

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
16. SOCIAL/ HEALTH		
Dr Cairns A R Bain NECSA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Acceptability of international standards for limits of public exposure to ionizing radiation. 	<p>A Health Risk Assessment will be-commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p> <p>Public and worker exposures limits to ionizing radiation are set by the National Nuclear Regulator and published in the Government Gazette. The relevant Regulation containing these limits can be downloaded from the NNR website www.nnr.co.za</p>
Mr Tim Barnard St. Andrew's College	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Social – cultural heritage, currently accessible to general public (fish kraals, middens). 	<p>Both Socio - Economic and Cultural Heritage Assessments will be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report). These studies will assess potential impacts of the proposed NPS and associated infrastructure on aspects such as cultural heritage and assess to the coastline (both on-shore and off-shore) and its resources.</p>
Ms Claire Craxton Plettenberg Bay Environmental Forum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Health and Safety <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What statistics are to hand guaranteeing the health and safety of the residents of Pearly Beach? It is documented that many forms of cancer are related and accredited to the presence of nuclear power stations and their lines. Where are these lines going to be placed? ○ What is the exact radius around the nuclear power station affected by radiation? In the meeting it was initially stated that only a 3 km radius is affected, but later a 15 km radius was mentioned. Could you please clarify this for me? ○ Could you also please inform me of the standard safety distances required for a nuclear power station, and if this proposed development meets those standards. 	<p>Eskom will not construct and operate a nuclear power station if it is not safe.</p> <p>In addition, the nuclear safety of, and the risk of a nuclear accident at the proposed power station will be independently assessed by the National Nuclear Regulator. The NNR will only issue a nuclear installation licence for the proposed power station if it is satisfied that the risk of an accident is acceptable low.</p> <p>Experience gained internationally is that people do not become ill or die from living in close proximity to a nuclear power station.</p> <p>Taking Koeberg as an example: Koeberg has operated for the past 23 years within very close proximity of wheat, cattle and diary farms. The nearest farms are within 10 km of Koeberg</p> <p>Everybody is exposed to natural background radiation everyday from, for example, the earth itself, the materials from which buildings are constructed, the sun, and on a</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
		<p>less regular basis from medical exposures (X-rays).</p> <p>The quantity of radiation exposure and what is absorbed by the body is measured in microSieverts (μSv) per annum. The National Nuclear Regulator (NNR) sets the limit of exposure arising from operations at nuclear installations. Hence the limit for Koeberg is set at 250 μSv per annum, far below the exposure from natural background radiation (which is about 2500 – 3000 μSv per annum), and less than the international standard of 1000 μSv per annum. The Koeberg Nuclear Power Station has been in operation for over 23 years - the public exposure to radiation as a result of Koeberg's operations has been less than 20 μSv per annum in general and less than 6 μSv per annum in 2005/6 – reference NNR Annual Report 2005/6 tabled in Parliament – available off the NNR website www.nnr.co.za), far below the limit set by the NNR.</p> <p>Samples of fish, meat, vegetables, milk water, etc are regularly collected from the area around Koeberg and analysed to determine any possible effects on the food chain. Samples are also sent overseas for independent analysis and proof that Eskom is operating within the required limits.</p> <p>Although the risk of an accident is very low, the National Nuclear Regulator (NNR) nevertheless requires emergency planning to be undertaken. For the proposed nuclear power station Eskom is considering the latest design of Pressurized Water Reactor (PWR) technology. Internationally, these designs have formal emergency planning zones less than 16 km. The NNR will however determine the emergency plan requirements and the extent of the required zone based on a safety assessment of the design of the proposed nuclear power station and the proposed site and environs</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Mr Paul Graham IDASA Training Centre for Democracy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Community feelings in regard to security, impact on land values and 'sense of place', and willingness of residents and other communities in regard to transportation and storage of materials and waste. ▪ Perceptions of South Africa as a nuclear community by citizens in and outside of the targeted areas. 	Potential impacts on land values, sense of place, safety and security will be investigated in the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).
Mrs Desiree Hey Land owner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Fresh drinking water in short supply in this area – how do we cope with extra thousands of people? ▪ Health hazards imposed by pylons (human and animals). ▪ Please keep us informed. 	<p>Should the proposed NPS receive the necessary authorizations, and regardless of the alternative site selected, ancillary infrastructure and services (such as potable water) will need to be provided as part of the proposed development. An Infrastructure Assessment, including Freshwater Supply will be commissioned during the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p> <p>Transmission lines and the associated infrastructure, including the pylons (towers) are required between the proposed power station and the existing national transmission network to enable the electricity generated by the proposed power station to be fed into the national transmission network. Separate EIAs will be undertaken for the proposed transmission lines. The EIAs for the proposed transmission lines will be co-ordinated to align as close as possible to the EIA for the proposed nuclear power station.</p>
Mr Douglas Hey Baardskeerders Bos Home Owners Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The sociological impact of the influx of workers. ▪ How a potential workforce of ±10 000 will be relocated and employed at end of construction. ▪ The impact on AIDS in an area of low infection rate. 	These matters will be addressed in a Social and Economic Assessments that will be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).
Ms Amanda Jephson and Mr Charl Laubscher	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We have a farm just outside Baardskeersbos and we are very opposed to this power station, which will have potentially devastating consequences for ourselves and our livelihood. 	Thank you for this comment.

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Mr Mike Kantey Watercourse cc	Issues to be addressed by Scoping Report: 2. Public and worker health issues 2.1 Base-line epidemiological study with particular reference to: (a) leukemia among 0-14 year-olds (b) Hodgkins Lymphoma (c) breast cancers among women (d) soft-tissue cancers among men 2.2. Baseline study of all nuclear industry workers 2.3. Baseline study of control groups for comparative purposes 2.4 Retrospective study of all medical records pf communities within 50 km of Koeberg Nuclear Power Station, comparing incidences of cancer as per 2.1 above between 1982 and 1984, and between 1997 and 1999.	These comments have been passed onto the Public Health Specialist who will be undertaking a Health Risk Assessment as part of the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).
Mr Francois Kotze & Mr E Peterson Overberg District Municipality	<u>Social criteria:</u> Potential social and environmental impacts of developments usually go hand in hand, irrespective of whether they are residential, industrial or of any other nature. It must therefore be asked whether proposed development: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Be detrimental to the interests of communities dependent upon the natural resources occurring in the region concerned? ▪ Are located in a manner which will ensure that neighbouring communities will not be exposed to hazards such as atmospheric pollution / radioactive contamination, noise, dust or fire? ▪ Could have undesirable impact on neighbouring communities, e.g. through loss of property value or tourism potential, increases in crime rates or any other aspects? ▪ Could generate traffic, which can be dangerous or disruptive in residential areas? ▪ If located inappropriately in terms of considerations such as those above, could they be re-located, or is mitigation of undesirable effects possible? 	Various specialist studies will be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA to address these issues (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report), the outcomes of which will be reported in the Environmental Impact Report EIR).

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
R Mike Longden-Thurgood Environment Representative, Institution of Nuclear Engineers, Environment Correspondent, National Association for Clean Air	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Although the new Generation III Pressurised water Reactors (PWRs) will be safer and more simple in design than their predecessors, such as the two existing PWRs at Koeberg, a nuclear plant cannot be safely run by staff who are separated from their families for long periods and who are, as a result, continually stressed because of forced family separation. It is a recipe for trouble and lack of morale, plus a situation where there is likely to be a high turnover of staff. ▪ South Africa doesn't have the facilities at the moment to educate and train adequate staff for even a four unit PWR site, let alone take the risk of highly trained South African staff leaving with their families to better posts and more hospitable conditions at power stations abroad as a result of unsatisfactory working and recreational environments. 	<p>Staff housing and living conditions will form part of the Social and Economic Assessments to be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p> <p>The training and development of South Africans for the proposed nuclear power is a component of the negotiations with the potential vendors that are likely to commence later in 2007.</p>
Mr M Phalane Earthlife Africa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Epidemiological studies. ▪ Health issues and geological plan. 	<p>A Health Risk Assessment and a Geological Assessment will be undertaken during the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p>
Dr Laurine Platzky Premier – Western Cape	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proximity to the built environment (housing, business, retail etc) 	<p>Safety aspects, including Emergency Planning Zones (EPZs), will be addressed in the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p>
Mr Sean Privett Walker Bay Fynbos Conservancy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proper evaluation of social impacts of building phase – maximise use of existing unemployed people, increase skills and input into long-term social upliftment of region. 	<p>These matters will be addressed in a Social and Economic Assessments that will be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p>
Mr Mias Strydom Estate Agent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Effect of radiation on the environment and humans. 	<p>This matter will be addressed in a Health Risk Assessment to be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p> <p>Note that everybody is exposed to natural background radiation everyday from, for example, the earth itself, the materials from which buildings are constructed, the sun, and on a less regular basis from medical exposures (X-rays).</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
		<p>The quantity of radiation exposure and what is absorbed by the body is measured in microSieverts (μSv) per annum. The National Nuclear Regulator (NNR) sets the limit of exposure arising from operations at nuclear installations. Hence the limit for Koeberg is set at 250 μSv per annum, far below the exposure from natural background radiation (which is about 2500 – 3000 μSv per annum), and less than the international standard of 1000 μSv per annum. The Koeberg Nuclear Power Station has been in operation for over 23 years - the public exposure to radiation as a result of Koeberg's operations has been less than 20 μSv per annum in general and less than 6 μSv per annum in 2005/6 – reference NNR Annual Report 2005/6 tabled in Parliament – available off the NNR website www.nnr.co.za), far below the limit set by the NNR.</p>
<p>Mr Manfred Suhr Kroondal and Wards EcoForum (KWEF)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In a socio-political unstable country where ordinary citizen fear for their lives every hour of the day, even inside their homes, thoughts of more Nuclear Power Plants should not be entertained. 	<p>Thank you for these comments.</p>
<p>R Mike Longden- Thurgood Environment Representative, Institution of Nuclear Engineers, Environment Correspondent, National Association for Clean Air</p>	<p>Socio-economics and power station management and operating staff</p> <p>I have already made the point about the potential extended reactor lifetimes. This becomes very important where the socio-economics of power station staff is concerned.</p> <p>Under specialist studies in the Background Information Document (BID) is included the subject "Socio-economics", and under potential environmental issues is included "Social and socio-economic impacts during construction related to influx of construction workers during construction and operational periods".</p> <p>These aspects appear to be narrowly confined to the impact on local communities of the influx of construction workers, and of staff who will subsequently be operating the reactors.</p>	<p>Thank you for these comments.</p> <p>The lifespan of the proposed power station would be in the order of 60 years, always subject to maintaining a high safety level and hence retaining its licence, and its financial viability.</p> <p>The scope of the various specialist studies will become apparent from the Scoping Phase, and all relevant issues will be investigated. Staff housing and living conditions will form part of the Social and Economic Assessments to be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>When there is a major operating site remote from large town or cities, the operating staff cannot be expected to work week in and out remote from their families. As a guesstimate, I would suggest that a family journey by road to the nearest major town or city which takes longer than 2 hours would be considered to be unacceptably remote.</p> <p>Running a large shore-based facility is nothing like manning a merchant ship which travels round the world for tens of thousands of kilometres, and when family separation becomes inescapable. Children need to be educated, and to be familiar with the normal way of life on land.</p> <p>I mentioned during the meeting that the life of the Koeberg reactors has been extended to 50 years, and it could well be increased to 60 years in another 20 years time. I also mentioned that the US NRC, who have been dealing with applications for lifetime extension of US Pressurised Water Reactors (PWRs) to 60 years, of which some have already received their approvals, he was of the opinion that the possibility of extending to 80 years was by no means remote. (Information comes to me via the World Nuclear Association; the US Nuclear Network digests; the US Environmental Protection Agency's radiation and nuclear digests; and the joint INucE/BNES <i>Nuclear Future</i> Journal).</p> <p>With the certainty of a 60-year lifetime for the Generation III PWRs, consideration must be given to the needs of staff and their families. These can only be satisfied if there is a reasonable sized town nearby, with all the facilities and services, which one would expect in such a town. Thus there would need to be primary and high schools; Medicare facilities and hospitals; a large shopping mall; churches; and hotels; a range of houses of different designs; cinemas; recreational facilities. The approach to the layout of such a town would need to be more on a "garden city" concept, rather than have a constricted geometrical and uninteresting layout. Houses of different designs, and catering for different needs, would enhance this "garden city" environment. Obviously the emphasis would be on the concept - which is slow getting off the ground - of mixed communities.</p>	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Mr Raymond A Williamson Melkbosstrand Ratepayers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Population Impact – short and long term. 	<p>This matter will be addressed in a Social and Economic Assessments to be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p>
Mr Byran Andrews	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Contamination of our waters and soil. 	<p>Geotechnical, Geo-hydrological, Hydrological and Fresh Water Ecology Assessments will be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA to address these issues (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report), the outcomes of which will be reported in the specialist reports and the Environmental Impact Report (EIR). All specialist studies will be peer reviewed by other independent and experienced experts.</p>
Mrs Jane Arderne Pam Golding Estate Agents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ People do not want to be so close to a nuclear power station – children will get sick. ▪ Unsightly and unreliable? Untested. Very unhappy 	<p>This matter will be addressed in the Health Risk and Visual Impact Assessments to be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p> <p>Experience gained internationally and from Koeberg is that people do not become ill from living in close proximity to a nuclear power station.</p> <p>This EIA is for a proposed nuclear power station based on the Pressurized Water Reactor (PWR) technology. The two designs that are under consideration evolved from previous designs (e.g, the Koeberg design). The majority of nuclear power stations operating in the world today are of the PWR design, and together have many years of safe operational experience.</p>
Mrs Sandra Cunningham	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Impact on health. ▪ Impact on population. 	<p>This matter will be addressed in a Health Risk and Social Assessments to be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
<p>Mr Louis De Wet Pearly Beach Cons. Society</p>	<p>Social and socio-economic impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The main gears of our regional economy are agriculture and tourism. The planned nuclear power station is a major industrial development and in direct conflict with current economic activities. ▪ It was said at the introductory meeting that Eskom will not house the staff on their property during the construction phase but that they will have to be accommodated in existing town communities. As far as possible workers will be drawn from local communities. The following scenario is likely to develop: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. If the required labour force is expected to be approximately 6 000, it is doubtful that local communities, including Gansbaai, Bredasdorp, etc., can supply as many as about 20%. Local unemployment statistics are highly inflated. 2. Housing for the balance of almost 5 000 will have to be provided somewhere. 3. It will be wishful thinking to accept that workers will enter this area without their families for a period of at least 7 years. 4. Should the wives only join the male workers and vice-versa, the population explosion will double to 10 000. 5. Alternatively, should each household bring two children, the number of souls immediately increase to 20 000 6. However this type of situation develops, it has the potential to permanently destroy, or at least detrimentally alter the socio-economic make-up of this region. ▪ Contribution of electricity supply to this region. Because of little industrial development in the area, no drastic increase in electricity demand is envisaged that will necessitate a nuclear power plant. 	<p>Economic Issues relating to tourism and agriculture will be addressed in the Economic Impact Assessment that will be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report). Please also refer to the Agriculture and Tourism Assessments (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p> <p>Staff housing and living conditions, as well as the make-up of the labour force (and their families) during and post-construction, will form part of the Social Assessment to be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p>
<p>Mr and Mrs Michael/ Susanne Fuchs Klein Paradijs County House</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Are there any real benefits of having to live with a power plant of this type and scale for the current inhabitants of the area? 	<p>These will become apparent from the outcomes of the various specialist studies which will be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Mrs Kathleen Elizabeth Fuchter-Wood	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Contamination. ▪ Health. ▪ Pristine. 	Various specialist studies will be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA to address these issues (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report), the outcomes of which will be reported in the specialist's reports and Environmental Impact Report (EIR).
Mr Johannes Jacobus Kotze	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Noise pollution must be limited. ▪ Crime prevention must be a priority. ▪ Customs and culture of residents must be respected. 	Noise, Social and Heritage Resources Assessments will be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report). Once identified, potential impacts will be mitigated via the implementation of an EMP. Should the proposed NPS be authorized and constructed, the EMP will be contractually binding on the main and sub-contractors and their staff.
Mrs and Mr Helen / Lars Manson-Kullin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Long and short term health impact on humans, animals and plants. 	A Health Risk, Vegetation and Faunal Assessment will be undertaken during the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report) to identify such impacts.
Mrs Qaphela Rhoda Moatshe Department of Health (Environmental Health)	<p>The Department of Health hereby recommends that the following issues of concern be addressed during the EIA process:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Extensive considerations must be taken of all health risks that may arise from exposure to depleted uranium, including future research needs around radiological and chemical toxicity. 2. Safety, Health and Environmental (SHE) policy must be in place. 3. Measures must be in place to reduce or eliminate Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs), especially Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), releases to the environment in terms of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs). 4. If coal is used as a source of fuel, then proper engineering control methods should be provided as well as measures for the disposal of the final product (ash) to an approved landfill site. 5. Measures to avoid and prevent contamination of water, food and soil with depleted uranium should be indicated and addressed, for example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How would you ensure that the public exposure limits are within the stipulated standards over a life time period? 	<p>A Health Risk Assessment will be undertaken during the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p> <p>Please note that coal is not a source of fuel for a nuclear power station. Also, please note that Eskom no longer uses PCBs on new installations.</p> <p>Department of Health officials (National, Provincial and Local) are urged to register their interest in the EIA and to participate actively in the process.</p> <p>Eskom has a suite of policies that will be applied to the proposed project, including a SHE Policy.</p> <p>Mitigation measures will form part of all specialist studies which will be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report). An Environmental Management Programme (EMP) will also be compiled for all phases of</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Are there any plans for continuous monitoring of chemical contaminants and health indicators, particularly those related to congenital malformations? ▪ Are there plans to limit exposure to the people living near the power plant and the entire public? ▪ How will emergency preparedness systems and occupational health measures be ensured? ▪ Please involve officials from the Provincial Department of Health from the earmarked potential sites. 	<p>the proposed NPS and its associated infrastructure. Should the proposed NPS be authorized and constructed, the EMP will be contractually binding on the main and sub-contractors and their staff.</p> <p>Everybody is exposed to natural background radiation everyday from, for example, the earth itself, the materials from which buildings are constructed, the sun, and on a less regular basis from medical exposures (X-rays). The quantity of radiation exposure and what is absorbed by the body is measured in microSieverts (μSv) per annum. The National Nuclear Regulator (NNR) sets the limit of exposure arising from operations at nuclear installations.</p> <p>Using Koeberg power station as an example: The limit for Koeberg is set at 250 μSv per annum, far below the exposure from natural background radiation (which is about 2500 – 3000 μSv per annum), and less than the international standard of 1000 μSv per annum. Koeberg has been in operation for over 23 years - the public exposure to radiation as a result of Koeberg's operations has been less than 20 μSv per annum in general and less than 6 μSv per annum in 2005/6 – reference NNR Annual Report 2005/6 tabled in Parliament – available off the NNR website www.nnr.co.za, far below the limit set by the NNR.</p>
Mr Pat Raolane MPR International	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Environmental impact in relation to the social, economic status. ▪ Research made in terms of social impacts. ▪ Involvement of the community within the area as to where the proposed nuclear power station construction site is, in terms of health hazards. ▪ To meet with organized labour within provinces that will be affected to clarify the need for such nuclear power station, and interested parties. 	<p>Various specialist studies will be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA to address these issues (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report), the outcomes of which will be reported in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The two important ones in this regard are the Social and Health Assessments (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Ingela Richardson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Medical surveillance programmes and/or epidemiological surveys. Both should be ongoing and should provide free medical services to all communities surrounding nuclear installations particularly for all illnesses known to emanate from ionizing radiation. An initial medical surveillance or epidemiological survey should be conducted to determine pre-nuclear prevalence of cancers etc. before any nuclear development proceeds and this should then be monitored in an acceptable way that involves independent representatives. Who will monitor the reactor, what monitoring processes will be used, for what period, for what substances or illnesses, by whom, at what cost? ▪ The size of the reactor - 31 hectares - is a large amount of space. It is no small development. How many elderly people and children live in that area? (in terms of vulnerability) 	<p>Thank you for your comments. They will be taken into consideration during the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA.</p> <p>Health Risk and Social Assessments, inclusive of exclusion zones, will be undertaken during the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p>
Mrs Sall-Ann Silberbauer Pam Golding Properties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Health and nuclear fall-out 	<p>A Health Risk Assessment will be undertaken during the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report). The risks of nuclear accidents will be assessed as part of the EIA.</p>
Mr Jacobus Slabbert Nelson Mandela Bay Municipality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Impact on air quality. ▪ Health risk assessment (radiation exposure). ▪ Noise impact. 	<p>Air Quality, Health Risk and Noise Assessments will be undertaken during the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p>
Mr and Mrs Diana Catherine / Louis Richard Serrurier	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Socio-economic impact on area i.e. squatters / roads etc 	<p>These matters will be addressed in the Social and Economic Assessments to be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Ms Yolanda Buckland The Milkwood Smiles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Keep our ozone and living space free of nuclear. It does infiltrate into our water, crops and earth. Keep our earth natural. 	Thank you for these comments.
Monika and Helmut Cremer	Objection: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Like all nuclear plants Pressurized Water Reactors (PWRs) emit H13 (tritium) and radiocarbon (H14) through the venting holes and the reactor stack. Especially tritium is a harmful radioactive element which is biologically very active and damages the DNA-structure, which can cause deformities and cancer 	Various specialist studies (including hydrology, geo-hydrology, agricultural, geology, freshwater ecology studies, amongst others) will be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA. These studies will attempt to address potential negative and positive impacts (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report) of the proposed NPS and its associated infrastructure, the outcomes of which will be reported in the Environmental Impact Report.
Heike and Wolfgang Engel Angels' SA	Objection: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Like all nuclear plants Pressurized Water Reactors (PWRs) emit H13 (tritium) and radiocarbon (H14) through the venting holes and the reactor stack. Especially tritium is a harmful radioactive element, which is biologically very active and damages the DNA-structure, which can cause deformities and cancer. 	These issues will be addressed in a Health Risk Assessment to be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).
Mr Justice Nzimande Eskom	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Atmospheric dispersion of gaseous effluents and the impact on the environment. 	An Air Quality Assessment will be undertaken during the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report) to determine the impact on air quality around all five alternative sites
Dr Warren J Tennant SAWS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Potential impact on air quality of region 	
Mr Richardt van Rensburg	Impact of Nuclear Power Station on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Health due to radiation / spillage 	
Professor and Mrs Duncan Russel Anderson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Can seriously disrupt farming and fishing way of life with influx of necessary labour force. 	Various specialist studies (for example social, agricultural, marine, botanical, tourism and economic specialist studies, amongst others) will be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA to address these issues (Section 10.6 of the Scoping Report). The outcomes of these assessments will be reported in the various specialists reports (which will be reviewed by independent specialist) and the Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Mrs Daniela Casciani	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Human beings are part of the environment: all over the world nuclear plant areas experienced raised level of various cancers. I find it difficult to accept that Koeberg escaped this fate. I wish to have this point openly investigated – compared – projected. 	<p>A Health Impact Assessment will be undertaken as part of the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p>
Mrs Barbara Mommen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The devastating effect, the industrial site surrounding any power plant would have on an area, renowned for pristine coastlines and conservation priorities. The effect would not only be local therefore the entire eastern Cape coastline needs to be made aware of planned nuclear possibilities. 	<p>This EIA is being conducted to understand and assess potential impacts (positive and negative) on the environment (social, economic, bio-physical).</p> <p>The proposed NPS has been announced locally in the areas surrounding each of the 5 alternative sites, regionally and nationally.</p>
Mr Francois Myburgh Overstrand Municipality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Social Responsibilities – the need and impacts of participants in the construction phase as well as detail of what will happen to people, job seekers flocking into the area (influx) after the construction phase needs to be explained. The special study area will hopefully deals with these as well as the need for community facilities and housing for people that will be involved in operating the plant. 	<p>These issues will be addressed in the Social and Economic Assessment that will be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report). Outcomes will be communicated as soon as they are available.</p>
Mr Francios Myburgh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although it is assumed that the impact of the influx of people during the construction phase as well as of those who may remain behind after the completion of construction, (thereby impacting negatively on the already high unemployment levels in the area), would be addressed by the specialists as part of this specific study, it is seen as important that the fears and concerns of affected residents be addressed as early as possible. 	
R.D.V. Nothnagel Pearly Beach Ratepayers Association	<p><u>Socio-Economic.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Nuclear Site Investigation Programme (NSIP) shows a clear racial and political bias in its regional sensitivity and site-specific sensitivity studies, and population projection figures are totally incorrect. Special consideration is given to 87 coloured residents of Buffeljagts when at the time of the evaluation there were more than 200 White and 100 coloured and black permanent residents at Pearly Beach. 	<p>The NSIP study was concluded over a decade ago and much of social, economic and biophysical environment on or around the alternative sites has changed dramatically since. The specialist studies undertaken during the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA will investigate all aspects of the receiving environment, and report of any aspects that many today preclude that alternative site from further investigation as an alternative for the construction and operation of the proposed NPS and its associated</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Are you aware that, since the investigation, 500 new residential erven have been approved in the Pearly Beach Caravan Park and that over sixty business and other erven have been rezoned to single residential? Since subdivision of the caravan park was approved, the owners have indicated intent to develop approx. 450 cluster houses on the remainder of the park. During this period the population of Eluxolweni has grown beyond 1000 residents. ▪ An influx of 6 000 construction workers to this area will have a serious effect on the community. ▪ Where is it intended to accommodate these people and from what source will their services be provided? ▪ Experience has proved conclusively that a large number of contract workers remain behind after completion of their project. ▪ This would put extra pressure on an already overloaded infrastructure. ▪ There is already a shortage of housing, very few job opportunities, limited shopping facilities and no public transport to the nearest shopping at Gansbaai. ▪ Although Gansbaai would no doubt benefit enormously from the increased economic activity, all the negative spin-offs of the project, such as crime, gangsterism and lawlessness would impact on Pearly Beach. Please note that the area falls on the boundary of two Police and Magisterial districts, with distances of 22, 48 and 70 km to the three police stations. ▪ Another concern is the economic effect that the presence of the nuclear plant would have on the farmers, particularly the smallholders. ▪ From my visit to the west coast sites, I observed that the area is far less densely populated than the Western Cape and that the potential for growth is far less in that area. ▪ The Northern Cape also has one of the highest unemployment figures in the country. It would therefore seem logical to place the proposed nuclear plant in that area, as it would not only provide jobs, it would also provide a financial injection and be much nearer the waste dumping site. 	<p>infrastructure. The issues of demographics, employment, accommodation of workers, as well as the social issues mentioned, will be specifically addressed in the Social and Economic Assessments that will be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Mr Rudolf Penderis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increase in crime. 	This issue will be addressed in the Social and Economic Assessments that will be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).
Mr Jan Rigaard Rocley Coast Farm (Pty)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Influx of too many people. 	This issue will be addressed in the Social and Economic Assessments that will be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).
Mrs Aleid Rijks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Health hazard by pollution. 	This matter will be addressed in a Health Risk Assessment to be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).
Mr Pieter Sneewe National Union of Mineworkers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Social Upliftment programme / Socio-economic Programme for the communities around the nuclear facility. Programmes must be monitored and evaluated by a Community Liaison Committee comprising of the surrounding community organization and Eskom. ▪ Social Development Initiatives 	These matters will be addressed within a suite of specialist studies to be commissioned as part of the impact assessment (Section 10.6 of the Scoping Report), in particular, the Social Impact Assessment Specialist Study.
Mr Bannett John Thomas (Brian) Sov	<p>After completion of construction of proposed power station what benefits will lead from this. We should look at future operations of the plant that students of the areas should get the necessary introduction to such a project so that their local community could benefit at finding employment. You find that many people come from elsewhere.</p> <p>People/persons must be nominated on a permanent basis to participate (locally), which could communicate on a local basis with the public.</p>	These aspects will be addressed in the Social Impact Assessment (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report). Future communication and community liaison will be dealt with within an Operational EMP that will be completed after this EIA has been completed.