

SUMMARY OF ISSUES RAISED BY REGULATORY AUTHORITIES AND IAPs

ISSUE RAISED	BY WHOM AND WHEN	RESPONSE GIVEN BY PROJECT TEAM (as amended/incorporated for the purposes of the scoping report submission)
Procedural issues		
<p>This is just a procedural task for you to consult with the landowners but we know our comments will fall on deaf ears because there is no way that a small community can formally object against a company that has invested billions into this project.</p>	<p>Comment raised by Johan Young at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015</p>	<p>Stakeholder engagement is an integral part of the EIA process, and moreover it is a legal requirement. All comments raised during the scoping and EIA/EMP phases will be compiled and submitted to the relevant decision making authority. These comments will be taken into consideration when the EIA is reviewed by the Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA).</p>
<p>How wide an area does the EIA cover?</p>	<p>Comments raised by Derik de Jager at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015</p>	<p>In terms of the actual area covered by the EIA, this will vary from one specialist study to another depending on the expected spatial scale of the anticipated impacts (for example some specialist investigations will be limited to the project site only and others will extend beyond the site boundary).</p> <p>It should be noted that the area for the public participation process is determined by the interested and affected parties (IAPs) identified and engaged as part of the process. In this regard IAPs include landowners, landusers, communities, industry and NGOs within the project site and in the surrounding area.</p>
<p>I do not have much faith in EIA processes in general especially looking at the projects that have been approved and developed in this area.</p>	<p>Comment raised by Johan Young at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015</p>	<p>South African environmental laws and regulations have, in recent years, become much more stringent and onerous than they were previously. The EIA process will be run in accordance with these laws and regulations.</p>

ISSUE RAISED	BY WHOM AND WHEN	RESPONSE GIVEN BY PROJECT TEAM (as amended/incorporated for the purposes of the scoping report submission)
In European countries there is a greater consideration for the environment. I am concerned about people's consciousness and lack of emotional value attached to the environment.	Comment raised by Hannes Olckers at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015	
I am strongly against the building of the smelter adjacent to my property (Remainder of the farm Grootkuil).	Comment raised by Marietjie Schoeman, via email, 27 July 2015	Your objection has been noted.
The only going option forward is that Siyanda will buy our portion adjacent to the smelter.	Comment raised by Marietjie Schoeman, via email, 27 July 2015	Your comment has been noted and will be forwarded to Siyanda for consideration.
<p>On-going stakeholder engagement meetings/forums should be held</p> <p>Relevant IAPs from the Wildebeeslaagte development should be engaged</p> <p>The solar project should be engaged</p>	Comments by Philip Schoeman and Pier De Vries during focused scoping meeting with Union Section Mine, 13 May 2015	Your comments have been noted. Stakeholder engagement is an integral part of the EIA process and moreover it is a legal requirement. Relevant parties involved in the Solar Project have been included in the stakeholder engagement process.
If the community can object to this project what will happen?	Comment raised by Kgosi Ramakoka during scoping meeting, Mmansterre, 21 July 2015	Any objection will be included in the record and submitted to the relevant decision making authority. These objections will be taken into consideration when the EIA is reviewed by the Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA).
Meetings should be scheduled at least every 6 months from construction to operation to keep the public updated with the process with regards to the operation of the smelter.	Comment raised by Sandy McGill, Mr and Mrs Schoeman at the scoping meeting, Swartklip Rec Centre, 21 July 2015	Your recommendation has been noted and this will be put forward to the Siyanda team.
Has SLR consulted with the surrounding landowners and land-users with regards to the proposed project?	Comment raised by Makahane Rudzani (DWS) at the authority site visit-meeting, Swartklip Rec Centre, 23 July 2015	Public scoping meetings were conducted with surrounding landowners and landusers. In addition to advertising the project in the Kwevoel and Sowetan newspapers, site notices were placed in and around the project area and surrounding communities, and background information documents (BIDs) were circulated.

ISSUE RAISED	BY WHOM AND WHEN	RESPONSE GIVEN BY PROJECT TEAM (as amended/incorporated for the purposes of the scoping report submission)
SLR should consult the Environmental Management Framework as a guideline.	Comment raised by Vincent Raphunga (WDM: Air Quality) at the authority site visit-meeting, Swartklip Rec Centre, 23 July 2015	The relevant EMFs, IDPs and SDFs have been taken into account as part of the compilation of the scoping report. Specific reference to the relevant documents has been made in Section 4.1, Section 6 and Section 7.4.12 of the scoping report.
<p>The Department further submits that the assessment of impacts related to the proposed development must take into consideration the following tools;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Limpopo Conservation Plan of 2013; - The Environmental Management Framework for the Waterberg District; - The Mining and Biodiversity Guidelines; - The Thabazimbi Spatial Development Framework and - Waterberg Spatial Development Framework. 	Comment raised by Mokgadi Mogoshoa (Limpopo Dept of Economic Development, Environment & Tourism) email dated 31 July 2015	
You may send a copy of the Scoping Report in terms of NEMA to LEDET for commenting.	Comment raised by Mokgadi Mogoshoa (Limpopo Dept of Economic Development, Environment & Tourism) email dated 31 July 2015	The Scoping Report will be distributed to all commenting and competent authorities and will also be made available to the public at selected venues.
The department of Water and Sanitation would like to see the service agreement letter between Siyanda and the Waterberg municipality for water supply.	Comment raised by Makahane Rudzani (DWS) at the authority site visit-meeting, Swartklip Rec Centre, 23 July 2015	It has been noted that your department would like to see the service agreement letter.
Technical issues		
Will ore be sourced from other operations or will it only be sourced from Swartklip? The size of the plant suggests that it will be able to process more ore than will be provided by Swartklip.	Comment raised by Hannes Olckers at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015	At this stage in project planning, it is expected that incoming chrome concentrate will be sourced from Union Section (Swartklip) mine and from the Amandebult mine which is adjacent to the Thabazimbi road

ISSUE RAISED	BY WHOM AND WHEN	RESPONSE GIVEN BY PROJECT TEAM (as amended/incorporated for the purposes of the scoping report submission)
Technology in engineering has developed over the years to a point where humans can actually co-exist with industrial developments. There are many advantages for everyone in such a project and at the end of the day we need to measure and take into account all the advantages as well as the disadvantages of such a project.	Comment raised by Basie Kruger at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015	The EIA report will assess both the positive and negative impacts associated with the proposed project.
How much water will this operation utilise, since I realise it is a large plant.	Comment raised by Hannes Olckers at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015	The operational phase water requirements are explained further in Section 4.2.2 of the scoping report.
Where is additional water going to come from for the purposes of the project? There is already a shortage of water in the town of Northam.	Comment raised by Hannes Olckers at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015	At this stage, it is expected that water for the project will be sourced from Union Section Mine. Other water supply alternatives currently being considered in the scoping report include borehole water as well as municipal water. More detail on the preferred alternative will be provided in the EIA report.
Will material transport only be done via road?	Comment raised by Hannes Olckers at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015	Finished product transport will be done mostly by rail, with some material transport being done by road if required. Ore will be transported either by rail or road (depending on the source). Other raw material will be transported by road. More detail on this is provided in Section 4.2.2 of the scoping report.
Why does the smelter have to be located at the proposed location?	Comment raised by Johan Young at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015	Several alternatives for the location of the project infrastructure have been considered. More detail is provided in Section 7 of the scoping report.
What is the proposed height of the chimney?	Comment raised by William Segone at scoping meeting, Mmansterre, 21 July 2015	The proposed height of the chimney is 65m (response by Andre Esterhuizen). This detail has been included in Section 4.2.2. of the scoping report.
Why not locate the proposed smelter next to the existing Swartklip mine? There is no procedure for zoning, it seems like anyone can propose their new developments	Comments raised by Sandy McGill, Mr and Mrs Schoeman at the scoping meeting, Swartklip Rec Centre, 21 July 2015	Several alternatives for the location of the project infrastructure have been considered. More detail is provided in Section 7 of the scoping report. The preferred alternative for the project

ISSUE RAISED	BY WHOM AND WHEN	RESPONSE GIVEN BY PROJECT TEAM (as amended/incorporated for the purposes of the scoping report submission)
wherever they choose.		infrastructure is located in the western section of portion 3 of the farm Grootkuil which is immediately adjacent to Union Section Mine as the primary ore source will be from that mine.
The proposed smelter could be developed anywhere in South Africa, why has Siyanda decided to propose the development here?		
If the project is approved and it happens to be that the smelter is located here in the village what will happen to the residents?	Comment raised by Vuyiseka Ngukutu at scoping meeting, Kwetsheza, 22 July 2015	The proposed location of the smelter is on portion 3 of the farm Grootkuil. The smelter will not be moved to Kwetsheza which is approximately 7 km from the proposed project.
What is the product from the smelter?	Comment raised by Busanya Kubakhaya at scoping meeting, Kwetsheza, 22 July 2015	Ferrochrome
Why has Siyanda decided to develop a new smelter when there is already an existing smelter at the Swartklip mine?	Comment raised by Makahane Rudzani (DWS) at the authority site visit-meeting, Swartklip Rec Centre, 23 July 2015	The Swartklip smelter is a platinum smelter whereas the proposed smelter would be a ferrochrome smelter. These two smelter types are different (response by Bheki Lebeko of Siyanda).
Our civil design team will be reviewing the proposed slag dump design and I emphasize the importance of a liner in accordance with the new regulations.		The engineering design for the slag dump will form part of the EIA which will be submitted for your departments review.
Where are the 700 people going to live during the construction phase?	Comment raised by Sandy McGill, Mr and Mrs Schoeman at the scoping meeting, Swartklip Rec Centre, 21 July 2015	Staff hired for the construction phase will be from nearby towns and communities. No housing will be provided on site.
Groundwater issues		
Will groundwater be tested for the purposes of the project? I no longer have any drinking water available in my boreholes	Comments raised by Johan Young at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015	SLR has undertaken the hydrocensus which will be used to inform the groundwater specialist study. The terms of reference for the groundwater study are included in Section 8.3.7 of the scoping report.
I am concerned about the groundwater impacts as a result of the slag dump.		
We are concerned about the water related impacts.	Comment by Philip Schoeman and Pier De Vries during focused scoping meeting with Union Mine, 13 May 2015	

ISSUE RAISED	BY WHOM AND WHEN	RESPONSE GIVEN BY PROJECT TEAM (as amended/incorporated for the purposes of the scoping report submission)
<p>Pivots on our farm cannot be used anymore due to the lack of water.</p> <p>Water levels in our boreholes have dropped significantly from 24m to 60m.</p> <p>Water is very scarce in the area. I do not know any borehole in the area that still has water.</p> <p>The issue with regards to the lack of water is a cumulative issue as no mine will take responsibility for the lack of water.</p> <p>Water is being drawn down into the pits. Therefore Siyanda should seek alternative means of sourcing water because the groundwater is very scarce for all farmers.</p>	<p>Comments raised by Sandy McGill, Mr and Mrs Schoeman at the scoping meeting, Swartklip Rec Centre, 21 July 2015</p>	<p>In addition to possibly sourcing water from boreholes on site, Siyanda is also investigating sourcing water from Union Section Mine. Detail on this is included in Section 4.2.2 of the scoping report.</p>
<p>What are the chances that they can include neighbouring farms in the groundwater study</p>	<p>Comment raised by Johan Young at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015</p>	<p>SLR included Mr Johan Young's borehole in the hydrocensus. Groundwater quality and quantity information will be made available in the EIA report.</p>
<p>What is meant by a weathered aquifer?</p>	<p>Comment raised by Hannes Olckers at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015</p>	<p>A weathered aquifer is usually shallow and is called the weather aquifer due to the weathering (or erosion) of the shallow geology through mechanical and chemical processes. More information on the aquifer type is provided in Section 7.4.1.7 of the scoping report.</p>
<p>Surface Water issues</p>		
<p>The Brakspruit river runs through the site and when it rains, this river flows heavily, therefore it is important that water contamination is investigated for pollution spread downstream.</p> <p>The Crocodile river is currently flowing with sewage water only. My concern is the impact that projects such as this will have in worsening issues like this in watercourses.</p> <p>When you refer to keeping "dirty water" separate, what do you mean?</p>	<p>Comments raised by Adri Young at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015.</p>	<p>Your concern has been noted. This will be investigated as part of the hydrology study, the terms of reference for which have been included in Section 8.3.6 of the scoping report.</p> <p>Dirty water (from surface runoff on site) will need to be contained in a dirty water containment system such as pollution control</p>

ISSUE RAISED	BY WHOM AND WHEN	RESPONSE GIVEN BY PROJECT TEAM (as amended/incorporated for the purposes of the scoping report submission)
		dams etc. to ensure that it is kept separate from clean water which will be diverted away from the site. As listed in the terms of reference for the hydrology specialist study (Section 8.3.6 of the scoping report) a detailed stormwater management plan will be designed by a civil engineer and this will be included in the EIA report.
What will happen if groundwater and surface water is contaminated by the proposed smelter plant?	Comment raised by Sello Mogale at scoping meeting, Mmansterre, 21 July 2015	Potential surface water and groundwater contamination will be investigated as part of the hydrology and groundwater specialist studies, the terms of reference for which have been included in Section 8.3.6 and 8.3.7 of the scoping report.
Are you saying that there will not be any pollution in the rivers?	Comment raised by Sandy McGill, Mr and Mrs Schoeman at the scoping meeting, Swartklip Rec Centre, 21 July 2015	Part of the scope of the hydrology specialist study will be to identify the areas which might be potential pollution sources. The terms of reference for the hydrology study are included in Section 8.3.6 of the scoping report. This will be investigated further and the results will be provided in the EIA.
For the purposes of the WULA, SLR should identify all relevant water uses on the proposed site and surrounding the proposed site	Comment raised by Makahane Rudzani (DWS) at the authority site visit-meeting, Swartklip Rec Centre, 23 July 2015	All relevant water uses will be identified and applied for.
Biodiversity issues		
I feel lucky to come home/retire in place that has such rich biodiversity, and this is being destroyed by projects in the area.	Comment raised by Hannes Olckers at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015	Your concern regarding biodiversity impacts has been noted and this will be investigated further in the biodiversity specialist study being undertaken for the project. The terms of reference for the biodiversity specialist study have been included in Section 8.3.5 of the scoping report and the specialist study will be provided in the EIA report.
We are concerned about the biodiversity. It does not just include the larger more easily visible animals. What about the bees and those parts of nature which are not easily seen?	Comment raised by Adri Young at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015	A specialist biodiversity investigation will be undertaken as part of the EIA/EMP process. Included in this will be an impact assessment on the flora and fauna in the area. The terms of reference for the biodiversity specialist study have been included in Section 8.3.5 of the scoping report and the specialist study will be provided in the EIA report.

ISSUE RAISED	BY WHOM AND WHEN	RESPONSE GIVEN BY PROJECT TEAM (as amended/incorporated for the purposes of the scoping report submission)
<p>We would also like some sort of specialist to come and see why our trees and grasses are dying. We think it may be "acid rain" from the present smelter - and a second smelter will probably make it worse. The trees that have died include: Maroelas, Sickle-bush, Dombeya (wild pear), "Kan-nie Dood, Jacket Plums, and Prickly Pears. A number of waterbuck and reed-buck also just died for no apparent reason.</p>	<p>Comment raised by Sandy McGill, via email, 29 July 2015</p>	<p>This is not part of the scope of the Siyanda EIA. If it will help SLR can recommend specialists that could be commissioned by you.</p>
<p>I am concerned about the conservation of the rich birdlife in the area. On our farm, there is a bird species of Fluff-tail which is found nowhere else in the country.</p>	<p>Comments raised by Sandy McGill, Mr and Mrs Schoeman at the scoping meeting, Swartklip Rec Centre, 21 July 2015</p>	<p>Your concern regarding biodiversity impacts has been noted and this will be investigated further in the biodiversity specialist study being undertaken for the project. The terms of reference for the biodiversity specialist study are provided in Section 8.3.5 of the scoping report. The specialist study will be provided in the EIA report.</p>
<p>There are more protected trees in this area than you mentioned in your presentation.</p>	<p>Comments raised by Sandy McGill, Mr and Mrs Schoeman at the scoping meeting, Swartklip Rec Centre, 21 July 2015</p>	<p>Your concern regarding biodiversity impacts has been noted and this will be investigated further in the biodiversity specialist study being undertaken for the project. The terms of reference for the biodiversity specialist study are provided in Section 8.3.5 of the scoping report. It should be noted that during the scoping level public engagement phase of the project most of the baseline environment details were sourced from national databases, however greater depth and detail on the current biodiversity status will be provided in the specialist studies which will be available as part of the EIA report.</p>
<p>This area is not classified as the Dwaalboom veld type as you have mentioned in your presentation</p>		
<p>Air quality issues</p>		
<p>I am concerned about air quality impacts. When the southerly wind blows, I will be breathing this air from the plant.</p>	<p>Comment raised by Hannes Olckers at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015</p>	<p>This will be assessed in the air specialist study, the terms of reference of which are included in Section 8.3.8 of the scoping report.</p>
<p>We are concerned about air quality impacts</p>	<p>Comment by Philip Schoeman and Pier De Vries during focused scoping meeting with Union Mine, 13 May 2015</p>	
<p>I am concerned about the air quality impacts</p>	<p>Comment raised by William Segone at</p>	

ISSUE RAISED	BY WHOM AND WHEN	RESPONSE GIVEN BY PROJECT TEAM (as amended/incorporated for the purposes of the scoping report submission)
and how far the pollution will travel from the proposed smelter.	scoping meeting, Mmansterre, 21 July 2015	
We are concerned about the dust fallout and the impacts that it might have on the receiving environment.	Comments raised by Sandy McGill, Mr and Mrs Schoeman at the scoping meeting, Swartklip Rec Centre, 21 July 2015	
Dust from existing mines is already an issue for neighbouring farmers. There is active monitoring done by the mines however according to the regulations the mine dust is under the exceedance limits. This does not make sense because we still experience veld deterioration due to the dust.		
I am concerned about air quality impacts with regard to the health associated impacts.	Comment raised by Grace Goso at scoping meeting, Kwetsheza, 22 July 2015	
You mentioned that there is currently baseline air quality monitoring done for the proposed project, would you kindly confirm the duration of the baseline monitoring.	Comment raised by Stanley Koenait (WDM: Air Quality) at the authority site visit-meeting, Swartklip Rec Centre, 23 July 2015	The duration for baseline monitoring is 12 months and commenced in June 2015.
What parameters are being measured as part of your baseline monitoring campaign?		The parameters measured include: dust fallout, PM10, PM2.5, SO2, NO2 and Volatile Organic Compounds.
Noise issues		
I am concerned about noise impacts.	Comment raised by Hannes Olckers at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015	This will be assessed in the noise specialist study, the terms of reference for which are included in Section 8.3.9 of the scoping report. The results of the study will be included in the EIA report.
We are concerned about the noise related impacts	Comment by Philip Schoeman and Pier De Vries during focused scoping meeting with Union Mine, 13 May 2015	
How far will noise travel from the proposed smelter?	Comment raised by William Segone at scoping meeting, Mmansterre, 21 July 2015	
The current noise levels are already a concern and should be monitored. On our farm we can hear the reverse hooters of trucks and the noise from bulldozers.	Comment raised by Sandy McGill, Mr and Mrs Schoeman at the scoping meeting, Swartklip Rec Centre, 21 July 2015	
Blasting issues		

ISSUE RAISED	BY WHOM AND WHEN	RESPONSE GIVEN BY PROJECT TEAM (as amended/incorporated for the purposes of the scoping report submission)
Should there be blasting, Siyanda should notify surrounding landowners and land-users ahead of time	Comment raised by Makahane Rudzani (DWS) at the authority site visit-meeting, Swartklip Rec Centre, 23 July 2015	Should blasting be undertaken this would be minimal and limited to the construction phase (for foundations only). Notifications will be provided. The terms of reference for further blasting investigations are included in Section 8.3.4 of the scoping report.
Land use issues		
What is the project area currently zoned as?	Comment raised by Johan Young at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015	According to the 2015/16 Integrated Development Plan for the Waterberg District Municipality, and as confirmed by the Thabazimbi Local Municipality the project area is currently zoned as a "mining focus area" and a "major infrastructure corridor area". See Section 6 of the scoping report. This will be verified by Siyanda prior to the development of the project.
If the proposed project area is currently zoned for agricultural purposes, a re-zoning process would need to be followed.	Comment raised by Makahane Rudzani (DWS) at the authority site visit-meeting, Swartklip Rec Centre, 23 July 2015	
The portion that is our biggest concern is left from the tar road from Northam towards Swartklip.	Comment raised by Marietjie Schoeman, via email, 27 July 2015	It has been noted that you are concerned about the portion of land on the left of the tar road soon after the Tiramogo Lodge Entrance (when travelled away from Northam). This is located adjacent to the Siyanda property, but not adjacent to where project infrastructure will be.
Soil issues		
It should be noted that the quality of soil is good. I have farmed sunflowers on my property for a long time with a successful yield	Comment raised by Sandy McGill, Mr and Mrs Schoeman at the scoping meeting, Swartklip Rec Centre, 21 July 2015	Baseline soil conditions will be included in the soils specialist study, the terms of reference for which are included in Section 8.3.3 of the scoping report.
Waste issues		
When you refer to the disposal of waste at a designated landfill site, I am concerned that it will be like the dumping site on the Brits Road just outside Northam.	Comment raised by Johan Young at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015	The disposal of waste will be done at a licensed/permitted waste disposal facility. This will most likely be contracted out to a reputable waste management service provider (See Section 4.2.1 and 4.2.2 of the scoping report)
Siyanda should ensure that the newly proposed sewage system is in place before operation of the project, due to the incapacity of the current sewage system.	Comment raised by Makahane Rudzani (DWS) at the authority site visit-meeting, Swartklip Rec Centre, 23 July 2015.	It has been noted that the Northam sewage treatment plant is already inadequate (see Section 4.2.2 of the scoping report).
Visual issues		

ISSUE RAISED	BY WHOM AND WHEN	RESPONSE GIVEN BY PROJECT TEAM (as amended/incorporated for the purposes of the scoping report submission)
People who live 28 km's away from the smelter will be able to see it.	Comment raised by Adri Young at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015	Your concern regarding visual impacts (and specifically those relating to sense of place) have been noted. This will be investigated further in the visual specialist study, the terms of reference for which are included in Section 8.3.10 of the scoping report. Dimensionally, in terms of the size of the furnace buildings and associated infrastructure, it would be similar. The visual impact will be assessed in a specialist study, the terms of reference for which are included in Section 8.3.10 of the scoping report.
Visually, the area is already destroyed by the existing mines. Occasionally when taking my clients on game drives I am asked to explain what the infrastructure and lights are in the landscape of the farms	Comment raised by Derik de Jager at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015	
It has been a very dry year as the rain has been scarce and this has resulted in the area looking very barren however it should be noted that it is an extremely beautiful/scenic area during the wet season.	Comments raised by Sandy McGill, Mr and Mrs Schoeman at the scoping meeting, Swartklip Rec Centre, 21 July 2015	
Does the proposed smelter look anything like the Herculite smelter in Brits?		
Traffic and Transport issues		
I am concerned about the increased pressure that the project will place on roads.	Comment raised by Johan Young at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015	Your concern has been noted and this will be investigated further in the specialist traffic study, the terms of reference for which have been included in Section 8.3.13 of the scoping report.
The local municipality does not have the means to fix the roads, therefore this proposed development is a big concern for vehicle owners since it will increase the traffic on the roads which will ultimately deteriorate the roads much quicker.	Comments raised by Sandy McGill, Mr and Mrs Schoeman at the scoping meeting, Swartklip Rec Centre, 21 July 2015	
The capacity of the railway system is a big concern because although the infrastructure exists it is not the most reliable method of transport and in past experience has shown that when the rail system fails the mines use more trucks. We are concerned about the		

ISSUE RAISED	BY WHOM AND WHEN	RESPONSE GIVEN BY PROJECT TEAM (as amended/incorporated for the purposes of the scoping report submission)
same issue with the proposed development		
I am concerned about the access route to site. Has this already been decided on?	Comment raised by Adri Young at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015	At present, two access road alternatives are being considered. Both of these access roads originate from the Dwaalboom Road (between Northam and Swartklip mine). See Figure 5 of the scoping report for an illustration of these two proposed access road alternatives.
Where is the proposed entrance to the smelter?	Comments raised by Sandy McGill, Mr and Mrs Schoeman at the scoping meeting, Swartklip Rec Centre, 21 July 2015	
My suggestion would be to use the R510 via Sefikile to access the plant in order to minimise traffic impacts. The Dwaalboom road is currently in a poor state and it is already congested with the current load of traffic. Adding more trucks to this road will make the situation worse.	Comment raised by Johan Young at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015	
We suggest Siyanda consider an alternative entrance from the Swartklip mine side and not the Tiramogo lodge entrance off the main road.	Comments raised by Sandy McGill, Mr and Mrs Schoeman at the scoping meeting, Swartklip Rec Centre, 21 July 2015	
Please clarify which railway is intended for use as well as details with respect to powerlines and designated routes for transportation of material.	Comment raised by Ingrid Morrison, via email, 20 July 2015	Section 4.2.2. of the scoping report provides detail on the proposed railway infrastructure to be used and Section 7.1.3 (specifically Table 8 and Section 7.1.5 provides further detail on the transport and powerline alternatives being considered).
With the entrance right next to my farm people will be crossing my farm to gain entry and this is a huge issue. In the past people would leave my gates open allowing my cattle to cross the main road which then becomes my issue if this had led to any accidents on the roads.	Comment raised by Sandy McGill, Mr and Mrs Schoeman at the scoping meeting, Swartklip Rec Centre, 21 July 2015	These negative socio-economic and land use impacts will be assessed as part of the socio-economic specialist studies, the terms of reference for which have been included in Section 8.3.16 of the scoping report.
Heritage issues		

ISSUE RAISED	BY WHOM AND WHEN	RESPONSE GIVEN BY PROJECT TEAM (as amended/incorporated for the purposes of the scoping report submission)
If there are graves located on the project area what will happen to them?	Comment raised by Joel Ramakoka at scoping meeting, Mmansterre, 21 July 2015	This will be investigated further in the specialist heritage study, the terms of reference for which have been included in Section 8.3.11 of the scoping report.
There are many graves on the proposed site. What will happen to these graves?	Comment raised by Sandy McGill, Mr and Mrs Schoeman at the scoping meeting, Swartklip Rec Centre, 21 July 2015	
Health issues		
I am concerned about the potential health impacts. Will a health impact study be undertaken?	Comment raised by Lucas Mogale at scoping meeting, Mmansterre, 21 July 2015	Health issues associated with potential air and water impacts will be assessed as part of the specialist studies and the results of these studies will be included in the EIA report. The terms of reference for these studies are included in Section 8.3.6, 8.3.7 and 8.3.8 of the scoping report.
Socio-economic issues relating to continuation of existing land uses		
What consideration is given to game farming given that the animals are sensitive to impacts such as noise, air quality and vibrations?	Comment raised by Hannes Olckers at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015	It is expected that game farming and surrounding land uses in the proximity of the project have already adapted to a certain degree of noise, air quality and vibration related impacts associated with Union Section mine, and this provides one of the motivations for selecting the site given that receptors are already sensitised to potential impacts. Qualitative commentary on the potential air noise and vibration impacts on animals will be provided in the EIA.
I am concerned that my property value will drop dramatically if a smelter is developed next to my farm. It has already been affected by the current mine.	Comments raised by Johan Young at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015	Economic impacts will be addressed as part of the economic specialist report, the terms of reference for which are included in Section 8.3.14 of the scoping report).
As game farmers we will be losing clients as people would not want to visit a farm that is right next to a smelter.	Comment raised by Derik de Jager at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015	
With all the changes that the project will bring about we will not be able to run our farm in the same manner as we are doing now.	Comment raised by Marietjie Schoeman, via email, 27 July 2015	

ISSUE RAISED	BY WHOM AND WHEN	RESPONSE GIVEN BY PROJECT TEAM (as amended/incorporated for the purposes of the scoping report submission)
<p>We are opposed to the new Ferro-chrome Smelter as it will affect our Game farming industry, and land values negatively.</p> <p>This is a huge issue and potentially an economic problem from the perspective of game farming and tourism because no one wants to visit a game farm next to a larger smelter.</p> <p>As a landowner you spend your entire life investing in your property and then when a company comes along to propose a development right next door it not only causes environmental impacts but also destroys your entire livelihood.</p> <p>The issues with regards to inward migration and informal settlements led to a drop in the property value of neighbouring farms.</p>	<p>Comment raised by Sandy McGill, via email, 29 July 2015</p>	
<p>What will happen if we have livestock grazing in the project area?</p>	<p>Comment raised by Steven Moatshe at scoping meeting, Mmansterre, 21 July 2015</p>	<p>The proposed site is on land owned by Siyanda. No community livestock grazing currently takes place there. The relevant land use(s) are explained in Section 7.4.2 of the scoping report.</p>
<p>What happens if the proposed smelter is located on land that we use for grazing, is there a compensation program in place for the loss of land for grazing?</p>	<p>Comments raised by Stembiso Mmbalene at scoping meeting, Kwetsheza, 22 July 2015</p>	
<p>Socio-economic issues relating to access control and security</p>		
<p>Please clarify aspects of security.</p>	<p>Comment raised by Ingrid Morrison, via email, 20 July 2015</p>	<p>These negative socio-economic and land use impacts will be assessed as part of the socio-economic specialist studies, the terms of reference for which have been included in Section 8.3.15 of the scoping report.</p>
<p>Siyanda should assist in the maintenance of the boundary fence between portions 3 and 4 of Grootkuil</p>	<p>Comment by Philip Schoeman and Pier De Vries during focused scoping meeting with Union Mine, 13 May 2015</p>	
<p>Siyanda needs to ensure that there is no unauthorised access (via pedestrians) to site otherwise workers will trespass on our and other privately owned land.</p>	<p>Comments raised by Johan Young at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015</p>	

ISSUE RAISED	BY WHOM AND WHEN	RESPONSE GIVEN BY PROJECT TEAM (as amended/incorporated for the purposes of the scoping report submission)
<p>What are Siyanda's plans to control inward migration of people in search of job opportunities? This will lead to new informal settlements being established in the area such as the situation next to Marulasfontein.</p> <p>We are concerned about our security. Siyanda must convince private landowners that no informal settlements will be established since not everyone will be guaranteed a job at the plant and those that do not get jobs will become desperate and therefore target private landowners.</p>	<p>Comments raised by Sandy McGill, Mr and Mrs Schoeman at the scoping meeting, Swartklip Rec Centre, 21 July 2015</p>	
<p>I am concerned about the influx of labour and the associated social impacts such as informal settlements, security and littering.</p>	<p>Comments raised by Johan Young at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015</p>	
<p>Ideally no housing development to be constructed on site for the purposes of the project</p>	<p>Comments by Philip Schoeman and Pier De Vries during focused scoping meeting with Union Mine, 13 May 2015</p>	<p>No housing will be established on site and workers will be sourced from nearby towns and communities as far as possible (see Section 4.2.1 and 4.2.2 of the scoping report).</p>
Socio-economic issues relating to influx of labour, pressure on services etc.		
<p>The proposed project and its promised jobs will result in an influx of people to the area which will ultimately lead to the establishment of a new informal settlement and its associated impacts such as crime.</p>	<p>Comments raised by Sandy McGill, Mr and Mrs Schoeman at the scoping meeting, Swartklip Rec Centre, 21 July 2015</p>	<p>These negative socio-economic and land use impacts will be assessed as part of the socio-economic specialist studies, the terms of reference for which have been included in Section 8.3.16 of the scoping report.</p>
<p>Are there any plans to upgrade the current sewage treatment plant, because the size of the current plant is already too small for the town of Northam and the capacity is inadequate to meet the needs of the town.</p>	<p>Comment raised by Hannes Olckers at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015</p>	<p>It has been noted that the sewage treatment plant is already inadequate. This has been discussed in Section 4.2.2 of the Scoping report.</p>
<p>The existing sewage treatment facility ran into problems due to lack of funds, theft and corruption. The Northam sewage issue has</p>	<p>Comments raised by Sandy McGill, Mr and Mrs Schoeman at the scoping meeting, Swartklip Rec Centre, 21 July 2015</p>	

ISSUE RAISED	BY WHOM AND WHEN	RESPONSE GIVEN BY PROJECT TEAM (as amended/incorporated for the purposes of the scoping report submission)
been a problem for more than 15 years.		
The current sewage plant exploded and if you drive on the Dwaalboom road, you can smell it.	Comment raised by Adri Young at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015	
Socio-economic issues relating to employment/unemployment		
Where possible, employment should be from local communities first	Comments by Philip Schoeman and Pier De Vries during focused scoping meeting with Union Mine, 13 May 2015	Your recommendation has been noted and has been passed onto the Siyanda project team.
With the influx of investment as a result of new projects, more investment is made towards the informal settlements. I'd like to see more investment into formal settlements/communities.	Comment raised by Frans Moatshe at scoping meeting, Mmansterre, 21 July 2015	Your recommendation has been noted and will be forwarded to the Siyanda team.
As the interested parties we would like to know whether jobs will be aligned for us.	Comment raised by Kgosi Ramakoka at scoping meeting, Mmansterre, 21 July 2015	Your request/concern has been noted and will be considered and clarified by Siyanda during the employment and procurement phase. Where possible, Siyanda will hire from nearby towns and communities.
Between now and 2017, can Siyanda advise the youth as to what skills they can acquire to ensure that we stand a better chance of getting the jobs.	Comment raised by Portia Moremi at scoping meeting, Kwetsheza, 22 July 2015	
With regards to the operational jobs, will Siyanda be looking for people with previous experience in smelting plants? I would like to know whether the workers during the construction phase will be considered for jobs during the operational phase.	Comment raised by Vuyiseka Ngukutu at scoping meeting, Kwetsheza, 22 July 2015	
Will Siyanda be hiring people from the area or other parts of the country?	Comment raised by Sandy McGill, via email, 29 July 2015	
Will the Mmansterre community also benefit from the project?	Comment raised by D. D Tau at scoping meeting, Mmansterre, 21 July 2015	
The Kwetsheza community is extremely impoverished, what are some of the benefits	Comments raised by Stembiso Mmbalene at scoping meeting, Kwetsheza, 22 July	

ISSUE RAISED	BY WHOM AND WHEN	RESPONSE GIVEN BY PROJECT TEAM (as amended/incorporated for the purposes of the scoping report submission)
that this community will gain from this project?	2015	
The main reason for the high unemployment rates in this community is because Kwetsheza does not form part of the tribal community, therefore we are unable to get proof of residence documents when they are requested by potential employees.	Comment raised by Grace Goso at scoping meeting, Kwetsheza, 22 July 2015	
Based on previous experiences, no information is communicated to the Kwetsheza community with regards to job opportunities.	Comment raised by Maweto Mehlo at scoping meeting, Kwetsheza, 22 July 2015	
You mentioned that there will be an estimate of 700 jobs during the construction phase and an estimate of 280 jobs during operation. I would like to know whether the 280 jobs will be an addition to the 700 jobs.	Comment raised by Grace Goso at scoping meeting, Kwetsheza, 22 July 2015	It is proposed that there will be 700 construction phase jobs and 280 operational phase jobs. When the construction phase is completed, the 700 construction phase jobs will also be completed and 280 permanent staff will be required for the operational phase.