

REVIEW OF TRANSPORT REPORTS FOR EIA FOR NUCLEAR 1

1. Background

Aecom was requested by Messrs Gibb to perform a peer review of the specialist transport report done for the Environmental Impact Assessment for the Proposed Nuclear Power Station (Nuclear 1) and Associated Infrastructure. The report (Version 12, August 2012) consists of four volumes, namely:

Volume 1: Status Quo Assessments

Volume 2: Impact Assessments

Volume 3: Annexures A - C

Volume 4: Annexures D - G

The Terms of Reference (TOR) for the peer review refer to nine questions which should be answered. These questions are discussed below. Before addressing these questions, a number of general comments are provided, which are mostly resulting from the protracted nature of the EIA process.

- 1.1 The reports have been completed three years ago, in 2012, and most of the data on which the analyses are based, is even older (2007 and 2008). This should not have a large impact on the results, but it could have an impact. The assumed construction program would have started in 2013, but the earliest starting date now is probably 2016, which implies that the traffic calculations are out by at least three years.
- 1.2 There has also been some recent road planning by the City of Cape Town, involving the status of the R27 (which is now planned as a freeway in the vicinity of Koeberg, and therefore has an impact on access provision), which has now overtaken some of the proposals in the document. To the credit of the authors, they did refer to this. The analysis provided is however not considered applicable in all respects any more.
- 1.3 A new Traffic Evacuation Study for Koeberg has been completed in 2014 and this work should now be consulted whenever the evacuation of Koeberg is considered.
- 1.4 New national guidelines for the preparation of Traffic Impact Assessments have been published by the COTO (TMH 17) in 2012. The exact impact of these guidelines on the investigations described in Volumes 1 to 4 could be small though. To be 100% up to date, it should be checked.

2. Fulfilment of TOR

All the items listed in the TOR have been addressed. In a few instances a question can be asked regarding some detail, e.g. with respect to the evacuation of Koeberg during the construction phase (Section 7.8):

- It has not been shown how it will work, as the issue was merely referred to the 2005 Emergency Plan which “will be required to be updated”. The latter has been completed in the meantime, but it is not available, so it is not known whether it included the construction phase of Nuclear 1. The 8500 construction workers referred to in Section 7.8, represent at least a fourfold increase in persons at the Koeberg site, and therefore can be considered a challenge. The suggested solution of 130 buses to be available on stand-by, could have practical implications.
- The “allowable evacuation time” of one week in Section 7.8 sounds strange?

At the Bantamsklip site it is suggested that landing facilities for a barge be provided to bring abnormal loads from Cape Town Harbour to the site. The cost implications of this are not discussed, as well as the possible need for an EIA to construct such a facility.

3. Objectivity of report

The objectivity of the reports is considered totally acceptable.

4. Technical, Scientific and Professional credibility

The technical, scientific and professional credibility of the reports are considered to be on a high standard and is totally acceptable.

5. Methodology defensible

The methodology and study approach comply with local best practices and are considered fully defensible. As mentioned above, the reports were completed at the same time that new national guidelines for such assessments were made available in SA, but the impact of the new guidelines is expected to be small.

6. Information gaps, omissions or errors

No information gaps were identified. A few small errors have been noticed, but they have a negligible impact on the report, e.g.:

- The Langebaan Airfield is shown at an incorrect location in Fig 3.2;
- The reference to allowable evacuation times of one week (Section 7.8) sounds incorrect;
- On page 104 a Figure 9.1c is shown, but there is no reference to the figure – appears out of place. Figure 9.8 on page 105 is not clear.

7. Recommendations sensible/best options

The recommendations appear sensible and are considered to represent the best options.

8. Alternative viewpoints clearly stated

Alternative solutions to a number of issues have been identified clearly and are evaluated adequately.

9. Style accessible to non-specialists

This point is difficult to evaluate objectively as this reviewer is considered a specialist in the transportation/traffic field. It can be said that the report reads easily when compared to other similar documents.

Even though the structure of the report is shown in the Table of Contents, it could be beneficial to list the four components (Volumes) of the report in the Introduction and explain exactly what is described where.

10. Normal professional standards met

There is no doubt that normal standards of professional practice and competence are met.

HJ STANDER Pr Eng

AECOM

4 DECEMBER 2015