

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
6. SITE SPECIFIC MATTERS		
Mr Richard Arderne Pam Golding Properties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Can't the station be built at Coega? Coega would seem to be a more suitable location? 	<p>Coega is not a site currently under consideration, as it was not identified in the Nuclear Site Investigation Programme (NSIP) as being suitable for the construction of a NPS.</p> <p>The whole South African coastline was investigated as part of the original Nuclear Site Investigation Programme (NSIP). Criteria, such as demography (existing population densities), ecological sensitivity, geology (rolling dunes and unconsolidated sands are, even with high engineering solutions, not suitable for a Nuclear Power Station due to their geological instability), the characteristics of the coastal area and the tides and wave action and seismicity, amongst others, were taken into account in determining the potential suitability of sites.</p> <p>The EIA will validate the findings of the previous site selection studies (NSIP), within the current social, biophysical and economic context, including the reasons why other potential sites in the area were deemed to be less or unsuitable.</p>
Mr Francois Bekker Springfontein Property	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Exclusion zones around the proposed reactor, as we would like to develop the farm in the future. 	<p>The National Nuclear Regulator will determine the number and size of emergency planning zones for the proposed power station.</p> <p>In the case of the Koeberg nuclear power station, two emergency planning zones are in place. The first zone is up to approximately 5 km from the power station, within which no further development may take place. The second zone is from 5 km up to approximately 16 km from the power station, within which limited development may take place.</p> <p>For the proposed nuclear power station Eskom is considering the latest design of Pressurized Water</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
		<p>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>
<p>Dr Michael Knight SANPARKS</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Brazil, Schulpfontein and Bantamsklip sites impact potentially on two National Parks, namely Namaqua and Agulhas. 	<p>Comment noted. This will be investigated in the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA by the specialists (Section 10.6 of the Scoping Report) and their recommendations will be detailed in their specialist reports and the Environmental Impact Report (EIR).</p>
<p>Mr J S Whybrow</p>	<p>Siting of the proposed new NPS in the Western Cape.</p> <p>Eskom is in the forefront of the world on using ambient air for the dry-cooling of large turbine-generators since the commissioning of Matimba and Kendal Power Stations on the highveld in the late 1980s.</p> <p>This departure from the conventional methods of condensing turbine exhaust steam arose as a consequence of repeated criticism of Eskom for squandering one of the country's most precious commodities – water.</p> <p>Now that Eskom has the technology and fifteen or so years of experience of dry cooling turbine exhaust steam in inland power stations, can Eskom please explain why they are not using that hard earned knowledge and siting their next nuclear power station with its associated power lines inland, away from the coastal tourists areas, using dry cooling technology?</p> <p>There are several benefits for Eskom siting its new power station away from the coast:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It could be sited anywhere as nuclear fuel transportation would not be a problem, unlike coal. ▪ It could be sited adjacent to the Mpumalanga – Western Cape 	<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> <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>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>transmission line corridor to minimise the costs of connecting into the existing power line network.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ If large quantities of the stored water were needed in close proximity for operational reasons, then any of the dams relatively close to the power lines corridor would suffice. ▪ It could be sited well away from heavily populated areas. ▪ It would not spoil the coastline. <p>From a technological point of view, there will be a drop in efficiency if the nuclear power station is sited inland using dry-cooling instead of cold seawater to condense the turbine exhaust steam, and that the efficiency will change daily as it is dependent upon the ambient air temperature. But as the ambient air temperature drops in the evening, the turbine efficiency will increase slightly, a feature particularly useful on cold winter's evening on the highveld when the peak power demand occurs on the Eskom system.</p> <p>This overall reduction in efficiency would be a small premium to pay for the flexibility of being able to site the new power almost anywhere in the Western Cape, and in the process preserve our pristine coastline for future generations.</p>	
6 (a) Site Specific Matters – Brazil		
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"> ▪ What if any, are there advantages or disadvantages to the local and wider communities of Kamiesberg Municipality? 	These will be investigated and reported on in the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA, via a suite of discipline-specific specialist studies that are to be commissioned (see Section 10.6 of the Scoping Report).
Mr and Mrs Karin/Deon Dreyer Wesgems Cc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We live and work at Brazil along with our small daughter and 5 other people who work with us. ▪ We have put a considerable amount of time and money and effort into our living quarters and live as environmentally friendly as possible. 	Thank you for your comments. These issues, where applicable, will be addressed in the impact assessment phase of the EIA.

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Jakkals Baai which is on Brazil is one of the most pronounced and largest bay on that part of the west coast. The surrounding environment has sustained minimal damage from mining operations, as a result the area is pristine and untouched, unlike much of the rest of the land in the area, which has been devastated by mining. ▪ It is the only place that people of the Northern Cape can get to the sea without De Beers security clearance for many kilometers, so as a recreational area it is of prime importance. Many people come regularly to camp and relax. ▪ There are also world-class waves, which attract surfers from all over the world. ▪ There are plans afoot to develop the tourism aspect of Brazil working with the local communities. This will also benefit the communities inland as youth camps and field camps are part of the plan. ▪ The coastline of Brazil is incredibly Beautiful and unspoilt and is a huge tourist attraction. The flora is pristine and many very rare species exist there. The animal life is abundant and rare species of rodent and reptiles have been found. ▪ We also have Cape Otter in residence. ▪ We would be happy to be part of this process and show you alternate areas more suitable. Brazil site has been earmarked 20 years ago. Things have certainly changed since then. This needs to be taken into account. The future of the area depends on it. 	<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>
<p>Mr Mike Kantey Watercourse cc</p>	<p>On the expansion of nuclear power in Namaqualand – a call for resistance and solidarity:</p> <p>The nearest, substantial community of Nama comrades is to be found in Kommaggas, a thriving community on the road between Kamieskroon and Hondeklipbaai.</p> <p>Apart from ancestral rights to the land itself, the Kommaggas community (and the rest of the Nama people in Leliefontein (Vaalputs Waste Dump), Steinkopf, Concordia and Springbok itself (NAMREC and the Namakwaland Aksie vir die Gemeenskap en die Omgewing, or NAGO) have been fighting this beast since the 1980s.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>As you most probably recall, I was at the Commission for Cultural and Linguistic Minorities in Durban in December 2005 (I think it was), and I am equally aware of the inalienable right of "First Peoples" to their ancestral lands and to dignified and respectful treatment under the United Nations Charter.</p> <p>It therefore grieves me greatly to have to inform you that these rights have already been trampled upon and that the citizens of South Africa, people who lost loved ones in the fight to realise the noble dreams of the Freedom Charter, in which "the land belongs to all who dwell in it", all those who have benefited from the fruits of Freedom, ought to stand together and oppose any attempt at expanding and extending the life of the nuclear industry in Namaqualand.</p> <p>This nuclear industry has been opposed from the start by all who fought under the banner of the Mass Democratic Movement. As a former General Secretary of Koeberg Alert in the 1980s, I myself was Chairperson of Tenants' Committee at Community House in Salt River when it was bombed, as well as being bombed along with the End Conscription Campaign in Observatory.</p> <p>The National Union of Mineworkers sponsored a resolution that was passed at an annual COSATU meeting, condemning the pursuit of the nuclear industry, surely a first precedent when a workers' organisation voted to put their own members out of work.</p> <p>As ANC loyalists, we sat on the Science & Policy Desk under Keith Gottschalk to determine the fate of nuclear policy under a future ANC-led Government in February 1994 and asked that it be reviewed properly and in a participatory spirit. This view was publicly confirmed by Cllr Dennis Goldberg at a meeting of the Wolpe Trust Forum last year.</p> <p>Now is the time for all cadres throughout the land to stand up and say "No!" to nuclear power and the nuclear power industry and -- in the name of democracy, human rights, sustainable development, economic justice and the furtherance of community and public health</p>	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>-- to say "No!" "No!" and "No!" again to an expansion in that industry on South African soil.</p> <p>Phantsi, amandla waNukliya, Phantsi! Long live the Spirit of Popular Democracy, Long Live!</p> <p>COMRADE SAKH'ISIZWE Claremont 2007</p>	
<p>Mr Mike Kantey Watercourse cc</p>	<p>We cannot and should not allow the feelings and aspirations of the Namaqualand Communities to be ridden over rough-shod in the name of "development" and "energy security".</p> <p>Our National Democratic Revolution was not fought for with blood and toil in order that the poorest of the poor and the most marginalised communities could be sacrificed to support a First-World urban lifestyle and a Soviet-style capital-intensive, State-run economy, and one which further brooks no tolerance for dissent, but rather tries by stealth to manipulate popular opinions and sentiments.</p> <p>I for one will not cease in my support for the human rights of the Nama people, regardless of the consequences.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
<p>Mr Ron Martin Western Cape Khoisan Council</p>	<p>As a member of the Western Cape Khoisan Council and the greater Khoi community, I am outraged at the way my Nama brothers & sisters are being treated with regard to the EIA process for Farm Brazil. I have been trying to gather information on the project and its implications, but it seems as if all Khoi organisations are deliberately being sidelined, for various reasons. The public participation is seriously flawed and I, as well as my organisation, will endeavour to gather as much info as possible to prepare a holistic response to this saga.</p> <p>Has a final decision been made? At what stage is the EIA process (scoping, EIR, etc)? Has anybody been informed of any avenues for appeal?</p>	<p>The EIA is in its first main phase, viz. the Scoping Phase. This must be followed by other main phases, viz. the Impact Assessment Phase, the integration of findings, and decision-making.</p> <p>Only when a decision has been made (by way of an Environmental Authorisation) does the appeal process commence. This will be advertised and I&APs will be informed on how to lodge an appeal. Please contact the public participation office for any information that you require as all members of the public are encouraged to participate in the EIA.</p>
<p>Ms Annelise le Roux Succulent Karoo Information Centre</p>	<p>Contribution of the warming of the sea to climate change feels like 2 to 3 on West Coast in the Benguela Current.</p>	<p>A Marine Ecological Study will be undertaken as part of the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Mr Darren Ball	<p>I am in opposition to the construction of the Nuclear Power plant to be built on the Diamond coast of Namaqualand. This is one of the countries most unique coastlines and building a nuclear power plant would restrict its use for the next 20,000 years.</p> <p>As an avid surfer and waterman I have concerns over the fact that building a plant would destroy the beach and waves at "Trailer Bay" and would put a 20,000 year ban on the beaches and surf spots of "Sampsons Bak" and "Paradise"</p> <p>I have many other concerns such as the effect on the wildlife and the peoples of the area. Please keep me informed of future developments of this site.</p>	<p>Thank you for these comments. As you are registered on the project database, you will continue to receive information about the proposed project.</p>
Mr Wynand Lategan	<p>I have personally surf Trailer Bay, Sampson Bak and Paradise. That piece of Diamond Coast is maybe the last part of our coastline that is unspoiled and mostly the way it was for centuries. Because of the restricted access it also gives the dedicated surfer of rare feeling of adventure in the true pioneering spirit. It would be a disgrace and tragic if this part of the coast is permanently close to visitors. Trailer Bay is also one of THE best spots I have surfed.</p>	<p>Thank you for these comments.</p>
Mr Alastair Davies	<p>I would like to say that destruction of these classic surf spots is a tragedy and should be avoided at all costs.</p> <p>Please look at alternate locations.</p>	<p>Thank you for this comment.</p> <p>Please note that this EIA is considering five possible sites for the proposed project.</p>
Mr Trevor Paice Gemstone Art cc	<p>Please do not destroy our planet any further. Surfing is pure. Nuclear is not.</p>	<p>Thank you for these comments.</p>
Mr Shaun Curtin	<p>Thanks for bringing the Namibian issue to my attention. In all honesty Namibia has way to many restrictions regarding surfing spots all ready, in saying this its understandable Southern Africa is experiencing a major energy shortage but in due respect with all the mining concessions and with it comes restrictions resulting in wave riding potential being lost, can't there be a way of giving access to surfers, hell surfers in general aren't international terrorists.....in</p>	<p>Thank you for these comments.</p> <p>Please note that five sites are being investigated as part of this EIA.</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>conclusion limiting a spot due to economic gains has only negative spin offs, catch a wake up and see the benefits of a recreational area, in leaving the surf area open, positive tourism youth development who in general is confined to a desert set up, not to mention conservation of a uniquely diverse and rare area.</p> <p>Sharp thanks for listening to a point of view shared by millions I hope, internationally as well as locally.</p>	
<p>Ms Annelise le Roux Succulent Karoo Information Centre</p>	<p>Who will maintain the roads to the power station? The Local Government in the Karoo cannot.</p>	<p>This will be addressed in the Social Impact Assessment to be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p>
<p>6(c) Site Specific Matters – Duynefontein</p>		
<p>Mr J H Booyesen Klein Zoute Rivier Residents Association</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Kleine Zoutrivier consists of 20 small farms avg. about 40 Ha each. We are within the 5km - restricted zone from Koeberg nuclear power station. This means that no development is allowed and that the farms and roads to these farms are getting worse by the day. This is because we as owners are responsible to maintain the roads (including the main road to all these properties). These roads are used daily by Eskom, Telkom, Police and the municipality. Unfortunately Koeberg (Eskom) the NNR and Blaauberg municipality allowed sand mining and other non - farming related activities to develop on some of the farms. This means 18-wheelers all the time. ▪ This brings us to real issue <u>the condition of the roads</u>. If the emergency exists at Koeberg we need to evacuate on the only road that leads straight back to Koeberg. We have to evacuate direct into the plume if a northwest wind is blowing. This is the wind blowing during winter months our raining season. This also means that if a release would occur during a rainy day the plume will not travel over us but the fission products will be absorbed by the rain and we will be the first to be contaminated. ▪ Another power station at Duynefontein will mean another 40 years restriction. 	<p>Emergency planning zones are briefly discussed in the Scoping Report (Section 4.9.2), and will be further addressed in the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA</p> <p>In the case of the Koeberg nuclear power station, two emergency planning zones are in place. The first zone is up to approximately 5 km from the power station, within which no <u>further</u> development may take place. The second zone is from 5 km up to approximately 16 km from the power station, within which limited development may take place.</p> <p>For the proposed nuclear 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> <p>Aspects related to current operations at Koeberg should be directed to Eskom or the National Nuclear Regulator.</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
<p>Dr Piet Claassen PE Claassen Town & Regional Planner</p>	<p>Nuclear power is essential:</p> <p>Thank you for your letter informing me of the proposed new nuclear power station, and for the opportunity to comment on it. I want to stress two important points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It is essential that one or more nuclear power stations should be built in South Africa to provide in the growing demand for electric power, and to replace the polluting fossil fuel power stations. ▪ The new power station must not be at Koeberg (Duynefontein), because it is too close to Cape Town and right in the middle of the future expansion area for Cape Town. Any one or more of the other four locations will be better than Koeberg. <p>Objections against nuclear power There are four objections against nuclear energy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The high cost. ▪ The power station may explode and cause devastation over a very large area. ▪ The waste products take thousands of years to degrade, and storing this radioactive waste is difficult and costly. ▪ The by-products can be used to manufacture nuclear bombs. This last objection can be ignored in the case of South Africa. <p>Below I discuss some of these objections. I indicate that it is essential to build nuclear power stations even though they are not ideal. The other forms of producing large quantities of power are even worse.</p> <p>Proximity to a city I do not know what the probability of an accident such as Three Mile Island or Chernobyl is, but even if it is extremely low, the damage that it could cause will be decreased infinitely if the power station is far from densely populated areas. Although much damage will be done to the natural environment, especially to marine life, it will not kill people directly.</p> <p>The possibility of a nuclear explosion looms very big in the public mind, and placing the power station in one of the remote sites will</p>	<p>Thank you for these comments.</p> <p>Safety aspects, including those related to neighbouring or nearby residential settlements, will be addressed in the impact assessment phase of the EIA (Section 10.6 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
	<p>decrease that objection considerably. The building of a nuclear power station at Koeberg was very grave mistake. The reason why it was built there was because the staff wanted to live in or near Cape Town – a most inconsiderate and selfish motivation.</p> <p>The isolated location of the new nuclear power station far from the existing grid-lines will also add to cost. But that is inevitable, as is the high cost of safely disposing of radioactive waste.</p>	
<p>Mr Dennis Smith City of Cape Town</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Environmental impact on possible future housing development in the area surrounding the nuclear power station, especially when close to Duynfontein. ▪ Please send all notification and documents to me via email or at the above-mentioned address. Also send to the list of councillors attached. 	<p>The experience around Koeberg is that there has been growth in terms of property development since the Nuclear Power Station was commissioned in 1984 (i.e. 23 years ago).</p> <p>The Macro-economic Assessment to be commissioned as part of the impact assessment will specifically deal with potential impacts on property values (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p> <p>Emergency planning zones are briefly discussed in the Scoping Report (Section 4.9.2), and will be further addressed in the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA</p> <p>In the case of the Koeberg nuclear power station, two emergency planning zones are in place. The first zone is up to approximately 5 km from the power station, within which no <u>further</u> development may take place. The second zone is from 5 km up to approximately 16 km from the power station, within which limited development may take place.</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
		<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>
<p>Mr Huberg Cronje</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I object to another nuclear power station at Melkbosstrand. Residential areas are on doorstep and further developments are being planned. Eskom has no interest or concern for residents as can be seen that they did not object to application for housing development of 1 200 houses within 5 km safety zone. 	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>6(d) Site Specific Matters – Bantamsklip</p>		
<p>Mr Roger Bailey Flower Valley Conservation Trust</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How will the road access be affected (Gansbaai-Die Damme)? ▪ Investigate alternative site. 	<p>Localized effects will be investigated in the impact assessment. There are currently five sites under investigation in this EIA.</p>
<p>Mr & Mrs Andre Bonhuys Baardskeedersbos</p>	<p>I would like to register my dismay and disapproval of your proposal of a nuclear reactor at Bantamsklip.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This is a fynbos biosphere with species on the red data list, a breeding ground for Southern Right Whales, Great White Sharks, perlemoen, rare geometric tortoises and Blue Crane. There are "undiscovered limestone caves" with middens, shards of history. And a massive seismic fault! My fynbos farm is within the 10 km radius. Besides fynbos, I produce olives and artichokes. My livelihood. At Baardskeedersbos (within the 16km radius) farmers produce milk - one of the few areas still prepared to farm with dairy despite shocking market prices. Tourism along the fynbos route is growing quickly and shark cage diving brings in much revenue. People flock to watch the whales and enjoy the fresh air and vistas. But most of all, the infrastructure cant cope. There is 1 tiny access road already struggling and many locals live here because it is "green". WE don't want electricity generated by any means other than ample 	<p>Thank you for these comments.</p> <p>The issues (biophysical, biological, social, cultural heritage, visual and land-use) you raise will be addressed in the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA by a suite of specialists (Section 10.6 of the Scoping Report).</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>sunshine and wind. We should be receiving tax incentives for quietly producing our own, NOT threatened by this invasion and destruction. We all rely on ground water.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This area has the lowest incidence of Aids in Southern Africa. The influx of thousands of migrant workers will change that and no doubt, besides competing with local labour, bring unsightly squatter camps, drugs and crime and threaten the small, indigenous population. People LIVE off the land here. Do not pollute it, clog our 1 road with caravans of cement trucks for the 6m slab! Not to mention unsightly pylons wrecking one of the most scenic spots in South Africa! Groot Hagelkraal is a National Heritage Site. Respect that and perhaps you will be respected. 	
<p>Dr S M Brouckaert Pearly Beach</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We have one of the lowest incidences of HIV in the country, in this area. We service at the local clinic in Gansbaai - an official total population (all race groups) of 7031 and unofficial of around 22000. ▪ We do have an Anti-retroviral site and our patients have to travel over 70kms with no public transport to Hermanus to access the ARV clinic there. ▪ A private charity sponsors a van every two weeks, that is the only chance for many of our patients - lack of privacy notwithstanding. ▪ The impact of at least 3 000 to 4 000 (best possible scenario) male labourers on the local population will be nothing short devastating. ▪ Drawn from anywhere else in the country they will automatically have a higher rate of HIV than the resident population. ▪ They will need to be housed within the local community. ▪ The local clinic is staffed by 2 sisters and 3 staff nurses and a doctor for 2 hours 3 times a week. ▪ How will we be able to manage the increased load on our already stretched resources and how will the local community be affected by this disastrous influx of people who will be with us for at least for 7 years, with no prospect of employment locally thereafter. ▪ We will be left holding the baby (and probably the orphans). 	<p>Thank you for these comments. Social and socio-economic (including health and health-care) issues will be investigated in the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The socio-economic impact on our community of such a project can only be negative. 	
<p>Ms Claire Craxton Plettenberg Bay Environmental Forum</p>	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above proposed NPS and Associated Infrastructure at Bantamsklip near the town of Pearly Beach. Taking the below into consideration, I strongly object to this proposed development on Pearly Beach and suggest the developers find a less eco-sensitive, unpopulated area for the Nuclear Power Station.</p> <p>The following are my main concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Aesthetics <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ As a holiday destination/retirement town, it could not be more inappropriate to propose building a nuclear power station in the vicinity. This area is renowned for its openness and whale watching in season, and this development would seriously jeopardise the natural amenities and, in turn, vital tourism. ▪ Beach Access <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This development would result in the loss of access to the beach (a public right). 	<p>Thank you for these comments. Biological, aesthetic and social/socio-economic aspects will be investigated in the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA (Section 10.6 of the Scoping Report). Specialist studies that will</p>
<p>Mr Michael D'alton Nuwejaars Wetland Special Management Area</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Full consideration must be given to the actual or perceived effect of this development, including during the construction phase, on the tourism and natural based industry of the immediate area. SANPARKS, private conservation initiatives, natural products, sustainable harvesting could all be adversely affected by the "bolt in the works" scare. The full potential of the area is now being uncovered and this project could severely affect both local and national economy. ▪ Huge changes have occurred since the original site ID's and better - suited sites on the west coast, with less environmental and social impact must be found. 	<p>This EIA is considering five alternative sites for the proposed NPS. Eskom may investigate other sites in the future for use in its nuclear programme.</p> <p>For each alternative site being considered in this EIA, issues such as those raised will be investigated via the various specialist studies that are to be commissioned (Section 10.6 of the Scoping Report).</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 site again for this EIA.</p>
<p>Ms Sally Jones Pearly Beach</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There are general details about the effect on the environment but this is what we argued in a lovely spot on the coast of Scotland to the benefit of residents I think. ▪ If the decision is to go ahead we need to say it is conditional on 	<p>These aspects will be addressed in the Visual Impact Assessment that will be commissioned as part of the impact assessment (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>“Best Practice” principles.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In Scotland we did not want the building to be identified as a nuclear power station so we demanded that the exterior of the building should be painted (using special and very expensive paint) a blue, which blends in with the colour of the sky. So at the most, people see a beautiful building. ▪ Again to camouflage the station there should be NO pylons. It is perfectly possible to bury the access in underground cables and is an absolute must for us in Pearly Beach. 	<p>Transmission lines are being dealt with in a separate EIA being undertaken in parallel with the current EIA.</p>
<p>Mr Werner Kriel Interested Party</p>	<p>Please register me as an Interested and Affected Party in the first of Eskom’s Environmental Impact Assessment processes concerning the proposed construction of a nuclear facility at Bantamsklip near the town of Pearly Beach.</p> <p>I would however like to raise the following issues to be included into the Environmental impact Report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ As a fourth generation holiday maker and soon to be resident at Pearly Beach I am particularly concerned about the impact the proposed development will have on the lifestyle I have come accustomed to and which I see as my inherited right. For generations we as a family have relied on this particular area for our fishing and bait harvesting needs. Restricting access to this particular strip of beach will put an end to over a 100 years of tradition and devoid my children the chance to become part of that heritage. I would therefore suggest a complete heritage study be done to investigate the similar impacts on other families. ▪ Beyond this, I hereby register the strongest protest possible towards this so-called development. 	<p>Thank you for these comments. A Heritage Resources Assessment will be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p>
<p>Mr Petrus A Scholtz Overstrand Municipality</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The process so far is good. I support the Bantamsklip proposal. 	<p>Thank you for this comment.</p>
<p>Mrs Mathia Schwegler Heidehof Provincial Nature Reserve</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The pylons from Bantamsklip to Botrivier to be under the ground or under the sea bed or to follow a different route i.e. to Rivier-sonder-end where it does less harm to nature and to tourism income. 	<p>Transmission lines are being dealt with in a separate EIA being undertaken in parallel with the current EIA.</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Mr Reginald Ewen Roy Sharp RER Sharp Pr Eng	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Considerable increase in population density, commercial activity and infrastructure in St. Francis Bay, Cape St. Francis and Oyster Bay, all of which are within the safety limits for evacuation as previously determined and advised by Eskom for a nuclear power station, sited at Thyspunt. ▪ I agree with the siting of a nuclear power station between Cape Town and Port Elizabeth to obviate power outages by completing the H.V supply ring. 	These matters will be dealt with in the Social Impact Assessment to be commissioned as part of Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).
Mr M P Temmers Moravian Church in SA (WCP)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The effect of the nuclear power plant 8 kilometres may have on the following development: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Dairy. ○ Vineyard cultivation. ○ Housing extension of 200 plots. ○ Settled community of Elim. ○ Agricultural activities. 	<p>These matters will be addressed in an Agricultural Assessment and the Social Impact Assessment to be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p> <p>Note that Koeberg has operated for the past 23 years within very close proximity of wheat, cattle and dairy farms. The nearest farms are within the 10 km radius of Koeberg.</p>
Mr Gerhard van Deventer Sandberg Fynbos Reserve	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ As an affected party, living in the vicinity of the proposed nuclear plant, I need to be informed of all meetings and decisions. 	Comment noted with thanks.
Mev Elrina Versfeld Pearly Beach Bewaringsvereniging	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Issues as mentioned in attached e-mail from Sally Jones. If Bantamsklip is the chosen site, where will the people be housed during the construction phase? ▪ A full EIA will also be requested as Bantamsklip is in fynbos veld. No overhead pylons will be requested. Studies to show that whale population will not be affected by warmer seawater. ▪ Keep all interested parties informed before news is published in newspapers. 	<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 of the Scoping Report).</p> <p>Please note that the transmission lines are being dealt with in a separate EIA being undertaken in parallel with this EIA.</p>
Mr Louis De Wet Pearly Beach Cons. Society	<p>Air pollution</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What are the air pollution comparisons between coal and nuclear stations? ▪ Aesthetic and visual impacts 	These matters will be addressed via Air Quality and Visual Impact Specialist Studies to be commissioned in the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA (see Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It is problematic to consider the aesthetic impacts of a power station, construction phase power supply and ultimate distribution lines separately as this is one issue and of major importance to this environmentally highly sensitive tourist region. ▪ Kilometres of high security fencing and overhead power lines are unthinkable. ▪ The complex itself can be mitigated through proper design. 	<p>The transmission lines require to integrate the power station to the national grid are under consideration but are being addressed in a separate EIA.</p>
<p>Mr and Mrs Michael/ Susanne Fuchs Klein Paradijs County House</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What will the impact be on tourism? Pearly Beach has been a quiet holiday resort for decades. Will the tourists still want to come to Pearly Beach if there is a nuclear power plant nearby? Will we be allowed to continue operating our quest house at the Pearly Beach (Little Paradise on the maps)? Will overseas guests (our main market) still want to come? Like their domestic counterparts, they come for the unspoilt natural surroundings, the whales and the sharks. ▪ How will the power plant affect the marine ecosystem? Every winter Southern Right Whales come to this coast to mate and calve. The existence of these whales used to be highly threatened. Now their numbers are growing again. In addition they are a great tourism attraction. The endangered white sharks, which are another tourist attraction, are also abundant along this coast. How will they be affected? What about the abalone, which is already under great threat by poaching activities. 	<p>This will be addressed in the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA via Tourism and Marine Ecology Specialist Studies (see Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p>
<p>Mr Werner Kriel</p>	<p>I would like to raise the following issues to be included into the Environmental Impact Report (EIR):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ As a fourth generation holiday maker and soon to be resident at Pearly Beach I am particularly concerned about the impact the proposed development will have on the lifestyle I have come accustomed to and which I see as my inherited right. For generations we as a family have relied on this particular area for our fishing and bait harvesting needs. Restricting access to this particular strip of beach will put an end to over a 100 years of tradition and devoid my children the chance to become part of that heritage. I would therefore suggest a complete heritage 	<p>A Heritage Resources Assessment will be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p> <p>Property values will be investigated as part of the Economic Assessment to be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>study be done to investigate the similar impacts on other families.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I am aware of a number of people that have recently bought property in around Pearly Beach as either a holiday destination or as a place for retirement. If the development goes ahead and the beach is close off it will deprive these people of the very reason why they bought the property in the first place. It is not a mere question of the lowered value of these properties that would result as a direct consequence of the construction of the nuclear facility, but where to move too. People who have bought property here have done so because they want to life and hopefully retire in Pearly Beach and not anywhere else. Would you like to retire next to a nuclear facility, adjacent to the beach you grew up which you are now not allowed to access? 	
<p>Captain M L Stakemire Hangklip / Kleinmond Federation of Ratepayers Associations</p>	<p>Eskom EIA: Nuclear Power Station, etc.: Overstrand</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ While we see the necessity and the advantages of Nuclear Power, we have no doubt it will be the subject of heated debate both within our Federation and in general. 	<p>Thank you for this comment.</p>
<p>Mr Salomon van den Heever</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Pollution; impact on fauna and flora as well as birdlife. Safety risks especially relating to <u>all</u> waste. Also, social and socio-economic impact during the construction phase as well as during the operations phase. Especially health and safety risks during construction and operation. ▪ Can I as an owner and resident of Pearly Beach be indemnified from a Chernobyl-USSR incident? 	<p>These will be fleshed out in the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA, via a suite of discipline-specific specialist studies that are to be commissioned (see Section 10.6 of the Scoping Report).</p> <p>The National Nuclear Regulator Act of 1999 and associated regulations make provision for 3rd party liability and compensation in the event of nuclear damage. The NNR Act and the relevant regulation can be downloaded from the NNR website www.nnr.co.za</p>
<p>6(e) Site Specific Matters – Thuyspunt</p>		
<p>Mr Christian Benecke St. Andrew's College</p>	<p>If the community does not want the station constructed for environmental, aesthetic, business, etc. related reasons, then the site should be moved to an area where these factors won't be affected e.g. (Coega).</p>	<p>The EIA will assess potential impacts of constructing the proposed NPS at each of the 5 alternative sites and the PPP process will solicit comments and issues from Interested and Affected Parties (I&APs).</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>The site was selected / studied in the 1980s, environmental awareness was nowhere as important as it is now, one must realise that the site is in a pristine area. Pristine areas are becoming fewer and further apart. The possibilities of locating the station at a site previously thought inadequate are made bigger with the development of modern earth moving technology.</p> <p>I feel that if the community do not want the station built then the costs of changing a slightly less viable site (Coega) to suit the needs of the construction should be obligatory.</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 site again for this EIA.</p>
<p>Mr Nicolas Andre Bouwer St. Andrew's College</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Site selection based on old technology. New technology may open a greater variety of sites further inland – away from sensitive areas such as tourist attractions, nature reserves, etc. 	<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> <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>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>
<p>Mr Bruce Coultas Cape St Francis Resident</p>	<p>Water and Sanitation: - Operation of the 2 units at Koeberg consume in the region of 120m³ of potable water on a daily basis. During construction and outages the consumption of potable water escalates dramatically. There is at present no pipeline capable of achieving this capacity. The construction of such a pipeline from the existing dams will again impact on the environment for many kilometers from the proposed site. An obvious solution is to ensure a desalination plant or a reverse osmosis plant is included in the construction requirements and so service the plant without impacting</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Infrastructure and services required for the power station would need to be provided by Eskom, in agreement with the relevant service providers (for construction and operation). Eskom will engage with the Local Authorities regarding accommodation requirements, and other infrastructure and services that may be required.</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>on local supplies.</p> <p>Having said that a concern still arises over the supply of potable water during construction and operation for workers, an unknown number, and the permanent staff of approximately 1500 who will maintain and operate the station. The construction of facilities for contract workers and the building of a small village for the Eskom employees will require a potable water system which does not currently exist in the area. This is a problem that residents in the area have struggled with over many years, relying on natural springs and ground water to compensate for inadequate pipe capacity. Which leads to sanitation.</p> <p>The nearest waterborne sewage system is in Humansdorp. For the rest of the area septic tanks, hold up tanks and pit toilets are the order of the day. The further pollution of the environment caused by the disposal of sewage into the ground by thousands of contract workers and Eskom employees and their families not to mention wastewater from the station would be untenable.</p> <p>Operational concerns: - The construction of Koeberg required the building of the Dynefontein village to house Eskom employees and their families due to its remoteness from urban areas. Over the years the urban sprawl of Greater Cape Town has ensured an active development of schools hospitals and services. The Eskom staff has changed and the majority of employees no longer live in close proximity to the station so ensuring a diverse culture developing.</p> <p>The possibility of this occurring in the Thuyspunt area is remote as the surrounds are either agricultural or holiday venues. This leads to a concern over the development and integration of the employees into the local community. Schooling is at a premium and medical facilities extremely limited. Well paid employees and their families not having the ability to socialise beyond the immediate confines of their homes can or will lead to anti social-behaviour. This in itself will drive a wedge through the community.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I fully support the proposal to construct a station at Thuyspunt.</p>	<p>Social integration is a subject that will be addressed in the Social Impact Assessment to be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p> <p>Issues related to water supply and sanitation will be dealt with by the Hydrological and Geohydrological Specialist Study (Section 10.6.5), the technical team and the EMP.</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
<p>Mr Rudiger Dahlhaeuser Interested Party</p>	<p>We strongly oppose Eskom's plans to construct the proposed Nuclear Power Plant in Oysterbay, Thyspunt. Since we are living near by in St. Francis Bay we will be affected by that plant.</p> <p>We do not want to live in an evacuation zone!</p> <p>The reasons of our opposition are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All pre-investigations of Eskom to identify this site as suitable for a Nuclear Power Plant are outdated. Especially in case of population figures but also concerning the danger of contamination by Radioactive Fallout into our main water resources of the Impofu Dam and the Churchill Dam. 2. Another issue that the PWR Reactor will dump in continuously hot/warm water into the sea. Nobody knows, at this stage, which influence this hot/warm water will have on our marine life. We do not know the influence on our chokka and fishing industry, which is located in the Port of St. Francis Bay and is relying on Exports! 3. Also the fact that there is only one escaping road leading out of Oysterbay makes the site not viable for the plant 4. The whole Kouga area is dependent on the Tourism Industry. <p>Therefore at least 90% of our foreign tourists will not come anymore. Beyond the foreign- and the South African property owners who can afford will move to elsewhere. (Incl. us)</p> <p>That will mean for the Kouga community an ecological disaster.</p> <p>Any Tourist and Holiday Maker like to enjoy the unique nature along our pristine coastline. Nobody wants to have a huge nuclear concrete monster near by, independent whether the NPS is regarded as safe or not. Further we feel that it is extremely unfair</p>	<p>Thank you for these comments.</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> <p>Potential affects on the marine environment and livelihood activities associated there with will be investigated in a Marine Assessment to be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p> <p>The EIA and nuclear licensing processes will determine the viability of each site.</p> <p>Potential impacts on tourism will be investigated in a Tourism Study as part of the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report). A Capacity Building and Awareness program is currently being rolled out to assist all members of the public to better understand nuclear power generation, waste management and the like.</p> <p>Comment noted with thanks. However, it should be noted that participation is not limited to public meetings. Indeed, there are many ways in which members of the public can participate in this EIA (outside of public meetings).</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>that roughly 90% of the citizen living in the Kouga area are not informed about Nuclear Power, its consequences and unsolved problems of final disposal and the necessary safety and emergency standards.</p> <p>Therefore we demand that independent consultants will hire international experts (not only Experts paid by the Nuclear Lobby) to inform the people about nuclear power, ionizing radiation, safety standards etc. so that everybody of them is able to make his own decision.</p> <p>That includes all our black colleagues and comrades living in the areas around the proposed NPS.</p> <p>Further we strongly recommend that a Public Hearings will be organized in St. Francis Bay and Cape St. Francis and not only in Humansdorp, Jeffreys Bay or Oysterbay.</p> <p>ACER Africa should take into consideration that many people do not have transport!</p>	
<p>Mr Chris Deysel National Port Authority (NPA)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I attended the participation meeting for the EIA on 11/06/2007 at Humansdorp, representing National Ports Authority (Lighthouse Services). A concern from our side is the distance (coast wise) from the proposed site (Thuyspunt) for the new power station to the Cape St. Francis Lighthouse, as the background lighting of the power station could have an impact on the Lighthouse as an aid to navigation in the area. 	<p>This matter will need to be addressed in the Visual Impact Assessment to be undertaken as part of the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</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 stress that our area namely St Francis Bay, Cape St. Francis and Sea Vista are in extreme close proximity to Thyspunt and are in the direct path of prevailing winds. Because of this it is of utmost importance that these particular residents be properly involved and educated in respect of this new development. 	<p>Thank you for this comment. The participation of all Interested & Affected Parties is encouraged for the duration of the EIA. Public meetings have been held in these areas.</p>
<p>Mr Ian Sinclair Fynn Marydale Properties</p>	<p>Please note that within the next 5 years the holiday population of St Francis Bay will reach 50,000 with only one exit road.</p>	<p>Thank you for these comments. They cover a wide variety of issues that will be taken into account in the specialist studies commissioned as part of the Impact</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>Scoping Phase: Thyspunt alternative</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In the context of the potential impacts of global warming on Planet Earth, the South African Government's intended move to nuclear-powered electrical generation is clearly necessary and accepted as such. ▪ However, the potential hazards and communal risks inherent in nuclear generation have led internationally to the establishment of related safety legislation. In this context the Thyspunt site, if selected, would become a stringently controlled Emergency Planning Zone (EPZ) established by the National Nuclear Regulator with the objective of facilitating swift and safe evacuation in the event of a nuclear accident. Population within any 30-degree sector and 16-kilometer radius of the nuclear installation would by law be limited to 10,000. The thriving town of St. Francis Bay, located 12 kilometers from Thyspunt, fits neatly into just such a sector, The implication, should the town's present population be less than 10,000, is that development would have to be limited or even, finally, prohibited. If, conversely, the population-already exceeds 10,000, there appears to be no way, short of physical demolition of property and infrastructure, or physical relocation of people, that Thyspunt could be a viable site in terms of the requirements of an Emergency Planning Zone. ▪ Apart from consideration of the viability or otherwise of Thyspunt as a nuclear site in terms of the country's legislation, the nature and the status of St. Francis Bay as a community within the geographically vast Kouga Municipality must be understood. St. Francis is essentially a residential / holiday and tourist centre, which has enjoyed and continues to enjoy tremendous growth and development since its foundation little over 50 years ago. Apart from its permanently located population the town houses a very large number of part-time residents, who own holiday homes which are occupied primarily during holiday periods, at which times large number of visiting friends and relatives are accommodated. The population in residence at any given time, therefore, is highly variable. Apart from this, there are large numbers of vacant, and highly valued plots already owned by investors who will in due course build 	<p>Assessment Phase of the EIA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Social Impact Assessment (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report) ▪ Emergency Response (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report). ▪ Marine Study, inclusive of potential effects on the fishing industry (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report). ▪ Macro-economic Impact Assessment (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report). ▪ Tourism Study (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report). <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> <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>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>homes on them and become residents. Black and coloured populations have kept pace.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In the municipal context it should be made known that whereas St. Francis Bay constitutes only approximately one third of one ward of a 10 –ward municipality, it is understood to contribute approximately one third of the total revenue of the Kouga Municipality. For this reason the financial repercussions of any event flowing from the findings of the EIA, which is unfavourable to St. Francis Bay, will go far beyond the confines of the Emergency Planning Zone. ▪ It should not be overlooked that the original identification of Thyspunt as a potential nuclear site, and its subsequent acquisition by ESKOM, took place in the early 1980's. It would be less than intelligent to assume that nothing has changed during the past quarter century. It is essential, therefore, that pre-conceived ideas should be carefully examined and that the current EIA process should be meticulously correctly, comprehensively and transparently carried out. ▪ The information set out in this preamble is intended to provide background to some of the more important issues, as set out and briefly discussed below, that warrant referral to the Scoping Process. <p>Issues requiring full examination by the Scoping Process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The viability of Thyspunt as a nuclear site in terms of the existing population of the affected (prospective) Emergency Planning Zone (EPZ), as related to the statutorily controlled maximum level. ▪ Bearing in mind the tremendous development which has taken place since Thyspunt was identified as a potential nuclear site, it is essential, as a definitive first step, to establish the validity or otherwise of the tacit assumption that, a quarter of a century later, Thyspunt remains a viable site. ▪ The most recent population census of the area concerned was during an "out of season " period of the year 2001 and is, furthermore, known to have been most ineptly and incompletely carried out. It would be wholly unacceptable as a basis for the projection of even the current permanently resident population. 	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>In any case, in a situation of involving nuclear safety there can be no ethical or practical alternative to planning for the worst normal situation, namely full holiday-time population. It is well known that resident head-counts at such times very substantially exceed 10,000. There is, however, no reliable existing documentary record of either maximum or minimum normal population levels. An accurate practical enumeration is essential before the legal viability of Thyspunt as a nuclear site can be determined.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Nuclear viability of Thyspunt in terms of adequacy of provision for emergency evacuation of residents. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It has already been demonstrated in an earlier EIA conducted in the late 1990's that the single access road serving the Emergency Planning Zone would be seriously inadequate in the event of a nuclear accident at Thyspunt whilst normal prevailing southwest wind was blowing. It has been estimated the nuclear fallout could reach St. Francis Bay within 10 minutes of a serious accident. This important aspect of the safety requirements for site viability should be re-addressed and assessed in the course of the current EIA exercise. ▪ The potential for nuclear contamination of Mpofu Dam and Catchment Area. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It should be recognised that the Mpofu dam at its nearest point is only approximately 10 kilometers from the Thyspunt site and that approximately 6 kilometers of its length falls within the 16 - kilometer radius of it. Bearing in mind that the dam provides a significant part of the water supply to Port Elizabeth as well as other smaller areas, the possibility of nuclear contamination in the event of an accident at Thyspunt merits serious attention in the course of the EIA process. ▪ The potentially adverse impact of a nuclear accident on Port St, Francis chokka industry <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The local chokka fishing industry based on the Port St. Francis harbour is a major contributor to the economy of the 	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>Kouga area, and depends for its catch on the coastal waters of this area. The proposed pressurised water reactor would draw large volumes of seawater for cooling purposes, which would be continuously recycled to the sea. The possibility of nuclear pollution of a section at least of the fishing area is thought to require serious examination, particularly bearing in mind the predominantly export nature of the chokka industry and its considerable financial value to the Kouga economy. Any factor detracting from its full viability would impact adversely on both the financial health of the area and employment within it. Contamination risk does not sell foods.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Some potential impacts of a decision to proceed with installation of a NPS at Thyspunt in association with the imposition of development limitation to meet the statutory requirements of an EPZ. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Bearing in mind that accurate and realistic determination of the population of the EPZ might well demonstrate that in terms of current nuclear safety regulations Thyspunt can no longer be regarded as a viable site for nuclear generation, the many unpalatable consequences of limitation of development could possibly be avoided. ○ However, should a decision be reached to proceed with the project, the St. Francis Bay community, and with it the Kouga community overall in certain aspects, would be faced with many intractable problems and issues flowing from development limitation or prohibition. It is to be hoped, first, that, should the existing population exceed the statutory limit, the relevant authorities would not resort to active physical disinvestment to bring it within bounds! ▪ Impact on undeveloped real estate and ongoing development projects. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There are, within the EPZ, numerous undeveloped residential plots and ongoing development, which, from the perspective of population restriction, represent potential incremental population. They also represent existing legal 	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>rights to develop, to which, furthermore, specific financial values can be attached. Apart from consideration of the status of such incremental population in the context of nuclear safety legislation, the current EIA must surely address the situation in terms of the consequences, legal, financial and / or otherwise of interference with these rights.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Impact on existing development Real Estate <p>The appreciation of property values in the St. Francis Bay area over the years has been phenomenal. It has flowed largely from the town's status as a leading residential, vacational and tourism centre, and as such has attracted much related attention as a centre for property investment. Limitation of development on grounds of the danger of nuclear disaster would be unlikely to promote further normal appreciation. This issue too, is recommended to full and transparent examination by the EIA process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Potential impact on regional tourist trade. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ As a leading South African coastal resort St. Francis Bay attracts considerable tourist activity, both local and foreign, which makes a significant contribution to the economy of Kouga area. During past years it has shown comparable growth to that of the general community; it has, indeed, been a prime factor under-pinning that growth. In common with property investors, tourists with wealth of alternative destinations available could well fail to be attracted by a resort where development was restricted due to the risk of nuclear accident. This, or any other factor that might adversely influence tourism could impact seriously on both tourist revenue and the level of black and coloured employment. Here again the serious attention of the EIA process is warranted. ▪ Overall potential impact on black and coloured employment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ It is common knowledge that there is serious unemployment among the black and coloured residents of St. Francis Bay, accentuated by the extensive and growing 	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>squatter population. The population explosion of the past few years has resulted from mistaken concepts of the amount of work available. Apart from its as yet unmeasured incremental contribution to the population of the area. It is self-evident that any factor which limits the economic activity of St. Francis Bay would add to the unemployment problem, along with its many unwelcome associated social repercussions.</p>	
<p>Mrs S J Hardie St. Francis Conservancy</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ More presentation and information St. Francis Bay, Sea Vista and other townships, which could be affected. ▪ Wind direction ▪ Kromme Trust, St. Francis Conservancy and all other environmental organisations must be represented at all meetings. 	<p>Contact details have been added to the project database.</p> <p>Potential visual effects and those of prevailing winds will be addressed in the Visual Impact Assessment and Climate Study to be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p>
<p>Mrs Shiela A Harvey Beckett B&B</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increase in population density since previous survey. ▪ We need a power station at Thyspunt to complete EHV ring from Cape Town to P.E. to ensure alternative supply to St. Francis Bay. 	<p>Comment noted with thanks.</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>
<p>Mr Anthony John Moore Greater St. Francis Bay Community Police Forum (GSFB CPF)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The GSFB CPF has for the past 8 years been trying to get the local SAPS Station in SFB upgraded from a satellite Station of Humansdorp to a fully fledged independent Station with appropriate new facilities (including Holding Cells). Progress on this issue has been slow, but it appears that at last things are moving. The GSFB CPF Executive Committee would not like to see the above negatively affected by the possible developments at Thyspunt, where obviously with the influx of the required labour, the attendant crime rise would necessitate a SAPS local presence at this site. 2. In line with the comments / questions raised at the meeting held in Humansdorp on Mon., 11th June at 15h00, the following elements need to be addressed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The definitive radius within which development is precluded (16km / 2km?) 	<p>Safety and security aspects will be discussed in the Social Impact Assessment and Climate Study to be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</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
	<p>There is a desperate need to build a new Primary School in SFB for predominantly previously disadvantaged children, and thus the siting at Thyspunt could militate against this project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Why have other suitable sites in the relatively unpopulated areas of the Transkei coast not been investigated? 	<p>The whole South African coastline was investigated as part of the original Nuclear Site Investigation Programme (NSIP). Criteria, such as demography (existing population densities), ecological sensitivity, geology (rolling dunes and unconsolidated sands are, even with high engineering solutions, not suitable for a Nuclear Power Station due to their geological instability), the characteristics of the coastal area and the tides and wave action and seismicity, amongst others, were taken into account in determining the potential suitability of sites.</p> <p>The EIA will validate the findings of the previous site selection studies (NSIP), within the current social, biophysical and economic context, including the reasons why other potential sites in the area were deemed to be less or unsuitable.</p>
<p>Cllr Elza Van Lingen Cape St. Francis Civic Association</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Thyspunt is closer to Oyster Bay. 	<p>Comment noted with thanks.</p>
<p>Tim Briscoe</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Please register my objection to the considered Thyspunt Nuclear facility. 	<p>Your comment has been noted.</p>
<p>Mr Byron Andrews</p>	<p>Milk and water are produced in huge quantities in this area (Oyster Bay) The Western Cape is barren and the water colder to cool the nuclear reactor</p>	<p>Potential effects on agricultural production will be investigated in the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA via an Agricultural Study (see Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p> <p>Marine Ecology Specialist Studies (see Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report) will be conducted, and will include an assessment of the impact of seawater temperatures.</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
<p>Mr Richard Arderne Pam Golding Properties</p>	<p>Thanks, look forward to hearing when you will be having a public meeting in St. Francis Bay. Can you let me know? I am concerned that property values will drop. Can't you consider Coega?</p>	<p>Up to the present, 25 public meetings have been held for the EIA; including in Cape St Francis. 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> <p>Property values will be investigated as part of the Macro-economic Assessment to be commissioned as part of the impact assessment (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p> <p>Coega is not a site currently under consideration, as it was not identified in the Nuclear Site Investigation Programme (NSIP) as being suitable for the construction of a NPS.</p> <p>The whole South African coastline was investigated as part of the original Nuclear Site Investigation Programme (NSIP). Criteria, such as demography (existing population densities), ecological sensitivity, geology (rolling dunes and unconsolidated sands are, even with high engineering solutions, not suitable for a Nuclear Power Station due to their geological instability), the characteristics of the coastal area and the tides and wave action and seismicity, amongst others, were taken into account in determining the potential suitability of sites.</p> <p>The EIA will validate the findings of the previous site selection studies (NSIP), within the current social, biophysical and economic context, including the reasons why other potential sites in the area were deemed to be less or unsuitable.</p>
<p>Mr Nick Bornman Oysterbay Beach Lodge</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Access road to Thyspunt (during construction) ▪ Use by tourists of walking trail along coastline towards Thyspunt. ▪ Safety of inhabitants at Oysterbay. 	<p>These matters will be addressed in the Traffic, and Tourism Assessments respectively to be commissioned as part of the impact assessment (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
		<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. 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 Kenneth Carter</p>	<p>Oysterbay Area</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Access to the area will obviously be restricted. Will this mean that walks along that part of the shore line as well as fishing and casual diving will be stopped? 2. From which point on the Oysterbay side will it be restricted? 3. What will be the effect on the marine life in the area? 4. Will access to the construction site be through Oysterbay? 5. Where will the construction team be housed, and for how long? 6. What impact will this project have on the values of the Oyster Bay properties? 7. What is the accepted distance a community has to be from reactor? 8. Has the type of nuclear plant that is to be built been proved as successful? 9. If the plant is going to be used to generate power mainly to assist the new harbour development program in P.E., then why is the project not put closer to the new harbour? 10. There are long stretches of coastline closer to PE that will not “shadow” communities. <p>As an Oysterbay house owner I am concerned about the negative effects this project will have on the area, not only during the construction phase but the long-term effects of a nuclear plant being on our doorstep.</p>	<p>The two technologies currently under consideration are proven technologies (Section 8.5 of the Scoping Report).</p> <p>In terms of the various issues raised, these will be investigated within a suite of specialist studies to be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA (Section 10.6 of the Scoping Report).</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
<p>Lianda Beyers Cronje Bantamsklip Anti-Nuclear Group (BANG)</p>	<p>I refer to our conversation this morning, 2 July with regard to the creation of a group that is against the erection of the proposed Eskom NPS at Bantamsklip near Pearly Beach.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The group is called Bantamsklip Anti-Nuclear Group (BANG). ▪ Mr Michael Deurr said residents who attended the meetings held in Gansbaai, Pearly Beach and Elim did not really received answers to pertinent questions. ▪ The group claim among other that the expected investment for the proposed 4000MW will reach R100 million and over for the plant alone. Additional costs for building and upgrading additional transmission lines as well as the distribution network can add another 50 per cent to this estimated cost – if plans go according to schedule. 	<p>Thank you for your comments.</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.</p> <p>Eskom has not initiated discussions with the vendors and therefore is not in a position to provide information relating to the cost of the proposed plant.</p>
<p>Mrs Patricia Honey</p>	<p>Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA: 12/12/20/944) for the proposed NPS and associated infrastructure Scoping Phase: Thyspunt alternative</p> <p>Preamble</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The potential hazards and communal risks inherent in nuclear generation have led internationally to the establishment of related safety legislation. In this context the Thyspunt site, if selected, would become a stringently controlled Emergency Planning Zone (EPZ) established by the National Nuclear Regulator with the objective of facilitating swift and safe evacuation in the event of a nuclear accident. Population within any 30-degree sector and 16 kilometer radius of the nuclear installation would by law be limited to 10,000. 2. The thriving town of St Francis Bay, located 12 kilometers from Thyspunt, fits neatly into just such a sector. If the population exceeds 10,000, there appears to be no way, short of physical 	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>These issues, where applicable, will be addressed in the impact assessment phase of the EIA through a number of specialist studies, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social Impact Assessment (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report). • Emergency Response (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report). • Marine Study, inclusive of potential effects on the fishing industry (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report). • Agricultural Capability Study (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report). • Social and Macro-economic Impact Assessments (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report)

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>demolition of property and infrastructure, or physical relocation of people, that Thyspunt could be a viable site in terms of the requirements of an Emergency Planning Zone.</p> <p>3. Apart from consideration of the viability or otherwise of Thyspunt as a nuclear site in terms of the country's legislation, the nature and status of St. Francis Bay as a community within the geographically vast Kouga Municipality must be understood. St. Francis is essentially an up-market residential, holiday and tourist centre, which has enjoyed and continues to enjoy tremendous growth and development since its foundation little over 50 years ago. Apart from its permanent population the town has a very large number of owners who own holiday homes which are occupied primarily during holiday periods, at which times large numbers of visiting friends and relatives are accommodated. The population in residence at any given time, therefore, is highly variable and in the December holiday period exceeds 30 000. Apart from this, there are large numbers of vacant, and highly valued plots already owned by investors who will in due course build homes on them and become permanent residents or add to the holiday population.</p> <p>4. The Black and Coloured populations have kept pace with the explosion of development over the last few years in the formal sector, and this permanent population in the Sea Vista area presently stands at 5000 to 6000.</p> <p>5. In the municipal context it should be understood that whereas St. Francis Bay constitutes only approximately one third of one ward of a 10-ward municipality, it contributes approximately one third of the total revenue of the Kouga Municipality. For this reason the negative financial repercussions that can result from the findings of the EIA, leading to the construction of a Nuclear power station, will go far beyond the confines of the Emergency Planning Zone, and can dramatically influence the income of the Kouga Municipality.</p> <p>6. It should not be overlooked that the original identification of Thyspunt as a potential nuclear site, and its acquisition by ESCOM took place in the early 1980's. It would be less than responsible to assume that nothing has changed during the past quarter century. It is essential, therefore, that pre-conceived ideas should be put aside and that the current EIA</p>	<p>(Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tourism Study (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report). <p>Section 10.6 of the Scoping Report provides a comprehensive description of the suite of specialist studies that will be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA.</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>process should be meticulously, correctly, comprehensively and transparently carried out anew.</p> <p>7. The foregoing information is intended to provide background information to some of the more important issues discussed below, and are relevant to the Scoping Process.</p> <p>Issues requiring full examination by the Scoping Process</p> <p>1. THE VIABILITY OF THYSPUNT AS A NUCLEAR SITE IN TERMS OF THE EXISTING POPULATION OF THE AFFECTED (PROSPECTIVE) EMERGENCY PLANNING ZONE IN RELATION TO THE STANDARDS AND LIMITATIONS SET BY LEGISLATION.</p> <p>Bearing in mind the tremendous development which has taken place since Thyspunt was identified initially as a potential nuclear site, it is essential, as a definitive first step, to establish the validity or otherwise of the tacit assumption that, a quarter of a century later, Thyspunt remains a viable site. It is our contention that the population in the area exceeds by far the limitations laid down by law, as follows:</p> <p>a. During the holiday period in December the population in St Francis Bay exceeds 20 000. The population in Cape St Francis during this period will be more than 10 000. This does not take into account the number of people in the surrounding environs along the Kromme River and adjacent developed areas. This probably adds up to as many as a total of 35 000 people in the area considered in terms of legislation to be affected, within the area bound by the 16 km, 30 degree sector limitation.</p> <p>b. From the number of registered stands in the area and the rights of owners to develop those properties not yet developed, if one assumes an average occupation number of 4 people per property, the sum total right to occupation of all property already registered and proclaimed will exceed the determinant cut-off number of 10 000 in any case.</p>	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>2. NUCLEAR VIABILITY OF THYSPUNT IN TERMS OF ADEQUACY OF PROVISION FOR EMERGENCY EVACUATION OF RESIDENTS. It has already been demonstrated in an earlier EIA conducted in the late 1990's that the single access road serving the Emergency Planning Zone would be seriously inadequate in the event of a nuclear accident at Thyspunt whilst a normal prevailing southwest wind was blowing. It has been estimated that nuclear fallout could reach St. Francis Bay within 10 minutes of a serious accident. This important aspect of the safety requirements for site viability should be re-addressed and assessed in the course of the current EIA exercise.</p> <p>3. THE POTENTIAL FOR NUCLEAR CONTAMINATION OF THE MPOFU DAM AND CATCHMENT AREA. The Mpofu dam at its nearest point is approximately 6 kilometers from the Thyspunt site and approximately 6 kilometers of its length falls within the 16-kilometer radius. Furthermore the dam is situated such that a South East wind will carry any contamination directly from Thyspunt to the dam. Bearing in mind that the dam is the major source of Potable Water Supply (treated at the water works at the Mpofu Dam) to most of the Cacadu District near the coast, including Port Elizabeth, Uitenhage, Jeffreys Bay, Humansdorp and every small consumer in between as well, the possibility of nuclear contamination in the event of an accident at Thyspunt merits serious attention in the course of the EIA process and must include the fact that such contamination of the Dams (Churchill and Mpofu as well as the catchment's area) for all practical purposes will be irreversible and would leave the area without a water supply permanently.</p> <p>4. THE POTENTIALLY ADVERSE IMPACT OF A NUCLEAR ACCIDENT ON THE PORT ST. FRANCIS CHOKKA INDUSTRY. The local Chokka Fishing Industry based at the Port St. Francis harbour is a major contributor to the economy of the Kouga</p>	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>area, and depends for its catch on the coastal waters of this area. The proposed pressurized water reactor would draw large volumes of seawater for cooling purposes, which would be continuously recycled to the sea. The possibility of nuclear pollution of the fishing area must be given serious consideration, particularly bearing in mind the predominantly export nature of the Chokka Industry and its considerable financial value to the Kouga economy. Any factor detracting from its full viability would impact adversely on both the financial health of the area and employment within it. Even in the event of no provable contamination of the sea the effect of perceptions of the overseas buyers concerning the Products can lead to serious adverse loss of market share in a market that is extremely quality-conscious.</p> <p>5. THE POTENTIAL NEGATIVE EFFECTS ON THE DAIRY INDUSTRY IN THE KOUGA AREA.</p> <p>This industry is a major player and National Supplier of Dairy Produce in our area and is subject to the same risks as the Chokka Industry.</p> <p>6. IMPACTS OF A DECISION TO PROCEED WITH INSTALLATION OF A NUCLEAR POWER STATION AT THYSPUNT IN ASSOCIATION WITH THE IMPOSITION OF DEVELOPMENT LIMITATION TO MEET THE STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS OF AN EMERGENCY PLANNING ZONE.</p> <p>Should a decision be reached to proceed with the project, the St. Francis Bay community, and with it the Kouga Community overall would effectively be stopped from achieving its full potential in regard to development of its main strength, being the Tourism Industry, both from the perspective of further Real Estate development being blocked and as a result of this, added to the negative perceptions about the Area as a prime Holiday Destination, be faced with job losses and many other negatives.</p> <p>7. IMPACT ON UNDEVELOPED REAL ESTATE AND ONGOING DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.</p> <p>There are, within the Emergency Planning Zone, numerous</p>	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>undeveloped residential plots and ongoing developments which, from the perspective of population restriction following the construction of a Nuclear Facility, and thus building of further housing development, represent huge job loss-potential in the Construction Industry, presently one of the major employers in our area.</p> <p>8. IMPACT ON EXISTING DEVELOPED REAL ESTATE The appreciation of property values in the St. Francis Bay area over the years has been phenomenal. It has flowed largely from the town's status as a leading residential, prime holiday and tourism centre, and as such has attracted huge property investment. With the construction of a nuclear power plant the possibility of a disaster, however unlikely, is guaranteed to severely limit any further normal appreciation and will most likely lead to depreciation of property values. This issue too, must be subject to full and transparent examination by the EIA process.</p> <p>9. IMPACT ON REGIONAL TOURIST TRADE. As a leading South African coastal resort St. Francis Bay attracts considerable tourist activity, both local and foreign, which makes a significant contribution to the economy of the Kouga area. In common with property investors, tourists with a wealth of alternative destinations available will fail to be attracted by a resort where the perception of risk of a nuclear accident exists. This or any other factor that will adversely influence tourism will impact seriously on both tourist revenue and the level of employment in a number of areas of activity. Here again the serious attention of the EIA process is warrant.</p> <p>10. OTHER FACTORS ROUTINELY REQUIRING SERIOUS CONSIDERATION IN ANY EIA PROCESS RELATING TO AN APPLICATION OF NUCLEAR POWER. 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 the important subject of emergency regulations. We fully trust that these matters will be considered in the normal procedures of the EIA process.</p>	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Patricia Honey	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ When the first studies were done by Eskom in the 1980's to identify sites and Thyspunt was selected as a possible site, South Africa had as yet not experienced the level of demigration that it has now. These coastal towns are no longer only holiday resorts but thriving and growing communities. The area called Sea Vista which lies between Cape St Francis and St Francis Bay now has an informal settlement with a population of what is estimated to be over 2500 people. Surely these factors alone would necessitate sites that were studied in the 1980's to be invalid in present time? ▪ Do you know if the figure that the farming area within a 50km radius of Thyspunt supplies 30% of the milk production of South Africa, is true? 	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>These issues, where applicable, will be taken into account in the impact assessment phase of the EIA.</p> <p>The milk supply figure will be verified within the Agricultural Assessment that is to be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p>
Dr Francois Maritz	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Protection of the area against the nuclear power station. If one should be built there, it would be strongly opposed. ▪ Please let me know what you plan to do in this regard. I will then be able to respond. 	<p>Thank you for this comment.</p> <p>All Interested and Affected Parties will be kept informed throughout the process of the status of the EIA.</p>
James (Jim) Michael Pattison	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Whether the factors which identified Thyspunt as a suitable nuclear station site (probably for PBR technology) approximately 20 years ago are valid in the light of 20 years of development in the Eastern Cape and S Africa. 	<p>The EIA will validate the findings of the previous site selection studies (NSIP), within the current social, biophysical and economic context, including the reasons why other potential sites in the area were deemed to be less or unsuitable.</p>
Andrew and Jacqueline Reynolds	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I am the owner of a home in 7 De Jonge Thomas Laan, Cape St Francis, and would like to register my opposition to the proposed nuclear power station at Thyspunt, due to its proximity to the residential towns in the area and the negative impact it would have on the property market, as well as the local economy. 	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>The potential impact on the property market and the local economy 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>
Alexandra Royal SRK Consulting	<p>Regarding the proposed nuclear power plant at Thyspunt, I would like to express my concern and reinforce certain issues.</p> <p>An environmental issue that is of great concern in my experience is the potential dust generation that may occur if the proposed nuclear power station is to go ahead. Sources may include the unpaved and paved road network within and around the site boundary and</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p> <p>These issues, where applicable, will be addressed in the impact assessment phase of the EIA.</p> <p>Dust will be addressed in the Air Quality, Traffic and Geotechnical Assessments that will be commissioned as part of the impact assessment (Section 10.6.5 of the</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>construction and operational activities. In terms of the construction phase, a significant source of dust / sand will be the 31 hectare sand dune that is to be removed. Besides this action being environmentally unsound, where will this sand be moved to? If it is stockpiled, it may create a temporary exposed dust source, which will generate large quantities of dust. These sources have the potential to emit substantially large quantities of dust, compounded by the high wind speeds experienced in this area, which will increase the erosion probability. This may cause dust to impact on the surrounding residential areas of Oyster Bay, St. Francis Bay, Cape St. Francis and the more informal residential areas, including Sea Vista. The larger dust particles may cause an aesthetic impact, whereby dust may collect on houses and other structures. This may be a major concern in St Francis Bay where the houses are painted white, which will cause the dust to show up.</p> <p>Also, if iron oxide is present in the dust particles, the white houses may stain red. Even though aesthetics may be a potential problem, the health impacts, resulting from finer particles, would be of much greater concern. Respiratory illness would be a huge problem. If the particles contain certain metals, long-term chronic diseases such as cancer may be a major concern in the future. These issues must be carefully scrutinised as it is bound to reduce the influx of tourists, which is a main source of income for the majority of the residents. The dust generation and associated potential health effects would cause a decrease in the property prices, which would be devastating to all the residents concerned.</p> <p>Has this issue of dust generation been addressed? If so, is baseline dust monitoring an option? Will the dust / sand be tested for metals and other contaminants? Is an air pollution model going to be conducted to predicted / estimate potential impacts? During operation, what are the potential pollutants that will be released into</p>	<p>Scoping Report).</p> <p>Health aspects will be addressed in a Health Impact Assessment to be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p> <p>Social and economic aspects will be addressed via a Social Impact and Economic Impact Assessment as part of the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report)</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	<p>the environment?</p> <p>In terms of environmental health, what are the health implications of building a nuclear power facility at such close proximity to thriving residential areas, which are growing exponentially? This is my major concern – What are the long-term health effects of living close to a nuclear power plant?</p> <p>The environmental and social issues are endless and completely outweigh the economic benefits that may result due to the development. The environment and the community cannot be subjected to unjust, immoral actions. We have seen the economic aspect win and reign over the environment and society time and time again, and then we ask ourselves why global warming and environmental disasters are occurring all over the world. This is exactly the reason – Money and greed!!! It's time for the environment and the people to be the number one priority!</p>	
Dr Ernst Bonnet	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Impact on community – influx of unskilled labourers 2. Impact on nature / sea life especially 3. Proof that Cape St Francis / Oyster Bay area is the ideal 1st choice of place for the power station 	<p>These issues 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>Should a particular alternative site be found to be the preferred site, the EIA Team would need to demonstrate the evidence for this resulting from the many different specialist studies being undertaken.</p>
Mrs Margaret Vena Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape	<p>Think carefully about the consequences. Look at the livestock and plants that will die.</p> <p>If you care about our children and us, please keep the danger away from us.</p>	<p>Thank you for these comments.</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 of the Scoping Report).</p>
Miss Anna Vena Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape	<p>It seems you want to get rid of us.</p>	<p>Eskom will not construct and operate a nuclear power station if it is not safe.</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	
Miss Theresa Harris Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape	The dangers/risks of the project must be dealt with. I hear that there will be problems for our community, such as people who will become blind and children who will be disabled.	<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 acceptable low.</p> <p>Everybody is exposed to natural background radiation everyday from, for example, the earth itself, the materials from which buildings are constructed, the sun, and on a less regular basis from medical exposures (X-rays). Due to the fact that radioactivity decreases with time, and that radioactivity is a natural phenomenon, life itself has evolved over time continuously exposed to much higher background levels of natural radioactivity and its associated radiation.</p> <p>The quantity of radiation exposure and what is absorbed by the body is measured in microSieverts (μSv) per annum. The National Nuclear Regulator (NNR) sets the limit of exposure arising from operations at nuclear installations.</p> <p>Using Koeberg power station as an example: The limit for Koeberg is set at 250 μSv per annum, far below the exposure from natural background radiation (which is about 2500 – 3000 μSv per annum), and less than the international standard of 1000 μSv per annum. Koeberg has been in operation for over 23 years - the public exposure to radiation as a result of Koeberg's operations has been less than 20 μSv per annum in general and less than 6 μSv per annum in 2005/6 – reference NNR Annual Report 2005/6 tabled in Parliament – available off the NNR website www.nnr.co.za, far below the limit set by the NNR.</p>	
Mr Marlon Jantjies Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape	The wind that will blow the gas our way Rather leave it, we are managing without nuclear power.		
Miss Leann du Plessis Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape	How long will it take to get away if danger comes from it? It seems as if we will have to leave St Francis soon after your nuclear power has been built.		
Mr Mthobeli Nkaayi Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape	We just say no. Our lives are very important. Look for another town. Our children's education is better [more important] than everything else.		
Miss Jennifer Louw Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape	We say no. Our lives are very important en we do not want our air to be polluted. We want the school. It is very important.		
Mrs Lea Saaiman Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape	We are sickly as it is in our little town so we do not want more ailments to torment us further. We want a school for our children who are the most important because they are the leaders of tomorrow.		
Mr Anthony Christo Quincy Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape	I do not second what is planned to happen. What do you think about our children's future?		

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Mrs Angelina Quincy Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape	Our lives are in danger. What do you think can't you do something. Because there are too may illnesses. Can't you make a difference? Have money for us so that we can move to another place. We do not work. We are too ill to live. Help us so that we do not die.	<p>www.nnr.co.za), far below the limit set by the NNR.</p> <p>The world's longest established nuclear power programme is that of the UK, and the UK Committee on Medical Aspects of Radiation in the Environment (COMARE) in their 11th report (2006) on "The distribution of childhood leukaemia and other childhood cancers in Great Britain 1969–1993." stated in section 5.3 that "We can, therefore, say quite categorically that there is no evidence from this very large study that living within 25 km of a nuclear generating site within Britain is associated with an increased risk of childhood cancer." This study analysed all the childhood cancer deaths in UK over a 25 year period, and is the largest study of its type done to date.</p>
Miss Julia Meintjies Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape	We are tired of being ill in this place and having ailments because every week we bury people. And I have a baby of four months who must still live for a long time. Our children need an education and want the school.	
Miss Sharon Munnik Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape	There is too much T.B. here – so we say no. Our children need health. We want the school. The school must be built because it is very important.	
Miss Rebecca Pietersen Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape	Our children will get cancer. We want our children to go to school in St Francis. Look for another town because we need the school.	
Mrs Angelina Thinner Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape	How much time do my family and I have to get out if any danger escapes? Is it really necessary to place us and our descendants in danger?	
Mr Christo Joseph Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape	Nature conservation and the fishing industry Please consider solar panels and wind power.	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>These issues will be addressed within a suite of</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Mr Pieter Thinner Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape	Our children's future and even our fishing industry. Wouldn't you like to consider a system of wind-generated electricity?	<p>specialist studies to be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA (Section 10.6 of the Scoping Report).</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.</p> <p>Specifically for Wind energy: An EIA is currently in progress for a wind energy facility of 100 MW on the West Coast of South Africa (near Vredendal). Wind energy is an important complement to other forms of electricity generation. Since the wind does not blow continuously, and, apart from pumped storage schemes (which use more electricity than what they produce), large scale storage of electricity is not yet possible, wind energy cannot be relied upon for neither base load nor peaking or emergency electricity generation.</p>
Mrs Dora Roberts Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape	We are ill already. Why do you want to come and kill us? I still want a good life with my children and grandchildren.	Thank you for these comments. A health risk assessment will be undertaken during the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA in order to assess any potential impacts of the proposed NPS.
Mr John Roberts Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape	I am already under treatment. What will happen if you bring even more illnesses? I have a big family who must be able to have a better life than me.	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Miss Lungelwa Mahijana Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape	What do you think of our children's lives and education? We need the school and it is therefore very important.	
Mr Nkosinathi Mdlele Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape	I am very dissatisfied with your plans which will en our children's lives. I still want to see them live well and get an education.	
Mr Daniel Munnik Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape	There are too illnesses in our town. We do not want more illnesses. Our lives are in danger. What about our children's education? "We want the school." "Find yourselves another town."	
Miss Louisa Cuthbert Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape	We are very tired of illnesses. We do not [want] any more that will cause us to bury [someone] every day. Thank you. We want a school for our children. St Francis is the only town without a school.	
Mrs Esmeralda Coerat Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape	I will never allow it for the power. My children's lives will be very much endangered. We already suffer so much from illness; how much more if the power comes. No thank you. There is too much illness in our country from which our children suffer. Look for another town.	
Mrs A. Serina Tallies Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape	We already have many illnesses in this town. Look for another town. My children struggle to learn now. I have already heard that a new school has t be built so we really need it.	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Mr April Sam Tallies Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape	I have lost many of my family so is that enough? Look for another town. I just need the school for my children.	
Mrs Edith Micheals Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape	There are many people in this place but more than half of them are ill. Just look for another place. The children's education is very important. We just need the school here.	
Mr Hashwell Marney Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape	There is too much illness here already and I have already lost many family members. I [do not want to] lose more family through illness. Where must our children learn if you take our schools away?	
Miss Geraldine Michaels Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape	I am already tired of illnesses. Look for another town. My children also need an education so the school must be built.	
Mr Piet Mtana Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape	I have a lot of diseases now. Do you want to kill me? I am a fisher too. I want to work there. Go look for anther town for the power station. Not here.	
Miss Vanessa Arries Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape	We are very tired of illnesses, because the clinic cannot help us with illnesses. We really need the school because our children must learn. It is very important after all.	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Miss Joleen Rossouw Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape	I am pregnant and do not want my child to be born into illness. So the illnesses must be stopped. And our school is very important and you cannot take our school away.	
Mr Edwid Bhamdi Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape	I still need my work as a fisherman. I just need the school for my children for a better life.	Thank you for these comments. Potential effects on fishing will be investigated in a Marine Assessment that will be undertaken as part of the impact assessment (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).
Miss Mara de Bruin Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape	I have lost many of my family from many illnesses so I do not want more illnesses here. I have children [who] need an education; therefore [the school] is very important.	Thank you for these comments. A health risk assessment will be undertaken during the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA in order to assess any potential impacts of the proposed NPS.
Miss Sylvia Solo Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape	We want the nuclear power. Look for another town. Our children need as school for a better life.	
Mrs Audrey Goeda Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape	Up to now we have enough illnesses here. Just look for another town. A school building for our children because St Francis Bay is the only place that does not have [a] school.	
Mr Daniel Goeda Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape	I have already lost many of my family. Look for another town. I do not have money to send my children to school far away. St Francis Bay must have a school.	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Mr Japhta Smit Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape	We have too many ailments in this place. We want to get rid of them. I am looking for a better life for the children for illness.	
Mr Wentzel Leander Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape	In the year we bury many of my family and I myself am not well now. Look for another town. I have very small children who must go to school, so the school is very important.	
Miss Sina Leander Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape	I have lost my child [two months ago / at two months] so this is enough now. I just need the school for my children right here in St Francis Bay.	
Miss Annalea Leander Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape	I just need a better and more healthy life for myself. That is why I say look for another town. What about my children's education if you prevent the school that has never been here?	
Mr Derick George Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape	The illnesses that the nuclear power will bring on. The school must please be built.	
Mr Abednego Goeda Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape	My reason is that St Francis Bay is a lovely place for all of us. I do not agree with what you plan to do. The reason is that we have children who are very small and pick up an illness easily. My family is not happy and refuse to accept what you are planning. I, Abednego, feel that it is wrong, because my family already has cancer. You now want them to die quickly.	Thank you for this comment. A health risk assessment will be undertaken during the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA in order to assess any potential impacts of the proposed NPS.

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
<p>Mrs Dina Goeda Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape</p>	<p>I do not agree at all with what you want to do. Why don't you choose another place? St Francis Bay is our place and we like it the way it is. You can think for yourselves that it will not work. Sorry, but I do not agree.</p> <p>I expect our children to make progress. Because everything is expensive the [illegible] bus is a lot, and we cannot afford it.</p>	<p>Thank you for these comments.</p> <p>A health risk assessment will be undertaken during the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA in order to assess any potential impacts of the proposed NPS.</p> <p>Thank you for this comment.</p>
<p>Mr Johnathan Hendricks Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape</p>	<p>I have no child. I do not want this thing here. I also expect a child who is healthy. We do not want [?] the nuclear reactor. What do you think of our lives?</p>	<p>Potential effects on fishing will be investigated in a Marine Assessment. Social and economic assessments that be undertaken as part of the impact assessment (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).</p>
<p>Ms Katie Xayimpi Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape</p>	<p>I do not agree with this at all. I think the fresh air from the sea is very good for our children and us. We do not want other oxygen's [gases] that will disturb our atmosphere.</p> <p>I enjoy excellent health at the moment. But [look for] another place where you can make your gas business.</p> <p>Nobody will ever agree to this. Think of our health, people, please. Thank you.</p>	
<p>Ms Violet Du Plooy Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape</p>	<p>No. No to the proposed nuclear power station.</p>	
<p>Mrs Magreth Hendricks Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape</p>	<p>We have buried many people who have died from cancer. We do not want more illnesses than what we already have. Look for another town for nuclear power.</p> <p>What we need here is a school. Many children suffer who do not go to school.</p>	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
<p>Ms Elma Hendricks Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape</p>	<p>Cancer and T.B. is already common here, so we do [not] want more diseases. Do you want to kill us? Go build your station in another town. I have children, so a school has to be built.</p>	
<p>Ms Veronica Links Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape</p>	<p>We already have too many illnesses here and do not want [expect] more illnesses. Many people have T.B. and cancer. Do you want to kill us then? We still need our lives and children too.</p>	
<p>Mr Abraham Hendricks Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape</p>	<p>Our fishermen still need work. We are in and out of hospital; we do not want more illnesses. My children still need more education, so I want the school.</p>	
<p>Mrs Ntombizodwa Vena Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape</p>	<p>There are 75% of diseases here in South Africa we do not need more. Education for our children is more important, we need schools in this place.</p>	
<p>Mr Williem Madume Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape</p>	<p>If this power station is being built here, what is going to happen to the work I do at sea. What are our children going to eat? Where will we get other jobs, we work there and don't need anything more. Education is important for our children because it is their future. We do not want a Nuclear Power Station.</p>	
<p>Mrs Nandipha Makhasi Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape</p>	<p>I am opposed to this because I have got asthma and many people are sick around here. We want schools because we do not want our children to travel far for their education.</p>	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Miss Phumeza Mavakala Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape	The reason we do not want this, is because it will bring diseases to all people. What we need is schools because education is more important for our children.	
Miss Nomthandazo Sotafile Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape	We do not want it, there are too many diseases around, TB etc. it is not good for the health of our children. The only thing we need is a school. Our children are struggling because there is no school.	
Miss Zoliswa Mtsolo Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape	The reason we are opposed to this, is that we bury people each and every day because of too many diseases. School is the only important thing and it should be closer.	
Miss Nomhlobo Ndesi Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape	The reason we do not want this is that we bury people each and everyday. There is lot of diseases. School is the most important thing and it should be nearer because we do not have money to send children to Humansdorp.	
Mr Sintu Dlokolo Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape	We are opposed to it. End of the story. Too many diseases. Fishermen's jobs must be kept. We need to fish.	
Mr Nkululeko Ndabangaye Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape	We do not need diseases, we are already sick around here. Education is the most important thing for our children.	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Mr Nceba Sgam Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape	No. Need school.	
Mr Joseph Madlala Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape	Look for another town, which is far away from people so that we do not become victims of the proposed Nuclear Power Station. We need a brighter future, a clinic and a shopping mall.	
Mrs Nosandile Yiweni Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape	Look for another town we have so much diseases, such as diseases from fiberglass. Now we suffer from dust. We need a school for the future of our children.	
Miss Bongeka Yiweni Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape	We bury people daily because of TB and Cancer. The chemicals you want to bring to our area cause diseases. We need a school in this place where you want to build a Nuclear Power Station.	
Miss Pumla Kompolo Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape	Look for another town for this Power Station, we have enough diseases. Education is more important than everything to our children.	
Miss Nosipho Njalo Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape	We do not want it, we have enough diseases in this place. Look for another town. We want a school and appropriate Municipal services only.	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Miss Nondyebo Maqungu Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape	We have been burying people in this place because of diseases. Education is more important, we need a school, and we are struggling here at St Francis Bay. We do not have money to send children to Humansdorp to school.	
Miss Phumza Nkwalase Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape	We do not want it because it will bring us more diseases than we already have. Education is our children's future, it is important.	
Mr Sindiso Mhlanga Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape	As a fisherman am I not going to lose my job because of you? We need a school for our children.	Thank you for these comments. These issues, where applicable, will be addressed in the impact assessment phase of the EIA. Potential effects on fishing will be investigated in a Marine Assessment. Social, health risk and economic assessments will be undertaken as part of the impact assessment (Section 10.6.5 of the Scoping Report).
Mrs Nobantu Matshokotsha Resident Sea Vista, Eastern Cape	I am opposed to this, how are my children going to learn? My husband is a fisherman working at sea. We do not want it and we will get sick. We do not have schools. We don't have a school for our children, they are attending school in an unsafe place in the middle of the forest.	
Miss Zanele Wani Sea Vista Community	In these days diseases keep on increasing because of the conditions we live under, it is enough now. Crime is increasing because of shortage of schools. If we have enough schools it will decrease.	Thank you for these comments. These issues, where applicable, will be addresses in the impact assessment phase of the EIA. In particular, a health risk assessment will be undertaken during the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA in order to assess any potential impacts of the proposed NPS.
Miss Unathi Ngwendze Sea Vista Community	We do not want another scourge. Our children will get sick we have had enough of burying people. We need a school with enough classrooms to learn and a high school. Thank you.	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Mr Marvin Jacobs	<p>All we ask for is our children to live long. We do not need this scourge.</p> <p>Need a school for our children to learn and succeed.</p>	
Miss Nandipha Mayoyo Sea Vista Community	<p>We do not need another epidemic we have had enough of burying people daily.</p> <p>We have enough crime, which has overcome the whole country.</p>	
Mr Victor Mpongoshe Sea Vista Community	<p>Do not want another scourge we had enough of burying people now and then.</p> <p>Need a school to take our children to, so that they will have a future here in St Francis Bay.</p>	
Mr Inock Mhlakaza Sea Vista Community	No.	
Miss Luvuyokazi Saki Sea Vista Community	<p>We are opposed to it. Look for another town.</p> <p>Our children need to learn.</p>	
Miss Luthandokazi Saki Sea Vista Community	<p>Look for another town.</p> <p>Education is important to our children.</p>	
Mrs Yvonne Saki Sea Vista Community	<p>We have had enough of diseases. Look for another town.</p> <p>We need a school.</p>	
Mr Piksani Saki Sea Vista Community	<p>Every weekend we bury people. There are many diseases that kill our children.</p> <p>We need schools for our children to learn.</p>	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Mr Mboneleli Bongco Sea Vista Community	No.	
Mr Monde Nyandeni Sea Vista Community	We do not want another disease that will kill us. We do not want it as residents. No.	
Mrs Liyema Gloria Nyandeni Sea Vista Community	We do not want something that will kill us and bring diseases to our children. We want a school for our children we do not have money to pay for transport to Humansdorp schools.	
Mr Tobela Nyandeni Sea Vista Community	No.	
Miss Lungelwa Bokuva Sea Vista Community	We want to live long, so if this comes, does it mean we must die. Education is important; if we have no schools we have no future.	
Miss Pamela Lukwe Sea Vista Community	We have been burying people and we have had enough, want to rest and be happy with our families. Need schools because they are key to our future.	
Miss Zandile Qoboka Sea Vista Community	Our children need to live a healthy life. We have had enough of people dying every day. Need good education so that our children will have a brighter future.	
Miss Qondiswa Mle Sea Vista Community	What do you think about our lives? Need a school because it is important.	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Mr Ntsikelelo Sabani Sea Vista Community	Because of many diseases people are sick around this place. We need a school. Education is important.	
Mrs Phumza Kamene Sea Vista Community	Because of too many diseases. There is no school for our children.	
Mr Ndodani Cikolo Mr Zukisana Ghubensja Mr Mzandile Cikolo Miss Nickelwa Gogota Mr Mbulelo Gogota Mr Mzikayise Ndlela Mr Mxolisi Gogota Sea Vista Community	Against the proposed Nuclear Power Station.	
Mr Monwabisi Nkosinkulu Sea Vista Community	Look for another place because we don't want nuclear here. Why do you choose to kill us? Build a school and promote education so that our children do not go to jail.	
Mrs Nokulunga Nkosinkulu Sea Vista Community	We don't want to die, please help us we do not want this thing you are doing to us. On top of the diseases we already have you bring another one. Build a school for the future, there is no school here, our children will be an illiterate generation.	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
Mr Willem Jantjies Sea Vista Community	<p>We do not want Nuclear Power Station we will die, we already sick.</p> <p>St Francis is the only town, which does not have school. Build school for us so that our generation will not go to jail.</p>	
Mrs Monica Jantjies Sea Vista Community	<p>We do not want another scourge because we have had enough of burying people daily. Look for another town.</p> <p>Education is more important, build a school for our children to learn.</p>	
Mr Zamuxolo Mlata Sea Vista Community	<p>We need schools.</p> <p>Need schools with enough classrooms to learn and we do not have a high school here. Thank you.</p>	