

**PROPOSED ESKOM NUCLEAR POWER STATION
AND ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE**

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT (EIA: 12/12/20/944)

**COMMENTS ON
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REPORT**

(Volume 30 RDEIR IRR 29 July 2011)

Issues have been received from the following stakeholders:

No	Name	Organisation
1	Juline Prinsloo	Kouga Tourism
2	Ivan Copeland	Interested and Affected Party
3	Jo Millar	The Bomb Surf
4	Samantha Leigh Manton	Interested and Affected Party

NO	DATE	NAME & ORGANISATION		
1	21 July 2011 Email	Juline Prinsloo Kouga Tourism	On another note I was informed by other parties that yourselves and Eskom had a meeting in the Kouga with Tourism and Chief Williams etc. I am so disappointed as Kouga Local Tourism has not been invited. Please revert back to me.	Jaana Ball telephonically explained to her on 21 July 2011 that no meeting was held with tourism only with Chief Williams and the Gamkwa Khoisan Council. The meeting with Chief Williams did not discuss tourism it dealt with issues specific to the Gamkwa Khoisan Council
2	22 July 2011 Email	Ivan Copeland Interested and Affected Party	Sort out those wind turbines!	<p>Please note that renewable energy (wind and solar) is not considered in this application. However, in terms of present alternative energy solutions renewable forms of energy (e.g. wind and solar), are unable to provide viable large scale base load power , or ease of integration into the existing power network in South Africa due to the intermittent supply and lower load factors of these renewable technologies. See for instance, EPRI (2010) referred to in Chapter 5 of the Revised Draft EIR Version 1.</p> <p>In some countries, Internationally, natural gas and hydro power are also used for base-load electricity supply. However, South Africa does not have sufficient quantities of indigenous natural gas and does not have the large rivers required for base load hydro-electric power stations.</p> <p>In light of the above, coal-fired and nuclear power stations are currently the only feasible options in South Africa for base load electricity generation.</p>
3	25 July 2011	Jo Millar The Bomb Surf	I object to Thyspunt being chosen as the location of Nuclear 1 because:	Thank you for comment and your input and participation in the Environmental Impact Assessment process. Please see

NO	DATE	NAME & ORGANISATION		
	Email	Petition	<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 Station in one of SA's windiest regions, when a wind farm could be easily constructed there instead. A quicker, 	<p>our response to your comments below.</p> <p>1 - 3. The impact assessment as part of the Environmental Impact Assessment did indeed identify significant potential impacts (neutral, negative and positive) on the flora, dune, wetland, tourism and marine environments amongst others at the Thyspunt site. There are however 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>In terms of wetlands, development of the Thyspunt site, in the absence of mitigation measures, will impact significantly on the wetland system. The following facts need be considered however:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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; • the proposed footprint of the plant is situated to avoid the wetlands; and • although the cumulative impacts of the proposed development of a Nuclear Power Station at the Thyspunt site, without implementation of mitigation measures, have been assessed as of high negative significance, offset mitigation is possible and would involve conservation of areas that include both the Eastern Valley Bottom wetlands and the Oyster Bay

NO	DATE	NAME & ORGANISATION		
			<p>cheaper option that would give clean, safe, renewable energy.</p>	<p>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>Therefore although it is acknowledged that Thyspunt would experience environmental impacts of high significance especially in terms of the impact on the cultural landscape, we still 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 Draft IRP released for public comment in October 2010, nuclear and renewable technology is an important component of South Africa’s future energy mix. You are referred to the Draft Integrated Resource Plan; the levelised cost of renewable technology is higher than that of nuclear.</p> <p>The assessment of nuclear safety risks are outside the</p>

NO	DATE	NAME & ORGANISATION		
				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.
4	26 July 2011 Email	Samantha Leigh Manton Interested and Affected Party	I object to the development of the Nuclear power station in Thyspunt.	Thank you, your comment is noted.