

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT (EIA)**

**EIA: 12/12/20/944**

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

**REVISED DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT  
REPORT**

**MINUTES OF PUBLIC MEETING**

**OYSTER BAY HALL, OYSTER BAY**

**30 MAY 2011**

**18:00 - 20:30**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	1
PREFACE .....	2
1. ATTENDANCE.....	2
1.1. ATTENDANCE – INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PARTIES .....	2
1.2. ATTENDANCE – ESKOM HOLDINGS LIMITED - APPLICANT .....	2
1.3. ATTENDANCE – INDEPENDENT ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTING TEAM .....	2
2. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS.....	3
3. CHAIRPERSON'S INTRODUCTORY REMARKS .....	3
3.1 CONDUCT AT MEETING.....	3
3.2 OBJECTIVES OF THE PUBLIC REVIEW MEETINGS.....	3
4. PRESENTATION: FINDINGS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REPORT .....	4
5. ISSUES AND COMMENTS RAISED AND DISCUSSED.....	4
5.1 ISSUES AND COMMENTS RAISED .....	4
6. WAY FORWARD AND CLOSING REMARKS .....	4
6.1 MINUTES OF MEETINGS.....	4
6.2 TIMEFRAMES .....	4
6.3 CHAIRPERSON'S CONCLUDING REMARKS.....	5
APPENDIX 1: RECORD OF ISSUES RAISED AND DISCUSSED.....	6
APPENDIX 2: PRESENTATION OF REVISED DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT .....	16
APPENDIX 3: ATTENDANCE REGISTER.....	17

## PREFACE

Should participants who attended the meetings require any changes to these proceedings, please notify the Public Participation Office (n1oysterbay@gibb.co.za) in writing within 14 days of receipt.

“Unidentified I&APs” (Interested and Affected Parties) refer largely to persons who attended the meeting and verbally raised issues without providing their names. This in no way diminishes the value of the issue raised. Should you recognise your issue and would like to have your name recorded next to it, please advise the Public Participation Office.

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

### 1. ATTENDANCE

#### 1.1. Attendance – Interested and Affected Parties

- As per attendance register.

#### 1.2 Attendance – Eskom Holdings Limited - Applicant

Name	Position/Role
Deidre Herbst (DH)	Senior Manager: Environmental Management
Dave Nicholls (DN)	General Manager: Nuclear Engineering
Mervin Theron (MT)	Manager: Regulation and Localisation
Beryl Blaeser (BB)	Middle Manager: Projects
Lerato Sedumedi	Senior Advisor: Regulation and Localisation
Lorraine Ndala	Senior Environmental Advisor
Gert Greeff (GG)	Infrastructure Manager
David West (DW)	Corporate Manager

#### 1.3 Attendance – Independent Environmental Consulting Team

Name	Organisation	Role in the project
Jaana-Maria Ball (JMB)	Arcus GIBB (Pty) Ltd	Nuclear-1 EIA: Project Manager
Reuben Heydenrych (RH)	Arcus GIBB (Pty) Ltd	Senior Environmental Scientist
Jacqueline de Goede (JdG)	Arcus GIBB (Pty) Ltd	Public Participation Officer and Minute-taker

#### 1.4 Attendance – Independent Chairman

Name	Organisation	Role in the project
David de Waal (DdW)	BKS Group	Chairman

## **2. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

The independent Chairperson, Dr. David de Waal, welcomed everyone to the meeting. He explained that the presentations were in English. He explained that participants are welcome to use the language of their choice as the EIA Team could communicate in Afrikaans.

He advised participants that the meeting is being recorded to ensure the accuracy of the minutes. He further advised the participants that the proceedings could be translated into Afrikaans and Xhosa, as and when necessary.

## **3. CHAIRPERSON'S INTRODUCTORY REMARKS**

### **3.1 Conduct at Meeting**

The Chairperson read through the points presented on the slide, which provided guidelines with respect to the conduct of all participants and for achieving a constructive debate and discussion. These points are contained in the main presentation, which is provided in Appendix 2.

He requested all participants to assist the team by having a constructive debate at the meetings.

The request was for an old fashioned meeting and one to raise ones hand when wishing to ask a question.

The Chairman confirmed that everybody will get a chance to ask their questions.

Furthermore, the Chairman requested from the I&APs that before they start with their comment or question that they first clearly state their name.

The presentation will be one (1) hour and thereafter the question session will commence.

### **3.2 Objectives of the Public Review Meetings**

The purpose of the Public Meetings is three-fold, viz.:

- ❑ To present and discuss findings of the various specialist studies undertaken during the Impact Assessment Phase.
- ❑ To present the conclusions and recommendations of the Revised Draft Environmental Impact Assessment Report.
- ❑ Provide an opportunity to Interested and Affected Parties to comment on the specialist study findings and the outcomes of the EIA.

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

Ms Jaana-Maria Ball and Mr Reuben Heydenrych representing the Independent Environmental Assessment Practitioners, Arcus GIBB (GIBB), presented the findings on the Revised Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

By way of introduction, Ms Ball, EIA Project Manager, thanked all present for their time and indicated that GIBB is pleased to be at the stage of presenting the findings of the specialist investigations and the outcomes of the Environmental Impact Assessment phase.

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

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

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

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

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

#### **6. WAY FORWARD AND CLOSING REMARKS**

##### **6.1 Minutes of Meetings**

Ms Ball indicated that the EIA Team would endeavour to distribute the minutes of the meeting to I&APs as soon as possible after the meeting.

I&APs will have 14 days to verify the minutes and provide their comments to the GIBB Public Participation Office.

##### **6.2 Timeframes**

In terms of the timeframes, I&APs were reminded that the extended public review period for the Revised Draft EIA Report ends on 07 August 2011.

Ms Ball encouraged all present to submit their comments to the GIBB Public Participation Office using one of the following methods:

By mail: GIBB Public Participation Office, Nuclear-1 EIA, P.O. Box 3965, Cape Town, 8000

By phone: 021 469 9180 (Office hours: Mon to Fri – 09:00 to 13:00 excl. public holidays)

By fax: 021 424 5571

By e-mail: nuclear1@gibb.co.za / nuclear-1@gibb.co.za

Comments received will be used to produce the Final EIR, which will then be submitted to the Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA) (the decision-making authority for the EIA) for their consideration.

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

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

### **6.3 Chairperson's Concluding Remarks**

The Chairperson thanked everyone for constructive engagement and encouraged I&APs to submit written comments and closed the meeting at 20h30.

**APPENDIX 1: RECORD OF ISSUES RAISED AND DISCUSSED**

Please note: In some instances, the names that were given by the speaker at the meeting did not correspond with the names provided in the attendance registers.

<b>OYSTER BAY PUBLIC MEETING (30 MAY 2011)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
1	Bill Trollip (Hermanus resident)	<p>Mr Trollip commented that until such time as the authorities choose what type of reactor is going to be installed, this whole assessment is a waste of time.</p> <p>For the simple reason that there are American, Japanese, Chinese, Korean, Russian and French reactors and each and everyone of them will have a different approach to the way they want it built. For example to bury it or not and the exact location. Surely a decision in this regard would be firstly required. Furthermore, where we are going to get the equipment from and what would the vendor's input be into the situation.</p>	<p>RH responded that unfortunately, one does not usually have the detailed plan and design of a proposed development when undertaking an Environmental Impact Assessment. The methodology that was used was that a consistent dataset was compiled by Eskom based on all pressurised water reactor plant types available internationally by various vendors.</p> <p>This is a conservative set of criteria that encompasses all the aspects of a nuclear power plant that potentially impacts the environment. If the proposed plant is authorised these criteria would be mandatory for potential vendors.</p>
2	Nick Bormann (Oyster Bay resident)	<p>Mr Bormann commented that the main concern for the people of Oyster Bay is the westerly access road that stretches between the Oyster Bay Community Hall and Umzamuwethu.</p>	<p>RH responded (referring to slide no. 42 of the presentation) that it was previously mentioned that the Oyster Bay mobile dune system is regarded by the biophysical specialists as very sensitive. For this reason GIBB has recommended that further impact on the dune system should be avoided. For similar reasons the proposed northern access road was found not to be acceptable.</p> <p>Already during the Scoping Phase of Environmental Impact Assessment, the Traffic Specialist looked at all the various road access routes and came to the conclusion which would be the best and preferred route from a traffic point of view.</p>

<b>OYSTER BAY PUBLIC MEETING (30 MAY 2011)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		Mr Bormann continued to mention that he therefore thinks that the main concern is the noise. Especially, if you are talking about 600 plus vehicles, trucks and busses proposed to travel on this road. Why can we not look at the blue route as an alternative seeing that the noise factor is such a great concern for the residents of Oysterbay?	RH responded that a Noise Impact Assessment was completed as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment and looking specifically to the noise adjacent to Umzamuwethu. The Noise Specialist came to the conclusion that the most significant source of noise would come from the Open Cycle Gas Turbine <sup>1</sup> plant that would operate at erratic intervals, from the high voltage yard situated north of the dune system. The noise would have to be mitigated to avoid undesirable noise impacts to residents of areas like Umzamuwethu.
3	Jaco Marks (Oyster Bay resident)	Mr Marks asked why the blue road access route cannot be connected midway with the purple route. If you connect these two roads then you would miss all the sensitive dunes.  Mr Marks commented that currently the road is not being maintained by the local government and the	JMB said she is just going to talk about the bio-physical aspects because she is a qualified botanist.  JMB replied that the dunes that would need to be traversed are hardened calcareous dune ridges and valley slacks and although the dunes look like degraded veld they are fairly sensitive in terms of vegetation communities. This fact has been highlighted by the Flora Specialist. When there is sensitive vegetation communities there are likely to be vertebrate and invertebrates as well.  The specialists did not look at the mentioned crossing of the Oyster Bay Headland Bypass Dunes specifically. However, this crossing is unlikely to be feasible when one takes in consideration the Biophysical Specialists views. This would need to be investigated further.  JMB replied that it is built in the EIA that the Applicant (i.e. Eskom) would need to maintain the road in the condition it is

<sup>1</sup> Open Cycle Gas Turbine

OYSTER BAY PUBLIC MEETING (30 MAY 2011)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>impact on the road will probably increase three hundred times. Thus the question is who is going to maintain the road? The road is not maintained by the government and the questions remains who is going to keep the road in good condition.</p>	<p>found before the commencement of construction.</p> <p>RH further added that the road is currently not in a good condition and thus it is not feasible for Eskom to use the road in its current condition. It is noted in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) that Eskom would need to bring the road up to feasible standard. During the first nine years of the construction period Eskom would be completely responsible for the maintenance of the access roads to the site.</p>
4	Johan Strydom (Oyster Bay resident)	<p>Mr Strydom said the following question is to Eskom. If the blue road access route is no longer being considered, why was Eskom still buying farmland on this route, as late as 2010?</p>	<p>RH responded that one of the key recommendations to Eskom in the Revised Draft EIR is that they are required to acquire extra land to ensure that areas such as wetlands (which are currently degraded) can be rehabilitated and conserved. Eskom is in the process of buying additional properties at their own risk, knowing full well that the Thyspunt site may not be authorised. Particular parcels of land and wetlands have been identified for acquisition and conservation.</p>
5	Jonathan Biko (Umzamuwethu resident)	<p>Mr Biko asked if he can speak Xhosa because his English is not up to scratch and could somebody please translate. <b>The minutes contain the translated version of the issue raised (translator: Mr Jongi Dyabaza).</b></p> <p>Mr Biko heard all about all the discussions, assessments, the roads and what was already done. He also heard the number of employees that will be on site.</p> <p>Mr Biko asked is Eskom going to do develop the people of the disadvantaged communities that are</p>	<p>RH responded that the recommendation of the EIA is that 25% of all employment needs to go to local people. Furthermore, one</p>

<b>OYSTER BAY PUBLIC MEETING (30 MAY 2011)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<p>sitting right on the doorstep of this proposed nuclear power station.</p> <p>Mr Biko has seen on the TV news about what is happening in Medupi. What is Eskom going to do to avoid what happened in Medupi, at the proposed nuclear power station?</p> <p>Mr Biko further commented that Eskom is employing people from other areas that are not living close to the project because the local community are unskilled, uneducated and suitable for skilled jobs. What is Eskom going to do to alleviate this problem?</p> <p>What is happening to avoid employing people from far away and not employing people from close by?</p> <p>As black people we are just taken as workaholics or wheelbarrow labour but lucrative tenders are given to white people whose been opposing this proposed nuclear plant. However, now that they (white people) realise that the nuclear plant is coming to us, Eskom is offering the tenders to them. The white people then go to the townships to gather people for the job.</p> <p>The request is that they must also be considered when Eskom requirements are not for highly skilled people.</p> <p>An example is that tenders are given to currently to</p>	<p>needs to bear in mind that the 7 700 figure that was mentioned, is only applicable to employment for the peak years of construction. Highly skilled jobs would have to be recruited from outside. However, unskilled labour would be employed locally.</p> <p>DH responded that in terms of the Medupi Power Station project there was a strike, two weeks ago, for a period of several days. The strike was mostly about foreign welders that were brought in from Thailand. She added that there is a general shortage of welders in South Africa therefore welders from others countries are recruited on large construction projects. Eskom has established a process to train specialist welders over the next few years. Many local people were trained during the construction of the Medupi Power Station. People are given general training during the construction phase and others who have Matric or have completed school are trained in positions as operators at the plants. Therefore when operations commence these people are already trained. The idea is to try to train local people to operate the power station. Eskom's intention with the new nuclear station is similar.</p> <p><b>Post-meeting note (from Eskom):</b></p>

<b>OYSTER BAY PUBLIC MEETING (30 MAY 2011)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		white people on site even though the requirements are not for such highly skilled people but not given to them because they are black. Tenders are only given to white people.	<b>Eskom is very serious about ensuring that local, previously disadvantaged communities do get opportunities. The tenders referred to in the meeting are related to land management and removal of invasive plants. Eskom has to follow the commercial processes, this requires that people are registered on the Eskom data base so that when the tender goes out they can be part of the tender process. Eskom has had meetings with local Business Forums and hope that they will assist in identifying people and companies that can register on the Eskom database.</b>
6	Sini (Surname unidentified) (Umzamuwethu resident)	Tired of the political twist and turns.	Comment noted.
7	Unidentified I&AP (Oyster Bay resident)	The unidentified I&AP announced that he had attended one of the EIA meetings last year in March and he had made a comment that was not minuted. In his opinion, if he had the time to follow-up and was paid what he believes he is worth then he would have challenged the case and tried to rectify the matter. He further mentioned that the reason he is standing up today is that there is definitely a bit of a political twist to these things invariably. However, the government has done an enormous amount to enable people to receive training.	DdW reiterated that the meeting was called to discuss and debate the Revised Environmental Impact Report. Furthermore, the election is over and the community has spoken. Furthermore, politics have nothing to do with this EIA and he called on the discussion to focus on the EIA for the proposed Nuclear-1.
8	Mizandi (Surname unidentified) (Umzamuwethu resident)	Mizandi commented that he is very disappointed because Eskom is taking so long to get started and the people from Umzamuwethu are looking forward to the proposed development.	Mervin Theron of Eskom responded that Eskom did not know when the Government would approve the proposed Nuclear-1, and indeed if they would approve it. The appointed Vendor would be responsible to develop local skills.

<b>OYSTER BAY PUBLIC MEETING (30 MAY 2011)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<p>What is Eskom's responsibility in terms of monitoring victimisation of the workers? What is going on?</p> <p>Eskom is already in bed with some popular public person as they are working on the tender already.</p> <p>I also heard about the training that Eskom is going to provide. We need the date when the scheduled training will commence.</p> <p>Majority of people need the development and Eskom should keep this in mind.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
9	Joseph Williams (Umzamuwethu resident)	<p>Mr Williams commented and referred to the access road indicated with the pink line that cuts through Umzamuwethu and Oyster Bay and stated that people move across this road. Also, people work in Oyster Bay and live in Umzamuwethu. People from Umzamuwethu also go to the beach in Oyster Bay. What are the safety standards that will be in position when the road is actually in use?</p>	<p>RH responded that there is definitely a concern for pedestrians crossing the access roads, especially around the Humansdorp, Sea Vista and Umzamuwethu areas. Therefore, traffic specialists recommended either an overpass or underpass be used in these situations. Hundreds of vehicles will be travelling on these roads and thus the overpass or underpass will be required to alleviate safety concerns.</p>
10	Zolani Maluni (Umzamuwethu resident)	<p>Mr Maluni asked if Thyspunt is a suitable site for a nuclear power plant?</p> <p>Are you working hand in hand with the local municipality for any deals or community trustees?</p>	<p>RH responded that three sites were assessed and recommended as being suitable for Nuclear-1. The site selection process preceded the EIA in the form of the Nuclear Site Investigation Programme. Suitable alternative sites for the construction of a nuclear power station were independently researched in the 1980s.</p> <p>DH responded that Eskom has engaged with the local authorities. This engagement would increase from now on and</p>

OYSTER BAY PUBLIC MEETING (30 MAY 2011)			
No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>During that time of the elections many people were victimised at the site where they were cutting bushes.</p> <p>If the nuclear plant is sustainable on the Thyspunt site then it should happen sooner rather than later. We need to emphasise we are for nuclear but if beneficial to the community.</p> <p>Before the construction site commences the houses first need to be built and this is going to help us.</p> <p>Everybody is looking at Eskom and asking when are they going to do that.</p> <p>When is it going to happen?</p>	<p>will become more concentrated as the certainty that this site will be authorised grows.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p><b>Post meeting note:</b>  <b>There are several authorisations that are required prior to this site being confirmed as the first site for a nuclear power stations. The Department of Energy and Eskom are working together to determine the process to be followed. It is hoped that this process will enable the tender process for the main vendor to commence in within the next 6 months.</b></p>
11	Nick Walman	Mr Walman commented that the 6 km exclusion zone around the nuclear power station excluded other development. What happened to that? I know it was reduced to 1 km but since then it has sort of disappeared.	RH responded there were larger exclusion zones in the early Scoping Phase. The design of the nuclear power station has changed and the exclusion zone is now based on international recommendations. The smallest exclusion zone is 800 m and no private development is allowed within this. Secondly there is a zone of 3 km within which there will be restrictions on future development. The owner controlled zone of Eskom is within 2 km of the power station, but is not required by legislation and is governed by Eskom's internal policies.
12	Unidentified I&AP (Oyster Bay resident)	The unidentified I&AP commented that the road will become a lot busier. Thus the question is what the	RH responded that the tourism assessment for Nuclear-1 found that the highest potential negative impact on tourism could

<b>OYSTER BAY PUBLIC MEETING (30 MAY 2011)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<p>impact will be on tourism in the area.</p> <p>Furthermore, is the nuclear power station specifically going to have an impact on the tourism in the area? If increase of vehicles on roads, what impact will this have on tourism?</p> <p>What is the impact going to be on tourism if nuclear plant is built in this area?</p>	<p>occur at the Thyspunt site. The impact on tourism has been quantified in bed nights and the negative or positive impacts of the proposed power station have been predicted during construction and operation. He added, however, that it has been the experience at other power stations such as the Medupi Power Station that local business-based tourism can increase substantially as a result of the influx of Eskom employees and contractors.</p>
13	Ilse van Lingen (Resident of St. Francis Bay and DA Member of Parliament)	<p>Ms van Lingen commented that the International Atomic Energy Institute (IAEI) told them through the NNR in parliament that the safety zones are not being deviated from the 16 km, 30 km or 50 km zones. This is according to the European standard which is not approved by the IAEA. This is what the manufacturers reckon is safe because they want to pass or get their product sold. This is not correct and we are investigating the correct information through IAEA at the moment. We must not believe what we see here.</p> <p>Ms van Lingen further commented that one must not confuse emergency planning zones with international standards and land ownership. We must understand that it has got to do with exit and safety routes to get out in case of an emergency.</p>	<p>David Nicholls of Eskom responded that There are no international norms and standards on the exclusion zone. The European Utilities standards recommend the 800 m and 3 km zones, the NNR in parliament indicated that they would consider changes to the emergency zones. Each site is studied and the emergency planning zones are confirmed based on these studies. Eskom has assumed the EUR standards based on the safety of the technology proposed for the plant.</p> <p>The Chairman noted the point.</p>
14	Philemon Mafikeng (Umzamuwethu resident)	<p>Mr Mafikeng commented that Eskom said it has a skills development project. The question is why can you not develop the people's skills before the start of the power station?</p>	<p>DH responded that this is a very good suggestion but Eskom is required to gain all the necessary approvals first before commencing with the construction of nuclear plant. This includes skills development.</p>

<b>OYSTER BAY PUBLIC MEETING (30 MAY 2011)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		Last year the community asked Eskom if they can give to the primary school in Umzamuwethu. Please advise if this is still on track.	DH responded that Eskom did come to the meeting and the school issue was raised. Eskom Development was asked to look at how to assist the Umzamuwethu school. She cannot guarantee what Eskom Development Foundation will give but she can say that they are visiting site this week and a proposal will be submitted.
15	Joseph Williams (Umzamuwethu resident)	Mr Williams asked where Umzamuwethu is located in this control zone is and will Umzamuwethu have space to grow as a community?	RH responded that the largest control zone is 3 km. Oyster Bay is about 5 km from proposed nuclear plant. Thus Oyster Bay and Umzamuwethu fall outside the control zone.  JMB responded that in EIR it is recommended that the plant be placed in the least sensitive area of the Thyspunt site.  RH further commented and re-explained the Thyspunt map slide and pointed out the distance of 5.5 km on the map.
16	Unidentified I&AP (Umzamuwethu resident)	The unidentified I&AP commented that he was one of the people that went to the Koeberg Nuclear Power Station last year in September. He would prefer that Eskom and GIBB not confuse the community. They are saying 5.5 km and that Umzamuwethu is outside the zone.	RH responded that there are different types of reactors. The Koeberg Nuclear Power Station was built in 1970s when nuclear reactors required larger emergency planning zones compared to today. The newer nuclear plant designs require much smaller emergency zones.
17	Unidentified I&AP (Oyster Bay resident)	The unidentified I&AP asked where the waste generated at the nuclear plant will be taken.	RH responded that there are two types of waste that require different forms of disposal. There is only one nuclear waste disposal site in the Northern Cape called Vaalputs waste Disposal Site. Low and intermediate level waste would be transported to this site in special containers. A special license is also required for radioactive waste transport. The second type of waste is high level waste. It is managed under very controlled

<b>OYSTER BAY PUBLIC MEETING (30 MAY 2011)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
			conditions and is kept on the site of the nuclear power station for the life time of the power station (i.e. 60 years).

## **APPENDIX 2: PRESENTATION OF REVISED DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

### **APPENDIX 3: ATTENDANCE REGISTER**