

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT (EIA)**

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

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

**DRAFT SCOPING REPORT**

**RECORD OF KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING HELD AT  
DURBANVILLE GOLF CLUB**

**21 FEBRUARY 2008**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	ii
1. ATTENDANCE.....	1
1.1 ATTENDANCE - INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PARTIES.....	1
1.2 ATTENDANCE – ESKOM HOLDINGS LIMITED .....	1
1.3 ATTENDANCE – INDEPENDENT ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTING TEAM .....	1
1.4 APOLOGIES.....	2
2. WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS AND OBJECTIVES OF MEETINGS .....	2
2.1 WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS .....	2
2.2 OBJECTIVES OF THE MEETINGS .....	2
2.3 INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY FACILITATOR .....	3
3. NUCLEAR 1 PROJECT UPDATE - PRESENTATION.....	3
4. FINDINGS OF THE SCOPING PHASE - PRESENTATION .....	4
5. TRANSMISSION INTEGRATION - PRESENTATION .....	4
6. ISSUES AND COMMENTS RAISED AND DISCUSSED.....	5
7. WAY FORWARD AND CLOSING REMARKS .....	5
7.1 FACILITATORS CONCLUDING REMARKS.....	5
APPENDIX 1 .....	6
APPENDIX 2 .....	21
APPENDIX 3 .....	22

## 1. ATTENDANCE

### 1.1 Attendance - Interested and Affected Parties

- Local Government.
- Provincial Government.
- Environmental Authorities.
- Conservation Interest Groups.
- Ratepayers and Residents Associations.
- Environmental Interest Groups.
- Industry.
- Media.
- Non-Governmental Organisations.

### 1.2 Attendance – Eskom Holdings Limited

Name	Eskom Division	Position/Role
Mr Tony Stott	Enterprises Division Nuclear Programmes	Senior Manager (Nuclear Stakeholder Management)
Mr Tyrone Singleton	Generation Division Environmental Management	Chief Environmentalist
Mr Dave Wynne	Generation Division Nuclear Portfolio	Corporate Specialist (Project Management)
Mr Gert Greeff	Generation Division Koeberg Nuclear Power Station	Manager, Eskom Nuclear Sites
Ms Carin de Villiers	Generation Division Koeberg Nuclear Power Station	Senior Government and Media Liaison Practitioner
Mr Kevin Leask	Transmission Division System Operations and Planning (Grid Planning)	Chief Engineer
Mr Thamsanqa Ngcobo	Transmission Division System Operations and Planning	Planner
Mr Itumeleng Noeng	Transmission Division Land and Rights	Senior Environmental Advisor
Ms Mammoloko Seabe	Transmission Division Land and Rights	Land and Rights Manager
Ms Bronwyn Stolp	Transmission Division Land and Rights	Asset Acquisition Manager

### 1.3 Attendance – Independent Environmental Consulting Team

Name	Organisation	Role in the project
Ms Jaana-Maria Ball	ARCUS GIBB (Pty) Ltd	EIA Project Manager
Mr Tim Liversage	ARCUS GIBB (Pty) Ltd	Assistant Project Manager
Ms Bongzi Shinga	ACER Africa	Public Participation Team Leader
Ms Karin Bowler	Karin Bowler Enterprises	Independent Facilitator
Ms Annelize Schwartz	ACER Africa	Public Participation Assistant
Mr J Combrinck	ACER Africa	Public Participation Assistant

## 1.4 Apologies

The following apologies were received by ACER (Africa):

<b>Company</b>	<b>Name</b>
De Beers Namaqualand Mines	Mr Donly Dave Cloete
Wildlife and Environment Society of South Africa	Mr Eric Herrman
Pearly Beach Conservancy	Ms Elrina Versfeld
Endangered Wildlife Trust	Mr Bradley Gibbons
WC Dept of Environmental Affairs, Development and Planning	Mr Percy Langa
Eskom	Ms Jenny Holthuysen
Industrial and Petrochemical Consultants	Dr Philip Lloyd
Dept of Minerals & Energy	Ms Lerato Sedumedi
Bergrivier Municipality	Mr Samuel Claasen
Woodlands Dairy	Mr Coenie Landman
Overstrand Conservation Foundation	Mr Rob Fryer
Kogelberg Branch, Botanical Society of SA	Prof Nancy van Schaik
Overstrand Municipality	Mr Louis van Heerden
Overberg Municipality	Mr Francois Kotze
Swartland Municipality	Mr Alwyn Burger

## 2. WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS AND OBJECTIVES OF MEETINGS

### 2.1 Welcome and Introductions

The facilitator, Ms Karin Bowler, welcomed all those present and thanked them for their participation in the review process of the Draft Scoping Report for the proposed Eskom Nuclear Power Station, which has been made available for public review. She then introduced the EIA Project Team members and the Eskom personnel.

She requested all stakeholders to introduce themselves and the organisations they represent.

### 2.2 Objectives of the meetings

Ms Bowler stated that this Key Stakeholder Feedback Meeting is intended to provide stakeholders with an opportunity to discuss the findings as they are currently presented in the Draft Scoping Report.

The primary objectives of the meeting were to present and discuss the following:

- Findings of the Draft Scoping Report.
- Project alternatives to be evaluated in the Impact Assessment Phase.
- Proposed Specialist Studies and their draft Terms of Reference.
- Plan of Study for Environmental Impact Assessment.
- Ongoing Public Participation Process.
- Process for collection of issues and concerns.

### 2.3 Introductory Remarks by Facilitator

Ms Bowler stated that at the previous Key Stakeholder Workshop held in Durbanville, there was criticism in terms of the following:

- ❑ Meeting turning out to be a platform for dealing with Eskom issues, which were not directly linked to the Nuclear 1 EIA.
- ❑ Stakeholders were not given sufficient time to articulate their concerns on the EIA.

On this note, she then requested all stakeholders to focus on the following:

- ❑ Issues that need to be addressed as part of the Nuclear 1 EIA, i.e. process issues and content of the Draft Scoping Report
- ❑ Information to be presented by various speakers.
- ❑ Clearly articulating their comments, issues and concerns, as they will set the scene for the specialist studies into the future.

Finally, she outlined all the presentations that will be given as part of the stakeholder feedback meeting and the various presenters:

- ❑ Mr Tony Stott presenting an update on Nuclear 1.
- ❑ Ms Jaana-Maria Ball and Mr Tim Liversage presenting findings on the Draft Scoping Report.
- ❑ Mr Kevin Leask presenting Transmission Integration of a Power Station at the proposed alternative sites.

### 3. NUCLEAR 1 PROJECT UPDATE - PRESENTATION

Mr Tony Stott, Senior Manager, Nuclear Stakeholder Management, Enterprises Division, Eskom presented an update on the Nuclear 1 project. The following sections were covered in the presentation:

- ❑ Overview of the proposed Nuclear Power Station.
- ❑ Potential suppliers.
- ❑ Commercial process.
- ❑ Transmission Line Integration Studies.
- ❑ Regulatory processes.
- ❑ Schedule for Nuclear 1 (indicative timeframes).

*A summary of the information presented is provided in Appendix 2. The issues raised and discussed following Mr Stott's presentation are summarised in a table presented in Appendix 1.*

#### **4. FINDINGS OF THE SCOPING PHASE - PRESENTATION**

Ms Jaana-Maria Ball, EIA Project Manager and Mr Tim Liversage, EIA Assistant Project Manager, ARCUS GIBB (Pty) Ltd presented the findings on the Draft Scoping Report. The following sections were covered in the presentation:

- ❑ Project Description.
- ❑ Project Motivation.
- ❑ Project Background.
- ❑ EIA Process.
- ❑ Issues identified in the Scoping Phase.
- ❑ Scoping phase findings.
- ❑ Impact Assessment – Specialist Studies.
- ❑ Plan of Study for EIA (Draft Specialist Terms of Reference).
- ❑ Public Participation Process.
- ❑ Way Forward.

*An outline of the information presented is provided in Appendix 2. The issues raised and discussed following ARCUS GIBBs presentation are summarised in a table presented in Appendix 1.*

#### **5. TRANSMISSION INTEGRATION - PRESENTATION**

Mr Kevin Leask, Eskom Transmission - Systems Operations and Planning presented an overview of the studies on the integration of the proposed power station into the transmission system at each of the alternative sites. His presentation included the following sections:

- ❑ Transmission requirements for integrating a large power station.
- ❑ Nuclear 1 requirements.
- ❑ Transmission power line corridors and sites.
- ❑ Nuclear 1 transmission requirements for:
  - Brazil and Schulpfontein Sites.
  - Duynefontein Site.
  - Bantamsklip Site.
  - Thyspunt Site.
- ❑ Status of Brazil and Schulpfontein sites.
- ❑ Transmission Line EIA process.

*An outline of the information presented is provided in Appendix 2. The issues raised and discussed following Mr Leask's presentation are summarised in a table presented in Appendix 1.*

## 6. ISSUES AND COMMENTS RAISED AND DISCUSSED

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 Durbanville Key Stakeholder Feedback Meeting.

Please note:

- ❑ ACER Africa has tried to capture and reflect as accurately as possible all issues raised at the Durbanville Key Stakeholder Feedback Meeting.
- ❑ Should you wish to edit your comments, please advise ACER Africa within two weeks of receiving these minutes.
- ❑ In some cases a name was not captured during the stakeholder meetings, this in no way diminishes the value of the issue or concern raised.
- ❑ Should you identify your input and would like your name to be registered next to it, please advise ACER Africa.

## 7. WAY FORWARD AND CLOSING REMARKS

### 7.1 Facilitators concluding remarks

In closing, the Facilitator encouraged stakeholders to review the Draft Scoping Report and to submit comments. She reminded stakeholders of their obligations in an EIA, which include the review of the various draft documents.

She also stated that the issues raised had been captured and will be included in the minutes, which will be made available to stakeholders. She also reminded all stakeholders that comments on the Draft Scoping Report should be submitted to ACER using the various means available:

Tel: 086 010 4958  
Fax: 035 340 2232  
Email: [nuclear1@acerafrica.co.za](mailto:nuclear1@acerafrica.co.za)  
Postal address: PO Box 503, Mtunzini, 3867  
Website: [www.eskom.co.za/eia](http://www.eskom.co.za/eia) on the "Nuclear 1" link

The facilitator thanked all Key Stakeholders and the study team for their input and participation in the EIA and closed the meeting.

## APPENDIX 1

### Record of Issues Raised and Discussed

NO	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUE/COMMENT/CONCERN	RESPONSE
1	Mr Andy Gubb Wildlife and Environment Society of SA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="577 443 1391 683">❑ Mr Gubb stated that it is crucial for stakeholders to be updated on the Transmission Lines EIA, i.e. where we are in terms of the Transmission Lines EIA. He finds it unacceptable for the Nuclear 1 EIA process to proceed whilst using findings from a process, which has been done somewhere else, i.e. EIA that has not been subject to Public Participation Process. It is important that due process is followed.</li> <li data-bbox="577 722 1391 818">❑ He would like to understand that there would be integration of the two EIAs, i.e. Nuclear 1 and Transmission Lines EIA. If integration does not occur, there is essentially a huge problem.</li> <li data-bbox="577 858 1391 1134">❑ Another concern, relates to the statement made by ARCUS GIBB that the original 5 sites have been reduced to 3 sites. One cannot expect the Nuclear 1 EIA, at a Scoping level to reduce the sites when information that has been used to scope the 2 sites has not been subject to a Public Participation Process. How can we use information from the transmission lines EIA (that has not been commissioned) to inform the Nuclear 1 EIA process?</li> </ul>	<p data-bbox="1417 443 2119 715">Mr Tony Stott indicated that it is a standard practice for all power stations to first deal with the siting of a power station and thereafter deal with the transmission line integration. The Nuclear 1 EIA and the Transmission line EIA would need to be treated separately although running in parallel. Mr Stott added that the separate execution of the respective EIAs has been discussed with DEAT and they are satisfied with the approach adopted by Eskom.</p> <p data-bbox="1417 754 2119 962">Ms Jaana Ball referred Mr Gubb to Section 8.8.2 of the DSR where a summary of the integration planning studies undertaken by Eskom is presented. She confirmed that the full report would be made available on the website for the EIA (<a href="http://www.eskom.co.za/EIA">www.eskom.co.za/EIA</a>) and in the Final Scoping Report (FSR) – Refer to Section 8.8.2.</p> <p data-bbox="1417 1002 2119 1201">A high-level integration study has shown that the Northern Cape sites are not viable alternatives for the Nuclear 1 power station for a number of reasons; hence they have been scoped out at this stage of the EIA. Details of the integration study is available in Section 8.8.2 and Appendix H.</p>

NO	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUE/COMMENT/CONCERN	RESPONSE
2	Ms Liz McDaid Green Connection	<p>She would like to highlight the following key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>□ From an EIA Process point of view, ARCUS GIBB's presentation is biased. Information on Nuclear 1 EIA needs to be based on facts. She indicated that she could easily prove her statement using the power point presentation. She feels very uncomfortable as the presentation of the consultant is biased and the information on the boards is misrepresented. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- She has already raised this point at the Public Open Day held at Vineyard Hotel, Newlands and it has now been confirmed by the power point presentation.</li> <li>- Information that is made available to the public needs to be accurate and focus on both positive and negative impacts.</li> <li>- As an example, a slide on benefits for a Nuclear Power Station has been shown. Why is a slide on potential negative impacts as indicated by the Specialists in the reports not shown? This must be shown when presenting to the public.</li> <li>- She also pointed out that there is no mention of waste disposal, waste management, associated risks, etc. Accordingly in her opinion, ARCUS GIBB is not presenting a balanced view to the public.</li> </ul> </li> <li>□ How can an EIA team use results from an EIA process, which has not even started, to influence the findings of Nuclear 1 EIA process?</li> <li>□ All 5 sites should be back on the table for detailed investigation, as the results of the Nuclear 1 EIA cannot, at this stage, determine that Brazil and Schulpfontein sites are unsuitable.</li> </ul>	<p>ARCUS GIBB noted the comments.</p> <p>Ms Ball indicated that this is a Draft Scoping Report. All comments received during the public review period will be used to refine the report, a product of which will be a Final Scoping Report to be submitted to the Environmental Authorities and made available for public review.</p> <p>Ms Ball also stated that in any EIA process, there are a number of feedback loops, as is the case with this EIA.</p> <p>Comment was noted.</p> <p>Comment was noted. It was emphasised that the decision to exclude the two Northern cape sites from further investigation for the proposed Nuclear 1 power station was based on several social and economic and project timing issues. Ms Ball encourages I&amp;APs to read the Scoping Report for a detailed explanation.</p>

NO	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUE/COMMENT/CONCERN	RESPONSE
3	Mr Francois Myburg	<p>He would like to highlight that on Page 6 of the Draft Scoping Report, there is a serious omission of the Overstrand Municipality when referring to the Bantamsklip Site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❑ The Bantamsklip Site is in the jurisdiction of the Overstrand Municipality.</li> <li>❑ As a result, there is factual information of the Overstrand Municipality that has been left out, e.g. economics.</li> <li>❑ Chapter 4.2 references to the statistics of the Overstrand Municipality - he suggested that the consultants address this before the public hearings in the area.</li> </ul>	ARCUS GIBB thanked Mr Myburg for the correction and confirmed that it has been noted and it will be corrected in the Final Scoping Report.
4	Mr Martin van der Merwe Pearly Beach Residents Association	<p>If Eskom is to build a Nuclear Power Station at the Bantamsklip Site, has Eskom considered the impacts on infrastructure?</p> <p>Can the receiving environment or the existing infrastructure cope with the influx of people, etc? Have the municipal services in the area been surveyed recently? It is crucial that the social and socio-economic issues are well understood. Regarding the required infrastructure, e.g. roads, water reticulation, sanitation, etc, has Eskom considered these in their costing?</p>	Comment noted and will be flagged for the specialist studies to be undertaken during the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA.
5	A Stakeholder Durbanville Key Stakeholder Meeting	<p>We are all aware that eventually all 5 sites will have Nuclear Power Stations. Should we not be focussing on the ranking or prioritisation of the sites, i.e. the most preferred site rather than going through all these studies? This is time consuming and has cost implications. Why do we have to go through this exercise all over again for Nuclear 2, 3, 4 and 5?</p>	<p>The sites will be ranked at the end of the EIA process and a recommendation made of the preferred site for the proposed Nuclear 1 power station.</p> <p>The development of further nuclear power stations on any of the remaining sites will require Eskom to make a separate application to the DEAT in terms of the National Environmental Management Act, 1998 (Act No 107 of 1998). In all likelihood the specialist studies undertaken for the proposed Nuclear 1 power station EIA will be used in subsequent EIAs.</p>

NO	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUE/COMMENT/CONCERN	RESPONSE
6	Ms Liz McDaid Green Connection	Ms McDaid stated that if ARCUS GIBB is an objective consultant, they should certainly have information available on their own website. Why, she enquired, is there only information on Eskom's website?	Ms Ball confirmed that Nuclear 1 EIA information is also available on ARCUS GIBB's website.  She further stated it is Eskom's standard practice to make all EIA documentation available on their website.  It was also highlighted that such a situation is standard practice as the cost of developing, hosting and managing their own website is often too expensive for smaller consultancies, who also do work for Eskom.
7	Mr Keenan van Wyk EarthLife Africa	In terms of human health, the Draft Scoping Report does not refer to the following: <input type="checkbox"/> People working at Koeberg Nuclear Power Station or on site. <input type="checkbox"/> Occupational Health and Safety studies. It mainly refers to the surrounding environments.  He suggested that the whole lifecycle of the plant must be investigated from the workers during the construction phase to the workers currently working on site and during the power generation phase.  In summary, benchmarking of the Nuclear Power Plant is important.	Comment noted.  The likely number of people working at the proposed Nuclear 1 power station during construction and operation will be finalised in the EIR report. Currently estimates, based on Koeberg have been included in the Scoping report. Approximately 6,000 people are estimated to be on site at the peak of construction and during operation the station could potentially employ between 1,000 – 2,000 persons.  This information will be included in the Draft Environmental Impact Assessment Report (DEIR).
8	Mr Raymond Williamson Melkbosstrand Ratepayers Association	<input type="checkbox"/> Where does Melkbosstrand town fit within this proposed Nuclear Power Station or development? According to the information he has, Melkbosstrand is within the 5 km zone. Melkbosstrand residents are therefore almost living within a nuclear power plant.	The location of Melkbosstrand to the proposed alternative site at Koeberg was explained.

NO	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUE/COMMENT/CONCERN	RESPONSE
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="577 263 1391 432">❑ Why is Koeberg named after the farm Koeberg and not Melkbos? Is Eskom trying to hide the fact that the nuclear plant is situated 5 km from a residential area? The nuclear power station should be named after a town where it finds itself, i.e. Melkbosstrand</li>   <li data-bbox="577 751 1391 954">❑ Reference to economic injections has been made during the presentations. Do we have any records of the economic injections into the area brought by the existence of a Nuclear Power Station? He would like to better understand the potential economic benefits that are associated with a Nuclear Power Station.</li>   <li data-bbox="577 994 1391 1058">❑ He is interested in getting information on benefits of having a Nuclear Power Plant, particularly for communities.</li>   <li data-bbox="577 1169 1391 1268">❑ He is concerned that there are areas in the Western Cape where there is no water? Would these Nuclear Power plants be able to carry out desalination?</li> </ul>	<p data-bbox="1415 263 2123 363">Eskom previously named power stations after a key feature in the area. Referring to the Koeberg plant, it was named in the late 1970s after the farm and the koppie in the area.</p> <p data-bbox="1415 403 2123 711">Eskom is definitely not trying to hide that fact that the plant is within a residential area and Eskom was not trying to hide Koeberg or not acknowledge the town where Koeberg finds itself. For this proposed Nuclear Power Station, a process for the selection of a suitable name will be undertaken. Assuming Eskom receives authorisation for a nuclear power plant on one of the sites, Eskom will appoint consultants to investigate possible names, taking into account local features and history.</p> <p data-bbox="1415 751 2123 884">This will be addressed in the Economic Specialist Study. Detailed investigations would be undertaken to better understand the economic injections associated with a Nuclear Power Station (refer to Draft Terms of Reference).</p> <p data-bbox="1415 994 2123 1126">The team undertaking the Social and Economics Studies will be requested to look at history to determine what the Nuclear Power Station has given back to the local community, using Koeberg as a case study.</p> <p data-bbox="1415 1169 2123 1233">Ms Ball confirmed that desalination is being investigated in the EIA.</p>

NO	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUE/COMMENT/CONCERN	RESPONSE
8	Mr Keith Wiseman City of Cape Town	<p>His concerns relate to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❑ Loss of potential income and shortage of land for housing as 31 hectares will be lost to a Nuclear Power Station.</li>   <li>❑ Due to the manner in which this Nuclear Power Station process is being dealt with, he is concerned that people who are new to the EIA process would not be able to contribute meaningfully. Although a number of stakeholders make an effort to participate in this EIA, it should be noted that such a process takes up a huge amount of human energy, and this is even worse if we are going to deal with these Nuclear Power Stations as incremental decisions.</li>   <li>❑ Is there an opportunity for Eskom or the study team to look at these sites in a bigger picture to be able to carry out better planning? A product of better planning would be beneficial to both Eskom and local authorities. In addition, better planning would have sound financial benefits for Eskom.</li>   <li>❑ Lastly, he referred to the premature scoping out of the Northern Cape sites. He concurred with Ms McDaid that sites in the Northern Cape should not be excluded at this early stage.</li> </ul>	<p>The 31ha referred to in the DSR related to the potential size of the nuclear power station. In this regard where the Duynefontein site was concerned this station will fall within the existing boundaries of Koeberg.</p> <p>The 31 ha does not refer to the potential loss of land set aside for future housing. It was however noted that the concerns had been recorded and will be addressed in the economic studies that will be undertaken during the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA.</p> <p>Comment noted and will be taken into consideration for future activities. Note however that the EIA is being and must be undertaken in accordance and in compliance with the requirements of the National Environmental Management Act and the associated Regulations.</p> <p>Eskom is considering the bigger picture. As discussed in the first round of public meetings in 2007, Eskom is investigating different options to expand the generating capacity by 40,000 MW by 2025.</p> <p>Comment noted. Arcus Gibb indicated that they felt that the scoping out of the Northern case sites was justified for the proposed Nuclear 1 power station as it did not meet the necessary criteria for Nuclear 1, including social, economic and timing issues.</p>

NO	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUE/COMMENT/CONCERN	RESPONSE
			The exclusion of the Northern Cape sites does not automatically result in their exclusion from future EIA processes, as they are still considered feasible for future nuclear power stations
9	Mr Keith Wiseman City of Cape Town	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="577 408 1391 571">❑ The issue around external costs has been raised by the City of Cape Town since 1999. This refers to costs borne by external stakeholders and local authorities, costs that are associated with housing opportunities, emergency planning zones, etc. Benefits and disadvantages should be well understood.</li> <li data-bbox="577 608 1391 770">❑ At this stage we are dealing with an EIA for 4,000 MW. By implication Eskom or the applicant will get a ROD for one site. Collectively, we need to look at a process to get 20,000 MW, i.e. need to design a process, which enables people from outlying parts to have influence.</li> <li data-bbox="577 807 1391 1007">❑ He strongly feels that Eskom needs to have a strategic approach to these sites. An example he provided is around the prioritisation process of the nuclear sites. Eventually, Eskom needs to develop all five sites. This takes a tremendous amount of energy, lots of resources (human and financial) and calls for a strategic approach.</li> <li data-bbox="577 1043 1391 1179">❑ Eskom's plans for these Nuclear sites also impact on municipal planning. He feels that it is possible for Eskom to prioritise the issues and the sites so that the municipalities can factor them into their planning.</li> <li data-bbox="577 1216 1391 1315">❑ Lastly, direct and indirect costs of Koeberg Nuclear Power Station should be understood in terms of how it impacts into the planning of the City of Cape Town.</li> </ul>	<p data-bbox="1415 408 1626 432">Comments noted.</p> <p data-bbox="1415 608 2110 887">It was emphasised that Eskom is following a strategic approach, and that options for the full 40,000 MW (of different technologies) required by 2025 are being considered. This specific EIA is for the first of the proposed nuclear power stations ("Nuclear 1") on one of a number of alternative sites. The sites will be ranked at the end of the EIA process and a recommendation made of the preferred site for this proposed Nuclear 1 power station.</p> <p data-bbox="1415 927 2110 1126">The development of further nuclear power stations on any of the remaining sites will require Eskom to make a separate application to the DEAT in terms of the National Environmental Management Act, 1998 (Act No 107 of 1998). In all likelihood the specialist studies undertaken for the Nuclear 1 EIA will be used in subsequent EIAs.</p>

NO	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUE/COMMENT/CONCERN	RESPONSE
10	Ms Sandy Strydom Dept of Transport and Public Works	<p>She raised the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❑ Currently, the province maintains the roads to Hermanus, Gansbaai, and Pearly Beach. The maintenance budget is reduced every year. The building of a Nuclear Power Station at the Bantamsklip Site would create even more pressure for maintenance, as there would be an increase on the existing infrastructure.</li> <li>❑ The social standing and economic growth of the area is mainly driven by tourism. If Eskom builds a Nuclear Power Station at Bantamsklip, what would happen to the tourism industry, which is the priority of the area? Can tourism and a Nuclear Power Station co-exist in such an environment?</li> <li>❑ Access to the area also needs to factor that there will be decontamination sites?</li> <li>❑ Regarding the evacuation plans of the decontamination sites, she wants the routes to be identified as soon as possible in the process so that the Department of Roads have sufficient time to work around these decontamination sites and factor them into their plans as well.</li> </ul>	Comments were noted. It was emphasised that all issues raised will be assessed as part of the Impact Assessment Phase.
11	Ms Liz McDaid Green Connection	<p>In terms of the transmission lines integration, it is crucial that we ensure that we have all the facts right. Any decisions we make for the Nuclear 1 EIA will have huge impacts in the long-term. It is information that needs to be properly assessed by objective consultants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❑ It is clear from the discussions today that Eskom has made a pre-decision that whatever the costs would be for Thyspunt, Bantamsklip and Duynfontein they would be willing to pay.</li> <li>❑ It was highlighted that the economic impact or cost for evacuation of people, costs of infrastructure, etc. may well be more expensive than building a new transmission corridor in the Northern Cape.</li> </ul>	<p>Ms Ball requested Ms McDaid to submit written comment detailing all her concerns.</p> <p>It was emphasised that the exclusion of the Brazil and Schulpfontein sites was not a result of their unsuitability of the sites for a nuclear power station but rather that these two sites are not viable alternatives for the proposed power station for which this EIA is being undertaken. The two sites will be considered in EIA's for future power stations.</p>

NO	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUE/COMMENT/CONCERN	RESPONSE
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❑ Why are we not keeping all options open, so that once we better understand the impacts through the specialist studies, then we can see where to go?</li> <li>❑ The levels of confidence need to be the same for all 5 sites. She cannot concur with the level of information at this stage that it is sufficient to scope out the two sites in the Northern Cape.</li> <li>❑ She can confidently state that the Northern Cape sites have been scoped out on the basis of Eskom's recommendations.</li> </ul> <p>Ms McDaid wanted clarity and confirmation on whether ARCUS GIBB would continue with the recommendations as were currently presented in the Draft Scoping Report, after discussions at this meeting.</p>	<p>Ms Ball confirmed that she would continue to defend the Draft Scoping Report as is, i.e. with its recommendations.</p>
12	Ms Liz McDaid Green Connection	<p>Referring to the Transmission Line Integration and the need for new power corridors in the Northern Cape, Ms McDaid stated that in terms of the costs, the worst-case scenario should be done for a city, which has a population of approximately 4 million people, e.g. Cape Town.</p> <p>The results might show that it would be less costly for Eskom to build a Nuclear Power Station in the Northern Cape where the population is not so dense.</p> <p>She strongly feels that none of the sites can be scoped out prematurely based on the information that is currently available.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Refer to comments above</p>
13	Mr Keenan van Wyk EarthLife Africa	<p>How is the spent fuel on site currently managed and how is it going to be managed for the proposed Nuclear Power Station?</p>	<p>Spent fuel is currently stored on site in spent fuel pools or dry casks under the regulatory control of the National Nuclear Regulator, and in accordance with international standards.</p>

NO	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUE/COMMENT/CONCERN	RESPONSE
		People in Namaqualand have concerns around nuclear waste.	<p>The South African Cabinet approved a National Radioactive Management Policy and Strategy in 2005. The Department of Minerals and Energy (DME) is currently drafting legislation to implement the Policy. Two options for the long-term management of spent fuel are possible: (a) direct final disposal of the spent fuel in a deep underground geological disposal facility, or (b) reprocessing of the spent fuel to extract unused uranium and plutonium for re-use and concentration and disposal of the residual (about 3-4% of the initial spent fuel) high level waste in a deep underground geological disposal facility. Both options are being pursued internationally.</p> <p>For the proposed Nuclear Power Station, Eskom intends to follow the same practices for the management of radioactive waste, as is currently done at Koeberg Nuclear Power Station and under the regulatory control of the National Nuclear Regulator and subject to the requirements of the National Radioactive Waste Management Policy and Strategy and any associated legislation or regulations.</p>
14	Mr Keenan van Wyk EarthLife Africa	The study team needs to go back to the communities, which are affected by the proposed Nuclear Power Station, e.g. Atlantis. He is concerned that Atlantis people do not have information and are being left out of the process.	<p>It was brought to Mr van Wyk's attention that databases from previous projects, which included Atlantis representatives, and community leaders were used to establish the database for the Nuclear 1 project.</p> <p>Information that is distributed to Atlantis Community is the same as information distributed to the all registered Interested and Affected Parties.</p>

NO	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUE/COMMENT/CONCERN	RESPONSE
			<p>In addition, advertisements are placed in the local and regional newspapers detailing the opportunities for participation.</p> <p>To date, Atlantis meetings have been arranged and were poorly attended. The second meeting was specifically at Mr van Wyk's request and to address the venue issue, however the results in terms of attendance were similar.</p> <p>Regarding the way forward – it was suggested that Atlantis Community Leaders present at the meeting should discuss with Ms Shinga of ACER (Africa) ways of improving communication with the Atlantis Community, for future interaction.</p>
15	Mr Henry Smith Atlantis Community	He feels that the coloured community in Atlantis is being excluded and are being left in the cold and the EIA is going ahead.	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>It was confirmed that the Atlantis Community Leaders present at the meeting would discuss with Ms Shinga of ACER (Africa) ways of improving communication with the Atlantis Community.</p>
16	Mr Andy Gubb Wildlife and Environment Society of SA	<p>He stated that he does not want to be part of a process, which uses unqualified information. He is becoming even more uncomfortable, especially if another EIA process will influence the decisions of the Nuclear 1 EIA process.</p> <p>He needs to understand where this Nuclear EIA process starts and ends. He feels that the EIA process is getting confused and affecting the stakeholder levels of confidence in the EIA.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Arcus Gibb will attempt to address Mr Gubb's concerns in the Final Scoping Report (FSR).</p> <p>It was also highlighted to Mr Gubb that the process was still in its initial stages. The scoping phase of the process is focused on gathering all issues to ensure that the Impact Assessment phase of the EIA was as comprehensive and detailed as practicably possible. It was emphasised that as the process progresses information and issues will become much clearer.</p>

NO	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUE/COMMENT/CONCERN	RESPONSE
17	Mr Morne Theron City of Cape Town	<p>He would like to understand the cumulative impact of Transmission lines for the following scenario's:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Ankerlig</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> PBMR</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Closed or Open Cycle Gas Turbines (CCGT/OCGT)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Nuclear 1</li> </ul> <p>If two or all of the above plans happen at once, what will be the impacts and what additional lines will be required?</p> <p>Lastly, will biodiversity offsets be looked at? This statement relates to all sites and not only Duynefontein site.</p>	<p>Mr Leask indicated the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> If Nuclear 1 goes ahead at Duynefontein, Eskom would require 3 new lines to the new 765/400kV Omega substation close to Koeberg power station and 2 more 400kV lines into the Cape Town area to the Philippi and Stikland substations.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> If Ankerlig (Gas 1) goes ahead – Eskom requires 1 new 400kV line from Ankerlig.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Conversion from OCGT to CCGT at Ankerlig – Eskom will require another new 400kV line from Ankerlig to the new 765/400kV Omega substation.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> PBMR – One of the existing Eskom 132kV lines will be looped into the PBMR site.</li> </ul> <p>Therefore the total number of lines if all the projects materialize will be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> 5x 400kV lines from Duynefontein</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> 2x 400kV lines from Ankerlig</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> 1x 132kV line loop-in to PBMR site</li> </ul> <p>Ms Ball confirmed that cumulative impacts have been flagged for the various specialist studies.</p> <p>Yes.</p>

NO	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUE/COMMENT/CONCERN	RESPONSE
18	Ms Jo-Anne Smetherham Cape Times Journalist	In terms of the public procedure, what has happened with the draft Nuclear Energy Strategy, which needs to be made available for public comment? She seemed to think that a crucial stage has been omitted and Eskom or Government is going ahead without following the necessary policy requirements.	Mr Stott highlighted that this is a government responsibility. He further indicated that there has been a draft Nuclear Energy Policy and Strategy, which was sent for public comment.  He indicated that, to his understanding, comments received from the public amount to a 600-page document, and that Government is currently working on the document taking the comments into consideration.
19	A Stakeholder Durbanville Key Stakeholder Meeting	What is the impact of the proposed Nuclear Power Station on biodiversity? When you filter your recommendations please relate it to other specialist studies, where applicable.	Comment noted and flagged for specialists and integration of Specialist findings.
20	Mr Erwin Kotze SA Air Force Base - Overberg	He would like to state that any new power station site being developed in the area puts a restriction on the air space.  He extended an invitation to ARCUS GIBB and the Specialists to visit the Air Force to show them what the Air Space is about.  The responsibilities include looking at other aspects, air space and transport space as well as the updating of aerological maps where applicable.	Comments noted.  Ms Ball thanked the South African Air Force for the invitation.
21	Mrs Melissa Naicker Dept of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning	Referring to Mr Stott's presentation – the timeline for power station construction is prior to receiving all necessary approvals. How can construction begin before all the necessary approvals have been obtained from the authorities?	It was explained that the NNR process, to which Mrs Naicker was referring, is a staged licensing process. If the NNR is satisfied with the overall safety case, it will issue a licence that allows for site preparation and construction. The NNR will not authorise progress to the subsequent stage until it is satisfied that first stage has been completed correctly and in accordance with the design, the safety case and the quality requirements. Similarly the NNR will

NO	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUE/COMMENT/CONCERN	RESPONSE
			<p>not authorise full power commercial operation until it is satisfied with the results of the commissioning programme. Hence the timeline shows the licensing process continuing up to the end of the commissioning and the start of commercial operation.</p> <p>The NNR process is independent of other regulatory processes, and does not substitute for other authorisations that are required.</p> <p>A number of approvals will be required before construction can commence.</p>
22	Ms Liz McDaid Green Connection	<p>She is concerned about the granting of a 45-day comment period and that there will be no extension. This is definitely not sufficient considering that there are 24 Specialist Studies. She requested confirmation that the comment period will be different for the review of Draft EIR and associated Specialist Studies.</p> <p>She would like confirmation that ARCUS GIBB and Specialists will look at the worst-case scenarios as part of their investigations.</p>	<p>ARCUS GIBB undertook to get back to all Interested and Affected Parties (I&amp;APs) that registered for the project regarding an extension to the Comment Period. (An extension was subsequently granted (total of 59 days) and communicated to all registered I&amp;APs).</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>
23	Mr Raymond Williamson Melkbosstrand Ratepayers Association	Would like to lodge a complaint about the sound quality of the venue as well as the microphone provided which did not work.	This was noted and ACER (Africa) will provide feedback to the Durbanville Golf Club.



## APPENDIX 2

### Presentations

#### **Nuclear 1 Project Update**

**Note:** The size of this presentation is 1, 413KB.

#### **Findings of the Scoping Phase**

**Note:** The size of this presentation is 535KB.

#### **Update on EIA for the transmission lines integration**

**Note:** The size of this presentation is 1, 015KB.

All presentations can either be downloaded on the website ([www.eskom.co.za/eia](http://www.eskom.co.za/eia)) or requested from ACER (Africa) at [nuclear1@acerafrica.co.za](mailto:nuclear1@acerafrica.co.za) or 086 010 4958

## **APPENDIX 3**

### **Attendance Register**