



## **BUSHMAN'S RIVER MOUTH / BOESMANSRIVERMOND**

Ratepayers' Association / Belastingbetalersvereniging Ward 3 / Wyk 3  
P.O.Box 50, Boesmansrivermond, 6190

Director General  
Dept. Water Affairs and Forestry  
Private Bag X 313  
Pretoria 0001

5<sup>th</sup> February, 2008

**Attn. Dir: National Water Resource Planning**

### **Re Albany Coast Water Scheme**

Dear Sir,

We have researched alternatives to the Bigen proposal for water supply to the Sunshine Coast via the Albany Coast Regional Water Scheme from the Glen Melville Dam and have sent some of our comments to them.

Firstly, let me state that we are not opposed to a scheme, in principal, as we are well aware of the problems of water supply in our area and all of the consequences with regard to lack of water supply. We do, however, believe that the alternative of a combination of wind power and Reverse Osmosis has not been investigated thoroughly.

One Megawatt of wind power costs approximately R10m, Reverse Osmosis capacity of three Megalitres of water costs approximately R10m which means that water can be delivered at any point along our coastline for approximately R20m per 3 Megalitres. We can allow an additional R10m per 3 Megalitres for engineering and infrastructure costs. This would make a total cost of R30m per 3 Megalitres of water which translates into a capital cost of R10m per Megalitre. The eventual desired capacity for the Albany Coast is approximately 30 Megalitres that would equal R300m which is a far cry from the R880m for the proposed scheme by BIGEN. Capacity could be appended as needed without upfront capital expenditure.

The whole system would be sustainable as there is basically an infinite capacity for raw water in the sea and there is an infinite source of power in the form of wind. We believe the previous study did not take into account the combination of RO and wind power. The current scheme is placing capital into pipelines, treatment works, pump stations and reservoirs up front. We believe this to be R500m into infrastructure which is not needed if water is produced "on site" so to say. RO water would have a TDS of 100ppm as opposed to the proposed scheme 700ppm TDS. There is no treatment needed as the treatment is part of the process.

We believe that this alternative would release money from proposed expenditure for improvement of water and sewerage reticulation within towns where water losses are up to 40% at present. Expropriation or registration of servitudes would be greatly reduced. Licensing agreements and water rights which have to be negotiated with DWAF would be largely negated. EIA regulation compliance would be reduced. There would be large advantages with this alternative scheme which are too numerous to mention.

We hope that you will consider investigating this alternative further. It is possibly not in the interests of Bigen but is in the interests of the community and consumer.

Yours faithfully,

Johann Smuts  
Chairman Bushman's River Ratepayers Association

Committee: Johann Smuts (Chairman), Charles Sprong (Vice Chairman) , Wendy Grove (Secretary), Charles Sprong (Treasurer), Schalk Kotze, R Phol, W Northrop, A.Vosloo, Gildenhuis, M.Mullins, Trevor Franklin, Ian Smith