

## Public Safety Information Forum Meeting held at the Koeberg Visitors Centre on 29 March 2012

**Chairperson:** Mr Clarence Mentor (absent)

**Deputy Chairperson:** Ms Smokie La Grange

### **ATTENDEES**

Mr N Lee  
Mr and Ms Mayhew  
Mr J Pereira  
Mr and Ms Williamson  
Ms R Adair  
Ms G Adair  
Mr D Lingard  
Mr Maigrot  
Mr J A Slabbert  
Mr J Taylor

### **OFFICIALS**

Ms D Joshua (*Senior Advisor Stakeholder Management - Eskom*)  
Ms P Henkeman (*Communication Officer – Visitors Centre*)  
Ms V Majola (*Senior Inspector – NNR Koeberg Site Office*)  
Mr L Phidza (*Stakeholder Management Manager - Eskom*)  
Mr K Featherstone (*Acting General Manager Nuclear Support - Eskom*)  
Mr J Dyabaza (*Senior Advisor Stakeholder Management – Eskom*)  
Ms Carin de Villiers (*Parliamentary Affairs Manager*)  
Mr J Norman (*Infrastructure Manager (Acting)*)  
Mr T Booyesen (*Middle Manager Design Basis*)  
Mr D Nicholls (*General Manager – Nuclear Engineering*)  
Mr N Foster (*Chief Physicist – Eskom*)  
Mr LK Ndube (*Chief Engineer – Eskom*)  
Mr R Bakardien (*Koeberg Operating Unit Power Station Manager*)  
Mr M Saaymans (*Manager Emergency Management – Eskom*)  
Mr S Van Rensburg (*Head of Disaster Management Centre (CoCT) – Area North*)

### **1. Welcome and Opening:**

The Deputy Chair, Ms La Grange welcomed everyone to the meeting and for coming out to attend the PSIF in the rainy weather. She apologises as she had a very bad fall and suffered a very bad sprain in her right ankle and hence is wheelchair bound. Ms La Grange confirmed that there is a quorum present as per the Constitution. The Chairperson or Deputy Chair and four members of the public constitute a quorum.

## **2. Apologies:**

The following apologies were tendered.

- Ms B Rass
- Ms MJ Van Vuuren
- Mr La Grange
- Mr G Pillay
- Ms A Lee
- Mr Riedewaan Bakardien (Koeberg PSM)
- Mr T Wilson

### **Question by Mr Williamson:**

Is there a rule about the Chairperson or Deputy Chairperson not attending a certain number of PSIF meetings or a rule that they have to attend a certain number of consecutive meetings? The reason I ask is because I can't remember seeing the Chair of the PSIF for quite a few meetings now.

### **Response by Deputy Chairperson:**

We're going to put it back into the hands of the NNR and I hope to have a response for you by the next meeting. We only heard that he will be unavailable again, two days ago. So I came in a wheelchair because I couldn't let you down. So I will get feedback to you from the NNR on the situation, as this is unacceptable.

## **3. Acceptance of the Minutes of the previous meeting:**

The Deputy Chair checked whether everyone received the minutes and confirmed that she had posted Mr Lee's minutes. She acknowledged and apologised that the minutes were late due to the technical problems experienced and due to the noisiness of the pub (Koeberg Club) where the last meeting was held.

### **Corrections:**

Mr Mayhew mentioned the following correction on Pg. 11, his wife was quoted as Sheilah Mayhew it should be Sylvia Mayhew.

Mr Lee noted the following correction on Pg. 3 it should be dot.docx not dot doc.

### **Comment by Mr Mayhew:**

Mr Mayhew commented that the Minutes were not as good as what they had been.

### **Response by Deputy Chair:**

We realise that. The recording equipment broke down; we couldn't hear. Trying to put the minutes together was an interesting exercise. They will improve.

### **Comment by Mr Mayhew:**

They have been good; they just were not as good as they have been.

### **Response by the Deputy Chair:**

The recording equipment tonight is working 100%.

The Minutes of the meeting were accepted by Mr Mayhew and seconded by Mr Williamson.

#### **4. Matters arising from the previous minutes**

**Comment by Mr Lee:**

I don't recall receiving the amended Constitution since after the deadline at the end of December 2011.

**Response by the Deputy Chair:**

We did not receive any comments on the Constitution other than from Mr Lee.

**Comment by the Deputy Chair:**

Seeing that we're talking about the Constitution, we can either agree to accept the Constitution in its current state and we can put it to the vote and if it is accepted it's accepted. Or we have three more months and then it's the ABF and it will be accepted in June. I think it's probably a good idea to put it to the vote. You can decide if you want to accept the Constitution in its current unchanged format?

**Comment by the Deputy Chair:**

We can do it by a show of hands, *yes we accept the Constitution*, or *no, we don't accept the Constitution*, and if it's no, then it's three months and then it's June and that's it.

**Comment by Mr Williamson:**

I think we should send the Constitution out via email to everyone and have it as an Agenda item in the next meeting. We've waited so long, so three months isn't going to spoil anything.

**Response by the Deputy Chairperson:**

Are we going to accept the Constitution in its present form?

**Comment by the Deputy Chair:**

There is no show of hands so we will send out the Constitution (amended, with your comments Mr Lee) via email or as per the address we have for the members, and then in June in the middle of winter where we usually just about make a quorum, we'll accept it, hopefully.

**Comment by Mr Featherstone**

With the Constitution being on the Agenda for the next meeting and if we are going to vote on it in the next meeting, we need to have all the comments back as well and not have any new comments in the meeting, that's all I'm asking, in the interest of moving forward, otherwise it's never going to happen.

**Response by the Deputy Chair:**

That's a fair comment.

**Comment by Mr Featherstone:**

So we will send it out in due time but we don't want comments in the meeting, we want comments before the meeting so that we can put it out to the members informing them what the comments were and how they have been incorporated rather than us trying to debate the new comments in the next meeting.

**Response by the Deputy Chair:**

Thank you.

**Comment by the Deputy Chair:**

There was another thing about the venue, especially in June when its pouring down with rain and those stairs are wet and difficult to ascend and descend. We were thinking about changing the venue in June to possibly Elkanah School in Table View. I don't know if this will disconcert people or if it will be easier to go there. At least it's easier to park and to get into the hall, more sheltered, shall I say. Because coming up these stairs in the wind and the rain is not easy. I wonder if you'll be amenable to a change of venue to accommodate the weather.

**Suggestions from the floor were:**

- Koeberg Club
- Van Riebeeckstrand Primary School
- The new High School in Melkbosstrand

**Response by the Deputy Chairperson:**

We will consider these suggestions and look at all the possibilities.

**Comment by the Deputy Chairperson:**

Can we move on to item 5 on the Agenda? It's a presentation by Mr Stephen van Rensburg Disaster Management Manager from the City of Cape Town.

**Emergency Traffic Evacuation Model by Mr Stephen van Rensburg –  
Head: Area North – Disaster Management Centre (CoCT):****Statement by Mr van Rensburg:**

I'd like to make a slight amendment to item number 5. It's not in fact the presentation on the Traffic Evacuation Model. The reason for that is because the first revision of the Traffic Evacuation Model is not yet complete. I'll just mention to you that the City of Cape Town (CoCT) has entered into a Memorandum of Agreement with the Operator, Eskom Koeberg, as well as the Provincial Government and it would not be prudent for my colleague from the Transport Planning Department to present the findings of that provision of the Traffic Evacuation Model prior to having full consensus amongst the signatories to that Agreement. It is a very important matter I'm sure you'll all appreciate that. Much has been done and it's close to being finalised, but it is not yet ready to be presented.

**Comment by Mr Mayhew:**

So if something went wrong tomorrow, we've got nothing. We've waited for over a year for you to come tonight to tell us.

**Response by Mr Van Rensburg:**

If something went wrong tomorrow, the Public Safety Information Forum would not have had any information on the updated Traffic Evacuation Model. Let me just clarify one thing, the Traffic Evacuation Model is the means by which the City of Cape Town must demonstrate to the National Nuclear Regulator (NNR) that it can evacuate the particular zones within a particular time frame, namely 4 hours for the 5km and 16 hours for up to the 16km Emergency Planning Zone. All other information is available to the public it's just the Traffic Evacuation Model, how the model works and the outputs of that model that will not be presented to this Forum this evening. Other than that I don't believe the Forum is lacking in any other information unless I'm missing something. So we just thought that we'd fill in for our colleagues from the Transport Management Centre. I'm not sure whether a presentation on Disaster Management within the City, how it's structured, how it works and some of our roles and functions around the preparation, planning and response for any incident at Koeberg has ever been done before so we thought this information is worthwhile presenting to the public. So I'll give you some background on what our approach is to disaster management and a brief look at our structure based on our approach to disaster management. We'll have a look at some of the important protective actions that the City and all the other intervening organisations are involved in in terms of the Koeberg Emergency Plan. I'd like to invite you to stop me at any time during the presentation when you have questions or you have issues that require clarity and I'll try and answer them to the best of my ability. I'd also like to extend this invitation to my colleagues from Eskom and the NNR, if there's anything they'd like to add that may add value, or anybody else for that matter, to please feel free to do so.

**Question by Mr Williamson:**

What do you consider a disaster?

**Answer by Mr Van Rensburg:**

A disaster is generally considered to be a situation that exceeds a community or an area's ability to cope, using their own resources.

**Question by Mr Mayhew:**

What would you call the Seli I on Table View Beach?

**Answer by Mr Van Rensburg:**

An incident.

**Question by Mr Mayhew:**

Not a disaster then? You could have oil all over the place?

**Answer by Mr van Rensburg:**

When you talk about a disaster in terms of Disaster Management and in terms of Legislation and the framework which I've referred to earlier, that has to be declared. If I use the Seli I as an example, if they plough all our resources into the situation and we still don't manage to mitigate the situation then a disaster is declared so that additional manpower, resources etc are made available, and funding is made available so that we can deal with that situation. So a disaster is declared when an area's ability to cope is exceeded. The last declared disaster in Cape Town was in 2008 with the Xenophobia. The City could not deal with it and the Province had to take over, and declared a disaster. The City is not geared to

deal with issues of social conflict; it's not within the ambit of the Municipality to provide services that deal with social conflict issues, ours are to deal with health, disaster management and engineering services etc.

**Question by Mr Lingard**

Would you not consider that if something happens at Koeberg as a disaster big enough for the City to take over and not leave it to be handled locally?

**Answer by Mr Van Rensburg:**

It depends on what situation happens at Koeberg?

**Response by Mr Lingard:**

I'm talking about an explosion for example.

**Answer by Mr Van Rensburg:**

Large, worst case scenario - a release. In all likelihood a disaster would most certainly be declared. In all likelihood it would possibly even be a National Disaster. It would most certainly be a local disaster and most certainly be a Provincial disaster and there's a very good chance that it could be National Disaster depending on the severity.

**Comment by Mr Taylor:**

If one looks at the Japanese example, the problem that we have with having a definition left in the hands the officials or politicians, is that they won't make the decision to declare a disaster until it's too late for the resources to be made available to effectively cope with the problem before it actually becomes a disaster.

**Answer by Mr Van Rensburg:**

That is fair comment. Our experience over the years has shown that to be correct and in many instances to be true. People are reluctant, Local Authorities, Provincial Governments even National Government are reluctant to declare disasters, they wait and wait and ask: "can't we hold out?" So you are absolutely correct. But the Disaster Management Act Legislation makes it a lot easier today, for example, in the City of Cape Town, the Mayor may declare a Local Disaster.

**Comment by Mr Saaymans:**

Just to add to your point, we have a local plan (the City's plan), a Provincial Plan and a National Plan. Contained within the National Plan it states that if we declare a General Emergency at Koeberg it will automatically be classified as a National Disaster. I think that makes it better in our situation that a National Disaster is declared immediately.

**Response by Mr Van Rensburg:**

That is correct, thank you Martin. Yes, there certainly is reluctance on the part of Government to declare disasters.

**Question by Mr Lingard:**

Coming back to my point: is there a mechanism for people on the outside to be able to evaluate a set of criteria that are available in the public domain that would say, if you've gone from step 1 to 10 you are then in a disaster and how those steps progress? In particular, if one looks at the evaluation of something happening at Koeberg. At the

moment it's in the hands of officials and politicians and it sounds as if it's going to stay there and that it's not ever going to reside in the hands of the public who is most at risk, and they are not in control of their fate. What I'm saying is that we need a mechanism that allows the public to say you have now gone past stage 3 and 4 and therefore it becomes a disaster.

**Response by Mr Van Rensburg:**

At this point in time as you've said, it's within the officials' domain to make that declaration. I don't know of any forum at this point in time that exists to be able to do this. Once again it depends on circumstances. People are heard, and in any situation where that happens people make a valuable contribution during times of disaster and large scale incidents. Local, Provincial and National Government have to take note, and do take note. For example, during the 2008 Xenophobia disaster, we got so much information off the ground from the local communities that assisted us to make that decision, but there wasn't any formal mechanism as such, as you referred to. But certainly that is where a lot of information does come from if people do listen to it.

**Comment by Mr Nicholls:**

At Koeberg we go to different alert stages by a strong definition of how we do them and a General Emergency is actually defined very accurately, and if that is then linked straight to the Act then we go to a National Emergency because we declared a General Emergency.

**Response by Mr Van Rensburg:**

That's absolutely correct; I thought you were just talking in general. Were you talking about a Koeberg-specific emergency? If that was the case, I apologise, I misunderstood, I thought you were talking about the declaration of disasters in general.

**Question by Mr Lindgard:**

It was a general question, but obviously it's got a specific outcome to the question. In other words, yes, in general, I understand what you're saying about disaster management, but specifically, we're sitting here addressing the Koeberg issues so if Koeberg has a set of criteria are those available to the public on the outside where they can say: "Hang on Koeberg, we've hit level 4, why aren't you declaring an emergency?"

**Answer by Mr Van Rensburg:**

No, that criteria exists within. There are certain triggers if you like, which when you reach those different stages of emergencies, be it Unusual Event, Alert, Site, General whatever it may be, those are clearly defined. So everybody at Koeberg is very aware of their responsibilities in terms of when what needs to be done. It is based simply on plant conditions and plant conditions tell you exactly what happened and what you should do.

**Response by Mr Nicholls:**

Looking at the Fukushima example with the Japanese being told not by the local population, but by the IAEA and other external agencies who were saying we see what you're doing and you should now be at this stage.

**Comment by Mr Van Rensburg:**

This situation is very unique in respect of the various stages and what gets done at a particular stage.

**Response by Mr Nicholls:**

Just out of interest, when we talked about the response to Fukushima one of the things that we are going to have to do which the Japanese didn't quite get right, and that we would have to be better at, is to allow external access to our plant data for people to give us support and advice from external organisations, and that would be actually exposing our current plant data to someone in Paris.

**Question by Mr Van Rensburg:**

Are we talking external organisations related to the nuclear industry?

**Response by Mr Nicholls**

One of the problems we have is actually the problem of turning from where we are now, where we don't have access to that, because we don't want to make it public information - to make it virtually internet-public, because we're not trying to hide anything - but we're trying to get more help.

**Question by Ms Adair:**

Does the public know if you're in that situation, do they get to know about those stages?

**Answer by Mr Van Rensburg:**

Absolutely.

**Question by Ms Adair:**

So it's open all the way?

**Answer by Mr Van Rensburg:**

Very much so. Media releases and public communication is a very important part of the Koeberg Plan, obviously, because the community is at risk. It forms part of what gets tested and what gets exercised during the Annual Emergency NNR Exercise.

**Comment by Mr Kevin Engel:**

This has come up before and we do invite the public to be part of our exercises. When we have another exercise we can arrange for the public to participate again. Then you can see it in real life. It's very clear that you cannot keep the public out of the decision making process. Because the procedure states: Now call SABC, it tells you exactly, as an Emergency Controller, how to manage every stage of the accident. I cannot see how the officials can keep this out, because our focus is the protection of the people and we are not worried about what the officials are saying at that stage.

**Response by Mr Van Rensburg:**

Those organisations like the SABC are actually involved during those exercises and they are also aware of their role and function as a public broadcaster.

**Question by Mr Mayhew:**

How often does the Emergency Planning Steering Oversight Committee (EPSOC) meet because there's a lot of people involved?

**Answer by Mr Van Rensburg:**

They meet quarterly. Yesterday was the meeting for this quarter.



**Comment by Mr Mayhew:**

And you got nowhere, because we are no further forward with the Koeberg Evacuation Plan.

**Answer by Mr Van Rensburg**

No, we got very far. In fact the Emergency Planning Committee is overseen by the Emergency Planning Steering and Oversight Committee (EPSOC) which the Emergency Planning Committee has to report to. The Emergency Planning Committee resolved at the previous meeting to have a workshop to look at how we can take lessons learnt from Fukushima and how we can implement those lessons learnt and turn them into real practical examples, and incorporate them into our planning. To go beyond the normal planning that we've done and go further ahead and look beyond worst case scenario and beyond what we're comfortable with at the moment. We've come up with quite an extensive list of issues. The Emergency Planning Committee is broken up into various working groups e.g. a decontamination working group, communication working group, evacuation working group, etc. We are having a look at. Having a look at Fukushima, and what we've learnt from Fukushima thus far with the information available, seeing what we can do to improve planning by going beyond normal planning and go beyond best practise to inform our planning even further. So there's an extensive list that is coming out of there which will see these working groups having their work cut out for them, and as I've said, they are overseen by the EPSOC (Emergency Planning Steering and Oversight Committee) so there cannot be any ducking and diving.

**Question by Mr Mayhew:**

You said you looked at the Plan after Fukushima about 6 months ago the first time you looked at it. And we're now 6 months on; we've been asking you come here to talk to us about the evacuation plan for the traffic, we've waited probably for a year so far, can you give us an idea of when you will talk to us about getting the traffic out of here because that is the important part - we don't want to be in the area if there's a problem. You never know what can happen. We know Koeberg has a very good safety record but we've got road works in Table View and we've got a huge problem in the mornings and in the evenings, so how are you going to get us out?

**Response by Mr Van Rensburg:**

I'd like to clarify a particular point you've made. The Traffic Evacuation Model was not anything that arose out of any Fukushima information. It is something that has to be done; it's a National Nuclear Regulator (NNR) requirement that we prove to them via a Traffic Evacuation Model (the only one) that we can or cannot evacuate the specific areas within the laid-down time frames. That Traffic Evacuation model first came out in 2006, so it's now time to review that model and see whether what's been happening in the area in terms of development and population influx, that we are still able to meet those particular requirements. We need to feed additional information into that model, population figures etc. Then we need to get consensus from the two signatories that are party to the agreement. Once that has been done and there's consensus in that regard, that will come into the public domain and that will be shared with the Public Safety Information Forum (PSIF). But at this particular point in time, I can say that we are still within the requirements as laid down by the National Nuclear Regulator. The new revised model will 'tell' us whether we are still within those parameters or not.

**Question by Mr Mayhew:**

Can you give us a clue, is it a year, two years, three years down the line, before that meeting once every three months, before we get that decision?

**Query by Mr Van Rensburg:**

Of the Traffic Evacuation model?

**Response by Mr Mayhew:**

Yes, of the latest Traffic Evacuation Model.

**Answer by Mr Van Rensburg:**

I'm going to stick my neck out and say I'm more than confident that we should have that information at the next Public Safety Information Forum.

**Question by Mr Mayhew:**

Within three months?

**Answer by Mr Van Rensburg:**

My Transport Management colleagues should be able to present it to you at the next PSIF as we are not far from obtaining consensus with Eskom and the Provincial Government.

**Response by Mr Mayhew:**

I look forward to seeing where it is within three months.

**Question by Deputy Chairperson:**

Mr van Rensburg that would be very nice, could we have some feedback by the next meeting about where we are with that Evacuation Plan?

**Response by Mr Van Rensburg:**

Yes, we can.

**Response by Deputy Chair:**

Thank you, I appreciate that.

**Question by Mr Martin Saaymans:**

I see there's a misconception. I think we need to establish from the Forum: is it the Evacuation Plan they want to see or is it the Evacuation Model, because there's a distinct difference between the two.

**Response by Mr Mayhew:**

I want to see how I'm going to get out of Table View if there's a problem.

**Response by Mr Saaymans:**

That's what I mean. What I'm trying to clear up is that the Traffic Evacuation Plan is in existence and could have been presented tonight if the City chose to. The Traffic Evacuation Model is between Eskom, the City of Cape Town and the Regulator (NNR) in terms of proving, based on the plans, that the time frames can be met. In the next three months nothing will necessarily change on the Plan unless the Model tells us that the Plan is ineffective. That is the difference that must be clearly understood. So if we propose a presentation for the next meeting, and by the sounds of it, it's the Plan that will be presented, I'm concerned about presenting the Model as it's a very technical excel spread sheet that plays with numbers which in my opinion is not conducive to public understanding.

**Response by Mr Van Rensburg:**

That Madam Chair is not my understanding. It was always on the Agenda that it was the Traffic Evacuation model that would be presented to show the Forum how we came to those figures, whatever figures they are, to be able to evacuate a certain area within a certain time. The Evacuation Plan was never on the Agenda to be discussed.

**Comment by Mr Saaymans:**

It's because of that confusion that I put it to the Forum, to try to give the right direction and clarify what the public wants to have presented.

**Question by the Deputy Chair:**

Mr Mayhew, is it specifically the Traffic Plan that you want presented?

**Response by Mr Mayhew:**

Yes. We've got all those road works in Table View and it's a real problem, morning and evening; no matter what time of day it is, it's a real problem. I want to see how I'm going to get out and what the provisions are for me to get out if I need to. I don't think I'll need it but you never know.

**Response by the Deputy Chair:**

We will make sure that we get a comeback on that.

**Comment by Mr Van Rensburg:**

We need to be clear it's not a Traffic Plan, it's an Evacuation Plan we're talking about. We need to call it what it is - an Evacuation Plan. Evacuation means getting into your car, traffic congestion and various other things; it is essentially an Evacuation Plan whether you evacuate by car, by bus or any other means. A number of these issues will be addressed and discussed when the Model is presented. To give you an idea, there are things such as contraflow, lanes can be turned into one way only, agreements with transport companies when you don't have transport for yourself that transport will be provided for you etc. That information can be found in the latest copy of the Emergency Plan Calendar. There's nothing more that you need to know. Anything more that you need to know other than what's in the calendar will be made available to you via the Public Broadcaster should anything need to be conveyed to the public.

**Question by Mr Mayhew:**

That's providing you're listening to the radio?

**Response by Mr Van Rensburg:**

Absolutely.

**Question by Mr Mayhew:**

What makes you sure everybody is going to listen to the radio?

**Comment by Mr Van Rensburg:**

Whether the lagoon/beach is flooding out we need to advise people in exactly the same way that they need to get out. Whether it's the community on the urban fringe which is surrounded by fire, it's exactly the same: they will be notified. The systems are in place to do that notification, it's all contained in the Plan and it will be explained when the Traffic Evacuation Model is presented.

**Question by Mr Taylor:**

I was hoping you were going to go to a slide that overlaid that zone radiuses over a map so that one can see where those zones extend physically in Cape Town. Do you have a slide that shows that?

**Response by the Deputy Chair:**

I'll get you a calendar.

**Question by Mr Taylor:**

So that is extracted from the Calendar?

**Answer by the Deputy Chair:**

Yes, you will find it in the Calendar.

**Response by Mr Van Rensburg:**

It was part of a larger presentation, but for the sake of brevity it was not included. There are calendars available and contained inside the calendar is a map that clearly indicates the zones.

**Question by Mr Williamson:**

My question is, within that 16km zone do you implement it by gradient or in a block. In other words my question refers to my neighbour may be 16km from the centre of the zone and I am 5.5km from the zone, who of us would be evacuated first? The 5.5km or the 16km or is it completely random?

**Answer by Mr Van Rensburg:**

The entire City of Cape Town is broken up into geographical zones that have been worked out, once again dependent on plant conditions, weather conditions and how things unfold. We talk in terms of zones but we would communicate that to you in terms of areas. For example, if we tell you to evacuate zones 1 to 7 we would tell you which areas we're referring to as you will not know. If you look on your Calendar you will see where those zones are. We will communicate that information to you in terms of areas such as Parklands or Sunningdale or areas of Melkbos. So we work them in zones and we talk about zones. Depending on weather and plant conditions, certain zones will be affected and others not. We will talk about the downwind sector and we will, for example, evacuate or shelter downwind in the 5 to 10 or 10 to 16km zones.

**Comment by Mr Keith Featherstone:**

Just to add to that for clarity. The 5km is the whole of the 5km, anything further out from that is always in the 67 degree wind sector. So it's based on the prevailing wind direction, and if one of the zones touches that sector, the whole zone is evacuated. So if you're talking about whether it's on the edge or not, we don't work on that, we work on the zones. If a zone falls within that wind sector we evacuate that whole zone even if it's only one percent of that zone that touches that sector. That is the way it works from the communication between Koeberg and the Disaster Management Centre. We just say that zone needs to be evacuated because it's in the sector and they take the whole zone. Although it's a fixed 67 degree arc that we evacuate or shelter, anything that touches that will be evacuated from a zone point of view.

**Comment by Mr Van Rensburg:**

Eskom talks to us in terms of zones but we convert that into areas for the public and those areas will be indicated in the media releases.

**Question by Mr Mayhew:**

Referring to an article in the Table Talk about the siren test (pointing at the Newspaper article). Have you seen that?

**Response by Mr Van Rensburg:**

No, I haven't seen it, I've seen similar reports elsewhere in other newspapers.

**Comment by Mr Mayhew:**

Because they (Table View residents) said they didn't get much notice?

**Response by Mr Kevin Engel:**

I will be commenting on it.

**Response by Mr Van Rensburg:**

I can understand your concern but Eskom will respond to it. Having been involved with this for many years I've also seen many reports in the paper and on the radio prior to any test taking place.

**Question by Mr Williamson:**

I must point out something with regards to the IRT system and any bus system. Are the drivers committed to servicing this area in case of a disaster? This is because anecdotal evidence is that the Golden Arrow Bus Service drivers refuse to come out here during an exercise. That is anecdotal evidence and I go back, maybe, 10 years. It's worth me mentioning this to ask whether the drivers are committed contractually to come out during a disaster? Because they've dropped us before.

**Response by Mr Van Rensburg:**

They are not committed in contract, one cannot cover something like that legally in an agreement. We are regularly in contact with the management of Golden Arrow so its news to me that even during an exercise that the Golden Arrow drivers are reluctant to come out.

**Comment by Mr Williamson:**

We have it in our Minutes if we go back far enough.

**Response by Mr Van Rensburg:**

Part of our arrangement with them and their contingency planning must be that in the event of driver absences they need to identify reserve drivers that can take the place of those who refused. Refusal is probably in practise what may well happen but its news to me from an Exercise point of view.

**Comment by Mr Williamson:**

The drivers didn't know it was an exercise; that was part of the plan. I just think it needs looking at.

**Response by Mr Van Rensburg:**

It's a valid point.

**Comment by Mr Saaymans:**

The agreements are in place with Golden Arrow as was mentioned. The question of the drivers' willingness to come out was asked many times before. The contingency plans therefore, if the drivers are not willing to come out, (obviously the busses don't belong to them they belong to the bus company), we would rely on internal City and Government resources to drive the busses like for example, the army, because you can find those drivers and drivers can be sourced. In studying other large scale emergencies I've never come across any person not wanting to help. Interestingly enough, in the Fukushima workshop we attended yesterday indications and reports are that instead of evacuating themselves they've opted to use their own car batteries and donate them to the plant in order to save the plant. All I'm saying is it's always surprising how the public and officials will sacrifice themselves for the greater good of the population.

**Response by Mr Van Rensburg:**

So in the event of Golden Arrow driver A not being available, they've got to activate their contingency Plan to get hold of driver B as their back up, failing that we would have to dig into our own resources or those of our supporting partners, such as the police or the National Defence Force. One needs to make sure that those support organisations have those plans in place; they are tested during these Exercises.

**Question by the Ms Adair:**

What is the reason for not issuing potassium iodate to people older than 40 years of age?

**Answer by Mr Saaymans**

It is based on research and evidence from studies done as well as historical testing from the time of Chernobyl, of the effectiveness of potassium iodate in older people; it was found that it's more effective in children under the age of 18. The effectiveness of potassium iodate in older people was also derived from a 25 year anniversary report of Chernobyl which was based on new research of people who were issued with potassium iodate and those not issued with potassium iodate and the benefits it had.

**Comment by Mr Nicholls:**

It is notable from the UNSCARE health results; it appears that all the thyroid cancer problems were seen with young people, children, teens and those in their twenties. There's no indication that I've seen, of thyroid cancers being seen in older people.

**Comment by Mr Van Rensburg:**

I also understand that it's safe to give to animals as well. The SPCA is one of our partners looking after the animal evacuation plan. It's quite a unique thing and there's not very many uses for it outside this type of environment. Stocks are decentralised in five or six different locations i.e Atlantis Fire Station, Melkbos Fire Station, Milnerton Fire Station, Health stores in Milnerton and Parow/Goodwood area.

**Questions by Mr Williamson:**

What happens if I'm evacuated from Melkbosstrand and Melkbosstrand is contaminated to a large extent and I cannot go back because it's contaminated? My clothes are still there, what do I do? I'm now in your Relocation Centre, what are you going to do with me, and how long will I be there?

**Response by Mr Van Rensburg:**

It's very difficult to say how long it might be for. You might have to stay there for a reasonably extended period of time and then plans will be made. The last thing to worry about is what is going to happen to my clothing. The question you should ask is what are you doing about it?

**Comment by Mr Williamson:**

Well, maybe I can't do anything about it, because it's all I have.

**Response by Mr Van Rensburg:**

Then I can tell you a plan will be made.

**Question by Mr Williamson:**

I might have walked away and left a few million rands worth of investment behind, what happens to that? I might be expendable but I've got a generation that comes after me, what happens to them?

**Response by Mr Van Rensburg:**

If the area can be decontaminated people are moved back into the area (that is after the area has been cleaned up and declared safe). In the event that it happens over an extended period of time you will need assistance, you will need to be provided with assistance if you are unable to make any provision for yourself. In the same way as when a squatter's house burns down and they lose everything in their shack. We provide accommodation for them, we provide food for them as well as medical care and attention - we provide for all their basic needs.

**Question by Mr Williamson:**

Can you provide us with insurance?

**Response by Eskom:**

The South African law states that any damages caused by a nuclear event offer strict liability of insurance. Strict liability means that you cannot sue our suppliers; you sue Eskom as the Licenced Operator irrespective of the cause of any nuclear damage. As presented at a previous meeting, we have insurance to limit the impact on Eskom.

*The following summarises the Nuclear Liability portion [added due to a request at the end of the meeting]*

- **As per the NNR Act, Eskom is strictly liable as the licence holder/operator of the nuclear installation;**
- **Any claims associated with a nuclear incident therefore are lodged against Eskom;**
- **The process for claiming would be communicated at the time of or immediately after the event;**

*Mr Stephen Van Rensburg handed out a Disaster Management Family brochure which links to a personal preparedness plan, to all the members, and informed members that is also available on the website at [www.capetown.gov.za/disaster](http://www.capetown.gov.za/disaster) with a link to the Koeberg site and also contains extracts of the Emergency Plan Calendar.*

## **6. Progress Update on Fukushima Disaster – Mr Dave Nicholls (General Manager – Nuclear Engineering)**

### **Comment by Mr Featherstone [arising from the presentation]**

Japan has 54 commercial reactors, yesterday the 53<sup>rd</sup> reactor was shut down; they now only have one nuclear reactor running as a result of Fukushima, and they don't know when any of them will be starting up again because the Regulator still has not finalised and accepted the stress tests that we are also doing for Koeberg, and because of the public opinion in Japan. Until they've been given the green light none of those reactors are starting up again. That amount of energy off line in Japan is putting Japan in an extremely chaotic energy situation.

### **Question from Ms de Villiers:**

I've been trying to look up reasons for the population not going back [in Japan]. From what I understand there are very small areas that are not clean, but there are massive areas that are perfectly liveable. In fact, me coming from Paarl, they should be evacuating me out of Paarl at the moment! I have a problem that there doesn't seem to be information available as to why they're not allowing people back into perfectly liveable areas.

### **Response by Mr Nicholls:**

There was a lovely example of that at one point. One of the villages, a village next door was evacuated from where they were to somewhere else and after the event they've realised that the village they came from had less dose than the village they were evacuated to and the residents don't want to go back. It's difficult to explain the level of emotion from the Japanese who were told for over 50 years that there's not the vaguest possibility of the nuclear power station being anything but perfectly safe. You may think we tend to underplay nuclear risk issues; the Japanese had a view which said it was impossible. So you've actually had a complete collapse of faith in the government and in the nuclear industry in Japan to a point where if they said: "The sun was going to rise tomorrow", they will ask: "Are you sure?" But it is a problem and it's important that we ensure we set good limits at the start of the event. We must pre-plan properly and not change the limits in the middle of it because it makes political sense, because undoing those limits becomes very difficult. In a sense the same thing is around Chernobyl in some ways as there are areas that are still nominally evacuation zones. If you look at Cornwall in the UK it meets two



criteria. For the UK, it is the intermediate level waste dump site because of the level of background radiation due to the granite and if you use the Chernobyl criteria, you'd have to evacuate Cornwall because of the radiation dose.

**Question by Mr Nick Lee:**

Do we have any "undoing plans" in place if we have to evacuate here and we need to bring people back again? In other words the criteria for allowing people back.

**Answer by Mr Saaymans:**

From an Emergency Planning point of view we have procedures in place for the late phase, the recovery phase, this is now after the accident. What you are referring to is the rehabilitation; we refer to it as infrastructure decontamination, I think Stephen [Van Rensburg] referred to it in his presentation. There are procedures in place explaining exactly what resources we would need and the method of how it will be done. This will be a joint venture between Eskom and the City and Government in terms of setting the criteria after the accident, and based on public opinion and other factors Government will make a decision on what those levels are. We will then provide the means and expertise on how to decontaminate infrastructure such as roads, houses and topsoil being removed, identifying dumpsites for the contaminated soil. There are procedures in place as to how we get back to normal or what was natural before the accident.

**Question by Mr Nick Lee:**

I don't think you've answered my question. What I'm trying to establish is, if we've decided to evacuate the 16km zone and all the muck and rubbish went in the Atlantis direction and we can't get back into Atlantis until it's cleaned up, but Duynefontein and Melkbos are completely clean, have you got criteria in place that will allow us to get back, and keep the other people out of there?

**Answer by Mr Saaymans:**

I think the point was made earlier, the 5km [zone] which stops before Melkbos, that whole area will be evacuated. Only the downwind sector will be evacuated, which is dependent on the wind direction.

**Response by Mr Nicholls:**

That is something that can be done in the Late Phase - we don't have a clear answer at the moment. I will make a comment that if we look at the depositions in Japan, the fact that their Emergency Plan didn't work that well and they didn't have a clear plan. As we understand what happened to them and if we had it on our plan, we would have said, the wind is northwest, evacuate that zone - let's evacuate the 67 degree zone going out to where the plume is. If we had that, we would not have evacuated the rest of the areas.

**Comment by Ms De Villiers:**

But I don't think that was what was asked, what Mr Lee asked was, what if the area gets cleaned up and it's back to an acceptable level, what is that level that says you can now come back to your area and your homes?

**Response by Mr Saaymans:**

The point I've tried to make is that it will be a joint decision between the spheres of government because it will be relative in terms of what that level is. It's not a predetermined level. Yes, we want to get back to a natural level, but that decision will be

made after the fact, based on the severity of the accident and it will be relative. This will be after they've considered the socio-economic factors and incorporated that to make a decision that this is the level that you need to get below, and only then people can move back into the area.

**Response by Mr Nicholls:**

Three things have happened here, they made a decision; it was a blanket decision, they didn't really think what the criterion was for restarting. The water situation is that they have now got 100 thousand tons of clean water which they cannot dump anywhere and they're building tanks to put more water in, and the last one is evacuation. These are always challenging issues and I'm not going to claim that we've got clear answers for them, the Japanese are in any case, bad at them anyway.

**Question by Mr Williamson:**

The question I have does not relate to Fukushima, it relates to a report back to parliament a week or two ago. Eskom was talking about their New Build Programme, I don't have all the facts, but there was talk about some of the major contracts that were going to be awarded around June/July and then the NNR responded saying that they've not be consulted. I just want to know where we stand.

**Response by Mr Nicholls:**

Eskom has not made any statements of when we will place any contracts for nuclear power stations of any kind because we are still waiting for the government to say that it is our function to do that. In other words, the government has not formally said to us that we are the people that will own the next nuclear power station. We have had no commercial discussions since the 2008 negotiations with Areva and Westinghouse which were terminated in late 2008. We have not entered into any commercial discussions with anyone and we have not, as you all know, put out any tenders to do with a nuclear plant. All we have done is indicate Thyspunt in the Eastern Cape as our preferred site and having completed the EIA, we are spending money in buying land in that area to ensure we have that site. There was a comment by the NNR and NECSA's feedback to the Parliamentary Committee whereby they implied that they've not actually been involved enough at this stage.

**Response by Ms de Villiers:**

I happened to sit in the meeting. The NNR issue essentially went around the fact that the grant they've received had been cut back by R15 million. As a result of that unfortunately Mr Mhikize did say that they did not feel they could discharge their functions properly. It was stated in the meeting and I was very perturbed when that was stated. There was nothing said about the contracts however, what was asked from the Chairperson of the committee was, we have a new build programme that will be going ahead. We have a Parliamentary committee that has been set up for this, what has been your involvement with that? That is where all the wheels came off. Whether he meant with that committee that has been set up, are they discharging any advice to that committee to which Mr Mhikize, (who is the CE of the NNR), said, no, we have not had any dealings with the committee. He did not say he had not had any dealings with Eskom up to that point. That was then taken out of the meeting and put in the newspapers. There was a huge press contingent in that meeting, as this was the only meeting that was going on that day, there

were about seven or eight journalists present at the meeting. But it was unfortunately misconstrued.

### **7 (a). Koeberg Quarterly Safety and Operational Feedback by Mr Kevin Engel:**

- We've shut down Unit 1 (Outage 119) for refuelling since 12 March 2012;
- Currently on day 18 of an 81 day outage;
- Approximately 3000 people on site;
- Main critical path is generator stator rewind;
- HP turbine – 10 year service;
- WANO peer review took place Nov/Dec 2011 – 20 Feb WANO Executives gave feedback to Mr Brian Dames (Eskom CEO). The purpose of the review was to assess our performance and compare us to best practise in the world – Informed our CEO that they have no concerns;
- We had the siren test on 29 February 2012 – didn't go too well. We've received many comments from the public and we also had the article in the Tabletalk and we're not proud of that performance but we've learnt quite a few lessons;

#### **Comment by Mr Williamson:**

This time around we could hear the announcement, after the previous siren test we complained that we could not hear the announcement as it was very unclear; this time around it was very clear. It could be the equipment or the voice because some voices are much clearer than others, which could very well be the reason everyone heard it this time.

#### **Siren Testing lessons learnt:**

*We have done an analysis and these are some of the lessons that we've learnt, that we need to improve on;*

- Many people complained that they were not aware that we were going to test the sirens so we need to do more radio awareness including interviews which should build up to the testing;
- Testing to be done far away from nuclear accident anniversaries e.g. Fukushima and Chernobyl because this can cause panic - this siren test was too close to the Fukushima anniversary; We should do it at a time period when we can communicate more freely;
- There were technical failures which resulted in garbled messages, which was the cause of most of our complaints;
- We also experienced problems with the distribution of the Emergency Plan Calendars which Mr Lewis Phidza will elaborate on;

#### **Comment by Mr Phidza:**

In the [Tabletalk] newspaper article it was reported that people were panicking, most of them coming from the Atlantic Beach Golf Estate. In our analysis we've found that one of the reasons was that our distributing company was forced to drop the calendars at the gate of the security complexes which means many of the residents did not receive the calendars in time. We've subsequently engaged with them to sort out the distribution problem within the Estate. The good news is that the Estate has taken it upon them to sort it out via their own internal system in assisting us to reach their residents. So one of the lessons learnt is that we have to work with the Estate to assist us in allowing the distribution of the calendars

to their residents. We've had a meeting with the Golf Estate, we've issued them with calendars and we've established a working partnership with that Estate.

**Comment by Mr Williamson:**

The City Traffic Department had the same problem, they couldn't get in to issue fines and they're quite happy with that.

**Comment by Mr Engel:**

The biggest lesson we've learnt is that there must be a build-up of public awareness leading up to the siren testing. The majority of the people should be aware that we're having the test otherwise it can lead to confusion.

**Question by Mr Lingard:**

A couple of years back in Parklands, sirens went off and it caused quite a fright. Could they not make the announcement first, that the sirens will be tested? If you broadcast it on the radio when the siren test will be taking place, not many will hear that because not everyone listens to the radio.

**Response by Mr Engel:**

The standard way that we do it is, you first announce: "This is a test...", then you sound the alarm and then you announce it again. However, due to some technical problems experienced with some of the sirens, the initial announcement failed. This is part of the test objectives to identify problems.

**Comment by Mr Mayhew:**

I honestly believe the gentleman from Cape Town [Mr Van Rensburg] hit the nail on the head, you can give me a calendar, but do I take any notice of it? That's the biggest problem and these people we talk about in the Newspaper article looked like they've had calendar, done whatever with it, and took no notice of it and started to panic: "what do I do?" They didn't bother to look at the calendar to see what they've got to do, and that's where the problem is. The gentleman hit the nail on the head by saying you've got to do some of these things yourself and you just can't rely on people in authority to do it for you.

**Comment by Mr Phidza:**

We too, have found that many people open the calendar but don't bother to read the calendar hence they didn't know what to do. But we will in future engage in more public awareness campaigns to create awareness and not rely on only one medium like the newspaper or radio because we're aware that not all people listen to the radio or read the newspaper, hence we will use various media to create effective awareness. Hence we're saying the complexes are also very important as they also need to tell us what works for them.

**Comment from Ms Majola (NNR)**

I am Vanessa Majola and I work for the NNR. I am the Senior Inspector for the NNR. On the day of the siren test, the NNR requested that I do an inspection and I was at Van Riebeeckstrand Primary School first and then moved to Pick 'n Pay in Melkbosstrand. What I've observed was that the siren was sounded first and the message came much later.

**Response from Mr Phidza:**

We are aware of the complaints and comments about the technical failures experienced on some of the sirens and it is part of our plan to improve and deal with technical problems and all the other related issues. As I've mentioned our intention is to communicate effectively to the public on these.

**7(b) Offshore Act: Mr Keith Featherstone, Acting General Manager**

**Background on the Offshore Act:**

COP 17 which was the big Conference Of the Parties, took place in Durban in December 2011. During that period SAPS arrested some people taking photographs from the beach access which turned out to be Greenpeace. They were subsequently deported out of the country. They were right down the beach close to the plant taking photos of the plant, and as a result we have been forced to relook the Acts that govern our area in the light of our accountability. The Act is clear since 1 April 1977 when the Act was passed; any person entering the area without permission from Eskom is guilty of an offense. We allow controlled access to the reserve at the road entrances but this does not include free access to and along the beaches. *What does this mean?* We have the restricted area around Koeberg which is the fenced area which is part of the exclusion boundary and as part of the Act we have to go back and reinforce this. We are in the process of obtaining signage, but prior to erecting the signage we will inform the community that restrictions to the beach will be applied. Once the signs are erected, the restrictions will be enforced.

**Question by Mr Williamson:**

Did I hear you correctly that access will be possible coming via the normal gate and then one can walk down to the beach?

**Response by Mr Featherstone:**

Controlled access to the reserve is what we allow. At the moment we're allowing people access onto the reserve through the pathways to walk in the reserve. How we're going to control it onto the beach, I don't know, we're going to have to look at that.

**Question by Mr Williamson:**

So at the moment we're not allowed on the beach?

**Response by Mr Featherstone:**

When you're in the reserve, you're allowed in the reserve in the controls of what you enter the reserve under and that is to walk on the walkways and in the paths. The walkways and the paths do not go to the beach at the moment and do not include the beach. We are going to have to address that and make that very clear when people enter through the main access. But the point of that, and that's the controlled access, which is entrance with Eskom's permission, so when you enter and sign in at the gate to go in, Eskom is giving you permission to go in because we know you're going into our property. That is the bottom line of what that control is meant to do. That's why we have to stop the general public walking down to the beach front.

**Question by the Deputy Chair:**

With regard to streets, would this be from Dunker to Koeberg or is it further in?

**Response by Mr Featherstone:**

The back wall of Edward Crescent (edge of Duynefontein) that goes straight down to the beach.

**Question by Mr Mayhew:**

Are we still able to visit the Visitors Centre?

**Response by Mr Featherstone:**

Yes, because that comes through the normal entrance down the road. When you sign in at the entrance as a normal visitor, you have free access to the Visitors Centre and to all the paths through the reserve. It not quite clear how that works to the beach. One of the paths goes to the top of the dunes but doesn't go onto the beach.

**Comment by Mr Norman:**

There is no access to the beach - it's fenced off. On the northern side there are signs that indicate "no access". It's clear; the signs say 'stay off the beach!'.

**Question by a member of the PSIF:**

You said that people from Greenpeace were found on the beach taking photographs, you've got 2 km water area off the beach. What if someone comes from three Anchor Bay side with a boat with a powerful camera, they can take a picture.

**Response from Mr Featherstone:**

Yes, they can. The point is it's not so much what they were doing is wrong; the fact is we have an accountability to ensure that this area is under our control because we've got a responsibility towards it. So there were people found in this area, taking photographs, who turned out to be Greenpeace which are people who are here to cause an embarrassment to us, so therefore we have to go back and say it is unacceptable. If you go on Google Maps you can get a nice picture of Koeberg anyway. The point is, people were in here that we purposefully don't want on our site.

**Question by Mr Lee:**

Can you explain the difference between the Dunes, the Nature Reserve and the beach, why is there a difference?

**Response by Mr Featherstone:**

The rules of this site are what we have to establish what we have. We have given people the access to the site as it is at the moment in terms of the paths. What we are finding is that the rules that we have here, we have not enforced, and it's causing us problems. We have to go back and reinforce this rule by saying: "It's not on". To suddenly go back and make the whole site freely accessible to the public is not going to happen. We can't do it, we have to have a way of controlling what we're prepared to allow on this site.

**Comment by Mr Norman:**

We have raised our Security levels, which some people might have experienced. We can close the gates and say to visitors: "Sorry, today, you cannot come in." At the beach we don't have that so there's one little sector that is exposed which is the beach. At our site we can communicate with all of our visitors and tell them: "Don't do this and don't go beyond this and don't do that." We know more or less how many people are on our site, but there's this whole section of beach where people are digging up mussels and catching fish which they shouldn't. They can walk right up to our outfall which is a danger and we could be held liable if someone drowns and we could be asked: "Why didn't you stop them?" Our visitors on the reserve we have, to some extent, some control over, the people on the beach just do what they want to.

**Question by Mr Lee:**

So can't you fence off the beach?

**Response by Mr Norman:**

No, we just have signs that say: "Stay off the beach."

**Response by Mr Featherstone:**

But we've got very fast response to get people arrested if they come in that area.

**Comment by Mr Norman:**

We're doing quite a good job by monitoring the boats on the sea.

**Response by Mr Featherstone:**

Mr Lee, to get back to your actual question about what's the difference between the dunes and the beach, I think it's just because of the sensitivity of the beach area and the fact that people loiter and do other things on the beach. In the northern part of the reserve I also don't understand why you can't walk up to the edge of the beach but there is "Don't go onto the beach" signs. The dunes are very sensitive and also because that's where people dig up mussels. On the reserve the paths are easy to demarcate and can be controlled.

**8. General:**

**Request from Mr Williamson:**

I would like to know from Mr Phidza if he can give me a document which will be for everyone's benefit, that will lay out the position regarding the insurance with regards to Eskom's liability and how much they have available for general disaster, and as was mentioned by Mr Nicholls, the reserve that would be available. So we would like it if you could give us something in writing that we can take to the public rather than giving my garbled response which will probably raise more questions than answers.

**Response by Mr Phidza:**

We will see what we can do, however the position is documented at the end of the "Emergency Traffic Evacuation Model" section of these minutes.

**Response by Mr Williamson:**

Thanks.

**Comment by the Deputy Chair:**

Are there any more questions? If not, the meeting is now adjourned.

**9. Date of the next meeting:**

The next meeting is scheduled for **28 June** and will be at the **Visitors Centre** unless otherwise communicated.

**10. Suggested Topics for 28 June PSIF:**

- Traffic Evacuation Model;
- Report of the EP exercise and summary of the close-out actions (EP 7 week exercise);
- Acceptance of the Constitution of the Koeberg Public Safety Information Forum;