

05 August 2015

Our Ref: J27035 / J31314
Your Ref: Email received 04 August 2011

Cape Town

14 Kloof Street
Cape Town 8001
PO Box 3965
Cape Town 8000

Tel: +27 21 469 9100
Fax: +27 21 424 5571
Web: www.gibb.co.za

Email: sally@mail.ngo.za Dear Ms Andrew and Mr Boshier

RE: ESKOM EIA CONCERNS FOR THE PROPOSED NUCLEAR POWER STATION AND ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE (DEA Ref. No: 12/12/20/944)

Here is some of the correspondence we have sent previously.(copied from emails we've sent to this address over the last few years) It still applies!

Comment 1:

We are delighted when Nuclear 1 was shelved.

We hope that you will do a fair and thorough EIA, and that good sense will prevail, and that ultimately all Nuclear energy will be shelved and replaced with the wiser, safer, cost-effective, job-creating, environment and people-friendly Renewable Energy.

Response 1:

Your comments are noted.

Comment 2:

Please keep all our objections and arguments that we have previously given you as part of your ongoing EIA process.

Response 2:

Your comment is noted. All previous correspondence has been captured as part of the Issues and Response Reports of the Draft and Final Scoping Reports as well as the Draft and Revised Draft EIA Reports.

Comment 3:

We have been re-researching the nuclear issue internationally. (with consideration for the climate change crisis)

I paste below the preface to a long and rigorous research report by the Austrian government.

I found that the below perspective correlates with the majority of the international, independent (non-vested) studies of the facts...

We are in support of the below perspective and on this ground reject any nuclear plants in SA (pbmr or otherwise). Instead we advocate Renewable Energy and Energy Efficient practices please see all the points raised in Austrian Gvt report preface. (pasted below – apologies to those who have received it before)

Full report www.lebensministerium.at/articleview/566781/1/7031
(go to bottom of page for English version)

1. NUCLEAR POWER: AN UNVIABLE RESPONSE TO CLIMATE CHANGE

Promoters of nuclear power have used climate change to try to resurrect this technology. In the panic of the climate crisis, there are even cases of environmentalists arguing we may have to resort to nuclear power as an emergency measure.

However, we should not let a crisis blind us to the truth about nuclear power. Although there have been developments in nuclear technology and spin-doctoring, it remains an expensive and dangerous option. There is damage and risk to people and environment involved in the mining, processing and transport of uranium. There is the unsolved problem of nuclear waste – which remains toxic for tens of thousands of years. There is the risk of nuclear weapons proliferation as well as the potential hazard of serious accidents.

The process of producing nuclear energy is itself energy-intensive and inefficient. Nuclear fuel is also finite (unlike renewable resources) – so is not a sustainable energy source.

The Austrian government commissioned a detailed and rigorous scientific study into the advantages and disadvantages of nuclear power in the context of the climate crisis. It concluded that nuclear power was not the solution. It stated that, “even if one were to overlook all (the) drawbacks, a nuclear power scale-up would come too late to contribute significantly towards the solution of the challenges of climate change”. The report also showed that “renewable energy sources are superior both ecologically and economically.”

This document can be accessed at:

www.lebensministerium.at/article/articleview/566781/1/7031 (go to bottom of page, ‘Assessment English’). [Tony Blair – please go have a look, old bean!] I’ve also listed a few nuclear websites later in this book, under ‘References and Resources’, for those who need further convincing, or who would like to get involved in anti-nuclear campaigns.

It remains something of a mystery to me why people (apart from those with vested interests such as nuclear scientists, investors and the military) continue to advocate nuclear power. To me the choice between coal and nuclear is like asking, ‘Would you rather be poked in the eye with a hot stick or hit on the head with a brick?’

My answer is: ‘Neither, thanks!’

(below is extract from AUSTRIAN GOVERNMENT REPORT: ‘Preface:
(see full report -link above)

“Preface

For many years Austria has followed a policy of exit from nuclear power. In the population and across all political parties there is wide-spread consensus that nuclear power is too risky an energy technology and that the use of nuclear energy burdens future generations irresponsibly with nuclear waste.

Meantime climate change has made the need to reduce green house gas emissions apparent. The foreseeable end of cheap oil and – somewhat later – of gas also requires a rethinking of energy policies.

Consequently I am frequently confronted with the question whether in the light of these developments a policy critical of nuclear energy was still legitimate, whether nuclear energy was not the lesser evil. Policy, just like science, sometimes must pause and check its premises. In this spirit I have asked the Austrian Nuclear Advisory Board, the pertinent scientific advisory body of the Austrian Government, to take up this question. Have advances in science and technology made a revision of the Austrian energy policy regarding nuclear necessary, especially in view of climate change and “Peak Oil”? Has the nuclear option become sustainable?

The assessment has now been completed and the message is an inconvenient one: in spite of nominal safety improvements in nuclear power plants a long list of “near-misses” documents that severe accidents can never be excluded; nuclear installations can only marginally be protected against terrorist attacks; proliferation continues to be a serious problem and a sustainable solution of the radioactive waste problem is not in sight. But even if one were to overlook all these drawbacks a nuclear power scale-up would come too late to contribute significantly towards the solution of the challenges of climate change and “Peak Oil”. Nuclear power is not even a cheap solution: energy efficiency measures and alternative energies are superior ecologically and economically. Maybe surprising for many: should nuclear be significantly up-scaled fissionable uranium would become scarce within a few decades, just like oil. The nuclear solution then leads to a plutonium economy – and fourth generation reactor concepts point in this direction – with all the associated dangers and significantly higher proliferation risks.

*Thus nuclear power is not **the** convincing solution some claim; rather it is no solution at all. There is no reason to change the Austrian policy. Our focus on energy efficiency and alternative energies is far sighted and the right way to go. We are convinced that in following this path we also contribute to the awareness building that is necessary to achieve a sustainable and more responsible use of energy.*

*Josef Pröll
Minister for Environment”*

Response 3:

Your comment is noted.

Yours faithfully
for GIBB (Pty) Ltd



Nuclear-1 EIA Team