are listed in Section 4.1 and Table 4.1 of Chapter 4 of the Final Scoping Report. All relevant activities have been applied for.</p> <p>ii) No amendment of the application is required at this stage.</p> <p>iii) Comment noted. A signed application form, including a signed landowner consent, has been submitted to the Department.</p> <p>iv) Impacts relating to traffic has been identified and included in Appendix M of this report. A detailed impact assessment will be undertaken for the EIA phase.</p> <p>v) All comments are included as part of the Comments and Response report included as Appendix C6. Proof of attempts made to obtain comments from all relevant stakeholders is included in Appendix C4.</p> <p>vi) The details of all alternatives considered (including site alternatives, layout and design alternatives, technology alternatives, grid connection alternatives</p>

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>2014.</p> <p>vi) Please provide a description of identified alternatives for the proposed activity that are feasible and reasonable, including the advantages and disadvantages of the proposed activity or alternatives will have on the environment and affected community as per Appendix 2 of the EIA regulations, 2014. Alternatively you must submit written proof of an investigation and motivation if no reasonable or feasible alternatives exist in terms of Appendix 2.</p> <p>vii) Due to the number of similar applications in the area all specialist reports must include a cumulative environmental impact statement. Identified cumulative impacts must be clearly defined and where possible the size of the impact must be quantified and indicated i.e. hectares of cumulatively transformed land.</p> <p>viii) Identified cumulative impacts must be rated with the significance rating methodology approved in the acceptance of the coping report.</p> <p>ix) The cumulative impact significance rating must inform the need and desirability of the proposed development.</p> <p>x) Detailed cumulative impact assessments must be provided in the EIAR for all specialist studies. The specialist studies must provide proof that other specialist reports conducted for renewable energy projects in the area were reviewed and indicate how the recommendations, mitigation measures and conclusions have been taken into consideration</p>		<p>and the 'Do-nothing' alternatives) are included within Section 2.4 of the FSR.</p> <p>vii) A cumulative impact statement will be included in all EIA-phase specialist reports. A detailed assessment of cumulative impacts will be included in the EIA Report.</p> <p>viii) Detailed cumulative assessments will be provided in the EIAR in line with the approved methodology.</p> <p>ix) The cumulative impact significance rating will be included in the EIA report and this will inform the need and desirability of the project.</p> <p>x) Detailed cumulative assessments will be provided in the EIAR. Where available, other specialist reports reviewed by specialists will be referenced in the specialist studies.</p> <p>xi) The bird and bat monitoring are in line with the latest guidelines. A letter of validity provided by the specialist is included in Appendix N of this report.</p> <p>xii) The current land use of the site and surrounds is provided in Chapter 5. Additional detail regarding the motivation for the site is included in section 2.4 of the FSR.</p> <p>xiii) These details are presented in section 1.4 of the FSR. CVs for the project team are included in Appendix A.</p>

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>when the conclusion and mitigation measures were drafted for this project.</p> <p>xi) The 12 months bird and bat monitoring must be conducted in line with latest guidelines. It is noted that monitoring was done between May 2013 and September 2014. As such this must be amended to include the updated requirements. A copy of the latest guidelines can be found on the BirdLife SA and SABAAPs website.</p> <p>xii) The FSR must indicate and describe competing land uses in the area. This must further motivate the desirability of locating the wind farm at the preferred location</p> <p>xiii) In accordance with Appendix 2 of the EIA regulations 2014 the details of the i – EAP who prepared the report and ii – the expertise of the EAP to carry out the scoping and EIA must be submitted.</p> <p>xiv) The FSR 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.</p> <p>xv) In terms of Regulation 45 of the 2014 EIA regulations this application will lapse if the applicant fails to meet any of the timeframes prescribed in terms of the Regulations unless an extension has been granted in terms of Regulation 3(7).</p>		<p>xiv) The FSR complies 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. Refer to checklist on page 3 of the FSR.</p> <p>xv) Comment noted and all timeframes will be adhered to</p>
22.	Cumulative impacts remain of high concern as there are several other wind energy facility applications in this region. Data from those facilities which have been built	Alana Duffel-Canham Manager (Scientific Services)	A combined sensitivity map will be produced for the EIA phase report which indicates the exact locations of the proposed turbines and associated infrastructure,absolute

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>should also be used to inform the layout, including the appropriate number of turbines.</p> <p>Once detailed specialist studies have been conducted and areas of high sensitivity have been determined by all specialists, a layout must be produced which indicates the exact locations of the proposed turbines and associated infrastructure and absolute no-go areas. The applicant and consultants must demonstrate how all recommendations and mitigation measures proposed by the specialists have been taken into consideration. Where impacts are considered to be unavoidable, this should be clearly stated and motivated.</p> <p>CapeNature reserves the right to revise initial comments and request further information based on any additional information that may be received.</p>	<p>CapeNature</p> <p>Letter: 23-09-2016</p>	<p>no-go areas as well as sensitivities identified by specialists.</p> <p>Cumulative impacts will be assessed in detail in the EIA report.</p> <p>Consideration of the wind resource and on-site sensitivities as well as other technical and environmental factors will inform the layout. While data from existing facilities may be available, since these are not directly adjacent to the site the data are not likely to inform the layout for the Hartebeest Wind Farm.</p>
23.	<p>This serves as a notice of receipt and confirms that your application has been captured in our electronic AgriLand tracking and management system. It is strongly recommended that you use the on-line AgriLand application facility in future.</p> <p>Detail of your application as captured: Type: EIA: Hartebeest Wind Farm Your reference number: 12/12/20/2200 Property Description: Zwartfontein 414,416 & Hartebeestfontein 412 & Other farms Dated: 09 September 2016</p> <p>Please use the following reference number in all</p>	<p>K. Maluleke</p> <p>pp. Director: Land Use and Soil Management</p> <p>Letter: 03-10-2016</p>	<p>Comment noted, the reference number provided will be used for all enquiries.</p>

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>enquiries: AgriLand reference number: 2016_09_0244 Enquiries can be made to the above postal, fax or e-mail address.</p>		
24.	<p>1. The Draft Scoping Report ("DSR") and Plan of Study ("PoS") for Environmental Impact Assessment ("EIA") dated September 2016 that was received by the Department on 20 September 2016, refers. The following consolidated comment by various directorates in Department is hereby offered.</p> <p>2. It is understood that the applicant, Hartebeest Wind Farm (Pty) Ltd proposes the following development:</p> <p>2.1. The development of a 160 megawatt (MW) wind energy facility ("WEF") comprising of 40 turbines;</p> <p>2.2. Each turbine will have a generating capacity of up to 4MW and will be supported by concrete foundations (15m x 15m x 2m);</p> <p>2.3. The turbine structures will have a maximum hub height of up to 120m per turbine and a rotor diameter of up to 136m; and</p> <p>2.4. Associated infrastructure (cabling, access roads, on-site substation, overhead power line, workshop area, concrete batching area and laydown areas, small transformers, etc.) will form part of the proposed development.</p> <p>3. Directorate: Development Management (Region 1) – Rodine Isaacs (Rodine.Isaccs@westerncape.gov.za; Tel: (021) 483 4092).</p>	<p>Board of Directors Western Cape DEA&DP Letter: 10-10-2016</p>	<p>1. Comment noted.</p> <p>2. Noted.</p> <p>3.1. Comment noted, the Final Scoping Report indicates that the power generation is envisaged to begin in 2019.</p> <p>3.2.1. Section 7.3 has been amended refers to Section 8.4 in the final scoping report.</p> <p>3.2.2. Figure 7.1 has been amended to Figure 8.1.</p> <p>3.3. Comment noted. The public participation process will not be undertaken between 15 December 2016 and 5 January 2016.</p> <p>4.1. Table 3.1 has been amended and refers to the Western Cape Noise Control Regulations of 2013 (Provincial Notice 200/2013) in the Final Scoping Report.</p> <p>4.2. A noise impact assessment is being conducted as part of the EIA process. Noise levels will need to be assessed to ensure that any emissions are in line with provincial regulations. Impacts related to dust has been considered in the final scoping report as well as</p>

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>3.1. Section 2.7 of the DSR indicated that the power generation is envisaged to begin in 2016. The EIA process is currently at the Scoping phase. You are hereby advised to amend the statement to reflect a more realistic date by when power generation is anticipated to commence.</p> <p>3.2. The following amendment to Chapter 8 of the DSR are required:</p> <p>3.2.1. Section 7.3 (Consideration of alternatives on page 176 of the DSR should be renamed to Section 8.4;</p> <p>3.2.2. The "worst case scenario" layout depicted in Figure 8.1 is incorrectly labelled as Figure 7.1 on page 177 of the DSR.</p> <p>3.3 According to the PoS for EIA, specialist studies and public participation will be undertaken from November – December 2016. Your attention is drawn to regulation 3(3) of Government Notice No. R. 982 of 4 December 2014. To ensure compliance with said regulation and to facilitate a transparent public participation process ("PPP"), you are reminded to not conduct PPP over the festive period, i.e. between Thursday 15 December and Thursday 5 January 2017.</p> <p>4. Directorate: Air Quality Management – Peter Harmse (Peter.Harmse@westerncape.gov.za; Tel: (021) 483 8343):</p> <p>4.1. Table 3.1 (page 61) of the DSR and Section</p>		<p>in Appendix K. Increase in dust will be assessed in the EIA phase. Mitigation measures in this regard will be included in the EMPr to be drafted during the EIA phase.</p> <p>5.1. Comments noted. Impacts on soils, ground and surface water quality due to hydrocarbon spillages will be assessed in the EIA phase. Aspects related to waste management and minimisation, with specific emphasis on the disposal of construction waste will also be included in the EIA phase.</p> <p>6.1. The project site proposed for the Hartebeest Wind Farm does not fall within a Renewable Energy Development Zone (REDZ). A map depicting the proposed development in relation to the relevant REDZ will be provided in the Draft EIA Report. The Draft EIA Report will also describe whether there are any conflicts between the REDZ (assuming the development is located within one) and the Critical Biodiversity Area ("CBA").</p> <p>6.2. No infrastructure is presently planned within the intact patches of Renosterveld and as a result, it is not considered to be directly important to evaluate their condition or follow a mitigation hierarchy as they would not be impacted by the development.</p> <p>6.3. A more detailed assessment on the different types of technology alternatives (e.g. wind energy vs. solar energy) and a detailed description of why the</p>

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>2.2.2 of the Noise Scoping Report dated September 2016 must be amended to refer to the Western Cape Noise Control Regulations of 2013 (Provincial Notice 200/2013).</p> <p>4.2. This Directorate requires that the potential increase in dust and noise generation during the construction phase and potential noise generation during the operational phase on the receiving environment be assessed and taken into account with the final design and layout of the proposed WEF.</p> <p>5. Directorate: Waste Management – Waleed Galvaan (Waleed.Galvaan@westerncape.gov.za; Tel: (021) 483 8788):</p> <p>5.1. Based on information contained in the DSR, this Directorate requires that the following impacts pertaining to the receiving environment be assessed and taken into account with the final design and layout of the proposed WEF:</p> <p>5.1.1. Potential impacts on ground and surface water quality due to hydrocarbon spillages from vehicles during the construction phase of the development;</p> <p>5.1.2. Potential impacts on soils due to hydrocarbon spillages from vehicles during the construction and operational phase of the development; and</p> <p>5.1.3. Aspects related to waste management and minimisation, with specific emphasis on the disposal of</p>		<p>proposed wind farm is considered more feasible than other technology alternatives, will be provided in the EIA phase.</p> <p>6.4. The Draft EIA Report will include a thorough assessment of road transport and access safety pertaining to the delivery of turbine components for the proposed Hartebeest Wind Farm. The PoS for EIA has been amended to ensure that the Social Impact Assessment also consider the transport and access safety impacts.</p> <p>6.5. The Draft EIA Report will include a detailed description of the associated infrastructure.</p> <p>6.6. The specialist studies will inform the layout of the proposed wind turbines. A thorough assessment of the turbine footprints as well as the development footprint of any associated development components (e.g. ancillary infrastructure, substation and power line, etc.) will be included in the Draft EIA Report.</p> <p>6.7. The approximate size of the workforce required during the construction phase will be indicated in the Draft EIA Report.</p> <p>6.8. Section 3.1 has been amended to refer to the Berg - Olifants Proto-Catchment Management Agency ("CMA") as being responsible for the issuing of water use licences.</p>

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>construction waste.</p> <p>6. Directorate: Development Facilitation – Adri La Meyer (Adri.LaMeyer@westerncape.gov.za; Tel: (021) 483 2887):</p> <p>6.1. The need and desirability of the proposed development; the site selection and technology alternatives; and the regulatory and planning context of the DSR have failed to address whether the study area falls within a Renewable Energy Development Zone ("REDZ"), which is crucial to determine whether the proposed development is located within a region earmarked for such facilities. The Strategic Environmental Assessment for wind and solar PV energy in South Africa (CSIR, 2013) integrates environmental, economic and social factors to identify eight REDZ. The identified REDZs included areas where large scale wind energy facilities can be developed in in a manner that limits significant negative impacts on the environment while yielding the highest possible socio-economic benefits to the country. The Draft EIA Report must clearly indicate whether the proposed development is located within a REDZ, which could provide a motivation for the development of the proposed WEF. A map depicting the proposed development in relation to the relevant REDZ must be provided in the Draft EIA Report. Furthermore, the Draft EIA</p>		<p>6.9. The Department of Environmental Affairs' reference number has been included in this Final Scoping Report for referencing purposes.</p> <p>7. One (1) hard copy and three (3) CDs of the Draft EIA Report will be addressed to the Directorate: Development Facilitation. A notification letter via e-mail will be sent out when the Draft EIA Report is available for comment.</p> <p>8. Comment noted, all correspondence will be directed to the officials indicated</p> <p>9. Comment noted.</p>

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>Report must clearly describe whether there are any conflicts between the REDZ (assuming the development is located within one) and the Critical Biodiversity Area ("CBA").</p> <p>6.2 According to the DSR and Ecology Scoping Report dated September 2016, the development site falls within a CBA with approximately 114ha of intact SwartaShale Renosterveld remnants (classified as a critical endangered vegetation) present on the site. Development proposals which are not aligned to the management goals of CBAs should ideally not be supported as the desired management outcomes for the CBA is to maintain natural land, rehabilitate degraded land to a natural or near-natural state and to manage for no further degradation. In this regard the mitigation hierarchy must be followed and unacceptable impacts on the CBA should firstly be avoided. If after having investigated alternatives to avoid the impacts altogether, it can be shown that avoidance is not possible, then alternatives to mitigate and manage the impacts must be explored. Unavoidable residual impacts should be rehabilitated. If, after rehabilitation, certain residual impacts of medium or higher significance will remain, then options to offset the biodiversity impacts should be explored.</p> <p>6.3 A more detailed assessment on the different types of technology alternatives (e.g. wind</p>		

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>energy vs. solar energy) and a detailed description of why the proposed WEF is considered more feasible than other technology alternatives, must be provided in the Draft EIA Report.</p> <p>6.4 The Draft EIA Report must include a thorough assessment of road transport and access safety pertaining to the delivery of turbine components for the proposed development, especially in light of the current road works/ upgrading of the N7. The PoS for EIA must be amended to ensure that the Social Impact Assessment also consider the transport and access safety impacts.</p> <p>6.5 The Draft EIA Report must provide a more detailed description of what the associated infrastructure of the WEF will entail, e.g. size in ha of the WEF and associated infrastructure in relation to the study area; whether wind measuring lattice masts will form part of the associated infrastructure; size of the laydown areas; confirmation that no on-site construction camps will be constructed, etc.</p> <p>6.6 The various specialist studies must inform the layout of the proposed wind turbines. A thorough assessment of the turbine footprints as well as the development footprint of any associated development components (e.g. ancillary infrastructure, substation and power line, etc.) must be included in the Draft EIA Report.</p>		

No.	Issue	Issue Raised By	Response
	<p>6.7 The approximate size of the workforce required during the construction phase must be indicated in the Draft EIA Report.</p> <p>6.8 Section 3.1 of the DSR (page 42) must be amended to refer to the Berg - Olifants Proto-Catchment Management Agency ("CMA") being responsible for the issuing of water use licences, and not the Western Cape West Coast Rivers CMA.</p> <p>6.9 Please include the Department of Environmental Affairs' reference number in future documentation for referencing purposes.</p> <p>7. Please provide this Department with one (1) hard copy and three (3) CDs of the Draft EIA Report, addressed to the Directorate: Development Facilitation. Please also inform this office via e-mail when the Draft EIA Report is available for comment as the Department received the DSR eleven days after it has been made available for public comment, which severely impacted on the time available to comment.</p> <p>8. Please direct all enquiries to the officials indicated in this correspondence should you require any clarity on any of the issues/comments provided.</p> <p>9. The Department reserves the right to revise initial comments and request further information based on any or new information received.</p>		