



environmental affairs

Department:
Environmental Affairs
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

Private Bag X447, Pretoria, 0001, Environment House, 473 Steve Biko Road, Pretoria, 0002

Email: Appealsdirector@environment.gov.za

APPEAL RESPONSE REPORT

PROJECT NAME/TITLE: Nuclear-1

PROJECT LOCATION: Duynefontein

PROJECT REFERENCE NUMBER: 12/12/20/994

DATE PROJECT/ACTIVITY AUTHORISED:

DETAILS OF THE APPELLANT	DETAILS OF THE APPLICANT
Name of appellant: Fish Hoek Valley Ratepayers and Residents Association (FHVRRA)	Name of applicant:
Appellant's representative (if applicable): Brian Youngblood Chair	Applicant's representative (if applicable):
Postal address: 8 Fifth Avenue, Fish Hoek 7975	Postal Address:
Email Address: bdyoungblood@gmail.com	Email Address:
Telephone number: 021 782 1950	Telephone number:
Fax Number: N/A	Fax number:

GROUNDS OF APPEAL	RESPONDING STATEMENT	COMMENTS FROM DEPARTMENT
<p>1. Most energy costing studies compare only the price of the fuel and say that nuclear is quite cheap. Some go a step further and include the initial build cost of the plant. What most studies do not include are the on-going maintenance, on-going disposal costs of spent fuel rods and safe plant decommissioning, making nuclear the most expensive per unit of electricity generated when compared with other fuel sources. In our case, even the initial cost and associated debt servicing should have rendered this project as a non-starter.</p>		
<p>2. Additionally, there are risks with nuclear plants not associated with other fuel types of plants, such as the implication of design flaws, aircraft strikes and seismic (peak ground acceleration of 0.3g for Koeberg is already at the threshold level with no margin for error for any increases due to any plant expansions) factors, not properly addressed in the specialist reports. Fukushima, Chernobyl, Three Mile Island, Enrico Fermi, SL-1, Sodium Reactor Experiment and Windscale were all supposed to be designed</p>		

safe and yet, look what happened. Due to the proximity (26km) of Koeberg to the greater Cape Town area, these risks and their acute and chronic effects on health are too great to be contemplated. Cape Town is too pretty to become a wasteland due to radioactive fallout. The increase in the cancer rate is too great as reported by those living anywhere near the fallout areas just mentioned. Thirty years later and the exclusion zone (Zone of Alienation) around Chernobyl is 1000 miles (1610 kms). Johannesburg and Pretoria wouldn't be safe.		
3. Capetonians have lost all faith in Eskom being able to maintain the existing Koeberg themselves when a metal bolt / loose magnetic material was found in February 2006 to have damaged the rotor and stator rods and now Eskom wants to start building here again.		
4. We agree that there should be a diversified energy mix, but none should be dependent on obtaining spare parts from overseas. Solar Voltaics are starting to be manufactured in South Africa, which follows local assembly. These are decent jobs producing quickly scalable energy alternatives. Uppington's Khi Solar One appears to hold great promise for being the model to produce dependable baseload in that it can generate electricity during peak demands after the sun goes down and doesn't require wind or wave action. These just mentioned are all non-polluting (vs		

coal), sustainable and renewable energy sources.		
5. The pre-set minds public participation processes in South Africa have become communication exercises, not related to consulting, much less listening as required to be truly participative. Subject matter experts are simply ignored.		
6. Germany is in the process of ridding itself of their nuclear power plants (from 23% of its energy to 0%). http://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-13592208 What do the Germans know?		

ARR comments by Case Officer

Name & Surname:

Approved by Supervisor

Name & Surname:

Date:

Signature:

.....

Date:

Signature:

.....