

APPENDIX D4 - COMMENTS AND RESPONSES REPORT

COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING DRAFT EIR PHASE

Stakeholder: Department of Environmental Affairs Date received: 02 November 2018	
COMMENT	RESPONSE
<p>The Department confirms having received the Draft Environmental Impact Assessment Report for the abovementioned project on 29 October 2018. You have submitted these documents to comply with the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations (EIA), 2014, as amended.</p> <p>Please take note of Regulation 40(3) of the EIA Regulations, 2014, as amended, which states that potential Interested & Affected Parties, including the Competent Authority, may be provided with an opportunity to comment on reports and plans contemplated in Regulation 40(1) of the EIA Regulations, 2014, as amended, prior to the submission of an application but must be provided an opportunity to comment on such reports once an application has been submitted to the Competent Authority.</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>Kindly quote the abovementioned reference number in any future correspondence in respect of the application.</p>	<p>The Department's acknowledgement of receipt of the Draft EIR documents for statutory commenting is duly noted.</p>
Stakeholder: West Coast Bird Club - Mr. Keith Harrison Date received: 07 November 2018	
COMMENT	RESPONSE
<p>Thank you for sending the link to the above project and the opportunity to comment.</p> <p>The West Coast Bird Club agrees in principle with the Draft Environmental Impact Assessment.</p> <p>However, the report is flawed in that there is no Avian Impact Assessment</p>	<p>No Avian Impact Report has been compiled in terms of this application –</p>

APPENDIX D4 - COMMENTS AND RESPONSES REPORT

COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING DRAFT EIR PHASE

<p>and impact upon the coastal seabirds which enter Big Bay. The final 850 metres (Figure Page 8) of open pipeline and offloading facility.</p> <p>The SFF Environmental Control Manager has brought in the recent past to the attention of both Governmental and NGO Ornithologists the fouling of the existing facilities by breeding Crowned Cormorants, (<i>Phalacrocorax coronatus</i>).</p> <p>Destructive methods had to be employed in the period before eggs were laid. Constructive methods agreed by ornithologists would be to attract the species back to Marcus Island from where they originated. A method using mobile nesting platforms has been developed by CapeNature successfully at Lamberts Bay. The platforms are constructed from recycled pallets.</p> <p>Where the onshore facilities (3 ha) will be sited, is in very good botanical condition, will an offset be required on the West Coast Peninsula, for example the WWF area at Jacobs Bay?</p>	<p>however the impact of the activity on coastal seabirds (during construction and operation) have been included in the impact's tables.</p> <p>The continuous monitoring of the presence of seabirds and the management thereof as been included in the operational EMPr.</p> <p>No offset has been provided for the loss of vegetation as a result of the LPG handling facility. Please take note that the facility has been proposed on an area that is considered to have the least</p>
<p>Stakeholder: CapeNature Date received: 09 November 2018</p>	
<p>COMMENT</p>	<p>RESPONSE</p>
<p>CapeNature would like to thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed service station and wish to make the following comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed pipeline alternatives pass through an area covered predominantly by Saldanha Flats Strandveld with Langebaan Dune Strandveld and Cape Seashore Vegetation occurring close to the coast. Patches of Saldanha Limestone Strandveld have also been identified in the study area. According to a recent assessment conducted by CapeNature's conservation planner there is less than 34% of the original extent of Saldanha Flats Strandveld remaining – this means that it qualifies as Endangered under criterion A1. Please note that the 2011 NSBA listings made use of very outdated aerial imagery for many areas including Saldanha. CapeNature's assessment used far more recent groundcover imagery for the assessment as well as groundtruthed 	

APPENDIX D4 - COMMENTS AND RESPONSES REPORT

COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING DRAFT EIR PHASE

<p>information. Only 5.4% of the original extent of Saldanha Flats Strandveld has formal protection (according to the most recent information) and therefore it is considered poorly protected.</p> <p>2. Saldanha Flats Strandveld is therefore of high regional conservation importance. The study area also forms part of a regional climate change corridor. Therefore, even though not all of the study area is of high sensitivity, it is all of high conservation importance and has therefore been determined as Critical Biodiversity Area (CBA). It should also be noted that the amount of CBA selected still does not meet the required area for meeting the conservation target for Saldanha Flats Strandveld i.e. even if all CBAs containing Saldanha Flats Strandveld were formally conserved, the conservation target of 24% of the original extent would still not be met. This means that even some degraded areas are important for meeting targets and increasing connectivity and buffering the more intact areas and hence have been mapped as CBA as well.</p> <p>3. There is some discrepancy between the DEIR (and comments and response report) and the botanical specialist report with regard to the size of the proposed handling facility. The DEIR states that the handling facility will be 3 hectares (within an 11 study site) but the botanical specialist report states that the handling facility will be 2 hectares. This can mean a significant difference in impact when there are Species of Conservation Concern present (such as on this site). Please confirm the size of the footprint and confirm with the botanical specialist if this will affect his impact ratings. It is imperative that the footprint does not extend into the areas where he determined it would cause a high negative impact. Confirmation must also be provided that the remainder of the study area for the handling facility will be managed as a conservation area.</p> <p>4. Complete rehabilitation of the entire pipeline route passing through the coastal dunes and natural vegetation must be considered essential mitigation. Active rehabilitation will be required and the success thereof will need to be monitored throughout the lifespan of the project. Other parties are also laying new pipelines and ideally construction of all pipelines and rehabilitation following construction should take place at</p>	<p>The discrepancy is based on the fact that although the facility footprint is stated in documentation provided to be 3ha, when measured on Google Earth it was found to be actually 2.1ha, but in order to be consistent it was assumed to be 3ha. The size of the facility will not impact on the impact significance ratings and the footprint will not extend into areas where it would be determined to cause a high negative impact.</p> <p>The remainder of the study area will be managed in accordance with the requirements as indicated in the EMPr which has been informed by the botanical specialist investigation.</p> <p>Complete rehabilitation of all disturbed areas has been included in the rehabilitation plan included as part of the EMPr which has been informed by the specialist recommendations.</p> <p>Please note that the aligning of the construction work of separate projects by separate applicant could prove to be logistically challenging as the works for</p>
---	--

APPENDIX D4 - COMMENTS AND RESPONSES REPORT

COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING DRAFT EIR PHASE

<p>the same time.</p> <p>5. A rehabilitation specialist should supervise all search and rescue activities and advise on suitable localities to plant the recommended species and monitor the success of the rehabilitation efforts.</p> <p>6. All parties requiring use of the pipeline servitude to managing must manage the remainder of the application area mapped as CBA as a conservation area. Whilst the servitude will be rehabilitated this does not ensure that there will not be further disturbance to the remainder of the natural vegetation on the properties in which the servitude is located. The site forms the southern extent of a climate change corridor and the biodiversity on site is considered irreplaceable and there are no options to meet biodiversity targets for patterns and processes represented here elsewhere.</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>the other parties have already been approved and commenced with. Noted, this has been included in the rehabilitation section of the EMPr.</p> <p>The management of the servitude as indicated by CapeNatures comments has been included as such in the EMPr.</p>
<p>Stakeholder: Western Cape Department of Transport and Public Works - Directorate: Road Planning Date received: 12 November 2018</p>	
<p>COMMENT</p>	<p>RESPONSE</p>
<p>The following refer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Your letter to this Branch dated 26 October 2018. b. This Branch's letter to you referenced 16/9/6/6/3-24/02 (Job 22418) dated 26 June 2018. <p>This Branch's letter referenced in 1a is still applicable.</p>	<p>The letter issued by the Branch, dated 26 June 2018, has been received and addressed in the comments and responses report in Appendix D3.</p>
<p>Stakeholder: West Coast District Municipality Date received: 21 November 2018</p>	
<p>COMMENT</p>	<p>RESPONSE</p>
<p>The West Coast District Municipality does not wish to offer any additional comments on the DEIR for the proposal. However, you are referred to the comments provided on the DSR (copy of letter dated 27 June 2018 attached) which are still pertinent.</p>	<p>The comments issued by the Municipality, dated 27 June 2018, has been received and addressed in the comments and responses report in Appendix D3.</p>

APPENDIX D4 - COMMENTS AND RESPONSES REPORT

COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING DRAFT EIR PHASE

Stakeholder: Department of Environmental Affairs	
Date received: 22 November 2018 (dated 12 November 2018)	
COMMENT	RESPONSE
<p>The draft Environmental Impact Assessment report (EIAR) dated October 2018 and received by this Department on 29 October 2018, refers.</p> <p>The Department has noted that the following has been addressed in the draft EIAR:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PPP has been undertaken. However, ensure that concerns raised by I&AP are adequately addressed and the PPP report is included in the final report. • Alternatives for the pipeline has been provided. Please ensure that the assessment of all alternatives are provided in the final EIAR. <p>In addition, the following must be addressed in the final report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please ensure that the EIAR comply with all the conditions of the acceptance of scoping report letter signed 22 August 2018. • The Department has further noted that there is a similar project on the proposed site, therefore; cumulative impact assessment must be considered for all identified and assessed impacts and must be refined to indicate the cumulative impacts significance rating. • The cumulative impacts identified must inform the need and desirability of the proposed development as well as the environmental statement on whether the proposed development must proceed or not. <p>General Comments</p> <p>You are further reminded that the final EIAR to be submitted to this Department must comply with all the requirements in terms of the scope of assessment and content of EIAR in accordance with Appendix 3 and Regulation 23(1) (a), 23(3), 23(4) and 23(5) of the amended EIA Regulations, 2014.</p> <p>Further note that in terms of Regulation 45 of the EIA Regulations 2014, this</p>	<p>All concerns raised by I&APs on the Draft EIR has been addressed and included in the Revised EIR as Appendix D4.</p> <p>Alternatives are assessed in Section 6 of the Revised EIR.</p> <p>The EIR has been amended to include all conditions included in the acceptance of scoping report letter issued by the Department on the 22 August 2018.</p> <p>A cumulative impact assessment has been included in section 6.3 of the FEIR. The cumulative assessment</p>

APPENDIX D4 - COMMENTS AND RESPONSES REPORT

COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING DRAFT EIR PHASE

<p>application will lapse if the applicant fails to meet any of the timeframes prescribed in terms of the 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>Stakeholder: Department of Water and Sanitation Date received: 23 November 2018</p>	
<p>COMMENT</p>	<p>RESPONSE</p>
<p>This Department has perused the abovementioned documents for the proposed LPG import facility and has the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No pollution of surface water or ground water resources may occur due to any activity on the property. • It is noted on page 34 of the Report that a new sewer pipeline to connect to existing infrastructure will be constructed. Please indicate if any watercourse will be crossed by the sewer pipeline. • Measures to control illegal dumping of construction waste must be in place as this may result in pollution to the surface water run-off. • No abstraction of surface or groundwater may be done without prior authorisation from this Department, unless it is a Schedule 1 Use or an Existing Lawful Use. • Storm-water runoff must be controlled to ensure that on-site activities do not culminate into off-site pollution. • All the requirements of the National Water Act, 1998 (Act 36 of 1998) in terms of water use and pollution control management must be adhered to at all times. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted. • No watercourses will be crossed. • Control of illegal dumping has been addressed in objective C16 of the EMPr. • No abstraction of groundwater is foreseen in terms of this application and its associated activities. • Control of stormwater has been addressed in Objective PD5 and Objective C7 of the EMPr. • Noted.
<p>Stakeholder: Sunrise Energy Date received: 26 November 2018</p>	
<p>COMMENT</p>	<p>RESPONSE</p>
<p>We confirm receipt of the draft Environmental Impact Assessment Report</p>	

APPENDIX D4 - COMMENTS AND RESPONSES REPORT

COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING DRAFT EIR PHASE

DEA Ref: 14/12/16/3/3/2/1069 and confirm that Sunrise Energy (Pty) Ltd ("Sunrise") is a registered I&AP.

Sunrise wishes to respond to the draft EIA, however in order to place the comments in context an overview of Sunrise's LPG Import Facility must first be noted:

Sunrise Energy LPG Terminal overview and capabilities Sunrise is a LPG Terminal Operator in terms of Section 56 of the National Ports Act No. 12 of 2005 at the Port of Saldanha Bay.

The Sunrise LPG Terminal consists of a multi-buoy mooring point ("MBM") within the port, a 3.1 km undersea pipeline connected to a 2km overland underground pipeline linked to the Sunrise LPG Storage Facility located at Erf16000 and 16001, Yzervarkensrug, Saldanha Bay. The attached diagram shows the position of the Sunrise LPG Terminal in relation to the proposed SFF LPG Import Facility.

The MBM and pipelines have been designed and constructed for a throughput capacity of more than 600,000MT per annum and can receive pressurised, semi-refrigerated or refrigerated carriers (using discharge heaters) of 3000 to 20000 Gross Tonnage (MT) in size.

Sunrise operates the LPG Terminal on an open-access basis, meaning that the facilities may be utilised by any importer, distributor or trader who requires the import of LPG. As we render services to international customers the LPG Terminal quantity, quality and safety systems are all fully automated, computerized and integrated and designed to the highest international standards.

Importantly, Sunrise does not import, trade or own LPG, meaning that it does not compete in the upstream or downstream market with third parties. Sunrise's responsibility is to facilitate the import of LPG through an efficient, modern terminal and subject to the payment of fees regulated by the

APPENDIX D4 - COMMENTS AND RESPONSES REPORT

COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING DRAFT EIR PHASE

National Energy Regulator of South Africa (NERSA).

Safety

LPG forms a flammable mixture with air in concentrations of between 2% and 10%, which means that it is a fire and explosion hazard. For this reason, safety standards associated with LPG handling are necessarily high and were given the highest priority in the design and construction of the LPG Terminal.

In addition to this, Sunrise ensures compliance at all times with both national and international standards.

The key Sunrise Energy safety measures include:

1. the mounding of the LPG storage bullets to protect against Boiling Liquid Expanding Vapour Explosions (BLEVEs);
2. design and fabrication of the bullets according to the pressure vessel code ASME VIII Div;
3. automated Emergency Shutdown and Fire Systems, which is automatically activated if a fire is detected;
4. firefighting systems are design to meet and exceed international NFPA standards;
5. automated gas and fire detection systems throughout the plant process areas;
6. high-integrity Safety Instrumented Systems (SIS);
7. no venting of hydrocarbons, with recovery of all vapours via a vapour recovery system; and
8. fully automated bullet transfer sequences and product loading preventing operator error.

Dedicated Off-loading

In consideration of the health and safety of people, property and the environment the positioning of the MBM within the port was very carefully considered by TNPA and Sunrise and the final decision to locate it at its current position was made to ensure the least amount of harm is caused in the event of an incident.

APPENDIX D4 - COMMENTS AND RESPONSES REPORT

COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING DRAFT EIR PHASE

Also taking into consideration the aforementioned, together with future port expansion, the MBM and pipelines were intended to serve as a dedicated LPG import facility and should therefore ideally be used by all parties who wish to import LPG through the port of Saldanha Bay. By limiting LPG importation to one point within the Port, apart from the safety benefits, more efficient utilization of specialized infrastructure and support services (such as fire, water and related incident management) can be ensured.

Purpose of applicable legislation: Petroleum Pipelines Act and the National Ports Act.

The object and purpose of both the aforementioned Acts is to, *inferred*:

- promote the efficient, effective, sustainable and orderly development, operation and use of port / petroleum infrastructure; and
- ensure the safe, efficient, economic and environmentally responsible transport, loading and storage of petroleum products.

In addition, NERSA and the TNPA, as the relevant Authorities, have already approved the construction and operation of a dedicated LPG terminal to serve the users of the Port of Saldanha Bay. The Sunrise LPG Terminal has been in operation since May 2017 and is available for use by all LPG importers. SFF should consider making use of this dedicated LPG infrastructure before embarking on a very expensive project which will duplicate existing infrastructure without providing any additional benefit.

Sunrise comments to draft EIA

It is Sunrise's view that the proposed facility will have the greatest impact on safety and the socioeconomic aspects of the immediate environment of the proposed facility.

It is with due respect and grave concern that we note that the safety aspect of both construction and operation of a LPG facility alongside and under two other major hazardous installations (the crude oil jetty and the iron-ore export facility) has been entirely omitted from the draft EIA. Having gone

A pre-feasibility Design HAZID study and QRA Report has been completed and included in the Draft EIA report submitted for comment. The scope of which included:

A HAZard IDentification study (HAZID) and Qualitative Risk Assessment (QRA) is performed as part of the pre-feasibility study for the proposed SFF LPG Storage Facility in Saldanha. A HAZID study is used as a tool with which to identify process related hazards on a high level based on the process flow

APPENDIX D4 - COMMENTS AND RESPONSES REPORT

COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING DRAFT EIR PHASE

through the process of construction and operation of a LPG facility ourselves it is of paramount importance that detailed consideration of these aspects be dealt with in the draft EIA. Not only would the proposed facility impact the safety and operation of these two MHI's, but should an incident occur it will directly affect the operation other port infrastructure, located within close proximity, effectively shutting down the Port of Saldanha for a lengthy period of time, with severe economic consequences for the Saldanha Bay / Vredenburg area.

Furthermore, no effort has been made to quantify and assess the socio-economic and physical risk during construction and operation, as well as the impact on, people, the community and neighbouring users/businesses of existing MHI infrastructure.

We request detailed consideration of the safety and socio-economic aspects, which we deem of paramount importance before we will be in a position to comment meaningfully on the draft EIA.

Recommendation

From our brief comments it is clear that a considerable amount of study and assessment has been omitted and must still be completed before the Environmental Impact Assessment adequately addresses all the risks and impacts and before it can be commented on in detail.

There are a number of high impact risks which have not been properly addressed but which can be adequately mitigated should SFF consider engaging with Sunrise to make use of the existing LPG Terminal (specifically the MBM), which has been specifically created with adequate capacity for the handling of LPG within the Port of Saldanha Bay.

diagrams for the proposed plant. The aim of the HAZID study is to identify, assess, and propose mitigation measures and/or recommendations for hazards identified early on in the project. The focus of the HAZID was specifically on the process related hazards associated with the design and construction of a LPG Storage Facility and the QRA complements the HAZID focusing on process related hazards. The HAZID also included the risks identified by the other design disciplines, i.e. Civil, Structural, Mechanical and Electrical and Instrumentation.

Any significant hazards identified that pose an intolerable level of risk to the project will be considered and actions included for this or the next phase of the design of the facility. Additional risk control measures are to be adopted to reduce the risk levels.

****Refer to appendix G3 of the Draft EIR.***

Additionally a cumulative assessment addressing the socio-economic impacts as well as other identified impacts associated with the proposed development has been included in the Amended DEIA report.

APPENDIX D4 - COMMENTS AND RESPONSES REPORT

COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING DRAFT EIR PHASE

Stakeholder: Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning
Ms Adri La Meyer (Directorate: Development Facilitation)
Ms Melanese Schippers (Directorate: Development Management)
Mr Vishwanath Gianpersad (Directorate: Waste Management)
Mr Hassan Parker (Directorate: Pollution and Chemicals Management)
Mr Peter Harmse (Directorate: Air Quality Management)
Date received: 26 November 2018

COMMENT	RESPONSE
<p>The Draft Scoping Report (“DSR”) dated May 2018, the Department’s comments thereto dated 4 June 2018, the e-mail notification of the availability of the Draft Environmental Impact Assessment (“EIA”) Report dated 26 October 2018 and the Draft EIA Report dated October 2018 as received by the Department on 26 October 2018, refer.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Department does not support the application in its current format as information contained in the Draft EIA Report and the Environmental Management Programme (“EMPr”) is incomplete and inadequate for decision-making purposes. A Revised EIA Report (inclusive of specialist studies, which address all the shortcomings, must be made available to all registered interested and affected parties per regulation 23(2) of the EIA Regulations, 2014 (as amended) prior to submission of the Final EIA Report to the competent authority. The Revised EIA Report and EMPr must meet the requirements of Appendices 3 and 4 of the EIA Regulations, 2014 (as amended), respectively. Below find consolidated comments from various Directorates within the Department on the Draft EIA Report. The Department’s comments only focus on the most salient shortcomings and flaws of the Draft EIA Report and the EMPr. <p><u>Directorate: Development Facilitation</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Directorate: Development Facilitation – Ms Adri La Meyer (Adri.LaMeyer@westerncape.gov.za; Tel: (021) 483 2887): <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Modification of the jetty 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Draft EIR will be revised based on the comments received during the Draft EIR phase. The revised draft will be sent for an additional 30 days commenting period to all key departments and registered interested and affected parties. The comments and flaws highlighted will be addressed in in the Revised Draft EIR. <p><u>Directorate: Development Facilitation</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Modification of the Jetty: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Additional details will be provided. This will also be clarified

APPENDIX D4 - COMMENTS AND RESPONSES REPORT

COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING DRAFT EIR PHASE

<p>3.1.1.The proposed development will entail, <i>inter alia</i>, the development of a liquid petroleum gas (“LPG”) handling facility, development of a pipeline for the transportation of dangerous goods and the modification of an existing jetty at the Port of Saldanha. The modification of the jetty entails the modification of the caissons located on the Langebaan side of the existing jetty. The caissons would be modified to include “furniture” on which vessels will be secured, as well as flexible hoses for the receiving of LPG. (Please also refer to paragraph 3.4.4 regarding the use of flexible hoses.)</p> <p>3.1.2.Limited information on what the modification of the jetty caissons would entail is available. It is further noted that Activity 19A of Listing Notice 1 of the EIA Regulations, 2014 (as amended) is not being applied for. The environmental assessment practitioner (“EAP”) is advised to consider the applicability of said listed activity if the jetty modification will result in an increase in the development footprint of the Port of Saldanha. If applicable, said activity must be applied for via the submission of a Revised Application Form to the competent authority and the impacts associated with the listed activities must be addressed in the Revised EIA Report and EMPr.</p> <p>3.1.3.CapeNature’s comments on the DSR requested more information on what the modification of the jetty will entail, the footprint size, and whether the marine and benthic environments will be altered. The EAP’s response to CapeNature’s comments in the Comments and Responses Report (“C&RR”) attached as Appendix D3 to the Draft EIA Report stated that <i>“The design specification of the modification required at the jetty will be provided to us in the engineering report. This will be included in the Draft EIR. Once this has been received the cumulative impacts on the marine environment will be included in the report.”</i> The Department sustains that the Draft EIA Report failed to provide a response to CapeNature’s comments as no information on the jetty modification, footprint size and impacts to the marine environment were provided. Furthermore, the engineering report alluded to, was not attached to the Draft EIA Report.</p> <p>3.1.4.The following information is required for decision-making:</p>	<p>during the site investigation on the 22 January 2019.</p> <p>3.1.2.Activity 19A is not applicable as none of the modifications will increase the existing footprint of the existing Jetty. The modification will consist of a structures built on top of the existing caisson - none of which will occur within the marine environment.</p> <p>3.1.3.No construction will occur in the actual marine environment. Additional information will be provided in the DEIR to address this issue.</p> <p>3.1.4.See below:</p>
--	---

APPENDIX D4 - COMMENTS AND RESPONSES REPORT

COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING DRAFT EIR PHASE

<p>3.1.4.1. The method for caisson installation, i.e. whether it will be built and installed on-site; or built off-site and then moved/floated to the installation site;</p> <p>3.1.4.2. Whether construction will need to be completed underwater and if so, provide a detailed description of underwater construction activities (i.e. whether dredging, excavation, infilling, pumping out water, soil compaction, etc. is required);</p> <p>3.1.4.3. Whether a cofferdam would be required;</p> <p>3.1.4.4. The footprints of the existing jetty and the modified jetty;</p> <p>3.1.4.5. If dredging is required, what mitigation measures are proposed for the impacts associated with the resuspension of contaminated sediments during construction dredging;</p> <p>3.1.4.6. If caisson installation will be on-site, what the impacts on the marine environment and avifaunal species will be and how these impacts will be avoided or minimised. A Marine Impact Assessment may be required depending on the method for caisson installation;</p> <p>3.1.4.7. What noise impacts are anticipated during the modification of the existing jetty? If underwater construction activities are required, the use of machinery (e.g. vibratory hammer, rock drill, etc.) to remove concrete structures may result in increased levels of vibration and noise that may affect fish, birds and other animals. The EMPr fails to provide noise pollution mitigatory measures prevent or minimise the impact of noise pollution during the modification of the existing jetty; and</p> <p>3.1.4.8. How will waste from the jetty modification be managed and disposed of?</p> <p>3.2. <u>LPG handling facility</u></p> <p>3.2.1. The proposed development includes the development of a LPG handling facility with total capacity of 8000 metric tons ("MT"). Please note the discrepancies in the Draft EIA Report, EMPr and the Botanical Assessment compiled by Nick Helme Botanical Surveys dated 24 October 2018 regarding the development footprint of the proposed</p>	<p>3.1.4.1. The modification of the existing caisson will require the installation of additional infrastructure on the existing jetty. This will comprise of items (fabricated off-site) to be mounted on the existing caissons to allow for the berthing of vessels alongside the existing caissons.</p> <p>3.1.4.2. No construction will occur in the marine environment.</p> <p>3.1.4.3. A cofferdam will not be required.</p> <p>3.1.4.4. The footprint of the existing and modified jetty will remain the same. The only thing that will differ will be that the modified caissons will have additional infrastructure available for the mooring of vessels and the offloading of LPG.</p> <p>3.1.4.5. No dredging is required. As per point 3.1.4.2 no construction will occur in the marine environment.</p> <p>3.1.4.6. Avian impacts during the construction and operational phases of the proposal have been included in the EIR.</p> <p>3.1.4.7. Noise impacts have been assessed in the EIR and included in the EMPr (Objective C18).</p> <p>3.1.4.8. General waste generated at the jetty will be managed by TNPA as the port authority. Construction waste generated at the jetty during construction phase will be managed appropriately by the contractor.</p> <p>3.2. <u>LPG Handling Facility</u></p> <p>3.2.1. The discrepancies have been amended.</p>
---	--

APPENDIX D4 - COMMENTS AND RESPONSES REPORT

COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING DRAFT EIR PHASE

<p>LPG handling facility.</p> <p>3.2.2.The Draft EIA Report interchangeably refers to the development footprint as 2ha (pages 11, 13, 83, 84, 102, 103 and 106) and 3 ha (pages 10, 33 and 51). Pages 61 and 66 of the EMPr refer to a footprint of 2ha whilst page 14 refers to a footprint of 3ha. The Botanical Assessment was based on a development footprint of 2ha. The findings of the Botanical Assessment stated that <i>“The area selected for the proposed Handling Facility (2ha) is of Medium botanical sensitivity, with only one recorded plant SoCC. Loss of this area would be of Low-Medium negative significance, and cannot be easily mitigated. The greater Handling Facility area is largely of High botanical sensitivity, with at least four recorded plant SoCC, and development of this entire area would have a High negative botanical impact, which cannot be easily mitigated.”</i> This Directorate is concerned that the impact assessment of the Botanical Assessment may have been based on the wrong development footprint of the LPG handling facility and that the significance of botanical impacts during the construction phase may be of a higher significance should the development footprint of the handling area be 3ha. (Please also refer to paragraph 3.4.2 below regarding the LPG handling facility alternatives.)</p> <p>3.2.3.The Draft EIA Report must be amended to correct the discrepancies in the number of mounded LPG tanks that will be constructed. Pages 7, 14, 30 and 35 indicate that the LPG handling facility will consist of two x 4241t spherical mounded LPG tanks, whereas pages 6, 10, 29 and 33 refer to four tanks. Based on the site layout plans attached as Appendices B1 and B2 and based on the size of the tanks being 4241t, the number of spherical mounded LPG tanks should be 2.</p> <p>3.3. <u>Berthing location</u></p> <p>3.3.1.The Draft EIA Report (as quoted verbatim from the Pre-Feasibility Study compiled by BVI Consulting Engineers (Pty) Ltd dated 20 June 2018) state that <i>“The berthing location will be responsibility of the SFF and will be informed by the CSIR study of berthing. The project can accommodate berthing of vessels on either side of the jetty and the</i></p>	<p>3.2.2.As above.</p> <p>3.2.3.The project describes the phasing of the project. The application is for 4 spherical tanks. Phase 1 will include building 2 tanks and phase 2 will include building the last 2 tanks.</p> <p>3.3. <u>Berthing Location</u></p> <p>3.3.1.A vessel mooring study was completed by PRDW – who have provided the berthing configuration at the Jetty. Please note that this process was done in consultation with the Port Authority who has to approve any configuration prior to implementation.</p>
--	--

APPENDIX D4 - COMMENTS AND RESPONSES REPORT

COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING DRAFT EIR PHASE

<p><i>exact equipment configuration and design should be carried out at the Feasibility stage of the project” (own emphasis).</i></p> <p>3.3.2.The Pre-Feasibility Study stated that <i>“All mooring infrastructure is available on the Saldanha side of the Jetty. If mooring will be conducted on the Langebaan side of the Jetty, fixed mooring points will have to be constructed. Fenders and Gangways, similar to the Saldanha side will have to be constructed. Electrical and I&C connections will also be required.”</i></p> <p>3.3.3.Based on the Draft EIA Report and indicated in paragraph 3.1.1 above, modification of the jetty will occur on the Langebaan side of the existing jetty and it is thus assumed that mooring will be conducted on the Langebaan side of the jetty. In the absence of a Feasibility Study, it is unknown whether the infrastructure required as indicated in paragraph 3.3.2 above, is readily available and accessible for berthing/mooring of vessels.</p> <p>3.3.4.Please provide more information on the CSIR berthing study and whether the study was required for this development application.</p> <p>3.3.5.Please further clarify the statement in the Draft EIA Report regarding the operator agreement between the applicant and MOGS, which would result in an increase in the number of vessels to be discharged in the jetty area (i.e. is the statement in support of the proposed development or would the agreement with MOGS result in increased impacts not assessed in the application?).</p> <p>3.4. <u>Alternatives</u> The objectivity of the EAP is questioned as there does not appear to be an independent assessment of alternatives. The various preferred alternatives are presented based on the information provided in the Pre-Feasibility Study and not based on the actual impacts of the various alternatives on the environment.</p> <p>3.4.1.<u>LPG handling facility site alternatives</u></p> <p>3.4.1.1. The applicant identified two areas for the location of the LPG handling facility. The preferred alternative (red site) is located on the</p>	<p>3.3.2.As above.</p> <p>3.3.3.As above.</p> <p>3.3.4.As above.</p> <p>3.3.5.As above.</p> <p>3.4. <u>Alternatives</u> An independent assessment has been done on the impacts of which the EAP is knowledgeable on - the Engineering / Pre-feasibility study (specialist study) has assessed impacts specific to the design specifications as such the EAP included this assessment based on the information provided to the EAP by the specialist.</p> <p>3.4.1.<u>LPG handling facility site alternatives</u></p> <p>3.4.1.1. Two areas were identified.</p>
--	--

APPENDIX D4 - COMMENTS AND RESPONSES REPORT

COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING DRAFT EIR PHASE

<p>south-eastern side of the existing oil storage terminal whilst the other location alternative (blue site) is located on the eastern side of the existing oil storage terminal. Per the Draft EIA Report and the Pre-Feasibility Study, the advantages and disadvantages of the two LPG handling facility alternatives are summarised in Table 1 below:</p> <p>3.4.1.2. The Draft EIA report states that “the advantages of the red site far outweigh that of the blue site” and that the blue site <i>“is not a reasonable or feasible option to be considered for development and is therefore not included in the impact assessment portion of this application.”</i></p> <p>3.4.1.3. It is unclear how the advantages of a shorter pipeline and communication and easier road access for the red site are indicated as disadvantages for the blue site. (In this regard, please also refer to paragraphs 4.5 and 6.1.1 below.)</p> <p>3.4.1.4. The terms of reference (“ToR”) for the Botanical Assessment was to <i>“identify the likely botanical impacts associated with the proposed pipeline route alternatives and the proposed handling facility”</i>. Based on the information provided in the Botanical Assessment, only the preferred site (red site) for the LPG handling facility was assessed. However, Figure 4 of the Botanical Assessment (map of botanical sensitivity in the study area) states that the <i>“unshaded areas within the project area (within 50m of any infrastructure here assessed) are of Low sensitivity.”</i> The blue site falls within the unshaded areas, i.e. it is of low botanical sensitivity.</p> <p>3.4.1.5. The Botanical Report concluded that primary construction phase impacts are the permanent loss within the 2ha handling facility footprint, which is likely to have an acceptable medium negative botanical impact, <i>“but development of the adjacent 6.6ha of High sensitivity vegetation would have an unacceptable Medium – High negative botanical impact.”</i> It is interesting to note that the adjacent 6.6ha site does not refer to the blue site.</p> <p>3.4.1.6. Operational phase impacts were identified to be of botanical significance for the LPG handling facility, notably in terms of loss of ecological connectivity.</p>	<p>3.4.1.2. Additional information / motivation has been provided in the relevant section of the revised DEIR.</p> <p>3.4.1.3. This table has been erroneously represented in the BVI report, which has been amended in the Revised DEIR.</p> <p>3.4.1.4. The botanical assessment has been amended to include the blue site.</p> <p>3.4.1.5. The botanical assessment has been amended to include the assessment of the blue site.</p> <p>3.4.1.6. That is the finding of the botanical assessment which has been included in the EIR.</p>
---	---

APPENDIX D4 - COMMENTS AND RESPONSES REPORT

COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING DRAFT EIR PHASE

<p>3.4.1.7. The Draft EIA Report does not provide an explanation who will develop the blue site for future crude oil tank expansion, when the expansion is planned and who is the landowner of the blue site area. The Revised EIA Report must provide the site coordinates for the LPG handling facility of the blue site if it cannot be demonstrated that the blue site presents a fatal flaw for the development of the LPG handling facility.</p> <p>3.4.2. <u>Pipeline route alternatives</u></p> <p>3.4.2.1. Three route alternatives for the proposed development of the LPG pipeline from the jetty to the new LPG terminal were identified.</p> <p>3.4.2.2. Alternative 1 crosses a significant area of undisturbed high sensitivity vegetation and it is thus the least preferred alternative from a botanical perspective. Alternative 2 is the most preferred development alternative from a botanical perspective, followed by the applicant's preferred pipeline route alternative.</p> <p>3.4.2.3. Whilst it is acknowledged that both Alternative 2 and the applicant's preferred pipeline route alternative would have acceptable levels of botanical impact (low negative) after implementation of mitigation measures, this Directorate is supportive of Alternative 2 as the preferred pipeline route alternative as the applicant's preferred pipeline will traverse an existing disturbed servitude through 600m of high and 120m of medium – high sensitivity area.</p> <p>3.4.3. <u>LPG offloading alternatives</u></p> <p>3.4.3.1. Two design alternatives for the loading and offloading of LPG from jetty were considered, namely loading arms and flexible hoses. Based on the information provided in the Draft EIA Report and as recommended in the Pre-Feasibility Study, loading arms have distinct advantages over flexible hoses. This Directorate questions why the EAP recommended that flexible hoses be chosen when the Pre-Feasibility Study shows otherwise. The Draft EIA Report states that</p>	<p>3.4.1.7. The property is that of SFF and would be for future development should it be required. At this stage though the facility has sufficient capacity for the storage of bulk crude oil. The development of that area was intended for development but thus far it has not been required due to the current capacity available at the current facility.</p> <p>3.4.2. <u>Pipeline Route Alternatives</u></p> <p>3.4.2.1. Yes.</p> <p>3.4.2.2. The preferred pipeline route would be considered to be in a better ecological state as it is the current servitude which would have been subjected to rehabilitation following the construction and development of the existing crude oil pipeline. The alternatives other than that of the preferred alternative would be considered to be more degraded as those areas have not been rehabilitated but have been left in their natural state to be degraded by activities occurring in the area.</p> <p>3.4.2.3. The present ecological state of the applicants preferred alternative is within an existing servitude of a medium to high sensitive area. It must be noted that the servitude has been disturbed previously and rehabilitated back to a state better than the surrounding areas (other pipeline alternative routes). It is with that said that the Applicant's preferred route should still be considered as the preferred alternative as the area has shown resilience to disturbance if followed up with rehabilitation.</p> <p>3.4.3. <u>LPG Offloading alternatives</u></p> <p>3.4.3.1. This section has been amended. Studies indicating the use of flexible hoses / fixed arms would be insignificant and can be disregarded. The use of flexible hoses would provide the user with the ability to offload a range of vessels and not be limited to a particular size</p>
--	--

APPENDIX D4 - COMMENTS AND RESPONSES REPORT

COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING DRAFT EIR PHASE

<p><i>“Although there are more advantages in using loading arms - the cost benefit of using flexible hoses far outweighs that of using loading arms and is therefore the only feasible and reasonably practicable alternative for the development”</i>. However, loading arms have superior performance, better durability and reliability, low maintenance, a longer life, less risk of spillages and trips and better safety. These advantages far outweigh the use of flexible hoses in the long-term and is recommended as the preferred alternative in the Pre-Feasibility Study.</p> <p>3.4.3.2. The EAP’s response to question 14, Section 2 of the Draft EIA Report (<i>“Is the development the best practicable environmental option for this land/site?”</i>) is given as <i>“Sensitive areas were identified and excluded from the developable areas. Refer also to the investigation in terms of alternatives assessed in terms of the proposed development”</i>. The response is disputed as the EAP did not consider all reasonable and feasible alternatives during the impact assessment.</p> <p>3.5. <u>Geotechnical information</u></p> <p>3.5.1. The Pre-Feasibility indicates that further geotechnical investigations and a detailed topographical survey are required for the LPG handling facility to confirm the characteristics of the material on the site and to do a more detailed design of the platform.</p> <p>3.5.2. The Pre-Feasibility Study refers to a desktop geotechnical study provided in Appendix A, but said appendix was not attached to the Draft EIA Report or the Pre-Feasibility Study. The Pre-Feasibility Study further states that a geotechnical survey <i>“shall be carried out during the feasibility stage of the project, this survey will confirm the expected geotechnical soil conditions and foundation solution proposed.”</i> In the absence of a Feasibility Study, it is unclear whether these requirements have been met and if they are a pre-requisite to inform the EIA application, as the Draft EIA Report fails to mention the need for geotechnical investigations and a topographical survey.</p>	<p>which is demonstrated by the use of fixed arms.</p> <p>3.4.3.2. All reasonable and feasible alternatives have been thoroughly investigated in terms of this process.</p> <p>3.5. <u>Geotechnical Information</u></p> <p>3.5.1. The geotechnical report as referred to in the study has been included as an annexure of the BVI report.</p> <p>3.5.2. As above.</p>
---	---

APPENDIX D4 - COMMENTS AND RESPONSES REPORT

COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING DRAFT EIR PHASE

<p>3.6. <u>General comment</u></p> <p>3.6.1. The sections in the Draft EIA Report (section 1.4) and EMPr (section 3.1.) dealing with legislative aspects must be amended to include the applicability of the National Environmental Management: Integrated Coastal Management Act, 2008 (Act No. 24 of 2008).</p> <p>3.6.2. Question 13, Section 2 of the Draft EIA Report was not answered – <i>“What will the cumulative impacts (positive and negative) of the proposed land use associated with the activity applied for, be?”</i>.</p> <p>3.6.3. Page 86 of the Draft EIA Report must be amended to read that <i>“The decision as to which mitigation measures to implement lies with the applicant and ultimately with the DEA”</i> (and not the DEA&DP). Similarly, the EMPr must be amended to indicate that the DEA is the competent authority and any amendments to the EMPr must first be approved by the DEA.</p> <p>3.6.4. Although comment from the Road Network Management Branch of the Provincial Department of Transport and Public Works was obtained, comment from the District Roads Engineer (Johannes.Pienaar@westerncape.gov.za; Tel: (023) 312 1842) must also be obtained regarding the proposed gravel access road that must be upgraded and realigned to provide a safer intersection with MR559.</p> <p>3.6.5. The description of the truck loading gantry must be included in the LPG handling facility components.</p> <p>3.6.6. Detailed information regarding storm water management must be provided in the Revised EIA Report and EMPr. The EMPr states that <i>“contaminated storm water collected from the entire site should be diverted to a settling pond, or series of ponds, such that the water can be reused in the concrete batching process.”</i> No further information regarding the storm water/ pond system is available and the storm water system is not depicted in the layout plans attached as Appendices B1 and B2.</p> <p>3.6.7. The site layout plan attached as Appendix B1 indicates connection to the existing fire water and water pipelines whereas the site layout plan attached as Appendix B2 indicate that new fire water and water pipelines are required. Please clarify the discrepancies.</p>	<p>3.6. <u>General Comment</u></p> <p>3.6.1. The assessment of the legislation has been added to section 1.4 of the Revised DEIR.</p> <p>3.6.2. A cumulative assessment was included in the revised DEIR which has informed question 13.</p> <p>3.6.3. The report has been amended.</p> <p>3.6.4. The report has been sent to Mr. Pienaar for his comment and input.</p> <p>3.6.5. A description of the loading gantry as well as a conceptual design has been included in the activity description.</p> <p>3.6.6. Stormwater management has been included in the Revised DEIR and the EMPr.</p> <p>3.6.7. New pipeline will connect to existing infrastructure.</p>
--	--

APPENDIX D4 - COMMENTS AND RESPONSES REPORT

COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING DRAFT EIR PHASE

<p>3.6.8.The descriptions for the abbreviations/acronyms for MOGS, OTMS and VLCC must be provided in the Revised EIA Report.</p> <p>3.6.9.The Draft EIA Report states that “<i>A Rehabilitation Plan will fall within the scope of the botanical assessment conducted for the proposed development</i>”; however, a Rehabilitation Plan was not included in the Botanical Assessment. The exclusion can be attributed to the ToR for the Botanical Assessment, which requested “<i>rehabilitation recommendations for the operational phase of the pipeline project</i>” as opposed to a Rehabilitation Plan.</p> <p><u>Directorate: Development Management</u></p> <p>4. Directorate: Development Management (Region 1) – Ms Melanese Schippers (Melanese.Schippers@westerncape.gov.za; Tel: (021) 483 8349):</p> <p>4.1. Applicable listed activities</p> <p>4.1.1.It is noted that Activity 56 of Listing Notice 1 of the EIA Regulations, 2014 (as amended) pertaining to the widening of roads by more than 6m has been applied for. The Draft EIA Report indicates that the road will be widened to 7.4m; however, the width of the existing road was not specified.</p> <p>4.1.2.Page 33 of the Draft EIA Report indicates that a new access road of 7.4m will be developed; however, Activity 4 of Listing Notice 3 of the EIA Regulations, 2014 (as amended) was not applied for.</p> <p>4.1.3.It is further noted that sewer and water pipelines will be installed. The diameter and length of these pipelines were however not specified in the Draft EIA Report.</p> <p>4.1.4.The applicability of the abovementioned listed activities, as well as the applicability of Activities 9 and 10 of Listing Notice 1 of the EIA Regulations, 2014 (as amended) must be confirmed. Should Activities 9 and 10 of Listing Notice 1 and Activity 4 of Listing Notice 3 of the EIA Regulations, 2014 (as amended) be applicable to the proposed development, an amended Application Form must be submitted to the competent authority and the and the impacts associated with the listed activities must be addressed in the Revised EIA Report and EMPr.</p>	<p>3.6.8.The abbreviations/acronyms have been included in the Revised DEIR.</p> <p>3.6.9.The botanical specialist has included in his recommendations the rehabilitation requirements necessary to mitigate the impacts associated with the development. This has been included in the Rehabilitation section of the EMPr.</p> <p>4. <u>Responses:</u></p> <p>4.1. Applicable listed activities:</p> <p>4.1.1. The existing road is a gravel road of approximately 4 – 5m in width.</p> <p>4.1.2.The activity has been added to the application.</p> <p>4.1.3.Listed activities 9 and 10 of Listing Notice 1 is not applicable as the length of the pipelines will not exceed 1000m nor will the pipelines exceed the internal diameter and throughput thresholds.</p> <p>4.1.4.As above. Activity 4 of Listing Notice 3 has been included and has been assessed as part of the revised DEIR. The amended application to be submitted to the competent authority.</p>
---	---

APPENDIX D4 - COMMENTS AND RESPONSES REPORT

COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING DRAFT EIR PHASE

<p>4.2. Impact assessment</p> <p>4.2.1.This Directorate’s comment of 4 June 2018 on the DSR requested that potential fire/explosion hazards resulting from the operational phase of the proposed development be assessed. The response in the C&RR is provided as <i>“Noted these potential impacts have been included for assessment.”</i> However, an assessment of the above was not included in the Draft EIA Report.</p> <p>4.2.2.The Revised EIA Report must include an assessment of the potential fire/explosion hazards resulting from the operational phase of the proposed development.</p> <p>4.3. Specialist studies</p> <p>4.3.1.It is noted that the competent authority requested that an Agricultural Specialist Study must be conducted; however, no Agricultural Specialist Study was included in the Draft EIA Report.</p> <p>4.3.2.The C&RR report states that <i>“The loss of potential agricultural land or agricultural potential by the proposed development has been assessed as part of the EIR.”</i></p> <p>4.3.3.It is noted that the Provincial Department of Agriculture (“DoA”) indicated that they have no comment on the DSR. It is advised that the DoA be approached to confirm the relevance of an Agricultural Specialist Study as requested by competent authority, and that the issue regarding the need for an Agricultural Specialist Study be clarified with the competent authority prior to the Revised EIA Report being made available for public comment.</p> <p>4.4. Pipeline route</p> <p>4.4.1.Page 60 of the Draft EIA Report states that <i>“The exact route has not yet been finalised”</i>; however, the preferred pipeline route is indicated in the next page (page 61) of the Draft EIA Report. (In this regard, also refer to paragraph 3.4.2 above.)</p> <p>4.4.2.The discrepancies must be corrected in the Revised and Final EIA Reports.</p> <p>4.5. LPG handling facility site alternatives</p> <p>4.5.1.The table on page 56 of the Draft EIA Report (and depicted in Table 1 under paragraph 3.4.1 above), indicates that disadvantages for the</p>	<p>4.2. Impact Statement</p> <p>4.2.1.The impacts have been assessed in the Revised DEIR and included in the EMPr.</p> <p>4.2.2.As above.</p> <p>4.3. Specialist Studies</p> <p>4.3.1.Through consultation with the competent authority during an onsite inspection the need for an agricultural specialist study was clarified and no longer required to be conducted.</p> <p>4.3.2.Please refer to the section on the assessment of the loss of agricultural potential as a result of the development.</p> <p>4.3.3.As above – the matter has been clarified.</p> <p>4.4. Pipeline Route</p> <p>4.4.1.The report has been amended to remove the discrepancy.</p> <p>4.4.2.The discrepancies have been amended.</p> <p>4.5. LPG Handling facility site alternatives</p> <p>4.5.1.Please refer to the sections above on this matter. The discrepancies have been amended throughout the report.</p>
--	---

APPENDIX D4 - COMMENTS AND RESPONSES REPORT

COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING DRAFT EIR PHASE

<p>blue site alternative are that it will result in a shorter pipeline route and easier road tanker access.</p> <p>4.5.2. These disadvantages must surely be regarded as advantages for the blue site alternative and require further investigation of the blue site as a feasible site alternative for the LPG handling facility.</p> <p><u>Directorate: Waste Management</u></p> <p>5. Directorate: Waste Management – Mr Vishwanath Gianpersad (Vishwanath.Gianpersad@westerncape.gov.za; Tel: (021) 483 8325):</p> <p>5.1. The following comment on the EMP are provided:</p> <p>5.1.1. The EMP adequately covers the roles and responsibilities of those involved in the project; however, the roles of the competent authority must also be defined.</p> <p>5.1.2. This Directorate is satisfied that waste management aspects during the construction and operational phases of the proposed development have been adequately addressed in the EMP.</p> <p>5.1.3. Please note that if the Municipality will be collecting waste from the site, written confirmation of the Municipality's capacity to access, collect and safely dispose of solid waste must be provided and included in the Revised and Final EIA Report.</p> <p>5.1.4. Reporting of incidents in terms of section 30 of the National Environment Management Act, 1998 (Act No. 107 of 1998) must include notification to Ms Nazeema Duarte at Saldanha Bay Municipality (Tel: (022) 7017116; E-mail: Nazeema.Duarte@sbm.gov.za) and Mr Simon Botha of the Department (Tel: (021) 483 0752/2571; E-mail: Simon.Botha@westerncape.gov.za).</p> <p>6. Directorate: Pollution and Chemicals Management</p> <p>Directorate: Pollution and Chemicals Management – Mr Hassan Parker (Hassan.Parker@westerncape.gov.za; Tel: (021) 483 6877):</p> <p>6.1 The Draft EIA Report fails to provide substantial motivations for the preferred alternatives, furthermore containing perceived contradictions such as:</p> <p>6.1.1 Page 56 of the Draft EIA Report: Some of the same expected advantages for the red site are listed as disadvantages for the blue</p>	<p>4.5.2. As above.</p> <p>5. Responses – Waste Management</p> <p>5.1. EMP</p> <p>5.1.1. Noted.</p> <p>5.1.2. Noted.</p> <p>5.1.3. Noted.</p> <p>5.1.4. Reporting requirements have been included in the EMP.</p> <p>6. Responses – PCM</p> <p>6.1. Additional motivations have been provided in the Revised DEIR. The reports have also been amended to resolve all discrepancies and issues as per the comments.</p>
--	--

APPENDIX D4 - COMMENTS AND RESPONSES REPORT

COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING DRAFT EIR PHASE

<p>site. (Please also refer to paragraph 3.4.1.3 above.)</p> <p>6.1.2 Section 6 (impact assessment) of the Draft EIA Report: It is unclear why the applicant's preferred pipeline route alternative, in various instances, has the same or lesser negative botanical impacts as Alternative 2; whereas it is expected that construction and operational impacts for both alternatives should be the same. Furthermore, Figure 4 of the Draft EIA Report (also in Figure 4 of the Botanical Assessment) indicates that the applicant's preferred pipeline route (along the existing servitude) is expected to cross Langebaan Dune Strandveld (medium – high sensitivity) whereas Alternative 2 passes through only low and medium sensitivity habitats.</p> <p>6.2 From a botanical impact perspective, this Directorate supports the proposed pipeline Alternative 2 over the applicant's preferred pipeline route alternative.</p> <p>6.3 Understanding the EIA Report is onerous, and it is advised that a list of abbreviations/acronyms and symbols is provided at the beginning of the report, prior to the Executive Summary, whilst furthermore maintaining a consistent metric unit system throughout the EIA Report.</p> <p>6.4 The following comments on the DSR have not been addressed in the Draft EIA Report, which must be addressed in the Revised EIA Report:</p> <p>6.4.1 How potential harmful environmental impacts of increased ballast water discharge into the harbour will be monitored and managed to prevent pollution and the possible introduction of alien species to the West Coast;</p> <p>6.4.2 Updating of safety plans in terms of the Vessels Under Pressure Regulations promulgated in terms of the Occupational Health and Safety Act, 1993 (Act No. 85 of 1993);</p> <p>6.4.3 Safety buffer zone requirements for the horizontal mounded bullet tank area; and</p> <p>6.4.4 What is the constant internal pressure of the storage tanks and what</p>	<p>6.2. Please refer to 3.4 above.</p> <p>6.3. Abbreviations and a glossary is provided at the beginning of the report.</p> <p>6.4. Responses:</p> <p>6.4.1.Vessels entering into the harbour must comply with the strict rules as indicated by the National Ports Authority which has implemented strict protocols for ships and ballast water. This is monitored and regulated by the National Ports Authority and not by the applicant.</p> <p>6.4.2.Please refer to the MHI in Appendix G7.</p> <p>6.4.3.Please refer to the MHI in Appendix G7.</p> <p>6.4.4.Please refer to the MHI in Appendix G7.</p>
---	---

APPENDIX D4 - COMMENTS AND RESPONSES REPORT

COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING DRAFT EIR PHASE

<p>mechanical requirements will be necessary to maintain this pressure?</p> <p><u>Directorate: Air Quality Management</u></p> <p>7. Directorate: Air Quality Management – Peter Harmse (Peter.Harmse@westerncape.gov.za; Tel: (021) 483 4383):</p> <p>7.1 Noise and dust management</p> <p>7.1.1 It is anticipated that dust and exhaust emissions will be generated during the construction phase of the various components of the proposed development.</p> <p>7.1.2 Dust generated must comply with the National Dust Control Regulations (Government Notice 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 conducting any activity in such a way as to give rise to dust in such quantities and concentrations that the dust, or dust fall, may have a detrimental effect on the environment, including health.</p> <p>7.1.3 Noise generated during the construction and operational phases must comply with the Western Cape Noise Control Regulations (Provincial Notice 200/2013) of 20 June 2013.</p> <p>7.1.4 Contractors must implement noise control/reduction measures. The EMPr must be updated to address this potential impact during the construction and operational phases of the various components of the proposed development.</p> <p>7.2 Odour impact management</p> <p>7.2.1 In terms of section 35(2) of NEM:AQA, the occupier of the premises must take all reasonable steps to prevent the emission of any offensive odour caused by any activity on the premises. The EMPr must be updated to include this requirement.</p> <p>7.3 Atmospheric emission licensing</p> <p>7.3.1 Should the proposed development trigger any listed activity in terms of section 21 of the NEM:AQA, an application for an atmospheric emissions licence must be submitted to the relevant licensing authority.</p>	<p>7. Responses – AQM</p> <p>7.1. Noise and dust management</p> <p>7.1.1. Correct.</p> <p>7.1.2. Noted this has been included in the EMPr.</p> <p>7.1.3. Noted this has been included in the EMPr.</p> <p>7.1.4. Noted this has been included in the EMPr.</p> <p>7.2. Odour impact management</p> <p>7.2.1. Noted- none anticipated.</p> <p>7.3. Atmospheric emission licensing</p> <p>7.3.1. Noted – none anticipated.</p>
--	--

APPENDIX D4 - COMMENTS AND RESPONSES REPORT

COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING DRAFT EIR PHASE

- | | |
|---|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none">8. Please direct all enquiries to the officials indicated in this correspondence should you require any clarity on any of the comments provided.9. The Department reserves the right to revise initial comments and request further information based on any information received. | |
|---|--|