

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

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT (EIA: 12/12/20/944)
DRAFT EIR ISSUES REPORT: ISSUES REPORT**

Issues submitted have been grouped in the categories listed below:

No	Category
1	EIA (technical and public participation)
2	Waste Disposal (Nuclear)
3	Financial/Economic
4	Alternative Generation Options (including renewables)
5	Safety and emergency situations
6	Site specific matters (a) Brazil (b) Schulpfontein (c) Duynefontein (d) Bantamsklip (e) Thyspunt
7	Compatibility with current IDP planning and provincial SDPs
8	Ancillary infrastructure (roads, construction camps, etc)
9	Vegetation (site specific) and biodiversity
10	Employment/training
11	Archaeology/Paleoecology/Cultural Heritage
12	Marine effects
13	Property effects (values)
14	Construction impacts
15	Uranium source/mining
16	Social/health
17	Agricultural effects
18	Nuclear technology
19	Other processes - NNR and Transmission Lines EIA
20	Tourism
21	Visual Impact
22	Water Resources
23	Revised Plan of Study for Impact Assessment (May 2009)
24	Comments raised as part of the Thyspunt Transmission Powerline Integration EIA
25	Comment raised as part of the Bantamsklip Transmission Powerline Integration EIA

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
1. EIA (technical and public participation)			
<p>Mr and Mrs Christine Garbett & Robert Garbett personally and on behalf of the following I&AP's and their members</p> <p>Pelindaba Working Group (members of CANE – National Coalition Against Nuclear ENERGY) Wat Props Pty Ltd Karee Trust Professional Aviation Services Pty Ltd.</p>	<p>Just to make this matter very clear; we do now expect a response to our July 16th letter, attached again for your convenience, within 14 days (30th September 2008).</p> <p>Further, please note that this letter also forms part of our submission in respect of the flawed draft scoping report of Nuclear 1.</p> <p>We wish to appoint our own qualified experts to conduct peer reviews of the studies at the expense of the applicant. The manner in which both the experts conducting EIA studies and their peer reviewers were selected without any reference to the majority of I&AP's interests is totally unacceptable and removed the legitimacy of the peer review system.</p> <p>Kindly urgently advise the correct procedure for I&AP's to follow in respect of the appointment of peer review experts and the range of fees and travel expenses applicable to their appointment, in respect of local and overseas experts, in order that this will not delay the EIA process which should not proceed until this vital matter has been satisfactorily resolved.</p> <p>Our complaint about the clear conflicts of interest of certain experts already appointed, (for example, nuclear proponent and spokesman, Kelvin Kemm, whom we have further learned also has financial interests within the nuclear industry) was dismissed. We view this treatment of I&AP's as unacceptable and understand that it will result in the EIA process being fundamentally flawed if no corrective action is taken by Arcus Gibb.</p> <p>We suggest in the interests of independence and transparency that all peer reviewers are selected by an independent panel of I&AP NGO's, and appointed by majority vote within the NGO panel, who will be representative of the majority of individual I&AP's both registered and also of those disenfranchised affected parties due to the lack of independent information being circulated</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. The peer review process was undertaken as an internal quality check of the specialist reports. Declarations of Independence for all Specialist Reviewers can be downloaded from the following website: www.eskom.co.za. Subsequently all peer reviewers appointed by Arcus GIBB, the independent environmental practitioners on this project are deemed to be independent and considered in the highest regard nationally and in most cases internationally within their respective disciplines.</p> <p>Any appointment of additional peer reviewers, by yourselves, would be at your own cost. All peer reviews would need to take place within the comment periods allocated as part of the EIA process.</p> <p>The need to undertake peer reviews of EIA reports is not a legal requirement and as indicated above was undertaken by Arcus GIBB as an internal quality assurance mechanism.</p> <p>The Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA) have also appointed an independent review panel to assist them in making the correct decision as to whether the proposed project should be authorised or not.</p> <p>Dr. Kemm is in no way involved in the EIA process for Nuclear-1.</p>	<p>Section 7.6.4 of the EIR</p> <p>Section 7.7.4 and Section 7.7.5 of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p>in a manner that will allow full public participation in this process. We anticipate your prompt confirmation that you will address these concerns as a matter of urgency.</p>		
<p>Mr Mike Kantey Watercourse cc</p>	<p>I happened to toddle over to the Plettenberg Library today (12 November 2008) to brush up on the Nuclear-1 Final Scoping Report</p> <p>The page numbering is non-existent, so I will refer to Appendix E13: Air Quality</p> <p>Page 3-4: Operational Phase, Second Bullet the emissions of radionuclides will be drawn from the actual historical data recorded at Koeberg Nuclear Power Station (worst-case scenario).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We have no idea what is meant by "worst-case scenario" 2. Since we do not even know what reactor we are talking about (whether the AREVA EPR or the Westinghouse AP1000), how can we base our "environmental impact assessment" on Koeberg, an outdated reactor? The EPR and AP1000 are supposed to be "Generation IV" reactors, so the manufacturers at least should provide the likely emissions (especially the expected annual quantities in Becquerel's of Strontium-90 and Cesium-137). These should be ADDED to those expected from the Pebble Bed Modular Reactor AND the existing emissions at Koeberg to give total expected annual discharges in Becquerel's. <p>The entire report waffles on and on about dust and sulphur dioxide and wind vectors and topography for 47 pages before coming to a brief halt at page 5-5, paragraph <u>5.2.2</u>.</p> <p>"Routine emissions during the operation of the power station would be low, and has to comply with the amount allowed by the Nuclear Regulator.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments on the air quality aspects of the Scoping Report.</p> <p>Please be assured that specialist information presented in the Scoping Phase of the EIA process is investigated further in the next phase (impact assessment), using the latest and most relevant data available – see below.</p> <p>Page 3-4: Operational Phase, Second Bullet</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Data on emissions of radionuclides since the start of operation at Koeberg were used. These emissions varied from year to year and the "worst-case scenario" simply means the year that resulted in the highest dose. The dose is calculated using the dose conversion factors for each radionuclide for every year. 2. The air quality specialist has, subsequent to the completion of the FSR, been provided with emission estimates for both the AREVA EPR and the Westinghouse AP1000, as well as envelope values for the worst-case scenario for either reactor type. These are used in the completion of the impact assessment specialist study. In addition the air quality modelling for the Duynefontein site included cumulative impacts for both the Koeberg Power Station and the proposed PBMR DPP. 	<p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E of the FSR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p>"The most significant impact of radionuclide emissions would be during a malfunction or accident. These scenarios need to still be developed before the significance of the risk to be determined."</p> <p>That's it, folks!</p> <p>An epic work of science, thousands of pages long reduced to 4.1 lines of text in the Scoping Report...</p> <p>How do we know the emissions will be low?</p> <p>Well you'll just have to believe us, because we're scientists!</p>	<p>In order to comply with NNR requirements, the proposed NPS will have to remain within the emission levels stipulated in its licence. Experience from Koeberg NPS has shown that emission levels consistently fall below the required levels, and the proposed NPS will ensure that it does the same. The specialist impact assessment report will examine this issue further.</p> <p>Please note that accident/ malfunction scenarios are dealt with in terms of the NNR licensing process, and as such are not examined in detail in this EIA process. This is in line with the DEAT-NNR Cooperative Agreement signed in 2006 and the notification from the DG (refer to Appendix B4 of the DEIR).</p>	<p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E10 and E24 of the EIR</p> <p>Appendix B4 of the EIR</p>
<p>Mr N R Simpson St Francis Bay Residents' Association</p>	<p>Eskom EIA (EIA: 12/12/20/944): Draft Scoping Report Feedback: Eastern Cape</p> <p>Thank you for your letter dated 19 June 2008, Ref No: Nuclear 1 09E, receipt of which is hereby acknowledged.</p> <p>May I, in the absence of Hilton Thorpe, Chairman of the St Francis Bay Residents Association, who is currently absent on holiday, refer to page 13 of the record of the Key Stakeholder Feedback Meeting held at the Kelway Hotel in Port Elizabeth on 5 March 2008. On that page, in response to Mr Thorpe's "comment under the sub-heading "Census Figures" is recorded the statement "Comment noted. Census data that will be used for the study will be that provided by STATSSA." We accept this statement, which, however, also fills us with misgivings and fore-bodings!</p> <p>We have made no secret of the fact that we are anxious, at all costs, to avoid any possibility of inappropriate political influence on the EIA, which is sure to have very significant impact on our</p>	<p>All comments and concerns identified are noted. Arcus GIBB however takes this opportunity to again assure you of our objectivity and the company's commitment to only participate in activities which are transparent and unbiased.</p> <p>Your concerns relating to the accuracy and potentially outdated nature of the STATSSA figures is noted. Although STATSSA figures were extensively used they were throughout the process evaluated against any other credible and referenced data. Information was also obtained from the Demarcation Board, IDP and the SDF of the Kouga Municipality.</p> <p>Furthermore the EIA team has on several</p>	<p>Chapter 6 of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p>Kouga community. The population level of the considered area has a very direct bearing on a number of important factors which will be considered in the course of the EIA. Our concern is based on the fact that <u>correct</u> census figures are required, and that they should not just be accepted as correct because they are provided by STATSSA. The census figures at present available are almost unbelievably outdated and unreliable, and ACER, as consultant is surely committed to do both accuracy and complete integrity of process.</p> <p>We most strongly ask you, therefore, when the time comes to refer to STATSSA for census figures, to insist on up-to-date information, and to reject any which is not based on a current census. This issue is dealt with fully in the scoping report submissions of both the St Francis Bay Residents Association and the St Francis /Kromme Trust. Just for the record, the final paragraph of this letter recapitulates the current head-count situation in our area.</p> <p>There has, we submit, been a tendency in some of Eskom's responses to questions, throughout the process to date, to lean on information gathered during the original Thyspunt investigation in early 1980's. That was a quarter of a century ago! It is, surely, inappropriate to use information which, in our fast-moving modern world, may well qualify as ancient history! Growth and development in the most-concerned population nodes of Cape St Francis, Sea Vista and St Francis Bay has, since then, been literally explosive. Local population desperately needs to be reliably enumerated at today's <u>actual</u> (not projected or guesstimated!) levels.</p> <p>Comments on Population level of Greater St Francis Bay Area</p> <p>Our area is characterized by the fact that there are two separate and clearly defined population levels, namely, in season" when most houses are crammed full of residents and guests, and out "of season". Clearly the higher level must be used in any situation which concerns personal safety or provision for safe evacuation of people in an emergency. Nuclear accidents, by definition, cannot</p>	<p>occasions requested that should any I&AP have access to any data that may be useful, to please provide such. In many instances this was done, and the data was subsequently forwarded to the specialist for consideration in their studies.</p> <p>It is correct that the NSIP reports formed the initial platform of information used in the EIA. Much of this information, despite being collected in the 1980s, is still relevant. It is however important to note that the NSIP reports were not the only information that was utilised. As the EIA process progressed and the associated specialist studies continued to develop more detailed assessments, as is appropriate for the Impact Assessment Phase, all initial information obtained from the NSIP reports during the Scoping Phase was either improved upon or updated.</p> <p>All findings contained in the specialist studies and Draft EIR will be based on current, peer reviewed specialist assessments.</p>	<p>Section 5.2.1 of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p>be planned! Having regard to the rate of local growth and development, the population figures reflected in the most recent Census, (2001) which, furthermore, was conducted during an “out of season” period, cannot possible bear any realistic relationship to the current facts of the situation. This is particularly the case because that census was most ineptly carried out in this area. A large number of residents were not even counted, - never saw an enumerator, - whole street were omitted. Neither Hilton Thorpe nor I, for example saw an enumerator other than as a member of a resting group, lounging and gossiping on some grassy verge! Relevant official complaints were lodged at the time by community bodies. Accurate, up-to-date population statistics could play a vital role in this EIA exercise. As a community, we must rely on <u>your</u> professionalism and integrity, not Eskom, for an EIA verdict we can accept with confidence.</p>	<p>Your concerns have been passed onto the relevant specialist to consider as part of his study.</p> <p>This information will be taken into account and every effort made to obtain the most accurate, recent information. However, the census data may be the most up to date information that is available.</p>	<p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E of the EIR</p>
<p>Ms Angela Andrews Legal Resources Centre</p>	<p>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR THE PROPOSED NUCLEAR POWER STATION AND ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE: COMMENTS ON DRAFT SCOPING REPORT</p> <p>We refer to your letter of 11 July 2008 and request clarification of the following points.</p> <p><u>Re page 5</u> You state “<i>please note that catastrophic incidents will be discussed in future reports</i>”.</p> <p>Kindly advise us where the subject of the study of catastrophic incidents is indicated in the plan of study for the environmental impact assessment and in which future reports such study of catastrophic incidents will take place.</p>	<p>This issue is not raised in the Plan of Study for EIA since catastrophic incidents are within the jurisdiction and mandate of the National Nuclear Regulator (NNR). The NNR will evaluate the safety case for the proposed nuclear power station to determine compliance with the requirements contained in Government Notice R388 of 28 April 2006, “Safety Standards and Regulatory Practices”. Regulation R388 contains requirements and limits related to both normal operations and accident situations.</p> <p>Please refer to chapter 10, section 10.6.5</p>	<p>Chapter 10 of the FSR and Section 6.4.18 of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p><u>Re page 6</u> You state “<i>the reason given is that the assessment of ‘upset conditions and accidents’ form part of other specialist studies</i>”. Kindly enumerate which other specialist studies contain a requirement of an assessment of ‘upset conditions and accidents’ and a precise location of reference to these requirements in the studies concerned.</p>	<p>Specialist Terms of Reference of the Final Scoping Report.</p> <p>(l) Air Quality Impact Assessment the final bullet requires the following: Discussion of potential radionuclide emissions during malfunction or accident, to determine probable time frames and significance of risk. (t) Tourism Study: Investigate the probable effect on the tourism economy arising from both routine and accident conditions, on the local, provincial and Garden Route regions.</p> <p>However please note that again accident conditions are something that is being assessed as part of the NNR safety case and the specialist undertaking these studies will assess the area of influence should an accident occur. Thus accident scenarios will not be expressly dealt with in the EIA. Please refer to the Co-operative Agreement between the NNR and the DEA of September 2007 and the notification of statement issued by the DEA regarding the consideration of matters pertaining to nuclear safety in EIA processes on nuclear installations contained as Appendix 2 of the Final Plan of Study for EIA, which is available on www.eskom.co.za/eia.</p>	<p>Section 10.6.5 of the FSR</p> <p>Appendix B4 and E24 of the EIR</p>
<p>Mr and Mrs Christine & Robert Garbett On behalf of The Karee Trust Wat Props Pty Ltd Pelindaba Working Group</p>	<p>Thank you for your response of June 27th 2008 on our DSR comments, however we wish to make it perfectly clear that many aspects of the DSR fall short of expectations, particularly in view of the proposed billions of public funds that are at risk of being unwisely invested by Eskom in a technology that will adversely encumber all existing and hundreds of future generations, with unacceptable and avoidable risks and costs.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Arcus GIBB was appointed to undertake the EIA through a tender process open to a number of Environmental Consultants.</p> <p>Arcus GIBB has and will continue to abide by requirements set out by the National</p>	<p>Chapter 6 of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p>We would like to stress that your responsibility as consultants <u>must be directed entirely towards the public's best interests</u>, particularly so in this case, where the applicant is, via the state, owned entirely by the public. The government is merely acting in a caretaker role over Eskom and may not be allowed by you as Independent Consultants, to foist its nuclear aspirations upon the general public through Eskom, nor, to bring pressure to bear in any manner upon your organization to slant this EIA process towards a pre determined nuclear outcome.</p> <p>To ensure that full accountability towards the general public for this EIA is taken seriously by your company, we request that you supply written assurances from you, your colleagues and in particular your board of directors as follows:</p>	<p>Environmental Management Act (NEMA) and the associated regulations. Government Notice Regulation Number 385 (i.e. GN No. R. 385) in the Government Gazette on 21 April 2006 stipulates the requirements for the appointment of and Environmental Assessment Practitioner.</p> <p>Arcus GIBB conforms to all these requirements. As Environmental Professionals Arcus GIBB will remain an independent and impartial consultant on this project and present information in an unbiased manner.</p> <p>Should any studies during the EIA process reveal that there is a flaw, this will be documented and communicated to the public and authorities.</p>	
	<p>a. that your company will act within the framework of statutory, fiduciary and legal corporate governance principles while conducting this EIA, and</p>	<p>Arcus GIBB will uphold its legal responsibilities throughout the Nuclear-1 EIA process.</p>	<p>Chapter 6 of the EIR</p>
	<p>b. that your company executives acknowledge and accept that the public intend to hold your board of directors personally and fully accountable should they fall short of their mandate and duty of independence in this matter that is entrusting the expenditure of billions of rands of public funds to the integrity and competency of this EIA process.</p>	<p>Your comment is noted.</p>	
	<p>c. That public meetings will engage the public in a manner that provides a full & clear picture of all the negative aspects of the proposed nuclear expansion programme and the potential health and safety risks of all affected parties, the environment and any other problems identified during this EIA process and that misleading or false claims,</p>	<p>Arcus GIBB always acts in an open and transparent manner and presents all information to the public. All information, positive or negative to the project will be made available to the public as part of the EIA process. Arcus GIBB takes exception to your</p>	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	such as are contained in your response to our comments, do not occur again.	statement that “misleading or false claims, such as are contained in your response to our comments, do not occur again”. Arcus GIBB has made no false statements, if you feel otherwise please specifically indicate where these false claims are in order for us to respond more accurately.	
	d. We request your companies unequivocal confirmation that this process is <i>not</i> predetermined and that the EIA of Nuclear 1 is <i>not</i> a facade and, if that is indeed so, we trust you will kindly revisit and revise false assumptions and incorrect assertions claimed about the “no go option” in the DSR.	Arcus GIBB confirms the EIA process for Nuclear-1 is not predetermined. Arcus GIBB has never made reference to any assumptions or incorrect ascertains. All information contained to date has been referenced to credible sources.	Chapter 6 of the EIR
	<p>Re your responses to our comments on the DSR, numbered 1 – 8:</p> <p>1.1 The response was not satisfactory. Insurance liability risks (and costs to insure such risks), need to be carried by Eskom, not, as is the case at present, borne 99% by the general public, who are as you concede, unable to insure against nuclear risks.</p> <p>This cost and associated risks must be quantified as part of the operational costs and quantified at an appropriate level. We will approach the NNR in this regard to ensure that the public is adequately protected with at least an appropriate amount of liability insurance arising from the operation of existing nuclear power stations. The correct and adequate amount of liability insurance MUST form part of the cost analysis and should already have been assessed by Eskom. We would appreciate sight of the existing Koeburg third party liability insurance policy, which we understand falls woefully short of adequate in terms of sum insured.</p>	<p>As indicated in our previous response, Section 30 of the National Nuclear Regulator Act of 1999 assigns strict liability for nuclear damage to the holder of the nuclear installation licence. This means that Eskom, who would be the holder of the nuclear installation licence, if granted, for the proposed nuclear power station is strictly liable and must insure against the risks.</p> <p>Section 29 of the National Nuclear Regulator Act of 1999 requires:</p> <p>(1) The Minister [of Minerals and Energy] must, on the recommendation of the [NNR] board and by notice in the Gazette, categorise the various nuclear installations in the Republic, based on the potential consequences of a nuclear accident.</p>	<p>Section 6.4.18 of the EIR</p> <p>Section 6.4.1</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
		<p>(2) The Minister must, on the recommendation of the [NNR] board and in consultation with the Minister of Finance and by notice in the Gazette, determine-</p> <p>(a) the level of financial security to be provided by holders of nuclear installation licences in respect of each of those categories; and</p> <p>(b) the manner in which that financial security is to be provided, in order for the holder of a nuclear installation licence to fulfil any liability which may be incurred in terms of section 30.</p> <p>As indicated in our previous response, Government Notice No. 581 of 7 May 2004 provides for the categorisation of existing nuclear installations and the level of, and manner in which financial security must be provided. Existing nuclear installations includes Koeberg. This Government Notice is available for downloading from the NNR web site www.nnr.co.za.</p> <p>If the proposed nuclear power station is constructed and starts operations, the Government Notice would have to be updated. The National Nuclear Regulator would recommend to the Minister of Energy the level of financial security that would be required, based on their assessment of the risk posed by the proposed nuclear power station.</p>	
	<p>1.2 Your response does not undertake to supply the information requested. Please also add the following</p>	<p>The determination, through the EIA process, of the potential environmental</p>	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p>under that section “Cost overruns are both expensive and to be expected for construction of nuclear power plants. What provision amount has been made to quantify this financial risk? Kindly ensure that this risk is included under direct cost estimates together with inflationary escalation cost estimates over the next 10- 15 years.”</p> <p>You state that Eskom is “In the process of developing a <i>business case</i> for Nuclear 1 ...” This is somewhat bizarre planning on the part of the state owned monopoly. If Eskom does not already have a <i>business case</i> for nuclear power generation, this entire process is premature and a waste of public funds and time. If Eskom does have a <i>business case</i> for Nuclear 1, we request a copy by return. If Eskom does not yet have a <i>business case</i>, when do you estimate that it will be available for comment? You go on to say that prior to a <u>final decision</u> being made, a thorough evaluation of all costs associated with construction and operation of the plant will be considered. Once again this is unreasoned planning. It is imperative that Eskom conducts a full financial analysis now of comparative generation costs and options. Only if that analysis strongly indicates that nuclear is, in each significant aspect, preferable over all other generation options, should this EIA process recommence.</p> <p>If, as you appear to indicate, only at the end of this EIA process, will the viability of nuclear power be determined, Eskom may well find, after several years of futile assessments, as we assert to be the case, that nuclear power is too expensive, carries too high a risk profile, and that better, safer, cleaner and environmentally compatible alternative power is available to meet the demands and is capable of generating power within a far shorter timeframe.</p>	<p>impacts, and the mitigation thereof, for any proposed activity, is only one of the processes that is undertaken to provide information to the decision-making process. A positive environmental authorisation does not imply that a proposed activity will definitely go-ahead. The financial viability is another process, and in the case of a nuclear power station there is also the nuclear licensing process. The results of all of the different processes are taken into account in the decision-making processes.</p> <p>The financial viability of a project is not determined through the EIA process. As mentioned in our previous response, 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, 1999 (Act No. 1 of 1999) from the Minister of Public Enterprises and notification to the Minister of Finance. Approval, and an electricity generating licence, is also required from the National Energy Regulator of South Africa (NERSA) prior to the construction of any new power station. NERSA determines the electricity prices/ tariffs in South Africa. NERSA evaluates any application for an electricity generation licence in terms of its impact on electricity supply and demand and on the electricity tariffs. NERSA holds public hearings on applications for electricity generating licenses.</p>	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
		<p>The Eskom business case is a confidential internal-to-Eskom document containing sensitive commercial and financial information from the vendors and hence is not a public document.</p>	
	<p>1.3 Eskom has made grossly inadequate financial provision for dealing with radioactive waste, security and storage at Koeberg. The amount of R2 billion provided for by Eskom is at least R60 billion short of adequate decommissioning costs based on realistic UK audit provision equivalents (R1.1 trillion in total). Eskom must provide responsibly and adequately for existing decommissioning costs; good corporate governance dictates that they should not attempt to procure further nuclear facilities as these costs will then even further unfairly burden the general public for current and future generations. Indeed Eskom should not be permitted to continue embarking on any future nuclear power planning until it has provided adequately for its past and current nuclear clean up and has at least deposited the required R60 billion per existing site and further R60 billion per proposed site, in trust accounts to safeguard the public interest.</p>	<p>The financial provision that will be required for the future decommissioning and spent fuel management is based on engineering estimates and reports from independent experts, and the estimated useful life of the power station. The contribution to the estimated required total financial provision is made on a monthly basis over the total estimated economic lifetime of the power station, and hence increases each month. The provisions are restated on an annual basis to reflect the changes in the time value of money. Each year, when reviewing Eskom's financial statements, the external auditors assess the adequacy of the financial provision. All information in the above regard is contained within the Eskom Annual reports</p>	
	<p>1.4 Comment not addressed adequately. Kindly confirm that the issues raised will be assessed and compared objectively</p>	<p>As indicated in our previous response, macro-economic issues relating to the construction of the nuclear power station will be assessed by the economic specialist study to be undertaken as part of the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA. This will include an assessment of the advantages and disadvantages to the South African economy from the proposed nuclear power station. Further the selection of technology is described in the Scoping Report and will be discussed further in the Draft EIR.</p>	<p>Chapter 8 and Appendix E17 of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p>1.5 Comment not addressed adequately. Kindly confirm that the issues raised will be assessed comprehensively and compared objectively and further will not exclude costs of government subsidies, NNR, short and long term waste related costs.</p>	<p>This EIA is for a proposed nuclear power station and associated infrastructure, which if approved will be owned and operated by Eskom. It is not dealing with the total nuclear industry in South Africa.</p> <p>As mentioned in our previous response, Eskom finances its activities through retained earnings and loans raised on the South African and international market. Currently Eskom receives no subsidies from Government. Eskom anticipates receiving loans from government to assist with the construction of power stations (of all kinds) and transmission networks.</p> <p>The nuclear licensees pay annual licensing fees related to the activities of the NNR. The quantum of the payable fees for each financial year is published in the Government Gazette in terms of section 28 of the National Nuclear Regulator Act of 1999.</p> <p>The short term costs for the management of waste is included in the operational costs of Eskom power stations. This would be the same for the proposed nuclear power station. Similarly, and as mentioned above, the financial provision for long term management of wastes is accrued through monthly contributions included as part of the operational costs of the power station. Again, the same process is envisaged for the proposed nuclear power station.</p>	
	<p>1.6 You state that “the provision (of R2 billion) will be used for decommissioning of the station as well as the</p>	<p>Refer to response above.</p>	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p><i>management and final disposal of spent fuel</i> this is clearly inadequate for decommissioning costs alone, being around 3 000% less than UK audit requirements (see also 1.3 above)</p>		
	<p>1.7 Eskom has no guarantee of attracting the required skills to adequately staff even the existing nuclear facilities; developing local skills do not guarantee that these newly skilled personnel will be retained in SA. The on going safety and security of nuclear facilities, the surrounding areas at risk, the safety of the general public, our tourists and business visitors all depend absolutely on the ability of Eskom to maintain adequate numbers and competent standards of personnel. Eskom must show beyond doubt that it can give an <i>absolute guarantee</i> that better than existing staffing levels are achievable over at least the next 40 years, if not all existing nuclear facilities should be decommissioned as soon as practical and no future facilities should be considered.</p> <p>The implications of glossing over this issue should not be underestimated as the potential of a local Chernobyl disaster can not be dismissed even under the very best of circumstances. Lack of skills such as currently exist in SA, together with two aging nuclear reactors, currently place the entire City of Cape Town at risk.</p>	<p>As mentioned in our previous response, Eskom has already commenced recruitment and training of South Africans to become operators of the proposed nuclear power station. At all times, Eskom Management (and the NNR) would require the correct complement of trained and experienced operators to be on duty. Eskom is aware of the scarcity of necessary skills and the associated costs associated with attracting such skills.</p>	<p>Section 3.21 and of the EIR</p>
	<p>1.8 Comment not addressed adequately.</p>	<p>As mentioned in our previous response, the issue of employment is one of the aspects that will be assessed in the relevant specialist studies as part of the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA.</p> <p>Note that the investigations conducted during the Scoping Phase did not yield any evidence that renewable energy is currently capable of providing base load electricity.</p>	<p>Section 3.21 of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 8 of the FSR and Section 4.2, 5.3 and 6.3.2 of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
		<p>Lack of sufficient base load electricity supply will negatively impact the economy and will lead to loss of jobs.</p> <p>Should any I&AP be in the possession of information relating to proven, feasible large scale renewable energy production which will meet the requirements of supplying base load electricity in South Africa, they are encouraged to submit this information to Arcus GIBB.</p>	<p>Section 4.10.1 of the FSR</p>
	<p>1.9 This response is not addressed adequately and is factually incorrect. Hundreds of thousands of sustainable unskilled & semi skilled jobs will be lost if nuclear power is preferred over a mix of renewable energy. This is, not only an economic tragedy, it is a matter of preventable human rights abuse to deprive the struggling class of their right to work.</p> <p>RE can compete with NP and is entirely suitable for required energy generation. RE is preferable in all important issues mentioned in the draft scoping report namely cost, lead time, environmental impact and operating characteristics. It is false to imply that RE cannot provide both base load and peaking power.</p>	<p>Information in the previous response is factually correct. The shortage of power in South Africa is a large threat to local jobs. Arcus GIBB does not agree that a greater number of jobs would be lost as a result of the construction of a NPS.</p> <p>As stated in our previous response renewable energy is and will be continue to be pursued as a source of power generation. It is Eskom's stance that ALL of the primary energy resources in or available to South Africa, including solar, wind, wave, ocean current, tidal energy, biomass, hydro, gas, coal and nuclear need to be harnessed using the appropriate technology to provide the electricity that South Africa requires to support its economic growth and development.</p> <p>The investigations conducted during the Scoping Phase of the EIA did not yield any evidence that renewable energy is currently capable of providing base load electricity in South Africa.</p>	<p>Section 4.10.1 of the FSR</p> <p>Chapter 8 of the FSR and Section 4.2, 5.3 and 6.3.2 of the EIR</p> <p>Section 8.9 of the FSR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p>1.10 Comment not adequately addressed and not factually correct. Chernobyl is a well-known case of people dying and becoming ill from living close to a nuclear power station. There are many other documented cases of health problems associated with routine nuclear emissions and various other nuclear accidents.</p>	<p>The information in the previous response is factually correct.</p> <p>The Chernobyl NPS made use of flawed technology which has been phased out since the disaster.</p> <p>As mentioned above 3rd party liability insurance is held by Eskom. Government Notice No. 581 of 7 May 2004 provides for the categorisation of existing nuclear installations and the level of, and manner in which financial security must be provided.</p> <p>Experience gained internationally from scientifically credible sources is that people do not become ill or die from living in close proximity to an operating nuclear power station.</p>	<p>Chapter 6 of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 4.9.1 of the FSR</p>
	<p>2 The response to this comment was evasive and did not address the issues advanced which inter alia requires our updated comparison of cost of RE v/s nuclear at the end of the EIA prior to submission of the ROD.</p> <p>There is a strong possibility of legal challenges to this process if this is not addressed adequately.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>	
	<p>3 Peer reviews are not acceptable unless they are conducted by independently appointed experts. Your approach appears to be one of ensuring that peer reviews are conducted on the basis of known outcomes for the proponents by pre appointing experts to do peer reviews. Your invitation that NGO's may appoint their own experts takes no cognisance of the fact that NGO's may not have the financial ability to pay for peer reviews, certainly these</p>	<p>Peer reviews are not required in terms of the EIA Regulations. However due to the sensitivity of this project is was felt by Arcus GIBB, the specialists and Eskom that peer reviews would add value to the quality of work. All peer reviewers are independent and have been appointed to provide a technical</p>	<p>Chapter 7.6.4 of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p>reports would be difficult if not impossible to conduct within the public comment period. A minimum period of 6 months would be required if you will not agree that independently appointed peer reviews should take place.</p> <p>The time required to assess the high number of studies in the EIA will also mean that the time allowed for public comment will need to be increased to a minimum of 120 days, preferably 6 months.</p> <p>We further request that funding is made available to NGO's for peer reviews to be undertaken by independent qualified experts in particular where the peer review is to be conducted by nuclear proponents or those with vested interests in the nuclear industry directly or indirectly.</p>	<p>review the various specialist studies in their field of expertise.</p> <p>This EIA process has already taken three years (September 2006 to September 2009) and all comments received thus far on the EIA and its specialist studies have been responded to and addressed, where appropriate. The EIA is expected to continue for at least another eight (8) months. I&APs have had and will continue to have the opportunity to engage with the consultants and the applicants extensively. The specific review period referred to was extended to 45 days and are considered adequate.</p> <p>Granting of monies to I&APs to conduct their own investigations is not a legal requirement and could ultimately amount to same action as Eskom appointing independent consultants. Please further note that the Department of Environment Affairs (DEA) has itself appointed a review panel to review the EIA from an independent basis.</p>	<p>Section 7.5 of the EIR</p>
	<p>4. Thank you for your response</p>	<p>It is a pleasure.</p>	
	<p>5. This response is factually incorrect, wholly inadequate and unacceptable.</p>	<p>Arcus GIBB is of the opinion that there is no information in the previous response that is factually incorrect.</p> <p>I&APs are encouraged to provide factually based evidence supporting any claim that information in the DSR is incorrect. This will assist in producing accurate reports and the DEA's decision making process Please</p>	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
		indicate how the information provided is factually incorrect and why it is wholly inadequate.	
	<p>6 This response is factually incorrect specialist studies that state that “nuclear power produces “little” (hardly a scientific term) GHG of the entire life cycle including mining and enrichment” are either not well informed or deliberately misleading. GHG are only part of the pollution problem, others such as the impacts of radon gas and increased radioactivity of the region; these emissions require further studies by independent specialists.</p> <p>You quote from UK White Paper on Nuclear Power that “CO2 emissions from nuclear wind generated electricity is the similar to nuclear” please provide scientific evidence of that if you are relying on such a statement to advocate nuclear. However, even were it to be true, wind power does not produce any radioactive emissions at all, and as such nuclear can not be favourably compared with wind, to do so is deliberately misleading or sadly lacking in fundamental knowledge.</p> <p>Your closing statement under 6 “As nuclear power production produces fewer emissions than other large scale forms of energy production it will not exacerbate climate change” is factually incorrect. Please take independent advice from an expert.</p>	<p>Arcus GIBB disagrees that the response is factually incorrect, and urges you to provide factual evidence that supports your statement.</p> <p>Emissions other than GHG are evaluated in the Air Quality specialist study.</p> <p>Thanks for the comment. This statement will be verified in the Draft EIR.</p>	Chapter 8 and Appendix E10 of the EIR
	<p>7 The responsibility and cost of cradle to grave waste needs to be adequately quantified. Insofar as this responsibility relates to impacts of radioactive waste that will endure and remain dangerous for thousands of years, an actuarial assessment is required to ensure that these vast amounts are paid into a trust account solely for the benefit of the public, who will bear both the risk and the cost of securing and storing radioactive waste for an indefinite period into the future.</p> <p>Eskom must detail precisely how it proposes to fund such amounts and how these amounts will be secured and invested in order to keep pace with the escalation in costs</p>	Refer to response above regarding financial provisions for decommissioning and spent fuel management.	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	of security and storage.		
	<p>8. The DSR is factually incorrect in the assertion that “at present the technology available is not advanced enough and can not produce sufficient amounts of power to meet the current electricity demand specifically as base load option” The bald statement that “For this (the above quoted) reason it is not feasible to consider these alternatives any further.” is unacceptable and will, if not adequately addressed, form yet another of the many fatal flaws identified in the EIA process.</p> <p>IF your assertion was correct, which it is not, rapid advancements and cost reductions in RE technologies make a compelling case for retaining the “No go option” during this entire process. If not, it appears that Eskom is indirectly saying that they bear no responsibility towards the public, and that nuclear is the only option on the table irrespective of the EIA outcome. Should the latter be so we remind you that the public will collectively be spending many hours on this EIA process, we do not intend to again engage in a futile exercise for no payment, as happened with the PBMR; we therefore would appreciate candour in your response.</p>	<p>To the best of Arcus GIBB’s knowledge, the DSR is factually correct. Should you have any credible resource that provides contrary information to what has been stated in the DSR, Arcus GIBB requests that you supply such for its consideration.</p> <p>Note that, as stated in the DSR, nuclear is not the only technology under consideration by Eskom for future electricity supply. Coal-fired, open cycle gas turbine and pumped storage scheme power stations are currently being constructed by Eskom. An EIA for a wind energy facility has been completed. NERSA already held public meetings in June 2008 regarding Eskom’s application for an electricity generating licence for this facility. An EIA for a concentrated solar thermal plant has been completed and an environmental authorisation has been obtained. The business case and funding for this project are currently being prepared.</p>	Chapter 5 of the EIR
	<p>9. New point Education, as opposed to indoctrination, of the general public is a pre requisite of a meaningful public participation process. Please confirm that you will provide a balanced and independent education process and a schedule of how you intend to conduct this aspect of the EIA.</p> <p>We trust that you will understand that while you may perhaps consider our remarks to be harsh, we have been involved with</p>	<p>In terms of the EIA Regulations, public education is not an aspect of the EIA.</p> <p>Arcus GIBB ensures that all public meetings, open days or workshops are conducted in an objective and transparent manner and will continue to do so through out this process.</p>	Chapter 6 of the EIR Section 7.5 of the EIR and Appendix D of the EIR

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p>various nuclear EIA public processes and have been bitterly disappointed at the lack of objectivity of the process. We trust this failure will not be repeated.</p>	<p>Independently of the EIA process, Eskom has been undertaking a nuclear awareness raising programme in the environs of the sites for the proposed Nuclear Power Station. This programme was initiated in August 2007. No end date has been set for this programme.</p>	
<p>Mr F Myburgh Overstrand Municipality</p>	<p>You are very much aware of the feelings, views and inputs made by the affected residents in the Gansbaai area. During the past public participation meetings, unhappy residents were told that their concerns would be addressed and discussed at meetings where the experts in the more than 20 specialised studies, will deal with the various topics. The interest shown in studies such as marine resources, social impact, local economic development and tourism and other, are quite substantial and high expectations were raised in terms of active public participation. The I&AP's are aware that the due date for submissions of the reports by the specialists were fixed at 25 August 2008 and was therefore surprised only to be engaged with a couple of the studies at a very late stage (three weeks before the due date).</p> <p>Especially the interaction by the consultants responsible for the social impact assessment, Messrs Octagonal Development, was found to be completely unacceptable. Attached for your information is a copy of the letter dated 7 August 2008 (see below), which reached some of the stakeholders late on that afternoon.</p> <p>The due date for "compliance, co-operation and participation" that was fixed as 16:30 on 8 August 2008, was regarded as unreasonable, unfair and certainly not in line with the objectives and requirements of legislation that guides these processes.</p> <p>At a meeting of the local ward committee (Wards 1 and 2 of the Overstrand Municipality) held on 13 August 2008 it was decided to lodge a serious complaint against the process followed by Octagonal Development to deal with this very sensitive and important component of the socio economic impact the proposed project may have to the area. Although it was appreciated that</p>	<p>Comments and concerns raised by the public during public meetings and key focus group meetings are provided to the specialists for consideration during their evaluation of environmental impacts. Specialists do not generally attend public meetings. All findings are presented at the public meetings by the Arcus Gibb's environmental practitioners.</p> <p>The nature of some specialist studies requires that the respective specialist undertakes a certain level of field work, which may entail interaction with certain members of the public. Information gained during such field excursions is used by the specialist to inform his/her assessment and report. Octagonal Development were following a process to gain information from the public to inform their studies.</p> <p>I&APs will be afforded the opportunity to review and comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report, which will contain the specialist studies.</p> <p>Comment noted. Sufficiently long commenting periods providing I&APs with opportunity to provide feedback will be given during the Public Participation process. All comments will</p>	<p>Section 7.5 and Appendix D of the EIR</p> <p>Section 7.5 and Appendix D and E18 of the EIR</p> <p>Section 7.5 of the EIR</p> <p>Section 7.5 and Appendix D of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p>consultants should be unbiased, it was felt that they should guide the public domain with pro's and cons in order to secure the success of the process and to achieve the goals laid down by legislation.</p> <p>The trustworthiness of EIA processes in general is already under severe pressure and practices like these enhances misperceptions pertaining to the integrity of these processes and therefore it is trusted that the complaint will receive the necessary attention and that I&AP's will be offered a fair opportunity to be heard and to influence the outcome of the assessment.</p> <p>Your speedy reply is awaited.</p> <p>Appended letter received from Octagonal Development</p> <p>Att: Mr W Jacobs, Kleinbaai Ratepayers Association</p> <p><u>RE: SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT</u></p> <p>Octagonal is contracted by Arcus GIBB and appointed as specialist consultant to execute a social impact study for Thyspunt, Bantamsklip and Duynefontein, with specific reference to a viability study currently being conducted by Arcus Gibb for ESKOM, pertaining to the establishment of a nuclear power station.</p> <p>The Kleinbaai Ratepayers Association is being considered as an important entity in this geographical area. It is obviously important to consider all the benefits and disadvantages attached to the establishment of nuclear power station in a specific geographical area.</p> <p>Various specialist consultants have been appointed to investigate all the critical important issues related to the establishment of a</p>	<p>be reviewed and addressed.</p> <p>Octagonal Development were not acting illegally and are not required to interact with the public. As independent specialist, Octagonal are, however, required to submit an unbiased report providing the positive and negative aspects of the proposed development as it relates to their study. As mentioned previously all specialist reports will be made available to the public, as part of Draft Environmental Impact Report, for their input. No attempt has or will be made to marginalise any group or hide any information from any member of the public or government.</p>	<p>Chapter 6 and Appendix E18 of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p>facility of this magnitude, in this geographical area.</p> <p>Legislation requires that all interested and affected parties should be involved and that a transparent process be followed to communicate all essential and relevant information, facts and findings through a public participation process, which will be conducted on a continuous basis and in compliance with all legislative requirements.</p> <p>Octagonal is only concerned with the social impact assessment. We wish to herewith afford you yet another opportunity to record any particular and important remarks you may wish to communicate in this regard.</p> <p>Octagonal is not requested or required to answer any questions or to address any concerns or issues, but merely to report on factual findings in this regard.</p> <p>Thanking you in anticipation for your compliance, co-operation and participation as well as appropriate remittance confirmation via e-mail, in order to reach us not later than Friday 8th August 2008 at 16h30.</p> <p>Sincerely Octagonal Development</p>		
<p>Mr Ruediger Dahlhaeuser For A Safe Tomorrow</p>	<p>Although registered as I&AP and member of F.A.S.T. I am still waiting for the minutes of the various public hearings held at St. Francis Bay and Sea Vista.</p> <p>Further I still waiting for comments of ACER (Africa) and Arcus Gibb regarding my serious doubts that the consultants of ACER (Africa) and Arcus Gibb conducting the EIAs for the nuclear power plants (above mentioned) and the PBMR trial version are independent as required by the NEMA.</p> <p>Herewith I would like to repeat my complaint that the consultants are not independent but biased. The reasons why I came to the</p>	<p>According to ACER records,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Letter 05E was posted to Mr Dahlhaeuser on 28 January 2008 advising him of the availability of the Draft Scoping Report (Volumes 1-3). Volume 3 of the DSR contained all records of meetings held prior to the compilation of the DSR. □ Letter 11E was also posted to Mr Dahlhaeuser on 04 August 2008 advising him of the availability of Final Scoping Report (Volumes 1 –3). Volume 1 of the FSR contained all records of meetings 	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p>conclusion that the consultants of ACER (Africa) and Arcus Gibb are not independent:</p> <p>Background Arcus Gibb and also ACER (Africa) has got the mandate to conduct the EIA. That means, it has to be investigated and assessed the possible environmental impacts of the proposed Nuclear power plants.</p> <p>Another assignment of the consultants and Eskom was to prepare and to transfer relevant information about the nuclear power (plants) to interested and affected parties/residents.</p> <p>But:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Instead of keeping themselves neutral, the consultants abused the public hearings as platform to promote nuclear power. Their statement: "nuclear power is one of the world's safest energy technologies" says it all. 2) In a letter (of 9th July 2007) Ms. Shinga defended ESKOM vehemently and tried to tell me that the Nuclear power is a sustainable development. Why she defended ESKOM at all and promoted nuclear power as neutral and "independent" consultant? 3) In phone Calls with Ms. Patricia Honey and Ryan Donnelly Acer (Africa) tried to convince Mrs. Honey that the nuclear power plant is absolutely safe by saying " the hot water released by the reactor would be fine for swimming. Mr. Donnelly was told by Acer (Africa) rather not to produce an own pamphlet for his public nuclear awareness program but the ESKOM'S pamphlet with the picture of the Koeberg nuclear power plant on the front page. 4) The Chairman of the F.A.S.T at St. Francis Bay received 	<p>held during the DSR review.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ Mr Dahlhaeuser is aware that all EIA project information including records of meetings can be downloaded from the website www.eskom.co.za/eia under "Nuclear 1-Generation" link ❑ All letters that have been distributed by ACER (Africa) to registered I&APs, including Mr Dahlhaeuser contain detailed information of the various public participation products and engagements. <p>The environmental impact assessment is undertaken by independent EIA Consultants (Arcus GIBB) in accordance with the applicable legislation and regulations. The decision on whether to grant an environmental authorisation is made by the Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism.</p> <p>Arcus GIBB and ACER Africa fully comply with the NEMA requirements and can guarantee their independence.</p> <p>Thank you for your input, however Arcus GIBB does not agree with the comments. The statement that "nuclear power is one of the world's safest energy technologies," does not reflect bias, but merely the conclusion of various studies conducted by appropriately qualified experts, references in this regard were provided as part of the Scoping Report.</p> <p>It is Ms Shinga's opinion that the email response sent to Mr Dahlhaeuser on 05 July 2009 was factual and was aimed at addressing concerns raised by Mr</p>	<p>Chapter 6 of the EIR</p> <p>Section 4.9 of the FSR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p>minutes, which were not complete. Beyond he found that the content of the minutes was incorrect. Strange enough the same happened to the Pelindaba Working Group. It is difficult to believe that all this happened by chance as these "amendments" made the minutes appear in a more favourable light for nuclear power.</p> <p>5) The public hearings which I attended in Humansdorp and in St. Francis Bay and the so-called Expert's Forum held in St. Francis too were controlled by the consultants clearly in favour of ESKOM. The available was for us as I&APs was strictly limited but in no case for ESKOM managers. ESKOM was granted to promote Nuclear power as "sustainable" development although nobody of Arcus Gibb and ESKOM was able to define the term "sustainable". Concerned and critical residents, however, were interrupted or simply forbidden to finish their questions.</p> <p>6) The stakeholders and interested and affected parties did not get comprehensive information about the plant design, worst case study, risk analysis and the financial impacts in short and long-term for the taxpayers. That means most of relevant information was not given. Therefore the public participation process as required by the NEMA has failed. My person is disappointed that such an important EIA was degraded as window-dressing venue.</p>	<p>Dahlhaeuser on various correspondence sent to ACER.</p> <p>These statements by Ms Honey are rejected and incorrect. These are perceived to be deliberate intentions to attack the integrity of the Public Participation Consultant.</p> <p>ACER (Africa) made it clear to the public that pamphlets that were being distributed by Mr Donnelly at the various public meetings neither originated from EIA team nor the Public Participation Consultant. It is noted that since the commencement of the EIA, Mr Donnelly has continuously distributed information to the public at his own discretion and with his own intentions.</p> <p>All aspects including any potential impact of the warm water released back into the ocean will be addressed as part of the various specialist assessments.</p> <p>Arcus GIBB does not advocate the manipulation or omission of information in such a way to renders it biased. It is critical to the integrity of the company that all meetings and documents are conducted and presented in a transparent manner. If you would kindly provide us with further details regarding the minutes; this matter will be investigated further.</p> <p>All comments in this regard are not agreed with. At no point has Arcus Gibb ever prevented any person from voicing their opinions regarding the project. People are</p>	<p>Appendix D of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 8 and Appendix E of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
		<p>actively requested to comment on the proposed project either at the public meetings or in writing, should they prefer or required to do so as a result of time restrictions on the public meeting. Arcus Gibb continually strives to ensure that the process is fair and transparent</p> <p>With respect to your indication that the project team was unable to provide a definition for sustainable development, illustrated during the public meetings, several definitions for sustainable development exist, each emphasising different aspects. Perhaps though the most commonly definition referred to is that contained in the Brundtland Commission's Report which defines sustainable development as follows, "development that meets the needs of the present generation, without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs." Definitions included as part of NEMA are based on this.</p> <p>The final decision with respect the environmental attributes of nuclear power as relevant to this EIA will be assessed by the DEA.</p> <p>The public meetings were undertaken as part of the scoping process, subsequently this phase of the process serves to highlight issues that need to be assessed as part of the Impact Assessment phase.</p> <p>Eskom is currently in the process of negotiating with two potential vendors, namely</p>	<p>Section 7.7.4 and 7.7.5 of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 7.3, 7.4, 7.5 and Appendix D of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
		<p>Arevia and Westinghouse. Only once these negotiations are completed will the cost and design of the proposed power station be known.</p> <p>The Draft Environmental Impact Report will contain discussions relating to the design and major events</p>	<p>Section 3.5 of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 3, 8 and 9 and Appendix E24 of the EIR</p>
<p>Mr Hilton Thorpe St Francis Bay Resident's Association</p>	<p>My attention has just been drawn to Fig 4.2 in Section E22 of the Specialist Reports. This still shows incorrect EPZs around the Thyspunt site, despite the fact that this was pointed out in our response to the Draft Scoping Report (see item 6.5.1 on p.3 of our response). I have not yet gone through in detail to see what other corrections have not been made, but once again, this undermines faith in the integrity of the whole EIA system. It is also not satisfactory that the Arcus GIBB legend completely covers Cape St Francis, as if it did not exist. Please will you draw the attention of the relevant specialist(s) to these deficiencies, and ensure that they are corrected before submission to DEAT.</p>	<p>Comment noted. This diagram forms part of the Traffic and Transportation specialist study, the authors of which confirm that the diagram is correct and reflects the information available at the time of the preparation of the report. It is Arcus Gibbs understanding that Ms Nuran Nordien (of Arcus Gibb) has communicated directly with Mr Thorpe and the issue has been resolved. The logo will be moved.</p> <p>It must be noted that the Emergency Planning Zones (EPZ) will be determined by the National Nuclear Regulator (NNR), as part of the nuclear licensing process.</p>	<p>Chapter 6 and Appendix E22 of the FSR</p> <p>Section 3.20, 6.4.18, 6.4.19 and Appendix E24 of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
<p>Ms Sharon Brink Bredasdorp/Napier Branch Botanical Society of SA</p>	<p>I have just gone through the relevant PDF document for my area namely, Southern Cape and points I raised in section 59 are accurate but somehow the response that is noted is not what I received. Nobody told me to contact Ms Ball (I have no idea who this is or how to contact her!) and none of my points were dealt with on a point to point basis.</p> <p>With regard to sub-sonic vibrations, which terms of reference was I suppose to refer to as no one at the open day event could even answer my question nor had any study been done in this field? I was assured that the technical people would be approached in this regard. I would have expected to find that point if none other to have received some comment instead all my comments are brushed aside with a paragraph "She was requested to review the Draft Terms of Reference to each of the specialist studies that she was concerned about and if she still felt that his concerns would not be addressed that she speak to Ms Ball from Arcus GIBB following the meeting or provide a written response submitted to ACER (Africa)" a fact I am not even aware of.</p> <p>The "commitment" of ESKOM at the open day is definitely not reflected in this document, I had more satisfactory discussions with those present than what this document reflects. Why the brushing aside of my comments? Surely these issues need to be answered not only to my satisfaction but to all the parties involved, a question missed by me is asked by someone else and so forth, the answer you provide for them answers a question I forgot to pose and <i>vice-versa</i>.</p> <p>I hope this document will be reviewed and my concerns adequately answered as per the brief of a Scoping Report and not only so that I can have my questions answered but so that others who have the same query (and I know of a few) will also then get the answers to these questions.</p>	<p>This discrepancy will be queried. Ms Ball is the Arcus GIBB (independent environmental consultants) Project Manager for this EIA. She was present at the public meeting in Bredasdorp, and part of the discussion group where these issues were raised. All comments submitted via the Public Participation process will be reviewed and addressed where necessary by Arcus GIBB. Note: The EIA Manager has personally called Ms Brink and the necessary changes in interpretation of the questions asked has been corrected.</p> <p>The Scoping Phase is restricted primarily to desk top studies and is intended to identify all factors to be addressed in the Environmental Impact Assessment Phase. Please refer to "Chapter 10 Plan of Study for EIA" in the Scoping Report, section "10.6.5 Terms of Reference for Specialist Studies." Page 22 under point "(q) Noise Study," requires the Noise specialist to address sub-sonic vibrations.</p> <p>Comment noted. No comments have intentionally been brushed aside. Every effort will be made in the future to capture comments as accurately as possible.</p>	<p>Section 7.5 and Appendix D of the EIR</p> <p>Section 10.6.5 of the EIR</p>
<p>Mr Robbie Louw</p>	<p>I have looked through the EIA documents listed at www.eskom.co.za/eia - Nuclear 1 and see NO REFERENCE WHATSOEVER to my submission. Maybe I overlooked the reference? Could you please let me know if the submission was</p>	<p>The website, which you refer to, is updated periodically at the end of each phase. Subsequently it was last updated at the end of the Scoping phase (August 2008). The next</p>	<p>www.eskom.co.za/eia</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p>taken into account, and if so, let me know where it is documented?</p>	<p>update will correspond with the release of the Draft Environmental Impact Report later in 2008. In light of this your comments submitted in September will not be on the internet site.</p>	
<p>Mr R Mike Longden-Thurgood Institute of Nuclear Engineers SA Branch</p>	<p>Please find herewith my comments on the final DSR for the Eskom Nuclear 1 project. <u>Note that the page identification numbers are those allocated by the Adobe format.</u></p> <p>I am working on the basis that, as a registered I&AP, I am invited to offer comments at any time.</p> <p>I understand that this FSR has already been submitted to the DEAT. However, there are a number of parts in it, which could be included in the draft and final EIRs, and therefore my reason for offering the additional comments set out in the attachment.</p> <p>However, there is one single aspect about the FSR with which I am very much concerned, as I have made abundantly clear in the attached comments. I feel strongly enough about it to repeat my concerns here.</p> <p>ARCUS GIBB have made the statement that they want to "work" the two Northern Cape sites, Brazil and Skulpfontein, out of this Nuclear-1 EIA process. If they succeed in doing this, then they either put these two sites out of any further consideration for the subsequent Nuclear-2, 3, 4, and possibly 5, processes, or in some way the goal posts which they are trying to entrench, now, they will have to provide justification for wanting to dig them up and move them later. There's either something very strange about this unsightful approach, or a definite conclusion has to be reached and agreed with Eskom, that the Brazil and Skulpfontein sites are genuinely considered not to be suitable under any circumstances for nuclear development.</p> <p>It would be wrong, in my view, to use what ARCUS GIBB presumably regard as unchallengeable arguments for rejecting these two sites for the Nuclear-1 process, and then airily declare</p>	<p>All comments, positive and negative are welcomed from I&APs at any time during the process.</p> <p>The FSR has been submitted to DEAT. Your comments will be considered for inclusion in the EIR.</p> <p>Arcus GIBB does not agree with your views concerning the Brazil and Schulpfontein sites. These two sites have been recommended for exclusion from further investigation for Nuclear 1 based on the following: Eskom Transmission Planning Division performed high level studies of the integration into the South African electricity supply system of a large power station at each of the 5 coastal sites. These studies included an assessment of the contribution to the transmission network stability, the contribution of the electricity supply to and the distance from the major load centres, the amount of transmission infrastructure that would have to be constructed and the time required for the integration at each of the respective sites.</p> <p>These studies have shown that the Brazil and</p>	<p>Appendix D8 of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 6 and 11 of the FSR and Chapter 1, Section 5.2 and 6.4.1 of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p>that they don't apply equally to the forthcoming Nuclear-2, 3, 4, and possibly 5, nuclear EIA processes. I find it hard to believe, in the circumstances that the credibility stakes have been properly thought through by ARCUS GIBB. I would like to know the arguments for and against these two sites in considerably more detail. Someone from ARCUS GIBB needs to contact me to discuss the matter.</p> <p>I have decided not to offer any comments on the numerous Split categories of Issues and Responses as I assume that they will be dealt with, as appropriate, in the main body of the draft EIR and its specialist appendices.</p> <p>ACER Note: A 25-page document accompanied this comment and has been dealt with as part of the lengthy submissions.</p>	<p>Schulpfontein sites are not feasible alternatives for the proposed Nuclear 1 power station. In terms of the NEMA EIA regulations a site has to be feasible for it to be considered as an alternative. If the proposed Nuclear 1 power station is constructed, it is necessary to evacuate power to the major load centres (i.e. the areas where the electricity would be used), therefore requiring the construction of new transmission power lines and associated infrastructure. At this stage, the demand for electricity in the Northern Cape is relatively small compared to the size of the proposed power station, and hence the electricity generated would need to be evacuated to the major demand centres in the Western Cape, Eastern Cape and Gauteng.</p> <p>The Eskom Transmission Planning Division has also indicated that these two sites cannot be integrated into the Eskom Power Grid in time to meet the demand for power (2016) - there is insufficient time for Eskom to have the environmental impact assessment completed, procure servitudes and build the power lines in two new corridors over more than 1 500 km to evacuate the power from either of these two sites to the major load centres in time to meet the required date for operation of the proposed Nuclear 1 power station.</p> <p>Both these sites are thus considered to be non-viable alternatives for nuclear 1 (although they are alternatives for future power stations). It has thus been recommended to exclude these two sites from further investigation in this specific EIA. It must be emphasised that the exclusion of the Brazil</p>	<p>Chapter 6 and 11 of the FSR and Chapter 1, Section 5.2 and 6.4.1 of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 6 and Appendix E of the FSR</p> <p>Chapter 6 and Appendix E of the FSR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
		<p>and Schulpfontein sites is not a result of their unsuitability for a nuclear power station but rather that these two sites are not viable alternatives for the proposed Nuclear 1 power station for which this EIA is being undertaken. The two sites will be considered in EIA's for future nuclear power stations, and will be investigated thoroughly at that appropriate time.</p> <p>As an I&AP you will be informed of all public meetings and are welcome to discuss your views in this forum or continue to submit written comment.</p>	
<p>Ms Renee Royal St Francis Bay Resident</p>	<p>I was under the impression that there were seven alternative sites for the proposed nuclear power station, although only three are being considered further in respect of power lines. Please advise.</p> <p><i>Note: Sivest, PPP Consultants for the Thyspunt Transmission Lines EIA forwarded this comment on behalf of Ms Renee Royal.</i></p>	<p>Five sites have been considered in the Scoping Phase of this EIA for the development of the proposed Nuclear 1 power station. The sites investigated were identified by independent consultants that undertook a Nuclear Site Investigation Programme (NSIP) during the 1980s as the most suitable sites for a Nuclear Power Station.</p> <p>Eskom Transmission Planning Division subsequently performed high level studies of the integration into the South African electricity supply system of a large power station at each of the five coastal sites. These studies included an assessment of the contribution to the transmission network stability, the contribution of the electricity supply to and the distance from the major load centres, the amount of transmission infrastructure that would have to be constructed and the time required for the integration at each of the respective sites. These studies have shown that the Brazil and Schulpfontein sites are not feasible</p>	<p>Chapter 5 of the FSR and Section 5.2.1 of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 6 and 11 of the FSR and Chapter 1, Section 5.2, 6.4.1 and Appendix E of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
		<p>alternatives for the proposed Nuclear -1 power station.</p> <p>The three sites taken forward into the detailed Impact Assessment Phase of this EIA are therefore Duynfontein, Bantamsklip and Thyspunt. During this phase, independent specialist teams investigate each site for a wide range of ecological, social and economic aspects, and provide recommendations for site choice and detailed mitigation measures required. These will be used by the Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA) to make a considered decision regarding environmental authorization of the proposed Nuclear-1 power station.</p>	<p>Chapter 7 and Appendix E of the EIR</p>
<p>Mr Richard Lorton</p>	<p>As I resident of the Overstrand I wish to object to the proposed Nuclear Power Station site on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Not enough public participation has taken place informing the communities of the implications of the siting. 2. The area is unspoilt coastline. It is socially irresponsible to impose a development of this nature onto a resort area. 3. Development of this kind is not in line with the regions tourist planning strategies. 4. The notice to interested and affected parties (from ACER (Africa) consultants dated 14 March ref Nuclear1 08E) informing them of an extension period for comment does not inform them where the draft scoping report can be reviewed. The report is not available for review on their website or on the Overstrand Municipalities website. Your response to this, prior to the 1 April 2008 closing date, would be appreciated. 5. The Koeberg Nuclear Power Station surely has the infrastructure necessary for an additional site. 6. Have alternative power generation methods (solar, wind etc) been investigated properly? 	<p>Your viewpoint has been noted.</p> <p>An extensive public participation process has taken place during the scoping phase with meetings and open days being held in many areas around the proposed sites.</p> <p>Future meetings will be planned taking this comment into consideration, however please note that opportunities for involvement in the EIA have been widely advertised (nationally, regionally and locally) and members of the public are encouraged to participate. The DSR has been made available to the public so that they can consider it and engage with the project team at public meetings or through ACER by email, fax, letter or telephone. As a separate exercise Eskom has also been undertaking a nuclear awareness programme to educate the public about nuclear power.</p>	<p>Section 7.5 and Appendix D of the EIR</p> <p>Section 7.5 and Appendix D of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
		<p>Comments are noted. The site is one of three sites that the Scoping Report recommends to be further assessed by means of detailed specialist studies in the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA. Upon completion of the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA Arcus GIBB will submit the final EIR to the DEA who will assess and make the final decision with respect to issuing either a negative or positive environmental authorisation.</p> <p>Comment noted. All proposed strategies for the region will be taken into account during the impact assessment phase and the relevant specialist studies</p> <p>ACER distributed letter 08E to registered Interested and Affected Parties on database, with an assumption that they are in receipt of letter 05E, which notified them of the availability of Draft Scoping Report. Letter 05E contained detailed information and lists of where DSR can be reviewed, obtained or accessed.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the possibilities that Mr Lorton could not have received letter 05E, letter 08E contained details of the Public Participation Consultant and further encouraged stakeholders to contact the PPP office should they require further information.</p> <p>Upon receipt of this correspondence, ACER contacted Mr Lorton to advise him of the various locations for accessing the Draft Scoping Report.</p> <p>Comment noted. Three alternative sites will</p>	<p>Chapter 7 of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 8 and Appendix E18 and E24 of the EIR</p> <p>Appendix G of the EIR</p> <p>Section 9.3.4 and Appendix G of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
		<p>be investigated during the EIA phase. At present a location adjacent to the Koeberg Nuclear Power Station is being considered as a possible site (Duynefontein).</p> <p>An assessment of alternative baseload generation technologies has been made in the draft scoping report.</p> <p>There are a number of issues that need to be taken into consideration when looking at the options for electricity generation; these include cost, lead time for construction, environmental impact, and operating characteristics relative to peaking and base load power generation</p> <p>It is Eskom's stance that ALL of the primary energy resources in or available to South Africa, including solar, wind, wave, ocean current, tidal energy, biomass, hydro, gas, coal and nuclear need to be harnessed using the appropriate technology to provide the electricity that South Africa requires to support its economic growth and development</p>	<p>Section 7.6 of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 8 of the FSR</p> <p>Chapter 5 and 8 of the EIR</p> <p>Section 4.2 of the EIR</p>
<p>Ms Cecilia Boshoff Future Granite</p>	<p>Don't spoil our lovely country even further with this nuclear site. Choose a desolate place if you have to.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>	
<p>Prof. R A Hasty WESSA Northern Cape Region</p>	<p>Thank you for the summary of the Draft Scoping Report (DSR) and the invitation for comments. The DSR is comprehensive and well-done.</p> <p>Although the recommendation was made in the Draft Scoping Report as to exclusion of the Brazil and Schulpfontein sites in the Northern Cape from the Environmental Impact connecting transmission line to the Eskom Power Grid; the Northern Cape</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Eskom Transmission Planning Division performed high level studies of the integration into the South African electricity supply system of a large power station at each of the 5 coastal sites. These studies included an</p>	<p>Chapter 1 and of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p>Regional Committee of WESSA strongly suggests that the two Northern Cape site be fully included in the EIA phase of the project. As the national need for the expansion of the electricity generating capacity over the next two decades will likely require thee construction of additional facilities, all potential sites should be fully considered.</p> <p>In addition to the environmental impact of the construction and operation of a large scale electricity generating facility at all the five sites, the following factors pertain specifically to that of a Nuclear Power Station (NPS) should be included in the EIA:</p> <p>Operational</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Transportation of nuclear fuels to and from NPS ▪ Emission control w.r.t. normal operations and various accidents scenarios, w.r.t. Release (gaseous, liquid and particulate) from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary Containment Vessel • Secondary Containment Vessel • Disposal of Trapped and contained released materials ▪ Storage, transport, processing and ultimate disposal of spent nuclear fuels <p>Decommissioning of NPS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Fuel and spent fuels ▪ Irradiated materials ▪ Operational wastes <p>The chemical and nuclear aspects of the specialist review of the EIA (Section 10.6.6 of the DSR, Chapter 10 Plan of Study, pages 23 and 24) do not appear to be covered or it is not obvious that they are covered within the fields of expertise of the specialists nor specialist review panel.</p> <p>Moreover, there is a strong feeling amongst the Northern Cape Committee of WESSA that the comparison of nuclear power and</p>	<p>assessment of the contribution to the transmission network stability, the contribution of the electricity supply to and the distance from the major load centres, the amount of transmission infrastructure that would have to be constructed and the time required for the integration at each of the respective sites. These studies have shown that the Brazil and Schulpfontein sites are not feasible alternatives for the proposed Nuclear 1 power station.</p> <p>In terms of the NEMA EIA regulations a site has to be feasible for it to be considered as an alternative. If the proposed Nuclear 1 power station is constructed, it is necessary to evacuate power to the major load centres (i.e. the areas where the electricity would be used), therefore requiring the construction of new transmission power lines and associated infrastructure. At this stage, the demand for electricity in the Northern Cape is relatively small compared to the size of the proposed power station, and hence the electricity generated would need to be evacuated to the major demand centres in the Western Cape, Eastern Cape and Gauteng, with the associated line losses over the long distances.</p> <p>The Eskom Transmission Planning Division has also indicated that these two sites cannot be integrated into the Eskom Power Grid in time to meet the demand for power - there is insufficient time for Eskom to have the environmental impact assessment completed,</p>	<p>Chapter 5 of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 5 of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p>renewable sources of power is inadequate as the comparison (page four of the DSR summary) deals only with large scale renewable sources which are dismissed as being inadequately developed to provide large scale power generation facilities that can supply a reliable base load and be easily integrated into the existing power network in South Africa. As renewable technologies, e.g., solar, can be fairly easily installed by the average homeowner in South Africa to provide a basic amount of home energy requirements and thereby lowering the demand for electricity from the grid, the comparison of nuclear power sources should be expanded. Therefore, it is further recommended that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The EIA report deal with the comparison between nuclear power and large renewable power generation facilities while also considering the benefits that can flow from individual solar or alternative renewable energy source installations. <p>Respectfully submitted on behalf of the Committee.</p>	<p>procure servitudes and build the power lines in two new corridors over more than 1500 km to evacuate the power from either of these two sites to the major load centres in time to meet the required date for operation of the proposed Nuclear 1 power station. Both these two sites are thus considered to be non-viable alternatives specifically for this proposed power station (although they are alternatives for future power stations). It has thus been recommended to exclude these two sites from further investigation in this specific EIA.</p> <p>It must be emphasised that the recommended exclusion of the Brazil and Schulpfontein sites is not a result of their unsuitability for a nuclear power station but rather that these two sites are not viable alternatives for the proposed Nuclear 1 power station for which this EIA is being undertaken. The two sites will be considered in EIA's for future nuclear power stations</p> <p>These comments will be forwarded to the specialist undertaking the relevant detailed specialist studies for the next phase of the project.</p> <p>1. Eskom's focus is on power supply in the megawatt range. Eskom is continually researching and investigating the potential to implement various alternative-generating technologies, and to partner where appropriate with other organisations. Installing solar panels is</p>	<p>Chapter 6 and 11 of the FSR and Chapter 1, Section 5.2 and 6.4.1 of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
		<p>considered an effective demand side management option but such systems are not able to provide the quality and quantity of electricity required for large industry and will not fulfil the total residential electricity demand.</p>	
<p>Prof Len Handler Barbarossa Residents Group</p>	<p>I am commenting on behalf of the Barbarossa Residents Group, a ratepayers association within the Constantia Valley, Cape Town.</p> <p>Inception of Project I am concerned that the five sites which form the basis of the Draft Scoping Report were identified in 1984. That means that at least a year or two before the project was initiated preliminary investigation for a Nuclear Power Station (NPS) had been done. What has happened in the intervening 15-16years? In my opinion the forward planning was appropriate but the execution has been dismal so that now the country has to devise contingency plans to cope with recurrent power failures caused by the predicted increased power demand and the need to service existing generators and unforeseen breakdowns.</p> <p>The <u>site</u> of the NPS has also been investigated by relevant experts but in this regard public or community perceptions have not been evaluated.</p> <p>8.8.1 Location of NPS on pp 8-26 and 8-27: examined various parameters. Recommendations were based in part on Site Suitability, one of the issues evaluated was Social Environment. I presume that means the opinion and attitudes of the affected communities.</p> <p>And then Table 18 on pp 8-33 to 8-36: the heading Social said there was "Insufficient Data" for all five sites.</p> <p>i. Capetonians are in general concerned about the presence of a functioning NPS on their doorstep. I presume those living in</p>	<p>All sites under investigation were identified as part of Eskom's strategic planning for nuclear power which included the twelve (12) year Nuclear Site Investigation Programme (NSIP), aimed to locate and rank suitable sites for the construction of a NPS. Refer to Chapter 5 of the DSR where the process and findings of the NSIP are outlined. As these sites have all been identified as viable, it is Eskom's intention to eventually construct a nuclear power stations on all sites, should the Environmental Assessment process confirm that all the sites are feasible.</p> <p>Every member of the public is welcome to participate in the EIA. Opportunities for involvement in the EIA have been widely advertised (nationally, regionally and locally) and members of the public are encouraged to participate.</p> <p>The opinions and views of the general public are captured in the issues and response reports. The social specialist studies will look at a range of potential social impacts that could arise from the nuclear power station.</p>	<p>Chapter 5 of the FSR and Section 5.2.1 of the EIR</p> <p>Section 7.5 and Appendix D of the EIR</p> <p>Appendix D8 and E18 of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p>Atlantis and Melkbos and Blaauwberg are more concerned and take comfort that the prevailing Cape Doctor will blow away all noxious isotopes in the event of an accident. Building a second NPS at Duynefontein only doubles the risk in the event of an accident (Losing bolts in the interface between stator and rotor during a service strengthens the citizenry's concern).</p> <p>ii. Pearly Beach (Bantamsklip) also seems an inappropriate choice because of its use as a vacation resort and eco-tourist potential.</p> <p>iii. Oyster Bay (Thyspunt) south of Humansdorp also has villages and Humansdorp in the vicinity. The population potentially affected by an accident is much smaller and unlike Cape Town the victims are not trapped on a Peninsula: they would be able to escape in any direction.</p> <p>iv. The sites in Namaqualand will have the least impact on in terms of social disruption. I have no idea what the additional costs of long transmission lines would be.</p> <p>So in summary the <u>preferred site for a NPS is Oyster Bay - Thyspunt or Namaqualand</u> if the costs are not excessive.</p> <p>I think it would be instructive to poll the affected populations on desirability in their neighbourhood</p>	<p>You are encouraged to review the EIR terms of reference which will detail the exact issues to be assessed as part of the Social specialist study</p> <p>The purpose of the Scoping Report is to identify issues that require further detailed assessment in the Impact assessment phase.</p> <p>Comments noted. All issues raised will be assessed, where appropriate as part of the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA.</p> <p>Every member of the public is welcome to participate in the EIA. Opportunities for involvement in the EIA have been widely advertised (nationally, regionally and locally) and members of the public are encouraged to participate.</p> <p>The reason for undertaking the public meetings is to hear what the public have to say, get there input and provide such feedback to the specialist undertaking the various specialist studies. All issues and comments received will be recorded in an issues and response report which will form part of the final EIR, which will be submitted to the relevant authorities for decision-making.</p>	<p>Section 10.6.5 of the FSR</p> <p>Chapter 1 of the EIR</p> <p>Section 7.5 and Appendix D of the EIR</p> <p>Section 7.5 and Appendix D of the EIR</p>
<p>Mr Raymond B. Croft (R.B.E.CROFT)</p>	<p>Whereas I am a firm supporter of nuclear generation, especially in the Western and Eastern Cape, far from the coalfields, I strongly oppose the proposed new siting, primarily for environmental concerns. There is a very strong argument, however, to erect a new nuclear power station close to the first one, at Koeberg, on the West Coast. Specialist skills can be concentrated and urban development is less intensive and dramatic than in the Hermanus, Stanford, de Kelders, Kleinbaai and Gansbaai areas.</p>	<p>Comments noted. All three proposed alternative sites will be investigated during the Impact Assessment phase, your comments will be passed to the relevant specialist to ensure that they are adequately addressed in the EIR</p>	<p>Chapter 8 of the FSR and Section 4.2, 5.3 and 6.3.2 of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
Callen van den Broeck	Oppose nuclear station	Comment noted.	
Mr Dirk Hartford	I protest	Comment noted.	
Mr Thabo Matjui	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ South Africa has been inundated with power outages recently and this proves the need for our electricity generators to be upgraded as well. ▪ At the moment there is a need for the new generators because demand is more than supply and this places ESKOM into crisis level with regard to deliveries. ▪ Furthermore one cannot afford to attend crucial meetings with your office because of financial disability. A financial injection is always needed to cover such meetings. ▪ In conclusion I think it is vital for Government and Eskom to further their goals by upgrading their old systems to the new one. 	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The DSR has been made available to the public so that they can consider it and engage with the project team. This can be done through ACER by email, fax, letter or telephone as well if I&APs are unable to attend public meetings.</p> <p>Comment noted</p>	Chapter 9 and Appendix G of the FSR
Andrée Bonthuys	<p>My concerns as a South African citizen and as a resident farmer within the 10 km radius of the proposed Bantamsklip nuclear site are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Eskom's plans for nuclear energy fly in the face of the White Paper which states that there must be extensive public consultation before a decision is taken to build more nuclear power plants. Somehow this implies, to me, a referendum? 2. Legal; Act 108 of 1996, chapter 2 section 24 states." everyone has the right...to an environment that is not harmful to their health and well-being." This nuke site is causing me and many other affected parties much stress, even at this early stage... 3. If Eskom's primary objective is "the provision of the necessary means and systems to meet the electricity needs of its 	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>The debate as to the applicability of nuclear power as an option to meet South Africa's energy needs falls outside the scope of this EIA. Including nuclear power into South Africa's energy mix is addressed through the National Integrated Resource Planning process. With respect to the South African 'Nuclear Energy Policy' all draft policy documents have undergone the necessary public debate which has culminated in the policy's approval by the South African Cabinet on 11 July 2008. Debate regarding the effectiveness of such a process or otherwise falls outside the scope of this EIA.</p>	Section 6.3.2 of the EIR

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p>consumers IN THE MOST COST EFFECTIVE AND SUSTAINABLE manner, can Eskom honestly say that this route of 5 sites, the 5 EIA's the many power lines EIA's, the construction of infrastructure, water, sewerage, transport etc here is the most cost effective? Not to mention the supply of uranium and the eventual disposal of toxic waste...</p> <p>4. The Bill of Rights also states...."that the government shall protect the environment for the benefit of present and future generations by preventing pollution and ecological degradation." It is impossible to build a nuclear power station on a pristine site with little or no amenities or infrastructure in the vicinity without causing major degeneration to a large part of the Overstrand (transport, power lines, water usage and pollution, sewerage etc). Bantamsklip has many species on the red data list for starters and only one access route via Route 43 which passes through areas looking at Tourism for revenue.</p> <p>5. What impact, rated RISK HIGH. will effluent and sewerage disposal have on fresh water ecosystems?</p> <p>6. Demographics: there has been population growth since the last census in 2001. How does this impact on plans?</p> <p>7. Human health risks - to my knowledge there are no cases of HIV in the immediate vicinity. Importing a labour force must change this statistic.</p> <p>8. I await the EIA on power line size and specific routes. The contentious White Paper on Expropriation concerns me enormously. How many more White Papers will be published to shift goal posts and counter human rights with regard to property, health etc?</p> <p>9. If the Minister of Minerals and Energy is responsible for the NNR and appoints the board, does the public have any say in these appointments (this is a democracy)? What qualifications? What transparency?</p> <p>10. Costs related to developing on a remote pristine site remain an issue (EIA's, purchase of further land, expropriation for power lines, development of infrastructure, transportation, water and effluent issues, security, construction etc).</p>	<p>The impact assessment phase of this EIA will include several Specialist studies across an array of environmental and socio-economic disciplines. Your comments have therefore been noted and subsequently passed on to the relevant specialists to be addressed as part of their respective studies.</p> <p>Issues 5, 6 &7 will be assessed by the relevant specialist.</p> <p>Comments noted. Your details have been passed on to the Transmission line EIA team and they will be making contact with you as apart of the transmission line EIA</p> <p>Throughout the world, Regulatory Authorities are appointed by Government, in terms of approved legislation.</p> <p>In South Africa, the National Nuclear Regulator Act 47 of 1999, approved by Parliament, provides the mandate and identifies the scope of activities of the NNR.</p>	<p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E of the EIR.</p> <p>Section 6.3.5 of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
		<p>In terms of the Act, the Board of the NNR specifically includes representatives of each of Labour, Business and affected Communities respectively, and specifically excludes anybody who is the holder of a nuclear authorisation or the employee of the holder of a nuclear authorisation.</p> <p>Each year, the NNR tables its Annual Report in Parliament. The NNR also provides ad hoc reports to Parliamentary Portfolio Committees on specific issues with which it is dealing. The NNR executes its mandate in an independent manner.</p> <p>Thank you for your comments they will be addressed, where appropriate, as part of the impact Assessment phase</p>	
M Scholtz	I object to nuclear power station being built at Pearly Beach	Comment noted.	
Mrs Daniela Casciani	<p>Thanks for the opportunity, I needed more time to read and try to assess the reports.</p> <p>Decision seems to be already taken –need only to finalise still great amount of promoting “nuclear “ either as the cleanest alternative of or the unavoidable choice (inefficiency of other technologies to provide base load).</p> <p>Great need of a more balanced and informative role of the reports (no emphasise on positives and minimisation of negatives) quote from Time February 25, 2008” the Olkiluoto reactor, which was planned to cost \$4.4 Billion now at least two years behind schedule and by some estimates around \$ 1 billion over-budget...still expected to turn a profit”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Still lots of concern about nuclear waste storing, transporting, handling, great need of detailed research “radionuclides emission” too generic, also need of in-depth info (type, quantity, frequency). 	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comments noted</p> <p>Comments noted</p> <p>The purpose of the scoping report is to identify issues for detailed assessment in the EIR. The EIR will assess the on site handling and storage of waste.</p>	Section 6.4.10 of the EIR

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ SFB is missing from lots of maps. Is it Sea Vista unified with S.F.B ? ▪ 20 years of Koeberg nuclear plant can be considered sufficient to start an epidemiological study on the possible health concern of workers and local residents. 	<p>There is a thorough process in place to monitor the health of people that are potentially exposed. This EIA will recommend a methodology to carry out epidemiological studies and provide as far as possible current baselines.</p>	<p>Chapter 8 of the EIR</p>
<p>Mr Richard Henn Sevenfive Consulting</p>	<p>Can you comment on the accuracy of the news reports in the media this week that Eskom have announced dates for a roll out plan of Nuclear 1, 2 and 3 (that much is clear and understood and is included in the amended scoping report on the Eskom website) but what is interesting is that some news paper articles have clearly stated that, assuming none of the sites are excluded during the EIA process, roll out will commence with Duynefontein, then Bantamsklip and LASTLY at Thyspunt.</p> <p>I see in the amended scoping report the dates for the roll out plan, but nowhere in there does it state which proposed site will host which particular phase of the project.</p>	<p>The site for the nuclear power plant has not yet been determined. In terms of which of the sites are planned for Nuclear-1; this will depend on the outcome of the EIA and technical information.</p> <p>All timing indicated in the PoS is indicative and will only be finalised once the task team established by Government have determined the way forward, the EIA is completed, the NNR licensing process has progressed, a business case has been approved by Eskom and approval to proceed has been obtained from NERSA.</p> <p>The final timing of the rollout of Eskom's proposed nuclear programme will be determined through the energy planning process.</p>	<p>Section 7.6 of the EIR</p>
<p>2. WASTE DISPOSAL (NUCLEAR)</p>			
<p>Mrs B M Blignaut Greenbelt Action Group – Roodepoort</p>	<p>We continue to oppose the implementation of nuclear power mainly on grounds of nuclear waste and the numbers of alternative energy sources available to South Africa.</p>	<p>Your objection is noted. The disposal of <u>non-radioactive waste</u> will be discussed in the Environmental Impact Report as well as the Environmental Management Plan (EMP). With respect to the various streams of <u>radioactive waste</u>, the handling of radioactive waste falls under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Minerals and Energy in terms of the Nuclear Energy Act, and is also subject to a licensing</p>	<p>Section 3.15, 3.18, 3.19, 6.3.4, 6.4.10 and 6.4.18 of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
		<p>process from the NNR. The EIR will however include a discussion of radioactive waste, as well as the amount of waste (both radioactive and non-radioactive) that will be expected from the proposed NPS. Waste disposal and transportation will be further addressed in the EIR (as requested in DEAT's letter dated 19 November 2008).</p> <p>Chapter 8 of the Final Scoping Report for the Nuclear-1 EIA discusses alternative forms of power generation. Eskom is in the process of exploring a number of different options to generate electricity and is investing in further development of renewable technologies. Figure 66 on Page 8-3 illustrates the Project Funnel, which reflects where the different projects (and associated technologies) are in the development process (i.e. the stage of the development of these technologies). Only certain electricity generation technologies are commercially available, although not necessarily financially viable in South Africa based on the availability of resources (fuel) and geographical constraints. The limited range of viable technologies is listed in Table 17 on Page 8-5. The Final Scoping Report is available on the following website: www.eskom.co.za/eia.</p>	<p>Chapter 8 of the FSR and Section 4.2, 5.3 and 6.3.2 of the EIR</p>
<p>Ms Vera Le Blanc Smith</p>	<p>(1) Aside from the prohibitive cost of nuclear power, the fact that it doesn't create many sustainable jobs, there is the danger of poor maintenance with so many skilled workers leaving South Africa, but the main horrific danger to this and future generations is the WASTE that will be created.</p> <p>(2) I understand that there is still a problem of disposing of waste from the present installations; but apart from that, it seems it is indestructible for centuries to come - no matter how it is stored the</p>	<p>1. The Terms of Reference for the Economic Specialists as laid out in the Revised Plan of Study for EIA; require that the following be considered: "<i>Employment impact</i>" and "<i>Skills required to operate a NPS and the opportunities that this may present for educational institutions. Moreover, the capability of South Africa to provide the necessary skills</i>". Also refer to response (2)</p>	<p>Chapter 10 of the FSR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p>containers & storage places will be contaminated and, eventually, leak out and destroy future generations.</p> <p>(3) The Rand University patented a new, more efficient solar panel - when interviewed on the radio the Professor said that factories would be built here (2 years ago) to manufacture them - they could be used in place of roofing tiles, etc. so that each house could be independent of electricity. Hectares of these panels could be put in place in our hot, arid areas, to create electricity at a fraction of the cost (AND NO DANGER) of nuclear power.</p> <p>(4) The more I hear of Eskom's insistence on nuclear power - the horrendous cost - the more I think of the Arms Deal and the way the costs escalated.</p>	<p>below.</p> <p>2. The disposal of <u>non-radioactive waste</u> will be discussed in the Environmental Impact Report as well as the Environmental Management Plan (EMP). With respect to the various streams of <u>radioactive waste</u>, it must be noted that handling of radioactive waste falls under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Minerals and Energy in terms of the Nuclear Energy Act, and is also subject to a licensing process from the NNR. In light of this, the EIR will include a preliminary discussion of radioactive waste, as well as the amount of waste (both radioactive and non-radioactive) that will be expected from the proposed NPS. Waste disposal and transportation will be further addressed in the EIR (as requested in DEAT's letter dated 19 November 2008).</p> <p>3. Your comment is noted. With regards to renewable energy (such as solar and wind), Chapter 8 of the Final Scoping Report for the Nuclear-1 EIA discusses alternative forms of power generation. Eskom is in the process of exploring a number of different ways in which to generate electricity and is investing in further development of renewable technologies. Figure 66 on Page 8-3 illustrates the Project Funnel, which reflects where the different projects (and associated technologies) are in the development process (i.e. the stage of the development of these technologies). Only certain electricity generation technologies are commercially available, although not necessarily financially viable in South Africa based on the availability of resources (fuel) and geographical</p>	<p>Section 3.15, 3.18, 3.19, 6.3.4, 6.4.10 and 6.4.18 of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 8 of the FSR and Section 4.2, 5.3 and 6.3.2 of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
		<p>constraints. The limited range of viable technologies is listed in Table 17 on Page 8-5. The Final Scoping Report is available on the following website: http://projects.gibb.co.za/.</p> <p>4. Your comment is noted.</p>	
3. FINANCIAL/ECONOMIC			
<p>Interested and Affected Party</p>	<p>The announcement on the background to ECS said it would apply "...to all electricity customers consuming more than 100 MWh per annum..."</p> <p>That is only half the story. You would need a very large residential establishment to consume that amount of electricity. Even a rather large house will not use much more than 36 000 kWh per, 1 000 kW =1MWh so 36 MWH so even the most extravagant residential consumer is not going to hit the 100MWH level. But what the statement quoted above means is that if you do use more than 100MWH each individual customer will have a specific target for allocations and savings. For the rest the flat rate applies, 20% in the case of residential use - one size fits all- almal oor die selfde kam geskeer. That is not made that clear.</p> <p>Of course probably the majority of consumers receive their bills from their local authority. Whether these bodies have the computer systems with the capacity to track consumption against the baseline, to track consumption month by month to see what band that month's consumption will fall in and what level of transgression has been reached is doubtful. I am willing to take bets that there will be many municipalities who simply will not be able to do this in the foreseeable future.</p> <p>If you thought the penalties for residential over-consumption were bad enough, take pity on the poor Government who has a target of 25% saving across the board as they are expected to lead by example. I am also willing to take bets that this will not be achieved. Then pity the poor taxpayer who will, inevitably, foot the bill.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p> <p>It is assumed that the stakeholder refers to the Energy Conservation Scheme (ECS) recently announced. The regulations and associated ECS rules set out specific electricity savings targets, electrical energy allocations and punitive electricity tariffs for all electricity customers greater than a defined size that exceed their allocations (http://www.engineeringnews.co.za/article.php?a_id=144751)</p> <p>It is unclear how the comments relate specifically to the Nuclear-1 EIA. This assessment is concerned with the construction, commissioning, operation and decommissioning of a Nuclear Power Station (NPS), and its associated activities. Issues regarding the charges and penalties for electricity consumption therefore fall beyond the scope of this EIA.</p> <p>However, your comment is noted.</p>	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p>Finally, where do reductions in capacity have the least economic impact? At the residential level of course. Some might say at government level but let's not go there.</p> <p>Alec (Spanner) Erwin (remember him?) announced that his department and Eskom had been "informed" by a World Bank report "Implementing Power Rationing in a Sensible Way" in devising the response to our electricity crisis. I am glad that I finally understand that bit of double speak. "Inform" undoubtedly means "know about and ignore as far as possible".</p> <p>Here are the "Twelve Lessons about Implementing Power Rationing and Demand Response in a Sensible Way" extracted from that report pages 165 to about 172.</p> <p>The full report is available as document 1317457 on the system. You judge how much he was "informed".</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Blackouts are the worst possible way to deal with electricity shortages. 2. There are smart ways to deal with shortages. Brazil is an example of an international best practice. 3. Price signals work to entertain demand response and help bridge the supply–demand gap. 4. A good rationing program should be tailored to the specifics of each power system. 5. Capacity and energy shortages affect power system reliability in different ways, but similar concepts may be applied to manage the crisis, particularly if technology is available. 6. Plan in advance, long before rationing is necessary and also as a way to avoid it. 7. Have good early warning signals before the situation gets out of control. 8. Explore creative ways to foster the rational use of energy on a permanent basis, using new tariff systems and quota-like arrangements or a similar concept. 9. Put someone in control with across-the-board authority to deal with a crisis. 10. Protect the poor from the consequences of rationing. 11. Do not socialize losses and gains. 12. Finally, honour contracts—always. 		

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p>Semi-finally - reminds me of the English judge who told counsel "Mr X, I have read your heads of argument and I am none the wiser." To which came the inevitable response "Possibly no wiser Milord - but far better informed". Was Spanner wiser or better informed or neither?</p>		
<p>Mrs Cheron Kraak Supertubes Surfing Foundation</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Economic and environmental issues. 2. The town will collapse economically if the surf populations do not support the town due to the nuclear station. 3. Jeffreys Bay's tourism economy is kept alive by international and national surfers. Petitions to follow from surfers world-wide. 4. The image of the surf industry is from Jeffreys Bay and possibly and more likely the whole surf industry of South Africa will be affected (turnover of this industry would exceed 1 x billion a year) 5. What if the international event was moved? Businesses would not survive the year. 6. If it is no longer the mecca of surfing, it would be cheaper for Billabong to move their company incurring 600 job losses and all the town revenue. <p>The proposed nuclear plants radioactive waste, regular radioactive emissions, potential disasters and the damaging effect on marine life is of grave concern to us. We find the locally recognised social, economic and environmental impacts of this proposed large nuclear plant to be unacceptable. Furthermore, the fact that there is no conceivable evacuation plan in an emergency for the local communities makes this proposed development unsafe.</p>	<p>All economic and environmental issues were incorporated in the scoping process and will be further detailed and assessed in the Environmental Impact Report.</p> <p>Thank you for your comments. The Impact Assessment phase will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • macro-economic • tourism, • marine • air quality <p>as well as several other studies that will discuss all issues relating to your concerns.</p>	<p>Chapter 8, 9 and Appendix E of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 8, 9 and Appendix E of the EIR</p>
<p>Mr Patrick Dowling Wildlife and Environment Society of SA: Western Cape Region</p>	<p>Thanks for the Nuclear 1 update.</p> <p>Is economic viability not one of the aspects that an EIA should investigate anyway? If one of the proponents is saying that costs are prohibitive and the fact of the matter is that these costs would be covered largely by taxpayers if the project went ahead is a deep flaw not <i>ipso facto</i> revealed? This raises further questions of an ethical nature about whether such a plainly problematic</p>	<p>A macro-economic specialist study has been undertaken as part of the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA (see Chapter 8 and 9 of the DEIR). It is, however, not the purpose of the EIA to make decisions on the economic viability of a project.</p>	<p>Chapter 8, 9 and Appendix E17 of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p>proposal should be taken further as if we were talking about a minor technical detail that could be easily mitigated?</p> <p>I look forward to your response.</p>	<p>Eskom has a formal approval process, with proper corporate governance, for all investment decisions. All Eskom's large investment projects, such as those required for the building of new power stations, go through a business case evaluation process. The proposal is finally be submitted to the Eskom Board for approval. Financial viability will be only one of the aspects considered by the Board during the decision-making process. Further the project requires approval in terms of the Public Finance Management Act, from the Minister of Public Enterprises and the Minister of Finance. The approval from National Energy Regulator (NEN) of South Africa, who is required to consider whether the project is a prudent investment.</p>	
<p>Mr Cornelis S Groenewald</p>	<p>I farm between Gansbaai and Baardskeedersbos. The power station planned at Bantamsklip could have a great positive impact on the area. It will open a lot of markets for agricultural products. It will also provide a large financial injection into the area. It could provide jobs to unemployed people, e.g. in agriculture and businesses in town. Roads will be upgraded, because with more people in the area, there will be more money in circulation. Therefore, I think the power station is a given because it would bring great relief, especially for agriculture which is currently suffering financially.</p>	<p>Your comment is noted, these aspects will be picked up by the relevant specialists during the EIA process.</p>	<p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E of the EIR</p>
<p>4. ALTERNATIVE GENERATION OPTIONS (INCLUDING RENEWABLES)</p>			
<p>Mr & Mrs Sally and Bowen</p>	<p>We have been re-researching the nuclear issue internationally (with consideration for the climate change crisis). I paste below the preface to a long and rigorous research report by the Austrian government. I can send you the full 4 Meg report, if you like. I found that the below perspective correlates with the majority of the international, independent (non-vested) studies of the fact.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Your concerns with regards to the use of nuclear power are noted, but we would like to remind you that the EIA process makes allowance for the consideration of alternatives. Information provided in the</p>	<p>Chapter 1, 4 and section 5.3 of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p>We are in support of the below perspective and on this ground reject any nuclear plants in SA (PBMR or otherwise). Instead we advocate Renewable Energy and Energy Efficient practices.</p> <p>For many years Austria has followed a policy of exit from nuclear power. In the population and across all political parties there is wide-spread consensus that nuclear power is too risky an energy technology and that the use of nuclear energy burdens future generations irresponsibly with nuclear waste.</p> <p>Meantime climate change has made the need to reduce green house gas emissions apparent. The foreseeable end of cheap oil and - somewhat later - of gas also requires a rethinking of energy policies.</p> <p>Consequently I am frequently confronted with the question whether in the light of these developments a policy critical of nuclear energy was still legitimate, whether nuclear energy was not the lesser evil.</p> <p>Policy, just like science, sometimes must pause and check its premises. In this spirit I have asked the Austrian Nuclear Advisory Board, the pertinent scientific advisory body of the Austrian Government, to take up this question. Have advances in science and technology made a revision of the Austrian energy policy regarding nuclear necessary, especially in view of climate change and "Peak Oil"? Has the nuclear option become sustainable?</p> <p>The assessment has now been completed and the message is an inconvenient one: in spite of nominal safety improvements in nuclear power plants a long list of "near-misses" documents that severe accidents can never be excluded; nuclear installations can only marginally be protected against terrorist attacks; proliferation continues to be a serious problem and a sustainable solution of the radioactive waste problem is not in sight. But even if one were to overlook all these drawbacks a nuclear power scale-up would come too late to contribute significantly towards the solution of the challenges of climate change and "Peak Oil". Nuclear power is not</p>	<p>Scoping Report and Environmental Impact Report indicated that there are very few available energy sources that are sufficiently advanced to be able to provide South Africa with the required base load generation capacity.</p> <p>Unlike Austria, South Africa has never made a policy decision to move away from nuclear power, and has recently (June 2008) approved the Nuclear Policy.</p> <p>Although your comments specifically references a single report it is relevant to note the following, with respect to European opinion on Nuclear power:</p> <p>All the European countries that have nuclear power stations (more than 15 countries), continue to operate those stations. Even the few European countries that decided to phase out nuclear power, still continue to operate the nuclear power stations (for example Germany still gets more than 25% of its electricity from nuclear power stations: Reference – European Union website energy fact sheets http://ec.europa.eu/energy/energy_policy/facts_en.htm) . Some European countries have already commenced construction of new nuclear power stations (e.g. Finland, France), while others have stated publically their intention to build new nuclear power stations (e.g. UK, Bulgaria, Finland, Lithuania, Slovakia, Italy).</p> <p>In addition, many non European countries have also stated publicly their support for Nuclear power, these countries include, for example, the United States of America, Japan</p>	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p>even a cheap solution: energy efficiency measures and alternative energies are superior ecologically and economically. Maybe surprising for many: should nuclear be significantly up-scaled fissionable uranium would become scarce within a few decades, just like oil. The nuclear solution then leads to a plutonium economy – and fourth generation reactor concepts point in this direction – with all the associated dangers and significantly higher proliferation risks.</p> <p>Thus nuclear power is not the convincing solution some claim; rather it is no solution at all.</p> <p>There is no reason to change the Austrian policy. Our focus on energy efficiency and alternative energies is far sighted and the right way to go.</p> <p>We are convinced that in following this path we also contribute to the awareness building that is necessary to achieve a sustainable and more responsible use of energy.</p> <p>Josef Pröl Minister for Environment, Austria</p>	<p>and China)</p> <p>Nuclear power produces virtually no sulphur dioxide, particulates, nitrogen oxides, volatile organic compounds (VOCs) or greenhouse gases (GHGs). Over the full life cycle – from mining of the uranium, iron ore and other minerals, manufacture of the components and construction of the power station, operation and maintenance of the power station through to decommissioning of the station and the management and disposal of waste – nuclear power emits less than 11 grams of carbon equivalent per kilowatt-hour (gC /kWh) (ref: Greenhouse gas emissions from energy systems: Comparison and overview (Dones, et al., 2003)). This is the same order of magnitude as wind and solar power including construction and component manufacturing, and two orders of magnitude below (i.e. one hundredth of) the average for coal, oil, and natural gas.</p> <p>The fuel cost for a nuclear power station (taking into account the cost of the natural uranium, the enrichment cost and the manufacturing cost) is less than the fuel cost for fossil power stations (coal, gas, oil), for the equivalent amount of electricity produced.</p> <p>Uranium resources are not infinite. Nevertheless there are sufficient resources of uranium available to supply the proposed nuclear power station for its expected life time.</p> <p>Every 1000 MW of nuclear power capacity needs approximately 200 tonnes of natural</p>	<p>Section 4.2.2, 4.3 and Appendix E10 of the EIR</p> <p>Section 6.3.2 of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
		<p>uranium per annum. Thus, 4 000 MW of nuclear power operating for a 60 year period would require about 48 000 tonnes of natural uranium. South Africa’s Reasonable Assured Resources (RAR) of uranium is estimated to be 521 000 tonnes, with a further 211 000 tonnes as inferred resources. [Reference: IAEA/NEA “Uranium 2005: Resources Production and Demand” – the “Red Book”]. Thus, South Africa has enough uranium resources to support a bigger than 20 000 MW nuclear programme for the envisaged 60 year lifetime of the modern nuclear power plants.</p> <p>Eskom in collaboration with the South African government are also pursuing improvements in the efficient utilisation of electricity. Eskom has a demand-side management and energy efficiency programme target of 3000 MW by 2012 and 8000 MW by 2025. 8000 MW would be equivalent to avoiding the construction of two large coal-fired power stations.</p> <p>Your concerns with regards to the safety of a Nuclear Power Station are also noted and the following response is provided:</p> <p>The nuclear safety of, and the risk of a nuclear accident at the proposed NPS will be independently assessed by the National Nuclear Regulator (NNR). Even though the risk of an accident is low, the NNR also requires that a viable emergency plan is implemented. The requirements for the emergency plan will be determined by the NNR and is based on the characteristics of</p>	<p>Section 6.3.10 and 6.3.11 of the EIR.</p> <p>Section 6.4.18 of the EIR.</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
<p>Mr Gian Maria Luigi Negra Bientang's Cave Seafood Restaurant</p>	<p>I have attached a report by Friends of the Earth, which reflects my views towards nuclear power. This study was done for the UK. but we would be faced with the same problems at the end of the day.</p> <p>We know that we have to find an alternative form of power now, lets not waste any more time.</p> <p>S.A. should be a leader in solar and wind power technology, yet we are lagging way behind the rest of the world. Why? I look forward to hearing from you.</p> <p><i>Is nuclear power the answer to our energy needs?</i></p> <p>The Government needs to combat <u>climate change</u> and meet future energy demands. But is nuclear power a viable option?</p> <p>Many people feel uncomfortable about nuclear power but cannot see any real alternatives. They are right to be wary. <u>Nuclear power is costly, toxic and not 'emission free'</u>. It is also not necessary.</p> <p>Friends of the Earth supports <u>safer, greener and cheaper solutions</u> that can collectively satisfy UK energy requirements and cut greenhouse gases.</p> <p><i>Why say no to nuclear?</i> Nuclear power is still unsafe and cannot help the UK meet its <u>pollution targets</u>. Here's the low-down on an energy a former <u>Environment Minister</u> says we need 'like a hole in the head'.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>Expensive</u> ▪ <u>Dangerous waste</u> ▪ <u>Environmentally unfriendly</u> ▪ <u>Security threat</u> 	<p>each individual site and its environs.</p> <p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Eskom is continually researching and investigating the potential to implement various alternative-generating technologies.</p> <p>There are a number of issues that need to be taken care of when looking at the options for electricity generation; these include cost, lead time for construction, environmental impact, and operating characteristics relative to peaking and base load power generation</p> <p>It is Eskom's stance that ALL of the primary energy resources in or available to South Africa, including solar, wind, wave, ocean current, tidal energy, biomass, hydro, gas, coal and nuclear need to be harnessed using the appropriate technology to provide the electricity that South Africa requires to support its economic growth and development. However only Coal, and Nuclear have proved that they can supply the required bas load.</p> <p>Eskom will not be permitted to construct and operate a nuclear power station if it is not safe.</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 acceptable low.</p> <p>Experience gained internationally is that</p>	<p>Chapter 8 of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 5 and 8 of the EIR</p> <p>Section 4.2 of the EIR</p> <p>Section 6.4.18 of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>Real alternatives</u> Expensive ▪ Costs more than wind - In 2002 the Cabinet Office estimated that nuclear could cost over 40% more per kWh than on/off-shore wind. ▪ Waste of money - Construction costs are large and unpredictable with delays causing greater losses. Windfarm costs are known, smaller and falling. ▪ Hits taxpayers - Disposal of existing waste will cost around £56 billion. More reactors mean more waste, with no guarantee that costs won't be passed on to the public. Dangerous waste ▪ Highly radioactive - Nuclear waste can remain dangerous for tens of thousands of years. ▪ Deadly inheritance - No one has yet demonstrated a safe way of disposing of it . ▪ Accidents do happen - Leaks and near misses cannot be ruled out. Environmentally unfriendly ▪ Way off target - Doubling nuclear power would reduce greenhouse gas emissions by at most eight per cent. ▪ Not emission free - Mining and transporting uranium, building nuclear plants and storage of nuclear waste all produce carbon dioxide emissions. ▪ Only electricity - It will not replace petrol and diesel - currently responsible for around 22 per cent of UK carbon emissions. Security threat ▪ Weapons - Uranium enrichment plants can be misused to make nuclear weapons. ▪ Vulnerable - No nuclear reactor could withstand a direct hit from a jumbo jet. ▪ Nowhere to hide - A successful attack could have an impact 40 times worse than the explosion at Chernobyl. 	<p>people do not become ill or die from living in close proximity to a nuclear power station.</p> <p>Taking Koeberg as an example</p> <p>Koeberg has operated for the past 23 years within very close proximity of wheat, cattle and diary farms. The nearest farms are within 10 km of Koeberg</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).</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. Hence 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. The Koeberg Nuclear Power Station 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>	<p>Section 3.20 of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p>Real alternatives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No need for nuclear - The UK's vast renewable resources combined with simple energy-saving tactics provide a safer, cleaner and more sensible solution. ▪ Secure supply - <u>Renewable sources</u> could generate more than half our current electricity needs by 2025. ▪ Quick technology - All the major renewable technologies can be implemented within three years. We'd be waiting at least ten for nuclear. ▪ Bright idea - A programme to phase out inefficient light bulbs could save a whole reactor's worth of electricity by 2020. ▪ Forward thinking - We could save fifteen reactor's worth by investing in the potential of using waste heat to generate electricity. 	<p>Nuclear power produces virtually no sulphur dioxide, particulates, nitrogen oxides, volatile organic compounds (VOCs) or greenhouse gases (GHGs). Over the full life cycle – from mining of the uranium, iron ore and other minerals, manufacture of the components and construction of the power station, operation and maintenance of the power station through to decommissioning of the station and the management and disposal of waste – nuclear power emits less than 11 grams of carbon equivalent per kilowatt-hour (gC /kWh) (ref: Greenhouse gas emissions from energy systems: Comparison and overview (Dones, et al., 2003)). This is the same order of magnitude as wind and solar power including construction and component manufacturing, and two orders of magnitude below (i.e. one hundredth of) the average for coal, oil, and natural gas.”</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</p>	<p>Section 4.2, 4.3 and Appendix E10 of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
		hearings on applications for electricity generating licences.	
Mr Walter Lewis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I would like to draw your attention to the fact that Brazil grows sugar cane and produces 80% of its own Ethanol, thereby saving Billions of Dollars spent on foreign currency. I suggest you try to influence those in power to do the same. ▪ Secondly, I noted that an engineer here in the USA has developed a generator below the surface of a busy section of a highway. When cars drive over the section it is turning a generator. It is an incredible idea worth millions to the developer of this concept and will save the country a fortune. It is worth the challenge. Talk to engineers in Stellenbosch who could work on a project like this. It is not a difficult or cost beyond imagination such as a Nuclear plant cost of today. <p>Good Luck</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Eskom is continually researching and investigating the potential to implement various alternative-generating technologies.</p> <p>There are a number of issues that need to be taken care of when looking at the options for electricity generation; these include cost, lead time for construction, environmental impact, and operating characteristics relative to peaking and base load power generation</p>	<p>Chapter 8 of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 5 and 8 of the EIR</p>
Prof Len Handler Barbarossa Residents Group	<p>I am commenting on behalf of the Barbarossa Residents Group, a ratepayers association within the Constantia Valley, Cape Town.</p> <p>Utilization of Solar Energy 8.4.1 on p8-9 refer A six-month pilot project to provide solar heating of water was introduced in March '07 in Gauteng, Western Cape and KZN. It is the end of March '08 i.e. 6 months after the project was concluded and I have not yet seen any report in the newspapers.</p> <p>During the past month I made enquiries at Kwikhot the supplier of the hot water cylinder in our house. I was given the same non-committal answers now as I was given in August '02 when the cylinder was installed and I then enquired about using solar energy to supplement the electrical geyser.</p> <p>If 30% of household power consumption is used for heating water then surely (subsidised) solar water heating is an easily implemented long term solution to ease / obviate the power crisis.</p> <p>Does Eskom believe that Solar water heating will dent their profits? I cannot think of any reason other than a possible shrinkage in profits that would make the sole power supplier SA is</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Eskom is continually researching and investigating the potential to implement various alternative-generating technologies. There are a number of issues that need to be taken care of when looking at the options for electricity generation; these include cost, lead time for construction, environmental impact, and operating characteristics relative to peaking and base load power generation.</p> <p>The positive impact of individual energy efficiency installations is agreed to be an important component in lowering the overall capacity requirement, but cannot be viewed as an alternative to generating the 40 000MW needed base load capacity by 2025.</p> <p>Eskom is currently implementing an extensive energy efficiency programme, that includes the subsidisation of solar water heaters and installation of CFL's amongst other</p>	<p>Chapter 5 and 8 of the EIR</p> <p>Section 4.2 of the EIR</p> <p>Section 6.3.10 and 6.3.11 of the EIR.</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p>so reticent about using what comes free and in over-abundance. May I suggest their profits would be increased if they marketed a product (like a solar heater) that would allow the average householder to be less reliant on the power station?</p>	<p>alternatives. Eskom has a target of 8 000 MW by 2025. This would be equivalent to avoiding the construction of two large coal-fired power stations</p>	
<p>Mr John Edward Thorne</p>	<p>In view on the present fiasco with regards to Eskom power cuts, I seriously doubt the ability of the organisation to maintain more nuclear power stations (bolts in the works etc.). Where will the required skilled workers be recruited? Solar and wind power should be a greater part of the way forward. Solar should have been in use decades ago and with sufficient government support and enthusiasm could still be of great benefit to the country and the environment!</p>	<p>Eskom expects to contract for this power station on the same basis as Koeberg (i.e. a “turnkey project”). Koeberg’s schedule was similar to that proposed for the new nuclear power station. Similar to Koeberg, the contract will include provision for the training of South Africans. The provision and retention of appropriate skills for all of Eskom’s new power stations is being addressed through Eskom’s recruitment and training and development processes.</p> <p>The job creation is likely to be bigger than the number of direct jobs created during the construction and later the operation and maintenance phase of the proposed power station.</p> <p>During construction, the number of direct jobs is expected to peak in the order of approximately 5000 - 6000 workers. Once the construction is completed, it is anticipated that the construction workers will transfer to new construction projects.</p> <p>During the operational phase, the power station would be a major employer of staff with a range of skills, from lower-skilled staff through to specialised skilled nuclear reactor operators, engineers and physicists. Using Koeberg as an example, there are currently 1000 - 1200 permanent employees at</p>	<p>Chapter 3 of the EIR</p> <p>Section 6.3.2 of the EIR</p> <p>Section 5.3 and 3.21 of the EIR</p> <p>Section 5.3 and 3.21 of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
		<p>Koeberg, i.e. under normal operating conditions. During shut down and maintenance periods, an additional 500 people are contracted and come onto site. The proposed power station would be about double the size of Koeberg; however the number of permanent employees is anticipated to be less than double the Koeberg requirements.</p> <p>Eskom is continually researching and investigating the potential to implement various alternative-generating technologies. There are a number of issues that need to be taken care of when looking at the options for electricity generation; these include cost, lead time for construction, environmental impact, and operating characteristics relative to peaking and base load power generation.</p> <p>It is Eskom's stance that ALL of the primary energy resources in or available to South Africa, including solar, wind, wave, ocean current, tidal energy, biomass, hydro, gas, coal and nuclear need to be harnessed using the appropriate technology to provide the electricity that South Africa requires to support its economic growth and development. However only Coal, and Nuclear have proved that they can supply the required base load.</p>	<p>Chapter 5 and 8 of the EIR</p> <p>Section 4.2 of the EIR</p>
<p>Avril Nunn</p>	<p>Thank you for this opportunity to use the extended period to submit additional comments on the above proposal.</p> <p>I am against the proliferation of Nuclear plants for generating Electricity. Especially on the relatively pristine coasts of our land. There are many other ways of generating electricity from the freely available sources of power available to us, which do not produce polluting by products. Radioactive waste has an extremely long</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Eskom is continually researching and investigating the potential to implement various alternative-generating technologies. There are a number of issues that need to be taken care of when looking at the options for</p>	<p>Chapter 5 and 8 of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p>half life, and the plans for storage of this dangerous material seem to be those of wishful thinking. "it will all be alright"</p> <p>Much more effort should be put into obtaining electricity from our freely available:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sun power. 2. Wind power 3. Tidal power. <p>Eskom is now at last promoting the use of solar power, which is good news. More research should be undertaken to improve the methods of obtaining and storing more electricity in less polluting ways than the production of nuclear waste. Are we going to send it out to space to get rid of it? We cannot yet tell which is less polluting to our world: Increased greenhouse gasses, or nuclear waste.</p>	<p>electricity generation; these include cost, lead time for construction, environmental impact, and operating characteristics relative to peaking and base load power generation.</p> <p>It is Eskom's stance that ALL of the primary energy resources in or available to South Africa, including solar, wind, wave, ocean current, tidal energy, biomass, hydro, gas, coal and nuclear need to be harnessed using the appropriate technology to provide the electricity that South Africa requires to support its economic growth and development. However only Coal and Nuclear have proved that they can supply the required base load.</p>	<p>Section 4.2 of the EIR</p>
<p>Ms Linda Louise Griffiths Hermanus Ratepayers Association (HRA)</p>	<p>Please keep the HRA informed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The HRA supports the development of technology for clean substitutes for the burning of fossil fuel for power <input type="checkbox"/> The HRA recognizes the need to utilize current alternative clean technology, which includes nuclear power generation. <input type="checkbox"/> The HRA encourages continuing research and development into technology in order to eradicate the generation of radioactive waste, which has long-term implications. <input type="checkbox"/> The HRA opposes the construction and operation of a nuclear power station at Bantamsklip – a biodiversity hot spot. 	<p>The role of the HRA is noted. All registered Interested and Affected Parties (I&APs) will be kept abreast of any developments during the EIA process.</p>	
<p>Ms Sharlene Vallance I&AP</p>	<p>I am totally opposed to any nuclear development or reopening of the nuclear station at Pelindaba. I live in Hartbeespoort and my children go to school here. Today's technology provides us with viable alternatives!!!</p>	<p>Your objection is noted.</p> <p>Please note that this EIA is not concerned with the Pelindaba complex and is focusing on the construction, operation and decommissioning of a Pressurised Water Reactor (PWR) type Nuclear Power Station (NPS) on either of the following sites located in the Western and Eastern Cape</p>	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
		respectively: Duynefontein; Bantamsklip and Thyspunt	
Dr Peter Inman Coega Development Corporation	<p>From the inception of the Coega Project, it was apparent that the anticipated large demand for power from the planned heavy industry would be best served by a local/dedicated power station. That successful model had been used for many years for major projects in the Middle East and elsewhere, but did not find favour with the responsible authorities at that time. When the Coega Integrated Power Project was initiated in 2002/3, the CDC and NMBM were the primary supporters and stakeholders after the three principals, Shell, Eskom and iGas. The opportunity for additional nuclear capacity in country was also recognized, as the increasing risk from global warming was already very apparent to discerning individuals. However, it was also recognized that nuclear new build would be controversial and time consuming, and a medium term solution would be required and gas was the only realistic option.</p> <p>With the NMBM, we have been strong promoters of base load power generation at the coastal growth centres, of which the NMBM is one. There are sound reasons for this including security of supply, network stability, reduction of transmission losses and diversification of primary energy sources. Under the direction of DME, now DOE, the CDC and NMBM were mandated to facilitate the fast-tracking of the CCGT Power Station at Coega. In effect, the CDC, the NMBM and iGas would take up where the original project left off and a revised Pre-feasibility Study is now with national government. However, the CDC and NMBM still have as their long-term goal, a nuclear power station for the Eastern Cape and thus have given formal support to Nuclear 1 at Thyspunt. Clearly, a nuclear power station at Thyspunt has to be connected to the national grid and such connection points are in the Metro and at Dedisa in the IDZ. For the record, Dedisa has been designed to accommodate up to 5, 000MW throughput and, once the 765kV lines are installed, the transmission capacity will be more than sufficient for the CCGT Power Station at Coega and/or</p>	Your comments are noted. CCGT was not regarded as a medium term application in place of nuclear power. Eskom and Government investigate a suite of energy generation options and carry out pre-feasibility and feasibility studies on all of these technologies as required. In order to meet South Africa's long term needs all technologies will need to be employed.	Section 5.3 of the EIR

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p>Nuclear 1 at Thyspunt.</p> <p>The above information clearly demonstrates that all relevant aspects of the generation and transmission capacities being considered have been determined holistically. Further, Nuclear 1 at Thyspunt is a key long-term enabler of sustainable growth for the IDZ, Metro, EC and the country. It is now common currency that the world has an energy deficit and that the historic easy solution of burning more fossil fuels cannot be followed without putting Planet Earth at serious risk. Nuclear 1 at Thyspunt will become a reality and the planned transmission lines to evacuate the power will have to be built. In terms of the proposed alternative routings for the power lines, the NMBM technical team is more qualified to comment.</p>		
<p>Mr Willy & Mrs Mieke Vanderhoeven I&APs</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Thanks for the pile of information in which you are trying to drown me; unfortunately it's all besides the key point we were trying to make: you don't need EIA studies if you opt for green power i.e. life threatening and nature damaging nuclear power! 2. How can any sensible human being in 2009 still support investments in extremely dangerous, life threatening power stations when cheaper, sustainable & green alternatives are readily available? And when the rest of the world has finally understood that there's only one future: GREEN! That's really beyond my understanding! Not enough "political" benefits maybe! 3. Although the initial investment for clean energy might be more expensive (which I doubt), at least it does not generate nuclear waste for which no safe disposal method has been found! Very doubtful if it ever will! 4. And unlike nuclear, natural energy power does not use uranium, the future cost of which nobody can predict, not even short term - <u>the price of wind, sun and water will be free in 10, 50, 100,</u> 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Your understanding is incorrect. Please see below for an excerpt from the NEMA EIA Regulations, GNR 387 of 2006, amended June 2009. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>The construction of facilities or infrastructure, including associated structures or infrastructure, for – (a) the generation of electricity where –</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (i) <i>the electricity output is 20 megawatts or more; or</i> (ii) <i>the elements of the facility cover a combined area in excess of 1 hectare.</i> <p>Thus, should a development trigger the above activity, it will require Scoping and EIA. At the very least, the development of, for example, a wind farm will require a Basic Assessment in terms of GNR 386 of 2006, amended in June 2009.</p> 	<p>Section 6.3 of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p><u>500 years!</u></p> <p>5. So what more justification does Eskom need to start building large-scale wind and solar energy generating plants / sites?</p> <p>6. Another major advantage: you can save all the money on EIA studies because there will hardly be any negative impact! Of course as Environmental Consultants this might not serve your purpose.</p> <p>7. I therefore copy Eskom and the relevant Ministries of Environmental Affairs and Energy who, based on what I've read recently really seems to care about life and the environment.</p>	<p>2. Your comment is noted. Chapter 8 of the Final Scoping Report for the Nuclear-1 EIA discusses alternative forms of power generation. Eskom is in the process of exploring a number of different electricity generating options and is investing in further development of renewable technologies. Only certain electricity generation technologies are commercially available, although not necessarily financially viable in South Africa based on the availability of resources (fuel) and geographical constraints. The limited range of viable technologies is listed in Table 17 on Page 8-5. The Final Scoping Report is available on the following website: www.eskom.co.za/eia.</p> <p>As indicated in the Scoping Report only two forms of energy generation are available in South Africa for base load electricity production, namely: nuclear and coal. Eskom is currently investing in both technologies. Hydroelectric power is also a viable base load option but South Africa does not have large rivers which could provide base load generation. Eskom is working with other Southern African countries to investigate and hopefully implement hydro options in the future.</p> <p>3. The disposal of <u>non radioactive waste</u> will be discussed in the Environmental Impact Report as well as the Environmental Management Plan (EMP). With respect to the various streams of <u>radioactive</u> waste, it</p>	<p>Chapter 8 of the FSR and Section 4.2, 5.3 and 6.3.2 of the EIR</p> <p>Section 3.15, 3.18, 3.19, 6.3.4, 6.4.10 and 6.4.18 of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
		<p>must be noted that handling of radioactive waste falls under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Minerals and Energy in terms of the Nuclear Energy Act, and is also subject to a licensing process from the NNR. In light of this, the EIR will include a preliminary discussion of radioactive waste, as well as the amount of waste (both radioactive and non-radioactive) that will be expected from the proposed NPS. Waste disposal and transportation will be further addressed in the EIR (as requested in DEAT's letter dated 19 November 2008).</p> <p>4. Your comment is noted. See Response 1. above</p> <p>5. Comments noted</p> <p>6. Your understanding is incorrect. Please see below for an excerpt from the NEMA EIA Regulations, GNR 387 of 2006, amended June 2009.</p> <p>1. <i>The construction of facilities or infrastructure, including associated structures or infrastructure, for – (a) the generation of electricity where –</i></p> <p>(iii) <i>the electricity output is 20 megawatts or more; or</i></p> <p>(iv) <i>the elements of the facility cover a combined area in excess of 1 hectare.</i></p> <p>Thus, should a wind farm development</p>	<p>Section 6.3 of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
		<p>trigger the above activity, it will require Scoping and EIA. At the very least, the development of a wind farm will require a Basic Assessment in terms of GNR 386 of 2006, amended in June 2009.</p> <p>7. Your comment is noted.</p>	
<p>Ms Kayla Kuczynski I&AP</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In starting this I would like to point out that I am not a botanist or a scientist. Neither I am I an eco-activist or a pessimist. I am however, I realist. I would like to bring to your attention that each of the people involved in this EIA have a moral obligation to consider the world once they have left it. What will your grandchildren say about you when the irreversible damage that such plants inevitably cause is left? Short term the Environmental Impact differs hugely from the long-term devastation that Nuclear power causes not only to our beautiful country, but also to the entire world. 2. The first world is quickly moving away from the use of Nuclear power, and onto far more sustainable resources. I am sure you are familiar with these, but if you are not I or many others will happily assist you with information. Why is the 3rd world moving backwards instead of forwards? Is this bureaucratic ball so heavy that no one can turn it around? Nuclear power is a poisonous and devastating way to produce power. Poisonous not only to its immediate environment (Not just to the sea water it will kill which is required for its cooling - and thus huge sections of marine life), but poisonous due to the waste it produces which your great, great, great grandchildren will still have to live with. 3. As these sites are at the coast, why not use Wave Power generators. They have an almost zero impact on the environment and will also create jobs without the risk of killing anything. As a realist, I do not stand in the way of progress, but rather stand for true progressive progress and not this antiquated "Lets poison the world and dump it somewhere else" kind of progress (read regress). 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Your comment is noted. 2. Chapter 8 of the Final Scoping Report for the Nuclear-1 EIA discusses alternative forms of power generation. Eskom is in the process of exploring a number of different ways in which to generate electricity and is investing in further development of renewable technologies. The Final Scoping Report is available on the following website: www.eskom.co.za/eia. <p>Your statement that the rest of the world is moving away from Nuclear is not correct. There are some countries that have decided not to pursue nuclear. However, several countries such as France, Finland, China and others are currently constructing nuclear power stations.</p> <p>During the detailed Impact Assessment Phase, the Marine Biology specialist study will assess the potential impacts of the nuclear power station (NPS) on marine species as well as assess the potential impacts of the thermal plume, record the baseline and predict future changes, identify potential impacts of organisms that may affect the cooling water supply and</p>	<p>Chapter 8 of the FSR and Section 4.2, 5.3 and 6.3.2 of the EIR</p> <p>Section 3.4 and 4.2 of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 8, 9 and Appendix E15 of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p>4. Please take your part in this very seriously and consider more than just your bank account, but the lives of your grandchildren and great grandchildren for whom you leave this world that we are creating</p>	<p>identify mitigation measures.</p> <p>The disposal of <u>non radioactive waste</u> will be discussed in the Environmental Impact Report as well as the Environmental Management Plan (EMP). With respect to the various streams of <u>radioactive</u> waste, it must be noted that handling of radioactive waste falls under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Minerals and Energy in terms of the Nuclear Energy Act, and is also subject to a licensing process from the NNR. In light of this, the EIR will include a preliminary discussion of radioactive waste, as well as the amount of waste (both radioactive and non-radioactive) that will be expected from the proposed NPS. Waste disposal and transportation will be further addressed in the EIR (as requested in DEAT's letter dated 19 November 2008).</p> <p>3. Your comment is noted. Please refer to Response 2 above. Wave technologies are not commercially available and are not suitable for base load electricity supply. Eskom is involved with research in this area and is collaborating with countries around the world that are piloting wave technologies.</p> <p>4. Your comment is noted.</p>	<p>Section 3.15 to 3.19, 6.3.4, 6.4.10 and 6.4.18 of the EIR</p>
<p>Mrs LN Straub I&AP</p>	<p>1. As a resident of Hermanus, Overstrand I would like to strongly object to the proposed Nuclear Power Station at Bantamsklip.</p> <p>2. We are in the tourism industry and believe that building a</p>	<p>1. Your objection is noted.</p> <p>2. During the detailed Impact Assessment Phase, the Tourism specialist study will</p>	<p>Chapter 10 of the FSR and Chapters 8 and</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p>Nuclear Power Station in our region is irresponsible and also not going for future generations. Have you considered Wind farms as a possible alternative?</p> <p>3. It is socially irresponsible to consider Nuclear Power as a future source of electricity. We have enough and also very strong winds in this region and we should make use of it as a natural source of energy.</p>	<p>assess the impact of the proposed NPS on sea usage and the tourism industry adjacent to the proposed sites. For further information on the Terms of Reference for the Tourism Specialist Study, please refer to the Revised Plan of Study for EIA available on the following website: www.eskom.co.za/eia.</p> <p>Chapter 8 of the Final Scoping Report for the Nuclear-1 EIA discusses alternative forms of power generation. The Final Scoping Report is available on the following website: www.eskom.co.za/eia.</p> <p>3. Your comment is noted. See Response 2 above.</p>	<p>9, Section 7.6.2 and Appendix E22 of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 8 of the FSR and Section 4.2, 5.3 and 6.3.2 of the EIR</p>
<p>Mrs B M Blignaut Green Action Group</p>	<p>We query the necessity of any form of nuclear power for South Africa. The problem of nuclear waste is a fundamental deferent other forms of energy notably wind, use of waste products, to lesser extent later to afar greater extent, solar are available since fossil fuels are presently considered undesirable.</p> <p>Solar energy is required and is in an advanced state of research. The more it is used, more costs will be adjusted to the need and use.</p>	<p>Comments are noted. There are a number of issues that need to be taken care of when looking at the options for electricity generation; these include cost, lead time for construction, environmental impact, and operating characteristics relative to peaking and base load power generation. The planning for the construction of new power stations must also consider the different types of power stations that are required and their cost (which impacts on the price of electricity), the time taken to construct them, the environmental considerations and their operating characteristics. The total demand for electricity in South Africa is not constant; rather it varies on a 24-hour basis, with peak demand in the early morning and in the late afternoon / early evening. To optimally meet the total demand, it is thus necessary to have both "base load" electricity generating power</p>	<p>Chapter 5 and 8 of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
		<p>stations designed specifically to generate electricity continuously at all hours, as well as “peaking” electricity generating power stations designed specifically to generate electricity only during the periods of peak demand. This is achieved by harnessing different energy sources and applying different technologies.</p> <p>Chapter 8 of the Final Scoping Report for the Nuclear-1 EIA discusses alternative forms of power generation. Eskom is in the process of exploring a number of different ways in which to generate electricity and is investing in further development of renewable technologies. Figure 66 on Page 8-3 of the FSR illustrates the Project Funnel, which reflects where the different projects (and associated technologies) are in the development process (i.e. the stage of the development of these technologies). Only certain electricity generation technologies are commercially available, although not necessarily financially viable in South Africa based on the availability of resources (fuel) and geographical constraints. The limited range of viable technologies is listed in Table 17 on Page 8-5. The Final Scoping Report is available on the following website: http://projects.gibb.co.za/.</p> <p>Finally, as indicated although all the respective alternative technologies are discussed in the Scoping Report and will, where relevant be discussed in the Final EIR the debate regarding the correct energy mix for South Africa forms part of the National</p>	<p>Chapter 8 of the FSR and Section 4.2, 5.3 and 6.3.2 of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
		Electricity Resource Planning process. Such a process is open to public participation and you are encouraged to engage government through such a forum.	
Mr MJ Yoell Uitkamp Action Group	The sooner we adopt nuclear energy as our power generation source, the better it will be. Fossil fuel pollution must be checked.	Your comment is noted.	
Mr M Brindeau	The use of coal for power generation must be stopped as soon as possible. I totally support the planning of the new nuclear power station.	Your comment is noted.	
Mrs J Cook Wheatlands Lodge	Why even bother – why not solar or wind generation?	With regards to renewable energy (such as solar and wind), Chapter 8 of the Final Scoping Report for the Nuclear-1 EIA discusses alternative forms of power generation. Eskom is in the process of exploring a number of different ways in which to generate electricity and is investing in further development of renewable technologies. Figure 66 on Page 8-3 illustrates the Project Funnel, which reflects where the different projects (and associated technologies) are in the development process (i.e. the stage of the development of these technologies). Only certain electricity generation technologies are commercially available, although not necessarily financially viable in South Africa based on the availability of resources (fuel) and geographical constraints. The limited range of viable technologies is listed in Table 17 on Page 8-5. The Final Scoping Report is available on the following website: http://projects.gibb.co.za/ .	Chapter 8 of the FSR and Section 4.2, 5.3 and 6.3.2 of the EIR
Mr & Mrs H & A de Vries	We accept the measures that have been taken for the using of coal, but the only concern is air pollution. Technology and development cannot be chosen, unless all safety measurements have been taken.	Although radiological safety aspects will be discussed as part of the EIR, inclusions will be for your information all safety aspects are detailed as part of the NNR authorisation	Section 3.20, 6.4.18 and Appendix E24 of the EIR

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
		<p>process.</p> <p>During the NNR licensing process, which includes public participation, safety aspects will be fully evaluated and addressed. Eskom will not be permitted to operate a plant that does not meet both national and international safety requirements</p>	<p>Chapter 1 and 6 of the EIR</p>
5. SAFETY AND EMERGENCY SITUATIONS			
<p>D Nagtegaal</p>	<p>I want to object in the strongest possible terms against the planned nuclear power plant at Pearly beach for a variety of reasons. Not the least of which are that nuclear power still is intrinsically unsafe but also because Eskom sees fit to go into business with partners like Areva and Laymeyer.</p>	<p>Comments noted. All alternative sites, proposed by the Scoping Report to be further investigated in the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA, will be subject to objective specialist assessments.</p>	<p>Chapters 8 and 9 and Appendix E of the EIR</p>
<p>Mr Mike Longden-Thurgood Institute Nuclear Engineers SA Branch</p>	<p>There is a matter with the Nuclear-1 EIA project, which might need some clarification. An I&AP has raised the issue of noble gas releases during planned purges, and made all sorts of frightening claims about decaying to caesium radioisotopes and strontium 90, with no knowledge that the purge gases are passed through activated charcoal filters.</p> <p>So I will be asking a question at the next KPSIF meeting if relevant data which has now accumulated at the ESL for over 20 years can be made available for the Nuclear-1 EIA process, in order to demonstrate exactly what the reality is where radioactive releases from the two Koeberg PWRs is concerned. I am making this point for the FSR for this process in response to an I&AP who has raised a frightening scenario – i.e. for people who don't know - during planned gas releases, and the harmful health effects. It's all very exaggerated, but in my view it is now necessary that some of these data are released.</p> <p>It's not a matter of national security, but that a far wider population spectrum will ultimately be living relatively near to nuclear power stations by the time all the 20 000 MW of projected generating</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. The clarity provided regarding the handling and content of purge gases is noted. It is important that the health effects of gas releases are understood and the use of existing data are helpful in gaining this understanding.</p> <p>Quarterly and Annually Koeberg Environmental Surveillance Reports are routinely submitted to the NNR and a commentary on Koeberg Environmental Surveillance is provided in the NNR's annual reports published on their website.</p>	<p>Chapters 8 and 9, Section 3.16 Appendix E10 of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	capacity from nuclear is actually operational. Therefore I can't see the National Keypoints Act being invoked to prevent the data from being released for one of the specialist's reports for this Nuclear-1 EIA process.		
6. SITE SPECIFIC MATTERS			
6 (a) Brazil			
Mr Charles Westley	<p>Due to medical reasons I have been unable to reply to previous writing. I very strongly recommend that the nuclear station be erected at Brazil.</p> <p>Reasons</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The coastal ecology has been totally destroyed by the mining companies " De Beers and Transhex." 2. There are no freshwater aquifers that can be affected. 3. The population in the area is very low. 4. Low tourism value and the nuclear plant will probably increase tourism in the area. 5. Prevailing winds SE to S thus moving any dust or radiation away to sea. 6. Power lines easily established in this area and labour will be available due to the cessation of the de Beers mining activities at Kleinzee. 7. The complete infrastructure and housing at Kleinzee will be available shortly. <p>Thanks for allowing me to comment.</p>	<p>In terms of the EIA regulations an alternative to be considered needs to be a feasible alternative. Construction of a NPS at Brazil would mean that Eskom would not be in a position to integrate this site from a transmission integration point of view into the power grid. Such integration would require a new corridor of approximately 1500km to be constructed, which would also have huge cost and potential environmental implications. This site is thus at this time not feasible.</p>	<p>Chapter 6 and 11 of the FSR and Chapter 1, Section 5.2 and 6.4.1 of the EIR</p>
6(b) Schulpfontein			
6(c) Duynefontein			
Mr and Mrs Peter & Antoinette Naude	After studying the report it is apparent that the 'Duynefontein' site is the most feasible site for an Eskom Nuclear Power Station.	Comment noted. At present Duynefontein is being considered as a possible site along with	Chapter 6 and 11 of the FSR and

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
		two other alternative locations. The scoping report serves to identify issues that need to be addressed as part of the Impact Assessment. At this stage no site is preferred ahead of any other site, such a recommendation can only be made once all the specialist studies are completed.	Chapter 1, Section 5.2 and 6.4.1 of the EIR
6(d) Bantamsklip			
Ms Corinne Opperman	A huge huge huge objection.	Comment noted.	
Ezanne Newton Johnson Newton Johnson Wines	PLEASE! NO!	Comment noted.	
Elinore Wrigley ME JAYNE Design and Layout	I object!!! Please do not do this!	Comments noted.	
Mr and Mrs Wally & Cheryl Reid	<p>We hear you are envisaging building (another) Nuclear power plant, this time in Pearly Beach.</p> <p>THIS IS ABSOLUTELY UNACCEPTABLE for various reasons:</p> <p>a) There is no safe future for nuclear power being generated by a dangerous medium while there's no proven environmentally safe solution for the unavoidable dangerous waste which will remain active for hundreds, probably even thousands of years.</p> <p>b) Pearly Beach is an expanding coastal town with highly populated areas to its West within 50kms and even Cape Town less than 150 km away!</p> <p><i>How can people with children be involved in such projects in the 21st century?</i></p> <p>Going into space is becoming a routine thing but SA do not yet know how to use free natural power supplied by sun, wind and water! Unbelievable! Or is it politically unwilling!</p>	<p>Please note that this is not the only site that is being considered as part of this EIA process, as such there is no certainty that Bantamsklip will be authorised for nuclear 1. The EIA process will guide the authorities in making a decision on which site, if any is most suitable, from a biophysical and social standpoint, for such a development.</p> <p>Eskom will not be permitted to construct and operate a nuclear power station if it is not safe.</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</p>	<p>Chapter 6 and 11 of the FSR and Chapter 1, Section 5.2, 6.4.1, 7.7.4 and 7.7.5 of the EIR</p> <p>Section 3.20 and Appendix E24 of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p>It is far too late to invest in further polluting energy; Eskom should urgently spend money in developing non polluting free and sustainable energy supplied by sun, wind and water!</p> <p>We can only hope you come to your senses ON TIME!</p>	<p>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>Eskom is continually researching and investigating the potential to implement various alternative-generating technologies. There are a number of issues that need to be taken care of when looking at the options for electricity generation; these include cost, lead time for construction, environmental impact, and operating characteristics relative to peaking and base load power generation.</p> <p>It is Eskom's stance that ALL of the primary energy resources in or available to South Africa, including solar, wind, wave, ocean current, tidal energy, biomass, hydro, gas, coal and nuclear need to be harnessed using the appropriate technology to provide the electricity that South Africa requires to support its economic growth and development. However only Coal and Nuclear have proved that they can supply the required base load.</p>	<p>Chapter 5 and 8 of the EIR</p> <p>Section 4.2 of the EIR</p>
Mr Marc Nel	Please consider the environment before building the station near Pearly Beach. Let alone a cool surf spot.	Comment noted. Three alternative sites will be investigated during the EIA phase, both from a biophysical and social standpoint in order to identify the most suitable site.	Section 5.2 and 6.4.1 and Appendix E of the EIR
Mr Cornelius Saayman (Pr Arch)	<p>I hereby object to the proposed construction of a nuclear power station at Pearly Beach.</p> <p>My objection is based on the protection of this pristine natural environment and I believe that stricter nature conservation legislation should be put in place for this area and that no construction should be allowed here, especially not an environmentally damaging structure such as a nuclear power station!!</p>	<p>Comment Noted.</p> <p>Thank you for your comments. The EIA will assess all environmental issues relating to the construction of Nuclear-1.</p>	Chapter 8 and Appendix E of the EIR

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
Helga Steyn	I hereby register my strongest objection to the erection of a nuclear power plant at the site near Pearly Beach.	Thank you for your comments. The EIA will assess all environmental issues relating to the construction of Nuclear-1.	Chapter 8 and Appendix E of the EIR
Mr Gordon Newton Johnson Newton Johnson Wines	I would hereby like to lodge an objection to the proposed nuclear site at Pearly Beach in the Western Cape. This area is home to pristine fauna and flora that must be protected for future generations and for the growing tourism industry in the Overberg that provides a livelihood for people of all walks of life.	Thank you for your comments. The EIA will assess all environmental issues relating to the construction of Nuclear-1.	Chapter 8 and Appendix E of the EIR
Mr Jason Stonehewer	<p>Regarding a few other points I would like to bring up for comment if not already addressed not sure if this is the correct platform to comment from. Please forward my comments if it is not, and please read if it is.</p> <p>1) LOCATION the distance from proposed nuclear power station site is always quoted as being 10km from Pearly Beach where as it is in fact less than 5km. I would like to know why this error is consistently made?</p> <p>2) ENVIRONMENT The area in question is undoubtedly a pristine environment for many km in all directions, this alone is a rare occurrence in this world and future tourism opportunities could be missed by the proposed power station and its 200 meters wide corridor of power lines cutting a path to the main line over 100km away. This, in my opinion will be looked at as a profound crime against the environment in years to come.</p> <p>3) LIGHT POLLUTION because of limited population in the proposed power station area the sky at night is again a sight that anyone living in densely populated areas often comment on the spectacular star gazing had in Pearly Beach something which would undoubtedly change with the influx of extra population in the construction of the proposed plant and all their lighting requirement, also</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>All issues raised have been passed to the relevant specialists to ensure inclusion in the respective specialist reports and subsequent proper assessment during the impact assessment phase.</p>	Chapter 8 and Appendix E of the EIR

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p>the construction and completion of the plant security lighting of the power station would dilute the brightness of the stars enough to destroy the spectacle alone.</p> <p>4) WORKFORCE introducing such a workforce to this area in the construction of the proposed plant would have a great environmental impact to the area that would change the character of the area completely then after the proposed plant is finished removing the majority of the workforce would change the infrastructure of the area again, has any consideration of the implications of this migration of this workforce being taken into account?</p> <p>I am positive these points are not new to you but I would appreciate some feedback</p> <p>I'm all for Nuclear power just not here.</p>		
<p>Mr Wolfgang Rolf Schirmer Ms Gertrud Schirmer</p>	<p>We, the undersigned, object to a nuclear power station being built at Pearly Beach.</p>	<p>Objection noted. Please note that this is not the only site that is being considered as part of this EIA process, as such there is no certainty that Bantamsklip will receive the necessary environmental authorisation. The final decision in this regard resides with DEAT.</p>	<p>Chapter 6 and 11 of the FSR and Chapter 1, Section 5.2, 6.4.1, 7.7.4 and 7.7.5 of the EIR</p>
<p>Bevan Newton Johnson Newton Johnson Wines</p>	<p>I would like to voice my strong opposition to the building of a nuclear electricity station at Pearly Beach.</p>	<p>Objection noted. Please note that this is not the only site that is being considered as part of this EIA process, as such there is no certainty that Bantamsklip will receive the necessary environmental authorisation. The final decision in this regard resides with</p>	<p>Chapter 6 and 11 of the FSR and Chapter 1, Section 5.2, 6.4.1, 7.7.4 and 7.7.5 of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
Mariska Nagtegaal - Vice	I object to a nuclear power station being built at Pearly Beach/Bantamsklip	DEAT. Objection noted. Please note that this is not the only site that is being considered as part of this EIA process, as such there is no certainty that Bantamsklip will receive the necessary environmental authorisation. The final decision in this regard resides with DEAT.	Chapter 6 and 11 of the FSR and Chapter 1, Section 5.2, 6.4.1, 7.7.4 and 7.7.5 of the EIR
Karla Karlovna Schwedersky	I object to a nuclear power station being built at Pearly Beach.	Objection noted. Please note that this is not the only site that is being considered as part of this EIA process, as such there is no certainty that Bantamsklip will receive the necessary environmental authorisation. The final decision in this regard resides with DEAT.	Chapter 6 and 11 of the FSR and Chapter 1, Section 5.2, 6.4.1, 7.7.4 and 7.7.5 of the EIR
Mr and Mrs Gwenda & Colin Newton.	We object to a nuclear power station being built at Pearly Beach.	Objection noted. Please note that this is not the only site that is being considered as part of this EIA process, as such there is no certainty that Bantamsklip will receive the necessary environmental authorisation. The final decision in this regard resides with DEAT.	Chapter 6 and 11 of the FSR and Chapter 1, Section 5.2, 6.4.1, 7.7.4 and 7.7.5 of the EIR
Mias Calitz	I hereby protest <u>against</u> a nuclear power station at the Pearly Beach site.	Objection noted. Please note that this is not the only site that is being considered as part of this EIA process, as such there is no certainty that Bantamsklip will receive the necessary environmental authorisation. The final decision in this regard resides with DEAT.	Chapter 6 and 11 of the FSR and Chapter 1, Section 5.2, 6.4.1, 7.7.4 and 7.7.5 of the EIR
Marius Wolfaardt Marna Wolfaardt Tanya Kruger Anton Wolfaardt Louise Wolfaardt Dirk Brand Antoinette Brand Marius Van Der	This mail is to acknowledge that we are against the construction of the proposed Pearly Beach Nuclear Power Plant.	Objection noted. Please note that this is not the only site that is being considered as part of this EIA process, as such there is no certainty that Bantamsklip will receive the necessary environmental authorisation. The final decision in this regard resides with DEAT.	Chapter 6 and 11 of the FSR and Chapter 1, Section 5.2, 6.4.1, 7.7.4 and 7.7.5 of the EIR

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
Merwe			
Stuart Cowie	<p>I would like to add my objections to the possible siting of a nuclear facility near to the Pearly Beach area and the sensitive East coast in general.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Pristine unspoilt Beach Area, a haven for animal & bird life. ▪ Very popular among tourists. ▪ Cause unease among present inhabitants. ▪ There are many more desolate & less popular areas for the siting. e.g. wild coast, old Transkei area, where it is at present dangerous for tourists to visit. 	<p>Objection noted. Please note that this is not the only site that is being considered as part of this EIA process, as such there is no certainty that Bantamsklip will receive the necessary environmental authorisation. The final decision in this regard resides with DEAT.</p>	<p>Chapter 6 and 11 of the FSR and Chapter 1, Section 5.2, 6.4.1, 7.7.4 and 7.7.5 of the EIR</p>
Emil Den Dulk	<p>To protest against a nuclear power station being built up wind of Hermanus, the whole of the Overstrand and Cape Town:</p>	<p>Objection noted. Please note that this is not the only site that is being considered as part of this EIA process, as such there is no certainty that Bantamsklip will receive the necessary environmental authorisation. The final decision in this regard resides with DEAT.</p>	<p>Chapter 6 and 11 of the FSR and Chapter 1, Section 5.2, 6.4.1, 7.7.4 and 7.7.5 of the EIR</p>
Irma Bezuidenhout Maurice Douree	<p>We strongly object to a nuclear power plant, as this is a pristine conservation area (one of the few undeveloped areas left) and the bay is also a marine protected area.</p>	<p>Objection noted. Please note that this is not the only site that is being considered as part of this EIA process, as such there is no certainty that Bantamsklip will receive the necessary environmental authorisation. The final decision in this regard resides with DEAT.</p>	<p>Chapter 6 and 11 of the FSR and Chapter 1, Section 5.2, 6.4.1, 7.7.4 and 7.7.5 of the EIR</p>
Tanya Kruger Maarten Kruger Marius Wolfaard Yvette Rossouw Jacobus Rossouw Mia Rossouw	<p>We are against the proposed Pearly Beach Power Plant. Please do not do build a nuclear power plant at Pearly Beach!</p>	<p>Objection noted. Please note that this is not the only site that is being considered as part of this EIA process, as such there is no certainty that Bantamsklip will receive the necessary environmental authorisation. The final decision in this regard resides with DEAT.</p>	<p>Chapter 6 and 11 of the FSR and Chapter 1, Section 5.2, 6.4.1, 7.7.4 and 7.7.5 of the EIR</p>
Mr Anton Kruger	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I would like to call your attention to the fact that the wrong email address for submitting opinions on the nuclear site at Pearly Beach was publicised in the Hermanus Times. ▪ The address was given as nuclear@acerafrica.co.za instead of nuclear1@acerafrica.co.za. 	<p>The advert referred to calling for objections on the proposed Nuclear Power Station did not originate from the EIA Team or ACER (Africa), the Public Participation Consultant. It was in fact a product of an ongoing and intensive</p>	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The editor was made aware of this fact but neglected to rectify the situation. ▪ I would like to suggest that we rather have a vote on the matter. Send a letter to each taxpayer living in the area and ask him/her if he wants the power station to be built at Pearly Beach. Is this not our right to decide about something with such a major potential impact on our lives? ▪ The current way of objecting is totally insufficient and badly advertised. It took me a whole week to get hold of this address!! ▪ Further more, a lot of the people (especially the older ones) are not computer literate. How should they object? ▪ I would also like to add my strongest objection against this power station. 	<p>campaign against the proposed Nuclear Power Station at the Bantamsklip site and was placed in the Hermanus Times by this campaign.</p> <p>Furthermore, there were no media advertisements placed in publications including the Hermanus Times during the months of June and July 2009, which were part of the Public Participation Process.</p> <p>The Public Participation Process, which is undertaken as part of the EIA, provides an opportunity to all Interested and Affected Parties to raise their comments during the process, be they negative or positive, and does not simply focus on requesting I&APs to object.</p> <p>Opportunities for participation in the EIA have been widely advertised (nationally, regionally and locally) and all members of the public are encouraged to participate. The format of public engagements has included public meetings, public open days and Focus Group Meetings. In addition, the public has been encouraged to raise comments at meetings as well as to submit written comments through ACER by email, fax, letter or telephone.</p> <p>The EIA Team regrets the inconvenience caused by the campaign products, which, without consent, listed the EIA PPP consultant's contact details.</p> <p>Your objection is noted.</p>	<p>Section 7.5 and Appendix D of the EIR</p> <p>Section 7.5 and Appendix D of the EIR</p> <p>Section 7.5 and Appendix D of the EIR</p>
Ms Francisca Schilder	I object to a nuclear power station being built at Pearly Beach.	Objection noted. Please note that this is not the only site that is being considered as part	Chapter 6 and 11 of the FSR and

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
		of this EIA process, as such there is no certainty that Bantamsklip will receive the necessary environmental authorisation. The final decision in this regard resides with DEAT.	Chapter 1, Section 5.2, 6.4.1, 7.7.4 and 7.7.5 of the EIR
Carla EIDorado	I object to a nuclear power station being built at Pearly Beach.	Objection noted. Please note that this is not the only site that is being considered as part of this EIA process, as such there is no certainty that Bantamsklip will receive the necessary environmental authorisation. The final decision in this regard resides with DEAT.	Chapter 6 and 11 of the FSR and Chapter 1, Section 5.2, 6.4.1, 7.7.4 and 7.7.5 of the EIR
Maarten Krüger	I am against nuclear power plant at Pearly Beach	Objection noted. Please note that this is not the only site that is being considered as part of this EIA process, as such there is no certainty that Bantamsklip will receive the necessary environmental authorisation. The final decision in this regard resides with DEAT.	Chapter 6 and 11 of the FSR and Chapter 1, Section 5.2, 6.4.1, 7.7.4 and 7.7.5 of the EIR
Steins and Van der Merwes	We strongly object to the nuclear power station near and around Hermanus. The real threat for the human kind is global warming and Hermanus and the nature reserves around it are a buffer against it. Surely you would not want to destroy an oasis like this in order to erect a power station which can be positioned in the wilderness where nothing grows.	Objection noted. Please note that this is not the only site that is being considered as part of this EIA process, as such there is no certainty that Bantamsklip will receive the necessary environmental authorisation. The final decision in this regard resides with DEAT.	Chapter 6 and 11 of the FSR and Chapter 1, Section 5.2, 6.4.1, 7.7.4 and 7.7.5 of the EIR
Mr Brendon Vice Ms Natassa Commerford	I object to a nuclear power station at Pearly Beach (Bantamsklip).	Objection noted. Please note that this is not the only site that is being considered as part of this EIA process, as such there is no certainty that Bantamsklip will receive the necessary environmental authorisation. The final decision in this regard resides with DEAT.	Chapter 6 and 11 of the FSR and Chapter 1, Section 5.2, 6.4.1, 7.7.4 and 7.7.5 of the EIR
Dries Retief	As an Overstrand municipality ratepayer, I object to a nuclear power station being built at Pearly Beach.	Objection noted. Please note that this is not the only site that is being considered as part of this EIA process, as such there is no certainty that Bantamsklip will receive the	Chapter 6 and 11 of the FSR and Chapter 1, Section 5.2,

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
		<p>necessary environmental authorisation. The final decision in this regard resides with DEAT.</p>	<p>6.4.1, 7.7.4 and 7.7.5 of the EIR</p>
<p>Mr and Mrs PJ Hude</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Gansbaai is about to be classified as “grass-fed beef producer” and whereby enjoy a premium of 200kg. Being within a 15km radius of a Nuclear Power Station will mean losing this premium. 2. We sell ± 100 tons of beef p.a. this could easily double, which would mean a considerable loss of people. 3. The wild co. has also approached us to establish a wind farm on Gansbaai. 4. This is a pristine coastline adored by tourists and fisherman will completely change this- there is no infrastructure to accommodate workman. 5. Or main concern is where will the waste making go? Nowhere feasible. 6. This proposition badly affects the farm animals for which reason we condemn the thought of a Nuclear Power Station. 	<p>Your concerns have been noted and will be passed on to the Agricultural Specialist.</p> <p>Low to medium-level radioactive waste produced will be stored at Vaalputs, which is located in the Northern Cape Province, 90 km southeast of Springbok.</p> <p>It is Eskom’s intention to integrate any housing infrastructure within the respective municipality’s current spatial development plans. This does not negate the possibility of a small percentage of the workforce being temporarily housed in a ‘construction village’ built on the site.</p> <p>All issues pertaining to both general and radioactive waste will be discussed in the EIR.</p>	<p>Chapter 8 and Appendix E21</p> <p>Section 3.18 and 3.19 and Appendix E24 of the EIR</p> <p>Section 3.21, 5.13 and 5.15 of the EIR</p> <p>Section 3.15 – 3.19, 6.3.4, 6.4.10 and Appendix E24 of the EIR</p>
<p>Ms Linda Louise Griffiths Hermanus Ratepayers Association</p>	<p>Please be assured that damaging our pristine coastline and Fynbos Environment is simply not on the agenda for us as concerned South African citizens and as such we object wholeheartedly to Eskom’s proposal for a nuclear power station at Bantamsklip near Pearly Beach.</p> <p>Bruce Castle and myself are owners of www.stanfordbirding.co.za and a driving force behind the Stanford Glendower Bird Fair. It is imperative for us that this Proposed Nuclear Power Station at Bantamsklip near Pearly Beach does not take place.</p> <p>The entire Overstrand area is recognised as an Important Birding Area (I.B.A.), thus subject to critical observation of International</p>	<p>Your comments are noted. Those pertaining to biological diversity will be passed onto the Flora, Fauna (vertebrate and invertebrate) and Tourism specialist.</p> <p>Avifaunal aspects are dealt with in the Vertebrate Specialist Study. Refer to Appendix E7 of the Final Scoping Report.</p> <p>Arcus GIBB hereby provides you with unequivocal confirmation that the EIA process is not predetermined. It is part of our professional responsibility to undertake an</p>	<p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E11, E13, E14 and E15 of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E13 of the EIR</p> <p>Section 6.4.1 of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p>Conservation standards and practices. South Africans are first and foremost the ones required to implement and observe such standards and practices.</p> <p>Avi-tourism is the fastest growing form of International Tourism and with tourism fast becoming the greatest contributor to SA's GDP, the importance of maintaining this Southern Coast of Africa as the "Riviera of Africa" and keeping in line with the Cape Whale Coast tourism marketing strategy, this "acre of Africa" is prime land and as such needs and has our protection.</p> <p>We object to the fact that this application by Eskom is financially backed by the left hand of the Government and the application is planned to be approved by the right hand of the Government. Everyone working for the project is being paid either by the Government or Eskom – but they are "in bed together". Does this not form some sort of legal transgression?</p> <p>We shall appreciate your acknowledgement of our objections to the Proposed Nuclear Power Station at Bantamsklip near Pearly Beach and look forward to hearing from you with regard to this crucial matter.</p>	<p>objective and independent EIA process. Arcus GIBB has and will continue to abide by requirements set out by the National Environmental Management Act (NEMA) and the associated regulations. Government Notice Regulation Number 385 (i.e. GN No. R. 385) in the Government Gazette on 21 April 2006 stipulates the requirements for the appointment of and Environmental Assessment Practitioner. Arcus GIBB conforms to all these requirements. As Environmental Professionals, Arcus GIBB will remain an independent and impartial consultant on this project and present information in an unbiased manner.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p>	
Mr PS du Toit and Mars GR du Toit	We join everyone else in registering our strongest objection to the building of a nuclear site at this sensitive area - what a travesty!	Your comment is noted.	
D.P Foreman	<p>As a rate payer/property owner in Stanford I wish to object in the strongest terms possible - the proposed Nuclear Power Station and associated infrastructure at Bantamsklip near Pearly Beach.</p> <p>This area is a pristine stretch of coastline with adjacent important fynbos area. This area is a great tourist attraction, bringing good income to the local people. Overseas visitors come for shark diving, whale watching and to study the fynbos and rare plants of the area.</p> <p>I cannot believe that Eskom could even consider such devastation to an area of great interest and destroying so much of a delicate eco system.</p>	Your comment is noted. Your issues will be considered by various specialists in the EIA phase.	Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E of the EIR

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p>PLEASE think again!! This development will be very all the people who live here and will destroy the tourist trade for good.</p> <p>It is urgent that you think again and find an alternative solution.</p>		
Ms Sarah James	I strongly object to Bantamsklip as a potential site for a nuclear power station.	Your comment is noted.	
Hanlie and Anja Allan	<p>I would like to oppose the building of the proposed nuclear power station at Bantamsklip near Pearly Beach.</p> <p>It will have a long lasting negative impact on the immediate and surrounding nature.</p>	Your comment is noted.	
Ms Nicolette Lloyd I&AP	<p>1. We have been living in Hermanus for over 25 years. We wish to register our strongest protest at this proposal as a nuclear power station of this size will impact not only severely on the environment, particularly on the flora, fauna, birdlife and marine life, which goes without saying, but also will impact severely on communities in the immediate vicinity and in fact as far away as Hermanus. It most certainly will also impact deleteriously on tourism as well as farming and fishing communities thus adversely affecting the economy of this region forever.</p> <p>2. Please, if you have to find a site for a nuclear power station, do so in an area that is not one of the most precious eco-tourism areas in South Africa.</p>	<p>1. Your objection is noted. A number of specialist studies will be undertaken during the detailed Impact Assessment Phase to assess the potential impacts of the proposed nuclear power station on the environment.</p> <p>The Tourism specialist study will assess the impact of the proposed NPS on sea usage and the tourism industry adjacent to the proposed sites. For further information on the Terms of Reference for the Specialist Studies, please refer to the Revised Plan of Study for EIA available on the following website: www.eskom.co.za/eia.</p> <p>2. The sites being considered in the Nuclear-1 EIA were identified during the Nuclear Site Investigation Programme (NSIP) implemented by Eskom in the 1980's. There are a limited number of sites which are suitable for nuclear power, based on a set of selection criteria. For more information on the NSIP, consult Chapter 5 of the Nuclear-1 Scoping Report available on the following website: www.eskom.co.za/eia.</p>	<p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E22 of the EIR and Chapter 10 of the FSR</p> <p>Section 5.2.1 of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
<p>Mr Riaan Venter and Mr Leon Smith I&APs</p>	<p>1. We have been living in Hermanus for over 6 years. We wish to register our strongest protest at this proposal as a nuclear power station of this size will impact not only severely on the environment, particularly on the flora, fauna, birdlife and marine life, which goes without saying, but also will impact severely on communities in the immediate vicinity and in fact as far away as Hermanus. It most certainly will also impact deleteriously on tourism as well as farming and fishing communities thus adversely affecting the economy of this region forever.</p> <p>2. It is a myth that it will provide job creation because the building of a nuclear plant requires specialised "labour" and it is unlikely that local communities will be eligible.</p> <p>3. Please, if you have to find a site for a nuclear power station, do so in an area that is not one of the most precious eco-tourism areas in South Africa.</p>	<p>1. Your objection is noted. A number of specialist studies will be undertaken during the detailed Impact Assessment Phase to assess the potential impacts of the proposed nuclear power station on the environment.</p> <p>The Tourism specialist study will assess the impact of the proposed NPS on sea usage and the tourism industry adjacent to the proposed sites. For further information on the Terms of Reference for the Specialist Studies, please refer to the Revised Plan of Study for EIA available on the following website: www.eskom.co.za/eia.</p> <p>2. Job creation is not a myth; various levels of skills are required at a nuclear power station during construction and operation. This aspect will be covered in the EIA.</p> <p>3. The sites being considered in the Nuclear-1 EIA were identified during the Nuclear Site Investigation Programme (NSIP) implemented by Eskom in the 1980's. There are a limited number of sites which are suitable for nuclear power, based on a set of selection criteria. For more information on the NSIP, consult Chapter 5 of the Nuclear-1 Scoping Report available on the following website: www.eskom.co.za/eia.</p>	<p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E22 of the EIR and Chapter 10 of the FSR</p> <p>Section 6.3.2 of the EIR</p> <p>Section 5.2.1 of the EIR</p>
<p>Mr & Mrs Paul and Merle Boshoff I&APs</p>	<p>1. We have been living in Hermanus for over 4 years. We wish to register our strongest protest at this proposal as a nuclear power station of this size will impact not only severely on the</p>	<p>1. Your objection is noted. A number of specialist studies will be undertaken during the detailed Impact Assessment Phase to</p>	<p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p>environment, particularly on the flora, fauna, birdlife and marine life, which goes without saying, but also will impact severely on communities in the immediate vicinity and in fact as far away as Hermanus. It most certainly will also impact deleteriously on tourism as well as farming and fishing communities thus adversely affecting the economy of this region forever.</p> <p>2. Please, if you have to find a site for a nuclear power station, do so in an area that is not one of the most precious eco-tourism areas in South Africa.</p>	<p>assess the potential impacts of the proposed nuclear power station on the environment.</p> <p>The Tourism specialist study will assess the impact of the proposed NPS on sea usage and the tourism industry adjacent to the proposed sites. For further information on the Terms of Reference for the Specialist Studies, please refer to the Revised Plan of Study for EIA available on the following website: www.eskom.co.za/eia.</p> <p>2. The sites being considered in the Nuclear-1 EIA were identified during the Nuclear Site Investigation Programme (NSIP) implemented by Eskom in the 1980's. There are a limited number of sites which are suitable for nuclear power, based on a set of selection criteria. For more information on the NSIP, consult Chapter 5 of the Nuclear-1 Scoping Report available on the following website: www.eskom.co.za/eia.</p>	<p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E22 of the EIR and Chapter 10 of the FSR</p> <p>Section 5.2.1 of the EIR</p>
<p>Ms Tracey Duivestein I&AP</p>	<p>I am concerned about the potential health hazards (still too many unanswered questions). I live within the 50 km evacuation radius and am very concerned that this will occur in a ecologically sensitive area, both land and sea.</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. A number of specialist studies will be undertaken during the detailed Impact Assessment Phase to assess the potential impacts of the proposed nuclear power station on the environment. The Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) will discuss the impacts of the nuclear power station (NPS) on human health.</p> <p>The exact extent of the evacuation zone in terms of the emergency planning has not been determined. Although this forms part of</p>	<p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E of the EIR</p> <p>Section 3.20, 6.4.18 and Appendix E24 of</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
		<p>the NNR nuclear licensing process discussions in this regard will be included in the EIR for your information.</p> <p>Although it has not been determined it is likely that it will be far less than the 50 km described by yourself. Koeberg's emergency planning is currently based on zones of 5 km and 16 km. Based on the EUR the assumption for this project is 800 meters and 3 kms.</p>	<p>the EIR</p> <p>Section 3.20, 6.4.18, 6.4.19 and Appendix E24 of the EIR</p>
<p>Mr RC Anderson For and on behalf of the members of the Hermanus Ratepayers Association and citizens of the Overberg generally</p>	<p>In my capacity as the responsible person for the Town Planning Portfolio and as executive committee member of the Hermanus Ratepayers Association, I submit the following:</p> <p>Our concerns and opposition to this nuclear power plant are numerous with principal concerns being:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Negative impacts on the tourism industry, which is recognized as the primary economic driver of the Overberg 2. Negative impacts on both the terrestrial and marine environment in a noted biodiversity hotspot. 3. Negative impact on the health of humans, fauna, flora, birdlife and the marine and terrestrial ecosystem generally. <p>This is not an exhaustive list but we thank you for including us in the debate and providing us, in the most transparent manner of all and any information correspondence etc. that may be generated in the process going forward.</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. All issues raised by I&APs will be appropriately discussed and if necessary assessed as part of the EIR.</p>	
<p>Mr & Mrs Jannie and Sandra Venter I&APs</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We reside permanently at the above address and our sons, Riaan Venter and Leon Smith, own property in Hermanus, which we visit regularly and intend to retire at in the near future. <p>We wish to register our strongest protest at this proposal as a nuclear power station of this size will impact not only severely on the environment, particularly on the flora, fauna, birdlife and marine life, which goes without saying, but also will impact severely on communities in the immediate vicinity and in fact</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Your objection is noted. A number of specialist studies will be undertaken during the detailed Impact Assessment Phase to assess the potential impacts of the proposed nuclear power station on the environment. All issues raised by yourself have been passed onto the relevant specialist for assessment and discussion in their respective reports 	<p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p>as far away as Hermanus. It most certainly will also impact deleteriously on tourism as well as farming and fishing communities thus adversely affecting the economy of this region forever.</p> <p>2. Please, if you have to find a site for a nuclear power station, do so in an area that is not one of the most precious eco-tourism areas in South Africa.</p>	<p>2. The sites being considered in the Nuclear-1 EIA were identified during the Nuclear Site Investigation Programme (NSIP) implemented by Eskom in the 1980's. There are a limited number of sites which are suitable for nuclear power, based on a set of selection criteria. For more information on the NSIP, consult Chapter 5 of the Nuclear-1 Scoping Report available on the following website: www.eskom.co.za/eia</p>	<p>Section 5.2.1 of the EIR</p>
<p>Mr Malcolm Bowling Ms Natalie Munro I&APs</p>	<p>1. I reside in Hermanus with my partner and we are more than concerned that a Nuclear Power Station with transmission lines is being built within the 50km radius at Bantamsklip. We have good friends in the Wolwengat area where the transmission lines are going to dissect. It cannot be good for you in any way. It is a beautiful coastline with such a diversity of flora and fauna. There must be another site, which is going to be far less populated and not a big tourist mecca.</p> <p>2. I am a bird enthusiast. Do you have any idea how many Blue Cranes and White Storks are going to die in the transmission lines? Does man really know the impact that a Nuclear power station has on the nature?</p>	<p>1. Your comment is noted. The sites being considered in the Nuclear-1 EIA were identified during the Nuclear Site Investigation Programme (NSIP) implemented by Eskom in the 1980's. Your concerns relating to the potential impact on tourism has been passed onto the respective specialist for inclusion in their report.</p> <p>2. Your comment is noted and will be relayed to the Bantamsklip Transmission Line EIA Team</p>	<p>Section 5.2.1 of the EIR</p>
<p>Mrs L Burman Hermanus Bird Club</p>	<p>1. The Hermanus Bird Club, with 180 members, is a contributor to the database of the Avian Demography Unit of the University of Cape Town and participates in regular counts of large birds such as Blue Cranes, Bustards etc in the area. We therefore have an interest in monitoring activities, which could affect the continued accuracy of such data.</p> <p>2. In addition Hermanus itself is within 50 kilometres from the proposed site and we believe that the erection of a nuclear power station at Bantamsklip will have a serious and adverse</p>	<p>1. Your comment is noted and will be relayed to the Bantamsklip Transmission Line EIA Team.</p> <p>2. A number of specialist studies will be undertaken during the detailed Impact Assessment Phase to assess the potential impacts of the proposed nuclear power station on the environment.</p>	<p>Chapters 8, 9 and Appendix E of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	effect on the environmental health of the area.	<p>For further information on the Terms of Reference for the Specialist Studies, please refer to the Revised Plan of Study for EIA available on the following website: www.eskom.co.za/eia.</p> <p>The current Koeberg nuclear operating licence only requires detailed emergency planning for a radius of 5 km and 16 km. The 50 km planning radius is unique to the Koeberg Nuclear Power Station and is a result of the proximity of the City of Cape Town to the Nuclear Power Station. Detailed emergency planning is not required for this radius, such planning radius' are not considered as no go zones and development can occur within these areas, furthermore they are specific to the Koeberg Power Station.</p> <p>Internationally emergency planning for the same type of PWR reactors that Eskom is investigating are considerably less than those currently being employed by the Koeberg Nuclear Power Station. The determination of the necessary Emergency Planning Zone (EPZ) forms part of the NNR licensing process. For the purposes of this EIA a 3 km EPZ has been assumed.</p>	<p>Chapter 10 of the FSR or www.eskom.co.za/eia</p> <p>Section 3.20, 6.4.18, 6.4.19 and Appendix E24 of the EIR</p> <p>Section 3.20, 6.4.18, 6.4.19 and Appendix E24 of the EIR</p>
J L Marais I&AP	I am concerned for my health and the harm that the proposed power station will do to the natural environment in the Overstrand.	Your comment is noted. A number of specialist studies will be undertaken during the detailed Impact Assessment Phase to assess and discuss the potential impacts of the proposed nuclear power station on the environment and human health.	Section 3.20, 6.4.18, 6.4.19 and Appendix E24 of the EIR
Ms Linda Griffith Hermanus	We are very concerned about this project, as we believe that a nuclear power station will impact detrimentally on our Overstrand	Your comment is noted. Please refer to chapter 8 of the Final Scoping Report for the	Chapter 8 of the FSR and Section

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
Ratepayers Association	<p>region and on our lives, and health, here in Hermanus.</p> <p>We urge the government to find alternative less dangerous methods for providing power for the country. Nuclear power is very dangerous and can have catastrophic results in the event of failure.</p>	discussion on alternatives.	3.20, 6.4.18, 6.4.19 and Appendix E24 of the EIR
Mr F Beukes I&AP	I feel that there are a lot of other areas where SA can build a power station plant, away from people and holiday places - out of sight.	The sites being considered in the Nuclear-1 EIA were identified during the Nuclear Site Investigation Programme (NSIP) implemented by Eskom in the eighties. There are a limited number of sites which are suitable for nuclear power, based on a set of selection criteria. For more information on the NSIP, consult Chapter 5 of the Nuclear-1 Scoping Report available on the following website: www.eskom.co.za/eia	Section 5.2.1 of the EIR
Ms Marlinda Wright I&AP	I would like to make it very clear that I am against the erection of the Power Station at the proposed area at our coast. We have been living at the coast for the last 17 years and use the coast for various relaxations activities - fishing, walks and camping. To continue with this proposed power station is not viable for anyone, except for the developers, that is way am totally against it.	Your objection is noted. The potential impact of the proposed nuclear power station on lifestyles, including relaxation activities, of communities in the vicinity of the proposed sites will be investigated and discussed in the tourism and social specialist studies.	Chapter 8, 9 and Appendix E18 and E22
Mrs Valerie Ackerman Resident of Pearly Beach	We do not want nuclear power contaminating this area. This area is of outstanding natural beauty, which attracts many tourists. It is not an industrial area. If nuclear is as clean and safe as we are being told then why not extend an existing power station. We have enough wind and sun in this country try some new technology.	<p>Your comment is noted.</p> <p>Chapter 8 of the Final Scoping Report for the Nuclear-1 EIA discusses alternative forms of power generation. The Final Scoping Report is available on the following website: www.eskom.co.za/eia.</p>	Chapter 8 of the FSR and Section 4.2, 5.3 and 6.3.2 of the EIR
Ms Sharon Barnsley I&AP	Our reason for registering is due to our concern regarding the possible harm that the proposed power station will do the natural environment in the Overstrand region.	Your comment is noted. A number of specialist studies will be undertaken during the detailed Impact Assessment Phase to assess the potential impacts of the proposed nuclear power station on the environment.	Chapters 8, 9 and Appendix E of the EIR

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
<p>Mr IJ and Mrs AA Pretorius I&APs</p>	<p>1. Our family have owned property near Gans Bay in the Overberg since the early 1940's (so know area very well) and we are very concerned about the proposed erection of a nuclear power station in the area. A great attraction of the Overberg for tourists is the fact that it has a relatively unspoilt coastline and large spaces of veld covered with indigenous fynbos. Visitors come from all over the country and overseas to enjoy the whale watching and shark cage diving. This area needs tourists to be sustainable as there are no big industrial developments in the Overberg.</p> <p>2. Now we have to face the effect of the nuclear steam fall out, that covers a wide area, on humans, marine life, wild life and vegetation. Despite allegations by the companies erecting nuclear stations, the steam fall out is not clear of nuclear residues.</p> <p>3. This has been supported by a number of scientific studies and observations. All this gives us cause for great concern and I trust that you will keep all these considerations in mind before making a final decision. Surely there must be another site available that is more suitable for a nuclear power station and that will not have such a devastating effect on an area desperate for tourists to provide the greater communities with an income.</p> <p>4. Thank you for giving us the opportunity to raise our objections and voice our concern.</p>	<p>1. Your comment is noted. During the detailed Impact Assessment Phase, the Tourism specialist study will assess the impact of the proposed NPS on sea usage and the tourism industry adjacent to proposed sites.</p> <p>2. Your comment is noted. The Air Quality and Climatology Specialist Study will provide a description of the dispersion potential and identify sensitive receptors (e.g. residential areas) and potential impacts on air from both non-radioactive and radioactive air emissions. In addition human health issues will be discussed as part of the EIR</p> <p>For further information on the Terms of Reference for the Tourism Specialist Study, please refer to the Revised Plan of Study for EIA available on the following website: www.eskom.co.za/eia.</p>	<p>Chapters 8 and 9, Section 7.6.2 and Appendix E15 and E22 of the EIR</p> <p>Chapters 8, 9 and Appendix E10 and E24 of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 10 of the FSR</p>
<p>Mr OC Viljoen Overberg Linefish Association</p>	<p>The members of the Overberg Linefish Association are extremely concerned about the possibility of yet another limitation to our already dwindling commercial and recreational fishing areas as we expect a total ban to be invoked on access to the site seawards of the proposed plant. This will not only impact commercial line fishermen, who are forced to roam far and wide along the Overberg coastline to find harvestable fish but also our pelagic trawlers seeking shoals of sardine, etc.</p>	<p>Your comments are noted and will be relayed to the Economic and Socio-Economic Specialists.</p>	<p>Chapters 8, 9 and Appendix E17 and E18 of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p>It must be noted that the DEAT permit limitations whereby commercials are limited to either linefish, or WCRL together with dwindling fishable stocks or abalone have already impacted negatively resulting in widespread poverty.</p> <p>We will monitor the studies and are willing to input our point of view to the appointed leaders of each study category.</p>		
Mr P Bendzulla I&AP	I would also like to express my deep concern that the establishment of a nuclear power station at Bantamsklip will impact negatively on both the land and sea based environments, the local fishing industry, crayfish and perlemoen populations, whale and other species migration and breeding, tourism to this beautiful and pristine part of the world, and property values.	<p>Your comment is noted. Various specialist studies will be conducted during the detailed Impact Assessment Phase of the environmental authorisation process. All issues raised have been passed onto the relevant specialists</p> <p>For further information on the Terms of Reference for the Specialist Studies, please refer to the Revised Plan of Study for EIA available on the following website: www.eskom.co.za/eia.</p>	<p>Chapters 8, 9 and Appendix E of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 10 of the FSR</p>
Mr Kenneth Owen Ms Brenda Owen Mr Michael Owen Mr Bryan Owen	We are concerned for our health and about the harm that the proposed power station will do to the natural environment in the Overstrand.	<p>Your comment is noted. A number of specialist studies will be undertaken during the detailed Impact Assessment Phase to assess the potential impacts of the proposed nuclear power station on the environment</p> <p>The Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) will discuss the potential impacts of the nuclear power station (NPS) on human health.</p>	Chapters 8, 9 and Appendix E of the EIR
Ms Jesse Pereira Catherine Pereira 31 van Dyk Street, Kleinbaai.	We are concerned for our health and about the harm that the proposed power station will do to the natural environment in the Overstrand.	Your comment is noted. A number of specialist studies will be undertaken during the detailed Impact Assessment Phase to assess the potential impacts of the proposed nuclear power station on the environment.	Chapters 8, 9 and Appendix E of the EIR

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
		The Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) will discuss the potential impacts of the nuclear power station (NPS) on human health.	Appendix E24 of the EIR
Mr Hans Swart I&AP	I am a property owner in the affected area, and wish to see development of this area as a controlled biodiversity node (with sustainable tourism and job creation opportunities) rather than an electrical energy provision centre with attendant polluting industries and no-go zones (and the health and environmental issues that go hand-in-hand with this).	Your comment is noted.	
Mr Frank Tennick Greater Hermanus Environmental Action Group	<p>The Greater Hermanus Environmental Action group (GHEAG) fully endorses the contents, viewpoint as presented by Mike Kantey in an open letter addressed to the Western Cape Provincial Government (see below). It does not make sense to proceed with the Bantamsklip development when the existing Koeberg Nuclear Power Station at Duynefontein in Cape Town can be upgraded to provide part of the required 4 000 MW.</p> <p>Mr Mike Kantey's open letter to the Western Cape Provincial Government</p> <p><i>"Having completed a successful tour of the Overberg Region, home to the proposed Nuclear Power Station at Bantamsklip, east of Pearly Beach and Gansbaai, I would like to draw your collective attention to matters as they now stand.</i></p> <p><i>I was privileged to address over 100 key stakeholders in the following communities: Stanford, Tesselaarsdal, Wolvengat, Elim, Bredasdorp, Struisbaai, Agulhas, Gansbaai: Buffelsjagt, Pearly Beach, Franskraal and Hermanus, as well as many conservationists, farmers, landowners, and operators of guest houses and B&Bs. Although only one individual represented the African communities, many meetings were well attended by so-called "Coloured" members.</i></p> <p><i>Regional Co-ordinator John Williams of the "Save Bantamsklip" campaign addressed the meetings on the relevant issues of biodiversity conservation and the consolidation of all terrestrial and</i></p>	Your comment is noted. Various specialist studies will be conducted during the detailed Impact Assessment Phase of the environmental authorisation process. All issues raised have been passed onto the relevant specialists	Chapters 8, 9 and Appendix E of the EIR

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p><i>marine reserves under the general heading of "biospheres" (itself co-ordinated by the outstanding work of Tertius Carinus of SANParks and the Agulhas Biodiversity Initiative, or ABI). I was tasked with the elucidation of the essence of nuclear energy and its perceived threat to agriculture, the harvesting of the sea, and thus ultimately to human health. I was also at pains to present the possible consequences to the region in the event of a nuclear disaster of the magnitude of Chernobyl (INES-7).</i></p> <p><i>It soon became apparent during the tour that the greatest economic strength of this region, and the equally greatest economic potential, lies precisely on what is already there: its magnificent natural environment, the age-old human practices of sustainable harvesting, and the more recent phenomenon of eco-tourism. In other words, if a regional economy is working really well with the maximum amount of benevolent co-operation and entrepreneurial flair, don't fix it.</i></p> <p><i>Into this delicate balance between human settlement and natural environment, the central government and Eskom now proposes to introduce a nuclear power station of 4000 MW with ancillary power lines, whose sole purpose is to take electricity away to remote areas for inappropriate mega-industrial projects. This will probably bring with it a short-term influx of foreign technicians and skilled workers (mostly from abroad), as well as a myriad of unskilled hopefuls, but will actively destroy any attempt at consolidating the biosphere initiatives and force European and other tourists to look elsewhere for recreation. As Dutchman Maarten Groos of luxury guesthouse Farm 215 put it: "if Europeans want a built-up area, it's cheaper to fly to Spain." The overbearing presence of a nuclear power station is equally likely to shred the highly lucrative and well-known shark- and whale-watching industries.</i></p> <p><i>Given all these considerations, we would like to appeal to the Provincial authorities to do everything in their power to oppose this inappropriate development and to register their concern not only</i></p>		

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p><i>by participating actively in the current Environmental Impact Assessment for "Nuclear-1, 2 and 3", but by resisting any attempt by Central Government or Eskom to coerce or persuade your good selves to relent in your opposition to the expansion of nuclear energy in the Western Cape.</i></p> <p><i>Speaking solely as the National Chairperson for CANE at this juncture (and not for "Save Bantamsklip"), this obviously extends to the many attempts to extend the life of the Koeberg Nuclear Power Station at Duynefontein and the concomitant export of nuclear waste to Namaqualand. You may recall that your government stood quite firm on the importation of toxic waste from the Eastern Cape, and yet is positively sanguine about exporting radioactive and highly toxic waste not only to the Northern Cape, but more importantly to be dumped unceremoniously in the ancestral home of the Namakhoi people.</i></p> <p><i>I trust that these sentiments will be well digested and discussed among your various office-bearers and public representatives so that -- despite the fatally flawed and politically irrelevant fiasco of the Environmental Impact Assessment process -- you will join us in our unyielding determination to stamp out this nuclear nightmare once and for all.</i></p>		
<p>Ms Marianne Rossouw I&AP</p>	<p>I am very concerned about my health and the harm it will do to our natural environment.</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. Various specialist studies will be conducted during the detailed Impact Assessment Phase. All issues raised have been passed onto the relevant specialists</p> <p>For further information on the Terms of Reference for the Specialist Studies, please refer to the Revised Plan of Study for EIA available on the following website: www.eskom.co.za/eia</p>	<p>Chapter 8, 9 and Appendix E of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 10 of the FSR</p>
<p>Ms Carol Sherwin I&AP</p>	<p>1. As a resident of Onrus River and as I work in Hermanus, daily walk the cliff paths to enjoy the fruits of the environment, I wish</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. Various specialist studies will be conducted during the detailed</p>	<p>Chapter 8, 9 and Appendix E of the</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p>to register my very strong objection to the Nuclear Power facility proposed at Bantamsklip. This project is nothing short of a public outrage and will impact on the entire environment not only regarding the long term detrimental effects on the flora and fauna (in which we pride ourselves and which is a HUGE tourist attraction bringing in much needed revenue to maintain the area, businesses etc) but also on the future health and well-being of all the residents in and around the Overberg.</p> <p>2. The long-term impact and effects of nuclear power have been defined, as science has already proven – and a facility of this kind can only prove disastrous to all concerned.</p> <p>3. This project is not conducive to “Job Creation”. Power lines criss-crossing our pristine Overberg will not merely be visually disturbing, but the power generated there from will be DETRIMENTAL TO EVERYONE’S HEALTH in the long term! This is a consideration of prime importance.</p>	<p>Impact Assessment Phase. All issues raised have been passed onto the relevant specialists</p> <p>The Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) will discuss the impacts of the nuclear power station (NPS) on human health.</p> <p>For further information on the Terms of Reference for the Specialist Studies, please refer to the Revised Plan of Study for EIA available on the following website: www.eskom.co.za/eia.</p> <p>2. Your comments are noted.</p> <p>3. See Response 1 above. Your comment regarding the power lines is noted and will be relayed to the Bantamsklip Transmission Line EIA Team.</p>	<p>EIR</p> <p>Appendix E24</p> <p>Chapter 10 of the FSR</p>
<p>Mr Andrew Ivey Mr Philip Ivey Mrs K J Williams Mr M F Webber Mr M Heyns Mr J P Bergh Mrs J T Kuiper</p>	<p>These persons have rights to properties Farm 636 and Farm 637 Dist Caledon. These farms lie within 50 kms of the proposed nuclear station and the persons are concerned about the possibly negative impact on the environment particularly the declared Nature Reserve on this property. In addition there is a concern of the negative impact on Eco-tourism, which produces income for the region.</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. A number of specialist studies will be undertaken during the detailed Impact Assessment Phase to assess the potential impacts of the proposed nuclear power station on the environment.</p> <p>A Tourism Specialist forms part of a team of several specialists evaluating the environmental aspects of the proposed project</p> <p>For further information on the Terms of Reference for the Specialist Studies, please refer to the Revised Plan of Study for EIA available on the following website:</p>	<p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E of the EIR</p> <p>Appendix E24 of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 10 of the FSR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
		<p>www.eskom.co.za/eia.</p> <p>These farms are unlikely to be impacted directly by the proposed nuclear power station. The current Koeberg nuclear operating licence only requires detailed emergency planning for a radius of 5 km and 16 km. It is important to note the planning radius' is not considered as a no-go zone and development can occur within these areas.</p> <p>Internationally, emergency planning for the same type of PWR reactors that Eskom is investigating are considerably less than those currently being employed by the Koeberg Nuclear Power Station. Based on the EUR the assumption for this project is 800 meters and 3 kms. The determination of the necessary emergency planning zones and all relevant safety aspect will be evaluated and finalised through the NNR licensing process.</p>	<p>Section 3.20, 6.4.18, 6.4.19 and Appendix E24 of the EIR</p> <p>Section 3.20, 6.4.18, 6.4.19 and Appendix E24 of the EIR</p>
<p>Mr Henry Gibson Die Bron Primary School</p>	<p>Die Bron Primary School falls within 50km of Bantamsklip Nuclear plant. We are concerned for the health of the children and the negative impact on the income of the parents.</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. A number of specialist studies will be undertaken during the detailed Impact Assessment Phase to assess the potential impacts of the proposed nuclear power station on the environment.</p> <p>The Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) will discuss the potential impacts of the nuclear power station (NPS) on human health. In addition an economic specialist study is also included as part of the suite of specialist studies.</p> <p>For further information on the Terms of Reference for the Specialist Studies, please</p>	<p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E17 and E24 of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 10 of the FSR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
		refer to the Revised Plan of Study for EIA available on the following website: www.eskom.co.za/eia	
Ms Renate' Murtz I&AP	Please note my participation in the petition to oppose the nuclear station.	Your objection is noted.	
Mr Dougie Boyes I&AP	<p>I holiday in Hermanus with my family and am more than concerned that a Nuclear Power Station with transmission lines is being built within the 50km radius at Bantamsklip. We have good friends in the Wolwengat area where the transmission lines are going to dissect. It cannot be good for you in any way. It is a beautiful coastline with such a diversity of flora and fauna. There must be another site, which is going to be far less populated and not a big tourist mecca.</p> <p>I am a bird enthusiast. Do you have any idea how many Blue Cranes and White Storks are going to die in the transmission lines? Does man really know the impact that a Nuclear power station has on the nature?</p>	Your comment is noted. Your comment on the Transmission lines will be relayed to the Bantamsklip Transmission Line EIA Team.	
Mr PWG Chapman I&AP	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. We believe that the site and the transmission lines should be treated under one EIA process. <li>2. We object to the proposed site at Bantamsklip on the grounds that it is an area of particular environmental sensitivity, being considered for a marine and coastal national park status and any EIA must convincingly demonstrate that the nuclear power station and power lines will not significantly destroy this potential. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. As a result of the complexity associated with a project of this magnitude, it is not feasible to conduct the two studies as part of the same EIA. Every effort will be made to ensure the two processes inform one another and that comments relevant to the Transmission Line EIAs are passed on to the relevant consultants. <li>2. Your comment is noted. A number of specialist studies will be undertaken during the detailed Impact Assessment Phase to assess the potential impacts of the proposed nuclear power station on the environment. It should be noted that all your issues have been passed onto the relevant specialist for consideration in their assessment 	Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E of the EIR

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
<p>Ms Jane Crawford I&AP</p>	<p>1. I have serious concerns about the proposed Bantamsklip nuclear power station, in particular relating to the harm the proposed power station would do to the environment of the Overstrand and the consequences that would follow.</p> <p>2. Bantamsklip is in the highly sensitive Cape Floristic Kingdom and I believe Red Data List species would be at greatly increased risk were the power station and its associated transmission lines to be located in the region, whether overground or underground cabling were used.</p> <p>3. Tourism is a major and growing contributor to the local economy, employing many from all communities in an area of high unemployment. Tourists are drawn both to the land and to the sea of the area and I believe the siting of a nuclear power station in the region would have a major negative impact on the tourism industry.</p>	<p>1. Your comment is noted. A number of specialist studies will be undertaken during the detailed Impact Assessment Phase to assess the potential impacts of the proposed nuclear power station on the environment. It should be noted that all your issues have been passed onto the relevant specialist for consideration in their assessment</p> <p>2. Your comment is noted. Both Faunal and Botanical studies will be undertaken during the detailed Impact Assessment Phase.</p> <p>3. The Tourism specialist study will assess the impact of the proposed NPS on sea usage and the tourism industry adjacent to proposed sites.</p> <p>For further information on the Terms of Reference for the Specialist Studies, please refer to the Revised Plan of Study for EIA available on the following website: www.eskom.co.za/eia</p>	<p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E11, E13 and E14 of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E22 of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 10 of the FSR</p>
<p>Mr RE Gaylard I&AP</p>	<p>I wish to record my vote against this site being used for a nuclear power station. The reasons are many, but include being in too close proximity to a vital tourist area, particularly during summer when the prevailing southeast winds would blow any contamination directly into the Overberg/Hermanus area. There is no proof that this is the most suitable site and many others further from settled areas could be considered.</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. A number of specialist studies will be undertaken during the detailed Impact Assessment Phase to assess the potential impacts of the proposed nuclear power station on the environment.</p> <p>The Tourism specialist study will assess the impact of the proposed NPS on sea usage and the tourism industry adjacent to proposed sites.</p>	<p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E22 of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
		<p>The Air Quality and Climatology Specialist Study will provide a general description of the dispersion potential and identify sensitive receptors (e.g. residential areas) and potential impacts on air from both non-radioactive and radioactive air emissions.</p> <p>The sites being considered in the Nuclear-1 EIA were identified during the Nuclear Site Investigation Programme (NSIP) implemented by Eskom in the eighties. For more information on the NSIP, consult Chapter 5 of the Nuclear-1 Scoping Report available on the following website: www.eskom.co.za/eia.</p> <p>Further, Bantamsklip is one of three proposed sites for a nuclear power station, along with Thyspunt and Duynefontein. The selected sites, if any, planned for Nuclear-1, -2, or -3; will depend on DEAT's decision based on the findings of the EIA process, and is not known at this time. DEAT will apply their minds to the Final EIR and approve Nuclear-1 and/or Nuclear-2 and/or Nuclear-3. The site/s for the nuclear power plant has thus not yet been determined.</p>	<p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E10 of the EIR</p> <p>Section 5.2.1 of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 6 and 11 of the FSR and Chapter 1, Section 5.2, 6.4.1, 7.7.4 and 7.7.5 of the EIR</p>
<p>Ms Arlene Whale Waters B&B</p>	<p>Our reasons are based on tourism related impact, as well as fauna (land and sea based), flora, water and health (personally) being affected. Infrastructure altered, congested roads, congested living areas. Interest not supporting tourism attracted. To mention but a few. We are a peaceful town, we do not need our environment, health and demographics altered because of delayed hindsight and plans made in haste.</p>	<p>Your comments are noted. A number of specialist studies will be undertaken during the detailed Impact Assessment Phase to assess the potential impacts of the proposed nuclear power station on the environment.</p> <p>For further information on the Terms of Reference for the Specialist Studies, please refer to the Revised Plan of Study for EIA available on the following website: www.eskom.co.za/eia.</p>	<p>Chapters 8, 9 and Appendix E of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 10 of the FSR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
Mrs Katé Pretorius I&AP	I am raising my concern regarding this power station to be erected seeing that we are regular visitors to the uninterrupted area of Pearly Beach. If this project goes ahead the Pearly Beach area will lose all its magic to visitors, there will be much more movement (people) in the area; crime rate will raise; infrastructure will not be suitable; the natural environment of the area will be lost.	Your comment is noted. A number of specialist studies will be undertaken during the detailed Impact Assessment Phase to assess the potential impacts of the proposed nuclear power station on the environment For further information on the Terms of Reference for the Specialist Studies, please refer to the Revised Plan of Study for EIA available on the following website: www.eskom.co.za/eia .	Chapters 8, 9 and Appendix E of the EIR Chapter 10 of the FSR
Mr Wayne M Munro I&AP	I have an interest in a property namely 204 Main Road, East Cliff in Hermanus with my wife and we are more than concerned that a Nuclear Power Station with transmission lines is being built within the 50km radius at Bantamsklip. The power station and the accompanying infrastructure is a very real threat to the whole of the Overberg not only as a sensitive ecosystem but also as a valued tourist destination.	Your comment is noted. A number of specialist studies will be undertaken during the detailed Impact Assessment Phase to assess the potential impacts of the proposed nuclear power station on the environment. For further information on the Terms of Reference for the Specialist Studies, please refer to the Revised Plan of Study for EIA available on the following website: www.eskom.co.za/eia	Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E of the EIR Chapter 10 of the FSR
Ms Sylvana Doran Ms Karen Szewzyk Ms Karen Wilkie Ms Juli Wilkie Ms Penny Childs	We greatly object to the proposed Bantamsklip Nuclear Power Station.	Your objection is noted.	
Ms Mariana Swart I&AP	This area is where my family (on my father's side) originally comes from. We holiday in the area and believe that building a nuclear station will harm the environment and the entire character of this beautiful part of our country.	Your comment is noted. A number of specialist studies will be undertaken during the detailed Impact Assessment Phase to assess the potential impacts of the proposed nuclear power station on the environment. For further information on the Terms of Reference for the Specialist Studies, please	Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E of the EIR Chapter 10 of the FSR

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
		refer to the Revised Plan of Study for EIA available on the following website: www.eskom.co.za/eia/ .	
Ms Bertie Roos I&AP	Please note that I oppose the power station at Bantamsklip.	Your objection is noted.	
Ms Marilyn van der Velden I&AP	I wish to register my personal discontent and opposition to the proposed nuclear power plant to be built at Bantamsklip. This is one the very few remaining pristine areas representing the shrinking Cape Floral Kingdom representing the lowveld fynbos. Ecologically speaking this is perhaps the worst choice of location possible! I do not agree with nuclear energy for the cost too far greater than the benefit.	Your comment is noted. A number of specialist studies will be undertaken during the detailed Impact Assessment Phase to assess the potential impacts of the proposed nuclear power station on the environment – this includes Botanical and Faunal studies. For further information on the Terms of Reference for the Specialist Studies, please refer to the Revised Plan of Study for EIA available on the following website: www.eskom.co.za/eia/ .	Chapters 8, 9 and Appendix E of the EIR Chapter 10 of the FSR
Mr Willy & Mrs Mieke Vanderhoeven	We just hear short notice that it is still your intention to build a Nuclear power station at Bantamsklip near Pearly Beach and that we have only until June 23 to protest again this construction. First of all I cannot understand how anybody with a little bit of common sense can today even consider building such a dangerous monster with no proven solution as to how to deal with the lethal toxic waste resulting from it. Affordable technology is (finally) available to produce clean, sustainable and absolutely no risk energy at a fraction of the cost of nuclear power. The coastline where you are planning to put this monster has lots of wind, permanent moving water and sunshine for more than 300 days/year. So how can you even consider for one second to invest today in dirty, expensive and proven life threatening proven energy? Who stands to benefit from this?	Your comments are noted. The Nuclear-1 EIA and the Bantamsklip Transmission line EIA processes will be ongoing for several months. You will have another opportunity to comment on the Draft EIR before it is submitted to the DEA for approval. A number of specialist studies will be undertaken during the detailed Impact Assessment Phase to assess the potential impacts of the proposed nuclear power station on the environment. Your issues have been passed onto the relevant specialist for inclusion in their assessment including the oceanography and tourism specialists.	Section 7.5 and Appendix D of the EIR Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E of the EIR

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p>Moreover, do you realise that</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The whales, one of the unique Hermanus eco-attractions, might stay away from this area because of the rising water temperatures and the pollution from contaminated water, to happen sooner or later! 2. Tourist will avoid this area knowing there's a nuclear power reactor sites after having seen the consequences of what happened in Chernobyl! 3. Hermanus sits within the 50 km "no go" zone which means that if a meltdown <i>a la</i> Chernobyl should happen (and you know it is bound to happen sooner or later!!) the whole area is to be evacuated, not to be populated again for at least 200 years. 4. Where are you going to dump the nuclear waste, in the sea? So that when the packaging starts leaking (which is also bound to happen sooner or later) you kill all the marine life, at least if there's any left by then! 5. We hope you have children; then please explain to them the consequences of what's likely to happen to them or their children's, children one day because of the unconsidered short-sighted decisions you are planning to make!! <p>We hope it's not too late to get common sense in the people of this country who are responsible for taking such life threatening decision!</p>	<p>With respect to alternative technologies, please refer to Chapter 8 in the Final Scoping Report.</p> <p>A full evaluation of safety aspects related to the plant will be carried out by the NNR as part of the nuclear licensing process which will also provide for public comment. The current Koeberg nuclear operating licence only requires detailed emergency planning for a radius of 5 km and 16 km. It is important to note the planning radius is not considered as a no-go zone and development can occur within these areas.</p> <p>Internationally, emergency planning for the same type of PWR reactors that Eskom is investigating are considerably less than those currently being employed by Koeberg. Based on the EUR the assumption for this project is 800 meters and 3 kms. The determination of the necessary emergency planning zones and all relevant safety aspect will be evaluated and finalised through the NNR licensing process.</p> <p>Please note that the disposal of radiological waste will be discussed as part of the Draft EIR. Nuclear waste will not be disposed of at sea. Currently all low and intermediate level waste are disposed of at Vaalputs in the Northern Cape. High level waste will be housed on site during the operation of the power station. South Africa is in the process of developing the necessary policies and procedures for the safe disposal of high level</p>	<p>Section 3.20, 6.4.18, 6.4.19 and Appendix E24 of the EIR</p> <p>Section 3.20, 6.4.18, 6.4.19 and Appendix E24 of the EIR</p> <p>Section 3.14 to 19 of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
		waste. South Africa will follow international best practice with regards to high level waste disposal.	
Ms Janet Marshall Art Café	What else can we do to stop this nuclear power station at Bantamsklip?	The purpose of the Public Participation Process (PPP) is to obtain public comment and input regarding the proposed development. The competent authority will review the various comments and concerns as well as the predicted impacts as determined by the EIA process, and thereafter make an informed decision regarding the proposed development. We encourage your continued participation in the PPP as a means to express your views and concerns.	Section 7.5, 7.7.4, 7.7.5 and Appendix D of the EIR
Ms Debbie Coetzee I&AP	<p>As a property owning resident of Hermanus, I hereby send my formal objection to the positioning of the proposed nuclear power station. The environmental effect of the warming of our waters and the subsequent effect on the sea creatures in our area, especially the Whales, from which much of our tourist revenue is obtained, is good enough reason to disallow the building of the reactor. Along with this, is the danger to the thriving communities within the designated 50 km “no go” zone, communities who have paid premium prices for property, have thriving families and businesses and have built up strong community bonds. Should there be a fall out, these communities and their residents are in danger of losing everything – is there a protocol for re-imbursment from the government if this happens??</p> <p>I say NO, NO, NO to a nuclear power station at Bantamsklip!</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. A number of specialist studies will be undertaken during the detailed Impact Assessment Phase to assess the potential impacts of the proposed nuclear power station on the environment. Your issues have been passed onto the relevant specialist for consideration in their assessment.</p> <p>For further information on the Terms of Reference for the Specialist Studies, please refer to the Revised Plan of Study for EIA available on the following website: www.eskom.co.za/eia.</p> <p>A full evaluation of safety aspects related to the plant will be carried out by the NNR as part of the nuclear licensing process which will also provide for public comment. The current Koeberg nuclear operating licence only requires detailed emergency planning for a radius of 5km and 16km. It is important to note the planning radius is not considered as</p>	<p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 10 of the FSR</p> <p>Section 3.20, 6.4.18, 6.4.19 and Appendix E24 of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
		<p>a no go zone and development can occur within these areas.</p> <p>Internationally emergency planning for the same type of PWR reactors that Eskom is investigating are considerably less than those currently being employed by Koeberg. Based on the EUR the assumption for this project is 800 meters and 3 kms. The determination of the necessary emergency planning zones and all relevant safety aspect will be evaluated and finalised through the NNR licensing process.</p>	<p>Section 3.20, 6.4.18, 6.4.19 and Appendix E24 of the EIR</p>
<p>Mr& Mrs Janice and Anthony Bohan I&APs</p>	<p>I wish on behalf of my husband and myself to object to the building and location of the proposed building of a nuclear power station at Bantamsklip site. The Overstrand is an area of such natural beauty and biodiversity will be adversely affected in so many areas. The whole area thrives on the natural wonders of this region, and it is threatened with destruction if the proposal goes ahead. You have heard all the arguments both for and the many against the scheme, so I only want to register our opposition to this building going ahead and would request confirmation that you have received our objection and add our names to the many you already have.</p>	<p>Your comment is noted.</p>	
<p>Mr Philippa Castle Stanford Glendower Bird Fair</p>	<p>Please be assured that damaging our pristine coastline and Fynbos Environment is simply not on the agenda for us as concerned South African citizens and as such we object wholeheartedly to Eskom's proposal for a nuclear power station at Bantamsklip near Pearly Beach.</p> <p>Bruce Castle and myself are owners of www.stanfordbirding.co.za and a driving force behind the Stanford Glendower Bird Fair. It is imperative for us that this Proposed Nuclear Power Station at Bantamsklip near Pearly Beach does not take place.</p>	<p>Your comments are noted. All the aspects you have raised will be submitted to the relevant specialists for comment.</p> <p>Arcus GIBB hereby provides you with unequivocal confirmation that the EIA process is not predetermined. It is part of our professional responsibility to undertake an objective and independent EIA process. Arcus GIBB has and will continue to abide by</p>	<p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p>The entire Overstrand area is recognised as an Important Birding Area (I.B.A.), thus subject to critical observation of International Conservation standards and practices. South Africans are first and foremost the ones required to implement and observe such standards and practices.</p> <p>Avi-tourism is the fastest growing form of International Tourism and with tourism fast becoming the greatest contributor to SA's GDP, the importance of maintaining this Southern Coast of Africa as the "Riviera of Africa" and keeping in line with the Cape Whale Coast tourism marketing strategy, this "acre of Africa" is prime land and as such needs and has our protection.</p> <p>We object to the fact that this application by Eskom is financially backed by the left hand of the Government and the application is planned to be approved by the right hand of the Government. Everyone working for the project is being paid either by the Government or Eskom – but they are "in bed together". Does this not form some sort of legal transgression?</p>	<p>requirements set out by the National Environmental Management Act (NEMA) and the associated regulations. Government Notice Regulation Number 385 (i.e. GN No. R. 385) in the Government Gazette on 21 April 2006 stipulates the requirements for the appointment of an Environmental Assessment Practitioner. Arcus GIBB conforms to all these requirements. As Environmental Professionals, Arcus GIBB will remain an independent and impartial consultant on this project and present information in an unbiased manner.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>	
Mr Guy Gafney	<p>I live on a magnificent farm near Pearly Beach, or Bantamsklip, and it is possibly going to be wrecked by huge, and terribly unsightly power lines.</p> <p>Build a power station next to Koeberg, where you have already destroyed the coastline.</p>	<p>Your comment regarding the visual impacts associated with the transmission power line will be relayed to the Bantamsklip transmission power line EIA team.</p> <p>Your comment regarding the location of the proposed Nuclear Power Station (NPS) is noted.</p>	
Mr David Lees	<p>I live in Stanford & feel that the power station would be better sited where the major power generation is needed (i.e. NOT in the rural & pristine Overberg region!).</p> <p>This would be disastrous locally and for our Tourism industry.</p>	<p>Your comment regarding the location of the proposed Nuclear Power Station is noted.</p> <p>A Tourism assessment will be undertaken as part of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the proposed NPS.</p>	Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E of the EIR

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
Ms Layna Fischer	I am concerned for my health, the health of communities likely to be affected by the Plant and about the harm that the proposed power station will do to the natural environment in the Overstrand.	The EIR for the proposed NPSs will incorporate the potential impacts on human health as well as the natural environment.	Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E of the EIR
Jan and Anke Roux Property Owner in Pearly Beach	We both oppose the possible erection of a power station due to the effect it will have on the fauna and flora both on the land and in the sea.	Your comment is noted. Both Botanical and Faunal Specialist Studies will be undertaken during the detailed Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA. For the full Terms of Reference for these studies, please see the Revised Plan of Study for EIA available on the following website: www.eskom.co.za.	Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E11, E13 and E14 of the EIR Chapter 10 of the FSR
Ms Gill O'Sullivan Kleinriviersberg Conservancy	We as a conservancy and as individuals strenuously object to a nuclear power station at Pearly Beach. The main income for the Overberg is derived from farming and fishing and tourism. A nuclear power station will adversely affect all of these, and therefore the local economy.	Your objection is noted. Issues relating to farming, fishing, tourism and the local economy will be specifically assessed during the Impact Assessment Phase by the following specialists: Agriculture, Tourism and Economic. Please also refer to the Terms of Reference for these specialist studies, contained in the Revised Plan of Study for EIA.	Chapter 10 of the FSR Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E17, E21 and E22 of the EIR
Mr & Mrs J & M Reed	The proposed nuclear power station at Bantamsklip will have major detrimental effects of tourism and the environment. This, in the long term, will affect many people who would otherwise have found employment in the many and varied opportunities that arise from burgeoning tourism. Instead of putting huge money into undeniably dangerous nuclear power, south Africa should be seriously looking into power from wind, wave, sun and yet to be discovered environmentally sound sources.	Your comment is noted. A number of specialist studies, as detailed in the Revised Plan of Study, will be addressing the potential impacts on tourism, the local economy and the environment during the Impact Assessment Phase. With regards to your comment on renewable energy (such as solar and wind), Chapter 8 of the Final Scoping Report for the Nuclear-1 EIA discusses alternative forms of power generation. Eskom is in the process of exploring a number of different ways in which to generate electricity and is investing in further development of renewable technologies. Figure 66 on Page 8-3 illustrates the Project Funnel, which reflects where the different projects (and associated	Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E21 and E22 of the EIR Chapter 8 of the FSR and Section 4.2, 5.3 and 6.3.2 of the EIR

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
		<p>technologies) are in the development process (i.e. the stage of the development of these technologies). Only certain electricity generation technologies are commercially available, although not necessarily financially viable in South Africa based on the availability of resources (fuel) and geographical constraints. The limited range of viable technologies is listed in Table 17 on Page 8-5. The Final Scoping Report is available on the following website: http://projects.gibb.co.za/.</p>	
<p>Mr EC Hunt</p>	<p>I live with my son and daughter and grand children in Tesselaarsdal, 22 km from Caledon. We are totally against this proposal of a Nuclear Power Station being built near here due to radiation. I watched a programme on TV nearly 2 years ago about people overseas where they started getting cancer due to the radiation from the power lines passing near the peoples houses. If Eskom goes ahead and builds these power stations and any of my family and myself contact radiation or cancer we will seek legal advice and sue Eskom for millions.</p> <p>Please consider peoples health as radiation can get into our dams and rivers and affect our health and cause cancer. People's health should come first.</p>	<p>Your objection is noted. Human Health will be covered in detail in the Environmental Impact Report. Human Health is also an aspect considered during the NNR licensing process.</p>	<p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E24 of the EIR</p>
<p>Mrs E Spaarwater Overstrand Heritage Committee</p>	<p>This Overstrand Heritage and Aesthetics Committee works within the National Heritage Resources Act 1999. Our aim is to protect the built and landscape environment. The huge power lines will be a blight on the character of villages such as Stanford and Wolvengat, not to mention the precious fynbos landscape.</p>	<p>Your comment is noted and will be relayed to the Heritage Specialist and visual specialists currently involved in the Transmission EIA.</p>	<p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E of the EIR</p>
<p>Gateway SuperSpar</p>	<p>We strongly oppose the Nuclear Power Plant planned for Bantamsklip due to the negative impact it will have on our environment and human health.</p>	<p>Your objection is noted. The potential impacts on human health will be discussed during the Impact Assessment Phase of the environmental authorisation process. The potential impacts on the environment will be addressed by various specialist studies, including the Flora, Fauna and Freshwater Ecology Specialist Studies.</p>	<p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
<p>Ms Virginia MacKenny University of Cape Town</p>	<p>Is this the place one writes to protest the development of the nuclear plant at Bantamsklip near pearly beach?</p> <p>I would like to protest any such development in South Africa given our huge resources in wind and solar power. Eskom should be developing safe and sustainable resources rather than ones that have implications such as nuclear waste where there is no foreseeable solution. We could become world leaders in the area of sustainable energy resources. The Pearly Beach area is a fynbos rich area with much possibility for ecotourism which will be completely compromised by such a power station.</p>	<p>Your objection is noted. With regards to your comment on renewable energy (such as solar and wind), Chapter 8 of the Final Scoping Report for the Nuclear-1 EIA discusses alternative forms of power generation. Eskom is in the process of exploring a number of different ways in which to generate electricity and is investing in further development of renewable technologies. Figure 66 on Page 8-3 illustrates the Project Funnel, which reflects where the different projects (and associated technologies) are in the development process (i.e. the stage of the development of these technologies). Only certain electricity generation technologies are commercially available, although not necessarily financially viable in South Africa based on the availability of resources (fuel) and geographical constraints. The limited range of viable technologies is listed in Table 17 on Page 8-5. The Final Scoping Report is available on the following website: http://projects.gibb.co.za/.</p> <p>The disposal of <u>non radioactive waste and radioactive waste</u> will be discussed in the Environmental Impact Report as well as the Environmental Management Plan (EMP). The EIR will include a discussion of radioactive waste, as well as the amount of waste (both radioactive and non-radioactive) that will be expected from the proposed NPS. Waste disposal and transportation will be addressed. <u>Radioactive</u> waste, handling of radioactive waste falls under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Minerals and Energy in terms of the Nuclear Energy Act, and is also subject to a licensing process from the NNR.</p>	<p>Chapter 8 of the FSR and Section 4.2, 5.3 and 6.3.2 of the EIR</p> <p>Section 3.15 to 3.19, 6.3.4, 6.4.10 and 6.4.18 of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
<p>Mr Michael Richmond Thompson</p> <p>Mr Alan Craig Mugford</p>	<p>As residents & property owners in the Overstrand [Stanford], we wish to register our objection to the building/siting of the above facility in our area.</p>	<p>Your comment is noted.</p>	
<p>Dr. Jan van der Velden, Zoete Inval Traveller's Lodge,</p>	<p>The e-mails I receive regularly still speak about a pebble bed reactor at Bantamsklip.</p> <p>It seems more likely to be a conventional reactor or reactors.</p> <p>Even though I am not against nuclear energy as such, any reactor of any kind at Bantamsklip is just plainly unacceptable.</p> <p>As one of the most biological diverse hotspots in the world, both on land and sea, any development of any kind is detrimental to the environment.</p> <p>As the owner of a 4 star Guesthouse, Backpacker business, specializing in eco tourism, I wish to voice my objection to the development of a reactor, pebble bed or otherwise at Bantamsklip. I am totally against it.</p>	<p>Your objection is noted. The proposed pebble bed modular reactor (PBMR) does not form part of this environmental authorisation process. However, it should be noted that the proposed location for the PBMR is at Koeberg (Duynefontein), not Bantamsklip.</p> <p>The technology currently being considered/proposed is that of a pressurised water Reactor. The same technology type of Koeberg power station</p> <p>There are a number of current designs for PWRs available in the market today.</p> <p>For further information, please refer to Chapter 8 of the Final Scoping Report. The Final Scoping Report is available on the following website: http://projects.gibb.co.za/.</p>	<p>Section 3.5 of the EIR</p> <p>Section 3.5 of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 8 of the FSR</p>
<p>R W Ivey Oude Bosch Private Nature Reserve</p>	<p>Oude Bosch Private Nature reserve is registered with Cape Nature and recognised as a prime area of indigenous fynbos flora and associated biodiversity of the properties on which it is situated falls within the 50 km radius of the proposed nuclear plant.</p> <p>The Nature Reserve is on Farm 637/Remainder and the owners also own Farms 37/3; 637/4; 637/5; and 637/6 dist. Caledon, at the foothills of the Kleinriviersberg Mountains and adjacent to the Kleinrivier River and Vlei. Cape Nature has recognised this area as conservation worthy and in addition it contributes to the eco-tourism of the district.</p> <p>The proposed development of a nuclear power plant at</p>	<p>Your comments are noted and will be relayed to the Faunal, Botanical and Tourism Specialists.</p>	<p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p>Bantamsklip will irreversibly endanger the conservation of the environment and impact negatively on eco-tourism in the Overberg region. For these reasons the persons below are most concerned with the proposals and wish to comment on any proposed development</p>		
<p>R Metcalf Kleinriviersberg Conservancy</p>	<p>The Kleinriviersberg Conservancy is situated in the Stanford area, Overberg region, Western Cape Province. The conservancy is bordered by the Kleinrivier mountains in the north, and the Klein River Lagoon in the south-west. The Klein River runs through the centre of the conservancy, from east to west. The total area of the Conservancy is 4 830 ha. Twenty-four properties form the Conservancy. The Kleinriviersberg Conservancy lies within the 50 kms radius of the proposed site.</p> <p>The Objectives of the Kleinriviersberg Conservancy include:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ The promotion of the conservation of indigenous plants and animals and their biological communities, landscapes and cultural heritage sites. ❑ To raise funds for achieving the objective of the conservancy through such means as eco- tourism. ❑ To network with other conservancies and generally act for the collective good of nature conservation in the Western Cape. <p>The economy of the members is largely dependent on eco-tourism and farming. The Overberg region is promoted as a world recognised eco-tourism centre. The members of the Conservancy believe that Bantamsklip power plant will have an irreversible negative impact on eco-tourism, farming and the conservation of the flora, birdlife and biodiversity of the area which inter alia contributes to eco-tourism.</p>	<p>Your comments are noted and will be relayed to the Faunal, Botanical, Tourism and Agricultural Specialists.</p> <p>The potential impacts on biodiversity, tourism, the local economy and agriculture will be assessed by the specialists during the Impact Assessment Phase.</p>	<p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E11, E17 and E22 of the EIR</p>
<p>Alan and Alison Toombs Lesley and Trevor Boynton Ross and Lara Toombs Robyn and Neil</p>	<p>A meeting was held at short notice on Thursday at Bosko Church in Hermanus on the topic of the proposed nuclear power station at Bantamsklip (between Pearly Beach and Buffeljags). As residents of Onrus we received an email from a friend who attended the meeting, drawing our attention to the proposed development.</p>	<p>Your objections and concerns are noted. Various specialist studies will be undertaken during the detailed Impact Assessment Phase to assess the potential impacts of the proposed nuclear power station on the environment – including economic, botanical, agricultural, marine, tourism and faunal</p>	<p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
Patterson	<p>We are fully aware of the destructive influences this type of development will have on our beloved Overstrand and the surrounding coastline and sea. I don't think that these need to be itemised to you as you must be aware of all of them, but as you do not live in and love this area, you obviously do not have the same concerns that those of us who do live here have. We won't even consider the consequences to us all or, if not in our life time, to our children and grand children who spend a great deal of their recreational time here, if ever some type of nuclear accident should occur. We object to all the day to day effects this would have on our lives, on the economy of the area and the negative impact on of the flora and fauna and aquatic life here.</p> <p>We would like to thus register our strong opposition to the development of this power station.</p> <p>The coastline of SA is so vast with many uninhabited areas – why does this very populated and popular area, up and down the coast from the proposed site, have to be targeted for the development (other than economic gain for a few)?? Obviously greater costs would be incurred if the power distribution had to be over longer distances, but this would be a small price to pay for the preservation of such an incredibly sensitive and important ecosystem. Economically, the short term benefits for a relatively small number of local people who might be employed in the construction, would certainly not outweigh the negative aspects of the project in the long term. Is the fact that the area is important for agricultural and that it is also one of the most popular eco-tourist areas in the country of no importance?</p> <p>As long time residents of Durban and Pietermaritzburg we would react in exactly the same way if the plans were to erect a nuclear power station somewhere on the Natal coast.</p> <p>Please make note of the fact that we as a family unit object strongly to the development of this power station.</p>	<p>studies.</p> <p>The sites being considered in the Nuclear-1 EIA were identified during the Nuclear Site Investigation Programme (NSIP) implemented by Eskom in the eighties. The identification of the sites, which Eskom historically purchased for the development of Nuclear power stations, were identified as a result of various socio-economic, biophysical and physical environmental considerations. For more information on the NSIP, consult Chapter 5 of the Nuclear-1 Scoping Report available on the following website: http://projects.gibb.co.za/.</p>	Section 5.2.1 of the EIR
Ms Elizabeth Riddell	I should like to add my name to the list of objectors to the	Your objection is noted. Various specialist	Chapter 8 and 9

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p>proposed Nuclear Power Plant in the Overstrand.</p> <p>The Overstrand is a haven of peace and beauty for both the residents and visitors to this area - to spoil this corner of our country by erecting an enormous nuclear power plant would be most detrimental to the flora, fauna, populace and the country's income from the tourist trade. We seem gradually to be destroying, in fact raping, everything natural that our country is most famed for. Hopefully you will be able to find another location which will in no way be detrimental and may even benefit that area.</p>	<p>studies will be undertaken during the detailed Impact Assessment Phase to assess the potential impacts of the proposed nuclear power station on the environment – including botanical, tourism and faunal studies.</p>	<p>and Appendix E11, E13, E14 and E22 of the EIR</p>
<p>Ms Janice Taylor</p>	<p>On behalf of the Taylor Clan in South Africa, we wish to oppose the building of the power station in the overstrand region.</p>	<p>Your objection is noted.</p>	
<p>Mr Allan Youens</p>	<p>I live in Stanford and feel that the power station would be better sited where the major power generation is needed (i.e. NOT in the rural & pristine Overberg region!).</p> <p>This would be disastrous for our Tourism industry.</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. The sites being considered in the Nuclear-1 EIA were identified during the Nuclear Site Investigation Programme (NSIP) implemented by Eskom in the eighties. The identification of the sites, which Eskom historically purchased for the development of Nuclear power stations, were identified as a result of various socio-economic, biophysical and physical environmental considerations. For more information on the NSIP, consult Chapter 5 of the Nuclear-1 Scoping Report available on the following website: http://projects.gibb.co.za/</p> <p>Furthermore in terms of transmission planning and the long terms security of the electricity grid power generation is required in proximity to load centres and areas of load growth the Western and Eastern cape are considered to be such areas. The location of the proposed sites is therefore in line with this planning.</p> <p>Various specialist studies will be undertaken during the detailed Impact Assessment Phase to assess the potential impacts of the proposed nuclear power station on the</p>	<p>Section 5.2.1 of the EIR</p> <p>Section 5.2 of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
		environment – including a Tourism Impact Assessment.	
Ms Judy Christie	<p>I would like to have it on record that I object to the proposed Nuclear Power Station being built at Bantamsklip. I reside in Hermanus and know that it will have an adverse impact on this tourist destination.</p> <p>In these poor economic times, Hermanus is battling to survive as a tourist town without the added negative connotations of a Nuclear Power Station being built in close proximity. I chose to live in Hermanus as it was a pristine town with champagne air and now to learn that a Nuclear Power Station is to be built with all the adverse conditions that go with it i.e. the released cooling water which will affect sea temps which in turn will have an effect on the whales visiting our waters, and the very real possibility of evacuation should there be a meltdown is just unacceptable.</p> <p>I would like to have acknowledgement of receipt of receiving this letter of objection.</p>	<p>Your objection is noted. Various specialist studies will be conducted during the detailed Impact Assessment Phase of the environmental authorisation process. A few relevant examples are described below.</p> <p>The Marine Biology specialist study will assess the potential impacts of the nuclear power station (NPS) on marine species as well as assess the potential impacts of the thermal plume, record the baseline and predict future changes, identify potential impacts of organisms that may affect the cooling water supply and identify mitigation measures.</p> <p>The Tourism Specialist Study will investigate the probable effect on the tourism economy arising from both routine and accident conditions, on the local, provincial and Garden Route regions.</p> <p>For additional information on the Terms of Reference for Specialist Studies to be conducted during the IA Phase, please refer to the Revised Plan of Study for EIA available on the following website: http://projects.gibb.co.za/.</p>	<p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E15 of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E22 of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 10 of the FSR</p>
ELL Ivey for Mr A Grier	The persons live within the 50 km radius of the proposed nuclear power plant and will be affected by the development of such a plant and the effect it has on the prime economic sources of the area:- tourism, farming and fishing. The possibility of radio-active	Your comments are noted. Various specialist studies will be undertaken during the detailed Impact Assessment Phase to assess the potential impacts of the proposed nuclear	Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E22 of the EIR

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p>within the 50 km radius is a further matter for registering as an interested and affected person. The properties of Mr Grier and Granton Trust are Private Nature Reserves and the conservation of the environment is a prime concern. These persons object to the possible negative impact of a nuclear plant and radiation on the environment and the negative impact on potential Tourism in the area which is a source of income and sustainability of Private Nature Reserves.</p>	<p>power station on the environment – including tourism and agriculture studies. For further details on the Terms of Reference for a number of specialist studies, please refer to the Plan of Study for EIA available on the following website: http://projects.gibb.co.za/.</p>	<p>Chapter 10 of the FSR</p>
<p>P M Grant Waterfalls Private Nature Reserve</p>	<p>Waterfalls Private Nature reserve is registered with Cape Nature and recognised as a prime area of indigenous fynbos flora and associated eco-systems. It provides a valuable source of water to the Kleinrivierlei.</p> <p>The properties on which it is situated falls within the 50 km radius of the proposed nuclear plant.</p> <p>The Nature Reserve is on Farm 632 and Farm 635 and I also own Farms 626 and 637/3 dist. Caledon, at the foothills of the Kleinriviersberg Mountains and adjacent to the Kleinrivierlei. Cape Nature has recognised this area as conservation worthy and in addition it contributes to the eco-tourism of the district. The proposed development of a nuclear power plant at Bantamsklip will irreversibly endanger the conservation of the environment and impact negatively on eco-tourism in the Overberg region. For these reasons I am affected by the proposals and wish to comment on any proposed development.</p>	<p>Your comments are noted. A number of specialist studies will be undertaken during the detailed Impact Assessment phase to assess the potential impacts of the proposed nuclear power station on the environment – including a Tourism Impact Assessment.</p> <p>For additional information on the Terms of Reference for Specialist Studies to be conducted during the Impact Assessment Phase, please refer to the Revised Plan of Study for EIA available on the following website: http://projects.gibb.co.za/.</p> <p>It is unclear as to where your reference of 50km is derived, in the case of Koeberg Emergency Planning zones are 5km and 16 km respectively. With respect to Nuclear 1 the proposed emergency planning zones currently being assessed in the EIA , but require final approval from the NNR are 800m and 3km. The significantly smaller emergency planning zones are the result of safety advancements associated with the plant types being considered by Eskom.</p>	<p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E22 of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 10 of the FSR</p> <p>Section 3.20 and Appendix E24 of the EIR</p>
<p>Mr & Mrs Angus and Linda McNeil</p>	<p>We object in the strongest possible terms to this Power Plant being constructed on Bantamsklip site.</p> <p>It is one of the last remaining pristine stretches of coastline - natural, undeveloped and unpolluted.</p>	<p>Your objections are noted.</p> <p>The Emergency Response Specialist study will address all emergency procedures applicable to both the construction and</p>	<p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E26 of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p>Stanford and Hermanus fall within the 50 km radius of the power plant and can be affected by radiation fallout should there be any accident. Not only will the nuclear power plant be unsightly but it will affect:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Marine life - altered sea temperature and turbulence caused by inflow and output of sea water to the plant. b) Flora, fauna and birdlife within a 50 km radius of the nuclear plant, as well as under transmission lines which will cover 1 - 1.5 wide and 400 km long, will also affect agricultural production. c) Consequently there will be an enormous impact on socio-economic activities of fishing, farming and tourism in the Overberg. <p>BANTAMSKLIP IS NOT the right site for a Nuclear Power Plant</p>	<p>operational phases.</p> <p>It is unclear as to where your reference of 50km is derived, in the case of Koeberg Emergency Planning zones are 5km and 16 km respectively. With respect to Nuclear 1 the proposed emergency planning zones currently been assessed in the EIA , but require final approval from the NNR are 800m and 3km. The significantly small emergency planning zones are the result of safety advancements associated with the plant types being considered by Eskom.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) During the detailed Impact Assessment Phase, the Marine Biology specialist study will assess the potential impacts of the nuclear power station (NPS) on marine species as well as assess the potential impacts of the thermal plume, record the baseline and predict future changes, identify potential impacts of organisms that may affect the cooling water supply and identify mitigation measures. b) A number of specialist studies will be undertaken during the detailed Impact Assessment Phase to assess the potential impacts of the proposed nuclear power station on the environment – this includes Botany, Fauna and Agricultural Specialist Studies c) See Response b) above. Additional studies include, Socio-Economic, Tourism and Economic Specialist Studies. 	<p>Section 3.20 and Appendix E24 of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E15 of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E11, E13 and E14 of the EIR</p>
Ms Sue Leber	As a business owner in the Overstrand, I herein, state my points of concern and wish to raise objection to the building of a Nuclear	(1) Your comment is noted.	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p>power facility at Bantamsklip.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I feel that the building of this Nuclear Power Station will adversely affect last remaining pristine length of coastline in the Overstrand. 2. The known effect of released cooling water raising the surrounding sea temperature by 5 - 15 degrees will surely affect the sea life that thrives on this cold coast and could interfere with the returning annual whale migration. 3. Eco-tourism & agriculture and its support business is the economic foundation of the Overstrand. Tourists will choose alternative destinations. As a business owner I would be adversely affected. 4. Hermanus sits within the 50 km "no go" zone. Meaning if a meltdown should happen the whole area is evacuated for a substantial number of 200 years. As a business owner I would be adversely affected. 	<p>(2) The potential increase in sea temperature immediately at the point of discharge is expected to be approximately 12 degrees Celsius, however the water is expected to return to ambient temperatures within 300m of discharge (based on Koeberg experience) During the detailed Impact Assessment Phase, the Marine Biology specialist study will assess the potential impacts of the nuclear power station (NPS) on marine species as well as assess the potential impacts of the thermal plume, record the baseline and predict future changes, identify potential impacts of organisms that may affect the cooling water supply and identify mitigation measures.</p> <p>(3) A number of specialist studies will be undertaken during the detailed Impact Assessment Phase to assess the potential impacts of the proposed nuclear power station on the environment – this includes Tourism and Economic Specialist Studies.</p> <p>For additional information on the Terms of Reference for Specialist Studies to be conducted during the Impact Assessment Phase, please refer to the Revised Plan of Study for EIA available on the following website: http://projects.gibb.co.za/.</p> <p>(4) During the detailed Impact Assessment Phase, the Emergency Response specialist study will address all emergency procedures applicable to both the construction and operational phases.</p>	<p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E15 of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix 17 and E22 of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 10 of the FSR</p> <p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E24 of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
<p>Dr Pat Miller Hermanus Botanical Society</p>	<p>The Hermanus Botanical Society is mandated by its members (over 380) to work towards the preservation and conservation of the flora and associated ecosystems of the area. Hermanus is less than 50 kilometres from the proposed site, which is within our area of concern. We believe that the erection of a nuclear power station at Bantamsklip will have a severe, irreversible and adverse affect on both the flora and the associated ecosystems of the area and are thus opposed to the use of this site for this purpose.</p>	<p>Your comments are noted. A number of specialist studies will be undertaken during the detailed Impact Assessment Phase to assess the potential impacts of the proposed nuclear power station on the environment.</p> <p>It is unclear as to where your reference of 50km is derived, in the case of Koeberg Emergency Planning zones are 5km and 16 km respectively. With respect to Nuclear 1 the proposed emergency planning zones currently been assessed in the EIA , but require final approval from the NNR are 800m and 3km. The significantly smaller emergency planning zones are the result of safety advancements associated with the plant types being considered by Eskom.</p> <p>For additional information on the Terms of Reference for Specialist Studies to be conducted during the Impact Assessment Phase, please refer to the Revised Plan of Study for EIA available on the following website: http://projects.gibb.co.za/.</p>	<p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E of the EIR</p> <p>Section 3.20 and Appendix E24 of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 10 of the FSR</p>
<p>Dr P K Miller Hermanus Resident</p>	<p>I am a resident home-owner at Hermanus, which is within 50 kilometres of the proposed site. I am of the considered opinion that a nuclear plant at Bantamsklip site will pose significant risks to my health and safety, as well as have a negative effect on the value of my property.</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. A number of specialist studies will be undertaken during the detailed Impact Assessment Phase to assess the potential impacts of the proposed nuclear power station on the environment – including an Economic Impact Assessment, as well as a Human Health Risk discussion. Your concern regarding property values will be relayed to the economic specialist.</p> <p>It is unclear as to where your reference of 50km is derived, in the case of Koeberg</p>	<p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E17 and E24 of the EIR</p> <p>Section 3.20 and</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
		<p>Emergency Planning zones are 5km and 16 km respectively. With respect to Nuclear 1 the proposed emergency planning zones currently being assessed in the EIA , but require final approval from the NNR are 800m and 3km. The significantly smaller emergency planning zones are the result of safety advancements associated with the plant types being considered by Eskom.</p> <p>For additional information on the Terms of Reference for Specialist Studies to be conducted during the IA Phase, please refer to the Revised Plan of Study for EIA available on the following website: http://projects.gibb.co.za/.</p>	<p>Appendix E24 of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 10 of the FSR</p>
<p>Mr & Mrs Glenda and Bevan Pope and Associate Artists the Mission's House Gallery</p>	<p>We as artists and families living and working in Onrusriver and surrounds are seriously opposed to the nuclear power plant planned for Bantamsklip for the hugely negative impact it will have on the environment and human health in support.</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. A number of specialist studies will be undertaken during the detailed Impact Assessment Phase to assess the potential impacts of the proposed nuclear power station on the environment – including a Human Health Risk Assessment.</p> <p>For additional information on the Terms of Reference for Specialist Studies to be conducted during the IA Phase, please refer to the Revised Plan of Study for EIA available on the following website: http://projects.gibb.co.za/.</p>	<p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E24 of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 10 of the FSR</p>
<p>Mr & Mrs Gys and Wendy Hofmeyr</p>	<p>We reside permanently at the above address and our family have owned this property for over 80 years.</p> <p>Wendy Hofmeyr is the duly elected Ward Committee member for Ward 3 of the Overstrand Municipality, which comprises Stanford and Voelklip and is a long-standing member of the Overstrand</p>	<p>Your objection is noted.</p>	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p>Heritage & Aesthetics Committee. Gys Hofmeyr is a Senior Counsel having practised at the Cape Bar for 45 years and acted as a Judge in the Cape High Court from time to time.</p> <p>We wish to register our strongest protest at this proposal as a nuclear power station of this size will impact not only severely on the environment, particularly on the flora, fauna, birdlife and marine life, which goes without saying, but also will impact severely on communities in the immediate vicinity and in fact as far away as Hermanus. It most certainly will also impact deleteriously on tourism as well as farming and fishing communities thus adversely affecting the economy of this region forever.</p> <p>Please, if you have to find a site for a nuclear power station, do so in an area that is not one of the most precious eco-tourism areas in South Africa.</p>		
<p>Ms Celia Clucas</p>	<p>As a property and land owner in Napier - Erf 388, 17 Jubileum Street,</p> <p>I would like to strongly object and oppose the proposed site for the nuclear power station in BANTAMSKLIP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❑ This area is a VERY sensitive fragile eco system unique in the worlds bio diversity in terms of flora and fauna ❑ This area is a SENSITIVE area for whales – also a unique sight for this endangered species of mammals. ❑ The beautiful scenic countryside of surrounding areas such as Napier and Bredasdorp will be forced to house unsightly power line cables, therefore destroying our countryside vistas and panoramic views. ❑ The area relies to a large extent on micro tourism, which will be lost as a consequence of this PowerStation being built in the area. <p>I am not convinced that a thorough investigation has been conducted toward the consequential ecological, or, potential social / human damage this power station will have on this very precious,</p>	<p>Your objection in noted.</p> <p>A number of specialist studies will be undertaken during the detailed Impact Assessment Phase to assess the potential impacts of the proposed nuclear power station on the environment. This includes: Botany, Fauna, Marine Biology, Visual, Tourism, Socio-Economic and a Human Health Risk Assessments and discussions. The specific Terms of Reference for these studies are described in the Revised Plan of Study for EIA available on the following website: http://projects.gibb.co.za/.</p> <p>During the detailed Impact Assessment Phase, the Marine Biology specialist study will assess the potential impacts of the nuclear power station (NPS) on marine species as well as assess the potential impacts of the thermal plume, record the baseline and</p>	<p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E of the EIR Chapter 10 of the FSR</p> <p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E15 of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p>unique and fragile environment. I therefore OBJECT to its current proposed location.</p>	<p>predict future changes, identify potential impacts of organisms that may affect the cooling water supply and identify mitigation measures.</p> <p>The Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) will discuss, for your information potential impacts of the nuclear power station (NPS) on human health.</p>	<p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E24 of the EIR</p>
<p>Mr Werner G Fourie</p>	<p>Concerning the new proposed Nuclear Project near Bantamsklip the following. We have a very pristine coastline in the Overberg and I think this new development will not be beneficial for the ecology and the coastline.</p> <p>Please look for another place to build this.</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. A number of specialist studies will be undertaken during the detailed Impact Assessment Phase to assess the potential impacts of the proposed nuclear power station on the environment.</p> <p>For additional information on the Terms of Reference for Specialist Studies to be conducted during the Impact Assessment Phase, please refer to the Revised Plan of Study for EIA available on the following website: http://projects.gibb.co.za/.</p>	<p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E22 of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 10 of the FSR</p>
<p>Ms Sally Andrew</p>	<p>I continue to object to your proposed nuclear stations, for all the reasons that I have previously raised. All the my concerns still remain. None of these have been adequately addressed.</p>	<p>Your comment is noted.</p>	
<p>Ms Elsa Gebhard</p>	<p>I live in Stanford & feel that the power station would be better sited where the major power generation is needed i.e. near the gold mines and NOT in a rural region with limited power requirements.</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. The sites being considered in the Nuclear-1 EIA were identified during the Nuclear Site Investigation Programme (NSIP) implemented by Eskom in the eighties. The identification of the sites, which Eskom historically purchased for the development of Nuclear power stations, were identified as a result of various socio-economic, biophysical and physical environmental considerations. For more</p>	<p>Section 5.2.1 of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
		<p>information on the NSIP, consult Chapter 5 of the Nuclear-1 Scoping Report available on the following website: http://projects.gibb.co.za/</p> <p>Furthermore in terms of transmission planning and the long terms security of the electricity grid power generation is required in proximity to load centres and areas of load growth the Western and Eastern cape are considered to be such areas. The location of the proposed sites is therefore in line with this planning.</p>	Section 5.2 of the EIR
Mr Greg Boers	I am opposed to it.	Your objection is noted.	
Mrs CM Louw	For Gods sake, why this sensitive " unieke" part of the world with the wonderful fynbos and irreplaceable fauna and flora. Find some other barren place where the echo system and all that goes with it, is not at risk. Not even to mention the overgrowing population. I would like to be kept up to date with these unacceptable intentions.	Your comment is noted.	
Mrs C Mills	I am part-owner of a heritage property close to the proposed area for construction & feel strongly that the undoubted effect on the natural terrain will affect the environment negatively. This will in accordance have an undesired affect on tourism & re-sale on property.	Your comment is noted. Your concerns will be relayed to the Tourism, Heritage and Economic Specialists.	Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E17, E20 and E22 of the EIR
Ms Shirley Lamb	<p>My family are Interested and Affected Parties as we have property in Pearly Beach. We strongly object to the proposed construction of a nuclear plant at Bantamsklip for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This region is an ecological heritage site containing an extremely large variety of plant species, many of which are endangered. Inadequate consideration has been taken of this fact, simply because it is a relatively unknown area. Because Eskom was able to acquire this land a long time ago, when environmental issues were of little consequence, does not give them the right to develop a nuclear plant on a valuable environmental asset such as this. This is a much bigger issue than a relatively small piece of land for a power station. It is a 	<p>Your comments are noted.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Your comment is noted and will be relayed to the Heritage and Faunal Specialists. 2. During the detailed Impact Assessment Phase, the Marine Biology specialist study will assess the potential impacts of the nuclear power station (NPS) on marine species as well as assess the potential impacts of the thermal plume, record the baseline and predict future changes, identify potential impacts of organisms that may affect the 	<p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E13, E14 and E20 of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E15 of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p>major conservation issue.</p> <p>2. The pristine coastline also contains a large variety of sea life from delicate sea urchins and squid to magnificent whales, dolphins etc. Heated water from the plant will cause untold damage to the marine life. While the rest of the world is trying to save the seas, we are setting out to destroy ours.</p> <p>3. Large tracts of land will need to be cleared to erect pylons to carry the power to other areas. These unsightly and dangerous power lines will scar even more vegetation.</p> <p>Surely all these points make any plans to develop the nuclear station unconstitutional. The constitutional rights of the people and the environment are being abused. Can this not be taken to higher court of law?</p> <p>Against forces such as Eskom and the Government our voices are small, but hopefully the public conscience is bigger and will not allow this to happen.</p>	<p>cooling water supply and identify mitigation measures.</p> <p>3. Your comment is noted and will be relayed to the Bantamsklip Transmission Line EIA Team.</p>	
<p>Mr Martin Wigand Stanford Valley Farm Owner</p>	<p>We are part of a group of people who owns the farm Stanford Valley, 10 km from Stanford. I am very concerned about the plans to develop the Bantamsklip site because of the impact on the immediate environment (Fynbos etc.), because of the planned powerlines which will also affect our land, and also because nuclear energy is not the way forward, considering the inhibitive costs of a plant and the still unresolved question of radioactive waste.</p> <p>I want therefore to register my objections as an interested and affected party.</p>	<p>Your comment is noted.</p> <p>A number of specialist studies will be undertaken during the detailed Impact Assessment Phase to assess the potential impacts of the proposed nuclear power station on the environment – including a Botanical Specialist Study. The specific Terms of Reference for this study is described in the Revised Plan of Study for EIA available on the following website: http://projects.gibb.co.za/.</p> <p>The disposal of <u>non radioactive waste and radioactive waste</u> will be discussed in the Environmental Impact Report as well as the Environmental Management Plan (EMP). The EIR will include a discussion of radioactive</p>	<p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E of the EIR Chapter 10 of the FSR</p> <p>Section 3.15, 3.18, 3.19, 6.3.4, 6.4.10 and 6.4.18</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
		waste, as well as the amount of waste (both radioactive and non-radioactive) that will be expected from the proposed NPS. Waste disposal and transportation will be addressed. <u>Radioactive</u> waste, handling of radioactive waste falls under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Minerals and Energy in terms of the Nuclear Energy Act, and is also subject to a licensing process from the NNR.	of the EIR
Mr Ian Wallace	Nuclear Power Stations are a huge issue for most Europeans. Hermanus' tourism WILL be adversely affected, so will the value of all the properties in the area. Will the State/ Eskom compensate for this?	Your comment is noted. A number of specialist studies will be undertaken during the detailed Impact Assessment Phase to assess the potential impacts of the proposed nuclear power station on the environment – including a Tourism Impact Assessment. Your concern regarding property values will be relayed to the economic specialist.	Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E22 of the EIR
Mr Jan van der Velden	<p>1. I want to reiterate as someone who is an environmentalist, medical doctor and qualified in occupational health as well, THAT BANTAMSKLIP IS THE WORST POSSIBLE PLACE TO PUT ANY POWER STATION. The environmental reasons are no doubt known to you by this time. Such as that it may mean the end of the annual sardine run.</p> <p>2. Because of health reasons, I drifted into tourism. I also asked my international guests in our guesthouse/backpacker establishment what they think would be the result of a nuclear powerplant close by. The answers were the same: That would spoil everything. Tourists will not come here anymore.</p> <p>3. This is an eco-tourism hotspot and eco tourists are extremely sensitive to environmental matters. So much so, that I am sometimes asked if the very white foam on the sea is not perhaps because of detergent pollution. That is a big concern in Europe. Then I have to explain, no, it is because of the slimy</p>	<p>1. Your comment is noted and will be relayed to the Human Health Risk Assessment and the Marine Biology Specialists.</p> <p>2. Your comment is noted and will be relayed to the Tourism Specialist.</p> <p>3. Your comment is noted.</p> <p>4. Your comment is noted. The Emergency Response Specialist study will address all emergency procedures applicable to both the construction and operational phases; and will consider evacuation and resources required for effective execution of the emergency responses.</p> <p>5. Your comment is noted.</p>	<p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E15 and E24 of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E22 of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E26 of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p>kelp, that only grows in cold water and the upwelling of nutrition rich cold water and plankton. Then they are in awe.</p> <p>4. I once stood above the reactor at Pelindaba and was very impressed by the turquoise and purple fluorescent water below me. So I am not against nuclear power as such, but then it must be in a suitable place. And current safety precautions are inadequate in my opinion. Nowhere in the world.</p> <p>5. The only patient with severe accidental radiation sickness I ever saw was in Canada. She worked on a potash mine and picked up and carried a canister that was accidentally dropped. Unbeknownst to her, it was a radioactive measuring device used underground. One would have thought that these kinds of accidents do not happen in first world countries.</p> <p>6. Go back to the history of nuclear energy and its pioneers. The doubting father of the nuclear bomb, J. Robert Oppenheimer, had 2nd thoughts and then turned against it. So the politicians turned against him. Imagine, you develop this super weapon, sacrifice your career, the Nobel Prize and your health to quickly end the war, save between .5 million to 1 million American lives, and then get your own people turn against you.....Niels Bohr and Werner Heisenberg were best friends, famous and at the top of their fields. Then the one followed his conscience and the other his political leaders. That is fascinating history.</p> <p>7. Whether nuclear power will go forward or not, depends more on the human element than the element U235. The human element may even overrule common sense and economics, but I hope not.</p>	<p>6. Your comment is noted.</p> <p>7. Your comment is noted.</p>	
Ms Gerda Groenewald	I object strongly to the Bantamsklip nuclear power plant, due to all the reasons supplied by the tourist information bureau.	Your objection is noted.	
M A James	As owners of Erf 259, Napier, Peter James and Maureen James do not want to have the nuclear Power Station erected at Bantamsklip and certainly we are dead against seeing huge pylons cutting across the farmlands in our environment.	Your objections are noted and will also be relayed to the Bantamsklip transmission power line EIA team.	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
Mr Robert Haarburger Arniston Spa Hotel	As the owner of the Arniston Spa Hotel, a 4 star luxury hotel with 65 rooms, employing over 100 people, we wish to state our <i>objection</i> to the proposed Bantamsklip Nuclear Power Station and Associated Infrastructure, as it will turn potential guests away from our tourist facility/town and this would lead to a loss of jobs and associated work/business opportunities in the Overberg region	Your objection is noted and your concerns will be relayed to the Tourism and Economic Specialists.	Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E22 of the EIR
Mr Robert Haarburger Arniston Seaside Cottages	As the owner of the Arniston Seaside Cottages, a 3 star graded self catering establishment, accommodating over 100 guests in 22 cottages and employing over 15 people, we wish to lodge our <i>objection</i> to the proposed Bantamsklip Nuclear Power Station and Associated Infrastructure, as it will turn potential guests away from our fishing village and this would lead to a loss of jobs and associated work/business opportunities for the local inhabitants. Arniston is renowned as a tourist destination and a nuclear power station would not be beneficial to Arniston which is situated in the heart of the Overberg region.	Your objection is noted and your concerns will be relayed to the Tourism and Economic Specialists.	Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E17 and E22 of the EIR
K I Neelmeyer	I wish to add my name, K I Neelmeyer, to the objectors to this planned nuclear power station at Bantamsklip, largely because of my concerns and fears the competence of the future employees who have to maintain and operate this power station, after the foreign contractors leave having commissioned this power station. It would appear that there is already a grave shortage of the necessary skilled technicians and operators and competent managers in the current South African power supply company, the environmental impact to the immediate coastal area and the surrounding coastal plain and the Overberg, the health risks and inherent dangers involved in generating nuclear power, and the long term maintenance and safety of such a power station, the future safe decommissioning of such a power generator, as well as the major impact of the multitude of large and unsightly HIGH VOLTAGE power lines that are going to have to cross through my immediate environment between Bredasdorp and Napier. This coastal area has been identified as a future residential growth area. It would be preferable to locate a nuclear power station in a less densely populated area along the West coast.	Your objection is noted. The Terms of Reference for the Economic Specialists as laid out in the Revised Plan of Study for EIA; require that the following be considered: <i>“Skills required to operate a NPS and the opportunities that this may present for educational institutions. Moreover, the capability of South Africa to provide the necessary skills”</i> . It should further be noted that all operators are re trained in according to national and international standards as well as been required to undergo regular skills assessment audits by various international bodies. ..The potential impacts associated with the decommissioning of the power plant will be assessed as part of the EIA. In addition Arcus GIBB will provide generic guidelines, principles and criteria based on international	Chapter 10 of the FSR Section 3.20 Section 3.22 of the EIR

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p>Personally, I would rather see 1000's of wind generators strategically positioned in our various outlying villages, than to have to live near a Nuclear power plant that will be serving the cities and not just our local needs.</p>	<p>literature and best practice. The EMP will also contain specific 'in principle' commitments which will ensure responsible decommissioning</p> <p>Further, the EIR will also elaborate on the NNR's role and requirements on decommissioning, and address the long term impacts and the long-term sterilisation of land, as requested by DEAT in their letter dated 19 November 2008.</p> <p>With regards to renewable energy (such as solar and wind), Chapter 8 of the Final Scoping Report for the Nuclear-1 EIA discusses alternative forms of power generation. Eskom is in the process of exploring a number of different ways in which to generate electricity and is investing in further development of renewable technologies. Figure 66 on Page 8-3 illustrates the Project Funnel, which reflects where the different projects (and associated technologies) are in the development process (i.e. the stage of the development of these technologies). Only certain electricity generation technologies are commercially available, although not necessarily financially viable in South Africa based on the availability of resources (fuel) and geographical constraints. The limited range of viable technologies is listed in Table 17 on Page 8-5. The Final Scoping Report is available on the following website: http://projects.gibb.co.za/.</p>	<p>Section 3.22 of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 8 of the FSR and Section 4.2, 5.3 and 6.3.2 of the EIR</p>
<p>Mr Stephen Smuts Owner of Sunbird</p>	<p>I fully support the content of the letter written by Angela Millar, Cape Agulhas Tourism Bureau. I write as the owner of a</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. Please refer to the response to the submission by the Cape</p>	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
<p>Lodge and Fynbos Reserve Chairman - Napier Mountain Conservancy</p>	<p>CapeNature recognised Voluntary Conservation Site of 350 ha on the Napier Mountain. Our alien clearing has created jobs that support several families in Napier. Our nature based lodge facility will also be badly affected. Transmission lines crossing the Bredasdorpberge through or near our Napier Mountain Conservancy will be catastrophic for everything we have worked so hard to achieve.</p> <p>I also endorse the belief that a power station in the area will be a disaster for the nature based tourism industry that so many have been working on for so long.</p> <p>I am the owner of a guest lodge located in my fynbos reserve in the mountain above Napier. I am also a qualified nature guide specialising in fynbos both on our property and across the Agulhas Plain. The power station and transmission lines pose a certain threat to all I and so many of my friends and associates have worked so hard to achieve. It is not an exaggeration to suggest that this development poses a threat to my income and that of the staff that I employ to restore our fynbos to its natural state by clearing alien vegetation.</p> <p>My property also forms part of the Napier Mountain Conservancy, a collection of 7 farms above Napier. The Conservancy of approximately 3000 ha. borders and connects with the SMA which in turn borders and connects with the Agulhas National Park</p>	<p>Agulhas Tourism Bureau.</p> <p>Your comment will be relayed to the relevant specialists, i.e. Botany, Tourism, Economy.</p>	<p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E11, E 17 and E22 of the EIR</p>
<p>Mr Gregory Boers</p>	<p>I would like also to take this opportunity to express my distress at the prospect of a nuclear power station in Bantamsklip and underscore my opinion that, should another nuclear power station be deemed necessary in the Cape, any such facility should be in the Koeberg area where a facility already exists (so as to spare any possible damage to other biospheres, and notably the wetlands in the Hermanus/Stanford area).</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. The Freshwater Ecosystems specialist will undertake a broad-scale identification and assessment of sensitivity, ecological function and conservation importance of any freshwater ecosystems on or associated with the sites.</p> <p>The specific Terms of Reference for this study is described in the Revised Plan of Study for EIA available on the following website: http://projects.gibb.co.za/.</p>	<p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E12 of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 10 of the FSR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
		<p>Duynfontein, the present site of Koeberg power station, is one of the three alternatives sites currently being investigated as part of the EIA</p>	
<p>Mr & Mrs Graham and Theresa Tothschild</p>	<p>We as a family living and working in Hermanus and surrounds are seriously opposed to the nuclear power plant planned for Bantamsklip for the hugely negative impact it will have on the environment and human health.</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. A number of specialist studies will be undertaken during the detailed Impact Assessment Phase to assess the potential impacts of the proposed nuclear power station on the environment.</p> <p>The Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) will discuss the impacts of the nuclear power station (NPS) on human health. The specific Terms of Reference for this study is described in the Revised Plan of Study for EIA available on the following website: http://projects.gibb.co.za/.</p>	<p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E24 of the EIR Chapter 10 of the FSR</p>
<p>Mr Michael Riddell</p>	<p>I would like to register my opposition into the proposed building of the Nuclear Power Station in Bantamsklip. I am a resident of Stanford.</p>	<p>Your objection is noted.</p>	
<p>Mr Andrée Bonthuys Portion 173 of Farm 213 Baardscheerdersbosch</p>	<p>As an Interested and Affected Party living within the 10km radius of the proposed Bantamsklip nuclear site, I would like to add the following comment.</p> <p>I feel certain that ecotourism, that which sustains most of this part of the Overberg and an industry that I see growing before my eyes daily, will suffer enormously.</p> <p>The drawcard of this Southern Overberg is its pristine nature, its "away from it all" charm, the abundance of flora, fauna, birds, the seasonal whales, the sharks, the fishing. The people who have settled in the area have established themselves here because of its simple charms. Many have chosen to live off the grid, in tune with the earth here and bring/attract visitors to the area to share</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. A number of specialist studies will be undertaken during the detailed Impact Assessment Phase to assess the potential impacts of the proposed nuclear power station on the environment, including a Tourism Specialist Study.</p>	<p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E22 of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p>their joy, whether they run guest houses, tour groups, shark cage diving operations, export flower, practice permaculture, artists, guides.</p>		
<p>Ebeline de Villers</p>	<p>We are property owners in Benguela cove next to Botriver lagoon. My main concerns are the effect on the ecology, fauna, flora and marine life.</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. A number of specialist studies will be undertaken during the detailed Impact Assessment Phase to assess the potential impacts of the proposed nuclear power station on the environment, including – Botany, Fauna and Marine Biology.</p> <p>The specific Terms of Reference for each of the Specialist Studies is described in the Revised Plan of Study for EIA available on the following website: http://projects.gibb.co.za/.</p>	<p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E11, E 13, E14 and E15 of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 10 of the FSR</p>
<p>Linda, Morgan, Merryck and Rory Griffiths.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Griffiths Family is TOTALLY against the building of a Nuclear Powerplant at Bantamsklip in the Overberg. 2. We appeal to the S.A. Government to consider an alternate place to build the plant. This proposed plant can be detrimental to health of all inhabitants and will pollute our beautiful countryside and sea. 3. Alternate methods of producing and generating electricity must be used to supply the population with electricity. 4. We hope reason and good planning will prevail to stop this construction in the Overberg. There must be alternate sites, far away from populated areas, for a nuclear powerplant. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Your objection is noted. 2. The sites being considered in the Nuclear-1 EIA were identified during the Nuclear Site Investigation Programme (NSIP) implemented by Eskom in the eighties. For more information on the NSIP, consult Chapter 5 of the Nuclear-1 Scoping Report available on the following website: http://projects.gibb.co.za/. Bantamsklip is one of three proposed sites currently being investigated as part of the EIA 3. Chapter 8 of the Final Scoping Report for the Nuclear-1 EIA discusses alternative forms of power generation. Eskom is in the process of exploring a number of different ways in which to generate electricity and is investing in further development of renewable technologies. Figure 66 on Page 8-3 illustrates the Project Funnel, which reflects where the different projects (and associated 	<p>Section 5.2.1 of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 8 of the FSR and Section 4.2, 5.3 and 6.3.2 of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
		<p>technologies) are in the development process (i.e. the stage of the development of these technologies). Only certain electricity generation technologies are commercially available, although not necessarily financially viable in South Africa based on the availability of resources (fuel) and geographical constraints. The limited range of viable technologies is listed in Table 17 on Page 8-5. The Final Scoping Report is available on the following website: http://projects.gibb.co.za/.</p> <p>4. Your comment is noted. See Response 2. above.</p>	
<p>Mr Niel Jonker Baardskeerderbos Art Route</p>	<p>As chairperson of this community driven initiative, I have the mandate from our ten members to oppose the proposed Nuclear Power Station at Bantamsklip.</p> <p>Representing a key eco-tourism attraction in the Southern Overberg, we provide opportunities for approx. 50 local households, by drawing approx. 1000 visitors to the area with our event.</p>	<p>Your comment is noted and will be relayed to the Tourism Specialist.</p>	
<p>Dr. Brendon Neumann PhD (Plant Pathology)</p>	<p>I have just purchased a piece of land outside of Stanford and have only now found out about the proposed nuclear power station at Bantamsklip. I believe the power lines could run very close to my property and as I plan to do organic farming here I am concerned that this would affect my ability to register the farm as organic. The lines will also destroy the fantastic view I currently have but that is of secondary importance to me.</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. Your concerns will be passed onto the consultants undertaking the Transmission line EIA</p>	
<p>Mr & Mrs Jim and Lee Wepener</p>	<p>We as a family living and working in Hermanus and surrounds are seriously opposed to the nuclear power plant planned for Bantamsklip for the hugely negative impact it will have on the environment and human health.</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. A number of specialist studies will be undertaken during the detailed Impact Assessment Phase to assess the potential impacts of the proposed nuclear power station on the environment.</p>	<p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
		<p>The Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) will discuss the impacts of the nuclear power station (NPS) on human health.</p> <p>The specific Terms of Reference for each of the Specialist Studies is described in the Revised Plan of Study for EIA available on the following website: http://projects.gibb.co.za/.</p>	<p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E24 of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 10 of the FSR</p>
<p>Mr & Mrs Sue and Jan Welthagen</p>	<p>My husband and I would like to protest about the proposed nuclear powerplant which will be erected within a 50 km 'no go zone' of our lovely and pristine Hermanus village.</p> <p>We feel very strongly that it will affect all aspects of the biodiversity of our area.</p> <p>We cannot condone the fact that released cooling water will raise the surrounding sea temperature and affect the marine life.</p> <p>Please keep our wonderful coastline as it is from Pearly Beach to Hermanus.</p>	<p>Your comment is noted.</p> <p>It is unclear as to where your reference of 50km is derived, in the case of Koeberg Emergency Planning zones are 5km and 16 km respectively. With respect to Nuclear 1 the proposed emergency planning zones currently being assessed in the EIA. , but require final approval from the NNR are 800m and 3km. The significantly small emergency planning zones are the result of safety advancements associated with the plant types being considered by Eskom.</p> <p>A number of specialist studies will be undertaken during the detailed Impact Assessment Phase to assess the potential impacts of the proposed nuclear power station on the environment. The specific Terms of Reference for each of the Specialist Studies is described in the Revised Plan of Study for EIA available on the following website: http://projects.gibb.co.za/.</p> <p>During the detailed Impact Assessment Phase, the Marine Biology specialist study will assess the potential impacts of the nuclear power station (NPS) on marine species as</p>	<p>Section 3.20 and Appendix E24 of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E of the EIR Chapter 10 of the FSR</p> <p>Chapter 8 and 9</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
		well as assess the potential impacts of the thermal plume, record the baseline and predict future changes, identify potential impacts of organisms that may affect the cooling water supply and identify mitigation measures.	and Appendix E15 of the EIR
Mrs Lyn Warner	As I live in the Overberg, huge areas of which will be negatively affected if the Bantamsklip Nuclear power station is erected.	Your comment is noted.	
Ms Angelika Esterhuizen Stanford Resident	<p>1. We are residents in Stanford, and run our tourist based business from here. We are very much against the proposed Nuclear Power Station at Bantamsklip.</p> <p>2. This area has a wide range of land and marine biodiversity, and is flourishing with shark- and whale-based tourism, as well as it being the second largest Birding Hot Spot next to Wakkerstroom, in SA. Our fynbos floral kingdom is well represented in its diversity and uniqueness in this area.</p> <p>3, The health risks to all living organisms, plant and animal, on land and at sea, are far too large, to warrant a facility like this, so that the power generated is to be taken up North for the Mining Industry to receive Electricity at a 90% discount to what Residents have to pay for theirs!</p> <p>4. With it's concomitant huge pylons bearing electromagnetic pollution over a vast tract of land, this will ruin the tourism trade, as our view-scapes is what the visitors come for, amongst afore mentioned reasons.</p> <p>5. In the case of a Fall Out, a radius of 50 - 80 km of land and marine life would be dead, sterile or maimed.</p> <p>6. Just because the sea water is cold enough here to cool the reactors, does not warrant destroying a part of the Cape coastal Marine Life, particular to this area, i.e.: the upwelling of sea brought on by our South Easterly winds, giving rise to plankton and seaweed, housing and feeding anchovies, pilchards and</p>	<p>1. Your comment is noted.</p> <p>2. Your comment is noted. A number of specialist studies will be undertaken during the detailed Impact Assessment Phase to assess the potential impacts of the proposed nuclear power station on the environment – including Botany. The specific Terms of Reference for each of the Specialist Studies is described in the Revised Plan of Study for EIA available on the following website: http://projects.gibb.co.za/.</p> <p>3. In terms of transmission planning and long term security of the electricity grid, power generation is required in proximity to load centres and areas of load growth the Western and Eastern cape are considered to be such areas. The location of the proposed sites is therefore in line with this planning. Bantamsklip is one of three sites that are been investigated as part of the Nuclear-1 EIA.</p> <p>Health risk discussion will be included as part of the EIR. Moreover studies undertaken at Koeberg illustrate that persons or animals do not become sick from living in close proximity to a nuclear power station</p>	<p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E11 of the EIR Chapter 10 of the FSR</p> <p>Section 5.2 of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E24 of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p>many more that make up our food chains.</p> <p>7. Alternative renewable energy sources from sun and wind would suit this area well, and will be sufficient for our non-industrial needs, here in at the tip of Africa.</p> <p>8. If you need power for smelting plants, make your energy close to those plants, not 1500+ km away. Has anyone calculated how much energy you will loose over this distance?</p> <p>9. As a Patron of the Stanford Conservation Trust, I, seriously and vehemently object to this proposed Nuclear Power Project.</p>	<p>4. Your comment is noted and will be relayed to the Bantamsklip Transmission Line EIA Team.</p> <p>5. It is unclear as to where your reference of 50km is derived, in the case of Koeberg Emergency Planning zones are 5km and 16 km respectively. With respect to Nuclear 1 the proposed emergency planning zones currently been assessed in the EIA , but require final approval from the NNR are 800m and 3km. The significantly smaller emergency planning zones are the result of safety advancements associated with the plant types being considered by Eskom.</p> <p>6. During the detailed Impact Assessment Phase, the Marine Biology specialist study will assess the potential impacts of the nuclear power station (NPS) on marine species as well as assess the potential impacts of the thermal plume, record the baseline and predict future changes, identify potential impacts of organisms that may affect the cooling water supply and identify mitigation measures.</p> <p>7. With regards to renewable energy (such as wind and solar), Chapter 8 of the Final Scoping Report for the Nuclear-1 EIA discusses alternative forms of power generation. Eskom is in the process of exploring a number of different ways in which to generate electricity and is investing in</p>	<p>Section 3.20 and Appendix E24 of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E15 of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 8 of the FSR and Section 4.2, 5.3 and 6.3.2</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
		<p>further development of renewable technologies. Figure 66 on Page 8-3 illustrates the Project Funnel, which reflects where the different projects (and associated technologies) are in the development process (i.e. the stage of the development of these technologies). Only certain electricity generation technologies are commercially available, although not necessarily financially viable in South Africa based on the availability of resources (fuel) and geographical constraints. The limited range of viable technologies is listed in Table 17 on Page 8-5. The Final Scoping Report is available on the following website: http://projects.gibb.co.za/.</p> <p>8. In terms of transmission planning and long term security of the electricity grid, power generation is required in proximity to load centres and areas of load growth the Western and Eastern cape are considered to be such areas. The location of the proposed sites is therefore in line with this planning. Bantamsklip is one of three sites that are been investigated as part of the Nuclear-1 EIA. In this light power generated from the power station will be utilised by the surrounding load centres with excess power feeding into the grid.</p> <p>The power losses associated with its transmission has been factored into the consideration of reasonable and feasible sites for the proposed location of the NPSs.</p> <p>9. Your objection is noted.</p>	<p>of the EIR</p> <p>Section 5.2 of the EIR</p> <p>Section 5.2 of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
Rose Marsh Interested and Affected Party	<p>I would like to register my vote against the nuclear power plant that is proposed in the Bantamsklip area. I have family that live in this area who will be directly affected by the environmental impacts of the plant and I come and visit the area myself. I'm sure I don't need to tell you that putting a plant in this area will, amongst other effects, raise sea temperatures which could have a fatal effect on the wildlife, especially whales that visit this coast. All companies operating in South Africa should have a responsibility to preserve the local wildlife and if, as usual, it's money that is the primary concern then the potential loss of income from eco-tourism should be considered in the argument to stop this development going ahead.</p> <p>I urge you not to damage the community and the surrounding landscape by allowing this project to continue and if you somehow think these plans are acceptable then I would appreciate a response to explain your justification.</p>	<p>Your objection is noted. Various specialist studies will be conducted during the detailed Impact Assessment Phase of the environmental authorisation process. A few relevant examples are described below.</p> <p>The Marine Biology specialist study will assess the potential impacts of the nuclear power station (NPS) on marine species as well as assess the potential impacts of the thermal plume, record the baseline and predict future changes, identify potential impacts of organisms that may affect the cooling water supply and identify mitigation measures.</p> <p>The Tourism specialist study will assess the impact of the proposed NPS on sea usage and the tourism industry adjacent to proposed sites.</p>	<p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E15 of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E22 of the EIR</p>
Mr & Mrs Owen	We do not want a power station on our doorstep.	Your comment is noted.	
Mrs S Raven and Mrs A Philip	We do NOT wish and OBJECT to have a nuclear power station at our doorstep - try the middle of the Karroo.	Your comment is noted. The sites being considered in the Nuclear-1 EIA were identified during the Nuclear Site Investigation Programme (NSIP) implemented by Eskom in the eighties. One of the criteria for selection was the proximity to vast quantities of water, required for cooling purposes. For more information on the NSIP, consult Chapter 5 of the Nuclear-1 Scoping Report available on the following website: http://projects.gibb.co.za/ .	Section 5.2.1 of the EIR
6(e) Thyspunt			
Mr Kobus Reichert Gamtkwa Khoisan	The Gamtkwa KhoiSan Council has requested that a site visit to the Thyspunt site be arranged in their comments for the purpose	A site visit with Mr Reichert did occur on 29 August 2008.	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
Council	<p>of the Draft Scoping Report. There was no response to this request in the report that has been distributed to the public.</p> <p>We again want to repeat the request as a matter of urgency. We have received various reports from members of the public about activities at the Thyspunt site, and we require access to the site to determine if any damage has been done to the KhoiSan people's heritage due to these activities.</p> <p>The fact that certain site clearing activities, and test drilling have been carried out without an registered archaeologist being present to monitor the situation is unacceptable. Eskom is well aware of the archaeological sensitivity of the site because they have 2 previous reports on the area by Dr. Binneman of the Albany Museum in their possession.</p> <p>In addition to our request for access to the site, we also request that all further activities be stopped at the site until a phase 1 Heritage Assessment has been concluded.</p> <p>We will appreciate your urgent response to these requests.</p>	<p>In addition to the site visit the EIA team and the Archaeological specialist has been in contact with the SAHRA with respect to current drilling activities occurring on site. The SAHRA has indicated that they will await the necessary specialist reports before undertaking any site visit.</p> <p>In addition to ongoing communication with the SAHRA, Eskom has been in contact with the relevant heritage specialist with regard to the drilling activities on site. A site visit has been conducted by a registered archaeologist to assess the impact of the activities taking place on site. It is the view of the independent archaeologist that no significant damage has occurred to any archaeological resource, but has in some instances allowed the archaeologist greater insight and access to areas where he previously would not have gained access.</p> <p>An environmental management plan is in place for the drilling and has been effective in limiting impacts on the site to date</p> <p>All drilling is necessary for the completion of the various geological and geohydrological specialist studies.</p> <p>In light of the limited impact that the drilling has had as well as taking in to consideration the view of the archaeological specialist it is not considered necessary to stop all activities for the purpose of undertaking a phase 1 heritage assessment</p>	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
<p>Ms Renee Royal Planner and Environmental Consultant</p>	<p>I have been going through the Final Scoping Report and have a number of comments, which I will forward under separate cover. In the meantime please could you confirm the 5 and 16 km Protective Zones for Thyspunt as indicated on Figure 4.2. (attached). It would appear to be incorrect when compared to Google Earth which indicated the distance between the proposed site and Cape St Francis and St Francis Bay as being within the 16 km zone (attached) and 19 km from Humansdorp.</p> <p><i>Note: Figure 4.2 can be emailed separately if necessary.</i></p>	<p>Comment noted. This diagram forms part of the Traffic and Transportation specialist study, the authors of which confirm that the diagram is correct</p>	
<p>Ryan Donnelly For A Safe Tomorrow F.A.S.T (NGO)</p>	<p>We would like to submit the following impact for the proposed nuclear power station at Thyspunt.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Our organic farm of orchards and vegetable gardens as mentioned before will be compromised by this proposed development. ▪ However we have not mentioned that this farm will be a new age healing retreat for chronic diseased patients with cancer and other terminal illnesses. ▪ Should the nuclear power station go ahead all our hard work would be for nothing? Because of the location of our farm in the direct downwind proximity to the proposed nuclear site at Thyspunt. ▪ All our watering is rainwater and the regular radioactive emissions would certainly compromise the very essence of our practice. New age healing is fast becoming recognised in South Africa but we are still very much behind when it comes to the USA and other countries in this regard. We learned this practice in the USA. ▪ Our healing practice will consist of fresh supply of live organic fruit, vegetables, herbs and salad greens with controlled live organic juice fasts. <p>We strongly support an alternative site for this nuclear power station development and or different environmentally friendly power generation technology.</p>	<p>Thank you for your information regarding your farm.</p> <p>A qualitative Human Health Risk Assessment, and Air Quality Climatological studies and Agricultural study, amongst others, are all included as part of the EIA and will assess the potential impacts that could be experienced as a result of the proposed development at the three alternative sites. These studies will form part of the EIA reports provided to the Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism (DEAT) for their consideration in decision-making. Please also note that a detailed Environmental Management Plan (EMP) would be developed using the specialist recommendations for the site concerned, to manage and mitigate against potential negative impacts.</p> <p>Monitoring which occurs on farmland surrounding Koeberg indicates no ill effects of the nuclear power station on any of the produce that is grown. All monitoring results are forwarded to the NNR.</p>	<p>Chapters 8 and 9 and Appendix E24 of the EIR</p> <p>Section 3.20 and Appendix E24 of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
		<p>As part of a separate authorisation process, that also involves public consultation; the National Nuclear Regulator will assess the nuclear safety as well as human health risk of the proposed nuclear power station.</p>	<p>Section 3.20 and Appendix E24 of the EIR</p>
<p>Mr S van den Berg Department of Minerals and Energy</p>	<p>PROPOSED NUCLEAR POWER PLANT: REMAINDER OF FARM 774 AND FARM 741, HUMANSDORP, EASTERN CAPE REGION</p> <p>Your inquiry dated refers 14 December 2007 refers.</p> <p>According to the records of this Department, the abovementioned land is not encumbered under any of the mineral laws and it is considered unlikely that the proposed use of the land will interfere with mining or incidental activities. This department will therefore have no objection to urge against the proposed nuclear power station.</p> <p>Please bear in mind that this Department will again have to be consulted regarding the matter, should the proposed development not take place within five years from the date hereof.</p>	<p>Thank you for this information.</p> <p>Your comment regarding further consultation requirements should the development not take place within five years from the date hereof, is noted.</p>	
<p>Jayson Webster Interested and Affected Party</p>	<p>Firstly what is going on with the proposed power station we heard on the news that is has been cancelled, as there is a problem with finance, is there still a proposal for a power station at Thyspunt?</p> <p>I have friends who live in Oyster Bay and they say land is being cleared and storage being put up what is this about? We are all under the impression that the power station has been cancelled. Please let me know thank you</p>	<p>The proposed nuclear programme has not been terminated but rather will be progressed following a different process - Government will establish a task tem, led by the Department of Minerals and Energy that will work with Eskom to develop and implement a framework for procuring a nuclear technology partner to support both the build and associated industrialization process.</p> <p>Although the process to introduce further nuclear power stations has changed (now being led by Government), the various investigations, that had previously commenced to prepare the sites for future</p>	<p>Section 5.2 of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
		<p>nuclear power stations, are continuing. These activities include, amongst others, the environmental impact assessment investigating three sites for a proposed nuclear power station, the environmental impact assessments investigating transmission line routes associated with the three sites, and the geotechnical and other studies required to characterize the sites to support a future application for a nuclear installation license from the National Nuclear Regulator.</p> <p>Please be assured that the construction and operation of the NPS will not commence without environmental authorisation and notification to Interested and Affected Parties (I&APs).</p>	<p>Section 7.7.4 and 7.7.5 of the EIR</p>
<p>Mr Peter Rautenbach Dream Supreme</p>	<p>I hereby wish to comment on the Draft Scoping Report as applies to the Thyspunt site. Dream Supreme fully endorses all comments and proposals made by Prof. Richard Cowling and the St Francis Conservancy.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>	
<p>Ms Elisabeth Rautenbach ST FRANCIS CONSERVANCY</p>	<p><u>COMMENTS ON DRAFT SCOPING REPORT: ESKOM NUCLEAR POWER STATION AT THYSPUNT</u></p> <p>The St Francis Conservancy wishes to bring to your attention that Prof. Richard Cowling is a member of this organisation, which highly esteems his expert knowledge and regards him as authoritative spokesperson in environmental matters affecting the Conservancy. Prof. Cowling has already submitted a reply to the Draft Scoping Report in his capacity as member of FOSTER. The St Francis Conservancy does not feel the necessity for a separate report as it fully endorses the accurately researched findings of Prof. Cowling.</p> <p>Based on these findings alone, the Conservancy fails to see why Thyspunt has not already been eliminated as a possible nuclear site. Other factors contributing to this opinion are:</p>	<p>Objection noted. Please note that this is not the only site that is being considered as part of this EIA process, as such there is no certainty that Bantamsklip will receive the necessary environmental authorisation. The final decision in this regard resides with DEAT</p> <p>All issues raised have been passed to the relevant specialists for their inclusion in their specialist studies and subsequent assessment as part of the Impact Assessment phase of the EIA.</p>	<p>Chapter 6 and 11 of the FSR and Chapter 1, Section 5.2, 6.4.1, 7.7.4 and 7.7.5 of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The archaeological sites, which would “entail lengthy, expensive and difficult mitigation measures”. How long will ESKOM wait for a survey to be concluded? 20 years? 2. The “ high visual intrusion” of a nuclear reactor. How does this fit in with regulations to coastal land-owners and Conservancy members who were not permitted to have electricity poles erected within visibility of the coast? 3. Climate: “High potential for dispersal of emissions into interior or towards PE”. Do we, as a Conservancy, want to feel responsible for this? 4. Vertebrates: “High number of threatened species...” What will happen to our highly endangered, endemic SAND TOAD? 5. Marine Biology: “ higher levels of endemism compared with...west coast”. What effect will the warming up of the sea-water have on our marine life? 6. Economic: “ Thyspunt is an established tourist growth point and a high-potential agricultural area”. How will the nuclear plant affect the dairy industry? How many workplaces will become vacant as a result of a decline in tourism? <p>In view of the above, and with acknowledgement of insufficient information as a result of incomplete surveys, the St Francis Conservancy cannot in any way condone the consideration of Thyspunt as a nuclear site.</p>		
Mrs Sara Stevenson	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. None of my previous issues have been addressed in the Draft Scoping Report. St. Francis Bay isn't even on the maps of some of the report. 2. Egress for a population you have not even attempted to count, despite being asked to do a count during last December, remains a major issue. I repeat: this population is in direct line of the primary wind flow. Evacuation time would, or could be 10 minutes! Bearing in mind there is only one access road, and a high percentage of the population has no transport. Thyspunt site should be scrapped for this reason alone. 3. Lack of impartiality in specialist reports. Independent 	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Objection noted. Please note that this is not the only site that is being considered as part of this EIA process, as such there is no certainty that Bantamsklip will receive the necessary environmental authorisation. The final decision in this regard resides with DEAT</p> <p>These matters will be addressed within a suite of specialist studies to be commissioned as part of the Impact Assessment Phase of this project.</p> <p>The specialist team were chosen due to their</p>	<p>Chapter 6 and 11 of the FSR and Chapter 1, Section 5.2, 6.4.1, 7.7.4 and 7.7.5 of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E of the EIR</p> <p>Section 7.6 and</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p>assessors are required, not government or Eskom paid people. A complete assessment is required including power lines, waste disposal, an independent NNR.</p>	<p>independence and experience (including local experience). Independent specialists will review their work. In addition to the specialist reports been peer reviewed the objectivity and integrity of all reports is assured as all specialist are members of respected professional bodies and as such are required to abide by strict professional ethics and standards.</p>	<p>Appendix E1 of the EIR</p>
<p>Mr Werner Kurt Illenberger Illenberger & Associates</p>	<p>COMMENTS ON DRAFT SCOPING REPORT: ESKOM NUCLEAR POWER STATION AND ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE: Thyspunt site</p> <p>Firstly, I fully agree with the endorse all the comments, criticisms and short-comings as pointed out by Prof RM Cowling, FOSTER, Cape St Francis.</p> <p>Secondly, there is an alternative site in the Eastern Cape that is much better suited to a nuclear power station and associated infrastructure. This is the Cape Recife peninsula. The advantages of Cape Recife are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Many parts of the area around Cape Recife are environmentally degraded, in comparison with the Thyspunt site that is virtually pristine. 2. The wind regime at Cape Recife is such that any hazardous air-born emissions would be blown away from the nearby urban areas of Nelson Mandela Bay Municipality. The dominant WSW wind would carry pollutants to the ESE, the secondary ESE wind (direction as measured at Cape Recife) would carry pollutants to the ESE, right onto St Francis Bay Village. 3. The difficulties and major negative environmental impacts that would results in routing and building an access road and powerlines at Thyspunt would be totally avoided. 4. The financial cost of building infrastructure such as access 	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>In terms of the EIA regulations an alternative to be considered needs to be a feasible alternative. All sites identified to be part of this EIA process were the result of an extensive Nuclear siting program that was undertaken during the 1980's. The assessment of the sites was not limited to biophysical and social characteristics but also included other site physical attributes such as seismicity, geology, availability of land, etc. You are encouraged to review the NSIP report as part of the scoping report.</p>	<p>Section 5.2.1 of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p>road and powerlines would be drastically reduced.</p> <p>The alternative Cape Recife peninsula must be considered in the EIA process.</p>		
<p>Mr E Busakwe Sea Vista Resident Association</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We support the building of the Nuclear Power Station at Thyspunt. ▪ We participated at the scoping process. ▪ We attended public meetings held at our area. ▪ South Africa needs power. ▪ We thank the team of Bonggi for taking away our fears. 	<p>Comments noted.</p>	
<p>Mr Sammy Brett Homenet Real Estate</p>	<p>I hereby want to congratulate Eskom for wanting to bring this project to our area. Be ensured of our community's full support. The Blompark community would like Eskom to send an Afrikaans speaking consultant to address them and explain to them the advantages of this whole project and how we will benefit from it.</p> <p>I am in the Real Estate Industry. Please feel free to contact me for housing needs.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Your suggestions are noted.</p>	
<p>Ms Renee Royal</p>	<p>What is the situation regarding the fact that Eskom were not going to pursue this project due to financial constraints, is it or is it not going ahead? Please advise which of the sites is Nuclear - 1, -2 and -3 Please give me contact details for the Road EIA.</p>	<p>On 5 December 2008 the Board of Eskom Holdings Limited announced its decision not to proceed with the proposed investment in the Nuclear-1 project due to the magnitude of the investment, and that Eskom had consequently terminated the commercial procurement process to select the preferred bidder for the construction of the Nuclear-1 project. (ref. http://www.eskom.co.za/live/content.php?Item_ID=8800)</p> <p>On the same day, the Department of Public Enterprises issued a statement that Government supported the decision of the Board of Eskom Holdings Limited, and that Government, in accordance with the South African Nuclear Energy Policy, is committed to exploring the use of nuclear energy as part of</p>	<p>http://www.eskom.co.za/live/content.php?Item_ID=8800)</p> <p>http://www.dpe.gov.za/home.asp?id=1055)</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
		<p>base-load energy generation and to build an associated industrial capability to support such generation. The statement further indicated that, in order to continue the introduction of nuclear generating capacity in South Africa, Government will establish a task team, led by the Department of Minerals and Energy, that will work with Eskom, to develop and implement a framework for procuring a nuclear technology partner to support both the build and associated industrialisation process. (ref. http://www.dpe.gov.za/home.asp?id=1055)</p> <p>Taking these two announcements into account, and the activities that are required to enable the use of nuclear energy as part of the base-load energy generation future requirements, Eskom confirms that the activities that are currently in progress to establish sites for nuclear generating capacity will continue. Such activities include, amongst others, the environmental impact assessment investigating three sites for a proposed nuclear power station, the environmental impact assessments investigating transmission line routes associated with the three sites, and the geotechnical and other studies required to characterize the sites to support a future application for a nuclear installation license from the National Nuclear Regulator.</p> <p>All access roads associated with the development of the nuclear power station will be included as part of this EIA – further details will be included in the EIR.</p>	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
Mr Geoff Hobbs I&AP	All I am looking for is the motivation justifying the development of Thyspunt. I have not been able to find it anywhere.	<p>All sites initially and currently investigated as part of this EIA were previously identified as part of an extensive nuclear sites investigation process (NSIP), undertaken in the early 1980s, as being suitable sites for the construction of a nuclear power station. The NSIP considered a range of biophysical, socio-economic and geophysical attributes and identified 5 potential sites: Thyspunt, Bantamsklip, Duynfontein, Brazil and Schulpfontein. Where possible Eskom purchased or secured, by other means, all identified sites, for the purposes of developing a nuclear power station. Thyspunt is located near to the Eastern Cape electricity demand growth centre.</p> <p>Following the Scoping Phase of the EIA, which scoped out Brazil and Schulpfontein for Nuclear 1, Thyspunt, Duynfontein and Bantamsklip were identified as potentially suitable for the development of a nuclear power station and therefore assessed as part of the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA. Based on the outcomes of the EIA and specialist studies on each of the three sites Arcus GIBB will make a recommendation as to the environmental suitability of the sites and which is the preferred site for Nuclear-1 Please refer to Chapter 6 and 11 in the Scoping Report for further detail.</p>	<p>Section 4.2, 5.2.1 of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 6 and 11 of the FSR and Chapter 1, Section 5.2, 6.4.1 of the EIR</p>
Mr Geoff Hobbs I&AP	I am a property owner at St Francis Bay. I shall appreciate it if you could kindly make available to me a copy of the motivation provided by Eskom for building a Nuclear Power Station at Thyspunt.	All sites initially and currently investigated as part of this EIA were previously identified as part of an extensive nuclear sites investigation process (NSIP), undertaken in the early 1980s. The NSIP considered a range of biophysical, socio-economic and geophysical	Chapter 6 and 11 of the FSR Chapter 1, Section 5.2, 6.4.1 of the EIR

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
		attributes and identified 5 potential sites: Thyspunt, Bantamsklip, Duynefontein, Brazil and Schulpfontein. Where possible Eskom purchased or secured, by other means, all identified sites, for the purposes of developing a nuclear power station. Following the scoping phase of the EIA, which scoped out Brazil and Schulpfontein for Nuclear 1, Thyspunt, Duynfontein and Bantamsklip were identified as potentially suitable for the development of a nuclear power station and therefore assessed as part of the Impact assessment phase. Based on the outcomes of the Impact Assessments on each of the three sites Arcus GIBB will make a recommendation as to the environmental suitability of the sites and which is the preferred site for Nuclear-1. See Chapter 6 and 11 of the Scoping Report for further information on this aspect.	
7. COMPATIBILITY WITH CURRENT IDP PLANNING AND PROVINCIAL SDPs			
8. ANCILLARY INFRASTRUCTURE (ROADS, CONSTRUCTION CAMPS ETC.)			
9. VEGETATION (SITE SPECIFIC)			
9 (a)	Brazil		
9(b)	Schulpfontein		
9(c)	Duynefontein		

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
9(d) Bantamsklip			
9(e) Thyspunt			
10. EMPLOYMENT/TRAINING			
11. ARCHAEOLOGY/PALEOECOLOGY/CULTURAL HERITAGE			
12. MARINE EFFECTS			
Mr Charl de Bruyn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I strongly object to this absolute monstrous eradication of nature ▪ Surely, if it is REALLY needed there are other places not so close to the sea which will have no end of effect on marine life. ▪ Why are the people planning such things always so short sighted? ▪ Why don't you get advice on the future? 	<p>Your objection is noted.</p> <p>A marine biology and oceanographic specialist study will be undertaken during the impact assessment phase of the EIA.</p>	Chapters 8, 9 and Appendix E15 of the EIR
Mr Stuart du Plessis	<p>I am a fisherman and represent the fishermen of Struisbaai totalling at more the 1000 fisherfolk.</p> <p>The Nuclear Power Station at Bantamsklip will have a direct influence on our lives, because it will have an effect on the sea temperature and also the current flow that brings the nearshore or better known as reef-fish like Steenbras, Red Roman, Galjoen, etc to our fishing grounds during the winter season. It will also influence the larger migratory fish like Geelbek (Cape Salmon), Yellow Tail, Silverfish, Shark, Kabeljou, Makriel, to move out of our area and thus leave us starving and cause the end of the last 2 traditional line fish harbours in RSA namely Struisbaai and Arniston.</p>	<p>Your comments are noted and will be relayed to the Marine Biology Specialist.</p> <p>The Marine Biology specialist study will assess the potential impacts of the nuclear power station (NPS) on marine species as well as assess the potential impacts of the thermal plume, record the baseline and predict future changes, identify potential impacts of organisms that may affect the cooling water supply and identify mitigation measures.</p>	Chapters 8, 9 and Appendix E15 of the EIR

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	The impact it will have on the communities that will consume the fish, especially the children, is also an issue that I will mention in my comments.		
13. PROPERTY EFFECTS (VALUES)			
Mrs Cheron Kraak Supertubes Surfing Foundation	<input type="checkbox"/> Property prices will fall as environmental people (including surfers) will not want to live here.	It is not anticipated that property prices will be affected. The power station will not be visible from Jeffrey's Bay and the town is of significant distance outside of the protective zones. An assessment of this aspect will be discussed in the Draft Environmental Impact Report.	Chapters 8, 9 and Appendix E17 and E22 of the EIR
14. CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS			
15. URANIUM SOURCE/MINING			
16. SOCIAL/HEALTH			
17. AGRICULTURAL EFFECTS			
18. NUCLEAR TECHNOLOGY			
Prof Len Handler Barbarossa Residents Group	I am commenting on behalf of the Barbarossa Residents Group, a ratepayers association within the Constantia Valley, Cape Town. Preferred Type of NPS The <u>type of reactor</u> to be installed, whether it be an EPR or AP1000, clearly must be left to experts in the relevant fields. Common sense dictates that proven technology should be bought with an honest tender process free of bribery corruption and trade-offs that occurred when our Navy was unnecessarily revamped.	Comment noted.	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p>For a number of years purchase of a Pebble Bed Modular Reactor has been discussed and I've attended a lecture by a proponent. I note in Table 17 on p 8-9 that this particular nuclear reactor is listed as "Demonstration" under Development Phase. South Africa is definitely the wrong country in which to install any machine without a proven track record.</p> <p>I strongly advise the authorities to make prudent decisions when selecting and purchasing. I too have been faced with the pressure to purchase evolving technology (angiography machines, CT and MR units for Groote Schuur Hosp) but persisted in recommending equipment that had been used for some time in the countries of manufacture. (Before submitting a recommendation I contacted an independent radiologist in the country to learn of the experience in the field). So, stay with proven work-horses</p>		
<p>Mr Eric Joffe I&AP</p>	<p>I am appalled, both as a private South African citizen and as an Exco member of the Table View Ratepayers Association, that your company still has the temerity to continue touting this form of Nuclear Power Generation, namely the Pebble Bed Nuclear Reactor (PBMR), as the answer to South Africa's energy woes. Why do we have to have nuclear energy at all? Why not a variety of renewable and sustainable alternate sources of energy?</p> <p>Surely the mere fact that the rest of the first world nations DO NOT USE THIS PBMR AS A SOURCE OF GENERATING ELECTRICITY ON A LARGE SCALE INSTALLATION AND HAVE NOT DONE SO SINCE IT'S INCEPTION IN GERMANY would be sufficient evidence to make us question its value and safety, let alone spend a small fortune just to try and prove what the rest of the world already know: that PBMR is not the prime choice for renewable, sustainable and problem-free energy generation.</p> <p>According to my sources the only PBMR has been de-commissioned as being non-viable and problematic. The process generated excess heat and hydrogen gas which could not be harnessed, as well as creating clouds of radioactive graphite dust. Decommissioning took many years to accomplish and they are now stuck with the problem of disposal of the residual nuclear</p>	<p>Your comments are noted. However, the proposed pebble bed modular reactor (PBMR) does not form part of this environmental authorisation process. This EIA process is assessing the proposed construction of a Pressurised Water reactor (Koeberg type reactor) at any of the three sites included as part of the EIA.</p> <p>PWR technology is a proven, reliable and tested form of power generation. Eskom is therefore familiar with the technology from health and safety as well as operational perspectives based on its experience with Koeberg.</p> <p>For further information, please refer to Chapter 8 of the Final Scoping Report. The Final Scoping Report is available on the following website: www.eskom.co.za/eia.</p>	<p>Chapter 8 of the FSR and Section 3.5 of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p>waste.</p> <p>I would like to know why we are not exploring the methods employed by the first world countries such as France, which generates enormous amounts of electricity by Nuclear Power, as well as other European countries including Germany. The pioneers of PBMR do now not use it, nor does the United States of America.</p> <p>The question is what exactly does your company know that I and the rest of the more civilised world do not and is this going to be another “Arms deal” which never gets to fruition but a small group of previously disadvantaged persons do very well out of it and live to endure the scandal that will inevitably follow like the sequel of a Ponzi scheme or some other equally disreputable event.</p> <p>My understanding of the rationale behind the push for nuclear power as opposed to any other form of energy generation is the need to keep a select group of highly paid government -funded nuclear scientists gainfully occupied. With what is of course the million dollar question, as the ANC government has "shut down" our armaments industry - remember, we used to supply the first world with helicopters (Rooi Valk), armoured vehicles (Ratel) and guns/ammunition. ???</p> <p>I wish to convey my objection in the strongest possible terms to the employment of PBMR technology anywhere in South Africa, when we have so many sustainable and renewable cheaper options.</p>		
Mr & Mrs Helmie and Amanda De Vries Franskraal B&B	<p>Except the use of coal, but air pollution is bad for the environment.</p> <p>Technology and development cannot be chosen unless all safety measures have been followed.</p>	Your comments are noted.	
Mr Johann Heunes Kleinmond Ratepayers Association	<p>Kindly note that the Kleinmond Ratepayers’ Association fully supports the envisioned plans for introducing more nuclear plants to enhance South Africa’s generating capacity!</p>	Your comment is noted.	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
19. OTHER PROCESSESS - NNR AND TRANSMISSION LINES EIA			
S.V. CLarke General Farm Manager Lex Gutsche Investment Trust T/A Woodlands Farm	<p>COMMENT: PROPOSED POWER NUCLEAR STATION – OYSTER BAY</p> <p>I represented our Dairy Farm at the Eskom Environmental Impact Assessment meeting in Port Elizabeth on 05th March 2008.</p> <p>We are seriously concerned about the Integration process of the seven power supply lines from the Nuclear Power Station. We are concerned and alarmed that the Eskom Representatives were unable to present us with the information we were seeking i.e.:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Where will the seven proposed electrical supply lines be routed? 2. We are very concerned, that Eskom was not able to inform the meeting, where the power lines would be positioned and, 3. We would like to be informed why Eskom does not know where the lines will be positioned. <p>Our Dairy Farm, Woodlands Farm, Humansdorp is situated on either side of the Oyster Bay Road, 10 km from Humansdorp and +- 14 km from the Nuclear Power Station site.</p>	<p>Comments are noted. The transmission line EIA will be a separate process to the Nuclear 1 EIA. Your details have been passed to the relevant Transmission EIA team and they will be contacting you shortly.</p> <p>It is still Eskom's intention to align the Transmission EIA and Nuclear 1 (site) EIA as closely as possible.</p>	
20. TOURISM			
Mrs Cheron Kraak Supertubes Surfing Foundation	<p><u>Environmental</u></p> <p>Effects on the marine life which is a huge tourist attraction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Thousands of dolphin swimming the coastline daily. <input type="checkbox"/> Whales coming to give birth close in the bay <input type="checkbox"/> Power lines through Jeffreys Bay affect on humans 	<p>The marine specialist (Prof. Charles Griffiths) has confirmed that the presence of a nuclear power station will not affect the habits of the ocean mammals. One is able to seasonally view whales from the Koeberg Power Station. Details of such an assessment will be included as part of the respective specialist reports.</p> <p>Power lines are not planned to pass through Jeffrey's Bay. Please refer to www.eskom.co.za for information on the EIA</p>	Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E15 of the EIR

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
		for the proposed Thyspunt transmission lines.	
21. VISUAL IMPACTS			
22. WATER RESOURCES			
Mr Rory Kew	<p>I am very concerned about the potential Hydrology impacts of the Koeberg site for several reasons.</p> <p>Firstly the area is already extremely fragile ecologically as a result of the very low annual rainfall (as detailed in the hydrology report), evidenced through the existence of non-perennial rivers.</p> <p>Secondly, although the report indicates “no notable surface water features” there are numerous wetland areas, not to mention the vlei in Table View within the 20 km radius, which would be very adversely affected through the hydrology impacts. All of these fall within the West Coast conservancy region and should as such be protected.</p> <p>Thirdly, there are many hundreds of households within the 20km radius, which are very dependent on groundwater due to the very arid environment.</p> <p>How do I go about addressing these concerns in a way that they are addressed with the appropriate degree of seriousness?</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Please note that the ecology of all the sites being investigated in this EIA will consider the potential impacts on the various ecological processes including the hydrology and corresponding wetlands, including those that you have made specific mention of. The results of these studies will be included for your review as Appendices to the Draft and Final EIR</p> <p>In addition your concerns with regards to dewatering and the potential impact that the proposed NPS may have on groundwater resources will be addressed in the Geohydrological specialist investigation. Arcus GIBB would also like to add that the decision has been taken to minimise the use of groundwater by incorporating a desalination plant into the design, construction and operational phase of the project. The potential impact of such a facility will also be addressed in the various specialist studies.</p> <p>Please be assured that every comment received is treated with the highest regard and consideration. You are encouraged to review the Draft EIR, once submitted for public review.</p>	<p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E of the EIR</p> <p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
23. COMMENTS RAISED AS PART OF THE THYSPUNT TRANSMISSION POWERLINES INTEGRATION EIA			
Ms Carianne Freebury Retail Africa (Pty) Ltd Planning, Infrastructure and Environment E-Mail: 22 May 2009 Thyspunt Transmission Lines EIA	Requested to be put in touch with the relevant EIA consultants for the Nuclear-1 Project.	Post Meeting Note Contact details of Arcus Gibb and ACER Africa forwarded on 22 May 2009.	
Ms Renee Royal Environmental Assessment Practitioner Renee Royal Environmental Planner E-mail: 01 June 2009 Thyspunt Transmission Lines EIA	Raised the concern regarding the Transmission lines crossing the Oyster Bay shifting sand dunes.	Post Meeting Note Forwarded to Eskom Transmission	
Mnr Willie Kleingeld Grondeienaar: Despatch PV Kommentaarvorm 27 Mei 2009 Thyspunt Transmission Lines EIA	Verneem of radio-aktiewe bestraling van toepassing is op die projek en verneem verder wat die impak op die gemeenskap se gesondheid sal wees indien radio aktiewe bestralings sou voorkom. Translation: Enquired whether there radiation is associated with this project and what the health impacts can the community expect should there be a leak.	Post Meeting Note Forwarded to Eskom Transmission Arcus GIBB response Your comment is noted. During the detailed Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA, the Human Health Risk Assessment (HHRA) will assess the impacts of the nuclear power station (NPS) on human health as well as identifying potential receptors. For the full Terms of Reference for the HHRA, please see the Revised Plan of Study for EIA available on the following	Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix 24 of the EIR Chapter 10 of the FSR

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
<p>Mr Richard Henn Sevenfive Consulting E-mail: 05 June 2009 Thyspunt Transmission Lines EIA</p>	<p>Requested comment on the accuracy of the news reports in the media this week that Eskom have announced dates for a roll out plan of Nuclear 1, 2 and 3 (that much is clear and understood and is included in the amended scoping report on the Eskom website) but what is interesting is that some news paper articles have clearly stated that, assuming none of the sites are excluded during the EIA process, roll out will commence with Duynfontein, then Bantamsklip and LASTLY at Thyspunt.</p> <p>Also mentioned that he has observed in the amended scoping report the dates for the roll out plan, but nowhere in there does it state which proposed site will host which particular phase of the project, and requested a comment on that.</p>	<p>website: www.eskom.co.za/eia</p> <p>Post Meeting Note Forwarded to Eskom Transmission</p> <p>Arcus GIBB response The site for the nuclear power plant has not yet been determined. In terms of which of the sites are planned for Nuclear-1; this will depend on the Department of Environmental Affairs' (DEA) decision based on the findings of the EIA process, and is therefore not known at this time.</p> <p>The timing of Nuclear-1 will be determined through energy planning processes and is subject to the approval of the regulatory authorities such as the National Nuclear Regulator, the DEA as well as NERSA's approval. It is common practice for proposed developments to be associated with anticipated timeframes for the execution thereof. Thus potential roll out dates is by no means an indication that the project will proceed irrespective of the findings contained in the EIR. Again, the DEA will make an informed decision based on the findings of the EIA process.</p>	<p>Section 7.7.4 and 7.7.5 of the EIR</p> <p>Section 7.7.4 and 7.7.5 of the EIR</p>
<p>24. COMMENTS RAISED AS PART OF THE BANTAMSKLIP TRANSMISSION POWERLINES INTEGRATION EIA</p>			
<p>Caroline Peterson, SANBI – South African National Biodiversity Initiative, Key Stakeholder Meeting, Cape Town International Airport,</p>	<p>Ms Peterson wanted to know why the EIA for Nuclear 1 was continuing after being put on hold by Eskom and the Government.</p>	<p>On 5 December 2008 the Board of Eskom Holdings Limited announced its decision not to proceed with the proposed investment in the Nuclear-1 project due to the magnitude of the investment, and that Eskom had consequently terminated the commercial procurement process to select the preferred bidder for the construction of the Nuclear-1</p>	<p>http://www.eskom.co.za/live/content.php?Item_ID=8800)</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
2009/03/16		<p>project. (ref. http://www.eskom.co.za/live/content.php?Item_ID=8800)</p> <p>On the same day, the Department of Public Enterprises issued a statement that Government supported the decision of the Board of Eskom Holdings Limited, and that Government, in accordance with the South African Nuclear Energy Policy, is committed to exploring the use of nuclear energy as part of base-load energy generation and to build an associated industrial capability to support such generation. The statement further indicated that, in order to continue the introduction of nuclear generating capacity in South Africa, Government will establish a task team, led by the Department of Minerals and Energy, that will work with Eskom, to develop and implement a framework for procuring a nuclear technology partner to support both the build and associated industrialisation process. (ref. http://www.dpe.gov.za/home.asp?id=1055)</p> <p>Taking these two announcements into account, and the activities that are required to enable the use of nuclear energy as part of the base-load energy generation future requirements, Eskom confirms that the activities that are currently in progress to establish sites for nuclear generating capacity will continue. Such activities include, amongst others, the environmental impact assessment investigating three sites for a proposed nuclear power station, the environmental impact assessments investigating</p>	<p>http://www.dpe.gov.za/home.asp?id=1055</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
		<p>transmission line routes associated with the three sites, and the geotechnical and other studies required to characterize the sites to support a future application for a nuclear installation license from the National Nuclear Regulator.</p>	
<p>An Attendee, Key Stakeholder Meeting, Cape Town International Airport, 2009/03/16</p>	<p>An attendee asked what the consultant's relationship is with DEAT and whether they had the same case officer for the plant and transmission EIAs. He also wanted to know what the timeline was with regards to the Nuclear 1 EIA process.</p>	<p>As independent environmental professionals Arcus GIBB will remain an independent and impartial consultant on this project and present information in an unbiased manner. It is part of our professional responsibility to undertake an objective and independent EIA process. Arcus GIBB has and will continue to abide by requirements set out by the National Environmental Management Act (NEMA) and the associated regulations. Government Notice Regulation Number 385 (i.e. GN No. R. 385) in the Government Gazette on 21 April 2006 stipulates the requirements for the appointment of an Environmental Assessment Practitioner.</p> <p>Although there are separate case officers for the Nuclear-1 EIA and the Bantamsklip Transmission Line EIA, the two case officers report to the same management structure, which ultimately reviews all recommendations and signs off on all decisions. Therefore the DEA will be in a position to apply their minds to any interaction between the two projects.</p>	
<p>Katrin Pobantz, Tesselaarsdal, Caledon Public Meeting, 2009/03/18</p>	<p>The Nuclear 1 EIA is a separate process from the transmission EIA and is further ahead than the transmission EIA. Why is this?</p>	<p>The complexity of a nuclear power station EIA is such that the quality of the process would be compromised if there was an attempt to combine an extensive linear project with it.</p>	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
		The availability of information as well as the different construction lead times have resulted in the site EIA been initiated earlier.	
Dr William Stafford, Protea Permaculture, Pearly Beach Public Meeting, 2009/03/21	Why are the transmission and plant EIAs not run as one process?	The complexity of a Nuclear power station EIA is such that the quality of the process would be compromised if there was an attempt to combine an extensive linear project with it.	
Dr William Stafford, Protea Permaculture, Pearly Beach Public Meeting, 2009/03/21	Dr Stafford asked for clarification on the decision making process. He wanted to know if DEAT receives two final EIRs, one for the transmission lines and one for the nuclear power station, and then makes two decisions which are completely separate from one another.	Yes, the Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA) will receive separate EIRs for the nuclear plant and associated transmission EIAs. The two decisions are not interdependent on each other.	
Dave Whitelaw, Pearly Beach Public Meeting, 2009/03/21	Why is the scoping of the transmission lines done with such haste when the plant site has not yet been determined?	The EIAs for the power station and transmission lines are being carried out according to normal or lengthier timelines when compared with similar projects. The Transmission EIA is therefore not being rushed. According to energy planning processes new base load is required by 2018 it is therefore important not to delay these EIAs.	
Dave Whitelaw, Pearly Beach Public Meeting, 2009/03/21	What does Eskom think of the fact that they are violating the principles of the EIA process by being pre-emptive in running the transmission lines EIA before the plant EIA has been finalized? It makes the construction of the power plant seem inevitable.	The complexity of a nuclear power station EIA is such that the quality of the process would be compromised if there was an attempt to combine an extensive linear project with it.	
		The undertaking of the transmission line EIAs is not pre-emptive as the transmission line EIAs for all three sites currently being considered in the Nuclear-1 sites EIA are being undertaken simultaneously.	
		The decisions for each EIA are not dependent on each other. A positive or negative decision on the sites EIA will not guarantee a similar decision in the transmission line EIAs.	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
Lesley Richardson, Flower valley Conservation Trust – Executive Director, Bredasdorp Public Meeting, 2009/03/23	Why is the transmission EIA going on when the plant EIA has been put on hold?	The EIA for the proposed nuclear plant and associated infrastructure has not been put on hold.	
Johan de Kock, Haasvlakte LBV, Bredasdorp Public Meeting, 2009/03/23	Mr Johan de Kock wondered if any study or EIA was able to stop the nuclear power plant from being constructed or is it a done deal.	The decision to go ahead is dependent on many approvals over and above the EIA. In terms of the EIA process the Final EIR will be submitted to the DEA, the decision-making authority. The DEA will apply their minds to the Final EIR and provide a positive or negative decision.	Section 7.7.4 and 7.7.5 of the EIR
Rory Allardice, ABI – Chairman, Bredasdorp Public Meeting, 2009/03/23	Mr Allardice (ABI) wanted to know why the plant EIA and transmission EIA were being done separately. He stated that it is not possible to see the full picture of the impacts of the projects on this area if the EIAs are being run separately.	<p>The complexity of a Nuclear power station EIA is such that the quality of the process would be compromised if there was an attempt to combine an extensive linear project with it.</p> <p>With specific reference to cumulative impacts, each of the EIAs will consider cumulative impacts on all issues specific to the respective EIA. Every attempt has been made to run the plant and transmission line EIA processes as close to parallel as possible, in order to facilitate the flow of information across the processes. Although each EIA will focus on assessing the specific issues related to the respective EIA issues pertinent to the corresponding EIA will be discussed in the nuclear sites EIA as well as the transmission line EIAs.</p> <p>The decisions for each EIA are not dependent on each other. A positive or negative decision on the nuclear plant EIA will not guarantee a similar decision in the transmission line EIAs.</p>	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
<p>Johnvin Hendricks, TAG, Tesselaarsdal Public Meeting, 2009/04/03</p>	<p>He wanted to know why the plant EIA and Transmission EIA were done separately. They also wanted to be involved in the plant EIA.</p>	<p>The complexity of a nuclear power station EIA is such that the quality of the process would be compromised if there was an attempt to combine an extensive linear project with it.</p> <p>With specific reference to cumulative impacts each of the EIAs will consider cumulative impacts on all issues specific to the respective EIA. Every attempt has been made to run the plant and transmission line EIA processes as close to parallel as possible, in order to facilitate the flow of information across the processes. Although each EIA will focus on assessing the specific issues related to the respective EIA issues pertinent to the corresponding EIA will be discussed in the nuclear sites EIA as well as the transmission line EIAs.</p> <p>The decisions for each EIA is independent of the decisions for the other EIAs. A positive or negative decision on the nuclear plant EIA will not guarantee a similar decision in the transmission line EIA.</p> <p>You have been registered on the I&AP database and will be kept informed of all information.</p>	
<p>Samantha Ralston, Cape Nature, Email, 2009/05/11</p>	<p>Cape Nature would like to express its concern with the proposed EIA process(es) being followed. It is our opinion that it would be inappropriate to consider the proposed nuclear facility at Bantamsklip without considering alternative locations for such a facility. Similarly, we are of the opinion that since the proposed transmission lines (the subject of this assessment process) are inextricably linked to the nuclear facility at Bantamsklip, it would be inappropriate to assess (not to mention consider granting approval</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Originally five (5) alternative sites were considered namely, Schulpfontein, Brazil, Thyspunt, Bantamsklip and Duynefontein. The Schulpfontein and Brazil sites were excluded during the Scoping Phase. The Final Scoping Report was approved by the DEA on 19 November 2008. Section 2.17.1 of this letter of approval from</p>	<p>Chapter 6 and 11 of the FSR and Chapter 1, Section 5.2, 6.4.1, 7.7.4 and 7.7.5 of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p>for) these two components of the development separately. Cape Nature acknowledges that it would be an enormous undertaking to conduct a single impact assessment for a proposed nuclear power facility (at various alternative locations) and their associated transmission lines (and their route alternatives). However, we are concerned that the full impact of the proposed facility cannot be adequately assessed if the impact assessments for the various components are dealt with separately. We suggest that piecemeal applications such as being undertaken here can result in environmental impacts being undervalued, especially cumulative impacts, and could result in “death by a thousand cuts”.</p> <p>Cape Nature therefore recommends a phased approach. While the EIA processes can run separately as a way to manage the vast amount of information, the results of each assessment should feed in to a final consolidated report on which a single decision for the entire development should be based. This way all issues and impacts associated with the proposed development can be considered.</p> <p>Please note that our comments relate only to biodiversity related impacts not the overall desirability of the proposed development.</p>	<p>the DEA states that “<i>The Department accepts the exclusion of the Brazil and Schulpfontein sites for further investigation in this EIA process, as they are not technically feasible at this stage. The Department has also however noted that these sites will be considered for future Nuclear projects.</i>”</p> <p>The complexity of a nuclear power station EIA is such that the quality of the process would be compromised if there was an attempt to combine an extensive linear project with it.</p> <p>With specific reference to cumulative impacts, each of the EIAs will consider cumulative impacts on all issues specific to the respective EIA. Every attempt has been made to run the plant and transmission line EIA processes as close to parallel as possible, in order to facilitate the flow of information across the processes. Although each EIA will focus on assessing the specific issues related to the respective EIA issues pertinent to the corresponding EIA will be discussed in the nuclear sites EIA as well as the transmission line EIAs.</p> <p>The decisions for each EIA are not dependent on each other. A positive or negative decision on the nuclear plant EIA will not guarantee a similar decision in the transmission line EIA.</p>	
<p>Strandveld Tourism and Conservation Association, Email, 2009/05/22</p>	<p>The fact the EIAs for the transmission lines and that for the power station are being done separately. The EIA process requires that the <u>cumulative</u> impact of a project should be assessed. The explanation given at public meetings: that the EIAs are being done for two different entities, Eskom Generation and Eskom Transmission is not acceptable. Transmission lines are an integral part</p>	<p>The proponent of the proposed transmission power lines and the power station and associated infrastructure is Eskom Holdings Limited. The complexity of a nuclear power station EIA is such that the quality of the process would be compromised if there was</p>	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p>of the associated infrastructure of a power station. Any future reports that will be prepared for consideration by the Environmental authorities and will subject to public participation should address the cumulative impact of the proposed development.</p>	<p>an attempt to combine an extensive linear project with it.</p> <p>With specific reference to cumulative impacts, each of the EIAs will consider cumulative impacts on all issues specific to the respective EIA. Every attempt has been made to run the processes as close to parallel as possible, in order to facilitate the flow of information across the two processes. Although each EIA will focus on assessing the specific issues related to the respective EIA issues pertinent to the corresponding EIA will be discussed in the nuclear plant EIA as well as the transmission line EIAs.</p> <p>The decisions for each EIA are not dependent on each other. A positive or negative decision on the nuclear plant EIA will not guarantee a similar decision in the transmission line EIAs.</p>	
<p>Strandveld Tourism and Conservation Association, Email, 2009/05/22</p>	<p>The DSR states that fundamentally different alternatives are usually assessed at a strategic level. It would appear that Eskom did not consider this option at the time of conceiving this project. If the power station and its associated transmission infrastructure were assessed jointly in a single EIA process, as it should have been, the outcome may be totally different from the outcome that will be obtained in the current processes. A power station situated in an internationally recognised biodiversity hotspot may require the use of underground lines which may influence the economics of the project if compared with another site where this may not be necessary.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Originally five (5) alternative sites were considered namely, Schulpfontein, Brazil, Thyspunt, Bantamsklip and Duynefontein. The Schulpfontein and Brazil sites were excluded during the Scoping Phase of the EIA.</p> <p>With specific reference to cumulative impacts, each of the EIAs will consider cumulative impacts on all issues specific to the respective EIA. Every attempt has been made to run the transmission and plant EIA processes as close to parallel as possible, in order to facilitate the flow of information across the processes. Although each EIA will focus on assessing the specific issues related to the</p>	<p>Chapter 6 and 11 of the FSR and Chapter 1, Section 5.2 and 6.4.1 of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
		<p>respective EIA, issues pertinent to the corresponding EIA will be discussed in the nuclear plant EIA as well as the transmission line EIAs.</p> <p>The decisions for each EIA are not dependent on each other. A positive or negative decision on the plant EIA will not guarantee a similar decision in the transmission line EIA.</p> <p>The cost aspect is important and would be incorporated into the business case that Eskom compiles in order to make an informed commercial decision.</p>	
<p>Bronwyn Botha, Overberg Crane Group – Regional Co-ordinator, Stanford Public Meeting, 2009/03/19</p>	<p>Ms Botha noted that the plant and transmission lines are indeed linked and the power plant is therefore an important issue in the Transmission EIA meetings.</p>	<p>The complexity of a nuclear power station EIA is such that the quality of the process would be compromised if there was an attempt to combine an extensive linear project with it.</p> <p>It should be noted that the undertaking of the transmission EIAs for all three sites currently been considered in the Nuclear-1 plant EIA, indicates that no decision has been made on the preferred site.</p>	
<p>Ilze Fisch, Karoo Soul Travel Lodge, Oudshoorn, Email, 2009/05/11</p>	<p>I would like to voice my concern for the intended devastation of our heritage by Eskom by wanting to put up a nuclear power station at Bantamsklip on the Overberg Coast. Please count me IN as in Interested and Affected Party.</p>	<p>Your comment is noted.</p>	
<p>Rob Fryer, Manager – OCF (Overstrand Conservation Foundation), Fax, 2009/04/29</p>	<p>Tourism is the lifeblood of the Overstrand economy, present and future. The potentially significant damage that is likely to occur to tourism development as a result of the combination of a nuclear plant at Bantamsklip and the associated transmission lines needs to be specifically studied in detail. The study needs to look at the cumulative effect of the power station and the transmission lines and all the associated construction and operational activities. The separation of the impacts is unlikely to give a true reflection and is therefore not acceptable. The Scoping Report must specify a</p>	<p>With specific reference to cumulative impacts, each of the EIAs will consider cumulative impacts on all issues specific to the respective EIA. Every attempt has been made to run the plant and transmission line EIA processes as close to parallel as possible, in order to facilitate the flow of information across the processes. Although each EIA will focus on assessing the specific issues related to the</p>	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p>study of the potential impact on future tourism development of the combined power station and transmission lines.</p>	<p>respective EIA, issues pertinent to the corresponding EIA will be discussed in the nuclear plant EIA as well as the transmission line EIA.</p> <p>Your comment is noted and will be carried over to the Tourism Specialists for both the Nuclear-1 plant EIA and Bantamsklip Transmission Line EIA.</p>	
<p>TAG – Tesselaarsdal Action Group, Email, 2009/05/21</p>	<p><i>As die krag in die metropool benodig word en nie hier nie, hoekom dan die kragentrales versprei om sogenaamd die Netwerk (grid) te balanseer, met die gepaardgaande enorme negatiewe impak op ons internasionaal-belangerike en sensetiewe omgewing? Hoekom rig hulle dan nie alle kragentrales by Koeberg op nie, dan is dit mos by die plek waar die krag benodig word en is die verlies as gevolg van die beweging deur die kragnetwerk wat hulle voorgooi, mos minimaal.</i></p> <p>[Translation] If the power is required in the metro, and not here, why are the power stations scattered all over to balance the grid with associated enormous negative impacts on our internationally important and sensitive environment? Why are all power stations not built at Koeberg, because it is the place where power is required and the loss of moving it through the network as claimed, is then minimal?</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. The sites being considered in the Nuclear-1 EIA were identified during the Nuclear Site Investigation Programme (NSIP) implemented by Eskom in the 1980s. One of the criteria for site selection was the proximity to vast quantities of water, required for cooling purposes. For more information on the NSIP, please refer to Chapter 5 of the Nuclear-1 Scoping Report available on the following website: www.eskom.co.za.</p> <p>The Duynefontein site is adjacent to the Koeberg nuclear power station and will be considered in the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA, along with the Thyspunt and Bantamsklip sites. If the nuclear programme for 20 000 MW's is realised all three sites and more would be required to accommodate the need.</p>	<p>Section 5.2.1 of the EIR</p>
<p>Strandveld Tourism and Conservation Association, Email, 2009/05/22</p>	<p>As mentioned in section 2 of the Assessment Report Groot Hagelkraal (Farm 281) is a registered National Heritage Site. It boggles the mind how such a site can even considered for a nuclear power station. Groot Hagelkraal is of extreme archaeological and historical significance and value; it is a national treasure and on this basis should be excluded as an alternative site for a power station. It would be like proposing to build a Nuclear Power station on the Sterkfontein caves or in the Drakensberg.</p>	<p>Groot Hagelkraal was registered as a National Heritage Site on Eskom's request with the knowledge by government and Eskom that it is a site identified for a nuclear plant.</p>	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
Jurgen Wolfhart, Robertson Public Meeting, 2009/03/16	Mr Wolfhart wanted to know if the Bantamsklip nuclear power plant had already been approved. If the power station is not approved he would like to know if the power lines will be used in the development of other power generation alternatives or if they only formed part of the nuclear project.	The three proposed sites are Duynefontein, Bantamsklip and Thyspunt. The site for the nuclear power plant has not yet been determined. Currently the transmission lines proposed are only for the evacuation of power for the 4 000 MW associated with Nuclear-1, should additional generating capacity be constructed on the same site, at some point in the future a separate EIA would need to be completed. It is however likely that where possible the same corridors would be utilised.	Chapter 6 and 11 of the FSR and Chapter 1, Section 5.2, 6.4.1, 7.7.4 and 7.7.5 of the EIR
J.C. Basson, Graham Beck Winery/Rooiberg Conservancy, Robertson Public Meeting, 2009/03/16	Mr Basson asked whether three power stations would require additional transmission lines other than the proposed lines already being investigated in the Robertson area.	Currently the lines proposed are only for the evacuation of power for the 4 000 MW associated with Nuclear-1, should additional generating capacity be constructed on the same site, at some point in the future a separate EIA would need to be completed. It is however likely that where possible the same corridors would be utilised.	
Boy Sakekamer, Villiersdorp Public Meeting, 2009/03/17	Mr Fyfer asked whether electricity use is going to increase till 2017 and wanted to know what Eskom is doing to meet this rise in demand until 2017 when the first nuclear plant will be commissioned. He added that his business spent over R2 million on acquiring generators as a back-up for when load shedding occurs.	The proposed development of Nuclear power is one generating alternative that Eskom is investigating currently Eskom is in the process of constructing two additional coal fired power stations (Medupi and Kusile) as well as a pumped storage scheme (Ingula). All three will have a combined generating capacity of approximately 11 300 MW. The anticipated commissioning dates for the first unit of these projects are as follows: Ingula: 2012 Medupi: 2012	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
An Attendee, Stanford Public Meeting, 2009/03/19	An attendee asked if Arcus GIBB would recommend to DEAT and Eskom that their report is too limited because it doesn't include the cumulative impacts of the transmission lines and the power plant. The attendee also wanted to know if the projects were mutually exclusive or dependent on one another.	Kusile: 2013 The complexity of a nuclear power station EIA is such that the quality of the process would be compromised if there was an attempt to combine an extensive linear project with it. The EIAs are not dependent on each other. Separate decisions will be made for each of the four EIAs and the DEA's decision with respect to each could differ.	
C. Dickensen, Farmer, Wellington Public Meeting, 2009/04/02	Mr Dickenson wanted clarity on the 3 proposed sites for development of the nuclear power station. He wanted to know if the planned development of these transmission lines would fall away if the Bantamsklip site was not selected and asked which site Eskom preferred.	The three proposed sites are Duynefontein, Bantamsklip and Thyspunt. Eskom has stated that it eventually intends constructing nuclear power stations that can generate 20 000 MW. The timing of the rollout Eskom's nuclear programme will be determined through energy planning processes and subject to NERSA approval. Therefore if a positive approval is received for both the plant and transmission lines, associated with each of the site alternatives, it is likely that all these sites will eventually be developed.	Chapter 6 and 11 of the FSR and Chapter 1, Section 5.2, 6.4.1, 7.7.4 and 7.7.5 of the EIR
J.J. Gardener, Tesselaarsdal Public Meeting, 2009/04/03	Mr JJ Gardener said he read in the newspaper that Koeberg wasn't working. He said this project wasn't to be taken lightly as it affects people's lives and Eskom should note that.	Koeberg nuclear power station has a load factor of approximately 81%. The article referred to is not known nor is the timing of the article, but it is likely that the reason why a unit was off was due to refuelling or a short unplanned outage.	
TAG – Tesselaarsdal Action Group, Courier, 2009/04/30	<i>Eco-sensitive building and back-to-basics living</i> We would like to point out that this community has a fairly large contingent of members who are set on promoting and implementing eco-friendly, natural building methods, farming methods etc. and who endorse the trend for a simpler, back-to-basics, more natural lifestyle. To this end, renewable sources of energy like wind and solar power are being used, and a general	Your comment is noted.	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
	<p>reduction of the carbon footprint is striven for. To now have the possibility of a nuclear power station and the associated high-voltage power lines on our doorstep, with the varied negative and long-term impacts that these would bring to the entire region, is contra to the very lifestyle that is being aimed for. Whilst the feeling is not to object to development per se, it should not be at the cost of a region that prides itself on and promotes the natural, unique heritage that it has been blessed with. Addendum X is a copy of a recent letter in The Argus, which is indicative of the similar trend and general feeling in our Tesselaarsdal community.</p>		
<p>TAG – Tesselaarsdal Action Group, Courier, 2009/04/30</p>	<p>Current electricity supply issues</p> <p>This proposed nuclear project and the associated high-voltage power lines have elicited some general comments in our community, and has resulted in certain points being raised about the current electricity supply issue that our country faces. Here are just a few: Before taking the drastic step of building another nuclear power station, Eskom should look to improve the efficiency of the current power generation capacity, which some are of the opinion is inefficient due to mismanagement. Additional incentives should be put in place to encourage electricity users, whether domestic or industrial, to use less power, and thus save themselves money. The drain of power generated in South Africa but which is being supplied to neighbouring countries should be halted - if these countries need assistance, Eskom should sell its expertise to these countries (rather than our power) in order to help these neighbours to establish their own power generation plants in their own regions. Renewable energy sources - households should be assisted and encouraged to implement wind and solar power to reduce their dependence on the power grid. This in turn would bring down the national demand, making more power available to industry & for development. Eskom needs to put more time and effort into researching wind, solar and wave power sources, rather than nuclear.</p>	<p>Please refer to the Scoping Report in which Eskom's initiatives with renewable technologies and demand side management are discussed. Every effort is being made to ensure that Eskom's operating power stations remain some of the best performing coal-fired power stations in the world. Neighbouring countries supply South Africa with electricity, Eskom has contracted with our neighbouring countries, these contracts provide for South Africa's needs first. A programme for assisting homeowners to install solar water heating has been implemented by Eskom.</p>	<p>Chapter 8 of the FSR and Section 4.2, 5.3 and 6.3.2 of the EIR</p>
<p>Mr Rico Sutter Breërivier Agricultural Association</p>	<p>He supported the idea of Eskom creating power generation alternatives closer to Cape Town. The cost and loss of energy must be quite extensive when transmitting electricity over such long distances from the north of the country. Initially the capital</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment, it is very relevant when considering that two of the load growth centres are in Western and Eastern Cape.</p>	<p>Chapter 1 of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
<p><i>(Multi -Stakeholder Workshop – Witzenberg Alternative Corridor Alignments)</i></p>	<p>input of generating alternative power will be great but it will be a huge investment for the future regarding lowering South Africa's carbon footprint.</p>		
<p>Mr Rory Allardice OICG <i>(Multi-Stakeholder Workshop – Overberg Alternative Corridor Alignments)</i></p>	<p>Mr Allardice wanted information on the application for the proposed nuclear power station sites. Apparently there were originally three separate applications; one for each of the three sites; now all three sites have been thrown together in one application. If this was the case he asked for clarification on why Eskom proceeded in such a manner.</p> <p>Mr Allardice argued that if Eskom should consider applying for all three sites it would nullify the reasoning behind eliminating the two sites on the West Coast that were part of the initial five sites.</p>	<p>Eskom initially submitted a single application for one 4 000 MW nuclear power station. There were five site alternatives, which have since been reduced to three. Eskom did consider the possibility of amending the application to allow for the possible provision of a decision on all three sites simultaneously.</p> <p>Currently, the original application still stands. Should Eskom wish to further develop a nuclear power station on the alternative sites, beyond the site identified by the Nuclear-1 EIA, a separate EIA process would be required.</p> <p>The selection of a preferred site in this EIA process will not exclude the remaining sites from being selected in future processes.</p>	<p>Chapter 6 and 11 of the FSR Chapter 1, Section 5.2, 6.4.1 of the EIR</p>
<p>Mr EC Fourie SANParks <i>(Multi-Stakeholder Workshop – Overberg Alternative Corridor Alignments)</i></p>	<p>Mr Fourie (SANParks) asked whether the transmission line implications were considered during the first detailed study that was done to determine the initial five sites. He was not convinced that transmission line implications were taken into account, as there seems to be a lack of integration between Eskom Generation and Eskom Transmission.</p>	<p>The NSIP studies then were focused on the identification of nuclear sites and not the particular on transmission infrastructure. It was inappropriate at the time to commence studies relating to the transmission lines 20 years in advance of determining the most suitable sites for construction of a nuclear</p>	<p>Section 5.2.1 of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
		power station. Following the Scoping Phase of the Nuclear-1 EIA, Thyspunt, Duynfontein and Bantamsklip were identified as potentially suitable for the development of a nuclear power station. EIAs for the transmission lines are in progress on these three sites.	
<p>Mr Geoff Whitelaw Stanford AA</p> <p><i>(Multi-Stakeholder Workshop – Overberg Alternative Corridor Alignments)</i></p>	<p>Mr Whitelaw said they believe a constructive process going forward can be established by forming specialist committees to investigate the possible impacts of both the proposed nuclear power station and power lines. Each specialist committee should consist of key representatives of all the various stakeholders; meaning representatives from Eskom, Arcus GIBB, NMA, and people from the area. Each specialist committee will then investigate their field of specialisation together with I&APs. These committees will report to a process run by Arcus GIBB to pull together all their findings. In that way consensus will be reached from the start. He added that they see multi-representation as the way forward.</p>	<p>The EIA is an objective process, managed by an independent Environmental Assessment Practitioner. All specialists are independent and are required as part of their studies consult with local specialists, communities and/or general members of the public. The findings of all studies are integrated into a single impact Assessment report by Arcus GIBB. The EIA process, associated regulations and guidelines are being used to ensure an effective decision-making process.</p>	
<p>Mr C Swart Buffeljagsrivier AA</p> <p><i>(Multi-Stakeholder Workshop – Overberg Alternative Corridor Alignments)</i></p>	<p>Mr Swart (Buffeljagsrivier AA) proposed that Nuclear-1 be built at Koeberg. If further nuclear power plants are proposed the Bantamsklip site can be considered again but with the correct timeframes and process in place.</p>	<p>Ms Muthialu noted Mr Swart's proposal but said that the project team do not have the mandate to discuss it. This question has been referred to Generation Division for a response.</p> <p>Bantamsklip is one of three alternative sites currently being investigated as part of the Nuclear-1 EIA.</p>	<p>Section 5.2 of the EIR</p>
<p>Mr Mike Gafney Strandveld AA</p> <p><i>(Multi-Stakeholder Workshop – Overberg Alternative Corridor Alignments)</i></p>	<p>Mr Gafney (Strandveld AA) mentioned that the cost of the Bantamsklip nuclear power station will be at least two times as much as for Koeberg or Thyspunt. If this was the case, he wanted to know why Bantamsklip is still being considered.</p>	<p>Mr Leask did not know what the estimated costs for the power stations are, but from a transmission point of view, the Bantamsklip site will definitely be more expensive than the other two sites.</p> <p>A firm understanding as to the cost implications for the development of a nuclear power station can only be fully assessed following the identification and conclusion of</p>	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
<p>Mr Deon Evert Wolvengat Action Group</p> <p><i>(Multi-Stakeholder Workshop – Overberg Alternative Corridor Alignments)</i></p>	<p>Mr Evert stressed the fact that the transmission lines and the power station should not be considered in isolation of each other. He wanted to know whether the Bantamsklip site was feasible from a technical point of view.</p>	<p>negotiations with a preferred vendor as well as where the proposed nuclear power station will be sited/located.</p> <p>Although separate and independent the transmission and sites EIAs are being managed to ensure that as much overlap, in terms of timing, is achieved thereby ensuring that they can inform one another. Any decision taken by the DEA on any of the processes is not dependent on the other.</p> <p>Based on the initial site selection process Bantamsklip was found to be technically feasible. Relevant studies (this EIA and the NNR process) required prior to starting with construction will confirm this feasibility.</p> <p>There is a national nuclear energy policy that was approved in June 2009. That policy requires the development of nuclear power in South Africa. Depending on the EIAs, all three sites will receive nuclear power stations eventually. In other words all the sites that receive an environmental authorisation will get a nuclear power station.</p>	<p>Chapter 1, 8 and 9, Section 5.2, 6.4.1 and Appendix E of the EIR</p> <p>Section 6.3.2 of the EIR.</p>
<p>Mr SM Thomson Stormsvlei Community</p> <p><i>(Multi-Stakeholder Workshop – Overberg Alternative Corridor Alignments)</i></p>	<p>Mr Thomson wanted clarity on why Eskom wants to build a nuclear power station so far away from the big cities where the power is needed.</p>	<p>Bantamsklip is technically viable and from a transmission point of view there needs to be more power sources in the Western Cape.</p>	<p>Chapter 1, 8 and 9, Section 5.2, 6.4.1 and Appendix E of the EIR</p>
<p>Mr Eugene Hendry Pearly Beach Ratepayers</p>	<p>Mr Hendry wondered why there isn't a 'no-go' alternative in the EIA for the nuclear power plant.</p>	<p>The specialists are investigating the 'no-go' option as is required by EIA regulations.</p>	<p>Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E of the EIR</p>

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
Association <i>(Multi-Stakeholder Workshop – Overberg Alternative Corridor Alignments)</i>			
Mr de Villiers <i>(Multi-Stakeholder Workshop – Overberg Alternative Corridor Alignments)</i>	Mr De Villiers said Eskom cannot say that Bantamsklip will definitely receive a nuclear power station down the line; they have to receive environmental authorisation before this can be said.	The development of a nuclear power station on any of the three sites, being considered, is subject to the necessary regulatory approvals. It is however Eskom’s intention to develop all three sites should they be considered feasible and the required approvals are received.	Chapter 1 and 6, Section 5.2 of the EIR
Mr Robert Fryer Overstrand Conservation Foundation <i>(Multi-Stakeholder Workshop – Overberg Alternative Corridor Alignments)</i>	Mr Fryer referred back to a previous public participation meeting where someone from Eskom told them that, should all three sites be approved, the first three power stations will be built at the first three sites, but the fourth and fifth power stations will be built at the first two sites; meaning the first two sites will eventually have two power stations each. If this was the case he wanted to know what the transmission implications would be if two power stations are constructed at Bantamsklip.	It is correct that the three sites may have the potential for additional units in the future subject to transmission grid requirements. This is an aspect that Eskom is investigating. Relevant regulatory processes would need to be followed to add additional units to any sites. The EIA for the transmission lines from the proposed Bantamsklip nuclear power station is assessing the transmission lines that would be required should two units to be constructed at that site.	
Ms Katrin Pobantz Tesselaarsdal Action Group <i>(Multi-Stakeholder Workshop – Overberg Alternative Corridor Alignments)</i>	Ms Pobantz agreed with what Mr Fryer said with regards to the SDF. She also commented that the appointment of the resource economist is a must and not a maybe. She also asked if one report, containing the impacts of both the power plant and the transmission lines, will be issued; although they are two separate EIAs, their impacts have to be combined at some stage as one cannot go without the other.	Although separate and independent the Transmission and sites EIAs are being managed to ensure that as much overlap, in terms of timing, is achieved thereby ensuring that they can inform one another. Any decision taken by the DEA on any of the processes is not dependent on the other. That is any decision taken on the Nuclear-1 EIA will not automatically result in a similar decision for the transmission EIA.	

NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE	EIR REFERENCE
		Two separate reports will be submitted to the DEA	
I&AP <i>(Multi-Stakeholder Workshop – Overberg Alternative Corridor Alignments)</i>	An attendee said the project team should provide better motivation for wanting to develop a massive power station in an area as sensitive as the Overberg area.	Noted. The ecological sensitivity of the area has been taken into consideration by the relevant suite of ecological specialists.	Chapter 8 and 9 and Appendix E