

The reader is requested to note the following:

- ***The Public Participation Process described in this chapter is a component of the Draft Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Report which was made available for public review between 06 March and 30 June 2010.***
- ***Sections 7.1 - 7.4 provide an account of the process undertaken during the Scoping Phase, therefore has not changed.***
- ***Section 7.5 has been updated and provides an account of the Public Participation Process undertaken for the review of the Draft EIA Report in 2010.***
- ***Section 7.6 outlines the Public Participation Process which will be undertaken during the review of the Revised Draft EIR.***

I&APs wishing to focus on the activities which have been undertaken since the release of the Draft EIR are advised to read Section 7.5 and 7.6 of this Chapter.

APPRECIATION TO INTERESTED AND AFFECTED PARTIES FOR THEIR PARTICIPATION

To date, many Interested and Affected Parties (I&APs) have participated actively during this Environmental Impact Assessment process, by attending meetings and by making written submissions. I&APs have contributed significant local knowledge and shared information on studies undertaken within the study area (Western and Eastern Cape). The EIA team should like to express its sincere thanks and appreciation for these efforts and the contributions of Interested and Affected Parties.

7 EIA METHODOLOGY

This chapter discusses the methodology that was followed for the EIA and public participation processes. The Scoping Phase identified environmental issues that need to be addressed and investigated in the EIA phase and identified three sites that were taken forward into the EIA phase. The issues identified include all environmental issues, including potential social and biophysical impacts associated with all phases of the project, namely construction, operation and decommissioning. The impacts associated with the 'No-Go' alternative will also be assessed. This section indicates the methodology that was followed by all specialists to assess the significance of the impacts, as well as the methods that were followed to keep interested and affected parties (I&APs) informed throughout the Scoping and EIA Phases.

The Scoping Phase commenced in September 2006 and ended in November 2008, with the approval of the Final Scoping Report by the then DEAT. The EIA phase commenced thereafter.

The EIA process, including the Scoping and EIA Phases, and where this Draft Environmental Impact Report fits into the process, are indicated in **Figure 7-1**.

The DEA approved the Plan of Study for EIA in January 2010 (Appendix B2). The Draft EIR was prepared and provided for public comment **from 6 March 2010. The period for comment on the Draft EIR was lengthened twice, and the end of the lengthened comment period was 30 June 2010. Owing to concerns from the public about the quality and inclusivity of some of the specialist reports, the EIA team decided to revise selected specialist reports and provide a Revised Draft EIR for public review. The current Revised Draft EIR is the result of this revision. Once the public comment period for the Revised Draft EIR is over, a final EIR will be prepared and submitted to the DEA for decision-making.**




Figure 7-1: Flowchart of the Scoping and EIA process, indicating the current stage in the process

7.1 Public Participation Process

The principles that govern communication with society at large are best embodied in the principles of the National Environmental Management Act (NEMA) (Act No. 107 of 1998, Chapter 1), South Africa's overarching environmental law. Public participation for environmental authorisation is guided by the EIA Process Regulation (GNR 385) and Guideline 4: *Public Participation in support of the EIA Regulations* (part of the guidelines for the implementation of Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations in terms of section 24(5) of the NEMA).

7.2 Objectives of public participation in an EIA

Public participation is the involvement of all parties who potentially have an interest in a development or project, or may be affected by it, directly or indirectly. It is a process leading to a joint effort by stakeholders, technical specialists, the authorities and the Applicant who work together to produce better decisions than if they had acted independently.

The objectives of public participation in an EIA are to provide sufficient and accessible information to stakeholders in an objective manner to assist them to:

- **During the Scoping Phase**
 - raise issues of concern and suggestions for enhanced benefits;
 - verify that their issues have been recorded;
 - assist in commenting on feasible alternatives; and
 - contribute relevant local information and knowledge to the environmental assessment.
- **During the EIA Phase**
 - contribute relevant local information and knowledge to the environmental assessment;
 - verify that their issues have been considered in the environmental investigations; and
 - comment on the findings of the environmental assessment.
- **During the Decision-making Phase**
 - be notified of the decision by the competent environmental authority on whether or not the project may proceed, and provide the opportunity for appeal.

Throughout the public participation process, the social impact assessment specialist was kept informed of the outcome of the public interactions and also attended a number of public meetings and workshops in order to be kept informed of the issues of social importance, so that he could address these issues in the Social Impact Assessment (SIA). The SIA specialist was also provided with the minutes of all public, key focus group and meetings and key stakeholder workshops. This is in addition to the direct interactions (e.g. one-on-one interviews) that this specialist had with selected key stakeholders.

7.3 Public participation during the Scoping Phase

During the Scoping Phase, various public participation activities were undertaken, aimed at:

- Ensuring that all relevant stakeholders have been identified and invited to engage in the scoping process;
- Raising awareness and increasing understanding of stakeholders about the proposed project, the affected environment and the environmental process being undertaken;
- Creating open channels of communication between stakeholders and the project team;
- Providing opportunities for stakeholders to identify issues or concerns and suggestions for enhancing potential benefits and to prevent or mitigate impacts;
- Accurately documenting all opinions, concerns and queries regarding the project; and
- Ensuring the identification of feasible alternatives and significant issues related to the project.

7.3.1 Identification of Interested and Affected Parties

In terms of the EIA Regulations under NEMA, stakeholders are required to formally register as I&APs for the EIA. The Public Participation Office started this process (**Box 1**) by developing an initial stakeholder list and advising stakeholders by letters addressed to them personally of the opportunity to register for the EIA. **Box 2** shows that these I&APs represented a broad spectrum of sectors of society.

Box 1 - Identification of Interested and Affected Parties (I&APs)
--

I&APs were identified through:

- | |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Stakeholders that participated in 400 MW Pebble Bed Modular Reactor Demonstration Power Plant (2005/2006).• Liaison with district and local municipalities within the three provinces (Eastern, Northern and Western Cape).• Advertisements in national, regional (all provinces where nuclear sites are proposed) and local publications in three languages (Afrikaans, English and Xhosa).• Registration process via a registration and comment sheet accompanying a Background Information Documents (BID).• Requesting I&APs to suggest on the comment sheet the names of stakeholders who should be involved in the EIA process. |
|---|

All I&APs identified in May 2007 received personalised letters, which were accompanied by a Background Information Document, printed in three languages (Afrikaans, English and Xhosa).

Box 2 - Sectors of society represented by I&APs on the direct mailing list

- National Government.
- Provincial Government (Eastern, Northern and Western Cape Provinces).
- Local Government (local and district municipalities).
- Agriculture (landowners, unions, farmers' associations).
- Tourism (tourism associations, landowners, operators, managers).
- Conservation authorities, including provincial nature reserves.
- Residents' and Ratepayers' Associations.
- Local residents.
- Environmental groups.
- Statutory and regulatory groups.
- Public enterprises, utilities and agencies.
- Organised business/commerce.
- Landowners.
- Industry.
- Media.
- Libraries.
- Educational organisations and institutions.
- Academics and consultants.

7.3.2 Registration of I&APs

The registration of I&APs has been an ongoing activity. During the Scoping Phase (up to August 2008), there were approximately 5 500 stakeholders registered as I&APs. These included landowners near the proposed sites, residents surrounding the proposed sites, all the authorities at the three spheres of government, I&APs that attended meetings, or had submitted comment or completed the registration sheet distributed with the BID, general public from various provinces (over and above the directly affected) in South Africa and representatives of interest groups living abroad.

A database of I&APs, indicating I&AP names and affiliations, is provided as **Appendix D7**.

7.3.3 Announcement of opportunity to become involved

The opportunity to participate in the EIA and to register as an I&AP was announced in May 2007 in three languages (Afrikaans, English and Xhosa) as follows¹:

- Placement of newspaper advertisements in 25 newspapers (**Table 7-1**) including national, regional and local newspapers. The advertisements were placed during the period 25 May 2007 - 28 September 2007.

Table 7-1: Paid newspaper advertisements for project announcement

No	Advertisements	Distribution	Language	Publication Date
1	<i>Sunday Times</i>	National	English	27 May 2007
2	<i>Rapport</i>	National	Afrikaans	27 May 2007
3	<i>Argus</i>	Regional	English	25 May 2007
4	<i>Cape Times</i>	Regional	English	25 May 2007
5	<i>Burger</i>	Regional	Afrikaans	25 May 2007
6	<i>Kaap Rapport</i>	Regional	Afrikaans	27 May 2007
7	<i>The Herald</i>	Regional	English	25 May 2007
8	<i>Gansbaai Courant</i>	Local	Afrikaans	06 June 2007
9	<i>Gansbaai Herald</i>	Local	English	06 June 2007

¹ Proof of these is contained in Appendices of the Draft and Final Scoping Reports.

No	Advertisements	Distribution	Language	Publication Date
10	<i>Hermanus Times</i>	Local	English	31 May 2007
11	<i>Table Talk</i>	Local	English	30 May 2007
12	<i>Tygerburger Table View</i>	Local	English	30 May 2007
13	<i>Kouga Express</i>	Local	English	31 May 2007
14	<i>Our Times</i>	Local	English	31 May 2007
15	<i>PE Express</i>	Local	English	30 May 2007
16	<i>Algoa Sun</i>	Local	English	31 May 2007
17	<i>Ons Kontrei</i>	Local	Afrikaans	1 June 2007
18	<i>Gemsbok</i>	Local	Afrikaans	30 May 2007
19	<i>Swartland Weskus Herald</i>	Local	Afrikaans	02 August 2007
20	<i>Tygerburger Milnerton Classified</i>	Local	English	01 August 2007
21	<i>Table Talk</i>	Local	English	01 August 2007
22	<i>Hermanus Times</i>	Local	English	09 August 2007
23	<i>Suidernuus</i>	Local	Afrikaans	10 August 2007
24	<i>Die Plattelander</i>	Local	Afrikaans	28 September 2007
25	<i>Die Namakwalander</i>	Local	Afrikaans	28 September 2007

- Distribution of a letter of invitation to become involved, personally addressed to initially registered I&APs, accompanied by a BID and a registration/ comment sheet. The BID contained details of the proposed project, maps showing the South African coastline and the proposed nuclear sites, and a registration and comment sheet for I&APs to register for the EIA. The registration and comment sheet also provided the opportunity for I&APs to indicate if they wished to receive further project correspondence.
- Delivering BIDs, accompanied by comment and registration sheets, at various public libraries (June 2007 - August 2007). **Table 7-2a** and **7-2b** show the distribution of the BID at public libraries and other public venues, respectively.

Table 7-2a: Distribution of BIDs at public libraries during the Scoping Phase

Province	Public Libraries	Contact Person
Western Cape	Atlantis Public Library	Mr A Davids
Western Cape	Beaufort West Public Library	Mrs A van Niekerk
Western Cape	Bredasdorp Public Library	Ms Danelle Rossouw
Western Cape	Cape Town Central Library	Librarian In Charge
Western Cape	Clanwilliam Public Library	Mrs N Leens
Western Cape	Elim Library Depot	Ms A Engel
Western Cape	Gansbaai Public Library	Ms Sharman Geldenhuys
Western Cape	Hermanus Public Library	Ms Alette Olwage
Western Cape	Koeberg Public Library	Mrs R Brown
Western Cape	Laingsburg Public Library	Mr F van Wyk
Western Cape	Malmesbury Public Library	Ms van der Vyver
Western Cape	Milnerton Public Library	Mrs Marietha Eyssen
Western Cape	Pearly Beach Public Library	Mrs Sharman Geldenhuys
Western Cape	Piketberg Public Library	Ms Rounelle McKnight
Western Cape	Vredenburg Public Library	Ms Salome Visagie
Western Cape	Welverdiend Public Library	Ms Lilian Newman
Western Cape	Wesfleur Library, Atlantis	Ms Jennifer Daniels
Eastern Cape	Humansdorp Public Library	Ms Marilyn Loggenberg
Eastern Cape	Jeffrey's Bay Public Library	Ms Linda Jack
Eastern Cape	Kareedouw Public Library	Ms Geraldine Kleinbooi
Eastern Cape	Kruisfontein Public Library	Ms Cathy Damons
Eastern Cape	St Francis Bay Public Library	Mrs Marie Brown
Eastern Cape	Ukhanyisa Public Library	Ms Precious Vumasonke
Eastern Cape	Plettenberg Bay Public Library	Mrs M Johnston
Northern Cape	Richtersveld Public Library	Mrs Cecilia Rossouw
Northern Cape	Springbok Public Library	Mrs S Victor

Table 7-2b: Distribution of BIDs at additional public venues during the Scoping Phase

Province	Local Public Venues	Contact Person
Western Cape	Arcus GIBB (Cape Town Offices) 14 Kloof Street, Cape Town	Reception
Western Cape	Baardskeerdersbos Winkel	Mr Manie Groenewald
Western Cape	Cape Agulhas Tourism Bureau, Bredasdorp	Ms Sanet Stemmet
Western Cape	Palmiet Pumped Storage Scheme, Visitors Centre	Ms Jenny Holthusyen
Western Cape	Wolvengat Community	Ms Kali Griffin
Eastern Cape	Oesterbaai Eiendome	Ms Elmarie Meyer
Eastern Cape	Jeffrey's Bay Business Forum	Mr Jannie Kruger
Eastern Cape	Jeffrey's Bay Tourism Office	Reception
Northern Cape	Komaggas Advise Office	Mr Jerry Landrew
Northern Cape	Houthoop Shed	Ms Veronica van Wyk

- Posting the invitation letter, BID, registration and comment sheet on the Eskom website www.eskom.co.za/eia under the "Nuclear-1" link.
- Erecting notice boards at all five sites (**Figures 7-2 to 7-6**).



Figure 7-2: On site Notice at Duynefontein



Figure 7-3: On site Notice at Bantamsklip



Figure 7-4: On site Notice at Brazil, Northern Cape



Figure 7-5: On site Notice at Schulpfontein, Northern Cape



Figure 7-6: On Site Notice at Thyspunt site, Eastern Cape

Since the announcement of the project in May 2007, the EIA process has enjoyed a fair amount of media coverage (Media Inserts 1 and 2). Several media articles have also encouraged the public to register as I&APs by publishing the contact details of the Public Participation Office.

Town angry over nuclear power station plans

ANÉL POWELL

CAPE TOWN: Despite assurances by Eskom three years ago that there were no plans to build a nuclear power plant at the Western Cape coastal resort of Pearly Beach, the parastatal has again named the area as a potential site for a new power station.

The inclusion of Bantamsklip, just 10km south-east of Pearly Beach, outside Gansbaai, as one of five potential sites for the second nuclear power station has enraged environmental group Earthlife Africa and has residents of the

fontein in the Northern Cape and Thyspunt, near Cape St Francis in the Eastern Cape.

Maya Aberman, the co-ordinator of Earthlife Africa, said the organisation would monitor the public participation process.

"If we feel it is necessary to take action, whether by protest or by litigation, we will do so. This is a signal from the government to put in nuclear power stations all over South Africa," she said.

The Eskom Board has approved the investigation of a nuclear capacity of up to 20 000MW in the next 20 years,

construction of the station could start in 2009/2010, with the first unit being commissioned in 2016.

But Aberman said Pearly Beach was a pristine site devoid of the infrastructure needed to build a plant the size of Koeberg.

"A pressurised water reactor will have a far greater impact than a pebble bed modular reactor, which requires a smaller piece of land," she said.

In 2005, Eskom spokeswoman Carin de Villiers confirmed that Eskom had bought the 1 838ha farm Bantamsklip

A feasibility study on possible sites for a pebble bed modular reactor found that two threatened vegetation species occur in Bantamsklip, as well as the one of South Africa's rarest endemic coastal breeding bird species, the African black oystercatcher.

Eskom had not replied to questions by the time of going to press.

Ehrina Versfeld, chairman of the Pearly Beach Conservation Society, said residents were being urged to take part in public meetings to be held in June.

She said the construction of

Figure 7-7: Article in *The Mercury*, 29 May 2007

Erwin announces plan for 14 pebble-bed reactors

HERALD CORRESPONDENT

PUBLIC Enterprises Minister Alec Erwin revealed yesterday that the state power utility Eskom was planning to open as many as 14 pebble-bed modular reactors (PBMRs) around the country to combat the country's dire electricity shortage.

This statement was according to a written reply to a parliamentary question.

He told Lance Greyling of the Independent Democrats that Eskom had submitted applications for an environmental authorisation and a nuclear installation licence respectively, for a PBMR demonstration

power plant to be constructed on the Koeberg site outside Cape Town. "The plan is to order 14 units, but decisions regarding future PBMR units are dependent on the PBMR demonstration power plant being authorised, constructed and successfully commissioned," said Erwin. —I-Net Bridge

Eskom 'must halt nuclear investigation at Thyspunt'

■ Power utility needs to prove it can evacuate population in emergency

Guy Rogers

ENVIRONMENT & TOURISM EDITOR

rogers@avusa.co.za

ESKOM must halt all investigations into the feasibility of Thyspunt as a nuclear site until it has proved that it can evacuate 25 000 residents along a single road, in 11 minutes, through the epicentre of a nuclear disaster.

That was the call yesterday from the St Francis Bay Ratepayers' Association whose chairman, Hylton Thorpe, was addressing a meeting about the Thyspunt nuclear project at a Port Elizabeth beachfront hotel.

The "key stakeholder feedback meeting" was hosted by Eskom with the stated aim of capturing all outstanding concerns about the project, which envisages the construction of a 4 000MW pressurised water reactor – more than twice the size of South Africa's only other nuclear power station at Koeberg.

Five possible sites were identified for this development last year when the scoping process started. Two of them are in the Northern Cape, two in the Western Cape – including Koeberg's Dunefontein site – and the last is at Thyspunt, on the Cape St Francis side of Oyster Bay, in the Eastern Cape.

One of the key issues highlighted at the meeting was the finding by Eskom's consultant Arcus Gibb, in their draft scoping report, that the two Northern Cape sites, at Kleinsee and Hondeklip Bay are "unfeasible".



Eco-cost of interfering with an ancient dune system could far exceed any other problems

Arcus Gibb project leader Jaana-Maria Ball said the reasons for this decision related to the lack of a power corridor up the West Coast to which these two sites could be linked.

The financial cost and time lag in having to erect a whole new transmission line system, and then having to connect it to the country's main north-south grid, were two of the reasons for the decision, she said.

She said the environmental cost of having to install all this new infrastructure had also weighed against the two Northern Cape sites.

Trudy Malan, operations manager of the Cape St Francis seabird rehabilitation centre Ajobatus, contested Ball's environmental argument, saying detailed studies first needed to be completed at all the sites before such a judgment had any value.

The eco-cost of interfering with an ancient dune system or causing marine pollution at Thyspunt could far exceed any other problems elsewhere, she noted.

Thorpe said his association was concerned that Eskom "continues to use the everything keeps going right type of slogan", focusing only on the best-case scenario and failing to probe the worst-case scenario.

He said the existence of the Thyspunt bypass headland dune field was

proof of a major factor that seemed to have been ignored by the consultants.

"With a bypass headland dune field, wind picks up sand from the beach and transports it overland, returning it to the sea on the eastern side. It is an indication of consistent wind direction and very high wind energy," he noted.

"In the case of the St Francis area, these winds blow from a south-westerly direction, directly from Thyspunt towards Sea Vista and St Francis Bay, which is what they've been doing for thousands of years."

The distance from Thyspunt to the township of Sea Vista is about 11km "so, in the event of an accident, when a 60km south-wester is blowing, as is not uncommon, the people of Sea Vista would have 11 minutes in which to evacuate their homes and shacks."

"It is estimated that there are in excess of 5 000 people living in Sea Vista, and very few even have bicycles, let alone cars."

There is also only one escape route, the road to Humansdorp, to serve the five communities of Rebelsrus, Mostert's Hoek, Cape St Francis, Sea Vista and St Francis Bay.

The population of these over peak holiday seasons could be as high as 25 000, and growing every year, he said.



HAVE YOUR SAY

Text us your view at: 32971

To text us, write news, followed by your message.

Figure 7-8: Article in *The Herald*, 6 March 2008

7.3.4 Obtaining comment – Scoping Phase

Initial comment was based on the BID and verbal explanations of the proposed project during meetings. I&APs could contribute comment in writing by either completing and returning comment sheets to the Public Participation Office, or attending public meetings, or through one-on-one interactions and focus group meetings.

(a) Written contributions

Numerous² written submissions were received either by mail, email or fax during the Scoping Phase up to August 2008. Issues were captured in an Issues and Response Report (IRR) that accompanied the Final Scoping Report. Submissions referred to as “lengthy submissions” also accompanied the categorised IRR and have been included in the Draft EIR.

(b) One-on-one interactions

One-on-one interactions were held by various team members with individuals and representatives of relevant sectors prior and after scheduled meetings. These interactions were particularly useful in identifying key issues and other relevant stakeholders.

Any information provided by I&APs during an interaction was provided to the Public Participation Team to capture on record and/or utilise it for stakeholder referrals and information dissemination.

(c) Meetings (Public, Open Days, Focus Group, Key Stakeholder and Authorities)

A combined total of 50 meetings (**Tables 7-3a to 7-3e**) with stakeholders were convened between June 2007 and March 2008, attended by over 1 700 I&APs. Records of all these meetings were appended to the Draft and Final Scoping Reports. All meetings took place in the language of choice of participants.

Subsequent to each meeting, minutes were distributed to attendees to verify that their contributions have been captured accurately. Information presented at the meetings was provided to all I&APs upon request and by making it available on Eskom website [www.eskom.co.za/eia/nuclear 1 - Generation and on the GIBB website](http://www.eskom.co.za/eia/nuclear_1_-_Generation_and_on_the_GIBB_website) <http://projects/gibb.co.za>. Additional requests for project information were also addressed by making this information available on the website as and when requested by I&APs. **Figures 7- to 7-12** show some of the meetings held during the Scoping Phase.

7.3.5 Issues and Response Report

Issues raised during the Scoping Phase were captured in an Issues and Response Report, appended to the Draft Scoping Report (January 2008). Issues raised during the Draft Scoping Report review period were included in the Issues and Response Report appended to the Final Scoping Report, issued in August 2008.

The Issues and Response Report included all comments raised at the various meetings and I&AP interactions as per **Tables 7-3a to 7-3e**.

² It is not the intention of this chapter to quantify submissions received during the Scoping Phase. However, all submissions have been captured in the relevant Issues and Response Reports of the Draft Scoping Report and Final Scoping Report, and filed both as hard and electronic copies for record keeping purposes.

7.3.6 Draft Scoping Report availability and Public Review

A letter was distributed to all registered I&APs informing them of the availability of the report. An Executive Summary (available in both English and Afrikaans) of the Draft Scoping Report accompanied all personalised letters. In addition, executive summaries were made available at all Public Open Days and Key Stakeholder Feedback Meetings.

Public Open Days were held to present and obtain comment on the Draft Scoping Report. **Tables 7-3a** to **7-4e** list these meetings, their times and venues. The main purpose of the Public Open Days was to reflect back to the public in terms of the following:

- Has the EIA team accurately captured issues raised by the public during Scoping?
- Has the EIA team understood the issues?
- Has the EIA properly contextualised and interpreted the issues?
- Are the proposed specialist studies going to provide answers to the questions raised by the public?

Assistance, where required, was provided to I&APs to facilitate understanding of the Draft Scoping Report so that I&APs had the opportunity to provide meaningful comment.

Both the draft and Final Scoping Reports were made available as presented in **Table 7-4**.

Table 7-3a: Public Meetings held during the Scoping Phase

No.	Province	Area	Venue	Date
1	Northern Cape	Houhoop	Houhoop Shed	06 June 2007
2		Koingnaas	Castle Hill	06 June 2007
3		Kleinsee	Blue Diamond	06 June 2007
4	Western Cape	Atlantis	Saxonsea Hall	08 June 2007
5		Duynefontein	Atlantic Beach Golf Estate	08 June 2007
6		Milnerton	Summergreens Hall	08 June 2007
7	Eastern Cape	Oyster Bay	Oyster Bay Hall	11 June 2007
8		Humansdorp	Humansdorp Community Centre	11 June 2007
9		Jeffery's Bay	Jeffreys Bay Hall	12 June 2007
10	Western Cape	Gansbaai	Pretorius Hall	13 June 2007
11		Pearly Beach	Pearly Beach Club	13 June 2007
12		Elim	Elim Church Hall	13 June 2007
13	Northern Cape	Komaggas	Komaggas Community Hall	11 July 2007
14		Houhoop	Houhoop Shed	12 July 2007
15	Eastern Cape	St Francis Bay	St Francis Links	25 July 2007
16		Sea Vista	Sea Vista Community Hall	26 July 2007
17	Western Cape	Atlantis	Thusong Service Centre	06 August 2007
18		Milnerton	Milnerton Golf Club	07 August 2007
19		Hermanus	Overstrand Municipality Auditorium	13 August 2007

No.	Province	Area	Venue	Date
20		Struisbaai	Struisbaai North Community Hall	14 August 2007
21	Northern Cape	Nababeep	Nababeep Junior Saal	09 October 2007
22		Port Nolloth	Port Nolloth Stadsaal	10 October 2007
23		Spoegrivier	Spoegrivier Gemeenskapsaal	11 October 2007
24		Soebatsfontein	Soebatsfontein Gemeenskapsaal	11 October 2007
25		Hondeklipbaai	Hondeklipbaai Gemeenskapsaal	11 October 2007

Table 7-3b: Meetings - Key Stakeholder Workshops

No.	Province	Area	Venue	Date
1	Eastern Cape	Port Elizabeth	The Beach Hotel	27 July 2007
2	Northern Cape	Kimberley	Kalahari Lodge	31 July 2007
3	Northern Cape	Springbok	Kokerboom Motel	09 October 2007
4	Western Cape	Durbanville, Cape Town	Durbanville Golf Course	13 August 2007

Table 7-3c: Meetings - Focus Group Meetings

No.	Province	Area	Stakeholder Group	Date
1	Western Cape	Cape Town	DEA, DEA&DP and DTEC	14 June 2007
2	Eastern Cape	St Francis Bay	Thyspunt Anti-Nuclear Group	26 July 2007
3	Eastern Cape	Port Elizabeth	DEDEA	27 July 2007
4	Western Cape	Cape Town	Cape Town City Council	06 August 2007
5	Eastern Cape	Port Elizabeth	Eastern Cape Regional Coastal Working Group	30 August 2007
6	Eastern Cape	Jeffrey's Bay	Kouga Local Municipality	30 August 2007
7	Eastern Cape	Port Elizabeth	Coega Development Corporation	31 August 2007

Table 7-3d: Public Meetings and Public Open Days

No.	Province	Area	Day and Date	Venue	Time
1	Northern Cape	Springbok	Tuesday, 12 February 2008	Kokerboom Motel	14h30 – 18h30
2		Garies	Wednesday, 13 February 2008	Garies Town Hall	15h00 – 19h00
3		Hondeklipbaai	Thursday, 14 February 2008	Community Hall	15h30 – 19h30
4	Western Cape	Duynefontein	Tuesday, 19 February 2008	Koeberg Conservation Centre	15h00 – 19h00
5		Cape Town Central	Wednesday, 20 February 2008	Vineyard Hotel, Newlands	15h00 – 19h00
6		Gansbaai	Tuesday, 26 February 2008	Pretorius Hall	15h00 – 19h00
7		Pearly Beach	Wednesday, 27 February 2008	Pearly Beach Club	15h00 – 19h00
8		Bredasdorp	Thursday, 28 February 2008	Glaskasteel Hall	15h00 – 19h00
9	Eastern Cape	Oyster Bay	Monday, 03 March 2008	Oyster Bay Hall	15h00 – 19h00
10		St Francis Bay	Tuesday, 04 March 2008	St Francis Links	15h00 – 19h00
11		Port Elizabeth	Wednesday, 05 March 2008	Kelway Hotel	14h30 – 18h30

Table 7-3e: Key stakeholder and Authorities Feedback Meetings

No.	Province	Area	Day and Date	Venue	Time
1	Northern Cape	Springbok	Tuesday, 12 February 2008	Kokerboom Motel	11h00 – 14h00
2	Western Cape	Durbanville	Thursday, 21 February 2008	Durbanville Golf Club	09h30 – 12h30
3	Eastern Cape	Port Elizabeth	Wednesday, 05 March 2008	Kelway Hotel	11h00 – 14h00



Figure 7-9: Public Meeting at Duynefontein



Figure 7-10: Public Meeting at Gansbaai



Figure 7-11: Public Open Day at Pearly Beach



Figure 7-12: Discussion session with Hondeklipbaai residents at a Public Open Day

Table 7-4: Availability of the Draft and Final Scoping Reports

Area	Venue	Street Address
EASTERN CAPE		
Humansdorp	Humansdorp Public Library	9 Vureau Street
Humansdorp	Ukhanyiso Public Library	Nanto Street, Humansdorp
Jeffery's Bay	Jeffrey's Bay Public Library	33 Da Gama Road
Jeffery's Bay	Jeffrey's Bay Business Forum	Sandown Buildings, Jeffrey Street
Jeffery's Bay	Jeffrey's Bay Tourism Office	De Gama Road, Shell Museum Complex, Jeffrey's Bay
Kareedouw	Kareedouw Public Library	5 Keet Street
Oyster Bay	Oesterbaai Eiendome	6 Tornyn Street, Oyster Bay
Plettenberg Bay	Plettenberg Bay Public Library	Building No 29, Spar Centre, Marine Drive
St Francis Bay	St Francis Bay Public Library	No 1 Assisi Drive, St Francis Bay
St Francis Bay	St Francis Bay Tourism Centre	1 Lyme Road South, St Francis Bay Centre
Kruisfontein	Kruisfontein Public Library	Cucido Street, Kruisfontein
NORTHERN CAPE		
Kamieskroon	Succulent Karoo Knowledge Centre	Charlotte Street, Kamieskroon
Kleinsee	Houthoop Shed	Houthoop Guest Farm, Komaggas Road
Komaggas	Komaggas Advice Office	Van den Heever Street
Port Nolloth	Richtersveld Public Library	Main Road, Port Nolloth
Springbok	Springbok Public Library	Makua Street
WESTERN CAPE		
Cape Town	Arcus GIBB (Cape Town Offices)	14 Kloof Street, Cape Town
Atlantis	Atlantis Public Library	Civic Centre, Grosvenor Avenue
Baardskeerdersbos	Baardskeerdersbos Winkel	22km from Gaansbaai on the Elim Road
Beaufort West	Beaufort West Public Library	15 Church Street
Bredasdorp	Bredasdorp Public Library	Church Street, Bredasdorp
Cape Town	Cape Town Central Library	City Hall, 2 nd Floor, Darling Street
Bredasdorp	Cape Agulhas Tourism Bureau, Bredasdorp	51 Long Street, Bredasdorp
Clanwilliam	Clanwilliam Public Library	Main Street, Clanwilliam
Elim	Elim Library Depot	3 Waterkant Street, Elim
Gansbaai	Gansbaai Public Library	Main Road, Municipal Buildings
Hermanus	Hermanus Public Library	Civic Centre, Magnolia Street
Koeberg	Koeberg Public Library	Merchant Walk, Duynfontein
Laingsburg	Laingsburg Public Library	Van Riebeck Street
Malmesbury	Malmesbury Public Library	Voortrekker Road
Milnerton	Milnerton Public Library	Pienaar Road
Grabouw	Palmiet Pumped Storage Scheme, Visitors Centre	Rockview Dam Road, off N2 South, Grabouw
Piketberg	Piketberg Public Library	13 Church Street
Vredenburg	Vredenburg Public Library	12 Main Street
Bredasdorp	Welverdiend Public Library	Ou Meule Street, Bredasdorp
Atlantis	Wesfleur Library, Atlantis	Wesfleur Centre, Atlantis
Wolvengat	Jenny's Handelaar	Main Road, Wolvengat
GAUTENG		
Bryanston	Bryanston Public Library	Cnr New & Pyne Streets, Bryanston
Rosebank	Rosebank Public Library	8 Keyes Avenue, Rosebank
Blackheath	Blackheath Public Library	Heathway Centre, Blackheath
Johannesburg	Johannesburg Public Library	Dr Beyers Naude Square, Cnr Market & Fraser Streets

7.4 Summary of issues raised

The contributions received to date (mainly from the Scoping Phase) from a wide range of stakeholders have assisted greatly to enrich the EIA process. A range of issues was raised as reflected in the Issues and Response Report that accompanied the Draft and Final Scoping Reports, in the extensive written comments and proceedings of public and stakeholder meetings. These issues guided the Terms of Reference for the specialist studies.

In order to facilitate integration, issues raised were grouped into categories. Initially, issues raised were grouped into 22 categories as shown in **Table 7-5**. During the later stages of scoping, issues which were related to the integration of the transmission infrastructure to the Thyspunt and Bantamsklip sites were also raised and included in this EIA, resulting in the issues being grouped into 24 categories.

Table 7-5: Summary of issues raised

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, palaeo-ecology and 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	Comments raised as part of the Thyspunt Transmission Powerline Integration EIA
24	Comment raised as part of the Bantamsklip Transmission Powerline Integration

No	Category
	EIA

Although issues raised were specific to the proposed sites, there are some issues that were common to all sites. These related to the following:

- Financial implications of the proposed nuclear power stations (including economic implications to the consumer);
- Economic impact of all phases of a nuclear power station including decommissioning;
- Economic impact of restrictions on land use that will result from the siting of a nuclear reactor around a particular site;
- Risks associated with human health including the possibility of a catastrophic incident;
- The extent to which the local conditions have been taken into account in determining the Emergency Planning Zones;
- Concerns around current arrangements for waste disposal (including high-level nuclear waste);
- The importance and ecological sensitivity of the proposed sites;
- Concerns about nuclear technology in general; and
- Consideration of alternative electricity generation options, with a specific emphasis on renewable energy.

All issues that have been raised have reflected the concerns of a wide range of different people, groups and organisations, special interest groups and private individuals. In order to understand the context within which the issues were raised, the reader is encouraged to refer to the detailed IRRs (**Appendix D8**), which accompany this Draft EIR,

It is also worth mentioning that the majority of I&APs who have been actively involved to date in the EIA process, are those who are opposed to nuclear technology in principle.

7.5 Public Participation for the Draft EIR

7.5.1 Public review of the Draft EIR and EMP

Public participation during the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA focused on:

- A review of the findings of the EIA, presented in the Draft EIR and its accompanying specialist reports; and
- Distribution of relevant reports and EIA information to the public.

7.5.2 Announcing opportunity to comment on the findings of the Draft EIR

The announcement of the availability of the Draft EIR was undertaken as follows:

- *All I&APs on the project database were notified through personalised letters of the Draft EIA Report availability.*
- *All reports, including Specialist Study reports were uploaded on the following websites:*
 - *Eskom website: www.eskom.co.za/eia under 'Nuclear 1 Generation' link*
 - *Arcus GIBB website: <http://projects.gibb.co.za> under 'Draft EIA Report' link*
- *Media advertisements (Table 7-6) were placed in various local, regional and national newspapers advising the general public of the availability of the Draft EIA Report as well as opportunities for participation during the review period.*

- **Key Stakeholders were notified of the availability of the Draft EIA Report and also invited to Key Stakeholder Feedback Meetings.**

Furthermore, all registered I&APs were notified of extensions to the review period via mail, email and through telephonic notifications. Telephone calls were made to representatives of interest groups to advise them of additional opportunities to comment on the Draft EIA Report.

Table 7-6: Newspaper advertisements announcing Draft EIR availability

PUBLICATION	DISTRIBUTION	LANGUAGE	INSERTION DATE
<i>Sunday Times</i>	<i>National</i>	<i>English</i>	<i>14 March 2010</i>
<i>Cape Times</i>	<i>Regional, Western Cape</i>	<i>English</i>	<i>11 March 2010</i>
<i>Die Burger</i>	<i>Regional, Eastern and Western Cape</i>	<i>Afrikaans</i>	<i>10 March 2010</i>
<i>Hermanus Times</i>	<i>Local, Southern Cape</i>	<i>English</i>	<i>11 March 2010</i>
<i>Table Talk</i>	<i>Local, Western Cape</i>	<i>English</i>	<i>10 March 2010</i>
<i>Tygerberger Milnerton</i>	<i>Local, Western Cape</i>	<i>English</i>	<i>17 March 2010</i>
<i>Tygerberger Tableview</i>	<i>Local, Western Cape</i>	<i>English</i>	<i>17 March 2010</i>
<i>Easi Ads</i>	<i>Local, Western Cape</i>	<i>English</i>	<i>12 March 2010</i>
<i>Die Gansbaai Courant</i>	<i>Local, Southern Cape</i>	<i>Afrikaans</i>	<i>12 March 2010</i>
<i>Suidernuus</i>	<i>Local, Southern Cape</i>	<i>Afrikaans</i>	<i>12 March 2010</i>
<i>The Herald</i>	<i>Regional, Eastern Cape</i>	<i>English</i>	<i>18 March 2010</i>
<i>Kouga Express</i>	<i>Local, Eastern Cape</i>	<i>English</i>	<i>11 March 2010</i>
<i>Our Times</i>	<i>Local, Eastern Cape</i>	<i>English</i>	<i>11 March 2010</i>
<i>P E Express</i>	<i>Local, Eastern Cape</i>	<i>English</i>	<i>10 March 2010</i>

7.5.3 Distribution of the Draft EIR for public comment

Printed copies of the Draft EIR were made available for public review at the venues indicated in Table 7-7.

Table 7-7: Venues where copies of the Draft EIR was made available

No	Area	Venue	Street Address
EASTERN CAPE			
1	<i>Humansdorp</i>	<i>Humansdorp Public Library</i>	<i>9 Bureau Street</i>
2	<i>Jeffrey's Bay</i>	<i>Jeffreys Bay Public Library</i>	<i>33 Da Gama Road</i>
3	<i>Kareedouw</i>	<i>Kareedouw Public Library</i>	<i>5 Keet Street</i>
4	<i>Kruisfontein</i>	<i>Kruisfontein Public Library</i>	<i>Cupido Street, Kruisfontein</i>
5	<i>Oyster Bay</i>	<i>Oesterbaai Eiendomme</i>	<i>6 Tornyn Street, Oyster Bay</i>
6	<i>Plettenberg Bay</i>	<i>Plettenberg Bay Public Library</i>	<i>Building No 29, Spar Centre, Marine Drive</i>
7	<i>St Francis Bay</i>	<i>St. Francis Bay Public Library³</i>	<i>No 1 Assissi Drive, St. Francis Bay</i>
WESTERN CAPE			
8	<i>Atlantis</i>	<i>Atlantis Public Library</i>	<i>Civic Centre, Grosvenor Avenue</i>
9	<i>Bredasdorp</i>	<i>Bredasdorp Public Library</i>	<i>Church Street, Bredasdorp</i>
10	<i>Baardskeerdersbos</i>	<i>Baardskeerdersbos Winkel</i>	<i>22km from Gansbaai on Elim Road</i>
11	<i>Cape Town</i>	<i>ARCUS GIBB Cape Town</i>	<i>14 Kloof Street, Cape Town</i>

³ The copy of the Draft EIA Report was later removed by public members from the public library to the Municipal Offices in St Francis Bay to facilitate better access for the general public. An additional copy of the report was later made available at the same venue in June 2010.

No	Area	Venue	Street Address
		Offices	
12	<i>Cape Town</i>	<i>Table View Public Library</i>	<i>Birkenhead Road, Table View</i>
13	<i>Elim</i>	<i>Elim Library Depot</i>	<i>3 Waterkant Street, Elim</i>
14	<i>Gansbaai</i>	<i>Gansbaai Public Library</i>	<i>Main Road, Municipal Buildings</i>
15	<i>Hermanus</i>	<i>Hermanus Public Library</i>	<i>Civic Centre, Magnolia Street</i>
16	<i>Koeberg</i>	<i>Koeberg Public Library</i>	<i>Merchant Walk, Duynfontein</i>
17	<i>Milnerton</i>	<i>Milnerton Public Library</i>	<i>Pienaar Road</i>
18	<i>Wolverdend</i>	<i>Wolverdend Public Library</i>	<i>Ou Meule Street, Bredasdorp</i>
19	<i>Wolvengat</i>	<i>Jenny's Handelaar</i>	<i>Main Road, Wolvengat</i>
GAUTENG			
20	<i>Johannesburg</i>	<i>Arcus GIBB Sunninghill Office</i>	<i>14 Eglin Road, Sunninghill, Johannesburg</i>

7.5.4 Review period of the Draft EIA Report

The Draft EIA Report was made available for public review during the following periods:

Table 7-8: Review period for the Draft EIR

Period	Explanation	Duration/Days
06 March – 10 May 2010	Comment Period	66 days
10 May – 31 May 2010	1 st extension to comment period	21 days
31 May – 30 June 2010	2 nd extension to comment period	30 days

In total, the Draft EIA Report was in the public domain for 116 days.

7.5.5 Opportunities provided to comment on the findings of the Draft EIR

The following methods of public review of the Draft EIA Report were available:

- An English Executive Summary of the Draft EIA Report accompanied all notification letters, which were distributed to registered Interested and Affected Parties (I&APs) by mail and/or email. Afrikaans and Xhosa Executive Summaries of the Draft EIA report were made available at all meetings with I&APs.
- Submitting comments in writing to the Public Participation Office by mail, fax or email.
- Printed copies of reports were made available for viewing at the public venues, including libraries (Table 7-7).
- CD copies of reports were also distributed to key stakeholders during the review period and also made available to I&APs on request.
- Attending meetings held to discuss the contents of the Draft EIA Report.

7.5.6 Meetings held to review Draft EIR

There was a range of meetings, which included Public Meetings (Table 7-9), Focus Group Meetings (Table 7-10), Key Stakeholder Feedback Meetings (Table 7-11) and Focus Group Meetings with Specialists (Table 7-11).

The three key objectives of the meetings held as part of the Draft EIA review were:

- To present and discuss findings of the various specialist studies undertaken during the Impact Assessment Phase.

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

Table 7-9: List of meetings held to facilitate the review and obtain comments on the Draft EIR

PROVINCE	AREA AND LANGUAGES OF MEETING	DAY AND DATE	VENUE	TIME
BANTAMSKLIP SITE				
Western Cape	Hermanus (English and Afrikaans)	23 March 2010	Overstrand Municipal Auditorium	18h00 – 20h00
Western Cape	Pearly Beach (English and Afrikaans)	24 March 2010	Pearly Beach Club	18h00 – 20h00
Western Cape	Bredasdorp (English and Afrikaans)	25 March 2010	Overberg Agri Hall	18h00 – 20h00
THYSPUNT SITE				
Eastern Cape	Oyster Bay (English and Afrikaans)	13 April 2010	Oyster Bay Hall	18h00 – 20h00
Eastern Cape	Humansdorp (English and Afrikaans)	14 April 2010	Humansdorp Country Club	18h00 – 20h00
Eastern Cape	St. Francis Bay (English and Afrikaans)	15 April 2010	St. Francis Links Golf Club	18h00 – 20h00
Eastern Cape	Sea Vista (English, Afrikaans and Xhosa)	16 April 2010	Sea Vista Community Hall	18h00 – 20h00
DUYNEFONTEIN SITE				
Western Cape	Cape Town (English and Afrikaans)	19 April 2010	Vineyard Hotel, Newlands	18h00 – 20h00
Western Cape	Duynefontein (English and Afrikaans)	20 April 2010	Atlantic Beach Golf Club	18h00 – 20h00
Western Cape	Atlantis (English and Afrikaans)	21 April 2010	Thusong Community Centre	18h00 – 20h00

Table 7-10: List of Focus Group Meetings held to facilitate the review and obtain comments on the draft EIR

PROVINCE	DATE	GROUP AND LANGUAGES OF MEETING	VENUE	TIME
Eastern Cape	24 May 2010	Coega Development Corporation (English)	CDC offices	09h30 – 11h30
Eastern Cape	24 May 2010	Kouga Local Municipality (English and Afrikaans)	Municipal Offices , Jeffery's Bay	13h30 – 15h30
Eastern Cape	24 May 2010	Rebels Rus Nature Reserve landowners (English and Afrikaans)	Protea Hotel Marine	17h00 - 20h00

Table 7-11: List of Key Stakeholder Meetings

PROVINCE	DATE	PROVINCE AND TOWN	VENUE	TIME
Eastern Cape	12 April 2010	Port Elizabeth (English and Afrikaans)	Protea Hotel, Marine	10h00 – 13h00
Eastern Cape	16 April 2010	Cape St Francis (English and Afrikaans)	Cape St Francis Resort	09h00 – 12h00
Western Cape	20 April 2010	Melkbosstrand (English and Afrikaans)	Atlantic Beach Golf Club, Melkbosstrand	10h00 – 13h00

Table 7-12: List of Focus Group Meetings with specialists held to facilitate the review and obtain comments on the Draft EIR

PROVINCE	DATE	GROUP / STAKEHOLDERS	VENUE	TIME
Eastern Cape	25 May 2010	St Francis Bay/Cape St Francis Stakeholders (English and Afrikaans)	St Francis Links	09h30 - 16h00
Eastern Cape	25 May 2010	Sea Vista Public Meeting (English, Afrikaans and Xhosa)	Sea Vista Community Hall	18h00 - 20h00

Meetings with specialists were arranged in the Eastern Cape for the Greater St. Francis Bay community, including St. Francis and Sea Vista. This was in response to I&APs in the St. Francis Bay area having expressed concern over the specialist findings and requested to be provided an opportunity to engage with the specialists who undertook the investigations. The objective of focus group meetings with specialists was to allow the specialists to respond to queries raised by stakeholders. Therefore, specialists who attended meetings were those relevant to the questions raised at the public meetings.

At all meetings, I&APs were encouraged to use the language of their choice. Languages used at each meeting are reflected in Table 7-7.

Similarly to the Scoping Phase, the contents of the Draft EIA report were visually presented (Powerpoint presentations) and verbally presented and discussed.

Contributions received at these meetings were recorded and transcribed and are contained in the minutes of each meeting (Appendix D6) and incorporated into the Issues and Response Report (Appendix D8). At the request of I&APs, electronic recordings of the meetings were also made available to those who requested such recordings.

7.5.7 Consultation with Authorities

Meetings with Authorities have been held as indicated in Table 7-13:

Table 7-13: Authority meetings

Date	Authority	Area	Time
03 June 2010	Eastern Cape Department of Economic Development and Environmental Affairs	Port Elizabeth	10h00 – 13h00
07 July 2010	South African Heritage Resources Agency	Cape Town	11h00 – 13h00

The objectives of meetings held with Authorities were to
(a) update them on the EIA process; and
(b) present and discuss the findings of the Draft EIA report and the specialist reports.

7.6 Public Participation for the Revised Draft EIR

As indicated above, owing to concerns from the public about the quality and inclusivity of some of the specialist reports, the EIA team decided to revise selected specialist reports and provide a Revised Draft EIR for public review. The current Revised Draft EIR is the result of this revision.

7.6.1 Public review of the Revised Draft EIR and EMP

The Revised Draft EIR and EMP are being made available simultaneously at various public places identified in consultation with I&APs for their review and comment. A 45 calendar day period has been allocated for this review to take place.

Public participation during the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA is focused on:

- *A review of the findings of the EIA, presented in the Draft EIR and its accompanying specialist reports, with specific emphasis on the reports that have been amended since the Draft EIR was provided for public review; and*
- *Distribution of relevant reports and EIA information to the public.*

In view of concerns raised about the accessibility of the information in the DEIR, especially to communities who predominantly speak languages other than English, the Revised Draft EIR will include an Executive Summary in Afrikaans and Xhosa, as well as Xhosa and Afrikaans versions of the executive summaries of all specialist reports. Open house meetings will also be held in communities that have requested this due to is a high degree of illiteracy, in order to promote understanding of the findings of the EIA.

7.6.2 Announcing opportunity to comment on the findings of the EIA

All I&APs on the project database will be notified via personalised letters of the Draft EIR and EMP availability. All reports, including technical specialist reports, will be uploaded on the Eskom website: www.eskom.co.za/eia under "Nuclear-1" link and on Arcus GIBB's <http://projects.qibb.co.za>.

7.6.3 Public open days

Public Open Days will be held during the comment period for the Revised Draft EIR. Notices of dates for these meetings will appear in press advertisements and in individual notifications sent to I&APs.

7.6.4 Distribution of reports for public comment

Printed copies of the Revised Draft EIR will be made available at the same venues as indicated in Table 7-7.

7.6.5 Final EIR and accompanying reports

The Revised Draft EIR and accompanying reports will be amended, where appropriate, following comment received during the review period. The reports will then be submitted to the

competent authority, namely the DEA, for consideration and decision-making.

All registered stakeholders will be notified of this activity via a personalised letter and will therefore have the opportunity to access submitted final reports on the website.

7.6.6 Notification of authority decision

Stakeholders will be advised in writing of the authority decision on the EIA, in other words, on whether environmental authorisation has been granted to the project or not and the conditions of the authorisation, if positive. Stakeholders will also be advised that the decision may be appealed, and will be provided with guidance on how to do so.

7.7 Impact Assessment

7.7.1 Introduction

The purpose of the EIA Phase of an EIA is as follows:

- Address issues that have been raised during the Scoping Phase;
- Assess alternatives to the proposed activity in a comparative manner;
- Assess all identified impacts and determine the significance of each impact; and
- Formulate mitigation measures.

This section outlines the methodology (or Plan of Study for EIA – approved by the DEA on 19 January 2010) adopted for the Impact Assessment phase of the EIA process. The EIA Phase entails the integration of the specialist studies to form this comprehensive EIR.

Relevant mitigation measures have been used to compile an associated Environmental Management Plan (EMP). In addition, this section records the specific terms of reference and impact assessment methodology that were utilised by the specialist team.

7.7.2 Plan of Study for EIA

Numerous acceptable approaches and methodologies exist by which the above purpose can be achieved. The legislation in South Africa, including the guideline documents published in support thereof, does not provide a specific methodology for the assessment of impacts.

Rather, an assessment framework is provided within which environmental assessment practitioners are expected to structure a project-specific assessment methodology. This assessment framework recognises that there are different methodologies available for assessing the impact of a development but that the specific methodology selected must provide for the following⁴:

- A clear process for impact identification, prediction and evaluation;
- Specification of impact identification techniques;
- Criteria for evaluating the significance of impacts;
- Design of mitigation measures to address impacts;
- Defining types of impacts (direct, indirect or cumulative); and
- Specification of uncertainties.

⁴ DEAT (2005) *Guideline 3: General Guide to the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations, 2005, Integrated Environmental Management Guideline Series*, Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism (DEAT), Pretoria

7.7.3 Specialist Studies

As a result of the nature and scale of the proposed project and the potential impacts on the environment, and resulting from the comments received during the Scoping Phase, various specialist studies were identified for the EIA process. The comments raised during the public participation process described above, and which were recorded in the Issues and Response Report (IRR), were used to develop the Terms of Reference provided to the specialist teams. In addition, independent specialists reviewed the specialist reports prepared for this process to ensure a high standard of technical quality.

The specialists appointed (**Table 7-8**) were required to outline the methodology they used, and clearly identify assumptions and sources of information. The knowledge of local people was incorporated in the study, where relevant. The description of the study approach included a short discussion of the appropriateness of the methods used in the specialist study in terms of local and international trends with respect to the specific practice. The key components outlined in the sections that follow formed part of the specialist Terms of Reference. **Table 7-14** summarises the specialist studies.

Table 7-14: EIA specialist team members and their fields of expertise

Task/ Discipline/ Local Involvement	Team Leaders	Organisation	Appendix no. of report (if applicable)
Support Team (Reviewers, Advisors and Consultants)			
Nuclear Specialist Reviewers	Jean-Marc Lavanchy	Colenco Power Engineering Ltd., Switzerland ⁵	n.a.
	Lucien Teunckens		
Peer Reviewers (Technical and EIA Process)	Mark Wood	Mark Wood Consultants ⁶	Appendix I
	Sean O'Beirne	SE Solutions	
Legal Advisor	Nicholas Smith	Nicholas Smith and Associates	n.a.
PPP Consultant	Dieter Heinsohn / Bongji Shinga	ACER Africa	n.a.
Technical Specialists			
Dune Geomorphology	Dr. Werner Illenberger	Illenberger and Associates	Appendix E2
Geological Hazard Assessment	Irma Hattingh / Johann Neveling	Council for Geoscience	Appendix E3
Seismic Risk Assessment			Appendix E4
Geotechnical characteristics			Appendix E5
Hydrology	Peter Rosewarne	SRK Consulting	Appendix E6
Geo-hydrology			Appendix E7
Fresh Water Supply			Appendix E8
Position of the 1:100 year Floodline	Stephen Luger	Prestedge Retief Dresner Wijnberg	Appendix E9
Air Quality and Climate Assessment	Lucian Burger / Prof. Hannes Rautenbach	Airshed Planning Professionals and University of Pretoria ⁷	Appendix E10
Flora	Barrie Low	Coastec	Appendix E11
Freshwater Ecology (Wetlands)	Dr. Liz Day	The Freshwater Consulting Group	Appendix E12
Vertebrate Fauna	Dr. James Harrison	UCT Avian Demography Unit	Appendix E13

⁵ These reviewers have not yet reviewed the report and will be used if necessary.

⁶ Janet Bodenstein of the Environmental Evaluation Unit of the University of Cape Town was the peer reviewer during the Scoping Phase. Due to her subsequent employment by the City of Cape Town and the resultant potential conflict of interest, she withdrew as peer reviewer in March 2008.

⁷ Mark Tadross of the Climate Systems Analysis Group of the University of Cape Town was the specialist during the Scoping Phase.

Task/ Discipline/ Local Involvement	Team Leaders	Organisation	Appendix no. of report (if applicable)
Invertebrate Fauna	Peter Hawkes	AfriBugs ⁸	Appendix E14
Marine Biology	Prof. Charles Griffiths / Tamara Robinson	UCT Marine Biology Research Institute	Appendix E15
Oceanography <i>and surf breaks</i>	Rhys Giljam	WSP Environmental Consultants ⁹	Appendix E16
Economic Impact Assessment	Gavin Maasdorp / William and David Mullins	Imani Development: Economic, Trade and Development Consultants / Conningarth Economists	Appendix E17
Social Impact Assessment	Alewijn Dippenaar	Octagonal Development ¹⁰	Appendix E18
Visual Impact Assessment	Alan Cave	Bapela Cave Klapwijk	Appendix E19
Heritage Impact Assessment	Dr. Tim Hart	UCT Archaeological Contracts Office	Appendix E20
Agricultural Potential Assessment	Jon Howcroft, Gavin Maasdorp	Imani Development: Economic, Trade and Development Consultants	Appendix E21
Tourism Impact Assessment	David Scott, Gavin Maasdorp	Imani Development: Economic, Trade and Development Consultants	Appendix E22
Noise Assessment	Adrian Jongens	Jongens Keet and Associates	Appendix E23
Human Health Risk Assessment	Willie Van Niekerk	Infotox	Appendix E24
Traffic and Transportation	Andrew Bulman, Nuran Nordien, Yusry Frizlar	Arcus GIBB	Appendix E25
Emergency Response Assessment	Mogwera Koathane (with amendments by Peter Rosewarne)	SRK	Appendix E26
Site Control Assessment	Peter Rosewarne	SRK	Appendix E27
Eskom Grid Planning Report	n.a.	Eskom	Appendix E28
Radioactive Waste Management	Japie van Blerk	Aquisim Consulting	Appendix E29
Debris flow and flooding	Dr. Werner Illenberger	Illenberger and Associates	Appendix E30

(a) Description of the affected environment

A description of the affected environment was provided. The focus of this description was relevant to the specialist's field of expertise. The specialist provided an indication of the sensitivity of the affected environment. Sensitivity, in this context, refers to the "ability" of an affected environment to tolerate disturbance, for example, if disturbance of the natural habitat results in the permanent loss of its biodiversity, the affected environment could be categorised as having a "low tolerance" to disturbance and is, therefore, termed a highly sensitive habitat. If, on the other hand, a habitat is able to withstand significant disturbance without a marked impact on its biodiversity, the affected environment could be categorised as having a high tolerance to disturbance (i.e. "low sensitivity" habitat).

⁸ Dr Mike Picker of University of Cape Town was the specialists during the Scoping Phase.

⁹ Prof. Frank Shillington of the University of Cape Town was the specialist during the Scoping Phase.

¹⁰ Octagonal Development was assisted by Tony Barbour (an independent SIA consultant) and Dr Neville Bews of Neville Bews and Associates.

(b) Legislation, policies and guidelines

A literature review of legislation, policies and guidelines applicable to the specialist study was conducted, and summarised for each specialist study. The specialists drew on this literature review as necessary when describing the assessment alternatives, and completing the impact identification and assessment. In particular, these documents assisted in providing a basis for determining the significance of potential impacts. In many cases, applicable legislation, policies and guidelines have also been drawn from to provide effective mitigation measures and management recommendations.

(c) Assessment of alternatives

Flowing from the recommendations made *at the scoping phase* and the DEA's approval of the Scoping Report in 2009, the following sites have been investigated further in the EIA Phase of the EIA process:

- Duynefontein;
- Bantamsklip; and
- Thyspunt.

(d) Impact identification and assessment

The specialists were required to make a clear statement, identifying the environmental impacts of the construction, operation, decommissioning and management of the proposed development. As far as possible, the specialist had to quantify the suite of potential environmental impacts identified in the study and assess the significance of the impacts according to the criteria set out in **Table 7-10**.

Each impact was assessed and rated as per the methodology described in **Section 7-7** below. The impact assessment provided an evaluation of the significance of each of the three phases of the project (i.e. design, construction and operational phases). The assessment of the data where possible was based on accepted scientific techniques, failing which the specialist made informed judgements based on his/her professional expertise and experience.

(e) Mitigation measures

Feasible and practical mitigation measures were recommended in order to minimise negative impacts and to enhance the benefits of positive impacts. The mitigation measures further addressed:

- Mitigation objectives: The level of mitigation being targeted?
For each identified impact, the specialists provided mitigation objectives, which would result in a measurable reduction of the impact. Where limited knowledge or expertise exists on such mitigation, the specialists consulted with other specialists on the team failing which the specialists again made a judgement call based on his/her professional experience.
- Recommended mitigation measures
For each impact the specialist recommended practicable mitigation actions that can measurably affect the significance rating. The specialists also identified management actions that could enhance the condition of the environment. Where no mitigation is considered feasible, this was stated and reasons provided.
- Effectiveness of mitigation measures
The specialists provided quantifiable standards (performance criteria) for reviewing or tracking the effectiveness of the proposed mitigation actions, where possible, as this will be utilised when drafting the monitoring component of the EMP.

- Recommended monitoring and evaluation programme
The specialists recommended an appropriate monitoring and auditing programme, which would be able to track the efficacy of the mitigation objectives. Each environmental impact was assessed before and after mitigation measures are implemented in order to show how effective or not mitigation will be. The management objectives, design standards etc., which, if achieved, can eliminate, minimise or enhance potential impacts or benefits were expressed as measurable targets where possible.

Once the above objectives are stated, feasible management actions, which can be applied as mitigation, were provided. A duplicate column in the impact assessment tables indicated how the application of the proposed mitigation or management actions has reduced the impact.

7.7.4 Specialist Peer Reviews

All reports produced during the EIA Phase of the EIA were peer reviewed for internal quality control purposes ***in the initial phases of the EIA for the first draft of specialist report, the comments provided were considered and incorporated into the final draft of the specialist reports prior to releasing to the public for comment.*** These reviews provided the EAP with an additional quality check, ensuring that all reports are objective and scientifically accurate. A comprehensive review panel was established, which included specialists in the respective specialist fields for all specialist studies (**Table 7-12**). Further peer reviews include legal review specialists, process review specialist as well as a nuclear review specialist. ***In addition to the peer review of specialist reports, a comprehensive review of the EIA process and Draft EIR has been performed. The results thereof are attached as Appendix I. The review team for this is indicated in Table 7-14.***

Table 7-15: Peer review team

Discipline	Reviewer	Organisation
Geology	Tim Partridge (late)	University of the Witwatersrand
Seismology	Johan de Beer	CSIR (retired)
Geohydrology	Christine Colvin	CSIR
Geotechnical Assessment	Jan Wuim	Stellenbosch University
Botanical Impact Assessment	Prof. Roy Lubke	Rhodes University
Fauna (Invertebrates)	Dawid Jacobs	University of Pretoria
Fauna (Vertebrates)	Tony Williams	Cape Nature Conservation
Hydrology	Arthur Chapman	Council for Scientific and Industrial Research
Freshwater Supply	Allan Bailey	SSI
Freshwater Ecology / Wetlands	Paul da Cruz	SIVEST Environmental Division
Oceanography	Eddie Bosman	University of Stellenbosch
Marine Biology	Prof. George Branch	UCT Zoology Department (retired)
Air Quality and Climatology	Donald Lush	2055218 Ontario Limited
Social	Greg Huggins	Water for Africa
Economic Impact	Randall Gross	African Development Economic Consultants
Human Health Risk Assessment	Michael Holiday	Michael Holiday and Associates
Agricultural Impact Assessment	Garry Paterson	Agricultural Research Council
Noise Impact Assessment	François Malherbe	François Malherbe Acoustic Consulting cc
Visual Impact	John Drummond	John Drummond Landscape

Discipline	Reviewer	Organisation
Assessment		Architects
Archaeology and Heritage	Prof. John Parkington	UCT Archaeology Unit
Tourism	Dave Blair	SIVEST Environmental Division
Accessibility and Transport	Stef Naude	HHO Africa
Emergency Response	Jeff Lafortune	International Safety Research
Site Control/Safety	Shane Mothaloga	Malepe Consulting
Geomorphology	Prof. Isak Rust	Earth Science Consulting

The peer reviewers were required to carry out the following during the Impact Assessment Phase of the EIA:

- Assess the relevant specialist study report in terms of its fulfilment of the Terms of Reference set;
- Consider whether the report is entirely objective;
- Consider whether the report is technically, scientifically and professionally credible;
- Consider whether the method and the study approach is defensible;
- Identify whether there are any information gaps, omissions or errors;
- Consider whether the recommendations presented are sensible and present the best options;
- Consider whether there are alternative viewpoints around issues presented in the report and if these are clearly stated;
- Consider whether the style of the report is written so as to make it accessible to non-specialists, technical jargon is explained and impacts are described using comparative analogies where necessary; and
- Report on whether normal standards of professional practice and competence have been met.

A Review Report template was provided for use during completion of the above assessment. The peer reviewer was required to complete all sections of the Review Report template, with due reference to the:

- Guideline for the review of the specialist input in EIA processes (CSIR and DEAD&P, 2005);
- DEAT guideline for Review in EIA, Integrated Environmental Management Information Series (DEAT, 2004);
- Terms of Reference provided to the relevant specialist author; and
- Final Scoping Report and Issues and Response Report contained therein.

The peer review team's *Curricula Vitae* can be found in **Appendix E1**.

7.8 Impact Assessment Methodology

The objective of the assessment of impacts is to identify and assess all the significant impacts that may arise as a result of the NPS. In the Impact Assessment Phase, additional impacts were identified through the various specialist studies to be undertaken and through ongoing I&AP consultation.

In order to assess impacts that relate to more than one element of the environment (e.g. visual quality and land use), certain specialists were likely to require information obtained from other specialists. An integration workshop was therefore held to ensure that all specialists and the applicant have a common understanding of the receiving environment and issues related to

the project are addressed in a synergistic manner. For each of the two main project phases (construction and operation), the existing and potential future impacts and benefits (associated only with the proposed development) were described using the criteria listed below.

7.8.1 Impact Assessment Rating Criteria

In accordance with Government Notice R.385, promulgated in terms of Section 24 of the NEMA and the criteria drawn from the IEM Guidelines Series, Guideline 5: Assessment of Alternatives and Impacts, published by the DEAT (April 1998) specialists were required to describe and assess the potential impacts in terms of the criteria as indicated in **Table 7-16**. This table provides a summary of the criteria and the rating scales that were used. The assignment of ratings has been undertaken based on past experience of the EIA team, the professional judgement of the specialists as well as through research. Subsequently, mitigation measures have been identified and considered for each impact and the assessment repeated in order to determine the significance of the residual impacts (the impact remaining after the mitigation measure has been implemented).

Subsequence to the release of the Draft EIR for comment, the peer reviewers of the Draft EIR indicated that improvements could be made to the method for assessing the significance of environmental impacts to ensure greater consistency in the assessments by different specialists. As a result thereof, the criteria for assessing impact significance have been comprehensively revised. These criteria, which result in a rating of consequence (the seriousness of the impact) and probability (the likelihood of the impact occurring) are combined to produce a significance rating. A detailed explanation of the criteria is provided below.

Table 7-16: Impact assessment criteria and rating scales

Criteria	Rating Scales	Notes
Nature	Positive	<i>This is an evaluation of the type of effect the construction, operation and management of the proposed NPS development would have on the affected environment.</i>
	Negative	
	Neutral	
Extent	Low	<i>Site-specific, affects only the development footprint</i>
	Medium	<i>Local (limited to the site and its immediate surroundings, including the surrounding towns and settlements within a 10 km radius);</i>
	High	<i>Regional (beyond a 10 km radius) to national</i>
Duration	Low	<i>0-3 years (i.e. duration of the construction phase)</i>
	Medium	<i>4-8 years</i>
	High	<i>9 years to permanent</i>
Intensity	Low	<i>Where the impact affects the environment in such a way that natural, cultural and social functions and processes are minimally affected</i>
	Medium	<i>Where the affected environment is altered but natural, cultural and social functions and processes continue albeit in a modified way; and valued, important, sensitive or vulnerable systems or communities are negatively affected</i>

Criteria	Rating Scales	Notes
	High	<i>Where natural, cultural or social functions and processes are altered to the extent that the natural process will temporarily or permanently cease; and valued, important, sensitive or vulnerable systems or communities are substantially affected.</i>
Potential for impact on irreplaceable resources	Low	<i>No irreplaceable resources will be impacted.</i>
	Medium	<i>Resources that will be impacted can be replaced, with effort.</i>
	High	<i>There is no potential for replacing a particular vulnerable resource that will be impacted.</i>
Consequence (a combination of extent, duration, intensity and the potential for impact on irreplaceable resources).	Low	<i>A combination of any of the following</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Intensity, duration, extent and impact on irreplaceable resources are all rated low</i> • <i>Intensity is low and up to two of the other criteria are rated medium</i> • <i>Intensity is medium and all three other criteria are rated low</i>
	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Intensity is medium and at least two of the other criteria are rated medium</i>
	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Intensity and impact on irreplaceable resources are rated high, with any combination of extent and duration</i> • <i>Intensity is rated high, with all of the other criteria being rated medium or higher.</i>
Probability (the likelihood of the impact occurring)	Low	<i>It is highly unlikely or less than 50 % likely that an impact will occur.</i>
	Medium	<i>It is between 50 and 70 % certain that the impact will occur.</i>
	High	<i>It is more than 75 % certain that the impact will occur or it is definite that the impact will occur.</i>
Significance (all impacts including potential cumulative impacts)	Low	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Low consequence and low probability</i> • <i>Low consequence and medium probability</i> • <i>Low consequence and high probability</i>
	Low to medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Low consequence and high probability</i> • <i>Medium consequence and low probability</i>
	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Medium consequence and low probability</i> • <i>Medium consequence and medium probability</i> • <i>Medium consequence and high probability</i> • <i>High consequence and low probability</i>
	Medium to high	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>High consequence and medium probability</i>
	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>High consequence and high probability</i>

An explanation of the impact criteria is provided below. Only the above-mentioned criteria were taken into account in the assessment of impact significance. In addition, the degree of confidence in the prediction of impacts, the nature of applicable mitigation measures and legal requirements applicable to the impacts have been described by the specialists.

(a) Nature

This is an evaluation of the type of effect the construction, operation and management of the proposed NPS development would have on the affected environment. Will the impact change in the environment be positive, negative or neutral? This description must include what will be affected and the manner in which the effect will transpire. It is important to describe the impact (the change in the environment), and not the source of the impact.

(b) Extent or scale

This refers to the spatial scale at which the impact will occur. Extent of the impact is described as: low (site-specific - affecting only the footprint of the development), medium (limited to the site and its immediate surroundings and closest towns) and high (regional and national). Extent or scale refers to the actual physical footprint of the impact, not to the spatial significance. It is acknowledged that some impacts, even though they may be of small extent, are of very high importance, e.g. impacts on species of very restricted range. In order to avoid “double counting, specialists have been requested to indicate spatial significance under “intensity” or “impact on irreplaceable resources” but not under “extent” as well.

(c) Duration

The lifespan of the impact is indicated as low (short-term - 0-9 years, typically impacts that are quickly reversible within the construction phase of the project), medium-term (10-15 years, reversible over time) and high (long-term, 15-60 years, and continue for the operational life span of the power station).

(d) Intensity or severity

This is a relative evaluation within the context of all the activities and the other impacts within the framework of the project. Does the activity destroy the impacted environment, alter its functioning, or render it slightly altered? The specialist studies must attempt to quantify the magnitude of the impacts and outline the rationale used.

(e) Impact on irreplaceable resources

This refers to the potential for an environmental resource to be replaced, should it be impacted. A resource could possibly be replaced by natural processes (e.g. by natural colonisation from surrounding areas), through artificial means (e.g. by reseeding disturbed areas or replanting rescued species) or by providing a substitute resource, in certain cases. In natural systems, providing substitute resources is usually not possible, but in social systems substitutes are often possible (e.g. by constructing new social facilities for those that are lost). Should it not be possible to replace a resource, the resource is essentially irreplaceable e.g. red data species that are restricted to a particular site or habitat of very limited extent.

(f) Consequence

The consequence of the potential impacts is a summation of above criteria, namely the extent, duration, intensity and impact on irreplaceable resources.

(g) Probability of occurrence

The probability of the impact actually occurring based on professional experience of the specialist with environments of a similar nature to the site and/or with similar projects. Probability is described as low (improbable), medium (distinct possibility), and high (most likely). It is important to distinguish between probability of the impact occurring and probability that the activity causing a potential impact will occur.

Probability is defined as the probability of the impact occurring, not as the probability of the activities that may result in the impact. The fact that an activity will occur does not necessarily imply that an impact will occur. For instance, the fact that a road will be built does not necessarily imply that it will impact on a wetland. If the road is properly routed to avoid the wetland, the impact may not occur at all, or the probability of the impact will be low, even though it is certain that the activity will occur.

(h) Significance

Impact significance is defined to be a combination of the consequence (as described below) and probability of the impact occurring. The relationship between consequence and probability highlights that the risk (or impact significance) must be evaluated in terms of the seriousness (consequence) of the impact, weighted by the probability of the impact actually occurring. The following analogy provides an illustration of the relationship between consequence and probability. The use of a vehicle may result in an accident (an impact) with multiple fatalities, not only for the driver of the vehicle, but also for passengers and other road users. There are certain mitigation measures (e.g. the use of seatbelts, adhering to speed limits, airbags, anti-lock braking, etc.) that may reduce the consequence or probability or both. The probability of the impact is low enough that millions of vehicle users are prepared to accept the risk of driving a vehicle on a daily basis. Similarly, the consequence of an aircraft crashing is very high, but the risk is low enough that thousands of passengers happily accept this risk to travel by air on a daily basis.

In simple terms, if the consequence and probability of an impact is high, then the impact will have a high significance. The significance defines the level to which the impact will influence the proposed development and/or environment. It determines whether mitigation measures need to be identified and implemented and whether the impact is important for decision-making.

(i) Degree of confidence in predictions

Specialists were required to provide an indication of the degree of confidence (low, medium or high) that there is in the predictions made for each impact, based on the available information and their level of knowledge and expertise. Degree of confidence is not taken into account in the determination of consequence or probability.

(j) Mitigation measures

Mitigation measures are designed to reduce the consequence or probability of an impact, or to reduce both consequence and probability. The significance of impacts has been assessed both with mitigation and without mitigation.

(k) Legal requirements

The specialist identified and listed the relevant South African legislation and permit requirements pertaining to the development proposals. Reference must be provided to the procedures required to obtain permits and describe whether the development proposals have the potential to trigger applicable licensing or permit requirements.

To apply the criteria and to assist in identifying the appropriate significance rating, an Excel spreadsheet was developed to automatically tally the ratings per criterion so that specialists did not have to painstakingly apply the conditions in the impact criteria and come up with a consequence and significance rating. This also ensured consistency amongst the different specialists.

The result of the above assessment methodology will be linked to authority decision-making by Authorities in the following manner:

- ***Low – will not have an influence on the decision to proceed with the proposed***

project, provided that recommended mitigation measures to mitigate impacts are implemented;

- *Medium – should influence the decision to proceed with the proposed project, provided that recommended measures to mitigate impacts are implemented; and*
- *High – would strongly influence the decision to proceed with the proposed project regardless of mitigation measures.*

7.8.2 Determination of preferred alternatives

The utilisation of standard impact assessment rating methodology by all specialists enabled the comparison of the overall significance of the impacts imposed by the NPS at the three alternative sites. Given the nature of the proposed development, and the wide spectrum of specialist studies undertaken for the proposed development, it was necessary to assign values of relative importance to certain specialist studies i.e. certain specialist studies were weighted of higher importance than others. The weighting of specialist studies was agreed at a specialist integration meeting held in November 2009. Criteria used in assigning weighting to different criteria included whether or not legal protection or policy guidelines are in existence for particular resources, the scarcity of resources and whether particular resources are essentially irreplaceable. The weighting is explained in **Chapter 9**. In addition to site alternatives, other alternatives (e.g. access alternatives and fresh water supply alternatives) were also assessed at a specialist integration meeting **held on 25 and 26 November 2009, after the draft specialist reports had been completed.**

7.8.3 Authority review

Once the public review period has closed all the comments received from the public will be considered and included into both the EIR and EMP reports. Subsequently, the final documents will be submitted to all relevant Authorities for review, comment and decision-making.

As mentioned in Chapters 1 and 6 of this report, the NNR and DEA signed a co-operative agreement to agree on the way in which these organs of state need to exercise their decision-making powers in EIAs where radiation issues are a key issue. Thus, with respect to radiological issues, these issues are better placed within the decision-making process of the NNR than within the DEA's decision-making process. The consideration of these same issues in the EIA process could be considered duplication of work that could be considered as unnecessary duplication.

The NNR will provide DEA with a response to specific questions on radiological issues put forward by the DEA. However, the responsibility to decide on the assessment contained in the EIA Report remains with the DEA. The EIA reports and studies thus provide the DEA with comprehensive assessments related to the radiological aspects of the project, amongst others. The process that is undertaken to receive an environmental authorisation is therefore as follows:

- All EIA reports and associated documents are submitted to DEA;
- DEA will send all reports and studies requiring NNR review and comment to the NNR;
- The NNR will submit comments and recommendations on the EIA reports and studies received to the DEA; and
- The DEA will use the NNR comments to inform their decision regarding environmental authorisation.

The EIA reports and studies that have, and will be, submitted to the NNR via the DEA are:

- The Draft Environmental Impact Report and Environmental Management Plan (including all appendices); and
- The Final Environmental Impact Report and Environmental Management Plan (including all appendices).

7.8.4 Authorisation

On receipt of an authorisation (positive or negative), all registered I&APs will be informed of the decision and the associated terms and conditions by the most appropriate method, including normal mail, email and facsimile. I&APs will also be reminded of the appeal process and the timeframes in which to submit any appeals in the event that they wish to appeal the Authorities decision.