

# **APPENDIX I**

## **Consolidation of stakeholders' feedback and project team responses**

No	Comments/issues/questions (presented <i>verbatim</i> )	Originator	Project team response
<b>EIA process issues</b>			
E01	Nowhere in you scoping report or other documents the detection, handling and controlling of Radio Active waste as well as the control of E waste.	Gert van der Walt	In terms of the proposed license that is being applied for, radioactive waste will not be allowed onto the site. This waste falls into what is known as Category "A" waste and is "verboden" on any landfill site. Note that all waste is checked at entry to the site and if not compliant with site license, will be turned away. eWaste, in terms of the new regulations, will be phased out from landfill in the next three to eight years, then it will be banned from landfill. However, there is already a programme which is developing and spreading around the country which involves the collection of eWaste and the recycling thereof. The proposal is that a separate collection point will be provided at the proposed Vlakfontein Waste Treatment Facility for eWaste. This will then be given to eWaste recyclers to take away.
	With reference to the Waste Giant EIA in Vereeniging, please can you let me know where I can get a copy of the BID?	Terri Clapperton	The scoping report is available from the Vanderbijlpark Library, Softchem's website (under news items), and Eugene from Mount Ridge Nature Conservancy also has his own personal copy.
	groundWork have been a National Key Stakeholder regarding waste and medical waste in SA since 1998. I have just been notified of this proposed waste treatment facility from a concerned community person in Vereeniging and find it very worrying indeed that we were not notified as a key stakeholder earlier. Please register groundWork as an I&AP for this EIA process.	Rico Euripidou	IAP name has been added to the IAP register.
	Additionally please email me all of the documentation that is available for this proposal as well as an exact description where in the EIA process this proposal is.	Rico Euripidou	All documentation for the project thus far available from the Softchem website under news items, including the scoping report and its appendices. We are in the latter part of the scoping phase.
	We would rather go to see a H:H landfill site such as Holfontein which also deals with Hazardous waste which is more in line with what is proposed for Vlakfontein. Marion hill is not taking the same waste as you propose for Vlakfontein. We feel that public participation has not been inclusive enough as many people in our area are unaware of this proposed landfill site. More time is needed to get people aware.	Charmaine Venter	The Vlakfontein site will differ from Holfontein in that the site will be developed to new standards. The purpose of the visit to Mariannahill is to demonstrate the principles of operating a landfill facility as a nature conservancy, as it is intended to do the same at Vlakfontein. This will ensure that the site has a minimal impact on the surrounding environment. All being done within the legislated timeframe.
E06	Traffic – no mention is made with regards to the number of trucks which will transport waste to the waste treatment facility. Increased traffic brings many negative impacts to the community eg increased noise, dust, air pollution, congestion, spillages from trucks, damage to roads, illegal dumping on the roadway, the dangers of accidents and harm to our families. We request that a traffic study be conducted to assess what the increase in traffic will be and what the risks will be to our health and safety, and the environment	Charmaine Venter	Road transport is governed by applicable legislation. The traffic impact assessment will ascertain some impacts on the environment and the ability of the infrastructure to handle an anticipated load. We do not anticipate a significant increase from what is currently taking place.
E07	MRC feedback Pages 1 - 9: The total number of names of landowners in document is 249 and the total number of names that signed the MRC register of objection is 121.	Mount Ridge Conservancy	All the names listed on pages 1-9 do not appeared to have signed the register of objectors.
E08	MRC feedback Page 10 Par 1: "registered as a green area".	Mount Ridge Conservancy	Does such a legal entity exist? Our understanding is that the proposed site is located within the Mount Ridge Conservancy area (which is registered with the Gauteng Conservancy an Stewardship Association – No. GCA061 Rural/Urban) in the northeast corner of the conservancy.
E09	MRC feedback Page 10 Par 2: Portion 1589 has been declared a protected area"	Mount Ridge Conservancy	Is this Portion 1589 or a farm no? How far away is this from the proposed waste treatment site?

No	Comments/issues/questions (presented <i>verbatim</i> )	Originator	Project team response
<b>EIA process issues (continued)</b>			
E10	MRC feedback Page 13 Section 2: "the application .... And the scoping report are both fatally flawed .."	Mount Ridge Conservancy	The purpose of a scoping report, which forms part of an EIA process, is to identify issues of concern to IAPs and then, having done the necessary investigations or studies, decide if any of these constitute a fatal flaw.*
E11	MRC feedback Page 13 last par: "... Portion 187... does not form part of the application ..."	Mount Ridge Conservancy	This is correct, this portion does not form part of the application and will be removed from the project site description in the final application.
E12	MRC feedback Page 14 Par 1: "Marius Koekemoer ...."	Mount Ridge Conservancy	Mr Koekemoer is not the owner of the properties and as such has no involvement in the proposed development.
E13	MRC feedback Page 14 Par 2: "Notice given to the community was defective and insufficient. ..."	Mount Ridge Conservancy	Notice was given in accordance with the relevant EIA regulations.
E14	MRC feedback Page 14 Par 5: "based on the enormous impact this venture would have on the community....."	Mount Ridge Conservancy	This impact is assumed by the objectors. Various studies and investigations have been and are currently being carried out to determine the impact, and the purpose of the scoping report is to identify potential issues or impacts. The application cannot therefore be considered to be fatally flawed until such investigations have been concluded.
E15	MRC feedback Page 14 Par 6: "Applicant will be afforded a second attempt....."	Mount Ridge Conservancy	The process for publishing a scoping report is carried out in accordance with the EIA regulations.
E16	MRC feedback Page 15 Par 3: "it is therefore further prove that the Scoping Report is a final document....."	Mount Ridge Conservancy	This statement ignores the due process to be followed in accordance with the EIA regulations. See No E14 regarding the purpose of a scoping report.
E17	MRC feedback Page 15 Par 4: " In terms of Section 16 of the National Environmental Waste Management: Waste Act 2008 ....."	Mount Ridge Conservancy	The act is called the National Environmental Management: Waste Act (No 59 of 2008). The issues raised will all be addressed in the final EIA report and the site operational plan, which will form part of the final license application. IAPs will have a further opportunity to comment on the EIA in accordance with the regulations. Section 16 relates to the "General duty in respect of waste management". The license application and related technical reports cover the relevant aspects to this section.
E18	MRC feedback Page 15 Par 5: "... the Minister or relevant MEC has not been specifically notified... as required in Section 17 of the abovementioned Act..."	Mount Ridge Conservancy	This statement is incorrect as Section 17 has no relevance to the application process.
E19	MRC feedback Page 16 Par 2: "...the scoping report and suitability of the area is inherently fatally flawed."	Mount Ridge Conservancy	The scoping and public participation processes are specifically designed to elicit concerns and issues of the IAPs, which may not have been addressed and which require further investigation.
E20	MRC feedback Page 17 Par 5: "The first section of the proposed access road has not been promulgated....."	Mount Ridge Conservancy	The issues relating to the access road, including relevant servitudes, are currently being investigated. The statement that "no road is in existence" is erroneous in that firstly, it physically exists and secondly, it is evident on a number of maps.
E21	MRC feedback Page 22 Par 2: "Koppisol is a holiday/caravan/camping facility...."	Mount Ridge Conservancy	The resort would appear to be about 2 km away from the proposed development.
E22	MRC feedback Page 22 Par 3: "In terms of the mining license granted to Vlakfontein Brickyard, it is incumbent on the owners to rehabilitate the area..... and this is an admitted attempt to circumvent the applicable law and make financial gains..."	Mount Ridge Conservancy	The question relating to the rehabilitation of the site must be addressed with the original owners or the liquidator. If the owners are in liquidation, it is unlikely that they have the funds to rehabilitate the site. The site was initially identified as being suitable for the proposed development as it already has substantial excavations which will provide the necessary landfill airspace and the fact that it is a "brownfield" site, which means that it is a disturbed site. The proposed development will assist in the rehabilitation of the site. This is not intended in any way to circumvent any applicable laws.
E23	MRC feedback Page 22 Par 5: "...As such Giant Waste will not be allowed to utilise the gravel available to generate funds nor to fill the weighbridge area....."	Mount Ridge Conservancy	Waste Giant will not require a mining license to operate the site since the site will be operated under a waste license in terms of NEMWA 2008. Any earthworks operations on the site will be for the civil engineering construction of the development and will not generate gravels for sale.

No	Comments/issues/questions (presented <i>verbatim</i> )	Originator	Project team response
<b>Air issues</b>			
A01	My children have asthma and what effects will the incineration of waste have on our air quality.	Charmaine Venter	Any emissions from the site including incineration will have to comply with the latest air quality standards, otherwise the facility will not be approved by the authorities.
A02	Buffer zone – I could not see what this buffer zone is going to be? We live 2km away from the proposed site – do we fall in this zone	Charmaine Venter	No.
A03	Impact on our roses and boreholes – our livelihood comes from our rose farm. What impact could an off-site emission from your landfill site have on our roses?	Charmaine Venter	See No A01.
A04	It also has a very strong odour. You mention leachate lagoons and dams – this sounds like a very large source of odours and air pollution. Are these lagoons going to be sealed	Charmaine Venter	Comment noted. All required areas will be lined (see also No W03), and waste areas covered every day, as per requirements.
A05	Die grondpad wat van die R82 afdraai na die stortingsterrein loop deur my eiendom. Ons is 3 gesinne wat in 3 afsonderlike huise teen die pad woon. Die huise is reeds vroeg in die vorige eeu, voor 1910, gebou. 'n Toename in verkeer, veral groot vragmotors, gaan baie stof en geraas veroorsaak en is 'n gesondheidsrisiko vir my en my familie. Watse maatreels gaan geneem word om stof te verminder? Sal die pad geteer word, wanneer en hoe lank nadat werksaamhede 'n aanvang geneem het? Indien die pad nie geteer gaan word nie, wie gaan verantwoordelik wees vir die skraap en nathou van die pad? Op waste basis gaan die pad nat gegooi word, 1 keer per dag of meer kere per dag? Gaan daar 'n spoed beperking wees op vragmotors wat die pad gaan gebruik? My familie woon aan beide kante van die pad en daar word dikwels deur die dag gestap van een huis na 'n ander, hier is ook kinders by betrokke en my familie se veiligheid is vir my van kardinale belang.	Jacobus Jonker	Dust suppression measures will be carried out by the proponent on a regular basis to minimise the impact of dust on the surrounding community. It is the intention to pave the road with asphalt within two years in order to reduce operating and maintenance costs. A speed limit will be implemented and adhered to by vehicles travelling to and from the site.
A06	MRC feedback Page 14 Par 4: “ Buffer zones applicable to the area in terms of current Municipal Regulations .....	Mount Ridge Conservancy	Please advise where these “regulations” may be obtained. Buffer zones for waste disposal facilities are determined in accordance with the Minimum Requirements for Waste Disposal to Landfill (DWAF, 1998). They are normally determined based on the requisite air quality modelling to be carried out for the site.
A07	MRC feedback Page 18 Par 1: “...the increase in dust, noise and wind pollution on the health of the inhabitants causes huge concern..”	Mount Ridge Conservancy	It appears that this is a given, however, the operations of the proposed development is intended to minimise or reduce these impacts. The concern is noted and will be mitigated with the appropriate measures in terms of dust suppression, paving of roads, limited working hours etc, where relevant.
A08	MRC feedback Page 18 Par 2: “...would not be able to cope with increased medical bills..”	Mount Ridge Conservancy	We are not sure what this refers to and what evidence there is to support this.
A09	MRC feedback Page 18 Par 3: “ ...indicated that they will tar the road.....not part of the Scoping Report ....”	Mount Ridge Conservancy	Once again, the purpose of the scoping report has been misunderstood. The report is intended to document the issues and concerns that have been raised by the IAPs, which require mitigation or further investigation during the EIA process.
A10	MRC feedback Page 18 Par 4: “Noise pollution and dust pollution as well as the unfavourable odours and insects have not at all been addressed in the report.....”	Mount Ridge Conservancy	See No A09. These issues will be addressed in the EIA report and site operational plan.
A11	MRC feedback Page 22 Par 3: “The possible effect of wind pollution was not reported on.....”	Mount Ridge Conservancy	An air quality report is in the process of being finalised that will address the potential for wind pollution. Plastic bags and rubble will not be “blown about by the wind” as suggested. Wind scatter and the management thereof will be addressed in the operations plan. Rubble cannot be blown about as this is normally deemed to consist of bricks, rocks and soils etc. All waste materials will be deposited in the landfill site in accordance with the license conditions and the operations plan.

No	Comments/issues/questions (presented <i>verbatim</i> )	Originator	Project team response
<b>Economic issues</b>			
E11	Economic impacts – you say that this facility will result in positive impacts like employment. What about the devaluing of our property?	Charmaine Venter	The property in the area should benefit from the infrastructure the said development will bring.
E12	MRC feedback Page 14 Par 5: “..no cost report has been submitted..”	Mount Ridge Conservancy	There is no legal requirement to submit a “cost report” or financial feasibility report other than the capital costs etc required as part of the waste license application.
E13	MRC feedback Page 15 Par 8: “Economic Criteria - ...lack of financial statements and proposed costs....”	Mount Ridge Conservancy	See comment for No E12.
<b>Fauna issues</b>			
F01	MRC feedback Page 10 Par 1: “.number of bullfrogs has dwindled since foundry sand was deposited on the Vlakfontein Brickyard site”	Mount Ridge Conservancy	Is there evidence to show that the reduced numbers of bullfrogs can be attributed to the foundry sand? We are not aware of the foundry sand – in any event the site will be cleaned up of any wastes or contaminants as part of developing the site.
<b>Process (technical) issues</b>			
P01	Will it be possible to forward me a copy of the lining detail as well.	Gert van der Walt	Lining detail forwarded on 20 October 2010.
P02	According to you reply all waste will be “checked” at entry to the premises. Based on the volumes does this mean that Portal monitors will be installed at the entry to the premises.	Gert van der Walt	Firstly, I assume that when you refer to “Portal” monitors, you are referring to checking for radioactive waste. As a rule, monitors are not installed at hazardous waste facilities as all hazardous wastes can only be transported with a waste manifest. What this means is that before any wastes are collected or transported, the waste generator has to provide an analysis of the waste and a waste manifest form has to be completed. This also indicates which licensed facility the waste will be transported to. This immediately precludes any radioactive waste from being collected. When the waste arrives at the treatment/disposal facility, the laboratory checks to see if the waste being delivered complies with the waste manifest. At this stage it is not the intention of installing such a monitor.
P03	A recycling facility in Mariannhill was shut down after medical waste was discovered there. How are we sure this is not going to happen in our area that medical waste will end up with normal domestic waste	Eugene Ferreira	The article specifically state the problem with the medical waste was that it was unsafe for the recyclers to handle the waste. At the facility we propose the accidental mixing of medical waste from waste generators will not cause such a problem. The liner system will prevent any pollution from such waste streams in any event. The solution is to have a system with minimal secondary handling of waste.
P04	I have also had a quick look at this DSR. The proponents want to build a hazardous waste LFS, a medical waste treatment facility (hydroclave) and a hazardous waste treatment facility (this is not specified) – exactly what technology will be used to “treat” hazardous and pathological medical waste?	Rico Euripidou	More detail will be provided in the EIA report once more design work has been completed.
P05	We want to know what effect this landfill site will have on our roses which we farm with just 2 km away from Vlakfontein.	Charmaine Venter	It is likely that the farm will fall outside the intended buffer zone and therefore the effect will be minimal, if any.
P06	Are only Waste Giant trucks going to transport the waste to the site, or are you going to allow members from the community/ other waste contractors/ transport companies to bring waste to the site? How are you going to make sure that the trucks are well maintained and that they don’t allow waste to spill while being transported?	Charmaine Venter	Other contractor trucks will also be allowed, however, see also Nos P21 and P26.

No	Comments/issues/questions (presented <i>verbatim</i> )	Originator	Project team response
<b>Process (technical) issues (continued)</b>			
P07	Health Care Risk waste treatment – your scoping report does not go into any detail on the volumes of health care risk waste, how your treatment process will actually treat the waste, what the environmental impacts will be, what will happen to the treated waste ie will it just be landfilled? More information is requested on this technology and the impacts it will have on our health. Your App G defines hydroclaving and incineration – why is this? Are you planning on using an incinerator as well? We require more information on this.	Charmaine Venter	The associated health risk with the incineration of medical waste is well documented and mitigating of dioxin is a prerequisite. The use of a combination of hydroclaving and incineration is the best possible solution.
P08	Extreme and high risk waste – you mention that this really hazardous waste will be accepted for landfilling, but that if treatment is required, you will ensure that this takes place. There is mention made in your App G that there is the risk that hazardous wastes can react and release toxic emissions. How much extreme and high hazardous waste is the site going to accept, and what will the waste be? Also, how are you planning to treat the waste that does not meet the requirements for a landfill site? I think waste treatment is very important, because it makes sure less toxic waste gets dumped into the ground, but will the treatment plant result in any health or environmental risks? We request that you provide us with a risk assessment ie a Major Hazard Risk Assessment which will provide us with an understanding of what impact all this toxic/ flammable/ reactive etc waste could have on us as a community is there was a reaction or a fire or explosion on your site. What will your emergency plans be? Also, what if one of your trucks spills toxic waste on our road causing an emergency and we have these fumes or a risk of fire so close to our homes? My son has asthma already – what will this do to his health?	Charmaine Venter	Unfortunately you live in an area with the highest levels of air pollution in the country. This could be a reason for your son's asthma. The proposed landfill and its activities will not exceed the ambient levels of pollution and its contribution will be minimal.
P09	Operating hours – Your App G makes mention that the site will operate from 7.00am to 5.00pm every day, even holidays and weekends. Even though you say that Hazardous waste will not be accepted after 3.00pm on weekends and public holidays, this is vey unacceptable to us. Your operations are going to generate noise, traffic, dust, odours, flies etc, and to have this going on every day of the week is going to impact on our quality of life.	Charmaine Venter	The impact of the activity should not be noticeable over a 2 km radius from the site.
P10	Leachate treatment – I know you mentioned the Marianhill Landfill site as being a very good example of a landfill site that is well managed as has good leachate treatment and odour controls etc, this Vlaktefontein site is going to have all sorts of toxic and odorous liquid and sludge waste, as well as health care risk waste – a very different operation to Marianhill I am sure. What will you be doing to contain the leachate, which is described in your App G as having a high pollution potential, can be carcinogenic and has been known to transmit disease?	Charmaine Venter	Not to sure why the operation will differ significantly from the Mariannhill scenario, but all impacts will be investigated. Any air pollution will be below the levels currently being experienced and will further be mitigated by the distance you are from the site. See also No W02.
P11	Cover material – are you going to take cover material from the environment eg soils? If so, where is this going to come from and what impact is that going to have on soil erosion, on traffic, on air quality eg dust?	Charmaine Venter	Cover material from the site will be used in covering waste, see also No S01.
P12	Illegal dumping – what are you going to do to prevent people from dumping waste on the roads leading to the site?	Charmaine Venter	Control and boom gates as discussed, as well as litter picking.

No	Comments/issues/questions (presented <i>verbatim</i> )	Originator	Project team response
<b>Process (technical) issues (continued)</b>			
P13	Waste acceptance – you say that hazardous waste will get analysed before you pick it up from a customer and before you treat it, or dispose of it. What tests will your lab do? Will these tests be able to tell you if the waste is different to what you thought it would be? You say that is a customer or transporter sends you waste that does not comply with the original sample more than two occasions, you may blacklist them – is this really an acceptable way to operate, as, as you say, it may have serious implications on health, safety, treatment efficiency and site loading if not detected	Charmaine Venter	List of prescribed test pH, TCLP, flammability, corrosiveness etc. See also Nos P21 and P26.
P14	Please note that there is a landfill in De Deur as well as one in Vanderbijlpark, both approximately 10 and 30km's away from Vlakfontein.	Philip Howard	Comment noted.
P15	Ons woon ± 10 0m vanaf die naaste gate waar storting gaan plaasvind. 'n Groot probleem wat ons voorsien is stank, vliee, brommers muskiete ens. wat gesondheidsrisiko's inhou.	Jacobus Jonker	It would appear that Mr Jonker's home is about 250 m away from the proposed landfill. Due to the nature of the proposed landfilling operations, nuisances such as flies and mosquitoes are not anticipated.
P16	Verder kan ons veiligheid bedreig word deur persone wat gate deursoek vir lewensmiddele en ander bruikbare artikels. Sels al word die terrein omhein gaan daar nog persone wees wat toegang sal probeer verkry en in die proses kan ons 'n teiken word vir diefstal en sels aanranding of moord. Ons het in die 17jaar wat ons hier woon nog nooit enige inbraak of diefstal gehad nie.	Jacobus Jonker	The proposed development site will have two security fences. Firstly around the actual facility (treatment and disposal area) itself, and secondly around the remaining area of the property in order to retain game on the site and also to prevent any unauthorised access to the site. The facility itself will also have security guards to patrol the area.
P17	Die ervaring by Waldrif stortingsterrein wys daarop dat wanneer stortingsterrein gesluit word vir die dag, afval somer langs die pad gestort word. Dit gaan op my perseel plaasvind en wie gaan verantwoordelik wees vir die opruiming daarvan? Plastiek, papier en ander afval gaan die hele omgewing vol waai en dit hou gevaar in vir wild en beeste wat daar wei. Reenwater vervoer plastiek na die vlei en vandaar na die dam en beland uiteindelik in die Kliprivier.	Jacobus Jonker	The proposed development is not a municipal disposal facility and will mainly be used for the disposal of industrial and hazardous waste streams. Illegal dumping of any waste materials will be strictly monitored and appropriate action taken to control it.
P18	Laastens gaan my eiendomgeen verkoopswaardehe nie. Wie wil nou langs 'n stortingsterrein woon?	Jacobus Jonker	There is no evidence to support the perception that the property will have no value.
P19	Met verwysing na vergadering wat op 19 Oktober 2010 gehou is by Vlakfontein Steenmakery is daar sekere ondememings gegee deur die Ontwikkelaar, wat wel op band opgeneem is en wel aangeteken is deur persone wat deur die gemeenskap aangestel is. Indien die Ontwikkelaar hou by die ondememings soos gegee kan die ontwikkeling se negatiewe impak verminder word. Indien die Ontwikkelaar nie hou by sy ondememings nie kan dit katastrofiese gevolge vir die omgewing en inwoners he. Watse waarborg het ons dat die Ontwikkelaar sy woord gestand sal doen? Op grond van bogenoemde wi! ek nogtans beswaar maak teen die beoogde ontwikkeling.	Jacobus Jonker	Firstly, the site will be developed and operated strictly in accordance with the waste site license conditions. The development will also be subject to the scrutiny of the monitoring committee, which will be constituted from members of the community. In the event that the site is not compliant, the DEA could close the site. In addition, the proponent will have a trust fund set aside for the rehabilitation of the site. This fund will be reviewed annually to ensure that sufficient funds are available at any one time.
P20	MRC feedback Page 14 Par 4: “.. chemical storage facility must be at least 700m from the perimeter....”	Mount Ridge Conservancy	Is this a municipal regulation? There is no intention to store chemicals on the site other than small quantities required for the treatment process.
P21	MRC feedback Page 18 Par 5: “...the health risks involved in pests that inhabit waste dumps.”	Mount Ridge Conservancy	The landfill is to be operated as a sanitary landfill which implies that certain operational procedures and standards are adhered to in accordance with the DWAF Minimum Requirements for Disposal of Waste to Landfill and the license conditions. No such pests are anticipated to inhabit the site.
P22	MRC feedback Page 18 Par 6: “...the possible impact of the proposed business on vulnerable farming activities such as his has not been investigated....”	Mount Ridge Conservancy	The determination of a buffer zone around the proposed development is currently being finalised. This buffer zone will ensure that no adverse impacts will be felt by affected local landowners. The fact that the farm may fall within 5 km of the proposed development does not necessarily make the site undesirable.

No	Comments/issues/questions (presented <i>verbatim</i> )	Originator	Project team response
<b>Process (technical) issues (continued)</b>			
P23	MRC feedback Page 19 Par 2: "Mr Hamman's property also borders on the Waldrift dumpsite..."	Mount Ridge Conservancy	It is noted that the Waldrift dumpsite is more than 7 km away from the proposed development. The issues of pollution etc (such as those relating to the Waldrift site), will be addressed in the EIA report and site operational plan.
P24	MRC feedback Page 21 Par 1: "...if it was properly conducted would have exposed the abovementioned inherent fatal flaws..."	Mount Ridge Conservancy	It is not clear what inherent fatal flaws are being referred to as the issues referred to thus far constitute issues that have either (a) already been addressed in the design of the site and/or the site operational plan, and (b) will be further investigated to determine the required mitigation measures if required.
P25	MRC feedback Page 21 Par 2: "...The averment that a landing strip made the Meydustria site undesirable also holds water for the current site ..."	Mount Ridge Conservancy	A requirement in terms of the DWAF Minimum Requirements is that a landfill should not be within a radius of 3 000 m of the end of an airport landing strip. The Vereeniging aerodrome is more than 4,5 km away from the proposed development.
P26	MRC feedback Page 22 Par 1: "...if it now becomes a refuge for unwanted waste material..."	Mount Ridge Conservancy	The proposed development will receive wastes for treatment and disposal under controlled conditions, which will be subject to a license being granted by DEA. In terms of crime, it is interesting that Mr Jonker, who lives immediately adjacent to the proposed development, states in a letter dated 27 October 2010, that in 17 years that he has lived there, they have not experienced any break-ins or theft.
P27	MRC feedback Page 22 Par 6: "The value of property will suffer negatively...."	Mount Ridge Conservancy	It is unclear how the value of property will suffer negatively and it would appear that many of the landowners with game on their properties are likely to be outside the eventual buffer zone.
P28	MRC feedback Page 22 Par 7: "...it is common knowledge that scavenging squatters will start occupying areas adjacent to the waste dump..."	Mount Ridge Conservancy	Scavenging on the proposed landfill site is not allowed in terms of the license conditions and in any event, scavengers or squatters will not be allowed on the site. There will therefore be no attraction for them to squat on adjacent land, which in any event is already occupied by the landowners.
<b>Soil aspects</b>			
S01	MRC feedback Page 22 Par 2: "Soil pollution....."	Mount Ridge Conservancy	We are not sure what this paragraph is intended to convey? All potential pollution risks and impacts are addressed in the design of the site, the operations plan and the EIA process. Mitigation measures, where necessary, will be identified and implemented to eliminate the risk of soil pollution.
<b>Water issues</b>			
W01	We only use borehole water and can you guarantee that that no leachate will filter into our borehole.	Charmaine Venter	The design of the site has to meet with all regulatory requirements in order to prevent the contamination of groundwater.
W02	We rely on borehole water for drinking water and irrigation. We request that you provide us with assurance that pollution of the boreholes will not occur, and besides what you say about your liners and all your monitoring, what happens if pollution reaches our boreholes?	Charmaine Venter	Need to investigate water flow direction. At present the opinion is that borehole contamination over that distance should not be possible.



No	Comments/issues/questions (presented <i>verbatim</i> )	Originator	Project team response
<b>Water issues (continued)</b>			
W03	Ons enigste waterbron is 'n boorgat en water le op 29m. Afval wat gestort gaan word kan aanleiding gee tot ondergrondse waterbesoedeling. Daar is geen waarborg dat maatreels wat deur die Ontwikkelaar geneem gaan word om besoedeling te voorkom effektief sal wees nie, en indien daar wel voortgegaan word met die ontwikkeling en waterbesoedeling vind wel plaas, waar gaan ons water kry en wie gaan daarvoor betaal? Reenwater gaan tot gevolg he dat stortingsgate mettertyd vol sal word en oorloop na die vleigedeelte op my grond. Dit hou 'n bedreiging in vir die vele voels en paddas. Water van die vlei afloop deur na 'n volgende dam waar die vislewe negatief beïnvloed sal word. Gaan stortingsgate gelyk met die grond oppervlakte gevul word of gaan dit hoer as grond oppervlakte wees?	Jacobus Jonker	The design of the landfill site and treatment facility is intended to prevent the contamination of groundwater and is strictly controlled by the site license conditions and the approved operations plan. The site will also be audited on a regular basis by independent auditors and the DEA to ensure that all standards and license conditions are being complied with. It is not the intention to allow rain water to fill the landfill cells as implied. All rainfall precipitation on the site will be strictly controlled and managed to ensure that polluted or contaminated water does not leave the site. This will therefore have minimal effect on the vlei as implied. The landfill will be constructed to a final level above the current ground level, however, no contaminated water will be discharged from site as a result of this. A comprehensive water management plan has been developed for the site to ensure that no contaminated water leaves the site.
W04	I would like to object to your proposal. It will severely contaminate the underground water supply that residents in the area are dependant on. There is no back up water supply from the waterboard in the area.	Philip Howard	See No W03.
W05	Hereby please note my objection to the proposed "Waste disposal" at Vlakfontein. My objection is based on the fact that I am dependent on the underground water from my borehole which may be contaminated by the proposed activities.	Carlos Marques	See No W03.
W06	MRC feedback Page 10 Par 1: "Contamination of the wetland will have a devastating effect .."	Mount Ridge Conservancy	The project is designed, and mitigation measures are to be implemented, such that no contamination of the wetland will take place.
W07	MRC feedback Page 16 Par 3:"..one of the excavation holes was filled with water..."	Mount Ridge Conservancy	The hydrogeological report states: "The variable and inconsistent levels at which surface water was recorded in the open pit excavation and borrow pits on site suggests that the source of this water is not groundwater seepage, but from accumulation of surface water runoff." A hydrogeological investigation has been carried out and the aquifer is classified as a "minor aquifer". Anecdotal evidence from the adjacent landowners would appear to indicate that the hydrogeological conditions northwest of the site are significantly different to that encountered on the site. Additional work will be carried out to confirm this. In terms of the design of the site, it is certainly not the intention to contaminate the underlying groundwater.
W08	MRC feedback Page 16 Par 4: "...a lining layer of 6 metre will prevent leachate to filter into the only water supply system of the area is flimsy...."	Mount Ridge Conservancy	This statement is erroneous in that it was stated that initially, where the existing surface water is exposed in the main excavation, this area would be filled in to establish a barrier of some 4 – 5 metres between the underlying water and then a lining system would be constructed above that in accordance with the regulations. This would be a Category B liner (new terminology states it to be a Category 1) and will be some 1,4 metres thick and will contain HDPE geomembrane liners, compacted clay liners and drainage layers which will form hydraulic barriers. The comments relating to Arcelor Mittal have no relevance as the facilities referred to were not designed/constructed or operated in accordance with any standards.
W09	MRC feedback Page 17 Par 2: "...the tests cannot be regarded as conclusive prove of the depth and stance of water in the underground water table..."	Mount Ridge Conservancy	The water table depths compare favourably with anecdotal evidence from adjacent landowners and the proposed barrier between the liner system as described above is intended to accommodate any fluctuations in water table level. The "public hearing" referred to was in fact a public participation meeting where it is intended to elicit concerns and issues from the community which may require further investigation.