

NO	DATE	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES / COMMENTS	RESPONSE
1	04 June 2011 Email	Mike Kantey Coalition Against Nuclear	<p style="text-align: center;">Nuclear plant workers suffer internal radiation exposure after visiting Fukushima</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>The Mainichi Daily News, May 24 2011</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">http://mdn.mainichi.jp/mdnnews/news/20110521p2a00m0na021000c.html</p> <p>The government has discovered thousands of cases of workers at nuclear power plants outside Fukushima Prefecture suffering from internal exposure to radiation after they visited the prefecture, the head of the Nuclear and Industrial Safety Agency said.</p> <p>Most of the workers who had internal exposure to radiation visited Fukushima after the nuclear crisis broke out following the March 11 quake and tsunami, and apparently inhaled radioactive substances scattered by hydrogen explosions at the Fukushima No. 1 Nuclear Power Plant.</p> <p>The revelation has prompted local municipalities in Fukushima to consider checking residents' internal exposure to radiation.</p> <p>Nobuaki Terasaka, head of the Nuclear and Industrial Safety Agency, told the House of Representatives Budget Committee on May</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. The incident at Fukushima as a result of a natural disaster has highlighted many important safety factors in terms of the future of nuclear energy. The industry is underway to adapt these safety factors into new designs and existing plants.</p> <p>Furthermore on the 18th Jan 2012 (NucNet) News reported; About 30 workers at the Fukushima-Daiichi nuclear power plant in Japan received between 100 millisieverts (mSv) and 250 mSv of radiation exposure, which would have increased their chances of cancer by about one percent to 2.5 percent, a parliamentary committee in the UK was told. Her Majesty's chief inspector of nuclear installations, Mike Weightman, told the House of Commons Energy and Climate Change Committee that in terms of the workers, "there don't appear to be any acute radiation effects".</p> <p>He said 30 of them have had "a significant dose", but it is not in the sense of an immediate life-threatening dose. In a declared nuclear emergency, the recommended limit is 100 mSv. The International Commission on Radiation Protection is mandated to sanction a maximum accumulated dose of 250 mSv in extraordinary circumstances. Mr Weightman said public evacuation was well-organised and exposure countermeasures for the public have been "effective so far", and there will be a longer-term health monitoring programme."</p> <p>Lastly please keep in mind that the assessment of nuclear safety risks are however outside the scope of the EIA process and will be considered in the National Nuclear Regulator's licensing process. Please refer in this regard to</p>

NO	DATE	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES / COMMENTS	RESPONSE
			<p>16 that there were a total of 4,956 cases of workers suffering from internal exposure to radiation at nuclear power plants in the country excluding the Fukushima No. 1 Nuclear Power Plant, and 4,766 of them involved workers originally from Fukushima who had visited the prefecture after the nuclear crisis. Terasaka revealed the data in his response to a question from Mito Kakizawa, a lawmaker from Your Party.</p> <p>The Nuclear and Industrial Safety Agency said it received the data from power companies across the country that measured the workers' internal exposure to radiation with "whole-body counters" and recorded levels of 1,500 counts per minute (cpm) or higher. In 1,193 cases, workers had internal exposure to radiation of more than 10,000 cpm. Those workers had apparently returned to their homes near the Fukushima No. 1 Nuclear Power Plant or had moved to other nuclear power plants from the Fukushima No. 1 and 2 nuclear power plants.</p> <p>According to Kakizawa, one worker at the Shika Nuclear Power Plant operated by Hokuriku Electric Power Co. in Ishikawa Prefecture returned to his home in Kawauchi, Fukushima Prefecture, on March 13 and stayed there for several hours. He</p>	<p>the Co-operative Governance Agreement included in Appendix B4 of the Revised Draft EIR Version 1.</p>

NO	DATE	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES / COMMENTS	RESPONSE
			<p>then stayed in Koriyama in the prefecture with his family for one night before moving out of Fukushima. On March 23, he underwent a test at the Shika Nuclear Power Plant that showed his internal exposure to radiation had reached 5,000 cpm. He was thus instructed by the company to remain on standby. The radiation reading dropped below 1,500 cpm two days later, and then he returned to work.</p> <p>Another male worker in his 40s told the Mainichi that he had waited at his home, about 30 kilometres from the crippled nuclear plant, following a hydrogen explosion at one of the troubled reactors. He later went through a test which showed his internal exposure to radiation had reached 2,500 cpm. "I think most of the radiation derives from iodine (which has a short half-life), and therefore the radiation reading is expected to drop. But I am worried," the man said.</p> <p>The local government in Nihonmatsu, Fukushima Prefecture, has received inquiries about internal exposure to radiation from its citizens. In response, it is considering selecting infants and people working mainly outdoors and measuring their internal radiation exposure levels using</p>	

NO	DATE	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES / COMMENTS	RESPONSE
			<p>whole-body counters, officials said.</p> <p>Internal exposure to radiation lasts longer and carries more risks than external exposure. People are deemed to have had internal exposure if whole-body counters detect over 1,500 cpm of radiation from them. If more than 100,000 cpm of radiation is detected from body surfaces, decontamination is said to be necessary.</p> <p>A special earthquake-resistant building that serves as a base for emergency workers at the Fukushima No. 1 Nuclear Power Plant had its doors strained by hydrogen explosions at the No. 1 and 3 reactors in March, making it easier for radioactive substances to come in. "We had meals there, so I think radioactive substances came into our bodies," a male worker in his 40s said. "We just drink beer and wash them down," he added.</p> <p>A 34-year-old male worker, who entered the nuclear complex earlier in May, voiced concerns over the lack of a sufficient system to check internal exposure to radiation. "Most of the workers around me have not undergone check-ups at all. Those in their 20s are particularly worried," he said.</p> <p>Tokyo Electric Power Co. (TEPCO), the</p>	

NO	DATE	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES / COMMENTS	RESPONSE
			<p>operator of the crippled Fukushima No. 1 Nuclear Power Plant, is to check workers' internal exposure to radiation whenever deemed necessary, in addition to regular checks conducted every three months. But as of May 16, only about 1,400 workers have gone through check-ups -- roughly 20 percent of the total number of workers. And only 40 of the workers have had their test results confirmed. The highest level of radiation to which a worker has been exposed so far is 240.8 millisieverts, and 39 millisieverts of radiation was from internal exposure.</p>	
2	10 June 2011 Email	Mathias Matysik Interested and Affected Party	<p>I wish to submit the following comment on the proposed Nuclear Power Plant known as Nuclear 1.</p> <p>After the recent tragedy in Japan and the Meltdown of one of its Nuclear power stations countries such as Italy and Germany have now declared a halt to all Nuclear power and have started closing down such facilities.</p> <p>This in the direct wake of the disaster in Japan. This alone should stand to reason that the Environmental impact in case of such a disaster is incalculable in human, animal, marine and the vegetation of the whole of the eastern cape. The position of this structure is of such a risk in so many ways that it should not continue.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. The incident at Fukushima as a result of a natural disaster has highlighted many important safety factors in terms of the future of nuclear energy.</p> <p>The assessment of nuclear safety risks are outside the scope of the EIA process and will be considered in the National Nuclear Regulator's licensing process. Please refer in this regard to the Co-operative Governance Agreement included in Appendix B4 of the Revised Draft EIR Version 1.</p> <p>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 the import of nuclear energy from France and there is a risk they will not manage as quickly to halt the dependency on fossil fuels, especially coal-based energy making the decision not as clear cut as it seems. The Washington Post (02 June 2011 -</p>

NO	DATE	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES / COMMENTS	RESPONSE
			<p>Nuclear power is an out of date form of energy and will only cost this country more that it will ever return.</p>	<p>http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/germanysnuclear-energy-blunder/2011/05/31/AGjjGkGH_story.html) reports that the International Energy Agency announced that global energy-related carbon emissions last year were the highest ever, and that the world is far off track if it wants to keep temperatures from rising more than 2 degrees Celsius, after which the results could be very dangerous. But the Breakthrough Institute, a think tank, points out that renewables would have to generate an incredible 42.4 percent of the country's electricity in 2020 to displace nuclear. The government could bring that number down some with very aggressive reductions in energy use. But, even then, all that will merely hold the German power industry to its current carbon footprint.</p> <p>This notwithstanding nuclear power is not being considered as an alternative to renewable power such as wind power in South Africa in terms of the Integrated Resource Plan (IRP). The IRP sets out the electricity demand over the next 20 years for an additional 56 000 MW capacity by 2030 and a mixture of sources, including wind power and nuclear power, has been completed in the approved Integrated Resource Plan 2010.</p>
3	10 June 2011 Email	Sally Andrew Bowen Boshier Interested and Affected Parties	<p>We still object for all the reasons laid out by us in numerous previous emails. None of these basic concerns have been adequately addressed.</p> <p>(And In the light on on-going nuclear disasters, it is amazing you persist with these irresponsible, expensive and</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Your previous comments have been recorded and will be included, as with all other comments received, in the Final EIR which will be placed before the Competent Authority for decision making purposes.</p> <p>The recent incident at Fukushima as a result of a natural disaster has highlighted many important safety factors in</p>

NO	DATE	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES / COMMENTS	RESPONSE
			dangerous proposals.)	<p>terms of the future of nuclear energy.</p> <p>The assessment of nuclear safety risks are however outside the scope of the EIA process and will be considered in the National Nuclear Regulator's licensing process. Please refer in this regard to the Co-operative Governance Agreement included in Appendix B4 of the Revised Draft EIR Version 1.</p>
4	10 June 2011 Email	Dr Toon Overstijns Interested and Affected Party	<p>My concern is that when nations like Germany decided to exit nuclear power generation by 2022, and other EU member states are considering the same measures, will this be a real viable long term option to generate electricity?</p> <p>In other words by the time the plant is completed we may be forced to abandon the project.</p> <p>The Japanese government is reconsidering as well and stops all constructions of new plants.</p> <p>My objection is that we need to evaluate the reports of Germany, Japan and other global players before we can really assess the safety for our community. Any decision before would be premature and potentially a financial waste.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p> <p>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 the import of nuclear energy from France and there is a risk they will not manage as quickly to halt the dependency on fossil fuels, especially coal-based energy making the decision not as clear cut as it seems.</p> <p>The Washington Post (02 June 2011 - http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/germanys-nuclear-energy-blunder/2011/05/31/AGjjGkGH_story.html) reports that the International Energy Agency announced that global energy-related carbon emissions last year were the highest ever, and that the world is far off track if it wants to keep temperatures from rising more than 2 degrees Celsius, after which the results could be very dangerous. But the Breakthrough Institute, a think tank, points out that renewables would have to generate 42.4 percent of the country's electricity in 2020 to displace nuclear. The government could bring that number down some with very aggressive reductions in energy use. But, even then, all that will merely hold the German power industry to its current</p>

NO	DATE	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES / COMMENTS	RESPONSE
			<p>My request is therefore to postpone the decision by 12 months to take these new elements into consideration by the local community.</p>	<p>carbon footprint. Also South Africa is located on a significantly more stable tectonic environment than Japan which being located so near to a major subduction zone has made it historically vulnerable to seismic events.</p> <p>This notwithstanding nuclear power is not being considered as an alternative to renewable power such as wind power in South Africa in terms of the Integrated Resource Plan (IRP). The IRP sets out the electricity demand over the next 20 years for an additional 56 000 MW capacity by 2030 and a mixture of sources, including wind power and nuclear power, has been completed in the approved Integrated Resource Plan 2010.</p> <p>Lastly it is acknowledged that the incident at Fukushima as a result of a natural disaster has highlighted many important safety factors in terms of the future of nuclear energy.</p> <p>The assessment of nuclear safety risks are however outside the scope of the EIA process and will be considered in the National Nuclear Regulator's licensing process. Please refer in this regard to the Co-operative Governance Agreement included in Appendix B4 of the Revised Draft EIR Version 1.</p> <p><u>Furthermore, the safety of the KNPS has recently been checked following the events at the Fukushima nuclear power plant. The evaluation by the NNR on the safety assessment done by Eskom concluded that KNPS is able to withstand these events.</u></p>

NO	DATE	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES / COMMENTS	RESPONSE
5	11 June 2011 Email	Diane Salters Interested and Affected Party	<p>I refer you and the decision makers involved in this process to the recent decision by the Japanese government, following the nuclear disaster there, to completely re-assess the risk factors involved in nuclear energy production and the safety standards required.</p> <p>This, together with the decision of the German government to phase out nuclear power entirely, raises further questions and cause for alarm.</p> <p>The need for a commitment to renewable and safe energy resources becomes even more crucial.</p> <p>Why should a developing country like SA not learn from the mistakes of the developed world and take a different path?</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p> <p>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 the import of nuclear energy from France and there is a risk they will not manage as quickly to halt the dependency on fossil fuels, especially coal-based energy making the decision not as clear cut as it seems.</p> <p>The Washington Post (02 June 2011 - http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/germanys-nuclear-energy-blunder/2011/05/31/AGjjGkGH_story.html) reports that the International Energy Agency announced that global energy-related carbon emissions last year were the highest ever, and that the world is far off track if it wants to keep temperatures from rising more than 2 degrees Celsius, after which the results could be very dangerous. But the Breakthrough Institute, a think tank, points out that renewables would have to generate an incredible 42.4 percent of the country's electricity in 2020 to displace nuclear. The government could bring that number down some with very aggressive reductions in energy use. But, even then, all that will merely hold the German power industry to its current carbon footprint. Also South Africa is located on a significantly more stable tectonic environment than Japan which being located so near to a major subduction zone has made it historically vulnerable to seismic events.</p> <p>This notwithstanding nuclear power is not being considered as an alternative to renewable power such as wind power in</p>

NO	DATE	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES / COMMENTS	RESPONSE
				<p>South Africa in terms of the Integrated Resource Plan (IRP). The IRP sets out the electricity demand over the next 20 years for an additional 56 000 MW capacity by 2030 and a mixture of sources, including wind power and nuclear power, has been completed in the approved Integrated Resource Plan 2010.</p> <p>Lastly it is acknowledged that the incident at Fukushima as a result of a natural disaster has highlighted many important safety factors in terms of the future of nuclear energy.</p> <p>The assessment of nuclear safety risks are however outside the scope of the EIA process and will be considered in the National Nuclear Regulator's licensing process. Please refer in this regard to the Co-operative Governance Agreement included in Appendix B4 of the Revised Draft EIR Version 1</p>
6	13 June 2011 Email	Byron Andrews Pam Golding Properties St. Francis Bay	<p>The residents of St Francis bay will continue to contest the flawed EIA that Arcus Gibb submits.</p> <p>The people of South Africa need to know that this is not a localized problem, but a national one.</p> <p>Every taxpayer in South Africa will end up paying double on their electricity bills to fund this financially unfeasible venture.</p> <p>Thyspunt is geographically incorrect for a nuclear power station. No trumped up EIA can change this fact.</p>	<p>Thank you. Your comments are noted. In 2007, when the EIA process for the Nuclear-1 application commenced there was no space available at the Coega site. Although space has now become available for a nuclear power station at Coega IDZ, due to other limitations (such as the need for micro-seismic monitoring), Coega cannot in terms of this EIA process for the proposed Nuclear-1 be considered reasonable and feasible alternative as there is currently a lack of information regarding its seismic suitability. It would take another five years to generate the same level of information as is available for Thyspunt, Duynefontein and Bantamsklip site alternatives.</p>

NO	DATE	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES / COMMENTS	RESPONSE
			<p>Building a nuclear power station at Coega, right where the power is needed, and where the infrastructure and labor are already there, would halve the cost to the taxpayers.</p> <p>Make the change now.</p>	
7	14 June 2011 Email	Bryce Hendricks The Bomb Surf Petition	<p>Petition against Eskom's proposed nuclear plant in Thyspunt:</p> <p>I object to Thyspunt being chosen as the location of Nuclear1 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. 4. Why develop a Nuclear Power 	<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>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 will, 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 NPS at the Thyspunt site without implementation of mitigation</p>

NO	DATE	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES / COMMENTS	RESPONSE
			<p>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>measures have been assessed as 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 Oyster Bay dune field 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 the above confirms that although Thyspunt would experience environmental impacts it is still maintained 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.</p> <p>4. As determined in the approved Integrated Resource Plan (IRP) 2010, nuclear and renewable technology is an important component of South Africa's future energy mix. The assessment of nuclear safety risks are outside the scope of the EIA process and will be considered in the National Nuclear Regulator's licensing process. However the safety aspects have been discussed in various specialist studies and the NNR process has also been included for public information. You are also referred to the Co-operative Governance Agreement included in Appendix B4 of the Revised Draft EIR Version 1.</p>

NO	DATE	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES / COMMENTS	RESPONSE
			<p>Own comments:</p> <p>1. The Eastern Cape is a windy place, the Drakensberg extends down into the region, chuck some windmills up!</p>	<p>4. As indicated in the EIR and in the above response, 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 20 000 MW of additional capacity by 2020 and a mixture of sources, including wind power and nuclear power, has been recommended in the approved Integrated Resource Plan 2010.</p> <p>Own comments:</p> <p>1. In terms of alternative energy solutions, only a few energy sources capable of providing a sustained power supply are available in sufficient quantities suitable for base-load power supply. In South Africa, coal, nuclear power and imported hydro power are used for base load electricity generation, while the Open Cycle Gas Turbines (OCGTs) (which use liquid fuel such as diesel), two hydroelectric power stations on the Orange River and pumped storage schemes are used for peaking and emergency electricity generation.</p> <p>A high level assessment of the implications of a wind farm as an alternative to a 4 000 MW nuclear power station has been included in Chapter 5 of the Revised Draft EIR. This analysis indicates an area of between 273 000 ha and 345 600 ha¹ will be required for 13 333 MW of installed capacity (depending on the rotor diameter). Due to the fact that wind is not available at all times, a capacity factor² of 30% is assumed and the effective power produced will be</p>

¹ For comparative purposes, Addo National Park is 164 000 ha (SANParks website) and Baviaanskloof Mega-Reserve is approximately 500 000 ha.

² The percentage of time that the installation can produce its full output

NO	DATE	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES / COMMENTS	RESPONSE
				<p>4 000 MW.</p> <p>Due to the variable availability of wind, it is not a simple solution to replace base load power generation such as nuclear with wind generation. In the case of wind turbines the output is a direct function of the local wind speed, and cannot be dispatched on request. This results in a requirement to have alternative means to supply the demand when there is too little or too much wind.</p> <p>A recent example of this was in September 2010 in Spain where the national wind turbines dropped to below 3 000 MW on Thursday from 4 600 MW on Wednesday, compared with peaks of more than 10 000 MW on Tuesday. This swing of 8 000 MW was equal to 20% of the national demand and is very difficult to sensibly manage without investing in base load options such as coal and nuclear and installing additional wind turbines for contingencies.</p> <p>In light of this the option to use wind power to provide stable, dependable base load supply to the grid is extremely challenging. Wind power therefore does need to be supplemented by more reliable base load generation.</p> <p>The cost of a large percentage of renewable technologies increases the cost of electricity significantly and is considered in some detail in the recently published Draft Integrated Resource Plan. It was for this reason that a balanced scenario was proposed. Finding a balance between the different options and the economic impact of unaffordable electricity.</p>

NO	DATE	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES / COMMENTS	RESPONSE
			<p>2. Yes, the operation will create thousands of jobs, but there aren't thousands of people there, they'll have to spend their precious money to build housing and roads and all the works, and that is just going to ruin the beautiful nature Reserve with this "low cost" housing, which will eventually just turn into a squatter camp like any one this country has put up... and did the incident in Japan teach these people nothing?</p> <p>3. Keep nuclear power stations away from the ocean! It will just get rid of natural beauty and destroy waves and fisheries, and not to mention pollute the fresh air! The Thyspunt area is the most beautiful and diverse area in SA, putting this power up will ruin it...if a simple South African citizen can see this, why can't the very rich and successful (yet not very useful) ESKOM see this! Come on!</p>	<p>2. The areas where accommodation will be required for the labour force will be integrated as far as possible with areas dedicated for housing in the existing planning processes of the local authorities within which the power station is proposed to be located. Where possible, employees (especially operational employees) will obtain accommodation in existing settlements. If new urban development has already been approved in the area of the nearby human settlements, it would be Eskom's preference to make use of the opportunities provided by this rather than create a new for residential development which would then require an EIA.</p> <p>Eskom has completed initial investigations into housing around all three sites. Apart from Bantamsklip, the current development around Humansdorp, Jeffreys Bay and in the greater Cape Town would accommodate housing needs and therefore would be highly unlikely to require an EIA.</p> <p>3. Impacts on the ocean and marine resources have been assessed in specialist studies such as the Oceanographic Assessment and associated Surf Breaks Addendum as well as the Marine Ecology Assessment (Appendix E16 and E15 of the Revised Draft EIR Version 1) and have found no fatal flaws in terms of these aspects. The Marine Impact Assessment has also been updated and this information will be made available for public comment and review.</p>

NO	DATE	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES / COMMENTS	RESPONSE
8	19 June 2011 Email	Tai Krige Interested and Affected Party	This is totally ridiculous – please stop killing us.	Thank you. Your comment is noted.
9	20 June 2011 Email	JC Vermaak Interested and Affected Party	South Africa and especially the Eastern Cape need electricity, not impact studies.	Thank you. Your comment is noted.
10	22 June 2011 Email	Anna-Marie Groenewald Interested and Affected Party	<p>We as South Africans should stand together to object to the building of Nuclear Power Plants in our beautiful country.</p> <p>Not only is it against the rules of nature, the devastation is horrific if something goes wrong.</p> <p>We all know of the recent tragedy due to an earthquake and for this reason Germany as a country now (June 2011) placed a total ban on any Nuclear Plants in their country and all their plants are going to be phased out gradually and closed down.</p> <p>If Germany, probably the country with the best and most modern technology in the world, decided against it, how can we, as a third world country even contemplate it?</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. 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 the import of nuclear energy from France and there is a risk they will not manage as quickly to halt the dependency on fossil fuels, especially coal-based energy making the decision not as clear cut as it seems.</p> <p>The Washington Post (02 June 2011 - http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/germanys-nuclear-energy-blunder/2011/05/31/AGjjGkGH_story.html) reports that the International Energy Agency announced that global energy-related carbon emissions last year were the highest ever, and that the world is far off track if it wants to keep temperatures from rising more than 2 degrees Celsius, after which the results could be very dangerous. But the Breakthrough Institute, a think tank, points out that renewables would have to generate an incredible 42.4 percent of the country's electricity in 2020 to displace nuclear. The government could bring that number down some with very aggressive reductions in energy use. But, even then, all that will merely hold the German power industry to its current carbon footprint.</p>

NO	DATE	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES / COMMENTS	RESPONSE
			<p>We have sunshine in access – let's make use of it. We have wind (at least in the Western Cape – we do) Let's use it!</p> <p>We have water (the sea is a mighty force. Let's use it!</p> <p>Nothing is perfect, but the tragedy of a Nuclear Plant going wrong surpasses all by far.</p> <p>Use the millions of Rands a Nuclear Plant costs to give house solar heating systems instead, water tanks for each for each home etc. Go Green!</p>	<p>This notwithstanding nuclear power is not being considered as an alternative to renewable power such as wind power in South Africa in terms of the Integrated Resource Plan (IRP). The IRP sets out the electricity demand over the next 20 years for an additional 56 000 MW capacity by 2030 and a mixture of sources, including wind power and nuclear power, has been completed in the approved Integrated Resource Plan 2010.</p> <p>Although in terms of alternative energy solutions, only a few energy sources capable of providing a sustained power supply are available in sufficient quantities suitable for base-load power supply. In South Africa, coal, nuclear power and imported hydro power are used for base load electricity generation, while the Open Cycle Gas Turbines (OCGTs) (which use liquid fuel such as diesel), two hydroelectric power stations on the Orange River and pumped storage schemes are used for peaking and emergency electricity generation.</p> <p>Lastly it is acknowledged that the incident at Fukushima as a result of a natural disaster has highlighted many important safety factors in terms of the future of nuclear energy.</p> <p>The assessment of nuclear safety risks are however outside the scope of the EIA process and will be considered in the National Nuclear Regulator's licensing process. Please refer in this regard to the Co-operative Governance Agreement included in Appendix B4 of the Revised Draft EIR</p>

NO	DATE	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES / COMMENTS	RESPONSE
11	22 June 2011 Email	Cheron Kraak Country Feeling	Trudy, I think it's time for the heavy guns.....what do you think? Let's get mean, and whip the hell out of them	Please note that this is a transparent process which requires professionalism from all parties. Making such threat is a very serious matter. We ask that you refrain from such threats and participate in an effective and peaceful manner.
12	24 June 2011 Email	Clive Rabie Interested and Affected Party	<p>As a resident of St Francis Bay I would just like to let you know that the sentiment in our village is changing to accept the eventual decision to build the Atomic Reactor at Thyspunt.</p> <p>But, the residents are going to fight tooth & nail not to have the access road through our village & that the contractor's village rather be built in Humansdorp.</p>	<p>Thank you. Your comments are noted. The alternatives in terms of the western access routes to the Thyspunt site are currently under review. Changes to the alternatives will be made available for public comment and review.</p> <p>The Transport specialist study was also revised and additionally acknowledges that the Thyspunt site requires significant transport infrastructure upgrades. 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, 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> <p>With respect to the construction village and accommodation for staff there is a recommendation that this be located in towns like Jeffrey's Bay and Humansdorp. The construction village is not considered in this EIA. However, Eskom is in discussions with local authorities who are helping them identify the best sites.</p>

NO	DATE	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES / COMMENTS	RESPONSE
13	26 June 2011 Email	Len Handler Interested and Affected Party	<p>Thank you for helping me with some of the voluminous paperwork of the EIA for the Nuclear Power Station.</p> <p>I'm pleased current thinking is to locate it outside the Western Cape.</p> <p>However, the good citizens of Jeffrey's Bay and Humansdorp may well be faced with the same conundrum that I feared here in Cape Town of how to escape in the event of a nuclear emission leak.</p> <p>I do not have much knowledge of the population density of the region, nor the quality of the roads, nor the strength and direction of prevailing winds to venture an opinion.</p> <p>I presume the Eskom planners have considered these factors and the various distances of their preferred location at Oyster Bay to Humansdorp (±20km), Jeffreys Bay (±30km) and Port Elizabeth (±90km).</p> <p>Overall the decision not to put all the nuclear eggs in one basket is wise especially if safety concerns have been addressed.</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 licensing process.</p>

NO	DATE	NAME & ORGANISATION	ISSUES / COMMENTS	RESPONSE
14	26 June 2011 Email	Robyn Williams The Bomb Surf Petition	<p>Petition against Eskom's proposed nuclear plant in Thyspunt:</p> <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>The GIBB Nuclear-1 Public Participation Office confirms that only point 4 (four) of "The Bomb Surf Petition" reflects in this Mr Williams' email.</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 56 000 MW of additional capacity by 2030, and a mixture of sources, including wind power and nuclear power, has been completed in the approved Integrated Resource Plan 2010.</p>