

NO	DATE	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES / COMMENTS	RESPONSE
1	22 May 2011 12:36 Fax	Michel Hucenko Interested and Affected Party	It is still my firm conviction that nuclear is the solution for our need of electricity supply. There will not be a Chernobyl or Fukushima in our country as we are neither Russian nor Japanese. Furthermore, I wonder how many South Africans have to die in the dark for the sake of a few butterflies or for some obscure political agenda. By the way I am living near Koeberg for 27 years and I still don't glow in the dark!	Thank you for your comments and participation in the EIA process. Please continue raising these comments at the Nuclear-1 public forums.
2	23 May 2011 12:48 Email	Walter Smith Project Gapwedge Properties 63 (Pty) LTD Project Manager	<p><u>Gapwedge Marine Aquaculture Land Based Finfish Project, Pearly Beach on portion 1 of the farm no. 385, Pearly Beach.</u></p> <p>As an interested and affected party (I&AP), Gapwedge fish farm <u>strongly appeals</u> against the proposed nuclear development on Bantamsklip.</p> <p>The Gapwedge fish farm has been busy for several years investing into a project to secure sustainable food resource. Our project complies with all legislation required locally, national and internationally. The Gapwedge marine finfish farm will be in approximate 15km radius of the proposed Bantamsklip nuclear site.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The impact of the proposed Nuclear Power Station on agricultural and marine resources has been assessed in both the Agriculture and Marine Biology Assessment reports (Appendices E16 and E15, respectively of the Revised Draft EIR Version 1).</p> <p>A agricultural survey undertaken within a 16 km radius of the Bantamsklip site found that the major impacts of a nuclear power station on agriculture (including food safety) would have a short term negative impact on agricultural production with regard to dust during the construction phase.</p> <p>The Marine Assessment confirms that in terms of the unintentional release of radiation emissions, technical design of the cooling system has minimised this risk, so that this impact on Marine resources is rated as having low consequence and low significance.</p> <p>Lastly In terms of safety there are extensive mitigation measures built into reactor design for safety and there are multiple precautionary defences against the consequences of</p>

NO	DATE	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES / COMMENTS	RESPONSE
			<p>Gapwedge are currently in the process to secure export markets and the proposed Bantamsklip nuclear development has a direct negative impact on these negotiations. Strategies for food safety and quality are at this stage of main concern.</p> <p>Gapwedge complies with the allocation of a right/exemption to engage in marine aquaculture activities, in terms of section 18 of the marine living resources act, 1998 (act no. 18 of 1998) ("THE ACT") Gapwedge was granted Environmental Authorization by the Department of Environmental Affairs & Development Planning for the project and all relevant role players were involved in all aspects.</p> <p>Please advise us on food safety, security and direct impacts on our project relating to your project. The proposed nuclear development on Bantamsklip is of great concern for Gapwedge and should there be any impact due to your proposed project, Gapwedge would then hold the applicant "Bantamsklip nuclear development" wholly liable.</p> <p>Gapwedge appeals against the</p>	<p>failures in materials, equipment and human error.</p> <p>For purposes of this EIA, it is further acknowledged that the NNR will issue a license for the construction of a nuclear power station at any particular site only if the design is in full compliance with the radiological dose limits and dose requirements laid down by the National Nuclear Regulator.</p> <p><u>COMMENT FROM INDEPENDENT NUCLEAR SPECIALIST:</u></p> <p>As discussed the facility will be subject to a licence application to the NNR - as has been discussed comprehensively above this will require a safety case which will examine the radiological impact from all initiating events which have the potential for an offsite impact including via marine pathways and from any routine releases in accordance with standards and practices in line with international best practice.</p>

NO	DATE	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES / COMMENTS	RESPONSE
			<u>proposed nuclear development on Bantamsklip!</u>	
3	19 May 2011 14:42 Email	Matthys C Horak ATNS, ATM Planning Department ATM Specialist	<p>From documentation previously provided and located on your web site it appears that a study is currently in place regarding this nuclear facility.</p> <p>In view of the fact that ATNS is an Interested and possibly an affected party you are respectfully requested to provide ATNS with as much information on this proposed facility – Exact location (Geographical position Degrees, Minutes, Seconds and decimals of a second in WGS-84 format) etc.</p> <p>The establishment of such a facility normally goes hand in hand with the establishment of a Restricted area as is the case with the “Koeberg Nuclear Power Station” – FAR36 GND/2,000 FT AGL See SA Aeronautical Information publication (SA AIP) ENR 5-11.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The information requested is as follows and contained within the Final Scoping Report:</p> <p>"The Duynefontein site is located adjacent to the existing Koeberg NPS, which is situated approximately 30 km north of Cape Town. The Duynefontein site is situated within the Western Cape Province Municipality and has the following co-ordinates: 33°40'36.00"S and 18°25'54.88"E.</p> <p>The Bantamsklip site is located approximately 5 km east of Pearly Beach and approximately 50 km northwest of Cape Agulhas. The site is situated on the Southern Cape coast, falls within the jurisdiction of the Overberg District Municipality and has the following co-ordinates: 34°42'28.95"S and 19°33'12.17"E.</p> <p>The Thyspunt site is located on the Couga Coast of the Eastern Cape Province, approximately 80 km west of Port Elizabeth. The site has the following co-ordinates: 34°11'22.51"S and 24°02'54.63"E."</p>

NO	DATE	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES / COMMENTS	RESPONSE
4	24 May 2011 18:06 Email	Rob Small Interested and Affected Party	<p>I agree to nuclear provided that :</p> <p>1. all the decision makers (including the ministers and business people) and other proponents of the 'nuclear energy solution' (scientists and technicians et al) agree to live permanently right on, or next door to, nuclear reactor sites , or on top of the places where spent fuel is stored, in perpetuity.</p> <p>2. that these same decision makers and proponents agree to put their full private wealth (property, shares, savings, everything) at the disposal of the country should any problems arise with contamination from their 'nuclear energy solution'</p> <p>If the decision makers and proponents can't do this, then I prefer to live with candles.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments and participation in the EIA process. It must be borne in mind that the Environmental Impact Assessment process is charged with assessing the significance of the construction of a Nuclear Power Station on three very specific sites and to make a recommendation in terms of the outcomes of the investigation. Therefore, although your comments are noted and will be included as part of the information presented to the Competent Authority for decision-making, it is not within the scope of the EIA to address comments of this nature.</p>

NO	DATE	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES / COMMENTS	RESPONSE
5	24 May 2011 08:54 Email	Peter Becker Koeberg Alert Alliance	<p>Thank you for your response.</p> <p>Please note we find this response unacceptable. If you analyse your attendance registers, you will find that excluding people from Arcus Gibb and Eskom, there were about 40 members of the public who signed the register in Newlands. For Melkbosstrand, the corresponding figure is about 9 members of the public.</p> <p>In the light of this, it is nonsensical to claim that the public participation process is best served by excluding Newlands in favour of Melkbosstrand. In fact, there were about twice the number of members of the public at Newlands than at the other two meetings combined.</p> <p>Please note that in our view this exclusion violates the requirement of a meaningful public participation, and that Arcus Gibb are avoiding the area where there is likely to be the most vigorous public participation. If you fail to arrange a meeting in Newlands, and provide reasonable notice of this, including advertising publicly, we intend to challenge the EIA process via any legal</p>	<p>The GIBB Nuclear-1 Public Participation Office replied via email on 25 May 2011 at 10:39.</p> <p>It is not GIBB's intention to exclude Newlands from the public participation process. GIBB has reviewed the requests for additional public meetings after the round of public participation for the Revised Draft EIR Version 1. The programme for public participation for the Revised Draft EIR Version 2 has, however, not been finalised. Any additional meetings, which require advertising, will be included in a single advert that will be placed in local and regional newspapers. Registered I&APs will also be notified of any additional meetings via post and e-mail.</p>

NO	DATE	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES / COMMENTS	RESPONSE
			means at our disposal.	
6	25 May 2011 11:05 Fax	Hubert Cronje Melkbosstrand Ratepayers Association	<p>For a number of years Melkbosstrand residents have tried to get information from ESKOM regarding insurance coverage for neighbouring communities in case of a disaster.</p> <p>This information has now become urgent and critical. It is ESKOM/NNR responsibility to make it available and it is out right to have this information.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. In terms of the National Nuclear Regulatory Act, the operator of a nuclear facility is obliged to take out insurance. The amount that is stipulated by the NNR is R 3 billion (the insurance is in US\$ denomination and the Rand value therefore differs from time to time). The NNR is, however, currently reviewing the amount of insurance that the nuclear power operator has to have. The current information can be obtained in Government Gazette No. 26327, Notice No. 581 dated 2004.05.07.</p>
7	25 May 2011 12:29 Email	Anthea Torr The Ascension Time	<p>I would like to request that a public meeting be held in the Southern Suburbs as well as in the North, as there are MANY, MANY people very concerned about any proposed nuclear expansion of any kind and the discussion regarding Nuclear-1 EIR needs to be attended by as many concerned citizens as possible.</p> <p>Please advise as soon as possible the</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. The choice of venues for the last round of public meetings were 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 related to issues specific to the Thyspunt site. The Duynefontein and Bantamsklip sites were not recommended as preferred sites. It was therefore considered that the public open houses and meetings advertised were sufficient to allow I&APs a reasonable opportunity to comment on the key</p>

NO	DATE	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES / COMMENTS	RESPONSE
			<p>plan to host a meeting in the Southern suburbs - the Vineyard Hotel - Newlands, was a good place - why not has it there again?</p>	<p>changes to the Draft EIR in this type of forum.</p> <p>However, GIBB has reviewed the requests for additional public meetings after the recent round of public participation for the Revised Draft EIR Version 1 but the programme for public participation for the Revised Draft EIR Version 2 has not been finalised. Any additional meetings, which require advertising, will be included in a single advert that will be placed in local and regional newspapers. Registered I&APs will also be notified of any additional meetings via post and e-mail.</p>
8	25 May 2011 12:31 Email	David Robert Lewis Interested and Affected Party	<p>Today's public meeting in Melkbosstrand regarding the Nuclear 1 EIA refers.</p> <p>I understand, this meeting is for interested and affected parties in the Melkbosstrand/Blouberg/Tableview area.</p> <p>Please could you organise a meeting for residents of Cape Town, in particular the Southern Suburbs.</p> <p>I am a resident of Woodstock in Cape Town, I will not be able to attend tonight's meeting.</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. The choice of venues for the last round of public meetings were 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 related to issues specific to the Thyspunt site. The Duynfontein and Bantamsklip sites were not recommended as the preferred sites. It was therefore considered that the public open houses and meetings advertised were sufficient to allow I&APs reasonable opportunity to comment on the key changes to the Draft EIR in this type of forum.</p> <p>However, GIBB has reviewed the requests for additional public meetings after the recent round of Public Participation for the Revised Draft EIR Version 1 but the programme for public participation for the Revised Draft EIR Version 2 has not been finalised. Any additional meetings, which require advertising, will be included in a single advert that will be placed in local and regional newspapers. Registered I&APs will also be notified of any additional meetings via post and e-mail.</p>

NO	DATE	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES / COMMENTS	RESPONSE
9	25 May 2011 12:34 Email 25 May 2011 13:41 Email	Samantha Jenner Interested and Affected Party	<p>I am most disappointed that there is no meeting arranged in a more accessible location. The previous meeting at The Vineyard Hotel was well attended and indicates an interest and demand for future meetings at central or accessible locations.</p> <p>The limited transport options available for tonight's meeting excludes a large portion of the community geographically. This is not acceptable.</p> <p>You are accountable for facilitating public participation and, if anything, additional meeting times and facilities available, especially given the additional interest that nuclear plants have been given in the last couple of months.</p> <p>I look forward to hearing your suggestions to remedy this failure.</p> <p>Thank you for your letter, however it does NOT an adequate reason. I&APs are not limited to those living in the immediate vicinity of the proposal site!</p> <p>The location of the meeting may be near the site but it is NOT easily accessible to others. Also, given that the meeting at the Vineyard was full and there has been</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. We agree that I&APs are not limited to those living in the immediate vicinity of the preferred (Thyspunt) site and it for this reason that meetings were held near the Duynefontein and Bantamsklip sites in addition to those at Thyspunt. Also please note that all registered I&APs were notified of the availability of the Revised Draft EIR Version 1 at public venues and on the GIBB and Eskom websites and have been afforded the opportunity to comment in the documents via letter, fax and e-mail during a comment period extended until 07 August 2011 (90 days).</p> <p>The choice of venues for the last round of public meetings were also 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 related to issues specific to the Thyspunt site. The Duynefontein and Bantamsklip sites were not recommended as the preferred sites. It was therefore considered that the public open houses and meetings advertised were sufficient to allow I&APs reasonable opportunity to comment on the key changes to the Draft EIR in this type of forum.</p> <p>However, GIBB has reviewed the requests for additional public meetings after the recent round of Public Participation for the Revised Draft EIR Version 1 but the programme for Public Participation for the Revised Draft EIR Version 2 has not been finalised. Any additional meetings, which require advertising, will be included in a single advert that will be placed in local and regional newspapers. Registered I&APs will also be notified of any additional meetings via post and e-mail.</p>

NO	DATE	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES / COMMENTS	RESPONSE
			<p>an increase in public interest sparked by the Fukushima Daiichi incident the option of additional meetings should be provided for. For instance, the area affected in any emergency would extend far beyond the area catered for in this meeting.</p> <p>Please reply with a reasoned response.</p>	
10	25 May 2011 13:00 Email	Neil Goodwin Interested and Affected Party	<p>I understand that Eskom intends to hold a public consultation meeting about its draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for Nuclear-1 only in Melkbosstrand (where no doubt only a few people can attend). Why is this? Surely such an important issue, especially post Fukushima should be aired in as many locations as possible to truly gauge the public mood on nuclear power?</p> <p>I would like you to consider holding one in Cape Town as soon as possible. Failure to consult as widely as possible on this major issue can only serve to invalidate your credibility and throw the veil of secrecy and despotism over correct legal procedure.</p> <p>I wait for your response.</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. The choice of venues for the last round of public meetings were 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 related to issues specific to the Thyspunt site. The Duynefontein and Bantamsklip sites were not recommended as the preferred site. It was therefore considered that the public open houses and meetings advertised were sufficient to allow I&APs reasonable opportunity to comment on the key changes to the Draft EIR in this type of forum.</p> <p>We agree that this is a sensitive issue that should be aired in as many locations as possible and it for this reason that meetings were held near the Duynefontein and Bantamsklip sites in addition to those at Thyspunt. Also please note that all registered I&APs were notified of the availability of the Revised Draft EIR at public venues and on the GIBB and Eskom websites and have been afforded the opportunity to comment in the documents via letter, fax and e-mail during a comment period extended until 07 August 2011 (90 days).</p>

NO	DATE	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES / COMMENTS	RESPONSE
				<p>However, GIBB has reviewed the requests for additional public meetings after the recent round of public participation for the Revised Draft EIR Version 1 but the programme for Public Participation for the Revised Draft EIR Version 2 has not been finalised. Any additional meetings, which require advertising, will be included in a single advert that will be placed in local and regional newspapers. Registered I&APs will also be notified of any additional meetings via post and e-mail.</p>
11	25 May 2011 13:11 Email	Alex Smuts Interested and Affected Party	<p>I am interested in the affects that Nuclear-1 EIR has on the environment, and I find it malicious that you should hold such important meetings in such small suburbs as Melkbosstrand.</p> <p>I request -- along with many others I'm sure -- that more meetings be held in more central areas such as the CBD, where there are organisations and peoples who want to voice their opinions.</p> <p>Please make the information that you are giving out more easily accessible to the public by holding more meetings in less conspicuous places.</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. The choice of venues for the last round of public meetings were 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 related to issues specific to the Thyspunt site. The Duynefontein and Bantamsklip sites were not recommended as the preferred site. It was therefore considered that the public open houses and meetings advertised were sufficient to allow I&APs reasonable opportunity to comment on the key changes to the Draft EIR in this type of forum.</p> <p>However, GIBB has reviewed the requests for additional public meetings after the recent round of public participation for the Revised Draft EIR Version 1 but the programme for public participation for the Revised Draft EIR Version 2 has not been finalised. Any additional meetings, which require advertising, will be included in a single advert that will be placed in local and regional newspapers. Registered I&APs will also be notified of any additional meetings via post and e-mail.</p>

