

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT (EIA)**

**EIA: 12/12/20/944**

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

**DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REPORT**

**KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING  
PORT ELIZABETH**

**12 APRIL 2010**

## 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 .....	3
1.3. ATTENDANCE – ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTING TEAM (EIA TEAM) .....	3
2. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS.....	3
3. FACILITATORS INTRODUCTORY REMARKS .....	3
3.2 CONDUCT AT MEETING.....	4
3.3 OBJECTIVES OF THE MEETING.....	4
3.4 SUMMARY OF ISSUES RAISED DURING SCOPING PHASE .....	4
4. PRESENTATION: FINDINGS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESMENT REPORT .....	5
5. ISSUES AND COMMENTS RAISED AND DISCUSSED.....	5
5.1 ISSUES AND COMMENTS RAISED .....	5
6. WAY FORWARD AND CLOSING REMARKS .....	6
6.1 MINUTES OF MEETINGS.....	6
6.2 TIMEFRAMES .....	6
6.3 FACILITATORS CONCLUDING REMARKS.....	6
APPENDIX 1: RECORD OF ISSUES RAISED AND DISCUSSED.....	8
APPENDIX 2: PRESENTATION OF DRAFT EIA REPORT .....	49
APPENDIX 3: ATTENDANCE LIST .....	50

## PREFACE

Should participants who attended the Key Stakeholder Feedback Meeting require any changes to these proceedings, please notify the Public Participation Office 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 input 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 the attendance register.

### 1.2 Attendance – Eskom Holdings Limited

Name	Position/Role
Mr Tony Stott	Senior Manager - Stakeholder Management Generation Business
Ms Deidre Herbst	Senior Manager – Environment Generation Division
Mr Gert Greeff	Manager - Nuclear Sites
Ms Carin de Villiers	Stakeholder Management and Communication Manager - Nuclear Division
Mr Mervin Theron	Manager Regulatory and Localisation – Nuclear Division
Mr Mandla Mbusi	Senior Advisor - Stakeholder Management

### 1.3 Attendance – Environmental Consulting Team (EIA Team)

Name	Organisation	Role in the project
Ms Jaana-Maria Ball	Arcus GIBB (Pty) Ltd	Nuclear-1 EIA: Project Manager
Mr Reuben Heydenrych	Arcus GIBB (Pty) Ltd	Senior Environmental Scientist
Ms Bongji Shinga	ACER (Africa)	Public Participation Consultant
Ms Karin Bowler	Karin Bowler Enterprises	Independent Facilitator

## 2. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

The Facilitator, Ms Karin Bowler, welcomed everyone to the meeting.

She explained that the meeting was being recorded, there were no objections from the participants.

## 3. FACILITATORS INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

The Facilitator explained that an agenda had been distributed. She said that there were two amendments to the agenda:

- A typing error: the discussion period is 1 hour 40 minutes and not just 40 minutes
- The time on item 4 should read as 12.15.

She further stated that the team would like to adhere to the times on the Agenda. However, as the meeting had started slightly later than advertised, this time will be added on at the end of the meeting. This will ensure sufficient time for questions.

One of the objectives of the meeting is for stakeholders to have the opportunity of voicing their issues and concerns. She informed all participants that it is imperative that when they stand up and raise an issue to please state their name and organisation so that the minute-taker can preface the comment that is made in the minutes and attribute it to the correct person.

She advised participants that the meeting is being recorded to ensure the accuracy of the minutes. She asked that points of clarification be held over until the discussion period.

### **3.2 Conduct at Meeting**

The Facilitator explained that participants are welcome to use the language of choice as the team can communicate in both English and Afrikaans.

The Facilitator further read through the points presented on the slide (Appendix 2), which provided guidelines with respect to the conduct of all participants and for achieving a constructive debate and discussion.

She requested all participants to assist the team by having a constructive debate at the meeting.

### **3.3 Objectives of the meeting**

The objective of the Key Stakeholder Feedback Meeting 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 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.

### **3.4 Summary of Issues Raised during Scoping Phase**

The Facilitator explained that the facilitator from the previous round of meetings thought it prudent to summarise a couple of key issues that came out of the process leading up to the EIA Report and also just to list some of those key issues. Having gone through the Issues and Response document, it is quite clear that these are only a few of the issues that were raised. Not all of them are relevant to the EIA process. Some of these issues belong to the NNR process.

For continuity purposes, the Facilitator briefly mentioned some of the issues:

*“Some people are opposed to and some are in favour of the proposed Nuclear Power Plants at Bantamsklip, Thyspunt and Duynfontein sites. There are concerns about the potential impact on health and safety issues. The community living in close proximity to the power station are concerned about their sense of place. They are also concerned about the visual impact of a power station. The affect on tourism is also an issue of concern. Altered sea temperatures could potentially affect marine life. Commercial and recreational fishing might be negatively impacted. Light pollution from the plant. Concern over property values have also been raised. Some people have expressed a lack of trust in the EIA process. Issues regarding the storage of hazardous waste. Consideration of alternatives such as renewable energy”.*

She emphasised that it is important for stakeholders to verify that issues, which were raised during the Scoping Phase, have been taken into consideration during the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Phase.

The Facilitator then introduced the project team to participants.

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

Ms Jaana-Maria Ball and Mr Reuben Heydenrych representing the Independent Environmental Assessment Practitioners, Arcus GIBB, presented the findings on the Draft Environmental Impact Assessment Report.

By way of introduction, Ms Ball, the 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 of the EIA.

Ms Ball and Mr Heydenrych then presented the findings on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (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

Ms Ball indicated that the EIA Team would endeavour to distribute the minutes of the meeting to I&APs within 21 days of the meeting.

I&APs will have 14 days after distribution to verify the minutes and provide their comments to ACER.

### 6.2 Timeframes

In terms of the timeframes, I&APs were reminded that the public review period of the Draft EIA Report ends on 10 May 2010. Arcus GIBB has allocated a 66 day comment period, which recognises that there are long weekends and Easter Weekend within the period 06 March – 10 May 2010.

**Post-meeting note: Following a request at subsequent public meetings, the end date for the public review period was extended to 31 May 2010, thus providing an 87 day comment period.**

Ms Ball encouraged all present to submit their comments to ACER (Africa) using one of the following methods:

- ❑ By mail: Public Participation Office, Nuclear 1 EIA, PO Box 503, Mtunzini, 3867
- ❑ By fax: 035 340 2232
- ❑ By email: [nuclear1@acerafrica.co.za](mailto:nuclear1@acerafrica.co.za)

Comments received on the Draft EIA Report are recorded and addressed on a weekly basis in the form of an Issues and Response Report. Comments received will be used to produce the Final EIR, which will then be submitted to the Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA) 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 Interested and Affected Parties informing them of the Authorities' decision.

### 6.3 Facilitators Concluding Remarks

The Facilitator stated that the onus of responsibility on your shoulders is to act as a reviewer to make sure that this process is robust and that your issues are answered. If not answered, it must be taken forward through the appropriate process. She encouraged everyone to make use of opportunities given to the stakeholders in terms of the National Environmental Management Act (NEMA) and the Constitution.

The Facilitator thanked everyone for constructive engagement and encouraged stakeholders to submit written comments and closed the meetings.

Interactions between I&APs and the Project Team continued after the meeting. However, ACER did not record discussions, which took place after the meeting.

**APPENDIX 1: RECORD OF ISSUES RAISED AND DISCUSSED**

**PORT ELIZABETH KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING**

No	Name	Comment	Response
1	Mr Ryan Donnelly For a Safe Tomorrow	<p>Mr Donnelly questioned the consultants' objectivity regarding the sources of information on alternative power generation options. He questioned how have the independent consultants gone about sourcing information, and what sources of information have been used to decide that nuclear power is the way to go.</p> <p>Mr Donnelly also wanted to know if there has been a more conclusive national energy summit in which stakeholders have been able to participate.</p> <p>Facilitator suggested that Mr Donnelly's question refers to the Integrated Resource Plan</p>	<p>Ms Ball: As stated previously in the presentation, there are two feasible base-load power options available to Eskom. There are other forms of energy generation such as renewables that Eskom is busy investigating and these do not replace the proposed project. Several of these have completed EIA processes, for example the Wind Energy Facility in the Western Cape and Solar Thermal Facility in the Northern Cape. The generation potential of these technologies is limited and cannot be considered as base-load.</p> <p>Arcus GIBB has also looked at published data available in the public domain. A full reference list is provided at the back of the Draft EIR.</p> <p>Mr Stott: There is the Nuclear Energy Policy that government has already issued that went through a public consultation process facilitated by the Department of Energy. The Department of Energy is also busy with the second version of the Integrated Resource Plan, which they have indicated will be published in June 2010.</p>
2	Mr Alwin Malgas Se Vista Forum	<p>Ons woon in St Francis Baai en ons sit met 'n gemeenskap wat Afrikaans en Xhosa praat. Hoekom kom die informasie na ons toe in Engels? Ek het dit maar net bekyk, [Daar is baie mense hierso wat min daarvan kan verstaan.]. Dis goed om hierdie goed op die slides te sien, maar hoe gaan ek na die gemeenskap terug wat nie verstaan nie? Hulle sukkel met 'n gemeenskap wat deurmekaar gemaak is met die krag en Arcus Gibb.</p>	<p>Ms Ball: Arcus GIBB has consulted the DEA on the matter. In terms of bringing back information to the public, we are able to and will present the findings of the Draft EIR in Afrikaans. We have meeting in Sea Vista on Friday, 16 April 2010 and we will gladly present in Afrikaans at that meeting if the community requests this. In terms of the specialists, some of them are not South Africans and the language used for professional technical reports, including theirs, is English.</p>

<b>PORT ELIZABETH KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<p>Dit is nie ek wat Engels nie verstaan nie, ek dink aan die gemeenskap wat sukkel.</p> <p><u>Translation</u>                      He lives in St Francis Bay and the community speaks Afrikaans and Xhosa. He questioned why information in English? [He has had a look at it and feels that there are many people within the community who would understand but little of it.] He states that is helpful to see the information explained on the slides, but the challenge is taking information back to the community who cannot understand it. The community who has become confused by the power station issues and Arcus Gibb.</p> <p>Mr Malgas further explained that it is not that he cannot understand English, but he is thinking of the community who has trouble [understanding].</p>	<p>Ms de Villiers added that if there is a question or answer that you do not understand, please raise your hand and it will be translated.</p>
3	Mr Janie Buckle SANBI - Working for Wetlands	<p>Mr Buckle stated that there are people who would prefer not to have nuclear power stations. He has a friend in Cape Town who has worked as an engineer at Koeberg Nuclear Power Station for about 20 years and his friend does not understand the need for nuclear.</p> <p>As per earlier discussion, he understands that every 18 months, a one third of uranium dioxide rods need to be put into a special container that needs to be cooled and kept at a certain temperature because if they get hot all sorts of things can happen.</p>	<p>Mr Stott: The rods do not go into casks, they are stored in the spent fuel pool. When re-racking of the spent fuel pool was carried out some of the rods were transferred to and are now stored in spent fuel casks. Koeberg Nuclear Power Station is required to contribute to the spent fuel fund. This provision is reported in the Eskom Annual report. An audit is undertaken every year by external auditors to confirm that information shared in the Annual Report is accurate.</p> <p>Once the Government has established a waste repository site, the spent fuel will go to that repository. The funds are available and will be able to cover the costs.</p>

PORT ELIZABETH KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>He enquired if this process has been included in the plans for the proposed nuclear power station, also within the economic context. According to his understanding, for many years to come, the process of cooling the rods will have to be continuously undertaken.</p>	<p>Ms Ball: There are two studies that considered this aspect. One is the Economic Study - it looked at construction, operational and decommissioning related costs. The costs have been built into the economic model.</p> <p>The second one is the Waste Specialist Study. <b>The only feasible and reasonable alternative for the disposal of Low-Level and Intermediate Level radioactive waste is disposal at the Vaalputs nuclear waste disposal site, as it is the only authorised facility for this form of waste in South Africa. Vaalputs has more than sufficient capacity for the waste that will be generated by Nuclear-1.</b></p> <p><b>With regards to High-Level Waste (spent fuel), the only alternative currently available in South Africa is long-term storage of the spent fuel in the nuclear power station. Vaalputs is being considered as a disposal site for High-Level Waste, but the required authorisation processes for this will take several years, so currently the disposal of spent fuel at this facility is not a feasible option.</b></p>
4	Mr Ntandazo Madyini Coega Development Corporation	<p>Mr Madyini requested clarity on the reasons for focussing the economic study mainly on the macro-economic impacts. According to his understanding, micro-economic impacts on the cost benefit side should also be considered.</p> <p>Based on the information presented, only macro-economic impacts have been assessed.</p>	<p>Mr Heydenrych: The economic study examined two different aspects of economic impact, one was macro-economic and the other one was cost efficiency. The study looked at the potential economic impact at different levels.</p> <p>The conclusion was in terms of the economic specialist' opinion, which indicated that the cost efficiency aspects weigh heavier than the macro-economic impacts.</p>

PORT ELIZABETH KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
			Therefore, Thyspunt was preferred from the independent technical specialist's point of view.
5	Mr Hilton Thorpe St Francis Bay Residents Association St Francis Kromme Trust	<p>Mr Thorpe commented on the waste issue, particularly high-level waste:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Nuclear waste is one of the issues that is constantly put on the back burner and set aside as something to be decided about later.</li> <li>▪ It is high time that waste is addressed before we go on with any new nuclear power generation program.</li> <li>▪ The decay period of high-level waste is not to be measured in hundreds of years, it should be measured in hundreds of thousands of years. We should be looking at very long-term decay periods.</li> <li>▪ All over the world waste has been a problem, the Fowler commission in England in the 1970s said it would be irresponsible to go ahead with any nuclear program if there was no recognised site for the long-term disposal of waste.</li> <li>▪ In England they did another survey and spent 5 years looking for sites for intermediate dumping of waste and they found lots of places suitable but nowhere politically acceptable. This is the problem, it is not a technical problem, it is a political problem. Nobody wants nuclear waste.</li> <li>▪ What is certain is that all nuclear power stations generate waste and there are no suitable sites in South Africa for that.</li> <li>▪ I find the EIA report unbelievably complacent over the waste issue. We have no final solution and</li> </ul>	<p>Ms Ball: <b>Waste management is covered in the Draft EIR.</b></p> <p>The NNR/ DEA co-operative agreement that is contained both in the Plan of Study for Impact Assessment and in the various appendices of the Draft EIR indicate that the NNR process should investigate and assess health and safety aspects and not the EIA process. There is also a letter from the Director General of the DEA and it excludes the issues around safety and radiation from the EIA.</p> <p>We have included the waste issue in the EIA, as appendices but the DEA will not be making decisions on those matters, they will pass them on to the NNR. Mr Thorpe's concerns regarding waste have been noted. The Terms of Reference for the EIA exclude an EIA for a nuclear waste repository (i.e. an EIA for a licensed waste site that will take nuclear waste).</p>

PORT ELIZABETH KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>waste has been excluded in the EIA like all the other contentious issues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Waste is an integral part of the project and the Draft EIA Report states that in the absence of a final disposal site, there is a possibility or probability of permanent disposal of high-level waste on site, whether it is Thyspunt, Bantamsklip or Koeberg. This is completely unacceptable to the affected communities and there should be a full EIA to determine a feasible option.</li> </ul> <p>Mr Thorpe concluded by saying that he believes that waste issue constitutes a fatal flaw in the entire process.</p>	
6	Mr Chris Barratt St Francis Kromme Trust	<p>Mr Barratt followed up on the waste issue.</p> <p>He queried which authority and piece of legislation provide for the delegation of nuclear waste from one department to another.</p> <p>Mr Barratt felt that the EIA has taken a very drastic move and excluded important aspects of the EIA. The fact that the consultant says, "<u>as far as he is aware and says co-operative agreement</u>" –does not necessarily mean that one can exclude the waste issue from the EIA and that is the difference.</p>	Mr Heydenrych: The National Environmental Management Act does provide for co-operative agreement between government bodies in order to facilitate co-operative governance.
7	Facilitator	For clarity purposes: In terms of the licensing process for nuclear and in terms of the NNR process, does the nuclear plant, once approved, need a separate EIA authorisation process for a high-level waste site?	Mr Stott: The NNR, in terms of its Act, must license nuclear facilities regardless of where they are in the country. There is a co-operative agreement between the NNR and DEA. The Nuclear Energy Act gives the Minister of Energy

<b>PORT ELIZABETH KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
			<p>responsibility for the management of all nuclear waste.</p> <p>If we create a separate storage facility over and above the specified limits, an EIA will have to be undertaken. If there is an off-site disposal facility for nuclear waste, regardless of whether it is low-level or high-level waste, that would have to go through all the required processes, including obtaining approval from the Minister of Energy.</p> <p>There is a new Act of Parliament, which was promulgated in 2009 called the National Radioactive Disposal Institute Act, This institute is given the responsibility to establish and control radioactive waste on behalf of the Minister. This includes waste from nuclear power stations and medical waste. The government is also going to start a process of establishing a final repository for spent fuel.</p> <p>The law does not require that the processes have to be completed before the construction of any nuclear power station. It is believed that, technically, all radioactive waste can be managed safely and kept isolated from the environment for many thousands of years.</p> <p>Ms Ball: The co-operative agreement is in terms of Section 6 of the NNR Act and Regulation 709.</p>
8	Mr Sydney Lamont Sea Vista Forum	Ek wil 'n boodskap gee aan al die mense wat hier is. Die kernkragsentrale wat Eskom van voorneme is om te bou: ek wou vir julle sê dit sal in St Francis Baai gebou word. Daar is nie 'n alternatief nie. Ek het 'n boodskap van die Here af gekry. Ek het dit gesien in my droom, Ek het ook gesien dat daar 'n ongeluk gebeur wat ons almal van hier kan gebruik as getuie.	Mr Lamont's message was noted.

PORT ELIZABETH KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>Die ongeluk deur 'n motor of 'n kar verbrysel 'n ding, maar dit was 'n ongeluk waar mense nie suurstof gekry het nie. Ek het hulle gesien presies in dra daar by die [onduidelik]. Ek wil vir Eskom vanmôre sê: as julle net julle plan verskuif na 'n alternatiewe plek dan sal hierdie ding nie gebeur nie. Ek weet vanmôre en Eskom weet Thyspunt is die verkiesste plek. Ek kan nie stil sit nie, ek moet dit afgee; as die Here praat moet ek vir hom luister. Verkoop daardie grond van julle en gebruik daai geld en gaan Bantamsklip toe of 'n ander plek. Dit is iets wat ek gesien het voor julle hier by ons gekom het. Ek is nie 'n waarsêer nie, dit is 'n boodskap van die Here af.</p> <p><u>Translation</u>                      He informed all present that he would like to share a message regarding the power station that Eskom proposes to build. His message was as follows:</p> <p>I wanted to tell you that the power station would be built at St Francis Bay. There is no alternative. I had a message from the Lord. I saw it in my dream. I also saw an accident happen which can [make witnesses of us all]. This accident of a motorcar or car destroys something, but it was an accident in which people could not get oxygen. I saw them being carried in exactly at the [unclear]. I just want to tell Eskom today: if you would only move your plan to an alternative site, this thing will not happen. I know today, and Eskom knows, that Thyspunt is the preferred site. I cannot be quiet; I have to pass it on: when the Lord speaks, I have to obey. Sell that land of yours and use the</p>	

<b>PORT ELIZABETH KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		money to go to Bantamsklip or some other place. This is something I saw before you came here. I'm not a soothsayer; this is a message from the Lord.	
9	Ms Andrea von Holdt Coega Development Corporation and Rebels Rus Nature Reserve Resident	<p>Ms von Holdt indicated that she is representing Coega Development Corporation in her capacity as the Environmental Manager and is also a concerned resident of Rebels Rus Nature Reserve, which is in very close proximity to the Thyspunt site. She then raised the following comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>The impacts on marine biology.</u> In the information document provided to I&amp;APs, it is indicated that the impacts on marine biology would be highly significant in the long-term. These are negative impacts of up to 6m<sup>2</sup>. The EIA report also indicates that these impacts could be mitigated sufficiently. She indicated that she is not clear as to what "sufficiently" means.</li> <li>2. <u>Impact on the Chokka industry:</u> She would like the report to provide specific information that will help her understand how significantly negative are the impacts, provide clarity on the nature of negative impacts on the lives of the Chokka fishermen who are always in Thyspunt. She mentioned that she was uncomfortable as she has not read this particular specialist report but would like that a response be given in detail in the report.</li> <li>3. It is also stated that that "<u>over a very long time the marine life will recover</u>", it is unacceptable from a conservationist point of view and would therefore like this point to be covered in detail and justified.</li> </ol>	<p>Mr Heydenrych: You are correct in your reading of the executive summary. The Marine Specialist concluded that there would be a potential impact of high significance within a limited area. In other words 3 km<sup>2</sup> in the short-term and 6 km<sup>2</sup> in the long-term over a period of 5 years. The area within that radius would be blanketed by sand of a certain thickness and that the marine processes within that area would effectively cease, and over a very long period of time they would start regenerating. According to the Marine Specialist, considering the distance that the sediment would be disposed offshore, as well as the location of the area, this was thought to be an acceptable impact.</p> <p>Ms Ball: Added that there were two specialists, Prof. Charlie Griffiths, an internationally renowned marine specialist and his colleague Dr. Tammy Robinson. They did specifically look at the potential impact on the Chokka industry in terms of its breeding cycle and the life cycle of the squid.</p> <p>Ms Ball offered that clarity will be sought from the marine specialist and a response provided.</p> <p><b>Post-meeting note: The Marine Biology Assessment is attached as Appendix E15 to the Draft Environmental Impact Assessment Report (Draft EIR). The report identified the following potential impacts on the marine environment in terms of Chokka squid:</b></p>

<b>PORT ELIZABETH KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<p>4. The presentation given on the visual impacts indicated that the visual impact would be of low significance. She stated that she holds a different opinion, since from her house in the Rebels Rus Nature Reserve; she will clearly see the Nuclear Power Station. Therefore, the visual impact is high.</p>	<p><b><u>Disruption of the marine environment during construction</u></b>                      The construction of an intake and outflow system for cooling water will result in temporary disruption to the marine environment. Under such circumstances the benthic habitat and in particular egg beds of the Chokka squid <i>Loligo vulgaris</i> are at risk of damage due to smothering, while turbidity may result in adults temporarily moving out of the area. This disturbance will be focussed within the construction phase and is likely to be localised and of short duration.</p> <p>Additionally, potential discarding of an estimated 6.37 million m<sup>3</sup> of spoil from the excavation of the intake tunnel, nuclear island and turbine hall poses a threat to the marine environment. From a biological perspective potential impacts would occur due to increased turbidity in the water column as a result of the suspension of fine particles and due to smothering of the benthic habitat by spoil placed on the sea floor. At this site only the disposal of all or half the spoil at a deep site using a medium discharge rate are considered acceptable from a marine ecology perspective. Following disposal on the seafloor, roughly 3 m of sediment will cover an area of 1.5 or 3 km<sup>2</sup> depending on whether only half or the full volume of sediment is disposed of. Following disposal, local water movement will result in shifting of the spoil in a north easterly direction towards Seal Point. Within the first five years following disposal the sediment is likely to spread to cover an area of between 8.3 km<sup>2</sup> and 6</p>

<b>PORT ELIZABETH KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
			<p>km<sup>2</sup> in sediment of between 5 and 10 cm. In the next five years loose sediment originally placed on the disposal site is expected to continue to spread in towards Seal Point. If disposal of the full volume of sediment is employed this spoil is likely to spread to cover a small area in the small bay east of Seal Point in 5 – 10 cm of sediment. If disposal of only half the volume of spoil is utilised, this area will not be affected. While the initial disposal site will be lost as a breeding area to Chokka squid <i>L. vulgaris</i>, the areas to which sediment spreads are unlikely to affect these squid as they lay eggs on both sand bottoms and rocky reefs. Sandy bottom communities establishing within sediment originating from the disposal of spoil are likely to be dissimilar to those of surrounding areas. This is due to the fact that this site is dominated by consolidated sands will naturally support different biotic communities to those occurring in loose sediments such as those derived from spoil.</p> <p><u>Release of warmed cooling water</u>                      No input of warmed water comparable to that of the proposed development exists along this section of coast. As this site lies at the warm end of the Agulhas Bioregion it could be argued that a portion of species occurring here may be near the upper end of their temperature tolerance range and hence could be particularly vulnerable to further temperature increase. Although theoretically possible, this is however, unsubstantiated.</p> <p>The fishery of greatest importance in the Thyspunt</p>

<b>PORT ELIZABETH KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
			<p>area is the coastal jigging fishery for Chokka squid <i>L. vulgaris</i>. The major spawning grounds of this species occur between Plettenberg Bay and Algoa Bay and it is here that these squid are targeted during the spawning season. Adult Chokka squid are adapted to a wide temperature range of between 8 and 22°C and are able to cope with rapid changes in water temperature, which allow them to easily move through thermoclines. As such it has been recognised that temperature is probably not a primary factor affecting the distribution of adults, but rather the distribution of their food source. This is reflected in catches peaking following drops in temperature resulting from coastal upwelling. It should be noted that it is not the drop in temperature which drives this change, but rather the process of upwelling. As such, elevated water temperatures resulting from the release of cooling water will not as a matter of course result in lower catches by the fishery.</p> <p>The egg capsules of this species are deposited directly onto the seafloor and develop optimally at temperatures between 12 and 20°C. At temperatures above 22°C egg development is retarded and mortality increases and above 24°C, 100% mortality is reached. Based on a background temperature of 19°C egg beds will be able to tolerate a maximum temperature increase near the sea bottom of 3°C. Oceanographic modelling indicates that while a mean increase of 3°C near the seabed will be limited to an area of roughly 0.2km<sup>2</sup> around the outlets of a 4 000 MW plant, an area of 0.5km<sup>2</sup> will experience an maximum increase of 3°C or more, if a nearshore pipeline outfall is used .</p>

<b>PORT ELIZABETH KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
			<p>This temperature increase will be focused at depths shallower than 15 m. Modelling also showed that should a channel outflow system be used for a 10 000 MW plant, a mean increase of 3°C would affect less than 0.1 km<sup>2</sup> but about 2.5 km<sup>2</sup> would experience a maximum increase of 3°C or more (Models were not constructed to consider this release system for a 4 000 MW plant, but its impact would be less than that of the larger 10 000 MW plant. As egg beds are laid down predominantly in areas shallower than 50 m (unless unfavourable conditions force adult squid offshore), a certain amount of egg mortality is expected, although precise estimates cannot be made as the exact location of egg beds is not known. Nonetheless, the area to be affected is in fact a tiny portion of the spawning ground which is centred between Plettenberg Bay and Algoa Bay (Augustyn 1991). In order to minimise impacts on egg beds the cooling system outflow should be located at a depth of more than 50 m.</p> <p>The release of warmed water is not predicted to have a significantly negative effect on fish, or marine mammals. This is due to their mobility and ability to avoid the localised warm water plume. In addition all of these species have wide-ranging distributions which extend far beyond the Thyspunt area. Although these species are likely to avoid the elevated temperatures immediately around the outfall, they are not expected to avoid the area in general.</p> <p>At Thyspunt there is notable potential for the</p>

PORT ELIZABETH KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
			<p>establishment of new warm water species, due to the already high ambient sea temperatures at this site and its proximity to the sub-tropical Natal marine bioregion, which could act as a source of immigration of warm-water species. Climate change related declines in sea surface temperature in this region (Rouault <i>et al.</i> 2009) are unlikely to reduce the risk of establishment of warm water species as water temperatures have declined by less than 1°C over the last two decades. Should the establishment of warm water species occur, it is, however, unlikely to have dramatic impacts on the local ecology as immigrant species will be restricted to a small area warmed to within their thermal tolerance range by the plume.</p> <p>Mr Heydenrych: We take note of your comments regarding the potential visual impacts.</p> <p>Ms Ball added that the visual specialist undertook his study from all aspects. <b>The Visual Impact Assessment conducted as part of the EIA is attached as Appendix E20 to the Draft EIR.</b> It reports that the visibility the Nuclear Power Station at Thyspunt is contained along the coast by east-west orientated dune fields. This limits the visual exposure of the Thyspunt Nuclear Power Station to the towns of Oyster Bay and Cape St. Francis.</p> <p>The main aspect that influenced the above conclusion is the presence of the visually dominant Thyspunt Nuclear Power Station and the associated transmission lines and buildings, all of which are visible to some degree from within a 10 km radius of the site, but mainly along the coastal edge. This is due to the</p>

<b>PORT ELIZABETH KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
			<p>landform that includes vegetated and moving dunes that trend east-west, almost parallel to the coastline and the extended visibility at night due to intense illumination of that site. However the general existing coastal night scene is disturbed by the intense incandescent lights on the 'Chokka' boats as they fish for squid near the shore. The light intensity varies according to the season for Chokka fishing. The visual intrusion on the landscape character will be increased by the HV Yard, the transmission lines and proposed northern access road that all become visually prominent in the panhandle of the property north of the high sand dune.</p> <p>The specialist study further proposes mitigation measures related to the colour of the large structures and masts, the erection of screens, lighting of structures and areas within the Nuclear Power Station and the position of soil dumps.</p> <p><b>A 3D representation is currently being prepared by the Visual Specialist.</b></p>
10	Mr Alwin Malgas Sea Vista Forum	Ons vang daai tjokka op [onduidelik] water. Hulle praat van 6 km <sup>2</sup> . Die hele tjokka bedryf gaan daarmee heen gaan as daai water gaan warm word. Ons vang hulle in 10m water. Hulle praat van 'n pyplyn – ons het 'n gemeenskap daar; ons mense het nie die informasie nie. Dit gee my die idee dat Eskom selfsugtig is. Hulle gee nie om vir die mense van St Francis nie.	<p>Facilitator– Kan ek vra [by] die vergadering by Sea Vista, dat daardie spesifieke spesialis meer spesifiek na die inligting kyk.</p> <p>Facilitator requested that, since detailed information could not be provided at the meeting, detailed information be sourced from the specialist study in preparation for the meeting at Sea Vista on Friday, 16 April.</p>

PORT ELIZABETH KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p><u>Translation</u>                      We catch this chokka on/in [word unclear] water. They talk about 6 km<sup>2</sup>. The whole chokka industry will be destroyed if that water gets warm. We catch them in 10m water. They talk about a pipeline – we have a community there; our people do not have the information. This creates the impression with me that Eskom is acting selfishly. They do not care about the people of St Francis.</p>	
11	Mr Ryan Donnelly FAST	<p>Mr Donnelly questioned where exactly and specifically is the concentration of the spawning ground of the Chokka.</p> <p>Follow up comment: They do not know where it is. The Draft EIA report merely refers to “a very large area”. This indicates that they do not know where the specific area is.</p> <p>Facilitator’s follow up comment to Mr Donnelly: if the specialists do in fact know where the area is and they can substantiate it, will you accept it? She asked Mr Donnelly if his concern is that it is an omission in the report and it needs addressed.</p>	<p>Ms Ball: There are 24 very complex specialist studies. This aspect is covered in the report and can be shared with Mr Donnelly after the meeting when copies of the specific reports were available.</p> <p>Mr Donnelly agreed.</p>
12	Mr Hilton Thorpe St Francis Bay Residents Assoc and St Francis Kromme Trust	<p>Mr Thorpe recalled that there was a discussion about pumping the spoil from Thyspunt to St Francis Bay. He would like to understand if the consultant is talking about the same spoil that is now going to take up 6km<sup>2</sup> of the seabed.</p> <p>He requested enlightenment on what happened to that</p>	<p>Ms Ball: Mr Thorpe’s statement is correct. The suggestion was raised at some of the meetings around Thyspunt as a potential alternative for using the spoil. Arcus GIBB consulted with the specialist that undertook the EIA and were informed that they had found a solution to the problem. As a result, the pumping of the spoil to St Francis Bay was not considered any further in the EIA as an</p>

<b>PORT ELIZABETH KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		suggestion because that would have benefitted St Francis Bay given the fact that St Francis Bay has significant beach erosion.	alternative.
13	Mr Andrew Skowno Wilderness Foundation SA	<p>He questioned if the international markets will buy Chokka from the area. It should be recognised that Chokka from the area is sold internationally and has a positive economic benefit in the area. He further asked if the specialist assessed the impact from an economic perspective?</p> <p>Facilitator: the Chokka industry may be one components but it feeds into the integrated perspective of all other impacts, whether they are positive or negative and whether they can or cannot be mitigated especially when you are looking at a community that is dependent on the international market. The actual extent of that impact must be detailed.</p>	<p>Ms Ball: It is certainly an important economic activity around the Thyspunt site. At all of the sites we considered the agricultural base economic activities. As an example, around Bantamsklip there is a wine industry, Thyspunt there is Chokka industry and dairy farming, all of these were taken into account in the economic study.</p> <p>In terms of quality control and in terms of the specialist studies, there were Terms of Reference as detailed in the Plan of Study for EIA. Arcus GIBB also had the report quality controlled by an independent specialist in the various specialist fields, including expert opinions to make sure that the specialist complied with the Plan of Study.</p>
14	Ms Kaylene Levack Joshua Heritage	She wanted to know if a Heritage Impact Assessment has been done and if so, what was the level of participation in the study. Section 25 of the Act states that cognisance has to be taken of Cultural Heritage – she enquired if cultural heritage has been part of the EIA.	Ms Ball: Dr Timothy Hart from UCT Archaeology Department undertook the Heritage Impact Assessment. He started off in late 2007, so it was undertaken over a number of years. Extensive fieldwork was undertaken at the various sites. There was extensive field sampling at Thyspunt. The key mitigation measure which has come out of this study and which has been incorporated in the Draft EIR as well as the Draft EMP is that full archaeological collections need to be undertaken. These may take a number of months if not years by a team of experienced archaeologists. The Heritage Report has been reviewed during the Scoping phase and is being further reviewed by the public and experts as part in the Draft EIR.

<b>PORT ELIZABETH KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
			Cultural Heritage was also part of the study and as such the study is in full compliance with the Heritage Resources Act.
15	Mr Hilton Thorpe St Francis Bay Residents Assoc and St Francis Kromme Trust	<p>Mr Thorpe drew attention to page 15 of the Executive Summary of the EIR which read, "Mitigation of Heritage Impacts particularly require the work of a science specific team dedicated to excavation over a period of several years prior to the onset of construction".</p> <p>That extract is in the Draft EIR. His question relates to how can construction begin in 2011. The same applies to the seismic investigation where they need very long time to determine the seismic implications in detail. Is Eskom going to jettison the idea of 2011?</p> <p>Facilitator noted that certain seismic studies have already been done in terms of the site selection and</p>	<p>Ms Ball: From the EIA perspective those mitigation measures were taken straight from the specialist reports and placed in the recommendations of the Draft EIR and the Draft EMP. If the DEA authorises this project with conditions, which is likely, that will be one of the authorising conditions.</p> <p>Ms Herbst: The important part to note is that the EMP stipulates what needs to be done before construction starts. Eskom has to comply with the EMP conditions. Therefore it will impact on Eskom's timelines and we will have to address this delay in our plans.</p> <p>However, there could be a phased approach in terms of what they excavate first. As an example, they could start at the construction area and then move to other areas. Eskom will have to obtain authorisation from the South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) and ascertain what can be completed during construction.</p> <p>Ms Ball: We have had initial meetings with SAHRA, together with the Heritage Specialist, in terms of the mitigation measures and seeing which resources are available in South Africa in terms of being able to complete some of this mitigation. The amount of time is based on the number of people available to undertake work on site.</p> <p>Ms Ball: There are many permits that the applicant, Eskom has to apply for and Arcus GIBB cannot respond on behalf of Eskom regarding their new build program.</p>

<b>PORT ELIZABETH KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<p>suitability. She however questioned if there are any additional seismic related studies that need to be undertaken and their implications on Eskom's build programme.</p>	<p>Mr Stott: Eskom has a deadline that they would like to meet, however, this timeline will be determined by the Integrated Resource Plan that government is developing. This includes whether they want to have nuclear as part of the energy mix and if they do, by when do they want the first power station to be operational. It could be 2018, 2020 or 2022, all of those dates have been mentioned in the media. Assuming that the government indicates that they want nuclear, apart from the EIA authorisation, Eskom will also need to get the nuclear license from the National Nuclear Regulator.</p> <p>One of the things they will do is look at seismic analysis, i.e. is the plant designed to withstand the projected seismic activity. We have seen that for Thyspunt there is a lot of margin, those studies have been done since we started investigating sites in South Africa. Thyspunt has ~0.16g (Peak Ground Acceleration). There is however less margin at Bantamsklip and for Duynefontein ~0.3g. Eskom has requested additional studies so that we can refine those figures, particularly for Duynefontein because if it is ~0.3g or higher Eskom will have to design a plant specifically for that. For Thyspunt we believe that the standard design can be used because there is sufficient margin within the seismic activity. But this is all part of the NNR's licensing process.</p>
16	Mr Graham Moolah St Andrews College	<p>He had the following concerns:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. On the site there are numerous pre-historic shell middens and on top of that we also have the fish kraals. Heritage comes from a race of people that</li> </ol>	<p>Ms Ball: the Heritage Specialist has mapped the heritage sensitivity on Thyspunt and it is an extremely rich site. One of the key mitigation measures that the specialist has recommended and which have been taken into account, is the setback line of 200 m from the coast to preserve the</p>

PORT ELIZABETH KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>are dead and what is going to be done to preserve this in the future. This has been untouched and unspoilt for hundreds of years. The wealth of our middens that are on the site will be gone forever once the nuclear site is built.</p> <p>2. Water: As we know in the area, there is a critical water shortage. Without water, we die. This applies to farmers and everybody. What Eskom has done and what the EIA has done during the seismic drilling – is drilling into the water table. They are drilling this table so badly that it looks like they are trying to destroy the wetlands and dry them out. It is unbelievable when you see the damage on the site. It is so bad that the Chokka fishermen, who used to fish directly off Thyspunt have moved as far as the Fish River Mouth to try and catch Chokka because of the destruction being done. We have a wealth of underground rivers and we are drilling into that underground water table and source. If we destroy or damage this, it will be a disaster to this area for the rest of time. Water is life.</p>	<p>majority of the middens. Please supply any information you have to Arcus GIBB..</p> <p>Water resources are a huge issue. A desalinisation plant is included in this EIA at all of the sites - taking sea water and desalinising it and that is why one of the alternatives examined was the potential impact of brine, which is concentrated sea water.</p> <p>Mr Stott: Obviously to do the hydrological studies, drilling has been undertaken. <b>Post meeting note: Ground water has not been pumped from the boreholes on the Thyspunt site, it is therefore not possible for the borehole drilling to impact on the water table.</b></p> <p>Ms Ball: The specialist has recommended that more monitoring points be drilled to determine precise mitigation measures.</p>
17	Mr Andrew Muir Wilderness Foundation of SA	<p>Mr Muir indicated that he is representing the Wilderness Foundation of SA in his capacity as the Chief Executive Officer.</p> <p>He then raised the following concerns:</p> <p>1. In a conversation with Sir David King, he mentioned that there is a technical adjustment</p>	<p>Ms Ball: I do not know the specifics regarding the technology process to recycle radiological waste. Arcus GIBB worked within the envelope of criteria for a generation 3 nuclear power stations. The parameters of this envelope of criteria were very conservative and Eskom and any vendor would have to comply to these criteria. The specialists looked at that criteria and undertook their</p>

PORT ELIZABETH KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>that is being done to recycle some of the waste that prolongs the process of using uranium and that there are new technologies coming into place. You mentioned that you would take this into account. I just need to know if this has been taken into account because clearly there are cost implications but it will impact positively on the overall waste disposal problem.</p> <p>2. Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA). An SEA has not been done in this area. The fact that Eskom and the environmental consultants cannot do an SEA, will impact on every citizen of the Eastern Cape and South Africa. The EIA regulations, which have been amended in parliament, should come through by June 2010 and it is ironic that we are talking about a need for an SEA, which will be a requirement for a development of this nature. I say it is ironic because this EIA process will be submitted to the DEA before the regulations become a requirement. I am raising this as a concern as I believe that if an SEA was done, it would have taken into account the strategic impact of the region. There will be serious concerns raised through a SEA.</p> <p>3. This development is on the boundary of the Baviaanskloof Nature Reserve, which is a World Heritage Site and this has not been taken into account at all because it is outside the boundary of the scope of the EIA. Baviaanskloof is subject to international legislation in terms of world heritage.</p>	<p>assessments based on these criteria. Mr Muir was requested to please provide the specific information referred to.</p> <p>In terms of the SEA issue, the EIA studies were not limited to local potential impacts. The specialists looked at the effects on the region. In terms of the Baviaanskloof Reserve, all specialists, particularly the biophysical specialists, are well aware of this important conservation area. Nevertheless, we will flag this issue and make confirm that this issue is addressed in all studies.</p> <p><b>Post-meeting note: New environmental-impact assessment (EIA) Regulations, which will be published shortly, will come into effect in July this year. These regulations do not include a requirement to carry out a Strategic Environmental Assessment.</b></p> <p>The statement regarding a positive conservation benefit was taken out of the independent specialist study. This was a conclusion that has come out from a number of specialist studies.</p> <p>Mr Stott: Eskom looks at what technologies are available and explore all new technologies. The technology that Mr Muir has referred to is the one that significantly reduce the amount of high-level radioactive waste that is produced. There has recently been some announcements, and have learned that Bill Gates is in fact looking at different types of technology. These are very much into the future and they are only likely to become commercially available in about</p>

<b>PORT ELIZABETH KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<p>4. Then, there is also the issue of the transmission lines and the various impacts related to Thyspunt and the impacts on many other parts of the Eastern Cape. That is why SEAs are important.</p> <p>Finally I really take objection to," Positive, overall conservation benefits," - this is insulting. You cannot say, when you consider the issues of water, marine life, visual impacts, that just because you are going to declare a small part of the land a reserve, that it is a positive conservation impact.</p> <p>You also cannot use the word "overall". It goes with the strategic side, as this does not take into account the long-term impacts of road transport and of transmission lines.</p> <p>The whole idea of an SEA is that you take a strategic view and not just the local impact. The same applies to the conservation, the reason why the Baviaanskloof Nature Reserve came into being is to create corridors of biodiversity to protect this set of biomes that we have in this area. Part of the corridors come from Cape St Francis area and an SEA would take that into account. That is why you cannot use the word "overall".</p>	<p>20 or 30 years time. Therefore this is too far into the future for us to consider for this nuclear power station.</p>
18	Dr Peter Inman Coega Development Corporation	<p>He stated that he is also a resident of Rebels Rus Nature Reserve and knows the area quite well. He raised the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The challenge to me is the damage that has been</li> </ul>	<p>Comments noted.</p>

<b>PORT ELIZABETH KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<p>referred to (drilling). I am not aware of how bad it is, but it is certainly not the way to do things. If there is going to be a certain amount of disturbance, this has to be very carefully controlled.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ If the idea, as stated in slide 62, i.e. taking the land and looking after it all the way up to The Links, because it is all beautiful, it is all worth preserving, then you are looking at the most wonderful site.</li> <li>▪ If you look at the bigger picture, it helps to conserve a much bigger area. You are currently looking at quite a small area and there is a lot more that is worth conserving. If you conserve a bigger area, you could actually be adding some value back.</li> </ul>	
19	Ms Chantal Oddy Rebels Rus Conservancy	<p>Is Eskom going to take a bigger area for conservation, because that is of interest to Rebels Rus Conservancy?</p> <p>Regarding the water issue, Rebels Rus has run out of water. There is nothing trickling into the tanks any more, so Eskom have definitely damaged the water table during the drilling at the Thyspunt site.</p>	<p>A recommendation has been provided by the specialists for an extended conservation area.</p> <p>Eskom stated that they are not taking water from the boreholes that have been drilled to complete the hydrological study.</p>
20	Mr Ryan Donnelly FAST	<p>Mr Donnelly objected to the manner in which the meeting is handled. Every time a question is posed to the Independent EIA consultants, which is within their scope of work, a question is passed on to the developer (Eskom) to respond. This has been experienced previously in the process. The public cannot have a situation where the developer is managing the EIA process. The EIA process has to be</p>	<p>Ms Ball objected to Mr Donnelly's statement. She further highlighted that there are some questions that are policy decisions etc, and that are way beyond the EIA. She advised Mr Donnelly that Arcus GIBB has responded to all EIA related questions.</p>

<b>PORT ELIZABETH KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		managed by the independent consultants.	
21	Mr Janie Buckle SANBI - Working for Wetlands	<p>Mr Buckle shared the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ I would like to make you aware that there two specialist studies by Rhodes University, Prof Fred Ellery, they are looking at that entire system and the uniqueness of that wetland system. Also the groundwater, and how that interrelates with the dune ecosystem. This is a very interesting subject. I have attended a conference on it already, this is nearing completion and you should gain knowledge from this study.</li> <li>▪ From a wetland point of view we are concerned about the access roads and the power lines. In future once this thing comes off we would like to have some feedback.</li> <li>▪ I have not seen the actual footprint of where the roads are and where the power lines are going. There are a lot of proposed mitigation measures for the dune system which we would have a problem with.</li> <li>▪ We are experienced in wetlands restoration so we could offer assistance with this aspect.</li> <li>▪ The uniqueness of the wetlands has been highlighted in your report but this is probably the one wetland in the world that has the [word unclear] ecosystem.</li> </ul> <p>Facilitator asked if it would not be beneficial to provide this information to the specialist now particularly in terms of the access roads. These are the types of things that need to be evaluated and written into the</p>	<p>Ms Ball: The dune geomorphology specialist, Dr Ellenberger, and our wetlands specialist, Dr. Liz Day, have been working with Prof Ellery and there have been meetings between these various experts. Also there is another lady (<b>Ms. Lauren Elkington</b>), also from Rhodes University, doing her PhD on the subject..</p> <p>The specialist study recommended specific mitigation that was obviously specific to their technical specialist area. Drs Day and Ellenberger have indicated extensive mitigation, which is highlighted in the Draft EIR, in the Draft EMP (Appendix F). I must emphasise again that these are draft specialist reports and a draft EMP.</p> <p><b>Post-meeting note: Comment by Dr Illenberger received via e-mail on 19 May 2010</b></p> <p><b>A study investigating the structure and functioning of the Oyster Bay Dunefield system is being undertaken by a group of scientists led by Prof. Ellery and involving Ms. Gillian McGregor and Ms. Lauren Elkington, all from the Department of Environmental Science, Rhodes University; as well as Prof. Richard Cowling from the Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University. An MSc thesis entitled “Morphology, patterns and processes in the Oyster Bay Dune field system” by Ms Elkington is at an advanced stage of preparation. This is a work in progress, and the data collected cannot be presented or discussed in the EIR until the MSc is completed. However, if the thesis is completed before the Final EIR is completed, the</b></p>

<b>PORT ELIZABETH KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		EMPs, therefore it is advisable to raise them timeously.	<p><b>results of the thesis will be incorporated into the relevant specialist studies.</b></p> <p>Ms Herbst: responded to Mr Buckle's offer of involvement at later stages. At this stage, there is no final design, once we start getting involved in final design it is always useful to have professional organisations, NGOs involved in some of the decision-making. Eskom has had a very successful partnership with BirdLife South Africa and Middelpunt Wetland Trust on the Ingula Pumped Storage Scheme, where during final design and construction decisions are being influenced by the partnership.</p>
22	Ms Judi Nwokedi Areva Women in the Nuclear Industry in SA SA Citizen	<p>Ms Nwokedi shared the following information, which formed a basis for her comment and recommendation:</p> <p>I grew up with two power stations in my back yard in a previously forced removal settlement in the Western Cape. I had the benefit and the not so positive benefit of a coal power station and Koeberg. They were re-declared areas for people of my racial background and we were forcibly removed to that area. Obviously we had no benefit from any public participation in any process whatsoever.</p> <p>The process that is being followed now to develop energy security for South Africa is critical, it is pivotal and it is groundbreaking in terms of whether we survive the economy or not.</p> <p>I think it is very important to the DEA and the related ministries in clusters that the public education process is undertaken. The public education process could be</p>	Comment noted.

<b>PORT ELIZABETH KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<p>undertaken parallel to the EIA because many issues will be discussed.</p> <p>I am not here to provide answers to some of the questions that have been asked, but in a public education process you can put the term key value chain of any energy solution to the South Africans not just stakeholders, so that South Africans can make decisions on the basis of objective neutral information that was provided to them.</p> <p>As South Africans we have been promised a public education process so that from the issues of base-load to carbon storage to co-generation to independent power producers – so that the debate takes place within the appropriate context.</p> <p>Lastly, on the spent fuel issues and technologies that are being developed, I would be happy to share my knowledge and talk about technologies that are in development and that are being deployed in countries across the world.</p>	
23	Mr Ryan Donnelly FAST	<p>Mr Donnelly fully supported Ms Nwokedi's recommendation with regards to information sharing. He felt that it is good idea. He also mentioned that he participated at the International Energy Summit in 2007 and there was representation from various stakeholders who are involved in the planning for energy.</p> <p>There were a number of energy groups that were objecting to SA's energy planning. It was however</p>	Comments noted.

<b>PORT ELIZABETH KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<p>more of a dictative kind of summit. He thinks that as far as gaining information and coming to decisions and conclusions of what is the way forward, it definitely needs to be a process that involves everyone, from the beginning.</p> <p>At the moment when it comes to the public domain, I am well aware that Eskom has published a lot of things in the public domain and I would say that, that information is not independent. We need to look to the independence of information.</p>	
24	Ms Andrea von Holdt Coega Development Corporation and Rebels Rus Nature Reserve Resident	<p>Ms von Holdt raised the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ She is of the opinion that the public cannot fight development and specifically this one. South Africa needs cleaner energy and do not want to go coal, so she thinks that the motivation for this specific project is there and it is clear.</li> <li>▪ However, the concerns that have been raised at the meeting are mostly related to the biophysical environment. She does not get the confidence from the EIA Consultants that the public queries are being satisfactorily answered.</li> <li>▪ She enquired if it would be possible to get the specialist to address meetings. The responses forthcoming from the Consultants are that “this will be addressed or that they will go back to the specialists”. Face to face contact with the specialists is what will provide the majority of assurance to a lot of queries.</li> <li>▪ Regarding the roads: In the summary report, it has been mentioned that there is a northern</li> </ul>	<p>Ms Ball: It is not typical in an EIA process to bring specialists to public meetings. GIBB does recognise that in some cases this would be beneficial if numerous issues are raised about a specific specialist report.</p> <p>It has been raised in correspondence from the DEA and we have considered it and we want to go through this round of meetings and see which issues come up. Particularly at Thyspunt site, the biophysical issues are complicated. They are issues that involve complicated mitigation measures to bring the significance of impacts down. We will bear this comment in mind and in the mean time please raise your issues around the studies you would like the specialist to address.</p> <p>GIBB will take all of your questions back to the specialists on a weekly basis, any issues that are raised during the week we send to the specialists and we get them to answer those queries with our assistance and then integrate it into an Issues and Response Trail. If there is a need to have a key focus group meeting around one or two specialist</p>

PORT ELIZABETH KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>access and a preferred western access. However, in the presentation, Mr Heydenrych mentioned an eastern access road, which was non-negotiable for large trucks. What is the situation with this road, as this concerns the residents of the Rebels Rus Nature Reserve? This access will impact specifically on the safety of our houses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will there be another round of public meetings if the public demands the presence of specialists?</li> </ul>	<p>studies, focus group meetings are very effective tools in an EIA.</p> <p><b>Post-meeting note: Focus Groups and another Key Stakeholder Meeting has been organised with selected specialists (marine, agriculture, traffic and transportation, social, geohydrology, freshwater ecology and dune geomorphology) in the Cape St. Francis/ St. Francis Bay area from 24 to 26 May 2010.</b></p> <p>Ms Ball: In terms of the eastern access road, this is for heavy vehicles, Yes, this access road will be used during construction phase because of the gradient and the access to the main roads for the heavy vehicles and heavy loads. These are huge vehicles with heavy loads and that will need to be strictly controlled, all the mitigation that are associated with that such as dust, noise, how many loads per day, etc. are built into the Draft EMP and the specialist studies themselves.</p> <p>There are two other access roads, one is a northerly access road and the biophysical specialist particularly found that this access road was unacceptable, in terms of passing over dune system and the associated sensitive wetlands and the inter-dune habitats for the flora and fauna. However, the visual specialist quite liked this road.</p> <p>In terms of the western access road that would come from Oyster Bay and roughly follow the existing road on the site, as we have said, the specialist have looked at corridors in this EIA and looked at the whole EIA corridor and they also looked at the road corridors and transmission line corridors</p>

PORT ELIZABETH KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
			and a detailed alignment, for example the wetland specialist and the botanical specialist have had that detailed walk-outs would have to be undertaken to find specific alignments for these roads. <b>The concerns raised regarding the road alignment will be discussed at the Focus Group Meetings to be held 24 – 26 May 2010.</b>
25	Mr Alwin Malgas Sea Vista Forum	<p>Ek wil beswaar maak, want die mense sê vir ons die een dag só en die volgende dag sê hulle só. Ek was binne Kalway Hotel waar Mnr Johan van der Walt verduidelik het waar die pad gaan wees.</p> <p><u>Translation</u>                      I want to object because one day we are told one thing and the next day another. I was at the meeting in Kelway Hotel where Mr Johan van der Walt explained where the road was going to be.</p>	
26	Mr Hilton Thorpe St Francis Bay Residents Association St Francis Kromme Trust	<p>The whole access road has a massive impact and it is what is wrong with this whole EIA.</p> <p>There is so much material information, which has not been supplied timeously. The first discussion that we heard of an eastern access road was in the EIR. There was nothing in the Scoping Report about the roads at all.</p> <p>The implications of bringing heavy machinery right past St Francis Bay is huge. All communities along that route are going to be affected.</p> <p>What does heavy load mean, does it mean about 4</p>	<p>Ms Ball noted the objection and stated that it will be taken into account.</p> <p>She pointed out that in the Scoping Phase there were no specific details of the site regarding access routes and that was pointed out and in fact a lot of the specialists had to go back for additional site visits to assess the corridors. They looked at the corridor rather than the road alignment, so it was not just the footprint of the road.</p> <p>Using the slides, Ms Ball explained the three alternative access roads.</p> <p>The details are in the Transportation Specialist Study.</p>

PORT ELIZABETH KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>loads of 1,000 tons, but if it means that every concrete mixer and steel truck etc. we are in for years and years of construction traffic. We could have a construction site here for the next 25 years.</p> <p>It is simply not right to impose such a facility on established communities where there is a successful tourism industry. The public does not have a definition of heavy loads and we object very strongly.</p>	<p>Basically it is abnormal loads and all details are in the study. <b>This study is attached as Appendix E25 of the Draft EIR. The study reports that a variety of heavy loads will be transported to and from the Nuclear-1 site during the construction period, with the heaviest load being transported via a Self Propelled Modular Transporter (SPMT). The SPMT's dimensions are approximately 42 m in length and can be either 5.33 m (two trailer wide) or 8.23 m (three trailer wide) in width.</b></p> <p><b>The study does however confirm that several construction phase details such as the location of laydown areas, number of construction vehicles and daily trip frequencies are currently unknown.</b></p> <p>Regarding the roads (referring to map), she indicated the central line of the corridor. The width of the corridors assessed was <b>2 km</b> and within this width an alignment must be found.</p>
27	Facilitator	<p>Mnr Malgas, terwyl jy uit was, het ek vir die mense gesê dat ek met Mev de Villiers gepraat het en sy sê dat daar blykbaar ander studies aan die gang is in die omgewing, waarmee die Departement van Paaie besig is. Sy wil net seker maak waar daardie paaie is en waar hulle loop en wie vir hulle verantwoordelik is om seker to maak dat daar nie 'n deurmekaarspul is rondom die paaie nie. Dit is om seker te wees dat die paaie projekte nie met hierdie projek deurmekaar raak nie.</p> <p><u>Translation</u>                      Mr Malgas, while you were out, I told the people that I</p>	<p>Ms de Villiers: She understands that there are 2 processes currently underway, as a phone call was received 6 months ago in connection with the road that is going to be constructed through Humansdorp to Oyster Bay and it was attributed to Eskom. In this regard, Ms de Villiers stated that Eskom has not been given instructions about any aspects relating to roads.</p>

<b>PORT ELIZABETH KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<p>have spoken to Ms de Villiers and she says that apparently there are other studies being done by the Department of Roads in this area. She wants to make sure where these roads are and where they will run, to make sure that there is no confusion about the roads. This is to make sure that the roads project does not get mixed up in people's minds with this project.</p>	
28	<p>Ms Andrea von Holdt                      Coega Development Corporation and                      Rebels Rus Nature Reserve Resident</p>	<p>Ms von Holdt stated the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ If the corridors are either 2km or 5km wide, surely at this final stage of the EIA, we should know the alignment within that corridor. Residents and people are affected and we should have access as to how these alignments are being chosen.</li>   <li>▪ Secondly, again I cannot see justification for the eastern access road if the report says the western access road is preferred.</li> </ul>	<p>Ms Ball: Referring to the map, she explained that in terms of input from the communities and in terms of the alignment this will happen post the EIA authorisation if it should take place. This question will have to be addressed to Eskom, but if there is expert knowledge of information within the corridors then we can recommend a specific alignment. We asked the specialists to look at a broad corridor.</p> <p>In Mr Heydenrych's presentation - he said that there are no alternatives to the eastern access road as farmer's said that they need this road and cannot do without it. In terms of the western access road and the northern access road – these were 2 alternatives as the second road to the site.</p>

<b>PORT ELIZABETH KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
29	Mr Hilton Thorpe St Francis Bay Residents Association St Francis Kromme Trust	<p>Following on Ms von Holdts' comment and response provided, he stated the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The response provided by the Consultant indicates why the whole EIA process is discredited.</li> <li>▪ The road access is a major environmental impact and if the road alignment is not included in this assessment what is the point of undertaking this EIA. To say this will be looked at after the ROD is quite unacceptable.</li> <li>▪ So many other things have also been excluded from this process that all that NEMA describes as material information should be contained in the EIA and in our view the DEA should never have approved this Scoping Report because the whole process has been conducted back to front.</li> <li>▪ Major issues affecting communities have been pushed aside and left until later on.</li> </ul>	<p>Ms Ball: The specialist reports found no fatal flaws within the corridor assessed. All they said in their recommendations was the detailed walk downs need to be done to determine the exact alignment if there are going to be deviations from the centre line of that corridor. So it has been adequately covered in detailed studies within those corridors by a range of specialists.</p>
30	Mr Ryan Donnelly FAST	<p>Mr Donnelly stated that Prof Richard Cowling from Cape St Francis is of the opinion that the western road should be chosen so that the communities in St Francis Bay are not negatively affected.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
31	Mr Donevin Lesch Coega Development Corporation	<p>Mr Lesch stated that it is good to have studies done but have they looked at the issue of groundwater, utilisation during the construction period.</p> <p>Having read the summary, it is a concern when they say they are going to utilise boreholes and some groundwater will be discharged into the marine environment, which is in an area, which is a drought stricken area. They have to be clear what is going to happen regarding this matter. This is a great concern.</p>	<p>Ms Ball: Your concerns are valid. One of the alternatives was that during the construction phase they would use groundwater and then move to the desalination plant. The specialists rejected this alternative. If authorisation is granted for this project they will use desalinated water from the beginning.</p> <p><b>Post-meeting note: Local water (municipal) will however be used during the construction of the desalination plant.</b></p>

PORT ELIZABETH KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		Facilitator encouraged Mr Lesch to check the specialist report to see if his concerns were adequately covered and if he is still concerned that there is insufficient information please make this submission again.	
32	Mr Petrus Leen Sea Vista Forum	<p>Ek wil net weet, ingeval die substasie by Thyspunt gebou gaan word, is daar enige veiligheidsmaatreëls? Die rede dat ek vra is wanneer die wind na Sea Vista se kant waai – die weste wind? Wat se versekering het ons as gemeenskap?</p> <p>Tweedens, sal daar genoeg tyd wees om al die mense te ontruim, want ek praat nou van plus minus 5000 mense in St Francis Bay. Wat se versekering kan Eskom ons gee?</p> <p><u>Translation</u>                      I just want to know, supposing that the power station is built at Thyspunt, will any safety measures be put in place? The reason is that the wind blows in the direction of Sea Vista, the westerly direction? What assurance do we as a community have around safety?</p> <p>Secondly, will there be enough time to evacuate all these people, because you are talking about approximately 5000 people in St Francis Bay. What assurance can Eskom give us?</p>	<p>In terms of human safety we have mentioned before that certain aspects fall under the National Nuclear Regulator Act. We did do a site control report and a site emergency response specialist report as part of the study. The DEA will not make a decision on that study, that is part of the site safety studies. Basically the NNR will issue a decision regarding issues around emergency evacuation from the zones and the owner of the site will have to comply with these restrictions and controls.</p> <p>Mr Stott: first of all Eskom will not build or operate a power station that is unsafe, we also have our own workers and employees to worry about. Secondly, over and above what Eskom believes, the NNR will check everything to make sure that the public is always safe. If the NNR feel that the public is in danger they can shut down the power station. The design of the power station that Eskom is interested in is the same for Generation 3. There are international specifications for that kind of power station, for example you would not need to do any evacuation outside of 800 m. It is a very different design from existing power stations and the existing conventions you have to take for example the Koeberg Power Station.</p> <p>The emergency plan that was mentioned – we are convinced that we have an emergency plan that can</p>

PORT ELIZABETH KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
33	Mr Alwin Malgas Sea Vista Forum	<p>Ons wil weet van ons veiligheid – wat is die risiko? In geval van 'n ongeluk, daar is omtrent 5000 mense. Mnr Stott sê die kragstasie is veilig.</p> <p><u>Translation</u>                      We want to know about our safety – what are the risks to us? In case of an accident, about 5000 people will be affected. Mr Stott says the power station is safe.</p>	<p>evacuate employees from the power station and that we can shelter anyone living in the area for the duration of any event to an acceptable level internationally.</p> <p>Ms de Villiers: In terme van die werking van die kragstasie moet ons kan bewys dat ons al die mense van die area kan uitkry in geval van 'n ongeluk. Dus, vanaf die begin, voordat die stasie operasioneel is, moet jy 'n program instel. Byvoorbeeld, (en ek kan net van Koeberg praat), ons het Sea Vista naby Wat almal sê is, hier is 'n ongeluk – dit is wat jy moet doen. Ons moet seker maak dat ons busse kan inkry in die area. Ons moet seker maak dat ons almal kan uitkry, so byvoorbeeld Atlantis wat naby is – daar is 75,000 mense, dis amper dieselfde gemeenskap as wat julle is, en ons moet daardie 75,000 mense uitkry as daar 'n ongeluk gebeur by Koeberg. Ons het busse, ons het taxis, ons het vervoer wat ons inbring om die mense uit te haal. Ons moet dit kan bewys en elke jaar bewys on dit vir die NNR. Ons het nie 'n keuse nie, hulle kan ons sluit as ons dit nie kan bewys nie.</p> <p>Met die nuwe ontwerp wat hulle gaan inbring is dit effens anders. As gevolg van die tegnologie wat baie meer gevorderd is as Koeberg s'n, is die area wat moet kan ontruim word baie kleiner. Sea Vista en St Francis Baai sit 20 km weg van die perseel af. Kom ons sê 5 km. Nou, met die nuwe tegnologie wat hulle inbring dwarsoor die wêreld, moet jy kan bewys dat jy binne 800 m almal kan ontruim. So dus nie eers buite ons heining nie.</p> <p><u>Translation</u>                      Ms de Villiers: In order to operate a power station, one of the requirements is that we have to prove that we would be</p>

PORT ELIZABETH KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
			<p>able to evacuate all the people in case of an accident. So right from the start, before the power station even becomes operational, you have to have a plan for that.</p> <p>For example (and I only use Koeberg as an example; here we have Sea Vista nearby), the plan has to inform everybody, in case of an accident, this is what you should do. We have to be sure that we can get buses into the area. We have to be sure that we can get them out. Take Atlantis, which is close to Koeberg: there are 75 000 people. That community is a lot like yours. We have to be able to get those 75 000 people out in case of an accident at Koeberg. We need to have buses, taxis, have transport that we can bring in to remove people. We have to prove that we are able to do this, and every year we submit proof of this to the NNR. We do not have a choice in this as the NNR can shut us down if we cannot prove that [we are able to evacuate everybody].</p> <p>With the new design that is planned for this power station, things are a little different. This is because the technology for this power station is much more advanced than Koeberg, the area that you must be able to evacuate is much smaller. Sea Vista and St Francis Bay are 20 km away from the site. Let's say 5 km. Now, with the new technology that they are bringing in all over the world, you only have to prove that you can evacuate everybody within 800m from the power plant. So that is not even outside our perimeter fence.</p>

<b>PORT ELIZABETH KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
34	Mr Chris Barratt St Francis Kromme Trust	<p>Previously we were told of the EPZ, as 15 km and the recent information we have been given refers to 800m. This is a significant change!</p> <p>Mr Barratt expressed his concern regarding incorrect maps and wrong distances that have been used repeatedly. This aspect has been discussed at various meetings and requested the Consultant to rectify the error. The distances were wrong in the original maps. The Sea Vista people were told that they are 20 km away and they are not.</p> <p>The consultant was requested to confirm distances from the nuclear power station in relation to the neighbouring communities.</p>	<p>Ms Ball: Oyster Bay is approximately 3 to 5 km on the western side and the nearest community from the site. On the eastern side is Cape St Francis, St Francis Bay and Sea Vista which are approximately 15 - 20 km from the site.</p> <p>Ms Ball: Referring to the map, from St Francis Bay to middle of site is 11 km, as the crow flies. From Sea Vista to the centre of the site is 10 km as the crow flies.</p>
35	Ms Judi Nwokedi Areva Women in the Nuclear Industry in SA SA Citizen	<p>In terms of the design, the most sensitive part of the plant is where the uranium is contained. The plant is designed in such a way that if there is any technical fault it shuts down. There is NO potential risk from a hazardous outpouring. This is proven throughout the world where there are nuclear plants. In Japan where there were two bombs, to America, to France. The latest PWR shuts down. No radioactivity. There is no threat.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>

<b>PORT ELIZABETH KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		In terms of civils, when we build the construction site, that is a different form of safety. That is to do with competency and skills and occupational standards on the plant. If people are building a pylon, a beam or whatever, in the current execution in Finland there were no accidents. In Normandy where I have visited these plants, zero accidents. In fact, safety standards at a nuclear plant anywhere in the world are executed at the highest levels. Most of the objections are political and emotional as opposed to technical.	
36	Mr Angus Clarke PERCCI	From the Chamber of Commerce, we understand that have to get a power station in a short space of time. There are technologies available and it is a matter of educating the communities about safety. Nuclear – overall is safe, there has been one Chernobyl where a lot of lessons were learnt. From Eskom’s side, they need to educate the people about nuclear and take the fear away. It is a safe technology. How many thousands of people are killed in coalmines and coal power stations?	Comments noted.
37	Mr Lawrence Msibi Bitou Local Municipality (Plettenberg Bay)	My issue is the supply of uranium, where will you be sourcing it and how will you transport it to site?	Mr Stott: These contracts have not been signed, as there is no authorisation as yet for this power station. For Koeberg we get our uranium from France or the United States. It arrives on the ship and is transported from Cape Town Harbour to Koeberg Power Station.  If authorisation is granted, it is almost certain that nuclear fuel will arrive at the harbour in Port Elizabeth Harbour then be transported by road to the site.

<b>PORT ELIZABETH KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
38	I&AP PE Key Stakeholder Feedback Meeting	It would be important to have a process that will be inclusive of all public representatives so that before you even start construction of a power station, everyone is 100% sure what is going to happen.	Comment noted.
39	Mr Ryan Donnelly FAST	<p>Mr Donnelly objected.</p> <p>My objection is basically an objection and a question. With regards to road alternatives, whether it is power, roads or whatever, whose responsibility it is to identify alternatives? Is it the developer or the independent consultant?</p> <p>Further to that, I would like the consultant to bring up the figure on annual inhalation dose of radionuclides. My question is where the 0.5 microSieverts lie in relation to the power station. There are people living within that area which would obviously be considered an overdose. What will happen to those people, will they be moved, what will they become?</p> <p>Also, I would like to say that limitations on radionuclides, is not material information with regards to knowing how we could be affected as agriculturalists or residents. Has there been any studies done on those types of technologies – on what the actual radionuclides emissions are?</p>	<p>The Facilitator acknowledged Mr Donnelly's objection.</p> <p>Ms Ball: the end width of the road will be 22m wide and the specialist looked at 100m from the centre line. If they could not find an acceptable corridor within that, they all worked together in the biophysical specialists and they were on site together for a couple of days. They then basically recommended another alignment.</p> <p>Regarding the decision for alternatives it is often a joint decision from the public, specialists and the client. For this study we started off with 5 alternatives sites, which we got from Eskom.</p> <p>Facilitator: in terms of the other issues – there are a lot of issues, it is not an ideal situation that you are dealing with in respect of regulations, which very clearly define to the environmental consultants what they can and what they cannot study as part of this process. It is not ideal. It leaves for a lot of discomfort with the general public knowing that there are certain issues that are not going to be evaluated as part of this EIA. The NNR has to conduct all the relevant studies before a licence can be issued. That process is also subject to intense public participation. The way that I understand this process is that a Environmental Authorisation can be given without those authorisations for the NNR process being in place. However, there would no</p>

PORT ELIZABETH KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
			<p>doubt be a very strong statement or a condition that the EIA can give a positive authorisation but the power plant will never be able to be built without a successful process with the NNR. This has to be done in the public domain. I encourage you, the issues that you have raised, keep chasing them in the NNR process because that licence cannot be issued if those questions are not answered.</p> <p>It does not matter what it pertains to, if it deals with any aspect of the NNR and the NNR Act, it has to be taken up within that process. The critical part is going to be the integration and that the two studies talk to this EIA together with the NNR. That is why your review process as a stakeholder is so important.</p>
40	I&AP PE Key Stakeholder Feedback Meeting	Is the NNR going to do a study on the potential impacts on agriculture?	Facilitator: It depends on what they have to look at in terms of the NNR. They would look at the safety issues.
41	Ms Andrea von Holdt Coega Development Corporation and Rebels Rus Nature Reserve Resident	<p>Ms von Holdt submitted these comments in writing at end of meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ No matter where in South Africa this nuclear facility is built, it must be done properly.</li> <li>▪ The EIA needs more reassurance on biophysical and socio economic impacts.</li> <li>▪ This is the biggest EIA, let us make this a Class 1 EIA!</li> <li>▪ Specialists need to be present at the meetings to respond to questions.</li> <li>▪ Disposal of nuclear waste is an associated activity – must be investigated.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Please note our response to your written comments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Biophysical and Socio-economic Impacts</b>  <b>In order to reach the Environmental Impact Assessment Phase and to compile the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR,) twenty-four separate specialist studies were conducted which considered the impacts of the nuclear power station on the physical, biophysical and socio-economic environment at Duynefontein, Bantamsklip and Thyspunt. Results and recommendations from the specialist studies formed the basis for the discussion on alternatives</b></li> </ul>

<b>PORT ELIZABETH KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Disposal of domestic/construction waste – where? The existing St Francis waste site is not an option.</li> <li>▪ Option of extending lifespan of Koeberg.</li> </ul>	<p>in Chapter 5 of the Draft EIR and the Impact Analysis and Recommendations and Conclusions in Chapters 9 and 10 respectively as well as the compilation of the Environmental Management Plan (EMP).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Presence of Specialists</b>                      A Key Focus Group Meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, 25 May 2010 at the St. Francis Links Golf Club in St. Francis Bay from 09:00 to 16:00. Selected specialists will attend the meeting to present on the following studies: Marine Ecology Assessment, Agricultural Assessment, Traffic and Transport Assessment, Social Impact Assessment, Wetland Assessment, Dune Geomorphology Assessment and Geohydrology Assessment.</li> <li>• <b>Disposal of Nuclear Waste</b>                      The only feasible and reasonable alternative for the disposal of Low-Level and Intermediate Level radioactive waste is disposal at the Vaalputs nuclear waste disposal site, as it is the only authorised facility for this form of waste in South Africa. Vaalputs has more than sufficient capacity for the waste that will be generated by Nuclear-1.</li> </ul> <p>With regards to High-Level Waste (spent fuel), the only alternative currently available in South Africa is long-term storage of the spent fuel in the nuclear power station. Vaalputs is being considered as a disposal site for High-Level Waste, but the required authorisation processes for this will take several</p>

<b>PORT ELIZABETH KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
			<p>years, so currently the disposal of spent fuel at this facility is not a feasible option.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Disposal of domestic/construction waste</b>                      Chapter 3 of the Draft EIR reports that waste generation during the construction phase will be of temporary nature, until the completion of the construction activities. In addition, waste will be non-radioactive. Two main types will be created during this phase i.e. General and Hazardous. The latter category includes low-hazard waste (h) and high hazard waste (H) The waste typically produced during the construction phase is that resulting from the actual construction activities as well as from numerous construction workers, support functions and support activities, which will generate domestic waste.</li> </ul> <p>Solid waste, excluding radioactive waste, will be transported to and disposed of at permitted off-site solid waste disposal sites. A number of disposal sites may need to be identified depending on the type of materials being disposed of. This waste relates to construction debris generated during building of the power plant and which comprises concrete and steel) as well as domestic waste generated from the canteens on site, which will cater for the construction workers.</p> <p>Solid waste production is likely to peak around the end of the first year and during the second year of construction, slowly and steady decreasing</p>

<b>PORT ELIZABETH KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
			<p>thereafter. The total amount of general waste generated every year is expected to be around 450 – 500 tons for one operational reactor unit and 850 – 900 tons if two units will be operational. The exact amounts of these different materials, as well as the portions that may be recycled and placed in landfill will depend on the operational structure of the licensed waste disposal facility, as well as that of the site-specific operations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Option of extending the lifespan of Koeberg This option was not considered as part of the scope of the current Environmental Impact Assessment.</li></ul>

## APPENDIX 2: PRESENTATION OF DRAFT EIA REPORT

Size of the Port Elizabeth Key Stakeholder Feedback Meeting presentation	1,407KB
Size of the Cape St Francis Key Stakeholder Feedback Meeting presentation	1,588KB
Size of the Melkbosstrand Key Stakeholder Feedback Meeting presentation	1,607KB

All presentations can either be downloaded from the following websites:

- ❑ Eskom's website: [www.eskom.co.za/eia](http://www.eskom.co.za/eia) under the "Nuclear 1-Generation" link
- ❑ Arcus GIBB website: <http://projects.gibb.co.za/> under the "Nuclear 1 EIA" link

or can be requested from ACER (Africa) at 086 010 4958 or by notifying Bongi Shinga at [bongi.shinga@acerafrica.co.za](mailto:bongi.shinga@acerafrica.co.za) or [nuclear1@acerafrica.co.za](mailto:nuclear1@acerafrica.co.za)

### APPENDIX 3: ATTENDANCE LIST

Surname	First Names	Title	Co/Org	Port Elizabeth Meeting 12 Apr 10	Cape St Francis Meeting 16 Apr 10	Melkbosstrand Meeting 20 Apr 10
Adams	Rashid	Cllr	City of Cape Town			Attended
Bain	Cairns	Dr	Nuclear Energy Corporation of SA (NECSA)			Attended
Ball	Jaana-Maria	Ms	Arcus GIBB	Attended	Attended	Attended
Barratt	Christopher & Valda	Mr & Mrs	St Francis Kromme Trust	Attended	Attended	
Becker	Peter	Mr	Koeberg Alert Alliance			Attended
Bergh	Vincent	Cllr	City of Cape Town – Sub Council Blaauwberg			Attended
Bouwer	Nicolaas Andre	Mr	St Andrews College	Attended		
Bowler	Karin	Mrs	Karin Bowler Enterprises	Attended		
Brenner	Heather	Cllr	City of Cape Town			Attended
Buckle	Japie	Mr	SANBI	Attended		
Clark	Angus	Mr	PE Regional Chamber of Commerce & Industry	Attended		
Cook	Derek	Mr	Macohy Investments CC		Attended	
Cowling	Shirley	Dr	Friends of the St Francis Nature Reserve		Attended	
Dale	Jenny	Mrs			Attended	
de Villiers	Carin	Ms	Eskom Holdings Limited	Attended	Attended	
Donnelly	Ryan James	Mr	For A Safe Tomorrow (F. A. S. T.)	Attended	Attended	
Ferndale	Tyronne	Mr	Nelson Mandela Bay Municipality		Attended	
Greeff	Gert	Mr	Eskom Holdings Limited	Attended		Attended
Hardie	George	Mr	Goed Geloof Farm and St Francis Conservancy		Attended	
Hardie	Sandra	Mrs	Goed Geloof Farm and St Francis Conservancy		Attended	
Henkeman	Pauline	Mrs	Eskom - Koeberg Visitors Centre			Attended
Herbst	Deidre	Ms	Eskom Holdings Limited	Attended		
Hutchinson	Martha-Maria	Mrs	St Francis Conservancy		Attended	

Surname	First Names	Title	Co/Org	Port Elizabeth Meeting 12 Apr 10	Cape St Francis Meeting 16 Apr 10	Melkbosstrand Meeting 20 Apr 10
Inman	Peter	Dr	Coega Development Corporation (Pty) Ltd	Attended	Attended	
Jacobson	Wolsley	Mr	Milnerton Rate Payers & Residents Association			Attended
Jeannes	Deon	Mr	Eskom Holdings Limited	Attended		
Jooste	Paul	Mnr	Oyster Bay RPA		Attended	
Jumat	Zain	Mr	Dept of Economic Affairs & Development Planning			Attended
Kraak	Cheron	Ms	Country Feeling		Attended	
Krause	Martin	Mr	Eskom Holdings Limited	Attended		
Lamont	Sydney	Mr	Sea Vista Forum	Attended	Attended	
Lategan	Tanya	Ms	Supertubes Surfing Foundation		Attended	
Leask	Kevin	Mr	Eskom Holdings Limited	Attended		Attended
Leen	Petrus	Mr	Sea Vista Forum	Attended	Attended	
Lesch	Donevin	Mr	Coega Development Corporation (Pty) Ltd	Attended		
Levack	Kaylene	Ms	Joshua Heritage	Attended		
Logie	Caryl	Mrs	Fourcade Botanical Group		Attended	
Longden-Thurgood	RM	Mr	Institute of Nuclear Engineers SA Branch			Attended
Mabentsela	Nombongo	Ms	Coega Development Corporation (Pty) Ltd	Attended		
Madyini	Ntandazo	Mr	Coega Development Corporation (Pty) Ltd	Attended	Attended	
Malgas	Alwyn	Mnr	Sea Vista Forum	Attended	Attended	
Marshall	Terence	Mr	Sandriver Sanctuary		Attended	
Miles	Melvyn	Mr	Eskom: Koeberg Visitors Centre			Attended
Moolman	Graham	Mr	St Andrew's College	Attended		
Mortimer	Bev	Ms	St Francis Chronicle Newspaper		Attended	
Msibi	Lawrence	Mr	Bitou Local Municipality	Attended		
Muir	Andrew	Mr	Wilderness Foundation SA	Attended		
Naiker	Melissa	Ms	Dept of Economic Affairs & Development Planning			Attended
Neilson	Peter	Mr	Nelson Mandela Bay Municipality		Attended	

Surname	First Names	Title	Co/Org	Port Elizabeth Meeting 12 Apr 10	Cape St Francis Meeting 16 Apr 10	Melkbosstrand Meeting 20 Apr 10
Nggumshe	Phumla	Ms	Bitou Local Municipality	Attended		
Nicholson	Peter	Mr	Billabong SA		Attended	
Norman	Jan	Mr	Koeberg NPS	Attended		Attended
Ntamnani	Ncedo	Mr	Eskom Holdings Limited			Attended
Nwokedi	Judi	Ms	Areva	Attended		
Oddy	Chantal	Ms	Rebels Rus Conservancy	Attended		
Oosthuizen	Joe	Mr	St Francis Bay Residents Association		Attended	
Oosthuizen	Paddy	Ms	St Francis Bay Residents Association		Attended	
Oswald	Elbrecht	Mr	City of Cape Town			Attended
Patel	Imraan	Mr	National Dept of Science & Tech			Attended
Potts	Tracey	Ms	Eastern Cape Parks		Attended	
Pyoos	Marjorie	Ms	National Dept of Science & Technology			Attended
Ralston	Samantha	Ms	Cape Nature			Attended
Rautenbach	Elisabeth	Mrs	St Francis Conservancy		Attended	
Royal	Renee	Mrs	Resident/Environmental Consultant		Attended	
Simms	Mike	Mr	St Francis Bay Residents Association		Attended	
Slamdien	Ashraf	Mr	Blaauwberg Administration City of Cape Town			Attended
Stott	Tony	Mr	Eskom Holdings Limited	Attended		Attended
Theron	Mervin	Mr	Eskom Holdings Limited	Attended		Attended
Theron	Morne	Mr	City Of Cape Town Resource Management			Attended
Thorpe	Hilton	Mr	St Francis Bay Residents Assoc & St Francis Kromme Trust	Attended	Attended	
Tilders	Helmie	Mr	FOSTER		Attended	
Titmuss	Pat	Ms	City of Cape Town			Attended
van Dyk	Carel	Mr	Nelson Mandela Bay Municipality		Attended	
Vockerodt	Brian	Mr	Eskom Holdings Limited	Attended		
von Holdt	Andrea	Ms	Coega Development Corporation (Pty) Ltd	Attended	Attended	

Surname	First Names	Title	Co/Org	Port Elizabeth Meeting 12 Apr 10	Cape St Francis Meeting 16 Apr 10	Melkbosstrand Meeting 20 Apr 10
West	David Michael	Mr	Eskom Holdings Limited	Attended		
Willemsse	Douw	Mr	City of Cape Town			Attended
Williamson	Raymond	Mr	Melkbosstrand Rate Payers Association			Attended
Wiseman	Keith	Mr	City of Cape Town: Environmental Management Dept			Attended