

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT (EIA)

EIA: 12/12/20/944

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

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REPORT

**KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING
CAPE ST FRANCIS**

16 APRIL 2010

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 (EIA TEAM)	3
2. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS.....	3
3. FACILITATORS INTRODUCTORY REMARKS	4
3.2. CONDUCT AT MEETING.....	4
3.3. OBJECTIVES OF THE MEETING.....	4
3.4. SUMMARY OF ISSUES RAISED DURING SCOPING PHASE	5
4. PRESENTATION: FINDINGS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESMENT REPORT	5
5. ISSUES AND COMMENTS RAISED AND DISCUSSED.....	6
5.1. ISSUES AND COMMENTS RAISED	6
6. WAY FORWARD AND CLOSING REMARKS	6
6.1. MINUTES OF MEETINGS.....	6
6.2. TIMEFRAMES	6
6.3. FACILITATORS CONCLUDING REMARKS.....	7
APPENDIX 1: RECORD OF ISSUES RAISED AND DISCUSSED.....	8
APPENDIX 2: PRESENTATION OF DRAFT EIA REPORT	53
APPENDIX 3: ATTENDANCE LIST	54

PREFACE

Should participants who attended the Key Stakeholder Feedback Meeting 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 the meeting and verbally raised issues without providing their names. This in no way diminishes the value of the issue raised. Should you recognise your input and would like to have your name recorded next to it, please advise the Public Participation Office.

1. ATTENDANCE

1.1. Attendance – Interested and Affected Parties

- As per attendance register.

1.2 Attendance – Eskom Holdings Limited

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

1.3 Attendance – Environmental Consulting Team (EIA Team)

Name	Organisation	Role in the project
Ms Jaana-Maria Ball	Arcus GIBB (Pty) Ltd	Nuclear 1 EIA: Project Manager
Mr Reuben Heydenrych	Arcus GIBB (Pty) Ltd	Senior Environmental Scientist
Ms Bongji 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

The Facilitator explained that an agenda had been distributed.

She further stated that the team would like to adhere to the times on the Agenda. However, as the meeting had started slightly later (15 minutes late) to allow all stakeholders to settle in at the meeting, this time will be added on at the end of the meeting. This will ensure sufficient time for questions. She asked that points of clarification be held over until the discussion period.

One of the objectives of the meeting is for stakeholders to have the opportunity of voicing their issues and concerns. She informed all participants that it is imperative that when they stand up and raise an issue to please state their name and organisation so that the minute-taker can preface the comment that is made in the minutes and attribute it to the correct person. She advised participants that the meeting is being recorded to ensure the accuracy of the minutes. She asked that all participants check that their issues have been captured correctly.

3.2 Conduct at Meeting

The Facilitator explained that participants are welcome to use the language of choice as the team can communicate in English, Afrikaans and Xhosa.

The Facilitator further 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 meeting.

The Facilitator said that because of the importance of the meeting, time might become a problem, she asked the floor for permission to check if everyone is satisfied with the proceedings and the potential to go over the stated time.

3.3 Objectives of the meeting

The objective of the Key Stakeholder Feedback Meeting 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.

3.4 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.

The Facilitator then introduced the project team to participants.

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 Assessment Report.

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 Environmental Impact Assessment Report (refer to presentation slides provided in Appendix 2).

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

5. ISSUES AND COMMENTS RAISED AND DISCUSSED

5.1 Issues and Comments raised

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

Please note: Should you wish to make any corrections, please advise ACER within two weeks of receiving these minutes.

6. WAY FORWARD AND CLOSING REMARKS

6.1 Minutes of Meetings

Ms Ball indicated that the minutes of meeting would be distributed to I&APs as soon as possible and every effort would be made to distribute them within 21 days from the date of the meeting.

I&APs will have 14 days after distribution 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 EIA Report ends on 10 May 2010. Arcus GIBB has allocated a 66 day comment period, which recognises that there are long weekends and 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 EIA Report are recorded and addressed on a weekly basis in the form of an Issues and Response Report. Comments received will be used to produce the Final EIA Report, which will then be submitted to the Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA) for their consideration.

The timeframe for submission of the Final EIA Report 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 Interested and Affected Parties 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 forward through the appropriate process. She encouraged everyone to make use of opportunities given to the stakeholders in terms of NEMA and the constitution.

The Facilitator thanked everyone for constructive engagement and encouraged stakeholders 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

CAPE ST FRANCIS KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
1	Mr Helmie Tilders FOSTER	<p>Mr Tilders said that his point did not have anything to do with the proposed nuclear reactor but rather the way in which the public meetings have been run. There is not a single notice in Sea Vista about any of the public meetings. There has been one notice put up by a local resident. He enquired if it is the consultant's responsibility to advertise public meetings and he wanted to know if this had been neglected.</p> <p>Mr Tilders asked if notice boards would not be better. He asked Mr Malgas to comment on this.</p> <p>Mnr Malgas: Wat gebeur in St Francis is dat ek nie glo dit is ons plig as St Francis om die gemeenskap te mobiliseer vir 'n vergadering soos vanaand nie. Ek probeer my bes op hierdie oomblik, soos ek beweeg deur die gemeenskap, om hierdie ding geadverteer te kry. Ek dink nie dit is aanvaarbaar vir ons as ons in hierdie gemeenskapvergadering vanaand beweeg, moet my vriend hier langsaan my op sy eie koste op hierdie township road [gaan] sodat ons die vissemanne kan inlig en die mense kan weet nie.</p>	<p>Ms Shinga responded by saying that the public had been notified. ACER (Africa) has a database of community members who have previously attended meetings at Sea Vista. In addition, there are leaders who represent their communities. All I&APs are notified and they in turn notify their constituencies if not already on database. ACER has also spoken to the municipalities and they are well aware of the meetings. ACER has had numerous consultations with the people of Sea Vista. Many of these people also receive personalised letters informing them about meetings.</p> <p>Ms Shinga added that meetings were also advertised in various publications using various languages. She said that obviously every individual cannot be reached and this is not the requirement of an EIA to go door to door but ACER does what is reasonable and acceptable and within the requirements of the law.</p> <p>Post meeting: The same processes were used to invite participants to previous meetings, the meetings were well attended and the requirement of posters was not raised. The meeting was announced in the community, the meeting was reasonably well attended. The team will also be returning to Sea Vista on Tuesday 26 May 2010 for a second public meeting and to specifically present on marine related aspects relevant to the Chocca industry.</p>

CAPE ST FRANCIS KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>Soos Helmie sê, ons het nie computers nie. Ek self het nie eers internet access nie.</p> <p><u>Translation</u> What is happening in St Francis is that I do not believe it is our duty, as St Francis, to mobilise the community for a meeting such as tonight. I am trying my best, as I go about in the community, to advertise this thing. I do not feel it is acceptable to us that if we want to attend this community meeting tonight that my friend here, sitting next to me, has to [go] on this township road, bearing his own costs, so that we can inform the fishermen and people can know. As Helmie mentioned, we do not have computers. I myself do not even have internet access.</p> <p>Ms Trudi Malan asked Ms Shinga how they can send underpaid letters to people and expect them to pay and how did they consider having a public meeting in Sea Vista on a Friday night. She knows 15 people who cannot attend due to Church meetings. She feels that there should have been more respect paid to the local community.</p> <p>Ms Cheron Kraak said she would like to include the lack of respect paid to the people of Jeffrey's Bay as she did not see anyone from that area at this meeting. No-one in Jeffrey's Bay is aware of any meetings.</p>	<p>Ms Shinga responded that they were alerted at the office that there were underpaid envelopes. ACER had sent out a one-page letter as well as the Executive Summary, which was printed back-to-back. Some post offices requested people to pay in a certain amount of money, this did not happen at every post office and has previously not been a problem. As compensation, the people who paid the money will be reimbursed. ACER apologies for this instance. She explained that when she dispatched the letters from the Durban Central Post Office, the teller did not inform her that the letters might be over-weight.</p> <p>She encouraged anyone with email addresses to send this information to ACER as this was a far more reliable and quick way of communicating.</p> <p>Ms Shinga stated that the community are not at all disrespected. When planning for all these meetings, these communities all under the jurisdiction of the municipality, the community is consulted and dates are checked. It has only recently been brought to ACER's attention that Friday is a problem and any future meetings in Sea Vista will not be held on a Friday. Ms Shinga said she had consulted with Mr Edward Busakwe, who is the community leader for Sea Vista and has been the key contact person since the EIA started (as advised by Kouga Local Municipality).</p> <p>Ms Shinga said that no signs had been put up but that adverts were placed in many newspapers including national, regional and local newspapers. Adverts are also placed in all the different languages used in the area.</p>

CAPE ST FRANCIS KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
			<p>The facilitator asked Ms Shinga to provide a list of the newspapers in which advertisements were placed.</p> <p>Ms Ball said that this information will also be placed on the website.</p> <p>Post Meeting Note: The advertisements were placed in the following news papers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Cape Times</i> • <i>Hermanus Times</i> • <i>Kouga Express</i> • <i>The Herald</i> • <i>Die Burger</i> • <i>Table Talk</i> • <i>Tygerburger Milnerton</i> • <i>Tygerburger Table View</i> • <i>Sunday Times</i> • <i>Our Times</i> • <i>PE Express</i> • <i>Suidernuus</i> • <i>Gansbaai Courant</i> • <i>Easi Ads</i>
2	Ms Francis Becker	She said that she is a concerned stakeholder and she has replied and sent her email address to ACER many times and she still does not receive correspondence via email.	The facilitator asked Ms Shinga to check the database to see if Ms Francis Becker is marked on database for email correspondence
3	Mr Alwin Malgas Sea Vista Forum	Mr Malgas said he was very upset as there was a meeting that evening that it would appear that it has	Comment noted and discussed above.

CAPE ST FRANCIS KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		not been properly organised. The letters that were sent out were in English and 80 – 90% of the community are illiterate. He said that he had matric and he battles to understand the letters.	
4	Mr Joe Oosthuizen St Francis Bay Residents Association	<p>Mr Oosthuizen feels that working through municipalities is not a good idea as it can be noted that there are no representatives from the Kouga Municipality at this meeting and no-one from this municipality ever contacts the Residents' Association.</p> <p>If meetings are held in Sea Vista the only way that the Residents' Association can deal with the Sea Vista Forum is to print information and put up notices. All organisations such as churches are contacted and they put the message across to the community.</p>	Ms Ball added that they have also been working with some of the community leaders in terms of the nature of the meeting, languages, etc. and they would be loud hailing the meeting. She gave assurance that if the attendance was poor another meeting will be organised.
5	Mr George Hardie Goed Geloef Farm/St Francis Conservancy	<p>Mr Hardie said that he had noticed on the presentation that all the various criteria have been covered by the experts. He feels that the majority of the experts are against Thyspunt as a preferred site but the consultants seem to end up with a calculated difference that Thyspunt is 76 points ahead against 57 for the others.</p> <p>He asked how these criteria have been weighted in such a way that Thyspunt ends up higher than the others. Is it a fact that all the weighting is being placed on economic factors as opposed to all the others?</p> <p>The facilitator added that specifically referring to the economic component, was this also part of that criteria</p>	<p>Ms Ball referred to the weighting table on the slide. She said Mr Hardie was correct, the biophysical specialist does not favour Thyspunt in terms of high biophysical impacts before mitigation. If the reports are examined carefully, they have identified key mitigation measures, which they have recommended that in their opinion will bring the potential impacts down to a low significance.</p> <p>The weighting took place during a two-day meeting with all 24 independent specialists.</p> <p>Mr Heydenrych explained, using the slide, that there were seven criteria that were regarded as key for the choice of the relevant site. Firstly integration into the national grid, secondly seismic suitability, those are two technical criteria. There are a number of biophysical criteria, firstly, dune</p>

CAPE ST FRANCIS KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>and was there additional weighting given to the economic component?</p> <p>Mr Hardie disagreed with Ms Ball and said that if you spent an extra R8b on roads and works, jobs would be created and houses could then be built.</p>	<p>geomorphology, which technically at this site is very important due to the dune fields. Impacts on wetlands, vertebrate fauna and invertebrate fauna and then economic impacts.</p> <p>Mr Heydenrych said that the economic impacts also paid a key role when regarding Bantamsklip as the least preferred site for Nuclear-1 because it is significantly more expensive in terms of absolute values, it is R8b more expensive than either of the other two sites because of the upgrades that would be required for roads and bridges, as well as the longer transmission line.</p> <p>Ms Ball added that during the integration meeting, the economic specialist put that into context. This works out as three years of low cost housing in this country.</p> <p>Mr Heydenrych said that the question had been asked about whether the different decision factors have been weighted and how they were weighted. He could not go into all the details but the table that is in Chapter 9 of the report, indicates implicitly how the factors have been weighted. All the assumptions that have been made with regards to weighting of various impacts relative to two different sites are indicated clearly in the table.</p>
6	Mr Ryan Donnelly For A Safe Tomorrow	Mr Donnelly said that from his understanding it would appear that the manner in which it is weighted is that Thyspunt is the preferred site for the developer with regards to a nuclear power station. It is not a preferred	Ms Ball replied that all the range of environmental factors were taken into account in the assessment. Obviously for the assessment of the preferred site, the most critical factors were used. Ms Ball added that the majority of the

CAPE ST FRANCIS KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>site as far as environmental views are concerned. He added that with the no-go alternatives, this now means that one of these sites has to be used. His belief is that the no-go alternative is entirely deficient of "independent all-inclusive information".</p> <p>Mr Donnelly said that when he refers to the environment he was talking about the social, biophysical and economic.</p> <p>Mr Donnelly asked if the integration into the grid and the placement in relation to the need are the two main reasons why the power station has been placed at Thyspunt. He went on to say that in his opinion the power station is being placed in this area, not because of environmental impacts but rather as the need of the developer.</p>	<p>specialists were biophysical specialists. They had all agreed that economic factors, integration into the grid, seismic suitability and other biophysical factors were incredibly important in determining which is the preferred site for Nuclear-1. That does mean that other specialist studies have been dismissed, they are also key to the study.</p> <p>Ms Ball said that these were some of the considerations, there were others such as seismic suitability which is one of the key considerations.</p>
7	Dr Shirley Cowling FOSTER	<p>Dr Cowling objected to the statement that this area is going to be a benefit to the environment. The fauna alone will be hugely affected by the trucks. The consultants say that everything can be mitigated, there are facts that are being completely overlooked.</p> <p>Ms Hardie enquired as to why the specialists were not present to answer questions.</p>	<p>Ms Ball said that as environmental consultants, Arcus GIBB need from stakeholders pertinent detailed facts. She asked that anything that was not in the report be submitted to them for inclusion in the final report.</p> <p>Ms Ball replied that this request has been during this round of meetings and as she stated earlier the requests are being considered. .</p>
8	Dr Shirley Cowling FOSTER	<p>Dr Cowling said that the report states quite clearly that the specialists do not fully understand the way the dune system works. It is filled with water and is slurry. Dr Cowling said that at the previous meeting (St</p>	<p>Ms Ball replied there has been a great deal of debate and not all of the scientists agree with each other. Fred Ellery, Werner Ellenberger and Liz Day have had a lot of debate around the dune systems. They are complex, which is</p>

CAPE ST FRANCIS KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		Francis Bay Public Meeting on 15 April), the project manager had said that the specialists do not fully understand the system. She asked why this had not been included in the weighting and the decision-making. All that seems to have been taken into account is seismic suitability and impact on dune geomorphology. She asked what the risk factor is around the incredibly dynamic unpredictable dune system on the site as the site is surrounded by this dune system.	<p>stated clearly in the reports. Werner's report clearly states that he does not foresee a significant impact if the access road crosses over the dunes.</p> <p>Drs. Illenberger and Day and Mr Barrie Low are recognised in their fields of expertise and have been very thorough in their assessments of the site and the potential impacts of constructing and operating a nuclear facility on this site. There was a level of uncertainty in April which has been addressed during the EIA phase of the EIA.</p>
9	Ms Trudi Malan Spokesperson for St Francis Alliance	<p>Ms Malan said that it is very clear and she wished to re-confirm that so far only technical and economical factors have been used to weight this site. She went on to say that Schulpfontein and Brazil were removed due to technical reasons. She wanted to re-confirm that this decision is not environmental, i.e. inclusive of social, biophysical and economic.</p> <p>Ms Malan went on to say that from an environmental perspective, a conservation valley has been proposed. She however feels that as an environmentalist, she sees the environment as a system. What will be done to the marine environment? The impacts on the marine environment in both the studies were not addressed. A tunnel will be constructed which is not addressed in the report.</p> <p>She went on to say that another impact not addressed is the new studies on entrainment of nuclear power reactors along the American Coastline. She had specifically requested that the methods be used when</p>	<p>Ms Ball said that Ms Malan was incorrect with the facts.</p> <p>Ms Ball strongly disagreed that environmental factors were not taken into account in the assessment of the preferred site. Four of the factors were biophysical factors. This assessment was undertaken together with all 24 specialists. The biophysical factors were weighted and taken into account in the assessment.</p> <p>Ms Ball went on to explain that in terms of the EIA methodology, potential short-term, medium-term and long-term impacts were investigated. On a local, regional and national level.</p> <p>In terms of the marine environment, Professor Charlie Griffiths and Dr Tammy Robertson were the specialists. Ms Ball said that she respects Ms Malan who is also a marine specialist, and she encouraged her to give detailed comments. The specialists had looked at the effect of brine and they provided specific mitigation measures.</p>

CAPE ST FRANCIS KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>this is decided. In the documents Koeberg is used as reference. Koeberg is 1,000 MW, this proposed plant is 4,000 MW.</p> <p>The fishing industry in the area is at risk. Eskom state that they might consider letting commercial fishing vehicles into the 1 km exclusion zone. It is however not stated that the brine plume and the plume of the discharge is going to come towards Seal Point. She asked what would happen in the 1 km that the fisherman might be allowed access to. The cumulative impact on the environment is not going to be mitigated away by suddenly making that a conservancy.</p> <p>Ms Malan went on to say that this country is in a new era. There are NEMA regulations, there is also a new Coastal Management Act which precludes hotels, etc being put on the site. Eskom should not say there will be other developments on the site.</p> <p>She asked about the entrainment effects of the 4,000 MW power station that is going to have on the environment. It has been proven in America, in a recent study, that the impact is huge.</p> <p>She went on to say that a desalination plant has been included, normally a desalinisation plant would trigger an EIA. However it seems to have become part of this EIA. She asked that the negatives on the environment of a desalination plant be listed.</p>	<p>Regarding heated water discharge, they also looked at this very specifically and they provided Arcus GIBB with mitigation measures.</p> <p>Ms Ball said that regarding the entrainment of marine organisms into the intake valves, this was also investigated.</p> <p>The issue of water has been raised from the beginning of this process. Alternatives had been examined in order to solve the issue of water. There is groundwater supply and 2 dams in this area, supplying the entire area. The specialist therefore came up with various alternatives which all of the specialists examined. For example, the desalination plant, the footprint and the visual aspects were investigated as was the effect on the marine environment. This has been assessed in detail in this EIA Study.</p> <p>It is appropriate in terms of the NEMA regulations include activities such as a desalination plant into this EIA and not to carry out a separate EIA.</p>
10	Ms Francis [surname]	She said that in terms of the economic impact, it would appear that the entire impact is on Eskom. This	Ms Ball said that as explained this was an integrated assessment, the economic specialist worked closely with all

CAPE ST FRANCIS KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>does not take the economic impact on the community into account at all. She has a business in Sea Vista and she asked if any of the specialists have approached any of the businesses in the area.</p> <p>There is also a municipality that is assessing everyone with very high rates, they are not present at this meeting. The impact on the entire area in terms of property values has not been assessed especially when the envisaged high traffic volumes are considered.</p> <p>She asked which way the wind was blowing and where they were situated when they conducted the noise study.</p>	<p>the other specialists. They assessed the economics on eco-tourism based activities. For example at Bantamsklip there is cut-flower farming, there is tourism activities around the whale watching, there is wine farming. Whereas in this area there is the Chokka Industry and a lot of accommodation establishments and an active tourism industry, the surfing competitions, etc.</p> <p>Post-Meeting Note: The Economic Assessment is attached as Appendix E18 to the Draft Environmental Impact Assessment Report.</p> <p>A macro-economic study was undertaken and they took all the aspects of tourism, agriculture, eco-tourism, property values in consideration, this information is contained in the specialist reports.</p> <p>Ms Ball explained that the noise study was undertaken by Prof. Adriaan Jongens from UCT. She could not say specifically on what day it was taken but she could put these questions to the specialist. He had a number of sampling points on the site. They looked at all the nearest residential areas such as Oyster Bay. A sampling point was just outside Sea Vista and another one on the Kromme River Bridge.</p>
11	Ms Martha Hutchinson Teacher	<p>Ms Hutchinson re-iterated what Mr Hardie had said about the weighting. It would seem from a general point of view that Thyspunt was unfairly weighted. Duynefontein appeared more favourable.</p> <p>She then voiced her objection to two issues. The first one was that conservation benefits at Duynefontein</p>	<p>Mr Heydenrych responded by saying that Koeberg already has a nature reserve, the Koeberg Nature Reserve, which is around Koeberg and includes the area of Duynefontein. Effectively the ecosystem around Koeberg and within Duynefontein where the proposed power plant would be, is already conserved. Eskom has an effective conservation strategy, they removed aliens from the area, the area is</p>

CAPE ST FRANCIS KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>would not be realised as opposed to conservation benefits at Thyspunt. That is very abstract and does not make sense.</p> <p>Her second objection was that there was no formal conservation, she asked that formal conservation be defined. She has been part of the Rebelsrus Nature Reserve and this has been established since the 1970s.</p> <p>Ms Hutchinson said that Rebelsrus was part of a larger conservancy.</p>	<p>also accessible to the public as a recreational resource. It is formally protected.</p> <p>Ms Ball referred to the specialist study which stated that with regards to Thyspunt and Bantamsklip if the remainder of the site is conserved, that would be beneficial from a conservation point of view..</p> <p>The facilitator asked if this is in terms of the Protected Areas Act. Mr Heydenrych replied that this was correct.</p> <p>The facilitator then asked Ms Hutchinson if Rebelsrus Nature Reserve was formally conserved and registered.</p> <p>The requirements for the management of a formally protected area are far more onerous in terms of management and duration when compared with a conservancy. Refer to the In terms of the Protected Areas Act, 2003 (Act No 57 of 2003) and proposed Regulations.</p>
12	Mr Ryan Donnelly For A Safe Tomorrow	Mr Donnelly said that the whole perception that this is going to be a formal conservation area is one thing. However, it is also going to be a high-level radioactive dumpsite.	Comment noted.
13	Mr Joe Oosthuizen St Francis Bay Residents Association	Mr Oosthuizen noted that in terms of the weightings, one of the most important issues that was brought up the previous evening is that the consultants had evaluated five sites that were chosen 30 years ago. Based on this these sites are being weighted. To his mind this is totally wrong. They should have used the same criteria and weighted something near the source	<p>Ms Ball said that she had provided an answer to this the previous evening.</p> <p>The NSIP were done 30 years ago, these were done by independent specialists. They went through a rigorous process and this took 10 years.</p>

CAPE ST FRANCIS KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>of power, where power is needed, so that electricity does not have to be shipped long distances. Eskom has instructed the consultant to give them the most ideal sites for power generation. If there was a blank canvas, this site would not have been selected.</p> <p>South Africans have a prime piece of this country, and this is about to be ruined, with power lines, bridges will be reconstructed, over 100 trucks per day on the roads for 7 - 9 years. It does not make any economic sense. It is wrong to say the economic impact is better in this area, it makes more economic sense to have it closer to where power is needed. The instructions from Eskom to the consultants were flawed right from the beginning.</p> <p>Mr Oosthuizen said that decisions cannot be made on information gathered 30 years ago. In the commercial world, this would be regarded as totally unacceptable.</p> <p>Mr Oosthuizen felt the fairest question would be to ask Eskom if a position closer to the source of energy would be more favourable than this site.</p>	<p>Arcus GIBB took these sites and instructed the specialists to investigate if they were still suitable for this project.</p> <p>The facilitator also asked a question of Eskom that if the planning was done 30 years ago, surely their planning and infrastructure must have changed substantially over the years. She asked what has been done with the grid planning and their load growth centres in that time. How much has that changed since the 1980s because that should be one of the fundamental principles. She asked Eskom to respond to how their planning has changed since 1980.</p> <p>Mr Stott responded that obviously the demographics have changed in the last 30 years. The geology, the coastline, the tides and the wave action have not changed. Therefore these are as valid today as they were 30 years ago. Demographics, agricultural practices, rural population, urban population have definitely changed.</p> <p>In terms of the needs for the country, Mr Stott explained that Eskom do not only need to build one power station, there are more power stations going to be built. Regarding Nuclear-1, from the Consultants' perspective, Thyspunt is the preferred site. However, other sites will be investigated for other power stations as the country needs 40 000MW of new electricity capacity by 2028, of which 20 000 MW has been earmarked for nuclear generation.</p> <p>He went on to explain that from when these statistics were done 30 years ago there was very little demand for electricity in the Eastern Cape, it has now picked up quite</p>

CAPE ST FRANCIS KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>The facilitator explained to participants that the manner in which the national grid is actually configured, and how it feeds into the electricity needs in the Eastern Cape has to be properly understood.</p>	<p>substantially. Power stations in this area are therefore required to support the growing demand in the Eastern Cape and to support the national grid.</p>
14	Mr Chris Barratt St Francis Kromme Trust	<p>Mr Barratt stated that he did not think that Mr Stott had answered the question. He spoke about problems with distribution, that has nothing to do with the situation of a power station if Eskom's current distribution is a problem.</p> <p>He asked for further clarification on the weightings. There have been numerous references to a 2-day meeting. He wanted to know if the minutes of this meeting were available, will they be published and if so why have they not been published to date.</p> <p>Mr Barratt then stated that the map is incorrect as it says estimated load growth points, it should read, estimated weak distribution points on Eskom's grid.</p> <p>Mr Barratt then asked if the 'notes' were available and if not, why because it is information which the public must access (if necessary).</p>	<p>Mr Stott responded by saying that it was not only the distribution that was a problem, it was the entire transmission network in the Eastern Cape is weak. That is the problem that electricity has to be delivered to industry and to residents. Residents only use about 30% of the available electricity in South Africa, 70% of the electricity goes to commercial buildings and industry.</p> <p>Mr Stott disagreed and said the map is accurate. It is based on information that Eskom has received from customers of their projection and of how they are going to expand into the future and therefore what the demand for electricity is going to be.</p> <p>Ms Ball said that there was not only one integration meeting there were three meetings for all of the specialists. There were also sub-cluster groups of meetings. 'Notes' and not minutes were taken of the meetings and they are internal working notes.</p>
15	Ms Cheron Kraak	Ms Kraak said she wanted to follow up on what Dr	Ms Ball said that this was a very important point and it has

CAPE ST FRANCIS KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
	Country Feeling	Cowling had said regarding the dynamic dune system. The new red listing that has been published, there are actually 13 plants that she knows of that occur in the dune system and which are threatened in some way. There are a further 10 which could well occur there. With all due respect to the specialists, if the dune system is trashed those plants will disappear forever and no amount of money will buy them back.	been reinforced by the specialist that the dune system is the most sensitive part of the site. If you have any further information to be past on to the specialist, please submit it in writing. The specialist reports acknowledge the sensitivity of the dune system and provide mitigation measures to minimise the impact on the sensitive wetlands and associated fauna and flora.
16	Mr Hilton Thorpe St Francis Bay Residents Association and St Francis Kromme Trust	Mr Thorpe said that when he saw the loadings on the screen he immediately thought he would like to know how Coega would have scored. He is aware that there are seismic problems at Coega but he is also aware that the brief to Arcus GIBB was 5 sites, they have not done a proper full examination of the potential of Coega. Clearly the economic side of it looks favourable as it is close to Port Elizabeth and the industrial development zone. He feels that what is being offered is damage control. Thyspunt is not a good site but the best must be made of it. That is the message that is being heard, whereas Coega is environmentally degraded, it has got all the infrastructural facilities and even a sub-station next door. There are, however, a couple of questions about this site. He then said that it is going to cost between R5 – R10b just for the infrastructure, to upgrade the roads and take back the power lines from Thyspunt and how could this be directed at mitigating problems found at Coega. This is not being investigated and he objects to this. It is not correct to say that alternatives have been investigated.	Ms Ball responded by saying that he had mentioned the seismic risk and she had mentioned the need for Nuclear-1 within a short space of time. The NSIP reports took 10 years to complete. There is ocean current problems with the Coega harbour, these are some of the issues that lead to the decision that Coega site was not feasible and reasonable for Nuclear-1. This does not mean that Eskom would not consider Coega for Nuclear-2 or 3. Ms Ball emphasised that all 24 specialists found that the three sites that were investigated and which were taken forward into the EIA phase as being suitable for investigation. Ms Ball said that Mr Thorpe's concerns are noted and she understands that he has obtained legal advice on the matter and the consultants would welcome the legal opinion.

CAPE ST FRANCIS KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>Ms Ball has said that this EIA is only concerned with Nuclear-1 and in terms of Nuclear-1 it could be said that these are the alternative sites. They are concerned about a nuclear programme for South Africa, which involves all 5 sites and is going to impact incredibly negatively on this area.</p> <p>Mr Thorpe went on to say that somewhere near Port Elizabeth must be investigated. Until that happens, this is not a proper process. He then asked Ms Ball to explain in detail why Coega was considered unsuitable.</p> <p>Mr Thorpe responded by saying that because Eskom is in a hurry to construct Nuclear-1 there is not time to investigate Coega.</p> <p>Mr Thorpe said that this was an appalling site to use for a nuclear power station but it might be acceptable due to a lack of anything better.</p> <p>Mr Thorpe feels that the lack of investigation is a fatal flaw.</p>	
17	Mrs Paddy Oosthuizen St Francis Bay Residents Association	Ms Oosthuizen said that everyone appeared to be on the same track. She asked if Ms Ball could tell them what the cost would be of upgrading Van Staden's Bridge and the bridge over the Kromme River.	Ms Ball said that she did not have that specific information at hand but would request that these estimates be included in the Final EIR.
18	Mr Mike Simms St Francis Bay Residents Association	Mr Simms said that he understood that the two most important criteria were integration into the national grid the network and second one was seismological risk.	Ms Ball replied that this goes back to issue of alternatives which had been addressed in detail earlier. She confirmed that other sites have not been assessed between Port

CAPE ST FRANCIS KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>What has been seen is that regarding integration into the grid network, the real demand lies in the Eastern Cape whereas this site is almost in the Western Cape. The Eastern Cape demand load is between Port Elizabeth and East London. In terms of using that criteria as integration, this has not been compared to any sites that might exist anywhere between these two towns. Therefore one would question how integration can be weighted into the assessment and whether this is a valid argument to use.</p> <p>In terms of the seismological, his understanding is that they have build nuclear power stations in Japan, in areas on the rim of fire. If they can build a nuclear power station in Japan then what could be wrong with the seismological situation along the whole South African coast between Port Elizabeth and East London.</p>	<p>Elizabeth and East London.</p> <p>Mr Simms is correct there are non standard nuclear power stations, Koeberg is one of them which are specifically designed to withstand seismic conditions.</p> <p>For Nuclear 1 the reason that Thyspunt is preferred is due to its relatively low seismic value compared to Bantamsklip and Duynefontein which provides some certainty that a standardised Nuclear plant can be built on this site. If a standardised plant is not suitable it will take additional time to finalise the specific design and to obtain NNR approval when compared with a standardised plant.</p>
19	Ms Trudi Malan Spokesperson for St Francis Alliance	<p>Ms Malan asked if it is correct that the studies that were used in the 1980s excluded the area between Port Elizabeth and East London. She thinks this is strange as this study is based on policies of the apartheid government as this site was excluded because it was within 100km of the Ciskei.</p> <p>The facilitator asked if the specialist had taken cognisance of the socio-political issues that have changed.</p>	<p>Ms Ball said that Ms Malan is correct. Her understanding of the NSIP report is that sites in the former homelands were not investigated by Eskom.</p> <p>Ms Ball replied that the 5 sites had been investigated and these were deemed to be suitable for Nuclear-1. All of the specialists, including the socio-economic specialist looked at the 5 sites and they did not look at sites all the way up the coast.</p>
20	Mr Ryan Donnelly For A Safe Tomorrow	Mr Donnelly took up the issue of the influx of workers and increase in population in the area. He asked what	Ms Ball said that their understanding is that there will be approximately 7,700 potential jobs at the peak of

CAPE ST FRANCIS KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>kind of an increase in population does the independent consultant envision for this area. He also asked that regarding the job seekers, where would these recruitment areas be and will there be any other recruitment areas. He also asked if there would be a specific bus line going straight to these recruitment areas and no-where else.</p> <p>Mr Donnelly asked if a study has been done on what the total envisaged population influx will be.</p> <p>Mr Donnelly said his concern relates to mitigation with regards to social impact in the area. Mr Stott explained to the meeting on the previous evening that there would be busses going from Humansdorp to the power station and that recruitment would be in Humansdorp. His concern is that Sea Vista, the closest affected community has no priority over the jobs and secondly they would have to travel to Humansdorp to get on the bus to travel back to the power station. He asked if there was going to be a bus that will pick up the residents in Sea Vista.</p>	<p>construction. This would attract workers to the area. The specialist has firmly recommended that at least 25% of the jobs, if possible, are given to local people, within the greater area. The specialist had examined Eskom's case studies in other large construction sites in terms of the potential numbers. Eskom does not appoint people at site, they engage with the department of labour and local government to determine where recruitment will take place.</p> <p>Ms Ball said the social specialist has made estimates in terms of workers, some would bring their families. The estimate is approximately 10,500 people.</p> <p>Ms Ball explained that because this study is still in the EIA phase, the specialist has made recommendations in regard to housing in Jeffreys Bay and Humansdorp and serviced areas there.</p> <p>Ms Herbst said that at Eskom's other sites, they have not limited recruitment to one area. For example at Kusile Power station, which is near Emalahleni, there is Phola which is about 20 km from the power station. Eskom has engaged with the local community leaders and a recruitment area has been set up in Phola. Eskom has also set up a recruitment centre in Emalahleni itself. In a remote area such as the Ingula Pumped Storage Scheme in the Drakensberg, there are lots of rural communities in the mountains, Eskom deals with the Chiefs, the Mayor, the department of labour and the various community leaders and arrangements are made for recruitment. Eskom would not only set up a centre in Humansdorp, it will be set up where it is required based on Eskom's discussions the</p>

CAPE ST FRANCIS KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>Mr Donnelly said that the point that he was trying to establish is that there is no mitigatable measure to deal with the social impacts in Sea Vista other than if Eskom takes on a body such as the Sea Vista Forum to manage and monitor who is a resident of Sea Vista.</p> <p>His last point concerns water. There is a perceived positive because of increase in agriculture in this area. He is a farmer and there has been a drought in the area, he asked if an in-depth water study had been done with regards to total population influx.</p> <p>Mr Donnelly said that he insists that the agricultural report does not indicate a positive impact until such time as the water issue can be sorted out.</p>	<p>department of labour and local government.</p> <p>Ms Ball said that a fresh water supply study was undertaken, they have recommended the desalinisation plant. In terms of the increased agricultural supply and the increased demand for water, she said that she could not answer that question presently but she would take this to the specialist concerned and have the it included in the Final EIR.</p> <p>Post-meeting Note: The Fresh Water Supply Assessment is attached as Appendix E9 to the Draft EIR. The assessment reports that There are no rivers or perennial streams at any of the three alternative sites. Construction and operation of Nuclear-1 will thus not have any direct impacts on surface water supply schemes or catchments. Furthermore, as Nuclear-1 will be developed at coastal sites where groundwater is near the end of the flow path, the only existing groundwater use that could be directly affected are the coastal springs. Any impacts on these springs will be of a localised extent. Desalination of sea water is identified as the most viable alternative for an assured water supply at all three alternative sites. Desalination has the least potential environmental impacts and it would not be affected by climate change.</p>

CAPE ST FRANCIS KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
21	Mr Alwin Malgas Sea Vista Forum	<p>[Parafrese] Mnr Donnelly is besig met 'n punt wat die gemeenskap hard raak. Dié een saak is uiters belangrik, want wat ek nou ontdek het in die verslag van hierdie mense, gaan oor die vis bedryf. Dit is vir my 'n probleem dat Eskom na onse mense toe gegaan het en vertel het van 7,000 werksgeleenthede wat gaan kom. Nou gaan ons binne 'n paar jaar in St Francis Baai se visbedryf sit [met probleme]. Waar gaan onse mense werk kry?</p> <p><u>Translation:</u> Mr Malgas says that Mr Donnelly has brought up a point that will have a big impact on the community. He thinks what he has just discovered in the report is a very important matter, because it is about the fishing industry. He thinks it is wrong that Eskom has gone to his people and told them about 7,000 job opportunities to come. [In reality], within a few years St Francis Bay's fishing industry will be [running into problems because of the construction of the power station]. He asks where his people will get jobs then?</p> <p>He quotes, "thus an exclusion zone of 1km width would account for roughly 1.8% of the total catch, which means there will be a decrease in the total catch annually. This would amount to about 27 tons per annum with an export value of €0.88 per annum". This is devastating for the community. "Either Thyspunt fishing ground were to be closed or as part of the exclusion zone the vessels based in Port St Francis would have to venture afield and therefore the</p>	<p>Ms Ball said that these were very important and serious questions.</p> <p>Mr Heydenrych explained that there might be some confusion about the exclusion zones and security zones. One of the exclusion zones required in terms of the NNR process is a zone that still has to be defined and imposed on Eskom is the so-called Protected Action Zone which is a zone within 800 m of the power station within which there can be no private development. This area is almost entirely within the current Eskom owned property, except for a small portion. There is also another exclusion zone and that is the security zone that is imposed within 1 km of the shore of the Eskom owned land. There may be restrictions on fishing within that zone. There are no other exclusion zones further from the power station.</p> <p>The facilitator asked Mr Malgas how far off shore they fished.</p> <p>Ms Ball said that she will ask the economic specialist to look specifically at the local economics and the effect on the local Chokka Industry.</p> <p>Ms Ball, the Chokka Fishery based in St. Francis Bay fishes all the way up and down the south coast. The Chokka spawning ground is found in depths of less than 50 m, which does fall within the 1 km zone. The specialist Dr Robinson reports that Chokka do spawn all the way out and there would indeed be an economic impact on the local fisheries. However, Dr Robinson said that the fishing boats</p>

CAPE ST FRANCIS KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>companies have to acquire larger vessels,” (which for the smaller ones there is not even a proper market to sell their smaller vessels so how would they be able to afford bigger vessels). “Which would not be able to enter Port St Francis” for which means the community are sitting with a harbour that they cannot use because all the small vessels would not be able to enter Port St Francis. So these companies would have to relocate their operations, which means that the fishermen have to go to Mossel Bay and he did not know if this would be suitable or reliable for the community. However, vessels based in Port Elizabeth that also fish from Thyspunt would also be affected.</p> <p>To summarise, the report says there will be 7,000 jobs available but the fishing industry will be severely affected in the medium and long term.</p> <p>Ms Malgas said that they fished 1.5 km from the shore. He said that they would be within the exclusion zone. He said if anyone went to look at this moment there would be about 40 boats fishing from Thyspunt and within the exclusion zone that is indicated on the map.</p> <p>Mnr Malgas said that every time Ms Ball refers to specialists, the question is did this specialist have any experience, did they ever catch Chokka themselves. Did they ever own or work on a Chokka boat. Mr Malgas said that he was a fisherman and he knows exactly what the situation is.</p>	<p>do move out beyond the site for the Chokka fishing at the moment.</p> <p>Post-meeting note: The Marine Biology Assessment is attached as Appendix E15 to the Draft Environmental Impact Assessment Report (Draft EIR). The report identified the following potential impacts on the marine environment in terms of Chokka squid:</p> <p><u>Disruption of the marine environment during construction</u></p> <p>The construction of an intake and outflow system for cooling water will result in temporary disruption to the marine environment. Under such circumstances the benthic habitat and in particular egg beds of the Chokka squid <i>Loligo vulgaris</i> are at risk of damage due to smothering, while turbidity may result in adults temporarily moving out of the area. This disturbance will be focussed within the construction phase and is likely to be localised and of short duration.</p> <p>Additionally, potential discarding of an estimated 6.37 million m³ of spoil from the excavation of the intake tunnel, nuclear island and turbine hall poses a threat to the marine environment. From a biological perspective potential impacts would occur due to increased turbidity in the water column as a result of the suspension of fine particles and due to smothering of the benthic habitat by spoil placed on the sea floor. At this site only the disposal of all or half the spoil at a deep site using a medium discharge rate are considered acceptable from a marine ecology</p>

CAPE ST FRANCIS KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
			<p>perspective. Following disposal on the seafloor, roughly 3 m of sediment will cover an area of 1.5 or 3 km² depending on whether only half or the full volume of sediment is disposed of. Following disposal, local water movement will result in shifting of the spoil in a north easterly direction towards Seal Point. Within the first five years following disposal the sediment is likely to spread to cover an area of between 8.3 km² and 6 km² in sediment of between 5 and 10 cm. In the next five years loose sediment originally placed on the disposal site is expected to continue to spread in towards Seal Point. If disposal of the full volume of sediment is employed this spoil is likely to spread to cover a small area in the small bay east of Seal Point in 5 – 10 cm of sediment. If disposal of only half the volume of spoil is utilised, this area will not be affected. While the initial disposal site will be lost as a breeding area to Chokka squid <i>L. vulgaris</i>, the areas to which sediment spreads are unlikely to affect these squid as they lay eggs on both sand bottoms and rocky reefs. Sandy bottom communities establishing within sediment originating from the disposal of spoil are likely to be dissimilar to those of surrounding areas. This is due to the fact that this site is dominated by consolidated sands will naturally support different biotic communities to those occurring in loose sediments such as those derived from spoil.</p> <p><u>Release of warmed cooling water</u> No input of warmed water comparable to that of the proposed development exists along this section of coast. As this site lies at the warm end of the Agulhas</p>

CAPE ST FRANCIS KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
			<p>Bioregion it could be argued that a portion of species occurring here may be near the upper end of their temperature tolerance range and hence could be particularly vulnerable to further temperature increase. Although theoretically possible, this is however, unsubstantiated.</p> <p>The fishery of greatest importance in the Thyspunt area is the coastal jigging fishery for Chokka squid <i>L. vulgaris</i>. The major spawning grounds of this species occur between Plettenberg Bay and Algoa Bay and it is here that these squid are targeted during the spawning season. Adult Chokka squid are adapted to a wide temperature range of between 8 and 22°C and are able to cope with rapid changes in water temperature, which allow them to easily move through thermoclines. As such it has been recognised that temperature is probably not a primary factor affecting the distribution of adults, but rather the distribution of their food source. This is reflected in catches peaking following drops in temperature resulting from coastal upwelling. It should be noted that it is not the drop in temperature which drives this change, but rather the process of upwelling. As such, elevated water temperatures resulting from the release of cooling water will not as a matter of course result in lower catches by the fishery.</p> <p>The egg capsules of this species are deposited directly onto the seafloor and develop optimally at temperatures between 12 and 20°C. At temperatures above 22°C egg development is retarded and mortality increases and above 24°C, 100% mortality is reached.</p>

CAPE ST FRANCIS KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
			<p>Based on a background temperature of 19°C egg beds will be able to tolerate a maximum temperature increase near the sea bottom of 3°C. Oceanographic modelling indicates that while a mean increase of 3°C near the seabed will be limited to an area of roughly 0.2km² around the outlets of a 4 000 MW plant, an area of 0.5km² will experience an maximum increase of 3°C or more, if a nearshore pipeline outfall is used .</p> <p>This temperature increase will be focused at depths shallower than 15 m. Modelling also showed that should a channel outflow system be used for a 10 000 MW plant, a mean increase of 3°C would affect less than 0.1 km² but about 2.5 km² would experience a maximum increase of 3°C or more (Models were not constructed to consider this release system for a 4 000 MW plant, but its impact would be less than that of the larger 10 000 MW plant. As egg beds are laid down predominantly in areas shallower than 50 m (unless unfavourable conditions force adult squid offshore), a certain amount of egg mortality is expected, although precise estimates cannot be made as the exact location of egg beds is not known. Nonetheless, the area to be affected is in fact a tiny portion of the spawning ground which is centred between Plettenberg Bay and Algoa Bay (Augustyn 1991). In order to minimise impacts on egg beds the cooling system outflow should be located at a depth of more than 50 m.</p> <p>The release of warmed water is not predicted to have a significantly negative effect on fish, or marine mammals. This is due to their mobility and ability to</p>

CAPE ST FRANCIS KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
			<p>avoid the localised warm water plume. In addition all of these species have wide-ranging distributions which extend far beyond the Thyspunt area. Although these species are likely to avoid the elevated temperatures immediately around the outfall, they are not expected to avoid the area in general.</p> <p>At Thyspunt there is notable potential for the establishment of new warm water species, due to the already high ambient sea temperatures at this site and its proximity to the sub-tropical Natal marine bioregion, which could act as a source of immigration of warm-water species. Climate change related declines in sea surface temperature in this region (Rouault <i>et al.</i> 2009) are unlikely to reduce the risk of establishment of warm water species as water temperatures have declined by less than 1°C over the last two decades. Should the establishment of warm water species occur, it is, however, unlikely to have dramatic impacts on the local ecology as immigrant species will be restricted to a small area warmed to within their thermal tolerance range by the plume.</p>
22	Mr Chris Barratt St Francis Kromme Trust	Mr Barratt said that the specialist report appears to say that there is a fish processing plant in Humansdorp, there is actually one in Port St Francis, which is not mentioned.	Information noted with thanks.
23	Ms Donna Jooste Coetsee Nature's Calling Magazine	Ms Jooste-Coetsee said that regarding conservation, the environment and the sea issues, specialists are being referred to, whenever questions are answered, Ms Ball quotes from the specialists. She asked how many of these specialists live in the area, how many of them fish, how many of them care for the environment.	Ms Ball replied that they had started off with 5 sites ranging from the Northern Cape down to the Eastern Cape. What was specified in the terms of reference to the specialists was that they must consult with local specialists and use local knowledge. They also had to undertake field work in the area. Some of this field work was extensive and some took weeks to complete. Arcus GIBB's criteria was to use

CAPE ST FRANCIS KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
			the best specialists that could be found in South Africa who were internationally renowned. Legislation demands that registered, experienced specialists be appointed. However, none of these specialists actually live in the area.
24	Mr Chris Barratt St Francis Kromme Trust	Mr Barratt asked for confirmation that each one of the specialists has visited this area and can a schedule be supplied of how long each specialist spent in the area.	Ms Ball said that this information is in the methodology section of the reports.. She confirmed that each specialist had spent time in the area and particularly the biophysical specialist. She said she would give actual confirmation of this. Many of the specialists are based in Cape Town. Also each specialists' CV is in the report. There is also a consolidated list of specialists and their full CVs also on the website.
25	Ms Andrea von Holdt Coega Development Corporation and Rebels Rus Nature Reserve Resident	<p>Ms von Holdt asked that the slide with the maps of the vertebrate sensitivity and the consolidated map of all the impacts on vertebrates and invertebrates be displayed. She then asked why the majority of the footprint is not sensitive.</p> <p>She also asked if she was correct in saying that it is 2,400 ha that was investigated and 73.79 is suitable for development and the footprint of the actual vicinity will be approximately 31 ha. When will it be known, where, within this 73 has the footprint will be constructed and will this have an impact on the 800 m radius. She asked this question because she is one of the landowners in the Rebelsrus Nature Reserve and the answer may determine whether she loses her property or not.</p> <p>She went on to say that it is continually mentioned that St Francis Bay and Oyster Bay and Cape St Francis</p>	<p>Ms Ball explained that the fauna is usually dictated by the flora and the habitat types. There are nine different communities including wetland communities on the detailed vegetation map.</p> <p>Ms Ball said that Ms von Holdt was correct. 31 ha is approximately 1.3% of the total area of the land. In terms of the exclusion zones, it is her understanding that it is taken from the centre of the power station.</p> <p>Mr Stott said that the zone was not taken from the centre of the power station, but it is taken from the perimeter of the power station.</p> <p>Mr Heydenrych clarified that the exclusion zone is currently an irregular shape and is defined as the EIA corridor and the power station may be constructed anywhere within that area. Once the power station is actually located, the shape</p>

CAPE ST FRANCIS KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>are the closest residential areas but actually people residing in Rebelsrus Nature Reserve are the closest.</p> <p>She also made a suggestion that the power station be constructed in the western section of the area so that these residents are not affected.</p> <p>Ms von Holdt then asked about the view shed analysis that was done. She asked if the visual specialist actually investigate the area where Rebelsrus houses are situated to determine whether it will be visible from this area.</p> <p>Ms von Holdt suggested that an Environmental Monitoring Committee be established. This committee should be made up of the developer, residents in the area, members of environmental authorities and local municipal authorities. This would ensure an opportunity for communities to be part of the development and to ensure that it does happen based on the requirements of the permits.</p> <p>Ms von Holdt said that specialists usually have a 3D photograph/diagram where they superimpose what the building would look like. Does Arcus GIBB have anything similar to show the audience? She does not know what this power station is going to look like and the slide is not clear.</p>	<p>of the exclusion zone will change. There would have to be a process of optimising the location as far as possible on a detailed level.</p> <p>Ms Ball said that they have recommended that the final positioning within this area needs to be investigated with the specialists and would obviously, if this were authorised, the DEA would build this into a condition and set a time frame.</p> <p>Ms Ball said that the specialist had looked at an area 16 km from the potential EIA corridor and they looked particularly the views from along the coastline. They also looked from existing residential areas.</p> <p>Ms Ball said that this was a firm recommendation in the Environmental Management Programme.</p> <p>Mr Stott confirmed that Eskom does this for all their projects.</p> <p>Mr Heydenrych, using the slide, clarified that there were two analysis undertaken by individual specialists basically on worst case scenarios, looking firstly 65m (station) and at the 95m mast which was for meteorological purposes. The visual specialist looked at the two heights and Arcus GIBB recommended that in terms of the meteorological mast that that should not be the preferred alternative and they have</p>

CAPE ST FRANCIS KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		She asked that some sort of plant be put onto the slide even if it is not the exact plant, specifically indicating height. She asked that the worst-case scenario be illustrated.	<p>recommended other technology.</p> <p>Mr Heydenrych explained that Eskom has not gone through the commercial process as yet so the type of plant is still unknown.</p> <p>Post-meeting Note: A 3D representation is currently being prepared by the Visual Specialist.</p>
26	Mr Derek Cook Macohy Investments	He asked who pays specialists who are involved in the environmental monitoring committees. If Eskom pays them, there might be the perception that they are biased towards Eskom.	Ms Herbst replied that for the Medupi Power Station, Eskom has a specialist in the Environmental Management Committee and he is reimbursed for his travel and contribution. Obviously Eskom do pay as someone has to pay for the specialists. At Ingula Pumped Storage Scheme, Eskom has partnership with NGOs and there is specific work and baselines that are done for Eskom that is paid for but they do act independently and they bring in other conservation specialists many of them come without expecting payment.
27	Mr Petrus Leen Sea Vista Forum	<p>Mnr Leen sê hy verstaan daar was 24 spesialiste. Hy wil graag weet: voordat hierdie gesamentlike verslag opgestel was, wat was elke een se bevindings, en wat dan as hulle as gemeenskap verskil met hierdie 24 spesialiste?</p> <p>Mnr Leen sê hy wil sekerheid verkry. As hy die visbedryf vat, was dit net een kamp wat die studie deurgegaan het, of was dit twee verskillende? Hy vra dit sodat hulle duidelikheid kan kry oor wat hulle bevindinge was.</p>	<p>Mnr Hydenrych antwoord dat elkeen van die 24 spesialis verslagte ook ingesluit is in die verslag so almal na die individuele verslagte kan kyk. Hulle het elkeen onafhanklik gewerk maar daar was ook sekere spesialiste wat saam gewerk het, soos die biofisiese spesialiste. Maar elke een van die spesialiste het op sy eie sy bevinding bereik and Arcus GIBB het die bevindinge saamgevoeg.</p> <p>In die meeste gevalle in elke spesialisveld was dit 'n aantal individuele besluite, maar byvoorbeeld wat die mariene bioloë betref was daar twee spesialiste. In die sosiale span was daar vier of vyf mense. Daar was ook onafhanklike</p>

CAPE ST FRANCIS KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p><u>Translation:</u> Mr Leen says his understanding is that there were 24 specialists. He would like to know what the findings were of each one, before the EIR was compiled. What happens if the community differs from the findings of the 24 specialists?</p> <p>Mr Leen says he wants more clarity: in looking at the fishing industry, for example, was only one ["camp" studied/studying][meaning unclear], or were there two different camps? He asks this in order to get more clarity about their findings.</p>	<p>mense wat die studies oorweeg het uit 'n wetenskaplike oorpunt om te sien of die metodes korrek was, om seker te maak dat die bevindinge korrek is.</p> <p><u>Translation:</u> Mr Heydenrych replies that each of the 24 specialist reports is also included in the report so that each can be studied individually. The specialists for the most part worked independently of each other, but there were also certain specialists that worked together, e.g. the biophysical specialists. But each of the specialists reached their own conclusions, and Arcus GIBB compiled their findings into one report.</p> <p>In most cases, each specialist field was handled by an individual, although in the case of marine biology, for example, there were two people, and the social team consisted of four or five people. There were also independent consultants who looked at the studies from a scientific point of view to ensure that the correct methodology was used that would lead to valid findings.</p>
28	Mrs Cheron Kraak Country Feeling	Mrs Kraak commented on the school. For at least 14 years the Sea Vista Primary School has needed new buildings and it is her understanding that due to the power station being built in this area that no new buildings have been constructed. She asked if new buildings would be constructed if the proposed power station is built in this area.	<p>Ms Herbst replied that she would reply using the example of other projects. . The Eskom Development Foundation will investigate the area and concentrate on those areas close to the site that are in most need and they identify what they can contribute. In areas surrounding other Eskom projects, schools have benefited by having classrooms added and even a facility for a teacher has been added to a school. When determining what is required at a school Eskom works closely with the Department of Education.</p> <p>Ms Ball said that this should be answered by the DEA.</p>

CAPE ST FRANCIS KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		Ms Kraak asked if the power line route has not yet been decided, what happens if Duynefontein power route is preferable than Thyspunt route.	However, she explained that there are three separate EIAs being undertaken and if there is a fatal flaw in the transmission lines, this nuclear power station will not be constructed, even if authorisation had been granted for the plant.
29	Mr Alwin Malgas Sea Vista Forum	Mr Malgas said that he feels that Eskom is now putting a smart idea forward. He asked why they have been silent on helping the community, he has never heard of an Eskom Development Foundation before. He feels that Eskom has attended meetings in order to tell the community that they will spend towards a school. He said there is land available in St Francis Bay that belongs to the Department of Environmental Affairs.	Ms Herbst said that she was merely using examples from other Eskom projects.
30	Mr Chris Barratt St Francis Kromme Trust	Mr Barratt stated that in the specialist report the Sea Vista school was shown as between 15 and 18 km from the site. He pointed out that in fact it is 10 km from the site. This is another of the many anomalies that are in the report.	Post-meeting note: Sea Vista is 12 km from the Thyspunt site.
31	Mr Helmie Tilders FOSTER	Mr Tilders asked for the access road slide to be displayed. He commented that this road will affect the residences of St Francis and Sea Vista more than anything else in this entire project. It has been quoted that 825 vehicles will use the road in the morning, over a three hour period that is about 1 vehicle every 20 seconds. In the evening 500 vehicles over a 2-hour period, which also means a vehicle every 15 – 20 seconds. How would this affect Sea Vista, where the trucks all slow down to take the corner? This has not been well	Ms Ball responded that these concerns are noted. Social, noise, traffic, biophysical concerns have all been noted. A follow up meeting has been arranged with Key Stakeholders and these aspects will be discussed in more detail.

CAPE ST FRANCIS KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>investigated, in the original report of the 1980s there was no eastern access route. He feels that economics should not determine where the road is placed. A plan should be formulated to bring it from the north or the north-west.</p> <p>It has been mentioned that all roads will be tarred, so therefore a tarred road could be constructed on the northern side.</p> <p>There is also the matter of the Sand River crossing which has been a constant problem and then there is a dip at the Seekoie River near Humansdorp.</p> <p>He emphasised that this one road will affect everyone living in St Francis Bay to Cape St Francis including Sea Vista residents in an incredibly negative way.</p>	
32	Mr Chris Barratt St Francis Kromme Trust	Mr Barratt added that Ms Ball had said that there would be a 24-hour shift at the power station. The impact will be vastly different if there are trucks using the roads on a 24-hour basis and not only during daylight hours.	<p>Ms Ball said that the social specialist has made recommendations in terms of working hours.</p> <p>Post-meeting Note: The Social Impact Assessment attached as Appendix E19 of the Draft EIR recommends the following mitigation measure (pg.178) –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction activities and vehicle movement should be restricted to daylight hours.
33	Mr Alwin Malgas Sea Vista Forum	Mr Malgas said that noise had been discussed previously. He asked that the specialists must bear in mind that in Sea Vista, houses are not constructed with 9-inch walls. The noise is going to be heard by the community and this will impact greatly on the lives of the community.	Comment noted.

CAPE ST FRANCIS KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
34	Dr Shirley Cowling FOSTER	Dr Cowling said that regarding the eastern access route, one of the major stakeholders is the Kouga council and she wanted to know if they have had any input into the report, particularly concerning the yellow eastern access road. If they have, this input is not indicated in the report.	Ms Ball responded she could not recall if the Kouga municipality had attended any of the meetings. Kouga Municipality is a key stakeholder and has been invited to comment on the report.
35	Ms Francis [Surname]	<p>She stated that she finds it hard to believe that the municipality has not been more active in commenting on this development. In the latest newsletter from the municipality, it is claimed that 95 houses have been built in Sea Vista during the last year but not one house has been built. Community issues have to be addressed and the municipality must become involved.</p> <p>She said that meetings with the municipality must include other stakeholders so that they can be questioned in the public domain.</p>	<p>The facilitator suggested that the municipality be formally approached for comment.</p> <p>Ms Herbst said that Eskom have held general discussions with the Kouga Municipality but she is not sure whether the specific issues concerning the access roads have been discussed.</p> <p>Ms Ball said that the Kouga Municipality had been formally invited to this meeting.</p>
36	Ms Trudi Malan Spokesperson for St Francis Alliance	<p>Ms Malan said there were two issues that needed to be addressed. She took exception to the yellow area being removed from the one slide.</p> <p>She then addressed Eskom and said that they have held several meetings with the local authority and these meetings have progressed to the stage that housing areas have been identified. These meetings have been held privately and the constituents from this community know nothing about these meetings. None of the ratepayers were invited to these meetings. She said that Eskom cannot hold meetings with the municipality in private. When Ms Malan phoned the municipality earlier that day to ascertain</p>	Mr Stott said that Ms Malan's insinuations are incorrect. It is true that Eskom has held discussions with the municipality as they had asked Eskom to come and see them when this site was chosen as one of the possible sites in the Scoping Report. They wanted to discuss both housing and rezoning. However, no decisions have been made as until authorisation is gained Eskom cannot move forward.

CAPE ST FRANCIS KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>who from their organisations would be attending this meeting she was told that no-one would be attending as the municipality are in discussions with Eskom.</p> <p>Ms Malan asked Eskom to address a letter to the municipality stating that no decisions have been made regarding housing.</p>	<p>Eskom will communicate this aspect with the municipality.</p>
37	A Stakeholder Cape St Francis	<p>She asked Mr Stott if the municipality were aware of the road that would go right through the village of St Francis Bay as well as the expansion of the bridge. She also asked if they were aware of the number of trucks that would be travelling along this road.</p>	<p>Mr Stott said that the municipality had received the same documentation and so they should be aware of all the data.</p> <p>This information will be shared formally with the Kouga Municipality.</p>
38	Francis [Surname]	<p>She stated that given that the major argument is that there is more power needed and it is needed soon. Given the fact that this power station is going to take 20 years to build, she does not understand why this is being proposed. She wanted a timeframe overview of all the processes. Timing is not a justifiable argument.</p>	<p>Ms Ball said that in the scoping phase, timing of all the permits was presented at the meetings. She said she could include this as an appendix to the final EIA report.</p> <p>Mr Stott explained that this particular project will take 7 years for construction, not 20 as mentioned by the speaker</p> <p>Mr Stott indicated that the speaker might be referring to the Integrated Resource Plan that the government is undertaking which will investigate a 20 year horizon. This plan should be issued in June 2010 and will indicate all the technologies that are required and by when they are required.</p> <p>Mr Stott added that energy planning will not end after 20 years, there have to be plans far beyond that period.</p>
39	Mr Ryan Donnelly For A Safe Tomorrow	<p>Mr Donnelly said that he is not comfortable with the independent environmental consultants looking at Thyspunt as a nature reserve because in reality it would be a waste dump. It would be a dangerous</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

CAPE ST FRANCIS KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>place that is why there are limitations placed on the area. Therefore he does not feel that it should be listed as a benefit. He asked that the consultants amend their positive impact to somehow include that aspect.</p> <p>In the beginning there was reference made to studies done on muscles with respect to radioactive contamination, he asked who did these studies and what studies have been done on human health and also who had conducted these studies (at Koeberg).</p> <p>Mr Donnelly added that as they were interested and affected parties in this area where they may well be subjected to similar emissions, could they see the studies. He also asked if any of these studies are done independently.</p> <p>Mr Donnelly also said that regarding all of the studies these are stacked up like dominoes. Should one fall, most of the others would also fall. He requested that the consultants undertake all the necessary studies to ensure that the information is as accurate as possible.</p>	<p>Ms Ball responded by explaining that the model of the Koeberg Power Station had been used, which is a Generation 2 type of nuclear power station.</p> <p>Ms Ball said that Prof Charlie Griffiths and Dr Tammy Robinson had conducted the marine specialist study, they did the same tests at Koeberg. She is unaware who Koeberg uses for health and safety monitoring.</p> <p>Ms de Villiers from Eskom explained that the health monitoring goes through the environmental survey and it is monitored through the NNR there are spot checks by the International Atomic Energy Agency.</p> <p>Ms de Villiers said they are available, at the moment Mr Mike Kantey has a full set of the studies from 1984 until 2006. If a nuclear power station was built, one of the things that would have to be done before commencement would be to obtain a baseline of what radioactive levels already exist in the area. Ms de Villiers said she would have to check if the initial studies were independent, the studies undertaken monthly, Koeberg provide the monitoring which is then checked by the NNR and spot checked by the International Atomic Energy Agency.</p> <p>Ms Ball said that this EIA did not cover health and safety issues that would fall under the NNR. Ms Ball agreed that</p>

CAPE ST FRANCIS KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>He also noted that East London did not appear to be a perceived growth as far as power was concerned, and he asked if there is a reason for this.</p> <p>Mr Donnelly asked for the slide on wind issues be displayed. What had been established from Ms Karin de Villiers is that the studies done on routine emissions and effects of them on the surrounding areas is usually conducted by the power company. When he examined the specialist report, it indicates that the information comes from two vendors. He is sceptical about the information that it is not independent of those who stand to profit from it.</p> <p>He went on to say that if the information is examined, he notes that the blue line represents a line that is an annual overdose, which is considered legally an overdose where no-one is allowed to dose anyone above that amount. His question was what will this mean for the residents and landowners at Rebelsrus, which is inside of the blue line. He does not object to the information – but he does object to the <u>source</u> of the information.</p>	<p>there was a huge amount of integration in these studies, that is the nature of the EIA, the specialists were required to verify information included in their studies.</p> <p>Mr Stott said that in reality the whole Eastern Cape needed power and the yellow indication on the map should be amended to reflect this.</p> <p>Ms Ball said that Mr Donnelly is correct, the air quality specialist took the most conservative estimates. They do come from potential vendors, one of which is Areva.</p> <p>Mr Heydenrych explained that the diagram indicates that according to the calculations of the independent air quality specialist, the doses that would actually occur on the site. These are above the legal limits, they are well within the limits.</p>
40	Ms Tanja Lategan Supertubes Surfing Foundation	<p>Ms Lategan asked about the private land and how much more land would need to be purchased and what process would that involve. This refers to access roads as well, would land be purchased for the roads.</p> <p>She added that there was talk of 4,000 ha piece of land being owned by Eskom.</p>	<p>Ms Ball responded that the specialist has recommended upgrades of the road to Humansdorp, which would necessitate purchasing servitudes, etc.</p> <p>Mr Stott said that if the project is approved, roads will have to be upgraded. Eskom does this in collaboration with the SANRAL as well as the Provincial and Local Government. Servitudes would most probably have to be purchased.</p>

CAPE ST FRANCIS KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
			Eskom cannot own roads. Negotiations would be held with landowners. Eskom does not have expropriation rights, if there was an unwilling seller, Eskom would have to approach the Minister to deal with this.
41	Ms Trudi Malan Spokesperson for St Francis Alliance	<p>Ms Malan asked Mr Stott to explain what will happen within Humansdorp. There is a huge social impact in Humansdorp and yet the people of this town seem to be unaware of the fact that hundreds of vehicles may go through their town each day.</p> <p>Ms Malan said that as previously stated, during the scoping process she had asked questions about access roads and she was told that this was unknown. Now in the draft EIA Report there is an access road with heavy traffic. The accumulative impact of this is huge. She said that she could not find the explanation for how the trucks will go from the N2 to the town of Humansdorp in the traffic study.</p>	<p>Ms Ball said that this presentation was given in Humansdorp three days previously.</p> <p>Ms Ball asked Ms Malan that if she knows of any organisations or key stakeholders or members of the public in this area, not only in Humansdorp, that would like to get involved in the project, please provide details to the team. The public meeting held was extensively advertised.</p> <p>The facilitator asked regarding any additional stakeholders that are identified, has there been a decision made regarding the comment period, as they would need to have time to comment.</p> <p>Ms Ball said that anyone could join the process at any time. She went on to say that it has been proposed to extend the comment period to the 31 May 2010.</p>
42	Mr Ryan Donnelly For A Safe Tomorrow	Mr Donnelly asked if a specific study could be done on the impacts on Humansdorp regarding the roads.	<p>Ms Ball said that there is a traffic study that had examined this and that separate EIAs will have to be undertaken for road upgrade or new roads.</p> <p>Post-Meeting Note: The Transportation Assessment attached as Appendix E25 to the Draft EIR has indicated where upgrades will be required in terms of the existing road infrastructure. The application for Environmental Authorisation further includes the following listed activities in terms of GN 386 and GN</p>

CAPE ST FRANCIS KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
			<p>387:</p> <p>GN 386 (15) The construction of a road that is wider than 4 metres or that has a reserve wider than 6 metres, excluding roads that fall within the ambit of another listed activity or which are access roads of less than 30 metres long.</p> <p>GN387 (5):</p> <p>The route determination of roads and design of associated physical infrastructure, including roads that have not yet been built for which routes have been determined before the publication of this notice and which has not been authorised by a competent authority in terms of the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations, 2006 made under section 24(5) of the Act and published in Government Notice R385 of 2006, where-</p> <p>(a) it is a national road as defined in section 40 of the South African National Roads Agency Limited and National Roads Act, 1998 (Act 7 of 1998);</p> <p>(b) it is a road administered by a provincial authority;</p> <p>(c) the road reserve is wider than 30 metres; or</p> <p>the road will cater for more than one lane of traffic in both directions.</p>
43	Ms Trudi Malan Spokesperson for St Francis Alliance	Ms Malan asked where the trucks will actually travel. Presently this road would not be able to cope with the volume and the weight of the trucks. It is stated in the report that a preliminary assessment of the route from Port Elizabeth Harbour to the site was undertaken as part of the study. The preferred route is shown in Figure 10.14. She pointed out the Figure 10.14 was	Ms Ball said that her comments were noted and she thanked her for pointing out the missing figure. She undertook to go back to the specialist study and get the figure posted onto the website. Ms Ball said that all comments were noted and these are draft reports and all comments will be addressed.

CAPE ST FRANCIS KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>not in the transportation report. Furthermore she said that the report states that if the movement of exceptionally heavy loads is required, Eskom will undertake a detailed study of the transportation route from Port Elizabeth harbour to the Thyspunt site. Presently, the public is commenting on a draft EIA report without half of the information, she said that this is unfair practice. She asked when are the Eskom studies going to be available.</p> <p>Ms Malan said that she was not being paid to do this study, but the specialists have been paid a lot of money. Ms Malan feels that she is being asked to go through each study and pick out errors.</p>	<p>Post-meeting Note: Unfortunately the figure referred to was omitted from the Draft EIR. The figure is available on both websites (www.eskom.co.za and www.gibb.co.za) and in all public venues from 24 May 2010.</p>
44	Mr Chris Barratt St Francis Kromme Trust	Mr Barratt said he would like to back up Ms Malan on the traffic and transportation issue as the process was flawed.	Comment noted.
45	Dr Peter Inman Coega Development Corporation	Dr Inman made a suggestion from the experience gained at Coega. Heavy construction traffic should be separated from the vehicles bringing people to site, as it is best practice. At Coega, they had two routes, one for the busses going through Motherwell with a proper drop-off point carefully designed to get people safely to site and then there was a totally separate road for the heavy traffic.	Suggestion noted, with thanks.
46	Ms Cheron Kraak Country Feeling	Ms Kraak noted that in the marine studies there had been no mention made of surfing or about Jeffery's Bay, which is a wonder of the world when it comes to surfing. Surfing has put Jeffrey's Bay on the map. There are thousands of people who exist due to the surfing tourism. Approximately 2 years ago they had	<p>Ms Ball said that the surfing and tourism issues were in the tourism study and not in the marine specialist study.</p> <p>Ms Ball said that in terms of the sand, the recommendation from the specialist is that the pipeline would have to be 1.2 to 1.8 km out to sea, directly from the power station.</p>

CAPE ST FRANCIS KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>obtained objections from surfers all around the world. When she wanted to submit these objections she was told that they were not relevant.</p> <p>Her second point was how would the surf be affected by all of the sand and the heat that would be pumped into the ocean. There are sensitive sand dunes in Jeffrey's Bay that cause the natural wave.</p>	<p>Ms Ball undertook to make sure that the oceanographic specialist (WSP) has taken this into account.</p> <p>Ms Ball said that the marine specialist actually used the modelling from the oceanographic study as a basis to see how much of the area would potentially be covered with sand. The oceanographic modelling showed that it would be 3 km² at first and then a further 6 km² after a number of years.</p>
47	Mr Ryan Donnelly For A Safe Tomorrow	<p>Mr Donnelly requested that a special study be undertaken on the surfing industry. It is a complex and involved subject that has a big impact on the economics of the whole town.</p> <p>Mr Donnelly said that he owns an organic farm and he would like to know how this nuclear power station is going to affect his chances of organic certification.</p> <p>He then requested that the entire process must not proceed any further until there is enough material information to be able to make informed comment.</p>	<p>Ms Ball said that his comments are noted in terms of the material information aspect.</p> <p>Post-meeting Note: The Economic Assessment attached as Appendix E18 to the Draft EIR reports that although Jeffrey's Bay is beyond the 20 km radius of Thyspunt, there are strong negative perceptions in sections of the population there about the impact of a NPS. This was ascertained both during field interviews and through the comments in the interested and affected parties' response trail. Thus, Jeffreys Bay is dealt with briefly. Tourism dominates the economy of the town, and is heavily based on surfing. The normal population of 40,000 swells to 100,000 over Christmas and New Year and to 50,000 during the Billabong Pro International surfing competition over ten days in July. This is one of eleven world championship events, and is the most important surfing event in the country¹. According to the Tourism Impact report (Imani 2009), the turnover of accommodation establishments in</p>

¹ Jeffreys Bay is widely recognised as South Africa's premier surfing spot with the world's longest right-hand wave break.

CAPE ST FRANCIS KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
			<p>Jeffreys Bay amounts to R633 million per annum. It proposes the following mitigation measure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An aggressive public relations campaign aimed at international product markets (e.g., in the case of squid fishing) or international bodies (e.g., the International Association of Surfing Professionals) to counter negative perceptions and boycotts of local products and events. This is an avoidance measure.
48	Mr Chris Barratt, Mr Paddy Oosthuizen and Mr Donnelly	<p>They requested for an additional 90 days to be added to the Draft EIA report review period.</p> <p>Mr Donnelly said the reason for the request is that the Sea Vista community still have not had the opportunity to begin their studies as there have not been Afrikaans and Xhosa Reports issued. If they cannot access information they cannot comment.</p>	<p>The request was noted for consideration.</p> <p>Ms Ball said that there would not be Afrikaans and Xhosa reports produced and this has been discussed with DEA. Presentations will be translated.</p>
49	Mr Hilton Thorpe St Francis Bay Residents Association and St Francis Kromme Trust	<p>Mr Thorpe wanted to follow up on the pumping of the sand out to sea. There was a proposal to pump sand from the site to St Francis Bay, where there is a beach erosion problem, he asked what had become of that proposal.</p> <p>Mr Thorpe added that there is a holding operation going on at the moment, which may be successful in stopping any further erosion. The erosion has gone so far already, however, that there are major problems.</p>	<p>Ms Ball replied that the study had been tracked down and she has spoken to the consultants and a solution has been found. Basically it was dismissed as an alternative for the soil disposal because the proponents told us that they had found a solution.</p>
50	Mr Helmie Tilders FOSTER	<p>Mr Tilders confirmed what Mr Thorpe and Mr Barratt have said. He also emphasised the request for a 90 day extension on the comment period. One of the</p>	<p>Request noted.</p>

CAPE ST FRANCIS KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>reasons for this is that the whole surfing community grows during winter and they should be given time to comment.</p> <p>His second point of concern is the sand being pumped into the sea. How will this affect the squid industry? An area of about 1 km is an exclusion zone, and then if sand is pumped into the sea, the current flows from west to east, therefore there will be an area of up to about 6 km of swirling sand in the current. Squid do not like swirling sand, which makes him worried that not only the exclusion zone will be affected, but rather an entire area will be affected. This needs to be addressed in detail.</p>	<p>Ms Ball replied that this comment has been noted and will take it back to the two specialists for them to study further.</p>
51	Mr Alwin Malgas Sea Vista Forum	<p>Mr Malgas wanted to know if Seal Point was also going to be affected. Squid prefer clear water and if there is a lot of sand, it will affect them.</p> <p>Mr Malgas then said that if the Sea Vista community had been considered from the beginning, would the reports have been in their language. He feels that this community is being neglected. Arcus GIBB cannot attend a meeting and expect to explain this large amount of reports in just two hours. He feels that it is their democratic right to have the reports in their own language. DEA have no local knowledge and are not considering the community.</p> <p>Mr Malgas said that Sea Vista was predominantly Afrikaans and Xhosa speaking. He asked that no terminology be used at the meeting at Sea Vista.</p>	<p>The facilitator asked Mr Malgas about the level of reading literacy in Sea Vista to establish if it would be beneficial to put the reports into another language if there are high levels of illiteracy.</p> <p>Ms Ball said that the meeting at Sea Vista would be presented in simple language. It will be presented in Afrikaans and Xhosa.</p>

CAPE ST FRANCIS KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		Mr Malgas asked if DEA could be convinced that Sea Vista is a key stakeholder and are an affected community.	Ms Ball noted that participants could make this request directly to DEA.
52	Ms Trudi Malan Spokesperson for St Francis Alliance	<p>Ms Malan noted that although this EIA did not cover the power lines, the power lines have been used to exclude Bantamsklip as a preferred site from the study. In the economic impact assessment, the loss due to lack of power supply balance, actually balances the fact that you move those because it is closer to the grid. The loss due to balance is less at Bantamsklip than at Thyspunt. Further in the economic impact assessment it is stated that at Thyspunt there is a need to remove 6.4 million cubic metres of sand and bedrock. At Duynefontein there is a need to remove 6.5 million cubic metres. At Thyspunt there is no time delay and at Duynefontein there is a huge time delay. She asked for an explanation.</p> <p>Ms Malan also asked that the distance from Thyspunt to Vaalputs is actually 960 km and not 930 km. From Bantamsklip to Vaalputs it is 887 km. That makes a difference when you examine transport costs. These are the type of things that were used in the economic assessment to weight and then to pick Thyspunt. There are numerous mistakes in the economic impact assessment.</p> <p>Ms Malan then asked if Koeberg is 1.800 MW how big does the land have to be on which Koeberg is placed.</p> <p>She feels that there might be an error in the amount of</p>	<p>Ms Ball stated that any mistakes in any of the reports would impact the assessment. Dr Cowling had approached Ms Ball and asked is there is a way of commenting on the weighting, and there is a way – comments on the specialist reports and comments on Arcus GIBB's weighting and conclusions and recommendations are welcome. She encouraged everyone to provide detailed comment.</p> <p>This error will be corrected in the Transportation Study contained in the Final DEIR.</p>

CAPE ST FRANCIS KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		land being set aside for Nuclear-1.	
53	Mr Petrus Leen Sea Vista Forum	<p>Mnr Leen het gesê sy bekommernis is dat daar baie gepraat is oor die Thyspunt stasie, maar sy probleem is wanneer daar begin word met konstruksiewerk vir sewe jaar, wat met die toerismebedryf gaan gebeur.</p> <p>Sy tweede punt is dat mense wat [vakasie]huise daar het, moeg gewerk is in Johannesburg en die ander groot plekke. Hulle kom hierheen om uit te rus. Sal [die konstruksiefase] nie vir hulle uitforseer vir sewe jaar nie?</p> <p>Sy derde vraag is wat dit gaan doen aan die eiendomsmark indien mense hier hul huise verkoop. As al hierdie dinge aan die gang is, gaan dit nie 'n breekpunt bring nie? Hy is 'n sub-kontrak werker en hy voel dat hy vir sewe jaar nie verseker sal wees dat hy gaan werk kry nie.</p> <p>Hy wil ook weet wat met die mense in die visbedryf gaan gebeur.</p> <p>Hy merk op, as voorsitter van die sektor-polisiëring, dat daar waarskynlik 'n invloei gaan voorkom van mense wat hoor dat hier 'n projek gaan wees. Hy wonder watter effek gaan so 'n invloei van mense hê op die huidige inwoners, aangesien hulle alreeds 'n probleem met instroming het.</p> <p><u>Translation:</u> Mr Leen said that a lot has been said about the Thyspunt station, but that his concern was what would</p>	<p>Mr Heydenrych het geantwoord en gesê hulle neem kennis van al die bekommernisse.</p> <p><u>Translation</u> Mr Heydenrych replied that they take note of all the concerns.</p>

CAPE ST FRANCIS KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>become of the tourism industry during the seven years of the construction phase.</p> <p>His second point is that the people that have [holiday] homes in Thyspunt, are drained by their work in Johannesburg and other big places and come there for tranquillity and rest. Would the construction phase not drive them away for seven years?</p> <p>His third question is what this will do to the property market if people start selling their homes. Would all these things together not lead to a breaking point? He is a sub-contract worker himself and feels that for seven years he will not be assured of a job.</p> <p>He also wants to know what would happen to people in the fishing industry.</p> <p>He also wants to comment in his capacity as chair of policing sector that there is likely to be an influx of people once it becomes known that a large building project was being undertaken. He wonders about the effect of such an influx [on the current residents], seeing that there is already a problem with influx.</p>	
54	Dr Peter Inman Coega Development Corporation	Dr Inman stated that the reason Coega had attended the meeting was that the whole point of the Industrial Development Zone was to try and add value to the beneficiation of raw materials. Some people have referred to them as 'The Banana Republic'. If there is going to be beneficiation of raw materials, where this is going to be done and which power station is going	Comments noted.

CAPE ST FRANCIS KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>to be used is another argument. He does understand the concerns. The point is, when there was the power crisis, suddenly the confidence of the country disappeared. A number of investors immediately stopped and would not sign and they have letters from banks saying, until guarantees are given nothing will be signed. This is impacting the entire country.</p> <p>Water is a problem in this area and he feels a separate EIA should be done to investigate the water. Emergency response plan is also a critical issue for a nuclear power station. Have Eskom thought of air transport. If people need to be evacuated in a hurry, is there a facility for air transport.</p>	<p>Post-meeting Note: Air evacuation is not considered in the Emergency Response Report which is attached to the Draft EIR as Appendix E26. A helipad will however be constructed in a suitable area and will be used as and when required. It may also be used when the helicopter is required to assist with the lifting of heavy equipment. The helipad will require aviation fuel storage of 5 m³.</p>
55	Mr George Hardie Goed Geloof Farm/St Francis Conservancy	Mr Hardie said that objections and comments have been raised all day and in each instance they were told that it would be referred to the specialists. He asked if their replies would be made public. Also, will the impacts arising from these concerns be made public especially if it reduces the viability of Thyspunt as the preferred site? This community want Thyspunt to be the third preferred site and if their objections have had an impact on the choice of site.	Ms Ball explained that they receive comments all the time. Arcus GIBB receive these comments in the form of an Issues and Response Report every Monday at 10h00. Arcus GIBB respond to these issues and this can sometimes take a few weeks as they need to go back to each specialist. The response that is then inserted into this report will be partially Arcus GIBB's response and partially the specialists response. If there is a long submission, Arcus GIBB usually responds as soon as this submission is finalised. A combined Issues and Response report will then be placed in the final EIA Report. If there are substantive changes to any of the reports, those reports would have to be taken back into the public domain for comment. If there are no substantive changes in the reports, then track changes are used in the necessary report and also track changes would be used in the final EIA Report. At the stage

CAPE ST FRANCIS KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
			<p>when they are ready to publish the final EIA Report, this would be communicated to all registered I&APs as well as place adverts in the local, regional and national newspapers to say that the final EIA report is now complete and has been submitted to DEA. The report would then be made available for information purposes on the websites, in the various public places for further review. At that stage any I&AP has the right to send submissions to the DEA. If a decision is then made one way or the other, any I&AP has the opportunity to appeal during the set appeal period.</p> <p>Minutes will be sent out to all attendees for a 14 day comment period so that everyone can verify these minutes. They will then be finalised and placed on the website.</p>
56	Mr Ryan Donnelly For A Safe Tomorrow	Mr Donnelly added that with respect to the Draft Impact Report, which is at the present stage, it is apparent to him that this EIA is deficient in many areas. There appear to be more objections than constructive comment. He wanted to request that this draft be updated prior to it going into a form where it referred as a final draft.	Post-meeting Note: Whilst some minor changes will be made to the Final Environmental Impact Assessment Report GIBB is of the view that the present EIR, and its associated Specialist Reports, are comprehensive and that the relevant Authorities will have sufficient information to make an informed decision.
57	A Stakeholder	He said that Ms Ball had agreed the previous evening to further presentations and meetings. He feels that these meetings should be held after the changes have been made.	Ms Ball explained that the process of updating and finalising the report would go from draft to final unless there are substantive changes.
58	Ms Renee Royal Independent Environmental Consultant and Resident	Ms Royal asked if at the same time the draft Environmental Management Plan can be examined, it is very thin and appears to be a "cut and paste" work from the specialist reports. This must also be a draft EMP available for comment.	Ms Ball said the draft EMP is very much part of the draft EIA Report.
59	Ms Trudi Malan Spokesperson for St	Ms Malan said she would like to make a statement on behalf of the Thyspunt Alliance that they do not accept	Ms Ball responded by saying that these concerns are noted.

CAPE ST FRANCIS KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
	Francis Alliance	<p>this draft EIA report as a draft.</p> <p>She quoted, "Information required for this report is sufficiently complete for Duynefontein and Bantamsklip. The following limitations are relevant to the Thyspunt site, the geo-hydrological investigations undertaken for the EIA was focussed on the NPS site itself with only two boreholes drilled within the mobile Oyster Bay dunefield and the hydrological investigation undertaken for the EIA focussed on the NPS site itself with no investigation on the mobile Oyster Bay dunefield".</p> <p>This is not a draft study as this information is not in the report and the public cannot comment on information that they do not have.</p> <p>Every one of the 24 specialist studies has this line, <u>"further studies are required before a decision can be made"</u>.</p> <p>Ms Malan said that they would like the DEA to be informed that this community does not agree that this is a draft EIA Report. The community want a full study with all the information contained therein.</p>	
60	Mr Alwin Malgas Sea Vista Forum	Mr Malgas said he would like to note that the meeting at Sea Vista is going to be conducted in Afrikaans and Xhosa. He then questioned if the minutes will be produced in English.	Ms Ball said that the minutes will be recorded and will be in Afrikaans, Xhosa and English.

APPENDIX 2: PRESENTATION OF DRAFT EIA REPORT

Size of the Port Elizabeth Key Stakeholder Feedback Meeting presentation	1,407KB
Size of the Cape St Francis Key Stakeholder Feedback Meeting presentation	1,588KB
Size of the Melkbosstrand Key Stakeholder Feedback Meeting presentation	1,607KB

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 LIST

Surname	First Names	Title	Co/Org	Port Elizabeth Meeting 12 Apr 10	Cape St Francis Meeting 16 Apr 10	Melkbosstrand Meeting 20 Apr 10
Adams	Rashid	Cllr	City of Cape Town			Attended
Bain	Cairns	Dr	Nuclear Energy Corporation of SA (NECSA)			Attended
Ball	Jaana-Maria	Ms	Arcus GIBB	Attended	Attended	Attended
Barratt	Christopher & Valda	Mr & Mrs	St Francis Kromme Trust	Attended	Attended	
Becker	Peter	Mr	Koeberg Alert Alliance			Attended
Bergh	Vincent	Cllr	City of Cape Town – Sub Council Blaauwberg			Attended
Bouwer	Nicolaas Andre	Mr	St Andrews College	Attended		
Bowler	Karin	Mrs	Karin Bowler Enterprises	Attended		
Brenner	Heather	Cllr	City of Cape Town			Attended
Buckle	Japie	Mr	SANBI	Attended		
Clark	Angus	Mr	PE Regional Chamber of Commerce & Industry	Attended		
Cook	Derek	Mr	Macohy Investments CC		Attended	
Cowling	Shirley	Dr	Friends of the St Francis Nature Reserve		Attended	
Dale	Jenny	Mrs			Attended	
de Villiers	Carin	Ms	Eskom Holdings Limited	Attended	Attended	
Donnelly	Ryan James	Mr	For A Safe Tomorrow (F. A. S. T.)	Attended	Attended	
Ferndale	Tyronne	Mr	Nelson Mandela Bay Municipality		Attended	
Greeff	Gert	Mr	Eskom Holdings Limited	Attended		Attended
Hardie	George	Mr	Goed Geloof Farm and St Francis Conservancy		Attended	
Hardie	Sandra	Mrs	Goed Geloof Farm and St Francis Conservancy		Attended	
Henkeman	Pauline	Mrs	Eskom - Koeberg Visitors Centre			Attended
Herbst	Deidre	Ms	Eskom Holdings Limited	Attended		
Hutchinson	Martha-Maria	Mrs	St Francis Conservancy		Attended	

Surname	First Names	Title	Co/Org	Port Elizabeth Meeting 12 Apr 10	Cape St Francis Meeting 16 Apr 10	Melkbosstrand Meeting 20 Apr 10
Inman	Peter	Dr	Coega Development Corporation (Pty) Ltd	Attended	Attended	
Jacobson	Wolsley	Mr	Milnerton Rate Payers & Residents Association			Attended
Jeannes	Deon	Mr	Eskom Holdings Limited	Attended		
Jooste	Paul	Mnr	Oyster Bay RPA		Attended	
Jumat	Zain	Mr	Dept of Economic Affairs & Development Planning			Attended
Kraak	Cheron	Ms	Country Feeling		Attended	
Krause	Martin	Mr	Eskom Holdings Limited	Attended		
Lamont	Sydney	Mr	Sea Vista Forum	Attended	Attended	
Lategan	Tanya	Ms	Supertubes Surfing Foundation		Attended	
Leask	Kevin	Mr	Eskom Holdings Limited	Attended		Attended
Leen	Petrus	Mr	Sea Vista Forum	Attended	Attended	
Lesch	Donevin	Mr	Coega Development Corporation (Pty) Ltd	Attended		
Levack	Kaylene	Ms	Joshua Heritage	Attended		
Logie	Caryl	Mrs	Fourcade Botanical Group		Attended	
Longden-Thurgood	RM	Mr	Institute of Nuclear Engineers SA Branch			Attended
Mabentsela	Nombongo	Ms	Coega Development Corporation (Pty) Ltd	Attended		
Madyini	Ntandazo	Mr	Coega Development Corporation (Pty) Ltd	Attended	Attended	
Malgas	Alwyn	Mnr	Sea Vista Forum	Attended	Attended	
Marshall	Terence	Mr	Sandriver Sanctuary		Attended	
Miles	Melvyn	Mr	Eskom: Koeberg Visitors Centre			Attended
Moolman	Graham	Mr	St Andrew's College	Attended		
Mortimer	Bev	Ms	St Francis Chronicle Newspaper		Attended	
Msibi	Lawrence	Mr	Bitou Local Municipality	Attended		
Muir	Andrew	Mr	Wilderness Foundation SA	Attended		
Naiker	Melissa	Ms	Dept of Economic Affairs & Development Planning			Attended
Neilson	Peter	Mr	Nelson Mandela Bay Municipality		Attended	

Surname	First Names	Title	Co/Org	Port Elizabeth Meeting 12 Apr 10	Cape St Francis Meeting 16 Apr 10	Melkbosstrand Meeting 20 Apr 10
Nggumshe	Phumla	Ms	Bitou Local Municipality	Attended		
Nicholson	Peter	Mr	Billabong SA		Attended	
Norman	Jan	Mr	Koeberg NPS	Attended		Attended
Ntamnani	Ncedo	Mr	Eskom Holdings Limited			Attended
Nwokedi	Judi	Ms	Areva	Attended		
Oddy	Chantal	Ms	Rebels Rus Conservancy	Attended		
Oosthuizen	Joe	Mr	St Francis Bay Residents Association		Attended	
Oosthuizen	Paddy	Ms	St Francis Bay Residents Association		Attended	
Oswald	Elbrecht	Mr	City of Cape Town			Attended
Patel	Imraan	Mr	National Dept of Science & Tech			Attended
Potts	Tracey	Ms	Eastern Cape Parks		Attended	
Pyoos	Marjorie	Ms	National Dept of Science & Technology			Attended
Ralston	Samantha	Ms	Cape Nature			Attended
Rautenbach	Elisabeth	Mrs	St Francis Conservancy		Attended	
Royal	Renee	Mrs	Resident/Environmental Consultant		Attended	
Simms	Mike	Mr	St Francis Bay Residents Association		Attended	
Slamdien	Ashraf	Mr	Blaauwberg Administration City of Cape Town			Attended
Stott	Tony	Mr	Eskom Holdings Limited	Attended		Attended
Theron	Mervin	Mr	Eskom Holdings Limited	Attended		Attended
Theron	Morne	Mr	City Of Cape Town Resource Management			Attended
Thorpe	Hilton	Mr	St Francis Bay Residents Assoc & St Francis Kromme Trust	Attended	Attended	
Tilders	Helmie	Mr	FOSTER		Attended	
Titmuss	Pat	Ms	City of Cape Town			Attended
van Dyk	Carel	Mr	Nelson Mandela Bay Municipality		Attended	
Vockerodt	Brian	Mr	Eskom Holdings Limited	Attended		
von Holdt	Andrea	Ms	Coega Development Corporation (Pty) Ltd	Attended	Attended	

Surname	First Names	Title	Co/Org	Port Elizabeth Meeting 12 Apr 10	Cape St Francis Meeting 16 Apr 10	Melkbosstrand Meeting 20 Apr 10
West	David Michael	Mr	Eskom Holdings Limited	Attended		
Willemse	Douw	Mr	City of Cape Town			Attended
Williamson	Raymond	Mr	Melkbosstrand Rate Payers Association			Attended
Wiseman	Keith	Mr	City of Cape Town: Environmental Management Dept			Attended