

No	Date	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
1	17 May 2011 11:53 Email	Kayla Wolfaardt Interested Party	<p>Extension of Comments Period for Revised Draft Environmental Impact Assessment Report for the Eskom Nuclear Power Station and Associated Infrastructure (Nuclear-1)</p> <p>In the wake of the International Nuclear disaster, are you really certain that you want this on your conscience?</p> <p>This letter formally applies to you to for an extension of a further 45 days, and in reality asks you to do everything in your human power to stall this project indefinitely. At a time when Germany is closing down its nuclear plants, we should be running from projects like this as fast as we can, not charging towards them. The future can only be a place where the safety and health of the planet and its inhabitants is our primary consideration.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. As you are aware, an opportunity to review the Revised Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) Report commenced on 09 May 2011 with a closing date of 23 June 2011. Various Interested and Affected Parties, including yourselves, have requested an extension of the review period.</p> <p>After due consideration of these requests, it was decided that the comment period will 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>The precautionary approach has, since the inception of this application for environmental authorisation, been applied in terms of Nuclear-1. As such the EIA team has ensured that the assessment of impacts and the methodology applied in terms of this assessment is scientifically sound, in line with best practice principles. The assessment report has been peer reviewed, not only by members of the public, but by three independent, experienced peer reviewers, who have confirmed that the EIA process have been undertaken as per the legal requirements. Furthermore, the BBC (http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-13592208) reports that Germany's decision to close down its nuclear power stations will most probably lead to an increase in the import of nuclear energy from France. Phasing out nuclear power will also result in increased dependence on fossil fuels, which result in proportionately larger releases of greenhouse gases into the atmosphere than nuclear power, which has a greenhouse gas footprint similar to some renewable technologies (see Section 4.2.2 of the Revised Draft EIR). There is a further risk that Germany will not manage to quickly halt its dependency on fossil fuels, especially coal-based energy, which creates unintended negative environmental impacts of its own.</p>

No	Date	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
			<p>Will you live near to such a plant, or condemn others to do so?</p> <p>Act wisely today, the alternative is too horrific to contemplate.</p>	<p>It should be noted that the EIA Regulations require the EAP to be independent of the agenda of both the applicant and the I&AP. More importantly it is the responsibility of the EAP to be objective. Therefore, to provide a personal opinion in this regard is not appropriate.</p>
2	<p>18 May 2011 12:18</p> <p>Email</p>	<p>Liziwe McDaid Green Connection</p>	<p>During the scoping phase of the Nuclear-1 EIA, we attended a public meeting at the Vineyard hotel, on the 19th April 2010. The meeting was well attended and a number of organisations that subsequently made submissions attended the meeting at that venue, presumably because it was convenient.</p> <p>However, in the details of the public meetings, no meeting is scheduled for the Vineyard Hotel in Newlands, nor is there any other venue in a nearby area. I find this astonishing and assume that there must be some error. It would certainly undermine public participation if there were to be no public meeting within an area which had showed so much interest in the project!</p> <p>We would therefore like to request that you confirm that there will be a public meeting in Newlands or close by and</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. 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 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, 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
			ask for details of the venue etc to be forwarded as soon as possible.	
3	18 May 2011 13:45 Email	David Le Page Southern African Faith Communities Environment Institute Assistant Director	<p>Please schedule a Public Meeting on the Nuclear EIA in central Cape Town</p> <p>During the scoping phase of the Nuclear 1 EIA, we attended a public meeting at the Vineyard hotel, on the 19th April 2010. The meeting was well attended and a number of organisations that subsequently made submissions attended the meeting at that venue, presumably because it was convenient.</p> <p>However, in the details of the public meetings now listed for the process ahead, no meeting is scheduled for the Vineyard Hotel in Newlands, nor is there any other venue in a nearby area. This will undermine public participation if there were to be no public meeting within an area which had showed so much interest in the project!</p> <p>We would therefore like to request that you confirm that there will be a public meeting in Newlands or close by and ask for details of the venue etc to be forwarded as soon as possible.</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. 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 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, 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
4	18 May 2011 08:54 Email	Marilyn Aitken Women's Leadership and Training Programme and The Grail Earth Network Representative	We request an extension of the time for comment from 45 to 90 days.	<p>Thank you for your comment. As you are aware, an opportunity to review the Revised Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) Report commenced on 09 May 2011 with a closing date of 23 June 2011. Various Interested and Affected Parties, including yourselves, have requested an extension of the review period.</p> <p>After due consideration of these requests, it was decided that the comment period will 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>
5	18 May 2011 11:49 Email	Byron Andrews Pam Golding Properties Gold Club Agent	<p>I have read your heavily biased EIA regarding the location of Nuclear 1 at Thyspunt.</p> <p>It is clear that the report is trying to present information in way that makes Thyspunt look like a favourable site. These lies will be exposed in time to come, and Eskom can expect a long and costly battle. At the end taxpayers and consumers, throughout the country will not allow this ridiculous project to continue.</p> <p>There is no financial sense in building a nuke, within 20km of a premier coastal holiday destination (whose rates and taxes account for most of the income generated by the Kouga municipality). Who will continue to pay rates when they have to evacuate the</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Please note that all sites were equally assessed within this EIA. However, we would appreciate receiving any additional information supporting your claim of bias in the Revised Draft EIR Version 1.</p>

No	Date	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
			<p>area?</p> <p>In the middle of the Eastern Cape's dairy producing region (benefits to agriculture include radioactive milk?)</p> <p>Pumping sand into the chokka spawning ground, because Thyspunt is in the middle of shifting sand dunes.</p>	<p>Please refer to Appendix E10 (Air Quality Assessment), E15 (Marine Impact Assessment), E21 (Agriculture Assessment), E22 (Tourism Assessment) and E25 (Transportation Assessment) of the Revised Draft EIR Version 1.</p> <p>The Agricultural Assessment has found that there will be short-term negative impact on agriculture in terms of dust during the construction phase only. However, there is potential for a positive impact on production by increasing the size of the local market for fresh produce as a result of the influx of population (Nuclear-1 employees, their families and construction workers) to the area. The Air Quality Assessment furthermore finds that, based on the predicted impacts of both non-radioactive and radionuclide air pollution, that the air pollution impacts will be insignificant at all the three alternative sites. Please also refer to the radiological assessment (Appendix E32) for further information on the potential impacts that may be experienced on the receiving environment. From the assessment it was found that the radiation levels that may be generated by the Nuclear-1 power station will fall well below the background radiation levels. Therefore, the potential for the power station to contaminate the surrounding resources throughout the area is considered to be highly unlikely.</p> <p>The Marine Impact Assessment (Appendix E15 of the Revised Draft EIR Version 1) concludes that the disposal of spoil at Thyspunt will have limited impact on the overall chokka squid stock, when considered within the context of the extensive area over which this species spawns. The affected area is less than one percent of the total spawning ground of chokka squid.</p>

No	Date	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
			<p>The costs of constructing power lines for over 100km spanning the Kromme river, Gamtoos and Van Stadens gorge.</p> <p>What about rebuilding the Van Stadens, Gamtoos and Kromme bridges to carry the weight of the nuclear reactor when they deliver to site?</p> <p>They claim to have a road that does not go through Humansdorp, but what about St Francis and Cape St Francis who will have hundreds of trucks on their roads everyday?</p>	<p>The costs of construction of transmission lines are dealt with in the Environmental Impact Assessment for the transmission lines. These are separate EIAs to that of the power station. In this regard, please refer to the EIR documents to be made available by SiVest on www.sivest.co.za/Download.aspx</p> <p>The recommended routes to the Thyspunt site in the previous version of the Report were revised as a result of public input and recommendations received between 29 May 2011 and 2 June 2011. Based on the feedback received, the R330 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, and 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. Bypass roads to the east and west of Humansdorp are also now proposed to be constructed to reduce the traffic impact on central Humansdorp. The revised specialist assessment will be made available for public comment and review as part of the Revised Draft EIR Version 2.</p> <p>In terms of the upgrades to public transport and access during the construction phases at Thyspunt, upgrades of existing road infrastructure will be required as stated in the revised Transport Specialist Study. The report confirms that the Thyspunt site requires significant transport upgrades with regard to public transport, access and emergency evacuation, during the construction phases. The report further states that propping will be required at most under bridges to ensure stability during the</p>

No	Date	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
			<p>No impact on tourism? Who are you kidding?</p>	<p>transportation with strengthening and bracing being required at the Van Staden's gorge arch bridge.</p> <p>The Tourism Impact Assessment concludes that as a result of the established premium tourism product offered in the Greater St Francis area, a nuclear power station will have a significant impact on the perceived attractiveness of the area. However, it is only from Seal Point at Cape St Francis and Oyster Bay that the Thyspunt site is visible (from a distance of more than 10km). The duration of the negative impact is reduced by the fact that perception is a time-based phenomenon and, with the passing of time, tourism agents and stakeholders will adjust their businesses to maximise their exploitation of the natural tourism product as experienced at each site. This is based on the experience with the Koeberg Nuclear Power Station. The overall impact at worst would be a short-term reduction in the tourism market, most notably due to a drop in the premium product image that the area currently enjoys. However, this short-term negative impact on current sense of place (premium holiday destination) could well be neutralised by business tourism, while the long-term impact would be likely to be positive.</p> <p>Keeping the above in mind, specialists agree that there are no fatal flaws at the Thyspunt site in terms of upgrading of transport infrastructure, impact on agriculture, air quality and tourism as well as spoil disposal and marine ecology. However, extensive mitigation measures, which are discussed in Chapter 9 of the Revised Draft EIR, summarised in Chapter 10 and included in the Environmental Management Plan (Appendix F of the Revised Draft EIR Version 1), are proposed to mitigate the potential negative impacts.</p>

No	Date	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
6	19 May 2011 08:45 Email	Gary Pienaar Political Information and Monitoring Service (PIMS) and Economic Governance Programme (EGP) Idasa, an African democracy Institute Senior Researcher: Governance and Ethics	<p>During the scoping phase of the Nuclear- 1 EIA, it is our understanding that a public meeting at the Vineyard Hotel on 19 April 2010 was well attended and a number of organisations that subsequently made submissions attended the meeting at that venue, presumably because it was convenient.</p> <p>However, there appear to be no plans for a follow-up public meeting during the EIA phase at this venue, or at any other venue nearby.</p> <p>Any such final decision is likely to undermine the value of public participation in an area that has apparently shown significant interest in the project. It would seem to me to be a logical instance of fair process that there should be continuity where significant interest is shown in a particular area, provided that a further and additional meeting at a venue close to the mooted project location would also appear to be justified.</p> <p>It is therefore requested that you confirm that there will be a public meeting in Newlands or close by, and that details of the venue, date and time</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. 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 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 are sufficient to allow Interested and Affected Parties (I&APs) reasonable opportunity to comment on the key changes to the Revised Draft EIR Version 1 in this type of forum.</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, 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
			are announced as soon as possible.	
7	19 May 2011 09:28 Email	Candice Pelser Project 90 By 2030	<p>Last year's public participation process included a meeting at the Vineyard Hotel on the 19th of April. We notice that the next round of public meetings do not include this venue, nor one nearby.</p> <p>In the interests of continuity and a fair public participation process, we hereby request that a public meeting for this area be added to the programme.</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. 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 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 are sufficient to allow Interested and Affected Parties (I&APs) reasonable opportunity to comment on the key changes to the Draft EIR in this type of forum.</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, 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>
8	19 May 2011 11:37 Email	Jesse Burton Energy Research Centre PhD Candidate, UCT	Last year, during the public consultation process for the Nuclear1 EIA, a public meeting was held at the Vineyard Hotel in Newlands, Cape Town.	Your comment is noted. 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

No	Date	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
			<p>I believe that this year the only scheduled meeting is to be held in Melkbosstrand, despite the high levels of public interest in the Newlands area.</p> <p>This seems to be a serious omission on the part of the organisers, and I would like to request that a public consultation be scheduled either in the Newlands area or in an area nearby.</p> <p>I would appreciate if you could forward the details of such a meeting to me as soon as possible.</p>	<p>Report predominantly relate to issues specific to the Thyspunt site. The Duynfontein and Bantamsklip sites are not recommended as the preferred site. It is therefore considered that the Public Open Houses and Meetings advertised are sufficient to allow Interested and Affected Parties (I&APs) reasonable opportunity to comment on the key changes to the Draft EIR in this type of forum.</p> <p>This is the reason that Melkbosstrand was chosen as the public meeting venue for the area around the Duynfontein 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, 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>
9	19 May 2011 11:48 Email	Julia van Biljon-Heidemann The Mineral Corporation Senior Adviser	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment.</p> <p>Please see attached e-mail sent some months back to the Environmental Officer on site (also discussed telephonically with him about a year ago).</p> <p>My point is simple – to urge that Tsunami risks be taken fully into account with proper scientific oversight, especially given the</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. The risks related to the possible occurrence of Tsunamis have been assessed in the Hydrological Assessment (of the Revised Draft EIR Version 1), the report on the position of the 1:100 year floodline (Appendix E9 of the Revised Draft EIR Version 1) and the Oceanography Report (respectively Appendices E6, E9 and E18 of the Revised Draft EIR Version 1). It is concluded that the potential exists for water levels to exceed the proposed elevation of the nuclear power station (10m above sea level) at all three sites should a tsunami coincide with extreme meteorological conditions (a meteo-tsunami event). The maximum calculated sea level for the life of the nuclear power station (including the effects of climate change) is 14.8 m above sea level. The occurrence of a tsunami</p>

No	Date	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
			<p>evidence at the site of such events in fairly recent geological time. Recent experience at Fukushima should prompt this step.</p> <p>(Email attachment pasted hereunder.)</p> <p>From: Julia van Biljon - Heidemann [mailto:jvb.umcebo@netactive.co.za] Sent: Friday, March 18, 2011 11:51 AM To: Henni.dBeer@eskom.co.za Cc: 'Hutchinson'; 'Daniel Reinecke' Subject: Tsunamis</p> <p>Hi Henni</p> <p>A am a niece of Marta Hutchinson, she introduced us briefly a few years ago when there was a talk by a retired nuclear scientist about nuclear energy at The Links.</p> <p>I spoke to you on the phone some time ago about the possibility of Tsunamis at Thyspunt, as a geologist I am interested in these phenomena, which are rare but nevertheless should be properly taken into account. With the recent events in Japan, I was wondering if there are specialists on the Thyspunt Eskom team who are</p>	<p>is, however, improbable given the low risk of seismic activity in the surrounding ocean.</p> <p>The experience of the Fukushima nuclear incident has indicated that the earthquake itself is unlikely to affect the structural integrity of the nuclear power station, but that the resulting tsunami may affect power supply to the nuclear power station. In this respect, the height above sea level of the backup generators for the plant is critical. If the generators are too low above sea level, they may also be affected by a tsunami and may fail to provide power to the power station. In the case of Fukushima, the backup generators were also flooded by the tsunami, which prevented them from providing power to the power station to allow for safe shutdown.</p> <p>At Thyspunt, the backup OCGT (Open Cycle Gas Turbine) plant is proposed to be located for the north of the power station at a height over 50m above sea level.</p>

No	Date	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
			<p>adequately quantifying this risk for the particular site envisaged.</p> <p>I also just wanted to remind you about the rock the Reinecke family has known about for years (we call it the "monolith") which an experienced geologist in the family has indicated points to a Tsunami event in the recent geological past.</p> <p>It is situated very near the Thyspunt point, I am sure members of the family could point it out to you.</p> <p>Please do let us know should you be interested.</p>	
10	19 May 2011 15:03 Email	Tristan Taylor Earthlife Africa Jhb Project Co- Ordinator	<p>Please see attached letter requesting an extension of an additional 45 days for comments on the nuclear-1 EIA from the following organisations:</p> <p>COSATU, South African Municipal Workers Union, Timberwatch, Greenpeace Africa, South Durban Community Environmental Alliance, GroundWork, Earthlife Africa Cape Town, Earthlife Africa Johannesburg, Noordhoek Environmental Action Group, Alternative Information Development Centre, Green</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. As you are aware, an opportunity to review the Revised Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) Report commenced on 09 May 2011 with a closing date of 23 June 2011. Various Interested and Affected Parties, including yourselves, have requested an extension of the review period.</p> <p>After due consideration of these requests, it was decided that the comment period will 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>

No	Date	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
			<p>Connection, Southern African Faith Communities Environment Institute, Renewable Energy Centre, Transition Centre.</p> <p>Thanking you in advance for a speedy response.</p> <p>(Refer to attachment pasted hereunder.)</p> <p>Extension of Comments Period for Revised Draft Environmental Impact Assessment Report for the Eskom Nuclear Power Station and Associated Infrastructure (Nuclear-1)</p> <p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>On the 9th of May 2011, Arcus GIBB released the Revised Draft Environmental Impact Assessment Report for the Eskom Nuclear Power Station and Associated Infrastructure (Nuclear-1) and indicated a comment period of 45 days until the 23rd of June 2011.</p> <p>This is insufficient time to deal with the mass of data in the Revised Draft Environmental Impact Assessment Report for the Eskom Nuclear Power</p>	

No	Date	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
	20 May 2011 15:29 Email	Tristan Taylor Earthlife Africa Jhb Project Co- Ordinator	<p>Station and Associated Infrastructure (Nuclear-1). The data available on your website amounted to over 700mb, and runs over two thousand printed pages.</p> <p>Just reading the entire report will take a significant amount of time, let alone considered thought and then in-depth comments. As many of the issues in the report have highly technical components, expert opinions will be need to be consulted.</p> <p>Therefore, 45 days is insufficient for meaningful and substantial comment.</p> <p>Therefore, we the undersigned, request a minimum extension of an additional 45 days (i.e. 90 in total) in order to prepare comments on this important EIA.</p> <p>Looking forward to your swift response and thanking you in advance for such.</p> <p>*****</p> <p>I have yet to hear from you, in writing, regarding the below issue.</p> <p>On Mon, 2011-05-16 at 10:59 +0200,</p>	

No	Date	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
			<p>Tristen Taylor wrote: Dear Arcus GIBB and Ms. Ball,</p> <p>Would you please respond to the below issue regarding speaking with a researcher involved in the EIA? 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 I sign of how seriously I regard this issue and the public's right to engage substantially in a public process.</p>	<p>GIBB acknowledges your request to liaise directly with Dr. Hart in terms of the Nuclear-1 Revised Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR). However, as the Environmental Impact Assessment Practitioner managing the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process, it is our legislated responsibility (among others) to capture all comments raised 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>In this regard, it must be pointed out that Regulation 58 of Government Notice R 385 of 2006 (in terms of which this application was lodged, and is pending) stipulates the requirements for EIA public participation procedures, and indicates that it is the responsibility of Interested and Affected Parties to submit comments to the Environmental Assessment Practitioner (EAP).</p> <p>Your attention is drawn in this regard, to two specific provisions in the EIA regulations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regulation 58(4), which states that “any written comments received by the EAP from a registered interested and affected party must accompany the report when the report is submitted to the competent authority”. • Regulations 59, which states that “The EAP managing an application for environmental authorisation must ensure that the comments of interested and affected parties are recorded in reports submitted to the

No	Date	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
				<p>competent authority in terms of these Regulations.</p> <p>As EAP for this EIA process, GIBB would not be able to discharge its legislated duties unless we are aware of and involved in any discussions between an I&AP and one of the specialists on our team.</p> <p>GIBB therefore requests that you provide us with a list of questions/ issues for Dr. Hart's response. This will ensure that GIBB can accurately capture all comments raised by yourselves and the response from the specialist on these comments and reflect these comments and responses in the submissions to the competent authority.</p>
11	20 May 2011 16:29 Email	Eleanor Welsh Interested Party	Have you reconsidered re having meeting in Hermanus?	<p>Your comment is noted. 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 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 are sufficient to allow Interested and Affected Parties (I&APs) reasonable opportunity to comment on the key changes to the Draft EIR in this type of forum.</p> <p>This is the reason that Gansbaai was chosen as the public meeting venue for the area around the Bantamsklip site and the area is easily accessible for residents. Additional meetings will be considered but at this point there is no certainty that an additional meeting will take place.</p>

No	Date	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
				<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, 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>
12	19 May 2011 15:29 Email	Antony and Mary Yoell Permanent Resident of St. Francis Bay	<p>Many thanks for advising us of the availability of a revised draft EIR for the proposed Nuclear power station at Thyspunt.</p> <p>Whilst not objecting to nuclear power in principle, we would like to register our concern that certain issues have not been adequately addressed in the report which will have a substantial negative impact on the residential/tourist towns of St Francis Bay/Cape St Francis.</p> <p>We are most concerned about the use of the R330 between Humansdorp and Cape St Francis as the main routing for construction vehicles over 7 years. No tourist (or resident) will want to sit behind lines of construction vehicles on a winding road for 15 kilometres and similarly will certainly not enjoy the</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Please refer to Appendices E10 (Air Quality Assessment), E15 (Marine Impact Assessment), E21 (Agriculture Assessment), E22 (Tourism Assessment) and E25 (Transportation Assessment) of the Revised Draft EIR Version 1.</p> <p>The Tourism Impact Assessment also concluded that as a result of the established premium tourism product offered in the Greater St Francis area, a nuclear power station will have a significant impact on the perceived attractiveness of the area. However, it is only from Seal Point at Cape St Francis and Oyster Bay that Thyspunt is visible (from a distance of more than 10 km). The duration of the negative impact is reduced by the fact that perception is a time-based phenomenon and, with the passing of time, tourism agents and stakeholders will adjust their businesses to maximise their exploitation of the natural tourism product as experienced at each site.</p> <p>With regard to the impact of traffic, the Transportation Specialist Assessment has been revised in order to minimise the traffic on the St Francis Bay to limited heavy loads. The majority of traffic will travel on the Humansdorp- Oyster Bay road which will be upgraded. During the peak December holiday period construction will be very limited.</p>

No	Date	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES/COMMENTS	RESPONSE
			<p>resultant noise and air pollution. This will result in tourists finding other more peaceful holiday destinations and many tourist based businesses will die, resulting in unemployment and an increase in crime in the area.</p> <p>We are also concerned about the impact on the squid industry. We cannot follow the argument that pumping 6,3 million cubic meters of sand into South Africa's prime squid breeding ground will not have a huge effect and will in all likelihood spell the end of the St Francis squid industry, also resulting in further unemployment.</p> <p>We are also concerned that an important Khoisan heritage site will be adversely affected and await the judgement of SAHRA with interest.</p> <p>We look forward to hearing these issues addressed at the Public Meeting on 31 May.</p>	<p>The Marine Impact Assessment (Appendix E15 of the Revised Draft EIR Version 1) concludes that the disposal of spoil at Thyspunt will have limited impact on the overall chokka squid stock, when considered within the context of the extensive area over which this species spawns. The pumping of sand/spoil will be for a very short period of time 4 – 6 weeks. The modelling completed on the movement of the spoil where the chokka spawn has indicated an additional layer of less than 1 cm of sand.</p> <p>Your comment is noted. The recommended position of the power station is such that the greatest concentration of archaeological sites on the Eskom property will not be directly affected by the power station. The largest concentration of sites is within 200 m of the coast, which will be left undeveloped, as per the revised Heritage Impact Report. The central portion of the site within the vegetated dunes has been found, through test excavations that were permitted by SAHRA, to be free of significant heritage sites. A revised Heritage Impact Assessment, which includes the findings of the test excavations, will be provided for public comment and review comments together with the Revised Draft EIR Version 2.</p>

13	Comment Sheet Completed Mail	Carola Steinberg Earth Life Member	<p>P8-9 Maintaining that “NoGo” cannot be considered an alternative because it is “imperative” for South Africa to “develop its power generation ability” is a totally facile statement in the face of the Chernobyl meltdown, the Fukushima accident. There are large spaces for generating wind and solar energy in the Karoo and West Coast and the reality that it would be cheaper to import power than build another nuclear power station.</p> <p>P17 Claiming that Nuclear Waste holds “no significant risk” if it is “contained according to management practices” approved by the “NNRU” (<u>GIBB</u></p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Please see our response below:</p> <p>P8-9 The EIA process is a project specific tool and therefore considers the impacts of the proposed development, as per the application for environmental authorisation, on the environment. This EIA therefore does not comment on government policy in terms of future energy planning. It is however important to note that the Integrated Resource Plan 2010 which has been ratified by Cabinet states that:” In addition to all existing and committed power plants (including 10 GW committed coal), the plan includes 9,6 GW of nuclear; 6,3 GW of coal; 17,8 GW of renewables; and 8,9 GW of other generation sources”</p> <p><u>COMMENT FROM INDEPENDENT NUCLEAR SPECIALIST:</u></p> <p>In addition to what has been said - the issue of competing technologies and preferred energy mix scenarios in the context of demand side and economic growth trajectories are clearly in the ambit of the IRP. IRP 2010 remains the formal IRP adopted by government. The regulatory regime is as stated and nuclear facilities are in general required to consider a range of "design basis security threats" as part of the design assessment process - however the exact nature of these threats and the preventative or mitigative provisions which may be put in place are for obvious reasons restricted in accordance with a "need to know" principle.</p> <p>P17 Radioactive waste management practices envisaged for the Nuclear-1 Power Stations are consistent with the IAEA guidelines for a Radioactive Waste Management Programme for nuclear power stations, from generation to disposal. The</p>
----	-------------------------------------	--	---	---

			<p><u>Nuclear-1 Public Participation Office:</u> <u>to confirm if this is correct with Ms Steinberg)</u> is a lie in the face of the reality that nuclear waste remains dangerous to human health for 20000 years.</p> <p>P15 It is an illusion to think that Eskom and its construction contractors will follow any “lengthy and complex mitigation” process to mitigate the environmental and heritage impact of their work.</p>	<p>Nuclear-1 Power Station will further strive to minimise production of all solid, liquid and gaseous radioactive waste, both in terms of volume and activity content, as required for new reactor designs. Systems are lastly designed to store processed solid radioactive waste for a period of up to three years within the facility, thereafter they are transported to Vaalputs. The storage containers are consistent with the requirements for the disposal of solid waste at the radioactive waste disposal facility at Vaalputs. The High-level waste unsuitable for disposal at Vaalputs will be stored safely on site until a suitable facility is available in South Africa. Responsibility for high level radioactive waste storage is with The National Radioactive Waste Disposal Institute Act (NRWDIA). With the implementation of appropriate mitigation measures all potential impacts are expected to be of low significance.</p> <p><u>COMMENT FROM INDEPENDENT NUCLEAR SPECIALIST:</u></p> <p>In addition it must be noted that the EIA process and Nuclear Licensing process for any off site waste storage facilities will be the subject of separate applications and are outside the scope of this submission. It must be noted that on site storage of spent fuel in ponds, vaults, or casks is a widely practiced and demonstrated technology which has been used to store fuels for many decades.</p> <p>P15 It is one of the key recommendations of the Revised Draft EIR Version 1 that a comprehensive heritage mitigation programme must be implemented prior to the commencement of any construction activities. No construction may commence prior to the completion of heritage mitigation measures. The effective implementation of this mitigation measure, and other mitigation measures, will be monitored by a team of independent</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>Environmental Control Officers, who will report to an Environmental Monitoring Committee, including representatives of local communities, SAHRA, other authorities and other relevant specialists.</p> <p>Also note that Environmental pre-mitigation measures are part of our environmental laws' requirements and shall be conducted for all construction sites before construction commences. Pre-construction mitigation measures have been conducted at all Eskom's construction site and this is taken seriously all the time. Just to give an example, at Ingula heritage mitigations were conducted before and during construction. An archaeologist was appointed to survey the site before construction to ensure that all heritage structures were identified, recovered and protected, including graves (which were removed in consultation with the families and in accordance to the Heritage Act).</p> <p>During construction work was stopped every time an artefact was found on site. Ingula has recovered a lot of historical artefacts and remains found on site and have been sent to a national museum in Bloemfontein until such time when the site's visitors' centre is operational.</p> <p>Search and rescues are also conducted before construction to ensure that all animals and protected plants are rescued from any harm. Animals are normally sent to the nearest reserves and plants kept in the nursery for replanting later after construction.</p> <p>Wetlands are also demarcated before construction for protection by fencing them in or anything that would protect them from being driven over etc</p>
--	--	--	--	---