

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT (EIA)

EIA: 12/12/20/944

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

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REPORT

**FOCUS GROUP MEETING
KOUGA LOCAL MUNICIPALITY**

KOUGA LOCAL MUNICIPALITY – COUNCIL CHAMBERS

24 MAY 2010

13H30 – 15H30

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	1
PREFACE	2
1. ATTENDANCE.....	3
1.1. ATTENDANCE – KOUGA LOCAL MUNICIPALITY	3
1.2. ATTENDANCE – ESKOM HOLDINGS LIMITED	3
1.3. ATTENDANCE – ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTING TEAM	3
2. OPENING, WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS.....	4
3. MEETING OBJECTIVES AND FORMAT OF MEETING.....	4
4. UPDATE ON NUCLEAR 1 EIA PROCESS PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION.....	4
5. ISSUES AND COMMENTS RAISED AND DISCUSSED.....	5
6. WAY FORWARD AND CONCLUDING REMARKS	22
ATTENDANCE LIST	23

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 – Kouga Local Municipality

Name	Position/Portfolio
Mr Robert Dennis	Executive Mayor
Mr Fumanekile Lloyd	Chairperson: Town Planning and Infrastructure
Ms Katrina Felix	Councillor
Ms Angelina Maseti	Councillor
Ms Magdalene Dlomo	Speaker
Cllr Virginia Camealio-Benjamin	Councillor: Ward 5
Mr Khayalakhe Michael Tshume	Councillor: Ward 9
Cllr Phumzile Olifant	Councillor: Ward 6
Mr Msingathi Gerard Mbandana	Councillor: Ward 10
Mr Ben Rheeder	Councillor: Ward 1 (St Francis Bay)
Dr Nico Botha	Councillor: Ward 3 (Jeffrey's Bay)
Ms Rosemary Rollison	Councillor: Ward 4
Cllr Vernon Stuurman	Councillor - Social and Economic Development
Mr Aubrey Marais	Manager – Electricity
Mr Eddie Oosthuizen	Manager - Technical Services
Ms Mari du Toit	Committee Member
Abrie Koegelenberg	Performance Management
Ms Laura-Leigh Randall	Media Liaison
Ms Trudi Malan	Community Representative (Thyspunt Alliance)
Ms Cheron Kraak	Community Representative (Thyspunt Alliance)
Mr Petrus Leen	Community Representative (Thyspunt Alliance)

1.2 Attendance – Eskom Holdings Limited

Name	Position/Role
Mr Gert Greeff	Manager - Nuclear Sites
Ms Carin de Villiers	Manager - Stakeholder Management and Communication, Nuclear Division
Ms Lorraine Ndala	Senior Environmental Advisor Eskom
Mr Jan Norman	Acting Infrastructure Manager Nuclear-1 – Divisional Client Office
Mr Jan Breytenbach	Nuclear-1 – Acting Project Manager
Mr Mandla Mbusi	Stakeholder Management – Koeberg Nuclear Power Station

1.3 Attendance – Environmental Consulting Team

Name	Organisation	Role in the project
Mr Reuben Heydenrych	Arcus GIBB (Pty) Ltd	Senior Environmental Scientist
Ms Bongzi Shinga	ACER (Africa)	Public Participation Consultant

2. OPENING, WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Mr Fumanekile Lloyd, Chairperson of Infrastructure and Town Planning, requested Cllr Benjamin to open the meeting with a prayer.

Mr Lloyd welcomed all present and introduced all Kouga Municipality officials and community representatives as per Section 1.1.

Mr Lloyd then requested that the Eskom and EIA Team introduce themselves, the organisations they represent and their roles.

Mr Reuben Heydenrych introduced himself and explained that he is representing Arcus GIBB, the independent Environmental Assessment Company that has been appointed by Eskom to undertake the Environmental Impact Assessment for the proposed Nuclear Power Station, known as Nuclear 1.

Mr Heydenrych then requested the EIA Team and Eskom representatives to introduce themselves. Introductions were done as per Sections 1.2 and 1.3.

3. MEETING OBJECTIVES AND FORMAT OF MEETING

Mr Lloyd advised all present that he will be chairing the meeting and indicated that the purpose of the meeting was to receive an update from the EIA Team on the progress of the of the Environmental Impact Assessment study for the proposed Eskom Nuclear Power Station as the Thyspunt site, within the Kouga Local Municipality, has been identified as the preferred location for Nuclear-1.

He further stated that the Kouga Municipality was aware that there had been a number of engagements with the public, interest groups and representatives of various organisations. He then stated that the Kouga Municipality Council is pleased to have a meeting so they can better understand the various aspects of the proposed Nuclear Power Station.

4. UPDATE ON NUCLEAR 1 EIA PROCESS PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION

Mr Heydenrych stated that a series of presentations have been given to the public during the past two months. The presentation that has been prepared for the Council is shorter compared to the ones given at the public meetings due to the limited time available. The main purpose of the presentation was to provide background to the project and the findings of the investigations to enable the Council to provide comments as part of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) review period.

He also informed the Kouga Municipality that the meeting is being recorded for the accuracy of the minutes, which will be distributed to all attendees.

A copy of the presentation can be emailed to participants upon request from ACER. Alternatively, it can be downloaded from the EIA websites (www.eskom.co.za and <http://projects.gibb.co.za>) under Nuclear-1 – Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

5. ISSUES AND COMMENTS RAISED AND DISCUSSED

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

No	Name	Comment	Response
1	Councillor	She wanted to know if the access road from Oyster Bay (shown in green) connecting to the yellow road is a new/proposed road or it is an existing road.	<p>Mr Heydenrych explained that there is an existing track along the route shown in green – but it is not necessarily implying that the proposed road will follow the exact track route.</p> <p>The road is proposed to turn off from the Oyster Bay road approximately 400 m – 500 m north of the Oyster Bay village. Where the road turns off, it does not follow the existing road.</p> <p>The biophysical specialist team has walked the route and identified a corridor within which a road could be built. A recommendation has also been made that prior to the construction of the road, a walk down by these specialists be undertaken to determine the exact alignment of the road.</p>
2	Councillor	If one looks at the at the road routes, to get to the routes presented, the road must start somewhere in Humansdorp. The main road goes through the town of Humansdorp, which is quite busy. She questioned if that was the intention and if that is what has been recommended?	<p>Mr Heydenrych confirmed that that was the current proposal. He however mentioned that alternative proposals have been put forward, such as coming around Humansdorp, as the associated social impacts are of concern.</p> <p>The alternative routes will have to be discussed with the Kouga Municipality to establish if they are viable alternatives.</p>

No	Name	Comment	Response
3	Mr Robert Dennis Executive Mayor	<p>He raised the following questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Decision-making</u>: He said that there might be a lot of debates, fighting, disagreements, agreements, etc. by the people of Kouga Municipality on something that may never happen. He wanted to know when would a firm decision be taken on the proposal? 2. <u>Security standards</u>: The 800m protection zone – is it the international requirement for nuclear plants? A while ago they were informed that the nearest development to such a facility should be 16 km or 32km, in case there is a need for evacuation. 3. <u>Umzamogethu</u>: would the proposed development 	<p>Mr Heydenrych responded as follows:</p> <p>Assuming that the public participation process is completed in May, the final report would then be submitted to the Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA) in June or end of June. The DEA is required by legislation to make a decision within 105 calendar days after the final report has been submitted. As had been shown on the EIA Process Flow Chart, there is a possibility for appeals (after DEA has made a decision), but the legislation does not specify how quickly the Minister must make a decision on those appeals. Timeframes based on previous experience suggest that it could take up to 9 months for the Minister to make a final decision. In summary, the final decision on Environmental Authorisation could be made at the end of 2010 or more likely in 2011.</p> <p>Using the slide, Mr Heydenrych explained that the 800 m line around the proposed power station position is a zone within which private developments and permanent residents cannot be allowed. The current international requirement specifies that this is the only zone where development is not allowed and an area out to 3 km where evacuation may be necessary will also have restrictions.</p> <p>The 16 km zone is applicable at the Koeberg Nuclear Power Station because it is older technology. The zones that are applicable at Koeberg Nuclear Power Station will not apply to the new technology, Generation III type technology.</p> <p>There is an 800 m zone and then a 3 km zone within which there are certain planning restrictions. (Using a</p>

No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>impact on future developments for the Oyster Bay and uMzamowethu area? This would inform the Kouga Municipality as to how they proceed with their activities in these areas.</p> <p>4. <u>Impact on sea life:</u> The potential impact on sea life in the area is another issue that has been raised by the public and the Council would like to understand if a study (as part of the EIA) has been done to understand the extent of the impact.</p>	<p>slide, he showed the locations of Oyster Bay and uMzamowethu). Therefore, there should be no restrictions on development in Oyster Bay and uMzamowethu.</p> <p><u>Post-meeting note:</u> The final exclusion zones will be determined through the NNR process, the EIA studies have been based on the European Utility (EU) requirements, which are assumed will be the relevant safety zones.</p> <p>A Marine Study has been undertaken as part of the EIA. Mr Heydenrych informed the attendees that the Marine Specialists would be attending a meeting in St Francis Bay on 25 May 2010 to interact with stakeholders. The main concern around the sea life is the chokka industry, which has been looked at specifically. There is an area/depth up to 50 m where the chokka spawns, according to the specialists. There are pipelines that take water in from the ocean and release warm water back into the ocean. The recommendation from the specialist is that the zones less than 50 m deep must be avoided. The spoil pipeline must release water at a depth more than 50 m, which in this area is approximately 1.2 to 1.5 km offshore. This recommendation was made specifically to avoid the impact on chokka. There will be a security zone of approximately 1 km offshore from the high water mark but its size will be determined by the National Intelligence Agency for security purposes.</p> <p>A response was provided as part of security zone on point 2 above.</p>
4	Ms Trudi Malan Thyspunt Alliance	She raised follow up questions regarding the Generation 3 type technology:	

No	Name	Comment	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="618 237 1312 300">❑ How many Generation 3 type technology plants are currently in operation in the world? <li data-bbox="618 308 1312 475">❑ What does Eskom use as a basis for the exclusion zones? Is it based on the European Utility Requirements (EUR)? The EUR is not government standards. EUR are companies like Eskom that got together and they decided on the security zone. <li data-bbox="618 483 1312 719">❑ According to and if you look at the regulations in the USA, it is a 10 mile radius and a 15 mile radius. If you look at Stockholm, Netherlands, etc, it is 5km zone and 20km zone. She would like to get clarity on this and how they decide on 800m when there is no plant in the world that is in operating as a generation 3 type technology. 	<p data-bbox="1335 237 2027 300">Carin de Villiers answered that none were in operation but that several were under construction.</p> <p data-bbox="1335 339 2027 1034"><u>Post-meeting note:</u> European and American Nuclear Regulators have indicated that they will only consider licensing nuclear plants if they can show that the 800 m and 3 km safety planning zones can be achieved. Based on this international trend and communication with the NNR it has been assumed that a similar requirement could be implemented in South Africa and this assumption has been used in this EIA. In a recent presentation to the portfolio committee the NNR stated that the major outcome of these new designs is that the emergency planning zones, specifically the Urgent Planning Zone (the zone within which evacuation of the public has to be catered for), would in all likelihood be reduced from 16 km in the case of the Koeberg Nuclear Power Station, to a much smaller radius that could fall within the property owned by the holder, and thereby to some extent minimize the issue of the control on urban developments which could potentially threaten the viability of nuclear sites.</p>
5	Councillor Olifant	<p data-bbox="618 1074 1312 1310">He raised a point of concern to the Chairperson, Mr Lloyd. He said that he thinks that the intention of the meeting was to address Kouga Council and there were other platforms that Eskom/the environmental consultant is using for the public to participate and it is in those sessions that the concerned groups should be raising issues.</p> <p data-bbox="618 1350 1312 1380">He indicated that he was unsure if at the session meant</p>	<p data-bbox="1335 1074 2027 1273">The Chairperson, Mr Lloyd indicated that the point of concern has been raised before, however, it was part of the invitation that at least 2 members of the public attend the session with Kouga Council. It is on that basis that the Kouga Council has allowed the members of the public to attend.</p> <p data-bbox="1335 1350 2027 1380">The Chairperson did state that he agrees with the</p>

No	Name	Comment	Response
		for Kouga Council, it would be correct to allow concerned groups to participate. He raised this point for clarity.	Councillor that the session is dedicated to the Kouga Council to be updated on the process, raise issues, etc. He further stated that he understands that the public has had numerous opportunities to participate.
6	Chairperson, Mr Lloyd	He wanted clarity on whether the EIA Report will be submitted to the DA, meaning Democratic Alliance.	It was clarified that the EIR will be submitted to the DEA (Department of Environmental Affairs).
7	Councillor Rheeder	<p>He wanted to raise a comment that he finds it strange that members of the public have been invited to the meeting with Kouga Council and then the Council feels uncomfortable when public members raise questions.</p> <p>He then continued as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ In the past 1.5 years, he has seen a lot of EIA correspondence for the proposed Nuclear Power Station. ❑ The one aspect that concerns him is that there are certain groups that are very uncomfortable about the process, they feel that the EIA has not been done properly and a lot of information is not included. ❑ If one looks at the proposed access roads, then he would like to agree with the concerned groups. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ If one looks at the access road from Oyster Bay side, he is sure that that was done on the map and 	<p>The Chairperson indicated that the presence of members of public in the Kouga Council meeting has been clarified, as it was not the Kouga Council that invited members of the public but was a requirement on the invitation sent to Kouga Council.</p> <p><u>Post-meeting note:</u> Members of the public were invited to the meeting by ACER on behalf of the EIA team.</p> <p>Mr Heydenrych responded that regarding the access roads and specifically the capacity of the roads, there is a traffic and transportation study, which looked particularly at the capacity of the Krom River Bridge and the rest of the roads (up to Port Elizabeth), which are proposed to be used for the extra heavy loads. The report is available for public comment and the Council is encouraged to interact directly with the traffic engineer (who is also attending the meeting at St. Francis Bay on 25 May 2010).</p> <p><u>Post-meeting note:</u> In terms of the loading of the road, one of the recommendations in the transport study is to carry out an evaluation on what loading the various roads can take prior to construction. Resurfacing may be required on certain roads.</p>

No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>not on the ground because where the road starts is a wetland (an important wetland) and that may be an issue.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="618 341 1312 576">❑ If we look at the Eastern access road, saying that that road will be for heavy traffic, then it means that the whole road from Humansdorp should be rebuilt because the present road cannot even take the current traffic volumes, including the bridge. So that will have a huge delay. This should be seriously looked at. <li data-bbox="618 584 1312 927">❑ The human impact on all our areas is a great concern, it is common knowledge that when a project like this takes place, there would be a huge influx of people into the area of development hoping to obtain work and after the completion of the project they remain in the area. The Kouga Council is aware that they are still battling with what was left when The Links Golf Course was built. The Nuclear Power Station is going to come with similar problem. <li data-bbox="618 935 1312 1238">❑ Building a Nuclear Power Station means skills. They are talking about 7 700 people working there and it will not be a lot of local people that have the skills to work there except general labourers. So, this is a point that needs to be seriously addressed in the Final Scoping Report (<i>suspect he meant Final EIA Report</i>) and where those people will be housed because after construction the Municipality will be left with a problem. 	<p>With regards to the Western Access road, it has been mentioned that there are wetlands, which may be affected. Mr Heydenrych confirmed that the identification of the route was in fact done on site by a team of biophysical specialists, which included the wetland, botany, dune geomorphology, and invertebrate specialists. All these specialists walked the route and according to them, they found that the route is feasible and acceptable from an environmental point of view. There may be some areas where the route comes close to the wetlands but if that is the case, it has been recommended by Arcus GIBB that specialists walk the route to ensure that those kinds of impacts are avoided when the final alignment is determined (if authorisation is granted).</p> <p>Post-Meeting note: All recommendations in the Draft EIR report are included in the EMP. The EMP is a legally binding document that Eskom will be required to comply with.</p> <p>With regards to human and social impacts, Mr Heydenrych acknowledged that there is a serious concern amongst the residents in the area. There is always an influx of people in the area whenever there is a huge construction development. The Eskom team has been in discussions with the local authority officials and the areas they have identified for housing are Humansdorp and Jeffrey's Bay. They have also looked at models that they would like to apply in the area, based on previous project experience. For instance, places and the areas where people would come for recruitment would be placed in central locations away from the construction site in order</p>

No	Name	Comment	Response
			to prevent job seekers swamping the construction site.
8	Councillor	<p>Regarding the provincial road running from Humansdorp through to Sea Vista (R330) that will be used by heavy trucks, he raised the following key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ When the process possibly starts, the Road Engineers that are working in the area need to be sensitised because there is a lot of activity that happens on the R330. ❑ The interaction of people in the road includes KwaNomzamo community, children going to school, etc. This happens on a daily basis. ❑ One of the recommendations that should be made by the Consultants to Eskom is building an overhead bridge - because it will be important for safety reasons. The Municipality is having the same problem as one goes to the Marina. It was said that an overhead bridge will be constructed and that has not happened. ❑ The roads issue is a serious one because once the project has been given a go-ahead, the developer may not come back to address the concerns that the Municipality has raised. <p>Accommodation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ He wanted to confirm that Jeffrey's Bay has been identified as a potential area for housing. He said that there are a lot of town houses in Jeffrey's Bay that must be utilised. ❑ He further stated that he is against settlement of people in shacks and slums and then the 	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Mr Heydenrych stated that Eskom is seriously considering the suggestion of building an overhead bridge on the R330 for pedestrians.</p> <p>Post-meeting note: The access roads and associated impacts are being re evaluated. Arcus GIBB and Eskom will engage with the municipality on these aspects prior to finalising activities. This will ensure that there is no duplication of efforts and that appropriate management and mitigation measures are implemented.</p>

No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>municipality is left with social problems at the end of construction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ The debate of housing should be robustly undertaken and the Municipality well engaged before construction commences. ❑ The Municipality needs to be in a position to better manage the situation and would not like to see people fighting one another for jobs. 	<p>It was confirmed that both Humansdorp and Jeffrey's Bay are being considered for housing.</p> <p>Post-meeting note: Eskom acknowledges this request and the importance of the issue. The municipality will be engaged in a formal manner through formal processes if an Environmental Authorisation is obtained.</p>
9	Councillor Olifant	<p>It has been mentioned there will be two access roads towards Thyspunt. He then alluded to the fact that the input of the Municipality would revolve more on the traffic capacity and on the road infrastructure.</p> <p>It is a concern to the Municipality because currently the R330 is a provincial road and its maintenance mostly lies within the provincial budget. His concern is that using a road that goes via Humansdorp, might be a burden to the Kouga Council in terms of costs associated with repairs, maintenance or rebuilding the roads to withstand the volumes and/or capacity.</p> <p>The number of vehicles that have been mentioned during the presentation are not even a quarter of vehicles at Kouga that make use of the roads. So it would be a heavy burden on the Kouga Council infrastructure.</p> <p>He then wanted to check if there is a specific budget to cover costs associated with repairs, maintenance and rebuilding of roads.</p>	<p>As part of this EIA, the Traffic Assessment has looked at the roads that may need to be upgraded. This has certainly been part of the economic modelling. They have looked at all the costs including upgrading of roads and bridges where they may be necessary.</p> <p>So certainly for the construction, Eskom has allowed for funding for the upgrading of roads.</p> <p>Post-meeting note: Eskom has not begun to source funding for Nuclear 1. The Integrated Resource Plan (IRP) should include a funding plan for different scenarios. Once this is in place Eskom will need to include all relevant costs associated with the construction of the nuclear power station into the budget and obtain approval for the expenditure from the Eskom Board of Directors. In terms of this discussions will need to take place with relevant authorities to determine roles and responsibilities including covering the cost of infrastructure. In other large projects Eskom has contributed to all</p>

No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>If the gravel road to Oyster Bay is used, will it be the responsibility of Eskom to tar that road or will it be a joint responsibility between Eskom and the Province. The reason he asked was that he had noticed that there was some pegging along the road (which indicates that some construction work is in the pipeline).</p> <p>The wetland which has been raised by Cllr Rheeder is of great concern. The area that is being referred to is a vlei. He indicated that he knows the wetland being referred to quite well as he was born in the area. It would be important that studies are made available to the public so that they can get independent opinion on the issue of wetlands/vlei.</p> <p>He brought to the attention of the Chairperson that the Specialists are paid by Eskom, so by implication, they cannot "bite the hand that feeds them".</p> <p>The Kouga Municipality cannot allow processes that will ruin and damage the wetlands. They would be happy to get an independent opinion on the areas of concern that they have elaborated on.</p>	<p>infrastructure directly related to the project for example the access roads (some of which are provincial) to Ingula pumped storage scheme and in Lephalale for the upgrade of a sewage plant amongst others. In other cases Eskom has contributed to the costs. In all cases however maintenance after completing construction of the power station remains the accountability of the provincial or local authority.</p> <p>Mr Heydenrych explained the wetland issue using a map produced by the wetland specialist to show the sensitivity of the site and area around the site. He showed areas within which the power station could be located and indicated the location of sensitive wetland areas and the number of wetlands around the Oyster Bay dunefield.</p> <p>He also pointed out the wetlands in relation to the western access road, which comes off the Oyster Bay road and stated they are confident that they have avoided the wetlands.</p> <p>He informed the Kouga Council that the Draft EIR and the specialist studies are available on the EIA websites (http://projects.gibb.co.za) under the 'Nuclear-1 - Draft Environmental Impact Report' and www.eskom.co.za/eia under 'Nuclear 1-Generation' link), at the Jeffrey's Bay public library and DVD's can also be made available upon request.</p>
10	Cllr Madlala	<p>He made the following comments regarding the social impacts:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> He is of the view that the neighbour of Kouga</p>	<p>Mr Heydenrych explained that he is not aware of other big</p>

No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>Municipality, Nelson Mandela Metro has the Petro SA project. If Petro SA is successful, it will be bringing in a large number of people that will be working in the region and that is likely to alleviate some of the challenges that Kouga Municipality might face, from a social point of view.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="618 483 1312 647">❑ He also wanted to check, in terms of two big projects happening in the region simultaneously, if they will be bringing people from outside the region. Is the importing of workers not going to create challenges for Eskom, etc.? <li data-bbox="618 691 1312 823">❑ How vigilant are the consultants in terms of the international lobby groups that will try to stop the project they are likely to have a negative influence on local social groups in the area? 	<p>projects happening in the Nelson Mandela Bay area. He is unable to comment on the numbers of workers who may be coming in as a result of those projects.</p> <p>Arcus GIBB as the Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) can only respond to comments received through the EIA process and cannot monitor the activities of interests of international lobby groups. The role of the EAP is to weigh the pros and cons of the project and to look at the positive and negative impacts of the project. It is up to Eskom to engage with the lobby groups, should they consider it necessary.</p> <p>Post-meeting note: To date no large international lobby groups have provided input into the EIA process. Arcus GIBB will continue to monitor this and if lobby groups engage after authorisation has been give, Eskom will engage with them.</p>
11	Councillor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="618 1214 1312 1347">❑ The proposed Nuclear Power Station is a big project. Regarding the bulk of employment, is Eskom going source workers from the local areas or is Eskom going to import workers into the area? 	<p>The Social Specialist has recommended that at least 25% (and preferably more) of the construction personnel should be sourced locally. Examples from previous large Eskom power station projects have been used as a basis. The contractors are required to also provide training to the</p>

No	Name	Comment	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="616 411 1314 683">□ Regarding the social impact, having a huge development in the area, adds pressure to the existing infrastructure. Cllr Olifant has alluded to the impact on infrastructure such as roads that are going to require upgrading, etc. Additional social requirements include health (capacity of hospitals), human resources (doctors which the Kouga Municipality does not have), etc. <li data-bbox="616 762 1314 858">□ Is the sourcing of local labour only applicable for the construction phase or it includes the operational phases (more permanent jobs)? <li data-bbox="616 1353 1314 1378">□ Has a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) 	<p data-bbox="1332 236 2029 370">workers to ensure that local people do not only undertake manual labour but that their skills are improved during the process. So, at least 25% of the peak of 7 700 workers must be local people.</p> <p data-bbox="1332 411 2029 507">This has been addressed in the Social Impact Assessment. The social specialist has looked at the educational facilities, hospitals, community facilities, etc.</p> <p data-bbox="1332 549 2029 750">Post-meeting note: The social specialist has identified that the social infrastructure in the Kouga Municipality is currently under-resourced and that Eskom would be required to address this issue. Eskom would liaise with the Kouga Municipality prior to construction on these aspects if authorisation was obtained.</p> <p data-bbox="1332 791 2029 1206">Ms de Villiers explained that as far as possible, for permanent jobs, Eskom would try and recruit from the area. It is Eskom's experience that local people tend to stay compared to people that have been brought into the area (as they tend to go back to the areas where they come from). Eskom's preference would be to source and train people from the local areas. Eskom has already looked into the area, they would need to commence with the training soon. Eskom has started recruiting engineers who come from the area, which would be brought back into the area to work at the power station should it be built in the area.</p> <p data-bbox="1332 1248 2029 1378">An SEA has not been done, it is not a requirement at in terms of the legislation. An SEA is a voluntary assessment that may be initiated by a private developer or by local or provincial government. Up to this stage, there has not</p>

No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>been undertaken for this project?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Transmission power lines - are they part of the nuclear power station EIA?</p>	<p>been a strong drive for an SEA to be undertaken in the area.</p> <p>The power lines have not been assessed as part of the nuclear power plant EIA. Power lines have been undertaken as a separate EIA study and by a separate consultant.</p>
12	Ms Trudi Malan Thyspunt Alliance	<p>Addressing the Chairperson, Cllr Olifant, Ms Malan stated the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> As community representatives, they appreciate the opportunity to be part of the Kouga Council meeting. <input type="checkbox"/> As a community, they do feel that they have studied the EIR documents and reports extensively. <input type="checkbox"/> They have from the community's side got some specialists to study the reports as well. <input type="checkbox"/> The issues that the community have on the proposed development need to be brought to the Council's attention. <input type="checkbox"/> The Council members are the leaders of the community, however the community feels that they are voiceless in this process, because the more they ask questions, the less answers they get. <p>She went on to raise concerns on the Transportation Assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> In the Transportation Impact Assessment for Thyspunt that was provided to the public by the expert, there were 6 missing figures and 31 missing Annexures. And so when the Thyspunt Alliance specialist had to comment, they could not 	

No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>comment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ When the information was asked for - the response was that the EAP is sorry for all the inconvenience they have caused. But it is still a question of they need to give the public more time to comment on complete information. <p>She further raised concerns on the Marine Specialist Study:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ There are issues on the Squid Industry which the EAP states has been extensively investigated in the Marine Study ❑ The specialist from the Rhodes University that has been requested to review the Marine Specialist report is 99% sure that the Squid Industry is going to be destroyed in the area because Eskom is going to pump 6.3 million cubic metres of sand (which is equivalent to trucks from the area to Cairo) into the sea, which is going to change the visibility of the sea and the squid needs clear water. ❑ In the Economic Impact Assessment, it says the impact on the Squid Industry. There are 4050 jobs in the Squid Industry. If this project is going to mean the end of the squid industry, the thousands of jobs that are being promised to the communities will not mean anything to them. ❑ Impact on tourism - the Kouga Municipality is going to loose 6.1 million from year 1 to year 6 during construction. ❑ Agricultural impact - is R 18.7 million per annum and they stand to loose - this is according to the studies that have been provided by the specialists. 	<p>Mr Heydenrych responded that the marine assessment has assessed the impact of the sediment on the squid. An Oceanographic Assessment, which looked specifically at the movement of sediment based on ocean currents, investigated where it would be acceptable to dispose of the sediment. There are two options for the disposal of sediment, which will come from the excavations of the foundations of the power station. These options are either to dispose of it on land or in the ocean. The Oceanographic Specialist looked at that and the Marine Specialist has based his assessment on what has been found in the Oceanographic Assessment. According to the Specialists, they found that the sediment would cover a section of seafloor or approximately 6km². That is the reason for the recommendation, which has been made by the specialists to dispose the spoil at least 1.5 km to 2 km offshore to avoid impact on the spawning grounds of the squid or chokka.</p> <p>Post-meeting note: On page 7 of the Economic Impact Assessment, it is stated: "According to the information supplied by the South African Squid</p>

No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>This area stands to loose big time and they are not making the information very clear in the studies (and that is what the communities are trying to say). This is the same information that Cllr Rheeder has been referring to.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ We have written a letter to various Ministers to complain about the fact that the communities are not being given the correct information. ❑ During the Scoping Phase, it was suggested that they investigate thoroughly the Squid Industry. ❑ In the entire report, the only reference to the Squid Industry is that 'it might have an impact and it will not have an impact'. ❑ When the Thyspunt Alliance got the specialist involved, they had completely different information. ❑ When they say a 1km exclusion zone, in the Economic Assessment, it says the Port St Francis boats will not be able to get there anymore, they will loose 38% of their catch when a 1km security zone is implemented. ❑ The security zone – Eskom cannot decide on the security zone that they will allow commercial fishing. This is a problem to the communities. <p>She then posed the question, when are they (Thyspunt Alliance) going to have an opportunity to present information that has been found by the specialists to the Kouga Council.</p> <p>The Thyspunt Alliance is not concerned or against Nuclear, they are concerned about the impacts of the development on their communities.</p>	<p><i>Management Industrial Association (SASMIA) (2007), between 1999-2005 an average of 33.2% of the total annual Eastern Cape catch originated in the area between 10 nautical miles (18.52 km) east and west of the proposed Thyspunt site. Thus, an exclusion zone of 1 km width would account for roughly 1.8 % of the total catch. This would amount to about 127 tons per annum with an export value of €0.88 million per annum”.</i></p> <p>Regarding the impact on tourism and agriculture – these studies have been undertaken as part of the investigations. In this area they have found, according to the agricultural specialist, that there may be a potential increase in agricultural production because of the influx of people who will produce a larger market for agricultural products. It is however not the case on other sites, such as Bantamsklip, because of the scarcity of water. Because of the availability of water in the Thyspunt area, the agricultural specialist indicated that the agricultural production could increase by approximately 15%.</p> <p>With regards to tourism, there will be an impact on tourism and tourism market differs quite substantially across all 3 sites. At Thyspunt, the finding was that there could be a negative impact of approximately 8% during construction and 0% impact during operation. This was based on the fact that there may be some people who view a nuclear power station as an undesirable kind of development given the nature of the current tourism market in the area, but it may also be the increase in business related tourism as a result of the construction teams and operation staff coming to the area during the operational life of the</p>

No	Name	Comment	Response
			<p>nuclear power station.</p> <p>All results are part of the specialists reports which have been made available for public review. In response to all the comments raised by the Thyspunt Alliance, Mr Lloyd stated that the community should have tried to engage the Council prior to the meeting with Eskom, Arcus GIBB and Kouga Council.</p> <p>The meeting has therefore been the Council's first engagement as part of the Draft EIR review. It would have been ideal if the Council met in the absence of Arcus GIBB and Eskom so that the Council and members of the public could debate the issue.</p>
13	Mr Reuben Heydenrych Arcus GIBB	<p>A question they have as the EAP, they have heard recently (not sure if it is with the Province) that the road from Humansdorp to Oyster Bay is being tarred and Arcus GIBB is uncertain about the status of the road. It has also been mentioned that the road is being pegged.</p> <p>Eskom would like to know from the Kouga Council if it is an option to use it as an alternative rather than coming through the eastern side along the R330 for at least some of the traffic [may be not for all the traffic].</p>	Kouga Local Municipality to provide a response.
14	Cllr Stuurman	<p>The manner in which he understands the process is that the Kouga Council is also a stakeholder in the process. He also understands that the Kouga Council is equal partners with the community in this process.</p> <p>He informed all present that he was going to be controversial in his closing remarks and stated the following points:</p>	Comments noted.

No	Name	Comment	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="618 272 1312 437">❑ We cannot debate this development as if it is a Kouga matter. We need to look at this development within the context of South Africa. We cannot talk about the economy of Kouga and not taking into cognisance the economy of South Africa. <li data-bbox="618 448 1312 612">❑ One controversy is that, in the not so long past, it was part of the Constitution of this country for blacks not to have access to electricity. We cannot beat around the bush as if there was nothing wrong. <li data-bbox="618 624 1312 788">❑ Now that we are rebuilding the infrastructure, we cannot come with sentimental issues, which are in fact not sentimental because what is happening is part of the South African Constitution, whether we like it or not. <li data-bbox="618 799 1312 1139">❑ He also stated that on his way to the meeting, he was listening to the Minister of Transport talking about the backlog on the road infrastructure, which is huge because it was upgraded 20 years ago. Now that we have to upgrade, we cannot debate in a manner that will only suit interests of a minority and not the interests of all people. So when we debate about Thyspunt, it may be located in Kouga but it will not be a Kouga development, it is a South African development. <li data-bbox="618 1150 1312 1374">❑ Another aspect is that, if one compares what is happening here and in the Western Cape, one does not see these adverse effects that are being portrayed to people in Kouga. May be those who lobby against the NPS must go to Koeberg and see for themselves what happens in and around Koeberg. 	

No	Name	Comment	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="616 236 1314 300">❑ As a person, he does not see anything wrong with nuclear power. <li data-bbox="616 306 1314 440">❑ He indicated that, he has the courage to say that he will lobby for the Nuclear Power Station openly – he is not going to hide his stance on the proposed development. <li data-bbox="616 446 1314 510">❑ He is not a specialist but he is trying to educate himself regarding nuclear power. <li data-bbox="616 517 1314 683">❑ He also posed a challenge to all present to do some introspection, at their homes, at their offices, etc and question themselves as to what type of energy have they used to be the people they have become today. <li data-bbox="616 689 1314 785">❑ Where people have made their money, they need to ask themselves, what type of electricity have they used to make that money. <li data-bbox="616 791 1314 887">❑ Now people are saying nuclear power is not the right form of energy but in the past years, they have used nuclear power from Koeberg NPS. <p data-bbox="616 932 1314 1024">In closing he then stated that there is no way that the Kouga Council can argue – all ANC Councillors must have a developmental state in mind.</p>	

6. WAY FORWARD AND CONCLUDING REMARKS

Mr Lloyd thanked Mr Heydenrych for presenting to the Kouga Council.

He stated that the Councillors have been debating some of the issues. He felt that some of the issues were clarified during the discussion session.

He then stated that the proposed Nuclear Power Station will be debated by the Kouga Council and an official position/stance would be taken as to whether they support or oppose the proposed Nuclear Power Station.

He also requested Eskom to ensure that bursaries are made available to students (as from next year, 2011) from the area so that deserving children can study further. This will ensure that people from Kouga do not only become labourers during construction but are provided with skills of a specialised nature as and when opportunities arise at the proposed Nuclear Power Station.

He then thanked all present for their inputs and declared the meeting closed.

ATTENDANCE LIST

Surname	First Names	Title	Co/Org	Kouga Municipality Meeting 24 May 2010
Botha	Nico	Dr	Kouga Local Municipality	Attended
Breytenbach	Johann	Mr	Eskom Holdings Limited	Attended
Camealio-Benjamin	Virginia	Ms	Kouga Local Municipality	Attended
de Villiers	Carin	Ms	Eskom Holdings Limited	Attended
Dennis	Robert	Mr	Kouga Local Municipality (EC108)	Attended
du Toit	Mari	Ms	Kouga Local Municipality	Attended
Felix	Katrina	Ms	Kouga Local Municipality	Attended
Greeff	Gert	Mr	Eskom Nuclear Sites	Attended
Koegelenberg	Abrie	Mr	Kouga Local Municipality	Attended
Kraak	Cheron	Ms	Thyspunt Alliance	Attended
Leen	Petrus	Mr	Thyspunt Alliance	Attended
Lloyd	Fumankile	Mr	Kouga Local Municipality (EC108)	Attended
Marais	Aubrey	Mr	Kouga Local Council	Attended
Malan	Trudi	Ms	Thyspunt Alliance	Attended
Maseti	Angelina	Mrs	Kouga Local Municipality	Attended
Mbandana	Msinyathi Gerald	Mr	Kouga Local Municipality	Attended
Mbusi	Mandla	Mr	Eskom Holdings Limited	Attended
Ndala	Lorraine	Ms	Eskom Holdings Limited	Attended
Norman	Jan	Mr	Koeberg NPS	Attended
Oliphant	Phumzile	Mr	Kouga Local Municipality	Attended
Oosthuizen	Eddie	Mr	Kouga Local Municipality	Attended
Rheeder	Ben	Mnr	Kouga Local Municipality	Attended
Rollison	Rosemary	Ms	Kouga Local Municipality	Attended
Tshume	Khayalakhe Michael	Mr	Kouga Local Municipality	Attended