

APPENDIX C: ISSUES AND CONCERNS TABLE

APPENDIX C: COMMENTS AND RESPONSE REPORT– SUMMARY OF ISSUES RAISED TO DATE BY AUTHORITIES AND IAPS

Abbreviations used in this table: (DEDECT) – Department of Economic Development, Environment, Conservation and Tourism; DWA – Department of Water Affairs; RLM – Rustenburg Local Municipality; MLM – Madibeng Local Municipality; WULA – water use license application

Normal text reflects issues raised prior to the review of the scoping report in 2012. **Bold written text** reflect issues raised during the review of the initial scoping report in 2012. *Italics written text* reflect issues raised during the 2014 scoping phase. **Shaded text** reflect issues raised following the review of the scoping report in 2014.

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
A	Procedural Related Issues		
1	Once the project is approved by the DMR, how will Tharisa communicate the Record of Decision?	Alex Salang General public scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	IAPs will be notified of the environmental decisions on the project via email or post, sms and placement of a newspaper advertisement in the same newspaper that was used for scoping.
2	How will the monitoring results be shared?		Monitoring reports are available for public review on request from the General Managers office (Tharisa)
3	Why has SLR not consulted us as part of Tharisa's EMP Amendment process?	Hilton Bedwell Focussed scoping meeting, 2 February 2012	This focussed meeting is part of the consultation process.
4	Due to the new date of our feedback meeting (13 February 2012) with Tharisa, we would like SLR to postpone the scoping meetings that are currently scheduled to take place on 16 February 2012 so that we can consult our lawyers in time for these meetings.	Hilton Bedwell, Johan van Heerden and Barend Clark Focussed scoping meeting, 2 February 2012	It was agreed that the meetings will not be postponed and that SLR will arrange a feedback meeting during the review of the EIA and EMP report phase to address all the raised issues and give feedback on the specialist studies. The purpose of the scoping meetings is to share information with the IAPs, understand their concerns and to ensure that these issues are covered in the terms of reference for the specialist studies.
5	Why has Tharisa constructed the foundation of the smelter house? We are aware that the mine has already constructed it without authorisation from the government.		Tharisa is of the view that no construction of the smelter house has commenced. The smelter has been removed from the project scope and therefore related issues are no longer considered relevant to this process.
6	We did receive the letter about the Environmental Impact Assessment. Please keep me up to date with any meetings and mail about this development as I am a landowner on both sides of the N4.	Jan Coetzee Email and fax, 09 February 2012	You have been included on the project's IAP database and as such will receive notifications related to the project and environmental assessment process.

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
7	We hereby formally request to that we be furnished with all information that is currently available pertaining to the proposed Tharisa development as detailed above and that we be invited to and be timeously advised of any and all meetings, hearings and other events pertaining to the proposed development.	Elsa Steyn Fax, 10 February 2012	At the time of the correspondence, the BID was sent to Ms Steyn on 10 February 2012. Ms Steyn is included on the public involvement database in order to receive ongoing notifications regarding the project.
8	Hi Stella, please forward me the meeting schedules because we did not know about it. Can you maybe give me Thulani's landline number, because he doesn't answer his cell?	Marita Potgieter Email, 14 February 2012	This information was provided to Mrs Potgieter on 14 February 2012.
9	Please provide me with all information regarding this EIA and management program as well as the date and place of the stakeholders meeting .We are landowners in walking distance (directly next to) of Tharisa Minerals , and with the history of the last 2 years next to Tharisa Minerals, will be at the meeting in full force	Hettie Le Roux Email, 23 January 2012	This information was provided to Ms Le Roux on 02 February 2012.
10	I am involved in development and empowerment of the affected communities (on Kafferskraal 342 JQ). I would like to be part of the project both in working and input distribution.	Joseph Nkoshosho Fax, 16 February 2012	This comment has been noted. All IAPs have an opportunity to review and comment on the environmental reports and summaries and to share this information with other community members.
11	When is the next meeting date?		All IAPs will be informed of the details of the feedback meeting in the summary of the EIA and EMP report.
12	Has Tharisa already submitted the water use license for the proposed activities?	Johan Swanepoel Key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	Tharisa will apply for the additional water uses associated with the project towards the end of the EIA phase. The DWA decision-making timeline is unknown.
13	<i>Tharisa must note that it cannot commence with the construction of north east waste rock dump without the approval of the water use license.</i>	<i>Marikana Eco Forum (contact person - Alet Swanepoel)</i>	
14	<i>Tharisa needs to apply for a water use license in terms for Regulation 704 for the north east waste rock dump.</i>	<i>Scoping meeting with Marikana Eco Forum Representatives, 26 March 2014</i>	
15	<i>How long will it take to get an authorisation from the Department of Water Affairs (DWA)?</i>		

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
16	Water scarcity in Marikana area is a huge challenge. Seeing that water demands for current operations are not well met, the Department would like Tharisa Minerals to indicate where water for the proposed expansion will be taken from. Tharisa must also provide a detailed illustration on how demands for water for current operations and proposed expansion will be met.	S.N Ntshangase (DWA) Fax, 31 October 2012	It is expected that water required for the project will be sourced from the mine's current water supply. The mine's water balance has been updated to reflect current operations and the project components (see Section 2.7.4 of the EIA and EMP report).
17	What is the planned source of water supply for the proposed projects?	Danie van Rensburg Key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	
18	Does Tharisa get its water from the Sterkstroom?	Hilton Bedwell, Johan van Heerden and Barend Clark Focussed scoping meeting, 2 February 2012	No.
19	Has it been authorised to get water from the Sterkstroom?		There is no need for such authorisation since Tharisa does not source its water from this river.
20	Tharisa did not consider the use of Buffelspoort dam as an alternative for water supply in the original EIA/EMP process.	Ian Ashmole Key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	Tharisa acquired the rights to the Buffelspoort water entitlements by virtue of purchasing properties which were allocated agricultural water rights from the Buffelspoort Scheme. Therefore Tharisa has the option of applying to use water that is allocated to its properties. It's important to note that Tharisa has continued to pay for this water even though it is not using it. The Buffelspoort water will be used as a last resort if Tharisa's water sources are insufficient and subject to application and approval from DWA. (Tharisa)
21	Tharisa should also note that water allocation from the Buffelspoort dam will only be limited temporary use and not a permanent use.		
22	The farmers that rely on irrigation water from the Buffelspoort dam say that their quotas will be restricted.	Andre Maritz Email, 24 January 2012	
23	We are concerned that should Tharisa be authorised to use the water from the Buffelspoort dam for mining activities there will be a shortage of water for other users particularly during the dry season.	Hilton Bedwell, Johan van Heerden and Barend Clark Focussed scoping meeting, 2 February 2012	

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
24	The underlying water use allocation is agricultural and the Department of Agriculture has declined the requests of all mines (including Tharisa) to use water that has been allocated to agricultural irrigation. This was publically stated by the department at the November 2011 Omaramba meeting between Tharisa mine management and stakeholders.	Buffelspoort Dam Action Group (Contact persons: Dr Shan Holmes and Tony Richards) Key stakeholder meeting, 23 February 2013	Tharisa acquired the rights to the Buffelspoort water entitlements by virtue of purchasing properties which were allocated agricultural water rights from the Buffelspoort Scheme. Therefore Tharisa has the option of applying to use water that is allocated to its properties. It's important to note that Tharisa has continued to pay for this water even though it is not using it. The Buffelspoort water will be used as a last resort if Tharisa's water sources are insufficient and subject to application and approval from DWA. (Tharisa)
25	The dam is already over allocated. In this regard, water from the dam is required not only for agricultural purposes but also to supply the Sterkstroom which is associated with both ecological and community water users. Any perceived excess water is actually required to recharge the hydrological water cycle and the Sterkstroom which has been classified as a fresh water ecosystem priority area (FEPA) requiring appropriate protection. As such, mining cannot be allowed to proceed if this FEPA resource is negatively impacted.		In line with DWA's water use hierarchy, Tharisa's water use strategy is to use water sources in the following order of preference: water ingress in the mining area / opencast pits, tailings return water, dirty storm water collection, boreholes (licensed), purchase of water from mines in the region that have excess water, and pipeline initiatives of the Rustenburg Joint Water Forum. The mine also sources water from Rand Water.
26	Sourcing water from surrounding mines will be difficult to achieve in a lawful manner because of the way in which the National Water Act has been structured. It was further stated in the case of Lonmin that its water use is unlawful therefore sourcing water from Lonmin cannot be considered.		
27	Tharisa Minerals must quantify the total volume of water that will result from the expansion of the west pit and apply for Section 21(j) and also 21 (a) if water will be re-used for mining purposes.	S.N Ntshangase (DWA) Fax, 31 October 2012	The dewatering requirements associated with the project components has been determined by the groundwater specialist and is included in the specialist report (Appendix F of the EIA and EMP report). Tharisa will apply for the additional water uses associated with the project towards the end of the EIA phase.
28	Tharisa Minerals needs to apply for a water use license for the expansion of the tailings dam under Section 21(g).		
29	The expansion of waste rock dumps will have to be applied for under Section 21(g).		

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
30	All identified water uses must be applied for as an amendment to an already issued water license to Tharisa Minerals. The amendment must be treated as a new water license application and licensing procedure must be followed as outlined in Section 41 of the National Water Act (Act 36 of 1998).	S.N Ntshangase (DWA) Fax, 31 October 2012	Tharisa will apply for the additional water uses associated with the project towards the end of the EIA phase.
31	Tharisa must bear in mind that they are operating without a water use license and as a result, they are operating illegally.	Ian Ashmole Key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	Tharisa obtained its water use license in July 2012.
32	Kindly be notified that we have commissioned an independent Social Impact Assessment to determine the impact of Tharisa Mine on the neighbouring properties and owners, Buffelspoort, North West Province.	Elsa Steyn Email, 8 March 2012	These comments have been noted.
33	We furthermore trust that you will afford us a reasonable period of 3 months during which to conduct the aforesaid study, in view of the fact that we as a community have not been involved in the mine's studies conducted to date, allegedly due to the mine's inability to identify us as an IAP.		
34	Tharisa does not have an approved WULA therefore it cannot mention an amendment of the WULA in the BID for the proposed projects.	Shan Holmes Telephone communication, 18 May 2012	Tharisa obtained its water use license in July 2012. As required, any WULA amendments will be submitted in consultation with DWA.
35	Tharisa is operating illegally because it does not have an approved WULA.		

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
36	<p>The WULA must be considered as procedurally irregular because since the original application was made Tharisa is proposing significant changes to the mine plan and infrastructure layout as part of the EIA that is currently underway. These changes should have been included in the WULA. Moreover, the public participation associated with the WULA was inadequate. In this regard the Buffelspoort Dam Action Group was not consulted nor was it timeously notified of the issuing of the WUL as a formal objector thereto. It is worth noting further that the relevant water reserve was not determined by the Department of Water Affairs prior to the issuing of the WUL.</p>	<p>Buffelspoort Dam Action Group (Contact persons: Dr Shan Holmes and Tony Richards) Key stakeholder meeting, 23 February 2013</p>	<p>As required, any WULA amendments required for the project will be submitted in consultation with DWA towards the end of the EIA process. The current public consultation process makes provision for informing and consulting with IAPs on water uses associated with the project and will be included in the WULA. IAPs will be provided with an opportunity to review the project's WULA.</p>
37	<p>Tharisa has been in a position of non-compliance with the Water Act because: it conducted water related uses prior to receipt of its WUL in 2011, the WUL does not include any exemption from R704 which renders certain activities as illegal, it is using water from boreholes that is allocated to agricultural irrigation use, and it has built a dam at risk and taken water from the Buffelspoort dam irrigation scheme (by tampering with the canal system) to fill this dam.</p>		<p>Tharisa now holds a WUL. At this stage, it is Tharisa's opinion that GN704 is not applicable to the use of its waste rock for the tailings dam. This will be confirmed with DWA.</p>
38	<p>The proximity of the quarry to the Sterkstroom is incorrectly stated in the WUL as 1000m when in fact it is a few metres away.</p>	<p>Buffelspoort Dam Action Group (Contact persons: Dr Shan Holmes and Tony Richards) Key stakeholder meeting, 23 February 2013</p>	<p>Tharisa has submitted a WUL amendment request (as per Section 18 of the NWA) to the DWA Regional office in order to address administrative errors contained in Tharisa's WUL. (Tharisa)</p>
39	<p>We would like to the following information to be made available in the next round of meetings with SLR and Tharisa: current and future plans of Tharisa mine, location of the ore, rivers, wetlands, roads, neighbouring mines, the monitoring network and the normal wind direction.</p>	<p>Pieter Wolvaardt Key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012</p>	<p>This information is included in the baseline environment and monitoring sections of the EIA and EMP report (Sections 2 and 21 respectively).</p>

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
40	When will the scoping report be distributed for public review?	Nols de Wet Key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	The initial scoping report was distributed for public review in June 2012. The updated scoping report was distributed in April 2014.
41	Is the public participation process already underway for the EIA process?	Kelebogile Mekgoe (RLM) Regulatory authorities scoping meeting, 21 February 2012	Yes. At the time of the scoping meeting, newspaper advertisements and site notices had been published / displayed, the background information document (BID) distributed and two public scoping meetings held. A record of the public participation process is included in Section 10 of the EIA and EMP report.
42	Please make sure that the minutes of all the scoping meetings are in the scoping report.		Minutes of all scoping meetings held to date are included in Appendix A of the EIA and EMP report.
43	Will the mine be applying for an atmospheric emissions license? Will the mine consult with the municipality with regards to this licence?		The mine will be applying for an atmospheric emission license (AEL) for the chrome sand drying plant. Tharisa will consult with the municipalities in this process. (Tharisa)
44	I reserve the right to comment to the Scoping Report. My comments will be supplied in writing.	Marius Botha General public scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	This comment has been noted.
45	Please provide transport, or select a venue that is close to the local communities such as Madithlokwa for meetings.	Appearance Ndlovu (Ward Councillor) General public scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	This comment has been noted and will be used for future reference.
46	We require larger maps please.	W I Engelbrecht General public scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	SLR will provide A3 maps, where required, in the reports.
47	I am located on Portion 3 of the farm Kafferskraal near the Tailings Storage Facility (TSF), yet I have not been consulted with yet. Why have we not been consulted yet?	Jan Coetzee General public scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	Mr Coetzee was an IAP on the project IAP database prior to the scoping meeting and acknowledged receipt of the project background information document. This property is owned by Tharisa and Mr Coetzee continued leasing the property until such time as he could move out. Mr Coetzee no longer lives on the property.
48	I am a guardian and mother of Deon Dawn Moleba, who is the owner of Portion 233 of Portion 146 of Kafferskraal 342 JQ. My son who is a minor, has no objection to Tharisa and the developments on the properties Kafferskraal 342 JQ, Rooikoppies 297 JQ and Elandsdrift 467 JQ.	Keitumetse Monica Moleba Fax, 20 February 2012	This comment has been noted.

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
49	I would like to have electronic copies of Tharisa's WULA, BID for the proposed projects as well as other documentation for my records.	Shan Holmes Telephone communication: 18 May 2012	Electronic copies of the WULA and the BID were sent to Dr. Holmes on Thursday 24 th of May 2012. The other EIA and EMP process related documents will be sent to Dr. Holmes as per the project's programme.
50	It is our instructions that your company has started with activities next to our client's property.	Frikkie Pretorius Fax: 21 May 2012	These issues related to the location of Tharisa's fence on private property. Tharisa engaged with the landowner and the fence was relocated. These issues were resolved with the landowner. (Tharisa)
51	Our instructions are that the environmental impact assessment and environmental management has not been finalised yet and therefore we and our client are of the opinion that your mining activities are illegal.		
52	We furthermore confirm that we have instructions to require proof of your rezoning and we would like to know exactly who the applicant for the rezoning application was.		
53	We would like to hear from you within the next seven days		
54	With reference to the above and our telephonic conversation on 15 June 2012, I will appreciate if you can mail the scoping report of Tharisa Mine to Mr F Salojjee to the following postal address: Mr Farouk Saloojee, P O Box 290, Rustenburg 0300.	Amanda Jeffrey Fax: 15 June 2012	Electronic copies (CDs) of the scoping report were mailed to these IAPs on 20 June 2012.
55	Thank you for the sms notification of the availability of the Tharisa Scoping report. Can you please forward me a copy thereof or send it through to your Rustenburg office for collection if it cannot be e-mailed.	Buks Kruger Email: 18 June 2012	
56	According to your map of the local setting, our farm is placed on the wrong side of the N4. Maakie-Saakie is situated on the Marikana side of the N4, we would like to know what the reason is for that and where this information was getting from. We would like to have a better and bigger print please as this A4 is not good enough.	Herleen Potgieter Email: 29 June 2012	The topographical map that you are referring to was bought from the government with labels on it including Maakie-Saakie. Tharisa only indicated their project areas. No changes to the base map can be made.

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
57	We will greatly appreciate if you can email us a map indicating where Portion 109 (A portion of Portion 8) and the Remaining Extent of Portion 12 (a Portion of Portion 8) of the farm Kafferskraal 342JQ are situated and details of purchasing.	Amanda Minaar Email: 29 June 2012	The mine has established a stakeholder engagement/complaints procedure; please approach mine management in order to resolve this issue. (Tharisa)
58	Atmospheric Emission License application and Water Use License applications should accompany the EIA report and no operation should take place before acquiring those licenses.	T.S Ngwato (MLM) Fax: 10 July 2012	Tharisa will apply for the additional licenses associated with the project towards the end of the EIA phase.
59	The proposed development is in close proximity to the residential area and that means Social Impact Assessment Study should be conducted and made available on the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Report and that study should also include the possible health effect the community members will be exposed to and measures to remedy that.	T.S Ngwato (MLM) Fax: 10 July 2012	Existing specialist information and/or additional specialist studies where used to undertake the relevant assessment and provide detailed management measures in the EIA and EMP report. These included assessing possible air-related health impacts on potentially sensitive receptors and impacts on the biophysical environment (see Section 7 of the EIA and EMP report).
60	The proposed development must have a minimal impact on the existing status of the biophysical environment by conducting relevant studies and coming up with mitigation measures.	T.S Ngwato (MLM) Fax: 10 July 2012	
61	Specialist studies for noise impact, visual aspect, air quality, water, soil, ecology impact and geological impact should be conducted and its reports to be incorporated into the EIA report.	T.S Ngwato (MLM) Fax: 10 July 2012	Existing specialist information and/or additional specialist studies where used to support the EIA. Copies of the specialist reports are attached as appendices to the EIA and EMP report.

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
62	<p>Tharisa minerals must conduct another geohydrological assessment. A lot has happened that impacted on groundwater resources since the beginning of the mining activity. The information that is referred to, from an EIA/EMP report 2008 might no longer be applicable or it must be updated. This will assist the mine to establish the impact that the mine has already done to the groundwater resources and help it to plan better going forward. Groundwater must always be monitored. The impacts to the groundwater users must be assessed at a distance of 5km radius. Hydro-census must also be conducted at a distance of 5km radius.</p>	<p>S.N Ntshangase (DWA) Fax, 31 October 2012</p>	<p>A groundwater study was conducted for the project and is attached as an appendix to the EIA and EMP report (see Appendix F). The study made use of the hydrocensus data collected for the mine in 2007 (based on a 10km radius) and water quality data from the mine's monitoring programme.</p>
63	<p>There was a ground water study to be done on the effect of the planned deeper pit, has been done, can we see it?</p>	<p>Marikana Eco Forum (Contact person - Alet Swanepoel) E-mail, 11 March 2014</p>	<p>The groundwater study was conducted for the project and is attached as an appendix to the EIA and EMP report (see Appendix F).</p>
64	<p>Environmental management programme (EMP) should be developed and incorporated into the final EIA report.</p>	<p>T.S Ngwato (MLM) Fax: 10 July 2012</p>	<p>The EMP in line with the requirements of the Mineral and Petroleum Resources Development Act, 28 of 2002 (MPRDA) and National Environmental Management Act, 107 of 1998 (NEMA) is included in Section 19 of the EIA and EMP report.</p>
65	<p>A lot of questions from the interested and affected parties (IAPs) regarding the intended development were asked during the public participation process and their questions but promised to be incorporated in the environmental impact assessment (EIA) report, such questions must be answered and incorporated in the final EIA report and made available to those IAPs. The questions are attached in annexure A to this letter and those questions are highlighted in green.</p>	<p>T.S Ngwato (MLM) Fax: 10 July 2012</p>	<p>All issues raised by IAPs have been addressed in the EIA and EMP report. Responses to these issues are included in this updated Issues and Concerns Table.</p>

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
66	A detailed layout plan which clearly indicates location of the proposed chrome sand drying plant and the hazardous substance storage area must be included in the EIA. Such layout should also include name of the institution or person who drew the plan, a date and plan reference.	Robert Nemanashi (DEDECT) Fax: 08 August 2013	The mine layout plan showing the project components is included in the EIA and EMP report (see Figure 2.1).
67	All specialists studies related to the proposed development which were identified during the scoping phase must be undertaken and included in the EIA report.	Robert Nemanashi (DEDECT) Fax: 08 August 2013	
68	A draft EIA report which includes the specialist studies undertaken must be submitted to all the relevant authorities for comment and their comments including comments from the IAPs which must be included in the final EIA to be submitted to the Department for consideration.	Robert Nemanashi (DEDECT) Fax: 08 August 2013	The planned public consultation process for the EIA phase of the process is outlined in Section 10.2.9 and 10.2.10 of the EIA and EMP report and caters for the comments made by the Department.
69	You may accordingly proceed with the undertaking of the EIA in accordance with the requirements of the regulation 31 of Government Notice No. R. 543 of 18 of June 2010 and the tasks that are outlined above, and in the plan of the study for the EIA.	Robert Nemanashi (DEDECT) Fax: 08 August 2013	This comment linked to the initial project scope is noted.
70	It must be emphasized to the applicant that construction of the activities on site must not commence until a favourable Environmental Authorisation has been issued.	Robert Nemanashi (DEDECT) Fax: 08 August 2013	This comment is included for consideration by Tharisa.
71	At this stage the Department cannot make any inputs with regards to civil designs. The report will be sent to Head Office for Civil Engineers' inputs.	S.N Ntshangase (DWA) Fax, 31 October 2012	The Department's comment is noted.

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
72	According to my knowledge and records, a lot of Tharisa's current "paper work" for instance their water use license is full of "typing errors" and incorrect information, and they are still breaking (not complying) with the EMP commitments that are outlined in Chapter 6. This means if Tharisa operates some activities illegally then Tharisa is just covering up by an amendment. I would like to see these faults (non-compliances) rectified before such an amendment can go forward.	Marikana Eco Forum (Contact person - Alet Swanepoel) E-mail, 11 March 2014	Tharisa has submitted a WUL amendment request (as per Section 18 of the NWA) to the DWA Regional office in order to address administrative errors contained in Tharisa's WUL. Your comments are noted for consideration by Tharisa.
73	With regards to the change of the general infrastructure layout, it is interesting that one of the alternatives being considered includes the "no project" option when one bears in mind that Tharisa has by its own admission already commenced effecting the 'proposed' changes, eg the designs and sizes of the tailings facility storages and the location of the topsoil berm wall.	Elsa Steyn Email, 24 February 2012	The activities mentioned are not considered material changes to the operations and were initiated from a business continuity perspective. (Tharisa)
74	Tharisa is currently using mine waste rock to build roads and tailings dam walls, but they do not have exemption from GN REG 704 June 1999.	Marikana Eco Forum (Contact person - Alet Swanepoel) E-mail, 11 March 2014	The use of waste rock for these activities was included in the approved EIA and EMP report (Metago, 2008) as well as in the integrated water and waste management plan (IWWMP) submitted in support of the water use license. At this stage, it is Tharisa's opinion that GN704 is not applicable to the use of its waste rock for tailings dam. This will be confirmed with DWA.
75	To come back to the tailings dam and the amendment, the planned new tailings dam will be built in the same manner as the first tailings dam with waste rock for walls, and again the amendment is there to rectify a fault in the first tailings dam by leaving out the linings.	Marikana Eco Forum (Contact person - Alet Swanepoel) E-mail, 11 March 2014	Tailings dam TSF 2 was approved as part of the approved EIA and EMP report (Metago, 2008). The project components include changes to the design of the tailings dams and do not cater for a new facility.
76	As discussed via phone we request a proper IAP meeting about this new venture of Tharisa.	Marikana Eco Forum (Contact person - Alet Swanepoel) E-mail, 11 March 2014	A focussed stakeholder meeting took place on 26 March 2014. Issues raised at the meeting have been included in this issues table. Minutes of the meeting are included in Appendix A of the scoping report.

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
77	<p>The EIA that is currently underway is procedurally irregular.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Firstly, it is unacceptable that SLR is prepared to conduct the EIA when Tharisa is in a position of non-compliance. This raises serious ethical questions about SLR. • Secondly, the public participation has been inadequate with key stakeholders such as the Buffelspoort Dam Action Group not being properly consulted. • Thirdly, the substance of the scoping report is misleading and flawed. • Moreover, it is not acceptable for Tharisa to expect stakeholders to engage in the EIA and thereby condone the current unlawful activities. 	<p>Buffelspoort Dam Action Group (Contact persons: Dr Shan Holmes and Tony Richards) Key stakeholder meeting, 23 February 2013</p>	<p>On the issue of alleged non-compliance: The responsibility for assessing and ensuring operational compliance sits with the regulatory authorities and Tharisa.</p> <p>On the issue of SLR's ethics: No reasonable person can expect SLR to take responsibility for operational issues because SLR's mandate is not related to operational issues.</p> <p>On the issue of inadequate involvement of the Buffelspoort Dam Action Group (BAG): The EIA process was delayed on request of the BAG to address a number of issues raised by the BAG. It is Tharisa's opinion that these issues have been addressed as far as possible. Moreover, due to recent changes in the project scope, the scoping phase of the project was revisited. The BAG were invited to be involved in this process but indicated that unless legal compliance is proven by Tharisa the stakeholders will oppose the EIA and will refuse to be involved in the public participation process.</p>
78	<p><i>Environmental assessment practitioners (EPAs) doing additional work for a mine when the mine is already in non-compliance is unacceptable. In this way, EPAs facilitate the mine to continue illegal operations. The role and function that EPAs play and the professional ethics of EPAs is in question. Young professionals need to act correctly and not facilitate illegal operations. The EIA methodology has been abused and this is a crying shame. There is a body of material evidence that shows that input from IAPs is not taken into consideration in the process. Irrelevant information is cut and pasted into documents.</i></p>	<p><i>Buffelspoort Dam Action Group (Contact person: Dr Shan Holmes) Tel, 20 March 2014</i></p>	<p>On the issue of the flawed scoping report: It is not clear what part of the report is allegedly flawed. A revised scoping report was produced for public review on the basis of the revised scoping process.</p> <p>On the issue of stakeholders condoning Tharisa's alleged unlawful activities by being involved in the EIA: Involvement in the EIA processes is voluntary. This involvement is in relation to the project. If there are concerns related to the Tharisa operations in general these can be specified by stakeholders and included in the record of public involvement.</p>

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
79	Unless legal compliance is proven by Tharisa the stakeholders will oppose the EIA and will refuse to be involved in the public participation process.	Buffelspoort Dam Action Group (Contact persons: Dr Shan Holmes and Tony Richards) Key stakeholder meeting, 23 February 2013	Your comment is noted for consideration by decision-making authorities. Tharisa is committed to finding amicable solutions to the issues raised.
80	<i>This process is wasting IAPs time, energy and money. IAPs are not prepared to consider anything more until the mine is fully compliant.</i>	<i>Buffelspoort Dam Action Group (Contact person: Dr Shan Holmes) Tel, 20 March 2014</i>	
81	<i>We would like SLR to leave a copy of the scoping report and summaries at Marikana Library for public review and comment.</i>	<i>Nomxolisi Malokoloko Scoping meeting 26 March 2014</i>	<i>SLR will do as requested.</i>
82	<i>Please make sure that Chris Bosch is informed of the changes of the project scope.</i>	<i>Marikana Eco Forum (contact person - Alet Swanepoel) Scoping meeting with Marikana Eco Forum Representatives, 26 March 2014</i>	<i>Chris Bosch is registered as an IAP on the project IAP database and has been notified of the changes to the project scope. (SLR)</i>
83	<i>We would like the scoping report and EIA and EMP report to indicate when the project components will commence.</i>	<i>Hettie Le Roux Scoping meeting with Landowners, 26 March 2014</i>	<i>An estimated timeline is included in Section 2.6 of the EIA and EMP report.</i>
84	<i>It is better to have a general feedback meeting than to have a separate one.</i>		<i>SLR will take your comment into consideration when setting up the EIA feedback meetings.</i>
85	<i>We would also like to have electronic copies of the reports (the committee members).</i>	<i>Hettie Le Roux and Isabel Hough Scoping meeting with Landowners, 26 March 2014</i>	<i>SLR will provide the landowner committee with CDs for distribution to its members.</i>
86	<i>People need to be addressed formally by their titles and not by their first names, including Dr Holmes.</i>	<i>Buffelspoort Dam Action Group (Contact person: Dr Shan Holmes) Tel, 20 March 2014</i>	<i>Your comment is noted.</i>

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
87	<p><i>Thank you for your indication that development is take place in this area. Please note that as of April 2013, all submissions to SAHRA must be via the South African Heritage Resources Information System (SAHRIS) (www.sahra.org.za). No submissions via e-mail or post will be accepted.</i></p>	<p><i>Phillip Hine, South African Heritage Resources Agency, E-mail, 22 February 2014</i></p>	<p><i>This comment was noted and the scoping report was submitted to SHARA via SAHRIS.</i></p>
88	<p><i>This office acknowledges the receipt of your application documents (scoping report) with regards to the above-mentioned (Tharisa project) on 14 April 2014 (Task T139/2014). The office responsible for this area is: Ms Sebenzile Ntshangase and can be contacted at (012) 207-9911. Comments would be forwarded in due time.</i></p>	<p><i>Cornia Theunissen, Department of Water Affairs, 15 April 2014</i></p>	<p><i>This is noted. The closing date for comments from regulatory authorities was 26 May 2014 – this provided authorities with 40 days to review and comment on the report. Any comments received after the final scoping report is submitted have been included in the EIA and EMP report.</i></p>
89	<p><i>You are required to submit the results of public participation process (PPP) as required in terms of regulation 50 (f) of the Mineral and Petroleum Resources Development Act, 2002 (Act N0. 28 of 2002). Notwithstanding the geographical location (i.e in relation to town and communities/farmlands) and ownership of the area applied for, please note that as part of the results of PPP the following details must be indicated: Date of public meetings; Minutes of the meetings, Views and concerns of the interested and affected parties etc. Also note that you may employ different methods to inform interested and affected parties about the public participation such as newspaper adverts, notification letters, public notices etc. However, these methods shall not be viewed as results of public participation rather means of notifying different parties.</i></p>	<p><i>Tshilidzi Phalala, Department of Mineral Resources, E-mail 23 May 2014</i></p>	<p><i>The results of the public participation process are included in Section 10 of the EIA and EMP report in line with the requirements of the MPRDA and the Department.</i></p>
90	<p><i>Thanks very much for the information.</i></p>	<p><i>Robyn Mellet, Aquarius, E-mail, and Josephine Krzyzanowska, Impala Platinum, 17 April 2014</i></p>	<p><i>Your appreciation is noted.</i></p>

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
91	<i>It is noted that your application has been forwarded to Eskom Distribution: North West Operating Unit, Land Development, P O Box 1319, Rustenburg 0300 for comments and direct reply to you. Comments from this office must also be obtained.</i>	<i>Advocate Ntika Maake, Eskom Transmission, Asset Management and Execution, E-mail 25 April 2014</i>	<i>Comments have been received from the North West Operating Unit, Land Development (see below).</i>
92	<i>This application affects our Eskom North West Operating Unit, Tharisa/ Spruitfontein 188kV and Middlekraal/Tharisa 188kV as well as ER121/8/21-ER121/8/36, ER121/8/21/1-ER121/8/21/4/1, ER121/8/21/1-ER121/8/4-ER121/8/4-ER121/8/13-ER121/8/18/4 Conductors. Eskom Distribution will raise no objection to the proposed application, provided Eskom's rights and services are acknowledged and respected at all times. (The details of Eskom's requirements have not been included here but do form part of comments included in Appendix D of the scoping report).</i>	<i>Mbengeni Tshidzumba, Eskom, North West Land Development, E-mail 23 April 2014</i>	<i>SLR has approached Eskom to obtain additional information on the infrastructure mentioned in Eskom's comments. Once received, this information will be compared to the project layout and addressed in the EIA and EMP report. Eskom's requirements as detailed in their comments dated 23 April 2014 will be addressed and incorporated into the EIA and EMP report, where applicable.</i>
93	<i>Please could you email me a copy of the Scoping Report?</i>	<i>Marlaine Andersen, Email, 22 April 2014</i>	<i>A copy of the scoping report was forwarded to the IAP on 23 April via post (electronic on CD). The IAP confirmed receipt.</i>
94	<i>Thank you for the email. As I mentioned, I have no comments for you.</i>	<i>Marlaine Andersen, Email, 28 May 2014</i>	<i>It is noted that you have no comments at this stage.</i>
95	<i>Please could Lonmin receive a copy of the Scoping Report, as we are directly affected by this project?</i>	<i>Hazel Fiehn, Lonmin Mine, E-mail 22 April 2014</i>	<i>A copy of the scoping report was forwarded to the IAP on 23 April via post (electronic on CD). The IAP confirmed receipt.</i>
96	<i>Your letter Ref. No.: T014-12 or 710.2002.00012 date 11th April 2014 refers: this Department has no objection to the revised scoping report as submitted.</i>	<i>Hennie Niehaus, Department of Public Works, Roads and Transport, Fax, 21 May 2014</i>	<i>Your comment is noted for consideration by the decision-making authorities.</i>
97	<i>The Madibeng Local Municipality, Department of Community Services, Waste and Environmental Management Division evaluated the report in terms of National Environmental Management Act (Act 107 of 1998), EIA Regulations and other legislations governing the EIA Regulations. The Division does not have any objections regarding the above mentioned application as long as all steps listed in the Environmental Management Plan will be followed.</i>	<i>Mpho Magasa, Madibeng Local Municipality, E-mail 30 May 2014</i>	<i>Your comment is noted for consideration by the decision-making authorities.</i>

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
98	<i>The Unit: Integrated Environmental Management (IEM) is satisfied with the proposed application. The mitigation measures and the recommendations contained in the specialist reports must adhered to.</i>	<i>Kelebogile Mekgoe Rustenburg Local Municipality, E-mail 26 May 2014</i>	<i>The mitigation measures and recommendations from specialists have been included, where relevant, in Section 19 the EIA and EMP report.</i>
99	<i>Please note that we do not have any comments.</i>	<i>Jacqueline Nkosi, Department of Rural Development Land Reform, E-mail, 23 May 2014</i>	<i>It is noted that you have no comments at this stage.</i>
100	<i>The applicant have not specify the “No go” area, it is crucial to allude to the “No go “ area and briefly discuss what will be the issue if the project does not continue.</i>	<i>Ratshalingwa Mulaudzi Bojanala Platinum District Municipality, E-mail, 28 May 2014</i>	<i>The “no-go” alternative has been considered for the project (see Section 2.9 of the EIA and EMP report).</i>
101	<i>The EMPR must be based on specialists input; therefore specialist studies, must be undertaken. You are advised to also undertake any studies which may be relevant during the impact analysis.</i>	<i>Tshilidzi Phalala, Department of Mineral Resources, E-mail 23 May 2014</i>	<i>Specialist studies were undertaken for the project (see appendices attached to the EIA and EMP report).</i>

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
102	<p>Furthermore note that the Amendment EMPR must be guided by the provisions of regulations 50 and 51 of the MPRDA and the following must form part of the process:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Amendment EMPR must contain a layout plan of the pit, tailing dam, waste rock facilities, a chrome sand drying plant and other operational and surface infrastructure changes including the precise extent of surface area to be covered. 2. The Amendment EMPR must commit to monitoring and indicate standards, methods and timeframe when monitoring performance assessment of the EMPR will be done. 3. The EMPR should provide a layout and a description of such monitoring and performance assessment report. 4. The assessment EMPR must indicate a closure objective including the end land use of the area after mining activities. 5. The company must include the procedures that related to emergencies and the proposed remediation thereto, for example: discuss the contingency plans with respect to floods, accidental spills and management of hazardous materials such as oil and diesel. 6. All issues raised must be incorporated and investigated as part of amendment together with the management and commitment. 7. Kindly be informed that amended EMPR must be submitted to this office on or before 16 September 2014. 	<p>Tshilidzi Phalala, Department of Mineral Resources, E-mail 23 May 2014</p>	<p>The Department's requirements have been noted. The EIA and EMP report has been compiled in line with Regulation 50 and 51 of the MPRDA as per the Department's comments.</p>

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
103	<p><i>I refer to your letter dated 11 April 2014 and Eskom Transmission's (Tx) letter dated 25 April 2014. I wish to confirm to you that Eskom's Transmission (Tx) Bighorn- Pluto 275kV power line was deviated for purpose of the above development. Eskom Tx's servitude rights over those properties affected by the deviation may be finalized in due course. Attached please also find extract of Eskom TxSi-System on which the deviation position of the mentioned power line is indicated in green. Further to the above Eskom Tx still raises no objection to the proposed changes to the pit, tailings dam and waste rock facilities, the chrome sand drying plant, and other operations and surface infrastructure changes, provided Eskom Tx's rights and servitudes are acknowledged and respected at all times. (The details of Eskom's requirements have not been included here but do form part of comments included in Appendix A of EIA and EMP report).</i></p>	<p><i>Advocate Ntika Maake, Eskom Transmission, Asset Management and Execution, E-mail 04 August 2014</i></p>	<p><i>The comments have been noted. Tharisa will comply with Eskom's requirements as outlined in the letter.</i></p>
B. Tharisa Stakeholder Engagement Related Issues			
1	<p>Tharisa does not comply with the commitment to conduct quarterly stakeholder meetings as per the original EIA/EMP report. They meet with the stakeholders only when they need authorisation for specific activities at the mine.</p>	<p>Hettie Le Roux Key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012</p>	<p>Many stakeholder meetings have been held, but not always at the required quarterly frequency and not with all stakeholders. Tharisa has set up a landowner committee forum to be used for information sharing between the mine and surrounding landowners. There are also monthly engagement meetings with community leadership (local councilor). (Tharisa)</p>
2	<p>Proposed regular meetings to be held with stakeholders as per the approved EIA/EMP report never materialized.</p>	<p>T Le Roux (Hettie) Email, 8 February 2012</p>	

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
3	The stakeholders need regular interaction with Tharisa.	Alex Salang General public scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	Tharisa has an “open door” policy where nearby landowners/ IAPs can contact the mine. Tharisa is maintaining a community complaint register which will be reviewed with feedback at every stakeholder meeting. Complaints can be lodged directly at the General Managers office. (Tharisa)
4	We (the surrounding landowners) are frustrated with Tharisa because we raise our concerns with them and they never do a thing about them. We do not trust Tharisa.	Hettie Le Roux and Hilton Bedwell Key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	
5	I would like to communicate with Tharisa’s management.	Danie van Rensburg (146 and 101 Kafferskraal) Key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	
6	Tharisa minerals have failed to address the problems created by the mine since its operations in the year 2008. How does Tharisa intend to address the new problem that will arise with the increase of activities such as noise, air pollution and ground water contamination and drainage?	T Le Roux (Hettie) Email, 8 February 2012	Tharisa has a detailed environmental monitoring programme to identify problems caused by Tharisa’s activities. Where this monitoring proves that community members have been materially adversely affected (such as drying of boreholes), Tharisa will rectify this. Where this monitoring proves that unacceptable environmental impacts are being caused by Tharisa’s activities, these will be rectified by Tharisa. (Tharisa)

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
7	<p>Previously raised concerns which have not yet been addressed include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pumping water at mine completely drain our boreholes. • Dust, noise and damage to our properties created by the blasting activities. • Overpopulation on mine residential property results in extensive use of farm road and this road cannot handle it. • The traffic and promise from mine management to close the said site never happened but occupiers and vehicles just increased creating a dust and safety risk. • Technology (internet connection) in the area affected by mine surrounding wall (soil berms south of the mine along the N4). • The mine is seriously affecting our income and lack of interest by mine officials is not helping the situation (has been going on for months). • Overall effect of above-mentioned problems on the quality of our lives. 	<p>T Le Roux (Hettie) Email, 8 February 2012</p>	<p>Tharisa has an “open door policy where nearby landowners/ IAPs can contact the mine. Tharisa is maintaining a community complaint register which will be reviewed with feedback at every stakeholder meeting. Complaints can be lodged directly at the General Managers office. These issues have been resolved between Tharisa and the relevant landowner.</p>
8	<p>They promised us a focussed stakeholder meeting but it still has not taken place and there is no indication about when and/or that it will take place. Thus SLR is closing the scoping process for comments without taking into account the comments of the true stakeholders in the proposed expansion. This makes a mockery of the scoping phase.</p>	<p>T Le Roux (Hettie) Email, 8 February 2012</p>	<p>A key stakeholder scoping meeting was held with the land owners in and around the mine on 16 February 2012 at the Retief Primary School. A general public scoping meeting was held later the same day. A follow on scoping meeting was held with representatives of the landowner committee on 26 March 2014.</p>

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
9	<p>Unless the manner of engagement between Tharisa and stakeholders is improved there is potential for the courts and the press to be involved. The request was made for Tharisa to stop engaging with stakeholders in a fragmented manner because this creates suspicion and uncertainty. Dr Holmes is the contact point for communication because as the chairperson of the Buffelspoort Dam Action Group she represents the following entities: Agriculture, Buffelspoort dam Management Committee, The RGKB Landowners Association, Upstream and downstream water users, Riparian landowners, Members of the hospitality industry, Buffelspoort Valley Conservancy, Local fisherman, Recreational user of the dam and river, The Magaliesberg Protection Association, and The Magaliesberg Management Committee.</p>	<p>Buffelspoort Dam Action Group (Contact persons: Dr Shan Holmes and Tony Richards) Key stakeholder meeting, 23 February 2013</p>	<p>Your comment is noted for consideration by the decision-making authorities.</p>
10	<p><i>Lapologang community once raised issues pertaining to their houses cracking due to blasting activities at Tharisa as well as issues around blasting fumes. Does anyone know what the feedback from Tharisa regarding these issues was?</i></p>	<p><i>Eric Mathebula Scoping meeting with Ward Committees, 26 March 2014</i></p>	<p><i>Tharisa undertook investigations in response to these issues and the reports/findings were communicated by Tharisa to the community leadership. These studies included additional air quality monitoring and a pre-blasting household survey. The results of the air quality monitoring showed that there were no issues. (Tharisa)</i></p>
11	<p><i>It looks like community leadership does not share information with the rest of the community. Ward councillor and committee members need to start giving community feedback from the various meetings that we hold with our community.</i></p>		<p><i>Your comment has been noted.</i></p>

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
12	<p><i>I am a neighbouring landowner (11 Spruitfontein) who was involved in the original EIA and EMP process for Tharisa mine. I would like to know why I never receive information from Tharisa regarding developments at the mine and or response to my queries? I have heard about various meetings between Tharisa and/or other landowners and I am never invited to these meetings. Why is this the case?</i></p> <p><i>I submitted my complaint regarding cable theft in the area as well as at the old houses that are owned by Tharisa, to date there is no response from Tharisa.</i></p>	<p><i>Tinus Cronje Scoping meeting with Marikana Eco Forum Representatives, 26 March 2014</i></p>	<p><i>This stakeholder has been included on the mine's database and forms part of the mine's communication structure, where relevant. (Tharisa)</i></p> <p><i>Tharisa has an "open door" policy where nearby landowners/ IAPs can contact the mine. Tharisa is maintaining a community complaint register which will be reviewed with feedback at every stakeholder meeting.</i></p>
13	<p><i>Any complaint from the public during the construction and operation of this project must be attended to by the person involved as soon as possible to the satisfaction of the parties concerned. A complaint register must be kept up to date and shall be produced upon request.</i></p>	<p><i>Kelebogile Mekgoe Rustenburg Local Municipality, E-mail 26 May 2014</i></p>	<p><i>A complaint register is maintained by the mine and will be used for the project.</i></p>
14	<p><i>It is with regret that I address this email to you as I unfortunately do not have another email address and phone calls are simply ignored or not returned. We have already on several occasions raised our concerns to Mr Thulani Ntshanga regarding the adverse effects that the Tharisa Minerals developments have on us as the owners of Plot 305 which is in proximity of these mining activities and developments.</i></p> <p><i>I sincerely hope that you could be of assistance or refer us to the correct contact in order to discuss and address these concerns.</i></p>	<p><i>Frikkie Pretorius Email, 25 June 2014</i></p>	<p><i>Follow up discussions between Tharisa and the stakeholder and currently being undertaken to address these issues.</i></p>
15	<p><i>At the end I urge you to urgently look into these issues and address it through the appropriate channels as we as a supposedly interested and affected party are seldom informed of meetings or forums where these issues can be brought forward if it even will be taken seriously.</i></p>		

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
C. Project/Technical Related Issues			
1	<p>According to Figure 1, Drawing T014-12, 01/2012 entitled local setting the item indicated as “proposed changes not completed” Item #1 “waste rock dump” covers, or at least partly covers the property “Portion 135 (portion of portion 8), Kafferskraal 342, Registration Division JQ. Could you please urgently confirm that my interpretation of the information sent to me is correct, or otherwise? This information would have a bearing on my interest in the two respective meetings scheduled for 16 February 2012, for which I received an invitation to attend, on behalf of my mother Mrs AC Retief. Could you also please provide a clearer indication of the interrelationship between Item #1 and the said Portion 135?</p>	<p>Prof JV Retief Email, 30 January 2012</p>	<p>Prof. Retief’s property has been purchased by Tharisa. (Tharisa)</p>
2	<p>The buffer area surrounding Tharisa Mine is already too narrow and should be increased so that the surrounding community is not exposed to the mining activities. Instead, Tharisa is seeking to expand its operations, thus further narrowing this buffer area. This is not acceptable.</p>	<p>Elsa Steyn Email, 24 February 2012</p>	<p>Potential impacts on surrounding land users and uses are assessed in the EIA (see Section 7 of the EIA and EMP report).</p>
3	<p>Does 400ktp relate to the size of the plant? What is its water consumption?</p>	<p>Ian Ashmole Key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012</p>	<p>Yes, it is the size of the plant. An updated water balance has been prepared for the mine (see Section 2.7.4 of the EIA and EMP report).</p>
4	<p>Will there be minor element impurities in the waste acid – this includes Se, Te, Bi, Hg, Pb, Zn, etc?</p>	<p>Buks Kruger Email, 8 February 2012</p>	<p>The smelter and the leaching process have been removed from the project scope and therefore related issues are no longer considered relevant to this process.</p>
5	<p>Will the leach circuits produce any jarosite products? What are the leaching characteristics of the iron sulphate and calcium sulphate residues from the leach circuit?</p>		
6	<p>Why does Tharisa want to construct a smelter house when they had previously informed us that they will not do so?</p>	<p>Hilton Bedwell Focussed scoping meeting, 2 February 2012</p>	<p>The smelter has been removed from the project scope and therefore related issues are no longer considered relevant to this process.</p>

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
7	Does Tharisa have any plans of undertaking underground mining activities in our area (south of the N4)?	Hilton Bedwell, Johan van Heerden and Barend Clark Focussed scoping meeting, 2 February 2012	No, Tharisa has no plans of undertaking mining activities south of the N4. (Tharisa)
8	What will Tharisa do with the by-products (e.g. nickel) from the smelting process?		The smelter has been removed from the project scope and therefore related issues are no longer considered relevant to this process.
9	Will the tailings dams be lined?		This is part of the tailings code of practice. Liner and pollution control details for the tailings dam are included in the EIA and EMP report (see Section 2.7.6).
10	<i>What is Tharisa going to use to line the base of the TSF as well as the TSF wall?</i>	<i>Marikana Eco Forum (contact person - Alet Swanepoel) Scoping meeting with Marikana Eco Forum Representatives, 26 March 2014</i>	The slag dump is no longer applicable as the smelter has been removed from the project scope. Related issues are no longer considered relevant to this process.
11	<i>What is Tharisa going to use to line the base of the TSF as well as the TSF wall?</i>		Liner and pollution control details for the tailings dam are included in the EIA and EMP report (see Section 2.7.6).
12	Will the Tailings Dump and Slag Dump be lined?	Hilton Bedwell General public meeting, 16 February 2012 Kelebogile Mekgoe (RLM) Regulatory authorities' meeting, 21 February 2012	This is part of the tailings code of practice. Liner and pollution control details for the tailings dam are included in the EIA and EMP report (see Section 2.7.6). The slag dump is no longer applicable as the smelter has been removed from the project scope. Related issues are no longer considered relevant to this process.
13	Are there emergency plans in place in case there is the tailings dam's failure?	Hilton Bedwell, Johan van Heerden and Barend Clark Focussed scoping meeting, 2 February 2012	Emergency response procedures for the mine include the failure of the tailings dam (see Section 20 of the EIA and EMP report).
14	<i>What emergency plans are in place should the TSF burst/ collapse?</i>	<i>Theunis van Rensburg Scoping meeting with Landowners, 26 March 2014</i>	
15	The smelter house description mentions both alloy granulation and crushing – which one of the two processes will be utilised?	Buks Kruger Email, 8 February 2012	The smelter has been removed from the project scope and therefore related issues are no longer considered relevant to this process.
16	There are a lot of smelters in the area such as IFM Ferrochrome and Xstrata's in the area. Which smelter is Tharisa considering as an alternative?	Nols de Wet Key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	Tharisa will sell the PGM concentrate to Impala for further processing. (Tharisa)

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
17	Why are the PGM and chrome concentrates not sold to IFM or other chrome smelters?	Johan Swanepoel Key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	PGM concentrate is being sold to other smelters. Chrome concentrate is sold mainly to Chinese smelters. Some chrome is sold to South African smelters. Tharisa continually evaluates the best possible markets for the chrome concentrate, including the possibility of IFM. (Tharisa)
18	Where will the chrome from Tharisa be sent to?	Johan Swanepoel Key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	Most of Tharisa's chrome is destined for China via Richard's Bay and Durban ports. Some is also sold to various south African smelters. (Tharisa)
19	Is Tharisa also intending to buy PGM concentrate from other mining houses for smelting purposes?	Theunis van Rensburg Key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	No. The smelter has been removed from the project scope and therefore related issues are no longer considered relevant to this process.
20	If Tharisa decides to use an off-site smelter, does it mean that another mining company will build an additional smelter to accommodate the PGM concentrate from Tharisa?	Pieter Wolvaardt Key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	Tharisa cannot comment on this, as it depends on the capacity of- and supply to the other existing PGM smelters. Tharisa does not have detailed knowledge of this. (Tharisa)
21	Will chrome 6 be a by-product of the smelting process?	Pieter Wolvaardt Key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	The smelter has been removed from the project scope and therefore related issues are no longer considered relevant to this process.
22	Will there be any harmful material in the slag? We do not want the slag to contaminate the waste rocks and the tailings dam.		
23	Will the storage of the LPG and acids be considered as hazardous areas?		
24	What are the dimensions of the smelter house?	Hilton Bedwell Key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	
25	At the informal community meeting the size of the proposed smelter house was downplayed; yet the EIA/EMP Programme Document proposes a smelter house with a footprint of 200m x 200m. This means that the community is being misinformed.	Elsa Steyn Email, 24 February 2012	
26	At the general public meeting of 16 February 2012 the footprint comparison stated that the Tharisa Smelter would be 200m x 250m – why is this different from the footprint as designated in the EIA/EMP Programme Document?		

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
27	Does Tharisa have an authorisation to carry out the proposed projects particularly the smelter house given that Tharisa previously informed us that Eskom couldn't supply them with the necessary electricity?	Jaco Schoeman (Kafferskraal 352) Key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	The smelter has been removed from the project scope and therefore related issues are no longer considered relevant to this process.
28	Tharisa previously stated in the past that not all the properties could be purchased due to lack of funds, who is funding the smelter project?		
29	What are the impacts that are associated with the proposed smelter house?	Nols de Wet Key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	
30	The fact that the Smelter Plant will be operated 24 hours per day is of concern. There already is great unhappiness in the community due to the fact that there is a lot of noise at night due to mine trucks being operated (reverse hooters), stones being crushed, other mechanical noise emanating from the mine, as well as the bright lights that are shining through bedroom windows. All of these are preventing the community from sleeping properly and they go to work tired the next day. This will be exacerbated by the proposed smelter plant being operated 24 hours per day. The current blasting at the mine contributes to the noise factor, but even more serious is the fact that it creates a safety risk to community members due to rocks that are thrown 700m from the mine.	Elsa Steyn Email, 24 February 2012	The smelter has been removed from the project scope and therefore related issues are no longer considered relevant to this process. In terms of noise, visual and blasting impacts associated with the approved operations together with the project components, these issues have been addressed in the EIA (see Section 7.2.13, 7.2.14 and 7.2.17, respectively, of the EIA and EMP report).
31	What will be the content of the tailings?	Hilton Bedwell Key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	The tailings is a slurry. Geochemical testing of bench tailings samples indicates that under the worst case scenario of mildly acidic conditions (i.e. acid rain) there is possible leaching of aluminium and manganese (see Section 3.3 of the EIA and EMP report).
32	What is the chemistry of the tailings? There is a concern from the government departments that there are heavy metals in the water.		
33	The General Manager (GM) and the Managing Director (MD) of the mine informed us in our meeting with Tharisa that the smelter has already been built and it is currently stored in Johannesburg.	Hilton Bedwell Key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	The smelter that is located in Johannesburg is Mintek's permanent testing facility not Tharisa's smelter. The smelter has been removed from the project scope and therefore related issues are no longer considered relevant to this process.

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
34	How far are the soil berms from the N4?	Hettie Le Roux Key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	Approximately 80m.
35	Where is the position of the tailings return water dam?	Martinus Barnard Key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	At the meeting this was described as per the locality map that was attached in the BID. This is the same position as shown on Figure 2 of the EIA and EMP report.
36	We would like to have the details of the smelter house so that we can have a proper understanding of how it will be operating e.g. gas cleaning technologies to be used, are they approved and what types of scrubbers will be used and how it can potentially affect the environment.	Pieter Wolvaardt, Ian Ashmole, Lappies Labuschagne Key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	The smelter has been removed from the project scope and therefore related issues are no longer considered relevant to this process.
37	How far is the proposed smelter house from the Marikana Road?	Hilton Bedwell General public meeting, 16 February 2012	The smelter has been removed from the project scope and therefore related issues are no longer considered relevant to this process.
38	How far is the large waste rock that is located on the eastern side of the mine from the settlement?	Calvin Thutlwane General public meeting, 16 February 2012	The eastern waste rock dump is approximately 90m from the Mmaditlhokwa/Silver City settlement referred to in the comment.
39	What will be done at the planned stock pile (NE waste rock dump)? How big is this new waste rock stock pile going to be? Are there old mine workings underground from this planned stock pile?	Marikana Eco Forum (Contact person - Alet Swanepoel) E-mail, 11 March 2014	The north east waste rock dump is planned with a footprint of approximately 95ha, an approximate height of 70m (in 15m high lifts) and a total volume of 19.98 million m³ (45.95 million tons of waste rock) (see Section 2 of the EIA and EMP report). This waste rock dump will accept waste rock from the eastern open pit operations. There are old underground mine workings within a portion of the waste rock dump.
40	Why is the large waste rock dump so close to the existing community?	Mavis Vilame General public meeting, 16 February 2012	The location and footprint of the waste rock dumps are unavoidable due to space constraints, the location of mineable ore resources and the presence of surrounding land uses.
41	What is the distance by law that is allowed from the house and the Western Waste Rock Dump?	Mr R and/or P C van der Westhuizen General public meeting, 16 February 2012	SLR is not aware of any distances provided for in the law.

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
42	You are required to submit the rehabilitation plan to the Department of Water Affairs. The Department is concerned that the waste rock dumps will not be rehabilitated close to its pre-mining state.	S.N Ntshangase (DWA) Fax, 31 October 2012	Details on the rehabilitation plan for the waste rock dumps are included in Section 2.8 of the EIA and EMP report.
43	At present Tharisa fails to adhere to its undertaking not to use the school road for the trucks to commute; it still does this and this endangers the lives of innocent school children. The smelter plant and higher number of trucks will increase the safety risks.	Elsa Steyn Email, 24 February 2012	Tharisa no longer uses the school road, an internal road is used to haul material from the West mine to the RoM pads. Tharisa has assisted in making the road safer for all road users by erecting restrictive speed signage and constructing speed humps. (Tharisa) The smelter has been removed from the project scope and therefore related issues are no longer considered relevant to this process.
44	The fact that the chrome sand drying plant will be operated 24 hours per day is of concern. There already is great unhappiness in the community due to the fact that there is a lot of noise at night due to mine trucks being operated, stones being crushed, other mechanical noise emanating from the mine, as well as the bright lights that are shining through bedroom windows. All of these are preventing the community from sleeping properly and they go to work tired the next day.	Elsa Steyn Email, 24 February 2012	Noise related impacts associated with the chrome sand drying plant have been addressed in Section 7.2.13 of the EIA and EMP report.
45	Nowhere in the EIA/EMP Amendment background information document (BID) is mentioned that the intention is to increase the life of the mine from 12-18 years – this was disclosed for the first time at the meeting of 16 February 2012. This is a further significant impact on the community that will increase the devaluation of their properties.	Elsa Steyn Email, 24 February 2012	This information was confirmed after the distribution of the BID. Typically, during the course of an EIA process the project description details are refined. Any changes in the project scope will be communicated with the IAPs via newsletters, reports or meetings.
46	Where is the slag going to be deposited?	Kelebogile Mekgoe (RLM) Regulatory authorities' meeting, 21 February 2012	The smelter has been removed from the project scope and therefore related issues are no longer considered relevant to this process.
47	Will the footprint of the TSF change with the new layout? In the BID document it states that it will be reduced, is this a type-error?		The changes to the sizes of the TSFs are as follows: approved TSF 1 size will change from 52ha to 70ha and the approved TSF 2 size will change from 100ha to 135ha (see Section 2 of the EIA and EMP report).

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
48	According to my knowledge and records, Tharisa is still breaking (not complying) with the EMP commitments that are outlined in Chapter 6: a) By working after the approved working hours and b) The way they stockpile topsoil, this mistake they want to rectify by this amendment.	Marikana Eco Forum (Contact person - Alet Swanepoel) E-mail, 11 March 2014	The EMP specifies that crushing, waste rock handling, or earth moving activities will not take place during the mentioned timeframes particularly on the western side of the mine. These activities are stopped during the indicated time period; the West crushing plant was decommissioned in 2011. (Tharisa) Changes to the topsoil stockpiles have been undertaken to improve noise and visual mitigation measures. As part of the EIA, a soil specialist was consulted to understand the effect of stockpiling soil to a height of 30m. The specialist has indicated that this can be done however when the soil is used for rehabilitation purposes, the sampling and analysis of soils as outlined in the EMP must be undertaken to determine the nutrient status of the soil and determine the need for active seeding or the addition of fertilisers (see Section 7.2.4 of the EIA and EMP report).
49	I just want to know how can Tharisa apply to stockpile the topsoil of 30m high? Will this not destroy it? Will it still be functional for the rehabilitation process?	Alet Swanepoel Email, 23 October 2012	This should read three hundred and twenty (320). This was corrected in the updated scoping report.
50	On page 4-7, first paragraph, first bullet, read as “three hundred and two (320) trucks per day”. Please correct this error, is it 302 or 320?	S.N Ntshangase (DWA) Fax, 31 October 2012	This should read three hundred and twenty (320). This was corrected in the updated scoping report.
51	<i>Where will the waste rock for the north east WRD come from?</i>	<i>Marikana Eco Forum (contact person - Alet Swanepoel)</i>	<i>This waste rock dump will accept waste rock from the eastern open pit operations. (Tharisa)</i>
52	<i>Will Samancor’s underground mine operations be affected by the north east WRD? Are Samancor’s underground pillars going to be affected by Tharisa’s north east WRD?</i>	<i>Scoping meeting with Marikana Eco Forum Representatives, 26 March 2014</i>	<i>Existing information indicates that a portion of the north east waste rock dump lies above mined out underground workings. The depth of these workings is expected to be >300m below surface. The positioning of the north east waste rock dump is not expected to have an effect on the workings due to their depth. This aspect was considered by Tharisa when determining the position of the waste rock facility.</i>
53	<i>I do not think Tharisa’s preferred site for the north east WRD is necessarily safe given the fact that there is an overlap between the two activities of which one of them involves dewatering for Samancor’s underground mine operations.</i>		
54	<i>The application must specify how they will manage the waste during the construction and after construction. It is recommended that the applicant specify what is going to be re-used, recycled, recover and reduced.</i>	<i>Ratshalingwa Mulaudzi Bojanala Platinum District Municipality, E-mail, 28 May 2014</i>	<i>A waste management plan is included in Section 7.2.5 of the EIA an EMP report.</i>

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
D. Blasting Related Issues			
1	Does Tharisa have a blasting certificate and a certificate to operate on Sunday from the DMR?	Theunis van Rensburg Key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	Yes. (Tharisa)
2	Does Tharisa monitor its blasting impacts?	Hilton Bedwell, Johan van Heerden and Barend Clark Focussed scoping meeting, 2 February 2012	Each blast is carefully designed and monitored by a specialist blasting consultant. Ground and air vibrations are monitored for each and every blast. The blast monitoring indicates that Tharisa's blasts should not cause damage to any infrastructure which is 500m or more away from the blast. (Tharisa) On a number of occasions, blast monitors have also been placed in properties on the south of the N4; these have also indicated that Tharisa's blasts will not cause any damage to any infrastructure on the south of the N4 (near their properties). (Tharisa)
3	How often does it monitor?		
4	Who monitors the impacts?		
5	Due to the blasting activities, the borehole pumps do not last and they are now pumping sand. What will the mine do about this?	Peter van Rensburg General public scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	Tharisa has an "open door" policy where nearby landowners/ I&APs can contact the mine. Tharisa is maintaining a community complaint register which will be reviewed with feedback at every stakeholder meeting. Complaints can be lodged directly at the General Managers office. (Tharisa)
6	We have raised issue with Tharisa on numerous occasions, how can we believe that Tharisa is going to address the matter?		
7	Current operations at Tharisa Mine particularly blasting related activities have caused damage to our structures e.g. cracking of houses/structures.	Hilton Bedwell, Johan van Heerden and Barend Clark Focussed scoping meeting, 2 February 2012	The blast monitoring indicates that Tharisa's blasts should not cause damage to any infrastructure which is 500m or more away from the blast. (Tharisa) Any damage reported to Tharisa and caused by Tharisa's blasting operations will be investigated and if Tharisa is the cause of such damage, the necessary compensation will be provided. (Tharisa)
8	Tharisa's blasting activities have damaged some of my structures (houses).	Tina du Toit and Christa Hattigh (238 Kafferskraal) Key stakeholder scoping meetings, 16 February 2012 Monica Moleba General public scoping meeting, 16 February 2012 WAJ Vorster Email, 17 February 2012.	
9	There is blasting that takes place between 3 and 4pm that causes the houses to shake. Will Tharisa take responsibility and fix the damage that is created by the blasting?	Mr R and/or Mr P C van der Westhuizen	

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
10	In some instances the level of water in boreholes has even risen and caused pumps to cease. Blasting has furthermore caused boreholes to collapse.	Elsa Steyn, comment Email, 24 February 2012.	The blast monitoring indicates that Tharisa's blasts should not cause damage to any infrastructure which is 500m or more away from the blast (Tharisa) Any damage reported to Tharisa and caused by Tharisa's blasting operations will be investigated and if Tharisa is the cause of such damage, the necessary compensation will be provided. (Tharisa)
11	There is no trust with regards to the blasting issues. People move to the road during blasting. There is no regard for people's discomfort. Before Tharisa continues, they need to fix what has been damaged.	Calvin Thutlwane General public scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	
12	Can we please have an independent person to monitor blasting related activities at Tharisa?	Hilton Bedwell General public scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	IAPs are welcome to appoint their preferred consultant. The mine already uses a specialist who is independent. Relevant reports are available from the General Managers office on request. (Tharisa)
13	We are concerned about fly rock from the blasting activities which is a safety related matter (south of the N4).	Hilton Bedwell, Johan van Heerden and Barend Clark Focussed scoping meeting, 2 February 2012	Blasting related impacts including ground vibrations, air blasts, fly rock and blast fumes have been assessed in the EIA and EMP report with input from a blast specialist (see Section 7.2.17). Detailed management measures are included in Section 19 of the EIA and EMP report.
14	Mine detonations are causing glasses to fall from the shelves and the houses of the surrounding community to crack. Intensifying the mining conducted at Tharisa will increase the problem.	Elsa Steyn Email, 24 February 2012	
15	<i>The specialist appointed to investigate this area should be aware that most of these building are old and not built to any building specifications, and cannot be compared to buildings in some mining town overseas the old buildings was part of the sentiment when properties was bought in this area, and was in good condition as there was no blasting or mine activity nearby.</i>	<i>Hettie Le Rox, Landowners Representative South of the N4, Email, 27 May 2014</i>	

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
15	<p><i>Firstly we are very concerned about the damage that are occurring to our house and property due to the mining activities and blasting. As mentioned previously to Mr Ntshanga, of which they came to photograph, whenever blasting happens in the mining areas these shocks can be felt up to the area where we live and these shocks cause extreme damage to our buildings as tiles are falling from walls, nails are falling from ceilings and these are coming loose, walls crack and become increasingly more and existing ones are getting worse and wider, windows are also coming loose and rattle all the time from the vibrations off mining activities. It is at such a point that we are not feeling safe in our own home any longer since we live in fear of something collapsing onto us inside the house.</i></p>	<p><i>Frikkie Pretorius Email, 25 June 2014</i></p>	<p>Blasting related impacts including ground vibrations, air blasts, fly rock and blast fumes have been assessed in the EIA and EMP report with input from a blast specialist (see Section 7.2.17). Detailed management measures are included in Section 19 of the EIA and EMP report.</p>
E. Soil Related Issues			
1	<p><i>The stripped and stockpiled topsoil may be chemically altered due to storage, this can potentially alter nutrient levels in the soil and result in loss of fertility, therefore proper management of topsoil must be ensured.</i></p>	<p><i>Kelebogile Mekgoe Rustenburg Local Municipality, E-mail 26 May 2014</i></p>	<p><i>A soil management plan is included in Section 7.2.4 of the EIA and EMP report with input from specialist work.</i></p>

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
F. Biodiversity Related Issues			
1	Our trees are already taking on strain from the current mining operations and we feel that the proposed projects will exacerbate the situation.	Hilton Bedwell, Johan van Heerden and Barend Clark Focussed scoping meeting, 2 February 2012 and key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	Biodiversity related impacts have been assessed in the EIA and EMP report with input from a biodiversity specialist (see Section 7.2.6 and 7.2.7). Detailed management measures are included in Section 19 of the EIA and EMP report.
2	We are also concerned that the bees that are needed for farming activities particularly for the pollination process will be in more danger of being depleted by the proposed activities- smelter house.		
3	The people from Madithlokwa cut down our trees for domestic purposes because they have no trees, bushes or grass in their resettlement village	A Botha General public scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	This comment has been noted.
4	There is a wetland that has been identified on several portions of the farm Rooikoppies. Which portions of the Rooikoppies farm will be affected by the proposed project components?	Kelebogile Mekgoe (RLM)	No activities will take place on the farm Rooikoppies. (Tharisa)

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
5	<i>The Unit: Integrated Environmental Management (IEM) has noted that there are SANBI wetlands identified on site.</i>	<i>Kelebogile Mekgoe Rustenburg Local Municipality, E-mail 26 May 2014</i>	<i>The National Freshwater Ecosystem Priority Areas Project (NFEPA) database was consulted and it was concluded by the biodiversity specialist that the wetlands within the project area are at a Level 4A in terms of the NFEPA classification system and are characterised as flat, unchanelled valley bottom and valley head seeps. NFEPA assigns a “no importance” value to these wetlands through its ranking system (SAS, 2014) (see Section 1.1.5 of the EIA and EMP report).</i>
6	<i>The natural environment around the mining area has been extremely disturbed due to the mining rights as well as the agriculture activities however the scattered patches of natural habitat must be protected to avoid further disturbance and deforestation due to an activity.</i>	<i>Ratshalingwa Mulaudzi Bojanala Platinum District Municipality, E-mail, 28 May 2014</i>	<i>Biodiversity related impacts have been assessed in the EIA and EMP report with input from a biodiversity specialist (see Section 7.2.6 and 7.2.7). Detailed management measures are included in Section 19 of the EIA and EMP report.</i>
7	<i>A specialist must investigate the impact of the proposed project on the biodiversity assessment and mitigation measures and recommendations of such report into the Amendment Environmental Management Programme.</i>	<i>Tshilidzi Phalala, Department of Mineral Resources, E-mail 23 May 2014</i>	
G. Groundwater Related Issues			
1	Will Tharisa compensate the landowners if the boreholes water is contaminated?	Hilton Bedwell, Johan van Heerden and Barend Clark Focussed scoping meeting, 2 February 2012	Tharisa has a detailed environmental monitoring programme to identify problems caused by Tharisa's activities. Where this monitoring proves that community members have been materially adversely affected (such as polluting of boreholes), Tharisa will rectify or compensate for this. (Tharisa)
2	Tharisa drilled a borehole of 300m deep on my property in the early phase of the mine and they have never revisited it. I would like Tharisa to test it and also include it in the groundwater monitoring system.	Jaco van Wyk Key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	The groundwater monitoring network at Tharisa is deemed to be adequate for the purposes of determining mining related groundwater impacts. (Tharisa)
3	My borehole's yield has decreased due to Tharisa's operations.	Hettie Le Roux Key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	Field work and tests have been conducted at the Le Roux property. The outcome of the test conducted in Mr Le Roux's presence indicated that the borehole was not properly maintained. (Tharisa)

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
4	How does Tharisa monitor groundwater to ensure that there is no contamination or it is determined as early as possible?	Hilton Bedwell, Johan van Heerden and Barend Clark Focussed scoping meeting, 2 February 2012	Tharisa monitors the quality and quantity of water in and around its operations. This includes the monitoring of the landowners upstream and to the west of Tharisa. These results have been documented in reports to the Department of Water Affairs. These reports are available on request. (Tharisa)
5	There is a general concern from the local residents that the surrounding mines are causing decrease in water quality and quantity.		
6	Tharisa should monitor its impacts on water resources in the area. We currently cannot pinpoint who is responsible for the decrease in water quantity and quality.		
7	Are these reports available for public review?		
8	The groundwater is currently being polluted by the mine, as is evident from the fact that the borehole water of the surrounding community is turning milky. Further expansion of the mine will only exacerbate this problem.	Elsa Steyn, comment Email, 24 February 2012.	A review of the mine's groundwater monitoring results was undertaken as part of the project (see Section 1.1.7 of the EIA and EMP report). Groundwater pollution related impacts have been assessed in the EIA and EMP report with input from a groundwater specialist (see Section 7.2.10). Detailed management measures are included in Section 19 of the EIA and EMP report.
9	There is loss of water (dewatering) due to the mine.	Farouk Saloojee Fax: 1 February 2012	Groundwater related impacts have been assessed in the EIA and EMP report with input from a groundwater specialist (see Section 7.2.10 and 7.2.11). Detailed management measures are included in Section 19 of the EIA and EMP report.
10	How will the deepening of the pits impact groundwater- dewatering process? I have a borehole that is located approximately 50m from the open pit.	Marthinus Barnard Key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	
11	The 180m deep pit is going to damage the groundwater system. How can anybody allow such damage to the environment?	Alet Swanepoel Email, 23 October 2012	
12	I object to the Tharisa Mines' proposed development as the underground water table will be polluted.	Andre Maritz, letter Email, 24 January 2012	
13	Will there be possible contamination of the groundwater due to the deepening of the pits?	Marthinus Barnard Key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
14	Has the possibility of chemical seepage from the TSF been considered?	Kelebogile Mekgoe (RLM) Regulatory authorities' meeting, 21 February 2012	Yes, the groundwater specialist study considered the potential dispersion of pollution from the TSFs. Groundwater related pollution impacts have been assessed in the EIA and EMP report with input from a groundwater specialist (see Section 7.2.10). Detailed management measures are included in Section 19 of the EIA and EMP report.
15	These mine waste rock contains levels of nitrates and sulphates and can cause pollution to the river and ground water.	Marikana Eco Forum (Contact person - Alet Swanepoel) E-mail, 11 March 2014	The pollution potential of the waste rock is included in Section 3.3 of the EIA and EMP report. A review of the mine's groundwater monitoring results was undertaken as part of the project (see Section 1.1.7 of the EIA and EMP report). Groundwater related impacts have been assessed in the EIA and EMP report with input from a groundwater specialist (see Section 7.2.10). Detailed management measures are included in Section 19 of the EIA and EMP report.
16	It is not only the tailings that contain nitrates but also the waste rock from the walls and this will cause pollution to the ground water and surrounding water courses.		
17	The same for the current waste rock stock pile, what measure where been taken that the nitrates are not leaching to the ground water?		
18	Tharisa Minerals must assess the impact of such expansion to water resources and also to other water users and indicate mitigation measures.	S.N Ntshangase (DWA) Fax, 31 October 2012	Groundwater related impacts have been assessed in the EIA and EMP report with input from a groundwater specialist (see Section 7.2.10 and 7.2.11). Detailed management measures are included in Section 19 of the EIA and EMP report.
19	<i>Seepage of contaminants from the TSF and WRD is also an issue which needs to be investigated.</i>	<i>Hettie Le Roux</i> <i>Scoping meeting with Landowners, 26 March 2014</i>	
20	<i>It must be noted that there are boreholes that are located 200m away from the TSF.</i>	<i>Theunis van Rensburg</i> <i>Scoping meeting with Landowners, 26 March 2014</i>	
21	How will the groundwater be affected by the proposed projects particularly the contamination of the Buffelspoort dam?	Hilton Bedwell and Pieter Wolvaardt Key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	It is unlikely that the water from the Buffelspoort dam will be contaminated by the operations at the mine as the dam is located approximately 3km upstream from the mine. (Tharisa)

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
22	<p>The Department would like Tharisa Minerals to present all the case studies on the final EIA where monitoring was conducted and proved to have caused adverse impact on other water users and present how the matter was resolved. It is also not adequate to say the impacts will be rectified, it must indicate how it will be rectified and indicate the time frames as to when such measures will be implemented. This is per the complaints received from Mrs T Le Roux (Hettie) via e-mail dated 8 February 2012, Hilton Bedwell, Johan van Heerden and Barend Clark comments on the 2nd and 16th of February 2012. They raised issues that related to the borehole contamination. Farouk Saloojee indicated that there is already loss of water due to dewatering by the mine. Jaco van Wyk raised an issue that Tharisa drilled a 300m deep borehole on his property and the mine never revisited it. He requested Tharisa Minerals to test it and include it in the groundwater monitoring system.</p>	<p>S.N Ntshangase (DWA) Fax, 31 October 2012</p>	<p>Tharisa undertook a site visit meeting with DWA where these issues were discussed and the necessary information provided to DWA.</p>
23	<p>The Department would like Tharisa Minerals to indicate studies they conducted to come to the conclusion that it is not the mine that was polluting community borehole that was reported to have turned milky by Elsa Steyn, a comment via the e-mail on 24 February 2012. A written report of this case must be submitted to the Department or be included in the final EIA.</p>	<p>S.N Ntshangase (DWA) Fax, 31 October 2012</p>	
24	<p>Similarly, Tharisa Minerals must submit to the Department a written response on the investigation of Hettie's borehole where it was concluded Hettie's borehole was not maintained as a reason that depleted a borehole yield. This report must be part of the EIA which must be submitted to this Department.</p>	<p>S.N Ntshangase (DWA) Fax, 31 October 2012</p>	

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
25	Similarly, Tharisa cannot use borehole water that has been allocated to agriculture irrigation use. This is has not been authorised by the Department of Agriculture.	Buffelspoort Dam Action Group (Contact persons: Dr Shan Holmes and Tony Richards) Key stakeholder meeting, 23 February 2013	Tharisa has approval from the Department of Water Affairs for using this water. (Tharisa)
26	Are there any boreholes near this planned waste rock stock pile?	Marikana Eco Forum (Contact person - Alet Swanepoel) E-mail, 11 March 2014	As part of the approved EIA and EMP report (Metago, 2008), a hydrocensus was undertaken to identify boreholes surrounding the mine. This included the area of the north east waste rock dump. A map showing the location of boreholes within the vicinity of the mine is included in the EIA and EMP report (see Figure 1.11 in the EIA and EMP report). Groundwater related impacts have been assessed in the EIA and EMP report with input from a groundwater specialist (see Section 7.2.10 and 7.2.11). Detailed management measures are included in Section 19 of the EIA and EMP report.
27	Are there boreholes within the proposed north east WRD?	Marikana Eco Forum (contact person - Alet Swanepoel)	
28	What are the impacts that are associated with tailings storage facility (TSF) on water resources- surface and groundwater due to the changes to the design of the TSF?	Scoping meeting with Marikana Eco Forum Representatives, 26 March 2014	
29	Are there any boreholes that are going to be affected by the west mine operations?		
30	Due to our land being uphill in relation to the mine, it can be assumed that should the pit deepens , the chances increase that one or more boreholes can be drained should the water line be in that direction.	Hettie Le Rox, Landowners Representative South of the N4, Email, 27 May 2014	
31	Storage into groundwater, which may contain elevated levels of chromium and other elements; therefore continuous water monitoring should be done on the existing and proposed waste rock dump (WRD) and tailings material.	Kelebogile Mekgoe Rustenburg Local Municipality, E-mail 26 May 2014	Tharisa monitors the quality and quantity of water in and around its operations. A monitoring programme is included in Section 21 of the EIA and EMP report.
32	The groundwater must be monitored to avoid the contamination of the ground water and the boreholes around the area. The hydrology and Geohydrology (water quality analysis) must be done to check the water quality status of this area.	Ratshalingwa Mulaudzi Bojanala Platinum District Municipality, E-mail, 28 May 2014	
33	A specialist must investigate the impact of the proposed project on surface and groundwater resources and deduce mitigation measures thereof and performance monitoring standards.	Tshilidzi Phalala, Department of Mineral Resources, E-mail 23 May 2014	Groundwater related impacts have been assessed in the EIA and EMP report with input from a groundwater specialist (see Section 7.2.10 and 7.2.11). Detailed management measures are included in Section 19 of the EIA and EMP report.

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
H. Surface water Related Issues			
1	What are the impacts of the mine on the Sterkstroom river?	Hilton Bedwell, Johan van Heerden and Barend Clark Focussed scoping meeting, 2 February 2012 Alex Salang (DWA) Regulatory Authorities' Meeting: 21 February 2012	Surface water related impacts have been assessed in the EIA and EMP report with input from a hydrologist specialist (see Section 7.2.8 and 7.2.9). Groundwater related impacts affecting the baseflow of the Sterkstroom have been assessed in the EIA and EMP report with input from a groundwater specialist (see Section 7.2.11). Detailed management measures are included in Section 19 of the EIA and EMP report. Tharisa has a surface water monitoring programme in place that includes monitoring of the Sterkstroom River. A review of the mine's surface water monitoring results was undertaken as part of the project (see Section 1.1.6 of the EIA and EMP report).
2	We are concerned that Tharisa has relocated Maditlhokwa community closer to the banks of the Sterkstroom and this may increase the potential negative impacts on it by this community.		
3	What is Tharisa going to do to ensure that the water is not contaminated?		
4	How will the mine ensure that the flow of Sterkstroom river will not be negatively affected?		
5	What will be the impacts of the proposed projects on surface water particularly contamination by heavy metals?	Marthinus Barnard Key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	
6	How will Tharisa control and monitor the pollution of the Sterkstroom river with the developments of their proposed projects?	A Botha Fax, 20 February 2012	
7	Another concern is the pollution concern associated with the tailings dam.	Buffelspoort Dam Action Group (Contact persons: Dr Shan Holmes and Tony Richards) Key stakeholder meeting, 23 February 2013	
8	Is the mine going to consider how the surface and groundwater will be affected by the dust and pollution from the mine?	Alex Salang (DWA) Regulatory Authorities' Meeting: 21 February 2012	
9	<i>What are the expected impacts of the tailings storage facility (TSF) on water resources- surface and groundwater?</i>	<i>Theunis van Rensburg Scoping meeting with Landowners, 26 March 2014</i>	
10	Will the slag deposits contribute to water pollution?	Kelebogile Mekgoe (RLM) Regulatory authorities' meeting, 21 February 2012	

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
11	There is a small river where the new tailings dam is going to be how will this river been diverted.	Marikana Eco Forum (Contact person - Alet Swanepoel) E-mail, 11 March 2014	The diversion of this non-perennial stream formed part of the mine's approved EIA and EMP report (Metago, 2008) and is included in the mine's water use license.
12	On the subject of the EIA and related proposed activities, it is unacceptable for Tharisa to propose a 200m deep pit for two reasons. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> One, this will drain groundwater reserves which will have unacceptable impacts on the water reserve, the Sterkstroom and on surrounding water users. Two, the practice of storing the pit inflow water in the old Hernic quarry is unacceptable because this water is contaminated and the contamination will seep into the Sterkstroom. 	Buffelspoort Dam Action Group (Contact persons: Dr Shan Holmes and Tony Richards) Key stakeholder meeting, 23 February 2013	Surface water related impacts have been assessed in the EIA and EMP report with input from a hydrologist specialist (see Section 7.2.8 and 7.2.9). Use of the Hernic quarry as a storage dam and groundwater related impacts affecting the baseflow of the Sterkstroom have been assessed in the EIA and EMP report with input from a groundwater specialist (see Section 7.2.10 and 7.2.11). Detailed management measures are included in Section 19 of the EIA and EMP report.
13	<i>Storage into surface and groundwater, which may contain elevated levels of chromium and other elements; therefore continuous water monitoring should be done on the existing and proposed waste rock dump (WRD) and tailings material.</i>	Kelebogile Mekgoe Rustenburg Local Municipality, E-mail 26 May 2014	<i>Tharisa monitors the quality and quantity of water in and around its operations. A monitoring programme is included in Section 21 of the EIA and EMP report.</i>
14	<i>Potential erosion of the tailings dam can also increase sediment pollution in the Sterkstroom River; this will be more pronounced if rehabilitation measures are not implemented.</i>		<i>Due to the distance of the tailings dam from the Sterkstroom River, it is unlikely that any erosion, if present, would impact on the sediment load of the Sterkroom River. The rehabilitation measures for the tailings dam are included in Section 2.8 of the EIA and EMP report.</i>
15	<i>A specialist must investigate the impact of the proposed project on surface and groundwater resources and deduce mitigation measures thereof and performance monitoring standards.</i>	Tshilidzi Phalala, Department of Mineral Resources, E-mail 23 May 2014	<i>Surface water related impacts have been assessed in the EIA and EMP report with input from a hydrologist specialist (see Section 7.2.8 and 7.2.9). Detailed management measures are included in Section 19 of the EIA and EMP report.</i>
I. Air Quality Related Issues			
1	My property was not included in the monitoring network and I would like it to be included.	Tina du Toit Key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	Tharisa has revised its monitoring network for air quality monitoring and this property has been included. (Tharisa)

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
2	The location of the proposed smelter plant will be right on our doorstep. I am concerned about the sulphuric acid and sulphur dioxide that will negatively impact our health.	A van Rensburg General public scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	The smelter has been removed from the project scope and therefore related issues are no longer considered relevant to this process.
3	The people who reside south of the N4 are concerned about the potential impacts of the smelter house on the air quality since the area is affected by the north westerly winds that prevail in the area.	Hilton Bedwell Key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	
4	I object to the Tharisa Mines' proposed development as smoke from the smelter will impact our health as well our fruits, planted crops and properties.	Andre Maritz, letter Email, 24 January 2012	
5	What SO ₂ and dust/particulate air pollution abatement equipment will be installed on the concentrate and chrome sand dryer plants as well as on the electric furnace off gas?	Buks Kruger Email, 8 February 2012	
6	The development will also encourage/accelerate global warming and is not environmentally friendly.	Andre Maritz, letter Email, 24 January 2012	The electric furnace was part of the smelter. The smelter has been removed from the project scope and therefore related issues are no longer considered relevant to this process. The chrome sand drying plant will be fitted with a baghouse to collect particulate matter. Air quality related impacts have been assessed in the EIA and EMP report with input from an air quality specialist (see Section 7.2.12). Detailed management measures are included in Section 19 of the EIA and EMP report.
7	What will be the impacts of the mine's dust fall out on the surrounding land uses such as farming activities- strawberries, citrus fruits and guavas.	Nols de Wet General public scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	
8	What will be the impacts of the proposed projects on the ambient air quality? Some of the people have allergies and others are asthmatic.	Marthinus Barnard Key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	
9	There are a lot of speeding trucks that use our dirt road causing a lot of dust in our area. We do not know whose trucks they are but could they please suppress dust and put speed humps on the road for our health, plants and safety purposes?	Jaco van Wyk Key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	
10	What will be the impact of the TSF on the air quality?	Joseph Nkoshosho General public scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	
11	How will the impact be reduced?		

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
12	The air is polluted by the mining activities, how will the proposed project components add to the current situation?	Monica Moleba General public scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	Air quality related impacts have been assessed in the EIA and EMP report with input from an air quality specialist (see Section 7.2.12). Detailed management measures are included in Section 19 of the EIA and EMP report.
13	We are concerned about the dust that will be generated from the dumping of the waste rock.	Calvin Thutlwane General public scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	
14	Has Tharisa improved their design of the tailings dams with regards to air pollution limitation?	Joseph Nkoshosho Fax, 16 February 2012	
15	Dust is also a very big problem. My husband has chronic asthma and has difficulty to deal with it.	Herleen Pogierter Email: 29 June 2012	
16	<i>How is Tharisa planning on managing dust from the waste rock dumps (WRDs), particularly the central WRD which is located near communities and the school?</i>	<i>Eric Mathebula</i> <i>Scoping meeting with Ward Committees, 26 March 2014</i>	
17	<i>Dust is most likely going to have an impact on greenhouse activities at the neighbouring farm. Please investigate the impacts on them.</i>	<i>Theunis van Rensburg</i> <i>Scoping meeting with Landowners, 26 March 2014</i>	
18	Levels of dust generated by mining activities are already at unacceptable levels and are a great inconvenience to surrounding community and a potential health risk. Further expansion of the mine in general and the proposed chrome sand drying plant in particular, will exacerbate the problem. As with noise, unrealistic associations are made between mine and other sources of dust. An increase in vehicle and smelting plant emissions (CrVI) is carcinogenic, which is highly problematic for community settlements neighbouring the plant.	Elsa Steyn Email, 24 February 2012.	
19	Will the two proposed ROM pads with ore stockpiles have dust and air pollution mitigation measures in place so as to have no negative impacts on the surrounding residents?	Kelebogile Mekgoe (RLM) Regulatory authorities' meeting, 21 February 2012	The additional ROM pad has been excluded from the project scope. Dust mitigation measures are included in Section 19 of the EIA and EMP report.
20	Will the above mentioned mitigation measures be outlined in the report?	Kelebogile Mekgoe (RLM) Regulatory authorities' meeting, 21 February 2012	Yes, detailed management measures are included in Section 19 of the EIA and EMP report.

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
21	Has the operation and the expansion project taken into account climate change?	Buffelspoort Dam Action Group (Contact person: Dr Shan Holmes) Tel, 20 March 2014	The only project component that has the potential to contribute to greenhouse gas emissions is the chrome sand drying plant. Relevant air quality related impacts have been assessed in the EIA and EMP report with input from an air quality specialist (see Section 7.2.12).
22	<i>The tailings material storage is susceptible to wind entrainment and can lead to some environmental impacts especially if there are sensitive receptors down wind. It is therefore recommended that proper rehabilitation measures be put in place (i.e. slopes well managed).</i>	<i>Kelebogile Mekgoe Rustenburg Local Municipality, E-mail 26 May 2014</i>	Air quality related impacts have been assessed in the EIA and EMP report with input from an air quality specialist (see Section 7.2.12). Detailed management measures are included in Section 19 of the EIA and EMP report.
23	<i>Dust generated by construction activities must be effectively controlled by water spraying and/ or other dust-allaying agents.</i>		
24	<i>This problem is ongoing and is affecting the health of the community surrounding the mine. Burning eyes, sneezing, burning throats. The increase in activity within walking distance from some of the landowners combined with the additional gaseous emissions will have major repercussions.</i>	<i>Hettie Le Rox, Landowners Representative South of the N4, Email, 27 May 2014</i>	
25	<i>Too many people have the same problem to be a coincidence. It is mostly elderly people in the area, and should not be exposed to these hazardous conditions.</i>		
26	<i>A specialist must assess the impact of the additional activities on air quality, develop an air quality management plan to counter such impacts and also recommend performance monitoring measures.</i>	<i>Tshilidzi Phalala, Department of Mineral Resources, E-mail 23 May 2014</i>	
27	<i>Dust and gasses are some days uncontrolled and excessive to the extent that continuous exposure will harm our health at the end of the day.</i>	<i>Frikkie Pretorius Email, 25 June 2014</i>	

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
J. Roads and Transport Related Issues			
1	Tharisa uses our dirt road (located South of the N4), are there plans of up-grading it? We would like Tharisa to upgrade it.	Hettie Le Roux Key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	The road referred to was upgraded and the contractors were evicted. (Tharisa)
2	Will Tharisa use the road with the bridge over the N4 to access the tailings dam?	Jan Coetzee General public scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	No. After numerous discussions with the relevant landowners, Tharisa has requested SANRAL not to reconstruct the bridge. (Tharisa)
3	There are a lot of speeding trucks that use our dirt road causing a lot of dust in our area. We do not know whose trucks they are but could they please suppress dust and put speed humps on the road for our health and safety?	Jaco van Wyk Key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	For some period in the past, the public road which leads to the school was used by chrome dispatch trucks using Tharisa's weigh bridge at the West portion of the mine while the weigh bridge located at the plant (eastern portion of the mine) was not functioning. This should not be necessary in future. Tharisa has already changed the route of its trucks from the West and this has resulted in Tharisa using only 200 meters of public road instead of the 3.4 km it was using before. (Tharisa)
4	I am concerned about the fact that the access road from Marikana to Retief is utilised by trucks daily and the dust suppression is not effective.	Jeanetta Seleka and Alex Salang General public scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	
5	Children and villagers walk along this road and they are faced with the dust and safety and security issues.		
6	Road safety issues have been previously raised, the specific details of the truck owners/users were submitted to Tharisa and nothing has happened to date. I do not trust Tharisa.	Mr R and/or Mr P C van der Westhuizen Key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	
7	What public road re-routing will be required?	Buks Kruger Email, 8 February 2012	The route of the approved road diversion will change slightly to accommodate the deepening of the pit (see the infrastructure plan, Figure 2.1 of the EIA and EMP report).

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
8	How is Tharisa planning to transport its products?	Hilton Bedwell, Johan van Heerden and Barend Clark Focussed scoping meeting, 2 February 2012	All products from the existing concentrator plants are transported from the plant to various destinations by road truck. Product from the chrome sand drying plant will be transported in a similar manner. (Tharisa)
9	Will the proposed projects cause an increase in traffic? How will it be dealt with?		Traffic related impacts have been assessed in the EIA and EMP report (see Section 7.2.18). Detailed management measures are included in Section 19 of the EIA and EMP report.
10	We do not trust Tharisa. What will happen in the future regarding traffic related issues relating to the proposed projects?	Jeanetta Seleka and Alex Salang General public scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	
11	Will the volume of the trucks increase on the dirt roads due to the proposed activities?	Hilton Bedwell Key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	
12	The reckless driving of mine trucks on the dirt roads is already problematic. An expansion would mean more trucks, and thus a greater problem.	Elsa Steyn, comment Email, 24 February 2012.	
13	More accidents happen on the road between the Toll bridge and cross over bridge to the other mines.	Herleen Potgieter Email: 29 June 2012	These are public roads under the auspices of the National Roads Department. (Tharisa)
14	The speed humps is a big problem, it might keep people from driving too fast, but it's a reason for peoples brakes to be changed more regularly than normally. My husband travels to Lonmin production plant and he had to change his vehicles brakes twice already in a short period of time.		Speed humps assist in making the roads safer to use therefore they should be approached with caution. (Tharisa)
K. Noise Related Issues			
1	The noise of the hooters has been addressed by Tharisa on the eastern side of the property.	Hilton Bedwell General public scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	This comment has been noted.

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
2	Why does Tharisa operate the plant for 24hrs/day when it has been indicated in the original EIA/EMP process that all activities that cause significant noise levels to the surrounding land users especially at night will only operate between 06h00 and 20h00?	Theunis van Rensburg Key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	Tharisa has purchased a number of properties in order to ensure that neighbours are not negatively affected by its operations. The EMP specifies that crushing, waste rock handling, or earth moving activities will not take place during the mentioned timeframes particularly on the western side of the mine. These activities are stopped during the indicated time period; the West crushing plant was decommissioned in 2011. (Tharisa)
3	We are unhappy with the negative impacts that we are experiencing due to the current operations particularly noise impacts at night. The reverse noise indicators, movement of the trucks and the many other activities that are taking place at night.	Hilton Bedwell, Johan van Heerden and Barend Clark Focussed scoping meeting, 2 February 2012	Tharisa is implementing noise abatement measures such as restricting and/or rescheduling work near to noise-sensitive areas during late night and early morning hours. Tharisa also has an “open door” policy where landowners/ IAPs can contact the mine. Tharisa is maintaining a community complaint register which will be reviewed with feedback at every stakeholder meeting. Complaints can be lodged directly at the General Managers office. (Tharisa)
4	Working during the nights is also a problem as the trucks on the wall dumping sand can be heard all night.	Herleen Potgieter Email: 29 June 2012	
5	The noise from the trucks dumping rock and specifically the reverse hooters is a disturbance at night.	Peter van Rensburg General public scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	
6	The night time noise of the crushers and the use of the Marikana/Retief road are disturbing.	Mr R and/or Mr P C van der Westhuizen General public scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	
7	We are completely against the current and proposed 24hr operations at the mine as the activities impact on us negatively. We need to sleep in a quiet environment without noise coming from the mine.	Hilton Bedwell, Johan van Heerden and Barend Clark Focussed scoping meeting, 2 February 2012	
8	There is a major noise disturbance from Tharisa's operations particularly the reverse alarm from the trucks at night. How will the proposed project components add to the current situation?	Tina de Toit and Hilton Bedwell Key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	As outlined in the EIA and EMP report, no crushing, waste rock handling, or earth moving activities will take place between 21h00 and 05h00 in areas where residences may be negatively affected at night.
9	We are concerned about the noise that will be generated from the dumping of the waste rock.	Calvin Thutlwane General public scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	Noise related impacts have been assessed in the EIA and EMP report with input from a noise specialist (see Section 7.2.13). Detailed management measures are included in Section 19 of the EIA and EMP report.

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
10	I would like the noise impacts of the project components to be assessed in this EIA process.	Hilton Bedwell General public scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	Noise related impacts have been assessed in the EIA and EMP report with input from a noise specialist (see Section 7.2.13). Detailed management measures are included in Section 19 of the EIA and EMP report.
11	Plant emergency sirens noise must please be included in the noise study.		
12	Noise is currently already at an unacceptable level, with mining operations keeping the surrounding community awake at night, as previously mentioned. Further expansion of the mine will only exacerbate this problem. Unrealistic associations are made between sources of noise in the EIA/EMP Programme Document: there is no comparison made between the noise created by mining activities and that of tractors or even traffic.	Elsa Steyn Email, 24 February 2012	
13	How will the waste rock dumps affect the community in terms of noise?	Alex Salang (DWA) Regulatory authorities' meeting, 21 February 2012	
14	<i>Noise impacts that are associated with the project components particularly the TSF and the north east waste rock dump must be investigated.</i>	<i>Theunis van Rensburg Scoping meeting with Landowners, 26 March 2014</i>	
15	<i>Noise has become a big issue to the residents who are located south of the N4 in the recent weeks. Why is this case? Please investigate the implications of the project components to the status-quo.</i>	<i>Hettie Le Roux and Dannie Potgieter Scoping meeting with Landowners, 26 March 2014</i>	Noise related impacts have been assessed in the EIA and EMP report with input from a noise specialist (see Section 7.2.13). Detailed management measures are included in Section 19 of the EIA and EMP report. A key mitigation measure is the restriction of noise generating activities to between 05h00 and 21h00.
16	<i>Due to the 24/7 activity of the concentrator and the ongoing truck movement on the berm wall, the noise level on the moment is very disturbing to one and all of the landowners, with the increase of the activity this problem will then become unbearable. Keeping in mind the distance of the properties from the mine. With the berm wall on only one side of the road, the traffic noise also increased due to backlash.</i>	<i>Hettie Le Rox, Landowners Representative South of the N4, Email, 27 May 2014</i>	
17	<i>Noise are some days uncontrolled and excessive to the extent that continuous exposure will harm our health at the end of the day.</i>	<i>Frikkie Pretorius Email, 25 June 2014</i>	

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
L. Visual Related Issues			
1	We are unhappy with the negative impacts that we are experiencing due to the current operations and we are concerned that these impacts are going to get worse should the government authorise the proposed projects.	Hilton Bedwell, Johan van Heerden and Barend Clark Focussed scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	Visual related impacts have been assessed in the EIA and EMP report with input from a visual specialist (see Section 7.2.14). Detailed management measures are included in Section 19 of the EIA and EMP report.
2	This is one of the biggest sources of concern to Living Waters Properties, as our property development's view is significantly encumbered by the mine. A further expansion of the mine only serves to exacerbate the problem. Given that the property development predates the mine, it is a legitimate and serious concern.	Elsa Steyn, comment received via email, 24 February 2012.	
M Heritage Related Issues			
1	The heritage of the churches that are located on the eastern side of the mine has been neglected.	Calvin Thutlwane General public scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	The project components are not expected to impact on these resources.
2	How will the proposed project activities impact on these resources?		
3	<i>It must be noted that there might be heritage resources within the proposed north east WRD area.</i>	<i>Carel Swanepoel Scoping meeting with Marikana Eco Forum Representatives, 26 March 2014</i>	A heritage study was conducted for the north east WRD. No heritage resources were identified within the footprint of the WRD (see Section 1.3.2 of the EIA and EMP report).
4	<i>What does relocation of graves mean? Does it mean the deceased will be re-buried at a new site?</i>	<i>Nomxolisi Malokoloko Scoping meeting with Ward Committees 26 March 2014</i>	<i>Yes. The reburial at a new site is dependent on the wishes of the deceased's next of kin.</i>

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
5	<p>Thank you for your indication that development is to take place in this area.</p> <p>In terms of the National Heritage Resources Act, no 25 of 1999, heritage resources, including archaeological or paleontological sites over 100 years old, graves older than 60 years, structures older than 60 years are protected. They may not be disturbed without a permit from the relevant heritage resources authority. This means that before such sites are disturbed by the development it is incumbent on the developer to ensure that a Heritage Impact Assessment is done. This must include the archaeological component (Phase 1) and any other applicable heritage components. Appropriate (Phase 2) mitigation which involves recording, sampling and dating sites that are to be destroyed, must be done as required.</p> <p>According to the information provided on this development included in the background information document (BID) and final scoping report, it is indicated that a Paleontologist will be engaged to assess the likely impacts on the palaeontological resources of the site. The proposed developments fall within the footprint of the larger mining area and the Heritage Survey compiled in 2007 for that larger area will be used as source material for the archaeological assessment for this proposal. SAHRA thanks you for the care taken with regard to the possible heritage resources of this proposed site and looks forward to receiving your heritage reports.</p>	<p>Colette Scheermeyer Email: 22 June 2012</p>	<p>The comments have been noted. The related heritage reports will be submitted to SAHRA for review and comment.</p>

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
6	<p><i>The removal, exhuming, destruction, altering or any other disturbance of heritage sites must be authorised by South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) in terms of the National Heritage Resources Act (Act No. 25 of 1999). The archaeological sites identified must not be disturbed before SAHRA has made a decision in this regard.</i></p>	<p><i>Kelebogile Mekgoe Rustenburg Local Municipality, E-mail 26 May 2014</i></p>	<p><i>The requirements of the SAHRA are noted and have been taken into consideration in the compilation of the EIA and EMP report, where applicable.</i></p>
7	<p><i>In terms of the potential impact of heritage resources, it is noted that existing Phase 1 Archaeological Impact Assessment (AIA) will be used to determine the possible impacts for the mining right area. It is further noted that a new Phase I AIA will be commissioned for the east waste rock dump project area. In addition, SAHRA notes that a Palaeontologist will be consulted regarding possible paleontological resources that may be affected.</i></p> <p><i>Considering that the original heritage assessment dates to 2007, it is requested that:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. The recommendations be re-evaluated to ascertain the condition of the heritage resources during this time. According to SAHRA records, this report by Dr Pistorius was never submitted to SAHRA for comment.</i> <i>2. SAHRA will await the results of the new archaeological and paleontological assessment before issuing a final comment on this project.</i> <i>3. All areas not previously surveyed and which will be impacted by current developments will also have to be surveyed.</i> <p><i>Any other heritage resources that may be impacted such as built structures over 60 years old, sites of cultural significance associated with oral histories, burial grounds and graves, graves of victims of conflict and cultural landscape or viewscapes must also be assessed.</i></p>	<p><i>Phillip Hine, South African Heritage Resources Agency, Letter - 28 May 2014</i></p>	<p><i>The requirements of the SAHRA are noted and have been taken into consideration in the compilation of the EIA and EMP report, where applicable.</i></p> <p><i>The heritage specialist reviewed the recommendations made in the 2007 specialist report. The results of this re-evaluation are included in Appendix K of the EIA and EMP report.</i></p> <p><i>The specialist report will be uploaded to SAHRIS for comment by the Agency.</i></p>

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
N. Socio-economic: Tourism Related Issues			
1	Buffelspoort area used to be the gate way for tourism but that is no longer the case due to all these mining activities including Tharisa Mine.	Hilton Bedwell Focussed scoping meeting, 2 February 2012	Land use related impacts have been assessed in the EIA and EMP report (see Section 7.2.16). Detailed management measures are included in Section 19 of the EIA and EMP report.
2	I object to the Tharisa Mines' proposed development as my business "Buffelspoort Liquor Store" is in the Buffelspoort Shopping Centre opposite the ATKV. Our business is mainly dependent on holiday makers. My fears are that because of the development fewer tourists will come to our area and therefore we will be disadvantaged.	Andre Maritz, letter Email, 24 January 2012	
O. Socio-economic: Employment and Social Labour Related Issues			
1	Where will the workers that will be needed for the proposed projects be from?	Pieter Wolvaardt Key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	Workers will be employed from local communities as far as possible. (Tharisa)
2	Tharisa needs to focus more on job creation programmes and the social impact of the proposed projects and not only focus on the impacts on the biophysical environment.	Mavis Vilame General public scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	Social, economic and biophysical impacts of the project have been considered (see Section 7 of the EIA and EMP report).
3	An employment strategy is required.	Sebenzile General public scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	Tharisa has adopted a recruitment policy. Tharisa is committed to maximising employment from local communities. (Tharisa)
4	Why is the employment of local people only for temporary jobs and not permanent?	David General public scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	
5	What is Tharisa's recruitment strategy?	Appearance Ndlovu (Ward Councillor)	
6	Will MDM be bringing in Civcon employees?	General public scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	
7	With regards to small business development, vender procurement is required to benefit the locals.		Yes. This is nothing unusual, but all contractors are required to maximise recruitment from local communities wherever feasible. (Tharisa)
8	Small businesses are not flourishing due to the existence of Tharisa Mine.	Calvin Thutlwane General public scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	This is done through the implementation of the mine's social and labour plan (SLP) as well as preferential appointment of existing and relevant local businesses for some of its projects. (Tharisa)

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
9	With the start of the smelter plant, Tharisa should start with learnerships to guarantee employment in the future.	Appearance Ndlovu, Ward Councillor General public scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	The smelter has been removed from the project scope and therefore related issues are no longer considered relevant to this process. A learnership program has been instituted, irrespective of the smelter. (Tharisa)
10	There is an influx of contractors, how will Tharisa address the migration?	Alex Salang (DWA) General public scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	Inward migration related impacts have been assessed in the EIA and EMP report (see Section 7.2.21). Detailed management measures are included in Section 19 of the EIA and EMP report.
11	<i>Tharisa seems to be giving Madithlokwa preferential treatment and side-lines Marikana West. Marikana West community would like to be given a fair chance when it comes to job opportunities at Tharisa.</i>	<i>Nomxolisi Malokoloko Scoping meeting with Ward Committees, 26 March 2014</i>	<i>Tharisa has noted your comment.</i>
12	<i>I think most of the people who complain about limited job opportunities at Tharisa are mainly people who were not born in this area, mainly work at Lonmin and are complaining on behalf of their friends and/ or family members who have been advised to come look for jobs in the Marikana area.</i>	<i>Siphokazi Mtande Scoping meeting with Ward Committees, 26 March 2014</i>	<i>Your comment has been noted for consideration by the decision-making authorities.</i>
13	<i>Please specify what type of people will be used during the construction in the mines and the number of people to be employed.</i>	<i>Ratshalingwa Mulaudzi Bojanala Platinum District Municipality, E-mail, 28 May 2014</i>	<i>A maximum of 100 jobs during construction comprising a combination of contractors and current workforce, where possible (see Section 2 of the EIA and EMP report).</i>
P. Socio-economic: Benefits			
1	What future plans does Tharisa have for Lapologang village and Retief Primary School?	Pieter Wolvaardt Key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	There are no immediate plans. When the mine has a positive cash flow, Tharisa may sponsor selected community initiatives. Tharisa has in the interim assisted the school with projects where possible. Lapologang is part of Ward 32 and community development issues are addressed through Tharisa's SLP and ongoing engagements with community leaders. (Tharisa)
2	Tharisa had promised to develop my land and they have not done anything about it to this day.	Jaco van Wyk Key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	Your comment is noted.

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
Q. Socio-economic: Land Purchase, Economic Losses and Compensation Related Issues			
1	We are unhappy that some landowners were compensated for enduring the negative impacts of the mining operations and some were not compensated. On what basis did Tharisa Mine compensate them?	Hilton Bedwell, Johan van Heerden and Barend Clark Focussed scoping meeting, 16 February 2012 Hilton Bedwell Key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	Tharisa is committed to appropriately address all issues and concerns raised by the community. Current management does not know why previous management decided on this because the environmental monitoring results indicate that there is no negative impact emanating from the mine. Current management is of the view that this was wrong. (Tharisa)
2	As a landowner of a farm near Lepologang, on which portions will the waste rock dump be located? Will this land be purchased by Tharisa? There is no certainty on the future of these matters, and as a result one cannot develop this land.	Hennie Potgieter General public scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	The location of the waste rock dumps is indicated on Figure 2 of the EIA and EMP report. Land acquisition is proceeding for property that Tharisa requires to operate the mine and plant. Affected parties would be informed when required. (Tharisa)
3	Tharisa mine has spoilt our property as there is lack of occupation. The two houses that we rent out to private company have been empty for over a year. We are very disappointed since Tharisa moved in our area. Tharisa is of no benefit to us at all. We are suffering financial losses due to the mine.	Farouk Saloogee Fax: 1 February 2012	Tharisa has an "open door" policy where nearby landowners/ I&APs can contact the mine. Tharisa is maintaining a community complaint register which will be reviewed with feedback at every stakeholder meeting. Complaints can be lodged directly at the General Managers office. (Tharisa)
4	Tharisa should provide the surrounding landowners with notification of intent to buy them out in advance because the farmers have lease contracts that they would like to honour.	Hilton Bedwell, Johan van Heerden and Barend Clark Focussed scoping meeting, 2 February 2012 Hilton Bedwell Key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	Land acquisition is proceeding for properties that Tharisa requires to operate the mine and plant. Affected parties would be informed when required. (Tharisa)
5	My farm is in the close proximity to the mine.	J Hislop Fax: 31 January 2012	
6	Is the land purchase programme by Tharisa going on?	Jaco Schoeman Key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
7	I stay at a property that is located between the mine and the N4. I am concerned that the proposed smelter house and the soil berms will be on my property. Is the Tharisa planning to buy us out?	Marieta Potgieter (127 Kafferskraal) Key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	Land acquisition is proceeding for properties that Tharisa requires to operate the mine and plant. Affected parties would be informed when required. (Tharisa)
8	The mine is encroaching onto my properties and they are losing value (Kafferskraal portion 140) not the other way round. Is Tharisa planning on buying our properties?	Johan Breedt Key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	The smelter has been removed from the project scope and therefore related issues are no longer considered relevant to this process.
9	Tharisa must consider purchasing our properties.	Peter Wolvaardt (110 Kafferskraal) and Theunis van Rensburg (144 Kaferskraal) Key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	
10	Can Tharisa take corporate responsibility and confirm that I cannot continue with my development?	A Botha General public scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	
11	Why did Tharisa not purchase my property? It is situated within the mining right area.	A van Rensburg General public scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	
12	Why has Tharisa not bought me out?	Mr R and/or P C van der Westhuizen General public scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	
13	Portion 135 of Kafferskraal farm was donated by the landowner to the community to build a school. Tharisa then bought this land without consulting with all the people. Who did Tharisa consult because no one knows about this transaction?	Calvin Thutlwane General public scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	At the time of the purchase Tharisa was unaware of any agreements between the landowner and community. (Tharisa)
14	I own land on both sides of the N4.	Jan Coetzee Email 9 February 2012	This comment has been noted.

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
15	We believe for all the negative things that the mine brought to our community it is not worth the little good they think they are doing. Seeing that the mine is almost in our dining room, no one has come to talk to us again since we did not want to accept their offer when they started.	Herleen Potgieter Email: 29 June 2012	The mine has established a stakeholder engagement/complaints procedure; please approach mine management in order to resolve this issue. (Tharisa)
16	Does the SLP address issues relating to how best can/will Tharisa ensure that local businesses do not suffer from the loss of their staff to the mine?	Johan Swanepoel Key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	No, but Tharisa is open to suggestions on this matter, without compromising the rights of workers to free choice and a competitive and fair wage. (Tharisa)
17	I have employed about 40 people on my farm. I have a problem with the mine because all of the best employees leave my farm and other surrounding farms for better opportunities at the mine. We cannot compete with the mine financially in terms of wages. What will be done to ensure that current and proposed activities do not affect my operation?	Jaco van Wyk Key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	
18	<i>Does Tharisa own pieces of land where the new north-east waste rock dump will be located?</i>	<i>Isabel Hough Scoping meeting with Landowners, 26 March 2014</i>	<i>No, they are currently privately owned but Tharisa is in the process of finalising their purchase. (Tharisa)</i>
19	<i>Property value is decreasing and the prospect of selling is about nil. The previously serene bushveld environment changes into a mining industrial area with the noise and visual impact of berm direct in front of you included. Our property is now an absolute worthless asset.</i>	<i>Hettie Le Rox, Landowners Representative South of the N4, Email, 27 May 2014</i>	<i>Economic related impacts have been assessed in the EIA and EMP report (see Section 7.2.19 and 7.2.10). Detailed management measures are included in Section 19 of the EIA and EMP report.</i>
20	<i>This problem is ongoing and the damage caused to the infrastructure is major, although the mine did repair some of the houses the damage is permanent and will eventually have a negative effect on the price of the property should the owner want to sell.</i>	<i>Hettie Le Rox, Landowners Representative South of the N4, Email, 27 May 2014</i>	

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
21	<i>Furthermore the property is being downgraded by increased theft of fences, livestock and planted crops. It is thus becoming practically impossible to try and make a living from your farm as things are stolen and simply disregarded as private property off which we consider it directly as a result of the mining employment and increased feet in the vicinity as this was never a problem before. What I therefore awaits are your urgent feedback regarding corrective actions on these issues and or how soon my property will be bought by Tharisa mines.</i>	<i>Frikkie Pretorius Email, 25 June 2014</i>	<i>Economic related impacts have been assessed in the EIA and EMP report (see Section 7.2.19 and 7.2.10). Detailed management measures are included in Section 19 of the EIA and EMP report. Land acquisition is proceeding for properties that Tharisa requires to operate the mine and plant. Affected parties would be informed when required (Tharisa)</i>
R. Socio-economic: Housing, Safety and Security Related Issues			
1	Where will the workers that will be needed for the proposed project stay?	Hilton Bedwell Key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	Workers will be employed from local communities as far as possible. There are no plans to provide housing to employees. (Tharisa)
2	Tharisa should provide housing for its workers because they are now becoming nuisance to us (the surrounding landowners) by sleeping over in the accommodation that is provided for our workers.	Hilton Bedwell, Johan van Heerden and Barend Clark Focussed scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	Tharisa does not have a policy to provide employee housing. Note that after August 2012, the number of contract construction workers reduced dramatically. (Tharisa)
3	Some of the workers cross our properties for access to the mine without our permission.	Tina du Toit Key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	If this situation persists after landowners have posted signage and confronted the trespassers, then Tharisa's security personnel and, if necessary, the local police can be asked to intercept the trespassers. (Tharisa)
4	The trespassing of individuals onto our property is a concern. Tharisa is not taking responsibility for security and safety.	Mr R and/or Mr P C van der Westhuizen General public scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	
5	We are also concerned about our safety and security in the area.	Tina du Toit and Hilton Bedwell Key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	This comment has been noted. Tharisa wants to have a positive impact on safety and security in the area. (Tharisa) Inward migration related impacts have been assessed in the EIA and EMP report (see Section 7.2.21). Detailed management measures are included in Section 19 of the EIA and EMP report.

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
6	Theft is now high and there is no positive sign that Tharisa will purchase our land.	Farouk Saloojee Fax: 1 February 2012	Criminal matters must be reported to the Marikana police. Tharisa has employed a Security Company which assists the police in patrolling the areas owned by the mine, and have in fact aided the police in arresting a number of suspects already. (Tharisa)
7	The spotlights from the mine are shining directly into our homes and are a safety hazard at night when approaching our home as they are confusing due to the fact that they are so close to the main road to Marikana. People get easily confused and are not sure if it is vehicles or the mines lights when you approach.	Herleen Potgieter Email: 29 June 2012	
8	Next to us is an old abandoned house (2rooms) where criminals are busy stripping copper from cables which I'm sure they took from the mine and during the night they sit there and do their criminal activities. It was reported and nothing was done about it. The black plastic covers of the cables and silver wires are still lying there.		
9	Unwelcome elements come and go as they please and theft is very high. My daughters 4 wheeler was stolen and we had to find it ourselves, as the Police was reluctant to do anything about it. It was found in the village near the river. Last weekend my sister in law sons 4 wheeler was stolen again and not found yet. Police is not coping with all the criminal activities since the mine started.	Herleen Potgieter Email: 29 June 2012	
10	<i>Crime rates have increased ever since the mine operations. Tharisa needs to put up patrol system in place in and around the mine operations.</i>	<i>Tinus Cronje Scoping meeting with Marikana Eco Forum Representatives, 26 March 2014</i>	
11	<i>The mine fence is not intact and it needs to be attended to.</i>		
12	<i>Does Tharisa have plans to increase its fenced off area?</i>	<i>Theunis van Rensburg Scoping meeting with Landowners, 26 March 2014</i>	<i>Not at this stage. (Tharisa)</i>

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
13	<i>For the proposed open pit rehabilitation and expansion, mitigation measures must be implemented to minimise health hazards and risk to Tsilong and Madithlokwa/ Silver City Village, and nearby landowners.</i>	<i>Kelebogile Mekgoe Rustenburg Local Municipality, E-mail 26 May 2014</i>	<i>Detailed mitigation measures to address these issues are included in Section 19 of the EIA and EMP report.</i>
14	<i>Input from the Department of Education would be that if any development or changes to the mining operations take place, it should not endanger learners or educators that are in the affected area. This would include but not be limited to noise, pollution and/ or any other associated impacts with mining.</i>	<i>Pauline Mokhutle, Department of Education, E-mail 28 May 2014</i>	
S. Socio-economic: Land-use Related Issues			
1	Our internet connections are repeatedly interrupted due to the operations of the surrounding mines.	Hettie Le Roux Key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	This matter has been addressed with Mrs Le Roux. It was discovered that Mrs Le Roux's service provider misled her. (Tharisa)
2	Tharisa needs to revise its monitoring network. Tharisa's monitoring network does not cover our area (south of the N4) and I would like our area to be included in the network.	Theunis van Rensburg and Hilton Bedwell Key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	There are sufficient ground water monitoring points on the south of the N4. Tharisa is revising its monitoring network for air quality monitoring and this will be taken into account. The blast monitors have been placed on numerous occasions at the Du Toit's property. It is important to note that Tharisa will not be able to monitor each and every household. (Tharisa)
3	Tharisa's activities are very close to Aquarius Mine. Are these activities not going to be in conflict with Aquarius's mining activities?	Lappies Labuschagne Key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	Tharisa does not have sufficient information to comment on surrounding mines' activities. (Tharisa) However, cumulative impacts are being considered where possible (see Section 7.2 of the EIA and EMP report).
4	Mr Danie Potgieter and the other landowners are concerned that they might have restricted access to their properties via the bridge that transverse the N4 on the farm Elandsdrift due to Tharisa's activities.	Hilton Bedwell Focussed scoping meeting, 16 February 2012 Key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	These properties have been purchased by Tharisa and therefore this is no longer an issue. (Tharisa)

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
5	The sand walls which are very close to our residence and which is a big safety hazard, had a large part of the wall sand slide after a rain fall and it slid through the barbwire that surrounded the mine. Due to that, our Labrador was cut very badly and was rushed to the Vet to close all the cuts he got from the broken barbwire. It costs us ± R5000.00. This fence is still in this bad condition. The sand wall was filled up again but no effort was done to clean up the slide or maintain the fence again.	Herleen Potgieter Email: 29 June 2012	Tharisa has an “open door” policy where nearby landowners/ I&APs can contact the mine. Tharisa is maintaining a community complaint register which will be reviewed with feedback at every stakeholder meeting. Complaints can be lodged directly at the General Managers office. (Tharisa)
6	My farm is located 200m away from the proposed smelter house, the rain falls in north-westerly direction and I am concerned that the potential acid rain might affect my current land use.	Hilton Bedwell Focussed scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	The smelter has been removed from the project scope and therefore related issues are no longer considered relevant to this process.
7	Are there any no zone areas/ buffer zone from the mine within which no activities are allowed to take place?	Key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	There is no legislated buffer zone for a mine site. Impacts on surrounding land uses are assessed in the EIA and mitigation measures provided.
8	Peace and tranquility, fruit trees, landowners’ children playing in the garden in the residency on our property is gone. Our natural environment is gone to the dogs.	Farouk Saloogee Fax: 1 February 2012	Land use related impacts have been assessed in the EIA and EMP report (see Section 7.2.18 and 7.2.20). Detailed management measures are included in Section 19 of the EIA and EMP report.
9	We are concerned that mining activities are taking over our agricultural land use in this area.	Hilton Bedwell, Johan van Heerden and Barend Clark	
10	We are also concerned that we will no longer be able to undertake farming- grow crops (lucern, vegetables and pigs and horses) and rear animals due to Tharisa Mine and the proposed projects (plot A1- A47 of the farm Buffelspoort).	Focussed scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	
11	What will be the impacts of the proposed projects on Mooinooi town and Pure Plaas game park that is located south of the N4?		

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
12	Some of us have been involved in the EIA processes for a long time and we are concerned that our area is now being described as a mining and industrial area instead of a fairly rural area. Does this mean our air, visual and land use and related activities do not matter anymore and that mines can do as they please?	Pieter Wolvaardt Key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	Land use related impacts have been assessed in the EIA and EMP report (see Section 7.2.18 and 7.2.20). Detailed management measures are included in Section 19 of the EIA and EMP report.
13	We are concerned that the proposed projects might deplete the bees in the area that we need for pollution process that is necessary for farming vegetables and fruits.	Hilton Bedwell Key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	
14	How are piggery farming activities going to be affected by the proposed projects?	Johan van Heerden Key stakeholder scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	The impact of the project on piggery farming activities has not been assessed specifically however in general, animals can be stressed by external factors and the affect this would have depends on how each individual animal responds to the stress factors.
15	Tharisa will be 50m away from my place, what will the impacts be?	Jan Coetzee General public scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	Land use related impacts have been assessed in the EIA and EMP report (see Section 7.2.18 and 7.2.20). Detailed management measures are included in Section 19 of the EIA and EMP report.
16	I am based on Plot 23, which is close to Lapologang, will I be affected by the proposed project?	Malo Lazarus General public scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	
17	How will the mining influence us? What is the short term and long effect on us?	HG Pieterse Letter dated 7 February 2012	
18	How will Madithlokwa community be affected by the proposed projects?	A Botha General public scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	
19	<i>Tharisa needs to take immediately surrounding activities to its mining operations into account during its planning and execution phases. The cumulative impacts needed to be addressed. These activities include other mining activities, engineering businesses and residential areas.</i>	<i>Theunis van Rensburg Scoping meeting with Landowners, 26 March 2014</i>	

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
20	<i>What are impacts associated with the proposed project components on Living Waters Properties (property developer) that is located south-west of the mine?</i>	<i>Isabel Hough Scoping meeting with Landowners, 26 March 2014</i>	
21	<i>The Madithlokwa community which is directly affected by the mine is a poor community and the mine rides over them because the community does not have the time, money, energy or professional resources to protect themselves. They breathe, eat and drink mine pollution.</i>	<i>Buffelspoort Dam Action Group (Contact person: Dr Shan Holmes) Tel, 20 March 2014</i>	Land use related impacts have been assessed in the EIA and EMP report (see Section 7.2.16). Detailed management measures are included in Section 19 of the EIA and EMP report.
22	<i>The Marikana incident did not happen because of the strikes; mining communities are in distress. Input is provided to the communities on social issues. The platinum mining belt is on a knife edge; the area has been violated. The Marikana massacre was not a surprise.</i>	<i>Buffelspoort Dam Action Group (Contact person: Dr Shan Holmes) Tel, 20 March 2014</i>	
T	Socio-economic: Resettlement Related Issues		
1	There are no clinics and amenities in Madithlokwa.	Samuel Modise General public scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	This issue should be taken up with the relevant government structures, Tharisa will assist where it can. (Tharisa)
2	The toilets at Madithlokwa are built on slabs on top of the soil. Water enters the toilet and over flows into the community, creating a health and sanitation issue	Jeanette Sekane General public scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	Tharisa has engaged with the developers of the amalooloo sanitation system and is in the process of seeking an amicable solution to this issue. (Tharisa) Tharisa has a water monitoring programme specifically related to the village for testing borehole water used as domestic supply. The results of this monitoring will be included in the EIA and EMP report (Tharisa)
3	The sewerage system was installed too shallow, resulting in faeces rising to surface when it rains (Madithlokwa).		
4	I am concerned that service delivery in Madithlokwa specifically the sewerage system and its impact on the river.	A Botha General public scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	
5	It is important to note that the current borehole used by the community is located in the middle of the toilets.	Jeanette Sekane General public scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	Water purification plants have been installed where water quality results deemed it necessary. Drinking water quality monitoring has been initiated and the water is within drinkable standards. (Tharisa)
6	In the Madithlokwa community, the boreholes and toilets are too close to each other.	Thomas Makaringe	

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
7	The Madithokwa shacks leak when it rains.	Phineas General public scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	The housing provided is of similar or better standard to the previous existing housing. Tharisa needs Madithokwa's participation in order to resolve this issue. (Tharisa)
8	There is increased crime in Madithokwa since Tharisa started operating.	Calvin Thutlwane General public scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	Your comment is noted. Criminal matters must be reported to the Marikana police. (Tharisa)
9	I was relocated and the material for my shack was lost.	Sylvester Matsego General public scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	If there are issues of this nature, one should approach Tharisa in order for the issue to be investigated. (Tharisa)
10	I pay rent to Tharisa for my house in Silver City, but there are no facilities.		Nobody is charged rent by Tharisa for housing in Madithokwa resettlement. (Tharisa)
11	Will the Rustenburg Local Municipality maintain the current living conditions? What will happen if they don't?	A Botha General public scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	It is Tharisa's intention to get Rustenburg Municipality to take over the infrastructure and management of Madithokwa. Until then Tharisa will maintain infrastructure including boreholes, waste removal and road grading. (Tharisa)
12	The water tanks that are provided in Madithokwa sometimes run dry and dust settles in them. Is the water from such tanks safe to drink?	Samuel Modise General public scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	If the tank runs dry, the water is still safe to drink afterwards. The system is such that the water will not run dry unless there is a power failure. (Tharisa)
13	The new Madithokwa township is located on barren land, with no trees or vegetation. We need Tharisa to provide trees and grass for this community.	Alex Salang General public scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	Tharisa has assisted with the planting of trees within the settlement. (Tharisa)
14	A separate meeting with Tharisa needs to be arranged to discuss amenities, and the DMR and other government departments are required to be at that meeting.	Appearance Ndlovu (Ward Councillor) General public scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	Such a meeting would be welcomed. (Tharisa)
15	The construction of new houses and the relocation project and of the Madiklokwe community involved only certain individuals as opposed to the whole community.		This relocation was undertaken with the relevant community leadership – ward committee. (Tharisa)
16	I would like to engage with Tharisa as to their reasons of not including the community?	Mavis Vilame General public scoping meeting, 16 February 2012	There were numerous community meetings which took place regarding the relocation. (Tharisa)
17	The project will bring success to the people of Madithokwa, unfortunately not all of us.	Jackson Phiri Fax, 16 February	Tharisa would like the project to be a success for all. Tharisa is open to suggestions in this regard. (Tharisa)
18	Where is the land and good houses you promised the people?		Housing standards and infrastructure has been improved from the previous situation. (Tharisa)

No.	Issue raised	By whom and when	Response given by project team as amended for the scoping report- responses are from SLR unless otherwise indicated
19	Where is my stolen transformer?		Tharisa doesn't know. Theft needs to be reported to the Police. (Tharisa)
20	I am staying near the river – the bridge was damaged by water, and yet Tharisa neglects the problem. The small foot path/road to the school was closed by Tharisa and now my children struggle to get to school.	Jackson Phiri Fax, 16 February	The bridge is part of a public road and not Tharisa's responsibility. Tharisa no longer uses this bridge for transport of ore. Tharisa has constructed a pedestrian bridge/ walkway over the Sterkstroom. (Tharisa)
21	There is no democracy near Tharisa. They employed black people to assist us but they neglect our crisis. Now I don't know where to go because they use their powers against us and their lawyers are hazardous to the lives of us, but nothing ever ends.		Tharisa seeks to balance all stakeholder interests in the development of the mine. (Tharisa)
22	As far as I understand, there is no agreement between the municipality and the mine that outlines the plans to move Madithlokwa community.	Kelebogile Mekgoe (RLM) Regulatory authorities scoping meeting, 21 February 2012	It was decided that once the resettlement had taken place, the community would be handed over to the municipality as a formal township. There is currently an agreement between the community representatives and the mine. The 848 households that have been identified for relocation would all have been completed by the end of June 2012. Tharisa is engaging the authorities (DMR and Municipality) regarding the proclamation of Madithlokwa. (Tharisa)