

PROPOSED ESKOM NUCLEAR POWER STATION AND ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT (EIA: 12/12/20/944) SCOPING: ISSUES REPORT

Issues submitted have been grouped in the categories listed below:

No	Category
1	EIA (technical and public participation process)
2	Waste disposal (nuclear)
3	Financial/ Economic
4	Alternative generation alternatives (including renewables)
5	Safety and emergency situations
6	Site specific matters (a) Brazil (b) Schulpfontein (c) Duynefontein (d) Bantamsklip (e) Thuyspunt
7	Compatibility with current Integrated Development Planning (IDP) and provincial Spatial Development Plans (SDPs)
8	Ancillary infrastructure (roads, construction camps, etc)
9	Vegetation (site specific) and biodiversity
10	Employment/ Training
11	Archaeology/ Paleoecology/ Cultural Heritage
12	Marine environment
13	Property environment (values)
14	Construction impacts
15	Uranium source/ mining
16	Social/ health
17	Agricultural effects
18	Nuclear technology
19	Other processes – the National Nuclear Regulator (NNR) and Transmission Lines EIA
20	Tourism
21	Visual Impact

Please note: There are submissions, which have been included as appendices. Although, these submissions have been referenced in the main Issues Report, the content is a separate appendix.

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
1. EIA (TECHNICAL AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESS)		
<p>Ms Angela Andrews Legal Resource Centre</p>	<p>We act for Earthlife Africa Cape Town. We have been instructed to advise you that our client wishes to register its disappointment at this early stage with the quality of the public participation process for the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) for the proposed Eskom Nuclear Power Station (NPS) and Associated Infrastructure.</p> <p>The following are matters of concern for Earthlife Africa:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Background documentation, advertised as available on the Eskom and Consultants websites in adverts in the papers on 25 May were not available until Wednesday 29 May. Given that the first of the meetings are to take place on 6 June, Earthlife wonders whether sufficient time is available to interested and affected parties to engage with the background documentation and prepare adequately for the public meetings. ▪ The public meetings planned for the 6th June are to be held on 6th June. The Nuclear Energy Corporation of South Africa (NECSA) will hold its quarterly public safety and information forum meeting for the Vaalputs Nuclear Waste Facility on that same date. Given the significance of both the Vaalputs meeting and the proposed new NPS public meeting, it is disappointing that scheduling has made it difficult for Interested and Affected Parties (I&APs) to participate as they might desire to. ▪ Public Meetings planned for Cape Town will take place only in the Northern Suburbs. The impact of an additional NPS at Koeberg is significant for all of the people of Cape Town, not simply those in the Northern Suburbs. The Koeberg site has essentially been swallowed up by Cape Town and is no longer a remote area of the City. Accidents like those at Chernobyl have amply demonstrated the extensive and long-lasting impacts of NPSs on human settlement areas up to hundreds of kilometers away 	<p>These comments are noted. However, as Earthlife Africa Cape Town is aware, there are numerous opportunities within an EIA process for stakeholder engagement. This includes submission of comments by I&APs on the EIA for the proposed NPS, as well as direct engagement with the EIA Team, as well as the project proponent or Applicant (i.e. Eskom Holdings Limited). Indeed, for this EIA, the Scoping Phase has already been extended to facilitate I&AP participation in this important phase of the EIA.</p> <p>The Comment Period for comment on the Background Information Document, presentations made at the various Public Meetings (PMs), Focus Group Meetings (FGMs) and Key Stakeholder Workshops (KSWs) and documentation posted on the Eskom website for this EIA, was extended by five (5) weeks due to the large public interest shown in the EIA for the proposed NPS. The closing date for the Comment Period during the project announcement phase was 28 August 2007. This gave I&APs twelve (12) weeks to review the Background Information Document and submit their comment.</p> <p>Twenty five (25) PMs, eight (8) FGMs and four (4) KSWs have been held throughout South Africa during the project announcement phase of this EIA. I&APs had opportunities during all of these meetings and workshops to ask questions and make comments regarding the background material presented in this EIA. Refer to the Minutes of these meetings and workshops contained within Appendices G4, G5 and G6 of the Draft Scoping Report (DSR). The EIA Team has accommodated I&APs who could not attend any of the scheduled meetings or workshops by hosting additional FGMs and one-on-one engagements.</p> <p>Members of the Vaalputs National Radioactive Waste Disposal facility Forum attended the public meetings (refer</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
		<p>to the Minutes of these meetings contained within Appendix G6 of the DSR).</p> <p>The EIA Team received very few requests for a PM to be held in the centre of Cape Town or the Southern Suburbs. The EIA Team will, however, consider other venues for meetings in Cape Town during the Scoping Phase.</p> <p>This DSR is also available to the public for review and comment. Advertisements have been placed in the newspapers and letters sent to the 7 000 registered I&APs notifying them of exact details and venues for viewing the DSR and exact details concerning public meetings, where there will also be opportunities for I&APs to discuss the contents of the DSR, before it is finalised.</p> <p>A summary of the public participation process (PPP) to date, as well as that to be followed in the future is detailed in Chapter 9 of this DSR.</p>
<p>Dr Cairns A R Bain NECSA</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ At public meetings and capacity building workshops there should be practical demonstration using radiation detectors that we all live in a radiation environment that certain natural rocks and products are radioactive. 	<p>The EIA Team will consider this suggestion for use in future public engagements.</p>
<p>Mr Andrew Barker Andrew Barker Development Consultants</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I notice that all the Public Meetings (PMs) are scheduled to take place in the Northern, Western and Eastern Cape areas. While I recognise that this may be due to the fact that the possible sites are located all the way along the Southern African coastline, I would like to strongly suggest that PMs are also held through the rest of the country, in each of the provinces, to give other people a chance to understand what this proposal and EIA is about and how they maybe affected and be able to add value and to contribute to its realisation. ▪ This development is of a national significance and I believe that national public participation programme (PPP) should be embarked upon by the EIA Team and that the public meetings are not restricted to coastal areas only. ▪ Furthermore due to the nature of land ownership, investments 	<p>This EIA is focused on five alternative sites for the proposed NPS. The Public Meetings (PMs), Focus Group Meetings (FGMs) and Key Stakeholder Workshops (KSWs) are thus scheduled in appropriate locations with respect to those 5 sites. This in accordance with standard EIA best practice in South Africa, and does not prevent individuals or organisations from registering as an Interested and Affected Party (I&AP), from submitting comments and from receiving information on the proposed project.</p> <p>It should be noted that this EIA was advertised nationally, regionally and locally, and all members of the South African public are encouraged to participate, regardless of where they reside.</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>and developments in South Africa, many of the properties in the coastal areas are owned by people, organisations and institutions located in other parts of South Africa. In addition, the head offices of many nationally-based organisations tend to be located in major metropolitan areas. For this reason, they should also be given the opportunity to attend PMs held in their areas to be able to contribute to the decision-making process on this important project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I believe it is also important to recognise that stakeholders are not only a source of resistance to development projects. They should also be considered as a resource to assist in the realization of a project and therefore a broad outreach for participants and stakeholders from other areas of the country should be considered as an investment by the proponents and managed in such a way that added value from their engagement can be realized. 	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p>
<p>Mr Nicolas Andre Bouwer St. Andrew's College</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Impact studies should be done by more than one body to ensure objectivity and to allow for comparisons. 	<p>The EIA Team has assembled a team of specialists who will undertake the different specialist study investigations that are required. In addition, a separate team of peer review specialists has been assembled. The review specialists include an EIA Process Reviewer, a Legal Advisor and a Nuclear Reviewer. This is considered sound environmental practice. Curricula Vitae of the specialists and the specialist reviewers are available for review on the Eskom website for this EIA.</p>
<p>Mr Dave Brook Milnerton Residents Association</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Further to the presentation and discussion at the Atlantic beach complex last Friday, I confirm that concerns that need to be addressed <i>inter alia</i> include the following (see also Section 19): ▪ The suggestion by Earthlife Africa that they be an internal reviewer to the process is not agreed with. They should remain external to the process and act if they are able as a peer reviewer. ▪ I thank you for the informative and interactive public meeting. 	<p>These comments are noted.</p>
<p>Mrs Lilian Ursula Bunzli</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Environmental sustainability. ▪ Please provide the I&AP's with as much information as possible and be open, do not try to hide issues, as the whole process will 	<p>The EIA is currently in the Scoping Phase. All available information has been shared with the public. However, it should be noted that, as the EIA progresses, additional information will come to light, which will also be</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	be regarded as dubious.	disseminated in the public domain.
Mr Bruce Coultas Cape St Francis Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ As a resident of Cape St. Francis I attended the public meeting at Oyster Bay regarding the above EIA related to the Thyspunt site. I would like to be considered as an I&AP and submit comments for consideration. 	The EIA Team confirms that you have been added to the project stakeholder database and welcomes your contributions to this EIA. It must be noted that the Thyspunt site is only one of five (5) alternative sites under investigation in this EIA.
Dr Shirley (Pierce) Cowling Friend of St. Francis Nature Reserve	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I should like to comment that the website for background information is poorly constructed and inefficient for those wishing to access it, e.g. there is no indication of the contents of the different parts. There is huge room for improvement on the presentation of information. ▪ It would be appropriated if a hardcopy of the documents could be made available at the Library in the St. Francis Bay Branch building of the Kouga Municipality in the village of St. Francis Bay. To drive to Humansdorp is a 40 km round trip. ▪ Hold meetings and make documents available in St. Francis Bay and also in areas through which waste will travel and siting of pylon lines. 	<p>Your comments have been forwarded to Eskom who manages the EIA web site. The EIA Team has sent to Eskom all information requested by I&APs for posting on the website.</p> <p>Background Information Documents (BIDs) have been distributed in hardcopy to the greater St Francis Bay, Cape St Francis and Sea Vista communities. Documentation is available from the St Francis Bay Public Library and the Oosterbaai Eiendome.</p> <p>Very well attended PMs were held at Oyster Bay (11 June 2007), St Francis Bay (25 July 2007), Sea Vista (26 July 2007), Jefferies Bay (12 June 2007) and Humansdorp (11 June 2007), as well as other venues throughout South Africa (refer to Chapter 9 of the DSR). A FGM was held with Key Stakeholders in the Greater St Francis Bay area, who have formed the Thyspunt Anti-Nuclear Group (TANG) on 26 July 2007. A separate PPP for the transmission lines EIA will be undertaken.</p> <p>Your comments regarding meetings will inform future rounds of meetings.</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
<p>Mr Rudiger Dahlhaeuser Interested Party</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ For public participation we recommend that the Consultants invite to the meetings all political parties, ratepayers, associations as well as the environmental groups of Jeffreys Bay, St. Francis Bay, Humansdorp, Cape St. Francis and Oyster Bay. Further the black communities must be informed immediately. 	<p>Every member of the public is welcome to participate in this EIA, regardless of affiliation. The EIA for the NPS, the meetings and workshops held as part of the PPP, as well as opportunities for involvement in the EIA has been well advertised widely (nationally, regionally and locally) and members of the public are encouraged to participate. In addition to this all registered stakeholders (approximately 7 000 stakeholders are currently on the stakeholder database for this EIA) have received notification of the EIA for the proposed NPS, invitations to participate and updates on the EIA. Meetings and workshops have also been advertised on the Eskom website for this EIA, as well as by means of the placement of posters. The stakeholder groups referred to (i.e. political parties, ratepayers, other associations and environmental groups) are registered as Key Stakeholders for this EIA and have received all the notification referred to above. At each meeting and workshop I&APs are requested to make referrals to the EIA Team for I&APs that must be contacted in order to be placed on the stakeholder database. The EIA Team is continually following up on this and the stakeholder database will be continually expanded throughout the EIA. Community leaders of marginalized communities have been contacted in order to make sure community members are informed about the EIA for the proposed NPS. Hand deliveries of background information are made to these communities. Refer to Chapter 9 of the DSR for more details on the PPP and advertisements placed.</p>
<p>Mr Ryan Donnelley Founder and chairperson of F.A.C.T. (For A Clean Tomorrow)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We object to the proposed NPS in terms of Section 24 of the South African Constitution (everyone has the right to an environment that is not harmful to their health or well being). ▪ Public notice for the proposed NPS has not reached the majority of Sea Vista residents. 	<p>Objection noted. The EIA will assess the potential impacts of the proposed NPS and associated infrastructure. The Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism (DEAT) will review the Impact Assessment Report produced and make its decision regarding the environmental authorization of the proposed NPS.</p> <p>BIDs were distributed to the Sea Vista residents, with your assistance. A PM was also held in the Sea Vista</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Mr Michael Duerr Affected Party, Pearly Beach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Are there more public participation processes (PPP) to be expected and when? 	Public participation will continue for the duration of the EIA. At any time, members of the public can engage with the EIA Team, and, importantly, meetings and workshops will be scheduled to discuss the outcomes of Scoping and the Impact Assessment Phase. Please consult the Eskom EIA website or contact ACER on the Toll Free Phone Number for more details. As a registered I&AP you will also receive continuous updates on the PPP for the EIA by email, fax or post. Refer to Section 10.5 of the DSR for more details on the future activities within the PPP for this EIA.
Mr Rob Fryer Overstrand Conservation Foundation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Please provide the discussion page facility on the website and ensure that the comments submitted by all I&APs are accessible via the website. 	The Consolidated Minutes of all the meetings and workshops held thus far in the EIA, as well as the issues and comments received, as documented in this Issues and Response Report (IRR), will be posted on the Eskom website for this EIA.
Mr Ian Sinclair Fynn Marydale Properties	<p>Factors routinely requiring serious consideration in an EIA process relating to the application of nuclear power:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It is unnecessary to dwell on the normal EIA concerns of nuclear power applications in general, which include such issues as the disposal of nuclear waste and important of emergency regulations. It is assumed that they will be taken into consideration in the normal procedure of the EIA. 	An EIA is a tool designed to identify and investigate key issues and associated potential environmental impacts. This EIA is being applied for this purpose. Scoping will identify the key issues, which will be investigated in depth in the Impact Assessment Phase.
Mr Peter Johnston University of Cape Town	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Academic and environmental organizations in the greater Cape Town area would be concentrated in Cape Town yet there is only meeting opportunity in (Milnerton) and with very short notice. 	Five (5) PMs meetings were held as part of the project announcement phase in the greater Cape Town area, as well as one (1) KSW. Meetings are typically not held during this phase in most EIAs. Further meetings and workshops will be convened to discuss the outcomes of the Scoping and the Impact Assessment Phases. Your request for a meeting to be held in central Cape Town is noted and will be considered by the EIA Team for future meetings and workshops.
Mr Douglas Hey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Full transparency at all stages of the EIA is required. 	This is the cornerstone of any public participation process (PPP) for EIAs and is being applied in this EIA.

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Mr Mike Kantey Watercourse cc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I would like it to be recorded in the official correspondence received, further, that it is somewhat disingenuous of Eskom to claim that "the landowners must give written consent". Surely, in an open democracy, which is subject to Section 26 of the Constitution, all stakeholders (or at least a "sufficient consensus" of 67 percent) must give their informed consent with regard to an industrial installation of any substantive scale in their region? Or is the presumption that landowners' rights precede and override any other human or environmental rights under the Constitution? ▪ Eskom should note well the findings against Mr. Wiehan with respect to Oudekraal, where the landowner's rights were overturned by lawyers acting for the City of Cape Town with regard to development on the land adjacent to Bakoven on the Cape Peninsula. ▪ I trust that this abnegation of the citizen's and the environmental rights is not another legal oversight on Eskom's part, nor one pertaining to the Ministers of Minerals and Energy and Public Enterprises respectively, in that they have "failed to exercise their minds" in permitting this development to go forward without proper consultation. ▪ I look forward to an informed response from Eskom's legal department, or ARCUS GIBB's legal adviser. 	<p>It is assumed that the written consent been referred to is the consent that the landowners of the proposed sites need to provide.</p> <p>This consent is a requirement in terms of the NEMA EIA Regulations, 2006 and is not consent to the proposed nuclear project but rather consent that Eskom (the applicant) can commission an EIA for a development that may occur on their property.</p>
Mr Jonathan Kingwill Bluepebble Independent Environmental Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Let's just stop and consider. Nuclear power development in this country is a serious matter and the decision to do so or not, and how, belong in the minds of the people of this country and not with a few isolated individuals squeezed by short-term political and economic agendas. I therefore urge the President of this country, to make the development of nuclear energy a national priority. Not in terms of building a NPS however, but rather in educating and asking the people about what the future should hold. And then every one of us can make that decision. We need a national referendum on matters of such importance. ▪ Each person in this country has a right to make such an important decision. Or did 1994 not happen? Perhaps then and in conclusion, the answers to the questions raised could be investigated broadly and deeply so that all who wish to participate can and are then willing to accept the responsibility 	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>It is the understanding of the EIA Team that the President, in consultation with Cabinet, has already taken the decision to investigate further nuclear power generation in South Africa, and for Eskom to increase this generation alternative in its energy generation mix in the future. This EIA concerns itself with the construction of a NPS and associated infrastructure at the most suitable site of five alternative sites, and the assessment of potential impacts associated with this. A separate process covering an application by Eskom for a nuclear installation license will be undertaken by the National Nuclear Regulator. Similarly a separate process covers a future application by Eskom for an electricity generating licence from the National Energy Regulator of South Africa.</p> <p>The development of the South African Nuclear Policy and</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>of those decisions and the resultant actions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Thank you for your time and please consider your own thoughts and actions in this matter deeply. 	<p>Strategy and the publication of the draft policy for public comment is being undertaken by the Department of Minerals and Energy.</p>
<p>Ms Chrizette Kleynhans Anglo American Black Mountain</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strategic Environmental Impact Assessment (SEA). ▪ Integrating EIA, Social Impact Assessment (SIA) and Bushmanland Conservation Initiative. 	<p>The Government (Department of Minerals and Energy) undertakes integrated energy planning, while the National Energy Regulator of South Africa undertakes integrated resource planning specifically for electricity demand and supply.</p> <p>Eskom continuously undertakes strategic planning. Part of Eskom's strategic planning for nuclear power included the twelve (12) year Nuclear Site Investigation Programme (NSIP), which aimed to locate and rank suitable sites for the construction of a NPS. Refer to Chapter 5 of the DSR where the process and findings of the NSIP are outlined. This EIA will integrate different disciplines in accordance with best environmental assessment practice. A social impact assessment is being undertaken as part of the EIA.</p>
<p>Dr Michael Knight South African National Parks Board (SANPARKS)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerned about development (direct) and indirect, the latter of which not typically addressed in EIAs. Need to assess the greater knock-on affects. 	<p>The investigation of cumulative effects is now mandatory (as per the National Environmental Management Act [NEMA] Regulations governing EIAs) and will be investigated in this EIA.</p>
<p>Mr Julius Koen Department of Tourism Environment and Conservation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What will the cumulative impacts be - mining of uranium, transportation, etc? 	<p>This is to be addressed in this EIA.</p> <p>This EIA is for the proposed nuclear power station. The mining of uranium, should additional mines be required, would be dealt with in terms of the Mineral and Petroleum Resources Development Act, 2004.</p>
<p>Mr Francois Kotze and Mr E Peterson Overberg District Municipality</p>	<p>Influence on all environmental, technical, economical, social and cultural-historical aspects as set out in attached document.</p> <p><u>Identified issues to address in the Scoping process</u></p> <p><u>Environmental criteria:</u></p> <p>What influence will the proposed development have on the environmental integrity of the region concerned through threats to habitat types, water catchments, watercourses, lakes, flood-plains or excessive utilization of natural resources such as water and soil?</p>	<p>Thank you for these comments. The issues raised will be used to inform future studies that are required as part of the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA.</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>Does the proposed development jeopardize the visual integrity of the region concerned through disruption of natural features, or skylines?</p> <p>Will ecological processes essential to maintenance of water drainage patterns, groundwater equilibrium, micro-climate, flood-attenuation, or land/sea interactions be disrupted?</p> <p>Will the proposed development pose a negative influence on biodiversity, e.g. through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Disruption of terrestrial, estuarine, coastal or marine habitat types; ▪ Pollution, eutrophication or modification of pH of water bodies, groundwater or the sea. ▪ Curtailing of movement of indigenous terrestrial or aquatic fauna ▪ Endangering of indigenous plant communities or species; ▪ Endangering of genetic integrity of any indigenous life-forms; ▪ Introduction of alien plant or animal species; ▪ Over-utilization of finite natural resources such as water. <p>What positive influence on biodiversity, e.g. through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Removal of alien vegetation; ▪ Removal of plantations and rehabilitation of areas thus cleared; ▪ Re-instatement of previous water courses and groundwater equilibrium; ▪ Removal fences and re-introduction of game and other wildlife; ▪ Environmental restoration within realistic cost-and time frames; ▪ Re-instatement of previously disrupted biological communities? <p>Will the proposed development create undesirable precedents, which could lead to further developments inappropriate to the region concerned?</p> <p>Will the proposed development have undesirable impacts on regional sense of place through inappropriate location on skylines, rocky outcrops or other highly visible places?</p>	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
<p>Ms Melissa Krige Interested Party</p>	<p>Thank you for the meeting yesterday to introduce yourselves and the possible NPS proposed for Pearly Beach. It was a good meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Firstly, I have a few questions following the meeting and I wonder to whom these should be addressed? ▪ Secondly, after the meeting I chatted to one of our staff members, Xolile who is a resident of Gansbaai's Masakhane. Xolile is well educated but he has no knowledge of the proposed NPS (and neither did many of the other local residents as a matter of interest!) His English is good but still I battled to explain how a NPS works and the full implications of what such a development would pose for the local community and natural environment of the area. I did pass on the glossy booklet that was available at the meeting to him. However, it is important for him (and indeed the whole Xhosa community) to have a broader grasp of what such a development will mean for those living in the vicinity. Is there information that covers the subject objectively, compiled by a neutral body (nuclear power-the facts for and against it) available in Xhosa? For instance, the fact that the plant will result in a 10 degree rise in nearby sea temperature is huge - this is the kind of information that people need to know. If there is a need for it, will you hold a similar meeting in Masakhane? Equally, Afrikaans is a predominant language here and many locals do not speak English. How can they also be accommodated? ▪ Why was the meeting held during working hours – surely this prevented many from attending? Can future meetings please be scheduled after working hours? 	<p>Thank you for these useful comments that will be used to inform future meetings. There will unfortunately always be people who cannot attend meetings whatever time is chosen. Please be aware that all public documents pertaining to this EIA are available in English, Afrikaans and Xhosa. Also, Eskom will be undertaking a nuclear awareness programme. The Masakhane community has been brought to the attention of the organizers of this programme.</p> <p>Comments noted and will be considered for future meetings</p>
<p>Dr Philip Lloyd Pr Eng Industrial and Petrochemical Consultants</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I could not find a way of accessing the Comment Sheet via your website. Indeed, the EIA was not listed among your current projects. It should be. Moreover, interaction with public concerns should be facilitated via either your corporate site or a dedicated one. 	<p>Thank you for these comments that will inform future public participation activities. The Comments Sheet has been made available on the Eskom website for this EIA. The Summer Greens PM venue had its limitations and will not be used again in this EIA. Meeting times will, however, never satisfy all I&APs and there will always be people who cannot attend meetings whatever time is chosen.</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>My suggestions for improving the public participation process are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Have meetings in venues far more visitor friendly and better equipped than the travesty of a community hall employed to kick off the project in Cape Town. The majority of Capetonians had never heard of Summer Greens before; it was remote from public transport; it lacked the facilities essential for holding such a meeting - such as a sound system; and it could not have accommodated the number of people that might have attended had a better site been chosen in the first place. ▪ Hold meetings at times chosen to suit the public - typically after 6pm - not during working hours. ▪ A website as suggested earlier. 	
<p>R Mike Longden-Thurgood Environment Representative, Institution of Nuclear Engineers, Environment Correspondent, National Association for Clean Air</p>	<p>Following Friday's I&AP meeting at Melkbos on the Eskom BID for the new major NPS, I have a few points to raise.</p> <p>A new role for Earthlife Africa (ELA)</p> <p>On a number of occasions, in my letters to the press, I have commented that Earthlife Africa should change their attitude towards the inevitability of nuclear power, be constructive instead and "come on board". The context was usually about the eventual long-term disposal of radioactive wastes and how they should be dealt with. The ELA representative at the meeting is, therefore, to be congratulated on wishing their organisation to become actively involved in an oversight aspect of the various consultants' work. I&APs will, it is trusted, be informed of the exact details of their involvement, to ensure that their involvement <i>will</i> be constructive, as their representative indicated he wanted it to be.</p> <p>Openness on nuclear matters to the public</p> <p>I have often said that the nuclear industry is its own worst enemy in having been so arrogant about nuclear technology for far too long; that it's a subject from their point of view which isn't worth the effort discussing with the majority of people because they won't understand it. I suspect that the major reason for this attitude is historical, and that it resides in the 1940s when nuclear energy first</p>	<p>Thank you for these insightful comments.</p> <p>In order to ensure the EIA Consultant's independence no Non-Governmental Organisation (NGO) will be part of the team, however all NGO's are welcomed to comment and actively review all reports. Should key focus meetings be required to discuss specific issues these can also be arranged.</p> <p>The specialists teams were chosen due to their independence and experience (including local experience). Independent specialists will review their work. Earthlife Africa (ELA), as can any other member of the public, is more than welcome to undertake their own independent reviews of the EIA and public consultation process (PPP) as well as the specialist studies.</p> <p>In terms of transparency, this is the cornerstone of public participation and environmental assessment, and is being applied in this EIA.</p> <p>In terms of issues to be considered in the EIA, one purpose of scoping is to identify these in order that they are taken up in the scope of their EIA and then</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>got under way during World War II (WWII), with the Manhattan Project in the United States of America (USA), which was established to develop the atom bomb. This was arguably the most highly secret project of the war years, transcending even the development of radar. For better or worse, some traitors cut the cat loose out of the bag and let it run to the Soviet Union, as it was at the time.</p> <p>Openness is where the EIA process has scored well, because the legislation requires I&APs to be satisfied that the process has been carried out to their satisfaction, and is transparent. When the Act was promulgated, I am certain that those civil servants in the DEAT who drafted it had never a thought in their minds that it would result once and for all for the nuclear industry in South Africa being required to put its feet firmly on the ground and start properly explaining what nuclear power is all about, and not to hide anything, except what can be fully justified as being of commercial significance to a rival reactor design organisation. And this latter fact needs to be properly explained in the EIA documentation in order to forestall questions, and even litigation.</p> <p>In the e-mailed <i>Nuclear Communications Network</i> digests which I receive by e-mail, the latest one, dated June 8 - right up to date - has the following piece of news:</p> <p>"Transparency Vital For Nuclear Industry, Says Nuclear Energy Agency (NEA) Workshop 8 Jun (NucNet): Transparency in the nuclear industry is vital for public confidence with the need for information to be made available to the public and media before it is asked for, a NEA workshop in Japan has concluded.</p> <p>The workshop, held in Tokyo and attended by officials from regulatory bodies, industry executives and journalists, concluded that hiding information could result in a loss of confidence from which the industry might find it hard to recover.</p> <p>If the nuclear energy industry is to be seen as transparent, regulators and utilities need to provide information before it is asked for, delegates at the workshop said.</p>	<p>investigated in the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA. A social impact assessment will investigate the issue of staff housing and other potential socio-economic impacts during the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA.</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>Conclusions from the workshop will be published on the NEA's website (www.nea.fr). The NEA is part of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)".</p> <p>I got a strong impression from the meeting and BID that little or no thought has been given to this aspect of the EIA process. Although one delegate did mention staff housing, this question seemed to have been directed more to the environmental impact than any concern for the welfare of the power station staff and their families.</p> <p>I would suggest that, in this EIA process, the socio-economics of operating staff and their families needs to take a high priority, and to be a declared part of the EIA process. Most certainly it should not to be brought on board as an afterthought.</p>	
<p>Mr Thabo LJ Matjiu Enviro Busters</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Be representative and transparent. 	<p>THE EIA Team that has been assembled is considered representative and the process that is being followed is considered transparent. This will be followed through for the whole EIA process.</p>
<p>Ms Liziwe McDaid The Green Connection</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I'm quite sure that a NPS situated on the Koeberg site will have a huge impact on Cape Town's 4 million inhabitants. So why is there no public meeting to held in Cape Town? ▪ I hereby tender my apologies for not making the public meeting on the 8th and the reason is that the meeting is held in the dark, far away from where I live. I request a public meeting to be held in a central Cape Town venue, as my ability to participate in the EIA is compromised by holding meetings out of town. 	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Future public meetings are planned and a central venue in Cape Town will be considered. However, please note that, apart from public meetings, there are other ways in which members of the public can engage in the EIA process. At any time, members of the public can engage with the EIA Team, and, importantly, meetings and workshops will be scheduled to discuss the outcomes of Scoping and the Impact Assessment Phase. Please consult the Eskom EIA website or contact ACER on the Toll Free Phone Number for more details. As a registered I&AP you will also received continuous updates on the PPP for the EIA by email, fax or post. Refer to Section 10.5 of the DSR for more details on the future activities within the PPP for this EIA.</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
<p>Mr Anthony John Moore Greater St. Francis Bay Community Police Forum</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It is strongly recommended that the Sea Vista community in St Francis Bay (previously disadvantaged community) be included in the Scoping Phase. 	<p>A project announcement Public Meeting (PM) was held in Sea Vista for the Scoping Phase of the EIA on the 26 July 2007. Every member of the public is welcome to participate in this EIA, regardless of their circumstances. The EIA for the NPS, the meetings and workshops held as part of the PPP, as well as opportunities for involvement in the EIA has been well advertised widely (nationally, regionally and locally) and members of the public are encouraged to participate.</p> <p>At each meeting and workshop I&APs are requested to make referrals to the EIA Team for I&APs that must be contacted in order to be placed on the stakeholder database. The EIA Team is continually following up on this and the stakeholder database will be continually expanded throughout the EIA.</p> <p>Your comment has been noted.</p>
<p>Dr Johannes A Opperman Solar Centre (SOLCEN)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ NGOs: Empower them to obtain their participation (they are crucial at the start of any investigation). 	<p>Eskom will be undertaking a nuclear awareness programme to educate the public about nuclear power.</p> <p>The EIA Team has tried to make it as easy as possible for the public and NGOs to participate in the PPP for the EIA. For example the Background Information Document (BID) has been made available in all three major languages used in the study area, the meetings have been facilitated in the local languages used in a particular area and presentations translated where required, meeting formats and the information presented has been slightly modified to empower participation by communities not having been previously exposed to nuclear power and meetings have been held in small communities where transport is a problem.</p>
<p>Mr M Phalane Earthlife Africa</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Involve all stakeholders. ▪ Educate. 	<p>Every member of the public is welcome to participate in this EIA, regardless of affiliation. The EIA for the NPS, the meetings and workshops held as part of the PPP, as well as opportunities for involvement in the EIA has been well advertised widely (nationally, regionally and locally) and members of the public are encouraged to participate. In</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
		<p>addition to this all registered stakeholders (approximately 7 000 stakeholders are currently on the stakeholder database for this EIA) have received notification of the EIA for the proposed NPS, invitations to participate and updates on the EIA. Meetings and workshops have also been advertised on the Eskom website for this EIA, as well as by means of the placement of posters. The stakeholder groups referred to i.e. political parties, ratepayers, other associations and environmental groups are registered as Key Stakeholders for this EIA and have received all the notification referred to above. At each meeting and workshop I&APs are requested to make referrals to the EIA Team for I&APs that must be contacted in order to be placed on the stakeholder database. The EIA Team is continually following up on this and the stakeholder database will be continually expanded throughout the EIA. Refer to Chapter 9 of the DSR for more details on the PPP and advertisements placed.</p> <p>Furthermore, Eskom will be undertaking a nuclear awareness programme to educate the public about nuclear power.</p>
Mr Lionel Phillips Matzikama Municipality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Speak the language of the area / region at public meetings. 	<p>If there is a need for translation at meetings, this can be requested and has been undertaken in all cases thus far in the PPP for the EIA. English, Afrikaans and Xhosa have been used where appropriate at various public meetings.</p>
Dr Laurine Platzky Premier – Western Cape	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Explain clearly in non-technical language. 	<p>This is attempted and I&APs are asked to request clarity if the language remains too technical. Furthermore, Eskom will be undertaking a nuclear awareness programme to educate the public about nuclear power. The use of technical language cannot be avoided completely, but is minimized in this programme.</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Mr KK Ravishanker Umbilo Secondary School	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Revelation of the impact analysis by an independent body - other than the survey conducted by Eskom. ▪ Environmental Impact for the next 50yrs. 	<p>ARCUS GIBB as the appointed independent environmental consultants for this project is required by the National Environmental Management Act (NEMA) Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations to declare their independence at the beginning of the project. This ensures that an objective and independent EIA process is undertaken. This has been done.</p> <p>Furthermore this EIA will consider the short, medium and long terms effects of the impacts of NPS, which is a legal requirement of the EIA process.</p>
Mr Daniel Reinecke Makhetha Development Consultants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The report on how the 5 sites were identified needs to be made available on the website. 	<p>The process undertaken for the identification of the five sites will be discussed in detail in Chapter 5 of the DSR. The Summary Report for the twelve (12) year Nuclear Site Investigation Programme (NSIP) has been posted on the Eskom website for the EIA for the proposed NPS.</p>
Mr Anthony Roper Stanford Ratepayers Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Traffic station on the R43 in conjunction with other ongoing EIA processes. 	<p>The EIA process will consider all cumulative impacts during the Impact Assessment Phase.</p>
Mr Mias Strydom Estate Agent	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Broad description of the phases of the project. 	<p>A comprehensive description of the EIA phases along the methodology used to carry out the different phases will be provided in the project documents. Guideline documents have also been posted on the Eskom website for the EIA for the proposed NPS. For the Scoping Phase this will be provided in detail in Section 1.2 of the DSR.</p>
Mr M P Temmers Moravian Church in South Africa (WCP)	<p>Eskom Nuclear Power Station "Bantamsklip" Our meeting at Elim on 13 June and your request for comment refer.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Due to limited knowledge of nuclear power, a workshop is requested during which the community could be informed in detail, after which we can comment. 	<p>Eskom will be undertaking a nuclear awareness programme to educate the public about nuclear power. The use of technical language cannot be avoided completely, but is minimized in this programme. The programme will schedule a session for Elim. Elim and surrounding communities, as well as other members of the public, are welcome to send in their comment on the proposed NPS at any stage during the EIA.</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Dr L Thilo University of Cape Town	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Re: additional power station at Duynefontein, Western Cape - Adjacent to the existing Koeberg Power Station, Cape Town ▪ Herewith I request that you register me as Interested and Affected Party in terms of an impact assessment for an additional nuclear power plant at Koeberg. 	You have been registered on the project stakeholder database and you will receive additional project information.
Cllr Elza Van Lingen Cape St. Francis Civic Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Why no meeting in St. Francis Bay? ▪ I need 5 copies of Kouga structure plan by Eskom - revised copy please. 	<p>Very well attended Public Meetings were held at Oyster Bay (11 June 2007), St Francis Bay (25 July 2007), Sea Vista (26 July 2007), Jeffreys Bay (12 June 2007) and Humansdorp (11 June 2007), as well as other venues throughout South Africa (refer to Chapter 9 of the DSR). A Focus Group Meeting was held with Key Stakeholders in the Greater St Francis Bay area, who have formed the Thyspunt Anti-Nuclear Group (TANG) on 26 July 2007. A separate PPP for the transmission lines EIA will be undertaken.</p> <p>There is no “Kouga structure plan by Eskom”. The structure plan is the responsibility of the relevant Authority. Copies can be obtained from the Kouga Municipality.</p>
Mr Keith Van Winkel St. Andrew’s College	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Involve everybody who has any interest. ▪ Make them feel like their opinion is valid and is important. ▪ Listen. 	All members of the public are welcomed and have been encouraged to participate in the public participation process through the media notifications. It is agreed that all opinions, inputs, comments, etc from the public are valuable and will be used to inform the impact assessment.
Mr Neels Visser Jeffreys Bay Business Forum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Nuclear power is synonymous with an atom bomb in the view of the uninformed. ▪ Maximum use of all media to inform the public and to put their minds at rest would ease your task. ▪ Get all schools involved. ▪ Get organised institutions – business chambers, agriculture and fisheries involved 	All members of the public are welcome to participate. As the EIA unfolds, there will be additional participation opportunities. If you are aware of people who should participate, please encourage them to do so. The I&APs are also encouraged to provide the project team with the contact details of community forums, organizations or individuals who they believe should be included in the PPP. Furthermore, Eskom will be undertaking a nuclear awareness programme to educate the public about nuclear power. Schools are included in the target group for this programme. Business chambers, agricultural and

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
		fisheries sectors have been included as key stakeholders on this EIA. If you are aware of any organizations that need to be included in the EIA process please let ACER know.
Mr Keith Wiseman City of Cape Town	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Please confirm registration of the City of Cape Town as a key stakeholder – see attached. We request a presentation by ACER, ARCUS GIBB and Eskom representatives be arranged. ▪ Participation by relevant City service units will be coordinated by this office. ▪ The City of Cape Town requests that it be recognised as a key stakeholder. ▪ Eskom and ACER are requested to attend an inter-departmental workshop to be convened by the city. 	It has been confirmed that the City of Cape Town is a key stakeholder for the EIA for the proposed NPS and the requested FGM has taken place on 6 August 2007. The City of Cape Town has also submitted their comments for the project announcement sub phase of the Scoping Phase of the EIA.
Mr J P (Wollie) Wolhuter Jeffreys Bay Ratepayers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The explanation to residents (who do not even understand electricity) in terms of what nuclear power entails is a matter of education, which does not belong in the EIA. Maybe with Eskom. ▪ Attached please find a one sided article that deals more with the establishment of a power station than the use of nuclear power as energy source. ▪ As a retired geologist and geo-hydrologist my greatest concern is soil formations, which include clay forming shale. Personally I would like to know more about this. 	<p>Eskom will be undertaking a nuclear awareness programme to educate the public about nuclear power.</p> <p>Specialist geological, geohydrological, seismic risk etc specialist studies will be undertaken during the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA. Please consult the Eskom project website for the EIA, as well as the DSR for more information. All EIA information will be available in the public domain, including geological/geohydrological information that is of relevance to the proposed project and EIA. The public who have specialist interests and knowledge are welcome to review the information.</p>
Mrs Anna Andrews	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ An up to date EIA to be conducted 2007/2008 selected by the public. 	The responsibility for appointing an Environmental Assessment Practitioner rests with the project proponent, in this case, Eskom Holdings Limited (Eskom). It is not common practice in South Africa that the public selects the EIA Team. The EIA Team that has been assembled is considered competent, experienced, representative and independent. This EIA will build on previous studies undertaken by Eskom to select suitable alternative sites for the construction and operation of a proposed NPS e.g. the 12 year Nuclear Site Investigation Programme (NSIP).

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Mr Byran Andrews	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increase in population since initial EIA (note: not EIA but Nuclear Site Investigation Programme – NSIP). ▪ An up to date EIA to be conducted 2007/2008, to be elected by the public. 	<p>The responsibility for appointing an Environmental Assessment Practitioner rests with the project proponent, in this case, Eskom. It is not common practice in South Africa that the public selects the EIA Team. The EIA Team that has been assembled is considered competent, representative, experienced and independent.</p> <p>This EIA will build on previous studies undertaken by Eskom to select suitable alternative sites for the construction and operation of a proposed NPS e.g. the 12 year Nuclear Site Investigation Programme (NSIP) (available on the Eskom website for the EIA for the proposed NPS).</p> <p>It is recognized that changes have occurred since the Nuclear Site Investigation Programme (NSIP) was finalized. Specialists' will be re-investigating and assessing each of the 5 sites again for this EIA.</p>
Mr John Basson Lighthouse Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ My colleague and I attended the public participation meeting on 13/06/2007 at Gansbaai, representing National Ports Authority (Lighthouse Services). We have raised the concern about "light pollution" at the meeting, but would like to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Do so in writing. Is the comments sheet handed out at the meeting available electronically? 2. Could you please arrange for the National Ports Authority, Lighthouse Services, to be registered as an I&AP (Interested and Affected Party) for all the proposed sites as there could be negative impacts on the Lighthouses (as Aids to Navigation) located in the vicinity of the proposed sites? 	<p>The EIA Team confirms that you have been added to the EIA stakeholder database and welcomes your contributions to this EIA, which can be made electronically.</p> <p>The potential impacts on lighthouses will be addressed in the Visual Impact Assessment to be undertaken as part of the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA (refer to Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p>
Francois Bekker Springfontein Property Holdings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Documents are to be sent to me personally in order for me to review it. ▪ It is important for us as the proposed reactor could affect our rights severely. 	<p>The EIA Team confirms that you have been added to the EIA stakeholder database and welcomes your contributions to this EIA. You will be updated regarding progress with the EIA and availability of documentation for review. The EIA Team will do whatever is practically possible to distribute information to I&APs personally. But due to the large numbers on the EIA stakeholder</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
		<p>database (over 7 000 at this stage in the process) and the bulk of the documents in some cases documents will be emailed, faxed & posted and in other cases I&APs will be notified (by media advertisements, posters, post, email and fax) of their availability at public places (refer to Chapter 9 of the DSR and the Eskom website for the EIA) for a list of venues. Should this not be convenient please contact ACER who will make other arrangements.</p> <p>The EIA is currently in the Scoping Phase. All available information has been shared with the public. However, it should be noted that, as the EIA progresses, additional information will come to light, which will also be disseminated in the public domain. Outcomes of the Impact Assessment Phase will be documented in the Environmental Impact Report, at which time potential effects on the environment (including landowners) will be known.</p>
<p>Mr Roald Hubert Besselaar</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The EIA Report, in its entirety, must be made available to all property owners in Oyster Bay and proper opportunity be given for comment and debate on the content. 	<p>The EIA is currently in the Scoping Phase. All available information has been shared with the public. However, it should be noted that, as the EIA progresses, additional information will come to light, which will also be disseminated in the public domain. The various reports produced during the EIA process will be available for review at the Oesterbaai Eiendome in Oyster Bay.</p>
<p>Mr Hannes Booyesen Klein Zoutrivier Resident Association</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This is the second letter responding to your invitation. Please acknowledge receipt of this letter. In short I would like to be reminded or invited to the public meetings once the new nuclear site has been announced. 	<p>The EIA Team confirms that you have been added to the EIA stakeholder database and welcomes your contributions to this EIA.</p>
<p>Mr Christian Philip Bornman</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Environmental impact on the area. 	<p>The purpose of the EIA currently being undertaken is to ascertain potential impacts (both positive and negative) to be able to effectively deal with them (via optimization of benefits or the mitigation of negative impacts).</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Mr Johan Brits Municipality of Msukaligwa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Before you start any EIA, first fix the current mess, which is endangering thousands of people's lives. ▪ The coal trucks are a national disaster on the roads, especially in the Ermelo area. ▪ Eskom is currently not adhering to legislation. ▪ Camden Power Station is currently a health liability and a danger to residents, many people have died already. ▪ Your public involvement should be sufficient and transparent in order to prevent the above, currently it is a disaster. Please let me know what you plan to do in this regard. I will then be able to respond. 	<p>The comments regarding the transportation of coal, and the Camden Coal-fired Power Station should be addressed directly to Eskom and/or to the National Department of Transport and /or the National Energy Regulator of South Africa.</p> <p>In terms of transparency, this is the cornerstone of public participation and environmental assessment, and is being applied in this EIA. Importantly, this EIA can deal only with relevant issues at hand, as defined by the scope of the assessment.</p>
Conservation International Sarah Frazee Steven Davids Siphokazi Mnyani Chandra Fick Philip Briel Nuchey van Neel Marjory Wildschutt Morne Farmer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We are an affiliated interest group consisting of Conservation International, SKEPPIES and Protean. We have travelled from Cape Town as far as Garies with the aim to attend the Eskom proposed NPS public consultation Meeting, Regretfully; we had to abandon our attempt to come to Hondeklip due to the inclement weather and bad road conditions. We believe we are not the only groups who could not attend and therefore request an alternative date in order for us to share our concerns and provide constructive input. ▪ We represent the environment, the local communities and renewable energy alternatives. ▪ We are willing able to provide guidance and assistance on the above mentioned issues and would like to be included in any further discussions. Please revert back to us regarding the date for a follow up meeting. <p><i>This submission is accompanied by Uranium Resources Nuclear Energy Background Paper prepared by the Energy Water Group, December 2006, EWG –Series No 1/2006 and the report titled “Energy, Entropy, Sunny Skies and South Africa” authored by Prof Thomas Harms Aug 2006</i></p>	<p>It is important that members of the public understand that public meetings are not the only means via which I&APs can participate in this EIA. There are various other means of participation such as submitting written comment, or contacting ACER on the toll free telephone number. To date, twenty five (25) PMs, eight (8) KSMs and 4 KSWs have been held. At this point very few new issues are being raised and all communities surrounding the five (5) alternative sites have been consulted and the project background communicated.</p> <p>However, importantly, there will be at least an additional two rounds of public meetings to discuss the outcomes of Scoping and Impact Assessment Phases.</p>
Mr Derek Vivian Cook Macohy Investments Zenzisa The Delphic Oracles 53	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Have ARCUS GIBB undertaken EIAs on previous NPSs? ▪ The exact area of possible danger / no development ▪ This site established in 1980s - survey now 2007 - new technology - new site. ▪ All facts be disclosed 	<p>The EIA for the NPS currently being undertaken is the first time that such an assessment is being undertaken for a conventional large light water reactor nuclear power station in South Africa. As such ARCUS GIBB is in the position of being the first independent environmental consultants to undertake the assessment in the country.</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
		<p>In terms of the exact area of possible danger, it should be noted that during the design of the facility, the relevant regulations and requirements will be taken into consideration to ensure the safe operation of the NPS. Furthermore, the NPS will have an Emergency Planning Zone (EPZ) surrounding it to ensure that any surrounding landowners or communities are not significantly affected by the NPS.</p> <p>The technology to be used for the NPS will be discussed in Section 4.6 of the DSR. New specialist studies will be undertaken for all proposed sites during the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA.</p> <p>ARCUS GIBB as the independent environmental assessment consultants are required to present objectively all facts and findings from the studies undertaken for the EIA and as such no information will be withheld from the public.</p>
<p>Ms Jennifer Cooper Chas Everitt</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Hold meetings in St. Francis, why Humansdorp? ▪ Give regular feedback. ▪ Be transparent. 	<p>It is important that members of the public understand that public meetings are not the only means via which I&APs can participate in this EIA. There are various other means of participation such as submitting written comment, or contacting ACER on the toll free telephone number.</p> <p>To date, twenty five (25) public meetings have been held during the project announcement sub-phase of the Scoping Phase. This included public meetings held in Humansdorp, Oyster Bay, Jeffereys Bay and St Francis Bay. Please refer to Chapter 9 of the DSR for additional details of meetings held. The Scoping Phase of the EIA is at a point, with no new issues being raised.</p> <p>However, importantly, there will be at least an additional two rounds of public meetings during the EIA to discuss the outcomes of Scoping Phase, as well as the outcomes of the Impact Assessment Phase.</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
		<p>In terms of transparency, this is the cornerstone of public participation and environmental assessment, and is being applied in this EIA.</p>
<p>Shirley Cowling Committee of FOSTER (Friends of the St. Francis Nature Reserves)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We should like to request that the final date for submission of Comment Sheet 1 be postponed to a date no less than two weeks after the local public meetings in St Francis Bay and Sea Vista. 	<p>For this EIA, the Comments Period on the project announcement documentation has already been extended to facilitate I&AP participation in this important phase of the EIA. This was communicated to all I&APs registered on the EIA stakeholder database at that time.</p>
<p>Lianda Beyers Cronje Bantamsklip Anti- Nuclear Group (BANG)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I am running an article to tell readers about the creation of this group of concerned residents and also invite them to register with Acer (Africa) and provide comments. ▪ I will really appreciate it if Eskom can come back to us with comments on the questions as soon as possible. I cannot see that it would be necessary to wait until the end of the scoping period, as Eskom should know the answers to most of the questions currently. If not, this is indeed a very worrying situation. 	<p>The EIA is currently in the scoping phase. All available information has been shared with the public. However, it should be noted that, as the EIA progresses, additional information will come to light, which will also be disseminated in the public domain.</p> <p>Since the EIA process has only just started it is obvious that the studies that are required and that form part of the specialist studies phase of the EIA process, cannot have been undertaken and completed. It is thus clear, that questions for which the EIA must provide answers could not have been answered during the initial round of public meetings. It would be preempting and unprofessional to try to guess the outcome of the specialist studies to provide answers to questions on issues that must still be studied in the EIA.</p>
<p>Mr R Dahlhaeuser Resident St Francis Bay/ Cape St Francis Environs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I attended the public meeting in Humansdorp and noticed that the public hearing was poorly attended. ▪ Not even one of our black and coloured citizens were there! ▪ Further I noticed that one of the main reasons for the weak attendance is the fact that at least 80% of the citizen here in the Kouga Community do not know what to say in such a meeting. ▪ Actually the people have got no experience and knowledge what does it mean using nuclear power. ▪ Nobody can make a decision on things he does not know. ▪ I feel that the way the public hearings are organized is wrong. ▪ Eskom has to launch at first an information campaign that provides training and knowledge about all pros and contras of Nuclear Power and then Eskom should ask for comments. ▪ Further Eskom may not hold back relevant information about the 	<p>This EIA is geared to the participation of all interested members of the public who are encouraged to participate. Further, this EIA is being undertaken in three languages (English, Afrikaans and Xhosa). The EIA Team has made every attempt to hold public meetings in the residential areas where the previously disadvantaged live. As the EIA unfolds, there will be additional participation opportunities. If you are aware of people who should participate, please encourage them to do so. The I&APs are also encouraged to provide the EIA Team with the contact details of community forums, organizations or individuals who they believe should be included in the PPP. Business chambers, agricultural and fisheries sectors have been included as key stakeholders on this EIA. If you are aware</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>risks of a proposed Nuclear Power Plant and the way that the fuel for the proposed Power Plant is processed. Also it is not fair of Eskom telling half the truth to the people.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In completion to my opposition sent to ACER Africa I would like to add that Eskom must not ignore the South African Constitution. ▪ Please read Bill of Rights-Chapter 2-Section 24 as Nuclear Power cannot be regarded as "Sustainable Development". ▪ Since we feel committed to support a full Public Participation concerning the proposed Nuclear Power Plant at Thyspunt we request to print for us 4000 of the Comment Sheet 1. ▪ We will supply these Comment Sheets to the citizen here in St. Francis Bay, Cape St. Francis and in Humansdorp. ▪ Please let us know when you are able to provide these Comment Sheets. ▪ Future Public Hearings should be properly announced in the local newspapers, which are: <i>Our Times</i> and <i>St. Francis Chronicle</i>. 	<p>of any organizations that need to be included in the EIA process please let ACER know.</p> <p>Furthermore, Eskom will be undertaking a nuclear public awareness programme to inform the public about nuclear power. Schools are included in the target group for this programme.</p> <p>All available information has been shared with the public. However, it should be noted that, as the EIA progresses, additional information will come to light, which will also be disseminated in the public domain.</p> <p>The aim of the EIA process is to determine whether the proposed NPS is sustainable from an environmental, social and economic perspective, and if so, which is the most favourable site for the construction and operation of the proposed NPS.</p> <p>Thanks for your comment it has been noted and will inform the planning for the next round of public meetings.</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
<p>Mr R Dahlhaeuser Resident St Francis Bay/ Cape St Francis Environs</p>	<p>In completion of my yesterdays complaint about the lack of public participation I would like to add:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) To do the public participation in the prescribed way we demand that the responsible consultants do the house-to-house or shack-to-shack drop of info brochures within a 100 km radius of the proposed site. Specially the previously disadvantaged communities within this area should be sufficiently informed and must get their public hearings in their locations. The consultants must be prepared to deliver the proof that really all villages, towns, settlements and locations have been properly informed and heard. 2) Additionally the information campaign must be extended to each and every town/settlement along the proposed transportation road of Nuclear Fuel or Nuclear Waste. Please ask for these routes and inform us accordingly. 3) We do need the deadlines upfront for each and every step of the EIA process and demand that these deadlines will be properly published. <p>Please inform us how ACER Africa will settle the matter of equal public participation.</p>	<p>Every member of the public is welcome to participate in this EIA. The proposed project has been well advertised (advertisements placed in local, regional and national newspapers, through community leaders and resident's associations and posters) and members of the public are encouraged to participate in the EIA. Twenty five (25) public meetings have been held to date, many of them in previously disadvantaged communities. Please refer to Chapter 9 of the DSR for additional details of meetings held, as well as Appendix G4, G5 and G6 for the minutes of meetings held.</p> <p>Traffic and transportation matters, including potential routes both during construction as well as normal operations will be informed by the Traffic Assessment that will be undertaken as part of the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p> <p>Dates cannot be given for the EIA process in advance as the process is fluid, depending on factors such as requests for extension of Comments Periods by I&APs, which has indeed been the case in this EIA, as well as time for the Authorities to review the deliverables submitted to them. A broad outline of the EIA programme has been provided as each of the public meetings and is available on the Eskom website for the EIA.</p>
<p>Mr R Dahlhaeuser Resident St Francis Bay/ Cape St Francis Environs</p>	<p>Many thanks for sending the answer to my e-mails of the 25th and 26th of June written by Ms. Bongzi Shinga.</p> <p>Unfortunately Ms. Shinga did not refer to my request to send 4000 Comment Sheets 1. She said that it would be inappropriate to supply from house to house or from shack to shack. Further she mentioned that ACER Africa would have sent out 3 000 invitations to interested parties.</p>	<p>ACER considered this to be an inappropriate mechanism of communication with the public.</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>Now my questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is it possible to get additional Comment Sheets? We would like to supply it to our own cost. ACER Africa should take into consideration that only 3 000 invitations by far do not cover the number of citizen living in the Greater St. Francis Area, Humansdorp and Jeffreys Bay City. We assume that somewhere between 20 000 to 30 000 citizens meanwhile are settled in the whole area affected by the proposed Nuclear Power Plant at Thyspunt, Oyster Bay (<i>please note that the Thyspunt site is one of five alternative sites proposed</i>). 2. Can we get per e-mail the list with the contact details of the 3 000 people invited by ACER Africa to participate and giving comments? (As the public hearings were in average poorly attended we would like to ask a number of people why there is no interest in the nuclear matter). 3. Further we would like to know how ACER Africa wants to deal with the fact that more than 50% of the people who will be affected are living not permanently in St. Francis Bay, Cape St. Francis and Oyster Bay? They are living partly in Port Elizabeth, Pretoria, Johannesburg, Durban etc. or in Europe. <p>Please let us know how we can proceed.</p>	
Mr Albert De Jong	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Geo-Technical? ▪ How many location alternatives will be assessed during impact assessment phase? ▪ What criteria will be used to screen out some of the location alternatives? 	<p>The geotechnical aspects will be investigate in the relevant specialist studies that are being undertaken as part of the EIA. During the Scoping Phase all five proposed sites will be evaluated in order to narrow down the number of site (if possible) for assessment during the Impact Assessment Phase. The site selection criteria that will be used to narrow down the sites will be discussed in Section 8.8 of the Scoping Report.</p>
Mr Piet-Nel De Vos	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ If all stakeholders are informed appropriately about the processes and procedures, which are to be followed, the process should run smoothly. ▪ Public involvement 	<p>Every member of the public is welcome to participate in this EIA. The EIA for the proposed NPS, the meetings and workshops held as part of the PPP, as well as opportunities for involvement in the EIA has been widely</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
		<p>advertised (nationally, regionally and locally) and members of the public are encouraged to participate. In addition to this, all registered stakeholders (approximately 7 000 stakeholders are currently on the stakeholder database for this EIA) have received notification of the EIA for the proposed NPS, invitations to participate and updates on the EIA. Meetings and workshops have also been advertised on the Eskom website for this EIA, as well as by means of the placement of posters. The stakeholder groups referred to i.e. political parties, ratepayers, other associations and environmental groups are registered as Key Stakeholders for this EIA and have received all the notification referred to above. At each meeting and workshop I&APs are requested to make referrals to the EIA Team for I&APs that must be contacted in order to be placed on the stakeholder database. The EIA Team is continually following up on this and the stakeholder database will be continually expanded throughout the EIA. Community leaders of marginalized communities have been contacted in order to make sure community members are informed about the EIA for the proposed NPS. Hand deliveries of background information are made to these communities. Refer to Chapter 9 of the DSR for more details on the PPP and advertisements placed.</p>
<p>Dr Hendrik de Waal Interested Party</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ When considering aspects to be included in an impact assessment in preparation of the construction and commissioning of a nuclear reactor, there are two main dimensions to be considered. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The first are the legal requirements as specified by the appropriate Acts. ○ The second (and to my mind the most relevant) are the aspects influencing the long-term acceptability of the nuclear industry in its broadest sense. ▪ With aspects such as global warming (partly caused by the burning of fossil fuels), the fast rate of industrial development and the "race" after the dwindling natural resources (fossil fuels), seen in perspective with the "impracticality" of most of 	<p>Thank you for these comments. Eskom will be undertaking a nuclear public awareness programme to inform the public about nuclear power. Schools are included in the target group for this programme.</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>the other alternatives, the "nuclear option" will be the solution essential for the future.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ironically, there was a time when nuclear power was accepted and popular. Incidents and events whoever caused a change and a decline in its popularity, to such an extent that the industry felt it necessary to commission a series of studies in an effort to identify the causes for this growing negativity. (Chalmers, J. Pijawka, D. and others 1982. <u>Socio-economic impact of nuclear generating stations</u>. The same authors published another report a year later on the impacts of nuclear generating plants on local areas in the <u>Economic Geography vol.59 (1): 66-80</u>. These studies were done at a number of utility/sites. The most important conclusions were: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) There were some communities that were definitely more negatively orientated towards the nuclear utilities in their areas than others. 2) These "negative" ones registered anxiety, fear and general negativity before construction started. ▪ It is interesting to note that The "Three mile island" utility was included in the study and that a survey after the incident showed that 50% of the surrounding community wanted the utility to be restarted. ▪ In planning the "PR" program before construction it is thus necessary to ensure that the "community" around a proposed nuclear facility has accepted it and are fully identified with it, a detailed profile of attitudes, expectations, fears and perceptions regarding the construction and commission of such facility must be compiled before construction. The information obtained is to be used in the planning of a public relations program off interaction (and where necessary trade offs) between the utility and the community/s. ▪ Structured interviews or detailed questionnaires should be conducted amongst a representative sample of communities 	
Mr Mario Dieckow	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Up to date EIA conducted by 2007/2008 by independent company selected by the public. 	<p>In South Africa the responsibility for appointing an experienced and qualified Environmental Assessment Practitioner rests with the project proponent, in this case, Eskom. The EIA Team that has been assembled is considered competent, representative and independent.</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
		<p>This EIA will build on earlier studies undertaken by Eskom, namely the Nuclear Site Investigation Programme (NSIP). Refer to Chapter 6 of the DSR for a review of these studies. A number of specialist studies will be undertaken as part of the EIA. Field studies have either taken place in the later part of 2007 or will take place in early 2008.</p>
<p>Darin and Rebecca Edwards</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Please add my wife and I to the list of concerned owners in Cape St Francis that are strongly opposed to any proposed nuclear power plant being erected in the area. 	<p>Thank you for this comment. Your contact details have been added to the EIA stakeholder database.</p>
<p>Mr John Dyer Ajubatus Environmental Management (Pty) Ltd</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Open discussion forums in which opinions of experts in nuclear physics can attend. 	<p>Future public meetings are planned as part of the EIA process. Experts of all kinds will be called in to be present at these meetings, if required. However, please note that, apart from public meetings, there are other ways in which members of the public can engage in the EIA process.</p>
<p>Rob Fryer Overstrand Conservation Foundation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ At the public EIA participation meeting in Gansbaai on 13th June a commitment was made that the Power Point presentations would be available on the Eskom website by Monday 18th June. To date they have not appeared on the Nuclear 1 page as expected. Please either post them on the web page or immediately send them to me so that I make reference to them when developing comment. 	<p>Your comment was forwarded to Eskom who manages the web site. The presentations were sent to the manager's of the website immediately after the meeting and uploaded.</p>
<p>Patricia Honey</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Do you know why Eskom would consider putting up a nuclear plant in an area that is gaining world recognition for its interest in preserving the environment? ▪ Will it affect the outcome of ACER's EIA if as many people as possible register with ACER and also sign petitions opposing the proposed NPS? 	<p>Eskom requires building power stations on the coast for a number of reasons, including the stabilisation of the transmission network and the improvement in the reliability and security of supply at the coastal area and particularly the coastal areas of high growth in the demand for electricity, and the reduction in transmission line losses. Apart from these objectives, there are also other advantages of locating a power station on the coast, the primary one being the use of seawater for cooling of the turbine exhaust steam and condensing it back to water.</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
		<p>It is not financially feasible to locate a coal-fired power station on the coast (due to the cost of transporting coal to the power station), whereas a nuclear power station is eminently suitable for location on the coast.</p> <p>The purpose of an EIA, and its associated public participation process, is not to serve as a vehicle for petitions. Furthermore, the outcomes of an EIA are not determined by numbers of participating (dissenting or agreeing) I&APs. Rather, an EIA is guided by issues, with a focus on key issues that unlock key potential impacts, whether positive or negative. Please note that ARCUSS GIBB as the Environmental Assessment Practitioner is undertaking the EIA and ACER Africa are the appointed PPP consultants.</p>
Patricia Honey	<p>To the Registered Officer of the public participation process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I would like to lodge a formal objection to the present cut off date of 20 July 2007 for all “Interested and Affected Parties” to register. The greater St Francis Bay area which lies 6 km downwind of the proposed nuclear site at Thyspunt stands to be greatly affected by the proposed nuclear site but was not granted a public meeting until recently. Further to this the public meeting granted, is after the cut off date of the 20 July 2007 as it has been scheduled for the 25 July 2007. ▪ The people of the greater St Francis Bay area, which includes Sea Vista, Cape St Francis and St Francis Bay earnestly request the right to have their meeting on the 25 July. Further due time to consider their concerns or opinions so that if applicable they may register as “Interested and Affected Parties” 	<p>Public participation will continue for the duration of the EIA. Also, the cut-off date for the Comment Period referred to in this submission was extended by one month to 28 August 2008 in response to requests by I&APs. A letter was sent to all registered I&APs on 26 July 2007 informing them of the extension.</p> <p>Furthermore, it is important that members of the public understand that public meetings are not the only means via which I&APs can participate in this EIA. There are various other means of participation such as submitting formal written comments and using the Toll free telephone number. To date, twenty five (25) public meetings have been held; and at a point, with no new issues being raised, a decision had to be made not to hold more meetings for the initial round. However, importantly, there will be at least an additional two rounds of public meetings to discuss the outcomes of scoping and the outcomes of the impact assessment.</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Mr Luke Hutchinson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Evaluation of all affected. 	<p>The purpose of the EIA is to assess the potential impacts of the proposed NPS on the receiving environment (social, economic and bio-physical). The outcomes and recommendations of the EIA will be documented in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR).</p>
Mr Paul Jooste Environmental Affairs and Nature Conservation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The comment columns of local newspapers are important opinion formers and reaches a lot of people. "Our Times" of 22 June had a lot of negative comment. 	<p>Thank you for this comment.</p>
Mr Geoff Knipe L.E.D.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I enjoyed your presentation in Gansbaai and do hope it went off well for you. 	<p>Thank you for this comment.</p>
Mr Johannes Jacobus Kotze	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Most residents are senior residents (citizens) and must be consulted. 	<p>Every member of the public is welcome to participate in this EIA. The project has been well advertised and members of the public are encouraged to participate.</p>
Mr Werner Kriel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I hereby register the strongest protest possible towards this so-called development. 	<p>Thank you for this comment.</p>
Alan Kynoch Pro Projects (PTY) LTD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I am opposed to the proposed NPS. 	<p>Thank you for this comment.</p>
Ms Christelle Le Roux	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Initial EIA to be updated to 2007. ▪ An up to date EIA to be conducted 2007/2008 by independent company selected by the public. 	<p>In South Africa, the responsibility for appointing an Environmental Assessment Practitioner rests with the project proponent, in this case, Eskom. The EIA Team that has been assembled is considered competent, representative and independent.</p> <p>This EIA will build on earlier studies undertaken by Eskom, namely the Nuclear Site Investigation Programme (NSIP). Refer to Chapter 6 of the DSR for a review of these studies. A number of specialist studies will be undertaken as part of the EIA. Field studies have either taken place in the later part of 2007 or will take place in early 2008.</p>
Mrs and Mr Helen / Lars Manson-Kullin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Meeting during holiday periods when all inhabitants are here. 	<p>Meetings will be scheduled to accommodate members of the public as far as is practically possible. It must also be noted that there are members of the public who dislike</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
		<p>public meetings during their vacation time. Public meetings are not the only means via which I&APs can participate in this EIA. There are various other means of participation such as submitting formal written comments and using the Toll free telephone number.</p>
David Marais	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We need power but without problems! 	Thank you for this comment.
Mr Thabo Lesiba Matjiu Enviro. Busters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Conservational impact study ▪ Air pollution and Releases. ▪ That the surrounding and affected communities be involved as well. 	<p>These matters will be addressed within a suite of specialist studies to be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p>
Mr Samuel Mdlalose Enviro Busters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Be representative and transparent, and include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Climatology ○ Air quality and health risk assessment. ○ Noise ○ Oceanography ○ Social Economics ○ Fresh Water Ecology 	<p>The EIA Team that has been assembled is considered representative and the process that is being followed is considered transparent. This will be followed through for the whole EIA process.</p> <p>In terms of issues to be considered in the EIA, these matters will be addressed within a suite of specialist studies to be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p>
James (Jim) Michael Pattison	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ So little information has been provided in your 'brochure' on the size, type and specification of the proposed power station that, either deliberately or deceptively, it makes it very difficult at this stage for I&AP's to participate properly in the EIA process. This must be corrected promptly. 	<p>An EIA is a tool designed to flesh out and investigate key issues and associated potential impacts on the environment (biophysical, social and economic). This EIA is being undertaken for this purpose. Scoping, as informed by the BID, will identify the key issues, which will be investigated in depth in the impact assessment.</p>
Mr Arthur James Perold	<p>Meetings held during the daytime should be moved to evening after 6 :00 pm, when working residents can attend.</p> <p>Comments related to the EIA meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Having attended your meeting held on the 8th June 2007 at the Atlantic Beach Golf Estate. I submit for your perusal the following comments: ▪ At the outset I must assure you that I am not opposed to the use of nuclear energy for the generation of electricity, provided that 	<p>Meetings will be scheduled to accommodate members of the public as far as is practically possible. Indeed, there are members of the public who dislike public meetings after hours.</p> <p>Comments concerning Koeberg and Eskom are noted but cannot be addressed in this EIA.</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>ALL facets connected with the system are competently attended to by highly qualified people. This does not appear to be the case at present as far as Koeberg is concerned.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The credibility of the management of Eskom and the Koeberg nuclear personal are at an all time low among the Public and Media because of inefficiencies, untrue statements and “cover-ups”. 	
Ms Penny Plougmann	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ An up to date EIA must be conducted. ▪ An up to date EIA to be conducted by an independent company, selected by the public. 	<p>In South Africa, the responsibility for appointing an Environmental Assessment Practitioner rests with the project proponent, in this case, Eskom. The EIA Team that has been assembled is considered competent, representative and independent.</p> <p>This EIA will build on earlier studies undertaken by Eskom, namely the Nuclear Site Investigation Programme (NSIP). Refer to Chapter 5 of the DSR for a review of these studies. A number of specialist studies will be undertaken as part of the EIA. Field studies have either taken place in the later part of 2007 or will take place in early 2008.</p>
Andrew and Jacqueline Reynolds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Please add me and my wife's objection to The Affected and Interested Parties List. 	Thank you for this comment.
Ingela Richardson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Have all affected communities been contacted by EIA consultants - in all official languages through radio media as well as newspaper for those who are illiterate or have no access to newspapers not in their own language. Door-to-door, community-by-community surveillance must ensure communities are all informed. This is a legal requirement of EIA's. ▪ How does ACER (Africa) intend notifying people of developments with this EIA - especially with regard to dates of Scoping Report deadlines, deadlines for replies, deadlines for appeals etc? What will be done to ensure that everyone who signs up initially as I&APs are kept abreast and informed if their addresses and contact details change? 	<p>It is not a legal requirement of PPPs within EIAs to contact all I&APs; rather, it is a legal requirement to undertake all reasonable means to afford the opportunity for participation. To date, the proposed project has been advertised nationally, provincially and locally (English, Afrikaans and Xhosa). Twenty five (25) public meetings have been held, over 6 000 BIDs distributed and letters sent out to members of the public. If you are aware of members of the public who have not heard about the proposed project, the EIA Team would welcome this information to try to encourage their participation.</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Mr and Mrs Diana Catherine / Louis Richard Serrurier	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All reports to be made public on Internet. 	All reports will be made public (when available) and there is a project web site where all reports will be uploaded (when available).
Mr Craig Symes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I hereby formally register my opposition to the proposed Thyspunt Nuclear Power Station. 	Thank you for this comment. Please note that Thyspunt is only one of five alternative sites being investigated in this EIA.
Ms Evelyn Taltwe Green Agi Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ People are against the proposal. ▪ Absolutely against the proposal. We do not want a 'nuke' here. 	Thank you for this comment.
Hilton and Julia Thorpe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I have a message from Ryan Donnelly to the effect that the submission date for comment on the Thyspunt nuclear EIA will be extended until after the public meetings to be held in the Kouga area on 26 July. ▪ This makes absolute sense, and I for one applaud that decision. Please may I request that you confirm that this is correct, and that you send a copy to Harry Weistra, Chairman of the St Francis Bay Residents' Association. 	The period was extended by approximately one month to 28 August 2007. All registered I&AP was informed of this extension by letter sent on 26 July 2007.
Anton and Shirley Wessels	We are violently opposed to the erection of a nuclear facility!	Thank you for this comment.
Ms Maya Aberman Earthlife Africa	<p>The following constitute the comments of Earthlife Africa Cape Town to the Background Information Document (BID) for the proposed Eskom Nuclear Power Station (NPS) and Associated Infrastructure and the Comment Sheet 1: Scoping Phase.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The BID makes reference to the "multi-faceted and complex" nature of generation technology choices. The document states, "It is conducted within the context of the framework of a multitude of South African policies". However Earthlife Africa Cape Town would like to draw attention to the following excerpt from the 1998 White Paper on Energy which states; "Government will ensure that decisions to construct new nuclear power stations are taken within the context of an integrated energy policy planning process with due consideration given to all relevant legislation, and the process subject to structured participation and consultation with all stakeholders." This commitment has yet to be fulfilled. Despite this, and in the absence of the mandate that might be supplied by such 	Policy is not only reflected in formal policy documents; it is also articulated in speeches and other forms of communications to take into account changing circumstances, for example its articulations on climate change. Government has articulated its policy of giving consideration to expanding South Africa's nuclear power capability. These articulations have been reinforced in the draft Nuclear Energy Policy and Strategy for South Africa issued by Government for public comment in August 2007.

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>processes, Eskom is pursuing the expansion of nuclear energy in South Africa.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The background document makes several broad statements about the suitability of various energy generation technologies and their feasibility for base and peak load power supply. These statements are unsubstantiated and Earthlife Africa Cape Town would like to draw attention to this. The document states, “only a few energy sources are suitable for base load power stations. The primary energy sources in South Africa that are suitable and available in sufficient quantities are coal and uranium.” Earthlife Africa Cape Town annexes to this submission the results of research undertaken about the potential contribution of renewable energy in South Africa. ▪ The background document attempts to classify nuclear energy as a form of sustainable development. Earthlife Africa Cape Town would like to correct this mistake. Nuclear Energy is not sustainable development for several reasons. 	<p>The comments regarding the contribution that renewable energy can make to base load supply of electricity and that nuclear power is not sustainable are noted. Earthlife Africa is invited to send the EIA Team documentation in this regard. This would be used to inform the Impact Assessment Phase of this EIA.</p>
Mrs Brenda Barratt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A full and complete EIA should be undertaken particular reference to the water supply to and from the Mpofu Dam. 	<p>The purpose of the EIA currently being undertaken is to ascertain potential environmental (social, bio-physical and economic) impacts (positive and negative) as part of the decision making process, and to identify how to effectively deal with them (via optimization of benefits or the mitigation of negative impacts). The EIA Team is aware of the Mpofu Dam and the potential impacts on sustainable water supply will be investigated in the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA.</p>
Mr and Mrs Valda R and Christopher Barratt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A full environmental impact study made without bias and disseminated in full to interested parties for comment. 	<p>ARCUS GIBB is undertaking the EIA as the independent environmental assessment practitioners who at the beginning at the project have to declare their independence in the process. Furthermore it is the responsibility ARCUS GIBB to ensure that a rigorous EIA process is followed to ensure that all potential impacts (positive and negative) are identified and where required the positives optimized and the negative impacts sufficiently mitigated.</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Mr Franklin JB Barratt Global Aviation Consultants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Public meetings where any fear may be voiced and allayed/acted upon. ▪ Local climate change. 	<p>Every member of the public is welcome to participate in this EIA. The project has been well advertised and members of the public are encouraged to participate. In addition, I&APs are advised that, apart from public meetings, there are many other ways in which they can participate in the EIA by submitting formal written comments or by contacting the project team on the toll free telephone number. The EIA Team has attempted to create an environment at the public and Key Focus Group meetings where any Interested and Affected Party (I&AP) can openly voice their concerns and fears about the proposed NPS.</p> <p>Local climate change will be addressed in the climatology specialist study as part of the Impact Assessment Phase (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p>
Mr Henk Bloem	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Alternative location of the proposed nuclear power station. ▪ All roleplayers must be notified at least three months in advance of any public meetings. 	<p>Five alternative sites are under investigation in this EIA.</p> <p>It is important that members of the public understand that public meetings are not the only means via which I&APs can participate in this EIA. There are various other means of participation such as submitting formal written comment and contacting the project team on the toll free telephone number. To date, twenty five (25) public meetings have been held in the EIA process. There will be at least an additional two rounds of public meetings to discuss the outcomes of scoping and the outcomes of the impact assessment. It should be noted that it is impractical to advertise public meetings three months in advance, as from experience in other EIAs many I&APs forget the dates and meetings are as a consequence poorly attended. The EIA Team will use as many means, as is practically possible to advertise future public meetings widely (e.g. local, regional and national newspapers, individual letters sent to registered I&APs, posters, posting of meeting programme on the Eskom website for the EIA, through community leaders etc).</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Mr Henk Bloem	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We are very concerned regarding your client, Eskom's application to build a Nuclear Reactor in this environment. We have received little or no information from you, which in itself raises another concern. How much information are you really passing on to those you are inviting to participate? We would like to see more information before we can analyze your client's application in order to make a reasonable comment. ▪ We further request that public process is duplicated on the internet in order to involve all the owners and holiday makers that will not be able to attend. In any event, meetings must be scheduled well in advance in order for those living far to make the necessary arrangements. ▪ We trust that you find this in order. Please do not hesitate to contact us on 082 882 5136 / hbloem@kleinfontein.net / Box 2011 Zwavelpoort. Please ensure our inclusion of our names on your stakeholder list. 	<p>An EIA is a tool designed to flesh out and investigate key issues and associated potential impacts. This EIA is being applied for this purpose. The Scoping Phase, as informed by the BID, will identify the key issues, which will be investigated in depth during the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA. By implication, there is an incremental increase in information available and the level of detail thereof. All information, as known and understood by the EIA Team will be made available in the public domain. The BID was released in the project announcement phase, the phase where the least information is known about the proposed project and EIA, as the specialist studies have not yet commenced.</p> <p>There is a project website (www. Eskom.co.za/eia/nuclear 1) where information on the EIA for the proposed NPS can be accessed.</p> <p>Your contact details have been added onto the EIA stakeholder database.</p>
Mr Bowen Boshier	<p>My comments on/or suggestions for the public participation process are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Seek advice from other organizations and countries (e.g. Germany) that may have had experience in implementing renewable alternatives. Examine how you can achieve the shift to sustainable sources of energy without disturbing the controlling corporation. ▪ Make sure that Eskom does not hide information from the public as they have done in the past, e.g. how much has been spent to date on the PBMR project. i.e. complete transparency by Eskom. • Please make available the literature that is used in this study e.g. <i>“ Comparison and overview (Dones, et al., 2003)</i> ▪ Allow independent specialists, and energy experts (knowledgeable in all forms of energy including Renewable 	<p>Nuclear energy is one of the alternative sources for power generation. There are various primary energy resources and technologies that can be harnessed to produce electricity. Numerous factors are considered during the evaluation of different options, including environmental impact, long term sustainability, operating characteristics, operability and maintainability, economic viability and life cycle costs, lead time for construction, whether the technology has been commercially proven, etc</p> <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.</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>energy) to oversee the process of the Scoping Report – in order to ensure that is not biased by pro-nuclear lobbies. The pro-nuclear perspective is already evident in the background documents you are sending us, which calls into question the validity of the entire process.</p>	<p>Eskom is also pursuing improvements in the utilisation of electricity. Eskom has a demand-side management and energy efficiency programme target of 3000 MW by 2012 and 8000 MW by 2025. 8000 MW would be equivalent to avoiding the construction of two large coal-fired power stations.</p> <p>This EIA is being conducted in an open and transparent manner, something that will continue for the duration of the EIA process.</p> <p>The reference "Greenhouse gas emissions from energy systems: Comparison and overview Dones et al 2003" referred to in the BID can be downloaded from the following web site address: http://gabe.web.psi.ch/pdfs/Annex_IV_Dones_et_al_2003.pdf or one can go onto the site http://gabe.web.psi.ch and do a search for the document.</p> <p>The EIA Team comprises independent specialists in all disciplines. Aside from the independent specialist there are also specialist and peer reviewers for the EIA.</p>
<p>Mr John Bower HW&W Projects Cc</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Adequate impact studies and opinion polls. ▪ Gather as much information as possible from all parties involved during all phases of the project. ▪ Information brochures and questionnaires need to be distributed. 	<p>Scoping will determine the issues that need to be investigated in the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA and the scope of the various specialist studies that would need to be undertaken.</p> <p>The EIA is not a tool to solicit opinions via opinion polls. The Public Participation Process (PPP) will attempt to gather as much information as possible from the widest range of stakeholders as is possible. Background Information Documents (BIDs) and letters informing registered stakeholders will be distributed during all phases of the EIA. Indeed over 6 000 BIDs have been distributed during the project announcement phase.</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
		<p>The broader public process for Eskom's nuclear power generation license is being undertaken as a separate exercise by the National Nuclear Regulator (NNR). This latter process will have a broad, country-wide focus. Eskom will also, independent of the EIA, be rolling out a public awareness programme that will attempt to educate the broader public about the pros and cons of energy generation through nuclear power.</p>
<p>Mr Angus Clark PERCCI</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The strategic positioning of the 5 sites and their priority. There is no generation facility currently in the Eastern Cape. ▪ Spin off quality of supply and the reliability of supply. ▪ Coega is a new development in the Eastern Cape, EL, PE, IDZ and needs to be supported with a reliable supply. 	<p>Comment noted. Eskom is aware of the shortcomings in its generation and transmission network capacity to meet South Africa's growing energy demands, in total as well as from a regional perspective. Eskom has a number of initiatives in progress to address these shortcomings – this EIA is one part of those initiatives.</p>
<p>Mrs Catherine Coni Tshwane University of Technology</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Full disclosure and availability of all documentation to all stakeholders that request this. 	<p>The EIA is currently in the Scoping Phase. All available information has been shared with the public to date. However, it should be noted that, as the EIA progresses, additional information will come to light, which will also be disseminated in the public domain.</p>
<p>Mr Derek Vivian Cook Dunes Guest Farm</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Transparency 	<p>In terms of transparency, this is the cornerstone of public participation and environmental assessment, and is being applied in this EIA.</p>
<p>Mr R Dahlhaeuser Resident of Cape St Francis and St Francis Bay and environs</p>	<p>1. As already complained ACER Africa and ARCUS GIBB consultants have ignored the NEMA as they started the process with a database of only 3000 addresses of affected or interested parties.</p> <p>This number is far away to meet the requirements of the NEMA. In Jeffrey' Bay, Humansdorp, St. Francis Bay and Cape St. Francis are roughly 20 till 25 times more people affected.</p> <p>Therefore I request that a census be conducted in these areas. Eskom and the consultants should take into consideration as well that more than half of the affected/interested parties of Cape St. Francis and St. Francis Bay living elsewhere in South Africa and foreign countries.</p>	<p>The EIA Team is unaware of any number stipulations in NEMA regarding the numbers of stakeholders regarding to be registered for an EIA. Further, an EIA process has to start somewhere, with I&APs being identified on an on-going basis throughout the EIA. Indeed most EIAs start with orders of magnitude fewer I&APs registered on the stakeholder database at project commencement. ACER Africa were fortunate to be provided with the stakeholder database for the PBMR EIA to use as a base database. Also, it should be noted that the EIA for the proposed project was widely advertised in the national, provincial and local media. Within the provisions of NEMA, there is an onus on members of the public to register their interest in an EIA for a proposed project. The stakeholder</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>As it is impossible to extend your database up to the required number of addresses and to get comments from all these currently uninformed people till the 28th of August 2007.</p> <p>I apply herewith officially to extend the Scoping Period by at least 6 months beyond the 28th of August 2007.</p> <p>Especially in Humansdorp and Jeffreys Bay are existing various big high density locations where black people are living. Therefore I kindly request to go into these locations to inform the people and to encourage them to register themselves as interested parties.</p> <p>2. As known we are challenging the independence of ACER Africa consultants and ARCUS GIBB as there are very strong indications that the consultants side with Eskom. We do not like to challenge the independence but we feel committed to a full democratic and fair process of the public participation.</p> <p>We are now waiting for the record of the various phone conversations with Mrs. Patricia Honey and my person. After scrutinizing the records the decision will be made whether we will pursue this case or not.</p> <p>3. Outstanding too are the minutes of the Public Hearings of Oyster Bay, Jeffreys Bay, Humansdorp, St. Francis Bay and St. Francis Bay-Sea Vista and the minutes of the Forum held at the Dunes Guesthouse.</p> <p><u>New Questions to Eskom:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assumed the Nuclear Power Plant will produce 4 000 MW in the year 2016 which percentage of the electricity produced there will be exported? ▪ Which percentage will be supplied for Eastern Cape? ▪ Please note that we expect your comments and answers of this e-mail within the next 3 weeks, latest till the 24th of August 2007. Should we get no answer till this date we have to take it as proven that Eskom refuse to answer. 	<p>database will expand as the EIA proceeds. Should any stakeholder know of a person or group of individuals that is potentially affected or interested in the proposed project please forward their details to ACER Africa.</p> <p>The period for initial comments during scoping was extended by four weeks. Comments will be accepted throughout the approximately two year EIA process.</p> <p>The EIA Team has made every attempt to include disadvantaged groups in the EIA process and have I&APs register as a stakeholder in the EIA process. Indeed a number of the twenty five (25) public meetings have been held in these communities. Eskom has also initiated, as a separate process to the EIA, a public awareness programme, which will target the specific communities raised in order to educate the community members regarding nuclear power.</p> <p>It would be greatly appreciated if you would provide the EIA Team with substantive evidence of their members compromising their independence (bearing in mind that what is submitted becomes part of a legal record that needs to stand scrutiny in a court of law).</p> <p>A transcript of the conversation has been submitted to Ms Honey for verification.</p> <p>Minutes of all meetings are in preparation and a consolidated set of minutes of all the public meetings (PMs), Key Stakeholder Workshops (KSWs) and Key Focus Groups (KFGs) will be distributed to all attendees, for their review and comment, when complete. A set of Draft Minutes are appended to this DSR in Appendices G4, G5 and G6.</p> <p>In the 2006/7 financial year Eskom exported 13 589 GWh to neighbouring countries and imported 11483 GWh, a net difference of 2106 GWh exported, which was less than 1% of the total electricity on the Eskom system. Eskom</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We are looking forward to hearing of you. 	<p>will continue to import electricity up to a maximum related to the reserve margin requirements. There are numerous projects in South and Southern Africa that are being investigated, planned or in progress that would impact whether South Africa is a net importer or exporter. At this stage it is anticipated that South Africa will become a net importer of electricity.</p> <p>Similarly the percentage of electricity that will be supplied to the Eastern Cape in 2016 will be dependent on the demand from the Eastern Cape compared to the remainder of South Africa. However note that Eskom supplies electricity on a national basis via the transmission network, not a regional or local basis. To ensure security and reliability of supply it is necessary that power stations are located in different parts of the country to stabilise the network while contributing to the supply of electricity.</p> <p>Responses to all questions and issues raised by the public in writing are provided in this Issues and Response Report.</p>
Mr Gerhard Davel Kukute (Pty) Ltd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Please communicate any relevant progress information via e-mail. 	This has been noted and will be undertaken.
Mrs Petrea Donnelly The Beach House	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Objections by local people. ▪ Nuclear waste. ▪ Future “accidents” ▪ Chapter 2 Bill of Rights – should not violate our constitutional rights to protect our future environment 	<p>These comments have been noted.</p> <p>The SA 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.</p> <p>For the proposed nuclear power station, Eskom intends to follow the same practices for the management of radioactive waste as used at Koeberg, under the</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
		<p>regulatory control of the National Nuclear Regulator and subject to the requirements of the National Radioactive Waste Management Policy and Strategy and any associated legislation or regulations.</p> <p>Eskom will not construct and operate a nuclear power station is it is not convinced of its safety. 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 acceptably low. The NNR can take away a licence that has already been granted if the NNR feels that nuclear safety is being compromised.</p>
<p>Mr Christopher L Foster</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Be more transparent and interactive with communities affected, don't hide behind technical/bureaucratic curtain. 	<p>In terms of transparency, this is the cornerstone of public participation and environmental assessment, and is being applied in this EIA.</p> <p>Every member of the public is welcome to participate in this EIA. The project has been well advertised and members of the public are encouraged to participate in the process in the following ways: attendance at public and Key Focus Group meetings, attendance of Key Stakeholder Workshops, submission of comments, and contacting the PPP Team directly on the Toll free number provided for the EIA.</p>
<p>Mr Rob Fryer Overstrand Conservation Foundation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Please ensure that these are considered during the drafting of the scoping report and that the Overstrand Conservation Foundation (OCF) is kept fully informed. Your attention is particularly drawn to the our concern that, apart from that relating to the actual EIA process with which we are very familiar, insufficient information is being provided to the public about the proposed sites, technical aspects of the proposed power plant and power line routes to allow meaningful participation in the EIA process. We urge that this lack of transparency be rectified without delay. 	<p>The EIA is currently in the project announcement sub-phase of the Scoping Phase. All available information has been shared with the public (including the process with which not everyone is familiar). However, it should be noted that, as the EIA progresses, additional information will come to light, which will also be disseminated in the public domain.</p> <p>Integration of the power plant to the transmission network is being investigated in a separate EIA.</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
<p>Mr Rob Fryer Overstrand Conservation Foundation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Basis for assessment of sustainability of the proposed nuclear plant and its location. ▪ The OCF has adopted the philosophy that environmental conservation can only be achieved through transformation towards a sustainable lifestyle. We believe that conservation of biodiversity is critically dependent upon the lifestyle choices made inside urban areas and that, if biodiversity is to be preserved in the remaining rural areas, we must influence people (in the private and public sectors) to realign their strategic and tactical plans for the built environment to allow communities to choose to live sustainably within the urban environment. ▪ The OCF considers that the Western Cape Provincial Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning (DEA&DP) has developed sound policies that, if allowed, will result in transformation towards sustainability in the Western Cape. Key to the communication of these policies is the Western Cape Provincial Spatial Development Framework (WCPSDF) and the related supporting guideline documents (including the Western Cape Bioregional Planning Manual). ▪ Although it is understood that the authority responsible for deciding the outcome of the EIA will be the national Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism (DEAT) and that not all proposed sites are located within the Western Cape, the OCF asks that the WCPSDF must be used as the basis for making the decision on the suitability of each potential location for the proposed nuclear plant. ▪ The impact of the cable (transmission power lines) route from the proposed nuclear plant site is material in deciding the plant site. ▪ The OCF strongly objects to the separation of the EIA for the cable (transmission power lines) route associated with the proposed nuclear plant from the EIA for the proposed power plant. Because of the sensitivity of the natural environment, both 	<p>Comments noted. This will be considered by the EIA Team and documented in the Environmental Impact Report.</p> <p>The WCPSDF has been made available to the specialists undertaking the EIA and will guide their investigations.</p> <p>Technical considerations are critically important in assessing whether an alternative site is feasible.</p> <p>While integration of the power plant to the transmission network is being investigated in a separate EIA, the two EIA process will be coordinated and aligned. The recommendation will include which of the sites are technically feasible and which site is the preferred site from an environmental perspective, taking into account both the proposed generation facility and associated infrastructure, as well as the proposed transmission lines and associated infrastructure (including sub-stations).</p> <p>Agriculture, tourism and economic specialist studies, amongst many others, will be key studies during the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA, in determining the potential environmental impacts of the proposed NPS and which of the alternative sites is the preferred site for the construction, operation and decommissioning of the proposed NPS.</p> <p>The OCF is encouraged to contact the public participation office should it feel there is outstanding information to which it has not been made party.</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>in terms of its high scenic importance in the local economy and in terms of vulnerability of threatened ecosystems, the impact of the cable route on the Overstrand may be more severe than that of the nuclear plant.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It is well documented that the growth of the Overstrand's local economy is dependent upon the development of the local tourist industry. The unspoilt scenic beauty and unique but threatened fynbos landscape makes the Overstrand highly attractive as a tourist destination. The nature of the landscape is such that potential cable routes from the proposed Bantamsklip site will be highly visible and unsightly and these will seriously detract from the tourist appeal of the Overstrand and damage the potential to develop the local economy to its full potential. The assessment of this impact must, therefore, form a key component of the process to determine the suitability of Bantamsklip as a potential site for the proposed nuclear plant. ▪ Please ensure that the OCF is kept fully informed as the EIA process proceeds and is provided with sufficient information to enable it to participate meaningfully in the process going forward. 	
Christine & Rob Garbett	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The proposed nuclear developments affect the entire country, not only the proposed coastal sites. The Eskom proposals are certainly of national concern, as such in our view, legally require national input and public participation. ▪ We strongly urge your project team to give an opportunity for Gauteng residents and residents of all other excluded provinces to participate. 	<p>This EIA is focused on five potential sites for the construction, operation and decommissioning of the proposed nuclear power station. However, it should be noted that this EIA was advertised nationally, regionally and locally, and all members of the South African public are encouraged to participate, whether they are for or against nuclear power generation and regardless of where the proposed sites are located.</p>
Ms Sahra Goeda Green Agri Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We do not want a nuclear reactor here. ▪ Go away – get lost no nuke. 	<p>Thank you for this comment.</p>
Ms Kali Griffin Wolvengat Farmer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Since initial environment impact study in early 90s late 80s area has grown enormously – initial study had 16 km radius no agri – zone - that for pebble bed not full-on nuclear reactor as at Koeberg – what of beef – dairy – crop food production also fishing what impact – How will this affect our farming? 	<p>The EIA Team recognizes that much of the environment at all 5 alternative sites has changed since the Nuclear Site Investigation Programme (NSIP) was concluded in the 1990s. Furthermore the NSIP was not an EIA and did not assess potential environmental impacts in detail. This</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Address Wolvengat Residents in our hall once some answers are investigated. ▪ Allow for proper question time. ▪ Different format compared to first meetings ▪ More public participation. 	<p>EIA includes a number of specialist studies, including an agricultural and economic study. These studies will assess the potential impacts of the proposed NPS on crop food production, beef farming, dairy farming and fishing, as well as many other agricultural and economic activities. The site selection criteria will be discussed in more detail in Section 8.8 of the DSR.</p> <p>Future public meetings will take all stakeholder comments regarding the format and location of meetings into account (although it is unlikely that all I&APs will be satisfied). There are two more rounds of public meetings in this EIA. Refer to Section 10.5 of the DSR for additional information regarding the future PPP planned for the EIA.</p>
Mr Vernon Gibbs Halls Hessequa Municipality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Environmental. ▪ Aesthetics. ▪ Noise. ▪ Air ▪ Ground water. ▪ Water resources. ▪ Alternatives. ▪ Contamination. ▪ Emergency procedures. ▪ Full EIA and EMP. ▪ Rehabilitation plans. ▪ Empowerment and employment opportunities. 	<p>In terms of issues to be considered in the EIA, all of the issues raised will be addressed within a suite of specialist studies to be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA (Section 10.6 of the DSR). The assessment of feasible alternatives (in the case of this EIA - site alternatives) is a key requirement of any EIA. A full EIA is being undertaken and an Environmental Management Programme (EMP) will also be compiled, which will include a rehabilitation plan.</p>
Mr and Mrs Eugene & Louise Hendry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Why Eskom should not inflict itself on innocent residents settlements, flora and fauna, and occupants of the sea at Bantamsklip. ▪ Become relevant to society by providing desalinated water to coastal communities, sewerage processing to local communities, and free electricity to local communities. (Take your farm and convert it into a fish farm hatchery). 	<p>The purpose of the EIA currently being undertaken is to ascertain potential environmental (social, bio-physical and economic) impacts (both positive and negative) as part of the decision-making process.</p>
Ms Shavonne Hill Summerhill Guest House	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Nuclear power stations are being dismantled in Europe because they are not cost-effective, are dangerous and nuclear waste is impossible to dispose off. ▪ Donations to be made into a trust fund to fight this legal action i.e. in court with lawyers. 	<p>Your comment has been noted.</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Mr Trevor Hoff Paradise Beach Community Association	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Impact on the environment (Member of Kouga Environmental Committee) 	<p>The purpose of the EIA currently being undertaken is to ascertain potential environmental (social, economic and bio-physical) impacts (positive and negative) as part of the decision making process, and to identify how to effectively deal with them (via optimization of benefits or the mitigation of negative impacts).</p>
Dr Peter NA Inman Coega Development Corporation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In my experience, negative impacts are invariably given greater weight than positive impacts and less effort goes into identifying and quantifying positive impacts. This is such a contentious issue that every effort must be made to be as impartial as possible and to include all practical and genuine positive impacts whilst of course doing the same for negative impacts. ▪ Overall, South Africa's carbon footprint is relatively large and, on a per capita basis, one of the highest figures in the world. This is due to the primacy of coal as the main energy input and the large mining and metallurgical sector. Dilution of this carbon footprint will be more critical in the future and the nuclear option will assist in this objective. ▪ The new generation of Pressurised Water Reactors (PWRs) are inherently safer than existing stations with fewer pumps and valves and much reduced total lengths of pipework. Also, control systems are presumably much more robust with more built-in redundancy. ▪ The sites identified in the previous study circa 1980s need to be critically re-examined as physical and socio-economic environments will have changed since that time. ▪ The strategic national need for coastal power generation rather than continued centralised power generation with longspur transmission lines must be clearly brought out. Security of supply and transmission losses are significant factors. The probable road scenario for electricity demand, bearing in mind National Government's determination to pursue a higher growth rate for the economy, requires that a bold rather than a timid approach needs to be taken. 	<p>Thank you for these comments. Where applicable they will be taken into account in the impact phase of the EIA.</p> <p>The purpose of the EIA currently being undertaken is to ascertain potential environmental (social, economic and bio-physical) impacts (positive and negative) as part of the decision making process, and to identify how to effectively deal with them (via optimization of benefits or the mitigation of negative impacts).</p> <p>The EIA Team recognizes that much of the environment at all 5 alternative sites has changed since the Nuclear Site Investigation Programme (NSIP) was concluded in the 1990s. Furthermore the NSIP was not an EIA and did not assess potential environmental impacts in detail. This EIA includes a number of specialist studies.</p> <p>Please be aware that Eskom has initiated a nuclear awareness programme amongst various communities in and around the five alternative sites. This programme aims to explain nuclear power generation in simple terms. No technical language will be used. The EIA and PPP Teams will also attempt to vary the presentation format, without losing the content, of public meetings in order to cater for the varying education and experience levels of I&APs.</p> <p>Comment regarding PPP is noted, and will be used to advise the planning for the next round of public meetings in the EIA. Twenty five (25) public meetings have been held as part of project announcement phase of the EIA.</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The alternative of more fossil fuel power stations, with the reality of increasingly severe impacts from climate change, must be clearly spelt out. Business as usual for energy usage could be considered as suicidal for our children and grand children. ▪ There must be a clear understanding that, having been marginalised in the past and having now achieved particularly good local growth, the Eastern Cape has the strongest case for local power generation. ▪ Education of the general public with the need to explain very difficult concepts must be a key element of the PPP. Graphic, photographic, video and dedicated TV presentations, maybe using the cartoon format, will have to be embraced ▪ The PPP must reach a wider audience, viz. Motherwell and adjacent rural areas, as that is where the greatest positive impacts of the project will be felt. ▪ Electricity demand growth curves are probably under-estimating the country's likely industrial growth. ▪ It will be necessary to clearly show all the processes together, licensing, safety audit, power line servitudes, hazardous waste disposal, environmental approval, etc. Lack of cohesion at governmental and operational levels could be a fatal flaw. ▪ Volatility of the hydrocarbon sector and unsuitability of renewable energy sector for base load needs to be highlighted. The importance of diversity in the energy mix is also a strategic consideration. 	<p>The specialist studies undertaken during the Impact Assessment Phase will assess the potential positive and negative impacts of the proposed NPS at a local, regional and national level.</p>
<p>Mr and Mrs Lukas & Rhode Janse van Rensburg</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide summary of licensing prerequisites. 	<p>In terms of the National Nuclear Regulator Act of 1999, a nuclear installation licence will be required from the NNR for the proposed nuclear power station. Eskom is likely to submit an application for such a licence in 2008.</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
		<p>Eskom will not construct and operate a nuclear power station is it is not convinced of its safety.</p> <p>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, based on a safety analysis report submitted by Eskom. 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 acceptably low and that the safety standards and limits will be met, both during normal and abnormal situations. The NNR can take away a licence that has already been granted if the NNR feels that nuclear safety is being compromised. The safety standards and limits are published in the Government Gazette and may be downloaded from the NNR website www.nnr.co.za.</p>
<p>Mr Henri & Joan Joubert</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Impact on local business. ▪ Impact on local tourism. ▪ Impact on overseas investment in local area. ▪ Safety etc. issues. 	<p>In terms of issues to be considered in the EIA, these matters will be addressed within a suite of specialist studies (including economic and tourism) to be commissioned as part of the impact assessment (Section 10.6 of the Scoping Report).</p> <p>Eskom will not construct and operate a nuclear power station is it is not convinced of its safety.</p> <p>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, based on a safety analysis report submitted by Eskom. 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 acceptably low and that the safety standards and limits will be met, both during normal and abnormal situations. The NNR can take away a licence that has already been granted if the NNR feels that nuclear safety is being compromised. The safety standards and limits are published in the Government Gazette and may be downloaded from the NNR website www.nnr.co.za.</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Mr Mike Kantey Watercourse CC	<p>Comments on the BID Document:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Number pages of document, as well as paragraphs, for easier reference: make cover = page 1 back cover =page 16 2. P.4 para 3: Please define “sustainable development” of <i>Brundtland Report Our Common Future 1972</i> - a commonly accepted definition worldwide 3. P.4 para 4, line 2: “when safely handled” <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3.1. Does this clause imply that there may be a hazard involved when not safely handled? 3.2 If such a hazard may exist, may we know the <u>precise nature</u> of that hazard and its consequent risk to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) workers, and (b) communities living within: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (i) a 20-km radius; (ii) a 50-km radius; and (iii) a 500-km radius? 3.3 Can this hazard be expressed in terms of 2m INES 7 accidents as defined by the IAEA? 4. P.4 # 4, line 2: “has little impact on ecosystems” <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4.1 Does “little” mean something? 4.2 If does mean “something”, what is the nature of that “impact” w.r.t.: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) conventional operation, in terms of <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (i) liquid effluent; and (ii) gaseous, or airborne emission, and (b) unscheduled releases of: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (i) liquid effluent, and (ii) gaseous, or airborne emissions 4.3 Can we have these impacts declared in terms of Bq/m³ with regard to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Strontium – 90; (b) Iodine – 131, and (c) Cesium – 137? 4.4 Can we further have these impacts benchmarked in terms of : 	<p>In terms of issues to be considered in the EIA, including those raised on the BID, the issues where applicable will be addressed within a suite of specialist studies to be commissioned as part of the impact assessment (Section 10.6 of the Scoping Report).</p> <p>Some of the issues relate to aspects under the mandate of the National Nuclear Regulator and will be dealt with in the nuclear licensing process once that process is initiated. Eskom is likely to apply for a nuclear installation licence in 2008, which will then initiate the nuclear licensing process.</p> <p>The reference "Greenhouse gas emissions from energy systems: Comparison and overview Dones et al 2003" referred to in the BID can be downloaded from the following web site address: http://gabe.web.psi.ch/pdfs/Annex_IV_Dones_et_al_2003.pdf or one can go onto the site http://gabe.web.psi.ch and do a search for the document.</p> <p>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>Experience gained internationally and from Koeberg is that people do not become ill or die from living in close proximity to a nuclear power station.</p> <p>Nuclear power stations do not release SO_x, NO_x and PM and carbon dioxide during their operation. Never the less this will be investigated during the EIA phase.</p> <p>Using Koeberg as an example: Koeberg has operated for the past 23 years within very close proximity of wheat, cattle and dairy farms. The</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>(a) dairy products, especially milk? (b) filter feeders, especially black, and white mussels, and abalone? (c) lamb, mutton, beef, and pork? (d) fruit and vegetables?</p> <p>5. Page 4, para 4, line 5 : “disposal “ of waste. Why has waste dumping (Not “disposal”) been excluded from the EIA?</p> <p>6. Page 4, para 4, line 8: Can we have the full reference for Dones <i>et al</i>, 2003</p> <p>7. Page 5, para2, line3: “effective emergency planning” 7.1 In terms of Duynefontein, can we have a detailed report on the emergency plan for the City of Cape Town, covering radius of 59km. 7.2 Does the northward expansion of the city of Cape Town pose any particular problem, given the NNR’s insistence on a 16-km exclusion zone? 7.3 Can the emergency Planning scenario be based on an INES accident as defined by the IDEA?</p>	<p>close proximity of wheat, cattle and diary farms. The nearest farms are within the 10 km radius of Koeberg. It has not affected the farming activities in any way. This can be attested to by the farmers in the Philadelphia area (farming union nearest Koeberg). It is suggested that farmers make contact with farmers living near Koeberg so as to get a feel of how they have experienced living and farming around Koeberg Nuclear Power Station. This will give them an independent opinion as to any impact on their farming activities.</p> <p>The expectation is thus that the operation of the proposed nuclear power station (remembering that 5 sites are being investigated for the proposed nuclear power station, one in the Eastern Cape, two in the Western Cape and two in the Northern Cape) will not hamper agricultural activities in the vicinity. This will be investigated as part of the EIA process - the impact on agricultural activities, both during construction and operation of the proposed power station is one of the specialist studies that will be undertaken.</p> <p>The fundamentals of safe disposal of radioactive waste are very well understood. The safety and management of radioactive waste forms part of the nuclear safety assessment that is performed by the National Nuclear Regulator.</p> <p>For the proposed nuclear 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 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>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Mr Mike Kantey Watercourse CC	I trust that this round of the EIAs for the PBMR and proposed PWR will proceed justly and fairly (as it indeed seems to be doing), so that there is no necessity to pursue a judicial path once again after the Record of Decision (ROD) has been delivered.	Thank you for this comment. This EIA is focused on the proposed Nuclear 1 project. The PBMR proposal is the subject of a separate EIA. The EIA Team is committed to undertaking a robust EIA, that is scientifically sound, conforms to all legal requirements and best practice, as well as being transparent.
Miss DJ Krivens Resident Port Nolloth, Northern Cape	<p>Yesterday (24th July 2007), I per chance visited my local council's offices, the Richtersveld Municipality Port Nolloth (RMPN), to deal with a private matter. Here, the local government structure services the 160 000 ha Richtersveld area of Namaqualand, Northern Cape Province. On 28th June, UNESCO awarded us the double honour of being declared an international botanical and cultural Heritage Site -- South Africa's 8th national honour -- or pride, if you will.</p> <p>While waiting to be served I saw a piece of paper with the words "nuclear" and "environmental impact" written on it. Adding: "for the proposed" and "infrastructure" to it, chills went up my spine. The form mentions ACER Africa, ARCUS GIBB Consulting Design Management, and Eskom, regarding a "scoping phase" questionnaire to do with a nuclear power station; and as for "Comment Sheet 1," is there a 2, 3, etc? Another scary word: "Stakeholders."</p> <p>It contains a deadline date: 20th July. What is this? I asked three staffers at our RMPN what this was. They did not know. I asked various acquaintances in my town (Port Nolloth), but they had not seen this paper before, either.</p> <p>Is someone entertaining ideas about nuking our Last Outpost? There is no other place on Earth like the Richtersveld. Thus, although my response is belated, I join our Komaggas brethren, further south, in shouting a resounding "NO!" And that, without having a clue what this piece of paper is all about -- a sheet asking for my personal details without detailing anything about yourselves, saves for a telephone and fax line, your e-mail address, and a postal address in Mtunzini, on the other side of our country.</p> <p>Me thinks your assessment is flawed. We have no local radio station or newspaper here to inform us of good and bad tidings in our</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. They will be taken into account, where applicable in the impact phase of the EIA.</p> <p>The legal requirement is to undertake all reasonable means to afford the opportunity for participation. To date, the proposed project has been advertised nationally, provincially and locally (English, Afrikaans and Xhosa) (25 adverts) 25 public meetings have been held (a public meeting was held in Port Nolloth on 10 October 2007), over 6000 BIDs distributed and letters sent out to members of the public. In towns/ villages where newspapers and radio are not common means of communicating (e.g. towns in the Northern Cape such as Port Nolloth) information posters have been used to advertise public meetings. Furthermore documents have been made available at over 37 venues around the country and on the Eskom website for the EIA. Community leaders (e.g. mayors, Councillors, Chairpersons of residents associations, NGOs, Ministers) have also been involved in disseminating information. Please also refer to Section 10.5 of the DSR which provides more details on the PPP for the EIA.</p> <p>If you are aware of members of the public who have not heard about the proposed project, the EIA Team would welcome this information to try to harness their participation. Please feel free to also contact the EIA Team through the Toll free number.</p> <p>Please refer to Section 9.3 of the DSR for venues where information regarding the EIA can be obtained.</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>location (except for a Grapevine and a Gripe Vine, of which both bush telegraph systems are decidedly dodgy.) Many Richtersvelders are far off from Port Nolloth, or pay their accounts via the Internet. Therefore, we do not physically visit RMPN's premises too often. So who has failed here? Was the onus on our RMPN to see to it that everyone be informed of this process? Why did we not receive a drop by your organisation in, say, our post-boxes? Were wads of these papers deposited at all our towns? Forgive me, but I am completely in the dark here (pun unintended.)</p> <p>Having said that, how did your study handle (potential) respondents who are blind, handicapped, the immobile elderly, or those who are illiterate? In fact, apart from the Afrikaans and English provided, what about those living here who do not fully comprehend either language? The magnitude of something like this requires better input, i.e., identifiable census taking-type folks, or like TV licence inspectors with clipboards, knocking on doors -- not pieces of paper whose presence pales amongst all the other pieces of paper one tends to bypass for the verbiage.</p> <p>What is this Scoping Process, and its partner, the Technical Process? We have a lot of sunshine, a powerful ocean, and gusty winds. If any form of energy is to be looked at, please let it be from Nature as we know Her. A recent <i>Sunday Times</i> (South Africa) news article mentions that brightly coloured birds (e.g., red, yellow) around Chernobyl fared worse than those with dull-hued plumage. We have a wetlands/bird sanctuary in Alexander Bay, and plenty of brightly coloured birds. Prevention is better than cure! (Refer to the recent fiasco where SA had to import foreign expertise to patch up our problems, and now another five-kilometres-radius beef about developers wanting to house people under a reactor's nose.)</p> <p>I am just a regular dweller here and live two streets away from the RMPN. And now this revelation. I reiterate To anything containing the word "nuclear," no thank-you! We live in Paradise and we do not want it nuked. We already have a cell tower to microwave us, and I think that is quite enough. Your reply in simple English will be much appreciated. We do not speak techno-legalese very well around here.</p>	<p>Should any member of the public have difficulty accessing, reading or understanding information about the EIA for the proposed NPS they are more than welcome to contact ACER Africa who will assist them.</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Miss Debbie Krivens	<p>Thank-you for your speedy E-mails of 26th and 27th July in response to my query about the ACER/Eskom EIA 12/12/20/944 proposal. I look forward to discovering more about what I'll code-name: "That Nuke Business." If it is any consolation, this E-mail goes out to you from my ACER Aspire 3053 WXCi WinXP Home Ed. Notebook.</p> <p>No offence, but I do not like opening MSWord docs (or) receiving huge E-mails with attachments, due to the fact that download time is long and pricey, and my antivirus company recently reported that 90,000 computer virii infected our globe in 2006 alone. I would thus rather visit Eskom et al's Webs and decide for myself what to download or not. However, I shall read your attachment soonest.</p> <p>On the 31st, I received per post (from a family member in Jo'burg), a newspaper clipping... either <i>The Sunday Times</i> or <i>The Star</i> ... entitled: "Eskom calls for expressions of interest in R1.1bn wind farm," by Samantha Enslin-Payne. This article pertains to the W. Cape Klipheuwel pilot wind farm, the private Darling (NW Cape Town) farm, and talk of a N. Cape solar power plant. If that is so, and if the parties concerned require "guinea-pigs" I would strongly consider participating in viability tests to run my small Port Nolloth cottage on clean energy!</p> <p>To put you and your colleagues in the picture, [i] our fresh water comes from Alexander Bay, 85 kms to the north, in rather inadequate pipes, often requiring the mixing-in of brack water; [ii] We do not have a modern sewerage set up; our tanks are thus pumped by the municipality's two trucks; [iii] Our electricity situation is currently good, although between 2000-2002 the appalling state of same was largely due to our previous council, not Eskom per se. As you can see, we are still behind the times in many respects and it would be wonderful to make the quantum leap by by-passing the coal and nuke route, etc., using the latest Eco-friendliest methods of power generation.</p> <p>In closing, if it is of any use to those concerned, I have heard that in the United Kingdom gripes are voiced about the noise generated by some of their wind plants. Therefore, one hopes that any plants in the South Africa will take this form of pollution into consideration, too.</p>	<p>Thank you for these comments. Your views on the negative impacts associated with renewable energy sources are noted.</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>For example, my town is a huge echo chamber. It is astounding how far sound travels here! Two years ago drilling took place some distance off, which I could actually hear and feel under my floor, especially in the wee hours of the morning. Also, there is a global outcry about a type of noise pollution collectively known as The Hum.</p>	
<p>Mrs Ryszard Vanessa Losoale - Strzelecki Sandal Guesthouse</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Underground water/rivers. ▪ Damage to the whole area environment 	<p>The purpose of the EIA currently being undertaken is to ascertain potential impacts (positive and negative) as part of the decision making process, and to identify how to effectively deal with them (via optimization of benefits or the mitigation of negative impacts).</p> <p>In terms of issues to be considered in the EIA, these matters will be addressed within a suite of specialist studies (including a geo-hydrological study) to be commissioned as part of the impact assessment (Section 10.6 of the Scoping Report).</p>
<p>Mr Peter and Colleen Laing</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ History of nuclear power stations in other countries has had many problems. These should be investigated and the consequences on the people and environment studied. 	<p>Thank you for your comment. The will be taken into account in the impact phase of the EIA.</p>
<p>Mr Leslie Lawson</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Full transparency and disclosure to all residents and stakeholders. 	<p>In terms of transparency, this is the cornerstone of public participation and environmental assessment, and is being applied in this EIA.</p> <p>Every member of the public is welcome to participate in this EIA. The project has been well advertised and members of the public are encouraged to participate.</p>
<p>Mrs Samantha Sara Lindsay St. Francis College (School)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ True environmental impact – fynbos, sea, wind pollution etc (passive or active). ▪ Local meetings – St. Francis Bay and Sea Vista. 	<p>The purpose of the EIA currently being undertaken is to ascertain potential impacts (positive and negative) as part of the decision making process, and to identify how to effectively deal with them (via optimization of benefits or the mitigation of negative impacts).</p> <p>In terms of issues to be considered in the EIA, these matters will be addressed within a suite of specialist studies to be commissioned as part of the impact assessment (Section 10.6 of the Scoping Report).</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
		Also, I&APs are advised that, apart from public meetings, there are many other ways in which they can participate in the EIA by submitting formal written comment or contacting the project team on the toll free telephone number. Public meetings were held in St Francis Bay on 25 July 2007 and Sea Vista on the same day.
Mrs Jackie Louw Sandals Guest House	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Damage to environment. ▪ Damage to tourism industry. ▪ Development impact. ▪ Marine and Conservation life 	In terms of issues to be considered in the EIA, these matters will be addressed within a suite of specialist studies (including a tourism and visual/ 'sense of place' specialist studies) to be commissioned as part of the impact assessment (Section 10.6 of the Scoping Report).
Mr Thomas MacDonald Movement Against Nuclear	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Say no to Chernobyl! ▪ Free the world of ozone destroyers. ▪ No future development on the coast within 1 km of high tide mark. ▪ Visible protests. 	Thank you for these comments.
Mrs Sharon Mare The Beach House	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Environmental damage. ▪ Local opinions must be heard. ▪ I vehemently don't want a nuclear reactor on my doorstep, as it will affect my life and my children's future negatively. 	The purpose of the EIA currently being undertaken is to ascertain potential impacts (positive and negative) as part of the decision making process, and to identify how to effectively deal with them (via optimization of benefits or the mitigation of negative impacts).
Mr Stuart Kent Mare	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Objections by locals. 	Thank you for these comments.
Mr Tyran Mare	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Our constitutional rights to a safe environment. 	The purpose of the EIA currently being undertaken is to ascertain potential impacts (positive and negative) as part of the decision making process, and to identify how to effectively deal with them (via optimization of benefits or the mitigation of negative impacts).
Mr Justice Nzimande ESKOM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Radioactive waste management. 	For the proposed nuclear power station, Eskom intends to follow the same practices for the management of radioactive waste as used at Koeberg, 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.
Mrs Magda Pick	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Possible danger to myself, my children and the environment. 	The purpose of the EIA currently being undertaken is to

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Mr and Mrs Michael & Cecelia Ravenscroft Kleynkloof Private Nature Reserve	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A referendum testing if the landowners in the area affected by the presence of a NPS, want it built in their area. 	ascertain potential impacts (positive and negative) as part of the decision making process, and to identify how to effectively deal with them (via optimization of benefits or the mitigation of negative impacts).
Mr Phillip Ravenscroft Maluti GSM Consulting Eng.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Get local residents and land owners to vote on whether they support the project or not. 	
Mr Jerry and Simon Rose-Innes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Impact on environment. 	
Mr Gregory Smith NiMBLE – Nelson Mandela Bay Local Environmentalist	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Within the nuclear strategy, what review mechanisms exist for a lobby for Provincial Energy Production Equity (PEPE)? ▪ PEPE considerations with national government imperatives – How much 'AFFIRMATIVE' development can the Eastern Cape expect within its lobby for PEPE. ▪ Who defines the nature of the Eastern Capes profile as national powerhouse? ▪ Please find a way for more (greater volume) of questions to be addressed. 	The EIA will attempt to, by various means, to answer all questions posed to the Team.
Mrs Sara Stevenson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lack of impartiality should Eskom be paying the firm appointed to manage the EIA. 	In South Africa, the responsibility for appointing an Environmental Assessment Practitioner rests with the project proponent, in this case, Eskom. The EIA Team that has been assembled is considered competent and representative. Furthermore it is a requirement of the appointed independent environmental assessment practitioner to declare their independence at the start of the project.
Dr Jaan J Taljaard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Everybody must have their say. 	Every member of the public is welcome to participate in this EIA. The project has been well advertised and members of the public are encouraged to participate.
Mr Cornelius Janse Uys TVD Consulting Engineer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Find out why the English parliament rejected pebble bed nuclear power (temporarily postponed) (biggest reason is the uncertainty regarding financial projection etc!) 	Please note that the PBMR proposal is the subject of a separate EIA and your comment has been forwarded to the Project Manager of that EIA.
Mr Johannes Vermaak Agri-Tsitsikamma East	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Do what is best for our region. 	Thank you your comment has been noted.

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
<p>Dr and Mrs Hans & Liesbeth Verstrate Oyster Bay Lodge</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Contact overseas power institutions where wind, bio and solar is very popular. ▪ Teach people to use less electricity ('saving lamps' etc) ▪ Increase price of electricity. All houses should have solar panels – buy self. 	<p>Thank you your comment has been noted.</p> <p>Eskom is pursuing improvements in the utilisation of electricity. Eskom has a demand-side management and energy efficiency programme target of 3000 MW by 2012 and 8000 MW by 2025. 8 000 MW would be equivalent to avoiding the construction of two large coal-fired power stations.</p>
<p>Mrs Julie Verfeld</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ That the power station be situated out of the radius affecting St. Francis Bay, Cape St. Francis, Oyster Bay and Humansdorp. 	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>Mr Charles Westley</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To convince the local people in Namaqualand within say ± 200pm on these sites to accept the idea and support it. ▪ Brazil and Schulpfontein are ideal sites as the echo system is already seriously damaged by mining. Kleinzee has the infrastructure to handle the Brazil project. ▪ The only problem I see is waste handling ▪ Hold open discussions in all the small villages and towns within 200 km of proposed sites explaining global warming etc. 	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>They will be taken into account, where applicable, in the impact phase of the EIA.</p> <p>The EIA Team has held twenty five (25) public meetings during the project announcement phase, many of these meetings in small towns near the 5 alternative sites.</p>
<p>Maya Aberman Nuclear Energy Costs the Earth Campaign (NECTEC) Earthlife Africa Cape Town</p>	<p>The following constitute additional comments of Earthlife Africa Cape Town (ELA-CT) to the Background Information Document (BID) for the proposed Eskom Nuclear Power Station (NPS) and Associated Infrastructure and the Comment Sheet 1: Scoping Phase. These comments do not serve as a replacement to initial comments submitted on 20 July 2007, but rather serve to raise additional concerns and register additional comments.</p> <p>ELA-CT has concerns about the safety of nuclear reactors in general and with the proposed type of reactor for Nuclear 1 – the pressurized water reactor (PWR). ELA-CT wishes to present the following paper; <i>Nuclear Reactor Hazards, Ongoing dangers of Operating Nuclear Technology in the 21st Century</i>, Greenpeace International, 2005; which serves to highlight its concerns. Of particular relevance are sections pertaining to</p>	<p>The purpose of the EIA currently being undertaken is to ascertain potential impacts (positive and negative) to be able to effectively deal with them (via optimization of benefits or the mitigation of negative impacts).</p> <p>Eskom will not construct and operate a nuclear power station is it is not convinced of its safety.</p> <p>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 acceptably low. The NNR can take away a licence that has already been granted if the NNR feels that nuclear safety is being compromised.</p> <p>This EIA is for a proposed nuclear power station based on</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>1.) Shortcomings of Pressurised Water Reactors (PWRs), pgs 15-19</p> <p>2.) Vulnerability of Nuclear Power Plants to Acts of terrorism and War, pgs 86-97</p> <p>3.) Climate Change and Nuclear Safety, pgs 115-126</p> <p>ELA-CT would emphasise that in the absence of a well researched and broadly consulted plan for the long-term problem of high-level radioactive waste, it is irresponsible and unacceptable to continue to generate such waste. In the context of South Africa's vastly inadequate Draft Radioactive Waste Management Policy and in a situation where even the Portfolio Committee on Minerals and Energy calls the above-mentioned document a "problem statement" more than a policy, ELA-CT would re-iterate that the generation of high-level nuclear waste should discontinue and plans to build additional power plants should halt.</p> <p>ELA-CT seeks to ensure that in the consideration of the impact of this project, the economic impacts are considered. An analysis of the costs associated with nuclear power plants shows that projects almost always over-run costs, that time-scales almost always slide and that nuclear energy is often more expensive than alternatives. ELA-CT wishes to present the following paper; <i>The Economics of Nuclear Power</i>, Greenpeace International, 2007, which serves to highlight its concerns.</p> <p>ELA-CT would also like to register concern that there have been no independent studies performed to investigate the impact of nuclear power station (NPS) operation on nuclear workers and/or communities living close to such installations (also know as epidemiological studies).</p> <p>ELA-CT deems it necessary at this stage also to address concern about the potential bias of the EIA consultant. Despite the implicit bias present when an "independent" consultant is employed and paid by the project proponent, it is essential that the consultant remain unaffected by and uninvested in the project outcome. Statements in the Durbanville Stakeholders meeting like "we hope to get authorization" must be guarded against.</p>	<p>the Pressurized Water Reactor (PWR) technology. The two designs that are under consideration evolved from previous designs (e.g, the Koeberg design). The majority of nuclear power stations operating in the world today are of the PWR design, and together have many years of safe operational experience.</p> <p>The SA Cabinet approved a National Radioactive Management Policy and Strategy in 2005. The Department of Minerals and Energy (DME) is currently drafting legislation to implement the Policy. Two options for the long term management of spent fuel are possible: (a) direct final disposal of the spent fuel in a deep underground geological disposal facility, or (b) reprocessing of the spent fuel to extract unused uranium and plutonium for re-use and concentration and disposal of the residual (about 3-4% of the spent fuel) high level waste in a deep underground geological disposal facility. Both options are being pursued internationally.</p> <p>The National Nuclear Regulator has issued standards and limits based on, and in some cases stricter than, international best practice, and monitors and ensures compliance with those standards, that ensure that exposures to radiation are far below internationally acceptable levels.</p> <p>An economic specialist study is included in the Impact Assessment Phase of this EIA.</p> <p>The issue of the potential bias of the independent EIA Consultant was raised during the meeting and acknowledged and corrected by the EIA Consultant concerned to "Eskom hopes to get authorization".</p> <p>The concern regarding the alignment of this EIA with the EIA for the transmissions lines and infrastructure is noted.</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>Another issue of concern is the separation of EIAs for construction and transmission for Nuclear 1. As correctly highlighted by representatives of local government in the Durbanville Stakeholders Meeting, if the EIA for transmission lags behind the EIA for construction, there is a legitimate concern that the EIA for transmission will be pushed through in the event of a positive RoD for construction.</p> <p>The final issue that ELA-CT would like to raise is with regards to the absence of the National Nuclear Regulator (NNR) from the Durbanville Stakeholders Meeting. It is the view of ELA-CT that was very unfortunate and disappointing.</p> <p>NUCLEAR REACTOR HAZARDS: Ongoing Dangers of Operating Nuclear Technology in the 21st Century</p> <p>The economics of Nuclear Power.</p> <p>See Appendix 1 & 2 below.</p>	<p>The comment regarding the NNR participation in the EIA meetings is noted. The NNR is a registered stakeholder for the EIA and is invited to all meetings.</p>
<p>Professor and Mrs Duncan Russel Anderson</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Pollution can and will result (even if far less than with coal). ▪ Move this site north of Coega harbour north / east of Port Elizabeth. 	<p>The EIA will assess the potential impacts of pollution created by the proposed NPS and associated infrastructure. Once assessed, effective mitigation measures will be identified and, if the proposed power station is constructed, implemented via an Environmental Management Plan (EMP). The EMP will serve to reduce any potential negative impacts during the construction, operational and decommissioning phases.</p> <p>A Nuclear Site Investigation Programme (NSIP) was undertaken in 1982 by independent environmental consultants from the University of Cape Town, which involved numerous phases to identify the 5 alternative sites being investigated in this EIA. Please refer to Chapter 5 of the Draft Scoping Report for the process involved in site selection for the proposed NPS and its conclusions and recommendations. The Summary Report of the study is also available on the Eskom website for the EIA.</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Mrs Barter Celeste Barker	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Please advertise in the <i>EP Herald</i> and on notice boards at public facilities. 	Thank you for this comment that will be taken forward for consideration in the planning for future public announcement.
Ms Shelley Blake	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Safety of individual residing in the area. ▪ Impact on tourism environment and industry in the area. ▪ Evacuation procedures – strategies etc. ▪ Process of building using semi-skilled labour and importing of skills into the area – influx of individuals and insufficient housing. ▪ Impact on property prices. 	These matters will be addressed within a suite of specialist studies (including tourism, economic, social specialist studies) to be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).
Andrew Bonthuys	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I am a concerned farmer within the 10 km radius of the proposed Bantamsklip site near Pearly Beach. I was told by a neighbouring resident that it has been announced that Thyspunt is the selected first site for development. Is this true or rumour? Please respond as I find no such announcement on the Eskom site and people here are celebrating (falsely?) that we will be left alone for a few more years. 	This EIA is focused on five alternative sites for the proposed NPS. No decision has (or can be) made at this stage and the EIA has to take its course. It is likely that DEAT will make a decision regarding the proposed NPS in 2009.
Mr Francois Robert Botes BMW	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The impact on the farming, sea (fishing and calamari) industry, this development will have an extreme influence (negative) on the local land and sea ecosystem (health). ▪ Negative effect on tourism – this area is of high importance on the tourism industry. ▪ Nature conservation!!! – In this prestige area this development would be (is) a No No. ▪ Land ownership, property – future prices would be law. ▪ Why not build it next to Koeberg! ▪ All in the same area the risk is already there or inland next to Johannesburg. 	<p>These matters will be addressed within a suite of specialist studies to be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p> <p>A Nuclear Site Investigation Programme (NSIP) was undertaken in 1982 by independent environmental consultants from the University of Cape Town, which involved numerous phases to identify the 5 alternative sites being investigated in this EIA. Please refer to Chapter 5 of the Draft Scoping Report for the process involved in site selection for the proposed NPS and its conclusions and recommendations. The Summary Report of the study is also available on the Eskom website for the EIA.</p>
Sharon Brink Botanical Society of SA	I am emailing my response to the proposed Eskom Nuclear Power Station (NPS) and Associated Infrastructure document (EIA: 12/12/20/944) I received today, 28 August 2007 as the reply date was for no later than this very day - rather an impossible task if I am	Please note that comments will be considered by the EIA Team throughout the EIA process. Comment periods have been set to ensure comments are captured in the various reports produced.

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>to use the standard method and as is I am a day late but I take it that my issues will none the less be addressed. The meeting our society was represented at ended rather abruptly in Struisbaai as the power was cut so we were never able to make our concerns known and now with the very late arrival of this document we have missed your deadline.</p> <p>1. The following issues must be addressed by the Scoping Process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provision must be made that when checking the natural vegetation (flora) that it be undertaken during the autumn to spring phase rather than the presently planned spring to autumn phase. Most of our bulbs will start flowering from March and again from August while most of the fynbos will flower across the winter months with a peak in September. This means that important data could be missed that is crucial to this unique flora. ▪ The micro fauna that occurs in this fynbos system must also be monitored i.e. insects, frogs, butterflies, moths, rodents etc. Their delicate balance is necessary for the viability of the fynbos. ▪ We have great concern as to how the nuclear waste will be managed especially with regard to the low level waste e.g. clothing. ▪ Increase in sea temperatures i.e. the sea temperature is warmer than at Koeberg and will take longer before normal sea temperature is attained and if this will have a negative effect on the weather as is seen when the warmer currents move further south than the norm and in the case of the warm water that sometimes develops off of the south western coast. 	<p>In terms of issues to be considered in the EIA, these matters will be addressed within a suite of specialist studies (including botanical, faunal, marine, oceanography specialist study) to be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p> <p>Your recommendations regarding preferable seasons for field have been passed onto the relevant botanical specialists, who are extremely experienced.</p> <p>Radioactive waste is internationally categorised into three levels:</p> <p>Using Koeberg as an example: Low-level radioactive waste consists of day-to-day refuse such as paper, gloves, plastic containers, disposable overalls, overshoes etc, which have low traces of radioactive contamination. It is compacted into metal drums (200 litre drums). These drums are transported by road to Vaalputs, the National Radioactive Waste Disposal site in the Northern Cape for near surface disposal. Vaalputs is managed by Necsa on behalf of the State, in terms of a licence issued by the National Nuclear Regular. The level of radioactive in the metal drums decreases with time; after approximately 30 years, the level of radioactivity is equivalent to natural background levels.</p> <p>Intermediate level waste consists of radioactive resins and sludges, spent filter cartridges and scrap pieces from maintenance work. Intermediate-level waste is solidified by combining it into a sand/cement mix, which is poured into concrete containers, which are transported to Vaalputs for near surface disposal. The level of radioactive in the concrete containers decreases with time; after approximately 300-400 years, the level of radioactivity is equivalent to natural background levels.</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>2. My comments on/or suggestions for the public participation and technical processes are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Give better warning and notice of meetings that are to take place. 	<p>Spent fuel or high-level radioactive waste: The spent fuel is retained at Koeberg in spent fuel storage facilities (pools and casks) licensed by the National Nuclear Regulator. The pools and casks have sufficient capacity for the 40-year design life of Koeberg.</p> <p>The SA Cabinet approved a National Radioactive Management Policy and Strategy in 2005. The Department of Minerals and Energy (DME) is currently drafting legislation to implement the Policy. Two options for the long term management of spent fuel are possible: (a) direct final disposal of the spent fuel in a deep underground geological disposal facility, or (b) reprocessing of the spent fuel to extract unused uranium and plutonium for re-use and concentration and disposal of the residual (about 3-4% of the spent fuel) high level waste in a deep underground geological disposal facility. Both options are being pursued internationally.</p> <p>For proposed nuclear power station, Eskom will follow the same practices for the management of radioactive waste as discussed above, under the regulatory control of the National Nuclear Regulator and subject to the requirements of the National Radioactive Waste Management Policy and Strategy and any associated legislation or regulations.</p>
Mrs Daniela Casciani	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Establish now a timetable for regular contacts e.g. monthly email update, workshops every three months and communicate it to the public. 	<p>Thank you for this suggestion, it will be considered for future communication.</p>
Mr Christopher Coombes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Threat of explosion, marine environmental issues. ▪ Noise and visual pollution, traffic issues ▪ Power line issues. ▪ Fence issues. 	<p>These matters will be addressed within a suite of specialist studies to be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p> <p>The EIA for the transmission lines is a separate study to this EIA, although both studies will be co-ordinated and integrated in order for the relevant Environmental Authorities to make an informed decision about the proposed NPS.</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Mr Pieter de Waal Belmet	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Listen to the public and institutions who ask reasonable questions. ▪ Develop alternatives. 	<p>An EIA is a tool designed to flesh out and investigate key issues and associated potential impacts. This EIA is being applied for this purpose. Scoping, as informed by the BID, will identify the key issues, which will be investigated in depth in the impact assessment. Thus the EIA Team will consider all relevant contributions made by members of the public.</p> <p>There are a host of alternatives that have been identified in the Scoping Phase. There has been consideration of alternate energy sources as part of Eskom's decision to propose building a NPS. Alternative nuclear technology and plant types are also being considered by Eskom. Alternative sites and the no-go alternative will be considered in this EIA.</p>
Ryan Donnelly For A Safe Tomorrow F.A.S.T.	<p>Our concerns with regards to the current public EIA process for the proposed NPS at all five sites.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It has come to our attention through a private survey that persons living in the Kwanzamo township outside of Humansdorp 19 km from the proposed nuclear site with a population of around 35 000 people do not know that there is a Nuclear power plant proposed for the area. Further more they do not know what a NPS is. ▪ There are numerous large townships in the near vicinity of the proposed nuclear development with large numbers of children and schools. ▪ We are concerned that the same situation exists at "Mandela bay" and the "Ocean view extension" at Aston bay, which is 21 km directly down wind of Thyspunt. ▪ It is our concern that a similar situation may exist around all five alternative sites in South Africa. ▪ It is also our concern from public meetings held by ACER Africa including ARCUS GIBB and Eskom that the presentation content is not of an informative nature with regard to what is being proposed. Content of the meetings have been focused on South Africa's energy issues, which does not inform the public of the nature of what is being proposed. Since recently objecting to this, the last meetings held began to include some information 	<p>Twenty five (25) PMs, eight (8) FGMs and four (4) KSWs have been held throughout South Africa during the project announcement phase of the EIA. The EIA for the proposed NPS, an invitation to register as a stakeholder and attend the above meetings has been advertised in twenty five (25) advertisements, as well as over 6 000 BIDs and letters that were distributed to all members of the public during the project announcement phase of this EIA. Furthermore I&APs attending these meetings were requested to forward the names and details of I&APs that should be contacted to be included in this EIA. Furthermore, community leaders (including the Kouga Municipality) have been asked to assist with communication with their constituencies regarding the EIA. I&APs also had opportunities during all of these meetings and workshops to ask questions and make comments regarding the background material presented in this EIA. Please refer to the minutes of these meetings and workshops contained within Appendices G4, G5 and G6 of the Draft Scoping Report (DSR). The EIA Team has accommodated I&APs who could not attend any of the scheduled meetings or workshops by hosting additional FGMs and one-on-one engagements.</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>as to what is being proposed but the large majority of the content still surrounded South Africa's energy issue.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Due to the nature and implications including potential of a nuclear development we feel that properly informing the people living nearby the proposed nuclear plants should be a priority before this process continues. Additionally any further meetings should include a clear description of the nature of the proposal and its potential implications. ▪ We also feel that an Independent Nuclear expert be at future meetings to answer questions and referee the meetings. ▪ We feel this is necessary because there have been instances at these meetings when the public have been misled by Eskom representatives. ▪ Since Eskom has a vested interest in the nuclear development we are concerned that questions answered by Eskom representatives alone cannot be considered as transparent or neutral with regards to the nature and implications of the proposal. ▪ This submission is presented by the Chair of For A Safe Tomorrow F.A.S.T. on behalf of its members of which there are currently 133. 	<p>If you are still aware of members of the public who have not heard about the proposed project, the EIA Team would welcome this information to try to harness their participation.</p> <p>In terms of information presented at this stage of the EIA, this is the best available information. However, as the process progresses, more detailed information will become available, which will also be disseminated in the public domain.</p> <p>The EIA Team would welcome your written confirmation of where the process of material provided has not been transparent, bearing in mind that this should stand the scrutiny of a court of law.</p>
<p>Prof and Mrs Calvyn and Michael du Toit</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Impact on property values in surrounding area (what happened when Koeberg was built). ▪ Impact on tourism development in the area. ▪ Impact on nature (fynbos and wildlife) in the area. ▪ First hold discussions with (and report to) a representative committee with assistance of a competent facilitator. Then organise mass meetings. 	<p>These matters will be addressed within a suite of specialist studies (including an economic and a tourism specialist studies) to be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p> <p>Thank you for your suggestion regarding an initial meeting with a representative committee.</p>
<p>Dr Collen Ebersohn Eco-Rate Environmental Consultancy</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Public participation must be comprehensive and totally transparent. ▪ All documents must be made available to the public. ▪ Public meetings must take place. 	<p>In terms of transparency, this is the cornerstone of public participation and environmental assessment, and is being applied in this EIA.</p> <p>The EIA is currently in the Scoping Phase. All available information has been shared with the public. However, it should be noted that, as the EIA progresses, additional information will come to light, which will also be disseminated in the public domain.</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
		<p>Future public meetings are planned. However, please note that, apart from public meetings, there are other ways in which members of the public can engage in the EIA process. Please refer to Section 10.5 of the DSR for more details on the PPP for this EIA.</p>
Mr Johan Ebersohn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The visual impact of the power station from Cape St Francis. ▪ The possibility of alternative energy sources e.g. wind. ▪ The dangers of radiation. ▪ The impact on property prices in Cape St Francis. ▪ Impact on tourism ▪ Impact on the environment. ▪ More than one public meeting. ▪ Please provide more information regarding size, layout, and position of the proposed power station. 	<p>These matters will be addressed within a suite of specialist studies to be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p> <p>Alternative energy sources that do exist are being investigated and implemented. Renewable energy sources currently cannot provide the base load requirements for South Africa's increasing energy requirements that the proposed NPS or other base load generation methods (e.g. coal-fired power stations) can.</p> <p>Additional technical detail concerning the plant itself will be made available to the public once a technology has been selected and a technology service provider has been appointed.</p>
Mr Dalls Fell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Environmental impact. ▪ Change of quiet coastline. ▪ Danger of pollution. ▪ Water shortage problems in the area already. ▪ Effect on property values in the area. 	<p>These matters will be addressed within a suite of specialist studies to be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p>
Mr Dominique Gilbert Phelindaba Working Group	<p>RE: Comment on Scoping Phase – Eskom proposed Nuclear Power Station and associated infrastructure.</p> <p><i>See Appendix 3 below</i></p>	
Mr Pete Gilchrist	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Escape routes ▪ Storage issues ▪ Leakage spillage (Japan is recent example) ▪ Better to use money on greener solutions wind, solar and wave 	<p>These matters will be addressed within a suite of specialist studies to be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
		<p>It is Eskom's stance that ALL of the primary energy resources including solar, wind, wave, ocean current, tidal energy, biomass, hydro, as well as 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. All the energy sources available in or to South Africa are currently under investigation and in some cases implementation.</p>
<p>Mr Paul Johan Grobler</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ List is already exhaustive. ▪ Transmission line routes would probably be included. 	<p>Thank you for this comment. Please note that these matters will be addressed within a suite of specialist studies to be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p> <p>The EIA for the transmission lines is a separate study to this EIA, although both studies will be co-ordinated and integrated in order for the relevant Environmental Authorities to make an informed decision about the proposed NPS.</p>
<p>Mrs Aleid Hoos Retired PE Teacher</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The impact on the environment. ▪ The effect on tourism to St Francis area. ▪ The effect on the value of property. ▪ To estimate the probability of nuclear accidents that can be disastrous on the whole area. 	<p>These matters will be addressed within a suite of specialist studies to be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p> <p>Eskom will not construct and operate a nuclear power station if it is not convinced of its safety.</p> <p>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 acceptably low.</p> <p>The NNR can take away a licence that has already been granted if the NNR feels that nuclear safety is being compromised.</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Mr Jan Hoos Retired Engineer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The effect on tourism coming to the St Francis area. ▪ The impact on the environment. ▪ The pollution of the skyline by electricity cables. ▪ The pollution of the seawater by wastewater. ▪ The effect on the value of property. 	<p>These matters will be addressed within a suite of specialist studies to be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p>
Mr Max Hoppe El Gecko Family Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Environmental degradation. ▪ Wide publicity needs to be given to the process. ▪ Instead of one meeting per centre, spend at least a week in an area. 	<p>These matters will be addressed within a suite of specialist studies to be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p> <p>This EIA focuses on five alternative sites for the proposed NPS.</p> <p>However, it should be noted that this EIA was advertised nationally, regionally and locally, and all members of the South African public are encouraged to participate, whether they are for or against nuclear power generation or the construction of a NPS and associated infrastructure at any one of the alternative sites, and regardless of where they reside.</p> <p>Your comment on public participation will inform future activities as the EIA process unfolds.</p>
Dr Peter Inman Coega Development Corporation (CDC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Should we not request a Focus Group Meeting (FGM) to ensure that our (i.e. Coega Development Corporation) case for the location of the power station in the Eastern Cape is clearly articulated? If everyone is agreeable, can we check diaries and then ask the ACER team to come down? 	<p>Future public meetings are planned. However, please note that, apart from public meetings, there are other ways in which members of the public can engage in the EIA process, such as FGMs. The EIA Team is willing to consider meeting with any group that requests this. A FGM with the CDC was held on 31 August 2007. Please refer to Appendices G5 and G6 for the minutes of all public and KFG meetings, as well as the Key Stakeholder Workshops (KSWs).</p>
Mrs Toska Joubert	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The form should also make provision for questions. 	<p>Members of the public are welcome to raise any questions, issues/comments or concerns they may have. They may provide these via any mode they wish. Examples are via the Comments Sheets provided, via fax, email, letter or telephonically via the Toll free number provided.</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Lance Kabot Olinka McIntosh Makai Kabot	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Myself and my family would like to be registered as interested and affected parties for the proposed Thyspunt Nuclear plant. ▪ We are opposed to nuclear power and strongly believe alternatives should be considered. 	<p>Thank you for this comment. Your contact details have been added to the EIA stakeholder database.</p> <p>There are a host of alternatives that have been identified in the Scoping Phase. There has been consideration of alternate energy sources as part of Eskom's decision to propose building a NPS. Alternative nuclear technology and plant types are also being considered by Eskom. Alternative sites and the no-go alternative will be considered in this EIA.</p> <p>It is Eskom's stance that ALL of the primary energy resources including solar, wind, wave, ocean current, tidal energy, biomass, hydro, as well as 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. All the energy sources available in or to South Africa are currently under investigation and in some cases implementation.</p>
Mr Jan Kapp DEAEA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Public involvement of all surrounding towns with 'roadshows'. 	<p>Every member of the public is welcome to participate in this EIA. The project has been well advertised and members of the public are encouraged to participate. Twenty five (25) PMs, eight (8) FGMs and four (4) KSWs have been held throughout South Africa during the project announcement phase of the EIA. Eskom is also rolling out a public awareness programme, which aims to educate the broader public about the pros and cons of nuclear power.</p>
Gavin Lawson The Zandvleijn Trust	<p>Last night on National TV it was announced that the decision had been made at National Government level that the building of the proposed nuclear power station would go ahead.</p> <p>Before the finalised comments are received?</p> <p>As the design, capacity or location site it has not been made available at this stage, it is not possible to comment on what is proposed.</p>	<p>The President, in consultation with Cabinet, has decided that nuclear power generation should be considered for the country in order to attempt to meet its increasing energy requirements. However, the aim of this EIA is to assess the potential environmental impacts of construction, operation and decommissioning a NPS and its associated infrastructure on five alternative sites, and to determine which of the five alternative sites is the most feasible at this stage. The national Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism (DEAT) is the</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>Support: Zandvlei Trust supports the concept of nuclear power generation of electricity as currently the only economically viable option for mass electricity supply.</p> <p>Concerns</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A concern is the safe transport of the fuel to and from the site for processing. 2. Also of concern is the safe keeping on site and transporting the non-usable waste and recording and managing this burial site in the long-term. 3. The long-term employment of suitably trained personnel and replacement of these personnel to the accepted international level of standards. <p>We would like to suggest that all the responsible managers undertake very regular auditing of all processes and procedures to maintain these set standards.</p>	<p>environmental authority who makes the decision regarding the authorisation of the proposed NPS, from an environmental perspective. This decision cannot be pre-judged and will be made after all the relevant information is put before DEAT and the Provincial Environmental Authorities (commenting authorities). This decision is expected in 2009.</p> <p>Once the technology has been selected, technical details on the proposed plant will be made available in the public for discussion and comments.</p> <p>The issues raised will be addressed within a suite of specialist studies to be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p> <p>Nuclear facilities and activities operate and take place under authorisations /licences issued by the National Nuclear Regulator. These authorisations /licences require regular and independent auditing of processes and procedures. The NNR itself also performs compliance monitoring. In addition, in terms of Eskom's commitment to safety and top performance, international peer reviews are conducted on Eskom's nuclear activities on a regular basis.</p>
<p>Mrs Jacqueline le Roux Cape St Francis Community Association.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Keep owners informed in understandable language 	<p>This is the purpose of the public participation process. Members of the public are welcome to contact the public participation office for clarity on any aspect of the proposed project and the associated EIA.</p>
<p>Mr Michael Bruce Lindsay</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Eskom and ARCUS GIBB should have a public forum and status update every 2 months in the greater St Francis area. 	<p>While public participation will continue for the duration of the EIA, the timing of public interaction will be determined by progress with the EIA to ensure that the EIA Team has new and relevant material to share with the public. Registered stakeholders will be updated regarding the status of the EIA on a continuous basis.</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
<p>Mr R Mike Longden-Thurgood</p>	<p>Eskom Nuclear 1 EIA process, first Scoping Key Stakeholders' Workshop (KSW), Durbanville August 13, 2007</p> <p>This meeting was the first one held in the Cape Town area for the scoping phase of the EIA process for Eskom's proposed Nuclear 1 Pressurised Water Reactor (PWR) reactor project. It was attended by invited key stakeholders. Previous meetings have been introductory in nature, as a part of the BID.</p> <p>The Key Stakeholder attendees included representatives from Earthlife Africa; CBOs; NGOs; the CoCT and local councils; CT Routes Unlimited. Other's present were from the facilitating organisation, ACER (Africa) and Eskom.</p> <p>The agenda included: Expected aims and outcomes of the meeting: Introduction to Nuclear 1; the EIA process; brief nuclear license process review; discussion and way forward.</p> <p>The points that were raised covered a considerable range of aspects of the Nuclear 1 EIA process. Inevitably costs were raised, and the continued constraints on the development of the northern coastal corridor of the Koeberg nuclear power site. There were a few strong challenges on some of the information, which was provided by Eskom, with rebuttals from Eskom. One delegate wanted to know why the EIA for the Eskom Nuclear 1 project was being separated from the corresponding EIA process for the overhead power lines. It was explained that, as the site for the Nuclear 1 power station hadn't yet been decided - one of the objectives of this EIA process - it was inappropriate to carry out a sequence of expensive EIA processes for power lines for sites, which may not be selected. On enquiry of the individual who raised this point, I was told that the concern was purely the visual environment effect on an important tourist region. However, it is a moot point if all five possible sites area of tourist interest.</p> <p>Another stakeholder asked why were the EIAs being separated into batches, the first one being for a nuclear power site to produce about 4500 MW(e), when the total additional output required by 2024 was 40 000 MW(e) over and above what it is now. The answer was</p>	<p>Thank you for these comments. Where applicable, they have been noted for the impact assessment phase of the EIA.</p> <p>Your request concerning time frames on which to comment on various EIA documents will be taken into account in programming the EIA as it progresses.</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>somewhat complex, associated with the fact that any EIA process has a "sell-by" date, after which it would have to be repeated. And the ultimate nuclear mix would not necessarily be from PWRs, because the PBMR would form a very important part of the mix, providing the demonstration plant performed up to its design expectations. And in a few decades, the need for fast reactors may become apparent.</p> <p>Quite a number of other points and issues were raised, some of which I commented on at the meeting. The following notes deal with my extended comments on the comments and issues, which were raised during the meeting, including an infill with additional information.</p> <p>I am not repeating the points, which I raised at the meeting held at the Milnerton Golf Club on August 7th. They were separate issues.</p> <p>1) Northern coastal corridor extension: this aspect is a matter of concern to the City of Cape Town because of the development constraints, especially in the 5 km radius exclusion zone, and the matter of the efficient evacuation of the population in the event of an emergency at the Koeberg nuclear power station.</p> <p>At the moment there's an outstanding High Court case from a potential developer within the exclusion zone. Seemingly the developer wants the High Court to make a decision in its favour, which would go against all the international norms for exclusion zones around nuclear power plants. It will be very interesting to hear the outcome. But the major worrying point about the case being brought before the High Court at all is the clear implication that the status of our National Nuclear Regulator has been brought into question.</p> <p>In respect of the emergency plan, and the responsibilities of the CoCT, I pointed out what doesn't seem to have been fully appreciated yet, namely that the Koeberg reactors have had their operating lives extended to 50 years. And if the French decide they can extend their similar reactors by a further ten years to a</p>	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>60 year life, as is now the norm for extensions in the United States, then that will also be applied to the existing Koeberg PWRs. Indeed, I have received a report through the Nuclear Network information system that a US Nuclear Regulatory Commissioner has predicted the possibility of extensions of their PWRs to an 80-year life.</p> <p>Nuclear power reactors could, therefore, be running on the Koeberg site for many decades into the future. That could obviously exercise some constraint on the expansion of the northern coastal corridor local to Koeberg, but whatever the constraint implications are, they clearly fall within the responsibility of the National Nuclear Regulator to decide, in consultation with the CoCT.</p> <p>In my view, the area on the other side of the R27, opposite the Koeberg nuclear power station, out to a minimum radius of 5 km, should be declared a Special National Park and be developed for educational, athletic and other outdoor activities. Currently it is a repository for alien Port Jackson trees.</p> <p>2) Specialist studies: the various subjects for these studies will be identified during the scoping phase, which is the whole object of this phase. It was pointed out to one of the Earthlife Africa representatives that it wasn't possible for them to collaborate with the work of the consultants as this could prejudice their independence, but special workshops would be arranged with the consultants after their reports had been completed. The specialist consultants will be chosen with attention to their experience for the various tasks they will be required to carry out. (That would mean it wouldn't be wise to select Professor Steve Thomas to assess the financial viability of the Nuclear 1 project).</p> <p>The scoping phase needs to be completed early in 2008, so that the consultants can start their work after the public participation process has been completed. It was pointed out that all I&APs will have the opportunity to make comments throughout the Scoping Phase.</p>	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>3) Answering questions at the public meetings: An ELA representative complained that, at the public meetings, the Eskom representatives don't include people who can answer all the questions authoritatively. This shows a clear misunderstanding of the objective of the Scoping Phase of an EIA process. Here are a few points, which completely negate the complaint.</p> <p>a) How can anyone decide on a preferred site for the new nuclear power reactors, from a selection, before all their site characteristics have been fully assessed by a specialist consultant? Earlier site reports - I haven't seen them myself - are very likely no longer relevant in relation to our existing legislation under the NEMA and the EIA Regulations: its sell-by date has long passed by. I can so easily say that the obvious choice is the existing Koeberg site, because of its size and the existing infrastructure, and also because operating staff and their families will not be located 600 to 1000 km away from what they might regard as civilization, when location in a remote area of South Africa is not their choice? But other factors, e.g. proximity to Cape Town, may become an over-riding factor <i>against</i> its choice. How can anyone authoritatively and democratically answer that question, now?</p> <p>b) How can one assess at such an early stage the exact cost of construction for a Generation III (upgraded) PWR type, when the preferred type from the currently available designs has yet to be subject to a critical assessment? Just suppose the choice is an EPR. There's only one first-of-class being constructed at the moment, in Finland. And Professor Steve Thomas of the University of Sussex was commissioned by the Legal Resources Centre in Cape Town, on behalf of ELA, to assess its viability. His conclusion was that it was grossly expensive. Yes, indeed, but what he didn't tell anyone was that the Finnish company which mixed the concrete for the containment building used too much water, and the Finnish nuclear regulator decided that they had to be 100% safe, and it had to be pulled down and reconstructed. Yes, indeed, it</p>	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>has been an extremely expensive error, hopefully not to be repeated anywhere else.</p> <p>Another choice could be the US AP 1000 - their version of an advanced PWR. Some have already been ordered from Toshiba-Westinghouse, but it is going to be some years before construction begins. And another US utility has now signed a contract with Areva for EPRs. Presumably the US utility was better informed on construction costs than what Prof Steve Thomas would have the South African government believe, for what, in my mind, must be some rather curious agenda in his mind.</p> <p>The Russians apparently also have an upgraded Generation III PWR. And, no, to defend their reactor design capabilities, now, they would never again design such a disastrous reactor type as the RBMK, which caused the world's worst nuclear disaster at Chernobyl.</p> <p>Which reactor will be chosen will be announced once all the characteristics of the available designs have been full appraised. To expect anyone from Eskom at an EIA public meeting to stick their neck out, now, is a complete failure to be pragmatic about it.</p> <p>4) Credibility of the EIA process: one delegate from Melkbos questioned the credibility of the EIA process, resulting from the experience they claimed to have encountered over a totally unrelated EIA process, in which a facility which could possibly adversely affect the Melkbos residents was never discussed with them. It had received a positive RoD, which was open for the public to submit their objections. It would seem strange if the ability, at the very least, for Melkbos residents to have been able to register as I&APs for the particular process hadn't been taken advantage of.</p> <p>The NEMA and EIA Regulations - the latter promulgated in April 2006 - make it quite clear that the EIA process is a public participation process. There has been no doubt about the level of</p>	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>public participation, which has been invoked for the Eskom Nuclear 1 project.</p> <p>It wouldn't be the first time that people who consider that they should have been involved in an EIA process have missed every public notice in the press and all poster and leaflet notifications of public meetings. Of the 25 or so EIA processes in which I have been involved, there has never been any question of withholding information from the public, nor of not having their involvement. (Apart, that is, from one or two EIA processes some years ago with which I wasn't involved, but which were highly suspect through dishonest practices, or some nominally independent consultant being discovered to have a pecuniary interest in the outcome).</p> <p>And yet there have been latecomers who have missed all the previous activities associated with specific EIA processes, claiming that they were never informed. This is obviously a problem with some people, for which there must be a number of reasons for their failure to observe or read notices. This is a very important aspect of the EIA Regulations which, to my knowledge, no psychologist has ever been invited to add their input: how does one go about making sure that everyone who needs to be informed of an EIA process which might affect them, don't miss the various notifications.</p> <p>5) Epidemiological study: an ELA representative raised the issue of an epidemiological study. He mentioned that he was continually getting reports from past Eskom employees at the Koeberg nuclear power station of developing cancers. They were claiming that these were arising as a result of their work at Koeberg, and exposure to ionising radiations.</p> <p>We all know only too well that, the older we get, so does the probability increase of cancers of all sorts developing. It is an unfortunate fact of longevity.</p>	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>I pointed out that a full epidemiological study is not a simple task: such a study would need to cover a minimum of 30 years, and preferably be continued throughout the life of a nuclear site, and indeed be continued with the employees, both those retired from Eskom and those who have resigned and taken up other jobs, until their deaths. I mentioned that I wasn't aware of any nuclear site where epidemiological studies had ever been initiated at an early stage.</p> <p>Ideally, an epidemiological study has to go back some generations, if the data are even available, to determine the history of families and the causes of death. What common factors are there about the deaths? Is there a clear evidence of a family history of a specific cancer type developing? Do some families show a genetic predilection to developing cancers due to age related deterioration of the immune system? Some people may even be highly susceptible to sufficient DNA damage just from the natural background radiation for cancer initiation, with a genetic predisposition to a weak immune system. Or whatever natural evolutionary process which ensures that DNA damage for potential cancer induction is destroyed.</p> <p>It has to be remembered that all successful living organisms on earth will necessarily have had to evolve with natural mechanisms to either repair or eliminate DNA damage from exposure to the natural background ionising radiation. It is when that natural repair mechanism weakens that cancers can develop.</p> <p>Taking a couple of examples: the matter of cancers and leukaemia in children, has been raised many times in relation to workers at the reprocessing plant at Sellafield, Cumbria, United Kingdom (UK), and at one of the now decommissioned gas cooled nuclear reactors at Hinkley Point, Somerset, UK. The latter became an issue with a Dr Chris Busby, with reported cancers in ex-employees at the nuclear power station.</p>	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>It took about thirty years of research, up quite a number of blind paths, to finally determine that the phenomenon of excess leukaemia in children of workers at the Sellafield plant was a cluster, which was the result of the genetic make-up of an imported population of professional staff and their families from other parts of Britain working at Sellafield. The pointer to this phenomenon was that clusters of a slightly higher incidence of leukaemia in children than the norm were found in other parts of Britain, with absolutely no connection with any nuclear facility. It is now even being questioned that living in proximity to overhead high voltage power lines may accelerate the induction of leukaemia in children with some specific DNA characteristic. That remains unproven.</p> <p>In the case of the cancers in adults at Hinkley, it was eventually found that Dr Busby had been working on data provided by the UK Statistical Office, which were grossly outdated! A review of the data by the H&SE found that whatever the alleged excess of the particular cancer was, in fact, an aberration induced by the use of outdated statistical data. The new statistical data that were eventually derived were based on updated epidemiological data. The alleged cancer excess claimed by Dr Busby was found not to exist.</p> <p>I have various papers published in the Journal of the UK Society for Radiological Protection, which I will try and find.</p> <p>It is a well-known fact that some percentage of any population group are going to succumb to various cancers. Anyone working at a nuclear facility is likely to claim that their exposure to ionising radiations was the cause, but without being able to provide any irrefutable proof. Such situations are trauma to anyone involved, including employers. In Britain, the UK.AEA used to make some restitution with an <i>ex gratia</i> payment, but making it clear that this was without prejudice, that they weren't accepting responsibility for the cancer induction. And this attitude is not at all unreasonable, considering that everyone is exposed to very similar types of highly penetrating ionising radiations throughout</p>	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>their lives, arising both from terrestrial and cosmic sources. And in some regions of the world, there are populations living on relatively high concentration uranium containing soils with dose rates as much as 50 times or more higher than the average background, e.g. the Kerala region in India. And they do not show any increased incidence in leukaemia in children or other cancers in adults.</p> <p>In my view, there is a very strong case for establishing an epidemiological study in the population surrounding the Koeberg nuclear power station from the point of view of establishing the norms of cancers, and general morbidity data. However, there tends to be a strong resistance to doing this, partly on grounds of cost because such studies have to be continued for decades, and the invariably unfortunate conclusion of an ill-informed public that this is admitting there's a problem: the real research intentions are twisted and contorted way from of the truth.</p> <p>Such problems could be eliminated by governments accepting the responsibility for such research work, but which country's government is going to set the precedent?</p> <p>I will cite two examples of situations, one, which is most unlikely to induce any cancers, the other in which a specific cancer was identified, and the reason.</p> <p>In the first case: the ionising radiation does rates on the surface of a typical PWR containment are only very slightly above the normal background, which falls away relatively rapidly as one moves further from the containment. As little as 50 to 75 metres from it, dose rates would be hardly measurable above the average background. If it can be proved by any mechanism that these low dose rates initiated some cancer, then it is likely that the individual was highly susceptible even to the natural background level of ionising radiations. As far as I am aware, this sort of radiation susceptibility has not yet been resolved by radiobiologists.</p>	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>In the second case: it has been found in numbers of houses in Britain in rural areas constructed from granite, where an extensive survey has been carried out by the H&SE, that the concentration of airborne Radon 222 (Rn-222) in the home atmosphere is far above the recommended maximum for continuous exposure. There could be houses in South Africa with similar high levels, although the prevalence is probably higher in Britain, especially in the winter months when houses are almost cocooned so as not to lose un-necessary heat from expensive-to-run central heating systems.</p> <p>Exposure to Rn-222 can cause upper respiratory cancers, an increase in the incidence of this type of cancer having been recognised. However, there's no likelihood of Rn-222 being emitted anywhere from a nuclear reactor. It's much more likely to be present if you go down a mine, or breathe in the atmosphere near to a coal or used gold ore dump, or a flyash dump, because of its uranium content.</p> <p>What were those lung diseases parochially called when miners got ill and returned to their homelands to die? Mesothelioma (from breathing in asbestos dust); silicosis (from breathing in silica and coal dust); and upper respiratory cancer from exposure to Rn-222.</p> <p>My point is that nuclear reactors tend to get the blame for a lot of health detriment problems which they can't even give rise to through their design. This is where epidemiological studies would allow the medical specialists to be able to differentiate between truth and fiction.</p> <p>6) Power line EIAs: I have already mentioned this matter, that we were told these were being carried out independently of the EIA for the nuclear plants as sites are selected. EIAs are expensive enough without carrying out un-necessary ones.</p>	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>7) The no-go situation where increasing electricity generation capacity is concerned: I got the impression that all the attendees did agree that, if the economy of South Africa is going to expand at the intended rate the government wants, electricity demand is bound to increase, as was indicated by the graphs which were presented. Therefore the no-go situation was readily dismissed. For one brief moment of time - 100% agreement!</p> <p>However, there seemed to be a bias towards using renewables for dealing with the base load. Unfortunately, neither wind nor solar are suitable for this particular purpose because, as Tony Stott pointed out, the base load is the continuous minimum electricity demand, 24/7. And it's going to inexorably increase over the next few decades.</p> <p>With wind generators, they are not much more than between 20 and 25% efficient because they can't operate when the wind is blows below some minimum speed, nor above an upper speed limit, when the blades have to be fully feathered. They are required to rotate at a constant speed over a range of wind velocities because they have to provide power at the synchronised alternating rate to feed into the national grid.</p> <p>And obviously the sun doesn't shine at any one spot on the earth's surface more than a useful 9/24. No one has yet invented a bottle storage system for electrons, to provide anything from 1000 to 4000 MW of electrical power for 12 hours, continuously. Banks of storage cells to achieve this output would be impossibly expensive, and have a limited life.</p> <p>However, the renewables do most definitely have their rightful place, as has been indicated in the government's intended energy source mix.</p> <p>8) Nuclear wastes: nuclear wastes are the bane of the nuclear generating industry. The South African government has yet to make its proposals available for public comment.</p>	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>However, there are some new factors which are gradually being taken note of where irradiated fuel elements are concerned, particularly as thermonuclear power still seems to be years, perhaps decades, ahead, although the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor (ITER) project under construction at the French Cadarache nuclear establishment may provide a number of useful answers</p> <p>Running vast underground mining activities to obtain uranium, and then permanently store it back underground as used fuel elements is a terribly wasteful way of dealing with what remains a very valuable fuel, and non-carbon dioxide emitting, too.</p> <p>The new developing philosophy is to separate the uranium and high atomic weight heavy elements produced during the fissioning processes from the fission products, using conventional chemical processing technology. The fission products can, if it is considered economically viable, be processed to separate out specific radionuclides of commercial use - Cs-134 for example. The remaining fission products are processed into glass blocks to stabilize them into a solid form, and then stored in underground repositories, effectively for all time.</p> <p>The uranium and the higher atomic weight radioisotopes - neptunium, plutonium, americium, curium, berkelium, and others, some of which are fissile (all are fissionable) - are purified and used for the manufacture of fuel elements for fast reactors.</p> <p>It will probably take many decades before fast reactors supersede PWRs, and the new Generation IV intrinsically safe reactors, on a large scale in South Africa, but the preference would be for the chemical processing work to be carried out after about 30 years storage, the useless fission products being put into permanent repository storage, and the uranium and other heavy elements into a different store ready to be recovered for fast reactor fuel processing.</p>	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>If we are not careful, permanent deep underground repository storage of the irradiated fuel elements will be disastrous when natural sources of uranium start to run out. Making its recovery difficult for reprocessing many decades into the future would not be the best way to go.</p> <p>A white paper is apparently being prepared by the government, giving proposals for South Africa to establish a full nuclear programme, from mining and separating uranium; fuel production; nuclear electricity generation; irradiated fuel reprocessing; and final radioactive waste product repository storage.</p> <p>Can reasonable period for comments on the DSR be provided?</p> <p>For the PBMR documentation, I needed to diligently read right through them, not do a quick scan, and prepare my comments as I progressed. The task took at least a total of 60 hours work, which one obviously doesn't get stuck in front of the PC continuously to do.</p> <p>I can well imagine the docs for the current Eskom Nuclear 1 EIA process being equally long, if not more so. It would be most helpful if a minimum of 2 months for responding could be allocated.</p>	
<p>Miss Samantha Manton Kamhali</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What area would be unusable if there is a problem with the plant? (All the way to Plett and past Port Elizabeth). ▪ Where would alternative housing, come from if there is a problem? (Government) ▪ To get the areas from Plett to Port Elizabeth involved in decision-making, because they will be affected if anything happens. 	<p>These matters will be addressed within a suite of specialist studies to be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p> <p>Although the risk of an accident is very low, the National Nuclear Regulator (NNR) nevertheless requires emergency planning to be undertaken. The NNR will determine the emergency plan requirements and the extent of the required zones based on a safety assessment of the design of the proposed nuclear power station and the proposed site.</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
		All members of the public are encouraged to participate in the EIA, regardless of where they live.
Curt Martheze	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I am in full agreement with the 'For A Safe Tomorrow' organisation run by Ryan Donnally and I would also like to make reference here to his submission, which I have read, and in so mentioning: a SAFE tomorrow is what it really deals with. ▪ I absolutely unquestionably renounce even the notion of a nuclear plant as a means of energy for our country. ▪ Thank you for reading, and for having a place to receive this email. 	Thank you for this comment.
Mr Peter McAinsh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Water discharge, property values, pollution ▪ Emergency plans. ▪ Evacuation plans. ▪ Waste disposal. ▪ We say No to nuclear. ▪ Total involvement of all I&APs in process. ▪ Complete transparency of Eskom's intentions. 	<p>These matters will be addressed within a suite of specialist studies to be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p> <p>In terms of transparency, this is the cornerstone of public participation and Environmental Assessment, and is being applied in this EIA.</p>
Mrs Dawn Mc Donald	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We say no to nuclear for our future children's safety and the ecology. 	Thank you for this comment.
Mr Richard Mc Donald	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Toxic pollution. ▪ Toxic containment. ▪ Keep community involved. ▪ Be transparent. 	<p>These matters will be addressed within a suite of specialist studies to be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p> <p>In terms of transparency, this is the cornerstone of public participation and Environmental Assessment, and is being applied in this EIA.</p>
Mr Jannie Minnaar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Koeberg is a better option since it already has the necessary facilities and road infrastructure. 	A Nuclear Site Investigation Programme (NSIP) was implemented in 1982, which involved numerous phases to identify the 5 alternative sites being investigated in this EIA. The Koeberg site will be assessed further in the EIA Phase Please refer to Chapter 5 of the Draft Scoping Report for the process involved in site selection for the proposed NPS.

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Mr Morgan Morris	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The whole issue – Do the right thing!! ▪ It all ends in tears!! ▪ You will split a community down the middle – not accepted. 	Thank you for this comment.
Mr Robin Moulang I.A.P. FAST	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Listen to the people who are affected not the people who stand to make money out of the decision. 	The purpose of the PPP is to involve and interact with all interested and affected parties.
Graham Noble	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I was surprised the BID contained no description of the planned plant, made no mention of the composition and quantities of materials to be used, the composition, characteristics and quantities of waste to be generated and the intended fate of that waste. When will that information be made known? ▪ I was also surprised at the wording of the list of possible impacts. It is so generalized it could apply as easily to the building of a house as to the building of a nuclear power station. At what stage in the process will a more definitive list be provided? ▪ I look forward to receiving the Plan for Scoping Study. 	<p>An EIA provides information on an incremental basis, as it becomes known. Once a Pressurised Water Reactor (PWR) plant type has been selected by Eskom, the kind of technical detail that is requested will be made available in the public domain and, indeed, will be assessed in the EIA.</p> <p>The listing of potential issues in the BID is merely to stimulate thought – it certainly is not (and does not say so) an exhaustive or detailed list of potential issues. The EIA Consultant has emphasised this fact in all of the meetings and workshops undertaken as part of this EIA.</p> <p>The Plan of Study for Scoping is available on the project website (www.eskom.co.za/eia/nuclear1)</p>
R.D.V. Nothnagel Pearly Beach Ratepayers Association	<p><u>Motivation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A clear and publicly motivated need is shown for the specific site compared to other national sites. ▪ From the above it seems clear that the Public Participation process was never considered by Eskom. And that the “Steamrolling” tactic, that is currently taking place, has been the order of the day from the outset. ▪ See also item on Agulhas National Park, above. ▪ I had the opportunity to visit the area of the alternative sites on the West coast recently and although I greatly admired the Namaqualand flowers in bloom, I am sure that the ecological impact on that area would be far less than it would be locally, if the plant was sited at Bantamsklip. 	Thank you for your comments – they have been noted and where applicable will be taken into account in the impact phase of the EIA..

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p><u>GENERAL.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I have tried to remain as objective as possible in my observations and comments on this issue but I cringe when I think of the large amounts of money that will be allocated to this project and what happened in the famous “Arms Deal”. ▪ It also frightens me when I think that the man, who stated that “The recent Koeberg problem was due to sabotage and that arrests were imminent”, a week later refuted the statement, both on national television, will be at the “Helm” of this major project. 	
<p>John Oddy Rebels Rus Conservancy</p>	<p>On behalf of Rebels Rus Conservancy, registered as an I&AP with regard to the above proposal, and in accordance with the EIA, the Scoping Phase, the various legislation and the relevant public participation process, I hereby thank you for the opportunity to submit our views, which we hereby formally do.</p> <p>1. Democracy and the Constitution of South Africa It is submitted that this EIA and scoping process has not been subject to the participatory governance and democratic principles of human and environmental rights as enshrined in the Constitution and other laws, particularly NEMA, and that no further progress of this EIA is allowed until such basic principles of democracy have been complied with.</p> <p>It is further submitted that the premise that nuclear energy is the only substitute for coal generated power, and is therefore unavoidable and inevitable, has inherent flaws, and must be declared and made available to the public at large, in line with everyone’s Constitutional rights as citizens of South Africa.</p> <p>It appears that the EIA and Scoping Process are based largely on assumptions about nuclear energy. There are various international reports, studies, articles, experiences and scientific research on nuclear energy that raise alarming and relevant issues with regard to global power generation and supply in the 21st century. These need to be considered by Eskom, the EIA and Scoping Phase. We therefore request:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ That the constitutionality of nuclear power first be re-submitted 	<p>Thank you for your comments – they have been noted and where applicable will be taken into account in the impact phase of the EIA.</p> <p>It is the understanding of the EIA Team that the President, in consultation with Cabinet, has already taken the decision to investigate further nuclear power generation in South Africa, and for Eskom to increase this generation alternative in its energy generation mix in the future. This EIA concerns itself with the construction of a NPS and associated infrastructure at the most suitable site of five alternative sites, and the assessment of potential impacts associated with this. A separate process covering an application by Eskom for a nuclear installation license will be undertaken by the National Nuclear Regulator. Similarly a separate process covers a future application by Eskom for an electricity generating licence from the National Energy Regulator of South Africa.</p> <p>The development of the South African Nuclear Policy and Strategy and the publication of the draft policy for public comment is being undertaken by the Department of Minerals and Energy.</p> <p>However, it should be noted that this EIA was advertised nationally, regionally and locally, and all members of the South African public are encouraged to participate, whether they are for or against nuclear power generation or the construction of a NPS and associated infrastructure</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>to a complete overview of all applicable environmental and human rights legislation, with due regard to the rights of the citizens of this country to be kept fully informed of any proposed developments with regard to nuclear energy policy. An autonomous, non-aligned democratically elected watchdog or ombudsman that is accountable to the citizens of South Africa must be established.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ That the public participation process and information forums must be advertised and held on a national level to reach all communities, landowners and users, and not only limited to small towns in the immediate vicinity of the Thyspunt site. ▪ That the general public must be guaranteed access to information insofar as all the health, safety, environmental, surveillance, emissions, waste, and economic issues of the nuclear power station are concerned need to be addressed, and must also be guaranteed unhindered access to the Constitutional court or human rights commission. <p>Environmental Issues</p> <p>The alternatives to nuclear energy need to be critically examined, as is required by the legislation under which this EIA and Scoping Process are being conducted. Nuclear energy is not the only alternative to the massive CO₂ and other pollution from coal power stations resulting in climate change. In fact, it is a very dangerous alternative when some of the wider more modern day global issues are taken into account, including:</p> <p>It's sustainability, economic viability and environmental impact is not yet proven, globally.</p> <p>Its full fuel cycle (from uranium mining and enrichment including CO₂ and CFC emissions, to the storage, transport and ultimate disposal of radioactive waste material including possible contamination as well as plant decommissioning) has not yet been resolved anywhere in the world. The cost to human and environmental safety is still unknown.</p> <p>Therefore we request:</p>	<p>at any one of the alternative sites, and regardless of where they reside.</p> <p>All environmental issues will be addressed within a suite of specialist studies to be commissioned as part of the Impact assessment (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p> <p>An Economic Study will be undertaken to identify and assess the viability of the proposed NPS at the alternative sites.</p> <p>A Health Risk Assessment, will be undertaken to identify and assess any health and safety issues resulting from the proposed NPS, at all of the alternative sites.</p> <p>A Site Safety Study will be undertaken as part of the nuclear installation licence application to the National Nuclear Regulator to identify and assess any security issues associated with the proposed NPS.</p> <p>A Tourism Study will also be undertaken to identify and assess the potential impacts associated with the proposed NPS.</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ That a thorough analysis of all the different types and volumes of emissions and waste products to be produced by the proposed nuclear power station at Thyspunt be conducted. All ancillary and associated processes must be investigated, including those that generate Uranium Hexafluoride, Hydrogen Fluoride or any other chemicals and substances for their potential danger and environmental impact they could impart. All “ associated infrastructures “ must be explained and subject to separate EIA’s if necessary. ▪ That a thorough investigation into all existing full fuel cycle studies be conducted, not only from the nuclear industry but also from opponents to nuclear energy. This should include a thorough geological investigation for the Thyspunt site and the associated radioactive waste disposal site. ▪ That the implications of this development on the region’s water supply be conducted, specifically the Mpofu dam which is a major supplier of water to the Eastern Province. ▪ That the implications of returning heated sea water used for cooling purposes back into the ocean on global warming and marine life. The exact nature of the sea water that is returned to the ocean – its radioactive content, and other additives gained during the cooling process – and what the implications are, taking into account not only what our nuclear industry asserts is their experience at Koeberg, but what has been discovered by environmental justice groups globally. The effect of radioactivity on fish, dolphins and other marine life must be established, including the local Chokka fishing industry. <p>Costs and related financial burden</p> <p>The nuclear industry is notorious for underestimating costs involved for the development of nuclear power stations. Budget over-runs, lack of private investment, and massive spending of taxpayers’ funds are all major concerns to civil society.</p> <p>We therefore request:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ That a thorough and transparent business plan involving all local 	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>and foreign, private and government partners and stakeholders (current and intended) be conducted, including an honest look at the track record of all businesses involved in these developments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ That guarantees and recourse must be made available to civil society if there is a massive abuse of taxpayers' funds and non-adherence to proposed budgets ▪ That unbiased investigation into the financial scenarios of existing nuclear stations be conducted and what the implications are on the public expenditure and for consumers, particularly electricity consumers. ▪ That a clear outline is given of which government organisations are responsible for and accountable on issues relating to cost. <p>Health and safety, liabilities and insurances We request:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ That a thorough investigation be conducted into the liabilities and third party insurance policies that exist and that are required by civil society, human and environmental rights. ▪ That independent monitoring of health, safety, environment and maintenance issues at the nuclear power station and associated structures be planned, including medical surveillance programmes not only for all workers involved but also for all people living within affected areas including construction sites, transportation routes and waste storage sites. The establishment of hospitals or clinics near affected communities, and the drafting of evacuation plans and disaster management plans must be done. ▪ That a clear outline is given of which government organisations are responsible for and accountable on issues relating to the health, safety, maintenance, environmental and human monitoring. ▪ That the design and type of reactor be subject to detailed international scrutiny and due diligence, taking into account international best practice, failures, track record and prototyping. <p>a. Terrorism, sabotage and the proliferation of nuclear</p>	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>weapons This is undeniably a relevant global issue, and must be taken into account. We therefore request:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ That this EIA and Scoping Process clearly outline exactly to which international treaties, protocols, agreements, organisations, groups and bodies etc South Africa has become a signatory or member, and how many others exist that are available to the global nuclear industry which provide checks and balances to which South Africa has not yet become a signatory or not yet ratified it's memberships. ▪ Additionally, that the EIA should consider "worst case scenarios" of sabotage and acts of terrorism that could be inflicted on the nuclear power station or any of the auxiliary industries and study the likely effects of these on both the environment, surrounding populations and country as a whole. <p>Tourism</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We request that a study be conducted on the current and future implications of the proposed development at Thyspunt on the tourism industry, acknowledging that the Thyspunt site is located on the internationally acclaimed Garden Route of South Africa. This should include the effect on Oyster Bay, St Francis Bay, the Kromme River, Jefferies Bay and Humansdorp, and it's effect on the growing eco tourism industry of the area, including the effect on job creation. ▪ That a thorough overview is conducted of the chains of command and responsibility, governance and accountability, regulatory control, environmental control, health and safety control, fiscal control and what mechanisms for transparency will be adopted for these controls. In addition a full explanation of the licensing processes involved in terms of authorisations, approvals and avenues for public participation must be made available. ▪ That if this EIA and Scoping Process are based on the reports of the desktop and field pre-feasibility studies conducted on the Thyspunt site by Eskom in the 1980's, then these must be made 	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>available to the public, and if necessary, be re-conducted</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ That the role of the National Nuclear Regulator (NNR) must be clearly communicated, and must fully transparent and objective in serving the interests not only of Eskom and the proponents of nuclear energy, but also those of the public at large. 	
JM Pattison	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We were told this evening that Eskom had decided to provide 20 000 MW of the 40,000MW generating shortfall using nuclear energy. We were also told that this EIA exercise is about one proposed 4 000MW nuclear station. ▪ But if 20 000 MW has to be nuclear, isn't it naive to imagine that this is about one power station? Isn't it in fact more likely that if the EIA found, for example, 3 sites to be environmentally acceptable, all 3 of those sites would in due course be utilised accordingly? If I am wrong in this, please explain why. 	<p>This EIA is examining five alternative sites for the construction, operation and decommissioning of one proposed NPS and associated infrastructure, viz. Nuclear 1. It is possible that more than one site will be found to be suitable, in which case, a preferred site will be identified. However, importantly, sites not selected in this EIA may well become sites for future nuclear generation plants, and would be subject to a separate EIA at the appropriate time.</p>
Daniel Reinecke Pr Eng	<p>I oppose the proposed activity regardless of the proposed location. There are safer and cheaper ways of making electricity that should rather be adopted, particularly for base load requirements.</p> <p>The Preamble to NEMA states, <i>“WHEREAS many inhabitants of South Africa live in an environment that is harmful to their health and wellbeing;</i></p> <p><i>everyone has the right to an environment that is not harmful to his or her health or wellbeing;</i></p> <p><i>the State must respect, protect, promote and fulfil the social, economic and environmental rights of everyone and strive to meet the basic needs of previously disadvantaged communities;</i></p> <p><i>inequality in the distribution of wealth and resources, and the resultant poverty, are among the important causes as well as the results of environmentally harmful practices;</i></p>	<p>It is Eskom’s stance that ALL of the primary energy resources including solar, wind, wave, ocean current, tidal energy, biomass, hydro, as well as 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. All the energy sources available in or to South Africa are currently under investigation and in some cases implementation.</p> <p>The Government (Department of Minerals and Energy) undertakes integrated energy planning, while the National Energy Regulator of South Africa undertakes integrated resource planning specifically for electricity demand and supply.</p> <p>Eskom undertakes strategic electricity demand and supply planning. The electricity forecast of the country is dynamic and continuously updated by Eskom. If the I&AP has valid, different information of which Eskom is unaware, this would be welcomed by Eskom.</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p><i>sustainable development requires the integration of social, economic and environmental factors in the planning, implementation and evaluation of decisions to ensure that development serves present and future generations;</i></p> <p><i>everyone has the right to have the environment protected, for the benefit of present and future generations, through reasonable legislative and other measures that prevent pollution and ecological degradation;</i></p> <p><i>promote conservation; and secure ecologically sustainable development and use of natural resources while promoting justifiable economic and social development;"</i></p> <p>It is my contention that the government and Eskom have not applied their minds to their responsibility of providing us with electrical power in accordance with NEMA. If they had done this, the present policy or intention of providing 20 000 MW of nuclear generated electricity over the next 20 years would not have been arrived at and adopted.</p> <p>The Preamble to NEMA says, "...inequality in the distribution of wealth and resources, and the resultant poverty, are among the important causes as well as the results of environmentally harmful practices;" It should be clear to any independent person that a nuclear programme is directly opposed to the principles of NEMA. It will reinforce and strengthen the present inequality in the distribution of wealth and resources, and should be opposed as a harmful environmental practice.</p> <p>It is the EAP's responsibility to investigate alternatives available for the generation of base load electricity but before this issue can be addressed the validity of the assumptions of future electricity demand needs to be evaluated. Energy intensive industries rather than domestic consumption are the largest users of electricity. For example, CAS, the Coega Aluminium Smelter at Port Elizabeth requires 1 400MW and the cost at which Eskom has agreed to</p>	<p>Also, it is brought to the attention of the I&AP that one cannot selectively quote from legislation – one needs to consider the legislation in its entirety, in this instance, the I&AP is reminded of the economic growth provisions within legislation, including NEMA.</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>supply this large amount of electricity for CAS has not been revealed, presumably because it is so much less than domestic consumers are paying. If this assumption is correct, and the EAP's independent evaluation should enable it to obtain this information from its client, it is in violation of Clause 2 (1) a of NEMA which states, <i>"The principles set out in this section apply throughout the Republic to the actions of all organs of state that may significantly affect the environment and shall apply alongside all other appropriate and relevant considerations, including the State's responsibility to respect, protect, promote and fulfil the social and economic rights in Chapter 2 of the Constitution and in particular the basic needs of categories of persons disadvantaged by unfair discrimination"</i> The EAP will be required to examine the assumptions on which the future demand has been based and should this not comply with the principles of NEMA, come to a revised estimate which does.</p> <p>Once the future demand has been correctly estimated, the question of alternatives in accordance with the principles of NEMA should be provided. It is my contention that the safety, environmental impact and cost of the nuclear option will exclude it from consideration.</p> <p>Professor Richard Cowling says, <i>"...that an urgent debate on the alternative energy sources should be launched and completed before any decisions were taken on what approach to adopt...A reactor at Thyspunt would also have unacceptably high environmental impacts and would exacerbate the already poor service delivery in the area... Having recognized the need to move away from coal-fired power because of its contribution to global warming, Eskom had come to a point where its lack of research into alternative supplies had been exposed and that the nuclear option had been foisted on us without any debate. We need to reduce our reliance on fuel and make other major moves to reduce our overall carbon footprint. With the problems with coal, there is a great opportunity to do something different. We need to seize that opportunity."</i> Reference 1.</p> <p>Another authority, Walt Patterson says, <i>"Britain has never built a</i></p>	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p><i>nuclear power station on schedule, or within budget, or that worked to its original specifications –not once. Despite the common impression to the contrary, Britain has never had a ban or moratorium on nuclear power. Any who want to build a nuclear station can. They just have to find somewhere to put it and someone to pay for it. No-one wants to, for entirely sensible reasons...All told, if we really had to rely on nuclear power to save us from climate change, we would be doomed. Fortunately, of course, we do not. The portfolio of more attractive opportunities both for using and for supplying energy is abundant, and expanding rapidly. People say ‘If not nuclear power, what?’ The answer should be obvious: if not nuclear power, not nuclear power. If governments do not arbitrarily divert vast amounts of money, resources and time into a nuclear black hole, other more promising options will eagerly seize them. In the January edition of Nuclear Engineering International, Amory Lovins of the Rocky Mountain Institute argues that small-scale low-carbon and no-carbon generation and cogeneration already produce more electricity than nuclear power worldwide, and that the lead is increasing rapidly. Improving performance of end-use technologies – buildings, lighting, motors, refrigeration, electronics – gives even faster and more certain payoff.” Reference 2</i></p> <p>I look forward to the EAP’s independent evaluation of the future demand and alternatives and trust that their independent finding would be that this EIA process should be terminated at Draft Scoping Stage with a recommendation that an independent and comprehensive assessment of the future demand and alternatives be undertaken. We tend to forget that if nuclear power stations were safe and cost effective then there would be no need for governments to propose them.</p> <p>The above facts are the crux of my opposition to the application. I am reluctant to go into other reasons against it because this would only serve to legitimise the application and tacitly accept it. I see no benefit in expending energy to persuade Eskom (government) to spend more of our money to mitigate and reduce the harmful effects of a nuclear programme.</p>	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>Should the EAP require more reason for terminating this application I suggest they need to comment on the competence and independence of the NNR and also ensure that they take into account the NEMA requirement of a adopting a risk averse and cautious approach, which takes into account the limits of current knowledge about the consequences of decisions and actions.</p> <p>I end this submission with the following quote from EF Schumacher: <i>"No degree of prosperity could justify the accumulation of large amounts of highly toxic substances which nobody knows how to make 'safe' and which remain an incalculable danger to the whole of creation for historical or even geological ages. To do such a thing is a transgression against life itself, a transgression infinitely more serious than any crime ever perpetrated by man. The idea that a civilisation could sustain itself on the basis of such a transgression is an ethical, spiritual, and metaphysical monstrosity. It means conducting the economic affairs of man as if people really did not matter at all."</i></p> <p>References 1. Prof Richard Cowling in an article on page 8 of 3 August 2007 edition of <i>Our Times</i>. 2. Walt Patterson in the April 2006 edition of www.theworldtoday.</p>	
Mrs Aleid Rijks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Skyline pollution by cables. ▪ First plan and research all pro's and con's then act. 	<p>This EIA is one of many planning exercises, studies and assessments being undertaken as part of the overall and comprehensive planning of the proposed nuclear power station.</p> <p>Please note that transmission lines linking the proposed power plant to the transmission network are the subject of a separate EIA being undertaken in parallel; to this EIA.</p>
Mr Dirk-Jan P Rijks Qatar National Hotels Company	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The effect on the value of our property in Cape St Francis ▪ The effect on tourism coming to St Francis area. ▪ The impact on the environment, nature, sea, bird life, plantation and nature reserve. ▪ The pollution of the coastline by the Nuclear Plant and all the 	<p>These matters will be addressed within a suite of specialist studies to be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	electricity cables. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The impact on the rental of our property to third parties. ▪ To study the impact on above factors before building the plant. To re-evaluate the probability of nuclear disasters that can happen to fault e.g. Harrisburg and Chernobyl. 	Please note that transmission lines linking the proposed power plant to the transmission network are the subject of a separate EIA being undertaken in parallel; to this EIA.
Mr Alan Robb Leaping Course Production	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ History of nuclear powers negative impact on environment. 	The purpose of the EIA currently being undertaken is to ascertain potential impacts (positive and negative) to be able to effectively deal with them (via optimization of benefits or the mitigation of negative impacts).
Mr J.Royal (Architect) Mrs R.Royal (Certified Environmental Assessment Practitioner) Miss K.Royal (Architect) Miss A.Royal (Environmental Scientist Air Quality Specialist)	<p>We own three properties in the St Francis Bay area and would like to register as Interested and Affected Parties in respect of the proposed Thyspunt Nuclear Reactor in the Kouga area. Please note that the date for registration 28 August 2007 does not preclude anybody from registering as interested and affected parties further along in the process.</p> <p>In respect of the process and the preliminary background documentation circulated, there are obviously many issues that require far more extensive investigation and further intensive public participation and consultation with the broader community of the area, including the largely expanded population in the Christmas holidays.</p> <p>In light of the above, it is a concern that time lines indicate that construction is intended to commence in 2009. Given the complexity of this project and specialist studies, it would seem that the process would take considerably longer than two years to complete.</p> <p>We would be like to be kept informed regarding all specialist studies that are conducted as all the issues that are being investigated are of concern to us.</p> <p>We would like to be kept informed of all the alternatives that are being considered in respect of alternatives to nuclear, alternative technology and alternative sites.</p>	<p>The public participation process will continue for the duration of the EIA and, importantly, at any time, members of the public are able to register their interest in the project and EIA.</p> <p>The issues raised will be addressed within a suite of specialist studies to be commissioned as part of the impact assessment (Chapter 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p> <p>All reports will be made public (when available) and there is a project web site where all reports will be uploaded (when available) (www.eskom.co.za/eia/nuclear1).</p> <p>Lastly, all EIAs need to be conducted within a timeline/programme. However, should additional time be required to complete the EIA, this will be motivated to the client for consideration. Communication will be maintained with I&APs throughout the EIA process.</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>In addition to the above, our concerns pertain to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Health and Safety ▪ Risk ▪ Air Pollution ▪ Water pollution ▪ Aesthetics and visual impact ▪ Social issues regarding influx of labour in respect of inadequate housing and services ▪ Devaluation of property values ▪ Power lines ▪ Transportation of hazardous nuclear waste ▪ Effect of water abstraction on marine environment ▪ Discharge of heated water to marine environment and chokka industry <p>We would like all documentation to be made available to us so that we can make informed comments and raise pertinent issues. This documentation would include all specialist reports, detailed plans as well as draft scoping report etc. We would also like to be kept informed of any public meetings.</p>	
Charles Tregoning	<p>I would like you to record my opposition to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Nuclear power as means of generating electrical energy. 2. The positioning of such a facility. <p><u>Constitutional rights</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I need not quote the constitution and the fact that all South African citizens have the right to a clean and toxic free environment. The preamble to NEMA states this clearly. <p><u>NNR</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The National Nuclear Regulator (NNR) has been known to be neither transparent nor objective, what we need is a new body coupled to say the Department of the Environment or some other impartial body to act in the interests of all stakeholders. <p><u>Insurance</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We need to see what insurance is in place and is it sufficient 	<p>Thank you for these comments.</p> <p>These matters will be addressed within a suite of specialist studies to be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment (Section 10.6 of the Scoping Report).</p> <p>Also, it is brought to the attention of the I&AP that one cannot selectively quote from the constitution and legislation – one needs to consider the constitution and legislation in its entirety, in this instance, the I&AP is reminded of the economic growth provisions within the constitution and legislation, including NEMA.</p> <p>Comments regarding the National Nuclear Regulator should be addressed directly to the NNR and / or to the Minister of Minerals and Energy.</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>and adequate should the unforeseen happen.</p> <p><u>Costs: The following need to addressed and made available.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To the environment, all the pervious studies from the 80s and all the current research being undertaken. All the local industries, chokka etc. The effects of low emission radio activity on the marine life and the local environment. The fact that the Mpofu dam is a few km away and supplies a large percentage of the water for the Metro and surrounding areas. ▪ To the surrounding communities, base line studies should be undertaken to be able to do any comparative studies in the future which include health (skin cancer statistics and all the other possible afflictions associated with radio active emissions. 	
<p>Mr Brand van den Heever Cape St Francis Civic Association</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Duynefontein was already the topic of environmental impact studies – also in terms of possible fall out. Why now investigate new sites with their own biodiversity issues and infrastructure limitations? If the location (in terms of distance) is not of economic importance, then Duynefontein is from an ecological perspective, as well as, economies of scale, the answer. 	<p>A Nuclear Site Investigation Programme (NSIP) was implemented in 1982, which involved numerous phases to identify the 5 alternative sites being investigated in this EIA. The Koeberg site (i.e. Duynefontein) will be assessed further in the EIA Phase. Please refer to Chapter 5 of the Draft Scoping Report for the process involved in site selection for the proposed NPS.</p>
<p>Mr Alex van der Westhuizen PAWC</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Publish more information on alternatives. Have information sessions during season when more of the affected people will be present in the coastal areas. 	<p>Meetings will be scheduled to accommodate members of the public as far as is practically possible. Indeed, there are members of the public who dislike public meetings during their vacation time.</p>
<p>Mrs Setha van Ees-van Tubbergh Van Ees Licensing</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Canvass as much informed and involved opinion as possible. Call on people directly affected by the construction of the facility for their input. 	<p>Every member of the public is welcome to participate in this EIA. The project has been well advertised and members of the public are encouraged to participate. If you are aware of members of the public who have not heard about the proposed project, the EIA Team would welcome this information to try to harness their participation.</p>
<p>Mr Erik Van Ees</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Make sure those locally affected are kept honestly advised of the process – and are given a genuine chance to participate – leading to final decisions. 	<p>Transparency is the cornerstone of public participation and is being applied in this EIA. As project information becomes available, it will be placed in the public domain. Furthermore, every member of the public is welcome to participate in this EIA. The project has been well</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
		advertised and members of the public are encouraged to participate.
Mr Louis van Heerden Overstrand Municipality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Light pollution. ▪ Please make copies of Draft Scoping Report (DSR) available in Hermanus and / or Kleinmond. 	<p>Visual effects will be investigated in a Visual Impact Assessment (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p> <p>All reports will be made public (when available) (including Hermanus and Kleinmond) and there is a project web site where all reports will be uploaded (when available) (www.eskom.co.za/eia/nuclear1).</p>
Prof Nancy Van Schaik Kogelberg Branch, Botanical Society of South Africa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Botanical, Zoological, Geological, surveys. ▪ I was disappointed that the Durbanville workshop turned into an Eskom – bashing session. Had hoped to hear more result from expert surveys of proposed sites. ▪ Please make Draft Scoping Report (DSR) available in Hermanus or Kleinmond Library. We should not need to drive to Cape Town to see it. 	<p>These matters will be addressed within a suite of specialist studies to be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p> <p>All reports will be made public (when available) (including Hermanus and Kleinmond) and there is a project web site where all reports will be uploaded (when available) (www.eskom.co.za/eia/nuclear1).</p>
Mr Peter Wells Resident Hermanus	<p>Earth Life</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Would Eskom sponsor Earth Life Africa to conduct its own investigation? Please give your reasons. ▪ How much cash would you be prepared to sponsor them? ▪ Is Eskom prepared to have a meaningful and candid relationship with Earth Life and why? ▪ As part of your presentation you presented an "in-house" environmental impact assessment group. Would it not serve the publics interest to have a truly independent body? Possibly a second opinion. ▪ As part of your presentation you suggested the ex-head of Green Peace is now pro Nuclear. Who is this person and how can he be contacted? <p>Procurement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Already, at this early stage the Americans and French are the preferred bidders. Russia is already excluded. To be honest, things are taking a familiar shape. ▪ In regards to the governments desire to purchase big ticket items 	<p>EarthLife Africa is welcome to conduct its own investigations. EarthLife Africa has already stated during one of the public meetings that they have sufficient funding. Eskom strives to have a meaningful relationship with all stakeholders including NGOs.</p> <p>The EIA Team is fully independent as required by legislation.</p> <p>Dr Patrick Moore is one of the founding members of Greenpeace. A search on the internet for "Patrick Moore" will provide more information.</p> <p>Questions related to the procurement of arms and military equipment are obviously not addressed by this EIA and should be directed to the appropriate Government Departments.</p> <p>Eskom's procurement processes are robust and are</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ I am not aware that President Mbeki has made one public comment in regard the Arms Scandal. Is this true and if so why? ○ South Africa purchased naval vessels from Germany with the capability to carry missiles and guns. Have these been installed? If not why? ○ Why does South Africa refuse to co-operate with the British and German investigators regarding the Arms Scandal? ○ What transparency will ESKOM guarantee that South Africans will not have to endure a similar sham? The above affect the poor more than the rich. ○ Would the procurement procedure be open to the media? <p>Parastatal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ESKOM is a parastatal which generated 4 - 6 Billion in profits in 2006. ▪ SAA is also a parastatal. It was bailed out by taxpayers to the tune of 1.5 Billion Rands this year. SAA promptly opened Mango which flooded the market with absurdly priced tickets. Thus using taxpayers' money to attack legitimate airlines. It is an obvious ploy to use taxpayers' money to take out the competition. I understand that for each international flight SAA undertakes runs at a loss of R 1 million + . BA uses 90 odd personnel to run 1 airplane. By comparison SAA employs 190. ▪ Is this the government's strategy with all legitimate business? ▪ As a parastatal how can I, the consumer, be assured the ESKOM will stick to best practice and not becomes a cumbersome unproductive giant? ▪ If you have a 2 yearly review where will it be published? ▪ How will we know the peer review report has not been edited? ▪ If you are already in a peer review program why are they not published? This is really a matter of Public Health. ▪ How will Eskom be held accountable for mistakes? <p>Research</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Last week the American Congress passed legislation empowering Renewable Energy sources. Previously fossil fuels had taken the lion's share of the funding. This new legislation dramatically reversed this process with fossil fuels now coming a 	<p>independently audited by national and international experts from a technical, commercial and legal perspective.</p> <p>Eskom issues an Annual Financial Report that is tabled before Parliamentary Portfolio Committees and that is independently audited and approved.</p> <p>Eskom has licences and authorisations for all its power stations, which can be revoked by the issuing Authority if the licence conditions are not met. Specifically for nuclear activities, the National Nuclear Regulator on a continuous basis monitors compliance with requirements, limits and best practice.</p> <p>Questions related to Government's approach to research should be addressed to the Government. Eskom's approach to research is documented in Eskom's Annual Report.</p> <p>Wind and solar energy are being investigated and implemented where appropriate.</p> <p>An EIA has a defined scope of work, usually associated with a particular project. An EIA cannot address issues outside this scope (and, indeed, I&APs cannot shed all their disaffections on one single EIA).</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>paltry 3rd. It signalled a dramatic shift in headspace.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What are Eskom and the Government doing to research and promote alternatives energy sources? ▪ Why do you sound anti Wind generated power? ▪ Why is solar power not being promoted? If it is how? ▪ By way of example. On a recent expedition to the Transkei I passed a clinic with solar electricity and cellular communication. The striking thing was no electrical and phone lines. What are the cost savings on such enormous infrastructure installations? ▪ Methane generated from sewerage farms is a viable energy source. At least it can contribute to saving energy. It is a renewable energy source. What research has been done and how can it impact in terms of saving? 	
<p>Mr Kevin Wolhuter Leathem Rhodes University</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I suggest that it is important to get the Plettenberg Bay as well as Port Elizabeth communities involved in decision-making, as they will be affected in the event of fallout! 	<p>Every member of the public is welcome to participate in this EIA. However, decision-making remains the domain of the Government.</p>
<p>Mr Pieter Sneewe National Union of Mineworkers</p>	<p>Public meeting to be held on a Saturday especially in the Northern Cape Areas. Start the public meetings with a film of the current (Koeberg) Nuclear facility to give public some background.</p>	<p>Comments on future public meetings will be taken into account when these are planned.</p>
<p>Ms Annelise le Roux Succulent Karoo Information Centre</p>	<p>Would like to make the documentation available in the Succulent Karoo Information Centre in the Environmental Library.</p>	<p>Thank you for this suggestion. Succulent Karoo Information Centre has been added to the public venue distribution list.</p>
<p>Mr Michael Duerr</p>	<p>This is my initial comment for the Eskom's Nuclear EIA process 12/12/20/944.</p> <p>Sorry for putting forward my comments at the last date, but I waited to no avail for the promised minutes of the meetings on the official Eskom/eia/nuclear1 site. It is worrying that promised facts and minutes are made not available for timely comments. This leads to possible later additions, depending on the delivered information from the EIA consultant and Eskom. Maybe you have to ask your lawyers to extend the comment period again until the relevant information is made public.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>The consolidated minutes of the various meetings and workshops have taken some time to compile and review. This is a function of the number of meetings and workshops, as well as the vast amount of material that had to be dealt with. Importantly, the public is able to comment throughout the EIA.</p>
<p>Garth Robinson</p>	<p>I wish to oppose this with all my heart, thanks.</p>	<p>Thank you for this comment.</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
<p>South African Heritage Resources Agency: SAHRA</p>	<p>Request for a Heritage Impact Assessment:</p> <p>We have received notification of the above project proposal, with the locality for it yet to be decided between the Northern, Western and Eastern Cape Provinces. If the project is to take place in the Western Cape Province, please be advised that any matter concerning heritage impact assessments must be dealt with Heritage Western Cape (Att: Mr Ndukuyakhe Ndlovu) 021 483 9685, Private Bag x9067, Cape Town, 8000), as this later institution has jurisdiction over the WC Province. On the other hand, if the locality chosen for the project falls within the Eastern Cape or Northern Cape, the South African Heritage Resources Agency is to be consulted on heritage matters.</p> <p>In terms of the National Heritage Resources Act (NHRA), no 25 of 1999, heritage resources, including archaeological or palaeontological sites over 100 years old, graves older than 60 years, structures older than 60 years are protected. They may not be disturbed without a permit from the relevant heritage authority. This means that before such sites are disturbed by development it is incumbent on the developer (or mine) to ensure that a Heritage Impact Assessment is done. This must include the archaeological component (Phase 2) mitigation, which involves recording, sampling and dating sites that are to be destroyed, must be done as required.</p> <p>Consequently, the quickest process to follow for the archaeological component would be to contract an accredited specialist (see attached accreditation lists) to provide Phase 1 Archaeological Impact Assessment Report. This must be done well in advance before the finale site option is finally chosen.</p> <p>The Phase I Impact Assessment Report will identify the archaeological sites and assess their significance. It should also make recommendations (as indicated in section 38) about the process to be followed. For example, there may need to be a mitigation phase (Phase 2) where the specialist will collect or excavate material and date the site. At the end of the process the heritage authority may give permission for destruction of the sites.</p>	<p>A Heritage Resources Assessment will be undertaken for each site that is carried forward for investigation as part of the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report). This assessment is being undertaken by Tim Hart and his team of archaeological nad heritage specialists.</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>Where bedrock is to be affected, or where there are coastal sediments, or marine or river terraces and in potentially fossiliferous superficial deposits, a Palaeontological Desk Top study must be undertaken to assess whether or not the development will impact upon palaeontological resources – or at least a letter of exemption from a Palaeontologist is needed to indicate that this is unnecessary. If the area is deemed sensitive, a full Phase 1 Palaeontological Impact Assessment will be required and if necessary a Phase 2 rescue operation might be necessary (see attached list of accredited Palaeontologists).</p> <p>Attached please find a list of accredited archaeological and palaeontological specialists who may be contacted to undertake the necessary archaeological or palaeontological impact assessments.</p>	
Dorothea Susanna Swart	I am too far away from Cape St Francis to attend meetings. Please send: (a) minutes, reports, etc. preferably by e-mail (b) coordinates of Thyspunt (longitude and latitude)	As material becomes available, it will be sent to all I&APs (including Ms Swart).
Eugene Botes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All objections raised by the CSFCA as set out in their newsletter (Cape St Francis Residents and Property Owners) • The impact on the natural environment and the unique ecology of the area • Alternative sites close to where the demand for electricity is – viz. P.E., Western Cape <p>The motives of the Government / Eskom in making use of technology that has been rejected all over the world 30 years ago</p>	<p>These issues will be addressed within a suite of specialist studies to be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p> <p>Nuclear power accounts for about 16% of the electricity produced globally. Numerous countries have announced plans or have already commenced construction of new nuclear power stations. Approximately 30 nuclear power stations are currently in construction around the world.</p>
Mr Danie Lambrechts	<p>Please take note of the fact that Eskom funded the subregional structure plan for the Southern Overberg during 1990 in order to identify the property as a nuclear power station. I think that the consultants were MLH and they should already have a large amount of information on the site and the rights, etc. I was also involved in the process.</p> <p>Previous processes and previously collected information should be taken into account and made available.</p>	<p>Previous studies have and will continue to inform the current EIA.</p> <p>The EIA Team has already been in communication with MLH.</p>
Jackie de Jager	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Environmental impact – visual pollution 2. Warming of sea water – higher temperatures resulting in 	These issues will be addressed within a suite of specialist studies to be commissioned as part of the Impact

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	extinction of existing marine life 3. Influx of large numbers of people – rise in crime 4. Speakers who will explain impact on marine life and environment	Assessment Phase of the EIA (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report). If required, specialists will attend public and focus group meetings to present their findings and to deal with questions.