

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
3. FINANCIAL/ECONOMIC		
Mr Mark Botha Botanical Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Likely cost of uranium over project life cycle. ▪ Economic analysis (internal and independent) of nuclear options and electricity unit cost. 	<p>Thank you for these comments. These issues, where applicable, will be taken into account in the impact assessment phase of the EIA. The EIA will include a macro economic and tourism assessment which will review the potential economic and tourism impacts of the project on the surrounding communities. The EIA will include a social impact assessment which will review the potential social impacts of the project on the surrounding communities. The EIA will include a infrastructure and transport assessment which will review the potential infrastructure and transport related impacts of the project on the surrounding communities. The EIA will, in addition to identifying and assessing the significance of potential impacts, also identify and assess the necessary mitigation strategies required to ensure sustainable development. All Eskom's large investments, such as those required for the building of new power stations, require approval, in terms of the requirements of the Public Finance Management Act, from the Minister of Public Enterprises and the Minister of Finance. Approval, and an electricity generating licence, is also required from the National Energy Regulator of South Africa (NERSA) prior to the construction of any new power station. NERSA determines the electricity prices/tariffs in South Africa. NERSA evaluates any application for an electricity generation licence in terms of its impact on electricity supply and demand and on the electricity tariffs. NERSA holds public hearings on applications for electricity generating licences. The purpose and need, alternatives, and costs (including externalities/opportunity costs) are covered in Section 4.10 and Chapter 8 of the Scoping Report. Outcomes of additional studies will be reported in the Environmental Impact Report. As with all of Eskom's new build projects all disturbed areas will be suitably</p>
Mrs Lilian Ursula Bunzli	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Financial feasibility – nuclear power stations are very expensive due to expansive safety measures. 	
Dr Piet Claassen PE Claassen Town & Regional Planner	<p>Effects of the increase in the cost of power</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ As the cost of power increases people will use it more efficiently, which may decrease the demand per person. (This is only partially true for a developing country such as South Africa, as the electric consumption of the large poor section of the community will increase as their wealth (hopefully) improves.) However, as the oil reserves of the earth are being used up, the demand for electric power will increase. For instance electric buses will return as a major form of transport in cities. With “electric buses” I mean the type that runs on rubber wheels, with overhead electric power lines. Electric trains will also make a big comeback for the transport of goods and passengers. But that is maybe 50 to 100 years in the future. 	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Over the medium term substitute sources such as solar water heaters will grow in demand, and will help to decrease peak demand. At present, however, the problem is cost. My recent research revealed that solar water heaters are still unrealistically expensive. I could not find low-pressure cheap solar water heaters. The market caters for the high-pressure electrically enhanced systems. 	
Mr Ryan Donnelley Founder and chairperson of F.A.C.T. (For A Clean Tomorrow)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We object to the high cost, safety, security, and waste problems of nuclear power stations. 	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Mr Michael Duerr	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Who and when will we be told about the financial implications for Nuclear 1? ▪ Who is making the assumptions for the project? ▪ What will the construction cost, construction time, load factor, operational life, O&M cost, fuel cost decommissioning cost and discount rate be for Nuclear 1? ▪ When will each of the before mentioned key pillars be published and from whom? ▪ What is the public participation in this respect? 	rehabilitated following the completion of construction activities.
Mr Peter Johnston University of Cape Town	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The need for nuclear power station. ▪ The alternatives. ▪ The cost. ▪ The opportunity cost. 	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Mr Mike Kantey Watercourse cc	Issues to be addressed by Scoping Report: 1. Economics 1.1. Full cost accounting of all stages of nuclear fuel chain: (a) uranium mining (b) uranium enrichment (c) nuclear fuel fabrication (d) nuclear fuel transport & security (e) nuclear power station construction (f) nuclear power station operation (g) nuclear waste handling and life-time storage, including: (i) low-level waste; (ii) medium-level waste; and (iii) high-level waste (h) emergency planning and routine drills (i) decommissioning and final, long-term storage of contaminated plant and buildings (j) transport of waste, including waste from decommissioned plant (k) security 1.2 Comparative costs at same site and for same output of MWe of: (a) coal-fired plant with mitigating, engineered filtration of sulphur and particulates, as well as carbon offsets, and using fluidised-bed technology to burn coal at higher temperatures. (b) natural gas-fired plant 1.2. Comparative costs of technology at nearby, suitable site with same output of MWe of: (a) solar in Northern Cape; (b) wind in Eastern Cape; (c) offshore wave technology in Western and Eastern Cape	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Mr Francois Kotze & Mr E Peterson Overberg District Municipality	Economic criteria Is the proposed development: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Financially viable and can guarantees be given that it will be constructed and operated in strict adherence to the Conditions of Approval? ▪ In a position to provide guarantees that in the event of its abandonment during construction, financial reserves will be available for rectification of environmental disruption caused by the construction so far? ▪ Capable of contributing to local or regional economies in terms of taxation structures, promotion of tourism, or by any other means? ▪ In a position to provide sustainable employment, during both its development and operational phases? ▪ Designed in a manner, which will be in keeping with available infrastructure such as roads, or railway and harbour facilities? ▪ Designed in a manner, which will ensure that negative impacts upon the rights or capital values of existing neighbouring properties will not occur? ▪ Planned in such a manner that its economic viability will not be at the expense of long-term ecological sustainability and that environmental safeguards will be maintained in the operational phase subsequent to construction? ▪ Designed in a manner, which will ensure that existing services such as road infrastructure, water supplies, waste- and sewage disposal will not be overloaded? 	
Mr R Mike Longden-Thurgood Environment Representative, Institution of Nuclear Engineers, Environment Correspondent, National Association for Clean Air	I don't know who prepared the original BID, but reading through the early part of it I have come across a very misleading statement, as follows: "The economic lifetime of electricity generating power stations is very long – on average 40 to 50 years. It is thus critical when determining the optimal mix of electricity generating power stations to take into account the contribution that new power stations will make to sustainable development in South Africa". Although Eskom has made its announcement that the Koeberg PWRs have had their lifetimes extended to 50 years from the original 40, following investigative work carried out by the French utility, EdF, on their reactors that this extended lifetime can be achieved; this is most	Thank you for your comments. The lifespan of the proposed power station would be the order of 60 years, always subject to maintaining a high safety level and hence retaining its licence, and its financial viability.

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>definitely not the end of the story.</p> <p>The US has many PWRs, very similar to those at Koeberg, but which are French modified Westinghouse PWRs. The US.NRC has already licensed a number of their PWRs for a life of 60 years, and most US utilities have submitted applications for their reactor lifetimes to be similarly extended. The greater majority are PWRs. I don't know if any of the far fewer non-PWR types have had, or are likely to have, any similar extensions approved. However, the possibility is being considered that the US PWRs could have their lifetimes extended to 80 years. This extension is absolutely vital for the US, despite the fact that the (US) AP 1000 is the next Generation III reactor type, the reason being quite simply that the replacement of their existing PWRs, which were all radically upgraded following the TMI-2 accident in 1977, would take far too long and prejudice their electricity generation capacity, and would be un-necessarily expensive.</p> <p>This life extension was discussed in <i>Nuclear Future</i>, May/June 2007 issue; "80 years plant lifetimes for current US Nuclear Plants".</p> <p>US NRC Commissioner Jeffrey Merrifield is reported to have said at the NRC's recent annual Regulatory Information Conference "<i>In the absence of some unforeseen circumstance, it appears that within a handful of years all 104 [of the nuclear reactors currently operating in the USA] will either be allowed to continue to operate for 60 years or be in various stages of review</i>".</p> <p>He went on to say that "<i>The vast majority of nuclear plants in the United States could be serious candidates for license extension for up to 80 years of operation - - - the NRC must prepare itself for that question</i>".</p> <p>The rest of the world most definitely is not going to be left behind, considering the extreme lengths that go into the construction and fabrication work for the PWRs, whether Westinghouse or French modified versions. I would suspect that Koeberg would go the same way.</p> <p>I contend that the BID must not give any misleading impression for the possible potential lifetimes for either the existing Koeberg PWRs or the Generation III Nuclear 1s.</p> <p>If it is too late to alter the BID, then these considerations for the extended life will need to be fully discussed in the Scoping and Environmental Impact reports.</p>	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Mr M Phalane Earthlife Africa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Business plant / economical finances 	Thank you for these comments.
Mr Lionel Phillips Matzikama Municipality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Small business development. ▪ Benefits to the area. ▪ Disadvantages to the area. 	These issues, where applicable, will be taken into account in the impact assessment phase of the EIA.
Dr Laurine Platzky Premier – Western Cape	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Budgets 	The EIA will include a macro economic assessment which will review the potential economic impacts of the project on the surrounding communities
Mr Louis Van Heerden Overstrand Local Municipality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Estimation of tax benefit to Municipalities, if any. 	
Mr DRD Wightman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Extending Koeberg is a mindset choice as harbour, etc in place but sites most north (w.coast) are strategically and environmentally (both built and natural) more correct and siting for minimal harbour requirements should make it more cost effective. 	
Mr Keith Wiseman City of Cape Town	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Contributions by the nuclear license holder to relevant external costs resulting from the nuclear installation. 	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Mr Byran Andrews	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 30% of milk production in our areas. ▪ Fishing industry will be hugely affected. 	<p>These issues, where applicable, will be addressed in various specialist studies as part of the impact assessment phase of the EIA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Macro-economic Specialist Studies (see Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report) ▪ Marine Ecology Specialist Studies (see Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report), which will include an assessment of potential impacts on fisheries (subsistence and commercial). ▪ Land Use and Agricultural Capability Study (see Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report). ▪ Social Impact Assessment Specialist Study (see Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report). ▪ Tourism Assessment Specialist Study (see Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report). <p>The National Nuclear Regulator Act of 1999 and associated regulations make provision for 3rd party liability and compensation in the event of nuclear damage. The NNR Act and the relevant regulation can be downloaded from the NNR website www.nnr.co.za</p>
Mr Christian Philip Bornman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Socio-Economic impact on surrounding areas. 	
Mr Robert Carmichael	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Our fishing industry will suffer due to the water temperature. 	
Mr Derek Vivian Cook Macohy Investments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Who will be liable for loss of earnings from evacuated guesthouses etc., No insurance other than life covers nuclear. 	
Mr Louis De Wet Pearly Beach Cons. Society	<p>Economic benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Short-term benefits will be realized locally but the long-term result will certainly be catastrophic with a heavy industry of this nature in the middle of a tourist region. ▪ Direct regional benefits are expected to be negligent. 	
Mr Mario Dieckow	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 30% of countries milk production in our area. ▪ Fishing industry will be seriously affected. 	
Mr John Carlide Leach Environmental Impact Interest Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The negative impact of job creation from building, service industries and tourism, which has the most potential for growth. ▪ The negative impact over the export of Tjokka. 	
Ms Christelle Le Roux	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Fishing industry at huge risk. 	
Mrs and Mr Helen / Lars Manson-Kullin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Real cost of building and supplying of generated power. 	
Mrs Carmen Janet Perrott	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What is the cost compared with other options e.g. coal, gas etc? ▪ Is the EIA going to include the impact on surrounding sea area? 	
Ingela Richardson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Insurances and liabilities. Compared with insurances and third party liabilities in the United Kingdom, or Austria, what this country provides for nuclear liability insurance is extremely low. NECSA/PBMR must clarify how much money each household is insured for, where the money will be held, who will pay this money, how will this money be claimed in the event of disaster. ▪ What are the calculated financial effects that will be suffered by the tourism industry? How much will people lose financially in terms of losses to tourism, agriculture, and property values? 	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Ms Maya Aberman	<p>The following constitute the comments of Earthlife Africa Cape Town to the Background Document for the Eskom Nuclear Power Station and Associated Infrastructure and the Comment Sheet 1: Scoping Phase.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Committing South Africa to investment in a recently estimated R400 billion nuclear energy expansion programme seems foolhardy. Founding energy generation in South Africa on a fuel that will be unavailable in 70 years seems nonsensical. Apart from the obvious, what we also risk is the opportunity cost. Putting at least 10-20% of our eggs into the renewable energy basket now, rather than sighing over the broken eggs in the nuclear basket in ten years time, seems the sensible option. Managing risk should mean using mature, tried and tested clean technologies where there is a reliable fuel source. 	<p>These issues will be addressed in the impact assessment via a Marine Ecology Specialist Study (see Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report), which will also include an assessment of potential impacts on fisheries (subsistence and commercial) and via a Macro-economic Specialist Study (see Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report). All Eskom's large investments, such as those required for the building of new power stations, require approval, in terms of the requirements of the Public Finance Management Act, from the Minister of Public Enterprises and the Minister of Finance. Approval, and an electricity generating licence, is also required from the National Energy Regulator of South Africa (NERSA) prior to the construction of any new power station. NERSA determines the electricity prices/tariffs in South Africa. NERSA evaluates any application for an electricity generation licence in terms of its impact on electricity supply and demand and on the electricity tariffs. NERSA holds public hearings on applications for electricity generating licenses. Every 1000 MW of nuclear power capacity needs approximately 200 tonnes of natural uranium per annum. Thus, 4 000 MW of nuclear power operating for a 60 year period would require about 48 000 tonnes of natural uranium. South Africa's Reasonable Assured Resources (RAR) of uranium is estimated to be 521 000 tonnes, with a further 211 000 tonnes as inferred resources. [Reference: IAEA/NEA "Uranium 2005: Resources Production and Demand" – the "Red Book"]. Thus, South Africa has enough uranium resources to support a bigger than 20 000 MW nuclear programme for the envisaged 60 year lifetime of the modern nuclear power plants. The National Nuclear Regulator Act of 1999 and associated regulations make provision for 3rd party liability and compensation in the event of nuclear damage. The NNR Act and the relevant regulation can be downloaded from the NNR website www.nnr.co.za. All comments relating to the Chokka industry are noted and will be taken into account in the relevant specialist studies to be undertaken as part of the EIA.</p>
Mr Derek Vivian Cook Dunes Guest Farm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What insurance is in place for loss of earnings, loss of life, permanent disability? 	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Ms Karen Humby South African Squid Management Industrial Association (SASMIA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Economic influence of the SA squid fishery: ▪ The Eastern Cape is the second largest of the countries nine provinces but despite its size and potential, it is the poorest province in South Africa (Geach, 2001). The eastern half of the province is considered the most serious impoverished. Eleven years ago it was estimated that 4,1 million people inhabit the Eastern Cape and 64% of these individual live in poverty¹. ▪ The economic value of goods and services generated by coastal ecosystems both direct (e.g. goods that are consumed viz. through commercial food production, transportation, tourism etc.) and indirect (e.g. waste and erosion control) was estimated to be approximately R179 billion per year (37% of South African's GDP) in 1998. Of the R44 billion estimated direct benefits, commercial food production (fishing and agriculture) was over R11 billion². The chokka Squid industry plays a vital role in this. ▪ Prior to the early 1980's chokka squid (<i>Loligo vulgaris reynaudii</i>) were trawled, as a by catch of the sole and hake fisheries. However, since 1984, hand-line jigging has displaced bottom trawling and has proven to be the superior fishing method (Augustyn and Smale 1995). This inshore squid fishery now accounts for over 90% of the annual South African chokka catch (Roberts and Sauer, 1994) and is considered one of the most valuable fisheries on the South African south coast (Augustyn et al.1994). With the fishery targeting spawning aggregation which are known to extent from Plettenberg Bay to Port Alfred, (Sauer et al. 1992 sq4), it is essentially an Eastern Cape industry (Roberts in prep) where 85-90% of the economic activity occurs in the province (Geach, 2001). 	

¹ Living standards and development database, 1994

² Coastal Policy Green Paper, 1998

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The industry started operation from small open deck ski-boats, however as the economics strengthened so the owners have further invested in the fishery. Furthermore, market pressure to produce a better quality product led to a change from ice vessels to vessels with onboard blast freezers. This has resulted in the introduction of larger deck boats as well as the building of fish processing factories. The cost of a fully equipped new vessel can range from R2.5-6 million, depending on its size, with a complete factory and cold storage costing between R6-10 million. Commercial banking institutions have always been reluctant in providing finance to those involved in fishing because of the high risks involved. ▪ Fishermen living within the impoverished Eastern Cape occupy a large sector of the squid fishery as Port Elizabeth is considered the centre of the commercial squid fishing industry with facilities for processing, packaging, distribution and exporting in existence. Furthermore, St Francis Bay plays an integral role, in that approximately 40% of the fishing vessels are based in the harbour and fishermen are drawn from Jeffrey's Bay, Humansdorp and St Francis Bay, several registered companies and processing factories operate in the area. Although the squid fishery operates mainly out of Port Elizabeth and St Francis Bay, a portion of its fishers are drawn from the former Ciskei and Transkei states. All the industry related employees rely solely on income generated from squid fishing resulting in the provision of approximately 5000 jobs in sea and land based enterprises. Considering families, it is further estimated that approximately 25 000 people are directly dependent on the squid fishery. The fisheries importance is emphasized by the fact that it generates approximately R400 million in foreign revenue (Roberts in prep). 	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The involvement of business is limited (Roberts in prep) and hence the fishery has promoted many small, medium and micro enterprises (SMME's). What's more, with the parameters for long term rights applications set by Marine and Coastal Management, a majority of these SMME's are black empowered and or BEE companies. Furthermore, with the ever-increasing awareness of the importance of social upliftment and education many of squid enterprises are already involved in safety training and ABET education and basic educational empowerment of their staff and fishermen. ▪ The dynamics of the industry has resulted in a huge diversity of companies involved in this fishery. In 2005, Marine and Coastal Management issued long-term fishing rights to 130 boats, which are owned by 114 companies resulting in 2300 fishing crew, approximately 150 shore management staff and approximately 1500 factory staff for the processing and packaging of the frozen product. ▪ Although the fishery is known to extend from Port Alfred Plettenberg Bay, Table 1 shows that between 28-37% of all catches occurred within 10N miles east and west of the Thyspunt Nuclear Power Plant location. An estimate of annual earnings over a period of six years (1999-2005) of each job category created by the squid fishery can be seen in Table 1. <i>(See Table at the end of this document)</i> ▪ Table 1: Estimate on annual earnings (crew and factory based) paid out; industry turnover and factory processing turnover paid over from squid catches. ▪ <i>(See Table at the end of this document).</i> 	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The large variability of percentages from year to year can be accounted for by the fact that squid are a highly mobile spawning species, with environmental parameters such as turbidity and bottom temperature playing a large influential role in the location of spawning (Dorfler, 2002) Sauer et al. (1991) suggested that upwelling plays a major role in the availability of squid on the inshore spawning grounds during summer. Furthermore, Oosthuizen (1999) has shown that squid egg development is highly related to water temperature, with optimum temperatures ranging between 120C and 150C. The squid fishery targets spawning aggregations on these eggs beds. If temperatures are not optimal adult squid that are ready to spawn will move away from the area. ▪ Furthermore, any eggs laid in the area are highly susceptible to developmental abnormalities and a high mortality. ▪ SASMIA would like to express its concern on behalf of the Squid Industry to the location of the proposed Thyspunt Nuclear Power Plant. The surrounding waters will be environmentally affected; by fluctuations in water temperature or contamination this will adversely affect the squid fishery. We anticipate that our foreign consumers will be very sensitive to the fact that our product could have been caught within close proximity to a nuclear power station and in particular in waters adjacent to the outlet of coolant water from a nuclear facility. ▪ This fishery is not a high volume fishery but the squid commodity is a high value commodity which is very sensitive to market perceptions The environmental friendly and contaminate free fishery products lobby is growing in strength from day to day and the slightest possibility of a chance of contamination whether perceived or real would no doubt reach our upmarket overseas consumers which would undoubtedly result in the immediate collapse of this fishery. 	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>The most economically impacted sector of the fishery will be the crew on board the vessels. Salaries are 100% commission based, so fishermen are paid individually for every kilogram of squid caught. Calculations are based on prices paid per kilo for the 2004 squid season, result in an approximate value of over R21 million worth of salary paid out from catches made in the proposed Thyspunt area (Table 1). <i>See Table at the end of this document</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ensuing effects will be felt by factories involved whether they are involved in the processing and packaging in preparation for export or just hold the product in cold storage. The average utilization of factories within the Eastern Cape processing squid is approximately 43%. Cold storage and handling costs that were paid from boat owner's factories for squid caught can be seen in Table1 (<i>See Table at the end of this document</i>). 	
Mr Leslie Lawson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Impact upon local industry e.g. fishing, tourism 	Thank you for these comments.
Mrs Lyell van Rensburg	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Fishing Industry will be ruined! 	<p>These issues will be addressed in the impact assessment via a Marine Ecology Specialist Study (see Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report), which will also include an assessment of potential impacts on fisheries (subsistence and commercial) and via a Macro-economic Specialist Study (see Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report), which will also include an assessment of potential impacts on the tourism sector. Tourism will be investigated in a Tourism Specialist Study (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p>
Mr Richardt van Rensburg	<p>Impact of Nuclear Power Station on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Fishing Industry. 	
Dr and Mrs Hans & Liesbeth Verstrate Oyster Bay Lodge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Businesses which would be affected by a nuclear reactor: tourism activities etc 	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Victor and Kim Breach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The financial burdens on the taxpayer are going to be astronomical, as the full cost of the construction as well as the running costs will never be able to be returned in the cost charged for electricity. ▪ The funds needed to finance this project will have to be borrowed, again at the cost of the taxpayer. ▪ The majority of the materials will have to be imported, as our construction industry at the moment cannot get adequate supplies. So these imports will have a huge drain on our monetary movements, with so much money going into foreign exchanges and not benefiting the South African economy. 	<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. Specific reference is drawn to the Macro-economic, Tourism and Social Impact Assessments (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report). 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 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>All Eskom's large investments, such as those required for the building of new power stations, require approval, in terms of the requirements of the Public Finance Management Act, from the Minister of Public Enterprises and the Minister of Finance. Approval, and an electricity generating licence, is also required from the National Energy Regulator of South Africa (NERSA) prior to the construction of any new power station. NERSA determines the electricity prices / tariffs in South Africa. NERSA evaluates any application for an electricity generation licence in terms of its impact on electricity supply and demand and on the electricity tariffs. NERSA holds public hearings on applications for electricity generating licences. Where applicable and possible all estimates will be provided as part of the specialist studies as part of the EIA.</p>
Mrs Dale Fletcher	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ If a coastline and especially Kouga requires more electricity why is the government then exporting power and selling it to would be aluminium manufactures at bargain prices? 	
Mr Clive Horlock	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Economic Impact: Loss of jobs due to exodus affluent person and disinvestments loss of asset value in properties. Impact on tourism etc. 	
Mrs Jacqueline le Roux Cape St Francis Community Association.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ If Coega needs more power, why is South Africa selling power to aluminium producers at cheap rates. ▪ Very expensive. Across the world projects like these are standing still due to a lack of funds 	
Mr Rudolf Penderis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Extensive economic development in the area. 	
Charles Tregoning	<p><u>Financial:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We need to see a transparent costing of the whole process. Foreign partners and the extent of their involvement. What implications this expenditure will have on the future price of electricity to the South Africa consumer who is ultimately funding the whole thing. ▪ No nuclear facility has been built within its budget. The nuclear facility being built in Finland has doubled from its original budget to 18 billion euros. 	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Mr Louis van Heerden Overstrand Municipality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Estimation of tax benefit to Municipality (if any) housing of employees (temporary and permanent). 	

Table 1: Estimate on annual earnings (crew and factory based) paid out; industry turnover and factory processing turnover paid over from squid catches. Ms Karen Humby South African Squid Management Industrial Association (SASMIA)

Year	Total for all squid catches (P Alfred to Plettenberg Bay)				Total for catches extending from Oyster Bay to Jeffrey's Bay				
	Catches (tons)	Crew Earnings	Industry Turnover	Approx. Factory turnover	Catches (tones)	% of total catch	Crew Earnings*	Industry Turnover	Approx. Factory turnover
1999	6,943	R54 million	R153 million	R5, 387 000	2,544	36.65%	R20 million	R56 million	R1, 971 000
2000	5,564	R47 million	R145 million	R4, 387 000	1,613	28.99%	R14 million	R42 million	R1, 288 000
2001	3,247	R28 million	R91 million	R2, 800 000	924	28.46%	R8 million	R26 million	R 800 000
2002	7,406	R85 million	R319 million	R8, 395 000	2,327	31.42%	R27 million	R100 million	R2, 632 000
2003	8,681	R81 million	R252 million	R6, 146 000	2,752	31.70%	R 26 million	R80 million	R1, 951 000
2004	9,639	R85 million	R260 million	R7, 283 000	3,412	35.39%	R29 million	R92 million	R2, 577 000
2005	6,990	R58 million	R175 million	R5, 147 000	2,516	36.00%	R21 million	R63 million	R1, 843 000

*incorp. fishermen, officers, shore staff