

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

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

**COMMENTS ON
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REPORT**

(Volume 55 RDEIR IRR 10 August 2011)

Issues have been received from the following stakeholders:

No	Name	Organisation
1	Banie Engelbrecht	Interested and Affected Party
2	A Glaser	Interested and Affected Party
3	Angie Curtis	Interested and Affected Party
4	Briaan Smit	City and Area Planner, Matzikama Municipality
5	Candice Pelsler	Interested and Affected Party
6	Chris Pretorius and Janli Maartens	Interested and Affected Parties
7	Leonie Mervis	Interested and Affected Party
8	Fiona Ross	Associate Professor – Department Social Anthropology - UCT
9	Fiona Hinds	Interested and Affected Party
10	Catherine and Hugh Corder	Interested and Affected Party
11	Jenna da Silva Pinto	Interested and Affected Party
12	Jill Mackay	Interested and Affected Party
13	Liezl Coetzee	Interested and Affected Party
14	Margaret Carol Mervis	Interested and Affected Party
15	Margaret Carol Mervis	Interested and Affected Party
16	Mark Attwood	Interested and Affected Party
17	Rob McLeod	Interested and Affected Party
18	Rod Tritton	Interested and Affected Party
19	V Govindsamy	Interested and Affected Party
20	Stephen Syrett	Interested and Affected Party
21	Dr Susanne Godhart	Interested and Affected Party
22	Chris Liepold	Interested and Affected Party
23	Anka Esterhuizen	Interested and Affected Party
24	Tristen Taylor	Interested and Affected Party
25	Dr David Fig	Honorary Research Associate, Environmental Evaluation Unit, Department of Environmental and Geographical Sciences, University of Cape Town Chairperson of the Biowatch Trust Independent environmental policy researcher

26	Daniel Hutchinson	Rebelsrus Trust Member
27	Harris Johnson	Interested and Affected Party
28	Francois Bekker	Interested and Affected Party
29	Amanda Jephson and Charl Laubscher	Interested and Affected Parties
30	Chris Barratt	St Francis Kromme Trust

NO	DATE	NAME & ORGANISATION		
1	04 August 2011 Email	Banie Engelbrecht Interested and Affected Party	<p>My interest is in the characteristics / features of the external infrastructures outside the Nuclear Station. That embodies employees (permanent / temporary / top structure) with reference to their residence, habitation, roads, schools, retail, trade, industrial, hospitals and so forth. This is my forte.</p> <p>It is a fact that first you need the above infrastructures then the main plan of action and constructions can follow.</p> <p>Whoever the contractor will be, will have to consider these facts.</p> <p>We are ready with a presentation of vacant land next to Humansdorp and the study of the environment.</p>	<p>The location and exact nature of the external infrastructure has not yet been determined. Once a decision is made on a location of the nuclear power station (assuming a positive authorisation is issued), the planning for the external infrastructure will be undertaken. At this stage, Eskom has held conceptual discussions with the applicable local authorities to determine the availability of appropriate land for employee villages, etc, but has not initiated detailed planning. The consistent dataset (Appendix C of the Revised Draft EIR Version 1) contains conceptual information on the facilities that will be required for the conventional nuclear power station.</p>
2	07 August 2011 Email	A Glaser Interested and Affected Party	<p>I am against the building of new nuclear plants at Thyspunt, Bantamsklip or Koeberg</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. Your comment will be addressed in the Revised Draft EIR Version 2 and Final EIR which will be placed before the Competent Authority for decision-making.</p>
3	07 August 2011	Angela Curtis Interested and Affected Party	<p>I am opposed to the flawed EIR being accepted.</p> <p>I am in support of the KAA submission.</p>	<p>Your comment and support for the Koeberg Alert Alliances' (KAA) submission is noted. Your comment will be addressed in the Revised Draft EIR Version 2 and Final EIR which will be placed before the Competent Authority for decision-making.</p>
4	07 August 2011 Email	Briaan Smit City and Area Planner Matzikama Municipality	<p>A land use application needs to be lodge with the Matzikama Municipality for land use approval before any construction may take place.</p>	<p>Your comment is noted. Land use applications are one of the more than 30 different authorisations that will be required for the proposed nuclear power station. Eskom is pursuing the environmental application first as it is a key authorisation. Should environmental authorisation be</p>

NO	DATE	NAME & ORGANISATION		
			Matzikama Municipality reserves the right for future comment.	granted, Eskom will apply for other authorisations.
5	07 August 2011 Email	Candice Pelser Interested and Affected Party	<p>I do not believe that the DEIR has sufficiently assessed the full impact of the proposed Nuclear-1.</p> <p>My specific concerns are well represented in the comments and questions submitted by the following organisations;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project 90 by 2030 • The Legal Resources Centre • Koeberg Alert Alliance • Earthlife Africa. <p>Please note my input as such.</p>	Your comment is noted. The responses to the comment from the various organisations listed by yourself will be addressed in the Revised Draft EIR Version 2 and Final EIR which will be placed before the Competent Authority for decision-making.
6	08 August 2011 Email	Chris Pretorius and Janli Maartens Interested and Affected Parties	<p>We, my wife, Janli Maartens and myself, Chris Pretorius, of Wolvengat, close to the proposed Bantamsklip site.</p> <p>Wish to object in the strongest to the proposed NUCLEAR development of this and any site in South Africa.</p> <p>When the rest of the developed and developing world has put a hold on developing any further nuclear power station, and are actually phasing those nuclear power stations that they have out, you want to develop (sic) them.</p> <p>Are we, SOUTH AFRICA, just to become the dumping ground for the "developed"</p>	<p>Your comment and objection to the Bantamsklip site is noted.</p> <p>It is not factually correct to state that the rest of the "developed and developing world has put a hold on developing any further nuclear power ..." The German government has taken a decision to phase out nuclear power. However, other European countries such as France and the United Kingdom are continuing to develop nuclear power as a key source of electricity. Several nuclear power stations are in the process of being constructed across the world, including in China, the United Kingdom and Finland.</p>

NO	DATE	NAME & ORGANISATION		
			<p>worlds technology seeing as their own countries no longer want it and well they the developers still just want to make more money out their technology which is outdated!! and dangerous to us humans, the fauna and flora and the wellbeing of our generations to come!!</p> <p>We have the most amazing country with the most amazing natural resources for alternative energy sources, yet you still want to contaminate it with unsightly nuclear power stations, you want to contaminate our air, our sea life, need I carry on.</p> <p>The basic bottom line is as follows; we object to you, ESKOM, developing the proposed NUCLEAR sites on the grounds that you are going to infringe on our basic human rights, and constitutional rights. And those of everyone who would be in the general area of the proposed sites.</p> <p>Regards, but with heavy concerns.</p>	
7	05 August 2011 Email	Leonie Mervis Interested and Affected Party	<p>I am against the building of a new nuclear power station at Thyspunt, Bantamsklip or Koeberg.</p> <p>I wish to fully endorse the Koeberg Alert Alliance (KAA) submission to the Nuclear-1 draft 2 EIR.</p>	Your comment and support for the KAA submission is noted. Your comment will be addressed in the Revised Draft EIR Version 2 and Final EIR which will be placed before the Competent Authority for decision-making.
8	06 August 2011	Fiona Ross	I learn with concern about the proposed	Your comment is noted.

NO	DATE	NAME & ORGANISATION		
	Email	Associate Professor – Department Social Anthropology – UCT	<p>nuclear site at Thyspunt.</p> <p>The area is important from a heritage point of view and the history and archaeology must be protected.</p> <p>Heritage and archaeological experts have identified the significance of the site and have strongly recommended that the site is unsuitable.</p> <p>It is unclear why these recommendations have not been followed.</p>	<p>We take note of your objection. However, recent additional monitoring of archaeological sites at Thyspunt (undertaken during the 2nd half of 2011 and therefore did not reflect in the Revised Draft EIR Version 1 of 2011, but is included in the Revised Draft EIR Version 2) indicate that there are very few archaeological sites within the proposed footprint of the power station and that these sites are of poor quality compared to the concentration of well-preserved archaeological sites along the coastline.</p> <p>The revised Heritage Impact Assessment (which will be provided to all I&APs for comment) concludes that <i>“it is possible to position the proposed nuclear power station in such a way that physical impacts to heritage sites of an archaeological nature can be minimised. Mitigation of any heritage material through sampling by controlled excavation, or creation of local exclusion areas is considered feasible with resources currently available.”</i> Some on-site storage (a small museum) may be necessary.</p>
9	08 August 2011 Email	Fiona Hinds Interested and Affected Party	I am opposed to the flawed EIR being accepted and I support the Koeberg Alert Alliance (KAA) submission.	Your comment and support for the KAA submission is noted. Your comment will be addressed in the Revised Draft EIR Version 2 and Final EIR which will be placed before the Competent Authority for decision-making.
10	07 August 2011 Email	Catherine and Hugh Corder Interested and Affected Parties	We Catherine and Hugh Corder object to the establishment of a nuclear power facility at Thyspunt on heritage grounds.	<p>Your comment is noted.</p> <p>The Heritage Impact Assessment (Appendix E) has assessed the potential impacts on heritage resources at all three alternative sites, including Thyspunt.</p> <p>We take note of your objection. However, recent additional monitoring of archaeological sites at Thyspunt</p>

NO	DATE	NAME & ORGANISATION		
				<p>(undertaken during the 2nd half of 2011 and therefore not yet reflected in the Revised Draft EIR of 2011) indicate that there are very few archaeological sites within the proposed footprint of the power station and that these sites are of poor quality compared to the concentration of well-preserved archaeological sites along the coastline.</p> <p>Therefore, the revised Heritage Impact Assessment (which will be provided to all I&APs for comment) concludes that <i>“it is possible to position the proposed nuclear power station in such a way that physical impacts to heritage sites of an archaeological nature can be minimised. Mitigation of any heritage material through sampling by controlled excavation, or creation of local exclusion areas is considered feasible with resources currently available.”</i> Some on-site storage (a small museum) may be necessary.</p>
11	07 August 2011 Email	Jenna da Silva Pinto Interested and Affected Party	<p>I am absolutely against the building of a new nuclear plant at Thyspunt, Bantamsklip or Koeberg.</p> <p>It is hard to understand why, whilst the rest of the world rethinks nuclear (some even cancelling their nuclear programmes), this country continues to forge ahead with little regard for the communities and future generations involved.</p> <p>Several critical issues have been raised by the Koeberg Alert Alliance (KAA) and I would like to endorse their submission.</p>	Your comment and support for the KAA submission is noted. Your comment will be addressed in the Revised Draft EIR Version 2 and Final EIR which will be placed before the Competent Authority for decision-making.
12	07 August 2011 Email	Jill Mackay Interested and Affected Party	I oppose acceptance of this EIR on the basis that it is flawed and therefore support the submission by the Koeberg	Your comment and support for the KAA submission is noted. Your comment will be addressed in the Revised Draft EIR Version 2 and Final EIR which will be placed

NO	DATE	NAME & ORGANISATION		
			Alert Alliance (KAA).	before the Competent Authority for decision-making.
13	07 August 2011 Email	Liezl Coetzee Interested and Affected Party	This is to note that I support the Koeberg Action Alliance's (KAA) submission concerning the incomplete nature of the Nuclear-1 EIR.	Your comment and support for the KAA submission is noted. Your comment will be addressed in the Revised Draft EIR Version 2 and Final EIR which will be placed before the Competent Authority for decision-making.
14	05 August 2011 Email	Margaret Carol Mervis Interested and Affected Party	<p>I am totally against the building of a new nuclear plant at Thuyspunt, Bantamsklip or Koeberg. We should all learn from the Japanese nuclear disaster.</p> <p>We have no right to expose future generations to the dangers and long term effects of such projects!</p>	<p>The design of the Fukushima Daiichi nuclear power station dates from the late 1960s and did not incorporate the substantial lessons in nuclear power station design that have been learnt in the decades since its construction. An analysis of the events leading to the Fukushima Daiichi incident will be included in the next revision of the EIR, which will be provided for public comment.</p> <p>One of the major differences between the design of the Fukushima Daiichi power station and later power stations in terms of spent fuel storage is that the Fukushima design includes the spent fuel pool in the containment structure, whereas in later designs (e.g. at Koeberg Nuclear Power Station), the spent fuel pool is separate from the containment structure and contamination in the containment structure does not impact access to, and operation of, spent fuel cooling systems. Several other major differences in nuclear power station design and operation have been implemented in the decades since Fukushima was built, including passive cooling.</p> <p>There are inherent dangers in nuclear technology (as with many other forms of technology) but if these are responsibly managed the risk to the public is negligible. The release of radioactivity from the Fukushima Daiichi plant is a regrettable incident that could have been avoided with proper planning. Unfortunately planning for</p>

NO	DATE	NAME & ORGANISATION	
			<p>the Fukushima Daiichi plant in terms of catering for tsunami events was poor, in that a very low tsunami was assumed than should be the case for a country like Japan, which is prone to frequent earthquakes of high magnitude. In contrast, emergency planning for the Koeberg Nuclear Power Station assumed a tsunami of 4 m, even though no tsunami has ever been recorded on the West Coast, and in spite of the fact that Southern Africa is seismically more stable than Japan. In addition to planning for a tsunami, planning for the Koeberg Nuclear Power Station assumes that a tsunami may coincide with a spring tide and major storm surges (a so-called meteo-tsunami event), and thus the terrace for the Power Station is built at a height of 8 m above sea level. Backup generators to supply power to the cooling systems has also been placed at heights of 12 m above sea level, besides the backup power that can be supplied from two gas-fired peaking power stations in proximity to the Power Station. Similar planning is in place for Nuclear-1, in that a combined tsunami and an exceptional storm surge has been assumed in deciding on the height of the nuclear island and the location of backup power supplies.</p> <p>Whilst the Fukushima Daiichi incident is without a doubt a tragic event, as it could have led to loss of life, some perspective is also required on this event. The tsunami was responsible for the loss of approximately 20 000 lives, the evacuation of approximately 450 000 people and the complete destruction of several coastal towns. On the other hand, not a single death or serious injury due to the radiation release from the power station has been recorded to date. This is not mentioned to minimise the significance of the nuclear incident, but to provide some perspective regarding the public perception of what is regarded as a significant risk. In the wake of the</p>

NO	DATE	NAME & ORGANISATION		
				<p>Fukushima incident, very critical attention has been focused on the nuclear power station. However, the everyday risk of living in vulnerable low-lying coastal areas prone to flooding seems to be tacitly accepted or at least not treated with nearly the same level of concern.</p>
15	06 August 2011 Email	Margaret Carol Mervis Interested and Affected Party	<p>I fully endorse the Koeberg Alert Alliance (KAA) submission to the Nuclear-1 draft 2 EIR.</p> <p>I am totally against the building of a new nuclear plant at Thyspunt, Bantamsklip or Koeberg.</p>	<p>Your comment and support for the KAA submission is noted. Your comment will be addressed in the Revised Draft EIR Version 2 and Final EIR which will be placed before the Competent Authority for decision-making.</p>
16	10 August 2011 Email	Mark Attwood Interested and Affected Party	<p>Please can I add my voice to the many who oppose the building of a new nuclear plant in SA.</p> <p>I am firmly against building of a new nuclear plant at Thyspunt, Bantamsklip or Koeberg and am opposed to this flawed EIR being accepted and hence support the KAA submission.</p> <p>Nuclear is a short-sighted and selfish way to generate power.</p> <p>The legacy it will leave for future generations is too ghastly to contemplate. We should be focussing our energy build firmly on sustainable sources of solar and wind.</p>	<p>Your comment and support for the KAA submission is noted. Your comment will be addressed in the Revised Draft EIR Version 2 and Final EIR which will be placed before the Competent Authority for decision-making.</p> <p>Your comment on development of renewable energy source is noted. It is not within the mandate of this EIA process to compare the costs and benefits of nuclear generation technology to renewable forms of electricity generation, since the EIA process is, by its very nature, a project-specific tool that focuses on a particular form of technology. Please refer to chapter 5 for a strategic discussion on form of power generation. However, government is pursuing renewable technologies in parallel to nuclear generation. It is to be noted that the Integrated Resource Plan (government's strategy for security of energy supply over the next two decades) requires a balanced mix of generation technologies, including 9 600 MW of nuclear and 18 700 MW of renewables. The purpose of nuclear generation is to provide reliable base-load power, which most of the renewable technologies are not capable of providing on</p>

NO	DATE	NAME & ORGANISATION		
				<p>the same scale. It is also pointed out in the Revised Draft EIR that a mixture of generation technologies is required in order to meet South Africa's future energy needs and that SA cannot place reliance on only a single form of technology or a limited number of technologies. Although the relative contribution of renewable technologies must increase over time, it is not a simple matter of replacing non-renewable technologies with renewable technologies.</p>
17	06 August 2011 Email	Rob McLeod Interested and Affected Party	<p>I wish to state that I am the opposed to this flawed and incomplete Nuclear-1 Environmental Impact Report being accepted.</p> <p>I hence not only support the Koeberg Alert Alliance (KAA) submission but press for this process to cease being bulldozed and demand that the public be better informed and consulted.</p>	<p>Your comment and support for the KAA submission is noted. Your comment will be addressed in the Revised Draft EIR Version 2 and Final EIR which will be placed before the Competent Authority for decision-making.</p>
18	07 August 2011 Email	Rod Tritton Interested and Affected Party	<p>Please let it be known that I know I speak for many people too busy and too apathetic to say for themselves when I say that I strongly believe that this EIR is flawed and unacceptable on a number of bases.</p> <p>I ardently support the Koeberg Alert Alliance (KAA) submission which quite plainly exposes a number of fatal flaws in this EIR, and I know that I speak for many people who cannot afford the time to be inundated by your thousands of pages of reports and caught up in the process, when they simply do not want anything</p>	<p>Your comment and support for the KAA submission is noted. Your comment will be addressed in the Revised Draft EIR Version 2 and Final EIR which will be placed before the Competent Authority for decision-making.</p>

NO	DATE	NAME & ORGANISATION		
			<p>nuclear in South Africa at all. Nuclear power is foolish and should be abolished, especially after the Japanese disaster.</p> <p>Nuclear power is patently unacceptable on many fronts, the expense being just one fatal flaw of nuclear power.</p> <p>The people who support nuclear are carelessly infecting the planet. Do you have plans to leave, or are you happy to infect your children with nuclear radiation?</p> <p>Wake up and let's stop this madness while we still can.</p>	
19	07 August 2011 Email	V Govindsamy Interested and Affected Party	I am against the building of a new nuclear plant at Thuyspunt, Bantamsklip or Koeberg and am opposed to the flawed EIR being accepted and hence support the KAA submission.	Your comment and support for the KAA submission is noted. Your comment will be addressed in the Revised Draft EIR Version 2 and Final EIR which will be placed before the Competent Authority for decision-making.
20	07 August 2011 Email	Stephen Syrett Interested and Affected Party	I am opposed to this flawed EIR being accepted and hence support the KAA submission.	Your comment and support for the KAA submission is noted. Your comment will be addressed in the Revised Draft EIR Version 2 and Final EIR which will be placed before the Competent Authority for decision-making.
21	02 August 2011 Email	Dr Susanne Godehart Interested and Affected Party	I support the submission of Earthlife Africa against the EIA for Nuclear 1.	Your comment and support for the Earthlife Africa submission is noted. Your comment will be addressed in the Revised Draft EIR Version 2 and Final EIR which will be placed before the Competent Authority for decision-making.
22	06 August 2011	Chris Liepold Interested and	Good day, I am writing on behalf of Chris G Liepold 21 Grosvenor Road Cape St	

NO	DATE	NAME & ORGANISATION		
	Email (sent by Tamara Manton)	Affected Party	Francis 6312 His objections are as follows; 1. Otters habitat is threatened. 2. Khoisan/Stranlopers (sic) fish traps and historical heritage needs to be protected.	1. Your objection is noted. The recommended position of the power station on the Thyspunt site takes into consideration the various sensitive features of the site, such as freshwater resources. The recommended footprint avoids open water sources. 2. The origin of the fish traps in the Thyspunt cannot without a doubt be traced back to Khoisan peoples who occupied the Thyspunt site. An analysis of the origin of these traps is included in the Heritage Impact Assessment – HIA (Appendix E22 of the Revised Draft EIR). The HIA reports as follows: <i>“Hine (2007) has re-examined the issue and found compelling historical evidence that most of the tidal fish traps existing today were built by colonial farmers in the 19th century and maintained by their descendants well in to the 20th century. What remains unknown is whether the tradition of tidal fish traps has historical continuity back to pre-colonial times. At present, the balance of evidence suggests this is not the case.”</i> We take note of concern for the historical heritage. However, recent additional monitoring of archaeological sites at Thyspunt (undertaken during the 2 nd half of 2011 and therefore not yet reflected in the Revised Draft EIR of 2011) indicate that there are very few archaeological sites within the proposed footprint of the power station and that these sites are of poor quality compared to the concentration of well-preserved archaeological sites along the coastline.

NO	DATE	NAME & ORGANISATION		
			<p>3. Tourism will be negatively affected (Garden Route is world famous).</p> <p>4. Emissions from plant with the prevailing South Westerly wind.</p> <p>5. 3km evacuation zone is implausible.</p> <p>6. How can our community's</p>	<p>The revised Heritage Impact Assessment (which will be provided to all I&APs for comment) concludes that <i>"it is possible to position the proposed nuclear power station in such a way that physical impacts to heritage sites of an archaeological nature can be minimised. Mitigation of any heritage material through sampling by controlled excavation, or creation of local exclusion areas is considered feasible with resources currently available."</i> Some on-site storage (a small museum) may be necessary.</p> <p>3. Your comment regarding tourism is noted. The concern on the impact on tourism is well-recorded in the Tourism Impact Assessment (Appendix E22 of the Revised Draft EIR). This study found that although tourism in the St. Francis region could be negatively affected during construction, there would most likely be not negative net impact on tourism over the long-term. This is consistent with the tourism experience near Koeberg Nuclear Power Station, where tourism products operate within sight of an operational nuclear power station. In contrast, should Nuclear-1 be constructed at Thyspunt, it would not be visible from St. Francis.</p> <p>4. Emission from the plant were modelled in detail in the Air Quality Assessment (Appendix E10 of the Revised Draft EIR) and found to be far below the level that would raise concern from a health perspective.</p> <p>5. Your comment is noted. Please note the EPZ proposed is as per the EUR standards. The NR will however determine the final EPZ radii during the</p>

NO	DATE	NAME & ORGANISATION		
			constitutional right to live without threat be taken away?	<p>NNR licensing process.</p> <p>6. Whilst it is true that there are (managed and well-controlled) risks associated with nuclear power generation, there are many other common risks (that have a far greater potential to lead to fatalities or serious and debilitating injuries) that the public is happy to accept on a daily basis. Such common risks include travelling in vehicles (more than 16,000 South African's killed on our roads each year – this does not count the number of serious injuries and incidents of paralysis) and common household chemicals like chlorine that can be used to make explosives but over which there is no control. In spite of the comparatively low risk of sickness or death from nuclear incidents (bearing in mind that there has been not a single fatality recorded from the release of radioactivity from Fukushima Daiichi but more than 20 000 combined deaths and missing persons recorded as a result of the tsunami), there remains a perception that nuclear technology results in an inherently greater risk of death or injury than other forms of commonplace risks. In spite of 20 000 deaths from the tsunami, there does not seem to be an equal perception of risk associated with living in coastal cities, living in areas prone to earthquakes or other commonplace risks that people have come to take for granted. Whilst there are numerous calls for nuclear technology to be avoided as a result of its risks, there does not seem to be a corresponding demand for other technologies (that carry far higher risks) to be avoided.</p>
23	07 August 2011 Email	Anka Esterhuizen Interested and Affected Party	I have no additional comments, and stand by my original reasons for opposing the Nuclear Plant envisaged for Bantamsklip.	<p>Your comment is noted.</p> <p>The location of Nuclear-1 in either the Eastern or</p>

NO	DATE	NAME & ORGANISATION		
			<p>The only other thing I want to add is:</p> <p>I strongly believe, that renewable sources of energy, proven successful throughout the world need to be explored for the use of the immediate, and surrounding inhabitants of the South Western Cape.</p> <p>We have no aluminium smelting here, or other activities that require huge amounts of electricity. So, the area that has these industrial loads should look for energy closer to home.</p> <p>I request that you keep me on your files as an Interested & Affected Party, and would like to be kept in the loop.</p>	<p>Western Cape is meant to address the electricity deficit in both these regions, where electricity demand exceeds electricity supply. The sources of demand include a range of activities, including household, retail and industrial. On average Eskom needs an increase of 13% in power generation per year and an additional 3% from independent power producers to meet electricity supply needs. It is uneconomical and risky to import the majority of the region's electricity from the coal-fired power stations on the Mpumalanga Highveld, and the electricity production from the Koeberg Nuclear Power Station is already fully utilised in the Western Cape. Eskom's power planning for the Western Cape already takes into account the additional generation capacity from other sources such as pumped storage in the Western Cape. Additional generation capacity is still required even after such sources are considered.</p> <p>Whilst renewable energy sources are also being developed in the Western Cape, this does not negate the need for a reliable large scale base-load generation alternative in this region.</p>
24	07 August 2011 Email	Tristen Taylor Earthlife Africa	Please note that the South African Municipal Workers` Union (SAMWU) has signed onto the Earthlife Africa Jhb submission to the Revised Draft EIA for Nuclear 1 (submitted to Arcus GIBB on the 5/8/2011).	Your comment and support for the Earthlife Africa submission is noted. Your comment will be addressed in the Revised Draft EIR Version 2 and Final EIR which will be placed before the Competent Authority for decision-making.
25	01 August 2011 Email	Dr David Fig Honary (sic) Research Associate, Environmental Evaluation Unit, Department of Environmental and	<p>In view of my support for the submissions mentioned below, please attach my name to the submissions of the following organisations in regard to the Revised Draft EIR for Nuclear-1</p> <p>1. Earthlife Africa Johannesburg/Legal</p>	Your comment and support for the Earthlife Africa and SA Faith Communities submissions are noted. Your comment will be addressed in the Revised Draft EIR Version 2 and Final EIR which will be placed before the Competent Authority for decision-making.

NO	DATE	NAME & ORGANISATION		
		Geographical Sciences, University of Cape Town Chairperson of the Biowatch Trust Independent environmental policy researcher	Resources Centre. 2. Southern Africa Faith Communities' Environmental Institute.	
26	06 August 2011 Email	Daniel Hutchinson Rebelsrus Trust Member	The EIR does not mention the impact on the stone age "fish kraals" at Thyspunt. These "fish kraals" are an example of "living heritage": Given the right combination of weather and tidal conditions, fish still get trapped in these incredible structures built by early hunter-gatherer communities. Any change to water temperature or salinity would cause these unique structure to stop "working", cutting off this glimpse into the pre-colonial past.	The origin of the fish traps in the Thyspunt cannot without a doubt be traced back to Khoisan peoples who occupied the Thyspunt site. An analysis of the origin of these traps is included in the Heritage Impact Assessment – HIA (Appendix E22 of the Revised Draft EIR). The HIA reports as follows: " <i>Hine (2007) has re-examined the issue and found compelling historical evidence that most of the tidal fish traps existing today were built by colonial farmers in the 19th century and maintained by their descendants well in to the 20th century. What remains unknown is whether the tradition of tidal fish traps has historical continuity back to pre-colonial times. At present, the balance of evidence suggests this is not the case.</i> " GIBB has conferred with Dr Tammy Robinson (<i>pers. com.</i> 09 November 2012) the Marine Specialist on the Nuclear-1 team and she has confirmed that the rise in temperature and salinity will not affect the fish kraals in the vicinity of the Thyspunt site.
27	07 July 2011 Email	Harris Johnson Interested and Affected Party	Please tell me are you producing nuclear weapon? I want to understand your email or is this Auto respond?	Email reply on 22 August 2011: The GIBB Nuclear-1 Public Participation Office acknowledge receipt of your email hereunder dated 07 July 2011 and confirm that this Public Participation office deals with Nuclear-1 Revised Draft EIR (DEA Ref No:

NO	DATE	NAME & ORGANISATION		
				12/12/20/944) for a proposed Nuclear Power Station.
28	02 August 2011 Email	Francois Bekker Interested and Affected Party	<p>On previous occasions I have requested information about the Milnerton geo-technical fault line that the current Nuclear reactor is built upon.</p> <p>You did not provide any information to us!</p> <p>What would be the result of a similar strength earthquake happens in the region of the current plant?</p> <p>We have a farm adjacent to Koeberg Nature reserve and would like to know urgently what the exclusion zones, or planned exclusion zones are, as it would severely affect what we could do on the land, and it would also affect the price of the land.</p> <p>I do not approve of the current processes your (sic) are following as you do not consult with adjacent landowners whose land prices could be severely affected if another plant is built nearby the current Nuclear plant.</p> <p>What is the expected lifespan of the current plant?</p> <p>Please provide the requested information</p>	<p>The Koeberg Nuclear Power Station (KNPS) is not built on a fault.</p> <p>The following extract from the Seismic Risk Assessment (Appendix E4 of the Revised Draft EIR Version 1) deals with the postulated Milnerton Fault. <i>“Dames and Moore (1976) concluded that enough circumstantial evidence exists to postulate the presence of a northwest striking fault offshore of Duynefontein but that it does not come closer than 8 km to the site. It is however possible that such a postulated fault could pass anywhere between 7 and 10 km offshore of Duynefontein (the inferred Melkbos Ridge Fault passes 7.5 km from the Koeberg Nuclear Power Station). No new research has been performed to confirm or refute the presence of the postulated fault or its point of closest approach to the site. The inference that the event happened closer to Milnerton than to Duynefontein is based on the reported damage to the farmhouse at Jan Biesjes Kraal.”</i> Should you have any scientifically validated peer-reviewed information to challenge these findings, GIBB would welcome the opportunity to consider this.</p> <p>The Koeberg Nuclear Power Station has been designed to withstand a peak ground acceleration of 0.3g, which is equivalent to an earthquake of magnitude 7 on the Richter Scale (directly below Koeberg).</p> <p>The sizes of the planned Emergency Planning Zones (EPZs) for Nuclear-1 are documented in Chapter 3 of the</p>

NO	DATE	NAME & ORGANISATION		
			<p>on an urgent basis, and I would like to discuss the matter with the head of GIBB or Eskom.</p> <p>I do not approve of the extension of the plant at Koeberg, as we would be affected by it.</p>	<p>Revised Draft EIR. These zones are much smaller than the current EPZs for the Koeberg Nuclear Power Station. Therefore, should Nuclear-1 be established at Duynefontein, Nuclear-1 would have no impact on land use.</p> <p>Accordingly, based on the potential presence of an offshore fault and the seismic events that have taken place in the Western Cape, the Koeberg Nuclear Power Station has been built on an “aseismic raft”, and all the components and plant systems that are important to nuclear safety have been designed to these seismic specifications so that they will be able to perform their expected functions during and after an earthquake.</p> <p>The expected life span of the Koeberg Nuclear Power Station is 40 years (i.e. it is expected to shut down by 2024), unless upgrading takes place to extend its life-span.</p> <p>Lastly the Nuclear-1 Stakeholder Register contains the contact details of in excess of 4 000 registered Interested and Affected parties including adjacent landowners. These contact details have been used to inform the public (via letter and e-mail) about the EIA process and the availability of documents for review. The team furthermore utilises public meetings, advertisements and the GIBB and Eskom websites to further communicate updates and information regarding the project to all concerned parties.</p>

NO	DATE	NAME & ORGANISATION		
29	03 August 2011 Email	Amanda Jephson and Charl Laubscher Interested and Affected Parties	Support Earthlife JNB Submission.	Your comment is noted. Your comment will be added to the Revised Draft EIR Version 2 and Final EIR which will be placed before the Competent Authority for decision-making.
30	08 August 2011 Email	Chris Barratt St Francis Kromme Trust	<p>Eskom Environmental Impact Assessment (DEA Ref. No.: 12/12/20/944) for a Proposed Nuclear Power Station and Associated Infrastructure - Revised Draft Environmental Impact Assessment Report</p> <p>We refer to the above and would advise as follows</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We are participating members of the Thyspunt Alliance and as such wish you to note that we fully support their submission. 2. You have not responded to items raise by this organisation's representatives (at various public meeting - but not limited to these meetings). 3. We believe that the final rating criteria, as well as your conclusions, are totally biased in favour of the developer and as mentioned previously reserve our rights. <p>We await hearing from you and to receiving the revised documentation as</p>	<p>Your comment and support for the Thyspunt Alliance submission is noted. Your comment will be added to the Revised Draft EIR Version 2 and Final EIR which will be placed before the Competent Authority for decision-making.</p> <p>Our previous responses to your organisation's comments remain valid. We have responded in detail to the issue of the rating system in the response to the Thyspunt Alliance (Issues and Response Report 64 – your submission dated 08 August 2012).</p>

NO	DATE	NAME ORGANISATION	&	
			advised by your representatives.	

Yours faithfully



For GIBB (Pty) Ltd
The Nuclear-1 EIA Team