

Appendix A1 NOTES OF PRE-APPLICATION AUTHORITIES MEETING

**NOTES OF DISCUSSION DURING THE SITE VISIT AND APPLICATION MEETING WITH
AUTHORITIES: PHASE 2 EXPANSION**

**Port of Saldanha
Bulk Terminal Saldanha**

11h00 – 14h00, 3 May 2006

1 Attendance				
Name	Organisation	Telephone	Fax	E-mail
Msimelelo Silomntu	SAPO/Transnet	022 703 4958 083 419 4579	022 703 4958	msimelelos@portops.co.za
Zain Jumai	DEA&DP: Coastal management	021 483 2889 084 402 3030	021 483 4527	zjumai@pgwc.gov.za
A. Matoti	DEA&DP	021 483 2748	021 483 4372	amatoli@pgwc.gov.za
Xola Mkefe	SANParks (West Coast National Park)	082 661 8152	022 772 2607	xolam@sanparks.org
Andrew Woghiren	PDNA	012 349 1307 072 567 5812	012 349 1229	Andrew@sefsa.co.za
Lyndon Metcalf	NPA	022 701 4338 082 405 2811	022 714 2285	lyndonm@npa.co.za
Mosili Ntene	DEAT	012 310 3031	012 720 3529	mntene@deat.gov.za
Lungile Rengqe	MCM - DEAT	021 402 3275	021 402 3009	lungelwa@deat.gov.za
Max Clark	HATCH			Max.clark@hatch.co.za
Sharon Jones	SRK	021 659 3060	021 385 7105	sjones@srk.co.za
Paul de Ruyter	SRK	021 659 3060	021 685 7105	pderuyter@srk.co.za
Introduction & Agenda				
<p>AW outlined the purpose of the meeting and site visit as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction to the project team and Transnet's representatives; • An overview of Phase 2 of the expansion proposal focusing on the port side of the project only; • Site visit around the iron ore handling terminal; • General discussion on potential issues and impacts; and • EIA process to be followed. <p>The above items formed the Agenda for the visit and discussions that ensued.</p>				
Dredging Permit				
<p>Lungile Rengqe: MCM representative noted the need for NPA to apply for the relevant dredging permits. She pointed out studies on the deposition sites for dredged material must be undertaken as part of this process. Information regarding what will be done with dredging material is also</p>				

required, and that legislation applicable to dumping may also need to be considered.

There will be a need to include the identification of new dump sites for dredge spoil, especially if ongoing dredging is required. The dredging permit application will need to include analysis of sediment samples.

Potential impacts of dredging and other marine works, which are a concern to the authorities include:

- Impacts on the marine environment (erosion and water circulation) particularly along the Langebaan lagoon area;
- Impacts on the benthic environment; and
- Beach erosion currently experienced at Langebaan, which is thought to have resulted from the previous extension of the berth. Studies undertaken by the CSIR to determine the impact on the bay must be considered.

Project Alternatives

Max Clark explained the various alternatives under consideration, which relate mainly to the positioning of the additional stockpiles. He noted the advantage and opportunity of assessing the alternatives early on during the EIA and Project Design Phase, since the EIA could inform the final decision on the most sustainable alternative. There was a discussion of the various alternatives thereafter, and the question as to which was the most preferred alternative was raised by AM of (DEADP). This question is difficult to answer at this stage as detailed feasibility studies are still in progress.

The scope of the rail line was discussed in broad outlines, however it was noted that there was a proposal to conduct this study as a separate EIA due to the fact that the information available on this aspect was still limited.

However the broad alternatives are:

- Doubling of the entire railway line; and
- Extension of all the existing loops along the railway line.

It was noted that all alternatives, included in the process, need to be reasonable. A comparison of the tradeoffs between various alternatives also needs to be provided.

Questions

A number of questions raised by the authorities during discussions, for which answers need to be provided include:

- Why wasn't the extension of the berth towards the west considered as an option?
- Why was the positioning of the additional berths adjacent to the (north) stockpile area not considered as an alternative to extending the quay?
- What alternatives were considered during the Phase 1A EIA, and were these fairly similar to the alternatives currently under consideration?
- What were the sensitivities associated with the dunes, and how were the sensitivities determined? Was a specialist study undertaken for an assessment of the dunes? What is the current conservation value on the dunes? What is the size of the dune area that would be affected? The dunes have historically been regarded as sensitive. – LM noted

that the area has been considered sensitive due to its connection with the greater dune system in the area. However, no study has confirmed this.

- What is the current status of the Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG) project, especially vis-à-vis the long term planning of the port? – LM noted that it is currently not being considered as it has been indefinitely postponed, and is not considered to be an issue in terms of the port's current planning. There is more flexibility in terms of the LNG project, compared to the expansion of the terminal. The port master plan is due to be released in June 2006.
- Why are the trains not covered?
- What is the volume of dust generated per train load?

EIA process

The EIA team explained that there were essentially two components to the project: the port upgrade and the rail upgrade. A single application was submitted to the National and Provincial environmental departments on 13 March 2006 for both components. Information regarding the proposed rail upgrade is not currently available, and a discussion regarding the possibility of separating the two aspects, and undertaking separate EIA processes for these two was discussed. It was, however, made clear that without approval of both aspects, the upgrade would not go ahead.

The question was asked as to what extent the rail study could be separated from the port study. Is it possible for the study to be undertaken as separate processes? It appears this was done for the Phase 1A application. The risk of one EIA process delaying the other was discussed. DEA&DP noted that they were generally not in favour of issuing incremental authorisations. They would prefer a holistic assessment of the entire project.

DEAT indicated that they were two separate listed activities, and the authorities would not be able to dictate whether or not they are submitted as a single or separate applications. Either way would be suitable, and the applicant would need to decide, but needs to be aware of the risks.

If they are separated, ideally all should be made aware of both processes, and where possible, the same authority representatives should be involved with both applications.

MC noted that it would probably be necessary to compile a summary report that focuses on the cumulative impact of the two EIA studies, such that the authorities are in a position to assess the project on its full merits and significance.

In summary the options to be followed in the EIA process are:

1. To apply for authorisation for the rail and the port expansion separately, i.e. conducting the studies as 2 separate EIAs, with 2 RODs, etc.
2. To conduct the studies as 2 separate processes under one application.

Alternatives

MC asked whether the authorities felt there were sufficient alternatives under consideration. - The layout depends on land availability hence, the alternatives are limited. Detailed design will determine what other alternatives are open for consideration, within the main alternatives.

Public Meetings

MC asked whether the authorities were in favour of or would insist on public meetings, and what their general views in this regard were. During the discussion that followed, the following points were made:

- Transparency and fairness is important, and public meetings are a means to ensure that this is achieved;
- Participation differs from consultation. The former is more passive, while the latter gives the public an opportunity to be heard, taking their concerns/issues into account;
- The choice to use public meetings should be based on the consultant's judgement, as it depends on the scale of the project. An analysis of the targeted audience will give a better indication as to the best public involvement tool to employ;
- Public meetings or Focus Group Meetings can serve as a cushion to identify public concerns early in the process. They should aim to be interactive, rather than simply informative. It should also be noted that it is the public's right to participate in the EIA process;
- The EIA process should be open, giving everyone an opportunity to participate; and
- AW noted that an open day held prior to a public meeting has often proved very successful on other projects, and this formula could be implemented as the need arises.

Compiled by Sharon Jones, SRK Consulting, 15 May 2006