

05 August 2015

Our Ref: J27035/ J31314
Your Ref: Email received 07 August 2011

WAG ACTION GROUP
Email: helenmansonkullin@gmail.com

Dear Helen Manson-Kullin and the WAG Action Group



Tshwane

Lynnwood Corporate Park
Block A, 1st Floor, East Wing
36 Alkantrant Road
Lynnwood 0081
PO Box 35007
Menlo Park 0102

Tel: +27 12 348 5880
Fax: +27 12 348 5878
Web: www.gibb.co.za

RE: ESKOM EIA CONCERNS FOR THE PROPOSED NUCLEAR POWER STATION AND ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE (DEA Ref. No: 12/12/20/944)

Comment 1:

Having spent much time and effort trawling through the 56kg's of the latest EIA report, it is with some disappointment that I can honestly say you still have not managed to actually address our villages concerns. We have still not met with any of your specialists on the ground who we were told would be visiting our area. You still seem to be unaware that people actually live here! On most of the detailed maps in this new EIA Wolvengat isn't even registered as a village...

Response 1:

Your comment is noted. The technical team will make changes to maps contained within the Revised Draft EIR Version 1 in order to give a clearer indication of the position of your village where required.

The Nuclear-1 specialist team visited the Duynefontein, Bantamsklip and Thyspunt sites and surrounding areas during the Scoping and Draft EIA phases of the project. Selected specialists have revisited certain sites after this as required to undertake their assessments. No need has been identified for the team to revisit these areas however if there are any questions you wish to address to a specific specialist please feel free to submit these to the Nuclear-1 Public Participation office during the review of the Revised Draft EIR Version 2. All registered Interested and Affected Parties will be informed of the availability of the Revised Draft EIR for public comment and review.

Comment 2:

Regardless of the endless fauna and flora implications, tourism, ecotourism and small business opportunities that will be completely obliterated by the development of Bantamsklip as a Nuclear power station site [whether Nuclear 1, 2, or 3], Eskom still proposes to build this thing in our back yard. We've been told not to over react, we've been told it will never happen, we've been told it will be good for business, but people actually live here! People have you all forgotten how many people died in the Chernobyl disaster? These are our homes that Eskom is threatening, our livelihoods!!

Then to add to the endless list of reasons Bantamsklip [and frankly any proposed nuclear development site] should not be developed as a nuclear power station we have the earthquake in Japan earlier this year to demonstrate just how easy it can go wrong. Countries with far more



GIBB Holdings Reg: 2002/019792/02
Directors: R. Vries (Chairman), Y. Frizlar, B Hendricks, H.A. Kavthankar, J.M.N. Ras
Arcus GIBB (Pty) Ltd, Reg: 1992/007139/07 is a wholly owned subsidiary of GIBB Holdings.
A list of divisional directors is available from the company secretary.

advanced nuclear programs are CANCELLING their plans and opting to phase out nuclear power all together. Surely we should take notice of this move???

Response 2:

Your comment is noted however it is inappropriate to suggest that the tragedy which occurred at Chernobyl could be forgotten.

It is acknowledged that the incident at Fukushima as a result of this natural disaster has highlighted many important safety factors in terms of the future of nuclear energy and is indeed a stark reminder of the unpredictability of the natural environment. However it is also well known that South Africa is located on a vastly more stable tectonic environment than that of Japan which is situated close to a major subduction zone within the Pacific Ocean and the two cannot, in all fairness, be compared to one another.

South Africa will not build its nuclear power stations on fault lines or on coasts susceptible to tsunamis, and it has already reviewed its regulatory system. We therefore stand by our assessment that serious incidents in South Africa are unlikely. We also reiterate that the architecture and technology of nuclear power stations have changed significantly since the Soviet built Chernobyl and that the safety factors incorporated in new nuclear power stations render the occurrence of a Chernobyl-type disaster extremely unlikely to say the least. Thus, the improbability of such incidents occurring in South Africa makes a scale assessment purely academic and not worthwhile. Please see Appendix E32 and E33 of the Revised Draft EIR (Version 2) for a more detailed discussion.

Lastly a team of over 30 independent specialists have found no fatal flaws at any of the three sites under investigation. In the event that the Thyspunt site is approved by the Department of Environmental Affairs for the construction and operation of Nuclear-1 Eskom would need to re-apply for Environmental Authorisation if Bantamsklip is put forward as a site alternative for Nuclear-2.

Comment 3:

So, to end with, the members of WAG [Wolvengat called Viljoenshof on some maps] continue to object and oppose in the strongest possible terms any and all proposed development of nuclear power stations at Bantamsklip or any other site and any and all associated infrastructure [powerlines etc]. See our mission statement attached. We don't plan to change our minds.

Response 3:

Your comment is noted and your objection will be included in the Revised EIR Version 2 which will be made available for public comment and review.

Yours faithfully
for GIBB (Pty) Ltd

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be a stylized 'S' or similar character.

The Nuclear-1 EIA Team