

SUMMARY OF ISSUES RAISED BY REGULATORY AUTHORITIES AND IAPs AS PART OF THE PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESS

ISSUE RAISED	BY WHOM AND WHEN	RESPONSE GIVEN BY PROJECT TEAM (as amended/incorporated for the purposes of the EIA/EMP submission)
Procedural issues		
Has SLR consulted with the surrounding landowners and landusers with regards to the proposed project?	Comment raised by Makahane Rudzani (DWS) at the authority site visit-meeting, Swartklip Rec Centre, 23 July 2015	Stakeholder engagement is an integral part of the EIA process, and moreover it is a legal requirement. Public and focussed scoping meetings were conducted with surrounding landowners and landusers. In addition to advertising the project in the Kwevoel and Sowetan newspapers, site notices were placed in and around the project area and surrounding communities, and background information documents (BIDs) were circulated.
This is just a procedural task for you to consult with the landowners but we know our comments will fall on deaf ears because there is no way that a small community can formally object against a company that has invested billions into this project.	Comment raised by Johan Young at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015	IAPs were provided with an opportunity to review the scoping report and all comments received (during meetings and public review periods) have been incorporated in this table (included in Appendix C) which will be submitted to the Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA). These comments will be taken into consideration when the EIA is reviewed by the DEA. Interested and affected parties (IAPs) will be provided with the same opportunity to review the EIA/EMP report. For a full record of the public participation undertaken refer to Section 7 of the EIA/EMP report.
How wide an area does the EIA cover?	Comments raised by Derik de Jager at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015	In terms of the actual area covered by the EIA, this varies from one specialist study to another depending on the expected potential spatial scale of the potential impacts (for example some specialist investigations are limited to the project area only and others will extend beyond the project area boundary). It should be noted that the area for the public participation process is determined by the IAPs identified and engaged as part of the process. In this regard IAPs include landowners, landusers, communities, industry and NGOs within the project area and in the surrounding area. For a full record of the public participation undertaken refer to Section 7 of the EIA/EMP report.

ISSUE RAISED	BY WHOM AND WHEN	RESPONSE GIVEN BY PROJECT TEAM (as amended/incorporated for the purposes of the EIA/EMP submission)
I do not have much faith in EIA processes in general especially looking at the projects that have been approved and developed in this area.	Comment raised by Johan Young at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015	The EIA process has been run in accordance with South African laws and regulations. Reference has also been made to the Equator Principles which is an international framework for environmental and social assessment. Refer to Section 5 of the EIA/EMP for the relevant legal and policy framework according to which the EIA process has been undertaken.
In European countries there is a greater consideration for the environment. I am concerned about people's consciousness and lack of emotional value attached to the environment.	Comment raised by Hannes Olckers at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015	
We have noted from the Appendix A: Issues raised to date by Regulatory Authorities and IAPS (section 7.3 of scoping report), that our client's objection to the proposed smelter, as voiced at the meeting by Marietjie Schoeman, was noted. This notice serves as confirmation of such objection. Our clients therefore confirm their objection to the proposed project and will only withdraw same if their property is purchased by Siyanda at fair market value.	Comment raised by Ernst Burger (on behalf of the Schoeman family, the beneficiaries of a Testamentary Trust) – draft scoping report comments, received on the 04 May 2016	Any objection will be included in the record which will be submitted to the DEA. These objections will be taken into consideration when the EIA is reviewed by the DEA.
If the community can object to this project what will happen?	Comment raised by Kgosi Ramakoka during scoping meeting, Mmansterre, 21 July 2015	
I am strongly against the building of the smelter adjacent to my property.	Comment raised by Marietjie Schoeman, via email, 27 July 2015	Although your farm (portion 0 (RE of Grootkuil 409 KQ)) is located adjacent to portion 3 of Grootkuil 409 KQ (the SCSC property), the proposed smelter is located in the western-most area of the SCSC property which is approximately 1.5 km away from your property boundary (at its closest point). Notwithstanding this, any objection will be included in the record which will be submitted to the DEA. These objections will be

ISSUE RAISED	BY WHOM AND WHEN	RESPONSE GIVEN BY PROJECT TEAM (as amended/incorporated for the purposes of the EIA/EMP submission)
		taken into consideration when the EIA is reviewed by the DEA.
The only going option forward is that Siyanda will buy our portion adjacent to the smelter.	Comment raised by Marietjie Schoeman, via email, 27 July 2015	Your comment has been noted and will be forwarded to Siyanda for consideration.
Meetings should be scheduled at least every 6 months from construction to operation to keep the public updated with the process with regards to the operation of the smelter.	Comment raised by Sandy McGill, Mr and Mrs Schoeman at the scoping meeting, Swartklip Rec Centre, 21 July 2015	Provision for regular stakeholder meetings is included in Section 9.1.9 of the EIA/EMP report.
On-going stakeholder engagement meetings/forums should be held.	Comments by Philip Schoeman and Pier De Vries during focused scoping meeting with Union Section Mine, 13 May 2015	
Relevant IAPs from the Wildebeeslaagte development should be engaged.		Relevant parties from the solar project and Wildebeeslaagte development have and will continue to be engaged as part of the public participation process. Proof of this consultation is included in Appendix D of the EIA/EMP report. The stakeholder database is also included in Appendix D.
The solar project should be engaged.		
SLR should consult the Environmental Management Framework as a guideline.	Comment raised by Vincent Raphunga (WDM: Air Quality) at the authority site visit-meeting, Swartklip Rec Centre, 23 July 2015	The relevant frameworks, IDPs and SDFs have been taken into account as part of the compilation of the EIA/EMP report. Specific reference to the relevant documents has been made in Section 6.2 and Section 8.1.14 of the EIA/EMP report. In addition these documents were used to compile the Social Impact Assessment included in Appendix P of the EIA/EMP report.
<p>The Department further submits that the assessment of impacts related to the proposed development must take into consideration the following tools;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Limpopo Conservation Plan of 2013; - The Environmental Management Framework (EMF) for the Waterberg District; - The Mining and Biodiversity Guidelines; - The Thabazimbi Spatial Development Framework (SDF) and 	Comment raised by Mokgadi Mogoshoa (Limpopo Dept of Economic Development, Environment & Tourism) email dated 31 July 2015	<p>The Limpopo Conservation Plan (V2), the Environmental Management Framework (EMF) for the Waterberg District and the Mining and Biodiversity Guidelines have been taken into account as part of the compilation of the EIA/EMP report. Specific reference to these documents is made in Section 8.1.6 and Section 15.6 of the EIA/EMP. In addition, these documents were used to compile the Biodiversity specialist study included in Appendix F of the EIA/EMP report.</p>

ISSUE RAISED	BY WHOM AND WHEN	RESPONSE GIVEN BY PROJECT TEAM (as amended/incorporated for the purposes of the EIA/EMP submission)
- Waterberg SDF.		
You may send a copy of the scoping report in terms of NEMA to LEDET for commenting.	Comment raised by Mokgadi Mogoshoa (Limpopo Dept of Economic Development, Environment & Tourism) email dated 31 July 2015	The scoping report was distributed to all commenting and competent authorities and was made available for public review from 7 April to 10 May 2016.
The Department of Water and Sanitation (DWS) would like to see the service agreement letter between Siyanda and the municipality for water supply.	Comment raised by Makahane Rudzani (DWS) at the authority site visit-meeting, Swartklip Rec Centre, 23 July 2015	Siyanda has submitted an application to the Magalies Water Board. This has been included in Appendix D.
The Limpopo Provincial Shared Service Centre acknowledges receipt of your letter dated the 14/04/2016 regarding the above matter [project]. Kindly note that Portion 3 of the farm Grootkuil 409 KQ is privately owned, as such the Department of Rural Development and Land Reform (DRDLR) has no jurisdiction over privately owned property. However you are advised to consult with the owner of the property. You are further advised to consult with the Office of Regional Land Claims Commission: Limpopo for land claim status on the said properties.	Comment raised by MF Makhuvha (Department of Rural Development and Land Reform) – draft scoping report comments, received on the 25 April 2016	SLR acknowledges that the DRDLR has confirmed receipt of the draft scoping report for review. It should be noted that Portion 3 of the farm Grootkuil on which the proposed smelter complex is to be developed has been purchased by Siyanda. Correspondence with the Land Claims Commissioner dated 7 September and 2 December 2015 (included in Appendix D of the EIA/EMP report) confirms that no land claims have been lodged on relevant farm portions on which the smelter complex or associated linear infrastructure is to be developed.
Please ensure that all relevant listed activities are applied for, are specific and that it can be linked to the development activity or infrastructure as described in the project description. The draft scoping report dated April 2016 does not have a description of each listed activity applied for. You are kindly requested to provide a description of each listed activity applied for, as per the detailed project description (and not as per wording of the relevant Government Notice)	Comment raised by B Ncube (National Department of Environmental Affairs) – draft scoping report comments, received on the 16 May 2016	A description of each activity to be undertaken as part of the project in its relevance to the listed activities being applied for has been included in the third column of Table 3 (Section 4) in the EIA/EMP report.

ISSUE RAISED	BY WHOM AND WHEN	RESPONSE GIVEN BY PROJECT TEAM (as amended/incorporated for the purposes of the EIA/EMP submission)
<p>If the activities applied for in the application form differ from those mentioned in the final SR, an amended application form must be submitted. Please note that the Department's application form template has been amended and can be downloaded from the following link: www.environment.gov.za/documents/forms</p>	<p>Comment raised by B Ncube (National Department of Environmental Affairs) – draft scoping report comments, received on the 16 May 2016</p>	<p>An amended application was submitted to cater for the change of scope (additional transport and waste management options) as per agreement with the DEA and correspondence dated 15 June 2016. The application was further amended and re-submitted to the DEA (together with the draft EIA) following the DEA's scoping acceptance letter dated 14 September 2016.</p>
<p>Please ensure that all issues raised and comments received during the circulation of the draft scoping report from registered IAPs and organs of state which have jurisdiction in respect of the proposed activity are adequately addressed in the final scoping report. Proof of correspondence with the various stakeholders must be included in the final scoping report. Should you be unable to obtain comments, proof should be submitted to the Department of the attempts that were made to obtain comments. The Public Participation Process must be conducted in terms of Regulation 39, 40, 41, 42, 43 & 44 of the EIA Regulation 2014. You are further reminded that the final SR to be submitted to this Department must comply with all the requirements in terms of the scope of assessment and content of Scoping reports in accordance with Appendix 2 and Regulation 21(1) of the EIA Regulations, 2014</p>	<p>Comment raised by B Ncube (National Department of Environmental Affairs) – draft scoping report comments, received on the 16 May 2016</p>	<p>All comments received to date have been summarised in this table (included in Appendix C of the EIA/EMP report) and hard copies have been included in Appendix D of the EIA/EMP report. In addition proof of correspondence to date with all stakeholders has been included in Appendix D. The final scoping report was compiled in accordance with the requirements in terms of the scope of assessment and content of scoping reports in accordance with Appendix 2 and Regulation 21(1) of the EIA Regulations, 2014. The public participation process has been undertaken in accordance with Regulation 39, 40, 41, 42, 43 & 44 of the 2014 EIA Regulations.</p>
<p>Further note that in terms of Regulation 45 of the EIA Regulations 2014, this application will lapse if the applicant fails to meet any of the timeframes prescribed in terms of these Regulations, unless an extension has been</p>		<p>As per letter received from the DEA on 15 June 2016, an 8 week extension to submission timeframes was granted and in this regard, the final scoping report was due for submission to the DEA on or before 12 July 2016. It follows that the final scoping report was submitted to the DEA on 8 July 2016.</p>

ISSUE RAISED	BY WHOM AND WHEN	RESPONSE GIVEN BY PROJECT TEAM (as amended/incorporated for the purposes of the EIA/EMP submission)
granted in terms of Regulation 3(7)		
You are hereby reminded of Section 24F of the National Environmental Management Act, Act No 107 of 1998, as amended, that no activity may commence prior an environmental authorisation being granted by the Department		It is understood by Siyanda that no activity may commence prior an environmental authorisation being granted by the DEA.
The scoping report cites information regarding heritage resources gathered from the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) and Palaeontological Impact Assessment (PIA) conducted for the project. According to information provided by the HIA and PIA, no heritage resources are located within the project area; however, these reports are not attached to the case. Additionally, the scoping report provides details and terms of reference for specialist studies to be completed during the EIA phase of the project, which includes an HIA and PIA. The HIA and PIA completed for the project must be submitted to SAHRA for further comment. Additionally, the EIA and appendices must be submitted to the case file to provide additional information pertaining to the project.	Comment raised by N Khumalo (South African Heritage Resources Agency) – draft scoping report comments, received on the 21 April 2016	A Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) and Palaeontological Impact Assessment (PIA) were undertaken for the purposes of the project. Although no palaeontological or cultural heritage resources were found to occur within the project area, there is a slight, but very unlikely possibility that fossils could be present in Quaternary alluvial deposits present in low-lying areas. In the event that resources are identified, a chance find emergency procedure should be implemented. Further information is included in Section 8.1.13 and Section 9.1.16 of the EIA/EMP report. The full HIA and PIA reports are included in Appendix M and N (respectively) of the EIA/EMP report. The EIA/EMP report (inclusive of all appendices) will be submitted to SAHRA for review and comment.
What happens if they extract water from a borehole before they get a water use license?	Comment by Marietjie Schoeman at focused meeting, on Johan Young's property (Kameelhoek ptn 9), 26 May 2016	The boreholes drilled on site to date have been drilled under the supervision of the environmental impact assessment team for baseline groundwater quality and quantity monitoring purposes (see Section 8.1.8 of the EIA/EMP for baseline groundwater information) and this monitoring will continue if and when the project becomes operational. Siyanda is considering the use of groundwater from one on-site borehole as emergency back-up
How has Siyanda already managed to drill boreholes without a water use license?		

ISSUE RAISED	BY WHOM AND WHEN	RESPONSE GIVEN BY PROJECT TEAM (as amended/incorporated for the purposes of the EIA/EMP submission)
		supply only if municipal water is not available. Should Siyanda wish to use borehole water at any stage this will require authorisation in terms of the National Water Act (NWA) through a Water Use Licensing (WUL) process. For further information on the project's daily water requirements refer to Section 4.2.2 of the EIA/EMP report.
For the purposes of the WULA, SLR should identify all relevant water uses on the proposed site and surrounding the proposed site	Comment raised by Makahane Rudzani (DWS) at the authority site visit-meeting, Swartklip Rec Centre, 23 July 2015	All relevant water uses will be identified and applied for as part of the WULA process. Siyanda has submitted a letter of intent to DWS outlining its intention to submit a WULA. This letter has been included in Appendix D. At this stage, it is expected that the applicable water uses in terms of Section 21 of the National Water Act (NWA) include (a), (b), (c), (g), (i) and (f). This list will be refined as part of the WULA process.
Is everything on schedule with the environmental process?	Comment by Marietjie Schoeman at focused meeting, on Johan Young's property (Kameelhoek ptn 9), 26 May 2016	There was an 8 week delay due to the scope change associated with the proposed additional access road and waste management alternatives and Siyanda applied for an extension from the Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA) to ensure that the scope change was appropriately addressed through meetings with potentially affected landowners/landusers and additional specialist input where required. This extension was granted by the DEA.
Technical issues		
Will ore be sourced from other operations or will it only be sourced from Swartklip? The size of the plant suggests that it will be able to process more ore than will be provided by Swartklip.	Comment raised by Hannes Olckers at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015	At this stage in project planning, it is expected that incoming chrome concentrate will be sourced from the adjacent Union Section (Swartklip) Mine. Provided the chrome concentrate from other potential mines is of a suitable quality the project can also accept concentrate from other mines (i.e. Amandelbult Mine).
Technology in engineering has developed over the years to a point where humans can actually co-exist with industrial developments. There are many advantages for everyone in such a project and at the end of the day we need to measure and take into account all the advantages as well as the	Comment raised by Basie Kruger at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015	The EIA/EMP report has assessed both the positive and negative impacts associated with the proposed project. The full impact assessment is included in Section 9 of the EIA/EMP report.

ISSUE RAISED	BY WHOM AND WHEN	RESPONSE GIVEN BY PROJECT TEAM (as amended/incorporated for the purposes of the EIA/EMP submission)
disadvantages of such a project.		
How much water will this operation utilise, since I realise it is a large plant.	Comment raised by Hannes Olckers at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015	During the operational phase it is expected that the potable water requirement will be approximately 86 m ³ /day. Process water requirements are expected to be approximately 133 m ³ /day. Further information on water requirements has been included in Section 4.2.2 of the EIA/EMP report.
Where is additional water going to come from for the purposes of the project? There is already a shortage of water in the town of Northam.	Comment raised by Hannes Olckers at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015	Siyanda will source water from within its water circuit as a first priority. It is predicted that no additional water will be required from external sources in the wet months. In the dry months additional make up water will be required from the municipal scheme. In addition, Siyanda is considering the option of having an on-site borehole as a backup option in emergencies only.
Where does Siyanda plan to source water from?	Comment by Vernon Koekemoer at focused meeting, on Johan Young's property (Kameelhoek ptn 9), 26 May 2016	
Will material transport only be done via road?	Comment raised by Hannes Olckers at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015	Finished product transport will be done mostly by rail, with some material transport being done by road if required. Incoming chrome concentrate will be transported either by rail or road (depending on the source). Other raw materials will be transported by road. More detail on this is provided in Section 4.2.2 of the EIA/EMP report.
What is the proposed height of the chimney?	Comment raised by William Segone at scoping meeting, Mmansterre, 21 July 2015	The proposed height of the chimney is approximately 65 m (response by Andre Esterhuizen). More detail on the technical project description is provided in Section 4.2.2 of the EIA/EMP report.

ISSUE RAISED	BY WHOM AND WHEN	RESPONSE GIVEN BY PROJECT TEAM (as amended/incorporated for the purposes of the EIA/EMP submission)
Why does the smelter have to be located at the proposed location?	Comment raised by Johan Young at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015	The proposed smelter is located immediately adjacent to the Union Section Mine (Swartklip Mine).
Why not locate the proposed smelter next to the existing Swartklip mine? There is no procedure for zoning, it seems like anyone can propose their new developments wherever they choose.	Comments raised by Sandy McGill, Mr and Mrs Schoeman at the scoping meeting, Swartklip Rec Centre, 21 July 2015	In order to reduce the carbon footprint, reduce energy use, limit haulage costs and optimise efficiency, the smelter complex was proposed in close proximity to the incoming primary source of chrome concentrate (i.e. adjacent to Union Section Mine). In this regard, two alternatives for the location of the smelter complex have been considered and the preferred alternative was deemed to be the western area of Portion 3 of Grootkuil. More detail on the alternative locations considered (as well as alternative routings for the proposed powerline and access road) is presented in Section 10 of the EIA/EMP report.
The proposed smelter could be developed anywhere in South Africa, why has Siyanda decided to propose the development here?		
Where is the proposed position of the smelter?	Comment by Vernon Koekemoer at focused meeting, on Johan Young's property (Kameelhoek ptn 9), 26 May 2016	
If the project is approved and it happens to be that the smelter is located here in the village what will happen to the residents?	Comment raised by Vuyiseka Ngukutu at scoping meeting, Kwetsheza, 22 July 2015	The proposed location of the smelter is on portion 3 of the farm Grootkuil. The smelter will not be moved to Kwetsheza which is approximately 7 km from the proposed project.
What is the product from the smelter?	Comment raised by Busanya Kubakhaya at scoping meeting, Kwetsheza, 22 July 2015	Ferrochrome. For a technical description of the smelting process to be undertaken as part of the proposed project, refer to Section 4.2.2 of the EIA/EMP report.
Why has Siyanda decided to develop a new smelter when there is already an existing smelter at the Swartklip mine?	Comment raised by Makahane Rudzani (DWS) at the authority site visit-meeting, Swartklip Rec Centre, 23 July 2015	The Union Section smelter is a platinum smelter whereas the proposed Siyanda smelter would be a ferrochrome smelter. These two smelter types are different (response by Bheki Lebeko of Siyanda).
Our civil design team will be reviewing the proposed design of the mineralised waste facilities and I emphasize the importance of a liner in accordance with the new regulations.		The design of these facilities includes containment barrier (liner) systems as per the outcome of the waste type assessments undertaken. See Section 4.2.2 of the EIA/EMP report for the results of the waste type assessment and a summary of the conceptual design proposed for the mineralised waste facilities.

ISSUE RAISED	BY WHOM AND WHEN	RESPONSE GIVEN BY PROJECT TEAM (as amended/incorporated for the purposes of the EIA/EMP submission)
Is BCR still operational? Are there plans for BCR to continue their operations?	Comment by Caitlin Hird at focused meeting, on Johan Young's property (Kameelhoek ptn 9), 26 May 2016	BCR stopped mining about 2 years ago and moved on without rehabilitating the area. To be honest we don't want the mine here but we can't stop it so we would appreciate it if Siyanda can accommodate our issues and concerns. BCR moved to Varkensvlei. I think their license to mine here next door is still valid but they ceased their operations (Vernon Koekemoer).
What is the proposed life of the smelter?	Comment by Johan Young at focused meeting, on Johan Young's property (Kameelhoek ptn 9), 26 May 2016	The expected life of the project is approximately 30 years. This is based on the current expected supply of chrome concentrate.
Groundwater issues		
Will groundwater be tested for the purposes of the project? I no longer have any drinking water available in my boreholes.	Comments raised by Johan Young at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015	SLR has undertaken a hydrocensus of the area which included sampling of baseline groundwater quality and quantity. This information has been used to inform the groundwater specialist study. Baseline groundwater information has been presented in Section 8.1.8 of the EIA/EMP report. The assessment of impacts associated with groundwater are presented in Section 9.1.9 and 9.1.10 of the EIA/EMP report. With regards to a reduction in groundwater levels, it should be noted that Siyanda will source water from the municipal supply scheme and will only source water from an on-site borehole in emergency cases when the municipal supply is not available. If required the borehole abstraction will comply with the recommended sustainable yield criteria which have been formulated to prevent any reduction in groundwater levels in the area. With regards to pollution of groundwater, the mineralised waste facilities will be designed with containment barriers to limit contamination of groundwater in the area (see Section 4.2.2 of the EIA/EMP report for further detail on the containment barriers proposed). In the unlikely event that the project results in a reduction in groundwater levels or quality then compensation will be provided
We are concerned about the water related impacts.	Comment by Philip Schoeman and Pier De Vries during focused scoping meeting with Union Mine, 13 May 2015	
Pivots on our farm cannot be used anymore due to the lack of water.	Comments raised by Sandy McGill, Mr and Mrs Schoeman at the scoping meeting, Swartklip Rec Centre, 21 July 2015	
Water levels in our boreholes have dropped significantly from 24 m to 60 m.		
Water is very scarce in the area. I do not know any borehole in the area that still has water.		
The issue with regards to the lack of water is a cumulative issue as no mine will take responsibility for the lack of water.		
Water is being drawn down into the pits. Therefore Siyanda should seek alternative means of sourcing water because the groundwater is very scarce for all farmers.		
What happens if the water table drops?	Comment by Vernon Koekemoer at focused meeting, on Johan Young's property (Kameelhoek ptn 9), 26 May 2016	
I am concerned about the groundwater	Comments raised by Johan Young at	

ISSUE RAISED	BY WHOM AND WHEN	RESPONSE GIVEN BY PROJECT TEAM (as amended/incorporated for the purposes of the EIA/EMP submission)
impacts as a result of the slag dump.	scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015	to affected groundwater uses and alternative water of an equal or better quality and quantity will be provided.
It is common knowledge that a Ferrochrome Smelter is associated with, amongst others: water pollution.	Comment raised by Ernst Burger (on behalf of the Schoeman family, the beneficiaries of a Testamentary Trust) – draft scoping report comments, received on the 04 May 2016	The full groundwater specialist study has been included in Appendix H.
What will happen if groundwater is contaminated by the proposed smelter plant?	Comment raised by Sello Mogale at scoping meeting, Mmansterre, 21 July 2015	
What are the chances that they can include neighbouring farms in the groundwater study?	Comment raised by Johan Young at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015	SLR included Mr Johan Young's borehole in the hydrocensus. Groundwater quality and quantity information has been presented in Section 8.1.8 of the EIA/EMP report and further detail has been presented in the groundwater study included in Appendix H.
What is meant by a weathered aquifer?	Comment raised by Hannes Olckers at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015	A weathered aquifer is usually shallow and is called the weathered aquifer due to the weathering (or erosion) of the shallow geology through mechanical and chemical processes. More information on the aquifer type is provided in Section 8.1.8 of the EIA/EMP report. Further detail is included in the groundwater study included in Appendix H.
Surface Water issues		
What will happen if groundwater and surface water is contaminated by the proposed smelter plant?	Comment raised by Sello Mogale at scoping meeting, Mmansterre, 21 July 2015	It is not expected that the project will result in surface water contamination. Potential surface water contamination impacts have been assessed in Section 9.1.8 of the EIA/EMP report and further detail is provided in the surface water report included in Appendix G.
Are you saying that there will not be any pollution in the rivers?	Comment raised by Sandy McGill, Mr and Mrs Schoeman at the scoping meeting, Swartklip Rec Centre, 21 July 2015	
The Brakspruit river runs through the site and when it rains, this river flows heavily, therefore it is important that water contamination is investigated for pollution spread downstream.	Comments raised by Adri Young at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015.	
The Crocodile river is currently flowing with sewage water only. My concern is the impact		

ISSUE RAISED	BY WHOM AND WHEN	RESPONSE GIVEN BY PROJECT TEAM (as amended/incorporated for the purposes of the EIA/EMP submission)
that projects such as this will have in worsening issues like this in watercourses.		
When you refer to keeping “dirty water” separate, what do you mean?		Dirty water (from surface runoff on site) will be contained in a dirty water containment system (via channels) which will be conveyed to a pollution control dam (PCD). This will ensure dirty water it is kept separate from clean water which will be diverted away from the project area. Further information and the assessment of impacts relating to stormwater management is provided in Section 4.2.2 and 9.1.8 of the EIA/EMP report. Detailed information is provided in the surface water specialist study (which includes a conceptual stormwater management plan) included in Appendix G.
Biodiversity issues		
I am concerned about the conservation of the rich birdlife in the area. On our farm, there is a bird species of Fluff-tail which is found nowhere else in the country.	Comments raised by Sandy McGill, Mr and Mrs Schoeman at the scoping meeting, Swartklip Rec Centre, 21 July 2015	The baseline biodiversity of the area has been addressed in Section 8.1.6 of the EIA/EMP report. It is expected that potential biodiversity impacts associated with the project will be limited with correct mitigation/management measures, and this has been presented in Section 9.1.5 and 9.1.6 of the EIA/EMP report. Further detail is included in the biodiversity specialist study which has been included in Appendix F.
I feel lucky to come home/retire in place that has such rich biodiversity, and this is being destroyed by projects in the area.	Comment raised by Hannes Olckers at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015	
We are concerned about the biodiversity. It does not just include the larger more easily visible animals. What about the bees and those parts of nature which are not easily seen?	Comment raised by Adri Young at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015	

ISSUE RAISED	BY WHOM AND WHEN	RESPONSE GIVEN BY PROJECT TEAM (as amended/incorporated for the purposes of the EIA/EMP submission)
<p>We would also like some sort of specialist to come and see why our trees and grasses are dying. We think it may be "acid rain" from the present smelter - and a second smelter will probably make it worse. The trees that have died include: Maroelas, Sickle-bush, Dombeya (wild pear), "Kan-nie Dood, Jacket Plums, and Prickly Pears. A number of waterbuck and reed-buck also just died for no apparent reason.</p>	<p>Comment raised by Sandy McGill, via email, 29 July 2015</p>	<p>The assessment of regional issues is not part of the scope of the Siyanda EIA. With regards to the generation of acid rain, this is not expected to be an impact associated with the project since the outcome of the air quality specialist study indicated that sulphur emissions are not expected to be a concern (see Section 9.1.11 of the EIA/EMP report and specialist study included in Appendix I).</p> <p>If it will help, SLR can recommend specialists that could be commissioned by you to investigate this further.</p>
<p>There are more protected trees in this area than you mentioned in your scoping presentation.</p>	<p>Comments raised by Sandy McGill, Mr and Mrs Schoeman at the scoping meeting, Swartklip Rec Centre, 21 July 2015</p>	<p>It should be noted that during the scoping level public engagement phase of the project, specialist studies had not yet been completed and in this regard most of the baseline environment details were sourced from national databases. With the subsequent completion of the specialist studies (for the purposes of the EIA), greater depth and detail on the current biodiversity status has been sourced. The baseline biodiversity of the area has been described in Section 8.1.6 of the EIA/EMP report. The potential impacts on biodiversity associated with the project are expected to be limited and have been presented together with proposed mitigation measures in Section 9.1.5 and 9.1.6 of the EIA/EMP report. Further information is provided in the biodiversity specialist study included in Appendix F.</p>
<p>This area is not classified as the Dwaalboom veld type as you have mentioned in your scoping presentation</p>		
<p>Air quality issues</p>		
<p>I am concerned about air quality impacts. When the southerly wind blows, I will be breathing this air from the plant.</p>	<p>Comment raised by Hannes Olckers at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015</p>	<p>On the issue of air quality impacts, it is expected that with the correct mitigation/management measures (such as dust suppression, covering of materials handling points, tarring of the access road etc.), air quality impacts can be reduced to acceptable levels. An assessment of air quality impacts (including proposed mitigation measures) is included in Section 9.1.11 of the EIA/EMP report.</p>
<p>We are concerned about air quality impacts</p>	<p>Comment by Philip Schoeman and Pier De Vries during focused scoping meeting with Union Mine, 13 May 2015</p>	
<p>I am concerned about the air quality impacts and how far the pollution will travel from the proposed smelter.</p>	<p>Comment raised by William Segone at scoping meeting, Mmansterre, 21 July 2015</p>	<p>The issue of veld condition is linked to dust fallout impacts. With excessive fallout veld condition can deteriorate. It is expected</p>
<p>It is common knowledge that a Ferrochrome</p>	<p>Comment raised by Ernst Burger (on behalf</p>	

ISSUE RAISED	BY WHOM AND WHEN	RESPONSE GIVEN BY PROJECT TEAM (as amended/incorporated for the purposes of the EIA/EMP submission)
Smelter is associated with, amongst others: air pollution.	of the Schoeman family, the beneficiaries of a Testamentary Trust) – draft scoping report comments, received on the 04 May 2016	that with the correct mitigation/management measures (such as dust suppression, covering of materials handling points, tarring of the access road etc.), dust fallout impacts can be reduced to acceptable levels. An assessment of dust fallout impacts (including proposed mitigation measures) is included in Section 9.1.11 of the EIA/EMP report.
We are concerned about the dust fallout and the impacts that it might have on the receiving environment.	Comments raised by Sandy McGill, Mr and Mrs Schoeman at the scoping meeting, Swartklip Rec Centre, 21 July 2015	Further detail is provided in the air quality specialist study included in Appendix I.
Dust from existing mines is already an issue for neighbouring farmers. There is active monitoring done by the mines however according to the regulations the mine dust is under the exceedance limits. This does not make sense because we still experience veld deterioration due to the dust.		
I am concerned about air quality impacts with regard to the health associated impacts.	Comment raised by Grace Goso at scoping meeting, Kwetsheza, 22 July 2015	
I am concerned about dust associated with using this road (alternative 3). It makes the veld un-utilisable and I am also concerned about health related impacts.	Comment by Johan Young at focused meeting, on Johan Young's property (Kameelhoek ptn 9), 26 May 2016	
You mentioned that there is currently baseline air quality monitoring done for the proposed project, would you kindly confirm the duration of the baseline monitoring.	Comment raised by Stanley Koenaitie (WDM: Air Quality) at the authority site visit-meeting, Swartklip Rec Centre, 23 July 2015	The duration for baseline monitoring was 12 months and commenced in June 2015. The parameters measured included: dust fallout, PM10, PM2.5, SO2, NO2 and Volatile Organic Compounds. The results from this baseline monitoring are included in Section 8.1.9 of the EIA/EMP report and further detail is provided in the specialist study in Appendix I.
What parameters are being measured as part of your baseline monitoring campaign?		
Noise issues		
I am concerned about noise impacts.	Comment raised by Hannes Olckers at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015	Detail on the current baseline noise environment is included in 8.1.10 of the EIA/EMP report.
We are concerned about the noise related impacts	Comment by Philip Schoeman and Pier De Vries during focused scoping meeting with Union Mine, 13 May 2015	It is expected that with the correct mitigation/management measures, project related noise impacts can be reduced to acceptable levels. An assessment of noise related impacts (including proposed mitigation measures) is included in Section
How far will noise travel from the proposed	Comment raised by William Segone at	

ISSUE RAISED	BY WHOM AND WHEN	RESPONSE GIVEN BY PROJECT TEAM (as amended/incorporated for the purposes of the EIA/EMP submission)
smelter?	scoping meeting, Mmansterre, 21 July 2015	9.1.12 of the EIA/EMP report. Further detail is provided in the noise impact specialist study included in Appendix J.
The current noise levels are already a concern and should be monitored. On our farm we can hear the reverse hooters of trucks and the noise from bulldozers.	Comment raised by Sandy McGill, Mr and Mrs Schoeman at the scoping meeting, Swartklip Rec Centre, 21 July 2015	
Noise from trucks is a major concern for us, especially at night time. The reverse alarm of trucks echoes through the veld. Trucks from BCR would also blast their music at night which increases the noise in the area.	Comment by Vernon Koekemoer at focused meeting, on Johan Young's property (Kameelhoek ptn 9), 26 May 2016	
It is common knowledge that a Ferrochrome Smelter is associated with, amongst others: noise pollution.	Comment raised by Ernst Burger (on behalf of the Schoeman family, the beneficiaries of a Testamentary Trust) – draft scoping report comments, received on the 04 May 2016	
Blasting issues		
Should there be blasting, Siyanda should notify surrounding landowners and land-users ahead of time	Comment raised by Makahane Rudzani (DWS) at the authority site visit-meeting, Swartklip Rec Centre, 23 July 2015	Should blasting be undertaken this would be minimal and limited to the construction phase (for foundations only) and notification will be provided. Blast associated impacts have been assessed in Section 9.1.13 of the EIA/EMP report.
Land use issues		
What is the project area currently zoned for?	Comment raised by Johan Young at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015	The project area is currently zoned for agriculture and in this regard a re-zoning application process will be undertaken to re-zone the land from agriculture to industry (see Section 5 of the EIA/EMP report). This process will be handled by PlanWize Town and Regional planners and is not part of the scope of the EIA.
If the proposed project area is currently zoned for agricultural purposes, a re-zoning process would need to be followed.	Comment raised by Makahane Rudzani (DWS) at the authority site visit-meeting, Swartklip Rec Centre, 23 July 2015	
It should be noted that according to the 2015/16 Integrated Development Plan (IDP_ for the Waterberg District Municipality, and as confirmed by the Thabazimbi Local Municipality the project area is currently ear-marked as a “mining focus area” and a “major infrastructure corridor area”. Further information on land uses associated with the project is included in Section		

ISSUE RAISED	BY WHOM AND WHEN	RESPONSE GIVEN BY PROJECT TEAM (as amended/incorporated for the purposes of the EIA/EMP submission)
		8.1.15 of the EIA/EMP report.
The portion that is our biggest concern is left from the tar road from Northam towards Swartklip.	Comment raised by Marietjie Schoeman, via email, 27 July 2015	It has been noted that you are concerned about the portion 0 of Grootkuil. This is located adjacent (north) to the Siyanda property, but not adjacent to where the smelter complex will be developed. Potential impacts on neighbouring land uses and proposed mitigation measures associated therewith are included in Section 8.1.15 of the EIA/EMP report.
Soil issues		
It should be noted that the quality of soil is good. I have farmed sunflowers on my property for a long time with a successful yield	Comment raised by Sandy McGill, Mr and Mrs Schoeman at the scoping meeting, Swartklip Rec Centre, 21 July 2015	Information on baseline soil conditions in the area is provided in Section 8.1.4 of the EIA/EMP report. It is expected that with correct management and mitigation measures (such as limiting the area of disturbance, correct stockpiling of topsoil resources etc.), soil related impacts will be limited. The assessment of impacts on soils (and proposed mitigation measures) is included in Section 9.1.3 and Section 9.1.4 of the EIA/EMP report. The detailed soils specialist report is included in Appendix E.
It is common knowledge that a Ferrochrome Smelter is associated with, amongst others: ground pollution.	Comment raised by Ernst Burger (on behalf of the Schoeman family, the beneficiaries of a Testamentary Trust) – draft scoping report comments, received on the 04 May 2016	
Waste issues		
1. Two separate facilities should be developed for the disposal of slag and baghouse dust, respectively. A key related motivator for waste separation is that by having separate waste streams one can maximise the possibilities for using/selling/reprocessing the materials and limiting disposal to land. In the case where disposal is unavoidable, there is a greater	Comment by Zama Mtembu, meeting held with DEA Waste Directorate, 14 April 2016	It is understood from the meeting with the DEA Waste Directorate (minutes included in Appendix D) that in the interest of ensuring the greatest possible opportunity for re-use/recycling of waste, that waste types should be kept separate and ideally co-disposal should therefore not be considered further. It is also understood by SLR that this carries the least permitting risk. In this regard waste types will be kept separate and the design work will be undertaken in support of two different facilities,

ISSUE RAISED	BY WHOM AND WHEN	RESPONSE GIVEN BY PROJECT TEAM (as amended/incorporated for the purposes of the EIA/EMP submission)
<p>likelihood of recovering the material later if it is not mixed or contaminated. In this regard, the first cell of the baghouse dust facility would be designed with a Class A liner (Type 1 waste) and the first cell of the slag dump facility would be designed with a Class C liner (Type 3 waste). Should test work on the project specific material result in a more favourable waste type determination then the remaining part of the facilities could be built according to reduced barrier system requirements. Of the three options, this option carries the least permitting risk.</p> <p>2. If waste must be co-disposed then the first cell should have a Class A liner catering for a Type 1 waste. Should test work on the project specific material result in a more favourable waste type determination then the remaining part of the facility could be built according to reduced barrier system requirements. Co-disposal may however limit the options available for re-using, selling, and/or reprocessing.</p> <p>3. A motivation can be submitted to co-dispose the waste onto a single mineralised waste facility with a Class C liner system catering for a Type 3 waste. Of the three options, this option carries the most permitting risks because it requires the regulators to accept a risk based discussion that considers the waste disposal ratios, potential for leachate, potential for water contamination, and all associated mitigation and management measures. Moreover, should test work on the project specific</p>		<p>namely a slag dump (with a Class C liner as called for by the outcome of the waste type assessment) and a baghouse slurry facility (with a Class A liner as called for by the outcome of the waste type assessment).</p> <p>Further information on the proposed design of the slag dump and baghouse slurry facility is included in Section 4.2.2 of the EIA/EMP report. The engineering design report (in support of the EIA/EMP) for these facilities is included in Appendix S. Further detail will be included in support of the WULA when this is submitted at a later stage.</p>

ISSUE RAISED	BY WHOM AND WHEN	RESPONSE GIVEN BY PROJECT TEAM (as amended/incorporated for the purposes of the EIA/EMP submission)
<p>material result in a less favourable waste type determination then the remaining part of the facility would have to be built according to a higher level of barrier system and there would be a question about the first cell being under-designed and inadequate. This poses additional risk management issues that would have to be detailed in scenario specific plans as part of the EIA submission.</p> <p>It should be noted that although the DEA can provide input and advise on the EIA related submission, the ultimate decision on the liner/barrier system design would be made by DWS.</p>		
<p>When you refer to the disposal of waste at a designated landfill site, I am concerned that it will be like the dumping site on the Brits Road just outside Northam.</p>	<p>Comment raised by Johan Young at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015</p>	<p>The disposal of waste will be done at a licensed/permitted waste disposal facility. This will most likely be contracted out to a reputable waste management service provider. For further information on waste management see Section 4.2.2 of the EIA/EMP report.</p>
<p>Siyanda should ensure that the newly proposed sewage system is in place before operation of the project, due to the incapacity of the current sewage system.</p>	<p>Comment raised by Makahane Rudzani (DWS) at the authority site visit-meeting, Swartklip Rec Centre, 23 July 2015.</p>	<p>It has been noted that the Northam sewage treatment plant is already inadequate (see Section 4.2.2 of the EIA/EMP report). Siyanda is entering into negotiations with the local municipality to join the Task Team (of which Anglo is currently a part) responsible for the funding and upgrading of the Northam sewage treatment plant. Siyanda is also making provision for an on-site sewage treatment solution for use in the event that the Northam sewage treatment plant is not operational.</p>
<p>Are there any plans to upgrade the current sewage treatment plant, because the size of the current plant is already too small for the town of Northam and the capacity is inadequate to meet the needs of the town.</p>	<p>Comment raised by Hannes Olckers at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015</p>	
<p>The existing sewage treatment facility ran into problems due to lack of funds, theft and corruption. The Northam sewage issue has been a problem for more than 15 years.</p>	<p>Comments raised by Sandy McGill, Mr and Mrs Schoeman at the scoping meeting, Swartklip Rec Centre, 21 July 2015</p>	

ISSUE RAISED	BY WHOM AND WHEN	RESPONSE GIVEN BY PROJECT TEAM (as amended/incorporated for the purposes of the EIA/EMP submission)
The current sewage plant exploded and if you drive on the Dwaalboom road, you can smell it.	Comment raised by Adri Young at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015	
What will happen to sewage on site?	Comment by Johan Young at focused meeting, on Johan Young's property (Kameelhoek ptn 9), 26 May 2016	
What will happen to waste water on site?		Waste water will be contained within a dirty water containment system which will be designed to ensure that clean and dirty water systems are kept separate. Provision is being made to treat water in the water system for use by Siyanda. If there is an excess of water (in the wet months) then treatment and discharge will be required subject to authorisation. The water management on site is described in Section 4.2.2 of the EIA/EMP report. Further detail is included in the surface water specialist study included in Appendix G.
Visual issues		
People who live 28 km away from the smelter will be able to see it.	Comment raised by Adri Young at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015	The existing visual environment of the area has been compromised by the dominance of mining and community activities as well as roads and powerlines etc. Detail on the baseline visual environment is included in Section 8.1.11 of the EIA/EMP report. It is expected that with the correct management and mitigation measures, visual impacts associated with the proposed project can be limited. Further information on potential visual impacts (and mitigation measure associated therewith) has been presented in Section 9.1.15 of the EIA/EMP report. According to the visual specialist study included in Appendix K the 'zone of potential influence' (the area defined as the radius about the centre point of the project beyond which the visual impact of the most visible features will be insignificant) is 12 km.
Visually, the area is already destroyed by the existing mines. Occasionally when taking my clients on game drives I am asked to explain what the infrastructure and lights are in the landscape of the farms	Comment raised by Derik de Jager at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015	
It has been a very dry year as the rain has been scarce and this has resulted in the area looking very barren however it should be noted that it is an extremely beautiful/scenic area during the wet season.	Comments raised by Sandy McGill, Mr and Mrs Schoeman at the scoping meeting, Swartklip Rec Centre, 21 July 2015	

ISSUE RAISED	BY WHOM AND WHEN	RESPONSE GIVEN BY PROJECT TEAM (as amended/incorporated for the purposes of the EIA/EMP submission)
It is common knowledge that a Ferrochrome Smelter is associated with, amongst others: strong lights burning 24 hours. With a chimney 65 m in height, the plant will be visible from all parts of our client's property.	Comment raised by Ernst Burger (on behalf of the Schoeman family, the beneficiaries of a Testamentary Trust) – draft scoping report comments, received on the 04 May 2016	
The use of vehicles on this road will not only be disturbing during the day with many impacts, but also at night with the use of headlights. We will be affected by this	Comment by Vernon Koekemoer at focused meeting, on Johan Young's property (Kameelhoek ptn 9), 26 May 2016	
Does the proposed smelter look anything like the Heric smelter in Brits?	Comments raised by Sandy McGill, Mr and Mrs Schoeman at the scoping meeting, Swartklip Rec Centre, 21 July 2015	Dimensionally, in terms of the size of the furnace buildings and associated infrastructure, it would be similar. Potential visual impacts and proposed mitigation measures associated therewith have been presented in Section 9.1.15 of the EIA/EMP report. Further detail is provided in the visual specialist study included in Appendix K.
Traffic and Transport issues		
I am concerned about the increased pressure that the project will place on roads.	Comment raised by Johan Young at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015	Information on baseline traffic levels on the relevant roads is provided in Section 8.1.12 of the EIA/EMP report. It is noted that the current level of service on the D869 is inadequate and various intersection upgrades (including the intersection of the R510) are required even without the addition of project related traffic. Traffic impacts associated with the proposed project (and proposed mitigation measures) have been addressed in Section 9.1.14 of the EIA/EMP report. The detailed traffic impact assessment has been included in Appendix L.
The intersection of the access road (alternative 3) with the main road from Northam is very dangerous. Cars drive very fast and this leads to a number of accidents which will only get worse if the Siyanda uses this intersection	Comment by Johan Young at focused meeting, on Johan Young's property (Kameelhoek ptn 9), 26 May 2016	
We experienced issues with BCR whereby 28 trucks were queuing behind each other on the main road to gain access to the operation however there was some issues with congestion on the internal BCR roads and these trucks all had to reverse back along the main road, causing major problems. Access road alternative 3 is not preferable.	Comment by Marietjie Schoeman at focused meeting, on Johan Young's property (Kameelhoek ptn 9), 26 May 2016	It should be noted that the traffic assessment considered the scenario in which railway capacity is unavailable thereby requiring additional use of trucks and road transport.

ISSUE RAISED	BY WHOM AND WHEN	RESPONSE GIVEN BY PROJECT TEAM (as amended/incorporated for the purposes of the EIA/EMP submission)
<p>There are major safety issues with using this access road (access road alternative 3). When BCR used this access road their trucks would get stuck on the road on many occasions. The angle of the Transnet crossing is too steep for big trucks and as a result many trucks would get stuck on the tracks which caused major delays in Transnet rail as these trucks could remain on the crossing for two weeks and all trains would be delayed</p>	<p>Comments by Johan Young at focused meeting, on Johan Young's property (Kameelhoek ptn 9), 26 May 2016</p>	
<p>The Northam road cannot take the additional traffic pressure.</p>		
<p>The local municipality does not have the means to fix the roads, therefore this proposed development is a big concern for vehicle owners since it will increase the traffic on the roads which will ultimately deteriorate the roads much quicker.</p>	<p>Comments raised by Sandy McGill, Mr and Mrs Schoeman at the scoping meeting, Swartklip Rec Centre, 21 July 2015</p>	
<p>The capacity of the railway system is a big concern because although the infrastructure exists it is not the most reliable method of transport and in past experience has shown that when the rail system fails the mines use more trucks. We are concerned about the same issue with the proposed development</p>		
<p>It is common knowledge that a Ferrochrome Smelter is associated with, amongst others: increased traffic – heavy vehicles, normal vehicles and pedestrians.</p>	<p>Comment raised by Ernst Burger (on behalf of the Schoeman family, the beneficiaries of a Testamentary Trust) – draft scoping report comments, received on the 04 May 2016</p>	

ISSUE RAISED	BY WHOM AND WHEN	RESPONSE GIVEN BY PROJECT TEAM (as amended/incorporated for the purposes of the EIA/EMP submission)
I am concerned about the access route to site. Has this already been decided on?	Comment raised by Adri Young at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015	Three access road alternatives were considered (see Section 10 of the EIA/EMP report). All of these access roads originate from the D869 (Dwaalboom road). The preferred alternative is the “access road corridor” described as alternative 2 in Section 10 of the EIA/EMP report. This access road will come off the D869 close to the Kilkenny siding and will travel in a southerly direction (adjacent to the Union Section Mine railway line) to the Siyanda site. Siyanda gave preliminary consideration accessing the project area from the south, the northern access roads were considered more viable for various reasons and access from the south was therefore not considered further.
Where is the proposed entrance to the smelter?	Comments raised by Sandy McGill, Mr and Mrs Schoeman at the scoping meeting, Swartklip Rec Centre, 21 July 2015	
My suggestion would be to use the R510 via Sefikile to access the plant in order to minimise traffic impacts. The Dwaalboom road is currently in a poor state and it is already congested with the current load of traffic. Adding more trucks to this road will make the situation worse.	Comment raised by Johan Young at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015	
Why does Siyanda not use the access road from Sefikile? There is already an existing truck stop, fuel bay, and shops. The capacity of the road is able to withstand the amount of trucks that they will need for their operations and it is also closer to their target employees from the surrounding communities. Using the road near Sefikile as an access road will also be keeping the traffic out of Northam	Comments by Johan Young at focused meeting, on Johan Young’s property (Kameelhoek ptn 9), 26 May 2016	
We suggest Siyanda consider an alternative entrance from the Swartklip mine side and not the Tiramogo lodge entrance off the main road.	Comments raised by Sandy McGill, Mr and Mrs Schoeman at the scoping meeting, Swartklip Rec Centre, 21 July 2015	
What happened to the original proposed route from the south of Union section mine?	Comments by Johan Young at focused meeting, on Johan Young’s property (Kameelhoek ptn 9), 26 May 2016	

ISSUE RAISED	BY WHOM AND WHEN	RESPONSE GIVEN BY PROJECT TEAM (as amended/incorporated for the purposes of the EIA/EMP submission)
<p>Please clarify which railway is intended for use as well as details with respect to powerlines and designated routes for transportation of material.</p>	<p>Comment raised by Ingrid Morrison, via email, 20 July 2015</p>	<p>The Siyanda railway siding will extend onto the Union Section Mine railway line which runs to the west of the project area and joins the main Transnet line to the north (see Figure 2 and 3 of the EIA/EMP report)</p> <p>Section 4.2.2 of the EIA/EMP report provides detail on the proposed powerline routing and designated means of transport for product and raw materials. For further information on the four alternatives considered for the routing of the powerline, refer to Section 10 of the EIA/EM report.</p>
<p>The access road adjacent to our property is registered as 3.5m servitude and not 9m servitude. We have proof of this and we will forward it to you. The only reason why it is currently 9m wide is because we had a service agreement with BCR mining who previously used this access road to get to their operation behind our property. They would compensate us for using the access road provided that we moved our fences back in order for the road to be wide enough for their trucks to turn etc. We are in the process of moving our fence back to the original position which would make the road 3.5m again.</p>	<p>Comment by Johan Young at focused meeting, on Johan Young's property (Kameelhoek ptn 9), 26 May 2016</p>	<p>PlanWize Town and Regional Planners have information which indicates that the registered servitude width is in fact 15.74 m wide. PlanWize contacted Mr Young to confirm a mutual understanding (based on legal servitude registration documentation) of the servitude width.</p>
<p>This access route cannot be on the table for Siyanda due to the registered servitude width of 3.5m and our plans to move our fences back to the original position. The purpose of this road is for private access to our farms and this is what it's registered for.</p>		

ISSUE RAISED	BY WHOM AND WHEN	RESPONSE GIVEN BY PROJECT TEAM (as amended/incorporated for the purposes of the EIA/EMP submission)
I have plans for extending my aquaculture farming and I will need the extra space therefore we will be moving our fences back to their original positions very soon (JY).		
The railway crossing is not suited for low bed trucks.	Comments by Johan Young at focused meeting, on Johan Young's property (Kameelhoek ptn 9), 26 May 2016	Your concern regarding low-bed trucks being too low to cross over the level crossing associated with access road alternative 3 (as presented in Section 10 of the EIA/EMP report) has been noted and this information will be passed on to Siyanda for consideration.
Heritage issues		
If there are graves located on the project area what will happen to them?	Comment raised by Joel Ramakoka at scoping meeting, Mmansterre, 21 July 2015	A Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) and Palaeontological Impact Assessment (PIA) were undertaken for the purposes of the project. No palaeontological or cultural heritage resources (including graves) were found to occur within the project area. If there are any chance finds during the development or operation of the project, a chance find emergency procedure should be implemented. Baseline information on the cultural/heritage resource environment is included in Section 8.1.13 of the EIA/EMP report and the assessment of potential impacts is presented in Section 9.1.16. The full HIA and PIA reports are included in Appendix M and N respectively.
There are many graves on the proposed site. What will happen to these graves?	Comment raised by Sandy McGill, Mr and Mrs Schoeman at the scoping meeting, Swartklip Rec Centre, 21 July 2015	
Health issues		
I am concerned about the potential health impacts. Will a health impact study be undertaken?	Comment raised by Lucas Mogale at scoping meeting, Mmansterre, 21 July 2015	Health issues associated with potential air and water impacts have been assessed in Section 9.1.8 and 9.1.10 (water) and Section 9.1.11 (air) of the EIA/EMP report. In addition, the spread of disease associated with influx of people associated with the project has been assessed in Section 9.1.17 of the EIA/EMP. It is expected that with the correct management and mitigation measures (which are also described in the abovementioned report sections), these impacts can be limited. The specialist surface and groundwater studies have been included in Appendix G and Appendix H respectively and the specialist air quality study has been included in Appendix I. The social impact assessment has been included in Appendix P.

ISSUE RAISED	BY WHOM AND WHEN	RESPONSE GIVEN BY PROJECT TEAM (as amended/incorporated for the purposes of the EIA/EMP submission)
Socio-economic issues relating to continuation of existing land uses		
What consideration is given to game farming given that the animals are sensitive to impacts such as noise, air quality and vibrations?	Comment raised by Hannes Olckers at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015	<p>The assessment of impacts relating to the disturbance of biodiversity (and associated mitigation/management measures) is presented in Section 9.1.6 of the EIA/EMP report. The detailed assessment is included in the biodiversity specialist report in Appendix F.</p> <p>It is expected that game farming and surrounding land uses in the proximity of the project have already adapted to a certain degree of noise, air quality and vibration related impacts associated with Union Section Mine, and this provides one of the motivations for selecting the site given that receptors are already sensitised to potential impacts.</p>
No hunter or eco tourist will visit a game farm that is situated adjacent to a Ferrochrome Smelter.	Comment raised by Ernst Burger (on behalf of the Schoeman family, the beneficiaries of a Testamentary Trust) – draft scoping report comments, received on the 04 May 2016	Given the location of the proposed smelter complex being immediately adjacent to the existing Union Section Mine it is expected that impacts on existing land uses in the area will to some degree be limited especially in the mitigated scenario when the additional impacts associated with the project are avoided/mitigated.
I am concerned that my property value will drop dramatically if a smelter is developed next to my farm. It has already been affected by the current mine.	Comments raised by Johan Young at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015	With regards to the potential impacts on land values in the area, it is a commitment in the EIA/EMP that a base case valuation of land surrounding the project area be done by an independent valuator. This valuation will provide a basis for future compensation negotiations if landowners are of the view that Siyanda related impacts have caused a decrease in land value.
As game farmers we will be losing clients as people would not want to visit a farm that is right next to a smelter.	Comment raised by Derik de Jager at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015	
Our clients are using their property for residential purposes, cattle and game farming, eco-tourism and hunting. The intended use of the adjacent land for a Ferrochrome Smelter will have a direct and detrimental effect on their current land uses, to which they are entitled in terms of their ownership as is confirmed in the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa.	Comment raised by Ernst Burger (on behalf of the Schoeman family, the beneficiaries of a Testamentary Trust) – draft scoping report comments, received on the 04 May 2016	The assessment of potential economic impacts (and associated mitigation/management measures) has been presented in Section 9.1.18 of the EIA/EMP report and the assessment of potential impacts on current land uses (and associated mitigation/management measures) has been assessed in Section 9.1.19. Further detail on expected economic impacts is included in the economic specialist report included in Appendix

ISSUE RAISED	BY WHOM AND WHEN	RESPONSE GIVEN BY PROJECT TEAM (as amended/incorporated for the purposes of the EIA/EMP submission)
With all the changes that the project will bring about we will not be able to run our farm in the same manner as we are doing now.	Comment raised by Marietjie Schoeman, via email, 27 July 2015	O while further detail on potential socio-economic impacts is included in the social impact specialist study in Appendix P
We are opposed to the new ferrochrome smelter as it will affect our game farming industry, and land values negatively.	Comment raised by Sandy McGill, via email, 29 July 2015	
This is a huge issue and potentially an economic problem from the perspective of game farming and tourism because no one wants to visit a game farm next to a larger smelter.		
As a landowner you spend your entire life investing in your property and then when a company comes along to propose a development right next door it not only causes environmental impacts but also destroys your entire livelihood.		
The issues with regards to inward migration and informal settlements led to a drop in the property value of neighbouring farms.		
What will happen if we have livestock grazing in the project area?	Comment raised by Steven Moatshe at scoping meeting, Mmansterre, 21 July 2015	The proposed smelter complex is located on land owned by Siyanda. No third party livestock grazing currently takes place there. The relevant baseline land uses are explained in Section 8.1.15 of the EIA/EMP report. Potential impacts on current land uses (including proposed mitigation/management measures) are presented in Section 9.1.19.
What happens if the proposed smelter is located on land that we use for grazing, is there a compensation program in place for the loss of land for grazing?	Comments raised by Stembiso Mmbalene at scoping meeting, Kwetsheza, 22 July 2015	
Socio-economic issues relating to access control and security		
We experienced first-hand all the issues related to the use of this road (access road alternative 3) as an access road for mines. One of the biggest issues for us as the neighbouring landowners is crime and safety. The trucks would line up on the access road	Comments by Johan Young at focused meeting, on Johan Young's property (Kameelhoek ptn 9), 26 May 2016	Access to the project area will be strictly controlled via a main security entrance and fencing. In addition, Siyanda will work together with landowners and landusers in the area to the benefit of all parties. These negative socio-economic (including impacts associated

ISSUE RAISED	BY WHOM AND WHEN	RESPONSE GIVEN BY PROJECT TEAM (as amended/incorporated for the purposes of the EIA/EMP submission)
and often use it as a truck stop which would lead to a number of issues such as public ablution, littering and also cutting our fences to get water from our property		with inward migration) and associated mitigation/management measures have been assessed in Section 9.1.17 of the EIA/EMP report. Land use impacts (and proposed management and mitigation measures) have been presented in Section 9.1.19 of the EIA/EMP report. Further detail on negative socio-economic impacts is included in the social impact assessment included in Appendix P.
Access control is also an issue for us. Residents from Smash Block will walk straight through all our properties to gain access to the smelter.		
With the entrance right near to my farm people will be crossing my farm to gain entry and this is a huge issue. In the past people would leave my gates open allowing my cattle to cross the main road which then becomes my issue if this had led to any accidents on the roads.	Comment raised by Sandy McGill, Mr and Mrs Schoeman at the scoping meeting, Swartklip Rec Centre, 21 July 2015	
Please clarify aspects of security.	Comment raised by Ingrid Morrison, via email, 20 July 2015	
Siyanda should assist in the maintenance of the boundary fence between portions 3 and 4 of Grootkuil.	Comment by Philip Schoeman and Pier De Vries during focused scoping meeting with Union Mine, 13 May 2015	
Siyanda needs to ensure that there is no unauthorised access (via pedestrians) to site otherwise workers will trespass on our and other privately owned land.	Comments raised by Johan Young at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015	
We are concerned about our security.	Comments raised by Sandy McGill, Mr and Mrs Schoeman at the scoping meeting, Swartklip Rec Centre, 21 July 2015	
Socio-economic issues relating to influx of labour, pressure on services etc.		
Where are the 700 people going to live during the construction phase?	Comment raised by Sandy McGill, Mr and Mrs Schoeman at the scoping meeting, Swartklip Rec Centre, 21 July 2015	Staff hired for the project will be from nearby towns and communities as far as possible. No new housing will be constructed on site. It should however be noted that the existing

ISSUE RAISED	BY WHOM AND WHEN	RESPONSE GIVEN BY PROJECT TEAM (as amended/incorporated for the purposes of the EIA/EMP submission)
Ideally no housing development should be constructed on site for the purposes of the project	Comments by Philip Schoeman and Pier De Vries during focused scoping meeting with Union Mine, 13 May 2015	farm residence on the Siyanda property (east of the smelter complex area as illustrated in Figure 24 of the EIA/EMP) will continue to be used as an employee residence .
Where is the proposed housing for employees?	Comment by Vernon Koekemoer at focused meeting, on Johan Young's property (Kameelhoek ptn 9), 26 May 2016	
I am concerned about the influx of labour and the associated social impacts such as informal settlements, security and littering.	Comments raised by Johan Young at scoping meeting, Northam Town Hall, 23 July 2015	It is expected that with the application of mitigation measures such as formal recruitment procedures, employment of locals as far as possible etc., inward migration (and associated pressure on services and establishment of informal settlements) will be limited. Socio-economic impacts including those associated with inward migration (and proposed management and mitigation measures) are assessed in Section 9.1.17 of the EIA/EMP. Further detail is included in the social impact assessment report in Appendix P.
What are Siyanda's plans to control inward migration of people in search of job opportunities? This will lead to new informal settlements being established in the area such as the situation next to Marulasfontein.	Comments raised by Sandy McGill, Mr and Mrs Schoeman at the scoping meeting, Swartklip Rec Centre, 21 July 2015	
Siyanda must convince private landowners that no informal settlements will be established since not everyone will be guaranteed a job at the plant and those that do not get jobs will become desperate and therefore target private landowners.		
The proposed project and its promised jobs will result in an influx of people to the area which will ultimately lead to the establishment of a new informal settlement and its associated impacts such as crime.		
The Hernic smelter in Brits is a perfect example of the housing invasion issues. The recent informal development (De Kroon) adjacent to the smelter is proof. The landowner forcefully demanded people to move from his property using bulldozers and as a result he was arrested for his actions.	Comment by Dirkie van der Westhuizen at focused meeting, on Johan Young's property (Kameelhoek ptn 9), 26 May 2016	
Previous experience with BCR mining has shown that increased traffic on this road	Comment by Johan Young at focused meeting, on Johan Young's property	

ISSUE RAISED	BY WHOM AND WHEN	RESPONSE GIVEN BY PROJECT TEAM (as amended/incorporated for the purposes of the EIA/EMP submission)
(access road alternative 3) leads to the establishment of informal settlements and people selling things along the side of the road with littering and issues such as stock theft.	(Kameelhoek ptn 9), 26 May 2016	
Socio-economic issues relating to employment/unemployment		
Where possible, employment should be from local communities first	Comments by Philip Schoeman and Pier De Vries during focused scoping meeting with Union Mine, 13 May 2015	Recruitment will as far as possible be from local communities first. This is described in Section 4.2.2 of the EIA/EMP report.
With the influx of investment as a result of new projects, more investment is made towards the informal settlements. I'd like to see more investment into formal settlements/communities.	Comment raised by Frans Moatshe at scoping meeting, Mmansterre, 21 July 2015	Your recommendation regarding investment into formalised communities will be forwarded to the Siyanda team for consideration.
As the interested parties we would like to know whether jobs will be aligned for us.	Comment raised by Kgosi Ramakoka at scoping meeting, Mmansterre, 21 July 2015	Your request/concern has been noted and will be considered and clarified by Siyanda during the employment and procurement phase of the project. Where possible, Siyanda will hire from nearby towns and communities. This is described in Section 4.2.2 and in 9.1.17 and 9.1.18 of the EIA/EMP report. Further detail can be found in the social impact assessment included in Appendix P.
Between now and 2017, can Siyanda advise the youth as to what skills they can acquire to ensure that we stand a better chance of getting the jobs.	Comment raised by Portia Moremi at scoping meeting, Kwetsheza, 22 July 2015	
With regards to the operational jobs, will Siyanda be looking for people with previous experience in smelting plants? I would like to know whether the workers during the construction phase will be considered for jobs during the operational phase.	Comment raised by Vuyiseka Ngukutu at scoping meeting, Kwetsheza, 22 July 2015	
Will Siyanda be hiring people from the area or other parts of the country?	Comment raised by Sandy McGill, via email, 29 July 2015	
Will the Mmansterre community also benefit from the project?	Comment raised by D. D Tau at scoping meeting, Mmansterre, 21 July 2015	
The Kwetsheza community is extremely impoverished, what are some of the benefits that this community will gain from this	Comments raised by Stembiso Mmbalene at scoping meeting, Kwetsheza, 22 July 2015	

ISSUE RAISED	BY WHOM AND WHEN	RESPONSE GIVEN BY PROJECT TEAM (as amended/incorporated for the purposes of the EIA/EMP submission)
project?		
The main reason for the high unemployment rates in this community is because Kwetsheza does not form part of the tribal community, therefore we are unable to get proof of residence documents when they are requested by potential employees.	Comment raised by Grace Goso at scoping meeting, Kwetsheza, 22 July 2015	
Based on previous experiences with other projects in the area, no information is communicated to the Kwetsheza community with regards to job opportunities.	Comment raised by Maweto Mehlo at scoping meeting, Kwetsheza, 22 July 2015	
You mentioned that there will be an estimate of 700 jobs during the construction phase and an estimate of 280 jobs during operation. I would like to know whether the 280 jobs will be an addition to the 700 jobs.	Comment raised by Grace Goso at scoping meeting, Kwetsheza, 22 July 2015	When the construction phase is completed, the 700 construction phase jobs will also be completed and 280 permanent staff will be required for the operational phase. This is described in Section 4.2.2 of the EIA/EMP report.