

**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 FOCUS GROUP MEETING WITH SPECIALISTS**

**ST FRANCIS LINKS GOLF ESTATE, ST FRANCIS BAY**

**25 MAY 2010**

**09H30 – 16H00**

## 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 – Specialists .....                                    | 3  |
| 1.4. Attendance – Environmental Consulting Team.....                   | 3  |
| 2. WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS AND MEETING OBJECTIVES.....                  | 3  |
| 3. FORMAT OF MEETING .....   | 4  |
| 3.1. Matters arising .....   | 4  |
| 3.2. Introduction of team, specialists and Eskom representatives ..... | 5  |
| 4. SPECIALIST PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSION .....                       | 5  |
| 5. ISSUES AND COMMENTS RAISED AND DISCUSSED.....                       | 5  |
| 5.1. RECORD OF ISSUES RAISED AND DISCUSSED.....                        | 6  |
| 6. WAY FORWARD .....   | 57 |
| 7. WAY FORWARD - DISCUSSION .....                                      | 58 |
| 8. CONCLUDING REMARKS.....   | 63 |
| SPECIALIST PRESENTATIONS.....  | 64 |
| ATTENDANCE LIST .....  | 65 |

## PREFACE

Should participants who attended the 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.

## 1. ATTENDANCE

### 1.1. Attendance – Interested and Affected Parties

- As per attendance list.

### 1.2 Attendance – Eskom Holdings Limited

| Name                 | Position/Role  |
|----------------------|--|
| Ms Deidre Herbst     | Senior Manager – Environment Generation Division                     |
| Mr Gert Greeff       | Manager - Nuclear Sites  |
| Mr Mervin Theron     | Manager - Regulatory Affairs and Localisation, Nuclear Division      |
| Ms Carin de Villiers | Manager - Stakeholder Management and Communication, Nuclear Division |
| Ms Lorraine Ndala    | Environmental Advisor - Environment Generation Division              |
| Mr Jan Norman        | Manager – Nuclear-1 Operations                                       |
| Mr Jan Breytenbach   | Acting Manager – Nuclear-1 EIA Project                               |

### 1.3 Attendance – Specialists

| Name                                   | Specialist Study/Discipline           |
|--|---------------------------------------|
| Prof Charles Griffiths                 | Marine Assessment                     |
| Mr Jon Howcroft                        | Agricultural Assessment               |
| Mr Yusry Frizlar                       | Traffic and Transportation Assessment |
| Mr Alewyn Dippenaar<br>Dr Neville Bews | Social Impact Assessment              |
| Mr Peter Rosewarne                     | Geohydrology Assessment               |
| Dr Liz Day                             | Freshwater Ecology Assessment         |
| Dr Werner Illenberger                  | Dune Geomorphology Assessment         |

### 1.4 Attendance – Environmental Consulting Team

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

## 2. WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS AND MEETING OBJECTIVES

The facilitator, Ms Karin Bowler, welcomed everyone to the meeting. She explained that during the last round of meetings held during March and April 2010, it became clear that many of the

people present at the various meetings had pressing issues in terms of the various specialist studies. It was agreed with the environmental consultant that they would arrange for meetings with the relevant specialists. There were approximately 27 different specialists who contributed to the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR). It would be impossible to have all of these specialists attend a meeting. The environmental team, therefore, examined the Issues and Response Reports (IRRs) and the proceedings from the previous meetings and identified which of the specialists would be relevant to this particular area.

### 3. FORMAT OF MEETING

The format of the meeting is therefore to serve the objective to allow the specialists to respond to queries raised by stakeholders. There were strict timeframes set for the meeting, the specialists have been asked to do a 15-minute presentation in which an overview of approach and methodology and key findings and recommendations will be presented. After the presentation there will be 60 minutes allowed for discussion. The specialist studies to be presented would be: Marine Ecology Assessment; Agricultural Assessment; Traffic and Transport Assessment; Social Impact Assessment; Geohydrology Assessment; Freshwater Ecology Assessment and Dune Geomorphology Assessment. The facilitator asked that if there were any social issues that arose from the specialist studies that need to be integrated into the Social Impact Assessment, they would be 'parked' and then integrated at a later stage.

The agreed format of meeting with stakeholders was that each specialist will do a 15 minute presentation and then a 30 minute discussion (questions and responses) be allowed after each presentation.

#### 3.1 Matters arising

| No | Name   | Comment  | Response  |
|----|--|--|---|
| 1  | Ms Trudi Malan<br>Cape St Francis<br>Civics and<br>Thyspunt Alliance | Ms Malan raised an objection that the minutes of the previous meetings were only received that morning (25 May 2010) on email. This makes it difficult to comment. | The facilitator confirmed that she received the minutes early that morning. She however requested that the meeting continue and administration related issues be addressed separately as comment period for both the minutes of the meetings and the Draft EIR is still open.<br><br>She added that everyone was aware of the issues that had been raised regarding the specialist studies. She asked that comment regarding the EIA process be submitted in writing to ACER Africa and if there are errors in the minutes of the public and key stakeholder meetings that all corrections be submitted to ACER within 14 days of receipt of the minutes. However, today the focus is on issues relating to the independent specialist studies. |

| No | Name   | Comment   | Response   |
|----|--|---|--|
| 2  | Mr Chris Barratt<br>St Francis Kromme<br>Trust | Mr Barratt noted that the facilitator had taken 20 minutes with the introductions. He asked for confirmation that there would be time under the 'Way Forward' to discuss the 'way forward' and not be told that there will be discussion. | The facilitator confirmed that there would be time for discussion regarding the 'way forward' in the Way Forward section of the meeting. |

The facilitator explained that the meeting is being recorded and she asked everyone to identify themselves and/or their organisation before raising their issues.

### 3.2 Introduction of team, specialists and Eskom representatives

The facilitator introduced the environmental team, the specialists and the Eskom representatives as per Sections 1.2 to 1.4.

## 4. SPECIALIST PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSION

Specialists presented the following assessments:

| No | Assessment                            | Specialist                               |
|----|---------------------------------------|--|
| 1  | Marine Ecology Assessment             | Prof Charles Griffiths                   |
| 2  | Agricultural Assessment               | Mr Jon Howcroft                          |
| 3  | Traffic and Transportation Assessment | Mr Yusry Frizlar                         |
| 4  | Social Impact Assessment              | Mr Alewijn Dippenaar and Dr Neville Bews |
| 5  | Geohydrology Assessment               | Mr Peter Rosewarne                       |
| 6  | Freshwater Ecology Assessment         | Dr Liz Day                               |
| 7  | Dune Geomorphology Assessment         | Dr Werner Illinberger                    |

Presentations can be emailed to participants upon request from ACER. Alternatively, can be downloaded on the EIA websites ([www.eskom.co.za](http://www.eskom.co.za) and <http://projects.gibb.co.za>) under Nuclear 1 – Draft Environmental Impact Report

## 5. ISSUES AND COMMENTS RAISED AND DISCUSSED

This section details all issues, comments and concerns, which were raised and discussed at the meeting after each presentation. Should you wish to make any corrections, please advise ACER within two weeks (14 days) of receiving these minutes.

**5.1 RECORD OF ISSUES RAISED AND DISCUSSED**

| <b>MARINE ECOLOGY ASSESSMENT SPECIALIST</b> |   |  |  |
|---|---|--|--|
| 1   | <p>Mr Greg Christy<br/>SA Squid Management<br/>Industrial Association</p> | <p>Mr Christy said that his organisation has joined the process in the latter stages. He had read the Executive Summary and was shocked to note that there was no mention of the squid industry.</p> <p>He asked if the professor had consulted any specialists in the squid industry, particularly those who work with the squid resource.</p> <p>He asked if the professor was aware that there is a Squid Scientific Working Group that deals specifically with the species. He does not recall any recognition of the environmental effects of the activity that is going to be done on site.</p> <p>He would like it minuted that they are concerned that there is a specific scientific working group that deals with the squid industry and yet at no stage was there any consultation with this group.</p> <p>He went on to say that there are contradictions that appear in the report. He asked at what depth the building spoil would flow into the ocean from the outflow pipe.</p> <p>Mr Christy said that within the same report, on page 36, it is mentioned that it was going to be a 27 m trench and that it will flow out at a 5m depth. Whereas on page 42 it says that it will be a few kilometres out at a depth of 30 m. As the Squid industry these</p> | <p>Prof Griffiths said that he had not personally consulted with any of these specialists as Dr Tammy Robertson had compiled that section of the report. He had however, read publications of various specialists.</p> <p>The professor said that he is not a member of the Squid Scientific Working Group, but is aware of its existence.</p> <p>Prof Griffiths said that his recollection is that it is 25m. <b>(Please see post meeting note)</b></p> <p>Ms Ball said that the specialists make recommendations in terms of minimising and/ or avoiding potential environmental impacts. This recommendation then is written up as a recommendation in the EIR and hopefully becomes one of the recommendations taken up by the Department of Environmental</p> |

**MARINE ECOLOGY ASSESSMENT SPECIALIST**

|  |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|
|  |  | <p>figures are important.</p> <p>Ms Malan then added that on page 26 it stated that it will be located at more than 50 m. (Quoted from Marine Specialist Report).</p> <p>Mr Christy then asked about the sediment that is going to be pumped out and then over a period of 10 years it is going to create sediment spoil of between 5 and 10 cm on the bottom of the ocean. This would occur within 10 km of the outfall pipe. He asked if this is what is going to happen because the specialist had stated that it would be localised.</p> <p>Mr Christy asked if this sediment layer is similar to the bottom strata that is there at present or is it a completely different strata.</p> <p>He noted that turbidity is one of the main factors in the abundance and availability to capture the squid.</p> <p>He noted that the study implies that this development</p> | <p>Affairs (DEA) in their Authorisation, if positive. This recommendation would then become a legally binding condition that Eskom, the appointed engineers, the vendors and the contractor would have to comply with.</p> <p>Ms Ball asked that stakeholders supply details in writing and these figures will be checked and added as a post-meeting note.</p> <p><b>Post-meeting note: The Marine Specialist confirmed that the building spoil would flow into the ocean from the outflow pipe at a depth of 50 m and at Thyspunt it will be at a distance of 1.2 - 1.4km offshore.</b></p> <p>Prof Griffiths explained that it would be pumped out from a pipe. Initially at a deeper layer over a smaller area, but because of marine currents and wave action it will spread out over a period of time. It should therefore go from being a relatively deep sedimentary layer over a relatively small area, to being a shallower sediment layer over a larger area over a period of time.</p> <p>Prof Griffiths explained that it would be sand from the site so therefore it should be similar in composition to the sand on site. It will be coastal sand on marine sand.</p> <p>Prof Griffiths replied that he had not claimed that there would be no effect. He had said that although there would be an effect it would be a low percentage of the total squid spawning grounds. The exact spawning grounds were not mapped in detail. He said that they do not know, if the spawning ground is removed,</p> |
|--|--|---|--|

**MARINE ECOLOGY ASSESSMENT SPECIALIST**

|  |  |   |  |
|--|--|---|--|
|  |  | <p>will not affect the squid industry. However, the bottom strata is being changed, this is where the egg-beds are, and squid do not randomly put their egg-beds wherever there is a sandy bottom. They use a very specific place. He asked if the study has mapped out the exact squid egg-beds, because historically they come back to the same area every year to spawn.</p> <p>Mr Christy noted that 32% of the industry catch is in the affected area. In the economic report (not sure if the Marine Specialist worked together with the Economist), it is stated that there will only be a 1 km zone therefore the percentage is very small. This is not the case as 32% of the catch is caught in that specific area. He said he was shocked that his does not appear in the Executive Summary, is fobbed off in the economic report where it is dwindled down to 1.8%. The Squid Industry rejects this. Prof Griffiths states that the sediment will be there, the food will be affected by the cold water as this is going to change, therefore the food will not be there. The bottom substrata for the squid to breed and lay their eggs is not going to be there, and yet it is stated that there will be very little effect on the industry. The Squid Industry has a problem with the findings of the study.</p> <p>Mr Christy replied that the industry does have maps and there are studies that have been conducted and everything is available. This area of the coast is the centre of the squid industry. This fishery extends from Plettenberg Bay to East London but this area between the Kromme Bay and Oyster Bay and Jeffrey's Bay is there all year round. This takes it from being a</p> | <p>whether they will in fact move to another spawning ground, or whether they will fail to spawn. (Post meeting note: the 1km exclusion zone is a security zone out to sea and has yet to be determined. This zone is based on the Koeberg set up which has a intake basin which is not proposed for the Thuyspunt site)</p> <p>The facilitator asked Mr Christy if he had specific maps on the spawning.</p> <p>The facilitator said that one of the things that she would like to 'park' for the social specialist is in terms of understanding the regional and the national and international economic ramifications, because this would have a potential social and economic impact.</p> <p>Prof Griffiths responded that if Mr Christy has additional data, he would be happy to incorporate this into his report. He asked that it be borne in mind that all marine impacts are being examined over a variety of different sites. Once a site is chosen it would be appropriate to make sure that all the information</p> |
|--|--|---|--|

| <b>MARINE ECOLOGY ASSESSMENT SPECIALIST</b> |   |
|---|---|
|   | <p>seasonal industry to being a permanent full-time employment industry. If some of these areas are closed this will mean that they might in the month of December be able to catch fish in Plettenberg Bay, they might catch in East London but consistently, this is the area where they catch the squid.</p> <p>Mr Christy undertook to forward to Prof Griffiths all the information available. He however mentioned that they would have preferred it if all information was incorporated before it was pronounced that Thyspunt is the preferred site.</p> <p>He added that as an industry, they feel that the specialist report has fallen short, both biologically and environmentally, particularly with regard to the squid industry. He feels that the main driving force in choosing a site should be the economic factors and the socio-economic impact.</p>   |
|   | <p>available be incorporated into the final report.</p> <p><b><u>Post-meeting note:</u> Comment from Dr. T Robinson (Marine Specialist)</b></p> <p><b>As marine scientists considering marine ecology impacts associated with the proposed Nuclear-1 development we are required to base any assessment on published and peer reviewed information. As such, our report to date has not included meetings or interviews with community leaders or role players. Any knock-on impacts from marine ecology affecting people (e.g. how chokka fisherman will be affected) are in fact not in our area of expertise and fall within the economic specialist study.</b></p> <p><b>Following the Focus Group Meetings, Professor Griffiths has made contact with Mr. Greg Christy who has unpublished information from the Chokka Fishing Association, which may assist our revised report. Once Professor Griffiths has received this information we will be in a position to assess it and, if it is suitable, include it in our assessment.</b></p> <p><b>With the greatest respect for the fisherman and other interested and affected parties, for us to do our job properly, we need to base our assessment on hard science and fact. By remaining impartial to the desires of the developer and emotions, needs and wants of affected parties we can best provide a rigorous assessment which accurately reflects the potential impacts on the marine environment. It is thus not out of disregard for them that we have not contacted them, but purely a reflection of us trying to provide an objective report based on the most</b></p> |

| MARINE ECOLOGY ASSESSMENT SPECIALIST |                          |   |  |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|---|--|
|                                      |                          |   | <b>scientifically sound information available.</b>   |
| 2                                    | Mr Ryan Donnelly<br>FAST | <p>Mr Donnelly enquired about the desalination plant. He asked what exactly is the brine and how it would affect the marine/sea life.</p> <p>Mr Donnelly asked if there are any chemicals that come out with the brine.</p> <p>He also asked about the hot water that will also come out, what sort of treatment measures are done to the cooling system. Is there such a thing as chlorinated water?</p> <p>Mr Donnelly asked if this has been assessed.</p> | <p>Prof Griffiths replied that the composition of the brine is in the marine specialist report and is about 1.5 times the concentration of normal seawater. It will therefore be heavier than seawater and will flow out of the pipe along the bottom of the sea floor. The wave action will mix the brine into the water column. The marine organisms do not like this highly saline water. In the immediate vicinity of the pipe there will probably be some mortality of but this was not a significant environmental impact.</p> <p><b><u>Post-Meeting note: Comment from Professor Griffiths (Marine Specialist): It is very difficult to specify exactly the distance from the pipe. The impact of the brine and the physical area of the impact will be dependant on the wave action and the sea current at a specific point in time. This will determine the extent of the impact however in general the impact will occur over a radius hundreds of metres from the pipe and not as far as kilometres from the pipe. In terms of mortality, if the salinity is equal to or exceeds 1.5 times the salinity of the surrounding sea water very few marine organisms will survive.</u></b></p> <p>Prof Griffiths replied that it is just concentrated sea water, it is salt with no added chemicals.</p> <p>Prof Griffiths said that the water that is routed through the cooling system of the plant is chlorinated by electrolysis so the chlorine that is in the seawater is utilised and this is what emerges and returns to sodium chloride in the seawater afterwards.</p> <p>Prof Griffiths said that it has been assessed in terms of what is</p> |

| MARINE ECOLOGY ASSESSMENT SPECIALIST |                                     |  |  |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|--|
|                                      |                                     |  | happening at the Koeberg Nuclear Power Station and the team from the University of Cape Town had been monitoring mortality in the vicinity of the Koeberg outfall since the plant had been constructed (i.e. 26 years).  |
| 3                                    | Mr Helmie Tilders<br>FOSTER         | <p>Mr Tilders said that he had a comment as he has been tasked to assess the economic report, which gets its information to do with the squid industry from the marine report. If the economics of this area are examined, the squid industry plays a huge role. It employs about 4,000 people, it has an income of half a billion to a billion rand per month. Yet, the squid industry is fobbed off in the marine report that is sorely lacking and never went into any detail of the squid industry.</p> <p>He wanted this comment to be minuted.</p>   | <p>The facilitator said that the social scientist would answer this question as far as they can and if they cannot, the issue would have to be dealt with in the economic study as part of the process.</p> <p><b>Post-meeting note: The Economic Assessment (Appendix E17 of the Draft EIR) reports that over the last 20 years the annual catch has ranged between 2 000 and 14 000 tons in the Eastern Cape with an average of 7 000 tons. The Port St. Francis-based companies average about 1 000 tons per annum. Squid is the most viable fishing industry in the area, almost the entire catch being exported to the European Union at an average price of about €7/kg.</b></p> |
| 4                                    | Dr Fred Ellery<br>Rhodes University | <p>Dr Ellery asked a follow up question on the squid spawning area. Wind is a good sorter of sediment as it pulls out fine sediment from the sediment that is being transported by long shore drift along the coastline. And if by pulling the fine sediment out at Oyster Bay and transferring it across the headland, as a headland-bypass dunefield, so what happens is that the region between Oyster Bay and the Kromme River is a region where the sediment is coarser than the surrounding areas. For that reason, he suspects that the squid are spawning in that area. What is going to happen is that the fine sediment will be re-produced back into the system and it is going to therefore have a major impact on the potential of those squid to spawn. This needs to be carefully considered.</p> | <p>Prof Griffiths said that they would be interested to incorporate this information into the study.</p>   |

| <b>MARINE ECOLOGY ASSESSMENT SPECIALIST</b> |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|
| 5   | Dr Warwick Sauer<br>Rebels Rus Nature Reserve | Dr Sauer noted that there was a lot of species – fish and shark species both on-shore and off-shore, they are very resident species. He asked if the study had examined the impacts of both construction phase and the on-going operational phase in terms of these resident species. | Prof Griffiths stated that there are resident species on the reef that will be affected. Re-colonisation will take place over a period of time. These environmental impacts on the reef system, the dumping of the spoil and the saline water are impacts, which will take place during the construction phase. The construction phase of the plant is 8 or 9 years. After this phase there will be recovery from these impacts, and he anticipates that there will be re-colonisation as has been seen when marine protected areas have been declared, they are rapidly re-colonised. This might take a period of a decade.  |
| 6   | Ms Donna Jooste-Coetsee<br>Nature's Calling   | Ms Jooste-Coetsee asked how the re-colonisation could take place once the power plant is operational, with the resultant heated water.  | Prof Griffiths said that that there would not be changes during operation but during construction there would be due to the dumping of spoil. There will be emission of desalinated water which will have a higher salinity (brine). During the operational phase all that will take place is that warm seawater will be pumped into the ocean and that warm seawater is less dense than the surrounding seawater so it will float to the surface and will dissipate. It is then mixed with the surface water within a distance of one or two kilometres (at the Koeberg Nuclear Power Station it is less than a kilometre). Animals that live on the reef during the operational phase should not come into contact with this warm seawater. |
| 7   | Mr Chris Barratt<br>St Francis Kromme Trust   | Mr Barratt asked Professor Griffiths where the pipe that will discharge the spoil is to be situated and what consideration was given to the damage that the laying of that pipe will have.  | Prof Griffiths stated that the engineering drawings have the location of the pipe and he believes that there will be 5 or 6 pipes that will go out and have fuser heads on the top of them. The outfall will not take place at a single location. At the present Koeberg site the outfall is right on the beach. In this proposed situation the construction is quite different as a coffer dam will be built, the pipes laid and then the spoil from the coffer dam will be used to cover and bury the pipes. The pipes will have a series of risers on them and this will therefore be a dissipated outfall and not a point outfall. The risers will extend some metres above the sea floor.  |

**MARINE ECOLOGY ASSESSMENT SPECIALIST**

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
|  |  | <p>Mr Barratt stated that he was not referring to the water but to the sand discharge. The question was actually what cognisance has the specialist taken in the study of the damage that the laying of the pipe will have. He quoted from the consultants letter that the objectives of the meeting were an opportunity for stakeholders to comment on the findings of the specialists and the specialists to present them. It is therefore the specialists who must present and answer questions and not Ms Ball.</p> <p>Mr Barratt asked if he was then to deduce that there would be an additional specialist study undertaken.</p> <p>Mr Barratt said that he agreed and he would like the distance from the coast and the depth explained.</p> | <p>Ms Ball commented on the scope of work that the specialists were given. With respect to spoil, the specialist was asked to examine the alternatives of on- and off-shore spoiling of sand. There were no specifications supplied at that stage to specialists and they were requested to provide recommendations specific to their discipline regarding what are the preferred methods of disposing of the spoil in order for potential environmental impacts to be avoided or minimised. The Marine Specialist gave specific recommendations in terms of the pumping of spoil to sea, in terms of flow rates and distance of the pipeline from the shoreline.</p> <p>Prof Griffiths said that they were informed of what the volume of spoil would be but his team was not familiar with the engineering structure of the actual pipe.</p> <p>The facilitator asked Mr Barratt if she could park this question and during the next session ask someone from the technical side to explain the pipes.</p> <p>The pipe design will be determined based on the recommendation of the specialist studies and further exploration of technical parameters. This design will only be completed once the vender has been identified. Therefore, as is the case with EIA's recommendations are made by the specialists, the applicant and the vendor will be required to implement these recommendations.</p> <p><b><u>Post-meeting Note</u></b><br/> <b>No additional specialist study will be undertaken. However if any new, significant information comes to light the current study will be amended with the information and will</b></p> |
|--|--|--|--|

| MARINE ECOLOGY ASSESSMENT SPECIALIST |  |  |   |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|---|
|                                      |  |  | <b>be made available to the public and stakeholders for review.</b>   |
| 10                                   | Ms Trudi Malan<br>Cape St Francis Civics<br>and<br>Thyspunt Alliance | Ms Malan stated that Prof Griffiths constantly refers to the fact that he is using Koeberg as the baseline study. Ms Malan feels that using Koeberg is like comparing squid with budgies. The values etc. from Koeberg cannot be used for various reasons. Several of the consultants have mentioned this – this is a completely different plant type, it is Generation 3, they are going to pump it out in tunnels. She went on to say that the professor has stated that the sea temperature will not be affected because of Koeberg experiences. The sea temperature in this area is higher, the possibility of the chlorination actually becoming toxic because of the heating and it is going into a heated environment. Prof Griffiths had also stated that because of global warming, everyone should pray for it now because it might cool the water in this area. She said she would like to use something from Prof Griffiths’ report, “although theoretically possible this however, is unsubstantiated.” | Prof Griffiths replied that the construction of the plant is different but that it is a useful comparison to examine what has happened at the Koeberg Nuclear Power Station since its construction and during operation. When the Koeberg Nuclear Power Station was being constructed, there were all sorts of newspaper stories and allegations about the huge impact that was expected to happen on the marine environment. None of these impacts have in fact taken place. The negative environmental impacts of the plant have turned out to be undetectable and even impacts, which are not negative such as the location of warmer water species occurring in the area has not happened. He agrees with Ms Malan that the construction of the plant is different but he feels that the experience of the construction of a nuclear plant should be used when looking through the environmental impacts. This is useful information. |
| 11                                   | Ms Donna Jooste-Coetsee<br>Natures Calling                           | Ms Jooste-Coetsee noted that Prof Griffiths had said undetectable but there is a death rate of 28% phytoplankton and 43 - 68% zooplankton and the whole ecological chain of the sea starts with those two microorganisms. If that life is killed how many animals living off these organisms that are vital to our oceans will be affected?<br><br>Ms Jooste-Coetsee said that 28% is more than one quarter.   | Prof Griffiths said that they appear to be speaking at cross-purposes because obviously in the volume of water that is pumped through the power station these impacts take place. The impacts are 28% within the volume of water that moves through the station and not 100%.<br><br>He went on to say that this is a limited volume of water and when that water is pumped back into the ocean - many cubic kilometres of ocean is passing through that area per day. In terms of the food chain, over the region, it is undetectable.<br><br>He added that the lifecycle of these organisms is replaced   |

| <b>MARINE ECOLOGY ASSESSMENT SPECIALIST</b> |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|
|   |   | <p>Ms Jooste Coetsee said that eventually over time there would be a knock-on effect.</p>   | <p>quickly – if you are talking about removal of phytoplankton/ zooplankton once a day then a quarter of the cells that were removed yesterday have now returned to a full complement.</p> <p>Prof Griffiths disagreed and said it would not have a knock-on effect as it was not an accumulative process. These are living cells, which are reproducing and generating themselves. There will be a small mortality rate from a small volume of water – the natural regeneration will replace that cell within a very short period.</p> |
| 12  | <p>Dr Peter Inman<br/>Coega Development Corporation</p> | <p>Dr Inman said that he has been building harbours for about 40 years in various parts of the world.. There are many power stations all over the world. There is a huge database of material which can be examined.</p> <p>Pipeline construction for undersea and submerged tube tunnels all have the same thing – there is dredging and disturbing. Dredging for a harbour – this has been done at Coega and it has been done off-shore. It is slightly different for Algoa Bay but investigate what has happened since.</p> <p>Re-colonisation normally is very quick, his organisation has placed aqua pods in the sea and the next day there will be something stuck to it. The sea normally re-colonises incredibly quickly, although he is not sure if the same would happen at Thyspunt as it is a unique environment, he has seen it in many places in different parts of the world.</p> | <p>Thank you for your comments.</p>   |
| 13  | <p>Mr Ryan Donnelley<br/>FAST</p>                       | <p>Mr Donnelley said that it appears that a larger area rather than the localised area has been investigated in the assessment as far as the marine environment is concerned. He asked how Prof Griffiths had structured</p>  | <p>Prof Griffiths explained that his task was to examine what impact this particular development would have on the wider area because any construction does cause local disruption. There cannot be a massive construction taking place without</p>   |

| <b>MARINE ECOLOGY ASSESSMENT SPECIALIST</b> |  |  |   |
|---|--|--|---|
|   |  | <p>his assessment as far as importance when it comes to the conclusion it has. If the localised area is compared to the rest of the world it is not going to show up, whereas if the localised area is the focus, the impacts are greater.</p> <p>If the area is compared to a larger body then of course the impact is reduced.</p> <p>He does not understand how this is now becoming a larger area that is being assessed. He thought the site and the area around the site was being assessed – meaning assessing a localised area.</p>                | <p>some environmental impacts on the actual site. He was mostly concerned about any really endangered species on that site with special features which were not replicated in any other areas. Any development has an impact on the footprint of the area in which it is built.</p> |
| 14  | Mr Greg Christy<br>SA Squid Management<br>Industrial Association | <p>Mr Christy responded that the Coega dumping was taken and dumped on a muddy substrate. Here it is being dumped on pristine reef intermingled with sandy bottom, intermingled with the environment that is perfect for squid reproduction. With regard to the effects of the dumping in the Kouga area, there have been effects felt in the pelagic fishery and also in the squid fishery. These records are available.</p> <p>He then asked Dr Inman (Coega) if the spoil pumped out to sea or was it pumped on land during the Coega construction?</p> | <p>Prof Griffiths said he is more than happy to include all this type of information into his study.</p> <p>Dr Inman replied that it was not all pumped out to sea. Approximately 10<sup>3</sup> m was pumped out to sea.</p>   |

| <b>AGRICULTURAL ASSESSMENT SPECIALIST</b> |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| No  | Name   | Comment  | Response   |
| 1   | Mr John Elliott<br>JAB Elliott Horticultural<br>and Landscape Consultant | Mr Elliott stated that everyone is aware that most agricultural land has a set carrying capacity and in terms of the footprint, he thinks it is 35 hectares for the Thyspunt facility. That 35 hectares does not take in the | Ms Ball responded in terms of the footprint, it has been stated what the core reactor building footprint will be but it has always been said that associated infrastructure would be added to this. Roads and all the other associated |

| <b>AGRICULTURAL ASSESSMENT SPECIALIST</b> |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|
| <b>No</b>                                 | <b>Name</b>   | <b>Comment</b>  | <b>Response</b>   |
|   |   | <p>size of the access road. The access road from St Francis Bay is approximately 10 km long and requires a 20 m wide road surface. The current road is 6 m, so there is a loss of 14 ha. That is a negative impact that was not even calculated in this process.</p> <p>From Cape St Francis to Humansdorp, this road will also be widened, this will result in more loss of agricultural land. The negative impact is therefore growing and was not quantified in this survey (from his understanding).</p> <p>In terms of the crossings, one cannot tell a cow and a farmer when the milk must be turned on and off. Eskom must be told when the trucks can run and when they cannot. There will be a few hundred cows crossing the road every day of the year.</p> <p>There is also loss of habitat in terms of fauna and flora where actual agriculture is not taking place, such as areas of fynbos. There will be a financial impact on the farmer who is losing land and there will be a great traffic effect and a timing effect for dairy farmers.</p> | <p>infrastructure has been assessed by all the specialists. They all received the same diagrams and cut-outs depicting their maximum footprint size.</p> <p>The facilitator said that at the previous evening's meeting Mr Elliott had mentioned the road reserve and does this mean that the vegetation in the road reserve will be maintained or disturbed.</p> <p>Ms Ball said that this would come out of the recommendations of the biophysical specialist reports, particularly the Flora Specialist Study. The detailed alignment of the road would have to be examined quite carefully.</p> <p>Mr Howcroft replied that in terms of the road, the existing servitudes will have to be investigated. The impact on the land will also need to be examined. The crossing of the animals is a valid point and must be mitigated with infrastructure such as underground crossings.</p> <p>The facilitator said that in terms of the road alignment and in terms of the moving of centre pivots, is there would be need to understand the issues and the process that Eskom may go through in terms of their negotiation process with the landowners. These issues will be dealt with by the Social Specialist.</p> |
| 2   | Ms Trudi Malan<br>Cape St Francis Civics &<br>Thyspunt Alliance | Ms Malan asked for an explanation on how the specialist had arrived at 10 – 15% positive impact on the agriculture. In the economic assessment there is an R18.7 negative. If the reason is that the farms will be more efficient, that can be done without the nuclear power station. She has spoken to Woodlands and they   | Mr Harcourt explained that he had looked at this as a potential positive impact but this will be up to the farmers whether they take this opportunity or not.   |

| <b>AGRICULTURAL ASSESSMENT SPECIALIST</b> |   |  |   |
|---|---|--|---|
| <b>No</b>                                 | <b>Name</b>   | <b>Comment</b>   | <b>Response</b>   |
|   |   | <p>say they cannot increase their production even though there will be more people in the area. Woodlands do not sell to locals they sell on to the big companies and then this produce gets distributed country-wide.</p> <p>Ms Malan said that Mr Howcroft has put this as a positive in his study because he is assuming an increase but if he studies the dairy industry, this assumption is wrong. She further added that if there was a vegetable industry in this area, it might have been a positive, but in the dairy industry this would not be the case. In the study it looks as though the dairy industry is going to benefit by 10 – 15% and that is a huge increase and it is untrue.</p> <p>Ms Malan said that in the Executive Summary of the report, it is stated very clearly, the production in the area around Thyspunt would increase by 10 – 15% while no change is anticipated in the Duynefontein area. She asked for this wording to be rectified.</p> | <p>Mr Howcroft said it was a potential increase and it was not stated that this would definitely happen. There have been changes in this region, it has not always been a dairy area. It used to be predominantly wheat, so it has changed. The change was due to the market.</p>   |
| 3   | Ms K Bowler<br>Facilitator                                    | The facilitator asked Mr Howcroft (Agricultural Specialist) if in his discussions with the local dairy farmers, in terms of how they are structured, is there a potential for them to re-look at how they can create a local market in this area. Are they fixed into the market and the structure that Ms Malan is referring to?  | Mr Howcroft replied that the impression gained from talking to farmers in the region is that they were positive about the opportunities that a development such as this would create.   |
| 4   | Mr Joe Oosthuizen<br>St Francis Residents<br>Assoc and FERRRA | Mr Oosthuizen indicated that he was concerned about the potential to the farming industry, it did not make too much sense to him. He also found in the study that in a lot of the farms the head of cattle was specified. In the case of two of the largest diary farms, however, the number of cattle was not specified. This is a very serious study and accurate information is required in order to  | Mr Howcroft explained that in terms of the data, he had attempted to get as much data as possible from the farmers. Where this could not be obtained, estimates were made given the known average holding in the area. He feels that a conservative approach was used in the analysis. The bottom line is that it is a significant industry with a high production volume compared to the other proposed sites. |

| <b>AGRICULTURAL ASSESSMENT SPECIALIST</b> |                           |  |  |
|---|---------------------------|--|--|
| <b>No</b>                                 | <b>Name</b>               | <b>Comment</b>   | <b>Response</b>  |
|   |                           | <p>make correct decisions. One thing that is very clear, when going through the Agricultural Specialist Report, that this is the highest impact of the three sites that have been identified for Nuclear-1. Virtually double the economic value of the next best option. He feels that this is sacrificing very high potential farming area the way it also seems as though the best squid in the country is also being sacrificed. These are the concerns that local farmers have. His question is therefore, is this a definitive study and is this going into the final report. If this is being used to score on a points system because it is stated that there are benefits to the industry, his background is agricultural extension officer and he knows the economic impacts and he still does not understand how these conclusions were reached.</p> <p>Potential positive is for a very short period of time, during the construction phase only. Then after that all the gains and the infrastructure the farmers have put in to increase their potential, according to this study, could be a very short investment period.</p> | <p>He does not agree that agriculture would be sacrificed. There are potential negative impacts in terms of the roads, but there is also potential positive market impacts.</p> <p>Mr Howcroft said the construction period is 8 – 9 years. He had stated in the report that in terms of the market given the amount of people and economic activity in the region during construction the increase will mostly be during the construction phase.</p>                                    |
| 5   | Mr Ryan Donnelley<br>FAST | <p>Mr Donnelley said his question was with regards to the local organic farming enterprises. Have they been included in this study?</p> <p>Mr Donnelley said he would like to be consulted with regards to this agricultural report and as a farmer he has invested 10 years of trying to establish a crop of organic plants. There are also other organic farmers in the area</p>   | <p>Mr Howcroft said that he does understand that there is a small-holding in the St. Francis Bay area which is investigating organic farming. Mr Howcroft has contacted organic certification organisations (International Organic Certification organisation) to get confirmation from them and being in the proximity of a nuclear power station would not affect certification. The organisation is more concerned about drift of pesticides from neighbouring non-organic farms.</p> |

| AGRICULTURAL ASSESSMENT SPECIALIST |      |   |   |
|------------------------------------|------|---|---|
| No                                 | Name | Comment   | Response  |
|                                    |      | <p>who supply an up-market market and outlets. As far as the actual market for organic farming was concerned, it is an upmarket market and therefore involves tourism. If the tourism industry is going to be impacted, then organic farming will also be impacted. This is therefore a negative and he is still battling to see how Mr Howcroft substantiates a positive impact on the farming in this area.</p> <p>He also enquired as to where in the world there is an organic farm in the same area as a nuclear power station. If you understand anything about organic farming, you will know that these particular people who do this type of farming, would never be farming anywhere near a nuclear power station. Their product is a specific product aimed at a specific market. The market is very sensitive when it comes to organic. He believes that the conclusions in the report are not substantiated.</p> <p>He asked that organic farms be included in the report as they are presently completely omitted.</p> <p>Mr Donnelly said they are practising organic farmers and he believes that they are in the process of being certified. He feels that this is irrelevant as they are practising farmers who have been omitted from the study.</p> <p>Mr Donnelley asked Mr Howcroft to contact him.</p> <p>He then asked regarding radionuclides (he knows there are many of these), have these been taken into account and have they all been taken into account, specifically</p> | <p>Mr Howcroft asked if the organic farms in the area were certified organic farms.</p> <p>Mr Howcroft agreed that the significance of organic farmers should be assessed compared to other agricultural production in the area and wanted to know whether this type of farming has got potential. However perception must be separated from fact. .</p> <p><b>Post-meeting note: The query will be investigated in more detail by the Agricultural Specialist and if any new, significant information comes to light the current study will be amended with the information and will be made</b></p> |

| <b>AGRICULTURAL ASSESSMENT SPECIALIST</b> |             |  |   |
|---|-------------|--|---|
| <b>No</b>                                 | <b>Name</b> | <b>Comment</b>   | <b>Response</b>   |
|   |             | <p>when it comes to plant material and how it is taken up by plant material. Has a study been done on all those different radionuclides and how they individually interact with these vegetable plants?</p> <p>All of the information on air quality comes from the applicant and those who stand to profit from this application. In terms of the information that is being used on which to base conclusions, he is of the view that it is not independent information and conclusions cannot be made on such information.</p> <p>Mr Donnelley objected and said that Areva and Westinghouse who are supplying all the information cannot be classified as good suppliers of information. They have vested interests in the application and they are completely non-independent.</p> <p>Mr Donnelley asked that the draft report be updated to inform the public of these procedures because they are being given information which they need to comment on and it is unclear.</p> | <p><b>available to the public and stakeholders for review.</b></p> <p>Mr Howcroft said that a literature review was conducted on the radionuclides. Under normal circumstances the emissions from the proposed Nuclear Power Station are low at 4% of the allowable limits in terms of legislation.</p> <p>Ms Ball said that Mr Donnelley has raised this point before and there is an independent air quality specialist study. As previously stated all health and safety issues around this proposed nuclear power station get taken up in the NNR process.</p> <p>Mr Howcroft said his study was based on information given to them by the Air Quality expert.</p> <p>Ms Ball explained that at the last meeting the envelope of criteria was spoken about, that this conservative set of criteria encompassed all the Pressurised Water Reactors (PWRs) available was provided to Arcus GIBB by Eskom. The specialists used this envelope of criteria in their assessments. If the selected vendor cannot comply with these criteria, the EIA is null and void.</p> <p>Ms Ball continued that there is an international association that checks licensed nuclear installations.</p> <p>Ms Herbst replied that this point has been responded to on previous occasions. The criteria that were given, that the specialists based their studies on, is information that was gathered from a number of PWR technologies. The</p> |

| <b>AGRICULTURAL ASSESSMENT SPECIALIST</b> |  |   |   |
|---|--|---|---|
| <b>No</b>                                 | <b>Name</b>  | <b>Comment</b>  | <b>Response</b>   |
|   |  |   | <p>emissions from the nuclear power station are not something that is decided by Eskom or by the vendors, it is based on years of international experience and is issued by the Regulatory arms in various countries. The International Association for Atomic Energy reviews this information.</p> <p>Ms Ball said that this information is in the report and has also been presented at every meeting held during the last two months.</p> <p>Ms Herbst said that it has also been responded to in the Issues and Response reports as well as in the minutes.</p> |
| 6   | Ms K Bowler<br>Facilitator                         | The facilitator said that Ms Jooste-Coetsee had asked that in the light of the absence of representation of the agricultural industry and the farmers at the meeting, how many of the farmers had been invited to the meeting.  | Mr Stan Clarke from Woodlands Farm indicated by hand that he is one of the representatives from the farming industry. A representative from the Department of Agriculture was also in attendance.   |
| 7   | Prof Richard Cowling<br>FOSTER                     | <p>Prof Cowling said that markets and perceptions have been mentioned. Markets are largely driven by perceptions. The perception that this massive dairy area is in the lee of a potentially lethal structure surely should have influenced the rating of the impacts of this infrastructure on agriculture.</p> <p>Prof Cowling asked that this be noted in the report that there is a negative impact on how the market could see products grown in the lee of a nuclear power station. A lot of people are anxious and nervous about nuclear and the moment that there is any hint of any kind of contamination in a product, there will be a huge outcry.</p> | <p>Mr Howcroft replied that there are nuclear power stations around the world where there is substantial agricultural development. . Even near the Koeberg Nuclear Power Station there is a dairy industry, wheat and grapes these industries are not negatively impacted by the fact that they are situated close to a nuclear power station.</p> <p>He does not deny that there is a negative perception in terms of nuclear. The facts are that there is agricultural development around nuclear power stations all over the world.</p>                          |
| 8   | Mr Hilton Thorpe<br>St Francis Kromme Trust<br>and | Mr Thorpe said that it is a concern and frustration that the whole radioactivity aspect of this has been handled by the NNR who cannot do anything until the specific   | Mr Howcroft replied that in terms of the positive market impact the figure of 10 - 15% is not only on the dairy industry. In terms of the emissions and information, there is an  |

| <b>AGRICULTURAL ASSESSMENT SPECIALIST</b> |                                      |  |  |
|---|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| <b>No</b>                                 | <b>Name</b>                          | <b>Comment</b>   | <b>Response</b>  |
|   | St Francis Bay Residents Association | <p>technology has been announced. So there are two processes being undertaken which should be running in parallel, feeding into each other, and they are not. Stakeholders have to persist in saying they are dissatisfied with this.</p> <p>The impression gained from reading the reports is that they have been written with as favourable as possible a comment in favour of Eskom. It comes up time and time again, it has come up again now with regards to this potential increase in the dairy industry market. It has come up for example in one of the environmental reports where it states that there will be an overall environmental benefit from the development because of the small nature reserve that Eskom would put around the site. This totally disregards the massive environmental impact that the plant itself would have on the area.</p> <p>It is understood that the likelihood of a major accident is very small, but what is unknown is exactly what the quantification is of the emissions. It was stated that there should be absolute transparency about this and people should be given the information. They have tried very hard to get information out of the NNR and out of Eskom regarding the specifics of the emissions at Koeberg and what affect this has on vegetables, fruit and dairy products etc. The answer given is that an application must be made to the Promotion of Access to Information Act. Why do the public have to make such an application, why can a straight answer not be given. He feels that this is another example of spin going on in favour of Eskom with no real facts being forthcoming.</p> | <p>opportunity to make sure that there are procedures in place so that the public can easily get information.</p> <p><b>Post-Meeting note: Section 32 of the Constitution guarantees to everyone the right of access to information held by the state and other persons or institutions. The Promotion of Access to Information Act 2 of 2000 ('PAIA') provides the framework and procedures for the exercise of the constitutional right to information. As Eskom is a parastatals institution PAIA is the appropriate vehicle to use in order to access the information required in a formalised manner.</b></p> |

| <b>AGRICULTURAL ASSESSMENT SPECIALIST</b> |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| <b>No</b>                                 | <b>Name</b>  | <b>Comment</b>   | <b>Response</b>  |
| 9   | Mr Joe Oosthuizen<br>St Francis Residents<br>Assoc and FERRRA            | <p>Mr Oosthuizen said that in the report it states that the powerlines are a separate study, that the powerlines will be going in two separate channels right across all the farmlands, from the site to Port Elizabeth. What affect would a high voltage powerline have on agriculture below it, cattle, dairy, sheep etc.</p> <p>He added that he believes that there will be an increase in rainfall in this area of about an inch per year (this is in all three areas) once a nuclear power plant is constructed.</p> | <p>Ms Ball explained that in terms of the transmission lines, it had been made clear from the beginning of the EIA that this is an EIA for a 4 000 MW proposed nuclear power plant. The EIAs for the transmission lines that would come out of the power plants have been undertaken by other environmental consultants and their independent specialists. Therefore she feels it is unfair to ask Mr Howcroft to answer questions relating to powerlines.</p> |
| 10  | Ms K Bowler<br>Facilitator   | <p>Ms Bowler said that what was actually being asked is who will examine the cumulative impacts of the entire infrastructure in this area in terms of all the specialist studies. This is a process related issue and she asked if this could be parked even though it is a critical question.</p>   | <p>This aspect will be referred to the Tx EIA.</p>   |
| 11  | Mr John Elliott<br>JAB Elliott Horticultural<br>and Landscape Consultant | <p>Mr Elliott asked if there is one EIA currently and this EIA is being dealt with and then there is a separate EIA running for the powerlines. In terms of the process with Department of Environmental Affairs and the government, do they both get assessed at the same time or is Nuclear-1 assessed first, and maybe accepted and then after that the powerlines come in the back door.</p>   | <p>The facilitator said that this was one of the first questions asked during these studies. This is a process related issue and we need to park it so that it can be dealt with later.</p> <p>Post meeting Note: The decisions will be made separately however any aspects relevant to the power line EIA in terms of cumulative impacts will be provided to the specialist doing the Agriculture studies for the Tx lines for consideration.</p>             |

| <b>TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT SPECIALIST</b> |  |   |   |
|--|--|---|---|
| <b>No</b>  | <b>Name</b>                                      | <b>Comment</b>  | <b>Response</b>   |
| 1  | Ms Elza van Lingen<br>NCOP – Cape Town, DA<br>MP | <p>Ms van Lingen said that Mr Thorpe had stated that there was a definite slant towards Eskom. She would also like to reiterate that there is a definite slant towards Thyspunt. If you compare what is happening at the other sites, in comparison to what is happening at Thyspunt, it is a pre-conceived decision.</p> <p>She also asked when the minutes of this meeting would be available because on 1 June 2010 there is a Parliamentary Committee who is interviewing the NNR and they are presenting the reasons why Thyspunt is the preferred site.</p> <p>Ms van Lingen said that if the assessment of all three sites is studied, then what is currently happening at Thyspunt, no one could deny that the development is taking place at Thyspunt.</p> | <p>Ms Ball responded that there has been no bias towards any of the alternative sites. The specialist studies examined and assessed all three alternative sites to the same level of detail. She asked Ms van Lingen to please substantiate her comment and send it in writing to the consultants.</p> <p>Regarding minutes that will be discussed in the Way Forward session.</p>  |
| 2  | Ms Donna Jooste-Coetsee<br>Natures Calling       | <p>Ms Jooste-Coetsee pointed out that the specialist had said that the Humansdorp Park road did not require any upgrades. She asked if he had ever examined that road. From the farm stall past Mzamowethu will definitely need upgrades.</p> <p>The locals at the township (bearing in mind some people living there are illiterate) have to be consulted. How many of these people have been told what is going to be happening along that route. They may well be shack dwellers but they are certainly not insignificant.</p>   | <p>Mr Frizlar replied that the assessment of the R330 carries all the way into Park Road. It is not only the rural portion. It examines the structural integrity, which will include the extension to Park Road.</p> <p>Ms Ball said that all the technical specialists need to consult relevant groups to undertake their specialist reports. Consultation of members of the public is undertaken through the associated public participation process.</p> |
| 3  | Ms K Bowler<br>Facilitator                       | Ms Bowler said that sometimes understanding impacts was also obtained by consulting   |   |

| <b>TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT SPECIALIST</b> |  |  |   |
|--|--|--|---|
| <b>No</b>  | <b>Name</b>  | <b>Comment</b>   | <b>Response</b>   |
|  |  | representative groups rather than individuals. The important thing is have representative community groups being informed and has the Municipality been engaged and are they aware of this. They have a legal and constitutional responsibility to make sure that these issues are taken into account together with the Roads Department.  |   |
| 4  | Mr Raymond Parker<br>Private - Assisting the St Francis Bay Residents Association with the Traffic and Transportation Assessment | <p>Mr Parker said that what concerns him is that a lot of the information contained within the presentation is not contained in the detailed report.</p> <p>He said that the specialist has alluded to the fact that some of the construction traffic is excluded from the calculations. That is fatally flawed because if one looks at the construction traffic related issues, particularly the access roads that need to be constructed, it is known that construction materials in the area are extremely poor and most of the road building material, such as aggregate, stone, etc. will come from areas further afield. Those make up vast quantities of heavy traffic. This must be included and mitigation measures put in place.</p> <p>He then said that the analysis deals only with the R330 and that might relate to the fact that there is contradiction between the two routes. This he believes is also fatally flawed as the process which needs to be investigated is the capacity of the road, the safety issues and the impact that this has on the current and future users of the road. When these volumes are examined, then the proposed Oyster Bay Road must be examined for utilisation. This must be clearly</p> | <p>The facilitator explained that what was shown in the presentation at this meeting is a result of constructive and positive engagement and suggestions at previous meetings. Cognisance has been taken of these issues and adjustments have been made.</p> <p>Mr Frizlar replied that when they were appointed they began to understand how the facility would be constructed. He acknowledged that more detail needs to be put into the revised traffic report.</p> <p>He also said that the proposal to have the traffic split (R 330 vs. the Humansdorp – Oyster Bay road) would do the reverse. and would increase the impact on the traffic flow of the road capacity and the intersections. The analysis that was shown last year (i.e. only using the R 330) is more of a worse case scenario than if one distributed some of the traffic to Oyster Bay for example.</p> <p>He said Mr Parker's comments were very valid on the safety</p> |

| TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT SPECIALIST |      |   |   |
|---|------|---|---|
| No  | Name | Comment   | Response  |
|   |      | <p>addressed in the report. At the moment only capacity analysis along the R330 and the intersections has been investigated.</p> <p>This leads on to the capacity analysis of the intersections and this relates purely to the operational issues on the intersections. It is understood that the road sections between the intersections and particularly on the areas through St Francis Bay and through Humansdorp do not only relate to capacity related issues. Safety issues, driving lanes, the width of the road, all need to be investigated.</p> <p>The access roads within the site should also be assessed. Nowhere in the transportation report are route alignments investigated or the actual positioning of the road and the effect that this would have on the site.</p> <p>He then said that the routing of traffic through Humansdorp CBD is not ideal. Especially if additional traffic is going to be put on the Oyster Bay Road, to mitigate use of the R330. Alternative routes need to be examined, linking through to the N2 specifically, but also then to the sites where the heavy construction material is coming from.</p> <p>The trip distribution has taken the existing trip distribution on the road looking at the existing traffic flow patterns between Jeffrey's Bay and Humansdorp and he thinks it might be wise, in the light of</p> | <p>and the impact side. As a team, there is a need to ensure that the issues addressed in the Social Impact Assessment are brought together in the summary report and properly representing the full picture. He suggested that it might be beneficial to duplicate this and show them in both reports to ensure that they are properly assessed.</p> <p>Regarding the route alignment of the access roads, at this stage there are fairly preliminary alignments that have not been assessed at a conceptual design stage. The assessment has been done in terms of a preferred routing and the more detailed work is currently being undertaken.</p> <p>This is in the brief from the consultants, to have a look at the alignment and he feels that from an EIA point of view, that is what was undertaken. They have not gone to the next level of detail to physically undertake a conceptual design.</p> <p>When examining the proposed alignment, they look for little, medium or large impacts.</p> <p>He said that the issue around the R330 is a valid one and he believes that there is already debate regarding the issue around road upgrading with the relevant road authorities. This is not only about the structural issues but about the revised cross sections. He thanked Mr Parker for highlighting this issue.</p> <p>The trip distribution was done on a worse case scenario and he feels it is likely to come down but he does not think they should be adjusted at this time.</p> <p>Mr Frizlar said that Eskom has a whole range of service</p> |

| <b>TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT SPECIALIST</b> |                              |   |   |
|--|------------------------------|---|---|
| <b>No</b>  | <b>Name</b>                  | <b>Comment</b>  | <b>Response</b>   |
|  |                              | <p>comments that have been made, to look at the trip distribution related purely to origins in terms of construction material as well as origins of where you anticipate the residential market to be.</p> <p>Mr Parker then added that regarding the upgrade of the Oyster Bay Road, the Department of Roads and Transport is currently busy with the design of that road to a minor surface road standard. He feels that this needs to be critically dealt with, very quickly so that they do not end up with a road, which is constructed to a sub standard level and cannot carry construction traffic.</p> | <p>providers so consultants have been working for Eskom as part of other assignments. When the Traffic and Transportation Team was appointed to the EIA they asked for the information regarding the proposal. Eskom's service provider had done some work on the access roads within the site and they had done a brief assessment on this in terms of the routing but the service provider is doing the work in much more detail.</p> <p>Mr Frizlar said that this was a very important issue. There is a separate process running and while there is no decision made on Thyspunt or the roads etc, it is important that Eskom start talking to the authorities to ensure that they are aware that there is a possibility that a Nuclear Power facility could be built at Thyspunt. To try and re-do this road in three or four years time would be a waste. Mr Frizlar said that he had raised this issue with Eskom.</p> |
| 5  | Dr Shirley Cowling<br>FOSTER | <p>Dr Cowling said that she had concerns about the Oyster Bay Road. There is an alternative on the Oyster Bay Road to Humansdorp where there is a turn-off just before the Elandsjag Dam towards Kakerbeensbos, this way the road would avoid going down the Rosa Drift.</p> <p>Dr Cowling said that she has raised this point previously and wanted an explanation as to why this is being ignored.</p> <p>Dr Cowling also wanted to know about the radioactive material that is going to be transported, how often will that be and what route will be used.</p>  | <p>Mr Frizlar said that he had driven some of these roads and was in the process of examining the potential of the road referred to.</p> <p>Ms Ball said that she has discussed this with Mr Frizlar and he has gone out to see the site, but unfortunately he had looked at the incorrect road.</p> <p>The current estimate is a maximum of 2 to 4 trucks per week of medium and low radioactive waste will be transported to Vaalputs. Eskom design staff gave him this information. No final routing has been given for this transport.</p>  |
| 6  | Prof Richard Cowling         | Prof Cowling said that his question relates to the  | Ms Ball stated that Arcus GIBB was unaware that the eastern   |

| TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT SPECIALIST |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|
| No  | Name  | Comment   | Response  |
|   | FOSTER                                      | <p>eastern access route. In the earlier processes involved with the nuclear facility at Thyspunt, the eastern access route was ruled out. It was regarded as a non-starter because it went through such a highly sensitive area. If one reads some of the other reports, there is a lot of concern about the eastern access route. He asked if this had been taken into consideration when planning Route 2.</p>  | <p>access road had been assessed as part of the Nuclear Site Investigation Process (NSIP).</p> <p>Ms Ball explained that they had examined alternative corridors. In terms of the eastern access road, this was given to Arcus GIBB by Eskom as a road alignment required for heavy vehicles and as such was a road without an alternative. The other two roads, the northern access route and western access route were alternatives to each other.</p> <p><b>Post-meeting note: Access roads are discussed in section 5.11 of the NSIP Eastern Cape Summary Report where the western access road, from a technical point of view, is identified as the preferred access road.</b></p> |
| 7   | Ms Bridget Elton<br>St Francis Bay Resident | <p>Ms Elton said that in theory Route 1 and Route 2 sounds great. However, the specialist cannot seriously believe that the workers (up to 80 busses per day) are going to accept the fact that they have to go on Route 1, which is an inferior road, when they could travel in comfort on Route 2. After a week of travelling on the inferior road they will protest.</p> <p>The R330 divides the learners from where they live. The traffic will go straight through where the children go to school and where they live. They ride bicycles, they play, and now to suddenly have a high volume and big loads of traffic is a fact that the specialist must take into consideration.</p> | <p>Comments noted.</p> <p><b>Post meeting note: The safety aspects will be assessed in the traffic and social assessment. Recommendations from these assessments will be incorporated into the final design and will include discussions with the relevant authorities and communities.</b></p>   |
| 8   | Mr Edmund Elton<br>Kromme Trust             | Mr Elton stated that he has read the report and he had discovered that there was a traffic engineering report,  | Mr Frizlar said that the issue around the exceptional loads is a fair question. When they had enquired about this there was a   |

| TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT SPECIALIST |      |   |   |
|---|------|---|---|
| No  | Name | Comment   | Response  |
|   |      | <p>but no where does it go into detailed road design. As there is no detailed road design, there was no detailed costing of alternative routes or roads and strengthening of bridges. In particular the Van Staaden's Bridge. This bridge is not designed for a 100 ton load, neither is the Kromme River Bridge. The report does not allow a very heavy vehicle across a bridge and hope that it will stand up to the load. The two bridges will have to be re-designed, as will all the existing roads. He asked if the costs have ever been considered, from the construction, to the strengthening of the bridges, strengthening the roads.</p> <p>He also noted that last year at a public meeting Ms Ball had stated that the Eskom engineer's had stated that there would be no alternatives to what they had specified. Since when does an engineer have that right to say there will be no alternative. Why has a completely new alternative road not been considered, to the Nuclear Power Station from the N2, avoiding St Francis Bay and Humansdorp?</p> <p>He then stated that an access road is proposed straight across the Sand River, he asked if it has been considered what future water flow across this river and the sand flow which takes 1 000 years from one side to the other. How is a road going to be designed to accommodate those two features across an environmental masterpiece, which can never be rebuilt?</p> | <p>team doing work for Eskom on the exceptional load routing from Port Elizabeth. Some of the preliminary work that they have examined, which includes visual assessment of bridges, measurements, basic calculations, etc. shows that the routing will work. It does require a much more detailed assessment of the quality/degree of degradation of some of the bridges. The second phase of the work he believes has started. The first assessment is not of poor quality as Mr Elton is suggesting.</p> <p>The second phase would require some non-destructive testing of bridges, etc. and that would be more conclusive. He feels sure that when appropriate, that type of information will be made available.</p> <p>The costing would depend on many factors. Everyone needs to understand that vehicles that travel on the roads are, in terms of the Road Traffic Act, so the loading is not as excessive as is believed. These are huge vehicles, and that is exactly why they drive at 5 km per hour (to ensure that they stay within the loading as required by the Act). No authority can allow a vehicle on the road that is outside the Act, therefore the loading is in the order of 10.5 tons per axle although two months ago Parliament approved an increase in the axle load to 13 tons. So it still has to perform on the public road in terms of the Road Traffic Act.</p> <p>Ms Ball said she did not recall the specific statement relating to alternatives being made in a public meeting as part of the EIA process. Ms Ball offered to look up the minutes of the meeting for clarification.</p> <p><b>Post meeting note: Arcus GIBB has attempted to locate the comment in minutes of meetings associated with the</b></p> |

| TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT SPECIALIST |   |  |   |
|---|---|--|---|
| No  | Name  | Comment  | Response  |
|   |   |  | Scoping Phase but has not been able to do this. Arcus GIBB will contact Mr. Elton directly if needed in order to obtain clarification regarding this matter. Various road alternatives are currently being assessed to minimise the potential impacts of increased traffic on the Humansdorp, St Francis Bay, Sea Vista and Cape St. Francis Bay residents.   |
| 9   | Ms Francis Becker<br>Rebels Rus Conservancy | <p>Ms Becker wanted to make people aware that there is not one school but two or three schools along the route. The traffic from the school from St Francis out to R330 is constant.</p> <p>She also stated that if there is going to be safety in this report, she also wanted a noise assessment done. Eskom is going to buy electricity from a wind farm in front of her property, there is heavy traffic behind her property, the noise impact will be huge. She feels that her property will be greatly devalued due to noise.</p>  | <p>Ms Ball explained that the noise specialist had undertaken sampling at various points, including opposite Sea Vista and the Kromme River bridge.</p> <p><b><u>Post-meeting note:</u> Comment from the Noise Specialist,</b></p> <p><b>The sound measurements conducted along the R330 and subsequent predictions and impact assessments of road traffic noise contained in Section 3.6.3 of the Noise Specialist report were representative for all land along the R330 south of Humansdorp including residential land near Kromrivier bridge and Sea Vista.</b></p> |
| 10  | Dr Fred Ellery<br>Rhodes University         | <p>Dr Ellery stated that there was no consideration of risk in the study. He is particularly concerned about the issue of risk in the event of a natural disaster. Wetlands and movement of sediment on the Sand River have all been discussed.</p> <p>What is important is the way that the sand moves in the landscape that has a very strong bearing on roads. People who live in the area will remember a debri-flow that occurred in 2007. The lack of consideration of a debri-flow happening and involving the road is a major omission in the study. He feels that</p> | Mr Frizlar said that this would be noted and investigated.  |

| TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT SPECIALIST |                                  |   |   |
|---|----------------------------------|---|---|
| No  | Name                             | Comment   | Response  |
|   |                                  | this should be seriously considered. If a vehicle is driving on the road and debris-flow happens, that vehicle will be knocked over and transported downstream. This has huge implications for the transportation of nuclear waste.   |   |
| 11  | Mr Stan Clarke<br>Woodlands Farm | Mr Clarke ( <i>representing Woodlands Farm which is located on route from Humansdorp to Oyster Bay</i> ) stated that the distance of the road which is going to be involved on the farm is from one end of the boundary to the other boundary and it is a distance of about 10 km. He is shocked to hear that this road will be going to carry 85 buses a day. Looking at the terrain, the only place where those buses can park, is on the farm. He is happy that the question of noise has been raised, especially on a dairy farm, dust which affects both animals and human beings and also of concern is the amount of people that are going to be in the vicinity. He is concerned because the people arrived on the farm to do the soil samples and the tests for the bridges to be built, a snare was set by these people and a bushbuck ram was snared. If 10 people can do this type of thing what are 500 to 800 people going to do? | <p>The facilitator said that many of these issues tie back to the previous specialist study in terms of agriculture, the social and economic specialists also need to take note of these concerns.</p> <p><b><u>Post-meeting note by Mr. Y. Frizlar (Traffic Specialist): The comments is noted. Parking for the buses has not been finalised but strict measures will be put in place controlling the access to and movement of individuals at a parking area.</u></b></p> <p><b>Conduct of persons on site will be governed by measures proposed by technical specialists and consultation with Interested and Affected Parties and other stakeholders and incorporated in the Environmental Management Plan.</b></p> |

| <b>SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT SPECIALIST</b> |                                       |   |  |
|--|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| <b>No</b>                                  | <b>Name</b>                           | <b>Comment</b>  | <b>Response</b>  |
| 1  | Ms K Bowler<br>Facilitator            | <p>Ms Bowler explained that there had been some issues left over from the previous presentations for the social specialists to deal with. Some of the issues might however fall into the economic specialist study.</p> <p>She added that Mr Thorpe is representing the interests of the Thyspunt Alliance, which comprises most of the civic bodies in the area, and he is going to ask questions and raise issues on their behalf.</p> <p>Ms Bowler asked if anyone had any objections to Mr Thorpe asking these questions, which would take approximately 10 minutes.</p>  | <p>There were no objections.</p>   |
| 2  | Mr Hilton Thorpe<br>Thyspunt Alliance | <p>Mr Thorpe stated that there is a requirement in the final Plan of Study Terms of Reference that accurate demographic figures for the peak holiday population for the greater St Francis area together with future projections be obtained. Mr Thorpe could not find these figures in the report.</p> <p>He then noted that people living in the area are concerned about job-seekers. Every time there has been a project in this area there has been an influx of people looking for work. This often results in squatter camps in Sea Vista, which causes all sorts of social problems. In the SIA it is stated that there will be a probable influx of unskilled and unemployed job-seekers and without mitigation the impact was medium with a high level of probability. With mitigation it reduces to probable. He asked on what hypothetical numbers the risk assessment was based.</p> | <p>Mr Dippenaar replied that the Tourism Study was handled by a separate specialist, this specialist had indicated that in the peak tourism season the figure could be 20 000 people that could potentially move into the area. The specialists had found it difficult to obtain accurate information on this aspect.</p> <p>Mr Dippenaar replied that in terms of job-seekers into the area, one would expect at least 6 000 – 7 000 people who may come to the area. There is a pre-construction period where it must be made well-known through different sources what kind of working opportunities is available, what kind of skills and exactly for what period of time these opportunities are available. People from a wide area must be informed beforehand exactly what is available. There will always be people who do not heed this notification and will come into the area.</p> |

| <b>SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT SPECIALIST</b> |             |  |   |
|--|-------------|--|---|
| <b>No</b>                                  | <b>Name</b> | <b>Comment</b>   | <b>Response</b>   |
|  |             | <p>Mr Thorpe then asked how could local labour be defined or identified.</p> <p>Mr Thorpe then confirmed that the mitigation measures for job-seekers are an information campaign, engagement between the contractor and local authorities to prevent squatting near the construction site, transparent public participation process with I&amp;APs, use of local labour and monitoring of the situation. He asked if Mr Dippenaar believes that these mitigation measures are going to address this particular problem.</p> <p>Mr Thorpe then stated that if Thyspunt is selected, the problem would be created by Eskom, what responsibility do they have to in some way assist in controlling this issue. He asked if it is solely up to the local community to do all policing and monitoring.</p> | <p>Mr Dippenaar responded that local labour has two forms of identification, one is in collaboration with the local authority and other Interested and Affected Parties (I&amp;APs) to draw a specific circle of either 20, 30 or even 80 km and only within this specified municipal area are people classed as local. The other more difficult identification is how long has a person resided in the area before he is considered to be local. This is a similar problem experienced by local municipalities when supplying low cost housing. His experience in general is that the community have a fairly good idea who qualifies as a local resident.</p> <p>Mr Dippenaar replied that when it comes to the employment of people, South Africa is a democratic society, and anyone has the right to work wherever they want to. It would be a gross violation of human rights to start making up criteria to prevent people from freedom of association and freedom to move around. In terms of job-seekers that come into the area and start illegal squatting, there are people that say the municipality will not enforce their own by-laws to make sure that squatting does not occur. This is a challenge and a problem. However, with a project of this nature, if handled correctly, and a specific strategy adopted, dealing with squatters will benefit the area as a whole.</p> <p>Ms Herbst responded that in terms of Eskom's responsibility in the large projects that Eskom is already involved in, Eskom has for example at Medupi, identified an area of 70 km around the site. The project has been quite successful in making sure that they focus on locals. There has been influx and the influx has caused some criminal activities which Eskom work with the Community Police to try and resolve, it is, however, quite a</p> |

| <b>SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT SPECIALIST</b> |             |   |   |
|--|-------------|---|---|
| <b>No</b>                                  | <b>Name</b> | <b>Comment</b>  | <b>Response</b>   |
|  |             | <p>Mr Thorpe said that the main concern is that in theory there are by-laws to control this type of thing but there is no obvious commitment by the local authority to enforce them.</p> <p>Mr Thorpe stated that the specialist had concluded that with mitigation measures the traffic impact would be low. He asked how the traffic can be assessed when the siting of staff and the construction villages have not been determined. The figures shown today by the traffic consultant are totally different from the figures shown in the Traffic Impact Report. There is no consistency with the facts.</p> <p>Mr Thorpe said that part of the problem was that the minutes from the previous meetings only arrived that morning. They therefore do not get feedback in time to prepare for additional meetings.</p> | <p>serious issue. Eskom sets up information centres in the nearest towns and Eskom include criteria in the supplier's contracts. There is therefore a great deal that can be done to implement the mitigation measures. Eskom has been particularly successful at Medupi. Eskom has also found that when employing people, and a non-local has applied, Eskom becomes aware of this fact quickly by the genuine local community. On the Medupi project Eskom has appointed 4,600 of the 6,000 semi-skilled employees from the local area.</p> <p>Ms Herbst added that Eskom works very closely with the contractors, the local authority, the provincial authorities etc. to ensure this policy is implemented.</p> <p>Ms Ball replied that in the beginning of an EIA process, the most conservative figures and estimates are used. Issues have been raised at previous meetings held in April and there have been extensive meetings held with the Traffic Specialist and the Eskom traffic experts. There is therefore now a more detailed breakdown of the impacts that need to be mitigated. The difference in figures is therefore a direct consequence of previous comments.</p> <p>Mr Dippenaar said that he used a basic principle, that anyone who lives or works next to a road for whatever purpose, or crosses a road for whatever purpose, must be safe. Any mitigation in terms of the traffic must make sure that people can</p> |

| <b>SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT SPECIALIST</b> |             |  |  |
|--|-------------|--|--|
| <b>No</b>                                  | <b>Name</b> | <b>Comment</b>   | <b>Response</b>  |
|  |             | <p>Mr Thorpe said that this does not take the noise impact into consideration. He also stated that the Noise Specialist Report states that no noise mitigation is required. That is due to the fact that this report only examines the construction site and does not examine the roads.</p> <p>Mr Thorpe then said that according to the specialist report, "sense of place" is a subjective concept and that everyone has a different view of their own sense of place. Ultimately sense of place is a reality, and is a very important reality; in fact it might be the most important reality in this whole development. This area has a unique sense of place which the community believes needs to be protected. It cannot be dismissed as subjective. He therefore asked is sense of place a purely subjective and theoretical concept or does it represent an important reality.</p> <p>Mr Thorpe said that many of the community had a problem as they saw what happened when Mossgas was constructed in Mossel Bay and what Mossel Bay has become compared to what it was prior to this development. In the SIA there was no reference to industrial development. If there is a huge plant at Thyspunt there will no doubt be ancillary industries that spring up around this development.</p> | <p>use or live safely next to a road. That is the basic principle irrespective of which road is used and even if there is a change in roads the principle remains.</p> <p>Mr Dippenaar said that noise is a different issue, he was discussing the safety issues. The question is to what extent noise can be mitigated with construction activities.</p> <p>Mr Dippenaar replied that sense of place is influenced by the reality around one. In this area people may feel that if there is this development and a large number of people are going to be moving into the area, plus a nuclear power plant, they might want to move as this was not what they came to the area for. Other people may feel differently, and might feel that there are now going to be opportunities for them. He agreed with Mr Thorpe that whether it is a road that is to be built, or a building that is to be constructed or more traffic those are harsh realities that definitely impact on how people experience their sense of place. There is therefore a subjective element placed on the realities.</p> <p>Mr Dippenaar replied that development is strange as sometimes factories are constructed in strange areas and it is difficult to foresee whether any industrial development will occur in this area. This would call for speculation.</p> <p>Dr Bews said that the report is an ongoing study and he feels that what is needed is that issues raised at this meeting need to be investigated and some issues in the Social Assessment</p> |

| <b>SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT SPECIALIST</b> |                                       |  |  |
|--|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| <b>No</b>                                  | <b>Name</b>                           | <b>Comment</b>   | <b>Response</b>  |
|  |                                       | <p>Mr Thorpe then asked if it would be correct to state that a nuclear power station at Thyspunt would irrevocably, unmitigably and permanently alter the sense of place of the area, and if so, should this be stated, clearly in the specialist report.</p> <p>Mr Thorpe questioned how this could be assessed when there was no construction traffic and the extra traffic over the bridge would cause huge noise impacts. Noise is completely inadequately addressed in this report.</p> | <p>need to be re-visited.</p> <p>Mr Dippenaar said that everyone is an individual and each person must make their own decision about whether the change will be good or bad, right or wrong, enhance your quality of life or reduce it, improve or lower the standard of living. How the development is viewed leads back to each individual's personal way they conceive reality.</p> <p>Mr Dippenaar said that people moving into the area, even after construction, will cause the area to change. He is fairly confident that he has identified and described the realities, they have identified the mitigation measures and he is confident that if mitigation is applied, life will not be the same, but not necessarily unacceptable for people to remain living in the area.</p> <p>Ms Ball said that the Tourism Specialist Study had examined the bed-nights, both business bed-nights and recreational/tourism bed-nights. If anyone had questions regarding this study they must please submit these in writing and they will be captured in the IRR.</p> <p>Ms Ball added that Mr Thorpe had previously made an accusation about the Noise Specialist Study – a number of data collection points were taken outside the actual Eskom-owned Thyspunt site. One of these collection points was opposite the Sea Vista community on the R330, another one just down the road at the bridge. It is therefore not true that only the potential noise impacts on the actual proposed construction site was assessed.</p> |
| 3  | Ms Laura Nixon<br>Oyster Bay Resident | Ms Nixon stated that the reports have changed so substantially in the recent time. During the last three   | Ms Ball replied that in terms of the access roads, all the presentations have been placed on the EIA websites. During  |

| <b>SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT SPECIALIST</b> |             |   |   |
|--|-------------|---|---|
| <b>No</b>                                  | <b>Name</b> | <b>Comment</b>  | <b>Response</b>   |
|  |             | <p>meetings it has been stated that the road was going to be a northern road from Thyspunt and would not go near Oyster Bay, at the last meeting it was going to be 230m from Mzamowethu. At this meeting the road is shown as going between Mzamowethu and Oyster Bay. Therefore the noise impact studies are going to be totally irrelevant for Oyster Bay as they need to be re-assessed in terms of the latest maps.</p> <p>She asked for an explanation as to why the recommendations change at every meeting.</p> <p>She also mentioned the exclusion zone. Oyster Bay is small, but the residents felt protected because although there are no resources, there is no police station, no fire brigade and there are constant water shortages the community lives harmoniously. What little there is, is stretched. Residents live there purely for the sense of place. It is remarkable and peaceful and beautiful. The reason why residents choose to live in this area will be forever damaged.</p> <p>She appreciates that potential problems have been raised in the report, she wanted to know what solutions have been found and what recommendations there are regarding the financing of increased services, such as medical services, fire services, policing services etc.</p> | <p>the Scoping Phase public meetings it was explained that there would be two access roads to the site required for emergency evacuation purposes in the unlikely event that there is an accident at the Nuclear Power Station, should it be built. Also during the construction phase the Eastern and the Western Access Roads are required to get both the heavy construction vehicles and the workers to site. During the EIA process, from the Scoping to EIA phase, the specialists were requested to examine broad corridors on site and the assessment of the proposed Northern, Eastern and Western Access Routes has been detailed in previous public meetings. The independent specialists held various meetings on site and recommendations for the corridors for each of the specialist disciplines are documented in the Draft EIR and also in all the presentations.</p> <p>With respect to the emergency planning zones (EPZs), originally the Koeberg example was used, but this will be a decision for the NNR. Eskom is now investigating Generation 3 type technology, the more up-to-date European Standards have now been used. The EIA is an iterative process and today concerns over a range of issues are being addressed. Traffic engineers are investigating the roads and should the alignments be changed, the respective specialists that did the assessments such as the Noise Impact Assessment, would have to re-do some of their data collection. The reports would then have to be updated and a Revised Draft EIR would need to be released in the public domain.</p> <p>Mr Dippenaar stated that what is true for Oyster Bay is also true for the whole area. The issue has to be dealt with in a sensitive way as this is a beautiful area.</p> |

| <b>SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT SPECIALIST</b> |                                |  |  |
|--|--------------------------------|--|--|
| <b>No</b>                                  | <b>Name</b>                    | <b>Comment</b>   | <b>Response</b>  |
|  |                                |  | <p>Ms Ball stated that the financing of increased services is more in the domain of the economic specialist and she undertook to check if this has been assessed in the report.</p> <p><b>Post-meeting note: Comment from Gavin Maasdorp (Imani): The Economic Impact Report did not deal with these items. The costs of these three services would be part of the costs associated with the normal incremental growth of a town, and the presence of a nuclear [power station will not make any difference to that fact. The demands on fire services are unlikely to be greater than they are now, at least on any significant scale, while policing costs fall under the SAPS and medical clinic costs under the provincial government not the municipality – clinics are used by the lower-income groups and there are state subsidies, while Eskom staff would be members of a medical aid scheme and would use private medical services.</b></p> <p><b>Water and electricity services would again be part of the normal pattern of urban development, and the costs of providing these services would be covered by user charges (the monthly municipal bills to householders). In addition, the new houses would have to pay municipal rates, and would result in an enhanced revenue stream to the local government.</b></p> |
| 4  | Prof Richard Cowling<br>FOSTER | Prof Cowling said that he appreciates that reality is relative and Mr Dippenaar states that it depends on the context. However, Mr Dippenaar has in his report given stakeholders a piece of his own reality which is to say that the impact on sense of place is low. He has allocated certain categories. What the community | Mr Dippenaar said that he had engaged with the community on all levels, such as organised groups, individuals, groups within Sea Vista, uMzamowethu, Humansdorp, school principals, the unemployed, people living in informal areas. Various interviews were conducted and focus group meetings were held with all strata of the community. That is why he has stated that some  |

| <b>SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT SPECIALIST</b> |   |  |   |
|--|---|--|---|
| <b>No</b>                                  | <b>Name</b>                                 | <b>Comment</b>   | <b>Response</b>   |
|  |   | would have preferred is some sort of feedback from the community such as a questionnaire survey. There is very little quantitative data in the report. Focus groups in the various communities could also have been consulted to get a sense of their reality. He acknowledges that there are many realities, but what is gained from the SIA is simply their own reality.   | people feel that this proposed project can help them obtain a better standard of living and better quality of life they are all for the development going ahead. On the other hand some people feel that there can be development but caution must be exercised so that the surrounds are not destroyed. There are vastly different opinions from the low income to the high-income groups.   |
| 5  | Ms Cheryl Gibson-Dicks<br>Thyspunt Alliance | <p>Ms Gibson-Dicks said that it was discouraging to note that the report does not refer to sustainable development. This is the key that underpins everything in South Africa, it is the way that the environment is approached, taking a long-term view. This refers to post-construction phase when many thousands of jobs have been created and a level is reached where skilled labour is being brought in.</p> <p>She then asked about methodology regarding comparative studies. When discussing sense of place have other communities been consulted, for example people who live close to nuclear sites, particularly at Koeberg. Has there been any international studies undertaken and communities questioned as to their perspective of living close to nuclear sites. Have any of these communities experienced an improvement in the standard of living.</p> | <p>Mr Dippenaar referred to a document called "Breaking new Ground" as his reference to sustainability. This document sets out that people need sustainable human settlements. In the SIA report Mr Dippenaar refers to sustainable human settlements based on the broad concept of Breaking New Ground. No development in this area, in terms of residential development, can happen if all aspects are not taken into consideration. Through the creation of sustainable human settlements one creates sustainable development.</p> <p>Mr Dippenaar explained that the Koeberg Nuclear Power Station was part of the three alternative sites and so he had spoken to people around the facility. What he had discovered was that a large number of people were not born when the Koeberg Nuclear Power Station was established. They have therefore grown up next to Nuclear Power Station of their own volition. The town of Atlantis was not established in those times. When consulting with people they hardly mention the Koeberg Nuclear Power station, it is there, it is accessible, there are hiking trails in the area and the community regularly visit the reserve.</p> <p>In terms of comparative studies, there was only one study in America and this was more concerning economics. There are a number of studies world-wide that deal with health issues and</p> |

| <b>SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT SPECIALIST</b> |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|
| <b>No</b>                                  | <b>Name</b>   | <b>Comment</b>  | <b>Response</b>   |
|  |   |   | with economic issues. There are no specific social studies about living near a nuclear power station.   |
| 6  | Mr Chris Barratt<br>St Francis Kromme Trust                   | <p>Mr Barratt stated that six weeks ago there were four meetings held in the area. At these meetings a number of errors and omissions were pointed out in the SIA report, have these been conveyed to Mr Dippenaar and if so what action had he taken.</p> <p>He asked if Mr Dippenaar relied solely on the minutes as a form of communication regarding comments raised.</p> <p>Mr Barratt then asked why Mr Dippenaar had received a draft form of the minutes when the public had received them that morning.</p> <p>Mr Barratt said that Mr Dippenaar had stressed many positive factors and appears to neglect negative factors. For example it is stated in the report that after the construction phase, there will be 1,200 – 1,500 permanent jobs available. The fact that there will be 4,000 jobs lost in the Chokka industry, is omitted.</p> | <p>Mr Dippenaar said that all the information from all the meetings have been sent on to him. He added that now that the period for comment had been extended all subsequent comments would also be sent on to him. It is then his responsibility to go through all the comments from the various meetings and make sure that they are addressed. If the issue relates to more than one specialist Mr Dippenaar said that he would also check on the other specialist reports as there was a team of specialists undertaking the studies.</p> <p>Ms Ball confirmed that the minutes were Mr Dippenaar's form of communication. He had received a draft version of the minutes shortly after the last meeting was held.</p> <p>Mr Dippenaar said that the economics and the Chokka Industry were aspects addressed by the economic specialist.</p> <p>Dr Bews added that there are definitely some issues that will have to be re-visited and this is one of them.</p> |
| 7  | Mr Joe Oosthuizen<br>St Francis Residents<br>Assoc and FERRRA | <p>Mr Oosthuizen agreed that there are many more negative social impacts than positive. One reality that is not pointed out in the report is that all the mitigations depend on the effectiveness of the Local municipality. In reality, the municipalities are not capable of putting into place any of the mitigation measures that have been suggested. Mr Oosthuizen said that he works with the municipality on a day-to-day basis. He has obtained a copy of the Blue Drop</p>  | <p>Mr Dippenaar replied that a question had been raised as to how the municipality is going to fund various items. One of the ways of funding is from additional revenues and not from existing ratepayers. For example what the development will bring to the area. The economic study can investigate this in detail.</p> <p>The other part of funding comes from the part that Eskom is willing to contribute.</p>   |

| <b>SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT SPECIALIST</b> |                                     |  |  |
|--|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| <b>No</b>                                  | <b>Name</b>                         | <b>Comment</b>   | <b>Response</b>  |
|  |                                     | <p>Report, the municipality has been informed for many years that they are not looking after the infrastructure. In three areas of Jeffrey's Bay where monitoring is undertaken, they are non-compliant with the sewage facilities, non-compliant with water quality, all three categories are totally red. St Francis Bay is slightly better, but other areas are worse.</p> <p>He added that last year there was an increase in rates and taxes of 46% (with incorrect valuations). This year a further 8.5% increase, of which 40% goes to salaries and wages, nothing goes to sustaining the infrastructure. If bigger infrastructure occurs with temporary influx of very few ratepayers, most of the people coming into the area will not be ratepayers. Therefore, the cost of carrying the infrastructure falls on the shoulders of the people living in the Kouga area, that is not acceptable.</p> |  |
| 8  | Ms K Bowler<br>The Facilitator      | Ms Bowler explained that on another project the DEA has investigated the consultation, recommendations and findings and management plans of the local municipality. The DEA would not approve the Draft Environmental Impact Assessment Report without substantive support. The national authority, as a commenting body, pays a great deal of attention to the local municipalities.  |  |
| 9  | Ms Thobeka Petse<br>Sea Vista Forum | Ms Petse said she is very worried as it is easy to state certain things but when it comes to implementation, it is difficult. It has been said that clinics will be built, she asked who is going to build these clinics. Is it the Provincial Government or is it the National Government? In Sea Vista there is a problem, as the  | Mr Dippenaar replied that all the social infrastructure, whether it is schools or clinics, are all at full capacity and are even over utilised. If any more people are added to this area and this is not addressed there will be serious social problems, which will accumulate and grow. |

| <b>SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT SPECIALIST</b> |   |   |   |
|--|---|---|---|
| <b>No</b>                                  | <b>Name</b>                                     | <b>Comment</b>  | <b>Response</b>   |
|  |   | clinic is highly unsatisfactory.  | <p>Ms Herbst responded by explaining that Eskom at the Medupi site Eskom were under the impression that the local clinics would be able to staff themselves and after a year of construction they realised that this was not going to happen. Eskom therefore has built a clinic which services all the workers and their families and they have also re-staffed and re-stocked the other clinics in the area. The other focus has been on education and where possible they have upgraded schools and have initiated crèches. Eskom does not take accountability for everything but obviously there is a great deal that Eskom can and will do within the project from a social perspective.</p> <p><b>Post-meeting note: Eskom will engage with local and provincial government as well as the Department of Education on a strategy which will ensure that the community is not negatively impacted by the extra demand on local facilities such as schools and clinics.</b></p> |
| 10   | Dr Peter Inman<br>Coega Development Corporation | Dr Inman shared information with regards to the scale of infrastructural requirements associated with Coega. He stated that the crude oil refinery that is being proposed at Coega will require R4.5 billion to be spent on upgrading water supply to the whole metro and the IDZ. An entire new sewage works has to be constructed. The ratepayers even in Nelson Mandela Metro cannot afford it and have asked National Government for a grant. | Information noted.  |
| 11   | Mr Ryan Donnelly<br>FAST                        | Mr Donnelly asked if a total population influx study had been done. There is reference to the amount of jobs that will be available, but in terms of total population influx, has this been done.   | Mr Dippenaar said that there was no detailed study done because the figures are dependant on what will happen in the area and one can only suggest and come up with certain scenarios. It is similar to growth, some work on 1.8% and some on 2.4%, some off 3.7%. In this area when housing is planned they work off 4.5% growth. Mr Dippenaar said he could give  |

**SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT SPECIALIST**

| No | Name | Comment | Response   |
|----|------|---------|--|
|    |      |         | scenarios, but exact figures are difficult to gauge. |

**GEOHYDROLOGY ASSESSMENT SPECIALIST**

| No | Name                                    | Comment   | Response  |
|----|---|---|---|
| 1  | Prof Richard Cowling<br>FOSTER          | Prof Cowling noted that Mr Rosewarne had made the point that the system was quite buffered when the boreholes fluctuations were examined, there appeared to be no relationship between rainfall and borehole levels. He asked Mr Rosewarne how he could explain the November 2007 event and how could you build the possibility of those type of events into the risk assessment or how was it incorporated into the model? | Mr Rosewarne said that the Sand River is situated quite far away from where most of the work was concentrated in terms of the nuclear footprint. He does not believe that this would have any affect on the nuclear power station. It might have an affect on an access road crossing. The impacts of access roads on groundwater and <i>visa versa</i> had not been investigated. The focus had been to mitigate fears about draining aquifers by pumping to supply irrigation. Further monitoring on the wetlands is continuing, so this could be expanded into the study. The geotechnical study also examines stability type issues and there is also a hydrology study which examines flooding issues. |
| 2  | Dr Shirley Cowling<br>FOSTER            | Dr Cowling noted that in Mr Rosewarne's model he had used a Koeberg size footprint. She asked if this is appropriate as her understanding is that this power station will be considerably larger.<br><br>She then noted that his model is based on a certain size of which Mr Rosewarne is unsure.  | Mr Rosewarne replied that he had used two scenarios, one is the illustrative footprint, the absolute worst-case scenario. The other is the Koeberg size installation which he feels is realistic.<br><br>Mr Rosewarne then explained that he had an enveloping footprint area, within that would be the nuclear power station, slightly larger than the Koeberg size plant. He has taken the worst-case scenario, which is vastly bigger than the Koeberg Nuclear Power Station.  |
| 3  | Mr Graham Moolman<br>St Andrews College | Mr Moolman said that the school had been on the site for in excess of 50 years. He said that Mr Rosewarne has stated that there are no effects of the springs coming into the water, which he feels is incorrect. There has never been a problem with the springs drying up no matter what droughts are being experienced. It has been recorded in the records of   | Mr Rosewarne said that drilling had been done and drawdown was created over a short period of a few days. The recovery of the holes had been monitored. The responses from the autographic recorders show a natural response. There is a Table Mountain Group (TMG) aquifer underneath which is full of water, it is under pressure from the Karibu mountains and flows all the way through pushing outwards. Holes were drilled in the   |

| <b>GEOHYDROLOGY ASSESSMENT SPECIALIST</b> |                                     |   |   |
|---|-------------------------------------|---|---|
| <b>No</b>                                 | <b>Name</b>                         | <b>Comment</b>  | <b>Response</b>   |
|   |                                     | <p>the school that there has always been adequate water. However, since the drilling started, it was very noticeable that the springs dried up, the bulrushes and the whole water table coming into the area at the shore levels have been ruined. He feels that there has been a knock-on affect to the other residents in the Rebels Rus area with water having to be brought in. The water flows in a south easterly direction and that is coming out into the coastal zone. What happens is undetected as all the underground rivers that are coming into the spring water and supplying this natural fresh water to the sea. This is very important to the marine ecology of the area, particularly the Chokka fishermen and spawning of the Chokka.</p> | <p>Algoa aquifer and the TMG aquifer next to each other and the water levels are the same. He refutes totally that the drilling has caused a degradation of the flow of the springs.</p>  |
| 4   | Dr Fred Ellery<br>Rhodes University | <p>Dr Ellery asked if the cobble layer that was mentioned is wide spread and on bedrock. He asked how much of the area it occupied.</p> <p>He asked Mr Rosewarne if he could speculate on the origin of the cobble layer.</p> <p>Dr Ellery then asked about the regional slope on the water surface. He asked what determines the slope.</p> <p>He also asked how this relates to the slope on the land surface.</p>  | <p>Mr Rosewarne replied that it is on bedrock and is discontinuous.</p> <p>Mr Rosewarne thinks that it is probably marine and not an old river channel.</p> <p>Mr Rosewarne said that it was fairly natural and he would estimate that it was 0.01%. Basically this depended on the pondability of the aquifer, the less pondable the aquifer the steeper the slope, because the water has been forced through the aquifer. If there is a highly pondable aquifer then there is a lower gradient. Also the contours tend to be fairly uniform in spacing, which shows that the aquifer parameters are fairly similar.</p> <p>Mr Rosewarne explained that it becomes shallower as it goes south because it is getting closer to the discharge point.</p> |

| <b>GEOHYDROLOGY ASSESSMENT SPECIALIST</b> |   |  |   |
|---|---|--|---|
| <b>No</b>                                 | <b>Name</b>   | <b>Comment</b>   | <b>Response</b>   |
|   |   | Dr Ellery explained that the reason he was asking these questions is that he wondered, if when modelling the impact of the extraction, there was a footprint given, does this footprint depend on on-going pumping or can it be pumped once-off.   | Mr Rosewarne explained that what would happen is that without the cut-off, pumping would need to be on-going.   |
| 5   | Ms Frances Becker<br>Rebels Rus Conservancy                     | Ms Becker noted that she has a property in Rebels Rus and they get their water from a spring. She was never asked about water use and she asked if anyone else was consulted. She also asked what was done about the properties that is within 5 km of the site.   | Mr Rosewarne said that there is a table in the report, he would have to check if Rebels Rus was mentioned. If this has not been done it will be rectified. However, this would not affect the modelling or the findings.<br><br>Ms Ball explained to Mr Rosewarne that the Rebels Rus Nature Reserve is next door to the Thyspunt site, and it comprises a number of narrow properties and the team might have visited one of the other properties. |
| 6   | Ms Trudi Malan<br>Cape St Francis Civics &<br>Thyspunt Alliance | Ms Malan stated that Mr Rosewarne had said that this was one of the most comprehensive EIAs he has worked on. She said the reason for this was that Eskom needs this information to build the power station. It saddens her that the same amount of attention is not given to the social, tourist and economic studies. The tourist study mentions that due to budgetary constraints they could not carry out all the work.<br><br>Ms Malan then asked that if, in Mr Rosewarne's recommendations he states that the site should be closer to the sea.<br><br>Ms Malan then quoted from the Geotechnical Study, "At the Thyspunt and Bantamsklip sites the final footprint should be placed as close to the sea as | Mr Rosewarne replied that he does not say closer to the sea necessarily as it could be placed anywhere on the site as this can be designed for.<br><br>Mr Rosewarne said from that aspect he would agree.   |

| <b>GEOHYDROLOGY ASSESSMENT SPECIALIST</b> |   |  |  |
|---|---|--|--|
| <b>No</b>                                 | <b>Name</b>                                 | <b>Comment</b>   | <b>Response</b>  |
|   |   | <p>possible. It is in the area where overburden sand thickness is least". She asked if this was also his recommendation.</p> <p>Ms Malan then said that this would cause a problem because from the climate change impact, the Tsunami height in this area is going to have a huge impact. It seems as though the two studies are not speaking to each other because the other study says that there has got to be at least a certain distance away from the ocean.</p> <p>Ms Malan asked for a definition of "as close to the coast as possible".</p> | <p>Mr Rosewarne said that closer to the sea does not necessarily mean next to the sea.</p> <p>Ms Ball said that each of the specialists had made recommendations in terms of least sensitive places on the site on all three alternative sites. For all three sites a climate change study was undertaken (Appendix E10). The climate change study has made a recommendation as well as other specialist studies regarding the coast. For example the wetland study made a recommendation of a setback line from the coast. The heritage study made a recommendation of a setback line from the coast and these recommendations have been taken into account and an overall recommendation from the EIA process has been made to Eskom that the setback line be 200 m from the coastline. Eskom has accepted this recommendation and it is provided on all the plans of the sites.</p> <p>Mr Rosewarne replied that from a purely groundwater point of view, not taking into account other aspects, 200 m.</p> |
| 7   | Ms Bridget Elton<br>St Francis Bay Resident | Ms Elton asked about the monitoring that is taking place on the other proposed sites. She also asked why there was such a concentration of monitoring on the Thyspunt site and it seems as though it has been predetermined that this is the site.   | Mr Rosewarne said that all the sites were receiving the same amount of attention. The additional monitoring is taking place at all three alternative sites.  |
| 8   | Mr Ryan Donnelley<br>FAST                   | Mr Donnelley stated that he was confused about the size of the footprint that Mr Rosewarne has factored into the report. The actual footprint is designed to   | Mr Rosewarne replied that the Koeberg Nuclear Power Station reactors are 30 years old. Modern design is different and sizes are different. He has taken a nominal figure as it is not for  |

| <b>GEOHYDROLOGY ASSESSMENT SPECIALIST</b> |   |   |  |
|---|---|---|--|
| <b>No</b>                                 | <b>Name</b>                                 | <b>Comment</b>  | <b>Response</b>  |
|   |   | accommodate a 10,000 MW nuclear power station. Koeberg Nuclear Power Station is a 1.800 MW power station. This is a significant difference in size. Has this difference been factored into the work that Mr Rosewarne is undertaking.   | design purposes, but it is illustrative. He has used the entire illustrative footprint which is approximately 1 200 m x 300 m and is a vast conservative overkill as to what the actual situation will be for this 4 000 MW installation. At this stage the size of the actual footprint is unknown.   |
| 9   | Ms Renee Royal<br>Environmental Consultant  | Ms Royal asked if it would be necessary to put in an application for a water permit to the Department of Water Affairs for dewatering of the underground water sources.<br><br>Ms Royal stated that the water permit application is a long process.   | Ms Herbst replied that at this stage she was unsure as they are busy going through all the processes and permits that they would be needed. Applications are only submitted after Environmental authorisation is obtained.<br><br>A lot of information that comes out of the EIA process would be used for the water permit process. A water permit application will also be a condition of environmental authorisation, if granted. |
| 10  | Mr Chris Barratt<br>St Francis Kromme Trust | Mr Barratt asked if Mr Rosewarne's involvement on this project was purely for the EIA or is he doing other work on the site and is other information being sent to Eskom.   | Mr Rosewarne replied that he was doing some other work on the Site Safety Reports, which is obviously for Eskom.<br><br>Ms Herbst added that there are a few specialist reports that are required for the Site Safety Report and the EIA, the same specialists are used for both processes to avoid duplication.   |
| 11  | Prof Richard Cowling<br>FOSTER              | Prof Cowling stated that he had looked through the report and he could not find the modelled radius drawdown figures. He did manage to find them in Dr Day's reports. Her Figure 4.7b shows the model radius drawdown of a 9,000 MW installation, with mitigation. With mitigation it definitely shows that the drawdown is extending well into the wetland area.<br><br>Her report suggests that this should be handled with | Mr Rosewarne stated that these figures were in his report and were Figures 2.17 – 2.19, 2.36 – 2.37, 2.58 – 2.61 and 2.63 – 2.64.  |

| <b>GEOHYDROLOGY ASSESSMENT SPECIALIST</b> |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| <b>No</b>                                 | <b>Name</b>  | <b>Comment</b>   | <b>Response</b>  |
|   |  | caution.   |  |
| 12  | Mr Hilton Thorpe<br>St Francis Kromme Trust<br>St Francis Bay Residents<br>Association | Mr Thorpe asked Mr Rosewarne about the eastern access road. This road is going to take a route passing the dunes and then into the dune slack which is the very centre of the flood incident that occurred in November 2007. There seems to be great concern about the possibility of plastic flow when there are very wet conditions in that dune slack and there will be heavy traffic going on the road the entire time. Mr Thorpe asked if Mr Rosewarne was concerned that the road will be stable enough to handle the heavy traffic under those sorts of conditions. | Mr Rosewarne said that this type of issue would not be dealt with in the geohydrology assessment. That issue is more geotechnical, in which case the geotechnical specialist may take the findings of the geohydrology and marry with geotechnical information and then do an assessment (which he presumed has been done).<br><br><b>Post-meeting note: The Geotechnical Assessment states that the geotechnical characterisation of the sites has both gained from other studies and provided information to other studies. Of particular significance has been the integration with the geohydrology study where the groundwater profile measured in the hydrogeological investigations and in the geotechnical investigations on the sites has been shared and incorporated into dewatering model scenarios and the geotechnical profiles that have developed for the sites.</b> |
| 13  | Dr Fred Ellery<br>Rhodes University  | Dr Ellery stated that he needs to understand how a nuclear site is kept dry. Presumably once the site has been built, does the cut-off wall simply allow the water table to rise back to its original level, or is the water continuously pumped down.<br><br>He asked for confirmation that the cut-off wall goes into bedrock and it comes all the way up the face of the cut sediment surface, and allows the water table to return to its original level.  | Mr Rosewarne explained that there will still be some scavenger wells in the cut-off area. There might be areas that are not particularly well drained or well cut-off by the wall. There will most probably have to be some mitigation measures.<br><br>This is correct.   |

| <b>FRESHWATER ECOLOGY ASSESSMENT SPECIALIST</b> |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| <b>No</b>                                       | <b>Name</b>                                | <b>Comment</b>   | <b>Response</b>  |
| 1   | Mr Helmie Tilders<br>FOSTER                | Mr Tilders noted that there were two options regarding dumping of spoil. One was to dump it on the ground, which Dr Day says is a no-go, and the second is to dump it in the sea, which the squid industry say is a no-go. Where will the spoil be dumped? | Dr Day replied that from a wetland point of view and a terrestrial point of view it would be convenient if it could be dumped in the sea. The main impacts are around the transport of large volumes of spoil. The disturbed areas where it could be dumped with little impact along the northern area present a problem in getting the spoil to those areas. All of the options that are technically feasible involve some kind of mass transportation system.  |
| 2   | Ms Donna Jooste-Coetsee<br>Natures Calling | Ms Jooste-Coetsee explained that she did investigative journalism and she usually ends with conclusions. She asked how Dr Day had arrived at her conclusion. Usually a conclusion is a summary.  | <p>Dr Day replied that her assessment has hinged on to what extent can impacts to wetlands systems be mitigated or ideally avoided during mainly the construction phase. This would ensure that the final project is actually going to be a conservation product and not a downgraded or degraded version of what is there at the moment.</p> <p>In terms of conservation the drawdown mitigation, if it is in place in the way that the initial design suggests, it can work. This ought to prevent any impacts on the Langefontein system.</p> <p>If with additional data this can be confirmed, the final product will ensure a better conservation future for wetland systems. Remember that these comparisons are to a no-development scenario in which Eskom pulls out of the site. From a wetlands situation, everywhere where wetlands are not conserved in a coastal system, they are degraded. Degradation is therefore part of the no-development scenario. It is not an ideal scenario. This is assuming that there will be human impact, the most impacted coastal seeps are those closest to areas where they are actively being used by present landowners.</p> |
| 3   | Ms Trudi Malan<br>Cape St Francis Civics & | Ms Malan disagreed with Dr Day, there is presently a new Coastal Management Act which unfortunately the  | Dr   |

| FRESHWATER ECOLOGY ASSESSMENT SPECIALIST |                                     |   |   |
|--|-------------------------------------|---|---|
| No                                       | Name                                | Comment   | Response  |
|  | Thyspunt Alliance                   | Marine Experts did not include in their study as one of the laws. So therefore, even if it is a no-go alternative and Eskom decides to sell the land and it is bought back, there is an option that it can become a conservation area. Therefore, to say no-go is a worse off scenario than putting a nuclear power station on the site is not true. This needs to be qualified. The new act sets down a setback line of 1 km, because it is un-zoned land.   | <p>Dr Day replied that one of the problems is that you move off the site, particularly towards the eastern portion of the site, the kind of insidious degradation of all of those wetlands there - I think a probable more realistic long term outcome for that site. I think that without the development of a nuclear system, what you do strongly risk is on-going degradation of these systems.</p> <p>Dr Day said that her report did not address the Coastal Management Act but it is referred to in the Botanical Report, <b>as well as Chapter 6 of the Draft EIR (Volume 1)</b>. She said that she could incorporate it into her report.</p> |
| 4  | Prof Richard Cowling<br>FOSTER      | <p>Prof Cowling said that he was confused about the drawdown issue. In the report there were 4 diagrams which represent two scenarios, one is a 9,000 MW and one is a 4,000 MW, with and without mitigation.</p> <p>Prof Cowling went on to say that there was uncertainty about the size of the plant. If it is 9,000 MW, even with mitigation, there would be a large impact on the wetlands.</p>   | <p>Dr Day said that in the report she alludes to the fact that the 9 000 MW is not realistic with the current scenario which is why only the 4 000 was mentioned during her presentation.</p> <p>Ms Ball said that this EIA was assessing a 4 000 MW nuclear plant.</p>   |
| 5  | Dr Fred Ellery<br>Rhodes University | <p>Dr Ellery stated that one has to realise that this is an incredibly complex set of wetlands that is in this area. There is a lot of the interest in these wetlands as they form an integrated complex and they are dependent on the dynamic landscape. They depend on the movement of sand, on wind and a range of allied processes. His concern is that a lot of the consequences of the nuclear power plant have not been investigated, and these relate to the power lines.</p> <p>Dr Ellery then asked if the power lines would affect the wind patterns and the flow of sediment across the</p> | <p>Dr Day replied that the power lines that she has included in the study are the ones that would span across the dune area. Excluded from the study are any power lines coming into the site or the lines evacuating the power from the station..</p> <p>Ms Ball said that this would be answered by the relevant specialist.</p>  |

| <b>FRESHWATER ECOLOGY ASSESSMENT SPECIALIST</b> |  |   |   |
|---|--|---|---|
| <b>No</b>                                       | <b>Name</b>  | <b>Comment</b>  | <b>Response</b>   |
|   |  | landscape.  |   |
| 6   | Ms Frances Becker<br>Rebels Rus Conservancy  | <p>Ms Becker said that Dr Day had mentioned the uniqueness of the wetlands yet in the end it all seems mitigatable. Has Dr Day considered loosing this as a unique site?</p> <p>Ms Becker stated that they have been asked to consider the needs of South Africa overall in terms of electricity. We should also then be asking what are the needs of South Africa in terms of water. This is an area that could support itself with this system. She does not understand why the importance of this water system is not being prioritised.</p> | <p>Dr Day explained that this is exactly what the mitigation focuses on. In terms of the wetlands system a conservative approach has been used. Anything that crosses a dune line on which dependant wetlands are located has been rated highly sensitive. The reason for the continued remodelling of the draw down effect is because the risk of any impact to Langefontein would make this a high negative. The mitigation being investigated in avoidance mitigation. There can be a measure that avoids a particular impact. If a nuclear site could be constructed with no impacts on any of the systems and assuming that there would be no impact on the coastal seep systems, from a freshwater position, she could not argue for a no-go over all developments.</p> <p>Dr Day said that from her perspective she is not looking at water as a resource that is utilised by people, she is studying it from an ecological perspective. She would see the use of this water for consumption as having a higher chance of causing degradation of the wetlands.</p> |
| 7   | Mr Hilton Thorpe<br>St Francis Kromme Trust<br>and St Francis Bay<br>Residents Association | Mr Thorpe said that all of the presentations are justifying a very undesirable development in the area and they are trying to conform to the minimal requirements. If there is no fatal flaw, it means that it conforms to absolute minimal requirements, it does not mean that it is a good site, for a nuclear plant. He asked if Dr Day considered this site to be suitable from the perspective of her speciality, or is it a site that will need a great deal of money to be spent on mitigation.  | Dr Day replied that she had had to think about this. Ideally the site should not be developed at all, this holds true for any development. However, the choices now are a nuclear development which poses a lot of challenges, but would be associated, if the impacts could be avoided, with securing a large area for conservation purposes. She could not see another option available at present that would allow that and which would not threaten on-going piecemeal deterioration. This is already in evidence westwards towards the dunefields. To answer Mr Thorpe's question, would she as a wetland ecologist  |

| <b>FRESHWATER ECOLOGY ASSESSMENT SPECIALIST</b> |                                     |   |   |
|---|-------------------------------------|---|---|
| <b>No</b>                                       | <b>Name</b>                         | <b>Comment</b>  | <b>Response</b>   |
|   |                                     |   | feel better or worse if the site went away, she believes that the wetlands and the system that they are associated with, would be better served if this could go ahead with all the conditions attached.  |
| 8   | Mr Ryan Donnelley<br>FAST           | <p>Mr Donnelley noted that the Executive Summary seems to have based its conclusions on possible other developments rather than the actual development at hand that the application is dealing with. This makes no sense to him at all. He also noted that regarding the assessment of the site, it is stated as being an overall negative impact, why is that not put into the Executive Summary?</p> <p>Mr Donnelley said that this was an important omission because as a layman reading this, there will be no understanding as to the actual impacts of the applicant's development.</p> <p>Mr Donnelley stated that the consultants are reaching for a solution to get away from negative impacts. The actual application of the impact of the development itself must be examined. That has been omitted in the Executive Summary of the Draft EIA Report.</p> | <p>Ms Ball asked Mr Donnelley if he was referring to the Draft EIR Executive Summary or the Specialist Report's Executive Summary. (It was the Draft EIR Executive Summary). All the specialists were asked to examine the entire Draft EIR and Arcus GIBB's interpretation of the results and the recommendations and to ensure that everything has been correctly captured.</p> <p>The same is expected from the stakeholders and would be captured in the minutes, in the Issues and Response Reports, etc.</p> <p>Dr Day said that she stands by her Executive Summary which states that based on the levels of confidence on existing data, given the importance of the system with which no risks should be taken, the uncertainty has made her give a high negative rating. This has been clarified by saying that if the information gaps can be fine tuned, the certainty can be increased in all of the areas listed so that they confirm the assessment that impacts can actively be avoided, then that assessment would change.</p> |
| 9   | Dr Fred Ellery<br>Rhodes University | Dr Ellery asked how much more studying time would Dr Day need to establish more firmly what she has researched.   | Dr Day replied that what was put in place from the beginning of this year was a number of bizometres and boreholes that specifically look at measuring water level immediately downstream of the Langefonteinvelei. Previously although the groundwater study had boreholes, a much higher level of   |

| <b>FRESHWATER ECOLOGY ASSESSMENT SPECIALIST</b> |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| <b>No</b>                                       | <b>Name</b>                                | <b>Comment</b>  | <b>Response</b>  |
|   |  |   | resolution around actual flow within and through the wetland was required. This is to try and design a cut-off system that would control de-watering. The monitoring program at present extends into 2011.   |
| 10  | Dr Shirley Cowling<br>FOSTER               | Dr Cowling asked that a third option be considered. If one were to speculate that something arises in the health and safety report and Thyspunt is no longer the preferred site. This report has made many people aware of the ecological value of this site, could a third option in this report state that if the development does not take place that this site becomes a RAMSAR site. | Dr Day said that she has alluded to this. She could be specific and agreed that this would be the ideal for the Thyspunt site.   |
| 11  | Dr Fred Ellery<br>Rhodes University        | Dr Ellery said that maybe an option should be that this site should not be used. Dr Day's report refers to this as one of a kind, irreplaceable, globally unique, is this where this type of infrastructure should be constructed?  | Dr Day said that the realistic no development option has to be considered. She agreed to put the option of a RAMSAR site into the report and assessed it as one of three options.  |
| 12  | Mr John Royal                              | Mr Royal asked if this was not a perfect opportunity for Eskom to put their best foot forward and do something wonderful for the country.   |  |
| 13  | Ms Renee Royal<br>Environmental Consultant | Ms Royal asked if a wetland delineation and a wetland functionality been done for all of the wetlands. She indicated that in KwaZulu Natal, a wetland delineation has become a requirement for all studies which impact on wetlands.  | Dr Day replied that a wetland functionality was conducted, but there has not been a formal wetland delineation done on the site. The delineation shown in the report is based on aerial mapping with local ground-truthing. This is not a requirement for the EIA. |

| <b>DUNE GEOMORPHOLOGY ASSESMENT SPECIALIST</b> |   |  |   |
|--|---|--|---|
| <b>No</b>                                      | <b>Name</b>   | <b>Comment</b>   | <b>Response</b>   |
| 1  | Dr Fred Ellery  | <p>Dr Ellery stated that a debris flow is not just water, it is a mixture of water and sand. The amount of sediment that was moved in that single event was colossal and the impact was severe. Dr Ellery asked Mr Illenberger to explain the reason for this event. If this event should happen again and trucks transporting waste are on the roads this could have very serious impacts.</p> <p>Dr Ellery said that Mr Illenberger had given a figure of 1:85 for the eastern slope on the dune field, and he is sure that this is the same for the southern slope on the water table. This figure of 1:85 is a critical thing. It is important if anything is done in the landscape to over-steep the land surface above this, there will be repeated occurrence of debris floods.</p> | Mr Illenberger replied that if trucks are being moved with radioactive waste and it is raining heavily that they should not move the trucks. The requirement is also for two access roads. In which case one road is damaged in a flood event.  |
| 2  | Ms Trudi Malan<br>Cape St Francis Civics &<br>Thyspunt Alliance | Ms Malan is concerned about flying the pylons in with helicopters. There has been problems with rescue helicopters along the Oyster Bay dune fields, the helicopters experienced problems with their turbines.   | <p>Comment was noted.</p> <p>Post meeting note: Using helicopters is a mitigation measure that can be used. The safety risk of doing this must be considered.</p>   |
| 3  | Ms Donna Jooste-Coetsee<br>Natures Calling                      | Ms Jooste-Coetsee wished to red flag the storage of the high level waste and the containers that will be on site. There is the possibility of leakages. There does not seem to be much in the report about the actual waste that is to be stored on site.  | <p>Ms Bowler pointed out to Ms Jooste-Coetsee that her question was not related to the Dune Geomorphology specialist study or any of the specialist studies that were being presented.</p> <p><b><u>Post meeting note:</u></b><br/> <b>Waste management is discussed in Chapter 3 and 9 of the Draft EIR.</b></p> |
| 4  | Prof Richard Cowling<br>FOSTER                                  | Prof Cowling stated that Dr Illenberger had not mentioned that the deposition of the spoil on the mobile dune field would be fatally flawed.   | Dr Illenberger replied that one cannot dump this material on the dunes, there would be fines, huge amounts of dust, the wetlands would disappear, so that is correct, that option is fatally flawed.  |

| <b>DUNE GEOMORPHOLOGY ASSESSMENT SPECIALIST</b> |                 |   |   |
|---|-----------------|---|---|
| <b>No</b>                                       | <b>Name</b>     | <b>Comment</b>  | <b>Response</b>   |
|   |                 |   | Prof Griffiths said that the spoil has to be disposed of and wherever it is disposed it is going to cause a problem.  |
| 5   | Ms Cheron Kraak | <p>Ms Kraak stated that the road from the north was a no-go and yet at a meeting yesterday when presentations were made to the council in Jeffrey's Bay, it was stated that this was the probable road.</p> <p>The council must be informed that an error was made in the presentation.</p> | <p>Mr Heydendrych said that he was talking about the Western Access Road.</p> <p>Ms Ball reiterated that the Northern Access Road is not a preferred access road for any of the biophysical studies. All have said no-go. She apologised if there had been any misunderstandings in the presentation. Ms Ball said that she would listen to the transcript and ascertain what road had been mentioned. If an error was made, a letter of clarification will be sent to all attendees.</p> |

## 6. WAY FORWARD

The facilitator stated that there were many issues raised at the beginning of the meeting in terms of the process related issues. She then requested the EIA Project Manager, Ms Ball to give a brief presentation about the way forward.

In mapping the way forward, Ms Ball stated the following key points:

- a) The meeting had been constructive and bringing the specialists to the meeting was positive for the EIA process. There have been additional technical comments raised by attendees who have specific technical expertise and local knowledge to that raised in the previous public and key stakeholder meetings. She thanked all those who had taken the time to attend this meeting.
- b) From the last set of meetings to date, comments on the Draft EIR have been received. Where relevant specialist input into the comments is obtained.
- c) Ms Ball apologised for the late distribution of the Minutes. She explained that Arcus GIBB needed to obtain specialist input into these minutes, as well as include post-meeting notes, and this had taken more time than anticipated. She requested that all attendees of the meeting comment on the minutes that had been distributed within 14 days.
- d) There have been requests for copies of the transcripts of the minutes, she will respond to those requests individually. She also acknowledged that the Thyspunt Alliance has appointed lawyers, Cullinan and Associates, to represent their members. Arcus GIBB has received a number of letters from these lawyers requesting an extension to the Comment Period.
- e) Ms Ball proposed that the comment period remains as 31 May 2010, in order for Arcus GIBB to obtain all comments on the Specialist Reports, and thereby allowing them to make an informed decision about the extension of the Comment Period and need for a Revised Draft EIR. She added that there was a good likelihood that a Revised Draft EIR will have to be released, with revised specialist reports. This Revised Report would have a further Comment Period of 45 days. If the current Comment Period can stand it will give Arcus GIBB a chance to get an idea of detailed comments with respect to the specialist studies.
- f) There is one specialist study wherein some figures were omitted due to human error, this was the Traffic and Transportation Specialist Study, those figures are on the websites and in all the public places. Comment on that particular specialist study has been extended to the end of June 2010.
- g) If there are any groups who cannot make the 31 May 2010 deadline, and want to contact Arcus GIBB via ACER to say they might be late with their comments, they are encouraged to do so as the Comment Period is not absolutely cast in stone.

## 7. WAY FORWARD - DISCUSSION

| No | Name                                | Discussion Point  | Comment/Response/For Action  |
|----|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| 1  | Ms Trudi Malan<br>Thyspunt Alliance | <p>She said that due to the minutes only arriving on the day of meeting she could not comment by the 31 May 2010. Four days to comment is too short. Ms Malan stated that they do not accept the 31 May 2010 as the date for comment on the minutes. If this date is set, they will have no choice but to consult their lawyers.</p> <p>Ms Malan said that they have pointed out several times that there are severe mistakes in the study, that there are omissions, etc. As far back as the Scoping Study, she personally wrote in that there should be a specialist Squid Study for industry, she had put forward Dr Warrick Sauer's name. This was ignored.</p> <p>She asked when these minutes would be available. The Thyspunt Alliance has got their own specialists involved in this development, and their specialists have other work to do. They cannot be expected to comment on the minutes within 4 days.</p> | <p>Ms Ball said that Ms Malan was confusing two issues. With respect to the Minutes (Cape St. Francis Key stakeholder Meeting and the Sea Vista and St. Francis Bay Public Meetings) which were issued on 25 May 2010, there is a 14 day comment period for these minutes. If Ms Malan would like an extension on this comment period to 21 days, that will be acceptable. Ms Ball would like comments on the Draft EIR by 31 May 2010 so that the specialists can begin working on the revisions of their reports.</p> <p>Ms Ball noted that legal action had been threatened.</p> <p>Ms Ball confirmed that Arcus GIBB would consider Ms. Malan's request but currently the Comment Period on the draft EIR ended on 31 May 2010 unless otherwise notified.</p> <p><b>Post-meeting note: The Comments Period was extended to 30 June 2010 (total 117 days) and all registered parties informed of this decision and the fact that a Revised Draft EIR would be produced and circulated for a 45 day Comment Period, this notification went out on 28 May 2010.</b></p> |
| 2  | Ms Trudi Malan<br>Thyspunt Alliance | <p>She explained that there are issues within the minutes that need to be fed back to their own specialists so that they can look at the EIA specialist reports and this will result in comments being submitted.</p>   | <p>Ms Ball stated that Arcus GIBB require feedback earliest, because it is more than likely that another Draft EIR will need to be issued.</p> <p>She would like the comments in because then they can</p>   |

| No | Name  | Discussion Point  | Comment/Response/For Action   |
|----|---|---|---|
|    |   | <p>She asked if Ms Ball could give this meeting the assurance that there will be a second draft EIA Report.</p>   | <p>consult with all the specialists and they in turn can begin their revisions.</p>   |
| 3  | <p>The Facilitator<br/>Ms Bowler</p>                | <p>She asked Ms Ball in terms of the Issues and Responses document if this document stands as the draft gathering of all the issues at the various meetings. Have the specialists had access to those IRR documents in draft form without the additional input from the public? She asked because it seems as though the specialists are working with one version of the response document. This version seems to be one that the public have not been able to comment on as to whether their issues have been captured correctly. The specialist studies that were presented today, may not accurately reflect the issues that the public have raised in the process to date. The specialists may therefore be disadvantaged as they might not be able to put the correct reports forward in an integrated manner.</p> | <p>Ms Ball responded that throughout the process the specialists were given all the IRRs that have been compiled since Scoping. They were all asked specifically to incorporate the comments into their reports.</p> <p><b>Post-meeting note: A consolidated Issues and Response Report has been incorporated in the Draft and Final Scoping Reports, as well as the Draft EIR.</b></p>   |
| 4  | <p>Mr Chris Barratt<br/>St Francis Kromme Trust</p> | <p>Mr Barratt commented and wanted it put on record that minutes are an official record of proceedings at a meeting. The public are not getting minutes, they are receiving documents months later, which are not minutes and which include the specialist comments. The public want minutes so that they can state whether they are a true reflection or not of the meeting.</p> <p>He added that Ms Ball is not prepared to give an extension, he wanted it recorded that he finds this absolutely disgusting. Out of the seven specialists speaking at the meeting, five said further studies are being undertaken or need to be undertaken. However, Ms Ball says that they are still continuing with work, but we must use this information that we have now.</p>  | <p>Ms Ball indicated that Mr Barratt is correct in saying that minutes are an official record and part of any EIA process documentation. That is why they are being returned to the stakeholders and members of the public for comment. The post-meeting notes were added to assist in giving information to the public. These notes are all clearly marked as post-meeting notes and are all in bold. If there are any specific comments on the minutes she asked that she be advised.</p> |

| No | Name  | Discussion Point   | Comment/Response/For Action   |
|----|---|--|---|
|    |   | <p>The people of St Francis Bay asked for additional copies of the EIA Report. This was requested 6 weeks ago, now what he would like is one copy with everything in it. The copy provided here did not have all the specialist reports contained therein.</p>   |   |
| 5  | Ms Trudi Malan<br>Thyspunt Alliance   | <p>Ms Malan said there were many documents that had been requested such as the notes from the Integration Meeting, these have not been sent. These had been promised. They have not had access to any of the items that they had requested. There has been no response from Arcus GIBB to the lawyers.</p>   | <p>Ms Ball replied that she had acknowledged the email from the lawyers the previous evening.</p>   |
| 6  | Mr Hilton Thorpe<br>St Francis Kromme Trust<br>St Francis Bay Residents Association | <p>Mr Thorpe asked Ms Ball who makes the decision on the extension of the comment period.</p>  | <p>Ms Ball said that extensions of time are requested on most EIAs. In the past, members of the public have approached the DEA to ask for an extension, they replied back to the public that this is not their decision.</p> <p>In this case, Ms Ball said that she has discussed it with the DEA official and has promised to provide a response to the request.</p> |
| 7  | Mr Hilton Thorpe<br>St Francis Kromme Trust<br>St Francis Bay Residents Association | <p>Mr Thorpe said he was concerned about the fact that the final Plan of Study for the development was finally approved on 19 January 2010 and all the specialist reports were released in March 2010.</p> <p>He then questioned if all these specialist reports have been prepared in terms of the final Plan of Study or in terms of the original Plan of Study.</p> | <p>Ms Ball explained that the Plan of Study for EIA had been revised twice. Comments had been received from members of the public and the various commenting Authorities. This information had been passed on to the specialists and built it into their Scope of Work as the process proceeded.</p>  |
| 8  | Mr Ryan Donnelly<br>FAST  | <p>Mr Donnelly requested that a copy of the Draft EIR with all specialists' reports be made available so that he is able to comment.</p>   | <p>Ms Ball replied that she acknowledges that there have been requests for the audio recordings of the minutes. A 14 day comment period is allowed so that comment can</p>  |

| No | Name  | Discussion Point   | Comment/Response/For Action   |
|----|---|--|---|
|    |   | <p>He stated that all the confusion with the comment period and to have a cut-off date serves no purpose, as it creates added pressure.</p> <p>He has a strong objection about the minutes. What is presented in the minutes is presented in a way that the arguments have been reduced in their wording. He severely objects to this practice. He asked for a copy of the audio minutes, to compare them to the written version. He had had this problem for three years</p>  | <p>be passed on how issues have been captured.</p> <p><b>Post-meeting note: Copies of the Draft EIR have been distributed to the following venues:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Humansdorp Public Library</li> <li>• Jeffreys Bay Public Library</li> <li>• Kareedouw Public Library</li> <li>• Kruisfontein Public Library</li> <li>• Oesterbaai Eiendomme</li> <li>• Plettenberg Bay Public Library</li> <li>• St Francis Bay Public Library</li> </ul> |
| 9  | Mr Chris Barratt<br>St Francis Kromme Trust | Mr Chris Barratt asked if correct copies of the Draft EIR with all the studies would be given to them. For example the Economic Study is not in any of the reports that were distributed earlier.  | <p>Ms Ball said that she had requested ACER to make a copy and send it to Mr Barratt and she asked Mr Barratt to discuss this with Ms Shinga.</p> <p><b>Post-meeting note: The Economic Assessment was attached as Appendix E17 to the Draft EIA Report sent to the Municipal Offices in St Francis Bay (and is on display at the Reception).</b></p>   |
| 10 | Mr Chris Barratt<br>St Francis Kromme Trust | <p>Mr Barratt said he would like to quote from the Minutes of Public Meetings distributed that morning, "<i>The facilitator said that there are many issues that still need to be unpacked and still a high level of discomfort in the audience about certain issues. There are debates that need to be held around certain topics. She went on to say that agreement had been reached to close the meeting with the understanding that there would be further meetings</i>".</p> <p>The extract from the minutes refers to public meetings. The</p> | <p>Ms Bowler said that she had not specified public meetings. A commitment was made to further 'meetings', this being one of them.</p> <p>Ms Ball said that the Key Focus Group meeting is a</p>  |

| No | Name                     | Discussion Point  | Comment/Response/For Action   |
|----|--------------------------|---|---|
|    |                          | <p>Key Focus Group Meeting cannot be regarded as a public meeting; it is a Key Stakeholder Meeting. He enquired as to when the public meetings will be held and who was invited to the meeting and how was it advertised (if it is indeed a public meeting)? Other meetings have been held in the area, he questioned if they were public meetings.</p> <p>Mr Barratt said that that was not what the public had been led to believe, particularly when the request was made at a public meeting in St Francis Bay.</p> | <p>consequence of those set of meetings. The meetings are organised to best suit what we need to achieve out of the meeting in terms of the EIA process. To bring seven specialists to a public meeting does not make sense. Ms Shinga has a list of all invitees to key stakeholder meetings, it is a list that keeps growing, as every time there is a meeting, more people attend. Basically it is the key stakeholders that are registered as such on the database that were invited. There are a number of other meetings being held, these are Key Focus Group Meetings with various groups such as Kouga Municipality, Coega Development Corporation (CDC) and Rebels Rus landowners.</p> <p>A public meeting will be held at Sea Vista (in the evening) to which the public is invited. Ms Ball extended the invitation to all present. If there are further requests for any meetings they will be considered by Arcus GIBB.</p> |
| 11 | Mr Ryan Donnelly<br>FAST | He stated that to hold a meeting with the Kouga Municipality without the key stakeholders being present is unacceptable.  | It was stated that public representatives were invited to the meeting with Kouga Municipality held on 24 May 2010.  |

In conclusion, Ms Ball advised all present that if the Draft EIR Comment Period is changed, all registered I&APs will be notified. She further encouraged all present to complete the attendance registers.

**Subsequent to the Key Focus Group Meeting at St Francis Bay, the Comment Period on the Draft EIR was extended to 30 June 2010.**

## **8. CONCLUDING REMARKS**

Ms Bowler encouraged all I&APs to check the Issues and Response Report documents to ensure that issues have been carried forward to the specialist reports. She further requested that if stakeholders are objecting to the process directly to the Environmental Authority, to also send a copy to ACER to ensure that comments are received by the EIA Team.

She thanked all participants and closed the meeting.

## SPECIALIST PRESENTATIONS

The sizes of the presentation are as follows:

| Presentation       | Size     |
|--------------------|----------|
| Agriculture        | 409 KB   |
| Dune Geomorphology | 4,298 KB |
| Geomorphology      | 232KB    |
| Marine             | 439 KB   |
| Social             | 100 KB   |
| Transport          | 1,026 KB |
| Wetlands           | 747 KB   |

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 – Draft Environmental Impact Report" link

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

### ATTENDANCE LIST

| Surname      | First Names         | Title    | Co/Org                                   | St Francis Bay Meeting 25 May 2010 |
|--------------|---------------------|----------|--|------------------------------------|
| Arderne      | Richard             | Mr & Mrs | Pam Golding Properties                   | Attended                           |
| Arnolds      | Randall             | Mr       | Kouga Local Municipality                 | Attended                           |
| Ball         | Jaana-Maria         | Ms       | ARCUS GIBB                               | Attended                           |
| Barratt      | Christopher & Valda | Mr & Mrs | Kromme Trust                             | Attended                           |
| Bews         | Neville             | Mr       | NB&A                                     | Attended                           |
| Bornman      | Nick & Una          | Mr & Mrs | Oyster Bay Rate Payers Association       | Attended                           |
| Bosman       | Yvonne              | Mrs      | St Francis Kromme Trust                  | Attended                           |
| Bosman       | Peter               | Mr       | St Francis Kromme Trust                  | Attended                           |
| Bouwer       | Nicolaas Andre      | Mr       | St Andrews College                       | Attended                           |
| Breytenbach  | Johann              | Mr       | Eskom                                    | Attended                           |
| Christy      | Greg                | Mr       | SASMIA                                   | Attended                           |
| Clarke       | Stan                | Mr       | Woodlands Farm                           | Attended                           |
| Cook         | Derek               | Mr       | Macohy Investments CC                    | Attended                           |
| Cowling      | Richard             | Prof     | FOSTER                                   | Attended                           |
| Cowling      | Shirley             | Dr       | Friends of the St Francis Nature Reserve | Attended                           |
| Cronje       | Botha               | Mr       | Eskom Transmission                       | Attended                           |
| Dale         | Jenny               | Mrs      | Kromme Trust                             | Attended                           |
| Day          | Liz                 | Ms       | Freshwater Consulting                    | Attended                           |
| de Villiers  | Carin               | Ms       | Eskom Holdings Limited                   | Attended                           |
| Donnelly     | Ryan James          | Mr       | For A Safe Tomorrow (F. A. S. T.)        | Attended                           |
| Elliott      | John                | Mr       | JAB Elliott                              | Attended                           |
| Elton        | Edmund & Bridget    | Mr & Mrs | Kromme Trust                             | Attended                           |
| Fuchter-Wood | Kathleen            | Mrs      | Pam Golding Properties                   | Attended                           |
| Gibson-Dicks | Cheryl              | Ms       | Thyspunt Alliance                        | Attended                           |

| Surname        | First Names   | Title    | Co/Org  | St Francis Bay Meeting 25 May 2010 |
|----------------|---------------|----------|---|------------------------------------|
| Greeff         | Gert          | Mr       | Eskom Nuclear Sites                               | Attended                           |
| Griffiths      | Charles       | Mr       | University of Cape Town: Zoology Dept             | Attended                           |
| Griffiths      | Morgan        | Mr       | Wildlife & Environment Society of SA : EC         | Attended                           |
| Hardie         | George        | Mr       | Goed Geloef Farm and St Francis Conservancy       | Attended                           |
| Hardie         | Sandra        | Mrs      | Goed Geloef Farm and St Francis Conservancy       | Apologised                         |
| Herbst         | Deidre        | Ms       | Eskom Generation                                  | Attended                           |
| Illenberger    | Werner        | Dr       | National Association for Clean Air Eastern Cape   | Attended                           |
| Inman          | Peter         | Dr       | Coega Development Corporation (Pty) Ltd           | Attended                           |
| Jooste-Coetsee | Donna         | Ms       | Natures Calling                                   | Attended                           |
| Jordaan        | Finney        | Mr       | Finmed Group                                      | Attended                           |
| Kelly          | JT            | Mr       | South African Roads Agency Limited (SANRAL)       | Attended                           |
| Kraak          | Cheron        | Ms       | Country Feeling / Thyspunt Alliance               | Attended                           |
| Kuhl           | Alison        | Mrs      | Supertubes Surfing Foundation / Thyspunt Alliance | Attended                           |
| Lesch          | Donevin       | Mr       | Coega Development Corporation (Pty) Ltd           | Attended                           |
| Logie          | Caryl         | Mrs      | Fourcade Botanical Group                          | Attended                           |
| Mabentsela     | Nombongo      | Ms       | Coega Development Corporation (Pty) Ltd           | Attended                           |
| Malan          | Trudi         | Mrs      | Cape St Francis Civics/Thyspunt Alliance          | Attended                           |
| Martin         | Gay           | Miss     | I&AP  | Attended                           |
| Mbusi          | Mandla        | Mr       | Eskom Holdings Limited                            | Attended                           |
| Moolman        | Graham        | Mr       | St Andrew's College                               | Attended                           |
| Mortimer       | Bev           | Ms       | St Francis Chronicle Newspaper                    | Attended                           |
| Mzanywa        | Mnikeli       | Mr       | Sea Vista Community                               | Attended                           |
| Ndala          | Lorraine      | Ms       | Eskom   | Attended                           |
| Nel            | Andre         | Mr       | Eskom Generation                                  | Attended                           |
| Nicholson      | Peter         | Mr       | Billabong SA                                      | Attended                           |
| Nixon          | Roger & Laura | Mr & Mrs | Oyster Bay Residents                              | Attended                           |

| Surname    | First Names    | Title    | Co/Org                               | St Francis Bay Meeting 25 May 2010 |
|------------|----------------|----------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Norman     | Jan            | Mr       | Koeberg NPS                          | Attended                           |
| Oosthuizen | Joe            | Mr       | St Francis Residents Assoc / FERRRA  | Attended                           |
| Papa       | Khanya Laduma  | Mr       | I&AP                                 | Attended                           |
| Parker     | Raymund        | Mr       | I&AP                                 | Attended                           |
| Petse      | Thobeka        | Miss     | Sea Vista Forum                      | Attended                           |
| Potgieter  | Godfried Abel  | Mr       | Kromme Trust                         | Attended                           |
| Pringle    | Lizette        | Mrs      | I&AP                                 | Attended                           |
| Rautenbach | Peter          | Mr       | Dream Supreme CC                     | Attended                           |
| Rautenbach | Elisabeth      | Mrs      | St Francis Conservancy               | Attended                           |
| Rheeder    | Ben            | Mnr      | Kouga Local Municipality             | Attended                           |
| Rosewarne  | Peter          | Mr       | SRK Consulting Western Cape          | Attended                           |
| Rowe       | Mark           | Mr       | Balobi Properties                    | Attended                           |
| Royal      | Renee          | Mrs      | Environmental Consultant             | Attended                           |
| Smith      | Tom            | Mr       | Eskom Holdings Limited               | Attended                           |
| Spoormaker | Mariska        | Ms       | Die Burger                           | Attended                           |
| Theron     | Mervin         | Mr       | Eskom Holdings Limited               | Attended                           |
| Thorpe     | Hilton & Julia | Mr & Mrs | St Francis Bay Residents Assoc       | Attended                           |
| Tilders    | Helmie         | Mr       | FOSTER / Thyspunt Alliance           | Attended                           |
| van Lingen | Elza           | Ms       | Democratic Alliance                  | Attended                           |
| Vockerodt  | Brian          | Mr       | Eskom Holdings Limited- Transmission | Attended                           |
| Weitz      | Frank          | Mr       | Dept of Agriculture                  | Attended                           |