

A.	Impact Rating: Construction	Pre-	NO-GO ALTERNATIVE										Short Description of Mitigation Measures	
			WITHOUT MITIGATION(N/A)					WITH MITIGATION(N/A)						
No.	ASPECT	IMPACT	Probability	Extent	Duration	Magnitude	Receiving Environment	Without Mitigation Score (Baseline)	Probability	Extent	Duration	Magnitude	Receiving Environment	With Mitigation Score (Impact assessment)
1	Botanical	Potential loss of Ceres Shale Renosterveld	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	The implementation of the no-go option would mean the status quo of the environment will remain the same. No mitigation measures recommended.
		Loss of Ecological Support Areas (ESA)	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	The implementation of the no-go option would mean the status quo of the environment will remain the same. No mitigation measures recommended.
		Soil contamination from vehicles on site	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	The implementation of the no-go option would mean the status quo of the environment will remain the same. No mitigation measures recommended.
2	Water	Loss of riparian habitat	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	The implementation of the no-go option would mean the status quo of the environment will remain the same. No mitigation measures recommended.
		Alteration of hydrology/ flow of streams surrounding dam due to increase of the dam wall	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	The implementation of the no-go option would mean the status quo of the environment will remain the same. No mitigation measures recommended.
3	Heritage	Loss of archaeological/ palaeological resources	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	The implementation of the no-go option would mean the status quo of the environment will remain the same. No mitigation measures recommended.
4	Dust	Potential dust from ground clearing and topsoil removal	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	The implementation of the no-go option would mean the status quo of the environment will remain the same. No mitigation measures recommended.
5	Visual		-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	The implementation of the no-go option would mean the status quo of the environment will remain the same. No mitigation measures recommended.
6	Noise		-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	The implementation of the no-go option would mean the status quo of the environment will remain the same. No mitigation measures recommended.

B.	Impact Rating: Construction Phase	NO-GO ALTERNATIVE	WITHOUT MITIGATION(N/A)						WITH MITIGATION(N/A)						Short Description of Mitigation Measures
			Probability	Extent	Duration	Magnitude	Receiving Environment	Without Mitigation Score (Baseline)	Probability	Extent	Duration	Magnitude	Receiving Environment	With Mitigation Score (Impact assessment)	
No.	ASPECT	IMPACT													
1	Botanical	Potential loss of Ceres Shale Renosterveld	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	The implementation of the no-go option would mean the status quo of the environment will remain the same. No mitigation measures recommended.
		Loss Ecological Support Areas	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	The implementation of the no-go option would mean the status quo of the environment will remain the same. No mitigation measures recommended.
		Soil contamination from vehicles/ concrete/ portable toilets	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	The implementation of the no-go option would mean the status quo of the environment will remain the same. No mitigation measures recommended.
2	Water	Loss of riparian habitat during construction of the dam wall & spillway	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	The implementation of the no-go option would mean the status quo of the environment will remain the same. No mitigation measures recommended.
		Alteration of hydrology/ flow of the stream downstream of the dam wall during construction of the dam wall & spillway	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	The implementation of the no-go option would mean the status quo of the environment will remain the same. No mitigation measures recommended.
3	Heritage	Loss of archaeological/ palaeological resources	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	The implementation of the no-go option would mean the status quo of the environment will remain the same. No mitigation measures recommended.
4	Dust	Potential dust from construction activities	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	The implementation of the no-go option would mean the status quo of the environment will remain the same. No mitigation measures recommended.
5	Visual	Potential visual impact from construction	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	The implementation of the no-go option would mean the status quo of the environment will remain the same. No mitigation measures recommended.

6	Noise	Potential noise from construction	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-						The implementation of the no-go option would mean the status quo of the environment will remain the same. No mitigation measures recommended.
---	-------	-----------------------------------	----	----	----	----	----	----	---	--	--	--	--	--	---

C.	Impact Rating: Operational Phase	NO-GO ALTERNATIVE	WITHOUT MITIGATION(N/A)					WITH MITIGATION(N/A)					Short Description of Mitigation Measures	
			Probability	Extent	Duration	Magnitude	Receiving Environment	Without Mitigation Score (Baseline)	Probability	Extent	Duration	Magnitude		Receiving Environment
No.	ASPECT	IMPACT												
1	Water	Alteration of hydrological regime flow of stream downstream of the dam wall and spillway Erosion and sedimentation	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	The implementation of the no-go option would mean the status quo of the environment will remain the same. No mitigation measures recommended.
2	Dust	Potential dust form operations	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	The implementation of the no-go option would mean the status quo of the environment will remain the same. No mitigation measures recommended.
3	Visual	Potential visual impact form operations	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	The implementation of the no-go option would mean the status quo of the environment will remain the same. No mitigation measures recommended.
4	Noise	Potential noise impact from operations	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	The implementation of the no-go option would mean the status quo of the environment will remain the same. No mitigation measures recommended.

D.	Impact Rating: Rehabilitation Phase	NO-GO ALTERNATIVE	WITHOUT MITIGATION(N/A)					WITH MITIGATION(N/A)					Short Description of Mitigation Measures	
			Probability	Extent	Duration	Magnitude	Receiving Environment	Without Mitigation Score (Baseline)	Probability	Extent	Duration	Magnitude		Receiving Environment
No.	ASPECT	IMPACT												
1	Botanical	Soil contamination from vehicles on site	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1			The implementation of the no-go option would mean the status quo of the environment will remain the same. No mitigation measures recommended.
2	Water	Loss of riparian habitat	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1			The implementation of the no-go option would mean the status quo of the environment will remain the same. No mitigation measures recommended.
		Alternation of hydrology of surrounding streams	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1			The implementation of the no-go option would mean the status quo of the environment will remain the same. No mitigation measures recommended.
3	Dust	Dust emissions during rehabilitation	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1			The implementation of the no-go option would mean the status quo of the environment will remain the same. No mitigation measures recommended.
4	Visual	Potential visual impact from rehabilitation	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1			The implementation of the no-go option would mean the status quo of the environment will remain the same. No mitigation measures recommended.
5	Noise	Potential noise from rehabilitation	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1			The implementation of the no-go option would mean the status quo of the environment will remain the same. No mitigation measures recommended.