

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT (EIA)**

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

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

**DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REPORT**

**PUBLIC MEETINGS, WEEK 1 – SOUTHERN CAPE**

**23 – 25 MARCH 2010**

<b>PROVINCE</b>	<b>AREA</b>	<b>DAY AND DATE</b>	<b>VENUE</b>	<b>TIME</b>
Western Cape	Hermanus	23 March 2010	Overstrand Municipal Auditorium	18H00 – 20H00
Western Cape	Pearly Beach	24 March 2010	Pearly Beach Club	18H00 – 20H00
Western Cape	Bredasdorp	25 March 2010	Overberg Agri Hall	18H00 – 20H00

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	2
PREFACE .....	3
1. ATTENDANCE.....	4
1.1. ATTENDANCE – INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PARTIES .....	4
1.2. ATTENDANCE – ESKOM HOLDINGS LIMITED .....	4
1.3. ATTENDANCE – ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTING TEAM (EIA TEAM) .....	4
2. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS.....	4
3. FACILITATOR’S INTRODUCTORY REMARKS .....	5
3.1 MEETING TIMEFRAMES.....	5
3.2 CONDUCT AT MEETING.....	5
3.3 OBJECTIVES OF THE PUBLIC MEETINGS.....	5
4. PRESENTATION: FINDINGS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REPORT .....	6
5. ISSUES AND COMMENTS RAISED AND DISCUSSED.....	6
5.1 ISSUES AND COMMENTS RAISED .....	6
6. WAY FORWARD AND CLOSING REMARKS .....	7
6.1 MINUTES OF MEETINGS.....	7
6.2 TIMEFRAMES .....	7
6.3 FACILITATORS CONCLUDING REMARKS.....	7
APPENDIX 1: RECORD OF ISSUES RAISED AND DISCUSSED.....	8
APPENDIX 2: PRESENTATION OF DRAFT EIA REPORT .....	79
APPENDIX 3: ATTENDANCE LIST .....	80

## PREFACE

The presentations at the Public Meetings were uniform in nature and, therefore, one set of proceedings has been prepared. Slides of the presentation are provided in Appendix 2. Interested and Affected Parties (I&APs) raised a variety of issues at the three public meetings and for ease of reference, these have been captured in Appendix 1, providing I&APs from the three public meetings an opportunity to cross reference issues raised at the individual meetings.

Should participants who attended the meetings require any changes to these proceedings, please notify the Public Participation Office in writing within 14 days of receipt.

“Unidentified I&APs” refer largely to persons who attended meetings and verbally raised issues without providing their names. This in no way diminishes the value of the issue raised. Should you recognise your issue and would like to have your name recorded next to it, please advise the Public Participation Office.

In order to provide a structure and to enable the reader to follow the proceedings with ease, Sections 1 to 6 have not been captured verbatim. In Appendix 1 “Record of all Issues Raised and Discussed” the key comments and questions have been captured more or less verbatim with minor grammatical editing (where relevant).

## 1. ATTENDANCE

### 1.1. Attendance – Interested and Affected Parties

- As per attendance register.

### 1.2 Attendance – Eskom Holdings Limited

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

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

Name	Organisation	Role in the project
Ms Jaana-Maria Ball	Arcus GIBB (Pty) Ltd	Nuclear-1 EIA: Project Manager
Mr Reuben Heydenrych	Arcus GIBB (Pty) Ltd	Senior Environmental Scientist
Ms Bongzi Shinga	ACER (Africa)	Public Participation Consultant
Mrs Antoinette Pieterse	Ferret Mining and Environmental Services	Independent Facilitator

## 2. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

The Facilitator, Mrs Antoinette Pieterse, welcomed everyone to the meeting.

The Facilitator explained that the meeting was being recorded. She advised the participants that the record is being taken to ensure an accurate reflection of the proceedings. She informed all participants that it is imperative that when they stand up and pose a question or make a comment, to please state their name so that the minute-taker can preface the question or comment that is made in the minutes and attribute it to the correct person.

At all public meetings, the Facilitator confirmed with participants that they were in agreement with the use of the audio recording device, which was used to record the proceedings, thereby ensuring the accuracy of the record of meetings.

At the Hermanus Public Meeting, Mr Mike Kantey checked with the EIA Team that I&APs can verify the accuracy of the transcription record. **Response:** EIA Team confirmed that the transcription record could be made available on request.

### 3. FACILITATOR'S INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

#### 3.1 Meeting Timeframes

The Facilitator explained that the meeting was scheduled to end at 20h00. Depending on the response of the participants the meeting could extend beyond the scheduled time, to a time, which would be suitable to all participants.

Please note the following:

- ❑ **Hermanus Public Meeting** – the timeframes that were allocated as per the Public Meeting Agenda were not adhered to (due to meeting participants arriving late necessitating a late start to the meeting, the length of the presentations and the need to answer questions raised by the public during the presentations) and the public expressed concerns around time management. The EIA Team extended their apologies regarding this issue and thanked participants for their tolerance to the end of the meeting.
- ❑ **Pearly Beach Public Meeting** – revised timeframes were adhered to. Although the discussions continued beyond the original allocated time, the extension was agreed between the participants and the EIA team.
- ❑ **Bredasdorp Public Meeting** – revised timeframes were adhered to. The participants indicated that they would like discussions to continue until they were all satisfied with the responses or had the opportunity to engage with the EIA Team.

#### 3.2 Conduct at Meeting

The Facilitator explained that participants are welcome to use the language of their choice - the EIA Team could communicate in English, Afrikaans and Xhosa.

The Facilitator read through the points presented on the slide, which provided guidelines with respect to the conduct of all participants and for achieving a constructive debate and discussion. These points are contained in the main presentation, which is provided in Appendix 2.

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

#### 3.3 Objectives of the Public Meetings

The twenty four (24) independent specialist investigations, which have been undertaken as part of the EIA, for the proposed Nuclear Power Station and Associated Infrastructure, have been completed. The outcomes of the specialist investigations and recommendations have been assembled and integrated into the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

The purpose of the Public Meetings is three-fold, viz.:

- ❑ To present and discuss findings of the various specialist studies undertaken during the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Phase.
- ❑ To present the conclusions and recommendations of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR).
- ❑ Provide an opportunity to Interested and Affected Parties (I&APs) to pose questions and comment on the specialist study findings and the outcomes of the EIA.

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

The Facilitator presented a summary list of issues, which were raised by I&APs during the Scoping Phase. The summary list, which was not intended to be all inclusive and comprehensive, is contained in the presentation provided as Appendix 2.

The Facilitator emphasised that it is important for I&APs to verify that their issues, which were raised during Scoping Phase, have been taken into consideration during the EIA Phase.

Ms Jaana-Maria Ball and Mr Reuben Heydenrych represented the Independent Environmental Assessment Practitioners (EAP), Arcus GIBB.

By way of introduction, Ms Ball, EIA Project Manager, thanked all present for their time and indicated that Arcus GIBB is pleased to be at the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) stage of the EIA.

Ms Ball and Mr Heydenrych then presented the findings of the specialist investigations and the outcomes of the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Phase (refer to presentation slides provided in Appendix 2).

*The issues raised and discussed following Arcus GIBB's presentation are captured in the table presented in Appendix 1.*

#### **5. ISSUES AND COMMENTS RAISED AND DISCUSSED**

##### **5.1 Issues and Comments raised**

The table contained in Appendix 1: "Record of Issues Raised and Discussed" details the issues, comments and concerns, which were raised and discussed at the meeting.

Please note:

- ❑ Should you wish to make any corrections, please advise ACER within two weeks of receiving these minutes.

## 6. WAY FORWARD AND CLOSING REMARKS

### 6.1 Minutes of Meetings

Ms Ball indicated that GIBB would endeavour to distribute draft minutes of the meetings within 21 days from the dates of the respective meetings.

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

Post-meeting notes are provided in bold in these minutes.

### 6.2 Timeframes

In terms of the timeframes, I&APs were reminded that the public review period of the Draft EIA Report ends on 10 May 2010. Arcus GIBB has allocated a 66 day comment period, recognising that there are long weekends, school holidays and the Easter Weekend within the period 06 March – 10 May 2010. (**Post-meeting note:** Following a request at subsequent public meetings, the end date for the public review period was extended to 31 May 2010, thus providing an 87 day comment period).

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

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

Comments received on the Draft EIR are recorded and addressed on a weekly basis in the form of an Issues and Response Report (IRR). Comments received will be used to produce the Final EIR, which will then be submitted to the Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA) (the decision-making authority for the EIA) for their consideration.

The timeframe for submission of the Final EIR will depend on how long it takes to finalise the report as well as on the type of comments that are received from I&APs during the review period.

A letter will be sent to all registered I&APs informing them of the Authorities' decision.

### 6.3 Facilitators Concluding Remarks

The Facilitator thanked all present for their input and participation in the process and closed the various meetings.

Interactions between I&APs and the Project Team continued after the various meetings. The discussions that took place after the formal public meetings were not recorded.

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

**HERMANUS PUBLIC MEETING (23 MARCH 2010)**

No	Name	Comment	Response
1	Mr Mike Kantey CANE	<p>Point of order: In the introduction by the Facilitator, on issues raised by the general public, e.g. human health, waste management, trustworthiness of the process, etc, these are not included in the key factors for decision-making.</p> <p>The agenda that is presented to us is skewed. This is a process point because the list of issues presented does not include what the public has raised during Scoping as reflected by the Facilitator.</p> <p>The only concern that has been included in Arcus GIBB's slide is the conservation issue Mr Kantey wished to know how the other concerns were going to be addressed in this meeting.</p>	<p>Ms Ball: Chapter 9 of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) deals with the assessment of issues/ potential impacts that came from all specialist studies.</p> <p>It was noted that feedback on all specialist studies could be given, i.e. not limited to what is presented in slide 22.</p> <p>It was agreed that Mr Heydenrych, Arcus GIBB will continue with the presentation and then Mr Kantey's concerns be raised after the presentation.</p>
2	Mr John Williams Save Bantamsklip Association	Mr Williams asked if socio-economic issues are considered as a conservation issue? He also wanted to know if the conservation issues are indeed addressed as per the slide 22.	The Facilitator suggested that feedback be given on all specialist studies.
3	I&AP	Bantamsklip site was conserved before Eskom bought the property.	Mr Gert Greeff indicated that the statement is incorrect.
4	Mr John Williams Save Bantamsklip Association	Mr Williams was of the opinion that when you talk about economic impacts vs economic benefit – there seems to be a bit of ambiguity. He asked what is being referred to?	It is referring to positive economic impact.



<b>HERMANUS PUBLIC MEETING (23 MARCH 2010)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
5	Mr John Williams Save Bantamsklip Association	Mr Williams suggested that the Heritage Impact should read as negative Heritage Impact.	Mr Heydenrych confirmed that it is potential negative heritage impact.
6	Mr Mike Kantey CANE	Point of clarity: the meeting has been told that Arcus GIBB has ruled out the discussion of transmission lines at the meeting. He was confused by the fact that this discussion has been taken out of the debate of tonight's meeting but then it is back again in the presentation?	It is included to provide information as to which sites will be preferred based on the transmission line integration. This is an integration issue, i.e. how easy it is to integrate this site with the rest of the grid in the system.  The proposed transmission lines, their routes and the potential impacts of the individual transmission lines are undertaken as a separate EIA process.
7	Mr John Williams Save Bantamsklip Association	Mr Williams noted that in terms of project alternatives – that marine issue was not included in the previous slides on impacts. The Marine issues are now included under alternatives.  Terrestrial aspects are included but not marine issues, which would seem to indicate that the site was not necessarily by the sea.	Mr Heydenrych in his introduction had indicated that he would focus on key decision factors. There was a Marine Specialist study, indeed there were 24 different specialist studies, and each of those specialist studies assessed different alternatives. What is not reflected in this presentation is all the specialist studies in the Draft EIR itself.
8	Mr Mike Kantey CANE	Mr Kantey raised concern that Mr Heydenrych was adding additional information in his words that were not included on the slides.  He contested the point of transmission lines going up and down the country-side, and in which direction the electricity is going. Mr Kantey indicated that he is flagging this point with particular reference to the intensive energy end user groups in the northern part of the country, such as Bayside Aluminium, which is a long way away from the coastline route.	Yes, everything is being recorded. The slides formed the basis of the presentation and have been posted to the EIA websites ( <a href="http://www.eskom.co.za">www.eskom.co.za</a> and <a href="http://www.gibb.co.za">www.gibb.co.za</a> ) and everything that is said verbally in the meeting was recorded and reflected in the minutes.  Load growth is projected for the Eastern and Western Cape regions requiring additional generation capacity along the coast in this part of South Africa to supply the demand and to stabilise the national transmission network. The initial excess electricity that would be generated would be transferred by the transmission lines to other parts of the country.

<b>HERMANUS PUBLIC MEETING (23 MARCH 2010)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
9	Mr John Williams Save Bantamsklip Association	Mr Williams asked for a description of brine and explanation of where it comes from?	Mr Heydenrych responded that fresh water would be produced through a desalination plant from seawater. The salt or the very high saline solution that is left over is called brine.
10	Mr Mike Kantey CANE	Mr Kantey requested clarity about the wording on the slide that indicated that Vaalputs is a high level Nuclear Waste deposit facility. He asked if this was policy?	Mr Heydenrych explained that Vaalputs is being considered, it is not current practice.  <b>The slide was subsequently revised to increase its clarity. What was meant by the presenter was that when the National Radioactive Waste Disposal Institute investigates potential site for a final repository for high-level radioactive waste Vaalputs is likely to be one of the sites considered in the investigation. Vaalputs is currently only used for the disposal of low and intermediate level radioactive waste.</b>
11	Mrs Linda McNeal Concerned citizen	Mrs McNeal asked for an explanation as to why solar, wind, renewables, etc, do not have a base load generation capacity?	To be explained during the discussion time.
12	Mr John Williams Save Bantamsklip Association	Mr Williams asked for clarification about decision-making. He enquired if the weights reflected on the slide were negative or positive? He asked if it is an impact issue or simply a focus of importance of issue.  He then enquired if the category has to be considered of high importance in order to receive more attention?  He also asked what does higher impact mean? Does it mean higher negative impact? Does it mean it is more important for decision-making?	Mr Heydenrych: The ranking has been done with the 24 independent specialists. A process was followed to determine which of those aspects or specialist disciplines are most important in terms of making decisions on which site is selected.  The importance of each of these impact categories influence decision-making. We are not looking at whether it is an impact of low significance or high significance.  Ms Ball: Reading 1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph "The potential impact of high and medium significance after mitigation. These impacts should have the greatest influence on decision making".

<b>HERMANUS PUBLIC MEETING (23 MARCH 2010)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		Is it the highest impact (negative impact) that receives more attention?	2 <sup>nd</sup> point: Where the impacts have the same significance on all sites, they have been filtered out as they do not provide a basis for choice for the preferred site. Ms Ball went on to remind Mr Kantey of the statement mentioned earlier that all of the specialists said, <u>with mitigation</u> (which is very important) the potential impacts within their discipline will be brought down to a low-significance level. So there are no fatal flaws in terms of any of the specialist studies and this applies to all the sites.
13	Mr John Williams Save Bantamsklip Association	Mr Williams added congratulations on the statement arriving at this point "Bantamsklip regarded as least preferred site for Nuclear-1" and hence we will continue listening and participating.	Noted.
14	Mr Mike Kantey CANE	<p>Point of order: Mr Kantey asked that a record be made regarding the stopping of this presentation at 20h05 as, in fact, a breach of public confidence. The Agenda records that the meeting will end at 20H00. It is an intolerable form of public participation and that the whole time has been filled by the proponent's information and nothing from the public.</p> <p>The Agenda states that from 19h00 to 19h50 there will be a discussion of issues. At this point in time which is 20h00, the meeting will take us to 21h00. Noting the time at which the meeting started, some people may have had their supper. He would like to submit that this in fact fringes on the capacity and the ability of people to focus for such a long period of time, to be able to engage substantively on the issue. Having prepared for this meeting from the 6<sup>th</sup> of March 2010. To come with significant information that needs to be shared, and as a matter of public record and having</p>	The Facilitator apologised on behalf of the EIA Team and confirmed that the EIA Team will stick to the Agenda for all future meetings.

<b>HERMANUS PUBLIC MEETING (23 MARCH 2010)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<p>actually waited for 2 hours to get to this point. The quality of public participation, again for the record, cannot be guaranteed in this instance. And therefore this EIA is not following due process.</p> <p>It is a fact that the Pebble Bed process has been thrown out because of not following due process. He said that the judges were not sympathetic with the PBMR EIA process. They were forced to re-do the EIA. He asked that the same mistake not be made again at Pearly Beach, at Bredasdorp, and at Thyspunt, etc.</p> <p>He suggested that the EIA team sticks to the agenda.</p>	<p><b>For the record: The Cape High Court judgement relating to the Record of Decision for the PBMR EIA in 2002 was due to the Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism not agreeing to meet with Earthlife Africa subsequent to the submission of the final EIR. The Court found that the EIA process had been comprehensively undertaken. The Court required the Director-General of the then Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism to accept submissions from the public and then to re-apply his mind regarding the Record of Decision. Eskom was not forced to do the EIA again. The EIA was initiated again due to design changes and not due to a decision by the Court.</b></p>
15	Mr Rob Fryer Overstrand Conservation Foundation	<p>Mr Fryer asked for information about the way that the EIA's are currently being combined, because according to his understanding there were separate EIA's for the 3 sites that are under consideration.</p> <p>Mr Fryer added that there is an intention under the new regulations to combine all these EIAs to be one EIA. However, this has not been done because the EIA regulations have not allowed it – he enquired if this was correct? There are separate applications being made for each of the sites, and yet there is one EIA Report being produced, which now compares the EIA of the 3 EIA sites. He asked how we arrived at</p>	<p>Ms Ball: There are a number of alternatives, as indicated on the slide, which were assessed in this process. Originally, Eskom had an application for one nuclear power station, up to 4 000 megawatts (MW), this included a number of alternative sites.</p> <p><b>Eskom did consider a combined application which could have resulted in an authorisation for more than one site however a decision was taken to remain with the original application.</b></p>

<b>HERMANUS PUBLIC MEETING (23 MARCH 2010)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<p>this point when we were expecting to have an EIA Report for all 3 proposals. Each of these proposals should have been submitted separately to the Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA), and were going to be assessed independently by the DEA as independent proposals because they are independent? He further enquired how we are suddenly faced with a combined conclusion when there should be 3 separate conclusions (each one submitted independently for DEA's consideration and decision)?</p> <p>Mr Fryer was expecting three separate reports and wanted to know where the Draft EIA Report for Bantamsklip was.</p> <p>When is a decision going to be made on the EIA for Bantamsklip?</p>	<p>The application is for one Nuclear Power Station for 4 000 MW. If Eskom wants to build a second nuclear power station, they will have to start a whole new EIA process.</p> <p>Ms Ball: Bantamsklip is one of the alternative sites assessed in this EIA. Each specialist study assessed the potential impacts at Bantamsklip</p> <p>The Bantamsklip site is not the preferred site for Nuclear-1. The EIA Report recommends Thyspunt as the preferred site. The DEA can either agree or not agree with a recommendation.</p>
16	Mr John Williams Save Bantamsklip Association	<p>Mr Williams followed on from what Mr Fryer has said. The process itself has not been concluded correctly. Based on the decision, made as a recommendation, the opportunity is lost to record the questions which we have pertaining to Bantamsklip because it has been excluded. This puts everyone in a very difficult position, because do we simply walk out now and trust that you will see through the process as you have recommended?</p>	<p>Ms Ball: You are quite correct; the DEA may say we do not agree with the consultant's recommendation. So, my advice to you all as community members, through all the 3 sites, is to please keep on recording your issues. Please scrutinise those specialist reports, please give us your comments. If you agree or disagree with the specialist report. All comments are recorded in the final report and you have it on record and in the minutes.</p>

<b>HERMANUS PUBLIC MEETING (23 MARCH 2010)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
			Ms Herbst: It is important to note that in all the EIAs that we have carried out, the DEA has never gone against the recommendations of the EIA consultant in terms of the recommended site.
17	Mr John Williams Save Bantamsklip Association	<p>Mr Williams noted that in the context of submissions that have been made regarding the specialist studies, he would like to record that Bantamsklip is a protected area and will remain a protected area, and we believe that Bantamsklip is a potential UNESCO World Heritage Site. We believe that Bantamsklip should, in fact, be sold by Eskom to someone like the SANParks. There are a number of sub-issues in relation to this:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Marine consideration seems to have been left out of the issues in terms of the weighting of impacts in your report. The people wish to record that they take exception to this.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The marine component of Bantamsklip is possibly more important than the terrestrial component of the area.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Stakeholders wish to emphasise their reasoning for this protected status.</li> </ul>	Points noted.
18	Mrs Linda McNeal Concerned Citizen	Mrs McNeal questioned why wind, solar, etc, cannot be as effective as coal and nuclear?	Mr Stott: The base load refers to the capacity to generate electricity continuously 24 hours a day. At the moment in South Africa, we estimate this winter, the peak demand to be about 39 500 MW, and that compared to the 43 000 MW per day, which is generated. So there is not much reserve margin.

<b>HERMANUS PUBLIC MEETING (23 MARCH 2010)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
			<p>However, at any other time of the day, the minimum amount of electricity needed is about 25 000 MW. Power stations have to continuously and collectively generate this amount of electricity, during every second of the day.</p> <p>Wind energy can generate electricity when the wind is blowing and in South Africa, wind efficiency is estimated at about 20% of the time. Solar only generates electricity when the sun is shining. Base load requires that you generate continuously day and night. A base load station needs to produce electricity for at least 70% of the time</p> <p>Eskom is however working at the storage capacity for solar energy that can make it into a pseudo base load - which is not commercially viable at the moment, anywhere in the world. But we hope that in the solar-thermal plant, which is proposed to be built near Upington that we will be able to include storage facilities in the form of molten salt.</p> <p>At the moment, it is only coal-fired power stations and nuclear that can provide the base load.</p>
19	Mr Mike Kantey CANE	Mr Kantey said it is important to understand and unpack some of the fallacies of the base load assumption. Base load is an artificial construct refers. It takes something as simple as Koeberg, which has been off for the past two to three weeks, here and there, and has been off sometimes unexpectedly such as when the bolt was found, etc. to show clearly that it is say that a nuclear power station has to generate power every minute of the day:	<p>Mr Stott replied that part of what Mr Kantey is saying is correct and part is incorrect. Certainly, if say a 1 000 MW of base load is replaced with wind, you would probably have to have 3 000 MW of wind energy. In terms of parts of the country connecting to the national grid, you would probably get the equivalent of that, but obviously you would need 3 000 MW instead of 1 000 MW.</p> <p>There is no commercial solar storage scheme yet in operation. There are solar thermal plants in America, California and Spain, that have been operating quite</p>

HERMANUS PUBLIC MEETING (23 MARCH 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❑ So, firstly, there is a sense of interrupted power supply in a nuclear power station.</li> <li>❑ Secondly, the angle of wind does not necessarily blow in the same direction at the same time but it does blow somewhere continuously. So, in some countries like in Ireland, they have potentially aggregated 10,000 MW of supply continuously from a wind farm. Wind farms, as part of the contribution to the grid, are viable night and day and research will prove this to be true.</li> <li>❑ Thirdly, Solar power, for example in California, Spain, etc, has been running successfully in other areas. These concentrated solar power plants have a molten salts storage system, which does in fact supply power and have been running successfully in some countries including southern Namibia and southwest Botswana.</li> </ul> <p>He went on to say that this base load argument is not factual. This definition that renewables cannot generate base load must be questioned. The fact that NERSA has capped renewable energy at 835 MW makes a mockery of the investment. No one will invest in renewable energy for 835MW.</p>	<p>successfully but they do not have molten salt storage capacity in commercial operation. We are certainly hoping that we will be able to do that at the solar-thermal plant for which we already have environmental authorisation. It will be the biggest solar-thermal plant of its type in the world</p> <p>Solar power has more potential in South Africa than in any other country.</p> <p><b>In 2009, Koeberg power station had a unit capability factor of 83 %. The unplanned capability loss factor was 2 %, which is considered world-class performance. Planned outages for refuelling and maintenance were 15 %.</b></p> <p><b>Eskom confirms that renewable technologies are part and parcel of the energy mix for Eskom.</b></p>
20	Mr Mike Kantey CANE	Mr Kantey asked if he could go back to the issue of 20,000MW, where it stated that in the discussion between DEA and Arcus GIBB (Jaana Ball) that Eskom is pursuing one nuclear reactor of 4000MW. However, in line with the country's long-term intention to investigate up to 20,000MW of nuclear, another	Comment noted.



<b>HERMANUS PUBLIC MEETING (23 MARCH 2010)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		application may be submitted by Eskom soon after the submission of the Final EIA report for Nuclear-1 expected to be submitted in June. So, in the second half of the year it will come back to Bantamsklip.	
21	Mr John Williams Save Bantamsklip Association	Mr Williams reminded Mr Stott that he had been requested to respond to the capping issue of renewables, which relates to the regulatory framework.	Mr Stott replied that he cannot deal with the capping issue, which is a NERSA decision.
22	Mr Paul Slabbert Strandveld Tourism and Conservation Association	<p>Mr Slabbert stated that regarding transmission and distribution of electricity, a concern around cumulative impacts was voiced at the meeting last year (he did not know the exact date of the meeting). This is definitely something that is assessed in EIAs.</p> <p>The nuclear power station EIA needs to assess the cumulative impact of transmission line corridors. The separation of issues of transmission and generation does not go down well with the public.</p> <p>He added that although there will not be an authorisation on Bantamsklip, however, there is a feeling that Bantamsklip is reserved, the way it is worded in the EIA.</p> <p>It would be interesting to note if there will be an authorisation for transmission. Imagine if there is an authorisation for transmission lines, i.e. the line is secure. This technically does not make sense, both in the EIA process and in practice to have a transmission authorisation without a site authorisation.</p>	<p>Ms Herbst: Eskom have previously completed EIAs for large coal fired power stations excluding the transmission lines. It is extremely difficult to deal with both EIAs together as one because of the complexity and different I&amp;APs with different issues. Authorities have always been quite comfortable with Eskom's approach of undertaking the EIAs separately.</p> <p>Ms Herbst: In this case, the Bantamsklip site has been identified as one of the potential nuclear sites for the future. Therefore, it makes sense to do the evaluation of environmental impact assessment for the transmission line, and when we do the site application, we can consider the impacts from the transmission line EIA as well as the EIA for the site. This could well be the case for the EIA for the Nuclear 2, 3 or 4.</p> <p>Ms Ball: The transmission EIAs are at the scoping phase. Where possible cumulative impacts have been considered. (Arcus GIBB are the project managers for the Transmission EIA associated with Bantamsklip).</p>

<b>HERMANUS PUBLIC MEETING (23 MARCH 2010)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<p>How can we continue assessing the distribution/transmission of power from Bantamsklip?</p> <p>How has DEA responded to the approach? He also asked if the DEA had their concern in the request to join or merge the two assessments and wanted to know what their response was to this issue.</p> <p>Technically, if DEA were happy with the approach, he would say that if Bantamsklip is scrapped from the table at this point, then the Transmission lines EIA should be stopped as well. He asked that this recorded.</p>	<p>Ms Ball: We have had numerous meetings with DEA and they are happy with the approach of separating the site EIA and transmission line EIA.</p>
23	I&AP	<p>I did not have time to read the entire report. But I have read the summary of what the consultants have said. There are 66 days to get 2 x CDs of the detailed specialist reports. Not much time to review the reports. Who will check on the consultants? If there are issues around the marine biologist – who will be reviewing the specialist studies?</p>	<p>Ms Ball: Arcus GIBB welcome peer review of the specialist studies. The DEA has also appointed a peer review panel. On the review panel, there are a number of members representing different disciplines; I know for certain, there is a flora and social specialist. Arcus GIBB has appointed ' in our opinion' the best specialists available. They are not only single specialists, they are specialist teams and in some cases up to 10 specialists per team. Peer reviewers have been appointed by Arcus GIBB to internally review specialist studies.</p>
24	I&APs	<p>Is it possible to make the list of the DEA peer reviewers of the specialist reports available to the public?</p>	<p>Ms Ball suggested that this I&amp;AP writes a letter to Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA) and request the list of peer reviewers that the DEA has appointed to its review panel directly from the Authority.</p>

HERMANUS PUBLIC MEETING (23 MARCH 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
25	Ms Katrin Pobantz Tesselaarsdal Action Group	<p>Ms Pobantz asked if once the peer review has given their review of the specialist studies, would their opinion be made available to the public, i.e. the peer reviewer's opinion on the specialist studies that have been undertaken?</p> <p>She also enquired if the DEA is going to base the decision on the peer review of the specialist studies and if the public will be allowed to have access to the information as part of the public process and access to information.</p>	<p>Ms Ball: Again, that question needs to be submitted to the Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA) Case Officer of the Nuclear-1 EIA.</p> <p><b>Clarification: DEA have appointed a panel to review the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and its specialist studies, this would include referencing specialist studies but to our knowledge (Eskom) the Review Panel's scope of work does not include a detailed review of each specialist study.</b></p>
26	Mr Mike Kantey CANE	<p>Mr Kantey said he wanted to go back to the list of issues, which were raised by the public, and particularly the issue of human health.</p> <p>He would like an issue recorded in these proceedings. Dating back to July 2007, in the initial record of key stakeholder meetings where he recorded a series of questions relating to the hazard posed by airborne and waterborne emissions and effluent. Mr Kobus of the National Department of Health picked this up and he requested to see responses to the issues raised by Mr Kantey. This was picked up in the January 2008 Scoping Report.</p> <p>Page 7-11, it states in <u>bullet 2</u> "the potential risks may occur if the radionuclides or hazardous chemicals reach the human body, through volatilisation, direct contact with the skin, migration of radioactive effluent into groundwater that is used as a drinking water source and used to irrigate crops" and <u>bullet 3</u> "atmospheric release of radioactive substances will</p>	<p>Ms Ball: Your issues have been noted.</p>

HERMANUS PUBLIC MEETING (23 MARCH 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>contaminate the air. The radioactive substances will subsequently be deposited onto the land and ocean through dry (fall out) and/or wet deposition (rainfall). The contaminants will then enter the soil surface, water bodies, ground water as well as the ocean through natural processes. Flora and fauna reliant on these natural resources will be affected by the radioactive substances”.</p> <p>And it goes on to list in issues:</p> <p>Section 7.3.11, bullet 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “ there are perceptions/fears of danger/accidents leading to a fall in land values and loss of organic certification”</li> </ul> <p>bullet 4,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “potential for contamination of crops through either through wet and/or dry deposition, irrigation of crops using contaminated surface and/or ground water and subsequent uptake by crops for human consumption”</li> </ul> <p>This is then recorded as a list of issues in the Scoping Issues and Response Report on pages 51, 52 and item 60 and also in the January 2008 Draft Scoping Report, 3.4 bullet 2 “ It is assumed (<i>please note that use of the word assumed</i>) that insignificant amounts of radionuclides will be released during the construction, decommissioning and further phases of the nuclear power station...”</p> <p>2<sup>nd</sup> bullet - the operational phases the emissions of</p>	

HERMANUS PUBLIC MEETING (23 MARCH 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>radionuclides will be provided by actual historical data researched at Koeberg, which was designed in the 1970s.</p> <p>3<sup>rd</sup> bullet – the client will provide the radionuclide expected to.....’</p> <p>So, in fact, the very person whose data set is subject to scientific scrutiny will in fact provide the data set and there is no independent person who will provide the data set for any study done anywhere else in the world. The proponent is going to provide the dataset.</p> <p>And then it goes on to say, on page 47, point 5.22 “radionuclides emissions.....and has to comply with the amount allowed by the National Nuclear Regulator” but there is no data set provided, why?</p> <p>So, when you come to the Appendix 5 of the PBMR Koeberg Radiation Air Quality Final Report, the effective dose of Cesium 137 is <math>6.9 \times 10^8</math> and Strontium 90 is <math>1.6 \times 10^7</math> and also in the reports of the EMS, 1982 - 2002, from Koeberg Nuclear Power Station, liquid effluents containing Strontium 90 were given in</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> 1988 - <math>3.03 \times 10^5</math>,</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> 1989 - <math>3 \times 10^4</math>,</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> 1991 - <math>7.96 \times 10^4</math></li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> 1994 – <math>5.36 \times 10^7</math></li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> 1995 - <math>9.5 \times 10^6</math></li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> 1997 – <math>1.51 \times 10^7</math></li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> 2001, etc.</li> </ul>	

<b>HERMANUS PUBLIC MEETING (23 MARCH 2010)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<p>In the PBMR report, this information is given in becquerels per annum. Yet in the Air Quality report of this Nuclear-1 EIA report, (it is giving references of 2002) and it says that we will not be talking about ingestion and there is no mention anywhere in the report of pathways of human health through the digestion of foodstuffs.</p> <p>Mr Kantey therefore questioned where in the Human Health report is the impact of radionuclides actually addressed in data set terms (scientific data or technical terms) and not in terms of the opinion or assumptions of the proponent?</p> <p>There is no data set, he has searched for it since the 6<sup>th</sup> March 2010 and there is no data set. Therefore, when it comes to actual technology, in terms of the International Atomic Energy Agency, according to National Nuclear Standards, where is the data?</p> <p>He added that the Air Quality report lets slip the information that the EPR is under consideration (probably missed out on the editing of the report) being the European Pressurised Reactor.</p> <p>He recorded that it is felt that this process from a scientific point of view is questionable. He would like to get experts from around the world to look at the peer review of the specialist studies.</p> <p>Mr Kantey informed Ms Ball that the information provided was a statement and he is not expecting a</p>	<p>Ms Ball: That was a long question, is noted and will be addressed.</p>

<b>HERMANUS PUBLIC MEETING (23 MARCH 2010)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<p>response.</p> <p>He then referred to page 3.3 of the EIA report, the amount of nuclear fuel waste over the life cycle (which does not say how long) is 1,880 tons. This information is very specific. And again, page 33-26 “according to ...and Energy Institute 2008 (reference in the Bibliography), the estimated liquid waste for the EPR plant type per unit is approximately 8,000m<sup>3</sup> per year per unit. Now where is that stated? Why are these facts here if they are not in the Executive Summary and not in your report? Where is the peer review?</p> <p>How can this information be so specific? Where is that study?</p> <p>He emphasised that this is in the Air Quality Report, Appendix E10 at page 326. This is an omission and is a tangible omission. Why is it not in the list of issues, in the Executive Summary, and what is the peer review going to do about this?</p> <p>The reviewer’s CV indicates that he has served on the Nuclear Atomic Energy Board from 1971 to 1984 and actually served again from 1986 to 1995. Mr Kantey wanted to know he could be seen as independent?</p>	

HERMANUS PUBLIC MEETING (23 MARCH 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
27	Mr Kobus Visser Tesselaarsdal Group Action	<p>In die voorlegging is verwys na die feit dat as Bantamsklip afgekeur word, dan sal hy verkoop word. Wanneer gaan ons hierdie punt bereik, dis my eerste vraag. Want as die lyne se proses goedgekeur word dan het julle 'n nuwe studie groep om hierdie proses op te graawe en aan die gang te sit en dit gaan nog moeiliker wees en dit is wat hy probeer sê as die lyne goedgekeur is dan gaan julle baie makliker 'n "site" goedgekeur kry. Nou wanneer gaan Eskom besluit dis genoeg, ons aanvaar Bantamsklip is nie aanvaarbaar nie.</p> <p><u>Translation:</u></p> <p>The presentation refers to the fact that if Bantamsklip is rejected, it will be sold. When will this point be reached? If the transmission lines is approved, then a new study group will have to restart this process and it will be more difficult to get the site approved. When will Eskom decide that this is enough? Bantamsklip is not acceptable.</p>	Ms Herbst: Bantamsklip has been identified as a potential site for a nuclear power station. We are continuing to consider it as a potential nuclear site. That is why we are continuing with the Environmental Impact Assessment for the transmission lines. It is likely that Bantamsklip will be considered for Nuclear-2 or -3. This EIA has indicated there are no fatal flaws in the Bantamsklip site.
28	I&AP	A question was raised regarding a fatal flaw and it was queried if the economic, the tourism impacts, etc, which are high impacts cannot be regarded as fatal flaws in the Bantamsklip site.	Noted.
29	Mr John Williams Save Association Bantamsklip	Mr Williams stated that the fact that the consultants are standing up comfortably and saying that there are no fatal flaws makes him conclude that the process is flawed.	Noted.



<b>HERMANUS PUBLIC MEETING (23 MARCH 2010)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
30	Mr Mike Kantey CANE	Mr Kantey warned that there has been a legal precedence in this country for throwing EIA reports out, it is in the public record. Earthlife Africa took the proponent to court and were successful because of fatal flaws in the process and not in the actual science. He is putting on record that, in the Air Quality report alone, there are so many flaws that could drive this bus.	Noted.  <b>As stated above (response to Comment 15), Mr Kantey's statement is not a correct reflection of the judgement. The Cape High Court judgement, which is available on request, specifically states that the EIA process had been comprehensively undertaken. The Court found that the Director-General of the then Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism declining to meet with Earthlife Africa subsequent to the submission of the Final EIR was not appropriate.</b>
31	I&AP	This I&AP stated that the reports that have been made available over time are a complete waste of time. Whether it is Nuclear-1, 2, 3 or 10, it is all totally irrelevant. What this means is that concerning the whole nuclear debate, the greatest fatal flaw is about waste and health. Where does the waste go? The only place where an Environmental Impact Assessment is should be conducted is at Vaalputs and in Namaqualand and where the storage of waste for the next 40 years, is going. That is the only huge fatal flaw. In terms of nuclear physics, waste is the unseen enemy. Flora, fauna, biodiversity, etc can be studied but until waste is investigated nationally, everything else does not matter.	Noted.  <b>The management and transport of waste is covered in the Draft EIR. Radioactive waste also falls within the jurisdiction of the Minister of Energy in terms of the Nuclear Energy Act and has been further delegated to the National Radioactive Waste Disposal Institute. Therefore radioactive waste will also be covered in more detail in their processes and the NNR licensing process.</b>
32	Mr Mike Kantey CANE	Mr Kantey informed the meeting that he also represents the Namaqualand Action Group for Environmental Justice, whose chairman is Mr Andy Pienaar. They are a community whose membership comes from every community represented in their structures from that area.	Comment noted.  <b>As stated above (response to Comment 11), the slide incorrectly indicated that Vaalputs was being considered as a disposal area for high level radioactive waste. It should have read, and has been changed in the presentation, that Vaalputs is likely to be</b>

<b>HERMANUS PUBLIC MEETING (23 MARCH 2010)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<p>Mr Kantey said that given that scenario and given Mr Andy Pienaar's determination for the past 2-3 decades to oppose the dumping of nuclear waste at Vaalputs - that slide presented by Arcus GIBB stipulates categorically that waste will be disposed at Vaalputs, this will be resisted. They will oppose the dumping of waste with all efforts because there is popular resistance to dumping of waste in Namaqualand.</p> <p>People do not come to meetings representing their jackets, in fact, they are mandated representatives. I acknowledge the presence of Tesselaarsdal Action Group, Strandveld Tourism and Conservation Association, Save Bantamsklip Association, etc and all other representatives and noted that they are mandatory representatives of the various communities.</p> <p>Another fascinating aspect, is how plans are forged in the Eastern and Western Cape to ship waste to the Northern Cape? So what is being said is that Bantamsklip, Thyspunt and the Northern Cape community will be sacrificed for the benefit of Alcan, Canadians and Australians.</p>	<p><b>considered as one of the options for a final repository for radioactive waste.</b></p>
33	I&AP	<p>This person stated that he understood that at Thyspunt there is a lot of archaeological collections (refer to specialist reports) that need to be undertaken prior to the commencement of construction on the site.</p> <p>It was asked how construction can commence in 2011 when you have a lot of information to still collate?</p>	<p>Ms Ball: With respect to Thyspunt, the specialist concerned indicated that mitigation measures need to be started straight away.</p> <p>Ms Herbst: It states that it says that site preparation will commence in 2011, those are however, very optimistic timelines. The Environmental Management Programme</p>

<b>HERMANUS PUBLIC MEETING (23 MARCH 2010)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
			(EMP) stipulates the recommendations of specialists and what actions are required. The EMP is legally binding, therefore Eskom will be required to implement the recommendations of, for example, the heritage specialist, prior to construction starting.
34	Mr Mike Kantey CANE	<p>Mr Kantey asked for clarity regarding safety issues. What is most important about public participation is the theory that people believe that people will participate. If someone says A and the consultant says B, and then there is no more discussion, that is not public participation. That is the same issue with the Issues Trail, which I will raise as part of the legal context, in terms of flawed process. When he raises an issue and is not addressed to his personal satisfaction, then there is no public participation.</p> <p>He added that this is an issue that relates to the technical specifications, they are not sufficient and he would argue and he would be scientifically right in the EIA. It is insufficient to claim that plant type is unknown. Specifics must be made available because when the safety case of the PBMR was considered, it was highly analysed by the National Nuclear Regulator and well documented.</p> <p>For Nuclear 1, we do not know what it is, we do not know if it is a BMW or Mercedes Benz, maybe it has an air bubble or maybe it does not.</p>	<p>Ms Ball commenced with a response but Mr Kantey stated that he is not expecting a response from Arcus GIBB.</p> <p>Mr Kantey indicated that the issue raised is a process issue on the table and cannot be responded to. It needs to be recorded. It is a fatal flaw of the process.</p>

<b>HERMANUS PUBLIC MEETING (23 MARCH 2010)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<p>How can a safety case for an unknown nuclear reactor be evaluated scientifically? (He was not talking about the perception, the public relations exercise), but a reactor in terms of the first principle: nuclear physics, in terms of nuclear engineering, chemical engineering, etc? Firstly, how it works is unknown, the air quality, and emissions, etc, cannot be evaluated when the type of the reactor is unknown.</p> <p>He said that only once Eskom's infinite wisdom has made an economic decision and can say, they have looked at Areva, they have looked at AP 1000 and this is what they are going to design for and only then can the EIA commence.</p>	
35	Mr John Williams Save Bantamsklip Association	Mr Williams requested Arcus GIBB to clarify the positive benefits at Bantamsklip, i.e. the positive benefits of marine reserve around the site.	Ms Ball: One of the specialist opinions was that should a nuclear power station be built at Bantamsklip, one of the positive benefits would be the establishment of a marine reserve. The specialist was of the opinion that the ongoing poaching would be prevented with the presence of Eskom on site.
36	Mr Mike Kantey CANE	Mr Kantey said that because this is a public participation process, he would like to register a very fundamental point with regards to filter feeders (Abalone). It is all in the Koeberg reports, the becquerel activity per kilogram of filter feeders. He stated that absolutely hilarious to read that there will be a net zero impact in the community around Bantamsklip.	Ms Ball: Explained for the benefit of all participants. The UCT has undertaken the marine studies at Koeberg Nuclear Power Station and they are the same specialists that have undertaken the investigations for the Nuclear-1 EIA.

<b>HERMANUS PUBLIC MEETING (23 MARCH 2010)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<p>Another point he raised is that the Buffelsjacht Community, a fishing community live on that sea life. How can the impact not be recognised?</p> <p>He stated that the fact is that information around becquerel activity around Koeberg Nuclear Power Station (20 years worth of information) is presented in Eskom's reports. It is not about UCT, it is the information presented in Eskom's reports.</p>	
37	Mrs Linda McNeal I&AP	<p>Mrs McNeal asked that the slide which refers to base load options as being only feasible with coal and nuclear be taken out because it is misleading the public. This is important as the team will be moving around to other communities, e.g. Pearly Beach, Bredasdorp, etc. Her understanding is that the base load is not only limited to coal and nuclear.</p>	<p>Mr Stott: The information presented is correct and honest. South Africa requires all the energy that can be acquired, from renewables to other base load generating sources.</p> <p>In terms of the International Energy Association – Energy Outlook, the different load factors are described as:</p> <p><i>While there are no definitive utilization breakpoints, base load plants are facilities that operate almost continuously, generally at annual utilization rates of 70 percent or higher. Intermediate load plants are facilities that operate less frequently than base load plants, generally at annual utilization rates between 25 and 70 percent. Peaking plants are facilities that only run when the demand for electricity is very high, generally at annual utilization rates less than 25 percent.</i></p> <p>Since renewable technologies have annual utilisation factors well below 70% they are not regarded as base load. Eskom's coal and nuclear plants operate above 70% and therefore these technologies are referred to as baseload.</p>

<b>HERMANUS PUBLIC MEETING (23 MARCH 2010)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
38	Ms Katrin Pobantz Tesselaarsdal Action Group	<p>Ms Pobantz stated that they are aware of renewable sources that can provide up to 10,000MW. But capping is set at 875MW and that does not make sense. There is a possibility for another power source, which does not kill people around them, which does not have the potential to explode.</p> <p>She also added that there is a potential of having passive houses, the residential houses could provide electricity back into the grid.</p> <p>She explained that this happens in Germany, give people an opportunity to feed into the grid and reduce their own consumption. Why is South African not giving people the incentive to start providing into the grid? She also went on to say that the Independent Power Suppliers should also be given the potential to come into the grid. She feels that this could be the first and quickest option and yet the Nuclear option, which costs a fortune, is being investigated.</p> <p>Eskom should be looking further than Nuclear.</p>	<p>Mr Stott: It is important to start differentiating between Eskom, the National Energy Regulator of South Africa (NERSA) and the Department of Energy (DoE). It is the DoE that deals with the energy planning for the country and not Eskom.</p> <p>The DoE is responsible for the Integrated Resource Plan (IRP) and determines what mix of renewables, hydropower, nuclear, solar, etc comes from Eskom and how much comes from the Independent Power Producers. The framework that enables the IPPs to provide electricity, it is not Eskom.</p> <p>NERSA provides the regulatory framework that enables the IPPs to produce into the network. If there is any cap, it is NERSA's cap and not Eskom's.</p> <p>Eskom is looking at a range of energy options. They are looking at wind; there is already environmental authorisation for a wind farm of 100MW and a concentrated solar power plant. Eskom is investigating other options, which will diversify the energy mix.</p>
39	Mr Mike Kantey CANE	<p>Mr Kantey noted that it has not been Eskom's decision to go nuclear, it is the National Government's responsibility to influence policy and that policy, which he has witnessed for the past years, has been determined outside Eskom's. It has been imposed on Eskom by the central government during the National Party era and beyond. It is difficult dealing with that policy.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

<b>HERMANUS PUBLIC MEETING (23 MARCH 2010)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<p>He went on to say that given that political faith, the only way citizens of this country can oppose this policy collectively, under the democratic order of the Constitution of South Africa, is to form a coalition (which may be opposing nuclear energy as a side show) but the real coalition is for People's Summit on Energy Policy which Dave Sax and Richard Worthington of WWF have already proposed for the middle of this year. So what we need to forge is a popular front for the liberation of energy policy. If the citizens of SA can do that, Eskom will become their allies overnight.</p>	
40	Mr Mike Kantey CANE	<p>Mr Kantey stated that this whole thing that has been running in Cape Town to subsidise industry, specifically to the Bayside and Hillside Aluminium Smelters. Clearly, the smelters are the big energy consumers and not residential; they are industrial and mining sectors and are located in the north of the country.</p> <p>He added that in fact, energy goes both ways to and from the grid, but we need to be aware that whether it is PWR, renewables or something else, a grid is a grid. These arguments have been going on since the 80's. So the real issue is - is it necessary to mess up a beautiful spot in the biosphere in the Agulhas Plain? He asked if it is it worthwhile, from a national interest similar to St Lucia, sacrificing this particular site out of national expedience.</p>	Comment noted.

<b>HERMANUS PUBLIC MEETING (23 MARCH 2010)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
41	I&AP	<p>Die hele ding oor alternatiewe energie gaan nie oor wat Eskom besig is om te bou nie; dit gaan oor wat onafhanklike verskaffers toegelaat word. Ons weet wat Eskom besig is om te bou. Ons wil hê Eskom moet die deur oopmaak saam met die regering sodat onafhanklike mense kan inkom. Die tweede ding is dat die departement van omgewing is 'n regeringsliggaam; dit is nie 'n organisasie nie.</p> <p>Die een ding wat ek ook wil vra, heeltemal af van hierdie punt af.</p> <p>Ons het 'n e-pos gestuur en gevra hoekom kan hierdie document nie ook in Caledon beskikbaar gestel word nie. Daar het niks van ons versoek gekom om dit beskikbaar te stel nie, want dit was ook vroeër genoem dat die mense wat op die lyne sit het eintlik niks met Bantamsklip te doen nie. Dit is die grootste klop nonsens wat daar is. Daardie mense, al sit hulle in Grabouw, dan is hulle net so betrokke in wat daar gebeur. Kan ons net hierdie inligting oral beskikbaar maak?</p> <p>Met die eerste Draft Scoping Report moes ons ook gevra het om dit beskikbaar te maak het in Caledon.</p> <p><u>Translation:</u></p> <p>The issue is that it is not about alternative energy that Eskom is building, but it is about what independent power producers are permitted to do. There is an</p>	<p><b>A copy of the Draft Environmental Impact Report was hand delivered by Ms Ball on 21 March 2010 and placed in the Caledon Public Library for public review on 23 March 2010.</b></p>



<b>HERMANUS PUBLIC MEETING (23 MARCH 2010)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<p>awareness of what Eskom is busy building. Eskom, together with government, should open the door to independent producers. Secondly; the Department of Environment is a government body and not an organisation.</p> <p>An issue that is completely off the point that was raised, an e-mail requested that these documents be made available in Caledon; however, there was no response to this request. It was also mentioned that the people who are affected by the transmission line have nothing to do with Bantamsklip. This is utter nonsense. Even if these individuals are in Grabouw, they are just as involved in what occurs at Bantamsklip. Can this information not be made accessible to everybody?</p> <p>Similarly, a request for the first Draft Scoping Report to be made available in Caledon also had to be made.</p>	

<b>PEARLY BEACH PUBLIC MEETING (24 MARCH 2010)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
1	I&AP Pearly Beach Ratepayers Association	The I&AP noted that it has been said that Bantamsklip is not being considered for Nuclear-1, and wanted to know the reason that it is not an option for Nuclear-1.	Mr Heydenrych: For the purpose of Nuclear-1 EIA, Bantamsklip option has been 'ruled out' as an alternative, as it is not the preferred site. But this is not to say that it will be excluded as a possible site in the future since the outcomes of this EIA are that the alternative sites do not have fatal flaws.
2	Mr Mike Ravenscroft Landowner	<p>Mr Ravenscroft asked if the team were aware that by excluding Bantamsklip site – that the longer they leave it, the more difficult it would be to get development in the area. The environment e.g. sense of place, visual, etc, are all the factors, which now have significance when considering potential developments. For the purposes of Bantamsklip, it should be noted that conservation is playing a far bigger part in the area, with the opportunities that are presented by the SANParks. Visual is a negative impact in nearly everything that we have discussed.</p> <p>He went on to say that by leaving Bantamsklip now, they are allowing an opportunity for it to become part of the Agulhas National Park.</p>	<p>Mr Stott: This EIA was for one nuclear power station at one site. Different sites were looked at in order to decide which one is the preferred option for Nuclear-1 (if it is approved). We have said at all public meetings since we started in 2007 that the estimation of nuclear power required is 20 000 MW.</p> <p>He went on to further explain that the government indicates that it requires more nuclear energy in South Africa, then Eskom will look at other potential sites. It is hoped that this information will be published in the Integrated Resources Plan (IRP), which the Department of Energy have stated that they will publish in June this year (2010).</p> <p>An EIA would have to be done should Nuclear-2 and Nuclear-3 be required. Therefore it does not mean that Bantamsklip has been ruled out forever.</p>

<b>PEARLY BEACH PUBLIC MEETING (24 MARCH 2010)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
3	Ms Amanda Jephson Save Bantamsklip Association	<p>Ms Jephson said that from what has been presented, it seems as though Thyspunt was the most sensitive site. She asked if an EIA is worth it, because it seems that regardless of what the EIA shows in terms of sensitivity, the final site selection was based on the economics, transmission integration and the close proximity of the site to the load centre, in this case, Coega.</p> <p>She queried if a site is chosen regardless of how sensitive the site is? Is it all about economics, transmission integration and load centres? It does not seem to make a difference in the selection process.</p> <p>The information that has been presented does show that Thyspunt is the most sensitive site. So in the end do you choose a site with a basis that you will conserve the site as a Natural Heritage Site?</p>	<p>Ms Ball: In terms of the assessment, we had 24 different specialists. In terms of clusters, there were 3 clusters, such as the biophysical environment, the socio-economics and economics. At the integration meeting with all 24 specialists, we considered potential impacts within their specific disciplines. The specialists assisted in identifying those studies that would influence the site selection. For example, where the significance was equal across all three sites, the outcomes of that study was excluded for the purposes of site selection. This is not to say that any one of the specialist recommendation and impacts are ignored, there are mitigation measures included in the EMP for all disciplines (appendix F).</p> <p>Ms Ball therefore disagreed with the speaker that environmental aspects were not looked at. The specialists helped us integrate the findings of the assessment of the alternatives. Our assessment now includes the factors such as cost implications and socio-economic implications.</p>
4	I&AP Pearly Beach Resident	<p>The speaker understood that there are new technological advancements of these nuclear power stations, i.e. new ways that do not use water-cooling. If that is true, it was questioned why we still using water-cooling technology?</p>	<p>Mr Stott: Certainly, even coal-fired power stations that we have in South Africa use dry cooling. There are nuclear power stations that use dry cooling but there are no power stations that use zero water for cooling.</p> <p>For a nuclear power station, for safety reasons, high volumes of water are always needed as a back up should you still need water for cooling. Even if you have a dry-cooling system, you need to have back-up water, e.g. a dam or near to the sea.</p> <p>At the moment in South Africa, nuclear power stations near</p>

<b>PEARLY BEACH PUBLIC MEETING (24 MARCH 2010)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		A second point was raised that no one presently views Eskom as financially stable. Where is Eskom getting the money for these Nuclear Power Stations?	<p>the coastline are needed for the use of the sea for cooling purposes. If the sea is not used, potable water would have to be used. South Africa is a water stressed country and cannot afford to use potable water for cooling purposes. The less water we use for industrial use, for power generation, the better.</p> <p>Government, together with Eskom, is looking at the funding options for the expansion of the electricity supply system in South Africa. For any kind of power station, regardless of whether it is a nuclear, coal-fired or renewable energy power station, funding is required.</p> <p>This is linked to a process called the Integrated Resources Plan (IRP), which is being done by the Department of Energy. The IRP considers how much the demand for electricity is likely to grow over the next 20 years, what kind of power stations should be built to meet that demand and who should build and operate those power stations. The cost of the different kinds of power stations is one of the considerations taken into account.</p> <p>The licensing process of the National Energy Regulator of South Africa also considers the impact of any new power stations on the electricity prices.</p>
5	Mr John Williams Save Bantamsklip Association	Mr Williams alleged that the Bantamsklip site is flawed and he will make submissions and commentaries right up to the end of the deadline date. He had 3 questions The first question concerns the site sensitivity map.	Mr Greeff: If I understand you correctly, the property, which you are talking about, is part of Walker Bay State Forest but is managed by Cape Nature at present. Eskom is busy talking to government regarding the purchase of the property which extends to the Bantamsklip site.

<b>PEARLY BEACH PUBLIC MEETING (24 MARCH 2010)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<p>He reminded everyone that the presenter stated that Groot Hagelkraal – was registered as site 72, registered before Eskom expropriated it. The presenter had correctly said that the SA Heritage status is an unregulated status so does not have legal status.</p> <p>The question Mr Williams asked is related to the fact that the site has occupied Soetfontein. He enquired if Eskom had bought Soetfontein and have they negotiated the use of Pearly Beach Nature Reserve with Cape Nature? Close examination of the map shows that the boundary is the Cape Nature Reserve.</p> <p>Mr Williams commented that this discussion is very interesting because they have already dug into the area and already expropriated the Cape Nature Reserve. The gentleman had stated that the whole area is called Waterford and belongs to the SANParks. The point of what is being discussed about is an area of a congregated protected area. Presently, Cape Nature is managing it very well. The point of the argument is that that area is part of a system of national and international importance. The Agulhas National Park extends and consolidates and enhances itself. What is happening is that by Eskom capturing that piece of land it has hamstrung the ability of the area to develop as an ecotourism area because of the threat that is constantly hanging over the stakeholders' head. He went on to say that in his opinion, Eskom will come and build a Nuclear Power Station whenever they feel like doing so.</p>	<p>Another correction that I can help you with is, the special section, which runs to the north, site 298, which has been registered by Eskom. The farm Groot Hagelkraal had been a proclaimed nature reserve, when Eskom bought the property but that proclamation lapsed on the purchase.</p>

<b>PEARLY BEACH PUBLIC MEETING (24 MARCH 2010)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		The threat of this power station is hanging right in the heart of our biodiversity area, in fact in the centre of endemism or the most endemic area of our country.	
6	Mr John Williams Save Bantamsklip Association	Mr Williams asked about the envelope criteria: what they heard is that authority is being sought for 4,000MW or 10,000MW. The fatal flaw here is that they cannot define the plant they are using. He would like to understand, how do you deal with the fact that you don't know what plant you are building?  He asked someone to explain the envelope of criteria. He compared this scenario to being told to buy the car, in the cubby hole, there will be the manual, you do not know any details about the car such as what the engine size is, etc.	Ms Ball: Eskom knows exactly what technology type they intend to use, it is a Pressurised Water Reactor (PWR), but they do not know the plant type. A correction to Mr Williams' statement is needed. She agreed that they have been working with an envelope of criteria, (of technical and environmental criteria) and it is a comprehensive envelope of criteria contained in Appendix C of Draft EIR. If an environmental authorisation were received Eskom would be required to build a plant that is within these criteria. This EIA is for 4000MW at one site.
7	Ms Amanda Jephson Save Bantamsklip Association Strandveld Tourism and Conservation Association	Ms Jephson then read an extract from the EIA report. According to the specialist, Bantamsklip is situated within a sensitive Overberg Region, the site is very sensitive on a number of Late Stone Age Heritage dimensions. By Western Cape standards, the preservation and volume of archaeological sites is exceptional. Mitigation will be lengthy, expensive and resource intensive. Furthermore, the natural heritage landscapes of the place are excellent and make a real contribution to the sense of place in the region. The power station is likely to be visible over a very wide area (bear in mind of how flat it is here). The transmission lines, which will leave the site, will impact the scenic qualities of some of the iconic and treasured landscapes.	Ms Ball: I will have to verify the quote. I am glad that you have read it and say it is in our specialist study. In a number of specialist studies, the specialists have rated the impacts with medium to high significance. The specialists have also looked at potential mitigation measures.  We have examined and discussed the report with Eskom and the 24 independent specialists. Recommendations have been built into the EMP and should any of the sites be authorised, Eskom would have to comply with the mitigation measures.

PEARLY BEACH PUBLIC MEETING (24 MARCH 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		She stated that she was endorsing what Mr John Williams had said. It is the Eastern entrance to the Cape Agulhas National Park. Can you imagine the tourists coming through to the Agulhas National Park and seeing this monstrosity?	
8	Ms Amanda Jephson Save Bantamsklip Association	Ms Jephson reiterated that it is stated that in the specialist report that Bantamsklip is highly visible and the visual impact cannot be mitigated. She does not understand how this matter is going to be dealt with.	<b>The comments received are being discussed with the visual specialist and if required the report will be modified when finalised.</b>
9	Mr John Williams Save Bantamsklip Association	Mr Williams noted that the end of the 2 <sup>nd</sup> question was answered but not satisfactorily.  Koeberg is 1 900 MW and here 4000MW or even 10 000MW is being discussed. The answer given was that the specialist would deal with all of this, does that mean that the specialist will deal with 2 or 3 units in each site?	Ms Ball: This EIA is for one nuclear power station of up to 4 000 MW, depending on the plant type this could be 2 or 3 units. In the site sensitivity analysis, the specialists looked at sensitive areas on the site, how many units can each site accommodate and identified any areas on the sites, which are not considered sensitive. 31 hectares is required for one Nuclear Power Station of 4000MW.  Should Eskom need to build another Nuclear Power Station, they will need to undertake another EIA process.
10	Mr John Williams Save Bantamsklip Association	Mr Williams said that an 800m buffer was referred to, he wanted to know what is a buffer zone?	Mr Heydenrych: A buffer is an area, which will be imposed by the National Nuclear Regulator in which no one may reside. The main purpose of a buffer is for safety. It means the power station needs to be located away from the road reserve.
11	Mr John Williams Save Bantamsklip Association	Mr Williams stated that there are no seismic regulations in South Africa and he questioned the use of USA seismic risk regulation criteria.	Mr Stott: Yes, you are correct. The seismic criterion for the site is not yet promulgated in South Africa. The National Nuclear Regulator (NNR) is accountable for this aspect. In the absence of regulatory criterion, we have been using USA, and we have used various international standards as a baseline from the International Atomic Energy Agency.

<b>PEARLY BEACH PUBLIC MEETING (24 MARCH 2010)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
			We have a seismic design and all stations are designed based on Peak Ground Acceleration (PGA) values. You may have noticed that Koeberg's PGA was higher. The existing Koeberg nuclear power station had to be designed in a manner, which considered the PGA value, which necessitated additional design.
12	I&AP	This I&AP noted that there is a fault line in Bantamsklip; it would seem irresponsible to even consider putting in a Nuclear Power Station at Bantamsklip. Why put it there?	Mr Stott: There is no upper limit for designing a nuclear power station intended to be constructed in an area with the potential for seismic activity. The existence of fault lines and hence potential seismic activity means that building would cost more and also take more time to build. It is all about the time it takes to do additional design and cost associated with an area which has higher seismic potential.
13	I&AP	A question was raised as to how many reactor units will be needed in order to generate 4,000MW? There are 2 units in Koeberg, why are more units required?	Mr Stott: It was up to 4 000 MW because at the time of starting this Nuclear-1 EIA, we were looking at two technologies. One of the technologies was 1 100 MW and the other one was for 1 650 MW, which would have translated to 3 300 MW if there were either 3 units (for the 1 100 MW technology) or 2 units (for the 1 650 MW technology) respectively per site. So, we instructed the environmental consultant, to be conservative, and to go for 4 000 MW.
14	Mr John Williams Save Bantamsklip Association	Mr Williams advised the Environmental Assessment Practitioner that the Oceanographic Specialist, Appendix E is not found on the website.	Noted with thanks. Appendix will be re-loaded on the website.



PEARLY BEACH PUBLIC MEETING (24 MARCH 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
15	Mr John Williams Save Bantamsklip Association	Mr Williams requested Eskom to exercise its corporate responsibility and that they consider very seriously selling Groot Hagelkraal (their site) to Agulhas National Park. An application is to be submitted to UNESCO for a World Heritage Status for the 20km radius of Bantamsklip between the Dyer Island Nature Reserve and SANParks.  It is believed that the criterion for a world heritage status actually exists and that Eskom should retreat from this position, which people believe, is unsustainable and has no mitigation measures.	Comment noted.
16	Mr Eugene Hendry Pearly Beach Residents Association	Mr Hendry asked if Eskom is looking for more sites along the coastline?	Mr Stott: Certainly, if the government in its Integrated Resource Plan, which they have indicated that they will publish in June this year (2010), indicate that they are going for more nuclear power stations, we would have to find more nuclear power station sites.
17	Ms Amanda Jephson Save Bantamsklip Association	I would like to pick up on this World Heritage Site and archaeology. <input type="checkbox"/> The statement of significance in your report states that Bantamsklip is highly significant in terms of Late Stone Age, which is 50 years (date is definitely wrong) ago and Middle Stone Age archaeology, which is 300 years (date is definitely wrong) ago. It further states that Late Stone Age of this area is directly linked to the heritage of South Africans who are alive today and is automatically protected by Section 35 of the National Heritage Resources Act. I would like to ask, with respect to the requirements of the NHRA, how is that protection going to help here?	Ms Ball: The specialist is from UCT and has extensive knowledge of the study area. One of the key recommendations in the Draft EIR is that extensive <i>in situ</i> excavations should be undertaken on site where Eskom wants to build a nuclear power station. If Eskom want to start with construction, Eskom will have to start with excavations quite early. Eskom have already established from the archaeologist as to how long it would take to compete the excavation.  In terms of the protection of the NHRA, all recommendations that have been made by the specialists are in line with the NHRA.

PEARLY BEACH PUBLIC MEETING (24 MARCH 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❑ In <i>situ</i> excavations being done are mentioned in the report. Ms Jephson enquired when these excavations are going to take place?</li> <li>❑ She also wanted clarity on the length of time for implementing mitigation measures, which had been mentioned as long periods. She asked if Eskom is prepared to wait for long periods to build the nuclear power station since it is urgently required.</li> </ul>	<p>Ms Herbst: Excavations can take up to 6 months. However, the important point is that no matter how long it takes it has to be done if it means getting more resources to complete the excavations, Eskom will have to do that. No matter how long it takes, we have to complete the relevant excavations prior to commencing with construction.</p>
18	Mr Mike Ravenscroft Kleynkloof Private Nature Reserve	<p>Mr Ravenscroft's issues concerned spent fuel:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❑ His understanding is that there are 3 categories of the waste and the high level/ spent fuel is the most dangerous.</li> <li>❑ He also understands that 2 types of waste will be taken to Vaalputs. Seeing the excavations that are done for waste levels 2 and 3, shows that Eskom is worried about nuclear waste.</li> <li>❑ Nuclear waste will be carted to the Northern Cape on South African roads and South African roads are not the safest in the world, he asked whose responsibility this will be.</li> <li>❑ He further enquired, in terms of transporting of waste from the site to Vaalputs, who is going to guarantee the safety of transportation.</li> </ul>	<p>Mr Stott: Whatever radioactive waste is generated at the power station would eventually need to be transported to the national nuclear waste depository site. At this stage, waste is transported via road to Vaalputs under the jurisdiction of Dept of Transport and also under the National Nuclear Regulator. They use the International Atomic Agency standards for the transport of radioactive waste. So, we have to comply with those standards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❑ Low and Intermediate level waste - the levels of radiation outside the container are well below the limits. For example, in similar transportation methods, which are used in Germany, Japan, UK, and France, you must be able to stand next to the trucks and radiation levels must be below the required limits. Tests are done and are in accordance with the National Nuclear Regulator (NNR). We have to meet the regulations before radioactive material can be transported to the repository site.</li> <li>❑ High-level waste, which is a category 3, at this stage, the Vaalputs site is not licensed to store high-level waste. In fact, there is no final repository site in South Africa that is licensed for high-level waste storage. The</li> </ul>

PEARLY BEACH PUBLIC MEETING (24 MARCH 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
			government promulgated legislation last year, the National Radioactive Waste Disposal Institute This body has been tasked to develop a repository for high radioactive waste.
19	Mr Marc Brindeau Franskraal Ratepayers Association	Mr Brindeau asked where sediment comes from when offshore disposal of sediment is mentioned.	Mr Heydenrych: Before the power station is built, an excavation needs to be done for power station foundations. Because a power station needs to be built on bedrock, as a result of the excavations, you have to dispose of the spoil either on land or in the ocean. Our recommendation is that the spoil be disposed in the ocean rather than on land because on land it would cause a much larger footprint.
20	Ms Amanda Jephson Save Bantamsklip Association	<p>Ms Jephson posed a 3 part question:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❑ What is the projected quantity of effluent from the proposed nuclear power station in cubic metres per annum?</li> <li>❑ What would the projected content of Strontium 90 be in Becquerel per annum? (Importantly, Strontium 90 is very dangerous).</li> <li>❑ What would the projected radioactivity be in a sample kilogram mass of abalone and black mussels in the vicinity of Bantamsklip? Those are filter feeders.</li> </ul>	<p>Ms Ball: The response will be checked with the specialists, who are internationally renowned marine specialists, e.g. Prof Griffiths. If information is not available on the existing reports, we shall provide responses in the Issues and Response Report.</p> <p>Ms Ball indicated that these are very important questions and will provide feedback to Ms Jephson.</p> <p><b>Pers. comm. Professor Charles Griffiths (Marine Specialist) 10/05/2010:</b></p> <p><b>1. The quantity of effluent released at the Koeberg Nuclear Power Station is approximately 27 km<sup>3</sup>/s. This is however not significant when compared to the total volume of fluid (sea water) that passes any particular point on the South African coast line in a specified period.</b></p> <p><b>2. A mussel filters through approximately 1 – 2 litres of water per day but does not abstract all of the</b></p>

<b>PEARLY BEACH PUBLIC MEETING (24 MARCH 2010)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
			<p>organisms and elements from the water. In some instances mussels have been used as passive monitors of heavy metal contents in seawater but in terms of radioactivity it is important to take into account that some background levels of radioactivity already exists.</p> <p>The following comment received from Dr. T.B. Robinson (Marine Specialist) also has reference:</p> <p>Since the 1940s human activity has resulted in varying degrees of contamination of the world's marine environment with anthropogenic radionuclides. Globally, the primary source of this contamination is fallout from over 520 atmospheric nuclear weapons tests (Friedlander et al 2005). These radionuclides now occur alongside naturally occurring compounds at varying concentrations throughout the world's oceans. In a recent review of radionuclides in the marine environment Friedlander <i>et al.</i> (2005) report the occurrence of Cesium (Cs-137) and Strontium (Sr-90) in bivalves along the west and east coast of America, in fish, mollusks, algae, seawater and sediment in Japan, in fish, seawater and sediments from the Arctic and related seas, and in fish, mollusks and crustaceans in the north Atlantic region. Equivalent data are not available for the southern hemisphere.</p> <p>Such background levels of radioactive Cesium were detected in monitoring in the vicinity of Koeberg Nuclear Power Station (Nuclear Power Station) prior to the operational phase of the station, when Cs-137 was</p>

<b>PEARLY BEACH PUBLIC MEETING (24 MARCH 2010)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
			<p>detected in a fish. Since then Cs-137 has been recorded in mussels, sand mussels and fish as part of the routine environmental monitoring programme at Nuclear Power Station (Alard 2005). The levels detected at Nuclear Power Station have been below the levels at which further investigations or compulsory reporting to the National Nuclear Regulator is required (Alard 2005). Strontium (Sr-90) has not been detected in marine organisms during routine radioactivity sampling at Nuclear Power Station (Alard 2005).</p> <p>Due to the very few organisms in which radioactive Cesium has been recorded at Nuclear Power Station, the low concentrations at which it has been recorded at and the lack of detection of radioactive Strontium, these compounds are not deemed to have a significant (or even detectable) impact on the marine environment around Nuclear Power Station Due to the design of the proposed Nuclear-1 plant, coupled with the experience gained at Nuclear Power Station, there is no reason to anticipate that contamination by Cesium or Strontium would occur as a result of the Nuclear-1 development.</p> <p>Alard, M.M.M. (2005) Environmental survey laboratory quarterly report (April - June). Submitted to Koeberg Nuclear Power Station.</p> <p>Friedlander BR, Gochfeld M, Burger J, Powers CW 2005 RADIONUCLIDES IN THE MARINE ENVIRONMENT A CRESP Science Review. pp 96.</p>

PEARLY BEACH PUBLIC MEETING (24 MARCH 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
21	Ms Carla Roelofse I&AP	<p>Ms Roelofse enquired about the financial impact be, in terms of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Business benefit in the area</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Impact of work force in the area</li> </ul> <p>While people are working in the area, will Eskom provide the infrastructure, will there be a permanent work force, etc and where will they be housed?</p>	<p>Mr Heydenrych: The Social Impact Assessment (SIA) has recognised the potential impacts arising from the influx of workers during construction. The SIA has also recognised that there may be work for additional people who come from outside the area seeking jobs. This has been recognised as a potential impact.</p> <p>In terms of permanent or temporary work force, Eskom has been advised to work closely with local authorities to identify an area, which is suitable for housing, construction camp and other associated infrastructure.</p>
22	Mr Malcolm Streaton	<p>Mr Streaton wanted to know how many people will work at the plant at any stage, and what the highest number will be during construction.</p> <p>He enquired where would people be housed during construction?</p>	<p>Mr Heydenrych: Approximately <b>7 700</b> people at peak. Not all the time. <b>(A figure of 5 000 was provided at the meeting and this has been updated).</b></p> <p>Ms Herbst: Eskom does not have all the answers at this stage, we were waiting for the selection of the preferred site. Once a site has been selected, Eskom can initiate detailed discussions with local authorities. It is during the discussions that details around the how and where we would accommodate that number of people will be resolved.</p> <p>Each area would be different, as an example, if we were to go to Duynefontein, it is a different scenario because you have the whole of Cape Town to absorb this number of people. However, if we were to come to Bantamsklip, we would need to have a special plan due to the lack of infrastructure. Just to share our experiences in Lephalale, which is quite a small town in the Bushveld in Limpopo Province, the contractors building Medupi power station needed to accommodate approximately 7 000 people. In</p>

<b>PEARLY BEACH PUBLIC MEETING (24 MARCH 2010)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
			<p>this case single quarters were used to accommodate approximately half of the employees. This was carefully planned and included a recreational area to try and keep people in the construction village. In towns, there were mostly permanent structures, which would remain after construction has been completed. These accommodated both single and married employees.</p> <p>Social issues such as supporting education, clinics and local infrastructure. The Eskom Foundation investigates the needs of the community once a preferred site has been selected and identifies areas where support can be given.</p>
23	Ms Amanda Jephson Save Bantamsklip Association	Ms Jephson stated that in fact, this is one of the aspects that has contributed to the exclusion of the Bantamsklip site as a preferred site. It is mentioned in the executive summary that it would be extremely difficult due to infrastructure requirements, destabilisation of the community, etc.	Ms Herbst: It is one of the issues that have been considered.
24	Mr Eugene Hendry Pearly Beach Ratepayers Association	Mr Hendry wanted to know about health impacts, and asked if there is any recourse from Eskom for the residents. He also enquired if there would be compensation during construction and operation.	<p>Ms Herbst: The EIA has identified some of those potential impacts, for which the mitigation measures are included in the Environmental Management Plan, which we have to comply with. If Eskom or the contractors do not comply with the Environmental Management Plan (EMP), construction is stopped. So there is compliance monitoring. The EMP is a legally binding document. In terms of other aspects that may not have been picked up by the Environmental Impact Assessment, it would obviously be looked at, on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>In some cases, we establish monitoring committees, which are representative of the relevant authorities, specialists and members of the community. If there is a legal issue, the</p>

PEARLY BEACH PUBLIC MEETING (24 MARCH 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
			matter follows the legal process. But in most instances, cases are resolved without having to go the legal route.
25	Mr John Williams Save Bantamsklip Association	<p>Mr Williams added the following issues regarding the marine component to the minutes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❑ Because of the proximity of Dyer Island, we would like to request that the modelling of the thermal plume, which is triggered by the suggestion of the pipeline, addresses the intake and outlet of the plant, bearing in mind that the pipe might be approximately 6 km from Dyer Island.</li> <li>❑ There is a noise, submarine noise level and there is a sediment transfer.</li> <li>❑ The current is predominantly in the south-easterly direction and the prevailing winds would be stronger in the south west direction rather than north west direction. In other words, that current and prevailing drift would go towards the Dyer Island.</li> <li>❑ Because of the sensitivity of the area we are asking that the marine study actually models over 4,000MW, 6,000MW, 8,000MW and 10,000MW.</li> </ul>	<p>Mr Heydenrych: The oceanographic specialist based her assessment on the oceanographic circulation patterns and in which direction the water flows and in which direction the spoil would be deposited, etc.</p> <p>The marine specialists are in fact the same specialists who are doing monitoring at Koeberg Nuclear Power Station. Therefore, the marine specialist is well acquainted with the modelling scenarios of a nuclear power station</p>
26	Mr Rudy John	Mr John asked how the noise affects the whales?	<p>Ms Ball: We have noted the comment and will take that back to the noise specialist. I am however confident that the whales have been considered as the marine environment has been an area of concern around Bantamsklip.</p> <p><b>Pers. comm. Adrian Jongens (Noise Specialist) 10/05/2010:</b></p> <p><b>The noise specialist has confirmed that there will be no impact on the whales as a result of any sound generated by the proposed Nuclear Power Station.</b></p>



<b>BREDASDORP PUBLIC MEETING (25 MARCH 2010)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
1	Mr Mike Kantey CANE	<p>Mr Kantey made reference: Slide 11, bullet 1: He said he finds it very difficult to understand scientifically, how the environmental impacts of a nuclear power station plant which pertains to human health can be analysed, if the type is unknown. How can we the impacts of emissions be scientifically analysed when we do not know what we are talking about? The impacts are described using an analysis of another power plant.</p> <p>The analysis using the car (Golf or Mercedes) does not work, as one needs a scientific analogy. He asked for an explanation and for scientific clarification, not using the car analysis - he wanted to know how impacts will be assessed?</p> <p>There is an AP 1000 and EPR - which one is being referred to?</p>	<p>Ms Ball: I would like to correct Mr Kantey, we do know the technology but not the plant type. It is a technical correction.</p> <p>The specialist used data, which has been based on an envelope of criteria and Eskom can explain how they arrived at the data that was used for the assessment.</p> <p>Ms Ball: We know that it is a Pressurised Water Reactor but we do not know the plant type (AREVA, Westinghouse etc).</p>
2	I&AP	<p>There was an enquiry regarding Scoping where it was asked if it is designed to see if there are any showstoppers on the Nuclear-1 project?</p>	<p>Ms Ball: Arcus GIBB undertook Scoping - which is aimed at collating issues, and to consider if there are any issues that need to be investigated further. Now we are in the Environmental Impact Assessment, which assesses the issues raised during the Scoping Phase.</p> <p>Based on the specialist investigations, there are no fatal flaws on any of the sites, once mitigation measures are implemented.</p>

<b>BREDASDORP PUBLIC MEETING (25 MARCH 2010)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
3	Mr Danie de Villiers Strandveld Tourism and Conservation Association	Mr de Villiers enquired about the term feasible – if the site is not feasible for Nuclear-1, it cannot be feasible for Nuclear 2 or 3. He asked for the accurate meaning o the term feasible.	<p>Ms Ball: I think Mr Heydenrych probably used the wrong terminology there. We have stated before that none of the specialists found fatal flaws on any of the alternative sites.</p> <p>The EIA Regulations talk about feasible and reasonable alternatives. Bantamsklip is a feasible alternative but it is however not our preferred alternative site for Nuclear-1.</p> <p>We do not know the future of the sites, but the sites which are not preferred for Nuclear-1 may, however, be used by Eskom for Nuclear-2 or Nuclear-3.</p> <p>An EIA would be undertaken for Nuclear-2 or Nuclear-3. The economic and social circumstances may have changed by the time Nuclear-2 or Nuclear-3 EIA studies commence. It would also have to be determined at that time if the alternatives considered are reasonable and feasible alternatives.</p>
4	Mr Mike Kantey CANE	<p>Mr Kantey put forward that he had a lot of questions and was very conscious of the nature of public participation. He was not sure how to handle questions given the time allowed and given the nature of concerns. He said he would not like to miss the opportunity for the public to listen to some of the concerns, which do not only concern him as CANE Chairperson, but also all constituent organisations, including Namaqualand, Pelindaba, Bantamsklip, etc.</p> <p>He finds it very difficult for an ordinary South African citizen to participate fully in a mandatory and constitutionally driven process. He asked for guidance from the Chairperson and the house as to how to</p>	<p>Facilitator: When we started the meeting, we had an agreement in principle that we can continue until 20h30, if need be.</p> <p>Ms Ball: This is not the only manner in which to participate but there are many other methods of participating in the process.</p> <p>The Facilitator confirmed with the participants that it was agreed that Mr Kantey would be given an opportunity to ask all his questions on an alternate basis.</p>

<b>BREDASDORP PUBLIC MEETING (25 MARCH 2010)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		proceed with participation when there are 40 minutes to ask and debate questions.	
5	Mr Leonard le Roux I&AP	Mr le Roux asked why the two Northern Cape sites, were originally rejected?	Ms Ball: In the Scoping Phase, the two sites were considered not feasible and reasonable for Nuclear-1. They would require large transmission corridors all the way to the national grid and extensive infrastructure construction, so they were scoped out based on the transmission integration.
6	Mr Tertius Carinus SANParks – Agulhas Biodiversity Initiative	Mr Carinus said that it is mentioned that there are only two alternatives in South Africa for base load, meaning coal or nuclear energy.  He had asked the following question earlier on in the process. This area is located in one of the hotspots for wave energy in South Africa and in the world. Why is wave energy not seen as an alternative for base load?	Mr Stott: Wave energy is certainly something that we are investigating and researching in Eskom but it is not commercially available in the large quantities that are needed in South Africa. It is not available in the range of 4 000 MW that we require from this particular nuclear power station.
7	Mr Tertius Carinus SANParks - ABI	Mr Carinus enquired about the conservation value adding at Thyspunt site and asked if this would be regarded as an offset measure? He feels it cannot be mitigation because there is an impact on the 31 hectares of the nuclear power station.	Ms Ball: You are certainly correct. There are various suggestions and recommendations from our specialists for Eskom to purchase land.  Offset measures are an option and have been recommended by some of the specialists.
8	Ms Katrin Pobantz Tesselaarsdal Action Group	Ms Pobantz asked for an explanation regarding the key criteria quantification for the sites. The scores for Thyspunt and Duynfontein have been supplied but not for Bantamsklip. She wanted to know the score for Bantamsklip?  Follow up question: She asked if it was a significantly lower score compared to Thyspunt and Duynfontein.	Mr Heydenrych: In the methodology we went through, we did the quantification, after we had already arrived at a conclusion that Bantamsklip was not a preferred alternative for Nuclear-1. So we did not score Bantamsklip.  Mr Heydenrych: We did not give Bantamsklip a quantified score. In terms of the qualitative impacts, we know what would occur on the site together with the cumulative impacts of transmission lines – and those would have been

<b>BREDASDORP PUBLIC MEETING (25 MARCH 2010)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		Ms Pobantz found it quite strange that Bantamsklip was not scored and would be interested in knowing the scoring.	higher at Bantamsklip than any of the other sites.
9	Mr Danie de Villiers Strandveld Tourism and Conservation Association	Mr de Villiers, as a point of clarity, noted that people have been told that the meeting is for a nuclear power station site and now they were told that Bantamsklip nuclear site has been scoped out using the cumulative impacts of transmission lines. He went on to ask how transmission lines are used for assessment. He wanted to know if the transmission lines were back in the discussion again (through the back door).	Ms Ball: As indicated earlier, the Scoping phase of the three transmission lines has been undertaken. We have the Scoping Reports, we have the list of issues and many of our specialists are working on both the transmission lines and the nuclear sites. We cannot pre-empt the recommendations and conclusions of the transmission line EIAs. That is why the Bantamsklip site was not scored and excluded as an alternative for Nuclear-1. However the assessment has taken note of the specialist reports and integrated them in the report.
10	Mr Danie de Villiers Strandveld Tourism and Conservation Association	<p>Mr de Villiers said that he had skimmed through the report and thinks it is a huge job and Arcus GIBB did a fantastic job, he added that he hoped that they had been paid enough. He then pointed out the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❑ The report is really Arcus GIBB's report and is not Eskom's.</li> <li>❑ Arcus GIBB has to be an independent Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP).</li> <li>❑ All the statements written in the report are supposed to be Arcus GIBB's statements.</li> <li>❑ There is a problem with some of the statements, which he saw in the report, he can see it is Eskom's statement and not Arcus GIBB's, as an independent EAP.</li> </ul> <p>He then highlighted for the purposes of the meeting, the whole issue around positive benefit if a Nuclear Power Station is built at Thyspunt and Bantamsklip –</p>	Ms Ball: There are 24 different specialists, the assessment identified positive benefits associated with the Nuclear Power Station at each of these sites. This has come up time and time again. Please read those specialist studies because that is the origin of the information of potential positive benefits. Arcus GIBB has taken note of the specialists' recommendations and have obviously integrated them into our report.

<b>BREDASDORP PUBLIC MEETING (25 MARCH 2010)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<p>because there is going to be a private conservation area. He pointed out that the whole of Strandveld is full of private nature reserves. There is an implication or impression given that Eskom is now going to do something special. He wanted it noted that they can do it themselves.</p> <p>The 2<sup>nd</sup> point he wanted to make is that if Eskom does not build a Nuclear Power Station, then they would have to sell the property and others may buy it and do something terrible on the property.</p>	
11	Mr Mike Kantey CANE	<p>Mr Kantey said he would like to follow up directly with Mr Danie de Villiers' contribution by looking, specifically at <u>Slide 34, bullet 3</u>:</p> <p>He read the following into the record of the meeting for the purposes of the issues trail:</p> <p>"Perceived risks associated with the Nuclear incidence could potentially lead to a change in the attitude and behaviour, reliable information and support....."</p> <p>He said what this tells him in the greater languages of literature is that - people have perceptions and Arcus GIBB has the proof. There is a lot of stuff that has been said orally and should be available in the recording. He would like it to be recorded that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> What the consultants are saying is that they have facts and what the public is saying is a perception.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> This to him is prejudice of the first order, what the</li> </ul>	<p>Ms Ball: I would like to re-iterate that we value all your comments, suggestions and input from many local experts. This particular slide comes directly from the executive summary of the Social Specialist Report., We have paraphrased it, but it comes directly from that report.</p> <p>The point has been noted and I will take it back to the specialist.</p>

<b>BREDASDORP PUBLIC MEETING (25 MARCH 2010)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<p>consultants are telling everyone is that the public are incompetent, unable to make a scientific assessment on the merits of the case</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>□ The public are cognitively and perceptually incorrect. We are like retarded children. The consultants are the experts, the scientists and engineers, they will tell the public what is true and the public will never manage to know what is true because they are too stupid.</li> <li>□ He suggested that everyone Google “ manage public perception” when an industry of managing public perception will be found. This is what the public are witnessing tonight – and this is what they have witnessed previously; it is management of public perception.</li> </ul> <p>He, representing many constituents, would like to object to that treatment, from a constitutional perspective.</p> <p>He stated that his question with relation to a word “perceived” had not been answered – he wanted to know what is it doing in the slide, which has Arcus GIBB’s signature?</p> <p>There have been learned journal references, volumes and volumes of submissions, and there is a very learned submission from Danie’s group (Strandveld Tourism and Conservation Association), extremely learned, and what the consultants are telling us is that everything that is in their submission, with respect, is calculated as “perceived” and not true and that’s the</p>	

<b>BREDASDORP PUBLIC MEETING (25 MARCH 2010)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		linguistic interpretation. You cannot use that word with respect to submissions made by the public.	
12	Mr Ettiene Fourie SANParks	Mr Fourie directed his question to Eskom and asked how soon do they think they will need Nuclear 2 and 3 – when will these other sites be activated?	<p>Mr Stott: As Ms Ball mentioned in one of the slides, the demand for electricity is growing at greater than 4%. Currently it is around 7% year on year. There is a continuing increase in the demand for electricity.</p> <p>The Government is working on the Integrated Resource Plan (IRP) 2. The previous version IRP1 which was published in December 2009 only went up to 2013. They are currently working on an Integrated Resource Plan for the next 20 years.</p> <p>The release of IRP 2 – expected in June 2010 - would inform us if there would be a need for Nuclear-2 and Nuclear-3. From Eskom's perspective, we believe that Nuclear-2 would be needed two (2) years after Nuclear-1 starts construction.</p> <p>In other words, in the second half of the year, if the Government decides on nuclear, we would have to submit the EIA application for Nuclear-2.</p>
13	Ms Katrin Pobantz Tesselaarsdal Action Group	<p>Ms Pobantz asked if the desalination plant was considered in the initial application by Eskom for Nuclear-1?</p> <p>She also asked if the desalination plant would not be subject to a separate EIA?</p>	<p>Ms Ball: Yes, a desalination plant is required and it has been assessed as part of the Nuclear-1 EIA.</p> <p>All specialists have assessed potential impacts of a desalination plant and in the alternative section you will see that we looked at the impact of brine (concentrated salty water).</p>

BREDASDORP PUBLIC MEETING (25 MARCH 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
14	Mr Kobus Visser Tesselaarsdal Group Action	<p>Ek wil net oor een ding duidelikheid kry. In die hele voorlegging word daar nie baie aandag gegee aan een ding nie. Julle het daardie punt uitgelaat wat julle op Hermanus gedoen het, naamlik om elke ding 'n punt te gee van wat sy belangrikheid was in die proses van besluitneming. Onder andere het julle daar gesê Marine Environment het net een gekry waar goed soos seismologie vier gekry het. My vraag is dit, hoekom is Marine Environment so laag geskat en tweede ding wat ek net vir Eskom wil vra is hulle moet net vir ons kwantifiseer hoeveel ton afval wil julle in die see inpomp en hoe diep wil julle dit in die see inpomp? Is daar 'n Impak studie gedoen op hierdie plek in die see en wat gaan daar gebeur?</p> <p><u>Translation:</u></p> <p>Clarification is required on one matter; in this presentation not much attention is paid to a certain issue that was presented at Hermanus, and has been omitted. Each issue was awarded a value according to its importance in the decision-making process. Amongst other things, it was stated that the Marine environment received a "1", where other matters such as seismology received a "4". Why is the Marine Environment so low? Secondly, can Eskom quantify the tons of waste that it will be pumping into the sea and how deep into the sea will this be pumped? Has an impact study been done in terms of where this pumping will take place and what the effect will be?</p>	<p>Die Marine Bioloog het spesifiek na daardie impakte gekyk. Hoekom dit nie net so belangrik ge-ag is as al die ander impakte nie, is omdat al die impakte gemitigeer kan word en dat dit die in Marine Bioloog se opinie is dat al die ander impakte laag genoeg is dat dit aanvaar kan word.</p> <p>Die Marine Bioloog het spesifiek na die omgewings by al drie terreine gekyk. Die materiaal wat uit die pyplyn gaan kom gaan kom, gaan is ongeveer 20 tot 25m onder seevlak wees en sal ten minste 'n kilometre van die hoogwater merk af wees.</p> <p><u>Translation</u></p> <p>The marine biologist specifically looked at this impact. The reason why this was not seen as important as all the other impacts, is that all the other impacts can be mitigated and the Marine Biologist is of the opinion that if all the other impacts are low enough, that this will be acceptable.</p> <p>The marine biologist specifically looked at all three alternative sites. The material that will be pumped offshore by pipeline, will be approximately 20 to 25 m below sea level and at least a kilometre from the high water mark.</p> <p>The quantities of soil, according to the Marine Biology Assessment, is 10.07 million m<sup>3</sup> spoil from the excavation of the intake tunnel, intake basin, nuclear island and turbine hall.</p>



<b>BREDASDORP PUBLIC MEETING (25 MARCH 2010)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
15	Mr Tertius Carinus SANParks – Agulhas Biodiversity Initiative	<p>Daar was 'n redelike sterk inset gelewer van landbou se kant af rondom die impak van die Transmissie lyne op die landbou ekonomie. And I did not see that in the Economic Impact. Waar is daardie insette, want dit het 'n redelike groot impak in die Landbou bedryf?</p> <p><u>Translation:</u></p> <p>A relatively strong contribution was made by agriculture regarding the impact of the transmission lines on the agricultural economy. This is not reflected in the Economic Impact study. Where are these contributions recorded – there is a relatively big impact on the Agricultural economy.</p>	<p>Soos Me Ball voorheen gesê het, hierdie spesifieke impak studie gaan net oor die Nuclear-1 Kernkragsentrale en nie oor Transmissielyne nie. Elke perseel besig met hulle eie omgewingsimpakstudies vir die Transmissie lyne. Daar is drie impakstudies om te kyk na hierdie terreine, so ek kan nie vir jou 'n antwoord gee voordat daardie Transmissielyne se Impakstudies voltooi is nie.</p> <p><u>Translation:</u></p> <p>As Ms Ball stated earlier, this specific impact study is only for the Nuclear-1 power station and not for the transmission lines. Each of the proposed nuclear sites has independent studies that are being conducted for the transmission lines. No answers regarding the outcomes of these studies can be provided at this stage as they are still ongoing.</p>
16	Mr Mike Kantey CANE	<p>Mr Kantey had a follow up question on emissions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Impact of Strontium 90 on effluent.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Impact in terms of the Becquerels per kilogram per mass.</li> </ul> <p>He felt that the information given was irrelevant. He did not want to go through a presentation on what is happening at Koeberg. He simply needs a response in becquerels per kilogram per mass. He added that the data set or the information is not in the report.</p>	<p>Mr Heydenrych: The marine biologist did look at this.</p> <p>Ms Ball: The specialist should have considered this and if the information is not there, we will get the specialist to provide the specific information.</p>

<b>BREDASDORP PUBLIC MEETING (25 MARCH 2010)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
17	Mr Tertius Carinus SANParks – Agulhas Biodiversity Initiative	<p>Mr Carinus said that he finds one part of this EIA, a grey area regarding Bantamsklip. The site is not important but too sensitive, but it is still potentially number 3. He wanted to know when they will hear from Eskom that the negative impacts associated with Bantamsklip make it unviable because of the length of transmission lines, when it will no longer be considered.</p> <p>He asked what they could do to help them take it off the list of potential nuclear power station sites.</p> <p>He went on to explain that SANParks is on both sides of the Bantamsklip site. So the chances of the area becoming a national park due to its conservation status are significantly higher.</p>	<p>Ms Ball: In terms of our EIA as previously explained, all specialists have found that with mitigation, there are no fatal flaws on any of the alternative sites.</p> <p>It has also been said that Bantamsklip is not the preferred site for Nuclear-1. I cannot comment on Nuclear-2 and -3.</p> <p>Mr Stott: Bantamsklip is still on our list. Duynfontein is also on the list. Thyspunt is also on our list. The two sites in the Northern Cape are still on our list. So those are the five (5) sites, which we have on our list at the moment. The specialist studies have found no fatal flaws on any of the sites (and that is the information we have been given). So there is no reason for Eskom to take any sites off the list.</p>
18	Mr Mick Dalton Agulhas Biodiversity Initiative	<p>Mr Dalton asked for an explanation for the criterion for a fatal flaw. He also asked for an example of a fatal flaw.</p>	<p>Ms Ball: A fatal flaw would potentially be an impact, which could not be mitigated. That is, an impact that would be of extremely high significance, even after mitigation.</p> <p>SANParks: A transmission line through the Kruger National Park is one example.</p> <p>Ms Ball: A pipeline of iron ore through the Kruger National Park from Mozambique.</p>
19	Mr Danie de Villiers Strandveld Tourism and Conservation Association	<p>Mr de Villiers noted that legislation and the EIA regulations say that cumulative impacts have to be considered.</p> <p>He said that they have heard that if Eskom wants to extend the nuclear power station, they would have to commission a new EIA, and this is because of</p>	<p>Ms Ball: During this EIA phase, in the Terms of Reference (TOR) of specialists, specialists were requested to identify any fatal flaws in the various sites. None of the specialists identified a fatal flaw on any of the sites.</p> <p>We also asked the specialists to look at potential cumulative impacts.</p>

<b>BREDASDORP PUBLIC MEETING (25 MARCH 2010)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<p>cumulative impacts and they are extremely important.</p> <p>Cumulative impacts in this report have been used to decide that Thyspunt is a preferred site. This is stated in the EIA report.</p> <p>However, he feels that cumulative impacts have not been considered when it comes to Bantamsklip and a statement is made that there are no fatal flaws. There could be a fatal flaw at Bantamsklip. It has just been stated that a fatal flaw is a transmission line through the Kruger National Park. Now, there is a proposed transmission line through the Cape Agulhas National Park. That is a fatal flaw. There is no consistency with the use of cumulative impacts.</p> <p>If cumulative impacts were in the TOR, why are cumulative impacts being used to decide that Bantamsklip should not be a preferred site and that Thyspunt should be?</p> <p>It is not a question of pre-empting a decision; it is a concern that cumulative impacts are being used to make a decision and to make a pronouncement.</p> <p>Mr de Villiers said that it just does not make sense to make another pronouncement and say that there are no fatal flaws.</p>	<p>Ms Ball: One of the reasons was that we could not pre-empt the outcome of the transmission line EIA.</p> <p>Ms Ball: Thanked Mr de Villiers and indicated that the point has been noted and the EAP will look into his comments.</p>

<b>BREDASDORP PUBLIC MEETING (25 MARCH 2010)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
20	Mr Ettiene Fourie SANParks	Mr Fourie asked a process question an enquired when an EIA for a nuclear site as well as transmission lines will be undertaken together in order to make a decision. He feels that one cannot be assessed without the other one, they need to be looked at holistically, to assess the cumulative impacts.	Ms Ball: I can respond in terms of the discussions we have had with the Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA) – basically it would depend on the outcomes of the other processes.  That question would have to be directed to the DEA as it is not a question to which I can provide a response.
21	Mr Tertius Carinus SANParks – ABI	Mr Carinus noted that the transmission lines are an issue in the area, whether it is through the park or through the wetlands. The area is inundated with the wetland systems. This has been a concern raised in the area.  There have been requests that this issue be dealt with and he said it would also answer Mr de Villiers' point on cumulative impact.	Comment noted.
22	I&AP	Ek wil net terugkom oor wat Danie gesê het. Op die voorlegging op Hermanus het julle gepraat van 10 000 megawatts per site. Met ander woorde as hierdie EIA goedgekeur is, dan is die plek geskik vir 10 000 megawatts. Dis die een ding. Die ander ding is, ons moenie vir onself 'n sak oor die kop trek nie. Hierdie lyne se EIA is om 'n praktiese rede van die kragentrale s'n geskei. Ek wil herhaal wat ek in Hermanus gesê het, as die kragentrale goedgekeur is, hoe gaan ons die lyne stop?  <u>Translation</u>  I just want to refer to what Danie had said. Regarding the submission it was mentioned in Hermanus that each site would have 10 000 megawatts. In other	Mr Heydenrych: Hierdie aansoek is vir 4000 megawatt, so as hierdie aansoek goedgekeur word mag Eskom slegs 'n 4000 MW Kragentrale bou. Hulle het wel vir ons gevra terwyl ons met hierdie studie besig was om te kyk of hierdie terreine verdere kragentrales kan akkommodeer. En dit is wat ons gedoen het. Spesifiek is daarna gekyk watter area op elke terrein moontlik geskik kan wees vir 'n kragentrale.  <u>Translation</u>  Mr Heydenrych: This application is for 4 000 MW, so if this gets approved, Eskom is only allowed to build a 4 000 MW Power Station. However, Eskom requested that the studies

<b>BREDASDORP PUBLIC MEETING (25 MARCH 2010)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		words, if this EIA gets approved, then this area will be suitable for 10 000 megawatts. To avoid anything being misconstrued, it should be clearly stated that for practical reasons, the EIA for the lines have been separated from the Power Station EIAs. As stated in Hermanus; if a power station gets approved, how will the lines be stopped?	investigate the total area that can accommodate a nuclear power station. This is what was investigated.
23	I&AP	Hierdie terein is klaar geskik vir 'n 10 000 MW kragentrale. <u>Translation</u>  This land is already suitable for a 10 000 MW Power Station.	Comment noted.
24	Mr Mike Kantey CANE	Mr Kantey drew attention to Slide 5, bullet 2  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❑ Please note that there is not a perceived impact – thank you very much for that language.</li> <li>❑ When the impact of the human health and safety is looked at, this issue is what we would like to record for the benefit of the public record. The Air Quality Report (he has looked at it since 06 March 2010) and its impacts in terms of fallout of Cesium 137 on the wheat fields and dairy farms and the effluent of Strontium 90 and its impacts on marine life – what is being looked at, simply put, is a Nuclear Power Station - it is not a ferrochrome smelter, it is not a coal-fired power station but it is a Nuclear Power Station.</li> <li>❑ When talking about an environmental impact, it is the environmental impact of nuclear material,</li> </ul>	Ms Ball indicated that she cannot comment on the co-operative agreement between the NNR and DEA.  Mr Stott: In South Africa, we have a National Nuclear Regulator Act (NNRA) and a National Environmental Management Act (NEMA). In some countries, the two Acts are combined but in South Africa, they are separate. That means that the National Nuclear Regulator and the Department of Environmental Affairs respectively have certain responsibilities. The National Nuclear Regulator is responsible for the evaluation of nuclear and radiological safety.  The National Nuclear Regulator (NNR) process, which is still to take place, will have public hearings, which are part of the process. The National Nuclear Regulator bases everything on a safety case. The NNR demands a full

<b>BREDASDORP PUBLIC MEETING (25 MARCH 2010)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<p>namely, by-products of nuclear fission process, that is the environmental impact that you want to investigate and very little else because it is a nuclear power station. When examining the data sets for a Nuclear Power Station, there are 2x major products, effluents, emissions of a nuclear power station, one is Strontium 90 and the other Cesium 137. The expectation is that data sets will be found with hard-core, scientific exposition of Cesium 137 and Strontium 90. This information will be found in Australia, in Germany, in France, in Belgium, but when one comes to South Africa, you find the Scoping out and exclusion of all those impacts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❑ These data must be shown in an environmental report. This report does not have any of this information. Essentially, a nuclear impact has not been looked at.</li> <li>❑ It is unscientific, it is untrue and incorrect, it is their perception that what they are telling us is correct.</li> <li>❑ But what Mr Kantey is saying is, it is his scientific evidential fact from lack of evidence that our perception is true and that this EIA is an unscientific report.</li> </ul> <p>He needs to see all the impacts on all the animals, human health, and dairy products, black and white – data sets – science and not perceptions.</p>	<p>safety case before they make a ruling on whether to grant nuclear licensing or not.</p>
25	Mr Etienne van Heerden Birdlife Strandveld	Regarding the “fatal flaw slide”: Ek vra die vraag uit my eie bekommernis oor die voël-lewe. Ek het op “slide” agtien gesien julle noem daar “no fatal flaws”	Mr Heydenrych: Transmissielyne. Die tansmissielyne is ‘n aparte EIA, dit word nie in hierdie EIA bespreek nie.

<b>BREDASDORP PUBLIC MEETING (25 MARCH 2010)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<p>en ek het op 'n webwerf 'n lys gekry van veertien "fatal flaws". Ek gaan hulle nie nou almal lees nie, maar een spesifieke een wat ek wil lees is die 8st punt. "Threatened protected bird species such as the blue crane, stanley's buzzards, large stalks, etc..... an exponential increase in deaths from collisions with the transmission power line." En nou wil ek ook net vra dat in hierdie dokument wat ons gekry het, het ek gesien dat daar 'n studie gedoen is wat die impak van hierdie projek gaan he op die gewerwede landdiere en ek sien geen verwysing na die voëllewe nie. Daar is geen studie gedoen volgens hierdie rekord nie en wat die impak sal wees nie. Ek weet ook die Endangered Wildlife Trust het uitgebreide werk gedoen op die impak wat kraglyne veral of die "Endangered Birdlife" het en dan ook veral op die "Bluecrane" wat "endangered" is.</p> <p><u>Translation</u></p> <p>Regarding the "fatal flaw slide", out of a concern regarding the bird life. It was mentioned on slide 18 that there are "no fatal flaws", but I found a list on a website of 14 "fatal flaws". Not all will be read out, with the exception of point 8. "Threatened protected bird species such as blue crane, Stanley's buzzards, large stalks, etc.... an exponential increase in deaths from collisions with the transmission power line." Also, according to this document that has been received now, it is noted that an impact study has been done on what impact this project will have on vertebra animals. According to these records [the</p>	<p>Mr Heydenrych: Transmission Lines. The Transmission Lines are a separate EIA and are not discussed in this EIA.</p>

<b>BREDASDORP PUBLIC MEETING (25 MARCH 2010)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		report] there has been no study done on what the impacts will be on birdlife. The Endangered Wildlife Trust has done extensive work regarding the impacts the Power Lines with have on "Endangered Birdlife" and especially on the "Bluecrane" which is endangered.	
26	Mr Danie de Villiers Strandveld Tourism and Conservation Association	<p>Mr de Villiers commented that again this question is about Arcus GIBB writing a report using Eskom's words. It is about coal vs nuclear.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❑ He accepts the statement that power has to be closer to a consumption area, there is no argument about that, as far as he is concerned, because of technological reasons.</li> <li>❑ When he makes the following statement, the report indicates that a coal-fired station on the coast does not make sense, that is why a nuclear power station is needed.</li> <li>❑ The fact of the matter is that the electricity consumption in Port Elizabeth is not even 800MW, now Eskom want to build a 4,000MW nuclear power station in the Eastern Cape. Cape Town consumption is not even 2,000MW.</li> <li>❑ His point is that these Nuclear Power Stations that will be built along the coast are for exporting power up to the economic heartland of the country. If it is important, the power station should be closer to the consumption area and end users.</li> <li>❑ As an example, the KwaZulu-Natal Coast would make more sense than any other sites here.</li> <li>❑ He wanted to know why Bantamsklip site is being looked at. Eskom should look at the KwaZulu-</li> </ul>	<p>Mr Stott: The demand for energy in the Western Cape has growing and is up to 4 000 MW during the winter peaks. We have those figures from the time (2006) when we experienced problems in the Western Cape and we have monitored that carefully.</p> <p>In the Eastern Cape, the growth is there and all indications are that it is still climbing. This is not linked to Alcan. You can go and talk to any of the business centres in the Eastern Cape.</p> <p>Also we do not have baseload power stations in the Eastern Cape, so we do need to anchor there. The power may be exported to other parts of the country but as the demand grows, the power station would also provide for the Eastern Cape area.</p> <p>We are starting to look further afield in South Africa and if the Integrated Resource Plan requires more nuclear power stations to be built, we will then look for more nuclear sites across the country.</p>



<b>BREDASDORP PUBLIC MEETING (25 MARCH 2010)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		Natal coastline <input type="checkbox"/> He feels that the only reason that Eskom has for this investigation is that Eskom bought the Bantamsklip site a while ago - in 1960.	
27	Mr Danie de Villiers Strandveld Tourism and Conservation Association	Mr de Villiers asked if the Western Cape is going to get Nuclear 2?	Mr Stott: According to the information that Eskom has, they would be looking at the southern and Western Cape sites for Nuclear 2.
28	Mr Mike Kantey CANE	Mr Kantey referred to the issues trail, Slide 6, 2 <sup>nd</sup> last bullet read together with Slide 61, bullet number 4 (mitigation measures):  <input type="checkbox"/> Bullet 4 reads "Vaalputs may be considered as a disposal site for High Level Waste in future". One of the difficulties I have is that I also have on my national executive, the Namaqualand Community and they are obviously bitterly opposed to the deposition and dumping of waste in their area. So it does to seem to be pre-empting to be saying that this will occur. <input type="checkbox"/> What is the justification for making high-level waste policy? Where is the justification for bullet 4? <input type="checkbox"/> People of Namaqualand are, in fact from the United Nations point of view, indigenous people of South Africa. There are also a number of land claims relating to the Namaqualand people. <input type="checkbox"/> What is of vital importance in terms of UNESCO values, is to identify in black and white Vaalputs as a site for high level nuclear waste without a single shred of consultation. <input type="checkbox"/> It strikes me as a pre-emptive measure and	Mr Heydenrych: Mr Beyleveldt is a representative of NECSA, where he is responsible for the management of Vaalputs waste site. I personally got that information from him.  They are considering Vaalputs, however, should they decide to use Vaalputs for high-level waste, that will only happen in many years to come. Should they go ahead, they will have to undertake a Nuclear Regulatory process, which also has a public consultation process.

<b>BREDASDORP PUBLIC MEETING (25 MARCH 2010)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<p>certainly cannot be compatible with the Constitution of South Africa and also the charter of the United Nations.</p> <p>Mr Kantey asked if Mr Beyleveldt had consulted with his neighbours as Mr Heydenrych is making such a statement?</p>	<p>Mr Heydenrych: That is for Mr Beyleveldt to answer.</p>
29	I&AP	<p>In een van die slides het jy genoem dat die ekonomiese positiewe impak 7.85% was. Ek wil net vra wie was hierdie spesialis gewees? Ek wil net weet hoe het hy by die punt gekom? Het hy die negatiewe impak ook bereken? Het hy enigiemand in hierdie area gekonsulteer? Want as ek die nuwe regulasies reg verstaan dan moet jy kyk na die toekomstige potesiaal van 'n gebied ook. So dit maak nie saak of Duinefontein 'n natuurreservaat is en ons nie is nie. Dis nie relevant nie. Ek wil net graag 'n ontleding hê van hoe het hy by hierdie punt gekom. Wat is die positiewe impakte en wat is die negatiewe impakte wat in aanmerking geneem is?</p> <p>Die Overberg se toerisme is in sy "baby shoes". Het hy dit in ag geneem?</p> <p><u>Translation</u></p> <p>On one of the slides it was mentioned that the positive impact was 7.85%. Who is this specialist? How did he get to this percentage? Did he also calculate the negative impacts? Did he consult anyone in this area? If the new regulations are understood correctly,</p>	<p>The Economic Specialist is Imani Development.</p> <p>Die resultate wat hy deurgegee het, is wel gekwantifiseer in terme van geld. Waarna hy gekyk het is in Engels "Bed nights", met ander woorde waarna hy gekyk het is hoeveel akkommodasienagte wel in daardie area effektief verkoop gaan word en hy het wel na negatiewe impakte en positiewe impakte gekyk.</p> <p>Definitief.</p> <p><u>Translation</u></p> <p>The results that have been provided have been quantified in terms of money. What he was looking at is called "Bed nights", in other words, how many accommodation nights will be sold effectively in that area. However, he did look at both negative and positive impacts.</p>

<b>BREDASDORP PUBLIC MEETING (25 MARCH 2010)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<p>then a person should also look at future potential of an area. So it does not matter if Duynefontein is a Nature reserve and this [area] is not. It is irrelevant. An analysis of how he reached this conclusion is requested. What are the positive and negative impacts that were taken into consideration?</p> <p>The Overberg tourism is still in its "Baby Shoes". Did he take that in consideration?</p>	<p>Definitely.</p>
30	Mr Mick Dalton Nuwejaars SMA & ABI	<p>Mr Dalton stated that he cannot logically see how a Nuclear Power Station built at Bantamsklip can improve tourism bed nights, anywhere. It is unimaginable! What other tourism related aspects have been considered?</p>	<p>Ms Ball: I am obviously not a Tourism Specialist but from my understanding as an EAP, I am aware that they looked at business as well as nature-based tourism.</p> <p>During construction, there would be an increase in bed nights, Eskom have seen it in Lephalale area and I have also experienced it personally – the increase in bed nights due to the existence of a power station.</p>
31	Mr Tertius Carinus SANParks - ABI	<p>Mr Carinus noted that it was highlighted earlier in the initial phase that this area has been identified as one of the 5 tourism development nodes in the country and in the Western Cape on the tourism development area.</p> <p>The tourism that we are talking about is a nature based tourism and not business related tourism. That is the difference.</p> <p>Because it is a rural side – it is nature based as opposed to Duynefontein, which is business related tourism. Thyspunt and Bantamsklip are similar in nature – they offer nature-based tourism.</p>	<p>Ms Ball: This is correct; the specialist has noted this and has discussed it in the report.</p>

BREDASDORP PUBLIC MEETING (25 MARCH 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
32	Ms Katrin Pobantz Tesselaarsdal Group Action	<p>Ms Pobantz referred to Slide 18, bullet 2 that states that all potential negative impacts can be mitigated.</p> <p>She wants to know, can the specialists say that?</p> <p>Mr Kantey added that the statement is logically unscientific. Perhaps it should read as "all potential negative impacts that we have assessed could be mitigated".</p>	<p>Ms Ball: We took the general consensus from all specialists.</p> <p>Point taken and noted.</p>
33	I&AP	<p>Ek het net 'n vraag rondom die Sismologiese gedeelte van die voorlegging. Daar staan spesifiek dat rondom Tuyspunt en dit geld nou vir Bantamsklip en vir Duynfontein ook. Daar is sekere sismologiese studies wat nog gedoen moet word. Dit sal twee tot drie jaar neem om hierdie studies afgehandel te kry. My vraag is net, hoe kan hierdie ding goedgekeur word en daar begin bou word in 2011, maar die studies gaan eers in 2013 voltooi wees?</p> <p><u>Translation</u></p> <p>A question regarding the Seismology part of the presentation; It was stated that around Thyspunt; and this applies to Bantamsklip and Duynfontein as well, there are certain seismology studies that still need to be done. It will take two to three years before these studies will be completed. How can this study be approved, building start in 2011, if these studies will only be completed in 2013?</p>	<p>Mr Stott: Those are results of studies that have been done over decades. All the power stations have to meet the seismic criteria. The more you have to design for seismic criteria, the more expensive the power station becomes. We want additional studies to refine that and to ensure that it is not over-designed and does not cost significantly more than what a standard nuclear power station should cost. So from Eskom's perspective, we are optimising on the plant design.</p> <p>Ms Ball: One of the key requirements within the National Environmental Management Act (NEMA), is that DEA requires sufficient information to assess and make an informed decision.</p> <p>For the purposes of this EIA, the specialists considered these results to be sufficient to be able to assess the potential impacts and so does Arcus GIBB.</p>

<b>BREDASDORP PUBLIC MEETING (25 MARCH 2010)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
34	Mr Rodney Anderson Hermanus Ratepayers Association and Overstrand Conservation Foundation	Mr Anderson referred to Slide 5:  He notes that there is vigorous opposition to the statements on impacts of tourism. It is not apparent that the studies took into account the true impact of what we perceive as the lifeblood of the area, eco-tourism, and nothing else. He fails to see how there can be an increase of 8.75% in tourism during construction.	Ms Ball: Thank you for those comments. It is precisely what we need from the public. The point is noted and will be checked with the specialist.
35	Mr Mike Kantey CANE	Mr Kantey then drew attention to the Thyspunt area: Slide 36 bullet 4 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❑ Bullet 4 is amazing; “a zero potential impact is predicted”.</li> <li>❑ There is on record a petition signed by 6,000 global surfers with the Billabong’s permission.</li> <li>❑ Jeffrey’s Bay is an international site for supertubes, and there is a supertubes foundation in Jeffrey’s Bay where he works.</li> <li>❑ There are signatures of world champions and the number 1 contender.</li> <li>❑ Mr Kantey is having a meeting with Billabong to discuss this issue because they see their sponsorship and brand directly threatened by the proposed Nuclear Power Station.</li> <li>❑ Jeffrey’s Bay lives and dies on Billabong. Worldwide champions surf in Jeffrey’s Bay.</li> </ul> <p>What the consultants and specialists did in Jeffrey’s Bay is unknown to them.</p>	Points noted.

<b>BREDASDORP PUBLIC MEETING (25 MARCH 2010)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
36	Mr Danie de Villiers Strandveld Tourism and Conservation Association	<p>Mr de Villiers would like to request Arcus GIBB to give real attention to what is being suggested and not only put our questions in the Issues and Response Report.</p> <p>He then directed a question to Eskom: Reading through the report, he came across a figure, which was a cost of a power station. The figure was about R180b. Mr Moroga made a statement a while ago of the amount of R400b. One of the reasons was apparently that there is a licence fee that has to be paid. He asked for some clarity on what the actual cost of building the Nuclear Power Station would be.</p>	<p>Ms Ball: Yes, GIBB will attempt to make all changes in track changes in the report to make it easier for the reader to see the changes made on the draft report (Draft EIR).</p> <p>He was not referring to the nuclear licensing, I think Mr Moroga was referring to the cost of transfer of technology, because the nuclear energy policy that the government approved in 2008 talks about local manufacture of components. If a country does not already have the knowledge, it will have to buy the design and manufacturing intellectual property and knowledge.</p> <p>So the cost of building a nuclear power station is dependent on whether SA just wants to buy one nuclear power station or a fleet of nuclear power stations, and whether SA also wants to buy the design and manufacturing intellectual property and knowledge. The choices in this regard will determine the eventual cost of each nuclear power station..</p>
37	I&AP	<p>An I&amp;AP enquired about decommissioning and asked when is decommissioning going to commence for the Koeberg Nuclear Power Station?</p> <p>Are they preparing to return the entire development to green fields situation? How do you deal with the entire mass of the unit, which is substantially radiated?</p>	<p>Mr Stott: Currently, Koeberg is 25 years old. Its original design life was 40 years. However, as with most power stations throughout the world, one looks at what the economic life is and is it feasible to extend it. So, Eskom is currently looking at extending the economic life of the Koeberg Nuclear Power Station.</p> <p>Eskom does not intend to take it back on the green fields as Eskom may want to build another nuclear power station on the same site. Regarding the decommissioning process itself, there are power stations that have been decommissioned in the world and one can use that information from experience of other countries.</p>

<b>BREDASDORP PUBLIC MEETING (25 MARCH 2010)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
			<p>An important factor is that the nuclear fuel has been taken out so the remaining radioactivity is in the steel vessels, piping, etc, which is mostly cut out and disposed of. The cutting up is mostly done remotely by remote machines, that is all under the control of the national Nuclear Regulator, looking after the radiological safety of all individuals working during the decommissioning phase.</p>
38	I&AP	<p>An I&amp;AP wanted clarification on the decommissioning issue. It is recognised that Koeberg Nuclear Power Station is ageing, I saw a dataset of radionuclides (i.e. radioactive materials) which shows that they have increased quite substantially over the past 25 years?</p> <p>This I&amp;AP wanted information on this issue.</p> <p>Follow up question from Mr Kantey: What is being discussed here is becquerels per annum in release from the stats and those from liquid effluents. Figures in the Cape from APS (Laboratory) report, have been seen and these figures are going up from <math>10^4</math> for Cesium, Strontium, going up to <math>10^6</math>, <math>10^7</math> and have almost doubled and never coming down below that level. We are talking about becquerels, we are not talking about the impact, and we are talking about effluent and emissions.</p>	<p>Mr Stott: The actual releases have not increased. The National Nuclear Regulator (NNR) has changed the methodology of how to calculate the impact of the releases. The first time they changed it, it increased the value slightly, the second time they changed it, the value decreased slightly.</p> <p>Their limits are 250 microSieverts (that is the radiation dose per individual). At Koeberg, our target is 30 microSieverts, so almost one tenth of that. We have never ever been above 20 microSieverts. At the moment it is averaging less than 10 microSieverts. So the impacts of our releases have been kept very low even though the plant has been in operation for 25 years.</p> <p>Mr Kantey is correct in that the NNR has placed something called the annual authorised discharge quantities and they do that for all radionuclides. We are not allowed to go above those levels, but for operational purposes, we are allowed to vary that and we do vary that. Some years depending if we had double outage, i.e. both units are on outage, for refuelling and maintenance, the levels will go up and in some years, the levels will come back down again.</p>

<b>BREDASDORP PUBLIC MEETING (25 MARCH 2010)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		He went on to say that is interesting that the levels do not come down again.	
39	Ms Katrin Pobantz Tesselaarsdal Action Group	<p>Ms Pobantz stated that when the cooperative agreement between the NNR and DEA was discussed, she understood that the safety issues fall on the shoulders of the NNR. She asked if there will be public hearings and not public participation process which is similar in the EIA?</p> <p>She added that if there were concerns about, e.g. the transport of nuclear waste from Bantamsklip, etc potentially who do people ask, how does the public find out what routes they have assessed, how do they get to comment on the process and understand and find out necessary information because this is a huge concern for everyone (human health and safety being assessed). This appears as a huge gap now that people don't know if they will have an opportunity to participate like they have done in the EIA process.</p> <p>She asked where does everyone stand.</p> <p>Ms Pobantz feels that this EIA process is actually incomplete because answers are unavailable because they will be shifted from the EIA consultants to the National Nuclear Regulator. The public have been told that the human health, safety issues are for the NNR to assess. All comments that are raised are shifted to the NNR and no one knows how the NNR is going to deal with that. She wanted to know how the EIA can be considered complete.</p>	<p>Mr Stott: The National Nuclear Regulator Act (NNRA) refers to public hearings, but the National Nuclear Regulator (NNR) has never had public engagements because the original license for Koeberg did not have such a requirement. So at this stage it is not clear what would be the nature of the public engagement. From Eskom's side we have already requested the National Nuclear Regulator (NNR) to consider how they will engage the public because it is in Eskom's interest to have this information moving forward.</p> <p>Ms Ball: I cannot answer on behalf of the NNR – your point has been noted.</p>



<b>BREDASDORP PUBLIC MEETING (25 MARCH 2010)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
40	I&AP	<p>Ek wil net terugkom na die kaart wat jy vir ons gegee het oor die "site" self van die geskiktheid, as ek reg onthou, was dit nie 70 hektaar gewees by Bantamsklip nie, en daar moet my vriende in Natuur bewaring my help. Ek kry die gevoel die persepsie word hier geskep dat Natuurbewaring begin ander kant die teerpad, maar hierdie kant van die teerpad waar die kragssentrale gebou word, daar kry die spesialiste 'n stuk op elke terrain; 'n netjies groot genoeg gebied waar daar niks is wat hulle pla nie?</p> <p><u>Translation</u></p> <p>Referring to the map presented for the site itself and its suitability. It showed 70 hectares of Bantamsklip, and Nature Conservation should confirm this. The perception is created that nature conservation only starts on the other side of the tar road, but on this side where the power lines gets build the specialist finds on each site, a neat piece just big enough where there is nothing that will bother them?</p>	Each of specialist areas sensitivity maps was overlaid by Arcus GIBB and only then did GIBB come up with the least sensitive area.
41	Mr Mike Kantey CANE	<p>We are talking about regulation and legal considerations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>□ The problem from a legal perspective is the language of no-show stoppers, insufficient information, scoped out, part of the co-operative agreement, etc.</li> <li>□ When it comes to the substantive issues, I am really arguing now, and anticipating a law-suit, but this possibly might even go to the constitutional court.</li> </ul>	All points noted.

<b>BREDASDORP PUBLIC MEETING (25 MARCH 2010)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> If you look at the structure of the EIA report from its structure at its inception and execution, you cannot really stand here and blame ACER, you cannot even blame Arcus GIBB and even Eskom cannot be blamed.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> It is the way in which everything has been passed, even the regulation. You certainly have to trust the infinite wisdom of the legal experts and lawyers.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Everything that is of vital importance that should enable a person to make an informed judgement has been scoped out.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Every application for the quantitative data sets that can make an informed decision around human health, the most vital form of life that everyone can ever think of, every possible question, waste, anything that has a bearing on a matter, in a legal perspective, has been scoped out.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Even the type of reactor, has been scoped out.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Legally, anything that one would need to know for an informed decision and representation and submission has been scoped out</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> What this leaves us with (I am saying this with the greatest concern from a constitutional point of view and a popular democracy), everything that matters has been scoped out. It leaves us, ladies and gentlemen, and I say this with a warning that, it leaves us with no redress, whatsoever, no access to information, unless under PAIA (even they could refuse us information for reasons of business confidentiality) we see business concerns being raised above tourist concerns.</li> </ul>	

BREDASDORP PUBLIC MEETING (25 MARCH 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❑ So, it seems to me that the regional economies of Thyspunt, Kouga Municipality and fragile economies of the Thyspunt and Bantamsklip, etc. are being thrown to the docks for higher business deals which are beyond the border of South Africa.</li> <li>❑ This is something that must be recorded, this is a way for people of South Africa to say we have had enough of exploitation, we have had enough of oppression, had enough of silence, we want the facts on the table, otherwise we go to the constitutional court again.</li> </ul>	
42	I&AP	<p>Soos mense nou al genoem het, 'n baie belangrike punt, is daar persone wat ons noem vissermanne wat glad nie ingelig word oor sulke gebeurlikhede nie en wat glad nie weet wat dit alles behels om 'n kragstasie opgerig te kry nie. Soos ek byvoorbeeld, wat in Buffelsbaai bly, kan ek vir u sê daar was nie inligting op die grond vir die eenvoudige mense om te besef wat dit presies behels nie. Daardie visserman wat elke dag uitgaan see toe om vir sy gesin te sorg, word nie gesê die afvalstowwe word in die see gestort en oor 'n tydperk gaan daar nie meer visse wees om te vang vir jou gesin nie. Ek kan ook nie onthou dat enige van Eskom se mense ons presies kom inlig het daaroor nie, indien daar 'n kragstasie in ons omgewing opgerig gaan word.</p> <p><u>Translation</u></p> <p>A very important point that has been mentioned by others; people that are known as "fishermen" who have not been informed at all about these</p>	<p>Ms Ball: The advertisements were placed in various national, regional and local newspapers. Ms Shinga was requested to provide a list of publications that were used to announce the availability of the Draft EIR to the I&amp;AP after the meeting.</p> <p>The marine specialist has proposed a number of recommended monitoring and evaluation programmes aimed at mitigating the impact of the Nuclear Power Station on the marine environment. These measures are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Monitoring of thermal pollution</u>                      At each site both the benthic and intertidal habitats should be sampled before construction, after construction, but before the onset of the operational phase, annually during operation and then for a minimum of five years after closure of the power station. Both benthic and intertidal sites predicted to be impacted (i.e. based on oceanographic modelling of the release plume) should be paired with comparable control sites. If suitable sites exist</li> </ul>

BREDASDORP PUBLIC MEETING (25 MARCH 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>developments and who know nothing about what the construction of a power station entails. This is applicable to individuals staying at Buffelsbaai where there has been no information made available.</p> <p>The fisherman that goes to sea everyday to provide for his family has not been told about the waste that will get dumped into the sea. This will have the effect that over a long period of time there will be no more fish to catch to provide for families.</p> <p>There is no recollection of any member of Eskom consultants that came to inform the communities that there might be a power station built in the area.</p>	<p>both sheltered and exposed rocky shores should be considered. At Bantamsklip special note should be taken of the abalone <i>H. midae</i> and dedicated surveys should be conducted to assess the densities of this gastropod. At Thyspunt surveys should be conducted to monitor for the presence of egg capsules of the Chokka squid <i>Loligo vulgaris</i>. Note: the use of indicator species is not recommended as the densities of marine invertebrates often varies dramatically through time, while changes in overall community composition are far more relevant. While sampling need not be repeated in different seasons it is important that annual monitoring take place at the same time each year.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Monitoring of spoil disposal sites</u>                      Prior to disposal of spoil at sea, benthic communities at the disposal site, and in the areas predicted to be affected by spoil in the first ten years following disposal (Prestedge <i>et al.</i> 2009a) should be sampled for at least two years. Following disposal of spoil, these sites should be sampled at the same time of the year as the initial samples for at least ten years. Importantly, communities establishing on the actual spoil site should be monitored to establish to what extent these communities recover through time.</li> </ul> <p><u>Monitoring of radiation emissions</u></p>

BREDASDORP PUBLIC MEETING (25 MARCH 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
			<p>An environmental surveillance programme should be implemented to monitor for radiation emissions in the marine environment. This would form part of the strict requirement of the National Nuclear Regulator Act. The design of such a programme is outside our area of expertise, but is likely to follow the Eskom Radiation Protection Environmental Surveillance Standard. Organisms which we recommend for inclusion in such a monitoring programme are the abalone <i>H. midae</i> at Bantamsklip and the chokka squid <i>Loligo vulgaris</i> at Thyspunt, as both are consumed commercially.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Monitoring of sewage effluent</u>                      A routine monitoring programme of water exiting the cooling water outlets should be established to ensure that sewage effluent entering the sea meets the standards set by the Department of Water Affairs and Forestry.</li> <li>• <u>Monitoring of organic, bacterial and hydrocarbon pollution resulting from polluted groundwater</u>  <b>Should pollution of groundwater be detected, monitoring of seawater quality in the area of groundwater discharge should commence immediately to ensure the safety of public health.</b></li> <li>• <u>Monitoring of African penguin (<i>Spheniscus</i></u></li> </ul>

BREDASDORP PUBLIC MEETING (25 MARCH 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
			<p><u>demersus) populations on Dyer Island</u>                      A long-term monitoring programme should be established to track populations of African penguins on Dyer Island near the Bantamsklip (Prof L. Underhill, University of Cape Town, <i>pers comm.</i>). Monitoring should take place before, during and after construction. Such monitoring should take place in conjunction with the penguin monitoring programme which is currently underway on the island and is run by the Avian Demography Unit at the University of Cape Town.</p>
43	Ms Katrin Pobantz Tesselaarsdal Action Group	Where does Arcus GIBB's work stop?	Arcus GIBB's work ends at the submission of the final EIA Report to the DEA and to the public domain. The DEA then takes some time to review the report and then the EIA communication/ correspondence ends when we notify Interested and Affected Parties (I&APs) of the DEA's decision.
44	Ms Katrin Pobantz Tesselaarsdal Action Group	<p>Ms Pobantz said that something has been mentioned about the peer review by the Department of Environmental Affairs. She asked if Arcus GIBB would have access to that information from DEA? Will DEA make information available on what the peer reviewers have said to Arcus GIBB?</p> <p>If Arcus GIBB had access, it would add another dimension to the EIA report.</p>	Ms Ball: I must state that it is not for all the EIAs that the DEA appoints a peer review panel. This is the second EIA where DEA has appointed a review panel, the first one being PBMR DPP EIA. DEA is the authorising body that will be advised by their appointed review panel. Arcus Gibb would not have access to the report prepared by the DEA peer review panel.

## APPENDIX 2: PRESENTATION OF DRAFT EIA REPORT

Size of the Hermanus Public Meeting presentation	1,434KB
Size of the Pearly Beach Public Meeting presentation	1,501KB
Size of the Bredasdorp Public Meeting	1,500KB

All presentations can either be downloaded from the following websites:

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

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

### APPENDIX 3: ATTENDANCE LIST

Surname	First Names	Title	Co/Org	Hermanus Meeting 23 Mar 10	Pearly Beach Meeting 24 Mar 10	Bredasdorp Meeting 25 Mar 10
Ackerman	Valerie	Mrs	Interested and Affected Party		Attended	
Alexander	Debbie	Mrs	Interested and Affected Party		Attended	
Anderson	Rodney C	Mr	Hermanus Ratepayers Association			Attended
Ball	Jaana-Maria	Ms	Arcus GIBB	Attended	Attended	Attended
Barnard	Gerrie & Lydia	Mnr & Mev	Interested and Affected Party		Attended	
Boshoff	Sophie	Mrs	Interested and Affected Party			Attended
Brindeau	Marc	Mr	Interested and Affected Party		Attended	
Brindeau	Alice	Mrs	Interested and Affected Party		Attended	
Burden	Rina	Mrs	Interested and Affected Party		Attended	
Carinus	Tertius	Mr	Agulhas Biodiversity Initiative (ABI)			Attended
Coetzer	Theo	Mr	Interested and Affected Party		Attended	
D'Alton	Michael & Jane	Mr & Mrs	Nuwejaars Wetland Special Management Area			Attended
de Kock	Johan	Mnr	Interested and Affected Party		Attended	
de Villiers	Carin	Ms	Eskom Holdings Limited	Attended	Attended	
de Villiers	Rocco	Mr	Interested and Affected Party			Attended
de Villiers	Ebeline	Ms	Interested and Affected Party			Attended
de Villiers	Danie	Mr	Strandveld Tourism & Conservation Assoc			Attended
du Plessis	Pierre	Mnr	Napier Landbouvereniging			Attended
During	Hardy CG	Mnr	Interested and Affected Party		Attended	
Evert	Dion	Mr	Interested and Affected Party		Attended	
Fourie	Ettienne	Mr	Agulhas National Park (SANP)			Attended
Fryer	Rob	Mr	Overstrand Conservation Foundation	Attended		
Fuchs	Michael & Susanne	Mr & Mrs	Klein Paradijs Country House		Attended	
Greeff	Gert	Mr	Eskom Nuclear Sites	Attended	Attended	Attended



PROPOSED ESKOM NUCLEAR POWER STATION AND ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE  
 REVIEW OF DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REPORT

Surname	First Names	Title	Co/Org	Hermanus Meeting 23 Mar 10	Pearly Beach Meeting 24 Mar 10	Bredasdorp Meeting 25 Mar 10
Groenewald	Amelda	Mrs	Interested and Affected Party			Attended
Groenewald	Karen	Mrs	Interested and Affected Party			Attended
Hayward	Bertus	Mr	Cape Agulhas Municipality			Attended
Hendry	Eugene	Mr & Mrs	Pearly Beach Ratepayers Assoc.		Attended	
Henrici	Gerald Willem	Mr	Pearly Beach Conservation Society		Attended	
Herbst	Deidre	Ms	Eskom Generation	Attended	Attended	
Heydenrych	Reuben	Mr	ARCUS GIBB	Attended	Attended	Attended
Heyns	J	Mr	Interested and Affected Party	Attended		
Hoekstra	Tierck	Mr	Natuurbehearings Raad	Attended		
Jephson	Amanda	Ms	Save Bantamsklip / Strandveld Tourism & Conservati		Attended	
Joubert	Pieter	Mnr	De Kelders Belastingbetaalers Verg		Attended	
Kantey	Mike	Mr	Coalition Against Nuclear Energy	Attended		Attended
Kleinhans	Harry	Mr	Interested and Affected Party		Attended	
Kriel	AF	Mr & Mrs	Interested and Affected Party		Attended	
le Roux	Leonard	Mr	Interested and Affected Party			Attended
Leber	Sue	Ms	Save Bantamsklip Organisation	Attended		
Lockyer	Lyn	Ms	Interested and Affected Party	Attended		
Lombardi	Giorgio	Mr	Vogelgat Nature Reserve	Attended		
Manson-Kullin	Lars & Helen	Mr & Mrs	Interested and Affected Party		Attended	
Mbusi	Mandla	Mr	Eskom Holdings Limited	Attended	Attended	Attended
Mc Neil	Angus & Linda	Mr & Mrs	Interested and Affected Party	Attended		
Miller	PK	Dr	Interested and Affected Party	Attended		
Miller	Pat	Dr	Hermanus Botanical Society	Attended		
Mills	Cherry	Mrs	Interested and Affected Party	Attended		
Muller	S	Mr	Overstrand Local Municipality	Attended		
Myburgh	Francois	Mr	Overstrand Municipality		Attended	
Otto	Hennie	Mr	Dyer Island Conservation Trust		Attended	

PROPOSED ESKOM NUCLEAR POWER STATION AND ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE  
 REVIEW OF DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESMENT REPORT

Surname	First Names	Title	Co/Org	Hermanus Meeting 23 Mar 10	Pearly Beach Meeting 24 Mar 10	Bredasdorp Meeting 25 Mar 10
Outhewaite	John	Mr	Interested and Affected Party		Attended	
Pietersen	Toni	Mrs	Facilitator	Attended	Attended	Attended
Pobantz	Katrin	Ms	Tesselaarsdaal Action Group	Attended		Attended
Pulker	Gaynor	Ms	Interested and Affected Party	Attended		
Ravenscroft	Mike	Mr & Mrs	Kleynkloof Private Nature Reserve		Attended	
Roelofse	Johan & Carla L	Mnr & Mev	Interested and Affected Party		Attended	
Schwegler	Walter	Mr & Mrs	Heidehof Provincial Nature Reserve		Attended	
Schwegler	Mathia	Ms	Strandveld Flora CC		Attended	
Slabbert	Paul	Mr	Strandveld Tourism & Conservation Assoc	Attended		
Smith	Kenneth & Elizabeth	Mr & Mrs	Interested and Affected Party		Attended	
Smith	KK	Mr	Interested and Affected Party		Attended	
Springer	St John	Dr	Interested and Affected Party	Attended		
Stemmet	Danie	Mnr	Interested and Affected Party		Attended	
Stott	Tony	Mr	Eskom Generation	Attended	Attended	Attended
Stroebe	Liana	Me	Agri Mega / Overberg Distriks Landbou Verg			Attended
Swart	Helena	Mrs	Aida		Attended	
Theron	Mervin	Mr	Eskom Holdings Limited	Attended	Attended	Attended
Toerien	D	Mr & Mrs	Interested and Affected Party		Attended	
van der Velden	J	Mr	Greater Hermanus Assoc for Commerce & Tourism	Attended		
van Heerden	Etienne	Pastor	Birdlife Strandveld			Attended
Visser	Kobus (JJ)	Mr	Interested and Affected Party	Attended		Attended
Warner	Lyn	Mrs	Interested and Affected Party	Attended		
Welsh	Eleanor	Ms	Save Bantamsklip Organisation	Attended		
West	David Michael	Mr	Eskom Holdings Limited	Attended	Attended	Attended
Williams	John	Mr	Save Bantamsklip Organisation	Attended	Attended	