

**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  
DUYNEFONTEIN**

**20 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 .....	3
3.1 CONDUCT AT MEETING.....	4
3.2 OBJECTIVES OF THE MEETING.....	4
3.3 SUMMARY OF ISSUES RAISED DURING SCOPING PHASE .....	4
4. PRESENTATION: FINDINGS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESMENT REPORT .....	5
5. ISSUES AND COMMENTS RAISED AND DISCUSSED.....	5
5.1 ISSUES AND COMMENTS RAISED .....	5
6. WAY FORWARD AND CLOSING REMARKS .....	6
6.1 MINUTES OF MEETINGS.....	6
6.2 TIMEFRAMES .....	6
6.3 FACILITATORS CONCLUDING REMARKS.....	6
APPENDIX 1: RECORD OF ISSUES RAISED AND DISCUSSED.....	7
APPENDIX 2: PRESENTATION OF DRAFT EIA REPORT .....	27
APPENDIX 3: ATTENDANCE LIST .....	28

## 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 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.

In order to provide a structure and to enable the reader to follow the proceedings with ease the minutes have not been captured verbatim and post-meeting notes have been added for clarity and information purposes and are indicated in **bold**.

## 1. ATTENDANCE

### 1.1. Attendance – Interested and Affected Parties

- As per attendance register.

### 1.2 Attendance – Eskom Holdings Limited

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

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

Name	Organisation	Role in the project
Ms Jaana-Maria Ball	Arcus GIBB (Pty) Ltd	Nuclear 1 EIA: Project Manager
Mr Reuben Heydenrych	Arcus GIBB (Pty) Ltd	Senior Environmental Scientist
Ms Bongzi Shinga	ACER (Africa)	Public Participation Consultant
Ms Karin Bowler	Karin Bowler Enterprises	Facilitator

## 2. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

The facilitator, Ms Karin Bowler, welcomed everyone to the meeting. She explained that the meeting was being recorded.

The facilitator then introduced the project team to participants.

## 3. FACILITATORS INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

The facilitator explained that an agenda had been distributed. She said that there were two amendments to the agenda:

- A typing error: the discussion period is 1 hour 40 minutes and not just 40 minutes
- The time on item 4 should read as 12.15.

She further stated that the team would like to adhere to the times on the Agenda. This will ensure sufficient time for questions.

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 points of clarification be held over until the discussion period. All issues will be captured in the Issues and Response Report (IRR) and she asked that all participants check that their issues have been captured correctly.

### **3.1 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.

### **3.2 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 EIA Phase.
- ❑ To present the conclusions and recommendations of the Draft EIR.
- ❑ Provide an opportunity to Interested and Affected Parties (I&APs) to comment on the specialist study findings and the outcomes of the EIA.

### **3.3 Summary of Issues Raised during Scoping Phase**

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

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

*“Some people are opposed to and some are in favour of the proposed Nuclear Power Plants at Bantamsklip, Thyspunt and Duynefontein 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 EIA Phase.

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

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

Ms Ball and Mr Heydenrych then presented the findings on the Draft EIR (refer to presentation slides provided in Appendix 2).

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

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

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

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

Please note should you wish to make any corrections, please advise ACER within two weeks (i.e. 14 days) of receiving these minutes.

## 6. WAY FORWARD AND CLOSING REMARKS

### 6.1 Minutes of Meetings

Ms Ball indicated that the EIA Team would endeavour to distribute the minutes of the meeting to I&APs 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 EIR 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, and again further extended by an additional 30 days. The closing date for comment is now 30 June 2010 (117 days).**

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

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

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

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

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

### 6.3 Facilitators Concluding Remarks

The facilitator stated that the onus of responsibility on your shoulders is to act as a reviewer to make sure that this process is robust and that your issues are answered. If not answered, it must be taken 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**

**DUYNEFONTEIN KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING**

No	Name	Comment	Response
1	Mr Mike Longden-Thurgood Milnerton Resident	<p>Mr Longden-Thurgood raised the following:</p> <p>Occasionally I&amp;APs get the reactor output wrong, believing that it is 4 000 MW(e), whereas this is a total heat output of a reactor, MW(t). The generating output is expressed as MW(e). This has not been made clear, with some I&amp;APs believing that a new Nuclear Power Station site would only have a single reactor.</p> <p>In a number of reports where the numbers of reactor units are mentioned, the assumption is that there will be two, e.g. the specialist's report on sound. If Eskom chooses the Areva EPR at 1 600 MW(e), two units will provide 3 200 MW(e), which is 800 MW(e) short of 4 000. If the Westinghouse AP1000 is selected, this may either be a 1 184 MW(e) version or the 1 250 MW(e) version, but both versions would require three units to provide a total output of 3 552 MW(e) or 3 750 MW(e), again both short of 4 000MW(e). Eskom needs to decide pretty quickly which PWR they intend to order</p> <p>Mr Longden-Thurgood requested that the EIA report mentions that the plant type might not produce exactly 4 000 MW.</p>	<p>Ms Ball replied that Arcus GIBB had assessed up to 4 000 MW and he was correct in that it depends on what plant type Eskom decides upon whether there will be two reactors or three reactors. The envelope of criteria encompasses any of the reactors that are on the market of Generation 3 type. She undertook to examine the studies if one of the specialists had inadvertently stated that it was two reactors, this will be amended.</p> <p>Mr Stott said that Eskom had asked the consultants to investigate 4 000 MW in order to be conservative. To ensure that the EIA was robust and valid, 4 000 MW was used.</p>
2	Mr Mike Longden-Thurgood Milnerton Resident	<p>In the specialist report on the emergency plan, a reference is made to EUR report which details emergency procedures, which Eskom has adopted, with its own report setting out its emergency</p>	<p>Ms Ball said that all aspects of this EIA process would be checked from a legal standpoint.</p>



DUYNEFONTEIN KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>procedures based on the EUR report. Questions:</p> <p>i) Neither of these reports are listed in the references.</p> <p>ii) Has the NNR agreed to the concepts set out in the EUR document, and that of Eskom?</p> <p>iii) Thirdly, it is intended that one or other of reports will be provided to I&amp;APs to review?</p> <p>iv) Has Eskom already had their new emergency plan approved by the NNR, and has it been implemented for the Koeberg NPS?</p> <p>v) If not, and either one or the other report is not offered for review by the I&amp;APs, will there not be a possibility of some individual or organisation claiming that the EIA process is invalid because of the non-disclosure of documents for this EIA process, as happened in the case of the EIA process for the PBMR?</p>	<p>The NNR have been notified of this proposal and is currently considering it.</p> <p>It has not been implemented for the Koeberg Nuclear Power Station. The current emergency plans for Koeberg will remain for now.</p> <p><b>Post-meeting note: The legislative requirements for nuclear facilities in South Africa are extensive. In the case of the Nuclear Power Station, two key authorisations are needed from two different regulatory authorities namely the Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA) and the National Nuclear Regulator (NNR). These authorisations are needed prior to construction activities commencing on the site.</b></p> <p><b>In terms of the National Nuclear Regulator Act 1999 (Act No. 47 of 1999, “the NNRA”), the NNR is responsible for managing radiation hazards from nuclear facilities. The National Nuclear Regulator Act therefore regulates nuclear activities. However, in terms of the National Environmental Management Act, 1998 (Act No. 107 of 1998) [NEMA], the DEA has a responsibility for assessing the impacts of the NPS on the environment, impacts which are likely to include those relating to certain aspects of the radiological hazards of the facility.</b></p> <p><b>Eskom has had preliminary discussions with the NNR regarding the acceptance of the specifications of the</b></p>

<b>DUYNEFONTEIN KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
			<b>European Utility Requirements (EUR) standards for Light Water Reactors (LWR) plants and it is a key assumption of this EIA that these specifications will be accepted in principle as they are international standards. No formal application has however been submitted by Eskom to the NNR in terms of the NNRA.</b>
3	Mr Mike Longden-Thurgood Milnerton Resident	In the specialist report on transport, for access to Duynefontein, some confusion appears to have been introduced with the numbering of the access points, with one access being what I would regard as inappropriate for the main route to the Nuclear-2 site. I believe that the confusion might have arisen because no road diagrams have been included, with the access point numbers being clearly indicated on them.  The Bus Rapid Transport System has not been mentioned as well.	If Arcus GIBB do find that the points mentioned have not been assessed she would raise this with the specialist and it will be included in the final report.  Ms Ball said that the specialist study does look at integrated transport for the public to all the sites, but not in a great amount of detail. Ms Ball undertook to go back to the specialist and get this type of information into the final report.  Ms Ball added that all the access roads to the Thyspunt site itself are public roads, the R330 and the route from Humansdorp down to Oyster Bay.
4	Mr Mike Longden-Thurgood Milnerton Resident	The Thyspunt site is shown in one specialist report as literally being surrounded by wind generation facilities. In respect of access, has agreement been reached with the wind generation companies for an access to the proposed Nuclear Power Station site?	Ms Ball said that there are a number of applications for wind farms around the Thyspunt site, one of which Arcus GIBB is undertaking the EIA. Ms Ball could not comment on Eskom's negotiations with these applicants.  Mr Stott said that there have been discussions at a high level with the applicants (Independent Power Producers) but they are all in the EIA phase.
5	Mr Mike Longden-Thurgood Milnerton Resident	He also requested clarity on the Open Cycle Gas Turbine (OCGT) as his understanding was that it would be converted to a Combined Cycle Gas Turbine (CCGT).	Ms Herbst replied that Eskom had completed an EIA for the Combined Cycle Gas Turbine (CCGT) and there has been approval granted but they are still investigating the commercial viability and the gas resource. She added that

<b>DUYNEFONTEIN KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
			at this stage the process is on hold. If Eskom did go the CCGT route, it must be borne in mind that the (Open Cycle Gas Turbine) OCGT at Thyspunt would only be for emergency start up. It is therefore unlikely that a CCGT would be installed.
6	Mr Mike Longden-Thurgood Milnerton Resident	In the main report, the possibility is mentioned that any one site could be considered for sufficient nuclear reactors to produce a total generated output of 10 000MW(e). Will there be a need for Eskom to give this consideration early on in this sequence of EIA processes, otherwise there could be wasted effort and expenditure on looking at the two sites up the west coast, namely Brazil and Schulpfontein. On the other hand, for these two relatively remote sites, a larger number of reactors would require a larger number of staffing, i.e. management, professional, technical, office and general labouring. The social aspect of having a considerable larger population group, with families, in a power station township could introduce a considerably more interacting community, with the possibility of more viable interests becoming available. The social issues report does not mention this aspect – at least as far as I can recall.	Ms Ball responded that all aspects encompassing the environment were investigated during the Scoping phase, including social, biophysical and environment. The biophysical characteristics of the sites on the western coast deem them quite suitable for a nuclear power station. However, in terms of Nuclear-1, they were not considered to be feasible and reasonable alternatives for the timing of Nuclear-1. She could not comment on whether Eskom would consider the Northern Cape sites for Nuclear-2 or -3.
7	Mr Vincent Bergh City of Cape Town	Mr Bergh said that his concern is the high-level waste, which is being stored at Koeberg, which would obviously, also be stored at any new power station.  His information is that presently there is no provision for a terror attack on the power station for insurance	Ms Ball replied that the site safety and radiological issues fall firmly in the ambit of the National Nuclear Regulator (NNR) Act and not NEMA and will be assessed by the NNR before Eskom can consider constructing or operating a nuclear power station. Arcus GIBB did undertake various studies such as emergency response and site control, which examined these aspects.

<b>DUYNEFONTEIN KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<p>purposes for people living in the vicinity. He asked if Eskom envisages making sure that such cover is available for the people living in the vicinity of the nuclear power station. If there is a terrorist attack and high-level waste is stored on site, everyone is extremely vulnerable.</p> <p>His second question related to the expansion of the City of Cape Town, which needs to occur northwards, towards the power station and towards Atlantis. The decommissioning of the current power station should take place within the next 15 years. If a new power station is constructed at Koeberg, this will mean that the area will be stagnant for the next 60 years, from 2025 to 2085 before any further expansion could occur.</p>	<p>Mr Stott said that the NNR Act requires Eskom to make financial provision for third party liability compensation claims in the event of nuclear damage. That is similar for every country in the world, this is why this type of insurance cannot be obtained from private insurance companies. A nuclear power station like any other power station also falls under the national key points and the State takes accountability for preventing terrorist attacks on power stations.</p> <p>Mr Heydenrych replied that the power station is proposed to be a Generation 3 type power station and because of the change in technology, the emergency exclusion zones are quite different to Koeberg. In the case of Nuclear-1 the smallest zone within which no development will be allowed is 800 m, that is in terms of EUR requirements. This will fall completely within the boundaries of the existing Eskom property. There is also a larger zone, which is 3 km where limited development applies.</p>
8	Mr Peter Becker Koeberg Alert Alliance	<p>Mr Becker said that he would like to comment on the previous question. The whole of the validity of this process is full disclosure to questions that are put to Eskom.</p> <p>He noted that the study had omitted the Vienna Convention and he questioned that this is a full answer to the question posed by the previous gentlemen. Eskom has limited liability of approximately R4b, and if you divide this by a few thousand houses this is not sufficient. He therefore</p>	<p>Mr Stott explained that South Africa has not signed the Vienna Convention [on Civil Liability for Nuclear Damage]. The Act of Parliament in South Africa [the NNR Act section 29] requires Eskom to make financial provision. Regulations that are issued by the Minister of Energy stipulate how much financial provision must be made [Regulation promulgated in Government Notice 581 dated 7 May 2004. Section 29 also allows for the Minister to require additional financial provision beyond what is stipulated by the Regulation]. The NNR Act [section 33] also makes provision for the Minister to go back to Parliament to</p>

DUYNEFONTEIN KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>does not believe that Eskom has sufficient insurance to cover households in the area. Mr Becker asked what the value is of insurance held by Eskom. He had asked this question during scoping but had never obtained an answer.</p> <p>Mr Becker also added that an EIA is about two basic items, what will happen to the pollution, i.e. the waste and will this affect human health. He understands the constraints that the EIA consultants are under as this is said to be part of the NNR process. What is unclear is why these studies are not included in this EIA, this has caused a great deal of confusion because although there are studies pertaining to this in the report they are not to be considered as a decision-making part of the EIA.</p> <p>Mr Becker noted that in the executive summary it was stated that there are no disqualifying conditions under the seismological risk assessment. At the same time an envelope of design criteria is mentioned for a standard off-the-shelf design. He said that by their own definition they had not gone outside the envelope. He asked if this means that this off-the-shelf design would be able to withstand a seismic risk of ~0.3 g. He then went on to say that the slide displayed in the presentation had indicated an approximate figure of ~0.3g, to give an approximate is not scientific reporting. He then asked if it is stated that the figure is approximately ~0.3g and the limit of the envelope is ~0.3g this must be a disqualifying factor. If there is a discrepancy of</p>	<p>appropriate more funds if this is required. Mr Stott said that he does not know the exact figure that is stipulated in the Regulation, but he would revert to Mr Becker.</p> <p><b>Post-meeting note: The current figure stipulated in GN 581 dated 7 May 2004 is R2.4 billion. Eskom makes the financial provision through insurance (that is obtained from the international nuclear insurance pools) and which is in dollar denomination resulting in a financial provision in excess of R3 billion. Every year Eskom has to provide proof that the financial provision (insurance) has been obtained.</b></p> <p>Ms Ball said that after discussions were held with DEA these reports were included for information purposes only. Questions pertaining to this have been brought up regularly. It has been made clear that these do not form part of the ambit of this EIA. The public will be given opportunity to comment on these type of studies during the NNR process. The mechanism to comment on the Integrated Resource Plan will also be posted on the website.</p> <p>Ms Ball replied that Arcus GIBB had tried to make the slides as simple as possible as a range of communities have been consulted. Koeberg had been designed around a ~0.3g so it is possible to design way above the 0.3 PGA values. What has been stated is that more time and more money is needed to finalise designs.</p>

<b>DUYNEFONTEIN KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		~0.1g it will exceed the design criteria of the standard envelope.	
9	Mr Zain Jumat Western Cape Dept of Environmental Affairs, Development and Planning	<p>Mr Jumat said that he had two questions relating to the desalination plant.</p> <p>He asked why desalination is the preferred option and he wanted to know if other types of water such as recycled water had been explored which is much less expensive than desalination.</p> <p>He asked to what extent the brine that is generated has been mitigated. What processes would be applied to that water. Desalination also uses ten times more energy. Eskom is looking at efficiency, why are they not considering other options.</p> <p>The executive summary refers to the discharge of warm water and the disposal of sediment but it does not mention the brine.</p>	<p>Ms Ball responded by explaining that the surface water specialist had examined various options of water provision at the site, one of which is obtaining water from the municipal supply. Desalination was recommended by the specialist and Eskom accepted that recommendation. The costs were built into the macro-economic model and was applied equally to all three of the sites.</p> <p>Regarding the potential impact of brine which is concentrated salt water, the marine specialist examined this and the land-based biophysical specialist also investigated this issue and it was recommended that during the construction phase that the brine be released in the surf zone to allow for sufficient and rapid mixing of the brine with the sea water. During the operational phase it is proposed that the brine water be mixed with the normal cooling water so that it will be discharged at a diluted state and that it be released through the tunnel with the slightly heated water.</p> <p>Ms Ball said that brine was mentioned on page 13 of the Executive Summary.</p> <p>Mr Stott said that Eskom would consider energy efficiency. In discussions with the local municipalities about the availability of water, certain recommendations were for desalination but Eskom is open to investigating the possibility of using recycled water.</p> <p>Ms Ball replied that the social and economic specialists</p>

<b>DUYNEFONTEIN KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<p>Mr Jumat said that he wanted to know to what extent local communities would benefit from this development. 7,700 jobs have been mentioned and what percentage of these jobs will be offered to local communities. These sites have a large impact on the local area and local communities should benefit.</p>	<p>have made specific recommendations in terms of 7 700 workers required during construction and the 1 400 required during operation. There has been a recommendation that at least 25% of the jobs be offered to the broader local community. There are also to supply services and downstream services, for example the establishment of crèches to look after children, fast food outlets, etc. and these could also benefit the local community.</p> <p><b>Post-meeting note: Current planning indicates that all water for the construction phase will be derived from the desalinisation plant. However, additional fresh water sources may be required for short periods of time during construction. During operation at all sites desalination provides a guaranteed source of fresh water supply for the lifespan of the proposed nuclear power station without jeopardising the availability of fresh water to other users. A desalinisation plant is therefore the preferred alternative for the provision of fresh water at all alternative sites. The wetland assessment does however propose the following mitigation measure:</b></p> <p>The option of disposing of treated effluent in an evaporation pond should ideally not be pursued, as this unduly enlarges the disturbance footprint of the site. Instead, it is recommended that the sewage treatment plant be designed such that full recycling of effluent is possible within the plant. Ideally, effluent should be treated to drinking water standards and used to supplement water produced by desalination, thus providing a more sustainable approach to the</p>

<b>DUYNEFONTEIN KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
			<b>management of waste and natural resources on the site.</b>
10	Cllr Heather Brenner City of Cape Town – Sub Council 1	Cllr Brenner said that she was interested in the number of vehicle trips during construction period. It states in the report that there will be 840 vehicles per day in the morning and that would be repeated in the evening. She asked if there has been any investigation into the amount of [wear and tare]/ [warranty] on the local roads around the proposed sites because maintenance of roads in the Cape Town area is a big issue and often a problem.	Ms Ball responded by agreeing that the roads issue is an extremely important impact on any construction project. The amount of vehicles would be extremely high and a large proportion would be heavy vehicles. The traffic impact has examined this issue in terms of the need for upgrades of roads. At the Thyspunt site the proposed access roads referred to are currently gravel roads. Eskom have held discussions with both South African National Roads Agent Limited (SANRAL) and the local provincial roads departments and municipalities regarding this issue. The access roads would need to be both constructed and maintained by Eskom.
11	Mr Keith Wiseman City of Cape Town	Mr Wiseman noted that the issues concerning the <u>spatial growth of Cape Town</u> have been raised many times.  1. What has been asked for is a comparative assessment of the alternative sites so that an informed decision can be made. This point was mentioned in the Plan of Study for Impact Assessment and there is a statement that a conservative assumption would be a 5 km evacuation plan. In fact what is now stated is that it is likely that an exclusion zone of 800 m and an evacuation zone of 3 km would apply. There is no source for this statement and it is unclear where this statement comes from. He is aware that this is not a decision for the EIA but would be for the NNR.	Ms Ball replied that regarding the 800 m zone, this information had originated from other examples overseas where the regulators in those countries have instituted this likely plan. References to this are in the EIR.  Ms Ball further stated that a planner had investigated the various sites and because the planning zone would be 800 m, in Duynefontein and in one portion of the Thyspunt site, this falls outside the Eskom owned property. Eskom is attempting to purchase this remaining land to make up all of the 800 m. The planner felt that this would have limited impact on any social aspects or land use planning in the area.  <b><u>Post-meeting note: In terms of the exclusion zones, the NNR will have to make a decision on the exclusion zone for the new nuclear power station.</u></b>



<b>DUYNEFONTEIN KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<p>2. He went on to say that within the Social Impact Assessment, the specialist states that this is a low significance impact based on the scenario of a 800m exclusion zone. The accumulative impacts have not been properly investigated, particularly of having for example a Pebble Bed Modular Reactor Demonstration Power Plant together with Nuclear-1 as well as the existing nuclear reactor at Koeberg. He understands that this is what the NNR would have to consider, the possibility of having three nuclear plants in the same area.</p> <p>3. In the Emergency Response Specialist report, Duynefontein was the least preferred site. That is not mentioned elsewhere, so things such as the impact on emergency services and public transport and the impact on the Integrated Rapid Transport (IRT) because of densities and population growth would need to be planned in, in terms of the West Coast growth corridor to make the IRT viable.</p> <p>4. The Emergency Response Report quotes the International Atomic Energy Agency by saying that major factors considered in the location of a nuclear plant are the affect of the plant on the region and population considerations. So sparsely populated zones are preferred to highly populated zones, that is the IAEA guidelines.</p>	<p><b>International practice based on Generation 3 design have been formalised in Europe. The European Utilities Requirements specifies internationally accepted emergency zones. Based on these international requirements, the current radius of the urgent protected zone directly around the power station is 800 m. This is a much smaller area than the zone around the Koeberg Nuclear Power Station. There is a larger, long term action protection planning zone outside of the urgent protected zone of 3km which applies.</b></p>

<b>DUYNEFONTEIN KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<p>However, this does not get carried through to the impact assessment report, in fact that conclusion from the specialist is not mentioned.</p> <p>5. When it comes to comparing the sites, the criteria are transmission integration, seismic suitability, dunes, wetlands, vertebrate fauna, invertebrate fauna and economic impacts. So the impact on population is not considered significant enough in the selection of Thyspunt over Duynefontein as the preferred site. That is a concern and they still feel that the spatial planning issues have not been assessed because Cape Town is a rapidly growing city. If Cape Town does not expand up the west coast, agricultural lands, biodiversity areas, mountain areas will have to be used for growth. This is a long-term impact on Cape Town.</p> <p>Mr Wiseman stated that the construction camp could result in a number of cumulative impacts, such as biodiversity, transport, services, etc. If authorisation is granted for Koeberg, the City of Cape Town would have to accept the construction camp.</p>	<p>Ms Ball replied that the social study did investigate the potential impacts of approximately 7 500 – 7 700 workers, which would include the families at the peak of construction. They also examined where these workers were likely to be housed, it differs at the various sites and Eskom's stance is that they would like to integrate most of the workers, for example, at Thyspunt there is serviced land readily available in nearby towns. Should there be a new housing development, a separate EIA would need to be undertaken. Should there be a need for a construction camp and there is serviced land available, this would be utilised.</p> <p>Mr Stott added that until the EIA are at the stage where a preferred site has been identified there can be no detailed discussions with any municipalities. There have been preliminary discussions held with all of the municipalities, including the City of Cape Town, of what the possibilities are for housing the construction workers and the eventually the full-time employees. There is the preference within the City of Cape Town to try and have people integrated into the proclaimed service areas and not to build new housing developments.</p> <p><b>Post-meeting note: Information contained with the specialist studies associated with the Nuclear-1 EIA is integrated throughout the Draft EIR. Information</b></p>

<b>DUYNEFONTEIN KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
			<p>pertaining to Emergency response is given in section 9.21 of the report amongst others. Although not explicitly stated that sparsely populated zones are preferred to highly populated zones, in section 9.21 reference is made to population density e.g. <i>“The presence of large populations in the region or proximity of a city to the nuclear power plant site may diminish the effectiveness and viability of an emergency plan In the course of the "selection" phase, during which a regional analysis is performed, sites in zones having the highest population densities are eliminated from the search; it is in effect reasonable, all other things being equal, to prefer sparsely populated zones to highly urbanised zones.”</i></p>
12	Mrs Janda McDonald Koeberg Alert Alliance	<p>Ms McDonald brought up the fundamental basis of the EIA and the fact that all the difficult and unanswerable questions have been passed on to various bodies such as the NNR, which is allowing the entire EIA process to proceed without any discussions or real data surrounding human health and safety. This is the most crucial part of the environmental assessment and if this EIA receives authorisation it will be misleading, as the crucial studies have not been assessed. All data regarding health and safety regarding nuclear installations are placed within the responsibility of the NNR.</p> <p>She said that the public demands that data such as levels and amounts of radioactive isotopes that would be emitted by a nuclear power station such as the one assessed, Generation 3, that documented health effects on the populations as a result of</p>	<p>Ms Ball said that as the EIA consultants they note Ms McDonald’s organisation’s opinion regarding what should and should not be in the EIA. As consultants, Arcus GIBB have followed the law of the land, the acts that are relevant to this particular study. She trusted that Ms McDonald would bring her concerns to the attention of the NNR representative.</p>

<b>DUYNEFONTEIN KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<p>prolonged exposure are undertaken. She demanded all information pertaining to levels that are reliable and acceptable to human health by global and natural monitoring, as well as by a medical authority which have been peer reviewed.</p> <p>She also mentioned the emergency plan, which is on the fringes of the EIA. Point 6 on page 2 of <u>The Assessment of Potential Impacts on Human Health</u>, states that the applicant must submit a Site Safety Report to the NNR comprising 'analysis to demonstrate viability of the emergency plan including transport and disaster management infrastructure'.</p> <p>Under the NNR Act, the declared 'Site Emergency' is limited to the nuclear site (not affecting the public). However, the management of off-site emergency (affecting the public) is the responsibility of Government authorities.</p> <p>In terms of the Disaster Management Act, the National Government Department of Minerals and Energy is responsible for coordination and management of matters related to nuclear disaster management at a national level. As per Section 25 of the Disaster Management Act, each national organ of state indicated in the National Disaster Management Framework must prepare a disaster management plan setting out contingency strategies and emergency procedures in the event of a disaster, including measures to finance these</p>	

DUYNEFONTEIN KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>strategies.</p> <p>She quoted on the Disaster Management Plan of 2005: 'It is recognised that where there is a need for urgent protective actions in the public domain and where the local authority is not yet in a position to order such protective actions, the holder of the nuclear authorisation should as a priority act in the interests of the public by advising or recommending such protective actions'.</p> <p>The responsibility of the NNR, related to large-scale nuclear disasters has thus been limited to advise and recommend action. Anything above this falls on the shoulders of the DME and National Government.</p> <p>One would assume that a <u>National Nuclear Disaster Management Plan</u> would have concrete and accessible plans in place, in the event of a disastrous large-scale release of radioactivity from a nuclear power station, which, though unfortunate and rare, remains a possibility with devastating consequences.</p> <p>However, the <u>National Nuclear Disaster Management Plan</u> is nothing more than a set of recommendations regarding procedures necessary to create emergency plans.</p> <p>Real issues which should be addressed would include:</p> <p>a) The provision, storage and accessibility to</p>	

DUYNEFONTEIN KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>protective clothing,</p> <p>b) The provision and accessibility by the public to prophylactic iodine tablets,</p> <p>c) The availability of nuclear shelters,</p> <p>d) The plan for evacuation looking at transport mechanisms and routes of escape.</p> <p>None of these have been dealt with in the <u>National Nuclear Disaster Management Plan</u>.</p> <p>If a nuclear disaster were to occur the following would take place if the <u>National Nuclear Disaster Management Plan</u> were to be followed:</p> <p>a) Koeberg would alert the NNR of the accident</p> <p>b) The NNR would ensure that the emergency plan on site is followed</p> <p>c) The NNR would alert the Department of Minerals and Energy</p> <p>d) The DME would alert the Local Authority</p> <p>e) The Local Authority would refer the matter back to the NNR for advice on what procedures to follow. A meeting would be convened by all three levels of government in the relevant Coordinating Centre.</p> <p><b>By which time it would be too late!</b></p> <p>She reiterated that the most important and unanswerable questions, which should be in the EIA, are not, and that this EIA might be passed not having taken into account human health and safety issues.</p>	

DUYNESFONTEIN KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
13	Ms Melissa Naicker Western Cape, Department of Environmental Affairs and Planning	<p>Ms Naicker noted that once the preferred site, which presently is Thyspunt, has been chosen, the consultants indicated that desalination plant would be used for water. It was also indicated that Eskom would be willing to carry the cost of such a plant. She asked for confirmation of this.</p> <p>She went on to ask if the issue of a possible desalination plant had been thoroughly investigated in the EIA. She questioned if the <u>location</u> of the desalination plant was investigated. She also asked if approval of the desalination plant was going to affect where the nuclear plant will be sited.</p>	<p>Ms Ball said that it is not only the desalination plant, but the access roads and all other infrastructure. All of the specialists had examined the entire infrastructure and this was contained in the Application Form and the amendment to the Application Form. It was assessed within the footprint particularly regarding biophysical impacts. Arcus GIBB have found an area within the preferred site as well as within the other sites that have not been recommended for Nuclear-1 suitable for the desalination plant and other associated infrastructure.</p> <p>In terms of the detailed layout of the plant, Arcus GIBB has made a recommendation that should this project be authorised, then the specialists would need to go back to site to determine exact locations of these various infrastructure.</p>
14	Ms Marjorie Pyoos Department of Science and Technology	<p>Ms Pyoos said that her question related to Ms Naicker's question. Mention was made of 24 specialist studies and she wanted clarification about the assessment.</p> <p>For example impacts on wetlands is mentioned in isolation, impacts on the wetlands during construction, during access and operation of the plant were examined. She thought the desalination plant made good sense.</p> <p>However, the impact of the seawater desalination plant on the wetlands would be phenomenal and if these two impacts had been assessed separately, there has probably been an underestimation of impacts. Ms Naicker wanted clarification on the</p>	<p>Ms Ball agreed that this was an important part of a complex EIA project. There was a high degree of integration amongst the specialist studies. The specialists shared their reports amongst one another as results became available. Where possible, all the specialists went out to site together, so that field assessments could be conducted together. Each specialist assessed the cumulative impacts. There was sharing of reports amongst the specialists and sharing of reports with the transmission line EIA consultants as well. There were also integration meetings around clusters of specialists held. During the process there were three 2-day workshops held for the specialists. During this time, after some heated discussions, consensus was reached using mitigation measures.</p>

<b>DUYNEFONTEIN KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		degree of integration.	
15	Dr Cairns Bain NECSA	<p>Dr Bain wanted to know about the cooperative agreement between the DEA and the NNR. He asked how effective would this agreement be when streamlining the EIA process.</p> <p>He also asked if there is a need for a working guideline to interpret this cooperative agreement.</p> <p>Lastly, he asked what the general view of the public is with the separation of these two acts.</p>	<p>Ms Ball said that there was a great deal of confusion surrounding the DEA and NNR processes. Ms Ball feels that there should be more guidelines and more education in the public domain about the various responsibilities.</p> <p>Ms Herbst said that this was a challenging aspect of the study and the NNR is very specific regarding how studies are conducted, as is the DEA. It is actually a positive that these two bodies got together and came up with the first terms of reference. They have had follow-up meetings and these have made things even clearer, specifically that DEA will not evaluate some of the studies.</p>
16	Mr Douw Willemse City of Cape Town - Electricity Services	Mr Willemse asked how far architectural design criteria have been incorporated into the whole process.	Ms Ball said that a visual specialist had investigated the sites and has put forward some recommendations in terms of visual design of the power station.
17	Ms Samantha Ralston Cape Nature	Ms Ralston said that she is quite concerned about the studies for the nuclear power station and the transmission lines being conducted separately. In particular it sounds like all the hot spots in the Western Cape have been identified. She is pleased that Bantamsklip is not the preferred option, she asked if this site had been permanently removed as an option or will it be considered as a future site.	<p>Ms Ball responded that the transmission lines EIA has been an extremely problematic and difficult EIA, specifically in terms of the environmental impacts on the surrounding areas in the Overberg Region. Eskom have not indicated that this EIA should be halted.</p> <p>Mr Stott said that this issue depends on what is produced in the Integrated Resource Plan (IRP), which is expected to be released in June 2010. If the IRP indicates that South Africa needs more nuclear power stations then more EIAs will be initiated and certainly Bantamsklip and Duynefontein will be included in future EIAs. Other sites will also be</p>



DUYNEFONTEIN KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
			investigated, therefore we have not instructed the transmission line EIA to stop, it does need to be completed.
18	Mr Morné Theron City of Cape Town	<p>Mr Theron noted that at Duynefontein there are so many biodiversity issues. They have recently appealed on the Administrative Complex, which has lead to the repositioning of the buildings in order to avoid sensitive transitional vegetation sites. The issue of a biodiversity offset is still not included in this study. This was something that was a condition of approval by the DEA in the Ankerlig OCGT site. He has not heard that this type of mitigation is proposed for Duynefontein.</p> <p>He added that it is a pity that something that is constantly mentioned and has been mentioned from the beginning of the study is ignored. This is such a critically endangered plant type that it will be lost no matter how carefully the land is prepared. It is disappointing that off site mitigation is not being proposed. They should acquire land off site and this should be a condition of approval.</p>	<p>Ms Ball replied that the particular specialist was Barrie Low and his team from Coastec, they also did the specialist study for Ankerlig OCGT site. There is 11 different plant communities at Duynefontein, there are approximately 380 species on the site, including red data species. There is also a dune system, which was assessed by both the dune specialist and the flora specialist. No off-site offsets have been recommended at this stage. There has been on site mitigation proposed for example clearing of vegetation and translocation of rare and endangered species and the positioning of the site.</p> <p>Ms Ball responded by saying that the specialist study is an independent study, independent of Arcus GIBB and independent of Eskom. Those recommendations have been made by that particular specialist. She asked Mr Theron to please submit his comments regarding off sets.</p>
19	Ms Samantha Ralston Cape Nature	Ms Ralston noted that Koeberg is ecologically very special and Eskom has done a great job in the private nature reserve. However, what would be beneficial, instead of having all the small piecemeal applications such as ???facilities, if they could sit around a table and discuss where they are planning to develop and expand (for all power plants) and then decide where to conserve. Maybe this	Ms Herbst replied that Koeberg is a formal nature reserve so it falls under the Protected Areas Act, it therefore has formal protection. From an Eskom perspective, on some of the sites, Eskom was required to purchase 8 000 ha as part of the authorisation condition. This is an easy offset as it was in a developing and unpopulated area. Eskom would be more than willing to discuss this with nature conservation and to share their future plans in terms of

DUYNEFONTEIN KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		discussion can be opened and this land can be donated to conservation. Her understanding is that Koeberg is just a private nature reserve, which legally does not have protection in the long-term.	conservation and biodiversity.
20	Mr Wolsley Jacobson Lions International and MRRA	Mr Jacobson said that his concern is the waste disposal. There does not seem to be any answer to the high-level waste storage. The fact that it is currently stored on site could be dangerous.	The facilitator said that this was a grave concern that falls under the ambit of the NNR but this issue must be dealt with.  <b>Post-meeting note: The National Radioactive Waste Disposal Institute Act, 2008 (Act No. 53 of 2008) came into effect in December 2009. The Institute has not yet formally been constituted. The EIR will be updated with further information on the formation of this Institute.</b>
21	Mr Vincent Bergh City of Cape Town	Mr Vincent asked if the process will end if this EIA is accepted, would there be any recourse if there are problems with for example the NNR, if they had to increase the exclusion zone to 5 km.	Ms Ball said that she could not speak on behalf of the DEA but Arcus GIBB have made it clear in Chapter 9 of the report where there is a list of assumptions and limitations. One of the key assumptions is the 800 m zone. If any of the parameters is changed, either by the applicant or through the NNR process, the assumptions that would be built into the conditions of the authorisation would then become invalid. A review of the entire study would then have to be undertaken.  Ms Ball also added that when a decision is made by the DEA, the decision is communicated with full details of conditions, there is then an opportunity for the public to study these conditions.  Ms Herbst said that DEA always has a clause that they have the right to withdraw the authorisation.

<b>DUYNEFONTEIN KEY STAKEHOLDER FEEDBACK MEETING</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
22	Mr Mike Longden-Thurgood Milnerton Resident	<p>Mr Longden-Thurgood said that the Koeberg PWRs are Westinghouse type with a lifespan of approximately 40 years, this might be extended to 50 years. He feels that the existing Koeberg will be extended to 60 years. When looking at Generation 3, this has a design life of 60 years, he would not like to predict what the extension life would be. He added that he finds it extraordinary that even with a design life of 60 years, that some I&amp;APs are insisting and demanding that the documents go to great detail on decommissioning. No-one can say what technology will be around in the future.</p> <p>Mr Longden-Thurgood said that decommissioning means removing a plant to a safe condition, removing the equipment plant, which is removable, it is not just dismantling the plant. Decommissioning is usually associated with dismantling and also the final removal of the radiated fuel has nothing to do with decommissioning. Making the fuel storage safe has everything to do with decommissioning.</p>	<p>The facilitator asked if this was not just good practice that good mechanisms are included in the process for decommissioning.</p> <p>Ms Ball responded that Mr Longden-Thurgood had an important point that this is something that is difficult to grapple with both by the specialists and by Arcus GIBB in terms of what decommissioning activity will entail especially when it is so far into the future. They have used the information at their disposal of case studies around the world and these have been incorporated into the report.</p> <p>Ms Ball also thanked Mr Longden-Thurgood for his valuable and constructive comments.</p>

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

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

**APPENDIX 3: ATTENDANCE LIST**

Surname	First Names	Title	Co/Org	Port Elizabeth Meeting 12 Apr 10	Cape St Francis Meeting 16 Apr 10	Melkbosstrand Meeting 20 Apr 10
Adams	Rashid	Clr	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		Attended	Attended	
Becker	Peter	Mr				Attended
Bergh	Vincent	Clr	Sub Council Blaauwberg			Attended
Bouwer	Nicolaas Andre	Mr	St Andrews College	Attended		
Bowler	Karin	Mrs	Karin Bowler Enterprises	Attended		
Brenner	Heather	Clr	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	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 Nuclear Sites	Attended		Attended
Hardie	George	Mr			Attended	
Hardie	Sandra	Mrs	St Francis Conservancy		Attended	
Henkeman	Pauline	Mrs	Eskom - Koeberg Visitors Centre			Attended
Herbst	Deidre	Ms	Eskom Generation	Attended		
Hutchinson	Martha-Maria	Mrs	St Francis Conservancy		Attended	
Inman	Peter	Dr	Coega Development Corporation (Pty) Ltd	Attended	Attended	

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

Surname	First Names	Title	Co/Org	Port Elizabeth Meeting 12 Apr 10	Cape St Francis Meeting 16 Apr 10	Melkbosstrand Meeting 20 Apr 10
Jacobson	Wolsley	Mr	Milnerton Rate Payers & Residents Association			Attended
Jeannes	Deon	Mr	Eskom	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	Attended		
Lamont	Sydney	Mr	Sea Vista Forum	Attended	Attended	
Lategan	Tanya	Ms	Supertubes Surfing Foundation		Attended	
Leask	Kevin	Mr	Eskom	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 - Port Elizabeth	Attended		
Naiker	Melissa	Ms	Dept of Economic Affairs & Development Planning			Attended
Neilson	Peter	Mr	Nelson Mandela Bay Municipality		Attended	
Ngcongolwana	Armstrong	Mr	SA Post Office	Attended		
Nggumshe	Phumla	Ms	Bitou Local Municipality	Attended		

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

Surname	First Names	Title	Co/Org	Port Elizabeth Meeting 12 Apr 10	Cape St Francis Meeting 16 Apr 10	Melkbosstrand Meeting 20 Apr 10
Nicholson	Peter	Mr	Billabong SA		Attended	
Norman	Jan	Mr	Koeberg	Attended		Attended
Ntamnani	Ncedo	Mr	Eskom			Attended
Nwokedi	Judi	Ms	Areva	Attended		
Oddy	Chantal	Ms	Rebels Rus Conservancy	Attended		
Oosthuizen	Joe	Mr	Chem-Dry SA		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 & Tech			Attended
Ralston	Samantha	Ms	Cape Nature Land Use Advice: Scientific Services			Attended
Rautenbach	Elisabeth	Mrs	St Francis Conservancy		Attended	
Royal	Renee	Mrs			Attended	
Simms	Mike	Mr	St Francis Bay Residents Association		Attended	
Slamdien	Ashraf	Mr	Blaauwberg Administration City of Cape Town			Attended
Stott	Tony	Mr	Eskom Generation	Attended		Attended
Theron	Mervin	Mr	Eskom	Attended		Attended
Theron	Morne	Mr	City Of Cape Town Resource Management			Attended
Thorpe	Hilton & Julia	Mr & Mrs	Waterways B & B, 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 Transmission	Attended		
von Holdt	Andrea	Ms	Coega Development Corporation (Pty) Ltd	Attended	Attended	
West	David Michael	Mr	Eskom	Attended		
Willemse	Douw	Mr	City of Cape Town			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
Williamson	Raymond	Mr	Melkbosstrand Rate Payers Assoc			Attended
Wiseman	Keith	Mr	City of Cape Town: Environmental Management Dept			Attended