

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

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

**DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REPORT**

**KEY FOCUS GROUP MEETING**

**GAMTKWA KHOISAN COUNCIL**

**27 AUGUST 2010**

**11H00 – 13H00**

## PREFACE

The draft minutes were distributed to meeting participants, who were given 14 days to comment on them. These minutes are the final minutes of the meeting and include comments received.

In order to provide a structure and to enable the reader to follow the proceedings with ease the minutes have not been captured verbatim and post-meeting notes have been added for clarity and information purposes and are indicated in **bold**.

## 1. ATTENDANCE

### 1.1. Attendance – Invited Stakeholders

<b>Gamkwa Khoisan Council</b>
Cllr !Krotoa Cynthia August
Dr N.E. Swarts
Mr. Kobus Reichert
Chief Ronald Booyesen
Mrs. Hettie Booyesen
<b>Observers</b>
Ms Trudi Malan
Mr. Chris Barratt

### 1.2 Attendance – Applicant - Eskom Holdings Limited

Name	Position/ Role in the project
Ms Deidre Herbst	Senior Manager - Environment Generation Division
Mr. Mervin Theron	Manager - Regulatory and Localisation
Ms Lorraine Ndala	Senior Environmental Advisor – Generation Environmental Management

### 1.3 Attendance – Golder and Associates – Public Participation Practitioner

Name	Role in the project
Ms Antoinette Pietersen	Facilitator

### 1.4 Attendance – Arcus GIBB (Pty) Ltd - Independent Environmental Consultants

Name	Role in the project
Ms Jaana-Maria Ball	Nuclear-1 EIA: Project Manager
Ms Inge Schovell	Environmental Scientist

### 1.5 Attendance – UCT Archaeology Contracts Office - Archaeology Specialist

Name	Role in the project
Mr. Tim Hart	Heritage Specialist

## 1.6 Attendance – South African Heritage Resources Agency – Heritage Authority

Name	Role in the project
Ms Mariagrazia Galimberti	APM Assessor

## 2. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Ms Antoinette Pietersen introduced herself as the Facilitator for this particular Key Focus Group Meeting. She then continued by asking Aunty Hettie Booysen to open the meeting up with prayer. Ms Pietersen welcomed everyone to the meeting and asked them to one by one introduce themselves to the group. Introductions were done as per Sections 1.1 to 1.5.

## 3. FORMAT OF MEETING AND DISCUSSION POINTS

Before the meeting was started, Ms Pietersen listed the objectives of the meeting namely:

1. To present the findings and recommendations of the Heritage Impact Assessment as it is in the Environmental Impact Assessment Report.
2. To listen to and get a better understanding of the issues and concerns of the Gamtkwa Khoisan Council as well as get suggestions for enhancing or updating the heritage specialist report.

She further stated that in view of the objectives and because she is an independent facilitator that this meeting should be focused on the objectives. Ms Pietersen then mentioned the following guidelines to be adhered to during the meeting:

1. One person should speak at a time.
2. Only one question should be asked at a time.
3. All communication should be directed through her.
4. Everyone is to show respect toward one another.
5. Do not be personal and focus on the issue at hand.
6. Keep questions within the purpose of the meeting and any other questions outside of this meeting will be parked and dealt with afterward by Arcus GIBB.

Ms Pietersen then made everyone aware that the meeting would be digitally recorded and that Ms Schovell will be taking minutes. She asked when the minutes will be available. Ms Schovell stated that the draft minutes should be completed by 30 August 2010 for review by Ms Ball who said that the final minutes would then be made available within that week for comment by the meeting attendees. The comment period for the minutes will be 14-days. Post-meeting note: **The presentation delivered at the meeting is attached to the minutes and both the minutes and presentation will be posted on the Nuclear-1 EIA website ([www.eskom.co.za](http://www.eskom.co.za)).**

Ms Pietersen requested all attendees to sign the attendance register and they were also asked if there were any other matters that they would like to add onto the agenda. There were no additions made. Ms Ball made it clear that it was more important to hear from the Gamtkwa Khoisan Council than to have a long presentation to which Mr. Reichert replied and said that point 4 on the agenda would give them sufficient time to voice their concerns.

Finally Mrs. Pietersen stated that the members of the meeting were more than welcome to ask their questions in Afrikaans and that she is willing to translate if need be. She then handed over to Mr. Tim Hart to do the Heritage Presentation.

#### 4. DISCUSSION SESSION

This section details all issues, comments and concerns, which were raised and discussed at the meeting. The draft minutes were distributed to meeting participants, who were given 14 days to comment on them. These minutes are the final minutes of the meeting and include comments received.

GAMTKWA KHOISAN COUNCIL			
No	Name	Comments	Response
1	Mr. Kobus Reichert	<p>He asked if Mr. Hart regards Thyspunt as a cultural landscape on its own and not just a case of several archaeological sites.</p> <p>He then asked that if the proposed site was located as far possible into the interior and if there were no cultural site (if there were nothing there at all) locate the identified area (because the final plan still not available), would the location of such a site have an impact on this cultural landscape without any mitigation being necessary?</p>	<p>Mr. Hart agreed that it is a cultural landscape, but a very complex one because it is multi-layered. It has many landscapes resting on top of each other over a long period that has been compressed into one. It is a landscape that represents the special living circumstances of the Khoi / San people over the last 5000 years. It also represents the settling pattern of the living stone age people. The landscape today is entirely different as the sea was in a different place and all of these are compressed into one. This is known as spatial archaeology but to some people it is known as heritage landscapes.</p> <p>Mr. Hart asked if it was alright to use another project as a means to answer the question. He said that in Elands Bay at Baboon Point, developers wanted to build houses and that this, within context of the Western Cape, is a prime archaeological site. The developer had then stated that the cultural landscape would not be affected because if one stands at the Elands Bay cave and looked out of it, that the development could only be seen slightly to one side.</p> <p>The two committees involved (Built Environment and Landscape [Belcom] and Archaeology, Palaeontology and Meteorite [APM]) reviewed the application separately. Belcom said that it would not have a significant impact whereas the APM committee found that the proposal would have a substantial impact on the general heritage and cultural landscape significance of the place which was upheld at</p>

GAMTKWA KHOISAN COUNCIL			
No	Name	Comments	Response
		Thyspunt is a most sensitive site in terms of archaeology and heritage. If Thyspunt is regarded as the least suitable site then when comparing it to other sites experienced, is it not a fact that it is more than another least preferred site in context of this application but actually one of the most sensitive sites in the country? This was directed to Mr. Hart.	<p>the MEC appeals hearing.</p> <p>Their reason was the way people perceive the significance of the Archaeology is experienced through the sense of place around the site even if no impacts are caused.</p> <p><b>Post-meeting note by M. Galimberti, SAHRA: A visual impact is always an impact.</b></p> <p>His final answer was therefore that the landscape could be regarded as a cultural landscape.</p> <p><b>Post-meeting note: The judgment in the Baboon Point case found that “there was little to no evidence that the economic development of the site outweighs the archaeological, cultural and historical significance of the proclaimed Provincial Heritage Site.” Every site needs to be assessed on its own merits and the merits of the proposed development. In the instance of Thyspunt, the site is not declared as a provincial heritage site. The nature of the proposed development at Thyspunt is different in nature and is intended to be of benefit to the economic development of the country as a whole.</b></p> <p><b>Additional post meeting note from M. Galimberti, SAHRA: It is true that the two types of developments at Baboon Point and Thyspunt are very different and the economic benefit for the country as a whole would be different, but it is also true that, if the economic development enhances the country as a whole, then it wouldn't really matter where the NPS will be built as the advantage would still be for the entire country and not only for the Eastern Cape.</b></p> <p>Mr. Hart stated that it was a very sensitive site.</p>
2	Councillor !KrotOa	Mrs. August stated that her expectation of the meeting	Ms Ball explained that as the environmental practitioners they have

<b>GAMTKWA KHOISAN COUNCIL</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Response</b>
	Cynthia August	was that everyone would come into an agreement that Thyspunt is a no-go area. She also said that they (the Khoi Khoi and San) are very sensitive about their heritage and are tired of being trampled on by people to get what they want. If the reason for this meeting is to get them to agree to the development then they are at the wrong 'table'.	to consider all the specialist studies as well as the viewpoints of all stakeholders including the Gamtkwa Khoisan Council. Arcus GIBB has issued the Draft EIR and given everyone time to review it and comment on it. Additionally many public meetings were also held and presently more focus group meetings are in progress on issues relating to each group. Therefore this meeting was called to gather the Gamtkwa Khoisan Councils' issues in this case mostly heritage and cultural, and take it back to the specialists for the necessary updating if need be. Therefore Arcus GIBB representatives are there to find out where the report is lacking or on which points the Council disagrees to Arcus GIBB are in the process of getting a number of reports revised such as the marine report, so it includes more information on the chokka industry, and a number of others. It was then stated that a revised Draft Environmental Report will be issued for comment.
3	Dr N.E. Swarts	<p>In terms of the various stakeholders, how important is the heritage value in the project? Regarding the process of evaluating all different aspects in the EIA how important is the heritage value in the context of the bigger scheme of things and considerations to the project?</p> <p>If an equal rating is given for example in terms of vegetation. Looking specifically at a particular geographical area, if one moves 1 km away from it you may find the same vegetation type. But when looking at what is happening at Thyspunt it cannot be replicated at all. So therefore to him weighting in terms of heritage is not important at all.</p>	<p>Ms Ball stated that in the evaluation methods in the draft EIR the potential impacts with the same rating across all sites were looked at and scoped out. Together with specialists, a range of criteria which were thought to be the most important were looked at. Numerical numbers were then assigned to these and each site was then assessed using these ratings. As far as Ms Ball could remember, the heritage ranking was similar across all the sites and was scoped out at that eventual ranking. It is a complicated process that is being reviewed together with two EIA process reviewers.</p> <p>Ms Ball explained that she was referring to the relative weighting scored against other studies. Additionally she also stated that from a botanical perspective it could be argued that vegetation can change over a small space of time and thus all these disciplines have their own complexities.</p>
4	Mr. Kobus Reichert	He said that the points raised by them are very clear. Thyspunt is a cultural landscape, a non renewable heritage resource and one of the most sensitive sites	Mr. Hart said that when writing the report, especially and if one wants to issue a no-go, then one has to be absolutely sure of the facts and be able to justify it. The only issue (where confidence

<b>GAMTKWA KHOISAN COUNCIL</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<p>in South Africa. It has to be preserved for South Africa's future. Why is something being discussed that should have been scoped out of the process a long time ago? This is an area that should have been declared a National Cultural Heritage Site.</p> <p>Turning it into an industrial zone is unacceptable. Why work through their submissions when everyone present should know that it is impossible to put a nuclear station at an area as sensitive as this. The development 7 km from Mapungubwe still had an impact on the heritage of the area. He appreciates the information provided by Mr. Hart but says he disagrees with the point that mitigation is even an option at Thyspunt. Mitigation will have no advantage to this community at all. Even if the facts are presented correctly, the conclusions are wrong.</p> <p>Mr. Reichert said that he understood that middle area could be seen as a window of opportunity but in the context of a cultural landscape it cannot be. The site identified in terms of the Heritage Impact Assessment possibly only represents 10% of what might be out there. So looking at this area which is possibly over 5000 years old if one could see beneath it then maybe there would not be a window of opportunity.</p>	<p>levels were low) is the lack of archaeological sites in the middle zone. The report however was brought as close as possible to a no-go but room was left for discussion as well.</p> <p>Mrs. Pietersen then asked if anything was done to have the area declared as National Cultural Heritage Site to which Mr. Reichert replied no because they expected the responsible property owner to do it. They do not believe that Eskom has looked at various options. He says that it is a white elephant because there are no development opportunities and therefore are unable to sell that land ever since 1980s. Eskom has disregarded the Khoi San heritage for many years.</p>
5	Ms Trudi Malan	She asked if she understood correctly that a no-go was not given because of the piece of land in the middle and if in fact does this means that they gave the developer the benefit of the doubt?	Dr. Hart stated that the level of confidence that was put into the report was low and did not give the benefit of the doubt to the developer. What he did was warn the developer that this was going to be a very difficult situation to resolve. And if given more time to spend on that piece of land, they will know more about it.
6	Dr N.E. Swarts	Where are the 5 main site located? It is interesting that they are all in the Western Cape. Why have the other parts of South Africa not been considered such	There are 2 in the Northern Cape, 1 at Thyspunt, 1 close to Koeberg and the last one is near Pearly Beach near Hermanus. Ms. Ball said that they started the EIA with the 5 sites. The Nuclear Investigative

<b>GAMTKWA KHOISAN COUNCIL</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<p>as KZN and Limpopo?</p> <p>He further asked whether these other sites (mentioned by Ms Herbst) from former homelands that were previously excluded will be re-looked at.</p>	<p>programme that was undertaken in the early 1980's by UCT concluded that these sites are suitable for nuclear power and therefore these sites were used.</p> <p>Ms Herbst said that the Nuclear Site Investigative Programme basically looked at the entire coast only excluding a few areas. If South Africa goes into the Nuclear programme pending the Integrated Resource Plan (IRP) approval by Government they will look at a lot more sites. Then Eskom will go through a process of looking at areas in addition to the previous sites identified.</p> <p>Ms Herbst said that the sites which were previously excluded will be looked at in the next round of the siting program.</p> <p>Mrs. Pietersen asked Dr Swarts if his concern revolved around the alternatives. He said it did not but that he was concerned about the fact that this new scoping that will be done will be on core apartheid sites and as it was pointed out these site will be re-looked at when something new happens.</p>
7	Mr. Chris Barratt	<p>For the sake of record on the above facts it was the previous so called independent homelands and 100 km from those borders that were excluded. So in actual fact it is over a third of the coastline of South Africa.</p>	<p>Mr. Theron stated that when those sites were selected a number of studies were done to collect data which was presented to the EIA consultant to verify. This was then reviewed by the various EIA specialists to find out if the data was still relevant to the current situation and the information received from the EIA specialist was that it was still relevant. Based on the assessment of that data, 5 sites were taken through the process. If another process is started it could take up to 5 – 6 years.</p> <p>Ms Malan disagreed with the above response saying that there have been many seismic investigations that were done. She stated that Eskom is hiding behind the 5 – 6 year issue. She said that in Dr Binneman's report he stated that Thyspunt should not be touched and now she is concerned that the independent consultants are advising Eskom that the sites are still suitable after they went</p>

<b>GAMTKWA KHOISAN COUNCIL</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Response</b>
			<p>through the original Nuclear Site Investigation Programme.</p> <p>She, together with other environmental consultants, looked at the original report and the only thing that was done in the original investigations was the meteorological investigation and very little environmental studies. There were site descriptions but no impacts were assessed at all. If the sites were selected only today, Thyspunt would have never made the environmental grade.</p> <p>She went on to say that instead they are sitting with a site that the government selected showing little concern to the people of the country and we must just make do with it. Eskom is now trying to fit the land to suit them and from a heritage perspective this should not be allowed to go forward.</p>
8	Councillor !KrotŌa Cynthia August	Councillor August agreed with Ms Malan. If the government does not acknowledge them then nothing has happened for the Khoisan community. If it is found out via Eskom that what she is thinking is true then they have 'another thing' coming. She asked that the so-called 5 – 6 year card stops being played. She also stated that if that area is spoilt it will be irreparable.	This point was noted.
9	Mr. Kobus Reichert	<p>The South African government spent millions of rand to develop the gravesite (of Sarah Baartman) which is currently a National Heritage Site.</p> <p>They did various assessments and the proposed developments that will happen there went did not go through site sensitivity analysis and there was no process of conserving the environment surrounding the grave to bring it into context with the spiritual aspect of the Khoisan legacy.</p> <p>He further asked why the South African government would spend so much money to honour the legacy of</p>	Mrs. Pietersen asked if Mr. Reichert felt a cost analysis should be done in terms of the price to develop a nuclear power station and the cost of actually preserving the heritage of the area. He said that there is no price that can be attached to something so sensitive.

<b>GAMTKWA KHOISAN COUNCIL</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<p>Sarah Baartman and then a few meters away decide to put up a nuclear power station on top of her heritage. It makes no sense.</p> <p>He also stated that if that is what happens then everything that was proposed at the Sarah Baartman meetings was all talk and that the Khoisan heritage are not really going to be considered when it comes to developments.</p> <p>To build an appropriate storage facility for the archaeology that must be removed from the cost will be very high. Together with these costs that will run into millions, more budget will be needed to do the mitigation works which will also take a long time. When adding all the figures, would it not be more feasible to find a more suitable site that will have fewer impacts on the environment and fewer impacts on the heritage resulting in less budget being needed. The remaining budget can then be used for something else.</p> <p>We see mitigation at Thyspunt as destruction. We agree that everyone is professional but we insist on the Khoisan legacy being maintained. A portion cannot be separated from the rest or we would have lost the only site of this nature that could have been used for future generations. Mitigation at this site would be like tearing pages out of a book, and then giving these pages to people telling them that this is the book.</p>	
10	Ms Trudi Malan	She stated that the archaeological cost was not included into the Economic Impact Assessment and requested that it is.	Her request was noted.
11	Mr. Kobus Reichert	What process will take place with regards to the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) sent out because	Ms Galimberti stated that SAHRA completely apposes to the development on this site. They prefer the sites in the Northern Cape

<b>GAMTKWA KHOISAN COUNCIL</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<p>most people do not understand the process involved and SAHRA's position regarding the HIA etc</p> <p>If Eskom wants to challenge SAHRA's decision what steps would they have to follow to do so?</p> <p>Taking SAHRA's decision into account, how does it affect the process with regards to the next draft that needs to be published?</p> <p>Can we be provided with SAHRA's comments in the meantime?</p> <p>He said he understands that SAHRA is one of the consenting authorities. How much weight can be put on their decision? As an example if 7 of 14 consenting authorities said no to the development would Arcus GIBB sue?</p>	<p>being used. They are presently waiting for the amendment of the EIA but their position on the matter has not changed since. She could not comment on the 2 sites in the Western Cape as Heritage: Western Cape will be commenting on them.</p> <p>Ms Galimberti said that the consultants will then have to do another assessment for them to review again.</p> <p>Ms Ball said that all comments, not only SAHRA's, are being reviewed. Certain specialist studies are also being reviewed of which some are complete and others are still in process. Arcus GIBB will revise the EIR once the revised studies are all received.</p> <p>She replied yes, but asked that they please note that all comments including SAHRA's will be included in the Revised Draft EIR.</p> <p>Ms Ball said that from an Arcus GIBB perspective the issues raised is what is looked at. This process is not a vote or tick box case. After reviewing the issues raised and the technical studies an assessment is done and a recommendation made to government. Government then gets other departments to comment on the report which will assist them in making a decision. It is not Arcus GIBB and neither Eskom's decision to make but rather the Department of Environmental Affairs.</p>
12	Dr N.E. Swarts	The ANC government must realise that it is a government by the people for the people and that if they ignore this community and their heritage the people will not forget it. They are truly concerned.	The comment was noted.
13	Mr. Kobus Reichert	He really appreciates the fact that they were invited to attend this focus group meeting since they have been asking for one for a very long time but were virtually ignored. However, because this may have a severe effect on the National status (a status in the HIA) it	Ms Ball asked if he could elaborate on the fact that they had been requesting for a key focus group meeting for while.

<b>GAMTKWA KHOISAN COUNCIL</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<p>has an overall effect on a national level on all KhoiKhoi and San people of South Africa. So it is good that they have been consulted with but the National Khoisan Council as well as the National Khoisan Facilitating Agency must also be consulted with as they are not aware of the development.</p> <p>He said that he had asked in his previous correspondence to be registered as a key stakeholder but that that request was ignored. When this was specifically objected to Ms Bongi Shinga informed him that this was an oversight that they were not identified as key stakeholders.</p> <p>Mr. Reichert however said that it was an informal meeting at which no minutes were taken and that that did not mean that they were then registered as key stakeholders of the project.</p>	<p>Ms Ball said she will go back and ask ACER for all records to see what exactly happened.</p> <p><b>Post-meeting note: The importance of the N.K.C and N.K.C.F.A is not disputed and as such consultation has taken place as part of the formal Environmental Impact Assessment process.</b></p> <p><b>According to ACER records, information on the project has continuously been sent to Mr. Kobus Reichert of Gamtkwa Khoisan Council since June 2007, i.e. from the early stages of Nuclear 1 EIA and/or project announcement. There are various levels of consultation that take place in an EIA process. The Public Participation Process creates various channels through which stakeholders can participate. During the EIA process, Interested and affected Parties could contribute issues either in writing by completing and returning comment sheets, or by attending meetings (Public meetings/focus group meetings/stakeholder meetings), or submissions of information at any stage of the process.</b></p> <p><b>Mr. Reichert has represented and submitted comments on behalf of the Khoisan Community during the Scoping Phase as well as during the Impact Assessment Phase. In addition, various project correspondence has been sent to Mr. Reichert as per table below.</b></p>

GAMTKWA KHOISAN COUNCIL																											
No	Name	Comments	Response																								
		<p>Mr. Reichert said that the perception they got was that the key stakeholders identified were people with money.</p> <p>There are many other people with whom they communicated that did not know about the situation but should have been consulted. These included Yvette Abrahams and Dianne Ferris.</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>ID</th> <th>Description</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>L02E</td> <td>Acknowledgement of Comments Received June 07</td> </tr> <tr> <td>L04E</td> <td>Letter 04 Scoping Extension 26 July 2010</td> </tr> <tr> <td>L05E</td> <td>DSR Availability Letter – 28 Jan 08</td> </tr> <tr> <td>L08E</td> <td>DSR Comment period extension – 14 Mar 08</td> </tr> <tr> <td>L11E</td> <td>Final Scoping Report Availability – 4 Aug 08</td> </tr> <tr> <td>L12E</td> <td>Project Updated Letter 22 Jan 08</td> </tr> <tr> <td>L13E</td> <td>Letter 13 Revised POS for EIA 18 May 09</td> </tr> <tr> <td>L14E</td> <td>Draft EIR Availability 3 Mar 10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>L15E</td> <td>Invitation to Key Stakeholder Feedback Meeting 03 Mar 10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>L17E</td> <td>DEIR Comment Period Extension 06 May 10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>L23E</td> <td>DEIR Further Comment Period Extension 27 May 10</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Ms Herbst mentioned that the group from the Council was personally invited to attend a site visit in September 2008. Ms Herbst then explained that what she was saying is that she did not think that they were being ignored, but his concerns will be looked into and addressed.</p> <p>Ms Ball explained that as the EIA process proceeds Arcus GIBB recognise who the stakeholders are and yes maybe there was an oversight but as soon as the Gamtkwa Community was recognized, they were invited to all stakeholder meetings as they were in the case of the last one.</p> <p>Ms Ball disagreed and added that any omission was not intentional. Ms Ball said they cannot guarantee who attends meetings, she</p>	ID	Description	L02E	Acknowledgement of Comments Received June 07	L04E	Letter 04 Scoping Extension 26 July 2010	L05E	DSR Availability Letter – 28 Jan 08	L08E	DSR Comment period extension – 14 Mar 08	L11E	Final Scoping Report Availability – 4 Aug 08	L12E	Project Updated Letter 22 Jan 08	L13E	Letter 13 Revised POS for EIA 18 May 09	L14E	Draft EIR Availability 3 Mar 10	L15E	Invitation to Key Stakeholder Feedback Meeting 03 Mar 10	L17E	DEIR Comment Period Extension 06 May 10	L23E	DEIR Further Comment Period Extension 27 May 10
ID	Description																										
L02E	Acknowledgement of Comments Received June 07																										
L04E	Letter 04 Scoping Extension 26 July 2010																										
L05E	DSR Availability Letter – 28 Jan 08																										
L08E	DSR Comment period extension – 14 Mar 08																										
L11E	Final Scoping Report Availability – 4 Aug 08																										
L12E	Project Updated Letter 22 Jan 08																										
L13E	Letter 13 Revised POS for EIA 18 May 09																										
L14E	Draft EIR Availability 3 Mar 10																										
L15E	Invitation to Key Stakeholder Feedback Meeting 03 Mar 10																										
L17E	DEIR Comment Period Extension 06 May 10																										
L23E	DEIR Further Comment Period Extension 27 May 10																										

<b>GAMTKWA KHOISAN COUNCIL</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Response</b>
			notes his perception of the key stakeholder meetings, but he also had to recognise that GIBB called him and requested the meeting and thus do recognise the group as important. Through the EIA process when going through the issues theirs was red flagged.
14	Ms Trudi Malan	She asked what work is currently occurring on site, not from an EIA perspective.	<p>Ms Ball said that Eskom should reply to this question as she could not reply on any work outside of the EIA. Mr. Reichert said that an archaeologist was also on site on Monday or Tuesday (23 – 24 August 2010) and he is sure it was not Mr. Hart (Mr. Hart confirmed that it was not him). Therefore what is happening at Thyspunt?</p> <p>Ms Galimberty stated that there was an application for a transmission line EIA but Ms Malan said that that was not it. Ms Ball also said that GIBB is busy with another EIA (Kouga Windfarm EIA) for which the specialists are on site at present, but Ms Malan again stated it is not that as it was on the Thyspunt side. Ms Malan feels that there is work occurring at Thyspunt.</p> <p>Ms Herbst said that she spoke to Mr. Gert Greeff (Eskom Nuclear Estates Manager) in the morning to find out about their last objection on drilling and the heritage issues and what was agreed upon. He said he recently received a map on future drilling that they wanted to do and he was unhappy about some of the GPS co-ordinates and was asking for a proper map and indicated that before they are allowed to do anything on site he will be contacting SAHRA. So this discussion indicates that no work is going on at site but that it might be someone walking to get GPS coordinates for future drilling but no actual work is taking place.</p>
15	Mr. Kobus Reichert	Are we then at that point where Eskom will acknowledge that it was a mistake to proceed with drilling operations without supervision from an archaeological perspective?	<p>Ms Herbst said that they dealt with that by getting people on site and getting to know what the circumstance was and a meeting was held to discuss it and agree on a way forward.</p> <p>Ms Ball added onto the issue of various stakeholders not being identified (see comment under No. 13). She said that a process of advertisement is used widely, regionally and nationally as well as word of mouth through the key stakeholders. Thus if any of the</p>

<b>GAMTKWA KHOISAN COUNCIL</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Response</b>
			<p>members of the Khoisan Council know of anyone who the EIA practitioners need to contact please let us know.</p> <p>Mr. Barratt said that they were not the only stakeholders left out, but that in fact there were numerous that were not contacted. He also felt that this was done deliberately. Ms Ball acknowledged his comments and reassured him that it was not done deliberately.</p> <p>Mr. Barratt then said that when most of the stakeholders are present at the first meeting and then not invited to the next one, it seems like it happened before. Mrs. Pietersen then asked if it were possible for Mr. Barratt to send to Ms Ball the names of the stakeholders that were not re-invited to the second meeting.</p> <p>Ms Ball responded by saying that when attending a key stakeholder meeting by just arriving it does not necessarily elevate you to a key stakeholder, but she would take the matter up with ACER and check all persons that attended previous workshops and see if they need to be flagged as stakeholders.</p> <p><b>Post-meeting Note: This task has been actioned by ACER. Gamtkwa Khoisan Council representatives (including representatives of National Khoisan Council and National Khoisan Conference Facilitating Agency provided by Mr. Reichert to ACER on 30 August 2010) have been categorised as Key Stakeholders on the database. Key Stakeholders on database are representatives who have a mandate to represent their constituencies or perspectives of their sectors and/or organisations.</b></p>
16	Mr. Kobus Reichert	Think their point has been made clear with regards to their position with this development and that their issues seriously need to be considered. In one of his previous comments referring to the UN Declaration of Indigenous Peoples Rights, he received a reply that that the land belongs to Eskom land and their	Comment noted.

<b>GAMTKWA KHOISAN COUNCIL</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Response</b>
		comment will be taken into account. This is the comment we receive on very important statements that we make. There is no way that the government can disregard the UN Declaration because they signed that and now they must implement it. Even if the Government is bound to this, it does not release Eskom from their responsibilities in this regard. They must stay in contact in terms of the process of Khoisan Recognition South Africa. There have been giant strides that have been made with the recognition process of the traditional Khoisan community structures to put them on an equal level with other traditional structures in South Africa. Do not get to a point where you build the structure and then suddenly you have to stop the process because these people have legal rights, stronger rights than seen in the Heritage Act. The Heritage Legislation in South Africa is lacking in several aspects. There is a huge gap in the legislation when it comes to the protection of the indigenous people rights.	
19	Mr. Chris Barratt	<p>Did Dr Hart (the Archaeology Specialist) receive the full copy of the initial report done by Johan Binneman, because it is interesting how the specialist report did not contain half of the records found init?.</p> <p>He then asked if Dr Hart attended a 2 – 3 day meeting With specialists to determine weightings. He then asked what weighting Dr Hart gave to the area.</p> <p>However, the area was still given an overall very low rating or zero rating?</p>	<p>Dr Hart said that he did. Ms Ball said that the report was made available to the specialist. This was confirmed by Dr Hart.</p> <p>Dr Hart acknowledged that he was at the meeting and said that he could not remember the exact weighting he gave. He did however know that he gave them, not the highest rating, but a high one. The reason for this, regarding botany, was that they were looking at a resource that does not breed and replace itself. So it was thought that it deserves more.</p> <p>Dr Hart disagreed and said that actually some of his fellow specialist had given higher ratings for the area than he did.</p>
20	Mr. Chris Barratt	How long will this current process take before the new draft is out?	Ms Ball said that it is hoped to be out before the end of September

<b>GAMTKWA KHOISAN COUNCIL</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Response</b>
			<b>Post-meeting Note: Due to the significant number of comments received from the public, the changes to the specialist studies and peer review comments the document will only be available in October.</b>

## **5. CLOSING REMARKS**

Ms Ball announced that if any Key Stakeholder or Focus Group Meetings occur that the Gamtkwa Khoisan Council will be informed. She also stated that GIBB and the specialist will go back and review and discuss with the specialists all comment made and then draw up a revised EIR.

Mrs. Pietersen thanked the Gamtkwa Khoisan Council for their availability and hospitality as well as for taking part in a productive discussion. She summarised the meeting in the following points.

- There is an extremely strong sense of place as well as a strong need for preserving the cultural landscape and leaving a cultural and social legacy for future generations.
- The particular community would not even consider mitigation measures as it is part of a heritage site and that they would prefer that this site become a no-go area.
- They also want the National Khoisan Council and the National Khoisan Facilitating Agency to be consulted with as part of the EIA process.

She then confirmed that minutes were taken and that it will be sent to all present for comment. Ms Ball asked if they could comment within 14 days as this is the comment period for minutes. All agreed. The meeting was then adjourned by Ms Pietersen.

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT (EIA)**

**EIA: 12/12/20/944**

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

**DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REPORT**

**KEY FOCUS GROUP MEETING  
COEGA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION (CDC) @ CDC OFFICES,  
COEGA INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ZONE**

**24 MAY 2010**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	1
1. ATTENDANCE.....	2
2. OPENING, WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS.....	2
3. MEETING OBJECTIVES AND FORMAT OF MEETING.....	2
4. ISSUES AND COMMENTS RAISED AND DISCUSSED.....	3
5. CONCLUDING REMARKS.....	8

## 1. ATTENDANCE

Name	Position/Portfolio
Mr Peter Inman	Senior Manager – CEO's Office, CDC
Mr Graham Taylor	Spatial Development Manager – Infrastructure Development Business Unit, CDC
Ms Andrea von Holdt	Environmental Project Manager – Operations Business Unit, CDC
Ms Deidre Herbst	Senior Manager – Environmental Generation Division, Eskom Holdings Limited (Eskom)
Mr Mervin Theron	Manager – Regulatory and Localisation, Nuclear Division, Eskom
Mr Loyiso Tyabashe	Chief Engineer, Nuclear Division, Eskom
Mr Andre Nel	Manager – Nuclear sites programme
Ms Jaana-Maria Ball	Nuclear-1 EIA Manager, Arcus GIBB

## 2. OPENING, WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Ms Deidre Herbst welcomed everyone at the Key Focus Group Meeting and thanked all for their participation. A round of introductions was made.

## 3. MEETING OBJECTIVES AND FORMAT OF MEETING

Ms Herbst stated that the purpose of this meeting was for Eskom and the independent EIA consultants to obtain further information from the Coega Development Corporation (CDC) regarding the possibility of the Coega Industrial Development Zone (IDZ) accommodating a nuclear power station. She stated that the question had been raised again by Interested and Affected Parties (I&APs) in the St. Francis Bay area as to why the Coega IDZ was not being considered as an alternative site for Nuclear-1, the first of Eskom's proposed nuclear fleet. She summarised the Nuclear Site Investigation Programme's (NSIP) assessment of the Eastern Cape Region and confirmed that the sites deemed to be most suitable were Tony's Bay and Thyspunt, which were combined to form the current Thyspunt site alternative in the EIA.

#### 4. ISSUES AND COMMENTS RAISED AND DISCUSSED

This section details all issues, comments and concerns that were raised and discussed at the meeting. Only the key points raised during the meeting were transcribed. Should you wish to make any corrections, please advise ACER within two weeks (i.e. 14 days) of receiving these minutes.

No	Name	Comment	Response
1	Dr Peter Inman (PI)	Is the assumption that a nuclear power station should be located 50 km away from residential area still applicable today? Colchester in the United Kingdom is 10 km away from a nuclear power station.	The current EUR that Eskom is utilizing as a specification requires the 800m and 3km Emergency Plan and Long Term Protective areas, respectively. Thus, the 50km issue raised is not a requirement. The reason that the 50km was used previously was to establish the Nuclear plant away from large cities.
2	Ms Andrea von Holdt (AvH)	She stated that she is all for challenging the assumptions made in the NSIP and determining whether they are still applicable today.	DH responded that the 10-year NSIP process acted as a 'funnel' for identifying reasonable and feasible site alternatives for the EIA for Nuclear-1. Mervin Theron (MT) added that approximately 8 years were spent investigating seismics of the alternative sites with over R1 billion spent on the technical investigations. JMB confirmed that all five sites assessed in the EIA were considered as reasonable and feasible alternatives by the appointed independent technical specialists in the Scoping Phase of the EIA.
3	PI	<p>Peter Inman stated that no airport is planned for IDZ at present as ACSA is not interested in the site earmarked for this purpose. The PetroSA site is situated East of the airport site</p> <p>As a result of literal oceanic drift sand will pile up in the bay. The ocean bed at the Thyspunt site becomes very deep very quickly thus Eskom would need to go further out with the inlet and outlet structures for deep water at the IDZ as the water is not so deep.</p>	DH commented that flight paths to the PE Airport may be a problem for a nuclear facility if located in the Coega IDZ.

No	Name	Comment	Response
4	Graham Taylor (GT)	<p>In terms of the Coega fault geotechnical studies have been undertaken for the site but full seismic studies i.e. micro-seismicity studies have not.</p> <p>Eskom requested these studies to be shared so as to understand their extent and methodology of work completed to date.</p>	
5	Deidre Herbst (DH)	<p>It is not anticipated that this site is a feasible and reasonable alternatives for Nuclear-1 based on our current knowledge of the site, but Eskom are looking at all potential site for future nuclear plants.</p>	
6	Andre Nel	<p>The NNR cannot make a decision regarding the 2 km zone that is required by Eskom to be owned and controlled by the Utility. The European Standard for Emergency Planning Zones (EPZs) for Generation 3 Pressurised Water Reactors (PWRs) is 800 m. It is a business decision that the 2 km be owner controlled. The Thyspunt site boundary is approximately 2 km from the centre point of the position of the proposed power station.</p>	
7	GT	<p>The following information was provided from the Google Earth image of the IDZ:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The IDZ boundary is approximately 9.3km from Alexandria Dunefield, which was assessed in the NSIP.</li> <li>• Motherwell township houses approximately 600 000 – 700 000 low income residents and is about 14 km from IDZ. Approximately 60% of these residents are unemployed. No residential leases are anticipated in the IDZ.</li> <li>• PetroSA Link –Single and busy moving ± 9km off</li> </ul>	

No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>shore.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Zone 11 is earmarked for bulk storage of fuel and a refinery and pipe supply tank farm as per the IDZ's Master Plan but will only be developed as commercial opportunities arise.</li> <li>• PPC land (zone 9-10) is located on the edge of the IDZ on the side near the Sunday's River Mouth. There is mining right issue and PPC can remove calcrete and is allowed to be ± 3km away from the coast to load and 9 km from Sunday's River Mouth.</li> <li>• There is a mariculture facility - Sea Arc – in Zone 10. It is located approximately 3 km from N3.</li> <li>• There are founding condition problems in Zone 7 (earmarked for Open Cycle Gas Turbine Plant - OCGT) although Zone 7 is more preferable a site as it is approximately 70 m above sea level and has only 15-20 m of sand overburden.</li> </ul>	
8	PI and GT	<p>The geotechnical studies for the IDZ will be made available to Eskom.</p> <p>Eskom needs to consider the positive aspects of the IDZ as a nuclear site, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Housing availability;</li> <li>• Labour availability from nearby Motherwell;</li> <li>• Availability of a harbour;</li> <li>• Ease of integration to grid – Transmission line corridor from the Dedisa sub-station of approximately 450 – 500 m with approval for 400kV lines and approval for 765kV lines to Grass Ridge and Dedisa substation; and</li> <li>• Long-term leasehold and if in national interest the</li> </ul>	

No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>CDC would consider selling the land to Eskom (it is considered good industrial land SAPOA can be contacted for market-related rates and the parcel of land has 'Special purposes' zoning)</p> <p>One possible constraint is the PetroSA pipeline (2X 12 km) risk. An oil spill would be a concern into the intake and possibly a major licensing risk.</p> <p>Cape Gannets, African Penguins are resident on St. Croix Island.</p> <p>The dune area on Zone 10 is currently Open Space in the Master Plan for the IDZ and could be developable with precautions. It is presently fairly invaded by Rooikrantz.</p> <p>There is a fault line from harbour through Zone 1, Neptune Interchange, Zones 3 and 5.</p>	
9	Andre Nel	Approximately 6 to 8 years of seismic studies are needed before SSHAC (Senior Seismic Hazard Assessment Committee) process can resume.	
10	DH	<p>In terms of Nuclear-2 and Nuclear-3 the Scoping process must check whether proposed sites are still reasonable and feasible alternatives.</p> <p>For Nuclear-4 and Nuclear-5 the NSIP process will be started all over again by Eskom and new sites sought.</p>	
11	JMB	<p>It was requested that the CDC provide Arcus GIBB and Eskom with the following documents:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Geotechnical studies for IDZ</li> <li>2. Seismic studies for IDZ</li> </ol>	The CDC agreed to provide the documents as requested as soon as possible.

No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>3. Copy of your latest IDZ plan (including off-shore structures) with the zoning and a list of planned activities/ developments for each zone</p> <p>4. Oceanography studies</p> <p>5. Marine studies</p> <p>6. Ecological studies (particularly for dune area in Zones 7 and 10)</p> <p>7. Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)</p> <p><b><u>Post-meeting note:</u></b></p> <p><b>In response to Arcus GIBB's query of 31 May 2010 as to whether the site offered to Eskom at the meeting for the purpose of constructing a nuclear power station (or any other site) was available in 2007/2008 the formal response from Peter Inman was:</b></p> <p><b>Given our understanding of what a nuclear power station requires, there were only two areas within the Coega IDZ that could conceivably have been used if an approach had been made to the CDC in 2007/8. Since sea water cooling is a prerequisite, then only land areas adjacent to the coast can be considered. This limits the choice to just two areas, Zone 1 (which already housed tenants and for which there were a number in the pipeline) or Zone 7/10 substantial parts of which were earmarked for various tenants most of which have since abandoned their projects due to their difficulties in securing project funding. Zone 1 would have to have been ruled out because of the proximity of other facilities not least the N2, the CDC's offices, St. George's Strand and the Port of</b></p>	

No	Name	Comment	Response
		<b>Ngqura, and the fact that it is probably closer to the so called Coega fault. Zone 7/10 would have been an option if it wasn't for the then active tenants and is an option now because most of the tenants have abandoned their projects.</b>	

## 5. CONCLUDING REMARKS

DH and JMB thanked all for their input into the meeting.

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT (EIA)**

**EIA: 12/12/20/944**

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

**DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REPORT**

**FOCUS GROUP MEETING  
KOUGA LOCAL MUNICIPALITY**

**KOUGA LOCAL MUNICIPALITY – COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

**24 MAY 2010**

**13H30 – 15H30**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	1
PREFACE .....	2
1. ATTENDANCE.....	3
1.1. ATTENDANCE – KOUGA LOCAL MUNICIPALITY .....	3
1.2. ATTENDANCE – ESKOM HOLDINGS LIMITED .....	3
1.3. ATTENDANCE – ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTING TEAM .....	3
2. OPENING, WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS.....	4
3. MEETING OBJECTIVES AND FORMAT OF MEETING.....	4
4. UPDATE ON NUCLEAR 1 EIA PROCESS PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION.....	4
5. ISSUES AND COMMENTS RAISED AND DISCUSSED.....	5
6. WAY FORWARD AND CONCLUDING REMARKS .....	22
ATTENDANCE LIST .....	23

## PREFACE

Should participants who attended the meeting require any changes to these proceedings, please notify the Public Participation Office in writing within 14 days of receipt.

**“Unidentified I&APs”** refer largely to persons who attended the meeting and verbally raised issues without providing their names. This in no way diminishes the value of the issue raised. Should you recognise your input and would like to have your name recorded next to it, please advise the Public Participation Office.

## 1. ATTENDANCE

### 1.1. Attendance – Kouga Local Municipality

Name	Position/Portfolio
Mr Robert Dennis	Executive Mayor
Mr Fumanekile Lloyd	Chairperson: Town Planning and Infrastructure
Ms Katrina Felix	Councillor
Ms Angelina Maseti	Councillor
Ms Magdalene Dlomo	Speaker
Cllr Virginia Camealio-Benjamin	Councillor: Ward 5
Mr Khayalakhe Michael Tshume	Councillor: Ward 9
Cllr Phumzile Olifant	Councillor: Ward 6
Mr Msingathi Gerard Mbandana	Councillor: Ward 10
Mr Ben Rheeder	Councillor: Ward 1 (St Francis Bay)
Dr Nico Botha	Councillor: Ward 3 (Jeffrey's Bay)
Ms Rosemary Rollison	Councillor: Ward 4
Cllr Vernon Stuurman	Councillor - Social and Economic Development
Mr Aubrey Marais	Manager – Electricity
Mr Eddie Oosthuizen	Manager - Technical Services
Ms Mari du Toit	Committee Member
Abrie Koegelenberg	Performance Management
Ms Laura-Leigh Randall	Media Liaison
Ms Trudi Malan	Community Representative (Thyspunt Alliance)
Ms Cheron Kraak	Community Representative (Thyspunt Alliance)
Mr Petrus Leen	Community Representative (Thyspunt Alliance)

### 1.2 Attendance – Eskom Holdings Limited

Name	Position/Role
Mr Gert Greeff	Manager - Nuclear Sites
Ms Carin de Villiers	Manager - Stakeholder Management and Communication, Nuclear Division
Ms Lorraine Ndala	Senior Environmental Advisor Eskom
Mr Jan Norman	Acting Infrastructure Manager Nuclear-1 – Divisional Client Office
Mr Jan Breytenbach	Nuclear-1 – Acting Project Manager
Mr Mandla Mbusi	Stakeholder Management – Koeberg Nuclear Power Station

### 1.3 Attendance – Environmental Consulting Team

Name	Organisation	Role in the project
Mr Reuben Heydenrych	Arcus GIBB (Pty) Ltd	Senior Environmental Scientist
Ms Bongzi Shinga	ACER (Africa)	Public Participation Consultant

## **2. OPENING, WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

Mr Fumanekile Lloyd, Chairperson of Infrastructure and Town Planning, requested Cllr Benjamin to open the meeting with a prayer.

Mr Lloyd welcomed all present and introduced all Kouga Municipality officials and community representatives as per Section 1.1.

Mr Lloyd then requested that the Eskom and EIA Team introduce themselves, the organisations they represent and their roles.

Mr Reuben Heydenrych introduced himself and explained that he is representing Arcus GIBB, the independent Environmental Assessment Company that has been appointed by Eskom to undertake the Environmental Impact Assessment for the proposed Nuclear Power Station, known as Nuclear 1.

Mr Heydenrych then requested the EIA Team and Eskom representatives to introduce themselves. Introductions were done as per Sections 1.2 and 1.3.

## **3. MEETING OBJECTIVES AND FORMAT OF MEETING**

Mr Lloyd advised all present that he will be chairing the meeting and indicated that the purpose of the meeting was to receive an update from the EIA Team on the progress of the of the Environmental Impact Assessment study for the proposed Eskom Nuclear Power Station as the Thyspunt site, within the Kouga Local Municipality, has been identified as the preferred location for Nuclear-1.

He further stated that the Kouga Municipality was aware that there had been a number of engagements with the public, interest groups and representatives of various organisations. He then stated that the Kouga Municipality Council is pleased to have a meeting so they can better understand the various aspects of the proposed Nuclear Power Station.

## **4. UPDATE ON NUCLEAR 1 EIA PROCESS PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION**

Mr Heydenrych stated that a series of presentations have been given to the public during the past two months. The presentation that has been prepared for the Council is shorter compared to the ones given at the public meetings due to the limited time available. The main purpose of the presentation was to provide background to the project and the findings of the investigations to enable the Council to provide comments as part of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) review period.

He also informed the Kouga Municipality that the meeting is being recorded for the accuracy of the minutes, which will be distributed to all attendees.

A copy of the presentation can be emailed to participants upon request from ACER. Alternatively, it can be downloaded from the EIA websites ([www.eskom.co.za](http://www.eskom.co.za) and <http://projects.gibb.co.za>) under Nuclear-1 – Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

## 5. ISSUES AND COMMENTS RAISED AND DISCUSSED

This section details all issues, comments and concerns that were raised and discussed at the meeting. Should you wish to make any corrections, please advise ACER within two weeks (i.e. 14 days) of receiving these minutes.

No	Name	Comment	Response
1	Councillor	She wanted to know if the access road from Oyster Bay (shown in green) connecting to the yellow road is a new/proposed road or it is an existing road.	<p>Mr Heydenrych explained that there is an existing track along the route shown in green – but it is not necessarily implying that the proposed road will follow the exact track route.</p> <p>The road is proposed to turn off from the Oyster Bay road approximately 400 m – 500 m north of the Oyster Bay village. Where the road turns off, it does not follow the existing road.</p> <p>The biophysical specialist team has walked the route and identified a corridor within which a road could be built. A recommendation has also been made that prior to the construction of the road, a walk down by these specialists be undertaken to determine the exact alignment of the road.</p>
2	Councillor	If one looks at the at the road routes, to get to the routes presented, the road must start somewhere in Humansdorp. The main road goes through the town of Humansdorp, which is quite busy. She questioned if that was the intention and if that is what has been recommended?	<p>Mr Heydenrych confirmed that that was the current proposal. He however mentioned that alternative proposals have been put forward, such as coming around Humansdorp, as the associated social impacts are of concern.</p> <p>The alternative routes will have to be discussed with the Kouga Municipality to establish if they are viable alternatives.</p>

No	Name	Comment	Response
3	Mr Robert Dennis Executive Mayor	<p>He raised the following questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="636 304 1317 475">1. <u>Decision-making</u>: He said that there might be a lot of debates, fighting, disagreements, agreements, etc. by the people of Kouga Municipality on something that may never happen. He wanted to know when would a firm decision be taken on the proposal?</li> <li data-bbox="636 863 1317 1034">2. <u>Security standards</u>: The 800m protection zone – is it the international requirement for nuclear plants? A while ago they were informed that the nearest development to such a facility should be 16 km or 32km, in case there is a need for evacuation.</li> <li data-bbox="636 1353 1317 1375">3. <u>Umzamogethu</u>: would the proposed development</li> </ol>	<p>Mr Heydenrych responded as follows:</p> <p>Assuming that the public participation process is completed in May, the final report would then be submitted to the Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA) in June or end of June. The DEA is required by legislation to make a decision within 105 calendar days after the final report has been submitted. As had been shown on the EIA Process Flow Chart, there is a possibility for appeals (after DEA has made a decision), but the legislation does not specify how quickly the Minister must make a decision on those appeals. Timeframes based on previous experience suggest that it could take up to 9 months for the Minister to make a final decision. In summary, the final decision on Environmental Authorisation could be made at the end of 2010 or more likely in 2011.</p> <p>Using the slide, Mr Heydenrych explained that the 800 m line around the proposed power station position is a zone within which private developments and permanent residents cannot be allowed. The current international requirement specifies that this is the only zone where development is not allowed and an area out to 3 km where evacuation may be necessary will also have restrictions.</p> <p>The 16 km zone is applicable at the Koeberg Nuclear Power Station because it is older technology. The zones that are applicable at Koeberg Nuclear Power Station will not apply to the new technology, Generation III type technology.</p> <p>There is an 800 m zone and then a 3 km zone within which there are certain planning restrictions. (Using a</p>

No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>impact on future developments for the Oyster Bay and uMzamowethu area? This would inform the Kouga Municipality as to how they proceed with their activities in these areas.</p> <p>4. <u>Impact on sea life:</u> The potential impact on sea life in the area is another issue that has been raised by the public and the Council would like to understand if a study (as part of the EIA) has been done to understand the extent of the impact.</p>	<p>slide, he showed the locations of Oyster Bay and uMzamowethu). Therefore, there should be no restrictions on development in Oyster Bay and uMzamowethu.</p> <p><b><u>Post-meeting note:</u> The final exclusion zones will be determined through the NNR process, the EIA studies have been based on the European Utility (EU) requirements, which are assumed will be the relevant safety zones.</b></p> <p>A Marine Study has been undertaken as part of the EIA. Mr Heydenrych informed the attendees that the Marine Specialists would be attending a meeting in St Francis Bay on 25 May 2010 to interact with stakeholders. The main concern around the sea life is the chokka industry, which has been looked at specifically. There is an area/depth up to 50 m where the chokka spawns, according to the specialists. There are pipelines that take water in from the ocean and release warm water back into the ocean. The recommendation from the specialist is that the zones less than 50 m deep must be avoided. The spoil pipeline must release water at a depth more than 50 m, which in this area is approximately 1.2 to 1.5 km offshore. This recommendation was made specifically to avoid the impact on chokka. There will be a security zone of approximately 1 km offshore from the high water mark but its size will be determined by the National Intelligence Agency for security purposes.</p> <p>A response was provided as part of security zone on point 2 above.</p>
4	Ms Trudi Malan Thyspunt Alliance	She raised follow up questions regarding the Generation 3 type technology:	

No	Name	Comment	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="618 237 1312 300">❑ How many Generation 3 type technology plants are currently in operation in the world?</li> <li data-bbox="618 308 1312 475">❑ What does Eskom use as a basis for the exclusion zones? Is it based on the European Utility Requirements (EUR)? The EUR is not government standards. EUR are companies like Eskom that got together and they decided on the security zone.</li> <li data-bbox="618 483 1312 719">❑ According to and if you look at the regulations in the USA, it is a 10 mile radius and a 15 mile radius. If you look at Stockholm, Netherlands, etc, it is 5km zone and 20km zone. She would like to get clarity on this and how they decide on 800m when there is no plant in the world that is in operating as a generation 3 type technology.</li> </ul>	<p data-bbox="1335 237 2029 300">Carin de Villiers answered that none were in operation but that several were under construction.</p> <p data-bbox="1335 341 2029 1031"><b>Post-meeting note: European and American Nuclear Regulators have indicated that they will only consider licensing nuclear plants if they can show that the 800 m and 3 km safety planning zones can be achieved. Based on this international trend and communication with the NNR it has been assumed that a similar requirement could be implemented in South Africa and this assumption has been used in this EIA. In a recent presentation to the portfolio committee the NNR stated that the major outcome of these new designs is that the emergency planning zones, specifically the Urgent Planning Zone (the zone within which evacuation of the public has to be catered for), would in all likelihood be reduced from 16 km in the case of the Koeberg Nuclear Power Station, to a much smaller radius that could fall within the property owned by the holder, and thereby to some extent minimize the issue of the control on urban developments which could potentially threaten the viability of nuclear sites.</b></p>
5	Councillor Olifant	<p data-bbox="618 1074 1312 1310">He raised a point of concern to the Chairperson, Mr Lloyd. He said that he thinks that the intention of the meeting was to address Kouga Council and there were other platforms that Eskom/the environmental consultant is using for the public to participate and it is in those sessions that the concerned groups should be raising issues.</p> <p data-bbox="618 1351 1312 1375">He indicated that he was unsure if at the session meant</p>	<p data-bbox="1335 1074 2029 1273">The Chairperson, Mr Lloyd indicated that the point of concern has been raised before, however, it was part of the invitation that at least 2 members of the public attend the session with Kouga Council. It is on that basis that the Kouga Council has allowed the members of the public to attend.</p> <p data-bbox="1335 1351 2029 1375">The Chairperson did state that he agrees with the</p>

No	Name	Comment	Response
		for Kouga Council, it would be correct to allow concerned groups to participate. He raised this point for clarity.	Councillor that the session is dedicated to the Kouga Council to be updated on the process, raise issues, etc. He further stated that he understands that the public has had numerous opportunities to participate.
6	Chairperson, Mr Lloyd	He wanted clarity on whether the EIA Report will be submitted to the DA, meaning Democratic Alliance.	It was clarified that the EIR will be submitted to the DEA (Department of Environmental Affairs).
7	Councillor Rheeder	<p>He wanted to raise a comment that he finds it strange that members of the public have been invited to the meeting with Kouga Council and then the Council feels uncomfortable when public members raise questions.</p> <p>He then continued as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❑ In the past 1.5 years, he has seen a lot of EIA correspondence for the proposed Nuclear Power Station.</li> <li>❑ The one aspect that concerns him is that there are certain groups that are very uncomfortable about the process, they feel that the EIA has not been done properly and a lot of information is not included.</li> <li>❑ If one looks at the proposed access roads, then he would like to agree with the concerned groups.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❑ If one looks at the access road from Oyster Bay side, he is sure that that was done on the map and</li> </ul>	<p>The Chairperson indicated that the presence of members of public in the Kouga Council meeting has been clarified, as it was not the Kouga Council that invited members of the public but was a requirement on the invitation sent to Kouga Council.</p> <p><b><u>Post-meeting note:</u> Members of the public were invited to the meeting by ACER on behalf of the EIA team.</b></p> <p>Mr Heydenrych responded that regarding the access roads and specifically the capacity of the roads, there is a traffic and transportation study, which looked particularly at the capacity of the Krom River Bridge and the rest of the roads (up to Port Elizabeth), which are proposed to be used for the extra heavy loads. The report is available for public comment and the Council is encouraged to interact directly with the traffic engineer (who is also attending the meeting at St. Francis Bay on 25 May 2010).</p> <p><b><u>Post-meeting note:</u> In terms of the loading of the road, one of the recommendations in the transport study is to carry out an evaluation on what loading the various roads can take prior to construction. Resurfacing may be required on certain roads.</b></p>

No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>not on the ground because where the road starts is a wetland (an important wetland) and that may be an issue.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="616 341 1314 576">❑ If we look at the Eastern access road, saying that that road will be for heavy traffic, then it means that the whole road from Humansdorp should be rebuilt because the present road cannot even take the current traffic volumes, including the bridge. So that will have a huge delay. This should be seriously looked at.</li> <li data-bbox="616 584 1314 927">❑ The human impact on all our areas is a great concern, it is common knowledge that when a project like this takes place, there would be a huge influx of people into the area of development hoping to obtain work and after the completion of the project they remain in the area. The Kouga Council is aware that they are still battling with what was left when The Links Golf Course was built. The Nuclear Power Station is going to come with similar problem.</li> <li data-bbox="616 935 1314 1238">❑ Building a Nuclear Power Station means skills. They are talking about 7 700 people working there and it will not be a lot of local people that have the skills to work there except general labourers. So, this is a point that needs to be seriously addressed in the Final Scoping Report (<i>suspect he meant Final EIA Report</i>) and where those people will be housed because after construction the Municipality will be left with a problem.</li> </ul>	<p>With regards to the Western Access road, it has been mentioned that there are wetlands, which may be affected. Mr Heydenrych confirmed that the identification of the route was in fact done on site by a team of biophysical specialists, which included the wetland, botany, dune geomorphology, and invertebrate specialists. All these specialists walked the route and according to them, they found that the route is feasible and acceptable from an environmental point of view. There may be some areas where the route comes close to the wetlands but if that is the case, it has been recommended by Arcus GIBB that specialists walk the route to ensure that those kinds of impacts are avoided when the final alignment is determined (if authorisation is granted).</p> <p><b>Post-Meeting note: All recommendations in the Draft EIR report are included in the EMP. The EMP is a legally binding document that Eskom will be required to comply with.</b></p> <p>With regards to human and social impacts, Mr Heydenrych acknowledged that there is a serious concern amongst the residents in the area. There is always an influx of people in the area whenever there is a huge construction development. The Eskom team has been in discussions with the local authority officials and the areas they have identified for housing are Humansdorp and Jeffrey's Bay. They have also looked at models that they would like to apply in the area, based on previous project experience. For instance, places and the areas where people would come for recruitment would be placed in central locations away from the construction site in order</p>

No	Name	Comment	Response
			to prevent job seekers swamping the construction site.
8	Councillor	<p>Regarding the provincial road running from Humansdorp through to Sea Vista (R330) that will be used by heavy trucks, he raised the following key points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❑ When the process possibly starts, the Road Engineers that are working in the area need to be sensitised because there is a lot of activity that happens on the R330.</li> <li>❑ The interaction of people in the road includes KwaNomzamo community, children going to school, etc. This happens on a daily basis.</li> <li>❑ One of the recommendations that should be made by the Consultants to Eskom is building an overhead bridge - because it will be important for safety reasons. The Municipality is having the same problem as one goes to the Marina. It was said that an overhead bridge will be constructed and that has not happened.</li> <li>❑ The roads issue is a serious one because once the project has been given a go-ahead, the developer may not come back to address the concerns that the Municipality has raised.</li> </ul> <p>Accommodation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❑ He wanted to confirm that Jeffrey's Bay has been identified as a potential area for housing. He said that there are a lot of town houses in Jeffrey's Bay that must be utilised.</li> <li>❑ He further stated that he is against settlement of people in shacks and slums and then the</li> </ul>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Mr Heydenrych stated that Eskom is seriously considering the suggestion of building an overhead bridge on the R330 for pedestrians.</p> <p><b>Post-meeting note: The access roads and associated impacts are being re evaluated. Arcus GIBB and Eskom will engage with the municipality on these aspects prior to finalising activities. This will ensure that there is no duplication of efforts and that appropriate management and mitigation measures are implemented.</b></p>

No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>municipality is left with social problems at the end of construction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❑ The debate of housing should be robustly undertaken and the Municipality well engaged before construction commences.</li> <li>❑ The Municipality needs to be in a position to better manage the situation and would not like to see people fighting one another for jobs.</li> </ul>	<p>It was confirmed that both Humansdorp and Jeffrey's Bay are being considered for housing.</p> <p><b>Post-meeting note: Eskom acknowledges this request and the importance of the issue. The municipality will be engaged in a formal manner through formal processes if an Environmental Authorisation is obtained.</b></p>
9	Councillor Olifant	<p>It has been mentioned there will be two access roads towards Thyspunt. He then alluded to the fact that the input of the Municipality would revolve more on the traffic capacity and on the road infrastructure.</p> <p>It is a concern to the Municipality because currently the R330 is a provincial road and its maintenance mostly lies within the provincial budget. His concern is that using a road that goes via Humansdorp, might be a burden to the Kouga Council in terms of costs associated with repairs, maintenance or rebuilding the roads to withstand the volumes and/or capacity.</p> <p>The number of vehicles that have been mentioned during the presentation are not even a quarter of vehicles at Kouga that make use of the roads. So it would be a heavy burden on the Kouga Council infrastructure.</p> <p>He then wanted to check if there is a specific budget to cover costs associated with repairs, maintenance and rebuilding of roads.</p>	<p>As part of this EIA, the Traffic Assessment has looked at the roads that may need to be upgraded. This has certainly been part of the economic modelling. They have looked at all the costs including upgrading of roads and bridges where they may be necessary.</p> <p>So certainly for the construction, Eskom has allowed for funding for the upgrading of roads.</p> <p><b>Post-meeting note: Eskom has not begun to source funding for Nuclear 1. The Integrated Resource Plan (IRP) should include a funding plan for different scenarios. Once this is in place Eskom will need to include all relevant costs associated with the construction of the nuclear power station into the budget and obtain approval for the expenditure from the Eskom Board of Directors. In terms of this discussions will need to take place with relevant authorities to determine roles and responsibilities including covering the cost of infrastructure. In other large projects Eskom has contributed to all</b></p>

No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>If the gravel road to Oyster Bay is used, will it be the responsibility of Eskom to tar that road or will it be a joint responsibility between Eskom and the Province. The reason he asked was that he had noticed that there was some pegging along the road (which indicates that some construction work is in the pipeline).</p> <p>The wetland which has been raised by Cllr Rheeder is of great concern. The area that is being referred to is a vlei. He indicated that he knows the wetland being referred to quite well as he was born in the area. It would be important that studies are made available to the public so that they can get independent opinion on the issue of wetlands/vlei.</p> <p>He brought to the attention of the Chairperson that the Specialists are paid by Eskom, so by implication, they cannot "bite the hand that feeds them".</p> <p>The Kouga Municipality cannot allow processes that will ruin and damage the wetlands. They would be happy to get an independent opinion on the areas of concern that they have elaborated on.</p>	<p><b>infrastructure directly related to the project for example the access roads (some of which are provincial) to Ingula pumped storage scheme and in Lephalale for the upgrade of a sewage plant amongst others. In other cases Eskom has contributed to the costs. In all cases however maintenance after completing construction of the power station remains the accountability of the provincial or local authority.</b></p> <p>Mr Heydenrych explained the wetland issue using a map produced by the wetland specialist to show the sensitivity of the site and area around the site. He showed areas within which the power station could be located and indicated the location of sensitive wetland areas and the number of wetlands around the Oyster Bay dunefield.</p> <p>He also pointed out the wetlands in relation to the western access road, which comes off the Oyster Bay road and stated they are confident that they have avoided the wetlands.</p> <p>He informed the Kouga Council that the Draft EIR and the specialist studies are available on the EIA websites (<a href="http://projects.gibb.co.za">http://projects.gibb.co.za</a>) under the 'Nuclear-1 - Draft Environmental Impact Report' and <a href="http://www.eskom.co.za/eia">www.eskom.co.za/eia</a> under 'Nuclear 1-Generation' link), at the Jeffrey's Bay public library and DVD's can also be made available upon request.</p>
10	Cllr Madlala	<p>He made the following comments regarding the social impacts:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> He is of the view that the neighbour of Kouga</p>	<p>Mr Heydenrych explained that he is not aware of other big</p>

No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>Municipality, Nelson Mandela Metro has the Petro SA project. If Petro SA is successful, it will be bringing in a large number of people that will be working in the region and that is likely to alleviate some of the challenges that Kouga Municipality might face, from a social point of view.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="618 483 1312 647">❑ He also wanted to check, in terms of two big projects happening in the region simultaneously, if they will be bringing people from outside the region. Is the importing of workers not going to create challenges for Eskom, etc.?</li> <li data-bbox="618 691 1312 823">❑ How vigilant are the consultants in terms of the international lobby groups that will try to stop the project they are likely to have a negative influence on local social groups in the area?</li> </ul>	<p>projects happening in the Nelson Mandela Bay area. He is unable to comment on the numbers of workers who may be coming in as a result of those projects.</p> <p>Arcus GIBB as the Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) can only respond to comments received through the EIA process and cannot monitor the activities of interests of international lobby groups. The role of the EAP is to weigh the pros and cons of the project and to look at the positive and negative impacts of the project. It is up to Eskom to engage with the lobby groups, should they consider it necessary.</p> <p><b>Post-meeting note: To date no large international lobby groups have provided input into the EIA process. Arcus GIBB will continue to monitor this and if lobby groups engage after authorisation has been give, Eskom will engage with them.</b></p>
11	Councillor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="618 1214 1312 1347">❑ The proposed Nuclear Power Station is a big project. Regarding the bulk of employment, is Eskom going source workers from the local areas or is Eskom going to import workers into the area?</li> </ul>	<p>The Social Specialist has recommended that at least 25% (and preferably more) of the construction personnel should be sourced locally. Examples from previous large Eskom power station projects have been used as a basis. The contractors are required to also provide training to the</p>

No	Name	Comment	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="616 411 1314 683">□ Regarding the social impact, having a huge development in the area, adds pressure to the existing infrastructure. Cllr Olifant has alluded to the impact on infrastructure such as roads that are going to require upgrading, etc. Additional social requirements include health (capacity of hospitals), human resources (doctors which the Kouga Municipality does not have), etc.</li> <li data-bbox="616 762 1314 858">□ Is the sourcing of local labour only applicable for the construction phase or it includes the operational phases (more permanent jobs)?</li> <li data-bbox="616 1353 1314 1380">□ Has a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)</li> </ul>	<p data-bbox="1332 236 2036 370">workers to ensure that local people do not only undertake manual labour but that their skills are improved during the process. So, at least 25% of the peak of 7 700 workers must be local people.</p> <p data-bbox="1332 411 2036 513">This has been addressed in the Social Impact Assessment. The social specialist has looked at the educational facilities, hospitals, community facilities, etc.</p> <p data-bbox="1332 555 2036 753"><b>Post-meeting note: The social specialist has identified that the social infrastructure in the Kouga Municipality is currently under-resourced and that Eskom would be required to address this issue. Eskom would liaise with the Kouga Municipality prior to construction on these aspects if authorisation was obtained.</b></p> <p data-bbox="1332 794 2036 1209">Ms de Villiers explained that as far as possible, for permanent jobs, Eskom would try and recruit from the area. It is Eskom's experience that local people tend to stay compared to people that have been brought into the area (as they tend to go back to the areas where they come from). Eskom's preference would be to source and train people from the local areas. Eskom has already looked into the area, they would need to commence with the training soon. Eskom has started recruiting engineers who come from the area, which would be brought back into the area to work at the power station should it be built in the area.</p> <p data-bbox="1332 1251 2036 1380">An SEA has not been done, it is not a requirement at in terms of the legislation. An SEA is a voluntary assessment that may be initiated by a private developer or by local or provincial government. Up to this stage, there has not</p>

No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>been undertaken for this project?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Transmission power lines - are they part of the nuclear power station EIA?</p>	<p>been a strong drive for an SEA to be undertaken in the area.</p> <p>The power lines have not been assessed as part of the nuclear power plant EIA. Power lines have been undertaken as a separate EIA study and by a separate consultant.</p>
12	Ms Trudi Malan Thyspunt Alliance	<p>Addressing the Chairperson, Cllr Olifant, Ms Malan stated the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> As community representatives, they appreciate the opportunity to be part of the Kouga Council meeting.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> As a community, they do feel that they have studied the EIR documents and reports extensively.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> They have from the community's side got some specialists to study the reports as well.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The issues that the community have on the proposed development need to be brought to the Council's attention.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> The Council members are the leaders of the community, however the community feels that they are voiceless in this process, because the more they ask questions, the less answers they get.</li> </ul> <p>She went on to raise concerns on the Transportation Assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> In the Transportation Impact Assessment for Thyspunt that was provided to the public by the expert, there were 6 missing figures and 31 missing Annexures. And so when the Thyspunt Alliance specialist had to comment, they could not</li> </ul>	

No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>comment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❑ When the information was asked for - the response was that the EAP is sorry for all the inconvenience they have caused. But it is still a question of they need to give the public more time to comment on complete information.</li> </ul> <p>She further raised concerns on the Marine Specialist Study:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❑ There are issues on the Squid Industry which the EAP states has been extensively investigated in the Marine Study</li> <li>❑ The specialist from the Rhodes University that has been requested to review the Marine Specialist report is 99% sure that the Squid Industry is going to be destroyed in the area because Eskom is going to pump 6.3 million cubic metres of sand (which is equivalent to trucks from the area to Cairo) into the sea, which is going to change the visibility of the sea and the squid needs clear water.</li> <li>❑ In the Economic Impact Assessment, it says the impact on the Squid Industry. There are 4050 jobs in the Squid Industry. If this project is going to mean the end of the squid industry, the thousands of jobs that are being promised to the communities will not mean anything to them.</li> <li>❑ Impact on tourism - the Kouga Municipality is going to loose 6.1 million from year 1 to year 6 during construction.</li> <li>❑ Agricultural impact - is R 18.7 million per annum and they stand to loose - this is according to the studies that have been provided by the specialists.</li> </ul>	<p>Mr Heydenrych responded that the marine assessment has assessed the impact of the sediment on the squid. An Oceanographic Assessment, which looked specifically at the movement of sediment based on ocean currents, investigated where it would be acceptable to dispose of the sediment. There are two options for the disposal of sediment, which will come from the excavations of the foundations of the power station. These options are either to dispose of it on land or in the ocean. The Oceanographic Specialist looked at that and the Marine Specialist has based his assessment on what has been found in the Oceanographic Assessment. According to the Specialists, they found that the sediment would cover a section of seafloor or approximately 6km<sup>2</sup>. That is the reason for the recommendation, which has been made by the specialists to dispose the spoil at least 1.5 km to 2 km offshore to avoid impact on the spawning grounds of the squid or chokka.</p> <p><b>Post-meeting note: On page 7 of the Economic Impact Assessment, it is stated: "According to the information supplied by the South African Squid</b></p>

No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>This area stands to loose big time and they are not making the information very clear in the studies (and that is what the communities are trying to say). This is the same information that Cllr Rheeder has been referring to.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❑ We have written a letter to various Ministers to complain about the fact that the communities are not being given the correct information.</li> <li>❑ During the Scoping Phase, it was suggested that they investigate thoroughly the Squid Industry.</li> <li>❑ In the entire report, the only reference to the Squid Industry is that 'it might have an impact and it will not have an impact'.</li> <li>❑ When the Thyspunt Alliance got the specialist involved, they had completely different information.</li> <li>❑ When they say a 1km exclusion zone, in the Economic Assessment, it says the Port St Francis boats will not be able to get there anymore, they will loose 38% of their catch when a 1km security zone is implemented.</li> <li>❑ The security zone – Eskom cannot decide on the security zone that they will allow commercial fishing. This is a problem to the communities.</li> </ul> <p>She then posed the question, when are they (Thyspunt Alliance) going to have an opportunity to present information that has been found by the specialists to the Kouga Council.</p> <p>The Thyspunt Alliance is not concerned or against Nuclear, they are concerned about the impacts of the development on their communities.</p>	<p><b><i>Management Industrial Association (SASMIA) (2007), between 1999-2005 an average of 33.2% of the total annual Eastern Cape catch originated in the area between 10 nautical miles (18.52 km) east and west of the proposed Thyspunt site. Thus, an exclusion zone of 1 km width would account for roughly 1.8 % of the total catch. This would amount to about 127 tons per annum with an export value of €0.88 million per annum”.</i></b></p> <p>Regarding the impact on tourism and agriculture – these studies have been undertaken as part of the investigations. In this area they have found, according to the agricultural specialist, that there may be a potential increase in agricultural production because of the influx of people who will produce a larger market for agricultural products. It is however not the case on other sites, such as Bantamsklip, because of the scarcity of water. Because of the availability of water in the Thyspunt area, the agricultural specialist indicated that the agricultural production could increase by approximately 15%.</p> <p>With regards to tourism, there will be an impact on tourism and tourism market differs quite substantially across all 3 sites. At Thyspunt, the finding was that there could be a negative impact of approximately 8% during construction and 0% impact during operation. This was based on the fact that there may be some people who view a nuclear power station as an undesirable kind of development given the nature of the current tourism market in the area, but it may also be the increase in business related tourism as a result of the construction teams and operation staff coming to the area during the operational life of the</p>

No	Name	Comment	Response
			<p>nuclear power station.</p> <p>All results are part of the specialists reports which have been made available for public review. In response to all the comments raised by the Thyspunt Alliance, Mr Lloyd stated that the community should have tried to engage the Council prior to the meeting with Eskom, Arcus GIBB and Kouga Council.</p> <p>The meeting has therefore been the Council's first engagement as part of the Draft EIR review. It would have been ideal if the Council met in the absence of Arcus GIBB and Eskom so that the Council and members of the public could debate the issue.</p>
13	Mr Reuben Heydenrych Arcus GIBB	<p>A question they have as the EAP, they have heard recently (not sure if it is with the Province) that the road from Humansdorp to Oyster Bay is being tarred and Arcus GIBB is uncertain about the status of the road. It has also been mentioned that the road is being pegged.</p> <p>Eskom would like to know from the Kouga Council if it is an option to use it as an alternative rather than coming through the eastern side along the R330 for at least some of the traffic [may be not for all the traffic].</p>	Kouga Local Municipality to provide a response.
14	Cllr Stuurman	<p>The manner in which he understands the process is that the Kouga Council is also a stakeholder in the process. He also understands that the Kouga Council is equal partners with the community in this process.</p> <p>He informed all present that he was going to be controversial in his closing remarks and stated the following points:</p>	Comments noted.

No	Name	Comment	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="618 272 1312 437">❑ We cannot debate this development as if it is a Kouga matter. We need to look at this development within the context of South Africa. We cannot talk about the economy of Kouga and not taking into cognisance the economy of South Africa.</li> <li data-bbox="618 448 1312 612">❑ One controversy is that, in the not so long past, it was part of the Constitution of this country for blacks not to have access to electricity. We cannot beat around the bush as if there was nothing wrong.</li> <li data-bbox="618 624 1312 788">❑ Now that we are rebuilding the infrastructure, we cannot come with sentimental issues, which are in fact not sentimental because what is happening is part of the South African Constitution, whether we like it or not.</li> <li data-bbox="618 799 1312 1139">❑ He also stated that on his way to the meeting, he was listening to the Minister of Transport talking about the backlog on the road infrastructure, which is huge because it was upgraded 20 years ago. Now that we have to upgrade, we cannot debate in a manner that will only suit interests of a minority and not the interests of all people. So when we debate about Thyspunt, it may be located in Kouga but it will not be a Kouga development, it is a South African development.</li> <li data-bbox="618 1150 1312 1374">❑ Another aspect is that, if one compares what is happening here and in the Western Cape, one does not see these adverse effects that are being portrayed to people in Kouga. May be those who lobby against the NPS must go to Koeberg and see for themselves what happens in and around Koeberg.</li> </ul>	

No	Name	Comment	Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="618 237 1312 300">❑ As a person, he does not see anything wrong with nuclear power.</li> <li data-bbox="618 308 1312 437">❑ He indicated that, he has the courage to say that he will lobby for the Nuclear Power Station openly – he is not going to hide his stance on the proposed development.</li> <li data-bbox="618 445 1312 510">❑ He is not a specialist but he is trying to educate himself regarding nuclear power.</li> <li data-bbox="618 518 1312 683">❑ He also posed a challenge to all present to do some introspection, at their homes, at their offices, etc and question themselves as to what type of energy have they used to be the people they have become today.</li> <li data-bbox="618 691 1312 788">❑ Where people have made their money, they need to ask themselves, what type of electricity have they used to make that money.</li> <li data-bbox="618 796 1312 893">❑ Now people are saying nuclear power is not the right form of energy but in the past years, they have used nuclear power from Koeberg NPS.</li> </ul> <p data-bbox="618 933 1312 1031">In closing he then stated that there is no way that the Kouga Council can argue – all ANC Councillors must have a developmental state in mind.</p>	

## **6. WAY FORWARD AND CONCLUDING REMARKS**

Mr Lloyd thanked Mr Heydenrych for presenting to the Kouga Council.

He stated that the Councillors have been debating some of the issues. He felt that some of the issues were clarified during the discussion session.

He then stated that the proposed Nuclear Power Station will be debated by the Kouga Council and an official position/stance would be taken as to whether they support or oppose the proposed Nuclear Power Station.

He also requested Eskom to ensure that bursaries are made available to students (as from next year, 2011) from the area so that deserving children can study further. This will ensure that people from Kouga do not only become labourers during construction but are provided with skills of a specialised nature as and when opportunities arise at the proposed Nuclear Power Station.

He then thanked all present for their inputs and declared the meeting closed.

### ATTENDANCE LIST

Surname	First Names	Title	Co/Org	Kouga Municipality Meeting 24 May 2010
Botha	Nico	Dr	Kouga Local Municipality	Attended
Breytenbach	Johann	Mr	Eskom Holdings Limited	Attended
Camealio-Benjamin	Virginia	Ms	Kouga Local Municipality	Attended
de Villiers	Carin	Ms	Eskom Holdings Limited	Attended
Dennis	Robert	Mr	Kouga Local Municipality (EC108)	Attended
du Toit	Mari	Ms	Kouga Local Municipality	Attended
Felix	Katrina	Ms	Kouga Local Municipality	Attended
Greeff	Gert	Mr	Eskom Nuclear Sites	Attended
Koegelenberg	Abrie	Mr	Kouga Local Municipality	Attended
Kraak	Cheron	Ms	Thyspunt Alliance	Attended
Leen	Petrus	Mr	Thyspunt Alliance	Attended
Lloyd	Fumankile	Mr	Kouga Local Municipality (EC108)	Attended
Marais	Aubrey	Mr	Kouga Local Council	Attended
Malan	Trudi	Ms	Thyspunt Alliance	Attended
Maseti	Angelina	Mrs	Kouga Local Municipality	Attended
Mbandana	Msinyathi Gerald	Mr	Kouga Local Municipality	Attended
Mbusi	Mandla	Mr	Eskom Holdings Limited	Attended
Ndala	Lorraine	Ms	Eskom Holdings Limited	Attended
Norman	Jan	Mr	Koeberg NPS	Attended
Oliphant	Phumzile	Mr	Kouga Local Municipality	Attended
Oosthuizen	Eddie	Mr	Kouga Local Municipality	Attended
Rheeder	Ben	Mnr	Kouga Local Municipality	Attended
Rollison	Rosemary	Ms	Kouga Local Municipality	Attended
Tshume	Khayalakhe Michael	Mr	Kouga Local Municipality	Attended

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT (EIA)**

**EIA: 12/12/20/944**

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

**DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REPORT**

**KEY FOCUS GROUP MEETING**

**SEA VISTA FORUM & CENTRE FOR ENVIRONMENTAL RIGHTS**

**18 NOVEMBER 2010**

**18H30 – 20H00**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	2
PREFACE .....	3
1. ATTENDANCE.....	4
1.1. Attendance – Sea Vista Forum and Associates .....	4
1.2 Attendance – Centre for Environmental Rights (CER) .....	4
1.3 Attendance – Applicant - Eskom Holdings Limited.....	4
1.3 Attendance – Independent Environmental Consultants – Arcus GIBB (Pty) Ltd .....	4
2. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS.....	4
3. DISCUSSION SESSION.....	6
4. CLOSING REMARKS .....	15
ATTENDANCE LIST .....	16

## PREFACE

Should participants who attended the meetings require any changes to these proceedings, please notify the Arcus GIBB Public Participation Office ([Nuclear1@gibb.co.za](mailto:Nuclear1@gibb.co.za)) in writing within 14 days of receipt.

“**Unidentified I&APs**” refer largely to persons who attended the meeting and verbally raised issues without providing their names. This in no way diminishes the value of the issue raised. Should you recognise your input and would like to have your name recorded next to it, please advise the Public Participation Office.

In order to provide a structure and to enable the reader to follow the proceedings with ease the minutes have not been captured verbatim and post-meeting notes have been added for clarity and information purposes and are indicated in **bold**.

## 1. ATTENDANCE

### 1.1. Attendance – Sea Vista Forum and Associates

Name	Organisation
Tobeka Petse	Sea Vista Forum
Isak Coenraad	Sea Vista Forum
Patrick Fredericks	Sea Vista Forum
Petrus Leen	Sea Vista Forum
Sydney Lamont	Sea Vista Forum
A. Malgas	Sea Vista Forum
Edward Busakwe	Sea Vista Resident
K. Sibeno	Community Development Workers DPLG
Elvis Olivier	Kouga Municipality
Mayor R. Dennis	Kouga Municipality
D. Ras	ANC Representative
K. Papa	ANC Secretary
C. Barratt	St. Francis Kromme Trust
T. Malan	Thyspunt Alliance

### 1.3 Attendance – Centre for Environmental Rights (CER)

Name	Role in the project
Melissa Fourie	Director CER; Legal representation for Sea Vista Forum
U. Sobekwa	Legal representation for Sea Vista Forum

### 1.2 Attendance – Applicant - Eskom Holdings Limited (Eskom)

Name	Position/ Role in the project
Deidre Herbst	Senior Manager - Environment Generation Division

### 1.3 Attendance – Independent Environmental Consultants – Arcus GIBB (Pty) Ltd (GIBB)

Name	Position/ Role in the project
Jaana-Maria Ball	Nuclear-1 EIA: Project Manager
Inge Schovell	Environmental Scientist

## 2. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Ms. Melissa Fourie welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked them for being punctual. She then introduced herself as the Director of CER representing the Sea Vista Forum and asked the meeting attendees to introduce themselves one by one to the group. Introductions were done as per Sections 1.1 to 1.5.

Ms. Fourie stated that the purpose of this meeting was to raise the rights of the Sea Vista community with Eskom and the environmental consultants responsible for the Nuclear-1 EIA.

Ms. Fourie stated that the Sea Vista Forum members had invited a number of other key stakeholders in the community to attend the meeting as observers.

A draft agenda was handed out to all participants and adopted by all present for use during the meeting.

### 3. DISCUSSION SESSION

This section details all issues, comments and concerns, which were raised and discussed at the meeting. Should you wish to make any corrections, please advise GIBB within two weeks (i.e. 14 days) of receiving these minutes.

<b>SEA VISTA FORUM AND CENTRE FOR ENVIRONMENTAL RIGHTS</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
1	Mr. Dennis	He asked how long the meeting will be and also stated that it should not be rushed.	Ms. Fourie stated that it was expected that the meeting be 1 hour in duration.
2	Ms. Fourie	<p>She stated that this Key Focus Group Meeting was offered by GIBB and Eskom to the Sea Vista Forum in order for the members of the Sea Vista Forum to explain their concerns regarding the public consultation process for the Nuclear-1 Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) and give suggestions on how to improve the meetings in Sea Vista, as well as discuss the way forward with respect to the EIA process.</p> <p>Ms. Fourie then referred to action 3 on the agenda and asked Ms Ball to provide an update on the EIA process and encourage Forum members to ask questions about it.</p>	<p>Ms. Ball stated that GIBB has held four productive public meetings previously in the Community Hall as part of the Nuclear-1 EIA. At each meeting the facilitator/ GIBB had requested suggestions from the community members present as to how the EIA Team could improve the meetings. GIBB has facilitated the present meeting in order to again listen to suggestions as to how to improve the public consultation process for the Nuclear-1 EIA. To date suggestions for meetings have included the preference for meetings to be held during the week (but not Fridays) after working hours. It has also been suggested that independent Xhosa and Afrikaans translators be employed at the meetings. All these useful suggestions have been used to improve the public participation process going forward.</p> <p>Ms. Ball reported that GIBB had received many comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and were busy compiling responses to these comments, with the assistance of its specialists. The responses to the issues would be distributed to the relevant I&amp;APs once complete. The Revised EIR and EMP will then be produced and the changes explained to all I&amp;APs. It is not possible, however, to give exact dates for the release of these revised reports because the specialists are still</p>

<b>SEA VISTA FORUM AND CENTRE FOR ENVIRONMENTAL RIGHTS</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
			busy with the revision of their reports.
3	Ms. Fourie	Asked how the National Nuclear Regulator (NNR) intersects with the EIA process?	Ms. Ball stated that the NNR and the Department of Environmental Affairs had signed a Memorandum of Understanding regarding the evaluation of applications for nuclear facilities, a copy of which is included in the Draft EIR. It is GIBB's understanding that the NNR has its own process with its own public participation process and its own scheduled documents that the public will be able to review. The NNR has the expertise to review and make decisions on the technological and nuclear issues whereas the DEA has the expertise to evaluate potential environmental impacts. The DEA has informed GIBB that they will not make decisions on aspects such as nuclear safety and radiological issues.
4	Mr. Fredericks	He stated that the documentation provided is not easy to understand and that that it should be in Xhosa and Afrikaans as well.	Ms. Ball stated it was understandable that much of the information was not easy to understand as it was very technical in nature. She stated that GIBB could try and explain processes better using diagrams and better explain the NNR and EIA process in the Revised Draft EIR. She then said that if anyone had any suggestions on how to better GIBB could explain the issues and processes presented in the Draft EIR that they should let her know.
5	Ms. Fourie	Ms. Fourie requested that the acronyms be explained to the group as the meeting proceeds to create a better understanding of the subject matter being discussed.	Ms. Ball suggested that GIBB would have flowcharts and diagrams to assist in explanations at public meetings in future. She acknowledged the comment and undertook on behalf of the EIA team to adequately explain all acronyms used in public meetings.
6	Mr. Dennis	Mr. Dennis said that the Minister made a premature announcement on EIA related issues which created a	Ms Ball stated that she presumes that the announcement referred to the Minister of Art and Culture's statements about

<b>SEA VISTA FORUM AND CENTRE FOR ENVIRONMENTAL RIGHTS</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		lot of animosity amongst the local community. He asked how the community/ EIA Team responds to such announcements?	the heritage aspects of the Thyspunt site. She mentioned that she had spoken to SAHRA and other affected parties regarding the issue. SAHRA has stated that they are waiting for the Revised EIR, which will include the revised heritage assessment, before they make any further comment into the EIA process.
7	Mr. Leen	Is Eskom putting forward a plan for the nuclear reactor? Mr. Leen further asked what the plan of action is with respect to safety measures in case of any incidents occurring. He would like Eskom and the NNR to explain the health and safety aspect of the proposed project to the group.	Ms. Herbst undertook to speak to her Eskom colleague at the Koeberg Nuclear Power Station with the view of organising a joint Eskom and NNR community education session regarding the different processes and the safety aspects of nuclear power stations.
8	Mr. Olivier	Mr. Olivier added on to Mr. Leen's question by asking if the EIA will still follow the process outlined would that mean that it will take even longer? Maybe 2 to 3 years extra?	<p>Ms Ball said that there are over 20 permits to be applied for by Eskom for the nuclear power station that do not involve GIBB at all, and are separate from the EIA process.</p> <p>Ms.Herbst said that there are 2 main processes to be followed by Eskom namely the NNR and the nuclear licensing process, as well as the EIA process. She went on to say that it is not just about putting forward a plan to the NNR. It involves more than just Eskom and the NNR but that it also involves the local Council and the local community, and that it would be specific to the design and structure of the proposed plant.</p> <p>She stated that as Eskom starts with the licensing process, all the detail of the process must be communicated with the public and the local Council so that everyone is involved with the development of the emergency plan. She also stated that the community asked to see the Koeberg Nuclear Power Station a few months ago and they then took 10 Sea Vista community</p>

<b>SEA VISTA FORUM AND CENTRE FOR ENVIRONMENTAL RIGHTS</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<p>Mr. Olivier further asked that if this Nuclear plant is supposed to be the 'Rolls Royce' of all, will its emergency plans be the same as that of the Koeberg Nuclear Power Station?</p> <p>The zones are confusing as it always changes. This needs to stop.</p>	<p>members to the site. Ms Herbst said that it was presumed that the detail Koeberg's emergency plan and how it worked was covered during this tour.</p> <p>Ms. Herbst said that it will be similar to Koeberg but that the exclusion zones that the Koeberg Nuclear Power Station has, the widest of which is 16 km, will be 3 kms in the case of the proposed Nuclear-1. As nuclear stations get built they improve on safety each time which means exclusion zones could become smaller. Eskom, with the local authorities will have to develop and manage an emergency plan for the employees at the nuclear power station and the surrounding communities. The plan must incorporate the NNR requirements.</p>
9	Ms. Malan	<p>Ms. Malan stated that the NNR had been in the St. Francis Bay/ Sea Vista area to meet with the local community and the community still does not know what is happening.</p> <p>Ms. Malan added that it was questionable as to whether the local Municipality could afford all necessary infrastructure.</p> <p>She also asked how all the residents and visitors in the area would get out of the area using one road?</p>	<p>Ms. Ball reiterated Ms. Herbst's suggestion of educational sessions to inform the public about issues that they do not understand.</p> <p>The comment was noted.</p> <p>Ms. Herbst stated that if the DEA approves the proposed nuclear power station they would add conditions from the EIR that Eskom will have to comply to.</p>
10	Mr. Olivier	Mr. Olivier stated that the next public meeting should be in Afrikaans and Xhosa.	Ms. Ball confirmed that an independent Afrikaans and Xhosa translator would be in attendance at the next public meetings in

<b>SEA VISTA FORUM AND CENTRE FOR ENVIRONMENTAL RIGHTS</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<p>He also said, “n Druive verkoper sal druive verkoop wat nie goed is nie, maar hy sal se dat dit goed is.”                      Mr. Olivier then suggested that maybe the NNR should also attend the next meeting to create balance.</p>	<p>Sea Vista.</p>
11	Mr. Dennis	<p>Mr. Dennis said that there is a communication gap between the community and the EIA Team. When there is no link between the community, the consultants and Eskom that is operating at a national level then you will find a bad situation because who will the people feel comfortable with?</p> <p>He stated that the municipality has been left out of this process. People want to know what the municipality says about this but they cannot comment as they have not been kept informed. He further stated that that the EIA Team would need to find a way to involve local institutions or state.</p> <p>He then referred to the EIA process itself and said that the reading material was not user friendly and that that needed to be changed to assist in creating a better understanding for the average person.</p>	<p>Ms Ball said that they welcome any assistance from the Mayor's Office.</p> <p>Ms. Ball disagreed and stated that a number of Key Focus Group Meetings had been held with the Kouga Municipality and that Municipal officials had been invited to all stakeholder meetings held in the area. Additionally she is willing to set up meetings with the Municipality in the future.</p>
12	Unidentified I&AP	<p>It was said that Eskom is playing 'cat and mouse'. It was said that the Municipality was thought to be relied on by the community</p>	<p>The comment was noted.</p>
13	Mrs Petse	<p>She said that she is surprised that this development was not known to the Municipality.</p>	<p>Ms. Ball stated that they have had 2 Key Focus Meetings to date with the Kouga Municipality as well as public meetings to which the Municipality was invited. There are minutes of these meetings available to the public.</p>

<b>SEA VISTA FORUM AND CENTRE FOR ENVIRONMENTAL RIGHTS</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
14	Mr. Malgas	Mr. Malgas said that he expected this to happen. He asked how he was supposed understand what all the terminology meant, let alone his mother, if the Mayor does not know?	The comment was noted.
15	Mr. Olivier	Mr. Olivier suggested that whenever there are meetings held that the Municipal Head should be emailed directly and the Mayor copied into the correspondence.	Comment noted. Ms. Ball said that she will take the Mayors cell number and keep in contact with him with regards his attendance at future public meetings.
16	Mr. Coenraad	Mr. Coenraad said that he was concerned about the traffic influx and the potential impact on the children in the area.	Ms. Ball acknowledged the comment and stated that both the traffic and transportation specialist, as well as the social specialist has addressed this aspect in their revised reports.
17	Ms. Malan	She stated that as an independent consultant, GIBB should also invite the specialists to meetings so that both sides are heard. She stated that all they have been hearing is one side of the story.	Ms. Ball said that GIBB is responsible for the EIA, including the public consultation process. On occasion specialists may be asked to present the findings of their studies at public meetings. She further stated that public meetings are open and that no-one will be excluded from them. She also said that GIBB always allowed meetings to run for as long as necessary and if more are needed they will arrange additional meetings.
18	Ms. Fourie	<p>Ms. Fourie summarised action items up to that point of the meeting:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Emails to be sent directly to the Municipal head and the mayor copied into these emails.</li> <li>2. Different languages to be used in material distributed and the NNR invited to attend the meetings.</li> <li>3. Material explaining the NNR and EIA</li> </ol>	<p>To clarify the actions Ms. Ball listed them namely:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The community does not understand the NNR and the EIA process but GIBB will do what they can to alleviate this problem at next public meetings by using posters etc. Ms. Herbst would try and assist in getting the NNR to come address the community. Post Meeting Note: Contact details of the NNR were provided to Melissa Fourie.</li> </ol>

<b>SEA VISTA FORUM AND CENTRE FOR ENVIRONMENTAL RIGHTS</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<p>processes should be developed by the various responsible parties and distributed in the community.</p> <p>She further made reference to a letter sent to GIBB by the CER, on behalf of the Sea Vista Forum, and summarised some of the main concerns contained therein.</p>	<p>Ms. Ball commented by explaining that posters and sketch drawings were used during the first meetings held in Sea Vista to explain processes. She also said that independent translators were present namely Mr. Reuben Heydenrych, of Arcus GIBB, who undertook all the Afrikaans translations. A gentleman from Eskom undertook the Xhosa translations as he has a working knowledge of the technical issues. At the time the attendees of the meeting were satisfied with the arrangement. GIBB would, however, arrange for an independent Xhosa translator for the next meetings. GIBB has also taken note of the dates, days and times suggested by the community for next public meeting. The community must note that if the entire meeting's proceedings are to be translated from English into Afrikaans and Xhosa the meetings would take a number of hours in duration.</p>
19	Mr. Malgas	<p>Mr. Malgas questioned the protocol followed at the public meetings. He stated that at the public meetings held at the St. Francis Links Golf Club there were only consultants present whereas here at this meeting there are Eskom representatives as well. He felt that the same protocol should be used for all public meetings. He also said that all meetings must have translators.</p> <p>He further stated that Eskom only presents what the people want to hear and that they do not speak about</p>	<p>Ms. Ball stated that during all public meetings if questions are asked about nuclear power and the design of the proposed nuclear power plant, those questions can only be referred to the Applicant - Eskom. She added that at the last meeting at Sea Vista, Mr. Heydenrych of Arcus GIBB was present as well as two independent technical specialists. The only difference between the meetings of Sea Vista and the one held at The Links Golf Club was that the one at the Links had the presentation only in English, as there was not request for translations into other languages.</p> <p>The comment was noted.</p>

<b>SEA VISTA FORUM AND CENTRE FOR ENVIRONMENTAL RIGHTS</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		the socio-economic issues.	
20	Ms. Malan	Ms. Malan said that issues are not being addressed and that presentations are too long leaving little time for questions. She added that practicalities do not get addressed. She asked why one meeting could not be held for all communities, black, white etc. they do not want to hear a lot, only about what is going to happen. Such as is there going to be job creation and what experience is needed to get these jobs? Ms Malan further suggested that maybe the next meeting should be a question and answer session with no presentations.	Ms Ball stated that if community members wish to send GIBB queries before the meetings GIBB would address these queries in the meeting.  Also it was not always easy for communities to come to one meeting because the did not always feel comfortable doing so.
21	Mr. Dennis	Mr. Dennis asked if there is a social impact assessment and if he could see it.	Ms. Ball confirmed that there is and it was one of the appendices to the Draft EIR available on <a href="http://www.eskom.co.za">www.eskom.co.za</a> and <a href="http://www.projects.gibb.co.za">www.projects.gibb.co.za</a> . She undertook to have a CD delivered to the Mayor the following week.
22	Ms. Malan	She asked if the EIR could be divided into 3 separate reports – one for each of the alternative sites.	Ms. Ball independently replied that this was impractical at this late stage in the EIA and would necessitate the revision of all the specialist studies which would be time consuming and expensive. Ms Herbst confirmed that this request was not practical since the studies needed to make an assessment of the impacts as well as compare the impacts on the different sites.
23	Ms. Fourie	Ms. Fourie stated that the Sea Vista community was not asking for the entire report to be translated but merely the executive summary of each report.  Accessibility should also be addressed and a copy or the entire report should be left at the office of the Sea	Comment noted and GIBB undertook to have the Executive Summary of the Main Report, as well as all the specialist reports translated into Xhosa and Afrikaans.  Ms. Ball undertook to arrange for the copies of the Revised Draft EIR to be placed at the public places requested.

<b>SEA VISTA FORUM AND CENTRE FOR ENVIRONMENTAL RIGHTS</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		Vista Hall, the clinic, the mini market in addition to the Municipal Offices.	
24	Mr. Papa	He stated that loud hailers should be used to announce meetings.	Ms. Ball acknowledged the request and stated that loud hailers would be used, as had been done for past meetings in Sea Vista.
25	Ms. Fourie	Ms. Fourie suggested that announcements be made at the local crèche, primary school and the church. She also said that independent translators should be used.  She then asked when the next meeting will take place.	Ms. Ball acknowledged the request and stated that every attempt would be made to advertise the meeting at all community facilities.  Ms Ball replied that the next round of meeting would only take place in 2011.
25	Unidentified I&AP	Why are there police at the meetings?	Ms. Herbst stated that some of the EIA Team members and Eskom officials had been threatened and for this reason police and private detectives had been present at all public meetings.
26	Mr. Malgas	He said that when comparing the meetings it is seen that at The Links Golf Club there were surveillance cameras but at the Sea Vista meeting there were many policemen.	The comment was noted and Ms. Ball confirmed that policemen were present at all the meetings.
27	Mr. Leen	Mr. Leen said that it was problematic to hold meetings on Fridays when people typically started partying at the start of the weekend. He stated that the best day to hold meetings in Sea Vista was a Wednesday.	The comment was noted and Ms. Ball confirmed that future meetings would be held on a Wednesday evening and the CER would be consulted, as a representative of the Sea Vista Forum, before the meeting date was finalised.
28	Ms. Fourie	What do you want to achieve at meetings?	Ms. Herbst suggested that there should be a short period before the meeting where individuals could come and discuss the

<b>SEA VISTA FORUM AND CENTRE FOR ENVIRONMENTAL RIGHTS</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
			issues.  Ms. Ball added that suggestions for the format and time of the meeting should come from the community and that GIBB would rely on the CER to communicate any preferences to GIBB.
29	Mr. Dennis	Stated that as elections were imminent, there would be door-to-door visits to the community and that that could be used as a means to gather questions from the community.	The comment was noted.
30	Mr. Malgas	Mr. Malgas stated that he is happy that the Sea Vista community's issues were being heard.	The comment was noted.

#### **4. CLOSING REMARKS**

Ms. Fourie said that it should be remembered that it is important that the community understands the EIA process and thanked all for attendance at the meeting. She then closed the meeting at 19:51.

### ATTENDANCE LIST

Surname	First Names	Title	Co/Org	Sea Vista Forum and CER Key Focus Group Meeting - 18 November 2010
Fourie	Melissa	Ms	CER	Attended
Sobekwa	U.	Ms	CER	Attended
Petse	Tobeka	Mr.s	Sea Vista Forum	Attended
Coenraad	Isak	Mr.	Sea Vista Forum	Attended
Fredericks	Patrick	Mr.	Sea Vista Forum	Attended
Leen	Petrus	Mr.	Sea Vista Forum	Attended
Lamont	Sydney	Mr.	Sea Vista Forum	Attended
Malgas	A.	Mr.	Sea Vista Forum	Attended
Busakwe	Edward	Mr.	Sea Vista Resident	Attended
Sibeno	K.	Mr.	Community Development Workers DPLG	Attended
Olivier	Elvis	Mr.	Kouga Municipality	Attended
Dennis	R.	Mr.	Kouga Municipality (Mayor)	Attended
Ras	D.	Mr.	ANC Representative	Attended
Papa	K.	Mr.	ANC Secretary	Attended
Barratt	C.	Mr.	St. Francis Kromme Trust	Attended
Malan	T.	Mrs.	Thyspunt Alliance	Attended
Herbst	Deidre	Ms	Eskom Holdings limited	Attended
Ball	Jaana-Maria	Ms	Arcus GIBB (Pty) Ltd	Attended
Schovell	Inge	Ms	Arcus GIBB (Pty) Ltd	Attended

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT (EIA)**

**EIA: 12/12/20/944**

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

**DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REPORT**

**KEY FOCUS GROUP MEETING**

**REBELS RUS LANDOWNERS**

**24 MAY 2010**

**17H00 – 20H00**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	2
PREFACE .....	3
1. ATTENDANCE.....	4
1.1. Attendance – Rebels Rus Landowners .....	4
1.2. Attendance – Eskom Holdings Limited.....	4
1.3. Attendance – Environmental Consulting Team .....	4
2. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS.....	5
3. FORMAT OF MEETING AND DISCUSSION POINTS.....	5
4. DISCUSSION SESSION.....	6
5. CLOSING REMARKS .....	29
ATTENDANCE LIST .....	30

## PREFACE

Should participants who attended the meetings require any changes to these proceedings, please notify the Public Participation Office in writing within 14 days of receipt.

“**Unidentified I&APs**” refer largely to persons who attended the meeting and verbally raised issues without providing their names. This in no way diminishes the value of the issue raised. Should you recognise your input and would like to have your name recorded next to it, please advise the Public Participation Office.

In order to provide a structure and to enable the reader to follow the proceedings with ease the minutes have not been captured verbatim and post-meeting notes have been added for clarity and information purposes and are indicated in **bold**.

## 1. ATTENDANCE

### 1.1. Attendance – Rebels Rus Landowners

Name
Ms Frances Becker
Dr Anton Bok
Mr Michael Charlewood
Mr Duncan Davies
Mr Roland Gathercole
Mrs Angela Gathercole
Mr Chris Jones
Ms Chantal Oddy
Mr John Oddy
Mr Charl Rautenbach
Prof Warwick Sauer
Ms Andrea von Holdt
Mr Robroy von Holdt
Mrs Libby von Holdt

### 1.2 Attendance – Eskom Holdings Limited

Name	Position/Role
Ms Deidre Herbst	Senior Manager - Environment Generation Division
Mr Gert Greeff	Manager - Nuclear Sites
Mr Mervin Theron	Manager - Regulatory Affairs and Localisation
Mr Mandla Mbusi	Senior Advisor - Stakeholder Management
Mr Jan Norman	Nuclear -1 - Operations
Mr Johann Breytenbach	Nuclear 1 - Project Manager
Ms Lorraine Ndala	Senior Environmental Advisor
Ms Carin de Villiers	Manager - Stakeholder Management and Communication, Nuclear Division
Mr Andre Nel	Manager - Site Safety Report Team

### 1.3 Attendance – Environmental Consulting Team

Name	Organisation	Role in the project
Ms Jaana-Maria Ball	Arcus GIBB (Pty) Ltd	Nuclear-1 EIA: Project Manager
Mr Reuben Heydenrych	Arcus GIBB (Pty) Ltd	Senior Environmental Scientist
Ms Bongsi Shinga	ACER (Africa)	Public Participation Consultant

## **2. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

Ms Ball welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced herself as the independent Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP) from Arcus GIBB.

She then requested all attendees to introduce themselves. Introductions were done as per Sections 1.1 to 1.3.

## **3. FORMAT OF MEETING AND DISCUSSION POINTS**

Ms Ball stated that the meeting with Rebels Rus landowners forms part of the EIA process and is being held after a number of requests were received during and after the recent public and key stakeholder meetings held in the Thyspunt, Cape St Francis and Francis Bay area. She hoped that the meeting would prove to be informative and constructive for all parties.

Ms Ball further mentioned that she was aware that there are a number of issues that the landowners would like discussed, as per an email received via ACER (Africa).

The issues are not limited to, but included the following:

1. Detailed maps and/or aerial photographs showing our properties and individual erf's within the RRNR in relation to the proposed Nuclear Power Station and the 800 m safety zone.
2. Detailed information on the extent of the impact on landowners - specifically landowners who are closer to the Nuclear Power Station, e.g. what does the Nuclear Power Station mean for the future of Rebels Rus properties?
3. Is the 800 m safety zone conclusive, or will this change, depending on the technology used for the NPS or depending on the NNR? Obviously the extent of the safety zone has a huge impact on some of the landowners within the RRNR.
4. Detailed information about our current access to the beach, alignment of proposed eastern road, construction impacts, etc.
5. Visual Impact Assessment and 3D Modelling.

Additional issues which were added at the meeting were as follows:

6. Expropriation
7. Potential health risks and safety as regards sea water
8. Sediment sludge from construction - disposal and movement of the sediment
9. Impact on groundwater and the effect of the potential groundwater draw-downs

#### 4. DISCUSSION SESSION

This section details all issues, comments and concerns, which were raised and discussed at the meeting. Should you wish to make any corrections, please advise ACER within two weeks (i.e. 14 days) of receiving these minutes.

REBELS RUS LANDOWNERS			
No	Name	Comment	Response
1	A Landowner Rebels Rus Nature Reserve	<p>The main priority for the Rebels Rus landowners is, are they going to be expropriated. If they are going to be expropriated, none of the issues raised in Section 3 will be applicable.</p> <p>He asked if there was any area that would require compulsory expropriation due to a nuclear facility.</p> <p>He asked if expropriation is therefore not essential in Rebels Rus area.</p> <p>He wanted to know if a person's property is within the 2 km exclusion zone and they choose to retain their property, would that be their own private choice.</p>	<p>Ms Herbst explained that Eskom used to have expropriation rights but they no longer have rights to expropriate. Eskom can initiate expropriation through the Department of Land Affairs. However, Eskom avoid expropriation and it would be the last option pursued.</p> <p>Ms Herbst said there was an area of about 2 km radius which Eskom would like to have under their own control. There are some sections of Rebels Rus property within this 2 km radius, which will be impacted. There would however be a process of discussions with the relevant landowners.</p> <p>Mr Greeff confirmed that it was not absolutely essential.</p> <p>Mr Greeff replied that this is not a preference. Mr Greeff explained that his function is to undertake the acquisition of the property for the nuclear sites. Ultimately he will also undertake the environmental management of such properties until such time as the proposed development takes place. There is a decision that has been made by Eskom, which indicates that Eskom would like to acquire all the property and manage all the property within the 2 km radius of the plant. Eskom would look at a 2 km radius outside the plant and all the properties involved bordering the inside of the 2 km radius. This is not to do with the actual Emergency Planning Zone (EPZ), which is</p>

<b>REBELS RUS LANDOWNERS</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
			800 m, it is more to do with security and access onto the nuclear plant site itself.
2	A Landowner Rebels Rus Nature Reserve	<p>Has it been decided exactly where the plant would be constructed? Is it going to be built at Thyspunt and not any other area in the Eastern Cape?</p> <p>He then asked if this is a preferred site does Eskom know where it is going to be.</p>	<p>Ms Herbst replied that three alternative sites have been assessed in the EIA and Thyspunt has been identified as the preferred site. The motivation and Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) must still be submitted to the Authorities (the Department of Environmental Affairs [DEA]) and only then will a decision be made on whether the recommendations are acceptable. There are still some criteria that are going to influence that decision. One is the Integrated Resource Plan (IRP). South Africa has made a decision that nuclear will be included in the mix. The IRP 2 will assess how much coal, how much nuclear, how much gas etc. would the country need and who is going to build this. That draft plan will only be released in June 2010. The IRP will therefore determine how South Africa moves forward in terms of which generation technologies will be constructed.</p> <p>The next process that has to be undertaken is the nuclear licensing process which also requires authorisation. The EIA is one decision amongst many that would eventually determine whether this site would be a nuclear site.. Currently it is considered the preferred site.</p> <p>Ms Herbst explained that the exact footprint is going to have to be determined during final design with input from some of the specialists. The specialist studies have identified an area where it would be preferable to position the station in order to have the least negative environmental impact. For example, the specialist conducting the geohydrology study, the ground water and the wetlands study, is carrying out more detailed studies to determine exactly what the influence of the groundwater on the</p>

<b>REBELS RUS LANDOWNERS</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
			wetlands are. This would assist in determining the buffer zone between the actual footprint of the site and the wetlands.
3	A Landowner Rebels Rus Nature Reserve	He understands that the footprint has moved approximately 3 km further east towards Rebels Rus, from the original zone, he asked why this has happened. He stated he saw some years ago that Rebels Rus Nature Reserve was originally 5km away from the Thyspunt site. Where the 2km line is shown in the current maps, it used to be 5km line.	<p>Ms Ball explained that only a recommendation has been made that Thyspunt is the preferred site, but no final decisions have been made. The DEA is the only Authority that can make this decision with respect to environmental matters.</p> <p>In terms of the positioning of the actual nuclear power station, there was no original preferred position by Eskom on the site. Site sensitivities and 'no-go' areas were investigated within each of the specialist's disciplines, these were mapped and there are a series of maps in the Draft EIR depicting site sensitivity. The sensitivity maps for each specialist discipline were then overlaid and an area has been found on this site that is the least sensitive. Within the least sensitive area, there is no pre-determined area for the power station footprint.</p> <p>There are also ongoing studies, e.g. the Wetland and Geohydrology specialists are collecting more data on site and have been doing so for the past year to try and get more certainty on their recommendations with respect to the nuclear power station preferred positioning to the wetlands and under groundwater flows.</p> <p>Mr Greeff explained that the first drawings presented were based on the Koeberg Nuclear Power Station footprint; this was at the time when the property was first purchased. Using a map, he showed that there were two footprints, one at Tony's Point and one at Thysbaai. He then showed the envelope of the power station based on current maps. Mr Greeff outlined the 2 km radius and showed the landowners which properties Eskom would like to purchase.</p>

<b>REBELS RUS LANDOWNERS</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
			Some of the properties are part of the actual footprint of the road corridor centreline. The blue line showed 'clips' the property of Mr Charlewood and cuts about 20 m deeper. The alignment still needs to be refined with the specialists as the process unfolds in the field. The properties involved will be Portions 74218; 74614; 74687; 74623; 74624; 74625 and 74611.
4	A Landowner Rebels Rus Nature Reserve	In terms of purchasing, if it cuts off a section of a property does Eskom attempt to purchase the entire property, or can it be sub-divided?	<p>Mr Greeff replied that if it were a small section of the property impacted, Eskom would attempt to purchase just the small section and not the entire property.</p> <p>Ms Herbst said that it would depend on the negotiation process. If the landowner wanted to retain a portion of his property that could be negotiated. However, should they want to sell the entire property that could also be negotiated. Eskom has had some cases where a landowner has an adjacent property that he feels would not be of value without the expropriated piece, such cases could also be negotiated with Eskom for sale, i.e. for Eskom to purchase both properties.</p>
5	A Landowner Rebels Rus Nature Reserve	He wanted to know if there is no construction on the edge of the Thyspunt property, could the 2km radius be adjusted inwards.	<p>Mr Greeff said that this is possible but at this stage it appears that the properties will be impacted.</p> <p>Mr Theron explained that the 800 m is based on the international specifications, i.e. the European Utilities Requirements (EUR). This still needs to be confirmed with the National Nuclear Regulator (NNR). There is a global requirement that no activity may occur within the exclusion zone of 800 m from the perimeter of the power station.</p> <p>Ms Ball emphasised that this is a schematic representation at</p>

REBELS RUS LANDOWNERS			
No	Name	Comment	Response
			<p>this stage as there have been no decisions made as yet.</p> <p>Mr Greeff said that he has been tasked with undertaking the valuations of the properties so that Eskom are aware of values. Only after the various decisions have been made will negotiations begin with the various landowners.</p>
6	Mr Chris Jones Landowner -Rebels Rus Nature Reserve	As a matter of clarification, the first process is land acquisition, which is a voluntary process. Should the negotiations with a particular landowner fail, then the willing buyer -willing seller will be applied, if this fails the Minister has to be approached for approval of the expropriation.	<p>Ms Herbst said that this was correct.</p> <p><b>Post Meeting note: Expropriation can only be exercised if Eskom is required through the regulations or license requirements to own the land in question.</b></p>
7	Mr Rob von Holt Landowner - Rebels Rus Nature Reserve	<p>Mr von Holdt asked who decided that the safety zone would be 2 km. He questioned why it could not be 1.4km.</p> <p>He further mentioned that the 2km boundary cuts across his property (Mr von Holdt), Mr Anton Bok, Mr Duncan Davies and borders Mr Charlewood. Mr von Holdt asked if the 2km radius was cast in stone.</p>	<p>Mr Greeff explained that this is a standard radius on all nuclear sites.</p> <p>Mr Nel stated that this came from a formal position paper that was approved by the Nuclear Division Safety Committee who stated that from a business perspective, they would purchase a 2 km radius around any plant. The 800 m is a EUR requirement. The NNR has made is very clear that decisions cannot be based on EUR requirements until the plant type has been approved and the full probabilistic safety assessments have been done. The NNR will decide what the emergency exclusion zones are. That however does not determine the land that Eskom has to own. From an Eskom business perspective, the decision was made that a 2 km radius around the plant must be purchased.</p> <p>Ms Herbst said that this was not part of legislation, it is a position paper based on internal business decisions. What is important is that this is not the final layout, it is the worst case scenario. The footprint of the power station will determine the</p>

<b>REBELS RUS LANDOWNERS</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<p>Another landowner stated that the 2 km was probably cast in stone but the boundary was not.</p> <p>Mr von Holdt asked if this might move from the eastern side to the western side, thereby causing the boundary lines to move.</p>	<p>zones.</p> <p>Ms Ball said that there were some constraints on the site. There were some faults on the site and one of the key constraints on any nuclear site is seismic risk and the seismic experts have said that the actual plant cannot straddle a fault line. There are also biophysical sensitivities on the site from heritage resources (recommending a 200 m buffer away from the coast) and the wetland specialists (talking about the Langefontein wetland which is highly sensitive, unique, one of its kind, has the headland bypass dune system, etc). So, these constraints have been factored in as well and that is the guidance that has been taken from an environmental perspective.</p>
8	Ms Andrea von Holdt Landowner - Rebels Rus Nature Reserve	<p>Ms von Holdt stated that at previous meetings the 800 m zone had been mentioned, the 2 km was not really a focus. It has also been mentioned that no residential dwelling may occur within the 800 m. She asked if people could live between the 800 m and 2 km area.</p> <p>She went on to say that this makes a huge difference as they are within this area. The information presented at previous meetings has been different. The issue of the 2km zone had not been made clear at previous meetings.</p>	<p>The activities allowed between the 800 m and 2 km are subject to the National Nuclear Regulator (NNR) regulations.</p> <p>Mr Nel explained that within the owner-controlled boundary (800 m) there would be no residential dwellings allowed.</p>
9	A Landowner -Rebels Rus Nature Reserve	<p>He stated that this means they could loose their houses. He said the 2km radius was a huge issue. Eskom has made a decision that they want 2 km, unnecessarily, and there is no regulation regarding the 2km except that Eskom thinks it is nice. The 2km zone is going to impact on their lives.</p> <p>He stated that he feels that the business decision is</p>	<p>Ms Herbst said that discussions with individual landowners would be extremely important. This issue is open to discussion and negotiation. The 2 km was based on certain criteria and those criteria will have to be made known. If Eskom want to expropriate there has to be a valid and sound reason to do so. The Minister will not allow expropriation based on a feeling or a business decision without any grounds.</p>

<b>REBELS RUS LANDOWNERS</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<p>not necessary.</p> <p>He added that if Eskom preclude any form of development the Rebels Rus landowners would fully support it and go along with it. They want to keep it as a small nature reserve and are very against any form of development. If possible, Eskom should leave Rebels Rus landowners where they live.</p>	<p>Ms Herbst said that this must be taken into account when Eskom examines the positioning of the power station. All the other biophysical issues also have to be considered. In addition, this would be looked at in terms of the business case, the criteria that has been used for the 2 km, owner controlled area and then a decision made on that basis.</p>
10	A Landowner -Rebels Rus Nature Reserve	<p>He stated that expropriation on the western side started in 1991 (according to a Newspaper which he has kept). Why were they expropriated then and yet the present landowners do not yet know if they are going to be expropriated or not.</p> <p>Why did Eskom not start negotiating with landowners 10 years ago?</p>	<p>Mr Greeff said that no one was expropriated then; it was a willing buyer - willing seller process.</p> <p>He explained that there have been two old footprints and based on the old footprints and the knowledge at that time, properties were bought on a willing buyer-willing seller process. He mentioned that, as an example Mr Wassenaar's property is not sold because he decided not sell at that time. So, all properties that were bought by Eskom many years ago were from willing sellers.</p>
11	Mr Reuben Heydendrych Arcus GIBB	<p>For information purposes, using sensitivity maps from the Biophysical Specialists explained the various areas and their sensitivity on the Thyspunt site. He showed the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Green area, which is the EIA corridor, which is the area within which the specialists focussed their assessments.</li> <li>▪ Yellow area, which is the boundary of the corridor for the High Voltage Yard.</li> <li>▪ Hatched areas, which are areas of wetlands (and also showed the Langefontein wetland).</li> </ul> <p>He showed the area where the proposed power station could be located after all sensitivity maps had been overlaid.</p>	
12	A Landowner -Rebels Rus Nature Reserve	<p>He asked why the footprint was not more westwards towards Oyster Bay.</p>	<p>Mr Nel said that the dune system has to be avoided. There is also a requirement of the EIA that there must be an open</p>

<b>REBELS RUS LANDOWNERS</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
			<p>corridor 200 m from the coastline.</p> <p>Ms Ball said that the specialist had examined, in detail, the EIA corridor and also its regional context.</p>
13	Ms Andrea von Holdt Landowner – Rebels Rus Nature Reserve	Ms von Holdt stated that if the dunes have to be avoided, the site is in the dunes. She asked what the difference was between vegetated and un-vegetated dunes.	<p>Ms Ball replied that according to the dune specialist and also the botanical and the faunal specialists as well as the wetland specialist, the mobile dune system is much more sensitive than the vegetated dune system. From a systems perspective, it is to allow the system to be impacted as little as possible.</p> <p>Ms Ball reiterated that this does not mean that the sensitive areas are no-go areas; in some cases there could be potential trade-offs or mitigation measures.</p> <p><b>Post-meeting note: Dr Werner Illenberger (Dune geomorphology specialist) further recommends that a 250 m buffer be established between the mobile dune system and any development in order to mitigate the impact of any development on the system.</b></p>
14	Landowner -Rebels Rus Nature Reserve	He noted that when he had purchased his property the dunes were not vegetated.	Ms Ball said that there was a key focus group meeting the next day (25 May 2010) at the Links Golf Course, and she invited all the participants of this meeting to attend. There will be a series of technical specialists at the meeting, who will present their findings and recommendations of their studies and be available to answer questions that I&AP's may have.
15	Landowner -Rebels Rus Nature Reserve	He asked if there was a map defining and showing the invasive and indigenous species in the dunes. The dunes have two separate issues, the sand, the invasive species and the indigenous vegetation.	Ms Ball said that this type of plan would be found in the Flora Specialist Study, Appendix E of the Draft EIR.
16	Ms Frances Becker Landowner – Rebels Rus Nature Reserve	She asked what if there is a decision to build more than 4000MW. Would Eskom need more land, meaning they eventually affect all landowners?	Ms Ball indicated that the EIA has assessed up to 4 000MW. Any nuclear power station above the assessed capacity would be subject to a new environmental authorisation process.

<b>REBELS RUS LANDOWNERS</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<p>She raised this question as a concern that landowners might agree to the 4000MW plant and then the applicant comes back and gives different information, in which case landowners will not be able to reverse the decision.</p>	
17	Ms Andrea von Holdt Landowner – Rebels Rus Nature Reserve	<p>Referring to the map, she pointed out that there is 73.79 ha, which according to site sensitivity is available for the proposed nuclear plant. Approximately half of the available area is required to build the proposed nuclear power station (31hectares). She wanted to know why would they move away from the preferred area, which is less sensitive.</p>	<p>Ms Herbst indicated that a sensitive area does not necessarily mean it is a no-go zone.</p>
18	Mr Rob von Holdt Landowner – Rebels Rus Nature Reserve	<p>Mr von Holdt said that Mr Greeff had said that the power station could be east of the red fault. If this is the case, would the eastern cut-off zone from which the 2 km is set move further west.</p> <p>If the footprint as it is called, is west of the fault, and Eskom cannot build across this fault, then the ground available, which is east of the fault, should have enough room to build all the ancillary buildings, etc. This would result in the properties in the east not being affected. Eskom already owns the ground to the west, so if this is well utilised there would be no need to purchase more ground. He asked what the 2km distance would be from where the green line of the footprint intersects with the red line close to the middle of the beach.</p>	<p>Mr Greeff said that this was not for the plant alone but the whole development. Mr Greeff said the cut-off zone would not move because this is based on the boundary line. This is the entire footprint of the plant and it includes ancillary buildings and parking areas, access roads, training centres, etc.</p> <p>Ms Herbst said that when the final footprint is established this will be taken into consideration.</p> <p>Mr Greeff explained that it is only the actual nuclear plant that is not allowed to straddle the fault. The remainder of the buildings may be built on either side of this fault.</p> <p>Mr Nel also explained that depending on the final technology selected, there could be one unit on the one side and three units on the other side. They could not split a unit on either side of the fault line</p>

<b>REBELS RUS LANDOWNERS</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		He stated that if the footprint is on the western side, then Eskom would not disrupt the Rebels Rus Landowners.	Ms Ball added that this EIA is for a 4 000 MW nuclear power station and depending on the commercial process, if authorisations are given, it would depend on the unit capacity of the reactors as to how many units would be potentially placed on the site.
19	Prof Warwick Sauer Landowner - Rebels Rus Nature Reserve	Does the pipe go off the beach and is this controlled? It is sub-terrain but would there be control on that section of the beach?	<p>Mr Greeff replied that as far as he is aware it would be extended out to sea.</p> <p>Mr Norman said that Eskom is not sure but may have certain restrictions imposed on them by the National Intelligence Agency. There may also be policies imposed by the NNR. The pipe will be buried so low that the security of the pipe itself will not be a problem. The area will be under surveillance and will be patrolled by security and people would not be allowed into the area after hours. Recreation will be within normal office hours and everyone will have to sign in and sign out of the area. This will also assist in identifying everyone in the area in case there is need for an evacuation. The beach area is therefore going to be open to the public.</p> <p>Mr Breytenbach stated that there is not a large security threat to the pipes because there are no pumps to the pipes, they gravitate the water to a large swimming pool which will be about 75 m x 50 m. The intake pipes will be either two pipes of 9 m in diameter or three pipes of 6 m in diameter. This will be a tunnel, which will be totally underground. The only pipes that might be seen are the outlet pipes. From the beginning, Eskom has stated that the boundary will be moved 100 m away from the high water mark. This was a limitation that was imposed similar to the 2 km radius. Eskom would like to construct the plant so that the public may have access to the beaches.</p>

<b>REBELS RUS LANDOWNERS</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
			Ms Ball confirmed that access will be open, she said there will be no gates erected on the beach.
20	A landowner Rebels Rus Nature Reserve	He noted that the 2 km fence line goes right through Rebels Rus. The residents on the inside of this might be purchased. He then stated that for the residents outside there will be only one gate on the Eastern access road. This means that they will have to drive a long way to gain access to the beach.	Ms Ball explained that the 2 km line is an 'imaginary line', it is not a fence line.  Ms Herbst and Mr Norman confirmed that that the beach would not be fenced.
21	A Landowner Rebels Rus Nature Reserve	The access to the beach is very important for everyone on the outside of the 2 km game fence line. Everyone will not be able to get on to the beach as some of the residents are using rights of way on the properties that Eskom wants to purchase.  Will the fence run parallel to the beach for security reasons?	Mr Nel said that they must bear in mind that everyone is looking at the game fence line as at the 2km line. The access route going east could mean that the game fence could be negotiated into future plans along the access route.  Mr Norman clarified that the security fence will be 200 m back from the high water mark. The game fence may be as it is at the Koeberg Nuclear Power Station, behind the first dune. He further stated that the intention is for the public to be able to go through the beach.
22	Ms Andrea von Holdt Landowner Rebels Rus Nature Reserve	Regarding public access to the beach, Ms von Holdt stated that as it stands the Rebels Rus Nature Reserve is an exclusive area; it is a privately owned nature reserve. The general public does not have access to the beach. In fact, there is no access road to the beach.  So this needs to be taken into consideration, as the Rebels Rus Landowners would not like not to be deprived of the privacy they have enjoyed in their	Comment noted.

<b>REBELS RUS LANDOWNERS</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		reserve.	
23	Ms Andrea von Holdt Landowner Rebels Rus Nature Reserve	Ms von Holdt said that the fencing could benefit the Rebels Rus Reserve because presently they have problems with people accessing the property and vandalising. So, if Rebels Rus landowners could negotiate fencing with Eskom, it would be great.	Comment noted.
24	A Landowner Rebels Rus Nature Reserve	He requested clarity on the controlled area from the sea.	Mr Greeff explained that the controlled area is 200 m from the high water mark.
25	A Landowner Rebels Rus Nature Reserve	He stated that he is worried about water and where it will be sourced.  He further asked if underground water would be used.	Ms Ball explained that in terms of the EIA recommendations, a desalination plant has been firmly recommended. This would be a packaged plant, which would take approximately one year to construct. Water would have to be sourced from the municipal source during the construction period. The desalination plant would be operational for the construction and operational phase of the nuclear plant.  Ms Ball said this was not a recommendation.  Mr Breytenbach said that there would be a main vendor on site to begin the site preparations, the levelling of the site, etc. During that time, roads, sanitation and water must be supplied to site. Therefore 6 months prior to this vendor arriving on site, Eskom will be on site. During that time roads, sanitation and the desalination plant will all be constructed. Obviously when Eskom first arrives on site there will be no water and therefore for a period of approximately 6 months other sources of water will be used but it will be for a limited amount of people and a limited amount of activities. This could include the use of underground water.

<b>REBELS RUS LANDOWNERS</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<p>If any underground water is to be used, he requested that an underground survey be conducted of where the dykes are. Everyone in Rebels Rus obtain water from fountains, which run over a sill into the sea. If that water drops by a slight amount then it will not run over the sill and that would mean that the residents would have no water.</p>	<p>Ms Ball said that there was a geo-hydrologist on the team and he would be presenting his study at the meeting the next day (25 May 2010). She undertook to raise these issues with the specialist. He has recommended that the underground water resource should not be stressed.</p> <p>Ms Ball also explained that there has been long-term monthly monitoring on the site, which began a year ago.</p>
26	Landowners Rebels Rus Nature Reserve	Noise, dust impacts associated with construction.	<p>Ms Ball encouraged everyone to study the Environmental Management Programme (EMP), which deals with dust and noise. This is a legally binding document which will be handed to Eskom and this would have to be audited externally during the construction phase and would be binding on the main contractor and also on any sub-contractors during the entire construction period. Eskom also has an Operational Environmental Management Plan (OEMP).</p> <p>Ms Herbst added that the environmental authorisation requires Eskom to have an OEMP.</p>
27	Landowners Rebels Rus Nature Reserve	Sediment sludge from construction – disposal and movement of the sediment.	<p>Ms Ball stated that in terms of off-shore and in-shore spoil, the specialists had been asked specifically to investigate various alternatives in this regard. On-land dumping of sand that needs to be excavated to reach the bed-rock for the founding conditions. All of the potential sites would be within the EIA corridor and the biophysical specialist had made recommendations in terms of the most degraded areas where this stock-piling of spoil could be placed.</p> <p>An Oceanographic Assessment has been done which looked specifically at the movement of sediment based on ocean currents, based on where it is proposed to dispose off the</p>

REBELS RUS LANDOWNERS			
No	Name	Comment	Response
			sediment. There are two options for the disposal of sediment, which will come from the excavations of the foundations of the power station, either to dispose it on land or in the ocean. The Oceanographic Specialist looked at that and the Marine Specialist has based his assessment on what has been found on the Oceanographic Assessment. According to the Specialists, they found that, it would sterilise a section of approximately 6 km <sup>2</sup> offshore. That is the reason for the recommendation, which has been made by the specialists to dispose the spoil at least 1.5 km to 2 km offshore to avoid impact on the spawning grounds of the squid or chokka.
28	A Landowner Rebels Rus Nature Reserve	In terms of that I see that they had said that cooling water discharges may contain co-discharges such as chlorine. These co-discharges have not been qualified and therefore an assessment on the significance of impacts associated with them has not been done or carried out in the report.  He wanted confirmation that the flow is 80 <sup>3</sup> m/sec.	Ms Ball said she would raise this with the marine specialist, as this is an important issue.  Ms de Villiers added that chlorine is added to the sea water at Koeberg and ongoing studies on the Marine environment at Koeberg showed no significant change on the marine life. Chlorine is actually made from the sea water.  Mr Breytenbach said that again this depends on the plant type but it is a maximum of 80 <sup>3</sup> m/sec.  Mr Theron stated that the specifications referred to are in the consistent data set of criteria.
29	Mr Rob van Holt	Mr van Holt referred to the decision on the siting of the plant as it is critical to the residents and to their future use of the properties at Rebels Rus. He asked when a decision was expected.	Ms Ball explained that the first decision is the DEA's decision on whether they accept the recommendations of the study in terms of the preferred site. They have appointed an international panel to evaluate this project, as well as local experts. It is Arcus GIBB's experience that even though there are timeframes, this

<b>REBELS RUS LANDOWNERS</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		<p>He asked if National Government has set a timeframe on this project, for example is it stipulated that this has to be constructed within 20 years.</p> <p>Mr van Holt then noted that they, as owners who would loose their property, do not know when this might occur.</p>	<p>will typically take a longer time to evaluate as it is a complicated study. The Comment Period is due to close on 31 May 2010, There have been requests to extend this date, which will be considered. After the end of the Comment Period the report will be submitted to the DEA, hopefully by July 2010. It is hoped therefore that a decision will be made by the end of 2010. During August/September the Integrated Resource Plan (IRP) 2 is expected from Government. Eskom would also need to examine the conditions laid out by the DEA and comply with these.</p> <p>Ms Herbst said that there was no set timeframe for the proposed project. The IRP would give an indication of the date when the Nuclear Power Station is needed. The timeframe would also be determined by various other authorisations, which are required for the operation of the plant and also the tender process.</p> <p>Mr Theron added that Eskom would need to go through a commercial process, i.e. to get a contractor to be able to define and present a safety case to the NNR.</p> <p>Ms Ball summarised that given that there is still the National Nuclear Regulator (NNR) site and plant process, which has to be completed, as well as 30 other authorisations. It can be said that a final decision to construct a nuclear power station on the Thyspunt site is still a while away.</p> <p>On the property acquisition issue, Mr Nel indicated that as funds become available from Eskom, and it has been confirmed that the Thyspunt site is preferred - if landowners have indicated that they would like to sell, Eskom will progress with the</p>

<b>REBELS RUS LANDOWNERS</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
			negotiations.
30	Ms Andrea von Holdt Landowner – Rebels Rus Nature Reserve	There are some issues on the Visual Impact Assessment, which need to be addressed, need to better understand the visual impact from their properties, etc.	Comment noted.
31	A Landowner Rebels Rus Nature Reserve	He questioned if the property valuers would evaluate properties prior to negotiations.	Mr Greeff indicated that valuers would be coming into the area for valuing the properties as an evaluation that is older than 1 year would no longer be applicable.
32	Mr John Oddy Landowner – Rebels Rus Nature Reserve	He wanted to know if there would be a repeat of the Focus Group Meeting with Rebels Rus landowners as he has found the one-on-one engagement useful.	Ms Ball explained that the Draft EIR review is supposed to be the last meeting engagement with Interested and Affected Parties (I&APs), however there have been requests for an extension of the Comment Period, etc. The comments received during the Comment Period will determine whether there are additional engagements or stakeholders will be advised of the submission of the Final EIR to the Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA) for a decision.
33	Landowners Rebels Rus Nature Reserve	Pollution of seawater, emissions and air quality.	Mr Heydenrych used Slide No 36 to describe the allowable emissions.
34	A Landowner Rebels Rus Nature Reserve	Are there any more exclusion zones?	There is an 800 m exclusion zone, 2 km which is an owner controlled boundary and 3 km Emergency Planning Zone (EPZ). The 800 m and 3 km EPZs were used in the EIA for assessing of potential impacts of the proposed nuclear power station.
35	A Landowner Rebels Rus Nature Reserve	When are landowners going to know of the final/agreed exclusion zones?	Such information would be available once Eskom has a vendor and has presented the safety case to the NNR. In addition, the NNR will have a public participation process. Even if the EIA process has been completed, the nuclear licensing process has to be undertaken.

<b>REBELS RUS LANDOWNERS</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
36	Ms Frances Becker	<p>She questioned why Eskom does not put the nuclear power station next to Koeberg where there is Eskom owned land already available.</p> <p>She further stated that if one reads the Draft EIA Report, everything is sensitive and then you come to a conclusion, which states that Thyspunt is a preferred site - it does not make sense.</p>	<p>Comment noted</p> <p><b>Post-meeting note:</b> Eskom's Nuclear Site Investigation Programme (NSIP) in the mid-1980s investigated the technical feasibility of five alternative sites, namely Thyspunt (Eastern Cape), Bantamsklip and Duynefontein (Western Cape), Brazil and Schulpfontein (Northern Cape). All these alternative sites were found to be technically feasible for the construction, operation and decommissioning of a conventional nuclear power station. However, because of the difficulty to integrate with the transmission system (amongst other reasons) the Northern Cape sites were removed from further consideration at the end of the Scoping Phase of this EIA.</p> <p>Studies regarding transmission issues have noted that the development of the Duynefontein site will result in an increased capacity of the generation pool in the Western Cape, which means a concentration of generation in one area at the expense of another. Strategically this exposes the transmission system to more risk as opposed to diversifying the generation closer to major load centres. This is the overriding strategic transmission advantage of the Thyspunt site, which will provide a new base load generation pool in a weak part of the Eskom transmission network and enable future potential load growth for the Eastern Cape.</p> <p>The EIA process for Nuclear-1 is further comprised of two main phases, the Scoping and EIA Phases. An application was submitted to the DEA in May 2007 and then amended</p>

<b>REBELS RUS LANDOWNERS</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
			<p>in July 2008 for a single nuclear power station of up to 4 000 MW. The Scoping Phase of the EIA is complete. The competent authority, the DEA, in consultation with the relevant provincial environmental authorities (the Department of Environmental Affairs and Development Planning [DEA&amp;DP] of the Western Cape and the Department of Economic Development and Environmental Affairs [DEDEA] of the Eastern Cape) approved the Scoping Report in November 2008. This approval included the recommendation that two of the original five alternative sites assessed during the Scoping Phase, namely Brazil and Schulpfontein in the Northern Cape, be excluded from further consideration in the EIA. Their exclusion was based on the fact that the alternative sites would not constitute reasonable and / or feasible site alternatives for Nuclear-1 based on limited local demand and the lack of existing electricity transmission corridors associated with these sites. The DEA approved the Final Plan of Study (PoS) for EIA in January 2010.</p> <p>The comparative assessment of the three alternative sites by Arcus GIBB was based on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Results of the specialist studies: specialists have indicated the relative significance of potential impacts with mitigation at each of the three alternative sites;</li> <li>• An integration workshop, involving all specialists, on 24 and 25 November 2009, where potential impacts and ranking of the alternative sites was discussed;</li> <li>• Costs; and</li> <li>• Transmission integration requirements.</li> </ul>

<b>REBELS RUS LANDOWNERS</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
			<p>Although there are obvious differences between the significance of the potential impacts of the three alternative sites, all specialists agreed that there are no fatal flaws at any of the sites (provided appropriate mitigation is implemented). The specialist further collectively agreed that all three alternative sites are suitable for development of a nuclear power station in time, given sufficient mitigation of impacts.</p> <p>The impacts of high and medium significance after mitigation were considered important for decision-making. These impacts were further filtered to a manageable number of key impacts for the purpose of decision-making. The following decision factors were selected as most important for decision-making:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transmission integration factors;</li> <li>• Seismic suitability of the sites;</li> <li>• Impacts on dune geomorphology;</li> <li>• Impacts on wetlands;</li> <li>• Impacts on vertebrate fauna;</li> <li>• Impacts on invertebrate fauna; and</li> <li>• Economic impacts.</li> </ul> <p>The Bantamsklip alternative would be costly because its location would require longer and larger transmission lines than either of the other two sites (900 km of combined 765kV and 400kV transmission lines at Bantamsklip vs. 500 km and 190 km of 400 kV lines at Thyspunt and Duynefontein respectively). The road and bridge upgrades that would have to take place to transport extra heavy loads from Cape Town harbour to Bantamsklip also</p>

<b>REBELS RUS LANDOWNERS</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
			<p>contribute to the high costs of this site. The Bantamsklip alternative would be R 8 billion less costs effective than either of the other two alternative sites. Despite the positive benefits that could potentially be realised through conservation of the northern portion of the site, bearing the cost and integration factors in mind, the Bantamsklip site was regarded as the least preferred site alternative and was removed from further consideration for this application. Only Thyspunt and Duynefontein were considered for selection of a recommended site and were compared using a numerical ranking model that takes only the weighted (filtered) decision factors into account. Thyspunt was identified as the preferred site for Nuclear-1.</p> <p>The most important argument in favour of Thyspunt with regards to biophysical impacts is the conservation benefits that would be realised through access control and active management of the site in the event of a nuclear power station being constructed there. This benefit would not be realised at Duynefontein, as the Koeberg Private Nature Reserve already includes the Duynefontein site. In addition the Thyspunt site has a considerably lower seismic risk profile, as well as being more favourably located in terms of Eskom's requirements for integration with the transmission system. The Thyspunt site is therefore recommended for authorisation in terms of this application. It is acknowledged that the Thyspunt site would experience environmental impacts of higher significance (particularly biophysical impacts) than Duynefontein. However, the conservation of the remainder of the site through access control and responsible long-term conservation management are significant positive impacts associated</p>

<b>REBELS RUS LANDOWNERS</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
			<b>with this site. Mitigation of identified potential negative impacts recommended by the specialists and in this EIR must be ensured.</b>
37	A Landowner Rebels Rus Nature Reserve	What are the social benefits for having a Nuclear Power Station?	<p>Using the Koeberg Nuclear Power Station as an example, it was explained that the Station has utilised part of the surrounding land as a private nature reserve. Great care has been taken to conserve and restore the coastal landforms, wetlands and various forms of vegetation and animal life indigenous to the area. There are several hiking trails through the reserve and visitors are welcome all year round. Although the area is controlled, the public has access to the area.</p> <p>Ms Herbst also gave examples of what has happened at the area around the Ingula Pumped Storage Scheme, which is presently under construction. Eskom was required to purchase 8000 hectares to form a conservation area. The area serves as habitat for a variety of species. A partnership was launched between Eskom and conservation groups BirdLife South Africa and Middlepunt Wetland Trust, which is aimed at generating benefits to offset the negative effects of the construction and operation of the pumped storage scheme.</p> <p>The establishment of partnerships were done during the EIA Process. It is up to the landowners to consider how they would like to see the area being managed, should a power station be built at Thyspunt. Eskom's previous experience has shown that Partnerships provide an effective system for monitoring environmental impacts during the construction and operational phases of the project.</p>

<b>REBELS RUS LANDOWNERS</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
38	A Landowner Rebels Rus Nature Reserve	He requested clarity on the 22m wide roads and the reasons for more than one road.	<p>It was explained that 22 m is not the width of the road that will be built. The 22 m width include a road reserve.</p> <p>Mr Breytenbach explained that for operational reasons, Eskom requires one road. However, for construction, Eskom require 2 roads.</p> <p><b>Post-meeting note:</b> The NNR do not stipulate that two roads are required during operation. However during the development of the safety case Eskom will be required to provide an evacuation plan which provides for various different emergency situations. It is therefore possible that Eskom will be required to have two exits from site during operation but it may not be necessary to have them both operational all of the time.</p>
39	A Landowner Rebels Rus Nature Reserve	Does Eskom have the money to fund this?	Through the Integrated Resource Plan (IRP) will determine what will happen with nuclear. The Department of Energy is working on the funding issue this question would be answered into the future. It is a question of whether the country can afford it and/or can the country afford not to do it?
40	Mr Rob von Holdt A Landowner – Rebels Rus Nature Reserve	<p>Mr von Holdt indicated that it is clear that the landowner properties which would be affected are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The von Holdts</li> <li>▪ Mr and Mrs John Oddy</li> <li>▪ Dr Anton Bok</li> <li>▪ Mr Duncan Davies</li> <li>▪ Mr Charlewood</li> </ul> <p>He then stated that they would like to keep their</p>	Discussions would need to take place with the landowners. It is also not the intention for Eskom to remove landowners from the area.

<b>REBELS RUS LANDOWNERS</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		properties. Furthermore, none of the landowners will be willing sellers. He then questioned if there was any thing in Eskom's power that could assist them to keep their properties?	
41	A Landowner Rebels Rus Nature Reserve	Will the water pipe outlet come out through the beach side?  What is currently happening at Koeberg with regards to the intake and outlet water pipes and the changes in temperature?	Mr Breytenbach explained that the inlet and outlet pipe would not be from the same point. The outlet tunnel is completely below ground level.  Ms Ball explained that in terms of sea water cooling, they have recommended specific mitigation measures in terms of a pipe out to sea and at a very fast pumping rate.  At Koeberg Nuclear Power Station, the warm water is mixed with the surface water within a short distance and cools down to ambient temperature within one kilometre of the outlet. .
42	Dr Anton Bok	<u>Groundwater situation in the area</u> He complained about the water table, which has dropped significantly over the past 2 years. They understand that there has been some damage done since the drilling took place on site.	Ms Ball encouraged and invited landowners present at the meeting to attend the key focus group meeting at St Francis Links. The specialist (geohydrology) that are part of the EIA team that undertook the drilling and draw-downs can shed some light on the issue.  <b><u>Post-meeting note:</u> The Geohydrological Assessment attached as Appendix E7 to the Draft EIR states that at coastal nuclear sites such as Duynefontein, Bantamsklip and Thyspunt, the nuclear footprint is likely to be located very close to the coastline. In terms of the groundwater cycle, this means that it is located in a groundwater discharge zone. There are, therefore, certain general geohydrological characteristics that are likely to be common to such sites and that must be taken into consideration. One of these are that groundwater flow rates are likely to be relatively slow because of low hydraulic</b>

<b>REBELS RUS LANDOWNERS</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
			<p>gradients.</p> <p>The report also states that in terms of the primary aquifer, build-up of groundwater seldom occurs because of the high hydraulic conductivity of these formations.</p> <p>Furthermore in the presentation by the specialist at the St. Francis Bay Key Stakeholder Focus Group Meeting held on 25 May 2010, the specialist further stated (with reference to a groundwater flow map) that the groundwater flow is towards the coast and any drilling conducted would therefore not influence ground water levels at Rebels Rus. The boreholes were sunk in order to establish ground water levels only and not for abstraction purposes.</p>

## **5. CLOSING REMARKS**

Ms Ball thanked all landowners for their time and valuable contributions into the EIA process. She encouraged all present to attend the meeting at St Francis Links on 25 May 2010 where specialists would be available to respond directly to stakeholders on the outcomes of the investigations.

### ATTENDANCE LIST

Surname	First Names	Title	Co/Org	Rebels Rus Meeting 24 May 2010
Ball	Jaana-Maria	Ms	ARCUS GIBB	Attended
Becker	Frances	Ms	Rebels Rus Nature Reserve	Attended
Bok	Anton & Jill	Dr & Mrs	Rebels Rus Nature Reserve	Attended
Breytenbach	Johann	Mr	Eskom Holdings Limited	Attended
Charlewood	Michael	Mr	Rebels Rus Nature Reserve	Attended
Davies	Duncan & Cecile	Mr & Mrs	Rebels Rus Nature Reserve	Attended
de Villiers	Carin	Ms	Eskom Holdings Limited	Attended
Gathercole	Roland & Angela	Mr & Mrs	Rebels Rus Nature Reserve	Attended
Greeff	Gert	Mr	Eskom Holdings Limited	Attended
Herbst	Deidre	Ms	Eskom Generation	Attended
Heydenrych	Reuben	Mr	ARCUS GIBB	Attended
Jones	Chris & Bettie	Mr & Mrs	Rebels Rus Nature Reserve	Attended
Mbusi	Mandla	Mr	Eskom Holdings Limited	Attended
Ndala	Lorraine	Ms	Eskom Holdings Limited	Attended
Nel	Andre	Mr	Eskom Holdings Limited	Attended
Norman	Jan	Mr	Koeberg NPS	Attended
Oddy	John	Mr	Rebels Rus Conservancy	Attended
Oddy	Chantal	Ms	Rebels Rus Conservancy	Attended
Rautenbach	Charl	Mr	Rebels Rus Nature Reserve	Attended
Sauer	Warwick & Jacqui	Dr & Mrs	Rebels Rus Nature Reserve	Attended
Theron	Mervin	Mr	Eskom Holdings Limited	Attended
von Holdt	Andrea	Ms	Rebels Rus Nature Reserve	Attended
von Holdt	Robroy	Mr	Rebels Rus Nature Reserve	Attended
von Holdt	Libby	Mrs	Rebels Rus Nature Reserve	Attended



**ARCUS**  
**GIBB**  
ENGINEERING & SCIENCE

**Johannesburg**

14 Eglin Road  
Sunninghill 2191  
PO Box 2700  
Sunninghill 2128

Tel: +27 11 519 4600  
Fax: +27 11 807 5670  
Web: www.gibb.co.za

## **Rebels Rus Interested and Affected Parties**

### **NUCLEAR-1 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT: SIMULATION OF POTENTIAL VISUAL IMPACTS FROM REBELS RUS NATURE RESERVE**

Dear Interested and Affected Party

A request was made at the Key Focus Group meeting held on 24 May 2010 in Port Elizabeth, and attended by owners of properties in Rebels Rus Nature Reserve (Rebelsrus), for a simulation of the appearance of the proposed Nuclear-1 Power Station at Thyspunt, when viewed from the coastal area of Rebels Rus.

A three-dimensional simulation of the appearance of the power station from Rebels Rus has been prepared and is attached to this letter by Alan Cave of Cave Klapwijk and Associates, the Visual Specialists for the Nuclear-1 EIA.

The power station has been superimposed on a photograph taken from the fourth last dwelling from the western boundary of Rebelsrus, close to the boundary with Eskom's property. The position from which the photograph was taken is as follows:

South: 34 degrees 11.30 minutes  
East: 24 degrees 44.61 minutes

The photomontage provides an indication of the scale, shape and colour of the completed power station, should it be constructed at Thyspunt. The position of the power station is based on the most probable position, according to the area of lowest identified environmental sensitivity. Maps have been provided in the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and shown at public and Key Focus Group meetings throughout the consultation process for the Draft EIR.

I trust that this fulfils the request from Rebels Rus landowners made at the above-mentioned meeting. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any queries in this respect.

Kind regards

**Jaana-Maria Ball**

Manager: Nuclear-1 EIA

Arcus GIBB (Pty) Ltd (Independent Environmental Impact Practitioners)



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



# *HERITAGE IMPACT ASSESSMENT OF THYSPUNT NPS SITE*

Tim Hart

Archaeology Contracts Office

c/o Department of Archaeology

University of Cape Town



## ***LEGISLATION***

Section 38 of the ***National Heritage Resources Act*** of 1999 makes the identification of those “heritage resources” which are considered part of the “national estate” mandatory for developments that fulfill certain criteria as prescribed by the Act.

When Heritage Resources are identified as part of an EIA, responsibility for compliance reverts from SAHRA (South African Heritage Resources Agency). Dept of Environment Affairs and Planning. SAHRA remains a commenting authority only, however the requirements of the NHRA apply.

## ***WHAT NEEDS TO BE CONSIDERED***

Heritage is defined in the Act as meaning “**any place or object of cultural significance**”

Cultural significance is defined as “**aesthetic, architectural, historical, scientific, social, spiritual, linguistic or technological value or significance**”

**The study involves assessing the impact of the proposed activity on the following.**

**Buildings and structures over 60 years old**

**Archaeological sites over 100 years old**

**Shipwrecks and aircraft wrecks over 60 years old in national waters (on water and in land)**

**Palaeontological sites and specimens**

**Meteorites**

**Special landscapes and streetscapes**

**Important natural areas and features**

**Any place where something important happened relevant to a community**

**Graves**

## ***HISTORY OF STUDIES FOR THE NUCLEAR SITE***

1987: A survey of the study area was undertaken for Eskom by Johan Binneman. He mapped a very rich array of archaeological sites at Thyspunt. He concluded that the site was sensitive and that mitigation would be required. The site was acquired by Eskom.

In subsequent years Dr Binneman sampled a number of the sites, the findings were included within his Phd.

ACO was appointed by Arcus Gibb Pty Ltd in 2007 to become involved in the EIA for 5 proposed NPA sites. Based on the available desktop information, the ACO concluded from the heritage perspective, that the two NORTHERN CAPE sites were most SUITABLE, and of all 5 candidate sites, THYSPUNT was the LEAST SUITABLE.

For economic and practical reasons the Northern Cape sites were “scoped out”.

In 2008 ACO conducted heritage assessment of the remaining 3 sites, again concluding that of the three potential sites (Bantamsklip, Schulpfontein and Thyspunt), Thyspunt was least suitable.

Heritage is one discipline among many that makes up an integrated EIA. Although it was found that in heritage terms that Thyspunt was the least suitable of the sites, the overall findings of the EIA determined that Thyspunt was the preferred site.

## *Our assessment of the sensitivity of Thyspunt....*

- The site survey revealed that Later Stone Age middens are *very* common in within 200m of the shoreline, and common within 400m. After 400m the frequency drops off. **These sites represent the heritage of a great many South Africans who have Khoi Khoi and/or San lineage.**
- There are well preserved archaeological sites in the dune field representing many ages of African pre-history spanning the Early, Middle and Late Stone Ages. Many of the later sites contain ceramics and features such as stone piles and hearths.
- The densely vegetated areas behind the coastal fore-dune were very difficult to search as the ground surface was only visible in cleared areas and along the roads. We don't know how frequent archaeological sites are in these areas, however the lack of sites along the existing east-west access road may be an indicator that sites are less common. We will only be able to assess this area if/when the vegetation is cleared.
- **It was concluded that Thyspunt contains a rich variety of pre-colonial heritage sites. The fact that we could only search a relatively small area due to thick vegetation cover means that there remains much to be learned about the way these sites are distributed on the landscape.**





## *Mitigation and Conservation*

Mitigation 1. At Thyspunt, the degree of potential destruction of archaeological material depends on where the NPS is to be built. Close to the sea means a severe impact, the more inland it can be built, the less the impact (every meter away from the shore counts). Eskom is therefore encouraged to move the facility as far inland as they can. A zone of least sensitivity between the dunes and the shore has been identified.

Mitigation 2: We cannot gauge the true impact in the least sensitive zone until trial excavations are undertaken. It is suggested that such excavations are mechanically done in the project target area and along proposed access roads. It may be possible to slightly alter road alignments to avoid or minimize impacts.

Mitigation 3: The final resort. *The best way to conserve a heritage site is to protect it from people and leave it alone .....* however if this is not possible in the face of massive development projects such as this proposal, the only mitigation we can apply is to “rescue” the heritage resource.



This 1800 year old archaeological site is being systematically removed from the site of a future mining operation.

....No matter how hard we try to do the work as accurately as we can, once the archeological site is moved, it is gone forever.

**Heritage resources are generally non-renewable.**



## ***CONCLUSION***

The Thyspunt site is highly archaeologically sensitive. In terms of heritage it is the least preferred of the three possible sites we have assessed.

The amount of damage that will occur to archaeological sites is dependent on exactly where infrastructure is to be located. Specialists have indentified a “least sensitive” zone which may cause the least impact in heritage terms, however the exact space needs of the NPS are not known as yet.

The least sensitive zone lies in areas that are not well archaeologically understood due to dense vegetation, similarly the proposed access roads. These areas need to be pre-tested to determine how much “rescue work” will be necessary.

Eskom is aware of the implications of archaeological work needed – high quality scientific excavation, adequate storage and logistical support, and of course the funds to achieve this.

Photomontage view of Nuclear-1 from Rebelsrus Nature Reserve



**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT (EIA)**

**EIA: 12/12/20/944**

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

**REVISED DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT  
REPORT**

**MINUTES OF AUTHORITY MEETING: DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC  
AFFAIRS, ENVIRONMENT AND TOURISM (DEAET)**

**OFFICE OF THE EASTERN CAPE DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC  
AFFAIRS, ENVIRONMENT AND TOURISM, PORT ELIZABETH**

**07 JUNE 2011**

**10:00 – 12:30**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

TABLE OF CONTENTS ..... 2

PREFACE ..... 3

1. ATTENDANCE..... 4

    1.1. ATTENDANCE – DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC AFFAIRS ENVIRONMENT AND  
        TOURISM (DEAET)..... 4

    1.2 ATTENDANCE – ESKOM HOLDINGS LIMITED ..... 4

    1.3 ATTENDANCE – INDEPENDENT ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTING TEAM ..... 4

2. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS..... 4

3. AIM AND EXPECTED OUTCOME OF THE MEETING ..... 4

4. PRESENTATION: KEY CHANGES TO THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT  
ASSESSMENT REPORT AND ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PLAN ..... 4

5. ISSUES AND COMMENTS RAISED AND DISCUSSED ..... 5

    5.1 ISSUES AND COMMENTS RAISED ..... 5

6. WAY FORWARD AND CLOSING REMARKS ..... 5

    6.1 MINUTES OF MEETINGS..... 5

    6.2 TIMEFRAMES ..... 5

    6.3 CONCLUDING REMARKS..... 5

APPENDIX 1: RECORD OF ISSUES RAISED AND DISCUSSED..... 6

APPENDIX 2: PRESENTATION OF REVISED DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT ..... 16

APPENDIX 3: ATTENDANCE REGISTER ..... 17

## PREFACE

Should participants who attended the meetings require any changes to these proceedings, please notify the Public Participation Office (nuclear1@gibb.co.za) in writing within 14 days of receipt.

In order to provide a structure and to enable the reader to follow the proceedings with ease the minutes have not been captured verbatim and post-meeting notes have been added for clarity and information purposes and are indicated in **bold**.

## 1. ATTENDANCE

### 1.1. Attendance – Department of Economic Affairs Environment and Tourism (DEAET)

Name	Position/Role
Mr Dayalan Govender	Regional Manager
Mr Alan Southwood	Biodiversity Officer
Mr Andries Struwig	Manager: EIM

### 1.2 Attendance – Eskom Holdings Limited

Name	Position/Role
Ms Lorraine Ndala	Senior Environmental Advisor
Mr Mervin Theron	Manager: Regulation and Localisation
Mr Lerato Sedumedi	Senior Advisor

### 1.3 Attendance – Independent Environmental Consulting Team

Name	Organisation	Role in the project
Ms Jaana-Maria Ball	Arcus GIBB (Pty) Ltd	Nuclear-1 EIA: Project Manager
Mr Reuben Heydenrych	Arcus GIBB (Pty) Ltd	Senior Environmental Scientist and Minute-taker

## 2. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Ms Jaana-Maria Ball (GIBB), representing the Independent Environmental Impact Practitioners, welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked the Department for hosting the GIBB Environmental Impact Assessment Team, as well as the Applicant, Eskom Holdings Limited (Eskom). She explained that the meeting was being recorded and that the minutes will be transcribed for comment. The issues and comments raised will be included in the Final EIR.

## 3. AIM AND EXPECTED OUTCOME OF THE MEETING

The aim for the meeting was to relay to the Department of Economic Affairs Environment and Tourism (DEAET) the changes in the Revised Draft Environmental Impact Assessment Report (EIR), and to give background regarding these changes as well as why they were implemented in the report. Further, an aim of the meeting was to discuss the process going forward according to the 2006 National Environmental Management Act (NEMA) Regulations, under which the EIA is being conducted.

## 4. PRESENTATION: KEY CHANGES TO THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REPORT AND ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PLAN

By way of introduction, Ms Ball, thanked all present for their time and indicated that Arcus GIBB is pleased to present the key changes to the Draft EIR.

Mr Reuben Heydenrych (GIBB) presented the findings on the Revised Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) (refer to presentation slides provided in Appendix 2).

*The issues raised and discussed following Arcus GIBB's presentation are captured in the table presented in Appendix 1.*

## **5. ISSUES AND COMMENTS RAISED AND DISCUSSED**

### **5.1 Issues and Comments raised**

The table contained in Appendix 1: "Record of Issues Raised and Discussed" details the issues, comments and concerns, which were raised and discussed at the meeting.

## **6. WAY FORWARD AND CLOSING REMARKS**

### **6.1 Minutes of Meetings**

Ms Ball indicated that the EIA Team would endeavour to distribute the minutes of the meeting to the commenting authority as soon as possible after the meeting.

The DEA&ET will have 14 days to verify the minutes and provide their comments to the GIBB Public Participation Office.

### **6.2 Timeframes**

In terms of the timeframes, those in attendance were informed that the public review period of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) has been extended to 07 August 2011.

Comments received will be used to produce the Final EIR, which will then be submitted to the Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA) (the decision-making authority for the EIA) for their consideration.

The timeframe for submission of the Final EIR will depend on the quantity and type of comments that are received from the authorities, as well as other I&APs during the review period.

A letter will be sent to all registered I&APs informing them of the authorities' decision.

### **6.3 Concluding Remarks**

Ms Ball thanked everyone for constructive engagement and encouraged them to submit comments on the Revised Draft EIR. The meeting was closed at 12:30.

APPENDIX 1: RECORD OF ISSUES RAISED AND DISCUSSED

No	Name	Comment	Response
1	Mr Andries Struwig	Mr Struwig asked why the Brazil and Schulpfontein sites were scoped out.	<p>RH responded that the main reason was because of integration problems surrounding transmission lines. The Brazil and Schulpfontein sites were judged to be too far from the existing and future electricity load centers. This was because the length of the transmission lines would mean a lot of power would be lost, as a result of 'line losses' during transmission of the power to the end users. He went on to say that it was not necessarily unfeasible from a nuclear perspective but the sites were not suited to the criteria for Nuclear-1.</p> <p>JMB added that Eskom would encounter difficulties building the long transmission lines required by the Brazil and Schulpfontein sites because they would have to negotiate with numerous land owners for servitude rights and there were environmental issues within these long transmission corridors. However, Eskom has not ruled out the possibility of building nuclear power plants at these sites in the future.</p>
2	Mr Andries Struwig	In response Mr Struwig stated he was concerned that the Brazil and Schulpfontein sites were scoped out based on issues surrounding transmission lines. He said construction of transmission lines should be the concern of a separate EIA.	JMB responded that the two sites were indeed scoped out based on transmission integration issues. But also they were scoped out because of the urgent need for more power generation. According to the IRP <sup>1</sup> an additional 9 600 MW have to get onto the grid by 2023 and there is an urgent need to replace 40 000 MW of existing generation capacity. Finally she said that currently South Africa is sitting at an 8 % reserve margin but it needs to increase this to 15 %. Because of this South Africa is currently facing an energy crisis.
3	Mr Andries Struwig	Mr Struwig expressed concern about the affects of spoil on the spawning grounds of Chokka.	RH stated that Chokka spawns at depths of no more than 50 m. The spoil will be dumped 5 km from shore at a depth far greater than 50 m.
4	Mr Andries Struwig	Mr Struwig asked if the dumped spoil would be transported by coastal processes into the	RH responded that to the best of his knowledge no but he would have to check the oceanographic report. He reiterated that the specialists' advice for the EIA was based on making the project workable.

<sup>1</sup> Integrated Resource Plan  
RECORD OF DEA&ET MEETING  
07 JUNE 2011

PROPOSED ESKOM NUCLEAR POWER STATION AND ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE  
 REVIEW OF REVISED DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESMENT REPORT

No	Name	Comment	Response
		Chokka spawning ground.	<p><b>Post-meeting Note:</b>                      The Marine Assessment (Appendix E15 of the Revised Draft EIR) states the following:  <i>“When associated with the discarding of spoil, disruption to the marine environment is significant. When mitigated by disposing spoil offshore (and by using only a medium pumping rate at Thyspunt), the impact is reduced to one of medium consequence and medium significance. The temporal and spatial limitations of the impacts associated with the disposal of spoil on Chokka squid at Thyspunt will have limited impact on the overall squid stock, when taken within the context of the extensive area over which this species spawns.”</i></p>
5	Mr Andries Struwig	Mr Struwig cited the EIR, which stated that spoil will affect only 1% of the national Chokka spawning ground. But he wanted to know how big this affect would be on the local Chokka fishery.	<p>JMB responded that studies have been done that have found that Chokka are widespread in the Thyspunt region and thus the significance of a 1% impact will not be great. But she said GIBB will have to relook at the report to confirm its findings.</p> <p><b>Post-meeting note:</b>                      Page 35 of the Marine Assessment (Appendix E 15 of the Revised Draft EIR) states the following with respect to the impact on Chokka:  <i>“From the above it is clear that <i>L. reynaudii</i><sup>2</sup> will be impacted by the release of warmed cooling water. It is expected that adults will avoid an area of about 0.2 km<sup>2</sup> if a nearshore release is chosen where they are likely to experience temperatures above 22°C and a certain amount of egg mortality is to be expected. Nonetheless, the area to be affected is less than one percent of the coastal spawning ground centred between Plettenberg Bay and Port Alfred.</i></p> <p><i>“It is also important to note that individuals of this species show no dependence on specific spawning grounds and move great distances between spawning grounds (Sauer et al. 2000). As such, adults avoiding the warm water plume are likely to simply move to another spawning ground.”</i></p>

<sup>2</sup> *Loligo reynaudii* (Chokka squid)

**PROPOSED ESKOM NUCLEAR POWER STATION AND ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE  
REVIEW OF REVISED DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESMENT REPORT**

<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
6	Mr Andries Struwig	Mr Struwig asked if there will there be an exclusion zone along the coast which will affect the Chokka fishers.	JMB responded that only 1 km of coastline would be closed off directly adjacent to the site for security reasons. She also said that it would close off a small portion of the Chokka fishing grounds. She added that they would get to the bottom of the issue on 20 June at a specialist's meeting with the Squid Working Group and the South African Squid Management Industry Association (SASMIA) <sup>3</sup> .
7	Mr Andries Struwig	Mr Struwig asked what changes would have to be made to the road network surrounding Thyspunt.	RH stated that the modelling for the roads was based on the equipment needed for construction materials being bought from the port in Port Elizabeth. He went on to state that there would be small upgrades to roads. Specifically the interchanges of the N2 where some turning circles would have to be widened. He added that the Kromme River would also have to be upgraded.  JMB said that the plans for the roads were not cast in stone.
8	Mr Andries Struwig	Mr Struwig asked if the eastern access road would be built to take heavy loads.	JMB stated that the construction of the road will be suitable for heavy loads. She went on to say that there will be approximately 63 heavy loads <sup>4</sup> throughout the 9 year construction period. The road will also be used to transport workers to the site from Sea Vista, St. Francis Bay and Cape St. Francis.  She added that the engineers think building the eastern access road will be much easier due to alignment issues.
9	Mr Andries Struwig	Mr Struwig questioned if it was appropriate to be building a road that could take heavy loads through a sensitive wetland. He went on to ask if building the	JMB responded that the western access road would be more difficult to build because it would cut through dunefields. There are also social issues connected with the western access road. In a public meeting the residents of Oyster Bay and Umzamuwethu have asked that the connection between the internal access road and DR176 does not cut through Oyster Bay and Umzamuwethu.

<sup>3</sup> A meeting with the Squid Scientific Working Group (under the Department. of Agriculture Forestry and Fisheries) has been arranged at the request of the SA Squid Management Industry Association (SASMIA)

<sup>4</sup> Defined as a load of more than 100 tons

PROPOSED ESKOM NUCLEAR POWER STATION AND ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE  
 REVIEW OF REVISED DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESMENT REPORT

No	Name	Comment	Response
		western access road would have a smaller environmental impact.	She reiterated the point that according to engineers the eastern access road would be easier to construct than the western access road.
10	Mr Andries Struwig	Mr Struwig questioned how appropriate it is to be building a large road to carry heavy loads that is only needed for the construction period. He went on to ask if plans have been made to downscale the road after the construction period had ended.	RH replied that the road is not that much bigger than a normal road because the trucks are of a standard design. The main concern is the trucks have large turning circles, which makes the geometry of the road different to a road for normal vehicles.
11	Mr Andries Struwig	Mr Struwig asked if the existing R330 could take the heavy loads disregarding the bridges.  Mr Struwig further stated that residents are concerned that the road (in reference to the R330) will be used for construction traffic.	RH replied yes it could.  <b>Post meeting note: Construction traffic will be via the Western access and not the R330.</b>
12	Mr Andries Struwig	Mr Struwig asked could the predicted traffic problems in Umzamuwethu be mitigated with underpasses and bridges.	JMB replied that building the road is a double edged sword because there are unavoidable social and biophysical issues. But the specialists think that this is the best alternative. The road currently carries a large number of pedestrians and runs by a crèche for small children. The community are unhappy about this even though underpasses will be built.
13	Mr Andries Struwig	Mr Struwig stated that Oyster Bay has huge problems with	JMB responded that the dune specialist, Dr Werner Illenberger, was of the opinion a road could be built through the dune field because there are ways to ensure that sand can blow

PROPOSED ESKOM NUCLEAR POWER STATION AND ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE  
REVIEW OF REVISED DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESMENT REPORT

No	Name	Comment	Response
		mobile dunes and he expressed concern that building a road through a mobile dune field will create a large management burden.	across the road safely.  She said that there were still outstanding issues with the road that had yet to be resolved, and that GIBB would be providing Eskom with a recommendation in this regard.
14	Mr Andries Struwig	Mr Struwig asked where the construction waste will be disposed of.	RH and JMB said that they would need to consult the waste specialist report.  <b>Post-meeting note:</b> <b>The Revised Draft EIR states that the Aloes Waste Site near Port Elizabeth would be used. The report states that the site has a remaining lifespan of approximately 5 years. Thus, in its current design it would run out of capacity prior to completion of construction at Thyspunt. However, expansion of the site is currently being planned.</b>
15	Mr Andries Struwig	Mr Struwig stated that the visual impact of the nuclear power plant is much less than that of wind turbines.	JMB stated that the SAHRA had recently approved a wind farm in the area, stating that a wind farm could potentially preserve the landscape value.
16	Mr Andries Struwig	Mr Struwig asked if the light as a visual impact been considered in the EIR.	RH replied that yes it had been. He went on to say that there is already a significant amount of light pollution from the Chokka industry. The light pollution of Nuclear-1 could be as large or smaller than the pre-existing light pollution but it will depend on the final design of the plant. Despite this the light pollution from the plant will not have an impact further than 2 km.
17	Mr Andries Struwig	Mr Struwig asked for the map <sup>5</sup> to be explained further because it was unclear.	RH replied that the green outlined shape on the map indicated the EIA Corridor; within which the power station can be placed and the yellow area is where the high voltage yard can be placed. The white hatched area is what is left over after all the environmental sensitivities have been considered.  JMB added that in the white hatched area of the map there was the possibility for non-

<sup>5</sup> "SITE SENSITIVITY: THYSPUNT – RECOMMENDED FOOTPRINT" as per the presentation

PROPOSED ESKOM NUCLEAR POWER STATION AND ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE  
REVIEW OF REVISED DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESMENT REPORT

No	Name	Comment	Response
			essential infrastructure to be built such as a visitor centre or museum. She emphasised that there is limited space and the non-essential infrastructure may have to be located off site.
18	Mr Andries Struwig	Mr Struwig asked what methodology was used to create the scoring system.	<p>RH said that the scoring is a weighted comparison. At the specialist integration meeting the waiting for each impact was agreed upon.</p> <p>JMB added that Chapter 9 of the EIR gives a full and detailed explanation of the methodology used for the scoring system. In short she said more than 250 potential impacts were put into a table. The impacts that were considered not significant or were the same across the three sites were removed from the table, thus leaving the impacts that differed at the three sites.</p> <p>She went on to say the site selection was both quantitative and qualitative. The weighting was created by GIBB has been subject to a round of public comment as well as three different peer reviewers.</p>
19	Mr Andries Struwig	Mr Struwig asked how the transmission integration factors can be weighed when it should be an entirely separate EIA.	RH responded that for the EIR GIBB considered transmission integration on a national scale, where the best place was to place a power station in relation to existing transmission infrastructure and demand. Thus the transmission integration in this context does not refer to the impacts of the powerlines.
20	Mr Andries Struwig	Mr Struwig asked why social impacts were not considered in the scoring.	JMB said the social impacts were considered to be the same at all sites and were therefore excluded.
21	Mr Andries Struwig	Mr Struwig stated that a minimum of 25% of employees will be taken from the local community. He asked will the migrant workers leave once the project has finished. And he went on to ask has it been considered that people will	<p>RH responded by saying that workers moving from the agricultural sector to work as a construction worker for Nuclear-1 was a concern but the social specialist did not consider it as a huge risk.</p> <p>JMB said that there is also concern about the ability of the current infrastructure to deal with an influx of workers. In an attempt to counter this problem, recruitment offices will be placed in the local communities such as Humansdorp and Jeffrey's Bay and not at the gates of the Nuclear-1 construction site.</p>

**PROPOSED ESKOM NUCLEAR POWER STATION AND ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE  
REVIEW OF REVISED DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESMENT REPORT**

No	Name	Comment	Response
		move from the agriculture sector to the construction sector.	
22	Mr Andries Struwig	Mr Struwig asked where the workers village will be constructed.	RH replied that the workers village was not considered in this EIA. However, Eskom is in discussions with local authorities who are helping them identify the best sites.
23	Mr Andries Struwig	Mr Struwig asked if Eskom will buy a site which already has authorisation to build the workers village.	MT replied yes Eskom would buy a site with pre-existing development rights.
24	Mr Andries Struwig	Mr Struwig asked if any considerations had been made about what was going to happen to the workers houses after the construction phase was over. And what was going to happen with the workers once the construction finished.	JMB stated that Eskom has a reasonable track record with similar big projects. For example at the Medupi Power Station although Eskom was required only to hire 25% locals in some cases their workforce has been made up of 40% local people.  MT said that the aim for Nuclear-1 is to make use of local people so that minimum relocation is necessary.  JMB added that communities have said in a public meeting that there is a dire need for more housing in the area and there has been some anger expressed at Eskom who will be taking up land that could be used for current housing needs for locals.
25	Mr Andries Struwig and Mr Dayalan Govender	Mr Struwig asked if local services were going to be upgraded.  Mr Struwig and Mr Govender expressed their concern that no land is currently zoned with development rights for a workers village in the area. They went on to say that the	MT responded that there is a need for Eskom to establish a stronger partnership with the local municipality because the municipality faces major challenges when it comes to service delivery.  RH and JMB responded that it is acknowledged in the Social Impact Assessment and in the EIR that the municipality faced major service backlogs. It is therefore recommended that Eskom must agree with the relevant services providers (including municipalities) on the apportionment of responsibility for service upgrades before the start of construction for Nuclear-1.

PROPOSED ESKOM NUCLEAR POWER STATION AND ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE  
 REVIEW OF REVISED DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESMENT REPORT

No	Name	Comment	Response
		<p>developers will not be able to get approval for a workers village because of a lack of infrastructure. Current EIA applications are being blocked until it can be demonstrated that sufficient services are available. Furthermore, the municipality lacks money to update infrastructure, thereby compounding the problem.</p>	
26	Mr Andries Struwig	<p>Mr Struwig asked if the figure quoted in the IRP of 9 600 MW generated by nuclear power includes existing power generated by nuclear.</p>	<p>RH said that there is a need for 20 000 MW of power to be generated in the next ten years. Of this amount 9 600 MW will be generated by nuclear.</p> <p>JMB added that this is in addition to the current capacity at Koeberg.</p>
27	Mr Andries Struwig	<p>Mr Struwig asked if another nuclear power plant will be built after Nuclear-1.</p>	<p>Mervin Theron responded that it has been indicated in the EIA that the other sites considered for Nuclear-1 will be considered in the future for other nuclear power stations.</p>
28	Mr Andries Struwig	<p>Mr Struwig asked for clarification on the emergency zoning.</p>	<p>RH responded by stating that no private development within 800m of Nuclear-1. Furthermore Eskom owns all land within 800 m of the power station. There will also be a 3 km zone within which development will be regulated. These zones are based on European Utility Requirements (EUR).</p> <p>The nuclear utilities of all European countries agreed on universal safety criteria for all nuclear power stations on the continent. The assumption of the EIA is that the National Nuclear Regulator (NNR) will approve the EUR zones. If this assumption is not correct, then the EIA may need to relook at these zones.</p>

**PROPOSED ESKOM NUCLEAR POWER STATION AND ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE  
REVIEW OF REVISED DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESMENT REPORT**

No	Name	Comment	Response
			RH added that, apart from the above-mentioned zones, there is a non-regulated 2 km owner-controlled zone around the power station. Eskom would prefer to own this zone to make it easier for them to control the environment surrounding Nuclear-1. Finally he added that these zones are much smaller those than the ones imposed at the Koeberg Nuclear Power Station, which are 5 km and 16 km.
29	Mr Andries Struwig	Mr Struwig asked that if in the event of a nuclear disaster would Oyster Bay and Cape St Francis be affected.	RH stated that Oyster Bay is 5.5 km away from the proposed site of Nuclear-1 and Cape St. Francis is 10 km away. Both towns would be unaffected by the security zone.  JMB added that originally residents from both towns supported the power plant because the security zones would mean controls on development in and around the towns.
30	Mr Andries Struwig	Mr Struwig asked what the existing no development zones were that the NNR imposes.	MT responded that these zones are 5 km and 16 km as at Koeberg.  Post-meeting note: The Duynfontien residential development is about 2-3 km away from the Koeberg Nuclear Power Station.
31	Mr Andries Struwig	Mr Struwig expressed concerns about the evacuation plan and asked if evacuation timescales had been looked at. He added that it should be considered that the population of Cape St. Francis doubles during the December holidays and this would affect evacuation timescales.	RH responded that evacuation planning is based on the temporary evacuation within 3 km from the power station.
32	Mr Andries Struwig	Mr Struwig asked if different types of fuel cells such as	MT responded that no, different types of nuclear fuels have not been studied because Eskom want a system similar to that at the Koeberg Nuclear Power Station. He went on to say this

**PROPOSED ESKOM NUCLEAR POWER STATION AND ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE  
REVIEW OF REVISED DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESMENT REPORT**

<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		Thorium had been studied.	was because Eskom have 27 years experience of managing the power station and want to use this knowledge to run Nuclear-1.  JMB added that an optional presentation by Eskom on nuclear safety in light of the Fukushima disaster has been offered after the public participation meetings.

**APPENDIX 2: PRESENTATION OF REVISED DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

**APPENDIX 3: ATTENDANCE REGISTER**

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT (EIA)**

**EIA: 12/12/20/944**

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

**REVISED DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT  
REPORT**

**MINUTES OF AUTHORITY MEETING: SOUTH AFRICAN HERITAGE  
RESOURCES AGENCY (SAHRA)**

**SAHRA HEAD OFFICE, 111 HARRINGTON STREET, CAPE TOWN  
24 MAY 2011**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS .....	1
PREFACE	2
1. ATTENDANCE .....	3
1.1. ATTENDANCE – SOUTH AFRICAN HERITAGE RESOURCES AGENCY (SAHRA).....	3
1.2. ATTENDANCE – ESKOM HOLDINGS LIMITED (ESKOM).....	3
1.3. ATTENDANCE – ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTING TEAM (GIBB).....	3
1.4. APOLOGIES .....	3
2. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS .....	3
3. AIM AND EXPECTED OUTCOME OF THE MEETING .....	4
4. PRESENTATION: FINDINGS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REPORT AND THE HERITAGE REPORT .....	4
5. ISSUES AND COMMENTS RAISED AND DISCUSSED .....	4
5.1 ISSUES AND COMMENTS RAISED .....	4
6. WAY FORWARD AND CLOSING REMARKS .....	4
6.1 MINUTES OF MEETINGS .....	4
6.2 TIMEFRAMES .....	4
6.3 CONCLUDING REMARKS .....	5
APPENDIX 1: RECORD OF ISSUES RAISED AND DISCUSSED .....	6
APPENDIX 2: PRESENTATION OF REVISED DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT .....	12
APPENDIX 3: ATTENDANCE REGISTER.....	13

## PREFACE

Should participants who attended the meetings require any changes to these proceedings, please notify the Public Participation Office (nuclear1@gibb.co.za) in writing within 14 days of receipt.

In order to provide a structure and to enable the reader to follow the proceedings with ease the minutes have not been captured verbatim and post-meeting notes have been added for clarity and information purposes and are indicated in **bold**.

## 1. ATTENDANCE

### 1.1. Attendance – South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA)

Name	Position/Role
Mr Dumisani Sibayi	Executive Officer: Heritages Resources Management
Ms Sonja Warnich-Stemmet	Acting Provincial Manger, SAHRA Western Cape Office
Ms Colette Scheermeyer	Archaeology, Palaeontology and Meteorite Unit
Ms Nonofho Ndobochani	Archaeology, Palaeontology and Meteorite Unit
Mr Andrew Salomon	Archaeology, Palaeontology and Meteorite Unit
Dr Mariagrazia Galimberti	Archaeology, Palaeontology and Meteorite Unit
Adv. Michael Petersen	Legal Advisor

### 1.2 Attendance – Eskom Holdings Limited (Eskom)

Name	Position/Role
Ms Deidre Herbst	Senior Manager: Environmental Management
Mr Mervin Theron	Manager: Regulation and Localisation
Ms Lorraine Ndala	Senior Environmental Advisor
Mr Samson Malaka	Senior Advisor: Project Management

### 1.3 Attendance – Environmental Consulting Team (GIBB)

Name	Organisation	Role in the project
Ms Jaana-Maria Ball	Arcus GIBB (Pty) Ltd	Nuclear-1 EIA: Project Manager
Mr Reuben Heydenrych	Arcus GIBB (Pty) Ltd	Senior Environmental Scientist
Mr Ryan Dolan	Arcus GIBB (Pty) Ltd	Environmental Scientist (Minute-taker)

### 1.4 Apologies

Name	Organisation	Role in the project
Mr Tim Hart	Archaeology Contract Office, University of Cape Town	Independent Heritage Specialist
Mr Phillip Hine	Archaeology, Palaeontology and Meteorite Unit	SAHRA

## 2. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

Mr Dumisani Sibayi, Executive Officer of the SAHRA Heritage Resources Management Division, welcomed everyone to the meeting and invited a round of introductions. Mr Sibayi reiterated that the purpose of the meeting should be for attendees to find solutions to the issues at hand without compromising on the respective mandates of the organisations present.

Participants were reminded that the meeting was being recorded and that draft minutes of the meeting would be available afterwards for comment.

### **3. AIM AND EXPECTED OUTCOME OF THE MEETING**

Mr Sibayi handed over discussion to Ms Jaana-Maria Ball (GIBB), who explained that GIBB, the independent Environment Impact Practitioners, would provide a brief overview of the Revised Draft Environmental Impact Report, as well as key changes to the Draft Environmental Impact Report and the Heritage Assessment. She explained that the presentation would be followed by a discussion regarding the current status of the report, and the way forward in the EIA process. This discussion would also cover the pending application with the SAHRA for a permit to conduct test excavations for archaeological sites on the Thyspunt site.

### **4. PRESENTATION: FINDINGS ON THE DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REPORT AND THE HERITAGE REPORT**

Ms Ball and Mr Reuben Heydenrych presented a brief overview of the findings of the Revised Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and the Heritage Assessment (refer to presentation slides provided in Appendix 2), with focus on key changes to the documents.

*The issues raised and discussed following GIBB's presentation are captured in the table presented in Appendix 1.*

### **5. ISSUES AND COMMENTS RAISED AND DISCUSSED**

#### **5.1 Issues and Comments raised**

The table contained in Appendix 1: "Record of Issues Raised and Discussed" details the issues, comments and concerns, which were raised and discussed at the meeting.

### **6. WAY FORWARD AND CLOSING REMARKS**

#### **6.1 Minutes of Meetings**

Ms Ball indicated that the EIA Team would endeavour to distribute the minutes of the meeting to SAHRA shortly after the meeting.

Once received, those present will have 14 days to verify the accuracy of the minutes and provide their comments to the GIBB Public Participation Office.

#### **6.2 Timeframes**

In terms of the timeframes, the SAHRA personnel were informed that the period for public review and comments for the Revised Draft EIR has been extended, as requested by various

I&APs. The deadline for submission of comments is 07 August 2011. The SAHRA was respectfully asked to submit comments on the Heritage Impact Assessment within this time period.

Comments received will be used to produce the Final EIR, which will then be submitted to the Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA) (the decision-making authority for the EIA) for their consideration. The final EIR, which will consider the comments from the SAHRA will also be submitted to the SAHRA for a decision on the preferred site.

The timeframe for submission of the Final EIR to the DEA will depend on the quantity and type of comments that are received from I&APs during the review period.

A letter will be sent to all registered I&APs informing them of the authority's decision.

### **6.3 Concluding Remarks**

Mr Sibanyi thanked everyone for constructive engagement and agreed that the SAHRA will finalise processing the application submitted by the Heritage Specialist, Mr Hart, for the 'test' excavations. He agreed that the Agency would do its best to provide comments regarding any information gaps in the Heritage Impact Assessment that must be addressed prior to consideration and decision by the SAHRA.

**APPENDIX 1: RECORD OF ISSUES RAISED AND DISCUSSED**

<b>AUTHORITY MEETING: SAHRA HEAD OFFICE, CAPE TOWN (24 MAY 2011)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
	Ms Jaana-Maria Ball, GIBB	Many members of the public requested that the comment period for Revised EIR be extended beyond the required 45 days. This has been granted and the deadline for submissions has been extended to 07 August 2011.	
	Dr Mariagrazia Galimberti, SAHRA	<p>She requested clarification on the size of the property at the Thyspunt site.</p> <p>She asked if the figure in the presentation included additional land that Eskom plans to purchase.</p>	<p>Ms Ball of GIBB responded that the figures listed on Slide 23 do not include the additional hectares for roads, etc. While the Thyspunt site area is indicated at 1 638 ha, GIBB is recommending that the footprint of the infrastructure be located in approximately 174 ha. Further, a recommendation from all specialist studies indicates that a 200 m buffer zone be maintained along the coastline.</p> <p>No it does not include the land that has been and will be purchased in the future. The additional land that Eskom purchases will not increase the size of the recommended footprint for the site. Subsequently it would result in a higher percentage of Eskom's land being designated for conservation purposes.</p>
	Ms Jaana-Maria Ball, GIBB	In March 2011, the archaeology specialist, Dr Tim Hart, produced a mitigation study based on the concerns of the SAHRA regarding the suitability of the Thyspunt site from a heritage perspective. This application for permit has been re-submitted to SAHRA for consideration by the panel. It is the understanding of GIBB that this is still pending approval.	Mrs Ndobochani clarified that there are two issues regarding Thyspunt, the impact assessment, and the application for test excavations following the findings of the impact assessment. SAHRA has responded to the archaeological and palaeontological impact assessment. In a meeting that followed this response, Eskom and GIBB indicated that they needed to do test excavations for the area that was not surveyed – hence the application for a permit to do test excavations. SAHRA is

<b>AUTHORITY MEETING: SAHRA HEAD OFFICE, CAPE TOWN (24 MAY 2011)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		In the recommendations of GIBB, it is stated that one condition for the permit being granted is that the specialist gain further access to the site able to conduct test excavations to verify the sensitivity and quality of heritage on site. This has been reflected in the application to SAHRA.	finalising this application.
	Ms Deidre Herbst, Eskom	There have been some applications submitted by the specialist, Mr Hart, for a permit to excavate on site for an in-depth heritage study. These were declined by the SAHRA based on the premise that the excavations were too extensive. As such, test excavations were later proposed, but a decision on this permit has been delayed for a total of eight months. Mr Hart has modified his application according to concerns from the SAHRA and Eskom wishes this process to move forward.	Ms Ndobochani answered that Mr Hart applied to the SAHRA for a permit to do test excavations, which was submitted to the permit committee. SAHRA had a meeting with Mr Hart in January 2011 to contextualise the application within the broader project area and to make it more clear for re-submission to the committee. She stated that SAHRA has been giving timely responses to the applicant, its only that these were not favourable to Eskom. In the whole process for this application, feedback has been given to the specialist, and this included having meetings with him at times. After re-consideration of the application, the specialist was to provide a map, which the SAHRA has received from Mr Hart a week prior to this meeting, and SAHRA staff are currently in the process of finalising the application. SAHRA will assess whether all required information is included for consideration of the application.
	Ms Deidre Herbst, Eskom	Eskom requests that the comments provided to Mr Hart be clear and that he is aware of what he needs to do to address issues on time. Eskom is relying on the SAHRA and Mr Hart to get answers and to move forward. This process has been frustrating to Eskom given the various delays in considering the application for a permit to carry out the test pits.	Adv. Petersen answered that the SAHRA is the responsible authority for conservation of heritage resources in terms of the Constitution as well as within the relevant legislation. It is therefore within SAHRA's jurisdiction to adhere to its prescribed processes and procedures for consideration of an application. In the event that certain information is required and the consultant does not provide this information, the SAHRA has the right to request this information. The SAHRA understands it

<b>AUTHORITY MEETING: SAHRA HEAD OFFICE, CAPE TOWN (24 MAY 2011)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
			is a time-consuming process and that this can be frustrating to the Applicant, but this is within the mandate of SAHRA.
	Ms Deidre Herbst, Eskom	Eskom understands and respects the mandate of the Agency. As this process has been going since August 2010, it is important that all parties move forward, regardless of the cause of the delay. Eskom would expect that the Agency communicate clearly and timeously with the specialist to ensure he can provide necessary information for consideration of the application.	Ms Scheermeyer answered that in terms of the permit application, once the SAHRA receives the information that was requested of the Applicant, the Agency has the responsibility to bring these concerns back to the committee to discuss and to reach a consensus. If at any point, this legislative process has not been conducted according to legal obligations, the decision can be challenged in court. Therefore it is required that the SAHRA follow the process as required.  Ms Herbst responded that Eskom understands that the SAHRA is not trying to deliberately delay the process.
	Ms Nonofho Ndobochani, SAHRA	The SAHRA has indicated in the past that it does not support the development as it has been presented to the Agency through impact assessment reports. An official response was given to that effect, which Eskom currently has. Following a meeting held last year, a revised Heritage Impact Assessment has been prepared and submitted to SAHRA. The SAHRA will review the report and comment accordingly.	Mr Sibayi indicated that while the SAHRA supports the mandate of Eskom in providing electricity, this should be done within the context of heritage recommendations.
	Mr Mervin Theron, Eskom	Mr Theron asked if the SAHRA has deadlines and a timeline for commenting and consideration of applications.	Ms Scheermeyer of the SAHRA indicated that permits are circulated the committee on Fridays every two weeks.  Ms Ball responded to confirm that this EIA is being considered under the 2006 National Environmental Management Act (NEMA) EIA Regulations. GIBB would like to respectfully request that the SAHRA comment within the 90-day Comment Period.

<b>AUTHORITY MEETING: SAHRA HEAD OFFICE, CAPE TOWN (24 MAY 2011)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
	Ms Deidre Herbst, Eskom	In terms of the SAHRA as a commenting authority, Eskom would like to receive comments regarding anything that is missing from the draft Heritage Report. The Agency will be given an opportunity at a later date to consider the overall suitability of the site and subsequent decision for approval. At this time, Eskom would simply like the SAHRA to indicate if there are any gaps in the Heritage Impact Assessment that would impair their ability to make a decision later on.	Ms Ball clarified by stating that the SAHRA should simply comment at this point on gaps in the Heritage Impact Assessment. The SAHRA will be given an opportunity to approve/ disapprove the proposed development once the Final EIR is submitted to the DEA.
	Ms Jaana-Maria Ball, GIBB	The Heritage Impact Assessment and the Visual Impact Assessment should be considered together by the SAHRA. GIBB requests that the SAHRA reads the Visual Impact Assessment within the context of heritage, specifically regarding the photomontage taken from Rebelsrus included in the presentation.	
	Mr Reuben Heydenrych, GIBB and Ms Deirdre Herbst, Eskom	One of the findings from the specialist study is that the Thyspunt site may qualify as a UNESCO World Heritage Site. Ms Herbst requested information regarding what the process would be if the site is determined to be a World Heritage Site. She requested clarification whether this designation would stop the power station from moving forward.	Mr Sibayi of the SAHRA said that in terms of this affecting the proposed activities, the site would also have to be indicated as a heritage site at the national level for this to be a consideration. Such a designation would need to first be proposed and later approved by the relevant committee. The responsible committee would be in the Eastern Cape. Ndobochani indicated that Mr Hart was not saying Thyspunt is worth of world heritage status, he was using the UNESCO definition of 'cultural landscape'.
	Ms Jaana-Maria Ball, GIBB	The understanding from GIBB is that this process might be extensive. Ms Ball requested information regarding who is responsible for moving this process	To add to Ms Ball's comment, Ms Herbst asked if the terms of the SAHRA's requests were met accordingly, would the potential designation of this site as a World Heritage Site derail

<b>AUTHORITY MEETING: SAHRA HEAD OFFICE, CAPE TOWN (24 MAY 2011)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
		forward and why the site hasn't been designated as a heritage site yet.	<p>approval of the development</p> <p>Ms Ndobochani responded that this should be addressed with Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA), as they are the authority on designating a World Heritage site.</p> <p>Adv Petersen of the SAHRA said that the issue of this delaying the process will have to be looked at and confirmed. After assessing this issue, the SAHRA will provide a clarification in writing. However, at this time the way forward should deal with the site in terms of its current designation. In other words, the EIA should not consider the site as a World Heritage Site.</p>
	Adv Michael Petersen SAHRA	As no one attending this meeting is on the permit committee, no one in attendance from the SAHRA has authority to make a decision on permit applications. So it is also important to clarify that the purpose of the meeting from the SAHRA's perspective is for information sharing.	
	Ms Jaana-Maria Ball, GIBB	There has been a request from the Thyspunt Alliance requesting a meeting with the Gamtkwa Khoisan Council in the St. Francis area. GIBB has been addressing the larger tribe (First Nation Tribe), under which GIBB has been informed the various Councils sit. GIBB has been approaching the chief of relevant tribes for public participation purposes, and they are then responsible for inviting other councils. Ms Ball requested feedback from the SAHRA as to whether the method of addressing the tribe chief is adequate for the purposes of public participation.	<p>Mr Sibayi of SAHRA said that this can potentially be dangerous as various tribes do not recognize certain kings or other tribes. It is important that various measures be taken to advertise public participation</p> <p>Adv Petersen of SAHRA added that one would first want to verify that the Chiefs are registered and recognised at the government level. To be safe, it is best to simply advertise for public participation from the general public.</p>

<b>AUTHORITY MEETING: SAHRA HEAD OFFICE, CAPE TOWN (24 MAY 2011)</b>			
<b>No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
	Ms Jaana-Maria Ball, GIBB	Ms Ball explained the extensive public participation process that GIBB has been conducting, including various public participation meetings, advertisements, as well as the translations of the Executive Summaries and public open day material in three languages. Specifically, she referred to one public meeting in Oyster Bay; a second meeting in St. Francis Bay, that is likely to be attended by members of the Khoisan Council; followed by a meeting with the First Nation Chief; then in the evening with the Sea Vista community. The following day there will be a public meeting in Humansdorp. It is GIBB's priority to involve marginalised communities and the public participation process has reflected this.	
	Ms Jaana-Maria Ball, GIBB	She requested verification on how to find the names of tribes recognised by the government.	Adv Petersen indicated that he would provide appropriate contact details after the meeting. Ms Ndobochani said another way of confirming the communities affected by a proposed project is to look at Section 38(3)(e) of the National Heritage Resources Act.
	Mr Dumisani Sibayi, SAHRA	Mr Sibayi indicated that he is from the Eastern Cape and that he understands and respects the need of inhabitants to have access to electricity. The SAHRA is not trying to block the development of a nation, but rather to ensure it is done in a way which respects the heritage of South Africans. Ultimately, the decision depends on the members of the permit committee (in terms of permit applications).	

## **APPENDIX 2: PRESENTATION OF REVISED DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT**

## **APPENDIX 3: ATTENDANCE REGISTER**

## DRAFT MINUTES OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING

**CLIENT** : Eskom Holdings SOC (Pty) Ltd  
**PROJECT** : Nuclear-1  
**PROJECT No** : J31314  
**PURPOSE** : Focus Group Meeting with Chiefs of the First Nations  
**PLACE** : Gamtoos Hotel and Caravan Park  
**DATE & TIME** : 20 November 2014 10:00 – 12:00  
**MINUTE TAKER** : T Naicker

NAME	REPRESENTING	E-MAIL ADDRESS	TELEPHONE
<b>PRESENT</b>			
T Naicker (TN)	GIBB	<a href="mailto:tnaicker@gibb.co.za">tnaicker@gibb.co.za</a>	012 348 5880
E Nortje (EN)	GIBB	<a href="mailto:enortje@gibb.co.za">enortje@gibb.co.za</a>	012 348 5880
M Williams (MW)	Chief of the First Nations		042 287 0664
J Little (CLittle)	Chief of the First Nations	<a href="mailto:SL9@clicks.co.za">SL9@clicks.co.za</a>	021 593 7742
L Maleiba (LM)	Chief of the First Nations	<a href="mailto:bloemm@dwa.gov.za">bloemm@dwa.gov.za</a>	041 452 4994
T Augustus (TA)	Chief of the First Nations	<a href="mailto:tcdriiving@gmail.com">tcdriiving@gmail.com</a>	041 484 1890
T Dow (TD)	Chief of the First Nations	<a href="mailto:dowtoetie@yahoo.com">dowtoetie@yahoo.com</a>	079 341 5707
J Ruiters (JR)	Chief of the First Nations	<a href="mailto:trc@hotmail.co.za">trc@hotmail.co.za</a>	083 978 1643
L Ndala (LN)	Eskom	<a href="mailto:Ndalal@eskom.co.za">Ndalal@eskom.co.za</a>	011 800 4622
T Bokwe (TB)	Eskom	<a href="mailto:Bokwett@eskom.co.za">Bokwett@eskom.co.za</a>	011 800 2303
R Prins (RP)	Chief of the First Nations		078 605 5298
M Felix (MF)	Chief of the First Nations		073 3905 702
J Joseph (JJ)	Chief of the First Nations	<a href="mailto:jr007@tiscali.co.za">jr007@tiscali.co.za</a>	083 258 9870

### APOLOGIES

M Cairncross

### ADDITIONAL DISTRIBUTION

Attendees at the meeting are encouraged to take their own notes and start acting on these rather than await the distribution of the minutes. The minutes serve as a record of events at the meeting. This meeting was presented in English and Afrikaans at the request of the attendees.

	DESCRIPTION
1.	<b>WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION</b>
1.1.	EN welcomed all attendees and thanked everyone present for the opportunity to interact with GIBB on the EIA (Environmental Impact Assessment) process for the proposed Nuclear-1 Power Plant that Eskom wishes to build.

	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>
1.2.	EN asked everyone to introduce themselves and indicate their role in the project. An outline of the presentation was provided, with an introduction to the project team and client.
<b>2.</b>	<b>PURPOSE OF THE MEETING</b>
2.1.	EN indicated that this was a Focus Group Meeting with the Chiefs of the First Nation for this EIA process and that the purpose of the meeting was to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Present and introduce the attendees to the recent changes with the proposed project and the EIA team and;</li> <li>• Provide further detail with regards to the process to date as well as provide the attendees with an opportunity to actively participate in the Environmental authorisation process.</li> </ul>
<b>3.</b>	<b>PROJECT PRESENTATION</b>
3.1.	EN gave a presentation in English and in Afrikaans highlighting what has been done in terms of the EIA process and what future actions still need to occur.
<b>4.</b>	<b>DISCUSSION</b>
4.1.	<b>Heritage</b>
4.1.1.	LM: what does the 200m grid and 400m grid mean? EN: it is either a 200m by 200m or 400m by 400m area used for excavation.
4.1.2.	TD: how many grave sites were identified and what will happen to those sites? EN: The HIA did not readily identify any grave sites on the Thyspunt site, but the procedure to be followed in the event of a grave being identified is outlined in the Environmental Management Plan.
4.1.3.	TD: how far is it from Papiessfontein because there is one known grave site and maybe more there? EN: Papiessfontein is towards the east and Thyspunt is in the South West. So they are about 40km apart.
4.1.4.	MW: currently we (the indigenous people) do not have access to go look at our heritage. Can Eskom make some provision for the Khoi people to go look at their heritage – a permit or something? EN & TN: we cannot give you an answer to that now, as this will have to be negotiated and discussed. But we do understand the need for it to be a living heritage resource.
4.1.5.	TB: are the chiefs talking about land in general or just in the NPS sites? The best we (Eskom) can do is to try and identify a national mechanism or procedure, through the SAHRA, by which the First Nation will be afforded an opportunity to view artefacts of heritage significance. Please note that this is outside the scope of the current meeting however Eskom will try to identify this procedure if one exists within the context of South African legislation. TD: the land in general.
4.1.6.	MW: the owner of the land controls access to the land so it is difficult for government to get involved. But maybe Eskom can arrange something for the land they own. EN: reiterated TB's previous statement.

	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>
4.2.	<b>Nuclear Waste</b>
4.2.1.	<p>JL: where will the nuclear waste be taken to?</p> <p>EN: low and medium level waste will be taken to Vaalputs in the Northern Cape, while high level waste will be stored on site until a final disposal site is available?.</p>
4.2.2.	<p>JL: why move the nuclear waste from the Eastern Cape to the Northern Cape?</p> <p>TN: the waste must be stored at a seismically and tectonically stable site. This is why Vaalputs was chosen.</p>
4.3.	<b>Safety</b>
4.3.1.	<p>JL: how can you prevent another Chernobyl event from happening? – provisions have to be made or we will lose out from an energy point of view.</p> <p>EN: as with all power generation processes, we must consider all the possible factors that surround energy generation and as such we have done various site safety studies, including Radiological Impact Assessments, etc.</p> <p>As noted in the presentation, Eskom is looking at using a Generation III type nuclear reactor which is a safer type of reactor design.</p> <p>The EIA shows that risks can be mitigated and there is also the NNR process still to be done, which will again look at these matters in more detail.</p>
4.3.2.	<p>JL: what about the Fukushima issue – have concerns about global warming and sea level rise been looked at?</p> <p>EN: the specialist studies compiled as part of the Nuclear-1 EIA process have considered sea level rise and the impact this may have on safety and the positioning of the Nuclear power station (NPS).</p> <p>The NPS position and site position is protected by our geographical position due to Madagascar so a Tsunami reaching us from the Indian Ocean is unlikely. Our South African southern coastline is also not situated close to a subduction zone or an area of high tectonic activity as is found near Japan or the North and South American east coasts.</p> <p>We do have minor earthquakes in South Africa, but not in and around the Thyspunt area.</p>
4.3.3.	<p>LM: what is the extent of the area that will be impacted by the process?</p> <p>Mention was made of dune vegetation and coastal area that will inevitably be affected by the construction and operation of the NPS – is the NPS going to be built partly in the Ocean?</p> <p>EN: The area identified as the Thyspunt site is 250ha in extent.</p> <p>EN: No, the NPS is not going to be built into the sea. Only the inlet and outlet pipes will go into the sea. The NPS will be kept away from the coastline.</p> <p>The area around the NPS will become protected, due to security requirements of a National Key Point and any heritage resources within this area will thus also become protected.</p>

	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>
4.4.	<b>Technical</b>
4.4.1.	<p>JL: there is a concern of spare parts. What about availability, expertise in the industry, reliability and training of the people?</p> <p>EN: in terms of job creation, there is great opportunity for local labour depending on the required skills.</p>
4.4.2.	<p>JL: Could the local community be advised then on what career they can follow so that they can be suitably qualified prior to the construction of the project commencing?</p> <p>EN: unsure but could possibly provide a general skills breakdown which will be required during the construction and operational phase of the project.</p>
4.4.3.	<p>LM: let's not lose focus on what today is about and try to stay on topic.</p> <p>EN: timeframes are very important but to put the opportunities for employment into perspective it is important to remember that the process to submission of the Final EIR report may still take up to six months if, not more. The competent authority thereafter needs to make a decision which, will in all likelihood, will be appealed.</p> <p>It is only after a decision on the appeal is made that the construction period of approximately 9 years can commence. So we are pre-empting these matters.</p>
4.5.	<b>Communications</b>
4.5.1.	<p>LM: No decisions on job creation can be made as not all the people that should be here are at the meeting. This is not GIBB's fault because of a lack of details.</p> <p>EN: I agree, we need to get as much information from the chiefs.</p> <p>MW: Eskom should play a bigger role in getting the chiefs together in order to get a unified decision.</p>
4.5.2.	<p>TB: in their written submission, the Chiefs are requested to please ensure that all written comments are very clear for ease of interpretation, and to make sure there is no doubt.</p> <p>JR &amp; JJ: we will send comments once we receive the minutes.</p> <p>LN: you are welcome to send other comments even though it was not in the minutes.</p>
4.5.3.	<p>TA: the Khoi people are the most impoverished people in South Africa. We struggled to get to this meeting. Please consider assisting in getting us to these meetings, etc.</p> <p>EN: we can consider an arrangement, but that must be planned in advance. Please indicate where you stay on our stakeholder list.</p>

	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>
4.6.	<b>Marine</b>
4.6.1.	<p>JL: I do not understand how the NPS works – lots of hot water coming out of the NPS into the sea. Won't this have an impact on the marine environment, which in turn could turn this high tourism area into ghost towns?</p> <p>EN: this will be discussed in detail next year at the Public Participation Meeting, but the marine impact can be mitigated so that it is not a fatal flaw. Also tourism was assessed and we can provide you after this meeting with the revised DEIR Version 2.</p>
4.7.	<b>Conservation</b>
4.7.1.	<p>JL: will there be a build-up of an industrial area around the NPS?</p> <p>EN: bulk infrastructure will be upgraded to support the NPS construction. No area of small factories around the site is however envisaged.</p>
4.7.2.	<p>JL: can we get a guarantee of this?</p> <p>EN: Koeberg is a good example of this. Eskom takes care of their land as responsible landowners.</p> <p>TN: there will be a protected area zone around the NPS of 2km in size wherein there will be no development, both for safety reasons and for environmental conservation reasons.</p> <p><b>Post Meeting Note:</b></p> <p>The Proactive Action Zone has a radius of 800m from the NPS and the Urgent Protective Zone has a radius of 3km from the NPS. Please note that the final distances will be stipulated by the NNR.</p>
4.8.	<b>CLOSURE AND WAY FORWARD</b>
	<p>EN closed the Public Meeting at 12:00 by confirming that no issues were raised during the meeting that were not answered or clarified during the meeting itself and would thus see that as a sign of no objection from the people present against the project.</p> <p>EN reminded all to submit their comments on the project to the Public Participation Office (details provided at the meeting and previous engagement), as their inputs are highly appreciated and will be incorporated in the final EIR.</p>