

PROPOSED ESKOM NUCLEAR POWER STATION
AND ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE

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

COMMENTS ON
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REPORT

(Volume RDEIR IRR 4 – 16 May 2011)

Issues have been received from the following stakeholders:

No	Name	Organisation
1	Peter Becker	Koeberg Alert Alliance
2	Piet Liebenberg	Our Times
3	Tanja Liebenberg	Supertubes Surfing Foundation
4	Greg Christy	SASMIA
5	Tristen Taylor	Earthlife Africa JHB – Project Co-Ordinator
6	Jan Wassenaar	Interested Party

No	Date	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
1	13 May 2011 09:55 Email	Peter Becker Koeberg Alert Alliance	<p>We have noted with consternation that the public meeting schedule excludes a session in the Southern suburbs which has previously occurred at the Vineyard hotel.</p> <p>During the previous session at this venue many substantive issues were raised, and it seems appropriate that the same (or a close by) venue is used to allow the same public to question the responses to their submissions.</p> <p>We therefore request that as a matter of urgency, the schedule is revised to include another public session in this area, and that this schedule is communicated to I&APs as soon as possible to allow time to plan to attend.</p> <p>Please could you acknowledge receipt of this email?</p>	<p>The GIBB Nuclear-1 Public Participation Office acknowledges receipt of Mr. Becker's mail dated 13 May 2011 and as such sent an email on 13 May 2011 at 10:34 confirming receipt of the email.</p> <p>The choice of venues for the current public meetings was based on proximity to the alternative sites and the most potentially affected parties, as well as accessibility for the Interested and Affected Parties (I&APs) from surrounding areas. The changes made to the Draft Environmental Impact Report Version 1 predominantly relate to issues specific to the Thyspunt site. The Duynefontein and Bantamsklip sites are not recommended as the preferred site. It is therefore considered that the Public Open Houses and Meetings advertised were sufficient to allow Interested and Affected Parties (I&APs) reasonable opportunity to comment on the key changes to the Revised Draft EIR Version 1.</p> <p>This is the reason that Melkbosstrand was chosen as the public meeting venue for the area around the Duynefontein site and the area is easily accessible for residents.</p> <p>It must be noted that I&APs have been afforded the opportunity to comment in other ways to the GIBB Public Participation Office on the Revised Draft Environmental Impact Report Version 1, namely by means of: fax, telephone call and written letter. The public comment period was also further extended by a further 45 days and closed on 07 August 2011.</p>

No	Date	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
				<p>I&APs will also be afforded the opportunity to comment on the Revised Draft EIR Version 2 and the Final EIR.</p>
2	<p>13 May 2011 12:04</p> <p>Email</p>	<p>Piet Liebenberg Our Times</p>	<p>Could you please tell me which document I need to study to determine the proposed road link with the N2?</p> <p>It is mentioned that Humansdorp be by-passed.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. This information was discussed in the Transport Assessment Volume 1 & 2 (Appendix E25 of the Revised Draft EIR Version 1). However due to concerns raised from the public around Humansdorp the Transport Specialist study was revised. The revised report recommends that the main street through Humansdorp and Saffrey Street be bypassed. New transport roads for abnormal load vehicles were therefore considered and three alternate bypasses were investigated. All three alternatives are proposed new roads that run along existing land boundaries between farmland.</p> <p>The preferred alternative directly links between Voortrekker Road (MR389) and Park Street (MR381) and is 850m in length. The beginning of the preferred alternative crosses the Boskloof Valley and the rest of the route will be constructed on Municipality land. It is considered as the most viable option as it is the shortest and most economical route to construct, and it has a good alignment for the transportation of abnormal loads. Once the route is constructed, it will also alleviate the traffic congestion in Humansdorp.</p> <p>The revised Transport specialist study further acknowledges that the Thyspunt site requires significant transport infrastructure upgrades. The R330</p>

No	Date	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
				<p>is now proposed to be used for light vehicle traffic and abnormal load transport, and sections will require upgrading for this purpose. The Oyster Bay Road is now proposed to be upgraded to a surfaced road to be used during the construction and operations phases for staff access, light vehicle traffic, heavy vehicle traffic and as an emergency evacuation route for areas such as Oyster Bay. DR1762, which links the R330 and Oyster Bay Road is now proposed to be surfaced to provide improved east-west connectivity.</p>
3	<p>13 May 2011 15:08 Email</p>	<p>Tanja Lategan Supertubes Surfing Foundation</p>	<p>According to recent publications, a series of public participation meetings are to be held in the St Francis area, Oyster Bay, Humansdorp and Port Elizabeth. We strongly object to the fact that no meeting has been scheduled for Jeffrey's Bay.</p> <p>As you are aware, many Interested and Affected Parties live in Jeffrey's Bay - a fact you acknowledged by, according to Jaana-Maria Ball, having public meetings during the scoping phase of the first EIA.</p> <p>The fact that these were, according to Ms. Ball, relatively poorly attended, does not mean that it is not necessary to bother - in our opinion it points to the fact that they were not widely advertised.</p> <p>At an organized march in July 2010 to protest against the proposed NPS, more than</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Your request for an additional meeting in Jeffrey's Bay is noted. In view of the recommended site in the Revised Draft EIR Version 1 being Thyspunt, the most effort (and thus most meetings around the proposed site) is being invested in those areas closest to Thyspunt in order to give not only the broader public, but especially Interested and Affected Parties closest to the Thyspunt site, the opportunity to participate in the EIA process.</p> <p>The choice of venues for the public meetings is thus based on proximity to the site and the most potentially directly affected parties, as well as accessibility from surrounding areas. This is the reason that Oyster Bay, St. Francis Bay, Sea Vista and Humansdorp were chosen as the public meeting venues for the Thyspunt site. The towns are easily accessible for Jeffrey's Bay residents. It must be noted that I&APs can comment in other ways to the GIBB Public Participation Office on the report, namely by means of fax, telephone call, post and email.</p>

No	Date	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
			<p>2,000 people attended - this on a Saturday morning during the Billabong Pro surfing event and a Springbok rugby test match.</p> <p>In addition, we would appreciate the requested meeting being held after 5pm, when more members of the public are able to attend.</p>	<p>I&APs will also be afforded the opportunity to comment on the Revised Draft EIR Version 2 and the Final EIR.</p>
4	<p>13 May 2011 12:18</p> <p>Email</p>	<p>Greg Christy SASMIA</p>	<p>We hereby request that the deadline for submissions be extended to enable us to properly assess the Draft Environmental Impact Assessment (<i>Revised Draft EIR Revision 1</i>) for Nucleur-1. We feel that the time limit as set down of 45 days is too short and inadequate. We feel that a more realistic time period if one is aiming for adequate and meaningful public participation, would be 90 days.</p> <p>Notwithstanding that this is a revised Draft, we feel that we would need proper engagement with all of the authors which make up the Arcus Gibb report to ensure that we understand fully the findings contained in the revised draft.</p> <p>We therefore request that meaningful Key Focus Group meetings be held before 45 days and that another 45 days be allocated for all to assess the comments and outcomes which will flow from these meetings.</p> <p>We as the South African Squid Industrial</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. The SASMIA's request for an extension to the review period is noted. Various other Interested and Affected Parties also requested an extension of the review period.</p> <p>After due consideration of these requests, it was decided that the comment period be extended by an additional 45 days. The closing date for comment thus changed to 07 August 2011 (i.e. a 90 day comment period).</p> <p>Meetings with the Squid Scientific Working Group concurrently took place in June and July 2011, at which the SASMIA was a participant. A full list of participants at the meetings were as follows:</p> <p>SWG Members: Dr H. Verheye (DEA Oceans and Coasts, Chair), Dr D. Durholtz (DAFF Resources Research), Dr M. Lipinski (DAFF Resources Research), Ms J. Glazer (DAFF Resources Research rapporteur), Prof. D. Butterworth (MARAM, University of Cape Town), Prof. W. Sauer (Rhodes University), Ms N. Downey (DEA Oceans and Coasts)</p>

No	Date	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
			<p>Association are the key group which is to be affected by any potential disruptions on the Marine Ecology by the building on the proposed Thyspunt site.</p> <p>Closely coupled to the Ecology aspect would be the Economic Aspects of any impacts on the fishery as a result of the disruption of the Marine Environment.</p> <p>In the light of the above we request a Key Focus Group meeting that must include :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sasmia (South African Squid Management Working Group • Authors of the Marine Ecology Report • Authors of the Economic Report • Squid Scientific Working Group <p>This above mentioned focus group meeting would serve to enable role players to engage directly with the specialists to get a better understanding of some of their findings.</p> <p>This document has been a long time coming and we would find it procedurally lacking if Arcus Gibb did not allow adequate time frames and correct forum formats to fully exhaust all of the Interested and Affected Stakeholders engagements</p>	<p>Observers: Dr M. Roberts (DEA Oceans and Coasts), Mr J. van der Westhuizen (DAFF Resources Research), Dr M. Bergh (OLRAC), Mr G. Christy (SASMIA), Mr E. van Niekerk (SASMIA), Mr D. Jeannes (ESKOM), Mr/Ms D. Herbst (ESKOM), Prof. C. Griffiths (UCT), Ms K. Humby (SASMIA), Ms/Dr J-M. Ball (Arcus GIBB), Dr T. Robinson (UCT), Mr J. van Zyl (DAFF).</p> <p>The Marine Impact Assessment has been revised as a result in accordance with the outcome of these meetings and will be made available for public comment and review as part of the Revised Draft Version 2.</p> <p>For further responses in terms of this discussion we refer the author to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IRR 19 of the Revised Draft EIR Version 1 received from Mr Greg Christy on 04 July 2011; • IRR 33 of the Revised Draft EIR Version 1 received from Mr Greg Christy on 22 July 2011; • Dawson, Edwards and Associates • IRR 74 of the Revised Draft EIR Version 1 received from Dawson, Edwards and Associates on 10 August 2011; and • IRR 136 of the Revised Draft EIR Version 1 received from Dr K Prochazka of the Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries and Dr Hans Verheye from Department of Environmental Affairs on 11

No	Date	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
				May 2012
5	16 May 2011 10:59 Email and Telephone call	Tristen Taylor Earthlife Africa JHN Project Co-Ordinator	<p>Would you please respond to the below issue regarding speaking with a researcher involved in the EIA?</p> <p>I am seriously disappointed not to have received a response from you, in what is arguably a Freedom of Speech issue. Surely, Arcus GIBB will, at least, respond to such a request?</p> <p>I have copied our legal representative (Ms. Andrews) and freedom of expression expert (Mr. Delaney) to this mail as a sign of how seriously I regard this issue and the public's right to engage substantially in a public process.</p> <p>“On Thu, 2011-05-12 at 15:30 +0200, Tristen Taylor wrote:</p> <p>Dear Ms. Ball,</p> <p>I attempt to speak to Mr. Hunt at UCT today regarding his work done on the Nuclear-1 EIA.</p> <p>He told me that he would only be able to speak to me if he had permission from Arcus GIBB and, in particular, yourself due to confidentiality issues.</p> <p>Would please grant Mr. Hunt with permission to speak to me regarding his Work.”</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. GIBB acknowledges your request to liaise directly with Dr. Hart in terms of the Nuclear-1 Revised Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR). As communicated telephonically by the GIBB Public Participation Office (Ms. J-M Ball) to Mr. Taylor on 16 May 2011, GIBB has a responsibility to keep the EIA and Public Participation Process transparent and to maintain accurate records of issues raised. As the Environmental Impact Assessment Practitioner managing the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process, it is our legislated responsibility to capture all comments on the Revised Draft EIR Version 1 and its associated specialist studies in order to present the competent authority with all relevant information for decision-making purposes.</p> <p>GIBB therefore requests (as was requested from Mr. Taylor), in line with best practice principles that Earthlife Africa provide GIBB with a list of questions/ issues for Dr. Hart to respond to. This will ensure that GIBB can accurately capture all comments raised by you and the response from the specialist on these comments.</p>

No	Date	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
6	20 March 2011 10:41 Email	Jan Wassenaar	Please can you inform me where I can get an electronic copy of the Thyspunt EIA and HIA ¹ ? I had previously been receiving the documentation but have moved and my address changed.	Thank you for your comment. The report will also be made available on the GIBB project website at the link provided below: http://projects.gibb.co.za/en-us/projects/eskomnuclear1reviseddrafteirversion2 The Heritage Impact Assessment is available on these websites as Appendix E20 of the Revised Draft EIR Version 1.

¹ Heritage Impact Assessment