

Our Ref: J27035

28 February 2011

Rebels Rus Private Nature Reserve  
Thyspunt Alliance

Email: [andrea.vonholdt@coega.co.za](mailto:andrea.vonholdt@coega.co.za)

**Attention:** Ms Andrea von Holdt

Dear Ms von Holdt

**ESKOM ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT (EIA: 12/12/20/944) FOR A PROPOSED NUCLEAR POWER STATION AND ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE: COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REPORT**

Arcus GIBB acknowledges receipt of your comments on the Draft EIA report. We thank you for your valuable comments and your participation in the Eskom Nuclear Power Station (NPS) Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process to date. Your questions and comments concerning the Nuclear-1 have been noted.

For ease of reference, responses to comments raised have been provided in the table below.

Should you have any queries with respect to the above please do not hesitate to contact Arcus GIBB.

Yours faithfully  
For Arcus GIBB (Pty) Ltd



---

Jaana-Maria Ball  
Nuclear-1

EIA

Manager

Page & Section number in VIA	Section in VIA	Comment (and Response)
1 <sup>st</sup> sentence of Executive Summary and 1 <sup>st</sup> sentence of Section 3.6 on pg 108.	"Eskom intends building new nuclear power stations on all three sites" and "...if no power station is built on any of the sites, the land will be sold"	<p>These statements are in total contradiction. The very 1<sup>st</sup> sentence in the executive summary is a very strong statement, which has been the message that Eskom has sent to all, from the beginning of the EIA process; i.e. that each site will ultimately house a nuclear power station (NPS). Then on page 108, it is stated that land will be sold to 'possible housing developers' if a NPS is not developed. The wool is being pulled over the readers' eyes.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> Your comments are noted. It has always been Eskom's intention to prepare for more than one nuclear power station. It was stated from the onset of the EIA process that all original five sites identified during the Nuclear Site Investigation Programme (NISP) will be considered for the development of power stations, as far as they are deemed reasonable and feasible by the EIA process. This is part of the long-term power generation strategy for South Africa. Therefore in line with Eskom's intention to pursue up to 20 000 MW of new nuclear power generating capacity, an application for the second nuclear power station may be submitted by Eskom soon after the submission of the Final Environmental Impact Report for Nuclear-1. However, should the nuclear programme not go ahead or a decision be taken that a nuclear power station cannot be built on this property which means that Eskom has no further need for it, it would be sold.</p>
Executive Summary: 3 <sup>rd</sup> paragraph, last sentence	Use of the term "road/s"	<p>Doubt is expressed here, as to whether a single access road or more than one access road will be constructed. It was clear from the round of public meetings held in April 2010 that Eskom intend constructing two access roads to the proposed NPS. The VIA should be corrected to state this fact.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> Two access roads are currently considered for the Thyspunt site and the Visual Impact Assessment report will be changed to reflect this.</p>

Page & Section number in VIA	Section in VIA	Comment (and Response)
Executive Summary: 4 <sup>th</sup> paragraph	"Listing of the visual criteria of visibility" on which the NPS was rated	<p>There is a clear omission of residential homes within the Rebels Rus Nature Reserve which begs the question as to whether the VIA and as such, the EIA considered impact of the NPA on any of our homes. This is noted throughout the VIA, where mention is made of the nearby towns of Cape St. Francis and Oyster Bay, but the focus should be the visibility of the NPS from our homes within the Rebels Nature Reserve, where some of the homes will be located within the 800m safety zone of the NPS.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> A visual simulation and photo montage of the visibility of the Nuclear Power Station in terms of the Rebels Rus community has been compiled and has been made available to the community. The Visual Impact Assessment will also be amended with this information.</p>
Executive Summary: 8 <sup>th</sup> paragraph	Visual exposure limited from the nearby towns	<p>Refer to the above comment, where it is blatantly clear that the VIA has omitted the closest homes; i.e. those in the Rebels Rus Nature Reserve (within 800m of the site) and only mentions the nearby towns. This is unacceptable. The VIA must include, to the highest detail, the impact of the proposed NPS from our homes in the Rebels Rus Nature Reserve.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> Please see our response above.</p>
Executive Summary: 3 <sup>rd</sup> page, heading "screens"	"...possible residential land uses in the coastal area east of the Thyspunt site..."	<p>Why use the term "possible", when there are definitely existing homes in this stated area of influence? This VIA MUST acknowledge that there are homes within the 800m safety zone of the NPA and beyond, and that these homes will be the most impacted by any of the activities associated with the NPS.</p>

Page & Section number in VIA	Section in VIA	Comment (and Response)
		<p><b>Response:</b></p> <p>Your comments are noted and the necessary changes will be made to the report. The addition of a visual simulation of the proposed power station's appearance from Rebels Rus addressed this concern.</p>
Page 1, Section 1.1, 2 <sup>nd</sup> paragraph	"Three possible sites....intensive studies by others"	<p>If these are the studies that Eskom commissioned approximately 30 years ago, then 1) IAPs should have access to them; 2) these studies must be interrogated as part of this EIA – 30 years ago there was no environmental legislation to dictate or inform the location of a NPA (or any such large development). It should not be assumed that any of the proposed locations of the NPS 30 years ago, are still viable in today's legislation and changed times. These studies should be interrogated; else this EIA is not considered an open &amp; fair &amp; thorough process. It could be a case of simply analysing the best of a bad bunch.</p> <p><b>Response:</b></p> <p>A review of the NSIP information was undertaken during the scoping phase and EIA process and the information was found to continue to be valid. Much of the information (e.g. geotechnical information) has not changed over time as the environment stays constant with respect to such issues. Detailed site-level biophysical assessments have been undertaken for all three alternative sites to ensure that the information with respect to the physical environment is as current as possible. In addition, the socially focused specialist studies have provided up to date information from published sources and directly from sources within the affected communities.</p> <p>Summaries of the documents are available on the Eskom and GIBB documents and detailed reports may be requested from Eskom in terms of the Public Access to Information Act.</p>
Page 5, Section 1.1.2, 3 <sup>rd</sup> paragraph	"...particularly scenic and relatively remote..."	Thyspunt is not "relatively remote" – it is a very remote area.

Page & Section number in VIA	Section in VIA	Comment (and Response)
		<p><b>Response:</b> Your comments are noted.</p>
Page 6, Section 1.2.2, 5 <sup>th</sup> bullet	“The communities of Oyster Bay and Cape St Francis near Thyspunt...”	<p>Again, a classic case of the omission of the closest and MOST AFFECTED residential area to the proposed NPS – that being our homes within the Rebels Rus Nature Reserve! This VIA and consequently the EIR MUST include this fact! Some of the residents in this Private Nature Reserve may lose our homes and the reports make no mention of this fact! This is unacceptable.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> Your comments are noted and the necessary changes will be made to the report. Also, as previously stated, a visual simulation and photo montage of the visibility of the Nuclear Power Station in terms of the Rebels Rus community has been compiled and has been made available to the community. The Visual Impact Assessment has been amended with this information.</p>

Page & Section number in VIA	Section in VIA	Comment (and Response)
Page 6, Section 1.2.3	No visual simulation or photo montage done	<p>It is totally unacceptable that the excuse of “time-consuming” can be used, where no photo montage is produced at this level of investigation. As stated in the last paragraph of this section, the Guideline (to be used as best practice) advises that a visual simulation/photo montage of the form in the landscape be done. This Guideline has been ignored, even though it is stated in Section 1.2.4 that it has been used as a “best practice” guideline for this study. It is also mentioned that layouts sand forms of the proposed facility are not known at present; however, in other sections (Section 2.1, first bullet) of the report, heights of the structures are given. In the first round of public meetings held more than a year ago, I requested that a photo montage be done (specifically from the most-affected homes in the Rebels Rus Nature Reserve) and both Eskom and their consultants agreed that this was important and that it should be done. It is clear that nothing has been done. It is a simple exercise (creating a photo montage) that would assist all affected residents, specifically in the Reserve, as well as the Environmental Authorities reviewing this report, to understand what it is we’ll be looking at. A photo montage/visual simulation must be done.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> A visual simulation and photo montage of the visibility of the Nuclear Power Station from Rebels Rus has been compiled and has been made available to the community. The Visual Impact Assessment has been amended with this information.</p>
Page 14, Section 2.4.1	“...relative remoteness”	<p>Thyspunt is not “relatively remote” – it is a very remote area.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> Your comments are noted.</p>

Page & Section number in VIA	Section in VIA	Comment (and Response)
Page 43, Section 3.1.2	Visual intrusion of the NPS from critical viewpoints	<p>Again, here is an example of the most critically-affected homes (critical viewpoints) having been omitted from the VIA. It is stated (in 4<sup>th</sup> bullet on Page 43) that visibility assessments were done from, amongst others, holiday homes to the east of the proposed NPS; however, Figure 2.1 on Page 11 indicates that photos were only taken from a distance of more than 2.5km from the proposed NPS. We have homes within 800m and directly facing the proposed NPS. It is imperative that photos be taken from these homes and that a photo montage be done (from these houses within 2.5km and closer to the NPS).</p> <p><b>Response:</b> As stated, a visual simulation and photo montage of the visibility of the Nuclear Power Station from Rebels Rus has been compiled and has been made available to the community. The Visual Impact Assessment has also been amended with this information.</p>
Page 44	Heading: Visibility from the Coastal Road	<p>What coastal road is being referred to? Is this the N2, the Oyster Bay Road or the coastal road leading to the Rebels Rus Private Nature Reserve? Please specify, as it makes a big difference to the reader.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> The road referred to is the coastal road from St. Francis Bay to Oyster Bay. This road is aligned east west and is located north of the dune field.</p>
Page 68, Section 3.2.2	“...drilling to obtain geotechnical data...”	<p>Although this comment/query has nothing to do with the VIA, I would like to know if an archaeologist was present during the geotech drilling?</p> <p><b>Response:</b> All drilling sites were inspected by the EIA Archaeologist who indicated that no damage to any sites of significant archaeological importance had occurred.</p>

Page & Section number in VIA	Section in VIA	Comment (and Response)
Page 68, Section 3.2.3	Visual impact of certain aspects of the construction phase	<p>No mention is made of the visual impact of the increase in traffic (especially massive construction vehicles)(and 8000 people!) along the various routes that will be used to access the proposed NPS, especially the roads that lead from Humansdorp to Oyster Bay and St. Francis and Cape St. Francis.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> There will be a visual impact created by construction traffic for approximately nine years during this phase of the project. Routes and use times will be selected to minimise traffic impacts, which will include visual impacts on the communities.</p> <p>The report has been amended to include a statement on visual impacts associated with traffic.</p>
Page 70, Table 13	Visual impact rating matrix	<p>How is it possible that the aspects and impacts for all three proposed NPSs can be assessed and the results given in a single table? Surely the aspects and impacts for each differ?</p> <p><b>Response:</b> Your recommendations will be considered by the visual assessment specialist and the necessary changes will be made to the report, if necessary.</p>
Page 71, Table 13	Visual alteration of night scene by lighting	<p>The probability of this impact is DEFINITE (not probable); and the consequence and significance are at least MEDIUM to HIGH and not LOW. Please review this assessment. How can the significance be low, when the duration of the impact is long and it's certain that the impact will occur? Again, here is an example where the specialist has not considered the impact from the viewpoint of the closest residents; i.e. those of us within less than 2.5km from the Thyspunt NPS.</p>

Page & Section number in VIA	Section in VIA	Comment (and Response)
		<p><b>Response:</b>  The reference to the impact being probable (there is a good possibility (greater than 50% chance) that the impact will occur) refers to the construction phase of the project. With strict impact mitigation measures the impact can be reduced.</p> <p>The reference to the impact being highly probable (it is most likely (50-90% chance) that the impact will occur) refers to the operational phase of the project. The definition of definite as stated in the report p. 65 is “where the impact will occur regardless of any preventative measures (greater than 90% chance of occurring). Due to the application of mitigation measures to reduce the impact, the probability is given as Highly probable. This means that it will occur but not at the magnitude that it would if nothing was done. The rating scales were given and the assessment had to apply them to their field of study. The impact has a high probability of occurring.</p>
Page 71, Table 13	Visual change to sense of place	<p>The probability of this impact is DEFINITE (not probable); and the consequence and significance are both MEDIUM to HIGH and not LOW. Please review this assessment. How can the significance be low, when the duration of the impact is long and it’s certain that the impact will occur? Again, here is an example where the specialist has not considered the impact from the viewpoint of the closest residents; i.e. those of us within less than 2.5km from the Thyspunt NPS.</p>

Page & Section number in VIA	Section in VIA	Comment (and Response)
		<p><b>Response:</b>  The reference to the impact being probable (there is a good possibility (greater than 50% chance) that the impact will occur) refers to the construction phase of the project. With strict impact mitigation measures the impact can be reduced.</p> <p>The reference to the impact being highly probable (it is most likely (50-90% chance) that the impact will occur) refers to the operational phase of the project. The definition of definite as stated in the report p 65 is “where the impact will occur regardless of any preventative measures (greater than 90% chance of occurring). Due to the application of mitigation measures to reduce the impact, the probability is given as Highly probable. This means that it will occur but not at the magnitude that it would if nothing was done. The rating scales were given and the assessment had to apply them to their field of study. The impact has a high probability of occurring.</p>
Page 71, Table 13	Visual change to sense of place of local coastal and inland area due to large scale and extent of structures	Again, as above, the probability is DEFINITE and not highly probable. It cannot be argued that the impact won't occur – the sense of place WILL change/be affected – it's definite!

Page & Section number in VIA	Section in VIA	Comment (and Response)
		<p><b>Response:</b> As above, the reference to the impact being probable (there is a good possibility (greater than 50% chance) that the impact will occur) refers to the construction phase of the project. With strict impact mitigation measures the impact can be reduced.</p> <p>The reference to the impact being highly probable (it is most likely (50-90% chance) that the impact will occur) refers to the operation phase of the project. The definition of definite as stated in the report p 65 is “where the impact will occur regardless of any preventative measures (greater than 90% chance of occurring). Due to the application of mitigation measures to reduce the impact, the probability is given as Highly probable.. This means that it will occur but not at the magnitude that it would if nothing was done. The rating scales were given and the assessment had to apply them to their field of study. The impact has a high probability of occurring.</p>
Page 72, Table 13	Change in visual quality of local area caused by new landforms and roads	<p>Again, as above, the probability is DEFINITE and not highly probable. It cannot be argued that the impact won't occur.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> As above, the reference to the impact being probable (there is a good possibility(greater than 50% chance) that the impact will occur) refers to the construction phase of the project. With strict impact mitigation measures the impact can be reduced.</p> <p>The reference to the impact being highly probable (it is most likely (50-90% chance) that the impact will occur) refers to the operational phase of the project. The definition of definite as stated in the report p 65 is “where the impact will occur regardless of any preventative measures (greater than 90% chance of occurring). Due to the application of mitigation measures to reduce the impact, the probability is given as Highly probable.. This means that it will occur but not at the magnitude that it would if nothing was done. The rating scales were given and the assessment had to apply them to their field of study. The impact has a high probability of occurring.</p> <p>\</p>

Page & Section number in VIA	Section in VIA	Comment (and Response)
Page 72, Table 13	Change in visual quality of local night scene by lighting	<p>Again, as above, the probability is DEFINITE and not highly probable. It cannot be argued that the impact won't occur. From the description of the lighting intensity given in the VIA, the significance of the impact should be HIGH (and not MEDIUM).</p>
		<p><b>Response:</b>  As above, the reference to the impact being probable (there is a good possibility (greater than 50% chance) that the impact will occur) refers to the construction phase of the project. With strict impact mitigation measures the impact can be reduced.</p> <p>The reference to the impact being highly probable (it is most likely (50-90% chance) that the impact will occur) refers to the operation phase of the project. The definition of definite as stated in the report p 65 is "where the impact will occur regardless of any preventative measures (greater than 90% chance of occurring). Due to the application of mitigation measures to reduce the impact, the probability is given as Highly probable. This means that it will occur but not at the magnitude that it would if nothing was done. The rating scales were given and the assessment had to apply them to their field of study. The impact has a high probability of occurring.</p>
Page 73, Section 3.2.8	Heading: Nature, Negative – "sense of place of the coastal and inland setting is degraded"	<p>Unless this phrase has been taken out of context or misunderstood, how can it be stated that the sense of place is degraded?? Thyspunt and the surrounding Conservancy and Private Nature Reserve status provide quite the opposite – it's a pristine area worthy of intensive conservation from irresponsible development.</p>
		<p><b>Response:</b>  The sense of place will be degraded therefore the nature of the impact is negative. The text will be altered to convey this meaning.</p>

Page & Section number in VIA	Section in VIA	Comment (and Response)
Page 74, Section 3.2.8	Heading: Extent, Local, Thyspunt	<p>What is the meaning of the 3km exclusion zone? At the round of public meetings held in April 2010 at PE and St Francis, Eskom stated clearly that the safety zone from the facility is 800m. Suitable clarification should be given in the Draft EIR.</p> <p><b>Response:</b>  The emergency planning zones for Koeberg are characterised by 5 km and 16 km radii around the power station. The 5 km radius around Koeberg is referred to as the Proactive Action Zone (PAZ) and the zone between 5 - 16 km radius is referred to as the Urgent Protective Zone (UPZ). No private development is allowed within the PAZ, and emergency evacuation planning (e.g. in terms of the density of development and capacity of access roads) must be applied to the UPZ. It is likely that the corresponding PAZ and UPZ for Nuclear-1 will be reduced to 800 m and 3 km respectively.</p>
Page 74, Section 3.2.8	Heading: Intensity: rating always high for <2.5km as access denied to the public within this radius	<p>As opposed to the above statement, which talks of a 3km exclusion zone, here we read of a 2.5km exclusion zone (access within this zone denied to public, according to the VIA) and at the round of public meetings held in April 2010, Eskom stated clearly that the safety/exclusion zone from the facility is 800m. This zone is of critical importance to those of us with homes in the Rebels Rus Private Nature Reserve, where we stand the possibility of losing our homes, depending on the extent of the exclusion zone. It is of utmost importance that this exclusion zone be seriously considered and the impact of the final decision must be assessed, particularly in light of the impact on home-owners. We don't want to lose our homes! It is also strongly recommended that, should the NPS ever be constructed at the Thyspunt site, that it be constructed on the West-most side of the possible construction footprint, which could very well mean that none of our homes in the Rebels Rus Private Nature Reserve will be affected. In light of this serious issue, we have requested a key stakeholder meeting with Eskom (requested at the IAP meeting held in April 2010 at Cape St Francis) where this issue, amongst others, will be discussed in detail.</p>

Page & Section number in VIA	Section in VIA	Comment (and Response)
		<p><b>Response:</b> The intensity rating of the visual impact is high in the radial zone less than 2.5km from the site boundary. The new exclusion zone is 800m. The text is incorrect as the exclusion zone changed from 3km to 800m. The text will be altered.</p>
Page 74, Section 3.2.8	Heading: Intensity – Medium: “...the visual character and sense of place will have been irreversibly altered”	<p>Please explain how one can make the statement in the middle column adjacent, and then state that the intensity is medium.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> The intensity of the visual impact decreases with distance and according to the definition of medium intensity that “the natural, cultural and social functions continue but in a modified way”. However the sense of place will have been irreversibly altered.</p>
Page 75, Section 3.2.8	Heading: Probability – Definite	<p>Table 13 does not reflect this. Table 13 states either probable or highly probable. It is recommended that Table 13 be amended to reflect DEFINITE.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> Refer to response above relating to Definite and Highly probable.</p>
Page 76, Section 3.2.8	Heading: Significance Rating: “The rating is therefore HIGH for all sites”	<p>Table 13 does not reflect this. Table 13 reflects either LOW or MEDIUM.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> This rating is for the nuclear power station and is shown on Table 14. Table 13 shows the impact on the aspects occurring in the various phases i.e. design, construction, operation, etc.</p>
Page 79, Section 3.2.8	Heading: Probability – Definite	As above, Table 13 does not reflect this.

Page & Section number in VIA	Section in VIA	Comment (and Response)
		<p><b>Response:</b> See Table 14.</p>
Page 84, Section 3.2.11, 3 <sup>rd</sup> paragraph	"...night time visual impact of the NPS is significantly reduced"	<p>The chokka boats produce a very bright light; however, this cannot be used to make the statement that the night time visual impact of the NPS will be <b>significantly</b> reduced. It appears as if the presence of the chokka boats is justifying the establishment of a NPS at Thyspunt and this should not be the case.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> Your comments are noted. However, we stand by our statement.</p>
Page 84, Section 3.2.11	Heading: Cumulative Impacts – Medium: "...future development in the area will extend the lit areas and thereby reduce the significance of the NPS lighting"	<p>This is NOT an assessment of future (other development over and above the NPS) development in the area. This statement is pre-emptive and cannot be made to justify a medium impact. This is unacceptable.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> Cumulative visual impacts need to be considered. The Duynefontein site is an example. The Koeberg Nuclear Power Station was the major light source 4 km from Melkbosstrand. The suburb of Duynefontein and its lighting is now 1km from this light source. The visual intrusion of the light is therefore reduced by the introduction of more light from adjacent development.</p>
Page 85, Section 3.2.11	Heading: Probability – Highly Probable	<p>This statement is only applicable to the Duynefontein site, as indicated by the use of the word "Koeberg NPS" in this statement. This is unacceptable and begs the question, once again: how can one assess the impacts on all 3 sites, cumulatively?? For Thyspunt, the probability is DEFINITE.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> Your comments are noted and will be considered.</p>
Page 85, Section 3.2.11	Heading: Significance Rating – Highly Probable	In the case of Thyspunt, the significance is DEFINITE.

Page & Section number in VIA	Section in VIA	Comment (and Response)
		<p><b>Response:</b> Your comments are noted and will be considered.</p>
Page 87, Section 3.2.12, 1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph	The Eastern Access Road: "...road will commence at the Cape St Francis road and be cut..."	Please provide more clarity on exactly where along the Cape St Francis road the eastern access road/servitude is proposed to commence.
		<p><b>Response:</b> Please refer to Figure 3.1.1 b)</p>
Page 87, Section 3.2.12, 3 <sup>rd</sup> paragraph, very last sentence	The Northern Access Road: "If this access is selected..."	<p>Surely the existing gravel road from Humansdorp to Oyster Bay will be upgraded in alignment and tarred, regardless of whether the Northern Access Road is selected or not? As the Draft EIR indicates, the Western Access Road to the NPS is the preferred route for access during the operational phase. Alternatively, there will be a maintenance road along the proposed transmission lines from the NPS towards Humansdorp, that head northwards over the dune field. Why not locate the Northern Access Road in the same servitude instead of making another access route?</p>
		<p><b>Response:</b> Refer to Figure 3.1.1 b) According to information obtained during October 2010, the Eastern Cape Department of Public Works is currently preparing for the tarring of the Oyster Bay – Humansdorp road. The standard of tarring will, however, depend on whether the power station will be built or not. Should the power station be built, then a road of a higher standard that can carry heavy vehicles will be constructed. Should the power station not be built, then a standard tar road that can carry passenger vehicles and buses will be built.</p>

Page & Section number in VIA	Section in VIA	Comment (and Response)
Page 100, Section 3.2.13	Heading: Duration – Longterm	<p>It is understood from this statement that the spoil from the excavation of material during construction will be stockpiled for the lifetime of the NPS; i.e. 16 – 60 years. Hence the visual impact of the spoil dumps is for the lifetime of the NPS. At the public meetings held in April 2010, Eskom &amp; the EAPs informed the IAPs that the spoil would be disposed of at sea, so that no spoil dumps would be created, or that if there was stockpiling of spoil, it would be for a short time. Please confirm and clarify in the revision.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> At the time of completion of the VIA report the instruction was to assess the visual impact of the entire volume of spoil and rock on the site or nearby. This is in line with the precautionary principle, in terms of which a worst case scenario (for visual impacts) has been assumed, the impacts of disposal of all the spoil on land was assessed. However, it has been recommended that all fine spoil must be disposed of at sea, in order to minimise the visual impacts and the impact on terrestrial ecosystems.</p>
Page 100 & 101, Section 3.2.13	Heading on pg 100: Probability – Highly Probable; Heading on pg 101: Significance Rating – probability is definite	<p>It is stated that the probability of the spoil dumps causing a visual impact is high (highly probable). I disagree with this. The probability is DEFINITE, as is stated on pg 101, under the heading Significance Rating. Please rectify in the revision.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> This will be done.</p>

Page & Section number in VIA	Section in VIA	Comment (and Response)
Page 102, Section 3.3	Heading: Thyspunt	<p>No mention has been made of the visibility of the proposed NPS from our homes in the Rebels Rus Nature Reserve. We are the closest residents to the NPS and a photo montage has not been included, even after this was specifically requested during the scoping phase of the EIA; and where the EAPs acknowledged that this was a simple and easy request to fulfill and that it would be included in the scope of work for the VIA. Again, at the key stakeholder meetings held during April, this issue was raised, and again the EAPs said that this request would be put forward to be included in the revised VIA. It is acknowledged that the design of the facility is not yet known, however, the heights of the structures area known, so with this information, a simple photo montage can be created. For those Rebels Rus residents with homes facing the proposed NPS, it is imperative that a photo montage be done.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> The photographic simulation has been done.</p>
Page 104, Section 3.5, 1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph	“...and the Wind Farm being built in the same area.”	<p>To my knowledge, this is a proposed wind farm and has not been built or is not “being built”, as indicated in the text of his section of the VIA.</p> <p><b>Response:</b> The reference is to the Scenario that one of the three sites will be developed as a wind farm.</p>
Page 108, Section 3.6	“...if no power station is built on any of the sites, the land will be sold”	<p>Also refer to the 1<sup>st</sup> sentence in the <u>Executive Summary of the VIA</u>. These statements are in total contradiction. The very 1<sup>st</sup> sentence in the executive summary is a very strong statement, which has been the message that Eskom has sent to all, from the beginning of the EIA process; i.e. that each site will ultimately house a nuclear power station (NPS). Then on page 108, it is stated that land will be sold to ‘possible housing developers’ if a NPS is not developed. The wool is being pulled over the readers’ eyes. <u>Which is it – develop a NPS on all 3 sites, ultimately or only on 1 and sell the other 2 to the highest bidder??</u></p>

Page & Section number in VIA	Section in VIA	Comment (and Response)
		<p><b>Response:</b>  The above comment is made without making reference to the paragraph 3.6 The No Go Option and paragraph 3.6.3 page 108 and 109. The full text of the relevant sentence is “ The ‘No Go” option for the Duynefontein, Bantamsklip and Thyspunt NPS sites is considered in the context of the statement from Eskom that if no Nuclear Power Station is to be built on a site, the property or the portion set aside for the purpose will be sold.” The NEMA regulations for EIAs state that the ‘No Go’ option has to be addressed.</p>
Page 109, Section 3.6.3; last sentence in the paragraph	“However, the land will be sold by Eskom”	<p>The land won’t be sold, according to the first sentence of the Executive Summary in this report, which states: “Eskom intends building nuclear power stations on all three sites”.</p> <p><b>Response:</b>  Refer to the response above.</p>