

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 2 – EASTERN CAPE

12 – 15 APRIL 2010

PROVINCE	AREA	DAY AND DATE	VENUE	TIME
Eastern Cape	Oyster Bay	13 April 2010	Oyster Bay Community Hall	18H00 – 20H30
Eastern Cape	Humansdorp	14 April 2010	Humansdorp Country Club	18H00 – 20H00
Eastern Cape	St Francis Bay	15 April 2010	St Francis Links Golf Club	18H00 – 21H30

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	1
PREFACE	2
1. ATTENDANCE.....	3
1.1. ATTENDANCE – INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PARTIES	3
1.2. ATTENDANCE – ESKOM HOLDINGS LIMITED	3
1.3. ATTENDANCE – ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTING TEAM	3
2. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS.....	3
3. FACILITATORS INTRODUCTORY REMARKS	4
3.1 CONDUCT AT MEETING.....	4
3.2 OBJECTIVES OF THE PUBLIC REVIEW MEETINGS.....	4
3.3 SUMMARY OF ISSUES RAISED DURING SCOPING PHASE	4
4. PRESENTATION: FINDINGS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESMENT REPORT	5
5. ISSUES AND COMMENTS RAISED AND DISCUSSED.....	5
5.1 ISSUES AND COMMENTS RAISED	5
6. WAY FORWARD AND CLOSING REMARKS	5
6.1 MINUTES OF MEETINGS.....	5
6.2 TIMEFRAMES	5
6.3 FACILITATORS CONCLUDING REMARKS.....	6
APPENDIX 1: RECORD OF ISSUES RAISED AND DISCUSSED.....	7
APPENDIX 2: PRESENTATION OF DRAFT EIA REPORT	61
APPENDIX 3: ATTENDANCE LISTS	62

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.

IMPORTANT NOTE

The EIA presentation was not given at the St Francis Bay Public Meeting. The I&APs stated that they did not want to spend time on a presentation. The meeting was therefore a question and answer session. Stakeholders wishing to read a record of the St Francis Bay can check the issues and responses, which are captured in Appendix 1.

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	Manager Stakeholder Management and Communication - Nuclear Division
Mr Mervin Theron	Manager Regulatory and Localisation – Nuclear Division
Mr Kevin Leask	Chief Engineer – Strategic Grid Planning
Mr Mandla Mbusi	Senior Advisor - Stakeholder Management

1.3 Attendance – Environmental Consulting 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
Ms Karin Bowler	Karin Bowler Enterprises	Independent Facilitator

2. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

The Facilitator, Ms Karin Bowler, welcomed everyone to the meeting. She explained that the presentations were in English. She explained that participants are welcome to use the language of their choice as the EIA Team could communicate in English, Afrikaans and Xhosa.

She advised participants that the meeting is being recorded to ensure the accuracy of the minutes

Due to late arrival of participants at some public meetings, the starting of some meetings was delayed by a few minutes later than the advertised times. In this instance, the Facilitator advised participants that the time would be added on at the end of the meeting (if required) to ensure sufficient time for questions.

She asked that points of clarification be held over until the discussion period.

3. FACILITATORS INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

3.1 Conduct at Meeting

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.

3.2 Objectives of the Public Review Meetings

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

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

3.3 Summary of Issues Raised during Scoping Phase

The Facilitator explained that the facilitator from the previous round of meetings thought it prudent to summarise a couple of key issues that came out of the process leading up to the EIA Report and also just to list some of those key issues. Having gone through the Issues and Response document, it is quite clear that these are only a few of the issues that were raised. Not all of them are relevant to the EIA process. Some of these issues belong to the NNR process.

For continuity purposes, the Facilitator briefly mentioned some of the issues:

“Some people are opposed to and some are in favour of the proposed Nuclear Power Plants at Bantamsklip, Thyspunt and Duynfontein sites. There are concerns about the potential impact on health and safety issues. The community living in close proximity to the power station are concerned about their sense of place. They are also concerned about the visual impact of a power station. The affect on tourism is also an issue of concern. Altered sea temperatures could potentially affect marine life. Commercial and recreational fishing might be negatively impacted. Light pollution from the plant. Concern over property values have also been raised. Some people have expressed a lack of trust in the EIA process. Issues regarding the storage of hazardous waste. Consideration of alternatives such as renewable energy”.

She emphasised that it is important for stakeholders to verify that issues, which were raised during the Scoping Phase, have been taken into consideration during the Impact Assessment Phase.

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

Ms Jaana-Maria Ball and Mr Reuben Heydenrych representing the Independent Environmental Assessment Practitioners, Arcus GIBB, presented the findings on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

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 stage of presenting the findings of the specialist investigations and the outcomes of the Environmental Impact Assessment phase.

Ms Ball and Mr Heydenrych then presented the findings on the Draft EIR (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.

6. WAY FORWARD AND CLOSING REMARKS

6.1 Minutes of Meetings

Ms Ball indicated that the EIA Team would endeavour to distribute the minutes of meeting to I&APs within 21 days of the date of the meeting.

I&APs will have 14 days to verify the minutes and provide their comments to ACER.

6.2 Timeframes

In terms of the timeframes, I&APs were reminded that the public review period of the Draft EIR 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

Comments received on the Draft EIR are recorded and addressed 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) 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 stated that the onus of responsibility on your shoulders is to act as a reviewer to make sure that this process is robust and that your issues are answered. If not answered, it must be taken within the process. She encouraged everyone to make use of opportunities given to the stakeholders in terms of the National Environmental Management Act (NEMA) and the constitution.

The Facilitator thanked everyone for constructive engagement and encouraged I&APs to submit written comments and closed the meetings.

Interactions between I&APs and the Project Team continued after the meeting. However, ACER did not record discussions, which took place after the meeting.

APPENDIX 1: RECORD OF ISSUES RAISED AND DISCUSSED

OYSTER BAY PUBLIC MEETING (13 APRIL 2010)

No	Name	Comment	Response
1	Mrs Una Bornman - Pensioner, Oyster Bay Resident	Mrs Boardman said that the exclusion zones had not been mentioned and she would like to know about them.	<p>Ms Ball replied that she was not an expert on these so she would pass this one to Eskom. Although the international norm for Emergency Planning Zones (EPZs) are detailed in the EIR and used to depict likely scenarios, the NNR will finally decide on the exclusion zone after the site safety studies are undertaken by Eskom's appointed independent consultants.</p> <p>Mr Stott: Eskom will certainly not build a power station that is not safe to the public and Eskom employees. Eskom has to abide by international rules as well as the NNR rules. The modern nuclear power stations have an exclusion zone of 800 m in which people cannot live.. Outside of the 800 m should never have to be evacuated. The design of the plant is crucial as whoever designs the plant has to conform to these requirements.</p> <p>Mr Stott went on to explain further that there is also a 3 km boundary so between 800 m and 3 km people might have to be sheltered and stay inside for up to a week. Finally, it is the NNR who decides if 800 m would be acceptable to comply with international standards or would they want a larger area. Eskom has no indication from them that it would be any more than 800m and 3 km at this stage.</p> <p>Ms Ball added that the diagram where Oyster Bay is indicated as 5.5 km from the proposed power station so they are well outside of the likely exclusion zone.</p>
2	Mrs Laura Nixon Local Resident	Mrs Nixon stated that in discussions at previous meetings a 10 km zone from Oyster Bay was spoken about. The implication was that the Oyster Bay	Ms Ball confirmed that Ms Nixon was correct as in previous meetings other exclusion zones were displayed. However, as the nuclear power plant generation technologies improve

OYSTER BAY PUBLIC MEETING (13 APRIL 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>community would not grow because it falls within that zone.</p> <p>She questioned if 10km is no longer the exclusion zone for the proposed nuclear power station.</p> <p>It was also mentioned that we (referring to community area) would not be the housing area, it appears that different information has been presented at the meeting.</p>	<p>around the world the exclusion zones have been reduced. As Mr Stott has indicated it will be up to the NNR to decide on the size of the zones. Arcus GIBB has therefore updated the reports accordingly to reflect current internationally accepted planning zones.</p> <p>Post-meeting note: The 800 m and 3 km EPZs were used in the EIA for assessing of potential impacts of the proposed nuclear power station.</p> <p>The housing area for construction workers would not be situated in Oyster Bay.</p>
3	Mrs Laura Nixon Local Resident	<p>Mrs Nixon enquired about housing in the area for the construction site and asked if the housing would be in Humansdorp.</p> <p>Mrs Nixon said there were grave concerns around the housing issue.</p> <p>She added that the idea of the 10 km zone would not have been as much of a concern.</p> <p>Mrs Nixon repeated her concern regarding the housing in Humansdorp. There had been an impression given that Oyster Bay would not be allowed to grow at all because of it being so close and therefore a security risk. Now the consultants are saying the access roads will have a huge affect on Oyster Bay and pass through the village. Oyster Bay is a tiny village.</p>	<p>Eskom's plans for housing have not been finalised. However, Eskom has carried out preliminary investigations and these aspects were considered by the social specialist. Eskom planned to investigate housing requirements in more detail and obtain certainty on this aspect, once the preferred site was identified through the EIA process.</p> <p>The preliminary discussions that Eskom has held with municipalities are that they would be looking in the areas of Humansdorp and Jeffreys Bay to house the majority of the construction and operational staff. If, however, an employee of Eskom felt that they wanted to buy property in Oyster Bay for example, that would be their right to do so. Eskom has no plans for a housing development in Oyster Bay.</p> <p>It has always been stated that access roads are needed on both the eastern and western sides of the Eskom owned property. The detail of these proposed access routes has not been discussed before in the EIA process as the specialists needed to undertake their assessments and indicate their</p>

OYSTER BAY PUBLIC MEETING (13 APRIL 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>Mrs Nixon then stated that they were also told that there would be certain housing requirements. Potentially, there could be 20,000 workers coming to look for work. If 7,000 of these people get jobs that means there would be 13,000 unemployed people. They will need to be housed, to be fed and if the jobs are not available that means huge social problems.</p> <p>Mrs Nixon voiced her personal displeasure at the fact that the exclusion zone has been changed. She could not believe that international criteria would be for only</p>	<p>preferred corridors for these access roads. A Focus Group Meeting is planned for 25 May where the access roads will be discussed in more detail.</p> <p>Mr Stott explained that when the Koeberg Nuclear Power Station was designed and constructed there were vastly different types of emergency plans. The exclusion zone for Koeberg is from 5 km and out to 16 km. There would be restrictions under that type of scenario for development in that 5 km to 16 km zone. However, international standards now require only an 800 m exclusion zone.</p> <p>The facilitator then asked if the social studies included in-migration as an impact related to construction activities.</p> <p>At the peak of construction there will be about 7 700 employees needed to construct the nuclear power station. The peak construction period is short (2 – 3 years) and then the numbers will decrease. During the operational phase there will be about 1 400 employees on site. Social issues, including the potential impacts of the influx of temporary workers have been assessed in the EIA. The social specialist found that in terms of the increase in the possibility of wage requirements and dairy farmer workers being enticed to work on the nuclear construction site, this is unlikely to happen as these are quite different types of work with respect to skills required etc. She said that in the opinion of the independent social specialist the construction of a nuclear power station should not negatively affect the dairy farmers in the Thyspunt area.</p> <p>The facilitator enquired about the information in terms of the new technology and asked when it became available,</p>

OYSTER BAY PUBLIC MEETING (13 APRIL 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>an 800 m exclusion zone. She queried how this could have changed between this meeting and the last meeting. They had always been led to believe that there was a 10 km exclusion zone and that they were protected.</p>	<p>specifically around the exclusion zone.</p> <p>Mr Stott said that the international standards and guidelines came into effect a few years ago. Before this EIA had started, but at that time Eskom were still under the impression that the NNR would impose the 'Koeberg type' of limits on Eskom. It was only when Eskom went to the actual vendors and asked if they could build to international specifications, subject to NNR agreement, that the exclusion zone was modified for Nuclear-1. This was in the latter part of 2008.</p>
3	Mr Kobus du Toit Oyster Bay Resident	<p>Mr du Toit stated that he is a private home-owner in Oyster Bay and he is very prejudiced as it is a holiday home and he comes to this place often.</p> <p>Principally he cannot understand, why humans have this tendency, while there are centres of economic activity in the country, there is a trend to go outside of those centres and spoil a pristine environment by putting up a commercial enterprise such as a nuclear reactor. He is not against nuclear energy <i>per se</i>, He is in fact for it because he regards it as the only viable option for the country's power requirements. However, he asked why put up a commercial development in a place like this? People accept that, in terms of the Eastern Cape, the area where the greatest input of energy is required, is the Port Elizabeth area. Why consider areas outside of the Coega area, where the energy will be required?</p> <p>Mr du Toit went on to say that his other concerns are the social concerns. This whole issue is going to change the Oyster Bay area. The social aspects will</p>	<p>Ms Ball replied and explained that Eskom started the Nuclear Site Investigation Program (NSIP) in the early 1980s. It was a 10-year independent study, which included various specialists studies. Many aspects were taken into consideration, including social, biophysical and, very importantly, seismic risk and stability of the underlying geology for a nuclear power station. The Environmental Evaluation Unit of the University of Cape Town proposed a number of suitable sites along the entire South African coastline. The sites identified as being most suitable in that NSIP process were included in this EIA as alternative sites.</p> <p>In terms of the social aspects that were assessed in the EIA, a full Social Impact Assessment (SIA) team looked at a whole range of issues, including the influx of workers, change in population demographics etc., and that specialist has indicated that with very careful management and mitigation, the potential negative impacts can be reduced to acceptable levels at all the sites.</p> <p>Mr Tony Stott added that initially two sites were selected through the NSIP in this area, namely Bonthys and Tony's Bay.</p>

OYSTER BAY PUBLIC MEETING (13 APRIL 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		need very careful management and he is not sure whether the capability exists within Eskom or in the country to manage this.	<p>These sites were combined to form the Thyspunt site which was selected as the most suitable nuclear site in the Eastern Cape.</p> <p>Mr Stott agreed with Mr du Toit regarding the importance of social aspects and added that they are very critical and they would have to be handled very carefully, should a nuclear power station be built at Thyspunt.</p>
4	Mr Jan Norman Eskom Holdings Limited	The facilitator provided an opportunity for Mr Jan Norman from Eskom to provide clarity on housing requirements for the nuclear power station	<p>Mr Norman stated that he works for Eskom on the Nuclear-1 project; and his focus is infrastructure for operational staff who will work at the plant for the next 60 years. Studies have shown that there is no requirement for Eskom to build any houses for the staff as there is a vast number of available serviced land in Jeffrey's Bay and Humansdorp. The discussions with the local municipalities have shown that the local property developers have indicated that staff could be accommodated in these towns. There will be a build up of people during the construction period over approximately 5 years, and there will not be an influx of 1 000 people per year. Construction staff will either come from the local community or will move into the local community. They will buy houses or land.</p> <p>For the construction staff, there will be accommodation requirements to accommodate approximately 7 000 people. This will include both accommodation for senior staff and single accommodation. At this stage a consultant has been appointed to investigate possible availability of land and they have identified five large tracts of land in the region. This land has also been identified by the municipality for property development. This land is in the Jeffrey's Bay area and Humansdorp.</p>
5	Mr Zandisile Ndamase Local Resident	Mr Ndamase said she would like clarity on whether would it make any difference to engage in discussions	Ms Ball referred to a diagram in the presentation that indicated the issues. She went on to explain that in order to address the

OYSTER BAY PUBLIC MEETING (13 APRIL 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>or has a decision has been made.</p>	<p>question regarding what is needed, she recommended that Ms Ndamase check specific the issues documented in the Draft EIR and submit her comments to ACER. Everything that is discussed tonight will also be captured in minutes and in the Issues and Response Reports and will be used to update the EIR. No decisions have been made in terms of this EIA or in terms of any of the other decisions such as the NNR decision regarding site and plant safety.</p> <p>Ms Ball also explained that she and Mr Heydenrych are presenting the specialist findings.</p> <p>Eskom wants to build a nuclear power station but it does not mean that they are going to build a power station. Eskom has to get authorisation from a number of authorities first.</p> <p>The facilitator added that the first authorisation that is required, is environmental authorisation. The authorisation can either be positive, which says to Eskom it can go ahead and build or it can be negative. After that, if there is a positive authorisation, there can be appeals. A positive authorisation is not necessarily the end of the process.</p> <p>Mr Stott also explained that there are about 33 permits that are needed. Of these, two are very important, the Nuclear License and the Environmental Authorisation. Prior to these decisions a decision needs to be confirmed as to whether South Africa will build nuclear power stations. This decision will be taken in the Integrated Resource Plan, an energy plan which examines the different kinds of technology that should be allowed in South Africa. The Department of Energy expects to issue this plan by the middle of 2010 for public comment.</p>

OYSTER BAY PUBLIC MEETING (13 APRIL 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
			<p>Mr Stott went on to explain should the Department issue the plan then Eskom has to resume the commercial process. The nuclear licence is issued by the NNR. They look at the health issues, the emergency plan, etc. and only once they are satisfied and give Eskom a licence to construct the power station can the utility start with construction. There are other permits such as water licences, natural heritage permits, etc. Eskom does not expect to get the nuclear licence until approximately a year after the decision is made, if it is a positive decision.</p>
6	Mr Nick Bornman Oyster Bay Beach Lodge	<p>Mr Bornman asked what would happen to this property if the site were not approved. He thought that if developer had to buy it and build four or five thousand houses, this might have a worse affect on this area.</p> <p>The facilitator asked if Eskom would consider selling the land.</p> <p>The facilitator noted that it would be a change of land use if any person decides to develop the property (Thyspunt). So whatever development occurs, it will have to go through an EIA process.</p>	<p>Mr Heydenrych said that the Thyspunt property could be sold and there may be a number of different plans. In terms of the biophysical specialist, there could be a conservation benefit by conserving the remainder of the 2 400 ha site. Approximately 31 ha will be development that is a significant conservation benefit for the area. Currently the area is not conserved. Those are the options for the public to weigh up.</p> <p>Ms Ball added that there are also other possible spin-offs that some of the specialists have recommended. For example, Eskom could buy up tracts of land and extend the nuclear plant up to the eastern access route towards Cape St Francis. Eskom would have to purchase land for the eastern access road should the authorisation be granted (this area includes the Langefontein Wetland Complex).</p> <p>Mr Stott replied that in terms of legislation Eskom are allowed to buy property for future use. However, if Eskom is never going to use the land in question, the utility will be obliged to sell it as they cannot just hold onto the property.</p>

OYSTER BAY PUBLIC MEETING (13 APRIL 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
7	Ms Charmaine KettleDas Local Resident	Ms KettleDas said there are many rumours regarding the power station. She wanted to know if it is true that there will be a housing development at KwaNomzamo.	Ms Ball explained that in discussions with the municipality early on in the EIA process, it was agreed not to consider Oyster Bay for staff housing due to the restricted water, sewage, access roads and a whole host of other issues. So Oyster Bay has not been considered for housing by Eskom. Eskom will not be building any houses for staff but the appointed contractor may.
8	Mr Zolani Mayoni Local Resident, ANC	Mr Mayoni wanted clarity about the housing development. He asked if the consultants are saying that the municipality said to Eskom that they could never place a housing development because of water related constraints in the area.	Mr Norman answered that Eskom will not build any residential homes for their staff. The contractor will require residential accommodation for his staff. There will be approximately 7,000 people and they would like to build housing in one place for these people. When Eskom mentioned to the municipality that they require a large tract of land for a mixture of married and single accommodation, they asked us please not to consider the Oyster Bay area. They did not tell us where to consider but only not to consider Oyster Bay. Eskom employees will be scattered. However the contractor needs one location due to the logistics of transporting people to the site.
9	Ms Charmaine KettleDas Local Resident	Her understanding was that the Kouga Municipality would not build houses for the KwaNomzamo community because of Eskom's development.	<p>The facilitator explained that the development being discussed in this EIA was separate from the development plans being referred to by Ms KettleDas.</p> <p>Post-meeting note: Eskom has not restricted the building of houses for Kwa Nomzamo.</p> <p>Mr Stott reiterated that the municipality were very clear that the construction of housing would not be in Oyster Bay.</p>
10	Mr Barry Bothas Local Resident	Mr Bothas asked if small businesses in the area will be given the opportunity to perform minor projects or will all the work go to the larger enterprises.	Ms Ball responded by saying that this is a recommendation from the specialist that there be use of local labour and local businesses. This is also in the agricultural study where there is the prediction that there will be an increase in the demand for milk. There will certainly be an increase for the demand for all

OYSTER BAY PUBLIC MEETING (13 APRIL 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>The facilitator asked if there is a vendor listing process.</p> <p>Mr Bothas, as an example said that if he wanted to provide a service such as fixing punctures for the vehicles – would he be able to tender for this type of job.</p>	<p>local services.</p> <p>Ms Deidre Herbst said that if the example of large coal fired plants that Eskom is involved in Lephalale and also pumped storage scheme in the Drakensberg is used, Eskom has enforced the use of as much local labour and businesses as possible. Eskom stipulate targets within contracts to use local labour and businesses. Obviously the large components are going to come from overseas.</p> <p>Ms Herbst said that this is not currently in place, but once approval is granted and Eskom is certain about construction, then the team will come into the area and start engaging with local forums and communities.</p> <p>Mr Stott added that in terms of the actual contracts with the suppliers, vendors have to specify how much localisation is going to take place, i.e. how much work they will give to local businesses, how much local labour will they use, how much of the localisation will they use. There are some points allocated to the minimum requirements, which need to be met by the vendors, if not then they will be penalised. These follow normal tender procedures.</p> <p>Eskom does try to encourage the use of local small business as much as possible.</p>
11	Mr van Zyl Oyster Bay Resident	Ek was redelik betrokke van die begin van Eskom se onderhandelings af. My bekommernis is oor die hele proses. Ek praat nie namens die boere nie. Daar is so veel dinge gesê en wat nou later net verander. Ek wil 'n voorbeeld gee. Aan die begin is daar nooit gepraat van 'n kernkragstasie nie – dit was 'n PBMR	The Facilitator said there were some issues that need to be unpacked. One of the critical issues is the whole issue relating to the PBMR reactor and which was originally negotiated with the local landowners. There is a need to explain the timeframes when the original negotiations were done and when the PBMR only came into play so that those issues can be separated out

OYSTER BAY PUBLIC MEETING (13 APRIL 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>(korrelbed modulêre reaktor). Die eerste keer wat ek daarvan gehoor het was by verlede jaar se vergadering. Dit was die eerste keer dat ek gehoor het dit is nie meer 'n PBMR nie maar 'n kernkragstasie. Ook die paaie: ek wou kom hoor of Eskom gaan help met verbetering van die pad? Vanaand hoor ons vir die eerste keer van 'n westelike roete. Ek kan vir u nog voorbeelde gee, daar is 'n wantroue by die meeste mense, wat nie gesê word nie.</p> <p>Translation He indicated that he has been quite involved in the process since the start of Eskom's negotiations. He is concerned about the entire process but he is however not speaking on behalf of the farmers. There have been a number of things that have been said and later on are changed. As an example, he mentioned the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The kind of power station to be built has changed. At first it was going to be a Pebble Bed Modular Reactor. Now it is a Nuclear Power Station. ▪ The first time he heard of this was at the previous meeting. That was the first I heard of it no longer being a PBMR but a nuclear power station. ▪ Also about the roads: is Eskom going to help improve the road? And today, for the first time, we hear about the western road. <p>I could give more examples, and that is the reason for a lot of unspoken mistrust that people have.</p>	<p>factually in terms of time frames.</p> <p>The facilitator also said that the issue with the roads is very interesting, because yesterday at a Key Stakeholder Meeting, a stakeholder had also said that the issue around the roads had changed and that certain information had been given over at the meeting with the Local Municipality. There is some confusion in information that is going out into the public domain.</p> <p>Ms Ball said that she would only talk on the EIA as she could not comment on any land negotiations conducted by Eskom. In terms of the EIA there have been two sets of public meetings. All the minutes of every public meeting which are verified by the public, are posted on the website. She requested that all I&APs who do not have access to the internet to speak to her after the meeting so she could arrange posting of minutes of previous meetings.</p> <p>Ms Ball further explained that nothing has changed regarding the roads. At the beginning of the project it had been explained that access roads would be necessary on the site. Information that has been presented by Arcus GIBB at the meeting is based on specialist recommendations. Specialists recommended that the western access road be the preferred alternative. They also recommended in the transportation specialist study that the road from Oyster Bay all the way to the R330 needs to be upgraded. This does not mean that this will be accepted by DEA. If DEA does accept this, a condition of the authorisation will be that this obligation must be fulfilled before construction. In the scoping phase an initial picture was presented, and the fundamentals have not changed but there are more details now. She stressed that they are recommendations.</p>

OYSTER BAY PUBLIC MEETING (13 APRIL 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
			<p>Mr Stott added that there appears to have been some misunderstanding with this EIA and PBMR. The original studies done in the 1980s and 1990s were for nuclear sites and at that stage we had a different type of nuclear power station. Sites were investigated for the Koeberg type of nuclear power station.</p> <p>Then in 1993 to 1994, Eskom started looking for a suitable site for the PBMR. Again in 1999, Eskom looked if they could build PBMR at Bantamsklip, Thyspunt and at Koeberg. At the time, it was decided that because it is a demonstration power plant, it should be built at Koeberg. In fact that EIA was almost complete and then there was a court case and the EIA was re-started.</p> <p>It was only in 2006 that Eskom started the nuclear power station EIA. They started the EIA with 5 sites and now there are three sites being evaluated. This is a different EIA and this is perhaps what has caused the misunderstanding.</p> <p>In terms of the roads, until Eskom actually get approval to build the power station, they cannot start engaging in this debate nor can they put money into new projects for roads.</p>

END OF OYSTER BAY MEETING

HUMANSDORP PUBLIC MEETING (14 APRIL 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
1	Mr Francis Searle Local Resident	Mr Searle asked if there is any way that the public can become involved in ensuring that the mitigating factors are managed by the construction people assuming that the project goes ahead.	Ms Ball responded that they had put in a recommendation that an environmental committee be established which would involve key stakeholders from the area around the proposed site. Ms Herbst (Eskom) responded by saying that this has been implemented at other large new build projects and is very effective. In addition to this one of the power stations, the Ingula Pumped Storage Scheme, Eskom has established a partnership with key conservation NGOs to ensure the effective management of the conservation area of 8000hectartes.
2	Mr Rupert Gerber Local Resident	Mr Gerber asked about the exporting of products, particularly to the EU, produced in this area, he wanted to know if there is a possibility that anything will change in the future. For example could they ban the import of Chokka from this area. He asked if they are currently exporting any fish to any foreign country from the Koeberg area.	Ms Ball said that this issue was addressed in the agricultural study and the marine impact assessment. In terms of agriculture the specialist has firmly stated that this would be a low significant potential impact, it is highly unlikely, that there would be either contamination or that markets would refuse to take products from this area. In terms of the marine life, she explained that the background levels of Strontium that are in the ocean all around the world. Monitoring has been done at Koeberg Nuclear Power Station and the values have not increased. This specialist also stated that this is highly unlikely. Ms Ball said that according to the agricultural study there is a very mature wine industry around the Koeberg Nuclear Power Station and these wines are sold all around the world. There is also other mixed farming.
3	Ms Leila Mahomed Mainstream SA	She inferred that some of the information presented by the consultants was misleading.	Ms Ball asked that it be placed on record that in no way do the environmental consultants want to mislead anyone in this

HUMANSDORP PUBLIC MEETING (14 APRIL 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
			presentation. Information has been taken straight from the specialist studies.
4	Ms Leila Mahomed Mainstream SA	<p>She made the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The no-go alternative is not an option. She is surprised to see that being given as an alternative. ▪ Base load – the recent study has shown that renewables can provide a base load because it follows the load flow of the country (use pattern) and can be considered as recent research suggests. ▪ Recent wind profile in SA – there is increasingly new information that is available internationally. <p>Have all these options been assessed as part of the EIA.</p> <p>Ms Mahomed said that her understanding of baseload is if it can meet the demand during the day. If you look at the most recent wind resource study, it shows that the way the wind blows across South Africa, it follows the load flow pattern - she offered to forward the necessary documents on to the consultants. There is increasingly new research in South Africa and internationally that show this.</p> <p>Ms Mahomed asked if the no-go alternative would be put back on the table again.</p>	<p>Ms Ball replied that from Arcus GIBB's perspective, it is their understanding that there are problems associated with wind energy generation and its placement on to the 'grid'. Base load supply needs to have reliability and quality of supply. For example electricity has to always be available to the consumer, particularly for large industry and mining. Regarding wind she explained that as a company they are working on a number of EIAs for wind generation facilities. Worldwide there are problems in terms of spikes onto the grid and in terms of reliability of supply. Wind can also be too strong or too weak there is a study presently to map the wind around the country.</p> <p>Mr Stott added that around the country the wind blows differently. There is therefore the argument that if you put the equivalent of 2 000 MW in the Cape and then you put another 2 000 MW in KwaZulu-Natal and another 2 000 MW in Gauteng then that could provide the baseload of a power station needing 4 000 MW. This is not correct, because there will be days when there is no wind or the wind is not the correct strength. The definition of baseload is the ability to supply electricity for at least 75 % of the time. The renewable energy feeding tariffs that the NNR has published, show that wind energy can provide electricity for 27 % of the time.</p> <p>Ms Ball said that they were always happy to receive new information.</p> <p>Mr Stott said that not more than 20 % of their energy comes from that. There is no country in the world that gets more than</p>

HUMANSDORP PUBLIC MEETING (14 APRIL 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
			<p>20 % of their energy from renewables.</p> <p>Ms Ball said the 'no go' alternative has been assessed.</p>
5	Ms Nicoleen Swarts Mainstream SA	Ms Swarts wanted to comment on the stability of power generation. Her understanding is that wind generation does actually contribute to the stability of the base load.	<p>Ms Ball said that her comment was noted and will be addressed in the issues and response report.</p> <p>Mr Leask, from Eskom said that in certain circumstances this was correct on weak parts of the network when the wind was generating. However the difference is that we are talking about base-load capacity and the system reserve margins if a large generator is lost during system peaks. The problem with wind generators is that they are individually small units and do not contribute much to the system dynamic inertia. What we are saying is that Nuclear-1 has not yet been approved and if the Government decides it does not want nuclear then wind is one of the options. Even if Nuclear-1 is approved, there is still an opportunity for wind to come in in large amounts.</p> <p>The facilitator said that Ms Swarts had raised an interesting point and she asked Ms Ball if these technical details are in the report, specifically in terms of alternatives.</p> <p>Ms Ball replied that these issues were covered to a certain extent but she asked Ms Mahommed and Ms Swarts to please send in as many details as possible regarding there issues. This will then be addressed and independent experts will examine this information and an answer will be sent to the meeting participants.</p>
6	Ms Nicoleen Swarts Mainstream SA	Ms Swarts referred to the presentation and asked about the Peak Ground Acceleration (PGA) levels.	Mr Heydenrych replied that Koeberg itself is not a standard nuclear power station, it was built specifically to withstand high PGA values.

HUMANSDORP PUBLIC MEETING (14 APRIL 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>Ms Swarts accepted the PGA as ~0.3g. She asked if could another power station be built at Koeberg.</p> <p>Is the proposed power station still a Pressurised Water Reactor type?</p>	<p>Mr Stott explained that due to the level of seismic activity, Koeberg was designed especially to cater for this. Underneath the nuclear reactor is the raft so that the whole structure can move.</p> <p>Mr Heydenrych said that it was possible but it would be much more expensive.</p> <p>Ms Ball said that economically this adds to the overall cost of the power station.</p> <p>Mr Stott said it is not to say the Eskom cannot build there, but if they do, they would have to make sure that the design took the uncertainty into account as it will definitely cost more and the economic factors have to be considered in the selection of a site.</p> <p>Ms Ball said the need factor had been considered for Nuclear-1, that is replacing this capacity in a short space of time.</p> <p>Yes, but a more advanced technology than Koeberg.</p>

END OF HUMANSDORP MEETING

ST FRANCIS BAY PUBLIC MEETING (15 APRIL 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
1	Ms Trudi Malan Spokesperson for St Francis Alliance	<p>Ms Malan stated as a point of order that the community do not feel that due process has been followed, nor that sufficient time has been allowed for comment. She stated that they do not accept the hour-long presentation, the Executive Summary has been published and as everyone has read it, the presentation should focus on issues not in the Executive Summary. The community would like more time to ask questions.</p> <p>Ms Malan again objected to the presentation being one hour long and the discussion period only 30 minutes.</p>	<p>The Facilitator said that this was respected and her point had been heard. She also stated that Mr Hilton Thorpe, representing the St Francis Kromme Trust and also the St Francis Bay Residents Association has requested formally to do a presentation on behalf of those communities. The facilitator said that the team must ascertain if Mr Thorpe does in fact represent all audience members and if everyone agrees to a presentation being given by Mr Thorpe.</p> <p>The facilitator proposed that the meeting be structured as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Environmental Consultants Presentation 2. 30 Minutes discussion 3. 30 Minutes Mr Thorpe's presentation 4. 30 Minutes general discussion <p>The facilitator explained that the presentation must be consistent across all meetings. She asked for a show of hands to see if everyone did not want the presentation by the consultants. There were a few people who wanted the presentation to go ahead. The majority of the members in the audience indicated that they were comfortable not to see the presentation.</p> <p>The facilitator conferred with the consultants and it was agreed that the meeting begin with the consultants answering questions posed by the audience.</p>
2	Mr Hilton Thorpe	Mr Thorpe said that there was a meeting held with	Comment noted.

ST FRANCIS BAY PUBLIC MEETING (15 APRIL 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
	St Francis Bay Residents Association and St Francis Kromme Trust	various bodies and it was decided to form the Thyspunt Alliance and instead of doing a presentation there has been a number of questions prepared which will be put to the consultants. Therefore he asked that the meeting structure be changed to reflect this.	
3	Mr Hilton Thorpe St Francis Bay Residents Association and St Francis Kromme Trust	Mr Thorpe asked about the validity of the EIA process: How can an EIA be contemplated when the specific nuclear technology is not been decided upon?	Ms Ball replied the technology was a pressurised water reactor type, similar to the Koeberg Nuclear Power Station. Eskom has experience in constructing and operating this type of reactor. The plant type is unknown to the utility. Eskom has begun a commercial process together with government. An envelope of criteria has been used in this EIA. The criteria were obtained from Eskom and these were modelled. The specialists used these criteria to undertake their assessments. If any other vendor approaches Eskom through the commercial process, should this EIA be authorised, and Eskom gain the various other permits (about 30 other permits are required) the vendor would have to comply strictly with those set of criteria. The criteria are based on generation 3 plant types whereas Koeberg is a generation 2 type.
4	Mr Ryan Donnelly For A Safe Tomorrow	Mr Donnelly asked what material information the consultants had with regard to emissions and radioactive emissions in particular. Mr Donnelly objected to this because he said it was within the scope of the independent consultants and if they continually leave their job to Eskom, it is a clear indication that this process is not independent.	Ms Ball replied that Eskom would have to answer this question as to how they acquired these criteria. Ms Ball explained that an envelope of criteria was provided to them by Eskom, Arcus GIBB then gave this information to the specialists and they reviewed this information. Ms Ball said that there were many references and these can be found in the Air Quality Specialist Study as well

ST FRANCIS BAY PUBLIC MEETING (15 APRIL 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		Mr Donnelly then asked if there had been any independent studies on radioactive emissions.	as the full reference list at the back of the report. There is a peer-reviewed reference list.
5	I&AP St Francis Kromme Trust	He stated that it has been mentioned that it is the generation 3 type that will be used but the report says that this is in fact the favoured one and that others will not be excluded.	Ms Ball replied that the envelope of criteria were for generation 3 type.
6	Ms Tania Jordaan The Window Secret	Ms Jordaan asked if the nuclear specialist came from one company or were a few companies used.	Ms Ball replied that the company was Colenco Engineering in Switzerland.
7	Mr Hilton Thorpe St Francis Bay Residents Association and St Francis Kromme Trust	<p>Mr Thorpe then stated that because the specific technology is unknown, the NNR is unable to do anything. It is a concern that the role of the NNR has been separated from the EIA, even though the DEA and the NNR are going to work together. The process is not taking place in parallel, the reason for this is simply that Eskom has not identified a technology. He asked when an announcement would be made about the technology.</p> <p>He further stated that even though Eskom favours Generation 3, the government had halted negotiations with Areva and Westinghouse about 2 years ago due to their technology being too expensive. He therefore asked the question what other Generation 3 vendors there were in the World and if so do they have the same safety standards.</p> <p>The facilitator asked Eskom to explain if the NNR have to wait for a decision on a plant type to be made before they can continue with the permitting</p>	<p>Ms Ball replied that as far as she was aware there are no restrictions in the NEMA that there is a requirement to wait for any other processes that might be run by the applicant.</p> <p>Mr Stott replied that the NNR can only start its work once Eskom provides it with a safety case. The safety case is obtained from the supplier and it is a huge document, which assesses the safety of the plant. Therefore Eskom does need to know the exact design of the power station. This can only be done once commercial negotiations are completed with the vendor. The NNR is looking at different designs throughout the world. Mr Stott went on to explain that the government were in fact still determining whether South Africa would have any nuclear power stations. This is being done through the Integrated Resource Plan Process that is currently being completed. This plan is expected in June or July 2010. If this plan does provide for nuclear power stations, Eskom will re-open negotiations with vendors throughout the world. It is however Eskom's stance that they will only</p>

ST FRANCIS BAY PUBLIC MEETING (15 APRIL 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		processes.	accept Generation 3 technologies.
8	Ms Trudi Malan Spokesperson for St Francis Alliance	<p>Ms Malan quoted from the Executive Summary, "With respect to this EIA, specialist studies relating to radiological issues have been included for information, as the DEA will not consider radiological impacts in their decision making". This means that this community must comment on the unknown affects of radiological issues, this, she feels is unfair and flawed.</p> <p>The facilitator acknowledged Ms Malan's comment and said that it is an issue that is raised at all the meetings. She requested the consultants to clarify this.</p> <p>The facilitator asked where specifically is the safety of the public taken into account. She asked if it would be part of the NNR process and then what happens if there is a positive authorisation of the nuclear site – will it become null and void if the NNR studies show that the safety concerns are not being taken into account.</p>	<p>Ms Ball replied that the consultants are governed by legislation and Acts such as the NNR Act, which clearly states that there is a place for co-operative governance and the NNR have the expertise and experience and capacity to assess radiological issues. In the Scoping Report as well as the EIA Report the co-operative agreement has been included and NEMA also provides for co-operative-type agreements. The DEA have informed the consultants that they do not have the capacity or experience to assess radiological issues. They have therefore tried to inform the public about this and it is the reason for the inclusion of four studies in this particular EIA that would not have typically formed part of an EIA.</p> <p>Ms Ball replied that there are two separate pieces of legislation. In terms of safety – this falls under the NNR Act. She went on to say that she assumes that if safety issues are not met Eskom would not be able to construct the plant.</p> <p>Mr Stott confirmed that if the NNR is not satisfied that a plant can be built and operated safely, they will not issue a nuclear installation licence, if Eskom does not have this licence, regardless of what other authorisations Eskom has, the plant cannot be constructed.</p>
9	Mr Mike Simms St Francis Residents Association	Mr Simms asked Eskom to confirm that they are not presently negotiating or tendering for a Nuclear Power Station.	Mr Stott said that Mr Simms was correct. Eskom is not in a position to negotiate with any vendors until they get the go-ahead from government.

ST FRANCIS BAY PUBLIC MEETING (15 APRIL 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		Mr Simms then wanted to know how Arcus GIBB could state in their report that construction would begin next year, 2011.	<p>Ms Ball replied that Eskom would like to begin construction next year, it is not a given that they will, Eskom has also indicated that this was an optimistic target. She also said that all the slides from the presentation would be placed on the Arcus GIBB website and each slide will be numbered so that people may comment on specific slides.</p> <p>Obtaining all the permits will take a great deal of time. Also, all specialist reports will be reviewed by the public. Recommendations and mitigation proposed by the specialists are important, and typically the DEA will build these into the conditions of authorisation and some of those recommendations are extensive, particularly the Heritage Resource recommendations. Ms Ball further explained that Eskom may not start construction until every condition is fulfilled. The DEA will audit this process very carefully.</p>
10	Mr Ryan Donnelly For A Safe Tomorrow	<p>Mr Donnelly asked if the information about the studies regarding annual inhalation of dust could be updated. He also asked if the figure which shows a blue line of .50 sieverts which is considered an annual overdose of radionuclides.</p> <p>He noted that this includes Rebels Rus and the sanctuary area, he wanted to know what would become of these people, will they be relocated.</p>	<p>Ms Ball said that she would ask the specialist to examine the data and verify whether it is correct or if it needs correcting. Ms Ball further explained that there is an international standard of 250 microSieverts per annum. Koeberg has set its own limits and currently operates well below this figure.</p> <p>Post-meeting note: It was established later in the meeting that Mr Donnelly had misinterpreted the graph in the report and what he thought was a higher reading than the limit was in fact a lower reading.</p>
11	Mr Alwin Malgas	Hy will net weet wat die veiligheid aspek betref. Is	The facilitator answered and explained in Afrikaans as

ST FRANCIS BAY PUBLIC MEETING (15 APRIL 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
	Sea Vista Forum	<p>dit nie veronderstel om in die impakstudie te wees nie?</p> <p>Tweedens het Mnr Stott het genoem dat hy nie bewus is wanneer en of die regering ooit 'n kernkragentrale sal bou nie. Maar in die volgende asem sê hy weer in Junie gaan ons hoor of ons [die voorgetelde planne goedgekeur is].</p> <p>Translation</p> <p>He wants to know about the safety aspects. Shouldn't safety aspects be part of the Environmental Impact Study?</p> <p>Secondly, Mr Stott mentioned that he didn't know whether or when the government will build a nuclear power station. But the next moment, Mr Stott said that we should hear in June whether [the proposal has been approved].</p>	<p>follows:</p> <p>Die een belangrike aspek insover dit die veiligheids-aspekte aangaan is dat dit nie as deel van die omgewingsstudie gedoen word nie. Dit word as deel van die NNR regulasies gedoen. Die bekommernis was wanneer gaan dit gedoen word en kan dit gedoen word. Dit word ná die omgewingsstudie en in die publieke domein gedoen, en almal het die geleentheid om deel van daardie studies te wees en daarop kommentaar te lewer. Soos wat Mnr Stott verduidelik het, kan die kragstasie nie gebou word tensy al die studies gedoen word nie. Daar is sekere permissie wat goedkeuring moet kry en daardie proses word in die publiek gedoen.</p> <p>Sover as wat dit Mnr Sims se vraag aangaan: Mnr Stott het gesê eers in hierdie jaar Julie gaan die regering 'n besluit maak oor of daar wel 'n kernkragstasie gebou kan word op hierdie land. So hoekom word daar in die studies gesê dat die konstruksie in 2011 gebou gaan word? Wat Mv Ball gesê het dat dit optimisties is want daar is verskriklik baie wat van nou tot dan moet gebeur en daar is 'n baie sterk moontlikheid dat dit nie dan sal kan geskied nie.</p> <p>Translation</p> <p>The important thing to remember about the safety study is that it is not done as part of the environmental impact study. Safety falls under the NNR regulations and will be considered in their study. There was a question about whether this will be done and when it will be done. This</p>

ST FRANCIS BAY PUBLIC MEETING (15 APRIL 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
			<p>will be done after the environmental study and will take place in the public domain. Everybody will have the opportunity to be part of these studies. As Mr Stott explained, the power station may not be built unless all the studies have been done. Certain permits have to be issued, and that process takes place in public.</p> <p>As for Mr Sims' question: Mr Stott first said that the government would decide in June of this year whether a nuclear power station can be built on this land. So why do the studies say that construction will commence in 2011? What Ms Ball said, is that that is a bit optimistic, because there is so much that has to happen before then, that it is very unlikely that it will be done by then.</p>
12	Mr Hilton Thorpe St Francis Bay Residents Association and St Francis Kromme Trust	Mr Thorpe asked about a technical term used in the EIA, that is the term material information. He asked Ms Ball to explain this term and whether the specific technology to be used is not possibly the classic example of material information.	Ms Ball responded by saying that her understanding of the term material information is enough information to make a decision or to undertake the assessment in order to make the decision. She corrected Mr Thorpe by saying that the technology is known it is only the plant type that is unknown. She feels this is not material information as they have the envelope of criteria that were used in the assessment. Vendors would not be able to submit a power station that does not within these criteria.
13	Mr Hilton Thorpe St Francis Bay Residents Association and St Francis Kromme Trust	Mr Thorpe raised the issue regarding alternative sites. Thyspunt site was selected 30 years ago on the basis of certain criteria (no-one seems to have seen these criteria). They are aware that the site is geologically stable, seismically stable, obviously hot water can be discharged into the sea. It is their view that the way in which the EIA was conducted does	Ms Ball replied that alternatives were examined in this EIA. During the Scoping phase, five suitable sites for nuclear power stations were chosen. Those sites came out of a Nuclear Site Investigation Programme (NSIP), which was undertaken in the early 1980s and comprised three phases. The first phase examined nationally, where regions were technically chosen. Then within

ST FRANCIS BAY PUBLIC MEETING (15 APRIL 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		not address alternative sites. Many things have occurred during the past 30 years, politically, socio-economically, demographically etc. and this EIA should look at alternatives to Thyspunt.	<p>these regions suitable sites were chosen and the Western, Southern and Eastern Cape were chosen. After this a detailed phase consisting of three studies which examined details of suitability. The site suitability was undertaken according to the current EIA procedure guidelines.</p> <p>Arcus GIBB started with suitable sites and these were investigated in the scoping phase. The NSIP report was reviewed and the 24 independent specialists were consulted. After more detailed investigations 2 sites were removed, viz. Brazil and Schulpfontein. This application is for one nuclear power station of 4 000 MW and if Eskom goes 1 MW over this limit they would have to start a new EIA from scratch.</p> <p>This application is therefore only for this specific power station. The alternatives were therefore; Brazil, Schulpfontein, Thyspunt, Bantamsklip and Duynefontein.</p>
14	Mr Mike Simms St Francis Residents Association	Mr Simms stated that he feels Ms Ball is avoiding the issue. The issue being that Arcus GIBB were given 5 sites to inspect and these have been covered. These were chosen in 1980 when the social, political and demographic effects were completely different. Today there is a major industrial access between Port Elizabeth and East London where the power is needed, and where infrastructure, labour and skills exist. Yet, these areas have been left out of the study. Therefore alternatives have not been adequately addressed.	<p>The facilitator added a question by asking if in terms of the terms of reference of the specialists were they asked to build on the socio-economic findings of 1980 and the changes that have arisen since then.</p> <p>Ms Ball responded by saying that the specialists were asked to start afresh with independent studies on the current situation and projected future situation. The 24 specialists found no fatal flaws in any of the 3 sites.</p>

ST FRANCIS BAY PUBLIC MEETING (15 APRIL 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
15	Mr Ryan Donnelly For A Safe Tomorrow	Mr Donnelly voiced his support of Mr Simms and said these sites were chosen three decades ago and Arcus GIBB have responded that these three sites had no fatal flaws. He felt that the question had not been answered as Mr Simms had asked had other alternative sites been investigated.	Ms Ball explained that because the Nuclear Siting Investigation Programme (NSIP) report was compiled in the 1980s, they asked all the specialists to investigate the impacts currently. In terms of the EIA Regulations, NEMA talks about looking at reasonable and feasible alternatives. Other alternatives have been put on the table by I&APs, these can be tracked in the IRR.
16	Mrs Sandra Hardie St Francis Conservancy	Ms Hardie referred to the social impact of the possible nuclear plant. She stated that it is her understanding that there are two plants planned and not one as stated by Ms Ball. These are being planned on pristine ground where people live for peace and tranquillity. They did not move to St Francis Bay to have a nuclear power plant on their doorstep. She asked if there are radionuclides emitted from Koeberg. If so, what is the cumulative impact and what is the delay period in natural levels.	Was there no answer???
17	Ms Tanja Lategan Supertubes Surfing Foundation	Ms Lategan said there was an article in the Cape Times in 2009 saying that the CEO of the Coega Development Corporation had said that there was a feasibility study of combined gas and coal power station to be erected at Coega which would be able to generate 3 000 MW. The balance of power would then be from wind power. She asked why then would 4,000 MW of nuclear power be needed. The facilitator asked for clarification if the Coega Development Corporation could contribute to the national grid and is it an option that would avoid	Ms Ball stated that by 2025 Eskom needs to replace 40 000 MW of generation capacity in the country. Many of the power stations are coming to the end of their lives. 4 000MW is this particular EIA application with a base load power station. There are two options that are commercially viable for base load, coal-fired power stations and nuclear power stations. She said she was not too sure about the close cycle gas turbine plant but she was sure it was not a base load power station, as it is run on diesel and is extremely expensive. Mr Stott replied that it is estimated that South Africa will need 50 000 MW of new capacity by 2028. That

ST FRANCIS BAY PUBLIC MEETING (15 APRIL 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		looking at a nuclear plant in the area.	<p>assumes that 10 000 MW of coal-fired power stations will shut down as they come to the end of their lives. Those power stations are needed in various parts of the country to ensure that Eskom can adequately supply electricity to the whole country and keep the grid strengthened. Eskom needs more than one power station in the Eastern Cape and more than one in the rest of the country as well. Therefore 50 000 MW required at 4 000 MW each.</p> <p>Certainly Eskom also needs open-cycle gas turbines and combined cycle gas turbines, they need wind, they need solar, they need nuclear and in the longer-term, coal. It is not a question of if you build one, you do not need the other one, South Africa needs them all.</p>
18	Mr Joe Oosthuizen St Francis Residents Association	<p>Mr Oosthuizen went back to the question raised by Mr Simms because he felt it had still not been answered. The question was very clear, working with 30 year old figures is unacceptable. In view of the fact that sites were selected 30 years back, did you get the instructions from Eskom to specifically look at 20 different sites along the whole coast line and evaluate them. What about Port Elizabeth and East London. The actual question that has to be answered is, "How many sites did the team evaluate in the Eastern Cape"?</p> <p>The facilitator asked Ms Ball if Arcus GIBB had accepted the report that was published in the 1980s, without question that these were the only</p>	<p>Ms Ball answered by saying that Arcus GIBB started off with 5 sites that were provided by Eskom, these sites were checked and assessed as part of the scoping phase to see whether they were still suitable. It was found that technically they are all suitable sites. The specialists then did detailed studies from 2007 until now.</p> <p>I&AP's are referred to the scoping report where the site selection process is discussed in detail. The site selection process was also discussed during the scoping phase public meetings.</p> <p>Ms Ball answered that there have been other sites investigated. Coega has been put on the table at the PE stakeholder meeting. The answer to this site was that it</p>

ST FRANCIS BAY PUBLIC MEETING (15 APRIL 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>sites that were available on which to base your studies. Did Arcus GIBB have the liberty to examine any other alternatives as opposed to those that were given to them as part of the initial study that was done. She went on to re-iterate that this leads on to how valid those studies are in the present day.</p> <p>The facilitator then asked that in terms of NEMA, alternatives must be assessed. She asked what the authorities' view had been on the alternatives (as had signed off on this study). Were the authorities satisfied that these sites, selected so many years ago, would form the basis of the alternatives to be assessed?</p>	<p>was not technically reasonable or feasible for Nuclear 1 given the time frames. Assessing new sites takes 10 years and in the opinion of Arcus GIBB there were enough alternatives for this EIA in terms of legislation.</p> <p>Ms Ball said that the facilitator was correct and she had recommended to Mr Thorpe that he could also consult with the authorities as they had approved the Scoping Report and they have also approved the Revised Plan of Study.</p> <p>Post-meeting Note: The Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA) has approved the Scoping report, which is based on the premise that only the sites identified in the Nuclear Site Investigation Programme need to be considered as they are the only sites that have been proved to be technically feasible.</p>
19	Ms Trudi Malan Spokesperson for St Francis Alliance	Ms Malan categorically refused to allow Eskom to respond. Ms Malan as a follow up question asked Ms Ball to clarify that she had said that if Eskom go 1MW over they would have to start the EIA over again. Ms Malan then quoted from the Executive Summary, "The area of the footprint assessed in the EIA makes provision for the potential future expansion of the power station to allow for a total capacity of 10,000 MW". Now Ms Ball has said that recent studies have been done in 2007. She wanted to know why the Social Impact Assessment	Ms Ball responded by saying that if Eskom wants to build a nuclear power station of 4,001 MW they will need to start a full EIA again. Arcus GIBB asked the biophysical specialist, how much land, from a footprint perspective, is available. Arcus GIBB have therefore not assessed any more than 4,000 MW of an output or an input. In summary, if Eskom want to add on to this nuclear power station they would have to start an EIA for the new facility.

ST FRANCIS BAY PUBLIC MEETING (15 APRIL 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>had been based on 2001 figures.</p> <p>She went on to state that the technical studies needed to construct the power station have been brilliantly executed, they have spent time on the site. However, the social impact that affects the community has had no money spent on it whatsoever. Census figures for 2001 have been used, this she feels is atrocious.</p> <p>She went on to say that Eskom must get off the nuclear bandwagon and start informing people about alternatives. Not only solar and wind but also smart grid systems and virtual power stations.</p> <p>She also stated that it takes so long to construct a nuclear power station that by the time it is up and running it would be a waste of time. It is the most expensive electricity in the world. In Finland, they are currently 4 years behind on time and 50% over budget. The same thing is happening in France.</p>	<p>Ms Ball admitted that the figures used by the Social Impact Study has been raised as an issue previously. The social specialist used the most recent data available. Ms Malan's concerns have been noted.</p> <p>Post-meeting note: The assessment of issues in the Social Impact Assessment were based on information gathered from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issues identified during the Scoping Process; • Planning and policy documents pertaining to the area; • Interviews with key interested and affected parties; • Social issues associated with similar developments; and • The experience of the author in the field of SIAs. <p>Post-meeting note: Short delays were experienced in France during concrete pouring but they are now on track for commercial operation 2013</p> <p>The facilitator then placed on record that an issue was raised about Eskom and in terms of certain objections and fairly strong statements were made. The facilitator wanted Eskom to respond but Ms Malan declined the proposal that Eskom to reply to her.</p>
20	Prof Richard Cowling FOSTER	Prof Cowling asked Ms Ball about the choice of site and fatal flaws and risk. He asked if she could	Ms Ball replied that Arcus GIBB had appointed a Dune Geomorphology Specialist on the team, a geologist, a

ST FRANCIS BAY PUBLIC MEETING (15 APRIL 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>describe the process used by the team to assess the risk of building a nuclear facility on a mobile dune system that is full of surprises. It delivered a very interesting surprise in November 2007. Did they have insights into this area and specifically this unique dune system?</p> <p>Prof Cowling responded by saying Arcus GIBB cannot treat the system piecemeal as it is all inter-related.</p>	<p>geohydrologist, etc. and the specialists have confirmed what he has said, that is, that the Oyster Bay headland bypass dune system is extremely rare, extremely unique from many perspectives. The proposed position of the nuclear power station would need to take this into account and the specialists have recommended that it not be built on that dune system itself, but rather on the more hardened dunes.</p> <p>Ms Ball stated that Dr Werner Ellenberger is the specialist and he has been liaising with colleagues at the Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University (in Port Elizabeth). Ms Ball asked Mr Heydenrych to explain the sensitivity maps which he did using maps from the presentation.</p> <p>Ms Ball then explained that these are draft reports and asked that if audience had any details to add to the drawings they must please submit them and these will be forwarded on to the specialists.</p> <p>In answer to a request maps of the proposed access roads were also displayed and explained.</p>
21	Mr Ryan Donnelly For A Safe Tomorrow	Mr Donnelly voiced an objection that this EIA is not a platform for the developer to further their agenda. Every time the independent consultants pass over a question to the developer it should be outside of the scope of the independent consultants. Mr Stott answered a question on need and alternatives and that is within the scope of the independent consultant. He then asked who, other than Eskom, has the independent consultants, consulted,	<p>Ms Ball replied that as she has previously stated, they had investigated alternatives to base load and they had used peer-reviewed documents, a full reference list is available in the report.</p> <p>Ms Ball also stated her objection, as she felt that she has not passed any question on to Eskom that relate to the EIA and she declared publicly both her and Arcus GIBB's independence. In the Final EIR there will be a</p>

ST FRANCIS BAY PUBLIC MEETING (15 APRIL 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>specifically other energy organisations such as the one he represents (For a Safe Tomorrow).</p> <p>The facilitator explained that there are certain aspects that the independent consultant is obliged to answer and then there are certain issues, which the developer has to answer.</p>	<p>declaration signed in front of a Commissioner of Oaths, stating this.</p>
22	Ms Donna Jooste Coetsee Nature's Calling Magazine	<p>In terms of the hot water being released into the sea, has any consideration taken into account the fragile eco-system in terms of the sea and how this water, which is being flushed into the sea, is going to slowly degrade the fragile system, no matter which site is chosen.</p>	<p>Ms Ball explained that through the operation of this nuclear power station heated water is released into the ocean. A number of studies assessed this. The Oceanography study modelled the sea bed and currents for all three sites. Furthermore the Marine Specialist Study also investigated this issue.</p> <p>The potential impacts on the marine environment are quite similar on all of the sites. The specialist found there were a number of potential impacts such as the disposal of sand, particularly the fine sand, as at two of the sites extensive excavations need to be done.</p> <p>The specialist has recommended, particularly at Thyspunt, because of the Chokka spawning, that based on the modelling undertaken, that the pipeline that takes the sand out would have to be 1.7 km.</p> <p>The pumping rate is also important in terms of sand disposal, and a medium pumping rate has been recommended to try and contain the sand in an area of 3 km².</p> <p>In the opinion of the independent specialist, Prof Charlie Griffiths and Dr Tammy Robinson this is an acceptable</p>

ST FRANCIS BAY PUBLIC MEETING (15 APRIL 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
			<p>impact and it is a low impact after mitigation measures are applied. The area around the pumping outfall will be sterilized for a long period of time, but after a long time, it will recover after 60 years.</p> <p>Post-meeting note: The specialist Marine Assessment reports that while spoil will be discarded only during the construction phase, the open water environment will be affected in the short term but the benthic environment will be negatively impacted for many years.</p> <p>In terms of sea water cooling, they have recommended specific mitigation measures in terms of a pipe (not a channelised pipe) out to sea and at a very fast pumping rate.</p> <p>In terms of brine, at all of the sites a desalinisation plant is included in the application as water is a scarce commodity in this area. The brine, or concentrated sea water, would also need to be pumped out to sea and the potential impact which during the construction phase would be the most intense, would have to be released, according to the specialists, at the surface zone. During the operational phase it would be mixed with the normal outflow water.</p>
23	Mrs Bridget Elton St Francis Bay Resident	Mrs Elton said that the people who live in Santerene know what it is like to live on a Sand Dune. Hardened or not it was proclaimed that houses could be built on them. They all have problems in their houses, which are on sand dunes. They have a unique sand river and unique dune system, hardened it might be, but it has not been	<p>Ms Ball clarified that her company was not going to build a power station anywhere; Arcus GIBB is the independent consultant and have only made recommendations.</p> <p>The aspect relating to the stability of the dunes and the impact on the nuclear power station: This is a</p>

ST FRANCIS BAY PUBLIC MEETING (15 APRIL 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		tested. Building anything like a nuclear power station on this system will cause problems. Houses have many problems such as mirrors, shower doors and floor tiles that crack. Sand moves, hardened or not. If a nuclear reactor is to be built on a dune that no-one can guarantee or has sound scientific evidence about this unique area, then she asked that this be investigated.	very important aspect and will be incorporated into the final design of the nuclear power station. The footprint of the power station lies between the dune and the sea.
24	The Facilitator	The facilitator confirmed that many of the issues being raised at the meeting relate to safety of design. The questions being asked by stakeholders are about the suitability of the sites. What are the criteria that the environmental consultants have looked at and what have been their envelope for the criteria that they have got to evaluate in terms of suitability. Where do the terms of reference start and stop and what are they evaluating in terms of the design of the site, in terms of suitability for the building on that site. She asked Ms Ball if these were part of the terms of reference.	Ms Ball responded by explaining that out of the 24 specialist studies the largest majority of studies relate to geology and geohydrology, which she then listed. All of these studies stated that with mitigation, it is technically, from an environmental aspect, possible. Decisions on the radiological and the safety issues do not fall within the ambit of this EIA they form part of the NNR process.
25	Ms Karen Hawinkels Local Resident	Ms Hawinkels referred to the Executive Summary and noted that it constantly refers to the fact that Thyspunt is not really the best place to build this power station. It states that there is a huge impact on the dunes, on the flora and fauna. Why, she asked, was this site then being pushed through when categorically it is stated that this is not the best place to build. Her second question was regarding the EIA, someone may be considered an expert in 2010, in	Mr Heydenrych responded that Ms Hawinkels was correct in her understanding of the Executive Summary. There are some potential significant impacts at the site. The area where the proposed site is proposed to be constructed has the lowest sensitivity on the site. He further explained that there was an integration meeting with all 24 specialists, and all of them agreed on a number of criteria according to which the most appropriate site would be chosen. Those criteria are listed in the report, they are technical, biophysical, social

ST FRANCIS BAY PUBLIC MEETING (15 APRIL 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>2015 they may no longer be considered an expert on that particular subject, but the community have to accept what they have advocated in 2010. Does the EIA allow continual assessment of the project?</p>	<p>and environmental criteria. According to those criteria, which were agreed with the specialists, Thyspunt was chosen as the preferred site.</p> <p>One of the significant benefits that they identified with regards not only to Thyspunt, but also with regards to Bantamsklip is that there is no formal conservation status on these sites.</p> <p>Considering the fact that the power station and its associated infrastructure is only going to take up 31 ha of the site means that the rest of the site can be effectively conserved as is the case currently with Koeberg.</p> <p>All the biophysical specialists agreed that that would be a significant conservation benefit for the sites.</p> <p>Ms Ball then answered the question about on-going studies by stating that they have had some good suggestions at the Bantamsklip round of meetings where the SANBI has volunteered to undertake monitoring and species surveys of the site on an on-going basis and a number of specialists have recommended on-going monitoring and on-going studies at the sites.</p>
26	The Facilitator	<p>The facilitator felt that a critical challenge in terms of any EIA project and in particular this one is the integration of all of the specialist studies. For example the integration of the access roads and have the specialists actually looked at the impact of these roads in terms of all the studies and has this been sufficiently covered and is it captured in detail</p>	<p>Ms Ball responded by explaining that the specialists were clearly given the entire proposed infrastructure, which encompasses the nuclear power station, and this does include access roads.</p> <p>She said that if each specialist report is examined in detail it could be ascertained that they made all the</p>

ST FRANCIS BAY PUBLIC MEETING (15 APRIL 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>within the reports.</p> <p>She went on to explain that the instructions to the specialists must include the long-term impacts and she asked if Arcus GIBB were given instructions to look at the environmental management programme and the plan in terms of mitigation and in terms of managing the site during the construction phase.</p>	<p>necessary assessments and these were integrated into summary tables at the end of each report.</p> <p>In Chapter 9 of the EIA Report these summaries are detailed.</p> <p>Regarding the access roads, Ms Ball stated that the specialists had been asked to set a road corridor. The specialists all visited the site together and examined the corridor and what is indicated on the map is the centre line of this corridor. It is not the exact position of the road. The key recommendation from the study is that the specialist will need to make a further site visit before the final route is selected.</p>
27	Ms Patricia Honey Resident of Cape St Francis	Ms Honey asked that the map of the access roads be shown. Her comment was that she did not know that there would be an access road from St Francis Bay to the site. She had not come across such information when asked to comment during the Scoping Phase. She wanted to know if the trucks carrying loads would go over the Kromme River, over the bridge, down past St Francis and how many trucks would use this route every day.	<p>Ms Ball replied that in the Scoping Phase the application form had listed various activities and access roads was one of these activities.</p> <p>At the scoping phase public meetings it was also stated that access needs to be found to each site. This is a large facility, which will have about 7 700 workers in the peak of construction and about 1 400 during operation, which equates to about 850 vehicles in the morning and about 900 vehicles in the day. The construction period will be about 7 years. Typically, for a coal-fired power station, there are approximately 200 heavy vehicles per day during the peak of construction.</p> <p>In terms of the scoping phase, eastern and western access roads were needed to be found. A process with specialists was conducted to find suitable corridor routes and some of those routes were rejected and others were</p>

ST FRANCIS BAY PUBLIC MEETING (15 APRIL 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
			<p>verified.</p> <p>In terms of upgrades, the transportation specialist has recommended a number of upgrades of these transportation routes.</p>
28	The Facilitator	The facilitator noted that the meeting had reached the time of 20h00 and she asked for verification that the meeting continue until 20h30 for a further check on time.	Participants agreed for the meeting to continue.
29	I&APs	It was noted that Mr Hilton Thorpe was appointed as spokesperson for many of the organisations and many questions had been formulated as a group and Mr Thorpe therefore needs time to ask these very specific questions that are key questions.	The facilitator then asked that Mr Thorpe ask his questions after the next two speakers.
30	Mr John Elliot Resident Cape St Francis	<p>Mr Elliot asked if it is correct that the document will remain unchanged unless there is an objection to certain aspects within the EIA document, and unless the consultant agrees to the objection, it will remain unchanged. He asked if this is correct.</p> <p>He went on to explain the reason for his question, it had been stated that Thyspunt will benefit from the conservation plan within the nuclear power plant area. Building anything in a natural area is not beneficial, there are a host of other ways to benefit a natural area but building a nuclear power station and then stating in a document that it will benefit conservation is ludicrous. This statement should be removed from this document.</p>	<p>Ms Ball thanked Mr Elliot for his comment and said that his concerns were noted and would be fed back to the specialist. She explained that she was reporting on what the specialists had stated at the integration meeting. She further clarified that it is a draft report.</p> <p>She went on to explain about the process. The independent environmental consultant is obliged to note all comments.</p> <p>There will be track changes used in the report so that all changes can be clearly seen. The DEA check every issue and response. She asked all present to check if their issues during the Scoping phase had been adequately addressed.</p> <p>The facilitator added that the statement regarding conservation had come from a specialist report. She</p>

ST FRANCIS BAY PUBLIC MEETING (15 APRIL 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
			encouraged Mr Elliott to read the specialist report and see what the methodology was and how this has been assessed and to also look at the overall recommendation. If he then disagrees with this, put this in writing and submit as a comment.
31	Dr Shirley Cowling FOSTER	<p>Dr Cowling expressed some concerns about the access road. The EIA has considered a specific area but they have not considered other areas. She asked if the experts had driven on the road past the Sand River bend and down the Seekoei Pass. They should have considered the dirt road past Oyster Bay which the Oyster Bay people have been begging for and considered taking the by-pass Elandsjag Dam which avoids another river pass. She therefore suggested that the specialist become familiar with the greater area.</p> <p>She then stated that she had read the reports very carefully, the wording is very strong that the yellow road, the eastern road is a non-negotiable and just has to happen. It does not, however, explain why.</p>	<p>Ms Ball explained that the eastern access road is a new access road and the alignment is fairly straight and the topography is fairly flat. The road would be 22 m wide (including the road reserve), and would be a tarred road.</p> <p>The transportation specialist, the noise specialist both did extensive studies along the R330. Any upgrade to a road outside the various lines, or any new road, triggers a listed activity and an impact assessment has to be undertaken.</p> <p>The transportation specialist and the noise specialist have both made recommendations in terms of routes and the effects of the roads.</p> <p>She asked Dr Cowling to come and speak to her after the meeting to clarify the other routes that she had proposed.</p> <p>This route was selected from an engineering perspective in terms of the gradient, as there are ultra heavy vehicles (42 m x 8.3 m) that would be using the roads.</p> <p>The report will be amended to show reasons why this route was selected.</p>
32	I&APs	They questioned the yellow mark on the map (Ref:	The yellow mark on the map is an unknown and Ms Ball

ST FRANCIS BAY PUBLIC MEETING (15 APRIL 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
	St Francis Bay Public Meeting	<p>Slide No 60, Title: Access Road Alternatives) – what it represented in relation to the development.</p> <p>Some I&APs suggested that it represents a housing development for the construction workers.</p>	<p>undertook to find out what it represents and to report it to the Key Stakeholder Feedback meeting at Cape St Francis the next day (16 April 2010).</p>
33	Mr Hilton Thorpe St Francis Bay Residents Association and St Francis Kromme Trust	<p>Mr Thorpe said that everyone was extremely conscious of the impact that the road system would have. He has read as many of the reports as possible, including the traffic impact report, the noise impact report and the social impact report. He said that everyone is most concerned about the social impact on this area. It will change the entire character of the area forever.</p> <p>He then asked how seriously are the specialists approaching the issue of the social impact of this whole proposed project.</p> <p>The social impact report says almost nothing about the impact of the road going past St Francis Bay. It states that certain noise mitigation measures will need to be taken. The noise study focuses almost entirely on noise at the construction site and has no comment about the noise of the traffic.</p> <p>How seriously, he asked, therefore, are the practitioners considering the social impact of this proposed project. This goes back to the question of alternative sites and Ms Ball has dismissed Coega.</p> <p>The consideration of the infrastructural cost and roads is one of the major costs, and the cost of</p>	<p>Ms Ball answered that she has asked Mr Thorpe to provide her with as much specific details as possible. Arcus GIBB have taken the studies seriously and she disagreed with Mr Thorpe when he stated that the noise specialist only examined noise at the construction site, that is not correct, she has looked at the specialist study and also contact the specialist telephonically to confirm information. Two areas within Cape St Francis and St Francis Bay were monitored. These points were opposite Sea Vista and at the Kromme River Bridge.</p> <p>Regarding the Social Impact Assessment, Ms Ball explained that the Social Assessment specialist was assisted by another Social Specialist Dr Neville Bews and everyone is aware that social issues are huge. There are a number of recommendations in that report, for example, the housing for the workers needs to be in one place.</p> <p>Sites have been investigated in Humansdorp and Jeffreys Bay for the construction phase but for the operational phase workers would be integrated into the communities.</p> <p>Arcus GIBB believe that the SIA is a thorough assessment but should anyone has issues please submit them as it is a draft report.</p>

ST FRANCIS BAY PUBLIC MEETING (15 APRIL 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>roads and transmission lines is considered to be approximately R10b.</p> <p>He asked Eskom what they could do with this money to mitigate any shortcomings in the Coega area. Seismic inadequacies does not mean the site is automatically ruled out. If you have R5b to R10b to spend – what could Eskom do?</p> <p>When the social impact is considered, the dismissal of all the alternatives, there are many things that could be done to mitigate the Coega site.</p> <p>Mr Thorpe, as a follow up question, asked about the social side where the almost certain influx of thousands (unpredictable numbers) of unemployed job seekers will occur. These will be unskilled labour and very few will obtain work. How will these people be dealt with when they do not obtain work and they do not leave the area?</p> <p>The Facilitator stated that the levels of surety that the residents are asking for is that their safety is not going to be compromised in terms of assuring them that the in-migration of the labour is going to be really well controlled.</p>	<p>Ms Ball said that the social specialist did assess the job seekers and has provided estimates of the influx of people into the area. He has also looked at potential mitigation measures.</p> <p>Ms Ball also stated that the social specialist has made recommendations regarding the influx of workers. Eskom has also provided information on how they deal with labour on other sites. Two good examples are currently running, one is the Kusile Coal-fired Power station the other one is the Braamhoek Pump Storage Scheme.</p> <p>Mr Stott explained that at other power stations that are presently being built, Eskom do not allow recruitment to take place at the gate of the power station. Recruitment can only take place in the nearest town. This avoids influx into the immediate area.</p> <p>Mr Stott stated further that Eskom has been in consultation with municipalities regarding construction housing. In this instance the housing would be in Humansdorp or Jeffreys Bay or even a combination of these two. The contractors would then have to bus the workers to site. Eskom is conscious of the social problems around this issue and are implementing management methods.</p> <p>Ms Ball then stated that the Economic Specialist examined the infrastructure costs in their modelling for both the transmission lines and the road upgrades. The Coega site was considered in the scoping phase but was</p>

ST FRANCIS BAY PUBLIC MEETING (15 APRIL 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
			considered unsuitable for Nuclear-1, therefore a comparative analysis has not been done.
34	The Facilitator	<p>The facilitator drew the meetings attention to the fact that it was 20h30 and there were still 4 questions remaining. She suggested a break and then take questions. It was decided to go ahead with the meeting until 21h00.</p> <p>A stakeholder stated that there were so many issues that still had to be dealt with, in fact they needed another evening, as every question seems to raise further issues, which need to be addressed.</p>	All participants agreed for the meeting to continue.
35	Ms Donna Jooste-Coetsee Nature's Calling Magazine	Ms Jooste-Coetsee asked if there could be another meeting held.	Ms Ball responded by saying that there is a Key Stakeholder Meeting being held the next day. If there are issues that have not been dealt with at this meeting, stakeholders may raise them at the meeting the next day. Should the alliance that has recently been formed require a meeting they should ask and a meeting will be arranged.
36	Ms Trudi Malan Spokesperson for St Francis Alliance	<p>Ms Malan again referred to the Executive Summary, the points that have been examined for decision-making exclude social impacts. She found the exclusion of social impacts strange, because they are huge in the area. This study cannot use information from Koeberg, which is a 1,000MW power station.</p> <p>She went on to say that the impacts as stated by the social impact expert, are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No schools in the area - they will build more schools. 	<p>Ms Ball responded by saying that the Executive Summary must be read in context. The statements regarding significant impacts without mitigation.</p> <p>In terms of specific details on specialist studies, such as the economic study, she could not comment, if there are errors in the report she asked that they be submitted in writing as these are draft reports. If these reports need to be revised, this will be done, even if it alters the end findings.</p> <p>Ms Ball went on to say that the environment comprises economic, social and biophysical. Regarding the</p>

ST FRANCIS BAY PUBLIC MEETING (15 APRIL 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>She asked who is going to build the schools. The social impact states that every school in this area is over-supplied. There is not one school in this area that can take one more child. That is not taken into account.</p> <p>She then quoted, "The most important argument in favour of Thyspunt with regards to biophysical impacts is the conservation benefits". This, Ms Malan said is what makes this study ridiculous. She said social impacts were not considered. There will be people, whether they are in Humansdorp of Jeffreys Bay, but there are no schools. The SIA states that the hospital has 15 doctors. The hospital in Humansdorp has not had 15 doctors in its entire life. This specialist must re-assess this. There are no clinics to deal with the influx of people, why were social impacts not considered, she asked.</p> <p>There appears to be 2 sites now, Duynefontein and Thyspunt. Bantamsklip is out because economically it is unviable for Eskom.</p> <p>She went on to say that there are errors in the economic impact study. This study states that there will be no delays at Thyspunt because no sand and bedrock need to be removed. Yet, three pages before, it states the cost of this removal.</p> <p>She stated that everyone has heard that Thyspunt was the selected site from the beginning. What is</p>	<p>economic impact, a macro-economic study was undertaken as well as an economic efficiency study. Ms Ball asked that people should read Chapter 9 of the EIA Report where full details of assessment is recorded. Particular impacts, after mitigation were then graded and ones which were not equal at all of the sites. These were used as the basis for site selection.</p> <p>The facilitator reiterated that Ms Malan had raised issues that were omitted and these must be flagged and answered.</p>

ST FRANCIS BAY PUBLIC MEETING (15 APRIL 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		being shown here is smoke and mirrors.	
37	Ms Anderson I&AP – St Francis Bay Public Meeting	<p>Ms Anderson wanted to know about the transport system. The nuclear waste has to be removed. To her knowledge, the waste retrieval site is on the west coast, which is a far way from Thyspunt and Kouga.</p> <p>The second point she wanted to make was that if this was still in the apartheid era, migrant workers could be controlled, but this cannot happen today. She wanted to know how Eskom thought they would be able to control people who are looking for work.</p> <p>Ms Renee Royal asked about high-level waste.</p>	<p>Mr Heydenrych replied that as far as waste is concerned, there is only one site for disposal of low and intermediate level radioactive waste, that is Vaalputs, which is in the Northern Cape. So it is correct that waste will be transported to that facility.</p> <p>The intermediate level and low-level waste will be transported by standard trucks (not an extra heavy load). The intermediate level waste is contained in drums, which are encapsulated in concrete according to international standards. People can stand next to the drum and there will be no effect from the waste.</p> <p>The low-level waste – things such as clothing, protective gloves, etc. these are stored in steel drums and also transported to Vaalputs.</p> <p>The high-level waste, which is spent fuel, will be stored currently indefinitely within the nuclear power station in a contained facility. There are no facilities in South Africa that accept high-level waste.</p> <p>Ms Ball said that waste is governed by the <u>National Nuclear Regulator Act, 1999 (Act No. 47 of 1999)</u> NNR Act and there is also a new act that has been promulgated the National Waste Disposal Institute Act, through these acts the final disposal point for the high-level waste will be determined.</p> <p>Post-meeting note: Radioactive waste is governed</p>

ST FRANCIS BAY PUBLIC MEETING (15 APRIL 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
			by the Nuclear Energy Act, (which is the umbrella Act under which the National Radioactive Waste Disposal Institute Act was promulgated) and subject to the licensing of the NNR under the National Nuclear Regulator Act.
38	Mr Ryan Donnelly For A Safe Tomorrow	<p>Mr Donnelly said that his earlier question remains unanswered. This question related to alternatives. The consultants have consulted the developer on alternative energy sources etc. Has the independent consultants consulted any independent energy organisations as far as alternatives, either locally or nationally. The organisation he represents has attended various summits such as the National Energy Summit. They have taken submissions to parliament and have been as active as possible. Yet, this organisation has not been approached as far as alternatives are concerned.</p> <p>Mr Donnelly said that his point is in terms of objectivity, with regard to the information on alternative energy, the source comes from the developer, Eskom. He again said his specific question is, "Have you approached any independent energy organisations with regard to alternatives".</p> <p>Mr Donnelly then wanted to know if the peer-reviewers were independent of the developer.</p>	<p>Ms Ball said that she had nothing further to add to the answer already given. They have looked at base-load and peer-reviewed reports in terms of other feasible alternatives. She re-iterated that they are not investigating renewables in this EIA.</p> <p>Ms Ball said that they had not. They have looked at peer-review studies which make it quite clear what is commercially viable in terms of base load in South Africa today.</p> <p>Ms Ball replied that they are independent.</p>
39	Mr Alwin Malgas Sea Vista Forum	Mr Malgas is concerned that no-one mentioned jobs. What he would like to know is about recruitment.	Ms Ball answered that the SIA had examined this point and have recommended that at least 25% of the labour needed during the phases come from the local

ST FRANCIS BAY PUBLIC MEETING (15 APRIL 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>He said Eskom have said that recruitment will not happen at the gates. Does this mean that people will be recruited in the streets? Does this also mean that the surrounding communities will be the pit diggers and the barrel pushers? What jobs are going to be available and who will get these jobs?</p> <p>A follow up question was asked. He wanted to know if the independent specialist knows how many people live in St Francis. They refer to 25% local labour and Ms Ball earlier said there is going to be 7,000 workers, that equates to many people.</p>	<p>communities. They also reviewed Eskom procurement policy.</p> <p>Ms Ball explained that “local communities” refers to Humansdorp, Jeffreys Bay, Oyster Bay, the broader local community.</p>
40	Mr Mike Simms St Francis Kromme Trust	<p>Mr Simms said that he is concerned about the reference to the competence of the specialists. I refer to a meeting held on 5 March 2008, a key stakeholder meeting, where the Kromme Trust brought up the fact that the specialist had been using the wrong wind directions for the Thyspunt site.</p> <p>Anyone who lives in this area (whether a surfer, a fisherman, a gardener, etc), knows that the wind blows from the south west. This was brought to the attention of the consultants and yet in Appendix E in the specialist survey, it continues to say that the predominant wind is north-westerly.</p> <p>He went on to say that the implication of this is that if it is a north-westerly wind the consequence is that any wind blows away from any population density. If it is south-westerly, it blows all the way to Port</p>	<p>Ms Ball said that she will take this back to the Air Quality Specialist.</p> <p>Post-meeting Note: The Air Quality Assessment attached as Appendix E10 to the Draft EIR utilises data obtained from both the South African Weather Services (SAWS) for Cape St. Francis as well as from the Eskom monitoring station at Thyspunt. Both these data sets, 2004-2007 for the SAWS data and January 2008 – September 2009 for the data from the Eskom monitoring station data, confirms that the most dominant wind direction in this region is from the west northwest to northwest.</p>

ST FRANCIS BAY PUBLIC MEETING (15 APRIL 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>Elizabeth.</p> <p>He further stated that the problem is that the Consultant had promised to rectify the same information over year ago and nothing was done about it. He would like this concern to be placed on record.</p>	
41	Mr Chris Barratt St Francis Kromme Trust	<p>This stakeholder said that at the same meeting there were various items pointed out one of which was that the maps showed 5 km radius. On Monday it was stated that Sea Vista was 20/22 km away from the site. However, when this was measured it is actually 11 km.</p> <p>In 2008 stakeholders had pointed out errors on the maps, they had asked for corrections to be made, they asked to be notified what method was being used to notify the specialists that there were errors.</p> <p>Now he wanted to know how, despite weekly reviews, that there are still errors on the maps in the current Draft EIA report.</p>	She added that changes would be made to the map mentioned. Sea Vista is 12 km from the Thyspunt site.
42	Ms Trudi Malan Spokesperson for St Francis Alliance	<p>Ms Malan said that this incorrect information had in fact informed the specialists. So the specialist studies are therefore null and void. How can it be stated that Vaalputs is closer to Thyspunt than Bantamsklip? She went on to say that if correct distances are used the economic study would change.</p> <p>The facilitator said that these were critical issues, the errors might be in the presentation of the</p>	Ms Ball noted that the specialists were provided with a whole series of maps, and she undertook to ensure that all of the facts and figures are correct in the next version of the report.

ST FRANCIS BAY PUBLIC MEETING (15 APRIL 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>information. The information may be contained somewhere in the specialist reports but it is not properly reflected on the maps and it was very clear regarding distances, specifically distance by road and as the crow flies.</p> <p>The facilitator said that secondly, in terms of the information that is provided to the specialists, specifically for approach and methodology she felt that this must be re-examined and properly understood so that everyone can work from the same page.</p> <p>The facilitator noted that the technical content of the reports which are now being reviewed by the public, has to be critically examined for accurateness. The specialists have to respond to these challenges.</p>	
43	Mr Mike Simms St Francis Kromme Trust	Mr Simms stated that there are many submissions that need to be sent in and he feels that 10 May 2010 is unacceptable in terms of amount of time that the public have been given to review these reports. Especially when considering the amount of errors that are currently being found. The public cannot trust the specialist reports.	<p>The facilitator noted Mr Simms concern.</p> <p>The facilitator asked for consensus that the meeting continue until 21h30. It was agreed.</p>
44	Mr Hilton Thorpe St Francis Bay Residents Association and St Francis Kromme Trust	<p>Mr Thorpe asked for an extension to the comment period.</p> <p>Mr Thorpe commented that it is appalling to him that specialists who have been paid to do a job and they cannot do it correctly. Now the public have to</p>	<p>An extension to the comment period has been granted it now closes on 31 May 2010.</p> <p>Ms Ball responded by saying she emphatically denies these allegations. There have been differences of opinion within the specialist body as to which is the</p>

ST FRANCIS BAY PUBLIC MEETING (15 APRIL 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>go through these reports and find the numerous elementary errors.</p> <p>He went on to say that if any aerial photograph of the area is examined, there is a bypass headland dune field, or the remains of one, which go directly from Thyspunt to Sea Vista to Harbour Road. The whole of the [sand stream] area, which used to be sand dune was part of the by-pass headland dunefield which came from Thyspunt. That reflects a high energy south-westerly wind which has blown for centuries, millennia, and the specialists cannot get it right!</p> <p>He noted that there is now a lack of confidence in this entire EIA process. He has told the consultants that this is a worry. All the consultants, the experts are selected, paid and appointed by the developer. How could this work, he asked, this leads to a perception of a conflict of interest.</p> <p>He therefore asked, has the mindset been from the outset that Thyspunt will be site.</p>	<p>preferred site. We had a tough two-day integration meeting with the specialists arguing against each other and with us. It was not a pre-determined EIA.</p>
45	The Facilitator	<p>The facilitator asked if the environmental consultant had agreed to further meetings with certain members of the audience.</p> <p>The facilitator added that she would like the issue of attendance of key specialists at further meetings to</p>	<p>Ms Ball responded by saying that if there was a need and a wish from this community for further meetings because they do not believe that the issues have been fully explored in the public domain, there is a key stakeholder meeting the next day. She would also consider any requests for further meetings. She added that key focus group meetings are an effective tool.</p>

ST FRANCIS BAY PUBLIC MEETING (15 APRIL 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		be considered.	
46	Mr Chris Barratt St Francis Kromme Trust	Mr Barratt referred again to the Port Elizabeth Key Stakeholder Feedback Meeting on 12 April 2010 where the impressive number of trees that were to be saved was mentioned. He went on to say that initially there were four copies of the Draft and Final Scoping Reports in this immediate area, there is now one copy of the Draft EIA report. This can be accessed a maximum of 7 hours per week. This is inadequate for this community; St Francis Bay library is open for 2 hours – 3 days per week. The community is expected to review these reports. The CD copies are also not suitable as some of the reports are upside down.	Arcus GIBB noted Mr Barratts' comment regarding reduced distribution of the Draft EIA Report and asked ACER to have an additional copy delivered to the area.
47	The Facilitator	The facilitator asked if the meeting could agree to a time of 22h00 when the meeting should end. She asked them to bear in mind that further meetings could be arranged.	Mr Donnelly said that his understanding was that Ms Ball had said that she would consider another public meeting, she did not confirm that there would be one. Ms Ball said that regarding extra copies of the report, she had spoken to Mr Thorpe, she has a number of electronic copies available which she had offered to Mr Thorpe to distribute. If a further hard copy is required it can be arranged.
48	Ms Trudi Malan Spokesperson for St Francis Alliance	Ms Malan said that she had read the report in its entirety and it takes a great deal of time and takes a lot of research to be able to understand the report.	Ms Ball responded by saying that this is the round of meetings where the Draft EIR is explained in simple layman's language. They have gone around to many

ST FRANCIS BAY PUBLIC MEETING (15 APRIL 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>According to her understanding of NEMA, the EIA consultant should take time and explain the report to the communities and this has not been done.</p> <p>As a point, she said that during the scoping meeting she had raised the issue of the access road, the answer she had received was that the access roads were not being investigated. There were people in the audience tonight who had never heard of the access roads until this meeting.</p> <p>This proves her theory that information is not getting back to the communities.</p> <p>Ms Malan then wanted to know why the Key Stakeholder Meeting was held in Port Elizabeth.</p>	<p>communities. Ms Ball invited all participants to the meeting at Sea Vista the next evening. This meeting will be held in English, Afrikaans and Xhosa.</p> <p>She explained that if they had been permitted to give the presentation, many of the questions would have been clarified.</p> <p>Ms Ball noted the comment. During the previous round of meetings the Key Stakeholder Meeting was held in Port Elizabeth and there were no complaints received.</p> <p>Ms Ball had asked ACER (Africa) to contact various groups to ascertain if they wanted a focus group meeting.</p> <p>Ms Shinga confirmed that various key stakeholder groups had been contacted. In some instances some groups preferred to attend public and key stakeholder meetings, which would help them establish the necessity of Focus Group Meetings. She also stated that Mr Hilton Thorpe was contacted in this regard.</p>
49	The Facilitator	The facilitator asked for confirmation from Ms Ball that there will be follow up meetings, whether they are going to be public meetings or focus group meetings needs to be confirmed at the Key Stakeholder Workshop the next day. The facilitator then asked for confirmation that the meeting could	Ms Ball confirmed this.

ST FRANCIS BAY PUBLIC MEETING (15 APRIL 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		close at 22h00, this was confirmed.	All participants agreed.
50	Mr Hilton Thorpe St Francis Bay Residents Association and St Francis Kromme Trust	Mr Thorpe wanted confirmation that the comment period would be extended.	Ms Ball said that originally 66 days was the comment period as there were a number of public holidays during the comment period. If there is a feeling that this is still too short, she asked that feedback be given to her. This is the first time in this round of meetings that additional time had been requested. There is still a further week of public meetings in Cape Town around the Duynefontein site. This will be considered.
51	Mr Koos Vermaak Resident	<p>Mr Vermaak said that he had built his house at the end of 1970 and has lived in the area for 30 years. He is concerned about the nuclear power plant and he agrees with most of the objections and concerns that people have raised.</p> <p>He said he is also a physicist, he has a BSc degree in Chemistry, Physics and Mathematics and is a Master of Mathematics and a Master in Physics, specialising on the effect of radiation on human beings. I have also a PhD in Physics. He said that he only mentioned these so that it is understood that he is qualified to talk about some of the issues raised.</p> <p>He was astonished to read in the St Francis Bay Home Owners Association's website, a letter that someone had written about how Strontium-90 from the proposed power plant will grow over the beaches, will contaminate the beach and will cause cancer. The letter had also stated that Cesium would go to where cows are and they will eat the Cesium and this will contaminate the people that</p>	<p>The facilitator asked Mr Vermaak if he was referring to an alternative strategy to use to object to the power station. She asked him to explain which strategy he would suggest.</p> <p>The facilitator agreed and said the substance and validity of the information in the reports must support the findings.</p>

ST FRANCIS BAY PUBLIC MEETING (15 APRIL 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>drink the milk and will cause cancer. He thinks that it is very irresponsible to publish nonsense such as this.</p> <p>The question of health and contamination from a power plant has been settled years ago, it is not an issue any longer. This is an issue from some of the green peace people who get their information from the internet and they frighten people in believing that this is true.</p> <p>Mr Vermaak said that he feels that the strategy to prevent the plant being built in this area should be different because if you use the safety approach the experts will laugh at this.</p> <p>He said that regarding alternatives, such as solar energy and wind energy, these are not base line type of energy that can be used. If the sun does not shine, there is no electricity. If the wind does not blow there is no electricity so it cannot be used as a base line for the grid. It can make a contribution at peak times. World wide solar energy and wind energy has a basic contribution of less than 1% of world needs.</p> <p>He concluded by saying he is concerned, but the correct strategy must be used if they want to prevent the power station being constructed in this area.</p> <p>Mr Vermaak said that the scare tactics will not help</p>	

ST FRANCIS BAY PUBLIC MEETING (15 APRIL 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>their cause. He emphasised that he was not talking on behalf of anyone else. He feels that the strategy should be that this is a tourist area, there are beautiful beaches, the sand dunes, the rivers, that must be emphasised. If the health effect is used as a strategy, this is true for Port Elizabeth where there are thousands more people living.</p> <p>He said the second strategy that can be used is the construction of the roads, the transmission lines, the losses on the transmission lines and also if Coega is not suitable, it must be explained to the public why it is not suitable.</p>	
52	Mr Ryan Donnelly For A Safe Tomorrow	<p>Mr Donnelly said that he could appreciate what Mr Vermaak had said regarding the health issues. However, as an individual, a stakeholder and a farmer, he would like to see information that is easy to understand and written in layman's language.</p> <p>Mr Donnelly said that it is his understanding that there are radioactive emissions, and he would like to understand more about these. He requested that a study be undertaken on the effects of radioactive emissions and contamination of agricultural grounds. The reason he asked for this is due to the fact that he is a farmer in the area and the rain usually falls as a mist, with a southerly wind. His understanding from research he has done, that radioactive emissions are brought to the ground by rain. Therefore an inhalation dose graph, it is a different thing compared to a contamination figure, with respect to agricultural ground. He feels that</p>	<p>The facilitator said that she is aware that the Integrated Resources Plan which is due out in July this year and discussions about this plan will also take place later during the year, will create a large debate in the public domain.</p> <p>Ms Ball said that the agricultural specialist had built on the air quality specialist study findings as well as the limits set by the NNR and they have assessed the impact of radiation on agricultural products in the area and they have said that it has extremely low significance because it is highly unlikely that it will occur.</p> <p>Ms Ball explained that the agricultural specialist had a 16 km radius from the nuclear power station site. They examined all the major agricultural activities in the area. In this are 95% of the area comprises dairy farming with</p>

ST FRANCIS BAY PUBLIC MEETING (15 APRIL 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>this is not a health and safety issue to be passed on to the NNR, he is requesting a study to be undertaken on the effects of radioactive emissions contaminating agricultural ground.</p> <p>He then said that he attended an energy summit in 2007, this was not a debate, it was a dictatorship by Eskom and Government and FAST were allowed to make submissions. At that time there were many energy groups that were not invited which caused a problem. As far as a source of information, where the nation has sat down to discuss what actually the way forward is when it comes to energy, has never happened. There is a need for a national energy summit, involving all stakeholders, then there will be a source of information to bring to the public.</p> <p>Mr Donnelly asked how big does an agricultural facility need to be in order for it to be included in the report. Ms Ball had told him at a previous meeting, that his farm had not been included in the study because it is too small.</p> <p>Mr Donnelly said that he wanted to flag that the Thyspunt site has many dams and the river catchment area to the north, it is this area that concerns him. This area will be affected by the southerly winds and the misty rain.</p>	<p>5% being a sheep farm and the odd smattering of other types of farming.</p> <p>Mr Heydenrych showed a slide which indicated what the NNR's requirements are in terms of the allowable limits of radiation. According to the air quality specialist, and he quoted from the particular government notice in terms of the NNR legislation, there is 2 limits of 1 000 microSieverts and 250 microSieverts.</p> <p>If the model is examined, in terms of what the radiation would be from the power station, there is a range from 0.02 microSieverts which would be the furthest from the power station to 0.5 which would be closest to the power station. The conclusion in terms of how that compares to legal limits is that it would be about .5% of the dose concentrate and about 4.5% and 1% of the annual effective dose limit.</p> <p>These 1,000 and 250 microSieverts levels are conservative levels with the effective dose being far below these levels.</p> <p>Ms Ball added that there is also background radiation and there is radiation in most foodstuffs. In terms of the agricultural study, they did assess the area to the north of the power station site.</p>
53	Ms Paddy Oosthuizen St Francis Bay Residents Association	Ms Oosthuizen asked how seriously are comments taken. She recalls that a long time ago Mr Thorpe sent in a submission in which he queried that old	Ms Ball said that there had been a written response sent to Mr Thorpe, which addressed in comments point by point. The letter is available on the website.

ST FRANCIS BAY PUBLIC MEETING (15 APRIL 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		stats had been used and he requested that a new census be taken during December. They have never had a response to this suggestion.	Regarding looking at the census data, a demographic study was undertaken by the specialist which looked more closely at the population groups but no full census was undertaken.
54	Ms Debbie Nicholson Debbie Nicholson Properties and Cape St Francis Civics	<p>Ms Nicholson had a statement to make. She acknowledged that the consultants have a difficult job as no matter what site is chosen, it is an emotive issue and you are dealing with the livelihoods of thousands of people. The only thing that could have won the public over would have been the sheer evidence of expertise and the consultant's handle on the situation. She was not sure if everyone felt as she did, but there is nothing that has proved to the public that the consultants have the situation under control. This to the public is worrying.</p> <p>Her first question was when the consultants were given five sites to investigate, was it possible for them to go back and say none of these sites are suitable they must all be discarded. Was it the case of having to find the best of a bad bunch, she asked.</p> <p>Her second question concerned methodology. She asked if the consultants had used a grid whereby sites were investigated and when the figure 6 on risk factor was reached in any particular field, that this site could be discarded.</p> <p>Ms Nicholson then asked if there are any routine</p>	<p>Ms Ball said they were put on the back foot as they had a professional presentation and they were not permitted to deliver this. Mistakes in the report will be corrected. Ms Ball requested Ms Nicholson not to take the proceedings of the meeting as a vote of no confidence.</p> <p>Ms Ball explained that when they were given the five sites, we could have gone back to Eskom and said that none are suitable. During the Scoping Phase, 2 sites had been discarded.</p> <p>Arcus GIBB to respond.</p> <p>Ms Ball said that there is a slide in the presentation</p>

ST FRANCIS BAY PUBLIC MEETING (15 APRIL 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		emissions of radionuclides from Koeberg.	regarding Strontium and Cesium levels all around the world. The results of the entire specialist studies both from a marine perspective and the impact of radionuclides on the marine environment, the agricultural environment, but we were not permitted to present these. They are up on the websites.
55	Mrs Sandra Hardie St Francis Conservancy	She addressed a remark to Mr Vermaak. She feels that more experts should have come forward and educated the public and notified the public. The fact that half of this audience did not know anything about the road access is horrendous. People are concerned about Strontium and Cesium and you cannot say they are wrong for looking up on the internet to try and find out more about them.	Ms Ball responded by saying that Eskom has undertaken some public awareness campaigns.
56	Sean (Did not sign the attendance register)	Sean requested a meeting where people or representatives can ask questions and specialists attend to respond to the questions. This request is because there has been very limited information responded to at the meeting. The facilitator said this had been raised before and this would indeed be a good idea so that people could gain a better understanding about the process. This should be held in laymen's language.	Arcus GIBB to consider. A Key Focus Meeting has been arranged where specialists will share more detail on their reports.
57	The Facilitator	The facilitator said there are many issues that still need to be unpacked and still a high level of discomfort in the audience about certain issues. There are debates that need to be held around certain topics in the specialist reports. She went on to say that agreement had been	

ST FRANCIS BAY PUBLIC MEETING (15 APRIL 2010)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>reached to close the meeting at 22h00 with the understanding that there will be further meetings. Ms Ball will inform you how and when these will take place. Another point for clarification is which specialists should attend these further meetings to interact with the public. She asked everyone to submit any additional issues in writing to ACER (Africa).</p> <p>She then thanked everyone for their constructive engagement and for their attendance.</p>	

APPENDIX 2: PRESENTATION OF DRAFT EIA REPORT

The size of the presentation is 1,605KB

All presentations can either be downloaded from the following websites:

- Eskom's website: 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 or nuclear1@acerafrica.co.za

APPENDIX 3: ATTENDANCE LISTS

Surname	First Names	Title	Co/Org	Oyster Bay Meeting 13 Apr 10	Humansdorp Meeting 14 Apr 10	St Francis Meeting 15 Apr 10
Anderson	Duncan & Yvonne	Prof & Mrs				Attended
Anderson	Caroline	Mrs	St Francis College			Attended
Andrews	Pamela	Miss				Attended
Andrews	Rob & Ann	Mr & Mrs	i-Lollo Lodge			Attended
Arderne	Richard	Mr & Mrs	Pam Golding Properties			Attended
Ball	Jaana-Maria	Ms	ARCUS GIBB	Attended	Attended	Attended
Barratt	Christopher & Valda	Mr & Mrs				Attended
Bartlett	Colin	Mr				Attended
Beckmann	Roderick	Mr	Eskom		Attended	
Bendeman	Ernest	Mr	Billabong SA			Attended
Bezuidenhout	Adriaann	Mr				Attended
Blaeser	Beryl	Ms	Eskom		Attended	Attended
Bomman	Nick & Una	Mr & Mrs		Attended		
Bowler	Karin	Mrs	Karin Bowler Enterprises		Attended	
Brown	James	Mr				Attended
Campbell	Drummond & Sandie	Mr & Mrs				Attended
Casciani	Pietro & Daniela	Mr & Mrs				Attended
Cawood	J	Dr	St Francis Bay Disaster Management Team			Attended
Cook	Derek	Mr	Dunes Guesthouse			Attended
Cooper	John	Mr	Chas Everitt			Attended
Copeland	Peter	Mr				Attended
Cowling	Richard	Prof				Attended
Cowling	Shirley	Dr	Friends of the St Francis Nature Reserve			Attended
Culinan	Cormac	Mr	Cullinan & Associates Inc			Attended

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

Surname	First Names	Title	Co/Org	Oyster Bay Meeting 13 Apr 10	Humansdorp Meeting 14 Apr 10	St Francis Meeting 15 Apr 10
Dale	Jenny	Mrs				Attended
Day	John	Mr	J Bay Boardriders			Attended
de Beer	Henni	Mr	Dept of Economic Development & Env Affairs		Attended	
de Beer	Maryna	Ms				Attended
de Beer	GA	Mr				Attended
de Jager	Wimpie	Mnr		Attended		
de Jager	Tracy	Miss	Chas Everitt			Attended
de Villiers	Carin	Ms	Eskom		Attended	
Devine	Malcolm	Mr & Mrs	Papillon Organics			Attended
Donnelly	Ryan James	Mr	For A Safe Tomorrow (F. A. S. T.)			Attended
du Toit	Kobus	Mr	Oysterbaai Rate Payers Association	Attended		
du Toit	Conrad	Mr			Attended	
Dyabaza	Jongi	Mr	Eskom Koeberg NPS		Attended	Attended
Elliott	John	Mr				Attended
Elton	Edmund & Bridget	Mr & Mrs				Attended
Errington	Colleen	Mrs				Attended
Fuchs	W	Mr & Mrs				Attended
Fynn	Ian & Jean	Mr & Mrs	Marydale Properties			Attended
Gerber	Rupert	Mnr			Attended	
Gouws	Pieter	Mr				Attended
Greeff	Gert	Mr	Eskom Nuclear Sites	Attended	Attended	Attended
Grimm	Wolfgang	Mr				Attended
Hardie	George	Mr				Attended
Hardie	Sandra	Mrs	St Francis Conservancy			Attended
Hawinkels	Karen	Mrs				Attended
Hemsley	Robert	Mr				Attended
Hemsley	Carol	Mrs				Attended

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

Surname	First Names	Title	Co/Org	Oyster Bay Meeting 13 Apr 10	Humansdorp Meeting 14 Apr 10	St Francis Meeting 15 Apr 10
Howlett	Justin & Candice	Drs				Attended
Hutchinson	David Innes John	Mr	Inkwise			Attended
Hutchinson	Martha-Maria	Mrs	St Francis Conservancy			Attended
Immelman	Justin	Mr				Attended
Jacobson Becker	Frances	Ms				Attended
Jeannes	Deon	Mr	Eskom	Attended		
Jooste	Paul	Mnr	Oyster Bay RPA	Attended		
Jooste-Coetsee	Donna	Ms				Attended
Jordaan	Tania	Mrs	The Window Secret			Attended
Ker-Fox	Dorothy	Ms				Attended
Kettledas	Charmaine	Ms	ANC	Attended		
Koch	AP	Mr				Attended
Koen	Krappie	Mnr		Attended		
Kraak	Cheron	Ms	Country Feeling			Attended
Krause	Martin	Mr	Eskom		Attended	Attended
Kuhl	Alison	Mrs	Supertubes Surfing Foundation			Attended
Lamont	Sydney	Mr	Sea Vista Forum			Attended
Lategan	Tanya	Ms	Supertubes Surfing Foundation			Attended
Le Roux	John	Mr	FOSTER			Attended
Leask	Kevin	Mr	Eskom	Attended	Attended	Attended
Leen	Petrus	Mr	Sea Vista Forum			Attended
Lindsay	Michael Bruce	Mr				Attended
Logie	Caryl	Mrs	Fourcade Botanical Group			Attended
Lubbersen	George	Mr				Attended
Mackenzie	Donald	Dr & Mrs				Attended
Mahomed-Weideman	Leila	Mrs	Mainstream		Attended	
Malaka	Samson	Mr	Eskom			Attended

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

Surname	First Names	Title	Co/Org	Oyster Bay Meeting 13 Apr 10	Humansdorp Meeting 14 Apr 10	St Francis Meeting 15 Apr 10
Malan	Trudi	Mrs	Ajubatus Marine & Wildlife Rescue			Attended
Malgas	Alwyn	Mnr	Sea Vista Forum			Attended
Maskew	Peter & Sheryl	Mr & Mrs				Attended
Maubec	Mel & Sheila	Mr & Mrs				Attended
Mayoni	Zolani Julius	Mr	ANC	Attended		
Mc Hugh	Peter	Mr				Attended
Mortimer	Bev	Ms	St Francis Chronicle Newspaper			Attended
Ndala	Lorraine	Ms	Eskom		Attended	Attended
Ndamase	Zandisile	Ms	ANCYL	Attended		
Neate	Mary-Lou	Mrs	Chas Everitt			Attended
Nicholson	Deborah	Mrs	Debbie Nicholson Properties			Attended
Niven	Louise	Ms				Attended
Nixon	Roger & Laura	Mr & Mrs		Attended		
Norman	Jan	Mr	Koeberg	Attended	Attended	Attended
Oosthuizen	Joe	Mr	Chem-Dry SA			Attended
Oosthuizen	Paddy	Ms	St Francis Bay Residents Association			Attended
Pagden	Lindy	Mrs				Attended
Payne	Shaun	Mr				Attended
Peacock	Roland	Mr				Attended
Petrie	Leon	Mr	Grinaker LTA			Attended
Pezarro	Paul	Mr				Attended
Ponzo	Bruno	Mr				Attended
Pringle	Lizette	Mrs				Attended
Rassie	James	Mr		Attended		
Rautenbach	Peter	Mr	Dream Supreme CC			Attended
Rautenbach	Elisabeth	Mrs	St Francis Conservancy			Attended
Richardson	George Roger	Mr				Attended

PROPOSED Eskom Nuclear Power Station and Associated Infrastructure
 REVIEW OF DRAFT Environmental Impact Assessment Report

Surname	First Names	Title	Co/Org	Oyster Bay Meeting 13 Apr 10	Humansdorp Meeting 14 Apr 10	St Francis Meeting 15 Apr 10
Richardson	Michael	Mr				Attended
Roberts	Geoff	Mr				Attended
Roche	Robin & Norma	Mr & Mrs				Attended
Rogers		Mr/s				Attended
Royal	Renee	Mrs				Attended
Royal	John	Mr				Attended
Sadler	A	Mr & Mrs				Attended
Searle	Francis	Mr			Attended	
Searle	Francis	Mr				Attended
Sevenster	Kotie	Mr	Calibre Security	Attended		
Singleton	Tyrone	Mr	Eskom Generation		Attended	
Smith	Tom	Mr	Eskom		Attended	
Spence	David	Mr				Attended
Stander	MD	Mnr		Attended		
Stott	Tony	Mr	Eskom Generation	Attended	Attended	Attended
Strydom	Johan	Mnr		Attended		
Swarts	Nicoleen	Ms	Mainstream		Attended	
Terblanche	OJ	Mnr		Attended		
Theron	Mervin	Mr	Eskom	Attended	Attended	Attended
Thorpe	Hilton & Julia	Mr & Mrs	Waterways B & B, St Francis Kromme Trust			Attended
Tilders	Helmie	Mr	FOSTER			Attended
Tudhope	Jill	Mrs				Attended
Tyala	Petrus	Mr		Attended		
Vlok	Len	Mr	Denron		Attended	
Welman	Esme Neva	Mrs				Attended
West	David Michael	Mr	Eskom	Attended	Attended	Attended
Yoell	Antony & Mary	Mr & Mrs				Attended

Surname	First Names	Title	Co/Org	Oyster Bay Meeting 13 Apr 10	Humansdorp Meeting 14 Apr 10	St Francis Meeting 15 Apr 10
Young	RB	Mr & Mrs				Attended