1. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

This Environmental Impact Statement provides a summary of the actual and potential impacts of the mining activities on the environment, <u>considering</u> the implementation of management and mitigation measures. It specifically addresses the nature, duration, likelihood, and significance of these impacts.

Blasting

Health and safety risk posed by blasting activities

Rating: Low – Medium

| | | | Consequence | | | Likelihood | Significance |
|----------|----------|--------|--------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|--------------|
| Severity | Duration | Extend | Oorisequence | Probability | Frequency | LIKCIIIIOOG | Olgillicance |
| 3 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2.5 | 7.5 |

Dust nuisance caused by blasting activities

Rating: Medium - High

| | | | Consequence | | | Likelihood | Significance |
|----------|----------|--------|--------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|--------------|
| Severity | Duration | Extend | Oorisequence | Probability | Frequency | LIKCIIIIOOG | Olgimicance |
| 3 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 16 |

Noise nuisance caused by blasting activities

Rating: Medium

| | | | Consequence | | | Likelihood | Significance |
|----------|----------|--------|-------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|--------------|
| Severity | Duration | Extend | Consequence | Probability | Frequency | Likeliilood | Significance |
| 3 | 5 | 2 | 3.3 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 13.2 |

Excavations

Visual intrusion associated with the excavation activities

Rating: Medium

| | | | Consequence | | | Likelihood | Significance |
|----------|----------|--------|-------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|--------------|
| Severity | Duration | Extend | Consequence | Probability | Frequency | LINGIIIIOOU | Significance |
| 2 | 5 | 1 | 2.6 | 4 | 5 | 4.5 | 11.7 |

Dust nuisance due to excavation activities

Rating: Medium

| | | | Consequence | | | Likelihood | Significance |
|----------|----------|--------|--------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|--------------|
| Severity | Duration | Extend | Oorisequence | Probability | Frequency | LIKCIIIIOOG | Olgimicance |
| 2 | 5 | 1 | 2.6 | 4 | 5 | 4.5 | 11.7 |

Noise nuisance generated by excavation equipment

Rating: Medium

| | | | Consequence | | | Likelihood | Significance |
|----------|----------|--------|-------------|-------------|-----------|------------|--------------|
| Severity | Duration | Extend | | Probability | Frequency | | |
| 2 | 5 | 1 | 2.6 | 4 | 5 | 4.5 | 11.7 |

Contamination of surface or groundwater due to effluent runoff from excavation area

Rating: Low – Medium

| | | | Consequence | | | Likelihood | Significance |
|----------|----------|--------|--------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|---------------|
| Severity | Duration | Extend | Oorisequence | Probability | Frequency | LIKCIIIIOOd | Oigililicance |
| 3 | 5 | 2 | 3.3 | 2 | 1 | 1.5 | 5 |

Unsafe working conditions for employees

Rating: Low – Medium

| | | | Consequence | | | Likelihood | Significance |
|----------|----------|--------|-------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|--------------|
| Severity | Duration | Extend | Consequence | Probability | Frequency | LIKCIIIIOOG | Olgillicance |
| 3 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 9 |

Negative impact on the fauna and flora of the area

Rating: Medium

| | | | Consequence | | | Likelihood | Significance |
|----------|----------|--------|--------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|----------------|
| Severity | Duration | Extend | Oorisequence | Probability | Frequency | LIKCIIIIOOG | Olgillilicance |
| 2 | 5 | 1 | 2.6 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 10.4 |

Potential damage to cultural or heritage aspects

Rating: Low

| | | | Consequence | | | Likelihood | Significance |
|----------|----------|--------|--------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|---------------|
| Severity | Duration | Extend | Oorisequence | Probability | Frequency | LIKCIIIIOOG | Oigililicance |
| 3 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |

Contamination of area with hydrocarbons or hazardous waste materials

Rating: Medium

| | | | Consequence | | | Likelihood | Significance |
|----------|----------|--------|-------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|--------------|
| Severity | Duration | Extend | Consequence | Probability | Frequency | LIKEIIIIOOU | Significance |
| 3 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3.5 | 10.5 |

Crushing

Dust nuisance due to the crushing activities

Rating: Medium - High

| | | | Consequence | | | Likelihood | Significance |
|----------|----------|--------|-------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|--------------|
| Severity | Duration | Extend | Consequence | Probability | Frequency | LIKCIIIIOOG | Olgillicance |
| 3 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 16 |

Noise nuisance generated by the crushing activities

Rating: Medium

| | | | Consequence | | | Likelihood | Significance |
|----------|----------|--------|-------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|--------------|
| Severity | Duration | Extend | Consequence | Probability | Frequency | LIKGIIIIOOG | Significance |
| 3 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 16 |

Contamination of area with hydrocarbons or hazardous waste materials

Rating: Medium

| | | | Consequence | | | Likelihood | Significance |
|----------|----------|--------|-------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|--------------|
| Severity | Duration | Extend | Consequence | Probability | Frequency | LIKEIIIIOOU | Oigillicance |
| 3 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3.5 | 10.5 |

Stockpiling and Transporting

Visual intrusion associated with stockpiled material and vehicles transporting the material

Rating: Medium

| | | | Consequence | | | Likelihood | Significance |
|----------|----------|--------|--------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|--------------|
| Severity | Duration | Extend | Oorisequence | Probability | Frequency | LIKCIIIIOOG | Olgillicance |
| 2 | 5 | 1 | 2.6 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 10.4 |

Weed and invader plant infestation of the area due to the disturbance of the soil

Rating: Low – Medium

| | | | Consequence | | | Likelihood | Significance |
|----------|----------|--------|-------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|--------------|
| Severity | Duration | Extend | Consequence | Probability | Frequency | LIKEIIIIOOU | Significance |
| 2 | 5 | 1 | 2.6 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 7.8 |

Dust nuisance from stockpiled material and vehicles transporting the material

Rating: Medium - High

| | | | Consequence | | | Likelihood | Significance |
|----------|----------|--------|-------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|--------------|
| Severity | Duration | Extend | Consequence | Probability | Frequency | Likeliilood | Oigillicance |
| 3 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 16 |

Degradation of access roads

Rating: Low - Medium

| | | | Consequence | | | Likelihood | Significance |
|----------|----------|--------|-------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|--------------|
| Severity | Duration | Extend | Consequence | Probability | Frequency | LIKEIIIIOOU | Significance |
| 2 | 5 | 1 | 2.6 | 3 | 2 | 2.5 | 6.5 |

Noise nuisance caused by vehicles

Rating: Low - Medium

| | | | Consequence | | | Likelihood | Significance |
|----------|----------|--------|-------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|--------------|
| Severity | Duration | Extend | Consequence | Probability | Frequency | Likeliilood | Oigillicance |
| 2 | 5 | 1 | 2.6 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 7.8 |

Contamination of area with hydrocarbons or hazardous waste materials

Rating: Medium

| | | | Consequence | | | Likelihood | Significance |
|----------|----------|--------|-------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|--------------|
| Severity | Duration | Extend | Consequence | Probability | Frequency | LIKCIIIIOOG | Oigillicance |
| 3 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3.5 | 10.5 |

Sloping and Landscaping during rehabilitation of the site

Soil erosion

Rating: Low

| | | | Consequence | | | Likelihood | Significance |
|----------|----------|--------|--------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|--------------|
| Severity | Duration | Extend | Oorisequence | Probability | Frequency | LIKCIIIIOOd | Olgillicance |
| 2 | 1 | 1 | 1.3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2.6 |

Health and safety risk posed by un-sloped areas

Rating: Low – Medium

| | | | Consequence | | | Likelihood | Significance |
|----------|----------|--------|-------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|--------------|
| Severity | Duration | Extend | Consequence | Probability | Frequency | Likeliilood | Significance |
| 4 | 5 | 1 | 3.3 | 4 | 1 | 2.5 | 8.3 |

Dust nuisance caused during sloping and landscaping activities

Rating: Low – Medium

| | | | Consequence | | | Likelihood | Significance |
|----------|----------|--------|-------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|--------------|
| Severity | Duration | Extend | Consequence | Probability | Frequency | LIKEIIIIOOU | Significance |
| 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2.5 | 7.5 |

Noise nuisance caused by machinery

Rating: Low

| | | | Consequence | | | Likelihood | Significance |
|----------|----------|--------|-------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|---------------|
| Severity | Duration | Extend | Consequence | Probability | Frequency | LIKEIIIIOOU | Oigililicance |
| 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 4 |

Contamination of area with hydrocarbons or hazardous waste materials

Rating: Low

| | | | Consequence | | | Likelihood | Significance |
|----------|----------|--------|-------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|--------------|
| Severity | Duration | Extend | Consequence | Probability | Frequency | LIKEIIIIOOU | Significance |
| 3 | 1 | 1 | 1.6 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3.2 |

Replacing the Topsoil and Re-Vegetation of the disturbed area

Loss of reinstated topsoil due to the absence of vegetation

Rating: Low – Medium

| | | | Consequence | | | Likelihood | Significance |
|----------|----------|--------|-------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|--------------|
| Severity | Duration | Extend | Consequence | Probability | Frequency | Likeiiiiood | Significance |
| 3 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2.5 | 7.5 |

Infestation of the area by weed and invader plants

Rating: Low - Medium

| | | | Consequence | | | Likelihood | Significance |
|----------|----------|--------|-------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|--------------|
| Severity | Duration | Extend | | Probability | Frequency | LIKCIIIIOOU | Significance |
| 3 | 4 | 1 | 2.6 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 7.8 |

Leisure Residential Infrastructure

Nuisance due to liberation of dust from the mining area

Rating: Low – Medium

| | | | Consequence | | | Likelihood | Significance |
|----------|----------|--------|-------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|--------------|
| Severity | Duration | Extend | Consequence | Probability | Frequency | Likeliilood | Olgimicance |
| 2 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 9 |

Noise nuisance caused by blasting activities

Rating: Low – Medium

| | | | Consequence | | | Likelihood | Significance |
|----------|----------|--------|--------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|--------------|
| Severity | Duration | Extend | Oorisequence | Probability | Frequency | LIKCIIIIOOU | Olgimicance |
| 1 | 5 | 2 | 2.6 | 3 | 2 | 2.5 | 6.5 |

Roads

The use of the road by heavy machinery and vehicles may cause deterioration

Rating: Low – Medium

| | | | Consequence | | | Likelihood | Significance |
|----------|----------|--------|--------------|-------------|-----------|-------------|--------------|
| Severity | Duration | Extend | Oorisequence | Probability | Frequency | LIKCIIIIOOG | Olgimicance |
| 2 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2.5 | 7.5 |

Socio -economic impacts

Work opportunities to forty seven workers (Positive Impact)

Rating: High Positive Impact

Skills development plan for workers (Positive Impact)

Rating: High Positive Impact

Local economic development plan (Positive Impact)

Rating: High Positive Impact

2. ENVIRONMENT IMPACT ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

The following methodology was used in the 2015 impact assessment:

DEFINITIONS AND CONCEPTS

Environmental significance

The concept of significance is at the core of impact identification, evaluation, and decision-making. The concept remains largely undefined and there is no international consensus on a single definition. The following common elements are recognised from the various interpretations:

- Θ Environmental significance is a value judgement.
- ⊙ The degree of environmental significance depends on the nature of the impact.
- Θ The importance is rated in terms of both biophysical and socio-economic values.
- Determining significance involves the amount of change to the environment perceived to be acceptable to affected communities.

Significance can be differentiated into impact magnitude and impact significance. Impact magnitude is the measurable change (i.e. intensity, duration, and likelihood). Impact significance is the value placed on the change by different affected parties (i.e. level of acceptability) (DEAT (2002) Impact Significance, Integrated Environmental Management, Information Series 5).

The concept of risk has two dimensions, namely the consequence of an event or set of circumstances, and the likelihood of particular consequences being realised (Environment Australia (1999) Environmental Risk Management).

Impact

The positive or negative effects on human well-being and / or the environment.

Consequence

The intermediate or outcome of an event or situation OR it is the result, on the environment, of an event.

Likelihood

A qualitative term covering both probability and frequency.

Frequency

The number of occurrences of a defined event in each time or rate.

Probability

The likelihood of a specific outcome measured by the ratio of a specific outcome to the total number of possible outcomes.

Environment

Surroundings in which an organisation operates, including air, water, land, natural resources, flora, fauna, humans, and their interrelation (ISO 14004, 1996).

Methodology that will be used

The environmental significance assessment methodology is based on the following determination:

Environmental Significance = Overall Consequence X Overall Likelihood

Determination of Overall Consequence

Consequence analysis is a mixture of quantitative and qualitative information, and the outcome can be positive or negative. Several factors can be used to determine consequence. For the purpose of determining the environmental significance in terms of consequence, the following factors were chosen: **Severity/Intensity, Duration and Extent/Spatial Scale**. Each factor is assigned a rating of 1 to 5, as described in the tables below.

Determination of Severity / Intensity

Severity relates to the nature of the event, aspect or impact to the environment and describes how severe the aspects impact on the biophysical and socio-economic environment. The table below will be used to obtain an overall rating for severity, taking into consideration the various criteria.

Table 1: Table to be used to obtain an overall rating of severity, taking into consideration the various criteria.

| Type of | | | Rating | | |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------|---------------|------------------|----------------|
| criteria | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Quantitative | 0-20% | 21-40% | 41-60% | 61-80% | 81-100% |
| Qualitative | Insignificant / | Small / | Significant/ | Great/ Very | Disastrous |
| | Non-harmful | Potentially | Harmful | harmful | Extremely |
| | | harmful | | | harmful |
| Social/ | Acceptable / | Slightly | Intolerable/ | Unacceptable / | Totally |
| Community | I&AP satisfied | tolerable / | Sporadic | Widespread | unacceptable / |
| response | | Possible | complaints | complaints | Possible legal |
| | | objections | | | action |
| Irreversibility | Very low cost to | Low cost to | Substantial | High cost to | Prohibitive |
| | mitigate/ | mitigate | cost to | mitigate | cost to |
| | High potential | | mitigate/ | | mitigate/ |
| | to mitigate | | Potential to | | Little or no |
| | impacts to level | | mitigate | | mechanism to |
| | of | | impacts/ | | mitigate |
| | insignificance/ | | Potential to | | impact |
| | Easily | | reverse | | Irreversible |
| | reversible | | impact | | |
| Biophysical | Insignificant | Moderate | Significant | Very | Disastrous |
| (Air quality, | change / | change / | change / | significant | change / |
| water quantity | deterioration or | deterioration | deterioration | change / | deterioration |
| and quality, | disturbance | or | or | deterioration or | or disturbance |
| waste | | disturbance | disturbance | disturbance | |
| production, | | | | | |
| fauna, and | | | | | |
| flora) | | | | | |

Determination of Duration

Duration refers to the amount of time that the environment will be affected by the event, risk or impact, if no intervention e.g. remedial action takes place.

Table 2: Criteria for the rating of duration.

| Rating | Description |
|--------|-------------------------------------|
| 1 | Up to ONE MONTH |
| 2 | ONE MONTH to THREE MONTHS (QUARTER) |
| 3 | THREE MONTHS to ONE YEAR |
| 4 | ONE to TEN YEARS |
| 5 | Beyond TEN YEARS |

Determination of Extent/Spatial Scale

Extent or spatial scale is the area affected by the event, aspect, or impact.

Table 3: Criteria for the rating of extent / spatial scale.

| Rating | Description |
|--------|---------------------------------------------|
| 1 | Immediate, fully contained area |
| 2 | Surrounding area |
| 3 | Within Business Unit area of responsibility |
| 4 | Within the farm/neighbouring farm area |
| 5 | Regional, National, International |

Determination of Overall Consequence

Overall consequence is determined by adding the factors determined above and summarized below and then dividing the sum by 3.

Table 4: Example of calculating overall consequence.

| Consequence | Rating |
|-------------------------|-----------|
| Severity | Example 4 |
| Duration | Example 2 |
| Extent | Example 4 |
| SUBTOTAL | 10 |
| TOTAL CONSEQUENCE: | 3.3 |
| (Subtotal divided by 3) | 3.3 |

Determination of Likelihood:

The determination of likelihood is a combination of Frequency and Probability. Each factor is assigned a rating of 1 to 5, as described below and in tables 6 and 7.

Determination of Frequency

Frequency refers to how often the specific activity, related to the event, aspect or impact, is undertaken.

Table 5: Criteria for the rating of frequency.

| Rating | Description |
|--------|-------------------------------------------|
| 1 | Once a year or once/more during operation |
| 2 | Once/more in 6 Months |
| 3 | Once/more a Month |
| 4 | Once/more a Week |
| 5 | Daily |

Determination of Probability

Probability refers to how often the activity or aspect has an impact on the environment.

Table 6: Criteria for the rating of probability.

| Rating | Description |
|--------|---------------------------------------|
| 1 | Almost never / almost impossible |
| 2 | Very seldom / highly unlikely |
| 3 | Infrequent / unlikely / seldom |
| 4 | Often / regularly / likely / possible |
| 5 | Daily / highly likely / definitely |

Overall Likelihood

Overall likelihood is calculated by adding the factors determined above and summarised below and then dividing the sum by 2.

Table 7: Example of calculating overall likelihood.

| Consequence | Rating | | | | |
|-------------------------|-----------|--|--|--|--|
| Frequency | Example 4 | | | | |
| Probability | Example 2 | | | | |
| SUBTOTAL | 6 | | | | |
| TOTAL LIKELIHOOD | 3 | | | | |
| (Subtotal divided by 2) | 3 | | | | |

Determination of Overall Environmental Significance:

The multiplication of overall consequence with overall likelihood will provide the environmental significance, which is a number that will then fall into a range of **LOW**, **LOW-MEDIUM**, **MEDIUM**, **MEDIUM-HIGH** or **HIGH**, as shown in the table below.

Table 8: Determination of overall environmental significance.

| Significance or Risk | Low | Low- Medium | Medium | Medium-High | High |
|------------------------------------------------|---------|----------------|-----------|-------------|---------|
| Overall Consequence X Overall Likelihood | 1 – 4.9 | 5 – 9.9 | 10 – 14.9 | 15 – 19.9 | 20 – 25 |

Qualitative description or magnitude of Environmental Significance

This description is qualitative and is an indication of the nature or magnitude of the Environmental Significance. It also guides the prioritisations and decision making process associated with this event, aspect, or impact.

Table 9: Description of environmental significance and related action required.

| Significance | Low | Low-Medium | Medium | Medium-High | High |
|--------------|------------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|
| Impact | Impact is of | Impact is of | Impact is real, | Impact is real | Impact is of the |
| Magnitude | very low | low order and | and | and | highest order |
| | order and | therefore | potentially | substantial in | possible. |
| | therefore | likely to have | substantial in | relation to | Unacceptable. |
| | likely to have | little real | relation to | other impacts. | Fatal flaw. |
| | very little real | effect. | other | Pose a risk to | |
| | effect. | Acceptable. | impacts. Can | the company. | |
| | Acceptable. | | pose a risk to | Unacceptable | |
| | | | company | | |
| Action | Maintain | Maintain | Implement | Improve | Implement |
| Required | current | current | monitoring. | management | significant |
| | management | management | Investigate | measures to | mitigation |
| | measures. | measures. | mitigation | reduce risk. | measures or |
| | Where | Implement | measures | | implement |
| | possible | monitoring | and improve | | alternatives. |
| | improve. | and evaluate | management | | |
| | | to determine | measures to | | |
| | | potential | reduce risk, | | |
| | | increase in | where | | |
| | | risk. | possible. | | |
| | | Where | | | |
| | | possible | | | |
| | | improve | | | |

Based on the above, the significance rating scale has been determined as follows:

High

Of the highest order possible within the bounds of impacts which could occur. In the case of negative impacts, there would be no possible mitigation and / or remedial activity to offset the impact at the spatial or time scale for which it was predicted. In the case of positive impacts, there is no real alternative to achieving the benefit.

Medium-High

Impacts of a substantial order. In the case of negative impacts, mitigation and / or remedial activity would be feasible but difficult, expensive, time-consuming or some combination of these. In the case of positive impacts, other means of achieving this benefit would be feasible, but these would be more difficult, expensive, time-consuming or some combination of these.

Medium

Impact would be real but not substantial within the bounds of those, which could occur. In the case of negative impacts, mitigation and / or remedial activity would be both feasible and fairly easily possible, In case of positive impacts; other means of achieving these benefits would be about equal in time, cost and effort.

Low-Medium

Impact would be of a low order and with little real effect. In the case of negative impacts, mitigation and / or remedial activity would be either easily achieved of little would be required, or both. In case of positive impacts alternative means for achieving this benefit would likely be easier, cheaper, more effective, less time-consuming, or some combination of these.

Low

Impact would be negligible. In the case of negative impacts, almost no mitigation and or remedial activity would be needed, and any minor steps, which might be needed, would be easy, cheap and simple. In the case of positive impacts, alternative means would almost all likely be better, in one or a number of ways, than this means of achieving the benefit.

Insignificant

There would be a no impact at all – not even a very low impact on the system or any of its parts.

-END-