

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT (EIA)

EIA: 12/12/20/944

**FOR THE PROPOSED ESKOM NUCLEAR POWER STATION AND
ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE**

**REVISED DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT
REPORT**

MINUTES OF PUBLIC MEETING

**HUMANSDORP COUNTRY CLUB
HUMANSDORP**

02 JUNE 2011

18:00 - 20:50

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	1
PREFACE	2
1. ATTENDANCE.....	3
1.1. ATTENDANCE – INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PARTIES	3
1.2. ATTENDANCE – ESKOM HOLDINGS LIMITED - APPLICANT.....	3
1.3. ATTENDANCE – INDEPENDENT ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTING TEAM	3
2. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS.....	3
3. CHAIRPERSON'S INTRODUCTORY REMARKS	4
3.1 CONDUCT AT MEETING.....	4
3.2 OBJECTIVES OF THE PUBLIC REVIEW MEETINGS.....	4
4. PRESENTATION: FINDINGS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REPORT	5
5. ISSUES AND COMMENTS RAISED AND DISCUSSED.....	6
5.1 ISSUES AND COMMENTS RAISED	6
6. WAY FORWARD AND CLOSING REMARKS	6
6.1 MINUTES OF MEETINGS.....	6
6.2 TIMEFRAMES	6
6.3 CHAIRPERSON'S CONCLUDING REMARKS.....	7
APPENDIX 1: RECORD OF ISSUES RAISED AND DISCUSSED.....	8
APPENDIX 2: PRESENTATION OF REVISED DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT	20
APPENDIX 3: ATTENDANCE REGISTER.....	21

PREFACE

Should participants who attended the meetings require any changes to these proceedings, please notify the Public Participation Office (N1humansdorp@gibb.co.za) in writing within 14 days of receipt.

“**Unidentified I&APs**” refer largely to persons who attended the meeting and verbally raised issues without providing their names. This in no way diminishes the value of the issue raised. Should you recognise your issue and would like to have your name recorded next to it, please advise the Public Participation Office.

In order to provide a structure and to enable the reader to follow the proceedings with ease the minutes have not been captured verbatim and post-meeting notes have been added for clarity and information purposes and are indicated in **bold**.

1. ATTENDANCE

1.1. Attendance – Interested and Affected Parties

- As per attendance register.

1.2 Attendance – Eskom Holdings Limited - Applicant

Name	Position/Role
Deidre Herbst (DH)	Senior Manager: Generation Environmental Management
Dave Nicholls (DN)	General Manager: Nuclear Engineering
Lerato Sedumedi	Senior Advisor: Regulation and Localisation
Lorraine Ndala	Senior Environmental Advisor
David West	Auditor

1.3 Attendance – Independent Environmental Consulting Team

Name	Organisation	Role in the project
Jaana-Maria Ball (JMB)	Arcus GIBB (Pty) Ltd	Nuclear-1 EIA: Project Manager
Reuben Heydenrych (RH)	Arcus GIBB (Pty) Ltd	Senior Environmental Scientist
Jacqueline de Goede	Arcus GIBB (Pty) Ltd	Public Participation Officer
Walter Fyvie	Arcus GIBB (Pty) Ltd	Senior Environmental Scientist (Minute-taker)

2. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

The independent Chairperson, Dr. David de Waal, welcomed everyone to the meeting. He introduced all the players in both Eskom Holdings Limited (Eskom), and Arcus GIBB (GIBB).

He explained that the presentations are in English. He explained that participants are welcome to use the language of their choice as the EIA Team could communicate in Afrikaans and there were Xhosa translators on hand.

He advised participants that the meeting is being recorded to ensure the accuracy of the minutes.

3. CHAIRPERSON'S INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

3.1 Conduct at Meeting

The Chairperson read through the points presented on the slide, which provided guidelines with respect to the conduct of all participants and for achieving a constructive debate and discussion. These points are contained in the main presentation, which is provided in Appendix 2.

He requested all participants to assist the team by having a constructive debate at the meetings. It would be an "old fashioned", polite, structure meeting and the following would apply:

- Work via chairperson
- Give your name every time you ask a question
- Please keep questions till the end
- Raise your hand and only speak when given the opportunity to
- Everybody should be given the chance to ask questions
- Remain polite

He ran through the proposed agenda which was accepted by all.

3.2 Objectives of the Public Review Meetings

The purpose of the Public Meetings is three-fold, viz.:

- To present and discuss findings of the various specialist studies undertaken during the Impact Assessment Phase.
- To present the conclusions and recommendations of the Revised Draft Environmental Impact Assessment Report.
- Provide an opportunity to Interested and Affected Parties to comment on the specialist study findings and the outcomes of the EIA.

He explained what it means if a point "is noted".

Discussion then followed regarding who was allowed to ask questions tonight. Issues raised were as follows:

Name	Comment
Chris Barrett (St. Francis Bay / Kouga resident)	Is this an open meeting? At last night's Sea Vista meeting, only 'locals' were given an opportunity to comment; I was not given an opportunity. Can you confirm if this is an open meeting, and is anyone, including outsiders, aloud to comment tonight?
Dr. De Waal (Chairperson)	Uncomfortable with this "no outsider" issue. If no "outsiders" are allowed to comment, then he had best leave as he is from Pretoria.

Name	Comment
Unidentified I&AP	For those people who stay here in the area, we must have the opportunity to ask all the questions we want to ask, as opposed to just having people talking to us.
Jaana-Maria Ball (EIA Manager, GIBB)	With respect to this EIA it is important to obtain input from I&APs all over the country. It is vital to obtain input from local communities around the proposed alternative sites and hence GIBB has been having meetings in different localities over the past two weeks. It is good to see so many people here from the Kwanomzamo community, as well as people who have driven here from further away. GIBB wants to hear questions from everyone, and this meeting will continue tonight until everyone has had a chance to ask questions.
Chris Barrett (St. Francis Bay/ Kouga resident)	Presumably this process is being minuted because people are not identifying themselves, not saying who they are, before they speak. I am a resident of the Kouga.
Dr Yvette Abrahams (Commissioner for Gender Equality)	A public meeting means anyone has the right to ask questions. The disruptions at last night's Sea Vista meeting were politically motivated. Disruptions came from three sources, an ANC councillor, the ANC Youth League, and a municipal employee paid by GIBB.
Jaana-Maria Ball (EIA Manager, GIBB)	It is imperative to GIBB that everyone is given a chance to speak. It should be noted that GIBB is not paying anyone from the municipality to assist them on this EIA.

Ms Deidre Herbst of Eskom stated that if time permits, Mr Dave Nicholls will be giving a presentation after this meeting on the nuclear incident in Japan. It will not form part of this EIA meeting, but will also be open to anyone who is interested.

4. PRESENTATION: FINDINGS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REPORT

Ms Jaana Ball and Mr Reuben Heydenrych representing the Independent Environmental Assessment Practitioners, Arcus GIBB (GIBB), presented the findings on the Revised Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

By way of introduction, Ms Ball as EIA Project Manager thanked all present for their time and indicated that Arcus GIBB is pleased to be at the stage of presenting the findings of the specialist investigations and the outcomes of the Environmental Impact Assessment phase.

Ms Ball and Mr Heydenrych then presented the findings on the Revised Draft EIR (refer to presentation slides provided in Appendix 2).

The issues raised and discussed following Arcus GIBB's presentation are captured in the table presented in Appendix 1.

5. ISSUES AND COMMENTS RAISED AND DISCUSSED

5.1 Issues and Comments raised

The table contained in Appendix 1: "Record of Issues Raised and Discussed" details the issues, comments and concerns, which were raised and discussed at the meeting.

6. WAY FORWARD AND CLOSING REMARKS

6.1 Minutes of Meetings

JMB indicated that the EIA Team would endeavour to distribute the minutes of the meeting to I&APs shortly after the meeting.

I&APs will have 14 days to verify the minutes and provide their comments to the GIBB Public Participation Office.

6.2 Timeframes

Ms Ball reminded the attendees that the public review period of the Draft EIA Report has been extended to 07 August 2011. Comments on the Revised Draft EIR can be submitted to the GIBB Public Participation Office using one of the following methods:

By mail: GIBB Public Participation Office, Nuclear-1 EIA, P.O. Box 3965, Cape Town, 8000
By phone: 021 469 9180 (Office hours: Mon to Fri – 09:00 to 13:00 excl. public holidays)
By fax: 021 424 5571
By e-mail: nuclear1@gibb.co.za / nuclear-1@gibb.co.za

She confirmed that various pieces of documentation has There are also DVDs available tonight for those that want them. Once GIBB has captured all your comments, GIBB will revise the report as needed and once finalised, will submit it to the Department of Environmental Affairs. All I&APs have the right to appeal the decision.

Various pieces of documentation have been made available been made available as hardcopies in the Humansdorp Library, as well as available in Port Elizabeth, St Francis Bay, Humansdorp and Oyster Bay. Electronic copies of the Report are available on the GIBB and Eskom websites. She mentioned that there were also a number of DVD copies of the report available tonight (30 DVD copies of the Report were distributed to attendees after the meeting).

Comments received will be used to produce the Final EIR, which will then be submitted to the Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA) (the decision-making authority for the EIA) for their consideration.

The timeframe for submission of the Final EIR will depend on how long it takes to finalise the report as well as on the type of comments that are received from I&APs during the review period.

A letter will be sent to all registered I&APs informing them of the Authorities' decision. I&APs have the right to appeal the decision.

6.3 Chairperson's concluding Remarks

The Chairperson thanked everyone for constructive engagement and closed the meeting at 20h50.

APPENDIX 1: RECORD OF ISSUES RAISED AND DISCUSSED

Please note: In some instances, the names that were given by the speaker at the meeting did not correspond with the names provided in the attendance registers.

HUMANSDORP PUBLIC MEETING (02 JUNE 2011)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
1	Sam van der Merwe (Koukamma area resident)	Concerned that this study is bound to the properties already owned by Eskom. What about alternatives? We know that the present power demand is as a result of Coega. Is there no way we could look at suitable alternative sites comparable to Thyspunt, but closer to Coega? If you look at the area east of Coega, there is a large unutilised area. Very little would be affected if that site was used. Why can't that be used?	<p>Reuben Heydenrych (RH) responded that the alternative sites were identified back in the 1980-90s, through the Nuclear Site Investigation Programme (NSIP). Nuclear safety is of paramount importance, and there are not many coastal sites in South Africa that would be suitable for a nuclear power station. Five sites were identified by independent consultants from UCT as being the most suitable sites investigated by the study and these formed the starting point of this EIA with respect to alternative sites. Regarding the Coega Industrial Development Zone (IDZ) as a candidate site, one of the challenges is that limited seismic monitoring has been done there. At the other candidate sites at detailed seismic monitoring has been carried out over several years. It would take at least five years to bring the Coega IDZ site up to the same level of detail as the three preferred sites are today. Other challenges include the fact that it is in an area of very deep sands. There is also a Coega fault, which has not been studied in-depth. Hence the recommendation has been made that for Nuclear-1, the Coega IDZ cannot be considered as an alternative site. It may well however be considered by Eskom in the future as a nuclear site.</p> <p>Jaana-Maria Ball (JMB) clarified that this nuclear power station is not driven by the Coega IDZ, but rather</p>

HUMANSDORP PUBLIC MEETING (02 JUNE 2011)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>You place emphasis on ecological effects on the limestone fynbos area. What about the coastal fynbos; it is also endangered? Don't underplay the importance of the word "could" when it says "it could be reduced" through the development.</p> <p>Regarding seismic activity, I understand that the presence of a geological contact zone caused you to plan your site in a specific area. Isn't that a warning that there is a seismic risk in the area?</p> <p>Regarding the marine ecology, many people depend on the sea as a food source. More studies may be needed to determine the exact effects on the sea currents.</p>	<p>because the lifespans of the existing coal-fired power stations in South Africa are coming to an end and also because of the increasing electricity demand (3% increase per annum) in the country.</p> <p>RH stated that there is coastal fynbos at Thyspunt, and the botanical specialist did look at this. It is however not as localised as the limestone fynbos. The specialist has stated that the coastal fynbos occurs in many areas outside the site and hence the impacts on coastal fynbos would not be that significant.</p> <p>RH explained that contact zones are lines where two different rock types come together; it is not a fault. From a seismic point of view, they are not features that cause earthquakes, but from an engineering point of view, critical buildings like the reactors should not be placed across these contact zones. From an earthquake risk point of view Thyspunt is actually the best alternative site.</p> <p>RH responded that extensive modelling of the marine environmental has been done in the oceanographic study, which was based on number of years of monitoring. The impacts of ocean conditions have been modelled. This information has been included into the Revised Draft EIR.</p>
2	Clifton Booysen (Humansdorp resident)	Want to make a statement, not ask a question. I have visited the Koeberg Nuclear Powers Station. For me the issue is about development and sustainable job creation. The station should not	Comment noted.

HUMANSDORP PUBLIC MEETING (02 JUNE 2011)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		go anywhere else; it must be here. We need the jobs.	
3	Juline Prinsloo (from Tourism Sector)	<p>It was stated that it will take 9 years to build, and will create 7 700 jobs. Are these jobs going to be local jobs, and do the 7 700 jobs include technical jobs?</p> <p>Can the existing infrastructure accommodate the expected influx of people?</p> <p>The expected 960 new vehicle trips through Humansdorp will require proper planning, and a proper route would have to be found to the R330. The four-way stop and the taxi rank will pose problems.</p> <p>Regards the Chokka industry and the heating the sea water, you have proposed multiple release points but has the success of this been proven elsewhere?</p> <p>You want to build cut-off walls to protect the wetlands. You didn't elaborate on the type of materials that will be used, or how you would look at the environmental aspects of the site etc.</p>	<p>RH stated that the 7 700 jobs will be created at the peak of construction (i.e. year 6). This includes all jobs, including manual labour and technical jobs. GIBB's recommendation is that at least 25% of these jobs must be for locals. Eskom will have to do training for the local people like has been done at Medupi Power Station.</p> <p>RH explained that the issue of the existing infrastructure is an important issue because there are already backlogs in infrastructure delivery. A key recommendation of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is that Eskom should agree with municipalities as to who will provide this infrastructure before construction starts.</p> <p>RH noted that the team is rethinking the transportation issue, and will consider alternative access routes passing around Humansdorp.</p> <p>Dave Nicholls (DN) said that, yes, discharge of water into sea is a standard, common technology used all over the world. If one mixes the water quickly, the temperature comes down quickly. Within a few hundred metres of the release point the water has returned to its original temperature.</p> <p>DN explained that the cut-off wall would be a barrier 20 m deep to the bedrock. It would stop water from seeping into the site. The wall is normally made of clay slurry. It</p>

HUMANSDORP PUBLIC MEETING (02 JUNE 2011)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>Not much has been said about tourism impacts. We would like to have inputs in this.</p> <p>Regarding the heritage impacts, there wasn't much said about storage of the radioactive waste, how do you store it etc.</p>	<p>has been used before and the same technology was used at the Koeberg Nuclear Power Station in the 1970s. Eskom does not foresee environmental issues with this barrier.</p> <p>RH stated that the tourism specialist was required to consult with all relevant stakeholders and GIBB will get the specialist to contact Mrs Prinsloo.</p> <p>RH explained that spent fuel would be stored on the site. It firstly goes into wet storage for 20 - 30 years, and thereafter goes into dry containers, encased in concrete and stays on site.</p>
4	Chris Barrett (St. Francis Bay/ Kouga resident)	<p>We have raised the issue of transport before. What you are envisaging at the moment, is one heavy-duty truck going down Saffrey street every 24 seconds, and also going down the R330 where there are kids crossing the road to school. This is excluding any existing traffic.</p> <p>This traffic issue must be looked at, because it affects the social and economic studies, and hence they must all be reviewed. I have heard it said that that no expenditure on the road between Humansdorp and St Francis would be required. This is nonsense.</p>	<p>JMB noted that the transport issue had been raised as a key issue over the last few days. GIBB will be asking the transportation specialist to relook at their recommendations and try to alleviate the traffic going through Humansdorp itself, and the traffic issues in Cape St. Francis and St. Francis Bay areas.</p> <p>JMB agreed that if the traffic report changes significantly then the other reports would have to be updated.</p>
5	Dr Yvette Abrahams (Commissioner for Gender Equality)	In Hankey we have had a similar issue regarding underpasses for pedestrians. Every underpass costs R70 million. If you redo the transportation report, every time that you add an underpass can you please add R70 million to the project cost, and explain who will pay for it. With regards to bulk services, who pays for those; the national tax payer, the municipal taxpayer or Eskom?	JMB stated that this issue had been raised before and that the economic specialist will be asked to look at this, if relevant.

HUMANSDORP PUBLIC MEETING (02 JUNE 2011)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
6	Renan Stuurman (Community leader)	Concerned that we are talking as a non-global player. We are talking as if there is no electricity crisis. We need to pre-empt the crisis. People's objections stem from a small town mentality. People are saying the power plant can be built anywhere but not here. People want to use their democratic rights to disadvantage others through their decisions. How many times will you come here before we build this plant? Energy is not a luxury; it is a need and will become even more so in future. Time is running out. What is the next step? We can't waste anymore time. There are needy people here. We cannot tolerate objections as if we don't have a past. This is our chance for us to live close to Thyspunt, close to resources. Let the power plant come.	Comment noted.
7	Dries du Preez (Jeffrey's Bay, developer of Fountain Mall)	The economies of Humansdorp and Jeffrey's Bay are in serious trouble, and are in desperate need for something to change. We need a driver to get business going again. We need something to happen very soon. We know about the changes that came to Ellisras (Lephalale) with the announcement of the Medupi Power Station. We need that kind of announcement in this area. How are you going to protect the jobs for locals, and ensure they are not lost to the inflow of workers from outside?	<p>RH responded that this has been raised in the Social Impact Assessment. Unfortunately people cannot be stopped from moving around or into the area, but it has been recommended that locals must get preference. Eskom has experience in engaging with local bodies to ensure locals get preference.</p> <p>Deidre Herbst (DH) stated that on previous projects Eskom has engaged with formal community representatives to determine who is local and who is not, to ensure locals do get preference. At Medupi Power Station Eskom agreed on a 70 km radius to identify locals, and transported people within that area. Eskom also had recruitment offices at areas removed from the site. One cannot stop impacts related to migration of people completely but there are ways to minimise it and ensure local employment.</p>

HUMANSDORP PUBLIC MEETING (02 JUNE 2011)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		I've heard that engineers, possibly Aurecon, were appointed to look at a coastal road alignment linking Paradise Beach, St Francis, and Jeffrey's Bay. Is it happening and is it a separate study? My concern is that this region will not benefit from Thyspunt if this road is not built. We need to look at more than just the Thyspunt power plant on its own, but development in the whole area. Need to make sure we get that coastal road.	RH replied that GIBB was aware of a coastal road proposal from Jeffrey's Bay to St Francis, but it's not part of the Nuclear-1 EIA. DH explained that there have been various discussions about transport routes, but the coastal option was not part of this EIA. Once Eskom is at a stage where they know where the access points will be, they will start an EIA looking at building roads. At present Eskom is concentrating on determining road access coming from N2 directly down to site.
8	Frank Tamboer	It is worrying that people who are also previously disadvantaged are opposing this proposal; but some people are also concerned that this development will give "darkies" the opportunity to live in the white areas, and whites are concerned about this. I am speaking for a collective of the community, not defending my own kingdom.	Comment noted.
9	Bruce Oliphants (Kwanomzamo resident)	Want to commend people from Jeffrey's Bay in sharing the same view in terms of job opportunities and economic improvement. My view is that should the project go ahead, jobs will be created and the economy of Kouga will improve. This is in line with one of the five key focus areas of the African National Congress (ANC) in its manifesto. But I am concerned with the estimated percentage of the local labour force that will be employed, only 25%. This doesn't deal with the crisis of unemployment here at the moment. Is this figure cast in stone? Migration of people from other areas to Kouga is natural and we can't change it. The present population is about 100 000 and 7 700 jobs are to be created. In Cape Town, most people residing there	RH responded that the recommendation of 25% local labour is a minimum but hopefully more than that would be achieved. DH explained that 25% is what Eskom would specify as a minimum in contracts. Sometimes it would be 50% and other times 10%, depending on the type of contract. However, there will be many other opportunities outside of the 7 700 created e.g. support services, food, and laundry etc.

HUMANSDORP PUBLIC MEETING (02 JUNE 2011)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>are those who have moved there from the Eastern Cape looking for greener pastures. The same in Gauteng, and many have gone there from the Eastern Cape. I recommend that Eskom urgently start compiling a database of local people here but should not cut off those who are migrating in.</p> <p>In past presentations it was shown that a high volume of vehicles will be using our roads. We agree that the present infrastructure is not sufficient and it is out of the question for vehicles to use the main road of Humansdorp or Saffrey Street. We are happy to hear that alternatives will be considered. Why don't you consider developing a road from the N2, an alternative road, which then joins into the road to Oyster Bay? Through this Eskom could create jobs through the construction of roads.</p> <p>I don't want to use this as a political platform, but earlier on a doctor made political statements which undermined a political organisation. We don't want to hear about the ANC or ANCYL which has nothing to do with the project. We are here to hear about Thyspunt.</p>	<p>RH commented that any roads used by Eskom would have to be upgraded and Eskom would have to maintain the roads. The suggestion of a link between the N2 and the Oyster Bay road will be taken to the transportation specialist for consideration.</p>
10	Dries du Preez (Jeffrey's Bay, developer of Fountain Mall)	The 7 700 jobs is only a small part of the improvements that would come to Thyspunt. If you consider the growth to supporting industries, it could probably create a further 10 000, 20 000 or 50 000 jobs.	Comment noted.
11	Godfrey Africa (Student of economics; law firm partner and a community worker)	What resource planning has Eskom done? It is a 9-year construction project, and we are a few years away from starting, so we should be able to identify enough young kids in grade 11 or 12 in the area that could be trained up to be engineers or artisans so that by the time the project starts, we have local technical skills	DH explained that not much resource planning has been done yet, but as soon as there is more certainty regarding the chosen site, Eskom will need to start doing that soon. In terms of identifying local young people for education, Jongi Dyabaza and representatives from

HUMANSDORP PUBLIC MEETING (02 JUNE 2011)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>available. This could increase the minimum of 25% to a better number.</p> <p>To what extent will Eskom be able to influence BBEE and local employment in the tenders? To what extent will you be able to ensure that the process doesn't end up with only friends of friends benefiting. What safety mechanisms are there to ensure this doesn't happen?</p>	<p>Eskom Development Foundation, has been going to schools closest to the site. Eskom has not started considering bursaries yet but will be getting the training manager to start on this soon.</p> <p>DN stated that Eskom has strong policies regarding local content. When Eskom started negotiating for nuclear units three years ago (which subsequently stopped because of the financial crisis), there were very strict clauses for local training, employment, etc. Eskom is presently driving this Thyspunt process, but it will eventually become a government lead process, and they will require local content. Dave West, who is here at this meeting, is from Eskom's Audit and Forensic Department and because of the significance of this project; the whole process is being audited by an external auditor. On every contract we require an external audit number to confirm it is fair.</p> <p>DN added that Eskom's Chief Executive is very strict on this. He and a number of Eskom staff went on a business trip to China. When they were presented with expensive watches by their hosts as gifts, he cancelled the trip and brought everyone back.</p>
12	Eugene Goliath (Kouga Municipality resident)	<p>How is Eskom planning to develop local skills before the plant is developed? I am actually supporting the development, but will the Kouga people become the future gardeners and sweepers at the plant? What is Eskom doing to develop skills in this area's schools? Eskom is not presently developing skilled artisan here. All the people here leave to be trained in other areas. Eskom should build</p>	<p>RH agreed that these were good suggestions and stated that GIBB would make sure that the Social Impact Assessment considers these, and where necessary, make these recommendations.</p> <p>DN noted that he runs the engineering department of</p>

HUMANSDORP PUBLIC MEETING (02 JUNE 2011)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>a training college here so that we have trained locals ready by 2013 or 2015 approximately. Of the 25% that will be local workers, at least 75-80% of those should be skilled workforce.</p> <p>When will your planning start? You said Jongi went looking at schools this week. This won't help much. You need to look at building a school. Eskom should do an Oprah Winfrey on us in this area.</p> <p>Maybe look at building a school where extra lessons in Maths and Science can be given by those who are already doing it in this area, like Mr Sammy Jantjies.</p> <p>The top technicians in this area are not from this area, they came here for the jobs. We want someone from this area, working on the project. This project gets my vote. One of the municipal CFOs in the Western Cape comes from this area. You said you have some people from Cape Town, at Koeberg. Similarly we would like to have people from this area, for this project. Local sustainability and development is needed.</p>	<p>Eskom's nuclear group. The nuclear engineering manager at the Koeberg Nuclear Power Station is Mr Cedric Davis, a coloured man from Cape Town. The head of standards is a coloured man from Cape Town. In general, about 70% of Eskom's members of staff are PDI individuals. All of his senior managers are PDIs, one of whom was sent to the United States for three years to get a PhD. Eskom is very keen to develop people.</p> <p>DN agreed. Regarding sustainability, this project will last for 80 - 90 years and it is unlikely that once established, that Eskom will ever stop using it. This project will still be going when we are all gone.</p> <p>DH explained that at Medupi, there was a long construction period and plenty of opportunity to train people, but what is more important is when operations start. When Eskom started construction they appointed people from the local community, all locals, and they will be operating and maintaining the Medupi plant once operational. All are from the local community.</p>
13	Unidentified I&AP	<p>Also supports transformation and empowerment but we must remember that this is not a Kouga thing, it is a South African need. When we say local we mean local South Africa, not Zimbabwe, or Namibia etc.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

HUMANSDORP PUBLIC MEETING (02 JUNE 2011)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
14	Chris Barrett (St. Francis Bay/ Kouga resident)	<p>Education and the future of the country is paramount. How many hundreds of millions of Rands have you spent on land here, and how much are you planning to invest in developing people?</p> <p>I'll leave it as the question was asked and unanswered.</p> <p>I asked about local training figures, not national figures. I asked for the amount spent on land as well.</p>	<p>DN said that he could not comment on planned spending in this geographical area specifically. Nationally, Eskom has taken on board about 4 000 learners, and has issued many bursaries. Eskom will be putting in place enough resources in this area to support the local requirements of the power station, and they have been very committed to people development in recent years.</p> <p>DH read from the 2010 Eskom Annual Report. In 2010, a total of 5 255 bursaries were in the Eskom pipeline, corporate social investment was R 58 million, and the amount spent on training was R758 million.</p>
15	Vernon Adams (Community representative)	<p>Need to know if the same thing that happened in Japan will happen here. People are spreading rumours in the community that the same thing will happen.</p> <p>What do we want? If there is no job creation in RSA, it's a problem. The opportunities are here for jobs. Let us stop arguing, and grab the opportunity. We have done a great job, and I don't feel that we will have a Japan incident here.</p>	<p>DN responded that the Japanese reactor accident happened for two reasons: the height of the plant above sea level and the height of the tsunami. The plant was basically flooded. The present plan is to build Thyspunt about 15 m or higher above sea level, which is higher than the Koeberg plant which is at 8 m. South Africa doesn't have tsunamis, but Eskom has modelled them for the power station. It should be noted that if the tsunami that hit Japan were to hit Koeberg, it would damage and maybe even destroy it, but it would not lead to a radioactive release. Koeberg was designed to a higher level of tsunami than the Japanese station. It is interesting that Japan is on the ring of fire, and still they designed to a lower standard than we did here in the 1970s. We have no fears over tsunami issues.</p>

HUMANSDORP PUBLIC MEETING (02 JUNE 2011)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
16	Godfrey Africa (Student of Economics, law firm partner and a community worker)	<p>Has Eskom had records of accidents at the Koeberg Nuclear Power Station? Safety is vital. Is Eskom communicating these statistics to the public?</p> <p>To what extent has Eskom engaged the councillors and local municipalities in terms of their Integrated Development Planning for this project? How ready is the municipality to embrace this project from that point of view? What communications have been had regarding the infrastructure needs?</p> <p>This is not a political project. It is about our country and community, and people should not come here to score political points.</p>	<p>DN stated that the Koeberg Nuclear Power Station has had no incidents that have shown any health effects on the public. Eskom does measure how much radiation is released from the station during normal operation and they publish this data in their Annual Reports. The international standard for exposure to the public is 1 000 micro Sieverts (μSv) per year. Eskom's maximum limit imposed by the NNR¹ is one quarter of that, 250 μSv. The level in Eskom's last annual report is about 5 μSv. The lowest point, at which measurable health effects can be seen is 100 000 μSv.</p> <p>RH commented that Eskom does need to engage local authorities. This is only the first authorisation that Eskom needs, and Eskom doesn't have certainty yet that it would get the Thyspunt site. It is GIBB's recommendation that the DEA should consider authorising the Thyspunt site, but it is not certain yet. Eskom are therefore not in a position to start that communication and planning yet. They will commence once the site allocation is certain.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>
17	Chris Barrett (St. Francis Bay/ Kouga resident)	<p>We have heard that various studies will be redone including the transport study, which will probably impact on the economic and cultural studies also. I have heard there will be a period of public review, presumably 45 days after their release. Is that correct? Will this apply to at least transport, economic, cultural, heritage and</p>	<p>RH responded that it will be 45 days and will apply to all the relevant studies that are influenced by the amendment of the traffic study.</p>

¹ National Nuclear Regulator

HUMANSDORP PUBLIC MEETING (02 JUNE 2011)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		marine/oceanographic reports, all of which are being looked at?	

APPENDIX 2: PRESENTATION OF REVISED DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

APPENDIX 3: ATTENDANCE REGISTER