

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
5. SAFETY AND EMERGENCY SITUATIONS		
Mrs Barter Celeste Barker	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Adherence to international norms for: ▪ Safety zone between power station and built environment (when did the 16k law change and why?) 	<p>Eskom will not construct and operate a nuclear power station if it is not safe.</p> <p>In addition, the nuclear safety of, and the risk of a nuclear accident at the proposed power station will be independently assessed by the National Nuclear Regulator. The NNR will only issue a nuclear installation licence for the proposed power station if it is satisfied that the risk of an accident is acceptable low.</p> <p>Although the risk of an accident is very low, the National Nuclear Regulator (NNR) nevertheless requires emergency planning to be undertaken. For the proposed nuclear power station Eskom is considering the latest design of Pressurized Water Reactor (PWR) technology. Internationally, these designs have formal emergency planning zones less than 16 km. The NNR will however determine the emergency plan requirements and the extent of the required zone based on a safety assessment of the design of the proposed nuclear power station and the proposed site and environs</p>
Mr and Mrs Noel & Jean Gedye	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In the event of an accident, however small marine life will be affected. ▪ As will the vegetation, humans and animals within a certain radius even the air will be polluted, has any thought been given to the strength of the prevailing wind - and its direction? 	<p>These matters will be addressed within a suite of specialist studies to be commissioned as part of the impact assessment (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report). Specific attention is drawn to the Air Quality and Marine Specialist Studies (Section 10.6.5 (l) and (k) of the Scoping Report).</p> <p>Eskom will not construct and operate a nuclear power station if it is not safe.</p> <p>In addition, the nuclear safety of, and the risk of a nuclear accident at the proposed power station will be independently assessed by the National Nuclear Regulator. The NNR will only issue a nuclear installation licence for the proposed power station if it is satisfied that the risk of an accident is acceptably low.</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
		<p>Although the risk of an accident is very low, the National Nuclear Regulator (NNR) nevertheless requires emergency planning to be undertaken. The NNR will determine the extent of the emergency plan and of the required zone based on a safety assessment of the design of the proposed nuclear power station and the proposed site and environs</p>
<p>Dr S M Brouckaert</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There has been no response, on the Eskom site or directly, to questions posed in regard to the geographical fault line that runs in the vicinity of the Bantamsklip site. ▪ The earth tremor which was experienced locally and which seriously damaged (destroyed) the house on Groot Hagelkraal, indicates that seismic activity in the region could present a significant risk to the safe operation of a nuclear installation. The consequences could be catastrophic to the immediate area and the entire Western Cape. ▪ Geological surveys have been undertaken. It is of grave concern to the public that these are not readily available for scrutiny and comment. 	<p>The presence and if present, the significance of geological faults will be addressed in a Geological Assessment with mitigation measures being proposed for the construction of the facility (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report), as well as in the site safety studies that are required by the National Nuclear Regulator.</p>
<p>Ryan Donnelly For A Safe Tomorrow F.A.S.T.</p>	<p>WE ARE NOT IN FAVOUR OF THE NUCLEAR PLANT AT THYSPUNT</p> <p>1. TOO MANY PEOPLE TOO CLOSE, VERY HIGH RISK</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Due to the large size of the proposed nuclear plant, Sea Vista, St Francis Bay, Cape St Francis and other areas should be within the first emergency-planning zone. (Without consideration of the prevailing South Westerly winds) The first and most deadly emergency-planning zone should extend 20 km from Thyspunt. ▪ We calculated this using the size of Koeberg (1800MW), its current emergency planning zones and the potential size of the proposed nuclear power station being 8000MW. ▪ Additionally, the National Nuclear Regulator said that the size of the plant will affect the size of the emergency planning zones. 	<p>Thank you for these comments.</p> <p>These issues, where applicable, will be addresses in the impact assessment phase of the EIA.</p> <p>Safety aspects, including safety zones, evacuation plans and the like will be addressed in the impact assessment (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p> <p>Eskom will not construct and operate a nuclear power station if it is not safe.</p> <p>In addition, the nuclear safety of, and the risk of a nuclear accident at the proposed power station will be independently assessed by the National Nuclear Regulator. The NNR will only issue a nuclear installation licence for the proposed power station if it is</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This Nuclear plant poses a potential risk of deaths to the surrounding communities. <p>2. EVACUATION IS NOT POSSIBLE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Due to the direction and strength of the prevailing wind in the area we estimate that in the event of an accidental radioactive fall out there will be approximately 15 minutes to evacuate Sea Vista, St Francis Bay and Cape St Francis. ▪ Jeffrey's bay with an even higher population will have around 30 to 40 minutes to evacuate. ▪ Due to the large population of the area especially in season and the fact there will be an impossibly short amount of time to evacuate, it is our opinion that this evacuation procedure is not at all possible. ▪ Additionally most Sea Vista residents and larger townships in Aston bay and Humansdorp do not have transport. <p>3. LARGER POPULATION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The population in the area has grown substantially over the years. ▪ The number of holidaymakers in the area has increased substantially. <p>4. LOCAL HOUSES AND TOWNSHIP SHACKS ARE NOT AIR TIGHT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Local houses consist of many thatch roof 's. Sea Vista has seen a major problem in the area with squatters continually infiltrating due to the thriving fishing and tourism industry in the area. ▪ A thatch roof house and a squatter's house are not airtight at all. ▪ In the event of a radio active fall out these people will not be able to escape the contaminated air by shutting their windows and staying indoors. ▪ Building a nuclear power station at this site will in our view be of a high-risk nature. 	<p>satisfied that the risk of an accident is acceptable low.</p> <p>Although the risk of an accident is very low, the National Nuclear Regulator (NNR) nevertheless requires emergency planning to be undertaken. For the proposed nuclear power station Eskom is considering the latest design of Pressurized Water Reactor (PWR) technology. Internationally, these designs have formal emergency planning zones less than 16 km. The NNR will however determine the emergency plan requirements and the extent of the required zone based on a safety assessment of the design of the proposed nuclear power station and the proposed site and environs</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>5. HIGH FINANCIAL BURDEN OF A RADIOACTIVE FALLOUT FROM THYSPUNT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ If this area was to experience a radioactive fall out, homes, businesses, agriculture etc will be permanently lost. ▪ People who are still alive after such an incident will suffer health problems for the rest of their lives and ultimately not be able to live for very long. ▪ Eskom and Municipality will be responsible for the different zones and because of that they will be financially responsible for the repercussions thereof. ▪ The St Francis bay and Jeffrey's bay infrastructure is large and directly down wind of Thyspunt. ▪ There is an emphasis on tourism, fishing, agriculture, dairy and surfing industry. The surrounding areas include the largest dairy industry in South Africa and the Mpofu dam just 10 km away, which supplies PE and the surrounding areas with water. ▪ Municipality has a tight budget in this area and they will not be able to manage the responsibility of resettling large communities and compensating them for health, job, property and business related losses. ▪ We believe that the potential financial repercussions of radioactive fallout in the area surrounding Thyspunt will be extraordinarily high. <p>6. RESPONSIBILITY WITH REGARDS TO CHILDREN</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There are many schools in the St Francis bay, Jeffrey's Bay and Humansdorp areas. ▪ A Nuclear power station at Thyspunt is in close proximity to many schools. ▪ A high responsibility risk for children exists for the proposed Nuclear power station at Thyspunt. ▪ It is well known that children suffer the most from exposure to radiation. <p>We are not in favour of a Nuclear plant at Thyspunt because of the potentially dangerous risk it poses on the well being of the surrounding communities children.</p>	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>This submission is presented by the chair of For A Safe Tomorrow F.A.S.T. on behalf of its members of which there are presently 133.</p>	
Mrs Dale Fletcher	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The risks of running a nuclear station are unacceptably high and that alternative energy sources are a viable way to solve our energy needs. South Africa's lack of technical expertise means that lower tech options are safer and more cost effective. Should there ever be a fall-out, Cape St. Francis is downwind of this area. 	<p>Thank you for these comments.</p> <p>These issues, where applicable, will be addresses in the impact assessment phase of the EIA.</p> <p>Safety aspects, including safety zones, evacuation plans and the like will be addressed in the impact assessment (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p> <p>Eskom will not construct and operate a nuclear power station if it is not safe.</p> <p>In addition, the nuclear safety of, and the risk of a nuclear accident at the proposed power station will be independently assessed by the National Nuclear Regulator. The NNR will only issue a nuclear installation licence for the proposed power station if it is satisfied that the risk of an accident is acceptable low.</p>
Mr Terence Edward Griffiths	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Validity of house owners / holders insurance policies – whose responsibility. ▪ Ability of inhabitants of less privileged to evacuate. ▪ Limited access routes for evacuation. 	
Mrs Rita Griffiths	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What emergency zone planning for Thyspunt? ▪ If our only escape route is the H'dorp road via Kromme Bridge – impossible to evacuate population. ▪ Population to be resettled – who provides finance for this? ▪ If the Greater St Francis area is evacuated, what financial effect would this have on the Kouga area? 	
Mr Clive Horlock	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Environmental Impact – During establishment, during normal operation and as a result of possible radiation leaks. ▪ Capacity of personnel in 3rd World Country to manage nuclear energy. ▪ Evacuation procedures of possibly 40 000 people along 1 exit. ▪ All inhabitants need to be educated on the pro's and con's (including worst case scenarios) of nuclear energy so that they are able to make informed and meaningful decisions. 	<p>Although the risk of an accident is very low, the National Nuclear Regulator (NNR) nevertheless requires emergency planning to be undertaken. For the proposed nuclear power station Eskom is considering the latest design of Pressurized Water Reactor (PWR) technology. Internationally, these designs have formal emergency planning zones less than 16 km. The NNR will however determine the emergency plan requirements and the extent of the required zone based on a safety assessment of the design of the proposed nuclear power station and the proposed site and environs</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Elise Krog	<p>Emergency evacuation plans and medical assistance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Considering the fact the radioactive waste can travel up to 1000 km's in the wind I guess that this is a mute point as the whole of South Africa would have to be evacuated should there be an accident and this for me is enough of a reason to can the whole process but there needs to be an evacuation plan in a minimum of a 100km radius in each city/community where a reactor is to be cited. This information must be available to all citizens literate or not in clearly marked signage posted at central points in the city or town so that everyone understands the evacuation plans. ▪ All the medical centres in the town must have an adequate supply of iodine (needs to be replaced regularly as it has a sell by date) and other necessary supplies. The costs of this would have to be adequately budged for by Eskom. ▪ Visitors to effected cities need to be informed through adequate signage of evacuation procedures and location of medical centres. 	<p>The National Nuclear Regulator Act of 1999 and associated regulations make provision for 3rd party liability and compensation in the event of nuclear damage. The NNR Act and the relevant regulation can be downloaded from the NNR website www.nnr.co.za</p>
Mrs Carol Patricia Lambert	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The risk created by building a nuclear facility within 10km of the Mpofu Dam which is the major source of portable water for Port Elizabeth and all towns between Kouga and PE along the coast. ▪ In the event of failure of radiation containment and resultant release to the atmosphere, with prevailing south westerly winds blowing, it would be impossible to evacuate the area in time. 	
Mr Robin Moulang I.A.P. FAST	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is it safe and fair for population and environment? ▪ Is it possible to evacuate the amount of people that will be here during holiday times in the events of a mistake or accident? 	
Mr & Mrs Peter and Annette Naude Speddick Industrial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Does SA have the technical expertise to build and run a safe reactor of this magnitude? ▪ If there is ever a fall-out, Cape St Francis is downwind of this area. 	
Mrs Frieda Riggard Seal Point Estates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Safety and security. 	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Mr Jan Riggard Rocley Coast Farm (PTY)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Nuclear fall out. 	
Mr Hans J Schollenberger Santam Limited	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The issue of safe containment of spent fuel on site (\pm 40-80 years). ▪ The issue of aiming for the lowest human density in the vicinity of the proposed site for such a plant. ▪ The risk of accumulation of two nuclear plants located in close proximity to each other w.r.t to accidents, earthquakes etc. See Japanese reactor incident after earthquake. 	
Dr TN and Mrs TL Skinstad	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Who wishes to live in the vicinity of nuclear power station with all the attendant risks of potential leakages? Chernobyl is a case in point. The recent malfunctions at Koeberg due to technician's errors do not instill any confidence. We do not have enough qualified engineers South Africa for the safe building and maintenance of projects like this. 	
Prof Nancy Van Schaik Kogelberg Branch, Botanical Soc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Safety aspects to allay fears of uniformed laymen. 	
Mr Peter Wells	<p>I am going to begin by saying this. During the power outages in 2006 it became very obvious that power has more than one meaning.</p> <p>If you build 5 or 6 nuclear power stations and supplied power to Africa for free for say 5 years their infrastructure or ability to generate power would collapse. Then in the 6th year our political masters said to our neighbours " we want you to do this" and our neighbours refused. Well with the click of a button they would descend into chaos. After a 5-day silence I am convinced they would be more amenable to your demands. Hence POWER has a very different meaning.</p> <p>In Australia the Government and mining lobby wanted to mine uranium at Coronation Hill. The Aboriginal custodians of Coronation Hill said that Bulla lived there and if you disturbed him he would rise up and kill you. Uranium is a very powerful genie.</p>	<p>Your comments are noted.</p> <p>These issues, where applicable, will be addressed in the impact assessment phase of the EIA.</p> <p>Note that this EIA is for a proposed nuclear power station and associated infrastructure, on one of 5 alternative sites that are being investigated.</p> <p>An EIA has a defined scope of work, associated with a particular project. An EIA cannot address issues outside this scope (and, indeed, I&APs cannot shed all their dissatisfactions on one single EIA).</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>I am led to believe that by International standards South Africa has very cheap electricity. How do we compare?</p> <p>I have asked some of these question bellow in a public forum but wasn't really satisfied with the answers. So please indulge me.</p> <p>I doubt all the bellow will be comfortable to answer but they will inform the final decision. Mistakes with Nuclear Power will not be all that comfortable either.</p> <p>ESKOM's Responsibility. You have the monopoly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ That bolt. How did it get into the reactor? If you aren't sure Zapiro's cartoon not bad inspiration. ▪ Minister Irwin's public statement suggested sabotage. What was the full story behind this? ▪ Why did ESKOM never take responsibility for this? ▪ After the power outages how much did the price of electricity increase and why? If not was there an extra surcharge attached to everybody electricity bill? ▪ Why were business not compensated for the losses when the CEO got a R 14 million bonus? ▪ ESKOM made substantial profits in 2006. What were they? ▪ What was the cost of the outages to the South African economy? ▪ Was the CEO 's bonus calculated because cash was saved by not doing standard upgrades? ▪ What was the cost of the refurbishment of CEO Gcabashe's Cape Town Office? How big was the floor space? How often did he use this office? ▪ How can we trust ESKOM to run 6 reactors when their track record suggests one is a problem? ▪ What percentage of Koeberg staff left/were retrenched due to affirmative action? ▪ Does Koeberg have an emergency evacuation plan? If so what is it? When was an emergency drill implemented? ▪ How do you plan to evacuate Cape Town and where will 	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>everybody go?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Are developers building within the 5 klm exclusion zone? ▪ Did the emergency outflow pipes get clogged by jellyfish? And when? ▪ Why is ESKOM suddenly rushing ahead with plans? ▪ Why was this planning not done years ago? <p>Safety of Nuclear Energy If handled correctly Nuclear energy can be an excellent source of energy. Questions remain</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What is the shelf life of "used" uranium? ▪ How and where will it be stored? ▪ How will it be transported? ▪ What is the cost of mining, transporting, processing and storing that uranium? That process has an enormous carbon footprint. Please quantify? ▪ Will it take more energy to send used uranium into space and posted off to burn out in the sun than the uranium produced down here on earth? ▪ What is the carbon footprint of storing nuclear waste? 	
Mrs Anna Andrews	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Carries risk of catastrophic Nuclear Power accident. ▪ No sufficient emergency plan. ▪ More that 10 000 people in and around surrounding areas. ▪ Prevailing winds a huge factor. ▪ Contamination of our seas and dams will effect the whole Cacadu area as well as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ P.E, Jeffreys Bay, Humansdorp. ○ 30% of milk production in our area. 	<p>Thank you for these comments.</p> <p>These issues, where applicable, will be discussed in the impact assessment phase of the EIA.</p> <p>Safety aspects will be addressed in the impact assessment phase of the EIA (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p>
Mr Byran Andrews	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Emergency planning zone inadequate ▪ Risk of catastrophic nuclear disasters. ▪ Prevailing winds major factor. 	<p>Eskom will not construct and operate a nuclear power station if it is not safe.</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Mr Roald Hubert Besselaar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To what extent a successful nuclear power station, operating normally without breaking down, will expose people in Oyster Bay to radiation or other harmful emissions. ▪ In the event of a temporary or permanent failure of the whole or a part of a nuclear power station, whether the radiation or other harmful emission are of such a nature as are able (on the assumption that sufficient quantities are emitted) to cause illness or death of people or animals in the Oyster Bay area. 	<p>In addition, the nuclear safety of, and the risk of a nuclear accident at the proposed power station will be independently assessed by the National Nuclear Regulator. The NNR will only issue a nuclear installation licence for the proposed power station if it is satisfied that the risk of an accident is acceptable low.</p> <p>Experience gained internationally is that people do not become ill or die from living in close proximity to a nuclear power station.</p>
Mr Christian Philip Bornman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Safety and health risks to surrounding area – long term. 	<p>Taking Koeberg as an example</p>
Mr Nick Bornman Oysterbay Beach Lodge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Security and safety is top priority. 	<p>Koeberg has operated for the past 23 years within very close proximity of wheat, cattle and diary farms. The nearest farms are within 10 km of Koeberg</p>
Mr Derek Vivian Cook Macohey Investments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Procedure for evacuation 	<p>Everybody is exposed to natural background radiation everyday from, for example, the earth itself, the materials from which buildings are constructed, the sun, and on a less regular basis from medical exposures (X-rays).</p>
Lianda Beyers Cronje Bantamsklip Anti-Nuclear Group (BANG)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Medium and low-level waste will need to be transported on our roads daily or weekly, presenting another danger in case of accidents. Is there a solution to that potential problem? ▪ What evacuation plan, if any, is in the pipeline in case of a catastrophe? What insurance does Eskom have in the event of people having to evacuate their homes, leaving their possessions and not being able to safely return for a long period? Apparently farms in New England are only now being able to sell their sheep again some 20 years after Chernobyl due to radioactivity in the meat. Apparently mushrooms in the forests of southern Germany are still radioactive? 	<p>The quantity of radiation exposure and what is absorbed by the body is measured in microSieverts (μSv) per annum. The National Nuclear Regulator (NNR) sets the limit of exposure arising from operations at nuclear installations. Hence the limit for Koeberg is set at 250 μSv per annum, far below the exposure from natural background radiation (which is about 2500 – 3000 μSv per annum), and less than the international standard of 1000 μSv per annum. The Koeberg Nuclear Power Station has been in operation for over 23 years - the public exposure to radiation as a result of Koeberg's operations has been less than 20 μSv per annum in general and less than 6 μSv per annum in 2005/6 – reference NNR Annual Report 2005/6 tabled in Parliament – available off the NNR website</p>
Mr Piet-Nel De Vos	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Safety due to construction. 	
Mr Louis De Wet Pearly Beach Cons. Society	<p>Safety impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Earlier it was said that the site is 10 kilometers from Pearly Beach. A recent newspaper report indicates the site to be 5.5 km away. It is assumed that the 10 km. is by road and the shorter distance a.t.c.f. ▪ The direct distance from Buffeljachts may be even shorter. ▪ How will the safety of these communities and farming communities in the immediate vicinity be protected? 	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Mr Mario Dieckow	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Emergency planning zone inadequate. ▪ Risk of catastrophic nuclear accidents. ▪ Contamination of the Mpopu Dam and catchment area which is major source of potable water to Cacadu District, Port Elizabeth, Uitenhage, Francis Bay and Humansdorp. 	<p>Parliament – available off the NNR website www.nnr.co.za), far below the limit set by the NNR.</p> <p>Samples of fish, meat, vegetables, milk water, etc are regularly collected from the area around Koeberg and analysed to determine any possible effects on the food chain. Samples are also sent overseas for independent analysis and proof that Eskom is operating within the required limits.</p>
Mrs Jacoba Johanna du Preez	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Long term risks to the surrounding communities. 	
Mr N L Hulett Leighton Hulett (PTY) LTD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The potential for nuclear contamination of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Impofu Dam and catchment area ○ Important Dairy Industry ○ Fishing Industry ▪ Potential of negative impact of a nuclear accident on the tourist trade. ▪ Viability of Thyspunt in terms of population within a 16km radius exceeding norms. ▪ Involve local environmental organizations. 	<p>Although the risk of an accident is very low, the National Nuclear Regulator (NNR) nevertheless requires emergency planning to be undertaken. For the proposed nuclear power station Eskom is considering the latest design of Pressurized Water Reactor (PWR) technology. Internationally, these designs have formal emergency planning zones less than 16 km. The NNR will however determine the emergency plan requirements and the extent of the required zone based on a safety assessment of the design of the proposed nuclear power station and the proposed site and environs</p>
Mrs Martha – Maria Hutchinson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Population density - what is a safe radius and what population density is allowed? 	
Mr John Carlide Leach Environmental Impact Interest Group	<p>In the event of a disastrous and catastrophic failure of radiation containment a management plan and intervention process needs to be in place to address the following areas which are of a major concern to me:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The contamination and distraction of the major source of water. ▪ The timeous evacuation of St. Francis Bay and its surrounds especially in the face of predominant south westerly. ▪ The lack of a disaster management plan. 	<p>Comments related to the National Nuclear Regulator have been noted and forwarded to the NNR</p>
Ms Christelle Le Roux	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Carries risk of catastrophic nuclear accidents. ▪ More than 10 000 people located in and around area of Thyspunt. 	
Mrs and Mr Helen / Lars Manson-Kullin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evacuation plan for surrounding area. 	
Dr Francois Maritz	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The dangers of a nuclear power station on the personnel component of Eskom 	
James (Jim) Michael Pattison	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The <u>evacuation logistics</u> should a catastrophic failure occur at Thyspunt during peak tourism season. 	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Mr Arthur James Perold	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In order to satisfy the residents of Melkbosstrand and other effected areas it will be absolutely necessary for Eskom to demonstrate its ability to handle effectively any situation which may arise as a result of a nuclear accident. This is apparently not the case at present. ▪ The occasional sounding of the evacuation sirens, and vocal announcements over the public address system are far from adequate action to be taken in the event of an accident. (I have previously called Eskom during a test to report that the announcements are inaudible in Old Melkbos within the 16 km zone, due to the wind noise blowing at the time) but nothing is done about it, and no one has contacted me in connection with my report. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The safety of the residents must be prioritised. 2. The credibility of the responsible Politicians, Management and Officials at the station have been severely tarnished, by conflicting and sometimes untrue statements having been made. Eskom must be honest and not attempt to “cover-up” incidents. 3. According to information derived from many Safety Forums meetings, it does appear that Eskom is not responsible for the safety or evacuation of residents in the event of an accident. We are told that this responsibility falls on the shoulders of the City Council Disaster Management Dpt. After many meeting and questions this Dpt has still to demonstrate its ability to handle a mass evacuation of the village successfully. ▪ We are told by their representative that they evacuated a school in one of the suburbs -this is a far cry from evacuating a village like Melkboss particularly if a worst scenario case is faced e.g. a special event day when every possible parking space has been taken up by spectators and competitors vehicles. Exiting these people who are mainly strangers to the area, in an orderly fashion, would be a nightmare, which has not been taken into consideration. ▪ In addition to that, we are faced with an extremely rapid population growth as well as poorly controlled Development. 	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Building development. Blocks of flats are being allowed on ground, which was previously zoned for commercial use. It is doubtful as to whether the authorities have any idea at all as to the number of additional residents who have moved into Melkbosstrand over the last ten years. In this regard it is of utmost importance that an independent body be appointed to conduct an immediate census in this regard. Of prime importance in planning a successful evacuation is the knowledge relevant to the population density as well as such factors as the number of motor vehicles, children at schools, old folk, both in private homes as well as in retirement homes, and how many of those people have no access to their own transport. ▪ It is to be borne in mind that Melkbosstrand suffers a somewhat unique situation in regard to transport. The public transport system is extremely poor and this results in most homes running two or more vehicles per family. ▪ The Disaster Management headquarters is in Cape Town, which is approximately 30km from Melkbosstrand. This fact would seriously impinge on the reaction time necessary. At an Eskom safety forums held in August 2005 a motion was carried that a nominated forum member present would attend the City Council Disaster Management meetings in order to provide feedback to the Forum where relevant. The representative from Council who was present agreed and undertook to notify the nominated person accordingly. There has been no communication regarding this matter from the Disaster Management, to date – June 2007. A few vague reasons have subsequently been given for the omission, however no invitation has been forthcoming. ▪ Shortcomings of this nature damage the credibility of the officials responsible for Disaster Management who are supposed to be responsible for our safety. 	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>Exit Roads</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Melkbos proper has only three roads leading out of the village these are 6th Ave, and 11th Ave, which both run into Otto Du Plessis Drive and then of course Otto Dup which is required to carry all the traffic exiting and entering from the Van Riebeek Strand and Koeberg areas. This is where the major congestion of traffic will occur because traffic coming from the Golf estate, Big Bay and Blauwbergstrand direction will create a situation where it will be impossible for the Melkboss traffic to enter Otto Dup. Drive. Apart from that it will make it impossible for emergency and rescue vehicles to enter the village. ▪ The officials of Disaster Management claim that they have the situation under control and that at a moments notice they are able to bring dozens of busses in to evacuate the elderly and school children. (Quote – by a Disaster Management Official at one of the recently held Eskom Safety Forum meetings). ▪ It would be highly irresponsible for consideration to be given to the expansion of the existing unit, or for that matter, allowing any tests or experiments of the much talked about P.B.R. unit, until such time that the safety of the residents of the village and surrounding areas have been adequately demonstrated. Much more will have to be done to ensure the safety of the residents and visitors, not only in Melkboss but also of those residing in Atlantis and exposure area as far as the CITY. ▪ The direction and intensity of the wind velocity will determine the area which will have to be evacuated and also the timeframe in which such action will be vital. ▪ Although no officials has admitted it, the so called 16 km zone will not be a cart blanche distance, but will definitely be determined by the velocity of the wind blowing at the time of the accident. It stands to reason that a very strong wind will carry a plume so much further and so much faster. This could result in a 16km area becoming a 32km zone. 	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>National Nuclear Regulator</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The N.N.R. must be given far more authority to curb or control building activities than they have at present. They should also be made responsible for issuing instructions and for the monitoring of such issues as may affect the safety of the Public. Their efforts would be reinforced if the international Nuclear Inspectorate could carry out an annual inspection of all the various safety aspects related to the possibility of a nuclear accident. We really need the expertise of those who have been exposed to investigating nuclear accidents in other parts of the Globe. 	
Ms Penny Plougmann	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Catastrophic Nuclear Accidents. ▪ No sufficient emergency plan. 	
Miss Catherine Regenass	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Safety - contamination at our main water supply is in too close proximity of proposed site. ▪ Evacuation - We only have 1 (one) entrance via Krom River for St. Francis Bay, Cape St. Francis and Sea Vista. 	
Ingela Richardson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The credibility of the regulators - specifically the NNR is not highly regarded, as it has not responded to public emergencies in the Vaal triangle where contaminated water was discovered by a Water Research Commission report. This is a huge concern for all South Africans. 	
Mr and Mrs Diana Catherine / Louis Richard Serrurier	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Risk of nuclear facility within 10km of Impofu Dam major source of possible water for Western section of Eastern Cape. ▪ Human evacuation difficulty. 	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Ms Maya Aberman	<p>The following constitute the comments of Earthlife Africa Cape Town to the Background Document for the Eskom Nuclear Power Station and Associated Infrastructure and the Comment Sheet 1: Scoping Phase.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Nuclear energy puts human and environmental health at risk during regular operations of uranium mines, fuel beneficiation and processing as well as energy generation. Nuclear energy has also been proven to carry the grave risk of accidental explosions resulting in the release of large quantities of radiation causing grave illness and death in tens of thousands of people. ▪ There is no such thing as a safe dose of radiation. There is a growing body of evidence suggesting that low doses may actually be more dangerous, as they may mutate cells more easily than high doses, which can kill the cells. Uranium mining is responsible for the greatest proportion of the health-related damages of the nuclear power industry. There is no debate as to whether radiation kills, maims, causes mutations, is cumulative, causes leukaemia, cancers, respiratory illnesses and attacks the immune system (with children, pregnant women and the elderly most vulnerable) because we already know it does.¹ The only disagreement is about what is legally considered an allowable dose. ▪ Nuclear power remains particularly dangerous and difficult to control, as 1999's accident at Tokaimura, Japan, once again illustrated.² At least 9 million people have been affected by the Chernobyl disaster, 2.5 million in Belarus, 3 million in Russia and 3.5 million in the Ukraine [where the Minister of Health attributes 10 000 premature deaths]. In total over 160 000 km² of land is contaminated in the three republics. 	<p>For all operation of its present and future nuclear plants Eskom is committed to operate under the standards set down by the National Nuclear Regulator (NNR) and in line with the international standards laid down by IAEA,</p> <p>The world's longest established nuclear power programme is that of the UK, and the UK Committee on Medical Aspects of Radiation in the Environment (COMARE) in their 11th report (2006) on "The distribution of childhood leukaemia and other childhood cancers in Great Britain 1969–1993." stated in section 5.3 that "We can, therefore, say quite categorically that there is no evidence from this very large study that living within 25 km of a nuclear generating site within Britain is associated with an increased risk of childhood cancer." This study analysed all the childhood cancer deaths in UK over a 25 year period, and is the largest study of its type done to date.</p> <p>Everybody is exposed to natural background radiation everyday from, for example, the earth itself, the materials from which buildings are constructed, the sun, and on a less regular basis from medical exposures (X-rays). Due to the fact that radioactivity decreases with time, and that radioactivity is a natural phenomenon, life itself has evolved over time continuously exposed to much higher background levels of natural radioactivity and its associated radiation.</p> <p>Eskom will not construct and operate a nuclear power station if it is not safe.</p>
Mr and Mrs Valda R & Christopher Barratt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Effects of the nuclear disaster on the local population, which has substantially increased over the years. ▪ Lack of evacuation routes in event of disaster. 	<p>In addition, the nuclear safety of, and the risk of a nuclear accident at the proposed power station will be independently assessed by the National Nuclear Regulator. The NNR will only issue a nuclear installation</p>

¹ Bertell, Rosalie. "Health and Safety Implications of Nuclear Development: The International Experience", in The Nuclear Debate: Proceeding of the Conference on Nuclear Policy for a Democratic South Africa (1994)

² Special Briefing, Nuclear Power and Climate Change, Friends of the Earth International, November 2000 and Schneider, M, Climate Change and Nuclear Power Commissioned by WWF - World Wide Fund for Nature - April 2000

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Mr Franklin JB Barratt Global Aviation Consultants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protection from contamination in event of “fall out” – water supply, people and property, farms. 	<p>licence for the proposed power station if it is satisfied that the risk of an accident is acceptable low.</p>
Mr Henk Bloem	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comprehensive plan in the event of a nuclear accident-taking place, with cognisance of the December holidays. A Trust fund large enough to afford any eventuality. 	<p>Although the risk of an accident is very low, the National Nuclear Regulator (NNR) nevertheless requires emergency planning to be undertaken. For the proposed nuclear power station Eskom is considering the latest design of Pressurized Water Reactor (PWR) technology. Internationally, these designs have formal emergency planning zones less than 16 km. The NNR will however determine the emergency plan requirements and the extent of the required zone based on a safety assessment of the design of the proposed nuclear power station and the proposed site and environs</p>
Mr Eric Cook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> That the power station be situated out of the radius effecting St. Francis Bay, Cape St. Francis, Oyster Bay and Humansdorp. The threat to lives in these areas is too great. To imagine that total evacuation of these areas in the case of an emergency is laughable. Eskom and the local authorities are incapable of this level of control. Unless foolproof safety measures can be guaranteed the project should only be considered in a location not affecting the safety to lives. 	<p>The National Nuclear Regulator Act of 1999 and associated regulations make provision for 3rd party liability and compensation in the event of nuclear damage. The NNR Act and the relevant regulation can be downloaded from the NNR website www.nnr.co.za</p>
Mr Johann Crafford Melkbosstrand Ratepayers Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Emergency evacuation plans (currently completely ineffective). 	<p>Taking Koeberg as an example Koeberg has operated for the past 23 years within very close proximity of wheat, cattle and diary farms. The nearest farms are within 10 km of Koeberg</p>
Monika + Helmut Cremer	<p>Objection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is only one arterial road in SFB. This makes it impossible to evacuate all the people in case of a nuclear accident (too many people to less transportation). The time needed for evacuate is too long. Especially the people from Sea Vista have no sufficient transportation. The area around SFB has regularly very strong wind, which can transport radioactive elements with high speed very far. In the case of emergency this could result in a lasting contamination of the Mpofu-Dam. The Mpofu-Dam belongs to the central water supply of the Cacadu district and Port Elizabeth. 	<p>The quantity of radiation exposure and what is absorbed by the body is measured in microSieverts (µSv) per annum. The National Nuclear Regulator (NNR) sets the limit of exposure arising from operations at nuclear installations. Hence the limit for Koeberg is set at 250 µSv per annum. far below the exposure from natural</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Mr R Dahlhaeuser	<p>New Questions to Eskom:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ At this stage nobody of Eskom is able to present any safety conceptions. Therefore I would like to know the existing safety plans for the workers of the Koeberg Nuclear Plant and the safety and emergency plans aimed to protect the citizen living around the Koeberg Nuclear Plant? ▪ We would also like to know how Eskom is measuring the various kinds of radiation within the plant and the storage facilities? Eskom should specify the various measuring methods. ▪ We would like to know the current level of radon gas within the 5 km zone of the Koeberg plant and the radon gas level and levels of radiation within the buildings of the interims storage? ▪ We should know the current level of radon gas and radiation around the Thyspunt site, at Cape St. Francis, St. Francis Bay, at Humansdorp, at Jeffreys Bay? ▪ We would like to get specified which hardware at the Koeberg Nuclear Plant and which liquids are classified as: Low level, intermediate level and high-level waste? ▪ We would like to know which impacts the emissions discharged via the reactor stacks could have on human health, environment, grass, plants and trees? 	<p>µSv per annum, far below the exposure from natural background radiation (which is about 2500 – 3000 µSv per annum), and less than the international standard of 1000 µSv per annum. The Koeberg Nuclear Power Station has been in operation for over 23 years - the public exposure to radiation as a result of Koeberg's operations has been less than 20 µSv per annum in general and less than 6 µSv per annum in 2005/6 – reference NNR Annual Report 2005/6 tabled in Parliament – available off the NNR website www.nnr.co.za), far below the limit set by the NNR.</p> <p>Samples of fish, meat, vegetables, milk water, etc are regularly collected from the area around Koeberg and analysed to determine any possible effects on the food chain. Samples are also sent overseas for independent analysis and proof that Eskom is operating within the required limits.</p>
Dr Johannes Hendrik Ellis AP Church	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Safety of residents. 	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Heike and Wolfgang Engel Angels' SA	Objection: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There is only one arterial road in SFB. This makes it impossible to evacuate all the people in case of a nuclear accident (too many people to less transportation). The time needed for evacuate is too long. Especially the people from Sea Vista have no sufficient transportation. ▪ The area around SFB has regularly very strong wind, which can transport radioactive elements with high speed very far. In the case of emergency this could result in a lasting contamination of the Mpofu-Dam. The Mpofu-Dam belongs to the central water supply of the Cacadu district and Port Elizabeth. 	
Mr Eric Garth Freemantle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Advise people of the dangers especially as this will close a nature walk from Cape St. Francis to Oyster Bay. 	
Ms Kali Griffin Wolvengat Farmer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What about geological fault at site? 	The presence and if present, the significance of geological faults will be addressed in a Geological Assessment with mitigation measures being proposed for the construction of the facility (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report), as well as in the site safety studies that are required by the National Nuclear Regulator.
Mr Mark Ian Jacobson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I own property in Rebels Rus less than 3km from the proposed site – a pristine reserve. What are exit strategies? 	Although the risk of an accident is very low, the National Nuclear Regulator (NNR) nevertheless requires emergency planning to be undertaken. For the proposed nuclear power station Eskom is considering the latest design of Pressurized Water Reactor (PWR) technology. Internationally, these designs have formal emergency planning zones less than 16 km. The NNR will however determine the emergency plan requirements and the extent of the required zone based on a safety assessment of the design of the proposed nuclear power station and the proposed site and environs For proposed nuclear power station, Eskom will follow the same practices for the management of radioactive
Mr and Mrs Lukas & Rhode Janse van Rensburg	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evacuation procedures and limits. ▪ High and low level radioactive material / waste / handling / storage / localities and time duration. 	
Mr Leslie Lawson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Nearness/Proximity to existing residents. ▪ Disaster Management Processes. 	
Mrs Samantha Sara Lindsay St. Francis College (School)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evacuation procedures/disaster containment – municipality. 	
Mrs Ryszard Vanessa Losoale - Strzelecki Sandal Guesthouse	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Wind – direction, strength / possible accident. ▪ Communication ways of evacuations. 	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
<p>Mrs Sharon Mare The Beach House</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Future accidents and their results. ▪ High likelihood of safety regulations being ignored. 	<p>waste as used at Koeberg, under the regulatory control of the National Nuclear Regulator and subject to the requirements of the National Radioactive Waste Management Policy and Strategy and any associated legislation or regulations</p> <p>Using Koeberg (1800 MW net output) as an example:</p> <p>Low-level radioactive waste consists of day-to-day refuse such as paper, gloves, plastic containers, disposable overalls, overshoes etc, which have low traces of radioactive contamination. It is compacted into metal drums (200 litre drums). These drums are transported by road to Vaalputs, the National Radioactive Waste Disposal site in the Northern Cape for near surface disposal. Vaalputs is managed by Necsa on behalf of the State, in terms of a licence issued by the National Nuclear Regular. The level of radioactive in the metal drums decreases with time; after approximately 30 years, the level of radioactivity is equivalent to natural background levels.</p> <p>Intermediate level waste consists of radioactive resins and sludges, spent filter cartridges and scrap pieces from maintenance work. Intermediate-level waste is solidified by combining it into a sand/cement mix, which is poured into concrete containers, which are transported to Vaalputs for near surface disposal. The level of radioactive in the concrete containers decreases with time; after approximately 300-400 years, the level of radioactivity is equivalent to natural background levels.</p> <p>Spent fuel or high-level radioactive waste: The spent fuel is retained at Koeberg in spent fuel storage facilities (pools and casks) licensed by the National Nuclear Regulator. The pools and casks have sufficient capacity for the 40-year design life of Koeberg.</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Mr Martin A Saaymans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Emergency infrastructure in the community. 	<p>The SA Cabinet approved a National Radioactive Management Policy and Strategy in 2005. The Department of Minerals and Energy (DME) is currently drafting legislation to implement the Policy. Two options for the long term management of spent fuel are possible:</p>
Dr Jaan J Taljaard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How the installation will affect the safety of the area. 	<p>(a) direct final disposal of the spent fuel in a deep underground geological disposal facility, or (b) reprocessing of the spent fuel to extract unused uranium and plutonium for re-use and concentration and disposal of the residual (about 3-4% of the spent fuel) high level waste in a deep underground geological disposal facility. Both options are being pursued internationally.</p>
Mr Richardt van Rensburg	<p>Impact of Nuclear Power Station on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Health due to radiation/spillage 	<p>The radioactivity of some of the materials in high-level radioactive waste decreases back to natural levels within relatively short periods of time. Other materials however remain radioactive for several thousands of years. Hence the need to dispose of high-level radioactive waste in deep geological disposal facilities where it is isolated from the environment.</p>
Dr and Mrs Hans & Liesbeth Verstrate Oyster Bay Lodge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Safety/presence of radiation during operation etc. ▪ Possibilities of evacuation in the event of accident 	<p>Eskom will not construct and operate a nuclear power station if it is not safe.</p>
Mrs Julie Verfeld	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The threat to lives in an emergency, evacuation is too great Eskom and the local authorities are incapable of ensuring a timeous total evacuation. ▪ The project should only be considered in a location that does not affect the safety of lives unless foolproof safety measures can be guaranteed. 	<p>In addition, the nuclear safety of, and the risk of a nuclear accident at the proposed power station will be independently assessed by the National Nuclear Regulator. The NNR will only issue a nuclear installation licence for the proposed power station if it is satisfied that the risk of an accident is acceptable low.</p> <p>Although the risk of an accident is very low, the National Nuclear Regulator (NNR) nevertheless requires emergency planning to be undertaken. For the proposed nuclear power station Eskom is considering</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
<p>Mrs Esme N Welman Lew Geffen Sothebys Int Realty</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Safety to the Dams (water for the town) ▪ Clearer information made to the public on what would happen in an emergency evacuation. 	<p>the latest design of Pressurized Water Reactor (PWR) technology. Internationally, these designs have formal emergency planning zones less than 16 km. The NNR will however determine the emergency plan requirements and the extent of the required zone based on a safety assessment of the design of the proposed nuclear power station and the proposed site and environs</p> <p>Everybody is exposed to natural background radiation everyday from, for example, the earth itself, the materials from which buildings are constructed, the sun, and on a less regular basis from medical exposures (X-rays). Due to the fact that radioactivity decreases with time, and that radioactivity is a natural phenomenon, life itself has evolved over time continuously exposed too much higher background levels of natural radioactivity and its associated radiation.</p> <p>Taking Koeberg as an example Koeberg has operated for the past 23 years within very close proximity of wheat, cattle and diary farms. The nearest farms are within 10 km of Koeberg</p> <p>The quantity of radiation exposure and what is absorbed by the body is measured in microSieverts (μSv) per annum. The National Nuclear Regulator (NNR) sets the limit of exposure arising from operations at nuclear installations. Hence the limit for Koeberg is set at 250 μSv per annum, far below the exposure from natural background radiation (which is about 2500 – 3000 μSv per annum). and less than the international standard of</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
		<p>per annum), and less than the international standard of 1000 μSv per annum. The Koeberg Nuclear Power Station has been in operation for over 23 years - the public exposure to radiation as a result of Koeberg's operations has been less than 20 μSv per annum in general and less than 6 μSv per annum in 2005/6 – reference NNR Annual Report 2005/6 tabled in Parliament – available off the NNR website www.nnr.co.za), far below the limit set by the NNR.</p> <p>Samples of fish, meat, vegetables, milk water, etc are regularly collected from the area around Koeberg and analysed to determine any possible effects on the food chain. Samples are also sent overseas for independent analysis and proof that Eskom is operating within the required limits.</p> <p>All potential impacts on water resources will be evaluated as part of the EIA</p>
Mr Terrence Smith	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I wish to state that I oppose nuclear. 2. Natural sand dunes will be damaged living 6 km away. My family will be endangered. 3. I will not be able to obtain health insurance. 	<p>Thank you for this comment.</p> <p>Aspects related to sand dunes will be addressed in the Dune Geomorphology Study that will form part of the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p> <p>The National Nuclear Regulator Act of 1999 and associated regulations make provision for 3rd party liability and compensation in the event of nuclear damage. The NNR Act and the relevant regulation can be downloaded from the NNR website www.nnr.co.za</p>
Mr L Ramatlakane Ministry of Community Safety	<p>Proposed nuclear power station and associated infrastructure: Department of Community Safety's Input</p> <p>1. INTRODUCTION Reference is made to the letter dated 25 May 2007 (only received on 20 June 2007) from your office regarding the</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>These issues, where applicable, will be addressed in the impact assessment phase of the EIA.</p> <p>Previous geological studies have shown the five</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>above-mentioned subject. This communiqué serves to provide the Department of Community's input to the proposed Nuclear Power Station and associated infrastructure. Procedurally, a geological survey is conducted to determine whether the site is geologically stable. An area that is prone to seismic and volcanic activities is not chosen. This report is based on the understanding that such survey was commissioned and the proposed sites were found to be suitable.</p> <p>2. ELECTRICITY SUPPLY IN RELATION TO SAFETY AND SECURITY</p> <p>The need to increase electricity supply in South Africa cannot be overemphasized. South African population is rapidly increasing. Parallel to the population increase is the need to improve people's life by providing basic infrastructure, which among other things include electricity and water.</p> <p>The electricity outage that has been sporadically experienced in the country in the past, particularly in the Western Cape provides an impetus for Eskom to speedily expand its electricity generation capacity to meet the demand. In this sense this initiative is timely and is destined to improve people's life.</p> <p>The provision of sufficient electricity has positive spin off for safety and security in the country. Environmental design factors (among others the availability and functioning of streetlights) impacts on crime in the country. Streetlights in the residential areas, recreational parks, and enroots to and from public transport interchange enable people and commuters to see potential criminals and act in a manner to protect themselves. The absence of lights in the above-mentioned areas make people vulnerable and increase fear among people (particularly women) who have walked to and from the public transport.</p>	<p>proposed sites to be suitable. However, this will be confirmed in the current EIA (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p> <p>Public participation continues for the duration of the EIA.</p> <p>Public participation is open to all members of the public. Also, the project has been widely advertised in national, provincial and local media.</p> <p>The whole South African coastline was investigated as part of the original Nuclear Site Investigation Programme (NSIP). Criteria, such as demography (existing population densities), ecological sensitivity, geology (rolling dunes and unconsolidated sands are, even with high engineering solutions, not suitable for a Nuclear Power Station due to their geological instability), the characteristics of the coastal area and the tides and wave action and seismicity, amongst others, were taken into account in determining the potential suitability of sites. Thyspunt was one of five sites identified as being suitable for the construction of a nuclear power station. The EIA will also validate the findings of the previous site selection studies (NSIP), within the current social, biophysical and economic context, including the reasons why other potential sites in the area were deemed to be less or unsuitable.</p> <p>This EIA is being informed by a suite of specialist studies that will be undertaken (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>The Department of Community Safety acknowledge that is a pressing need for energy in South Africa, and in principle support the proactive initiative of building a new nuclear power station in the Cape. I am convinced that in addition to the provision of electricity, it would have a social and economical impact on the people who are residing in the Province where the proposed nuclear power station would be built. However, it is worth mentioning that in thee future attempts should be made to opt for renewable energy source, as they are more advantageous compared to non-renewable energy source. Having said that, I would like to make the following specific contribution regarding the initiative:</p> <p>3. KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION</p> <p>3.1 Public and stakeholders participation</p> <p>Unfortunately your letter reached me after the dates for public participation. Nevertheless I'll make the following general comments:</p> <p>Consideration must be given to a wide public participation as required by the process Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) to ensure that the public's awareness on this issue is raised. Participants must be drawn across the spectrum and must include farmers, business people, local residents, politicians and other interested and affected parties. Perhaps the same platform (public participation) could be used to educate the public about possible ways of saving energy in the country.</p> <p>3.2 Identification of the site for the proposed Nuclear Power Station (NPS)</p> <p>A particular consideration should be taken during the process of identifying the suitable site for the proposed Nuclear Power Station. For safety and health reasons, the site should be away for residential areas as</p>	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>required by law. A thorough analysis should be done to ensure that residential and commercial development does not spiral to reach that particular site in the next couple years. The radioactive wastes in any dose, attack the immune system, causes respiratory illness, leukemia in the children and excess radiation may also cause genetic abnormalities. The problem is the longevity of the radiation hazard. From an environmental perspective, an environmental perspective, an assessment of the rare, endangered and indigenous animals and plant species must be done with purpose of identifying an alternative habitat for these species if there is any.</p> <p>I wish you well with your important task at hand.</p>	
Mr Daniel Vena Municipality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Do you really want to get rid of us? <p>We are scared.</p>	<p>Thank you for these comments.</p>
Mr John Roberts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I am a fisherman. I can't loose my work. Please go to other places. <p>We need schools in our place. Thanks</p>	<p>An EIA is a tool designed to identify and investigate key issues and associated potential environmental impacts positive and negative.</p>
Vuyelwa Ethel Dayizana Zion Apostolic Church	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We don't want sickness. <p>We want school for children and graveyards.</p>	<p>A whole host of specialist assessments, including health and socio-economic assessments will be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment of the EIA (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p>
Mrs Nozipho Goyi Methodist Church	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I don't want anything, which bring sickness, try another town not in St Francis Bay. <p>I have many children who need schools.</p>	
Mr Sizwe Sidinana	<p>Every week people die, what do you think about our lives.</p> <p>My children need right life.</p>	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Mr Andrew Vena Seed of Abraham Church	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Consider the dangers that may occur.▪ The sickness that can be caused by the nuclear of yours.▪ The future of our children.▪ The future of the fishing business.▪ Our people have got a fear of this plan because of what has happened in some Europe countries.▪ The gas to come out of those chimney's. <p>Please don't destroy us and our children with your nuclear bomb.</p>	