

NO	DATE	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES / COMMENTS	RESPONSE
1	30 May 2011 13:08 Email	Olivia Andrews Project 90 X 2030 Operations Manager	At the public meeting last week you mentioned that there have been international studies done on the carbon emissions of the entire nuclear fuel cycle, would you be able to send them to me/point me in the direction of where to find them please?	The GIBB Nuclear-1 Public Participation Office sent the reference to Ms Andrews on 08 June 2011. . The reference, as quoted in Chapter 4 of the Revised Draft EIR, is: Dones, R, Heck, T & Hirschberg, S. <u>Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Energy Systems: Comparison and Review</u> . In Paul Scherrer Institut 2003 Annual Report. Paul Scherrer Institut: Villigen, Switzerland.
2	29 May 2011 08:15 Email	Carmen Spilsbury The Bomb Surf Petition	<p>The "Petition against Eskom's proposed nuclear plant in Thyspunt" form has been submitted from your site on the 4/5/2011 9:45:43 AM</p> <p>I object to Thyspunt being chosen as the location of Nuclear-1 because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The EIA itself acknowledges that Thyspunt would experience environmental impacts of higher significance (particularly biophysical impacts) than the other shortlisted site, Duynefontein. 2. The negative impact on local flora, wetlands, dunes, ocean and tourism during construction and operation and the danger to local communities in the event of a radioactive incident. 3. One of the EIA's main arguments in favour of choosing Thyspunt being that it would be beneficial to the conservation of the area is completely devoid of logic. 	<p>Thank you for comment and your input and participation in the Environmental Impact Assessment process. Please see our response to your comments below.</p> <p>1 - 3. The impact assessment at Thyspunt as a result of the construction and operation of the Nuclear Power Station did indeed identify significant potential impacts (negative and positive) on the flora, dune, wetland, tourism and marine environments amongst others. There are also some impacts of potentially higher significance at Duynefontein, for example the impact on the Atlantis Mobile Dunefield (from a botanical point of view).</p> <p>Development of the Thyspunt site in terms of the wetlands present may, in the absence of mitigation measures, impact significantly on the wetland system. However, the proposed footprint of the plant is situated to avoid the wetlands. The cumulative impacts of the proposed development of a single Nuclear Power Station at the Thyspunt site without implementation of mitigation measures have been assessed to be of high negative significance. However, offset mitigation is possible and would involve conservation of areas that include both the Eastern Valley Bottom wetlands and the</p>

NO	DATE	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES / COMMENTS	RESPONSE
			<p>4. Why develop a Nuclear Power Station in one of SA's windiest regions, when a wind farm could be easily constructed there instead. A quicker, cheaper option that would give clean, safe, renewable energy.</p>	<p>Oyster Bay dunefield itself, as far as the impacted area at the upstream boundary of The Links golf estate.</p> <p>Oceanographic impacts related to the construction phase are considered to be of low significance.</p> <p>As a result a number of mitigation measures have been suggested and included in a draft Environmental Management Plan in order to mitigate the impact of the nuclear power station on the environment.</p> <p>Therefore although it is acknowledged that Thyspunt would experience potential environmental impacts of high significance, especially in terms of the cultural landscape, we maintain that the conservation of the remainder of the site through access control and responsible long-term conservation management are significant positive impacts associated with this site. This is confirmed by the Botany and Dune Ecology Assessments, which conclude that a key positive impact would be the creation of a nature reserve for the non-developed portion of the site, thus improving conservation of sensitive habitats. In the event that full mitigation as well as offset measures were implemented, the net impact to wetlands on the Thyspunt site is also likely to be one of positive significance, and a preferable scenario to the "no-go" alternative.</p> <p>4. As determined in the IRP 2010, nuclear and renewable technology are both important components of South Africa's future energy mix. You are referred to the Integrated Resource Plan 2010, which indicates that the levelised cost of electricity (LCOE) for renewable technology is higher than</p>

NO	DATE	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES / COMMENTS	RESPONSE
				<p>that of nuclear. Two significant international comparisons of LCOEs of different generation technologies come to the same conclusion that nuclear technology's LCOE is competitive with other technologies, including renewables.</p> <p>As indicated in the EIR, nuclear power is not being considered as an alternative to renewable power such as wind power. No single source of power can provide in South Africa's need for an additional 40,000 MW of additional capacity by 2030. A mixture of sources, including wind power and nuclear power, has been recommended in the approved Integrated Resource Plan 2010. Therefore nuclear and renewable power options need to be pursued in parallel.</p>
3	3 June 2011 16:10 Email	Johan Smith	<p>Please read my short letter very carefully.</p> <p>I want to give you SERIOUS ADVICE on how to handle the general public in Jeffrey's Bay/Humansdorp area on the objections to the nuclear station</p> <p>1] Trudie Malan, who is steering the opposition, is against every type of development and objects to anything. She is the one that "wat almal opwerk en stook". What you should do is to simply ask her if she has electricity in her house, where does it come from, has she a road to her house etc/etc what about that so called environmental damage.</p> <p>2] Then also a very important point that is</p>	<p>Thank you. Your comments have been noted. Please continue raising these comments at the public forums. The economic and tourism specialist studies are relevant to your statements.</p>

NO	DATE	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES / COMMENTS	RESPONSE
			<p>never mentioned</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a]what happened at Koeberg b]the fishing in area b]waste removal c]farming etc. <p>If as the objectors cry foul, why did all these negatives not happen at Koeberg? Remember the general public does not think that far, all they hear is the negatives. The most important thing to raise to the general public is to be fully behind the Nuclear Station is money – money – money.</p> <p>Most of them only have the one property that they stay in. If at any stage it is mentioned that house prices will greatly increase and also rentals, I guarantee you 90% will be behind you.</p> <p>The problem is they don't think that far, you must make it clear.</p>	

NO	DATE	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES / COMMENTS	RESPONSE
4	03 June 2011 17:39 Email	Fanie	<p>Graag will ek nie kommentaar lewer nie, maar saam gesels.</p> <p>Die persone wat so heftige teenkanting bied is niks anders as selfsugtig nie want hulle eerlik is sal hulle erken dat die “plant” eerder by iemand anders se voorstoep gebou kan word!</p> <p>Die kommer vir huise kan as voorwaarde wees dat huise in plekke waar plakkersgebied is, gebou word op hulle koste en na projek klaar moet die huise aan die gemeenskap oorhandig word. Sodoende baat die gemeenskap daarby. Die selfde kan in Jeffrey’s Baai en Humansdorp gedoen word.</p> <p>Kommer oor warm water in die see. Hoe moeilik is dit om warmwater koud te maak? Pop water in reeks oorloop damme en oornag is dit yskoud.</p> <p><i>Translation:</i> <i>The persons who are so heavily opposed are nothing more than selfish because if they are honest they will admit that plant can rather be built on somebody else’s doorstep.</i></p>	<p>Dankie. Ons neem kennis van u kommentaar and waardeer dat u by publieke vegaderings u opinie sal gee. . Verskeie opsies word oorweeg ten opsigte van behuising maar dit sal onderhewig wees aan ‘n onafhanklike omgewings-impakstudie.</p> <p><i>Translation</i> <i>Thank you. We take note of your comments. Various options are being considered in terms of construction and operational housing but this will be subject to a separate EIA process.</i></p> <p>In terme van die kommer oor die vrylating van warm water in die see, sorg die tunnel ontwerp van die ystellings sisteem dat enige negatiewe impakte verminder kan word omdat meer as een vrylatingspunt en ‘n vinnige vloeitempo daartoe bydra dat die oortollige hitte vinnig verminder word om vermenging met orliggende koeler water te maksimaliseer.</p> <p><i>Translation</i> <i>In terms of the release of warm water used for cooling purposes, a tunnelled design of the release system mitigates potential negative impacts, through multiple points of release to aid dissipation of excess heat, by releasing cooling water above the sea bottom to minimise effects on the benthic environment and by utilising a very high flow rate at the point</i></p>

NO	DATE	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES / COMMENTS	RESPONSE
			<p><i>The worry about houses can be made a prerequisite i.e. houses can be built in informal settlement areas at the cost of the project and can later be handed back to the community. In this way the community benefits from the project. The same can be done in Jeffrey's Bay and Humansdorp.</i></p> <p><i>Concern about warm water in the sea – how difficult is it to make warm water cold? Pop water into a series of overflow dams and it will be ice cold overnight.</i></p>	<p><i>of release to maximise mixing with cool surrounding water.</i></p>
5	03 June 2011 09:06 Email	Juline Prinsloo Kouga Local Tourism Organisation Chairperson	<p>We have attended your session last evening in Humansdorp. Please note that I have mentioned that you must please consult with us as we are the Umbrella body for Tourism in the Kouga. Our Head Office is stationed in Humansdorp at the Cultural Centre.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. The GIBB EIA Team consulted with Ms. Prinsloo on 14 July 2011.</p>
6	11 June 2011 09:26 Fax	Romney Tilson Brooks Interested Affected Party	<p>The proposed western access road to the Nuclear Power Station at Thyspunt will be within 20 m from my property at Erf 355, Oysterbay. Not only will this completely devalue my property, but it is going through a pristine wetland.</p> <p>I object in the strongest possible terms to this as an access road.</p> <p>If an alternate route is not found, I will take</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The alternatives in terms of the western access routes to the Thyspunt site are currently under review. Substantive alternatives are being considered. These will be shared with the public in the release of the Revised Draft EIR Version 2.</p>

NO	DATE	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES / COMMENTS	RESPONSE
			<p>this matter further, even if this needs to be addressed in a Court of Law.</p> <p>I am not against the building Nuclear-1 at Thyspunt, but am of the opinion that the money would be much better spent on renewables.</p>	
7	07 June 2011 11:50 Email	Len Handler Interested and Affected Party	<p>“6. The Revised Draft EIR comprises a Main Report (Volumes 1 to 2) and Appendices (Volumes 3 – 24 including Site Photographs, Authority Correspondence, Public Participation Documentation, Technical Criteria, Specialist <i>Curricula Vitae</i> and Reports, Draft Environmental Management Plan, EIA Legislative Requirements Checklist and a Peer Review Report).”</p> <p>My question is: Where in the 24 volumes do I find answers to my questions regarding evacuation of CPT population in the event of an accident at Duynefontein?</p> <p>I told you that previously I was unable to find answers and feared I had missed the relevant chapter. Are you able to find someone who can give me the volume and page no.?</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Emergency evacuation is dealt with in the Emergency Response Report (Appendix E26 of the Revised Draft EIR). This will however be dealt with in more detail as part of the National Nuclear Regulator (NNR) licensing process.</p> <p>The Koeberg emergency plan team consisting of members from Eskom, the Local Authorities and other support organisations are available around the clock to handle any emergency at the power station. In the unlikely event of an emergency at Koeberg, Eskom will notify the City of Cape Town Disaster Risk Management immediately. Eskom will recommend appropriate protective actions as per the requirements of the NNR to the relevant authorities. Representatives of National, Provincial and Local Government will authorize the appropriate protective actions to be implemented. Emergency response personnel and resources from all spheres of government will carry out these actions.</p> <p>An emergency calendar is also sent to the area surrounding Koeberg every year. This calendar gives details of the emergency plan for those people living closest to the station.</p> <p>The NNR requires evacuation of the 5km precautionary</p>

NO	DATE	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES / COMMENTS	RESPONSE
				<p>Action Zone (PAZ) within 4 hours, and the downwind affected sector of the Urgent Protective Action Planning Zone (UPZ) between 5km and 16km to be evacuated within 16 hours. The City of Cape Town Disaster Risk Management would utilise the My Citi Buses as well as other public transport resources to evacuate people in the relevant emergency planning zone who do not have their own transport.</p> <p>Every two years the NNR tests preparedness of the various organisations involved in the Koeberg emergency plan.</p>