

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT (EIA)

EIA: 12/12/20/944

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

RECORD OF PUBLIC OPEN DAYS

AREA	DATE	VENUE	TIME
Oyster Bay	Monday, 03 March 2008	Oyster Bay Hall	15:00 - 19:00
St Francis Bay	Tuesday, 04 March 2008	St Francis Links	15:00 - 19:00
Port Elizabeth	Wednesday, 05 March 2008	Kelway Hotel	14:30 - 18:30

OVERVIEW OF PUBLIC OPEN DAYS

The main purpose of the Public Open Days was to reflect back to the public in terms of the following:

- Have we captured issues raised by the public correctly during Scoping?
- Have we understood their issues?
- Have we properly contextualised and interpreted their issues?
- Are the proposed specialist studies eventually going to provide answers to the questions raised by the public?

FORMAT OF PUBLIC OPEN DAYS

The information displayed at the Public Open Days held in the Northern, Western and Eastern Cape Provinces was similar in nature.

Supporting documentation prepared by ARCUS GIBB included the following booklets:

- Summary of Draft Scoping Report (English and Afrikaans versions).
- Poster booklet (English and Afrikaans versions).
- Draft Terms of Reference for Specialist Studies.
- Receiving environment.

Additional information prepared by Eskom Holdings Limited included the following booklets:

- Nuclear energy - Unleashing Africa's Energy.

The content of the mobile display used at the various Public Open Days can be downloaded from the Eskom's website www.eskom.co.za/eia under Nuclear 1 link or requested from the Public Participation Office, ACER (Africa) at nuclear1@acerafrica.co.za or 086 010 4958.

The Independent EIA Project Team members and Eskom staff were available at various Public Open Days to address questions, comments and concerns that were raised by Interested and Affected Parties.

This document presents a summary record of issues and questions raised at the various Public Open Days. ACER has tried to capture and reflect as accurately as possible all issues raised at various public meetings. Should you wish to edit your comments, please advise ACER within two weeks of receiving this summary document.

This record has been:

- Compiled by:** ACER (Africa) Environmental Management Consultants
Reviewed by: ARCUS GIBB (Pty) Ltd
Accepted by: Eskom Holdings Limited, Generation and Enterprises Divisions

FOR EASE OF REFERENCE

COMMENTS RAISED AT	INCLUDE NUMBERS
Oyster Bay	1 - 13
St Francis Bay	14 - 44
Port Elizabeth	45 - 49

RECORD OF ISSUES RAISED AND DISCUSSED AT OYSTER BAY

No	Name & Organisation	Issue/Comment/Concern	Response
1	An I&AP Oyster Bay Public Open Day	Concerned about the following issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Crime situation. <input type="checkbox"/> Construction village – where will it be located? <input type="checkbox"/> Infrastructural requirements. 	Various specialist studies (for example social, traffic, transportation, tourism, macro-economic) form part of the detailed impact assessments of this EIA. These assessments will consider the impact that such a development would have on the existing infrastructure and the need for new infrastructure and on development in the area and on social aspects such as crime. The studies will also consider the requirements for accommodation and associated infrastructure. Eskom will engage with the Local Municipalities at the appropriate time regarding the infrastructure requirements.
2	Mr Paul Jooste	He is positive about the Nuclear Power Station development. Some issues that need to be considered as part of the development are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Influx of people looking for jobs. Even if they do not get employment, they will stay in the area. <input type="checkbox"/> Those that are employed might stay afterwards, i.e. after construction has been completed. 	At this stage, Eskom estimates that approximately 6000 – 7000 people will be employed at the peak of the construction period, while between 1500 and 2000 people will be employed during normal operation of the proposed power station. Various specialist studies (for example social, traffic, transportation, tourism, macro-economic) form part of the detailed impact assessments of this EIA. These assessments will consider the impact that such a development would have on the existing infrastructure and the need for new infrastructure and on development in the area. The studies will also consider the requirements for accommodation and associated infrastructure. Although Eskom will require that the contractors make every effort, where practical, to employ local labour, this will be insufficient and hence outside labour will be required. Eskom's preference is to, as far as possible, recruit locally. There are numerous infrastructure development projects planned for South Africa, by Eskom as well as other entities. It is thus

No	Name & Organisation	Issue/Comment/Concern	Response
		<input type="checkbox"/> The Municipality has approved the construction and upgrading of a road to Oyster Bay. Can Eskom influence the design of the road to accommodate the construction requirements?	<p>anticipated that construction workers will transfer to the next project once construction is complete on this proposed power station.</p> <p>Eskom is not aware of the Municipality approval for the upgrading of the road to Oyster Bay. Eskom will engage with the Municipality in this regard.</p>
3	Mr Johannes Vermaak Agri-Tsitsikamma Oos	<p>Eskom should not waste more time. There are more people supporting Nuclear Power Stations than they currently think. Concerns are not nuclear energy <i>per se</i>, they are mainly social related issues, e.g.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Employment <input type="checkbox"/> Construction workers <input type="checkbox"/> Housing <input type="checkbox"/> Safety <input type="checkbox"/> Infrastructure, etc 	Comments noted. These comments have been taken into consideration.
4	An I&AP Oyster Bay Public Open Day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> How are you going to access the Nuclear Power Station at Thyspunt, please explain the alignment of the road? <input type="checkbox"/> What will the access road look like? 	Access will be dealt with as part of the road and transport studies and will be discussed in the specialist report and the draft EIR.
5	An I&AP Oyster Bay Public Open Day	What are you envisaging in terms of the direction of this development?	<p>The proposed project, for which this EIA is being undertaken, is a nuclear power station and associated infrastructure, of up to 4000 MW to be constructed on one site. The Scoping Report recommends that the detailed impact assessment phase of the EIA be conducted on three of the five alternative sites, including the Thyspunt site, The EIA will however also consider the maximum number of units, and hence the total generating capacity that each of the three sites could accommodate.</p> <p>Subject to the required authorisations being granted, construction of the proposed Nuclear 1 power station could</p>

No	Name & Organisation	Issue/Comment/Concern	Response
			<p>commence at the beginning of 2010, with operation of the first unit in 2016/2017.</p> <p>Transmission lines would also be required – this would be the subject of a separate EIA process.</p>
6	An I&AP Oyster Bay Public Open Day	How will the proposed Nuclear Power Plant affect the Tjokka Industry?	A marine biological and economic assessment will be undertaken during the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA in order to assess the potential impacts of the proposed NPS.
7	An I&AP Oyster Bay Public Open Day	What type of emissions can be expected from the proposed Nuclear Power Station?	A detailed Air Quality assessment will be undertaken during the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA in order to assess the potential impacts of the proposed NPS.
8	Ms Laura Nixon	<p>What is Eskom's Environmental policy for such developments? Does Eskom try to minimise the detrimental effect on the environment as far as possible?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Concerned that when the road is upgraded, crime will increase in the area. Can Eskom deal with security issues?</p>	<p>Eskom's policy is to conduct its business in a caring, responsible and sustainable manner, providing high quality electricity to its customers whilst reducing the impact that its activities have on the environment. Eskom ensures compliance during construction and operation with the Environmental Management Plans that are compiled for all of their projects. Eskom appoints external, independent auditors to confirm compliance with all legal requirements.</p> <p>Various specialist studies (for example social, traffic, transportation, tourism, macro-economic) form part of the detailed impact assessments of this EIA. These assessments will consider the impact that such a development would have on the existing infrastructure and the need for new infrastructure and on development in the area, including social aspects such as security and crime. Eskom does not have a mandate to manage security issues outside of its own property and</p>

No	Name & Organisation	Issue/Comment/Concern	Response
		<p>❑ Concerned about the influx of new people into the area. The community in Oyster Bay is settled, peaceful and comprises mainly law-abiding and well-behaved people. The influx of new people and new infrastructure might mess up their social systems and structure.</p>	<p>activities, but would engage with the appropriate mandated Authorities on such issues. The studies will also consider the requirements for accommodation and associated infrastructure</p> <p>Comment noted and will be flagged for the specialist studies to be undertaken during the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA.</p>
9	An I&AP Oyster Bay Public Open Day	Will the hiking trail along the coast be closed to the public?	During the construction period (assuming that authorisation to proceed with the project is granted), access to the site on which the proposed Nuclear 1 power station is being constructed, would be restricted for safety and security reasons. Similar to what occurs at Koeberg, once construction has been completed, Eskom would grant controlled public access to the areas of the site not required to be secured in terms of the National Key Point Act.
10	An I&AP Oyster Bay Public Open Day	Will the proposed Nuclear Power Station have an impact on the Tjokka boats that come very close to the coastline?	<p>The requirements of the National Key Point Act will come into force as soon as construction of the proposed power station commences. This will include restrictions on the coastal side of the power station. The exact extent of these restrictions will only be known once the design of the proposed power station, including the design and layout of the sea water intake systems has been completed.</p> <p>A marine biological and economic assessment will be undertaken during the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA in order to assess the potential impacts of the proposed NPS.</p>
11	Mr Mias Strydom OBC Properties	At Tony's Bay there are heritage sites. Khoi people stacked some rocks on top of each other and used these as fishing traps. He would like to suggest that Nuclear 1 Specialists contact local specialists,	Thank you for your comments. This information will be passed onto the Heritage Specialist that is undertaking the study for the project.

No	Name & Organisation	Issue/Comment/Concern	Response
		such as Tommy Bohrman of the Nelson Mandela University and Mr Binneman of the Albany Museum for information on these environmental and World Heritage Sites. <i>[For any information on these sites or contact details of relevant people, please contact Mr Mias Strydom by e-mail at emias@netactive.co.za]</i>	
12	Mr Koos Mans	Concerned about the influx of people into the area during construction. Added to this is a concern around construction workers who might stay after construction is complete. It has been observed in many parts of the country that construction workers stay in the area even if they are no longer employed. A consequence to this is the potential increase in the crime rate in the area.	<p>Comment noted and will be flagged for the specialist studies to be undertaken during the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA. At this stage, Eskom estimates that approximately 6000 – 7000 people will be employed at the peak of the construction period. Various specialist studies (for example social, traffic, transportation, tourism, macro-economic) form part of the detailed impact assessments of this EIA. These assessments will consider the impact that such a development would have on the existing infrastructure and the need for new infrastructure and on development in the area. The studies will also consider the requirements for accommodation and associated infrastructure</p> <p>.Although Eskom will require that the contractors make every effort to employ local labour where practical; this will be insufficient and hence outside labour will be required. Eskom's preference is to, as far as possible, recruit locally. There are numerous infrastructure development projects planned for South Africa, by Eskom as well as other entities. It is thus anticipated that construction workers will transfer to the next project once construction is complete on this proposed power station.</p>
13	Mr Koos Mans	Nuclear Accident - would like to know what happens in the worst-case scenario, how far will it spread and whether the plume can reach Port Elizabeth? He is concerned about the evacuation of people and whether everyone would be evacuated in time?	Eskom will not construct and operate a nuclear power station if it is not safe. In addition, the nuclear safety of, and the risk of a nuclear accident at the proposed power station will be independently assessed by the National Nuclear Regulator.

No	Name & Organisation	Issue/Comment/Concern	Response
		<p>What concerns him is the ignorance of people (in general) and the fact that they live in dangerous surroundings without being aware of it. He explained that even a silo could be like a huge bomb. With the right temperature and with a spark, a silo can explode and wipe out everything in the vicinity.</p>	<p>The NNR will only issue a nuclear installation licence for the proposed power station if it is satisfied that the risk of an accident is acceptable low. Even though the risk is low the NNR also requires that a viable emergency plan is implemented. The NNR will require regular demonstration that any emergency plan is implementable.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>

RECORD OF ISSUES RAISED AND DISCUSSED AT ST FRANCIS BAY

No	Name & Organisation	Issue/Comment/Concern	Response
14	Mr Chris Barratt	He is concerned about the notifications of the Public Open Day. He is raising this concern on behalf of the Sea Vista community.	Notifications were sent via personalised letters to all registered Interested and Affected Parties. Notifications were sent on 28 January 2008. In addition, advertisements were placed in various National, Regional and Local Newspapers.
15	Mr Robin Simpson St Francis/Kromme Trust	Requested ACER to ensure that the Kromme Trust submission is included in the Final Scoping Report.	<p>Comment noted and ACER confirmed that this submission has already been included in the issues being collated as part of the Draft Scoping Report.</p> <p>At the time when this error was pointed out, ACER, on behalf of the Project Team sent a letter apologising for this omission and/or error.</p>
16	Mr Ryan Donnelly For A Safe Tomorrow	Why are some of the submissions missing? He finds it unacceptable that some submissions are missing. In some cases, I&APs are quoted saying something completely different to what they actually said at the meeting. He would like to know how this will be rectified and requests that all meetings should be recorded to ensure that the minutes are presented accurately.	This issue has been dealt with as indicated in comment 15 above.
17	Mr Lifa Mbombiya Sea Vista Resident	<p>He would like to request that Eskom takes some representatives from Sea Vista to visit Koeberg Nuclear Power Station so as to give them a better understanding of a Nuclear Power Station and its operation.</p> <p>This request from the Sea Vista residents has been passed on to Eskom representatives during previous meetings.</p>	Eskom has already undertaken some nuclear awareness training in the Eastern Cape, including in Sea Vista. Eskom will engage with the Local Authorities and the Sea Vista community regarding the request for a visit to Koeberg power station.
18	Mr Alwin Malgas	Referring to the comment above, he also wanted to know when would Eskom consider the request. It is important for the Sea Vista community.	

No	Name & Organisation	Issue/Comment/Concern	Response
19	Ms Trudi Malan Ajubatus Marine	<p>She is concerned as to why the team is not using local expertise? There are a number of local specialists who have worked in the area. She also referred to the fact that Prof Graham Kerley of the Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University raised the same concern at a Key Stakeholder Meeting held in Port Elizabeth.</p> <p>She is not questioning the knowledge or expertise of the appointed specialists, but obviously one would get a better picture from a local specialist's perspective.</p> <p>Eskom, as the Client should have more input into which specialists should be used. Using specialists who do not know the area exacerbates incorrect information. For instance, the tourism numbers that have been given in the Draft Scoping Report are ridiculous.</p>	<p>Ms Ball, the EIA Project Manager encouraged all present to inform the EIA team of the local specialists, and that ARCUS GIBB would communicate with the specialist on the team and request them to hold discussions with these specialists in order to obtain local knowledge.</p> <p>Eskom as Client cannot enforce which specialists are to be used, as it might compromise the independence of the Consultant.</p>
20	St Francis Bay Residents present at Public Open Day	<p>Concerns raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Information displayed at Public Open Days by the Consultants is biased towards Eskom. ❑ The public does not want to meet with Eskom. They want to meet with the consultants. ❑ It was questioned why Eskom was present at the Public Open Day? ❑ Expressed their dissatisfaction with the Public Open Day set up – they need a public meeting. Based on their opinion, a Public Open Day seems to be showcasing how good Eskom is. ❑ Why a Key Stakeholder Workshop is only held in Port Elizabeth? Also, selected members of the public received invitations. A Key Stakeholder Workshop should be held at St Francis Bay. 	<p>Public Open Days were structured to enable the public to reflect on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Has the EIA team captured the issues raised by the public correctly? ❑ Has the EIA team understood issues raised? ❑ Has the EIA team properly contextualised and interpreted the issues? <p>Essentially, the public was expected to feedback by identifying gaps in information based on the content of the Draft Scoping Report. This is on the assumption that the public has made an effort to read the documents made available for review. Eskom representatives were present at the Public Open Days to receive feedback from the public and respond to comments/concerns as and when required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Port Elizabeth is a central venue for the Eastern Cape administrative area.

No	Name & Organisation	Issue/Comment/Concern	Response
			<input type="checkbox"/> Invitations are sent to representatives of various sectors and organisations. Key stakeholders have a mandate to represent their structures and are required to feedback to their constituencies. In addition, stakeholders have a responsibility to review the various reports and provide feedback to the study team.
21	Mr Ryan Donnelly For A Safe Tomorrow	There should be feasible methods for better communication with the surrounding communities, e.g. KwaNomzamo, Sea Vista, etc.	Comment noted.
22	Mr Hilton Thorpe St Francis Bay Residents Association/Kromme Trust	<input type="checkbox"/> The whole EIA process is disintegrated. <input type="checkbox"/> Eskom is going to a new Nuclear programme without looking or taking care of nuclear waste disposal. <input type="checkbox"/> It is completely unacceptable and would be irresponsible to go for another nuclear programme if the waste disposal issue has not been taken care of.	<p>The EIA is being conducted in accordance and in compliance with the requirements of the applicable legislation and regulations.</p> <p>The South African Cabinet approved a National Radioactive Management Policy and Strategy in 2005. The Department of Minerals and Energy (DME) is currently drafting legislation to implement the Policy. Two options for the long-term management of spent fuel, after an initial period of storage at the power station, are possible: (a) direct final disposal of the spent fuel in a deep underground geological disposal facility, or (b) reprocessing of the spent fuel to extract unused uranium and plutonium for re-use and concentration and disposal of the residual (about 3-4% of the spent fuel) high level waste in a deep underground geological disposal facility. Both options are being pursued internationally.</p> <p>For the proposed nuclear power station, Eskom intends to follow the same practices for the management of radioactive waste as that followed for the Koeberg power station, under the regulatory control of the National Nuclear Regulator and subject to the requirements of the National Radioactive Waste Management Policy and Strategy and any associated legislation or regulations. Eskom is confident in the safety of</p>

No	Name & Organisation	Issue/Comment/Concern	Response
			these practices for the management of radioactive waste.
23	Mr Ryan Donnelly For A Safe Tomorrow	<p>Minutes of the meetings should be recorded properly and professionally. He referred to the compiled minutes as “dog’s breakfast”. He further indicated that he could do a better job.</p> <p>Follow up comment – he stated that he is not willing to provide changes/corrections to these minutes to the consultant as they are well paid for doing this task and it is expected that they will be done properly. He further stated that he spends a lot of his time on the Nuclear 1 project and does not receive payment for his time.</p>	<p>Mr Donnelly’s derogatory remarks were noted. In this regard, he was requested to indicate his specific areas of concern on the “Records of Meetings - Volume 3” so they could be rectified.</p> <p>Suggested changes that were provided by Mr Donnelly to Ms Shinga of ACER (Africa) are appended to these minutes.</p>
24	Ms Nomalungelo Cynthia Ntengwane Sea Vista Resident	<p>Her concerns are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Does not know the dangers associated with the proposed Nuclear Power Station. <input type="checkbox"/> Does not have a clear picture of what is being proposed. <input type="checkbox"/> Would like a detailed explanation of what the Nuclear Power Station is about. <input type="checkbox"/> Is it possible for Eskom to take representatives from Sea Vista to Koeberg Nuclear Power Station so they can have a better understanding of the proposal? 	<p>Ms Carin de Villiers, Eskom Generation spent some time with Ms Ntengwane and other community members from Sea Vista providing information on the following aspects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> What is a Nuclear Power Station? <input type="checkbox"/> Operational requirements of a Nuclear Power Station? <input type="checkbox"/> Practical examples of what is happening in and around a Nuclear Power Station (using Koeberg as an example). <input type="checkbox"/> How does a Nuclear Power Station generate electricity? <p>Eskom will engage with the Local Authorities and the Sea Vista community regarding the request for a visit to Koeberg power station</p>
25	An I&AP St Francis Bay Public Open Day	What will be the size of a Nuclear Power Station? Will it be the same as Koeberg?	The proposed Nuclear Power Station will be slightly bigger than Koeberg, but whereas Koeberg has an output of 1800 MW, the proposed Nuclear 1 power station will have an output of between 3200 and 3500 MW.
26	An I&AP St Francis Bay Public Open Day	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Which water source will be used for cooling the power station? <input type="checkbox"/> Are there any pipes from the Nuclear Power Station to the sea? 	<p>Sea water will be used to cool the steam in the turbines and condense it back to water for reuse in a closed system.</p> <p>The design of the sea water intake and the outfall for returning</p>

No	Name & Organisation	Issue/Comment/Concern	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> People in the area live on fish – will there be an impact on fish species? 	<p>the sea water to the sea has not yet been finalised, but it is envisaged that there would be pipes going into the sea.</p> <p>A Marine Biologist will be undertaking an assessment during the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA in order to assess potential impacts of the proposed NPS.</p>
27	Mr Jim Pattison	<p>Issues of concern:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Accountabilities of the Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism and National Nuclear Regulator. <input type="checkbox"/> Worst -case scenario from a release point of view. <input type="checkbox"/> Scenario planning for an emergency plan. 	<p>DEAT are the authorising body for this EIA and will be the authority that makes the decision regarding an environmental authorisation.</p> <p>The National Nuclear Regulator will review the safety case for the proposed power station and will make the decision regarding the issuing of a nuclear installation licence.</p> <p>A cooperative Agreement, required in terms of the National Nuclear Regulator Act exists between the NNR and DEAT to avoid duplication and ensure synergy between their respective regulatory processes.</p> <p>Eskom will not construct and operate a nuclear power station if it is not safe. In addition, the nuclear safety of, and the risk of a nuclear accident at the proposed power station will be independently assessed by the National Nuclear Regulator. The NNR will only issue a nuclear installation licence for the proposed power station if it is satisfied that the risk of an accident is acceptable low.</p> <p>Even though the risk of an accident is low, the NNR also requires that a viable emergency plan is implemented. The requirements for the emergency plan will be determined by the NNR based on their assessment of the design and safety analysis of the proposed power station and the characteristics of the site and its environs. The NNR will require regular</p>

No	Name & Organisation	Issue/Comment/Concern	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="539 368 1355 504">❑ Site selection – original work undertaken on a set of conditions, which have significantly changed, e.g. political environment, economics, etc. Need to focus on the current situation and develop criteria for site selection. <li data-bbox="539 544 1355 639">❑ Revision of the Terms of Reference (ToR) for specialists, e.g. Transport, Tourism, Land-Use (Agriculture, Fisheries). The programme should be aligned with the revised ToR. 	<p data-bbox="1386 264 2069 293">demonstration that any emergency plan is implementable.</p> <p data-bbox="1386 333 2130 533">The original site selection was undertaken in the 1980s and not all of the conditions are different. For issues around Social and economic issues, specialist studies have been commissioned to look into the potential impacts of the NPS on these aspects and to identify what the current situation is at these sites.</p> <p data-bbox="1386 576 2130 711">All specialist study TOR are contained in the Plan of Study for EIA contained within the DSR, all I&APs were urged to please review and provide specific comments if they were not happy with the specialist TOR.</p>
28	Mr Robin Simpson St Francis/Kromme Trust	<p data-bbox="539 727 1355 855">Concerned about the fact that the National Nuclear Regulator (NNR) reports to the Department of Minerals and Energy, which is part of the Government. Therefore, the NNR is not an independent party from the Government.</p> <p data-bbox="539 1246 1355 1310">He is concerned about political interference when a decision is made regarding the proposed Nuclear Power Station.</p>	<p data-bbox="1386 727 2130 791">Throughout the world, Regulatory Authorities are appointed by Government, in terms of approved legislation.</p> <p data-bbox="1386 799 2130 1062">In South Africa, the National Nuclear Regulator Act 47 of 1999, approved by Parliament, provides the mandate and identifies the scope of activities of the NNR. In terms of the Act, the Board of the NNR specifically includes representatives of each of Labour, Business and affected Communities respectively, and specifically excludes anybody who is the holder of a nuclear authorisation or the employee of the holder of a nuclear authorisation.</p> <p data-bbox="1386 1070 2130 1206">Each year, the NNR tables its Annual Report in Parliament. The NNR also provides ad hoc reports to Parliamentary Portfolio Committees on specific issues with which it is dealing. The NNR executes its mandate in an independent manner.</p> <p data-bbox="1386 1246 2130 1343">Eskom's projects are conducted in accordance with strict and robust commercial processes, and are continuously monitored and audited by independent national and international auditing</p>

No	Name & Organisation	Issue/Comment/Concern	Response
			specialist organisations. These auditing organisations would identify and would report any inappropriate activities or influencing of the commercial and procurement processes.
29	Mr Robin Simpson St Francis/Kromme Trust	Concerned about the road that they want to make through the dunes.	Comment noted. The draft Scoping Report noted that the access roads to the Thyspunt site will have to be investigated in the detailed impact assessment phase of the EIA.
30	An I&AP St Francis Bay Public Open Day	On a personal note, Mr Dave Wynne was questioned if he would come and stay in St Francis Bay or invest his money in an area where a Nuclear Power Station is proposed?	In responding positively, Mr Wynne also indicated that his daughter is working at the Koeberg Nuclear Power Station. If it were not a safe place, he would have discouraged her from working at the nuclear power station.
31	An I&AP St Francis Bay Public Open Day	Concerned about the capabilities and track record of companies who will be employed to render services and the fact that Black Economic Empowerment will influence the awarding of contracts as opposed to the ability to undertake work. Does this mean that there will be no points /score card system on the tender documents?	Construction and operation of the proposed Nuclear Power Station would be according to internationally acceptable standards. The supplier would also be accountable for the work being carried out and/or services rendered. The two suppliers whose proposals are being evaluated for the proposed Nuclear 1 power station have international standing and recognition. Proposals from vendors for the supply of power stations to Eskom undergo technical and commercial evaluations by teams independent of each other. The correctness and robustness of these evaluations are independently reviewed and audited. Only once the reports of the two teams have been completed are they integrated into a final evaluation report. The commercial evaluation includes a consideration of localisation in respect of the Accelerated Shared Growth Initiative for SA (ASGISA) and a consideration of BEE partnering.

No	Name & Organisation	Issue/Comment/Concern	Response
32	Ms Trudi Malan Ajubatus Marine	<p>Why have the two sites been scoped out? These sites should not be scoped out based on economical issues only. She strongly feels that the report is flawed. The justification provided for scoping out the sites is not good enough. The Draft Scoping Report only has 3 sentences explaining the reasons for the scoping out of Brazil and Schulpfontein.</p> <p>Environmentally, it does not make sense. What environmental factors have you considered to exclude the Northern Cape sites?</p>	<p>In terms of the EIA regulations an alternative to be considered needs to be a feasible alternative.</p> <p>If the proposed Nuclear 1 power station is constructed, it is necessary to transmit the power produced by the power station to the major load centres (i.e. the areas where the electricity would be used), therefore requiring the construction of new transmission power lines and associated infrastructure. At this stage, the demand for electricity in the Northern Cape is relatively small compared to the size of the proposed power station, and hence the electricity generated would need to be sent to the major demand centres in the Western Cape, Eastern Cape and Gauteng.</p> <p>The Eskom Transmission Planning Division has indicated that these two sites cannot be integrated into the Eskom Power Grid in time to meet the demand for power - there is insufficient time for Eskom to have the environmental impact assessment completed, procure servitudes and build the power lines in two new corridors over more than 1500 km to send the power from either of these two sites to the major load centres in time to meet the required date for operation of the proposed Nuclear 1 power station. Both these two sites are thus considered to be non-viable alternatives specifically for this proposed power station (although they are alternatives for future power stations). It has thus been recommended to exclude these two sites from further investigation in this specific EIA.</p>
33	Ms Trudi Malan Ajubatus Marine	<p>Have you done studies on the sand flow? Sand flow should be studied over a period of 5 years. There is already a problem with sand on the beaches. If this is taken into consideration, then it is immediately clear that there is a fatal flaw on this site.</p>	<p>The moving dunes have and are being taken into account in the EIA process.</p> <p>The site conditions, including the geology and dynamic nature of sand, would be taken into account in the location of the footprint and the design of the proposed power station.</p>

No	Name & Organisation	Issue/Comment/Concern	Response
34	An I&AP St Francis Bay Public Open Day	Concerned about the fact that Eskom cannot even give the size of the structure. How can public submit comments when information such as this is not available yet?	This information will be available and included in the Draft Impact Assessment Report that will be available for public comment.
35	Mr Robin Simpson St Francis/Kromme Trust	<p>Feels that a viability study (of the site) should be done at the beginning of such a project.</p> <p>How can the National Nuclear Regulator guarantee that this area will be safe?</p>	<p>The whole South African coastline was investigated as part of the original Nuclear Site Investigation Programme (NSIP). Criteria, such as demography (existing population densities), ecological sensitivity, geology, the characteristics of the coastal area and the tides and wave action and seismicity, amongst others, were taken into account in determining the potential suitability of sites. Thyspunt was identified as a viable site.</p> <p>Additional geological and hydrological re-confirmation studies are currently being undertaken. The results of these studies are input into the EIA process, which forms part of the assessment of the viability of a site.</p> <p>Eskom will not construct and operate a nuclear power station if it is not safe. In addition, the nuclear safety of, and the risk of a nuclear accident at the proposed power station will be independently assessed by the National Nuclear Regulator. The NNR will only issue a nuclear installation licence for the proposed power station if it is satisfied that the risk of an accident is acceptable low.</p> <p>Even though the risk of an accident is low, the NNR also requires that a viable emergency plan is implemented. The requirements for the emergency plan will be determined by the NNR based on their assessment of the design and safety analysis of the proposed power station and the characteristics of the site and its environs. The NNR will require regular demonstration that any emergency plan is implementable.</p>

No	Name & Organisation	Issue/Comment/Concern	Response
36	Ms Trudi Malan Ajubatus Marine	There is a huge feeling of distrust. Previously, it was requested that a meeting should be held in St Francis area and the team did not comply with it. A meeting in St Francis is required as the affected parties live in this area and not in Port Elizabeth. The government officials get paid for their time, but the public have to travel on their own time and expenses, therefore, government officials should rather come to St Francis.	Key Stakeholder Meetings are held at high level of discussions. These meetings are held with key representatives from various sectors and organisations. Key Stakeholders have a responsibility of representing their constituencies and presenting their perspectives on the project. Therefore, it is not necessary for the general public to attend these meetings. Lastly, Port Elizabeth is a central venue for the Eastern Cape administrative area.
37	An I&AP St Francis Bay Public Open Day	Is the 31 ha area just for 4,000 MW? Is Eskom applying for an 8,000 MW plant with the NNR? The application that is with DEAT, is it an application for 4,000 or 8,000 MW? And what are the specifics? He feels that Koeberg is not a correct example?	The application is for a proposed nuclear power station of up to 4000 MW and the associated infrastructure. This is to ensure that the EIA is conservative in its assumptions and findings. The application for a nuclear installation licence to the National Nuclear Regulator will be made once the vendor, and hence the specific technology and design, has been selected, and hence will be more specific about the capacity of the power station (in the range 3200 to 3500 MW). The EIA will consider the maximum carrying capacity of the site from an environmental perspective. However, the construction of additional units on the site in the future would require environmental impact assessments and nuclear installation licences (as well as other permits / authorisations / licences) for those units.
38	Ms Trudi Malan Ajubatus Marine	The people of Humansdorp and Jeffreys Bay have been excluded in the study. Although the majority of people work in St Francis Bay, it is important that they are afforded similar opportunities to participate.	Public Meetings or Open Days are one of many options for submitting comments on the proposed project. There are various methods of communicating comments/concerns and issues to the EIA team.

No	Name & Organisation	Issue/Comment/Concern	Response
39	Ms Trudi Malan Ajubatus Marine	Why is the land in the Schulpfontein and Brazil area regarded as sensitive? For the Thyspunt Site, the transmission lines will go over Baviaanskloof, which is a World Heritage Site. Therefore, from an environmental point of view, the Schulpfontein and Brazil sites makes more sense.	All the sites have got their own various sensitivities, it is for this reason that a number of specialist investigations have been commissioned to assess the potential environmental impact of the proposed NPS on the environment. However as has been mentioned previously in terms of the EIA regulations an alternative to be considered needs to be a feasible alternative. The Eskom Transmission Planning Division has indicated that these two sites cannot be integrated into the Eskom Power Grid in time to meet the demand for power - there is insufficient time for Eskom to have the environmental impact assessment completed, procure servitudes and build the power lines in two new corridors over more than 1500 km to send the power from either of these two sites to the major load centres in time to meet the required date for operation of the proposed Nuclear 1 power station. Both these two sites are thus considered to be non-viable alternatives specifically for this proposed power station (although they are alternatives for future power stations). It has thus been recommended to exclude these two sites from further investigation in this specific EIA.
40	An I&AP St Francis Bay Public Open Day	Concerned about the fact that the EIA studies are dealt with separately, i.e. transmission lines and Nuclear sites.	It was stated that it is a standard practice for all power stations to first deal with the siting of a power station and thereafter deal with the transmission line integration. The Nuclear 1 EIA and the Transmission line EIA would need to be treated separately although running in parallel. Eskom has discussed the separate execution of the respective power station and transmission line EIAs with DEAT who indicated that they are satisfied with the approach adopted by Eskom.

No	Name & Organisation	Issue/Comment/Concern	Response
41	Ms Trudi Malan Ajubatus Marine	On the tourism development side, they want to launch a mountain biking route. The route already exists, but the proposed Eskom Nuclear Plant will prevent the launch from happening. Would Eskom allow this route to be used if it is permitted?	During the construction period (assuming that authorisation to proceed with the project is granted), access to the site on which the proposed Nuclear 1 power station is being constructed, would be restricted for safety and security reasons. Similar to what occurs at Koeberg, once construction has been completed, Eskom would grant controlled public access to the areas of the site not required to be secured in terms of the National Key Point Act.
42	Mr Derrick Cook Landowner - St Francis Bay	Eskom should have an idea of where the road will go. The road cannot go over the sand dunes. He requested that the public be informed of where the preferred site will be as well as the access road to the site. The nuclear site and the access road are inseparable.	This information will be provided in the next phase of this project.
43	Mr Hilton Thorpe St Francis Bay Residents Association/Kromme Trust	Japan is building Nuclear Power Stations in earthquake areas. It seems that a lot depends on the site foundations. Are you not investigating other possible sites, as these sites have been chosen years ago when other circumstances existed and with the lack of other additional technology?	For the proposed Nuclear 1 power station, which is required to come into operation from 2016 onwards, the sites previously identified in the independent site investigations undertaken during the 1980s - termed the Nuclear Site Investigation Programme (NSIP) – are being considered. Additional geological and hydrological re-confirmation studies are currently being undertaken on these sites, for input, as appropriate into the EIA studies and/or the Site Safety studies, and into the design of the proposed power station. Since South Africa needs new power stations, and later will need to replace older coal-fired power stations as they reached the end of their economic life, investigations will be initiated to identify additional sites for future nuclear power stations. These will be in addition to the sites previously identified.

No	Name & Organisation	Issue/Comment/Concern	Response
44	An I&AP St Francis Bay Public Open Day	How is Eskom going to deal with the increase in cancer from mining uranium? Specific reference was made to people working in the mines.	<p>The effect of mining uranium is outside of the scope of work for this EIA</p> <p>The statement that there is an increase in cancer from mining uranium is not substantiated. In South Africa uranium is currently produced as a by-product of gold mining operations. Many mining and mineral processing operations (e.g the production of gold, copper, uranium, heavy minerals, phosphate) involve radioactivity and radiation exposures. One of the roles of the National Nuclear Regulator is to regulate radiation exposures from naturally occurring radioactive material (NORM), such as is found in the mining and minerals processing sector. The latest (2006/7) Annual Report of the NNR contains information regarding occupational exposure to radiation and shows significant reductions to exposures over the last 6 years. The NNR Annual Report can be downloaded off their website www.nnn.co.za</p>

RECORD OF ISSUES RAISED AND DISCUSSED AT PORT ELIZABETH, KELWAY HOTEL

No	Name & Organisation	Issue/Comment/Concern	Response
45	Mrs Libby von Holdt Rebels Rus Nature Reserve	<p>The following comments were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="533 422 1352 523">❑ In terms of visibility, what experience will a person have from the Rebels Rus Nature Reserve? Will visual studies be done from various vantage points? <li data-bbox="533 560 1352 624">❑ Landowners within the 16km are hoping that Eskom would buy the land and turn it into a nature reserve. <li data-bbox="533 660 1352 761">❑ Due to the sea outfall, few people have access to the area. Residents are fearful, as they are not sure where the development will end. <li data-bbox="533 798 1352 861">❑ Where will access to the Nuclear Power Station be? Will it be from Oyster Bay? <li data-bbox="533 898 1352 999">❑ There is an existing track in the area, which they do not want to be used as access to the Nuclear Power Station. If this were to be used it would be disastrous. <li data-bbox="533 1035 1352 1067">❑ Does Coega play a big role in terms of the growth load? <li data-bbox="533 1104 1352 1168">❑ Owners from the local reserve are concerned about growth in access and access to the nature reserve for poaching, etc. <li data-bbox="533 1204 1352 1305">❑ Potential for expansion of the Nature Reserve. Potential for Eskom to purchase/proclaim as much land as possible to curb further development along the coast. By proclaiming the area, landowners would also be protected. Suggest buy the buffer area 	<p>A visual assessment will be undertaken during the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA in order to assess any potential impacts of the proposed NPS.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>This information will be provided in the next phase of this project. Marine specialist studies will be undertaken as part of the detailed impact assessment phase of the EIA.</p> <p>Access roads to the Thyspunt site will be investigated in the detailed impact assessment phase of the EIA.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted. Eskom already owns ~90% of the total Thyspunt site, and will be negotiating the purchase of the remaining land from the respective landowners. Further land purchases would be considered in the context of the site's</p>

No	Name & Organisation	Issue/Comment/Concern	Response
		<p>of the reserve.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="533 347 1352 411">❑ Threat of poaching and over-development because of the uniqueness of the area. <li data-bbox="533 485 1352 580">❑ Fire requires cooperation between Eskom and local people in the reserve. In the past, some houses were burnt down due to uncontrolled fires. <li data-bbox="533 628 1352 692">❑ Would like a copy of a good quality map showing the locality of the proposed Nuclear Power Station. 	<p>viability for nuclear power generation and long-term conservation.</p> <p>This will be considered during the Impact Assessment Phase of the project.</p> <p>This will be considered during the Impact Assessment Phase of the project as well as the Environmental Management Plan.</p> <p>Better quality maps would be provided in the Draft Environmental Impact Report.</p>
46	Mrs Libby von Holdt Rebels Rus Nature Reserve	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="533 708 1352 804">❑ Would Eskom consider construction of the power lines along the road reserve? The lines along the road reserve will ensure that there is no bisecting or upsetting a new set of landowners. <li data-bbox="533 852 1352 1011">❑ Why are the Transmission Lines EIA not being done as part of the Nuclear 1 EIA? Is the separation of the EIA not pre-empting the Transmission Lines EIA process? Is it possible to get authorisation for the Nuclear Power Station and not for the transmission lines? 	<p>The Transmission Line EIA will be conducted as a separate process, in which a number of alternative alignments will be considered.</p> <p>It was stated that it is a standard practice for all power stations to first deal with the siting of a power station and thereafter deal with the transmission line integration. The Nuclear 1 EIA and the Transmission line EIA would need to be treated separately although running in parallel. Eskom has discussed the separate execution of the respective power station and transmission line EIAs with DEAT who indicated that they are satisfied with the approach adopted by Eskom.</p>
47	Mr Bryn Davies Evans Geelhout River Landowner	<p>The following comments were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="533 1171 1263 1203">❑ How serious are these Nuclear Power Station proposals? <li data-bbox="533 1347 1352 1374">❑ He is concerned that he is within the 16km radius – based on the 	<p>Assuming a 4% growth in the demand for electricity, South needs an additional 40000 MW of electricity generating capacity by 2025. This proposed nuclear power station is one of the projects for which studies are in progress to obtain the required authorisations.</p> <p>Eskom will not construct and operate a nuclear power station if</p>

No	Name & Organisation	Issue/Comment/Concern	Response
		map in the Draft Scoping Report.	<p>it is not safe. In addition, the nuclear safety of, and the risk of a nuclear accident at the proposed power station will be independently assessed by the National Nuclear Regulator. The NNR will only issue a nuclear installation licence for the proposed power station if it is satisfied that the risk of an accident is acceptable low.</p> <p>Note that the 16 km refers to one of the zones currently required for the Koeberg nuclear power station (there re two zones, a first zone up to approximately 5 km from the power station, within which no further development may take place, and a second zone from 5 km up to approximately 16 km from the power station, within which limited development may take place).</p> <p>For the proposed Nuclear 1 power station Eskom is considering the latest design of Pressurized Water Reactor (PWR) technology. Internationally, these designs have formal emergency planning zones less than 16 km. The NNR will however determine the emergency plan requirements and the extent of the required zone based on a safety assessment of the design of the proposed nuclear power station and the proposed site and environs.</p>
48	Mr Bryn Davies Evans Geelhout River Landowner	<input type="checkbox"/> Tidal wave current is within reach and Eskom should be using it for power generation.	<p>It is Eskom's stance that ALL of the primary energy resources in or available to South Africa, including solar, wind, wave, ocean current, tidal energy, biomass, hydro, gas, coal and nuclear need to be harnessed using the appropriate technology to provide the electricity that South Africa requires to support its economic growth and development. Projects are already underway regarding the different energy sources. However, present technologies are not advanced to a sufficient standard to exploit renewable energy and cannot produce sufficient amounts of power to meet the current electricity demand.</p>

No	Name & Organisation	Issue/Comment/Concern	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="533 244 1352 379">❑ What will happen to the volume of waste generated in the Nuclear Power Station? In Crocodile River, waste caused the water to turn into heavy metals. This is of concern as they are using water in Geelhout River for drinking purposes. <li data-bbox="533 523 1352 691">❑ Mpofu Dam is also within the 16km radius of the proposed Thyspunt site. If something goes wrong, 16,000 mega litres of water would be contaminated. The prevailing south-westerly wind from Thyspunt site will directly affect the Mpofu Dam area should there be radiation fallout or an accident. <li data-bbox="533 730 1352 794">❑ He understands that there is low level waste – if a person is surfing, will they not get heavier from the lead? <li data-bbox="533 1010 1352 1074">❑ One advantage about a Nuclear Power Station is that it will ensure that this area remains in a pristine condition. <li data-bbox="533 1121 1352 1217">❑ Need to take cognisance of the Woodlands Dairy - the value of the river frontage and land value. There is also a potential increase of farming activities in the area. 	<p data-bbox="1384 244 2136 483">Low and intermediate level wastes will be transported and disposed of at Vaalputs, the National Radioactive Waste Disposal site in the Northern Cape, whilst high-level (spent fuel) will be retained at the power station itself in spent fuel storage facilities, (pools and casks) licensed by the National Nuclear Regulator, subject to the requirements of the National Radioactive Waste Management Policy.</p> <p data-bbox="1384 523 2136 587">A hydrological specialist has been appointed and will assess the impacts of the NPS on water.</p> <p data-bbox="1384 730 2136 970">The National Nuclear Regulator establishes Annual Authorised Discharge Quantities to ensure that the public exposure arising from the release of radioactive liquids or gases into the environment are very low, well below the exposures received from natural background radiation levels. Low level radioactive waste is packaged according to standards specified by the NNR and transported to and disposed of at Vaalputs.</p> <p data-bbox="1384 1010 1592 1042">Comments noted.</p> <p data-bbox="1384 1121 2136 1217">Comment noted. Such issues will be addressed in the specialist studies to be undertaken during the detailed impact assessment phase of the EIA.</p>
49	Mr Bryn Davies Evans Geelhout River Landowner	<p data-bbox="533 1265 920 1297">Water Testing, Monitoring, etc</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="533 1305 1352 1361">❑ In terms of monitoring water – how do you monitor your borehole water? 	<p data-bbox="1384 1297 2136 1361">A Hydrology and Geohydrology specialist study will be undertaken during the Impact assessment phase of the EIA,</p>

No	Name & Organisation	Issue/Comment/Concern	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> At what stage will a water user know that it is unsafe to use borehole water for drinking purposes? <input type="checkbox"/> Will water be tested? As a landowner, will he need to test his water? <input type="checkbox"/> Will he need to pay for testing his water or will Eskom take care of it? <input type="checkbox"/> In terms of water testing, does Eskom only focus on their area of operation or will they extend to adjacent areas, etc? <input type="checkbox"/> Does Eskom ever make the results available to landowners? <p>Insurance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> What are the provisions for insurance? 	<p>which will address the potential impacts that the NPS may have on water resources.</p> <p>During operation of the proposed power station, regular environmental monitoring of the environs surrounding the power station will be undertaken, including the monitoring of groundwater, vegetation, agricultural products (such as milk), sea food etc. The results of such monitoring are reported to the National Nuclear Regulator. The NNR includes their assessment of the environmental monitoring in their Annual Report, which is tabled in Parliament. The NNR Annual Report can be downloaded from their website www.nnr.co.za</p> <p>The National Nuclear Regulator Act of 1999 and associated regulations make provision for 3rd party liability and compensation in the event of nuclear damage. In terms of section 30 of the Act, the holder of a nuclear installation licence is, whether or not there is intent or negligence on the part of the holder, liable for all nuclear damage caused by or resulting from the relevant nuclear installation. The holder of the nuclear installation licence is required to provide financial security to meet this requirement.</p> <p>The level of financial security is determined by the National Nuclear Regulator and is published in regulations issued by the Minister of Minerals and Energy.</p> <p>The NNR Act and the relevant regulation can be downloaded from the NNR website www.nnr.co.za.</p>

Name: Mr Ryan Donnelly

Organisation: For A Safe Tomorrow

This section presents Mr Donnelly's suggested changes, which were provided verbally to Ms Shinga, ACER (Africa) at the Public Open Day held at St Francis Bay, St Francis Links on Tuesday, 04 March 2008, as part of the Draft Scoping Report review.

These comments are specific to the minutes recorded at the public meetings held during the period 06 June - 16 August 2007.

Source	Recorded Comment	Mr Donnelly's suggested change(s)
St Francis Bay Public Meeting, St Francis Links (25 July 2007) No 343	What part of the presentation could make an Interested and Affected Party (I&AP) make an informed <u>decision</u> ?	Should read as "What part of the presentation could make an Interested and Affected Party (I&AP) make an informed <u>comment</u> ?"
St Francis Bay Public Meeting, St Francis Links (25 July 2007) No 363	He is not happy with ACER.	This comment should have followed dissatisfaction comments raised by Mr Dahlhauser and Ms Honey and not read as a stand-alone comment.
Meeting held at The Dunes Country House (26 July 2007)	The meeting was held with members of the "Thyspunt Anti-Nuclear Group (TANG)" on the record of minutes.	Mr Donnelly indicated that there is no such group as "Thyspunt Anti-Nuclear Group".
Sea Vista Public Meeting (26 July 2007) No 315	What gases come out of the chimney? Are they radioactive? Are there any of the gases that Eskom is not able to filter?	It should be captured that he first questioned if there is a chimney at a Nuclear Power Station.
Sea Vista Public Meeting (26 July 2007)	No record on the minutes.	He raised a question/comment about the prevailing south-westerly wind conditions and the possibility of a nuclear accident under prevailing wind conditions.
Sea Vista Public Meeting (26 July 2007) No 320	As all of you can hear, people fear the Nuclear Power Station. What will happen at the end if people still fear this proposed Nuclear Power Station? (This comment was raised by Pastor Vena in Xhosa)	Mr Donnelly indicated that the comment was "if all people at Sea Vista do not want the Nuclear Power Station, will you still go ahead?"
Sea Vista Public Meeting (26 July 2007) No 319	He raised objections to information presented, responses provided by the team at the Sea Vista public meeting.	He indicated that his objections at the Sea Vista meeting were on the content of the Background Information. Too much time is spent on Background Information, which takes focus away from the essence of the EIA (social, economic and biophysical).

These are the changes/comments that Mr Ryan Donnelly pointed out at the Public Open Day. Although requested to submit these in writing, Mr Donnelly has never submitted formal changes in writing to Ms Shinga of ACER (Africa) as he feels that it is not his duty to record minutes. At

the time of the Public Open Day, Mr Donnelly admitted that he could not recall exactly what he had said at the public meetings and therefore it would be difficult to provide accurate changes.