

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

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT (EIA: 12/12/20/944)

**COMMENTS ON
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REPORT VERSION 1**

(Volume RDEIR IRR 5 – 137 May 2012)

Issues have been received from the following stakeholders:

No	Name	Organisation
1	Francois Bekker	Interested Party
2	Dr. Peter Inman	Coega Development Corporation

No	Date	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
1	02 May 2012 16:29 Email (Previous email 02/08/2011)	Francois Bekker Affected Party (adjoining landowner)	<p>On previous occasions I have requested information about the Milnerton geo-technical fault line that the current Nuclear reactor is built upon. You did not provide any information to us!</p> <p>We have a farm adjacent to Koeberg Nature reserve and would like to know urgently what the exclusion zones ,or planned exclusion zones are, as it would severely affect what we could do on the land, and it would also affect the price of the land.</p> <p>I do not approve of the current processes you are following as you do not consult with adjacent landowners whose land prices could be severely affected if another plant is built nearby the current Nuclear plant.</p> <p>What is the expected lifespan of the current plant?</p> <p>Please provide the requested information on an urgent basis, and I would like to discuss the matter with the head of GIBB or Escom (sic).</p> <p>We are adjoining landowners and we could be severely affected by any future developments and the building of new reactors.</p> <p>On numerous occasions I have requested information and meetings with yourselves or Escom (sic) and you do not have the decency to respond to my requests.</p> <p>We will not allow it and will take the necessary actions to protect our rights. I request your immediate response.</p>	<p>Koeberg Nuclear Power Station (KNPS) is not built on a fault line.</p> <p>The following extract from the Seismic Risk Assessment (Appendix E4 of the Revised Draft EIR) deals with the postulated Milnerton Fault. <i>“Dames and Moore (1976) concluded that enough circumstantial evidence exists to postulate the presence of a northwest striking fault offshore of Duynefontein but that it does not come closer than 8 km to the site. It is however possible that such a postulated fault could pass anywhere between 7 and 10 km offshore of Duynefontein (the inferred Melkbos Ridge Fault passes 7.5 km from the Koeberg Nuclear Power Station). No new research has been performed to confirm or refute the presence of the postulated fault or its point of closest approach to the site. The inference that the event happened closer to Milnerton than to Duynefontein is based on the reported damage to the farmhouse at Jan Biesjes Kraal.”</i> Should you have any scientifically validated peer-reviewed information to challenge these findings, GIBB would welcome the opportunity to consider this.</p> <p>The KNPS has been designed to withstand a peak ground acceleration of 0.3g, which is equivalent to an earthquake of magnitude 7 on the Richter Scale (directly below Koeberg).</p> <p>Accordingly, based on the potential presence of an offshore fault and the seismic events that have taken place in the Western Cape, the KNPS has been built on a “seismic raft”, and all the components and plant systems that are important to nuclear safety have been designed to these seismic specifications so that they will be able to perform their expected functions during and after an earthquake.</p> <p>The sizes of the planned Emergency Planning Zones (EPS) for Nuclear-1 are documented in Chapter 3 of the Revised Draft EIR. These zones are much smaller than the current EPZs for the KNPS. Therefore, should Nuclear-1 be established at Duynefontein, Nuclear-1 would have no impact on land use.</p> <p>The expected life span of the KNPS is 40 years (i.e. it is expected to shut down by 2024, unless upgrading takes place to extend its life-span.</p> <p>Your comments regarding the construction of additional reactors are noted. GIBB cannot comment on requests for information that you</p>

No	Date	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
				<p>have made directly to Eskom as GIBB only has a mandate to respond through the EIA process.</p> <p>Please note that adjacent landowners are included in the interested and affected party database. GIBB has confirmed that your details are included in the Nuclear-1 EIA stakeholder database.</p>
2	17 May 2012 08:07 Email	Dr Peter Inman Coega Development Corporation	<p>We are engaging with the Eskom nuclear team who are responsible for the early site works and they have informed us that only PE port was seriously considered for the importation of the large components required for Nuclear1.</p> <p>I am surprised that the new port of Ngqura was not considered since Transnet have a perennial complaint that access into the congested port area in PE is a challenge even for container traffic.</p> <p>When Pechiney and later Alcan investigated heavy haul routes for their proposed Aluminium Smelter, PE port was found to be a challenge. Further, the CDC specifically took account of heavy haul and abnormal load requirements with their infrastructural designs serving the IDZ and new port. We therefore consider that there has been an oversight in the planning for the transport of large components for Nuclear 1 and that this needs to be addressed.</p> <p>We have made the Eskom nuclear team responsible for the early site works aware of this oversight.</p>	<p>A port assessment was done and the full “Thyspunt Site Abnormal Load Haul Route Investigation” report is included as an annexure to the revised Traffic and Transport Assessment, which will appear in the Revised DEIR v2.</p> <p>The report is based on the assumption that either the ports of Port Elizabeth or Ngqura would be used. There has been no formal decision on which port would be used as yet, but the report states that the road traffic flow at the Port of Ngqura is less congested than at the Port of Port Elizabeth.</p> <p>The report further concludes that either of the two ports, Port Elizabeth or Ngqura, could be used for off-loading the large equipment. Both ports have suitable exit routes, although some additional work will be required in Port Elizabeth to make the current exit usable.</p>